

VLADIMIR E. KHOJABEKYAN

REGULARITIES OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC
PROCESSES IN ARMENIA

IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES
AND AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE 21st
CENTURY

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԱԶԳԱՅԻՆ ԱԿԱԴԵՄԻԱ

Մ.ՔՈԹԱՆՅԱՆԻ ԱՆՎԱՆ
ՏՆՏԵՍԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԻՆՍՏԻՏՈՒՏ

Վ.Ե.ԽՈՋԱՐԵԿՅԱՆ

ԺՈՂՈՎՐԴԱԳՐԱԿԱՆ ԳՈՐԾԸՆԹԱՅՆԵՐԻ
ՕՐԻՆԱԶԱՓՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԸ
ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆՈՒՄ

XIX-XX ԴԱՐԵՐՈՒՄ
XXI ԴԱՐԻ ՇԵՄԻՆ

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ 2004

НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК
РЕСПУБЛИКИ АРМЕНИЯ
ИНСТИТУТ ЭКОНОМИКИ ИМЕНИ
М.КОТАНЯНА

В.Е.ХОДЖАБЕКЯН

**ЗАКОНОМЕРНОСТИ
ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКИХ
ПРОЦЕССОВ В АРМЕНИИ**

**В XIX – XX ВВ.
НА ПОРОГЕ XXI ВЕКА**

ЕРЕВАН 2004

32(47.925)
K-42

W70

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

Institute of Economics after M. Kotanyan

VLADIMIR E. KHOJABEKYAN

**REGULARITIES OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC
PROCESSES IN ARMENIA**

**IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES
AND AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE 21st
CENTURY**

8747

EREVAN 2004

Published with the resolution of Scientific Council
of the Institute of Economics after M. Kotanyan of NAS RA

This monograph is devoted to bringing to light the characteristic features of the growth and movements of the population of Armenia in the 19th and 20th centuries and their tendencies for the 21st century. Great emphasis is placed on the problems of demographic processes in Armenia.

Special attention is paid to the exposure of peculiarities in the reproduction and migration of the population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia in the 19th and the 20th centuries as well as at the beginning of the 21st century.

The new economic methods, unsupported by a research basis, have had a negative impact on the various factors that play a certain role in the natural growth of the population-and they will continue do so. In the future, they will also influence the direction and intensity of external and internal migrations. This monograph is rich with fundamental solutions aimed at regulating demographic situation, including migration and softening its social impact.

Translation by E.L.Danielyan

ISBN 5-8080 0569-8

© The Press of NAS RA, 2004



The warmest thanks to my loving daughters Armine, Narine, Gohar, and sons Armen and Davit Khojabekyan. In gratitude for moral support I devote the book to my grandchildren Karlen Stepanyan, Liza and Haik Ghazaryan, Anna and Boris Avetisyan, and Vladimir Khojabekyan.

With best wishes
Author

DEDICATION TO MY PARENTS

With deepest love to my parents - great educator EGHISHE father, constant advisor mother GRAP, uncle BENIAMIN, to the sacred memory of my untimely deceased four brothers. Of seven children only three of us survived - my sister MELANIA, my brother HARBİK and me.

My dear parents, I am very much obliged to you, but excuse me that I was unable to pay back filial debt as a token of love and duty towards you. Under each word and line of my writing is hidden my cherished love, the difficult and long way of its creation seemed easy to me, because I fulfilled your precept to serve people honestly, and I was inspired with aspiration for repayment with dignity parental sufferings. Your love lent wings to me at the moments of writing; hard days and nights seemed to flow and every word was born under the sweet melodies of unparalleled parental love.

It is astonishing, very astonishing, the might of parental love...

During the years of World War I you, together with hundreds of thousands of persecuted refugees, with many great sacrifices, barely could save yourselves of the Turkish yataghan. You escaped the Genocide by a miracle.

In 1915 you moved from the village Yuzveran of Lower Basen to Sarighamish. But following the advancement of the Russian troops you again returned to your native village.

In 1918 you finally left the country. A part of the village's youth (Your relatives Tigran and Hambar Efendi, who was a member of the court in Erzurum), which was able to carry arms, in 1915 were jailed and decapitated by Turks. The rest, including You, my father,

were opposing the Turkish attacks, enabling the population to leave the village. In the February freezing winter of 1918 you anchored with great difficulty in "agitated" Gyumri. Gifted with erudition and patriotism, You, during that period enlisted for the voluntary regiments of General Andranik. In order to join his regiments you needed a horse and fire-arms and for getting that my mother, on her own free will, conferred as a gift the "jewelry" of her poor dowry. My mother was always so clever and reasonable. She lived for 92 years surprising everyone with her reasonable advice, conscientiousness, well-bred, virtuous and modest behavior. She was forgiving, just a model of kindness. Starvation, epidemic and death were chasing in Gyumri. My one-year old elder brother, grandfathers and grandmothers, uncles and aunts and other relatives died in Gyumri. My mother was in my 12-13 years old uncle Benjamin's charge. He carried off from the railway station whatever he could for their survival. At that age sometimes he worked as a porter. After wandering for many years in various parts of Armenia (Vanadzor, Stepanavan, Dilijan, the Kamo region on the shore of Lake Sevan) in 1922 with many other migrants you became permanent residents of the village Khatchaghbiur in the district of Vardenis. My dear father, together with many other jobs, you worked as a foreman of main roads in the village. The winding uneven path running along the river-bank from the village to the district centre was too much ill-provided. On the eve of the Great Patriotic War you constructed a straight and even high road of about 2 km length, far away from the river. It will exist forever. The villagers then called it "The road of Eghishe".

We must also note that my uncle served in the army, got self-education and from a worker advanced and became a leading chief in the Kirovakan (Vanadzor) chemical industrial complex. His photo was put in the newspaper "Pravda." During the years of the Great Patriotic War he was called up to the front and was twice wounded badly. After recovery Benjamin Khojabekitch held his post again in his industrial complex. He was gifted with humor.

Thus since 1922 your wandering life had finished.

But alas... Decades later, the fate of a wanderer with staff fell to the lot of the Armenian rising generation - your grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Your grateful son V.E.Khojabekyan

"...I can't understand, why must comrade Khojabekyan lecture at the Institute? He is a prominent specialist in the field of demography and statistics, isn't he? About economic questions might lecture a person who has enough time. It's a pity that Khojabekyan is busy with that."

**Victor Hambardzumyan
President of the National Academy
of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia**

THE NATIONAL IMAGE - A LANDMARK OF THE SCIENTIST'S INTELLECTUAL LIFE

The full member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, doctor of economy, professor, the outstanding economist-scholar Vladimir Eghishi Khojabekyan is well-known in Armenia, the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States and abroad. He passed a fruitful course of life, in which for about five decades he has worked as a specialist-economist and prepares specialists in the field of economics.

V.E.Khojabekyan was born on March 2, 1929 in the village of Khatchaghbiur of the district of Vardenis of the Republic of Armenia. He was educated primarily in his birth-place and in 1946 he finished secondary school in Vardenis. In 1954 he graduated from the faculty of economics at the Erevan State University with honours. A year later he entered a post-graduate school in Erevan State University and in 1959 graduated it as an economist. In 1963 he defended the theses for the Masters of economics, in 1975 the Doctor of economics. In 1963 he attained the degree of leading research worker, in 1977 - the degree of professor. In 1982 he was elected Corresponding Member of NAS RA, in 1994 - a Full Member of NAS RA. In 1999 he was elected to be a Full Member of the International Academy of the Problems of National Security.

In 1946-1949 V. Khojabekyan worked at the secondary school of the village of Khachaghbiur. After graduating University until 1960 he worked in the Armenian State Publishing House

(*Haypethrat*). Since 1960 he has continually worked in the Institute of Economics of NAS RA. In 1960 he was elected an acting senior research worker, in 1963 was appointed to be the scientific secretary of the Institute. From 1967 to the present he has periodically been elected as the head of the department of demographics and labour resources, the deputy-director (since 1983) and director (since 1999) of the Institute.

Presidium of NAS of RA, evaluating the merits of V. Khojabekyan, stated: "It is difficult to overestimate his contribution to the development of the Armenian economic thought, his restless, insistent aspiration for putting into service to the people and Motherland his fundamental researches, as a scholar and a citizen."

V. Khojabekyan has made a great contribution to the development of economics. He is the author of more than 470 published and unpublished scientific works, including 15 monographs, 340 published articles and scientific reports, as well as about 150 handwritten archive materials, including scientific works and the correspondence with the Central Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the former GDR and American and British Biographical Institutes.

Scientific works of V. Khojabekyan have been published in Armenian, Russian, German and other languages in Erevan, Moscow, Kiev, Berlin, New York, Paris, Athens, Delhi, Tehran, Vienna, Tbilisi and elsewhere, bringing him an estimable fame in several foreign countries. Since the 1970s until now he has made scientific speeches in international conferences held in Erevan, Moscow, Berlin, Leningrad (St.Petersburg), Sidney, Kiev, Budapest, Athens, Delhi, Tehran, Vienna, Leipzig, Dresden, Alma-Ata, Tbilisi, Tashkend, Ashkhabad, Orenburg and other places, which have been published in international and local periodicals.

The first works of V. Khojabekyan (since the end of the 1950s) were devoted to the theoretical questions of labour productivity, the exposure and estimation of the reserves of inter-production, their classification, revelation and exploitation of the reserves of industrial enterprises.

Theoretical economic generalizations are combined with the scientific analysis of factual materials in his works. These were the first publications devoted to this problem, so they were honored by the high assessment of the scientific press. His well-grounded results have also been applied in production.

Since the mid-1960s, the questions of the reproduction of the Armenia's population and its labour resources have become the basic problems of economics.

On the occasion of the 70th jubilee of V. Khojabekyan the Presidium of NAS of RA stated in its message: "Really, it is difficult to overestimate your merits in the development of theoretical and practical economics. Graduating from the faculty of economics at Erevan State University, you completely devoted yourself to the research of scientific problems in the field. This has been very important in our Republic. You are the author of fundamental works, which have a modern spirit, scientific novelty, the spirit of the prediction of future, and conclusions based on fundamental solutions... The scientific community of our country records with great satisfaction your tremendous scientific merits in the sphere of research on the problems of the reproduction of the Armenia's population and labour resources, revelation of their tendencies in a long perspective, generalization of employment regularities, the formation of the present labour market at the present, centralized urbanization, demographic and socio-economic prediction, the demographic policy in the disaster zone (the Spitak earthquake zone) and Artsakh.

You surprise all of us not only by productivity of your scientific thought, but we admire the degree of your scientific organization and unceasing pedagogic zeal. Today an army of young scholars look at you with a gratitude. For them you have been a real teacher, the best leader and they are now very active in science, as well as in different spheres of economic life of the Republic of Armenia."

V. Khojabekyan projected the demographic picture of the Armenia's population for different stages in the long-range outlook

¹ "Gututyan", the newspaper of NAS of RA, March 8-5, 1999, N5, p.1.

on the basis of exposure and assessment of directions of the manifestation of the development of demographic regularities, tendencies and the role of the factors of the population increase. They include the periods of 1966-1985, 1970-2000, 1979-2016, as well as from 2000 to 2050-2060.

In 1968 under the scientific leadership of V. Khojabekyan and with his direct participation a three-volume book, titled "Broadened Reproduction of Population and the Use of Labour Resources in 1966-1985 in the Armenian SSR," was published in Moscow. It had both theoretical significance and practical importance. For the first time in long-term outlook an accurate scientific prediction of the reproduction of the population and the substantiation of the ways of formation and preparation of labour resources of the Republic was made. Additionally, an accurate five year prediction was made for elaboration of corresponding methods and the norms of optimal distribution of labour resources and the make up of the balance of labour resources. With high regard for the work, Presidium of the NAS of RA in 1969 qualified it as a research work of "a great theoretical interest and important applied significance." It is noteworthy. Presidium decided "... to present the work to *State Planning Committee* of the Armenian SSR, recommending to use it in the planning of the republican economy in prospect."²

V. Khojabekyan in his further monographs generalized the past experience and the results of social and economic development of the republic's population with a long view of the future. He also undertook an analysis of modern problems and additional works of wide range. Particularly, in the 1960-1970s V. Khojabekyan generalized about two important complementary and supplementary spheres in a voluminous two-volume monograph. One was a research work which included modern times, another - covered a period of a century and half. The author showed great intellectual talent for solving special and unique problems.

The first book is entitled "Contemporary Problems of the Reproduction of the Population of the Armenian SSR". It is devoted

² The protocol of the meeting of the Presidium of the NAS of RA, Erevan, 1969, vol. 9 (602).

to the theoretical and practical aspects of the demographics in the period until 2000. Thorough research in this text is provided concerning the means of reproduction of the labour resources and the rise of productivity of their exploitation, the problems of socio-economic development of the Republic of Armenia and the improvement of the branch and inter-branch structure of the national economy in long perspective. Also covered are the definition of the limits of the spheres of employment of social production and non-social labour of the regional economy, according to the requirements of the national economy.

V. Khojabekyan's scientific conclusions and suggestions provided the state planning organizations with the directions of the development of both the demography and national economy.

V. Khojabekyan also scrupulously studies the problems of demographic policy. Since the 1960s in his publications he considered this as an essential part of the socio-economic policy to be realized in the country. There are many new questions of the demographic policy, projects, proposals and solutions explored in his republican and international publications. It is worthy to note that he was one the first scholars in the former USSR, who made a proposal with scientific grounding about the one-year and then two-year physiological holiday with pay for women³.

In his next monograph "The Population of Armenia and Their Employment (1828-1978)", for the first time in the historic-economic literature he analyzed the peculiarities of the reproduction of Armenia's population, the changes in the character of employment, the picture of its on the socio-economic historic development during 150 years and the consolidation of the population in Soviet Armenia. Consideration of these issues was given within the general background of exposure of the historic significance of Eastern Armenia's forming a part of the Russian Empire.

Thus his conclusions, as the result of the scientist's long intellectual work, have been based on a fundamental research basis.

³ "Methodological Problems of the Demographic Studies in the Socialist Society", Kiev, 1973, p.176-177.

In the 1980s V.Khojabekyan undertook a large-scale and substantially unique research work concerning the forecast of the perspective numbers of the urban and rural populations (altogether 158 inhabited localities) of the republic between 1979 and 2016, which were grouped according to administrative and economic regions, single towns, cities and villages. Forecasting the population, for the first time the republican average was summed up on the basis of concrete additives from the point of view of the urban and rural populations. Taking the longer perspective, the population was predicted for each year according to gender, age, ability to work, legal work capacity age, retirement and many other factors. Such research is the first of its kind. The population was forecasted according to the age, from 0 to 100 years old. The annual births, deaths, the per capita births by the age group of women from the age of 15 to 49, mechanical movements of population were predicted.

In 1987 Presidium of the NAS of RA at its special meeting appreciated and expressed its satisfaction regarding "the high level of theoretical, scientific, ideological and national-economic significance" of this work⁴.

The scope of survey of the settling of population and urban centralization is rather wide. It is significant that materials of sociological character (selective and mass questionnaire polls) were widely used in the surveys. The trends of development of little towns were grounded in such methodology. For the first time the essence of the subsidiary economy was revealed. A special attention was paid to the exposure of the resolution of different kinds of problems connected with the processes and the causes of changes in the labour force's fluidity, youth's professional orientation, in the family as well as in demography. The recommendations issuing from the research were not properly realized.

The Spitak earthquake made V.Khojabekyan look at these scientific problems in a new way, grounding the necessity of the realization of large-scale demographic policy. His monograph "The Disaster and Anxiety" is devoted to such problems. The demographic

consequences of the earthquake, its influence in the disaster area, especially at its epicenter, were demonstrated in the monograph. He propounded new scientific ideas and approaches for elaborating a policy directed at overcoming demographic consequences of the state of emergence in the disaster area, as well as suggested fundamental proposals for solution of various questions of the social character. It was not occasional that on December 16, 1988 at the general meeting of the Academy of Sciences of the RA his ideas, expressed in his speech, met approval of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the former USSR N. Rizhkov.

By the same methods, he disclosed the policy of deportation and assimilation of the Armenians in Azerbaijan and Mountainous Karabakh (Artsakh) in the monograph "Artsakh at the Moment of Test" (1991).

During decades such a policy was planned and realized in Azerbaijan on the state level. For the first time the new-found archive documents were put into circulation about anti-Armenian policy in Nakhijevan, Mountainous Karabakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) and generally in Azerbaijan from the 1920s to the present time. These included the processes of deportation and genocide of the Armenians in Sumgait, Kirovabad, Baku and other parts of Azerbaijan.

The scientific reports and publications of V. Khojabekyan about distribution, settling, employment, urgent socio-economic problems of the Armenians deported from Azerbaijan were presented to the government of the Republic of Armenia. The analysis of these problems found their application in the program elaborated in 1993 aimed at the strengthening of the inhabited localities in the border areas of the Republic of Armenia. Such relevant work V. Khojabekyan continues up to the present. The problem of alleviating the migration from the border regions and the settling of the population deported from Azerbaijan were included in his field of research work. All attempts of the Azerbaijani "scholars" to falsify the real demographic processes (since the 19th century) in Armenia were disclosed.

⁴ The protocol of the meeting of the Presidium of the NAS of RA, Erevan, 1987, vol. 6 (1992).

Unfortunately, today the trend of reduction of the population due to the current circumstances may be observed. Periodically V. Khojabekyan straightforwardly sounds the alarm in his publications to stop this disastrous process with the help of economic strategies. To that end he has put forward his initiatives in order to keep the population of the Republic of Armenia at least at the present level.

The results of such investigations must remain close to the corresponding institutions by the demand and help of the state. They have to manage economy, first of all, by taking into consideration the requirements guaranteeing the population increase.

According to the forecasts of V. Khojabekyan, in 2000 the Republic's population should amount to about 3,900,000. But during the years of independence the population decreased because emigration had become a general disposition.

Analyzed in the monograph are the problems of the deportation of the Armenian population from Mountainous Karabakh, and from Azerbaijan to Armenia (1988-1991), and then, in 1991, emigration from Armenia. These negative processes took place because of the undeclared war unleashed by Azerbaijan against Armenia, during which the Armenians living in the border areas also emigrated. It was a result of the artificial economic and energetic crisis created in the Republic of Armenia. Emigration took place because of the decline of the national economy, high supply of the labour force and its low demand, unemployment, poverty, turning apartments into frozen caves, cutting down of minimum wages, as is shown in the monograph. Special attention is paid to the gender and age structure of the emigrant population, outflow of capital, brain drain and the emigration of youth.

Much attention is paid to the essence of the positive and negative expression (as a result of emigration of the population) and the negative demographic consequences.

Today, naturally, peace doesn't reign in the works of the economist. There is the memory of the past, the collision of opinions, their approval and negation, and arising parallels to the experienced events...

In 1998 was published V. Khojabekyan's "The Problems of Employment in Armenia in the Transitional Period". The author gives a critical analysis of the present collapse and the ways of getting out of it. The book contains present concerns, answers to these concerns, as well as applied advice and guidance.

The questions of employment and formation of market economy are accentuated in the works published during the last decades. However, the market has not yet been controlled by the state and has a chaotic and non-civilized character. The formation of the civilized market is here identified as the main problem.

V. Khojabekyan pays great attention to the elaboration of the regulating economic mechanisms of the labour market in Armenia in the transitional period. The main wealth of the society, labour resources must be activated through the elaboration of a reasonable employment policy. The author reveals the ways of bringing out the country of the crisis situation. For the first time, generalized conditions of the market economy's formation and the necessity of the market's regulation during the transitional period in the Republic of Armenia are analyzed as a whole. V. Khojabekyan accentuates the need for the development of labour-intensive and science-intensive industries that demand a highly qualified work force, don't pollute the environment, have low both investment production and water supply. Also highly valued are industries that promote production of a wide scope of export items that are light weight, small in size, and easy to transport.

V. Khojabekyan, together with industry, pays great attention to power engineering, agriculture and other branches of material production, the spheres of service, priorities of the development of research and educational, public health systems, in addition to the questions of economic integration with the external world and employment.

The main trends of the formation of employment in agriculture, as well as prerequisites and conditions guaranteeing real employment are revealed in the context of elaborations in the field of agrarian policy. V. Khojabekyan substantiated the necessity at the present stage for the realization of the policy of the rise of the state

protection, stimulation and competitiveness with respect to the domestic producer in agriculture. Attention was paid to the questions of the regulation of Armenia's agriculture and economic integration with the external world in order to form the basis for rational employment in agriculture. Opportunities for softening migration from villages were revealed.

It seemed that V. Khojabekyan in his numerous fundamental works published in Erevan (1991-2003) and Moscow (1993-2003) completed the research of the problems of demographics, including the use of labour resources in the country. But his valuable monograph "The Reproduction and Movements of the Population of Armenia in the 19th and 20th Centuries and at the Threshold of the 21st Century" was devoted to the exposure of the growth and movements of the population and the specific features and regularities of the ethno-demographic processes (the first publication in Armenian in 2001, the second publication in 2002). It includes the period of about three-century-old history of Transcaucasia, Eastern Armenia and the present Republic of Armenia. The work is of the Armenological character and is devoted to the compact analysis of the problems of demographic, history and national economy.

The focus of attention is, first, the questions of the growth and migration of the Armenian population in Transcaucasia - the provinces of Erevan, Gandzak (Elisavetpol), Tiflis (Tbilisi) and Baku, as well as the oblast (district) of Kars, particularly, concerning their large towns and cities. In 1886-1913 the Armenian population constituted 22,5-23 % of the whole population of Transcaucasia and about 40 % of the urban population. The character of the Armenian gainfully employed population is revealed in the monograph: the large percentage of the population in the Transcaucasian provinces, including Erevan province, was mainly occupied in agriculture, while in the provinces of Tiflis, Baku and Elisavetpol (Gandzak) they were involved in the spheres of industry and commerce.

Second, special attention is paid to the movements in the population of Erevan province, the district of Kars, the regions of Surmalu, Mountainous Karabakh, Gardmank', Zangezur, Gugark' together with Javakhh' as integral parts of Eastern Armenia.

Third, the present general picture of the population and economics - from 1920 to the present time - is thoroughly examined. One and a half million Armenians out of three million Armenian population living in Western Armenia fell a victim to the Genocide committed by Turks and the rest found shelter in Eastern Armenia or dispersed to different parts of the world. These tragic events and their demographic consequences are explained with a detailed interpretation in the monograph.

Much attention is paid in the monograph to the questions of the analysis of the high birth rate in Soviet Armenia in the prewar and postwar times, the sharp decline of the birth and death rates (characterized as the lowest in the world) in the mid-1960s and the 1970s, early marriages and later, their high rate and the growth of productivity, modulation in the decline of the birth rate and marriage at different periods. There were 75,000 births in 1960, 55,700 in 1970 and 81,200 in 1986.

V. Khojabekyan pays much attention to the problems of the reduction of the birth rate and the increase of mortality at the present time. These problems are analyzed as an immediate reflection of the changes which take place currently in the economic, social and political life of the Republic of Armenia under the influence of geopolitical circumstances.

The process of the sharp reduction of the birth rate as a consequence of the increase of the number of unmarried people, which diminishes the family member's number, and population's aging, is substantiated in the monograph.

According to the official statistics, there were 32,300 live births in the Republic of Armenia in 2002, a live birth rate of 10,1 and a death rate of 8,0 and a natural growth rate of 2.1 per 1,000 population. V.Khojabekyan criticizes such statistics and through scrupulous research work demonstrates that the birth and death rates per 1,000 population are higher in reality. The fact is that the statistics about the absolute numbers of birth and death rates are real indeed. But, since a considerable proportion of the population has emigrated, but continues to be registered in the Republic of Armenia, the numbers concerning birth and death rates per 1,000 population in

reality should be distributed among larger proportion. Meanwhile, in spite of the fact that the refugees still are registered in Armenia while living in other countries, they do not contribute to the birth rate of the republic.

Of course birth and death rates of the population have reduced not only because of social and economic reasons, when the key issue of the family became having either one, or in the best case - two children or no child at all. Still a decisive role also belongs to the emigration of the young people. It is enough to say that, according to V. Khojabekyan, until 2002 the negative balance of the emigrating population of the Republic of Armenia constituted 1,400,000 - mainly the reproducing generation.

Fourth, the demographics and the socio-economic state of the Republic of Armenia at the threshold of the third millennium are examined. A forecast is made about the main demographic trends and socio-economic progress of the Republic of Armenia, as well as the need of reduction of the tension in the increase of the population.

First, during coming 15-20 years the elaboration and use of a fundamental demographic policy will be urgently necessary.

Second, the fundamental questions of the forecast of population in 2000-2050 are of great interest. It may be concluded, that until the middle of the 21st century the birth rate will decline, though at some stages it may revive. In each case, the rate of change in the increase of population will reduce owing to the increase of mortality and in future the sharp rise of the latter's rate, though infantile mortality will reduce reaching its lowest level.

The Republic of Armenia greatly needs a socio-economic and demographic state doctrine about population migration.

V. Khojabekyan thinks that temporary emigration lays the basis of irretrievable migration. The problem of immigration is connected with positive and negative changes taking place in the Motherland, as well as the assimilation of emigrants as the result of the loss of the mother tongue, national culture, art, psychological uniqueness and other national values and formation of new values. It is the main obstacle of immigration.

The forecast of the trends of softening of emigration, the revelation of the importance of its abolition and reviving of immigration are the main aims of the monograph.

The analysis of the problems of employment also is a very important field of research for finding ways that may lead to the softening of emigration. The problems of creation of new work places are considered in the context of the important strategy of rational employment and the guaranteeing of the country's economic security. The cardinal problems of this monograph are the questions of giving organized character to the migration.

V. Khojabekyan made a forecast of possible trends of migration at the threshold of the third millennium. He has made a valuable contribution to the further development of economic thought in Armenia.

V. Khojabekyan's investigations arrive at the conclusion that at the threshold of the 21st century as an important condition of the population's emigration may be considered the coming demographic situation, the unfolding of the market economy's, the capacity of the intensive development of all branches of social production, the objective processes of scientific and technical progress, the aspiration for approaching the world standards in that sphere, technological reequipment of enterprises, their reorganization, modernization and the processes of fundamental modification of the sectoral structure of the national economy, the leveling of the territorial disproportions of the social and economic development, regulation as of the institutions of higher learning of the Republic of Armenia as well as the daily increasing number of their students.

According to V. Khojabekyan, the trends of immigration from the outer world of the population of the Republic of Armenia in the near-term outlook may be forecasted by a gradual overcoming of the continuance of the socio-economic tension, the final resolution of the Karabakh conflict in favour of the Republic of Armenia, the process of application of the emigration policy with respect to illegal Armenian emigrants in the outside world, the degree of labour and social securing of legal emigrants, any kind of manifestation of the national and social discrimination, at any time the display of the

economic crises. The amount of income of the Armenian emigrants abroad also presents itself as a very important issue.

The interests of Armenia prompt its involvement in the outside labour market and a deep inter-winning with the market on the state basis. It is a way of getting out of the tensed situation of the labour market, which will give a chance to soften unemployment, raise the value of work force, eradicate poverty, develop the middle class in order to moderate emigration and increase productivity.

The monograph is rich with projects and solutions of softening the emigration.

Thus, the population increase and its migrations, from the 19th century to the present day, and the future trends in the 21st century, are for the first time presented to the reader's attention in the whole monograph.

V. Khojabekyan is not an isolated scientist. Some other professional problems were worked out, published collective research works, edited subject collected research works in the Institute of Economics of the NAS under his direction.

His activities are characterized by cooperation with other scientific organizations. In 1963-1975 the works were coordinated by State Planning Committee of the USSR, in 1975-1985 - the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1976-1980 - the GDR Central Institute of Economics; and in 1990 - the Russian Federation Institutes of Economics, and Labour and Employment, the CIS and Baltic countries. At one time V. Khojabekyan was a member of the problematic council of "The Demographics and Labour Resources" of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Scientific cooperation with the above-mentioned institutions continues, including the joint investigation of the present emigration problems.

The results of the works based on bilateral agreement concluded in 1976-1980 between Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR and German Democratic Republic were estimated at their true worth by both Academies. In 1983 the joint work "The Fundamental Problems of Demographics and the Reproduction of Labour resources" by V. Khojabekyan and the research workers of

the GDR Central Institute of Economics was published in Russian. In 1984 it was awarded the diploma of the All-Union Competition of the Presidium of the USSR Science and Economy Department. In 1983, the portion written by V. Khojabekyan was translated into German and published in Berlin.

We must notice that the results of V. Khojabekyan's research were always in the centre of the leadership of the NAS RA. The results of his research works and conclusions, recommendations, instructions and bases were presented at the annual meetings of the NAS (1987), discussed at the meetings of the Presidium of the NAS (1969, 1987), repeatedly at the annual meetings of the departments of Social Sciences, History and Economics, later the Humanities...

For his productive research V. Khojabekyan was honoured with a diploma of the NAS RA in 1973 and 1978. Articles devoted to his merits were published in the 5th volume of the Armenian Soviet Encyclopaedia in 1979 and in the 2d volume of the Armenian Encyclopaedia in 1995 and in the Dictionary of the American Biographical Institute in 2000. In 1999 he was honoured with the title of the Man of the Year.

The circle of his scientific-organizing work is rather large. V. Khojabekyan also has made a great contribution in preparation of highly qualified economists, including researchers in the field of Economics. For nearly half a century he has taught in the higher education system. He completely shares his knowledge with his pupils. The problems of manpower development and retraining are in the centre of his attention. Many post-graduates and research workers defended their candidate theses under his guidance. The published works have text-book value in the spheres of higher education, post-higher education and additional professional readings.

Academician V. Khojabekyan created a scientific school of the demographics and labour resources of the Republic of Armenia. Today he is considered to be the founder of the economic demographics and continues to be its scientific leader.

For many years V. Khojabekyan was the Academician-Secretary's deputy and then a member of the Bureau of the Department of History and Economics of the NAS. Nowadays he is a

INTRODUCTION

member of the Bureau of the Department of the Humanities. At the same time he is the chairman of the Philosophic, economic and juridical problematic scientific councils, the Economic council of the Armenian Encyclopaedia, the scientific council of the Institute of Economics of the NAS RA, the professional council of the Erevan state economic institute on the defense of theses. V. Khojabekyan is the representative-member of the Institute of Economics of the NAS in the Armenian Encyclopaedia's scientific editorial and different magazine's editorial boards, including the international magazine "The Problems of Management of the Theory and Practice". He is the author of many up-to-date valuable published articles found in such international magazines as the above-mentioned one and the "Society and the Economics" of the Academy of Sciences of the Russian Federation, as well as in different volumes of the Armenian Encyclopaedia.

V.Khojabekyan is one of those scientists whose research works deserved attention of the leadership of the Republic of Armenia, sharing the anxiety on behalf of employment of the Republic's population. They were honoured with thanks (1997 and 1998) for his active position and practical proposals.

Just in the same way in one's time V.Khojabekyan's works were appreciated at their true value by the Central Committee of the Communist party of Armenia, the Council of ministers, the State Planning Committee, the City Committee of Erevan...

During all his active life V.Khojabekyan has been distinguished by principality, scientific conscientiousness, diligence and responsibility. He devoted all his patriotic creative activities for the welfare of the economics and the Motherland. That's why in 2003 V.Khojabekyan was decorated with the government award - Movses Khorenatsi Medal "for significant achievements in the area of science."

Academician of NAS RA V.A.Mikaelyan
Doctor of Historic sciences, professor H.N.Karapetyan,
Doctor of Economics, professor G.G.Khanikyan
Doctor of Economics, professor E.H. Ordyan

In the course of historical development mass movements or migrations always accompanied the demographic processes in Armenia and have a millennial history. On this point, from the 5th century many works were written in Armenian and foreign languages concerning the movements of population. However, for the purposes of the present work there is no need to penetrate the depths of history, otherwise it will take us too far.

Let us be content with the history of the last two centuries and the published literature during that time. So, this monograph is dictated by the necessity of presentation of the correlation of the real past picture and certain regularities, changes in the number of the population of the Republic of Armenia, as well as the movements of the population in the 21st century and the revelation of the trends in variation of the population.

The research devoted to certain parts of the problem first of all relates to the migration of the Armenians from Persia and Western Armenia, as well as to the questions of the number, structure, distribution and movements of the population in Eastern Armenia after joining to Russia.

The questions about organization of migration from Persia and Western Armenia in 1828-1830, the settlement of migrants in Eastern Armenia, the growth and, according to the settlements, the movement and employment of the population of Eastern Armenia, including the Erevan and Nakhijevan khanates, as well as the present territory of the Republic of Armenia and Mountainous Karabakh, and Javakhk are considered⁵ on the basis of the research of the 1829-1832 cameral⁶ registration.

⁵ See particularly "A Description of the Armenian Migrants from Persia to Russia", Moscow, 1832; A.I.D.Eritsyan, "All-Armenian Catholicosate and the Armenians of the Caucasus in the 19th century", part I, (1800-1834), Tiflis, 1894; E.S.Lalayan, "The Nakhchavan or Nakhijevan Police District", Tiflis, 1908; G.Aghanyants, "The Karin Migration" (1829-1830), Tiflis, 1891; Gh.Alishan, Shirak, Venice, 1881; Gh.Alishan, Ayarat, Venice, 1890; Gh.Alishan, Sisakan, Venice, 1893 (all in Armenian); S.Glinka, "The Description of the Resettlement of the Armenians of Atropatene to Russia",

Certain questions of the problem were not neglected by the Soviet historiography too. Though, it would be just to say that this problem was presented not in special works of the Soviet historiography, but in various research works during that period⁷.

Moscow, 1831; I.Shopen. "The Historic Monument of the State of the Armenian District in the Epoch of Its Joining to the Russian Empire", St.-Petersburg, 1852; I.Y.Aleksanov. "A Brief History of Armenia with an Appendix "The Armenians in Russia", Rostov-on-Don, 1884; K.A.Borozdin. "The Migrants in Transcaucasia", St.-Petersburg, 1891; M.Akhov. "Russia and the Armenians", St.-Petersburg, 1897 (in Russian); A.K.Jivelegov. Armenians in Russia, Moscow, 1906; V.Brusov. The Chronicle of the Historic Destiny of the Armenian People", Moscow, 1918 and other monographs, as well as in different issues of "A Survey of the Russian Possessions of Transcaucasia", St.-Petersburg, 1836, part IV, "A Collection of Materials for a Description of the Places and Tribes of the Caucasus" and annual collection of "The Caucasian Calendar" from 1845 to 1916, and in the studies of the volumes of "A Code of Materials on the Studies of the Economic Way of Life of the State Peasants of the Transcaucasian Territory" (all in Russian).

⁶ The settlement, the size of families, the sex and age structure were registered by cameral registrations for the taxation. That is why the number of the registered population didn't represent completely the facts. The first cameral list was made in Russia in 1806, the next - under the direction of I.Shopen, in 1829-1832, but in some places it was continued until 1834. The registration was done also in 1842 and 1873 for more precise definition. In 1884 statistic committees were founded in the Russian empire's provinces; they did the registration per family in 1886. In 1897 the first All-Russian general census was done.

⁷ Soviet Armenia in 1920-1925 (a collection), Erevan, 1926; Z.Korkotyan. "The Demography of Erevan (the picture of the centenary growth - 1830-1930)", Erevan, 1930; Z.Korkotyan. "The Population of Soviet Armenia During the Last Century (1831-1931)", Erevan, 1932; P. Abelyan. "The Population of Armenia in Pre-Soviet and Soviet Periods", Erevan, 1931; Kh. Avdalbekyan. "The Armenian Question in Eastern Armenia (1801-1917)", Erevan, 1959; V. Parsamyan. "Griboyedov in the Armenian-Russian Relations", Erevan, 1947; Z.Grigoryan. "The Joining of Eastern Armenia to Russia and Its Historic Significance", Erevan, 1978; M.Adonts. "The National Economy and the Armenian Economic -Scientific Thought at the Beginning of the 20th Century", Erevan, 1968 (all in Armenian); Z.Grigotyan. "The Joining of Eastern Armenia to Russia at the Beginning of the 19th Century", Moscow, 1959; A.Ambaryan. "The Development of the capitalistic Relations in the Armenian Village", Erevan, 1959; "The Joining of Eastern Armenia to Russia" (A Collection of Documents. Editor Ts.Aghayan.), vol. II, Erevan, 1978; "The Development of

Such a conclusion, in any case, doesn't overshadow the history and the huge literary heritage of the pre-soviet and Soviet periods, which include some elements of the above-mentioned fundamental problem, in the aspect of comparatively long periods.

The publications of Z. Korkotyan are of special interest. The author scrupulously studied the cameral lists elaborated and grouped by I. Shopen, together with published statistic materials of current censuses, as well as about 200 handwritings and archive sources. Z. Korkotyan brings into complete form the centenary picture of the growth of the population in Soviet Armenia (as a part Eastern Armenia) (1831-1931) by making the numbers more exact, their elaboration, the correlation, analysis and generalization of different sources. Together with a complete list of inhabited localities he gives the changes of their names, the type of the settlement, the geographic characteristics, and the number of population according to the national and confessional identity (1831, 1873, 1886, 1897, 1908, 1914, 1916, 1919, 1922, 1926 and 1931).

This work, together with I.Shopen's above-mentioned work, continues to be a reliable source for the specialists interested in the questions connected with the population of the Republic of Armenia. The works of P.Abelyan must not be neglected too.⁸

The subject-matter of the population in the 1960s became one of the core problems of research of the Institute of Economics of the NAS. Up to now it continues to maintain its relevance. This subject-matter was also researched in the Institute of Economics of the State Planning Committee of the Armenian SSR, the chairs of geography of the Erevan State University and later the Erevan Institute of the National Economics. The regularities of historic development of the population and the processes of migration (since 1828) are examined in the publications of M.Adonts, L.Davtyan and V.Khojabekyan. They also touched upon the problems connected with the distribution, settling and concentration of the Armenian population in the cities and town in Transcaucasia, as well as the question of the

Erevan after the Joining of Eastern Armenia to Russia " (A Collection of Documents. Compiler T.Hakobyan), Erevan, 1978 all in Russian).

⁸ P.Abelyan. The Population of Armenia in the pre-Soviet and Soviet Periods (January 1, 1914-Januari 1, 1930), Erevan, 1930 (in Armenian).

settlement of the territory, particularly, some regions of Eastern Armenia, by the Russian sectarians (Molokans).⁹

In the mid-1970s special monographs were published which were devoted to the Armenians of Western Armenia, and the deportations of their generations up to the 1960s - the different stages of their repatriation, and provisions of dwellings and employment.¹⁰

Since the mid-1960s very serious demographic forecasts have been made in the above-mentioned institutes for different stages of the long-termed perspective. In publications devoted to the problems of revelation of the regularities in the reproduction of the population and labour resources are discussed as the birth rate and the death-rate indices parallel with the questions of population migration and the processes of urban centralization and settling.¹¹

⁹ M.Adonts. "The Economic Development of Eastern Armenia in the 19th Century", Erevan, 1957; D.S.Vardumyan. The Characteristic of Main Ethnographic Districts of Armenia in the 19th century, M., 1964 (both in Russian); L. Davtyan. "The Population of Soviet Armenia", Erevan, 1965; G.Avagyan. "The Population of the Armenian SSR", Erevan, 1975; V.Khojabekyan. "The Population of Armenia and its Employment (1828-1978)", Erevan, 1979; V.Khojabekyan. "The Agrarian Policy and the Movements of Population", Erevan, 1989 (all in Armenian); V.Khojabekyan. "The Demographic Aspects of Urbanization in the Armenian SSR", Erevan, 1991 (in Russian).

¹⁰ See as mentioned monographs, as well as H.Meliksetyan. "The Deportation of the Western Armenians and the Repatriation from the Armenian Diaspora", Erevan, 1975 (in Armenian).

¹¹ "The Expanded Reproduction of the Population and the Use of the Labour Resources of the Armenian SSR in 1966-1985" (a territorial section of the scientific Council of the AS of the USSR "Optimal planning and the Management of the National Economy", in three volumes, the scientific leader and the main author V.Khojabekyan.), CEMI USSR, Moscow, 1986; V.Khojabekyan, Yu.Vase, R.Shefer. The Demographic Problems and the Reproduction of Labour Resources, Erevan, 1983; V.Chodzabekjan. Bevölkerungswachstum und arbeitskräfteressourcen in der Armenischen SSR, Berlin, 1983; S.Karapetyan. The regional Specifics of the Social-Demographic Development of the Armenien SSR, Erevan, 1986 (all in Russian); V.Khojabekyan. The Population of the Armenian SSR and Modern Problems of the Reproduction of the Labour Resources, Erevan, 1976 (in Armenian).

Because of the Soviet censorship, the real picture of the demographic situation representing a long period and its various stages, very often was passed over in silence or wasn't presented in the examined publications devoted to the growth and movements of the population of Armenia¹². In particular they refer to the obstacles and arbitrary actions impeded by the Azerbaijan SSR and the Nakhichevan ASSR against the Armenian population who in 1918-1920 hardly escaped the Turkish and Musavat butchers and became refugees, and later desired to return and resettle in their native regions. Owing to the new archive materials put into circulation it became possible to illuminate the origin of the Armenians' deportation in the Azerbaijan SSR that was ended in our days.

In any case, the process of the historic development of the population from the 19th century to our days and the tendencies of the pre-phase of the 21st century, as a complete monograph for the first time was presented in 2001 in our published book¹³.

The subject of this book is Eastern Armenia until 1913 and, in particular, the provinces of Erevan, Tblisi, Elisavetpol and the district of Kars and the region of Artsakh. A great deal of attention is paid to the settlement and movements of the Armenians in Transcaucasia, particularly, in its cities and towns. From 1913 the research includes the movement of the population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia, as well as Artsakh and Nakhijevan.

A special attention is paid to the disclosure of the regularities of the present stage of population reproduction. These regularities are affected by the changes in the economic, political and social life of the Republic of Armenia.

¹² V.Khojabekyan. "The Population of Armenia and its Employment (1828-1978)"; V.Khojabekyan. "Artsakh at the Hour of Test", Erevan, 1991 (in Armenian). G.G.Sarkisyan's monograph: "The Population of Eastern Armenia in the 19th Century-the Beginning of the 20th Century" (Erevan, 2002) is devoted to the detailed comparative analysis of the ethnic structure of the population (p. 13) (in Russian).

¹³ V.Khojabekyan. "The Reproduction and Movements of the Population of Armenia in the 19th and 20th Centuries and at the Threshold of the 21st Century", Erevan, 2001 (in Armenian).

At the same time, the earthquake and the events which occurred in 1988 in interethnic relations that changed considerably the demographic situation and the population's demographic behavior in Armenia will continue to influence the situation for a long time.

From this moment the scientific analysis and generalization of the migration process appeared in the centre of studies of some research institutes of the Republic of Armenia.

Since the 1990s the research has continued in the Institutes of Economics, Philosophy and Law, the Institute of Economic Research of the Ministry of Economics and Finances, the Economic faculty of the Erevan State University, the Chairs of Economics and Ethnography, the Erevan State Economic Institute and a number of social organizations.

The causes of migrations of the refugees from the Azerbaijan SSR, the frontier zone and the disaster area of the Spitak earthquake, the structure of migrants and consequences of the migration, as well as the prerequisites of the softening of the emigration are researched on the basis of various Gallup polls. In 1991-2003 were published about twenty books and brochures, many articles in magazines and collections, and periodicals were published, most of which were published in Armenian, then Russian and English languages. Further, mention of these works and their authors will be made in the footnotes of the present monograph.

The manifestation of many of the factors of population reproduction will mostly be dependent upon the demographic policy of the state, which at the present stage is almost neglected. The elaboration and application of the demographic policy on the scientific basis is an important condition for softening the demographic tension, the regulation of changes in parameters of qualitative growth, as well as quantitative characteristics, the formation of migrant streams, the guaranteeing the rational structure of the urban-centralization and settling.

By the way, the complete study of the processes of emigration of the population of the Republic of Armenia is also being done for the first time. There is no publication generalizing this problem. At

best, it was reflected in discussions of various questions devoted to revealing the regularities of population reproduction of the Republic of Armenia.

Proceeding from the necessity of filling this want, the character of movements of the Armenian population in the Transcaucasia during the 19th-20th centuries and internal and international migrations, their types, directions of streams in relation to Armenia during last decades of the Soviet system – at the time of fermentation of its decline and after its collapse, as well as the causes of the intensity of migration are scrupulously examined, revealed and generalized.

The movements of the population in conditions of the Soviet system were principally explained by economic reasons. From 1988 interethnic relations became decisive (though they were also important earlier) and they became critically apparent at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, especially during the fermentation of the destruction of the Soviet system and after its collapse.

The work is done on the basis of the corresponding data of the National Statistic Service of the Republic of Armenia. In this regard the reference literature published by the statistic organ is of certain interest. The statistic collections contain corresponding information about annual migrations of the population within the territories of the CIS, the Baltic states, far and near foreign lands. From 1992 for several years, in order to assess the size of migration, the statistic organs realized a series of research, including the volume of aviation transportation (in the Republic of Armenia aviation is almost the single transportation means of connection with the outer world), as well as truck haulage crossing the border. But these data are not complete, because the statistic and other corresponding organs are not active in registering the whole volume of the migrants. These facts reflect certain regularities and trends about the types, character, directions of migration, causes of the migration of population and other questions.

Some generalizations are done even on the basis of these uncertain data. Parallel to it, for the purpose of determining the

approximate amount of population migrating from Armenia some hypotheses and corresponding suggestions are offered, without expectancies of a final solution or answer to this very difficult question.

By the way, the migration in Armenia has a chaotic, not regulated character. Since 1988 it has taken place spontaneously. Meanwhile, the organized migration may serve the aims of the regulation of the labour market, stimulate the regulation of the mobility of the labour force, thus, in territorial regard, in some extent guaranteeing the balance of demand and supply for the labour force.

The application of the wishful variant of the demographic development from the point of view of the interests of society, in its turn, will contribute to the restoration of the distorted process the reproduction of the population, bringing out the economy from stagnated state, and the Republic, on the whole, from the socio-economic and political impasse.

The author of the present monograph is far away from a thought to present it as a perfect one.

PART ONE **THE POPULATION OF EASTERN ARMENIA IN** **THE 19th CENTURY**

CHAPTER ONE **THE START OF CARAVANS TO EASTERN ARMENIA**

1. Repatriation from Persia

During its centuries-old history Armenia was often raided by foreign conquerors. From the late Middle Ages Armenia was an apple of discord between Persia and Turkey. Their barbaric raids ended not only in the robbery and destruction of the material and spiritual values created by the people, but also in terrible massacres – the most horrible harm caused by endless raids of barbarians. Because of these raids the Armenian population diminished, the gender-and-age ratios changed as a direct or indirect cause of wars. During wars thousands of people were killed and trampled, while famine and infectious diseases caused by the wars claimed thousands more as victims. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of people, particularly, women and children were captured and driven deep into the countries of the conquerors, which increased their own population and improved their nations at the expense of the Armenians.

The 1639 war between Persia and Turkey ended with the final division of historic Armenia into *Eastern Armenia* and *Western Armenia*. This was the beginning of a difficult demographic period for the Armenian people. The peril of extermination hung like the sword of Damocles on the head of the Armenian people. For centuries the conquerors pursued a policy of extermination – massacres, apostasy by violence and deportations – of the Armenians. This was accompanied by a policy of resettling Eastern and Western Armenia with foreign elements: Turks, Persians and Kurds. Because of that, already in 1827 the percentage of the Armenian population had diminished. Situation was desperate in the Erevan and Nakhijevan khanates, the Ordubad district and Artsakh. In 1805, after unification of Georgia with Russia in 1801, some

territories (Lori-Pambak, Kazakh and Shamshadin) of Eastern Armenia also were conquered by the Russian Empire. On November 12, 1813 Karabakh and some other *khanates* together with Zangezur (Kapan, Meghri and Goris) joined up the Russian Empire according to the Treaty of Gyulistan concluded by Russia and Persia. These territories formed the Elisavetpol province.

Until 1827 the population of a part of Eastern Armenia under the rule of the Russian Empire constituted more than 44, 600 (21,400 in the occupation zone of Georgia, and 23, 200 in the occupation zone of the Gandzak khanate), 63.3 % of which were Armenians.¹⁴

The rest of Eastern Armenia (the Erevan and Nakhijevan khanates) joined the Russian Empire on February 10, 1828 by the Treaty of Turkmenchay concluded between Russia and Persia¹⁵. According to the 15th Article of the Treaty, the Armenian population of Atropatene had to decide to remain in Persia or to immigrate to Eastern Armenia. It was directly said in the Treaty:

...during the war or temporary occupation of the mentioned territory no one, of any rank, might be persecuted or abused because of his expressed opinions, actions and behavior. Besides, these ranked persons and inhabitants will be given a year, starting from today, in order that they together with their families could move from the Persian territory to Russian regions, bringing with them their property and selling it without any obstacle caused by the government or local authorities. The property sold or taken away by those persons must be out of taxation or customs-duty. A five-year term is determined for the real estate: either to be sold or submitted to any voluntary order. But that amnesty doesn't relate those persons who within the period of one year will commit any crime for which they may be convicted.¹⁶

¹⁴ These and above mentioned numbers are calculated on the basis of the materials published in "The Acts, Collected by the Archeographic Commission" (vol. I, p.461-462) (from now on - "The Acts...") (in Russian).

¹⁵ About the distribution of Armenians in Persian Armenia see in details J. Reclus. The Valley of Arax and Armenians, "Ararat" (XX, 1887) and "The Basin of Lake Urmia and the Near East", Vagharshapat, 1890 (both in Armenian).

¹⁶ "The Acts Concluded before of the Peace with Persia", St. Petersburg, 1828, p.6 (in Russian).

According to the Article 12 of the Treaty the free sale of the real estate was anticipated for those emigrants who would go to Persia from this bank of the Arax river (Eraskh-Araks)¹⁷.

The sides would not create any obstacle in the questions of emigration and possession of property.

Colonel Lazar Lazaryan was charged with organization of emigration of the Pers-Armenians. He acted together with Prince Movses Arghutyan according to a list of rules consisting of 19 points. Nerses Ashtaraketsi played a very important role in organization of emigration from Persia as well as Western Armenia (1829-1830).

Persia was not interested in emigration of the Armenians, because it lost industrious people, and Iranian Aderbaijan was becoming depopulated. According to Alexander Griboyedov's data, the Armenians' emigration caused damage to Persia, which in silver, as a whole, was estimated at 32,000,000 rubles. It was the price of the material values produced by them in Persia¹⁸.

According to data sent by Griboyedov to the Vice-Chancellor count Neselrod, the Armenians by their craft-work and trade provided the state with a profit reaching 1,600,000 rubles.¹⁹ The crown-prince Abbas-Mirza did his best to stop the process of emigration. He applied methods contradicting the points of the Treaty. The crown-prince promised to create materially favourable conditions for the Armenian population, to free them from taxes during six years, to give them grants and awards and other kinds of privileges²⁰. The crown-prince promised to give the Armenian population more subsidy, than the Russian government allotted.

¹⁷ Ibid., p.4,9.

¹⁸ The historical materials of VII volume of "The Acts...", partially of "A Description of the Armenian migrants from Persia to Russia", as well as the works of S.Glinka, I.Shopen, A.Eritsyan, E.Lalayan served as sources in this chapter for research of the questions relating to organization of immigration from Persia and Turkey to Eastern Armenia in 1828-1830, the number of migrants, their structure and distribution.

¹⁹ "A Description of the Armenian migrants...", p.67.

²⁰ "The Acts...", vol. VII, p.620.

The crown-prince himself disseminated a rumour that a bad lot awaited Armenians in Russia and that they would find themselves in serfdom and without means, the young people would be recruited. Notwithstanding all these obstacles the Armenians took a firm decision to emigrate. The promises of Abbas-Mirza and his secret agreement with the Persian population not to buy lands from the Armenians couldn't stop their emigration.

Colonel Lazar Lazaryan, who carried out the Pers-Armenians emigration, on February 14, 1828 wrote in his letter addressed to General Paskevitch that the Armenians, leaving their houses, lands under crop and gardens, expressed their readiness to emigrate to Russia.²¹

The emigration, which according to the Treaty had to be fulfilled in one year, took only three months. As far as it concerned the organization of the movables' sale (also was given one year-term), most of the emigrants from Tabriz, Khoy, Maragha left one of their family members for that purpose.

At the end of the April 1828 1,000 families from Maragha and Tabriz did their night's lodging in the desolate fields of the Nakhijevan khanate. There hadn't yet been any shelter and adequate food. Because of that, on April 25, 1828 Paskevitch informed N.Ashtaraketsi about 1, 000 families who were in great need and had no bread and food, though the Russian government granted them money. So Paskevitch considered necessary to stop immigration.²² In addition, the measures had not been undertaken in order to solve the problems of food supply, buying grain for sowing, as well as the housing. During that year it was difficult to find any way out.

On April 14 the Erevan District Department reported to the leader of the migration affairs L. Lazaryan in Tabriz, that "all those who have no means to get food must stay in their place".²³ The migration Department asked high command to stop temporarily the migration. Such a decision was also prompted by the fit of epidemic. But it was already impossible to stop, even temporarily to hold those who were ready to migrate.

²¹ Ibid., p.595.

²² Ibid., p.615.

²³ Ibid.

Maragha and Tabriz were followed by Urmia. 2,000 families²⁴ that left Urmia on May 1 spent the night under open sky in Salmast. On May 9 4,500 families crossed the Arax. Lazaryan asked Paskevitch the Erevan Department to undertake corresponding measures for the reception and help of the repatriated Armenians. He wrote to Paskevitch: "The spending that now treasury will do in order to help migrants, all, will be returned with something to spare, because... the Armenians of Urmia and Salmast are famous for their indefatigable diligence."²⁵

For the first time in the Armenian history caravans went into Eastern Armenia.²⁶ Their rear guard was coming from Tabriz (there remained only 6 families) and its environs, Salmast, Maragha, Maku, Khoi, Urmia and other districts. The movement of the Armenians from Western Armenia, Gandzak, and Karabakh to the Ararat valley had an older history.

According to a number of sources, the general number of the migrants from Persia to Eastern Armenia was about 45 thousand (8,249 families, of which 100 families were Syrians). After one-two years, according to the cameral registration, the number of the settlers in the Erevan and Nakhijevan khanates and Ordubad district constituted 35,560 (6,946 families).²⁷

The Syrians, who lived in 6 villages of Urmia, first settled in the region of Nakhijevan, then, three years later, resettled in the village of Tartar in the region of Shushi. Ten years later they returned back to the Erevan district because of diphteritis and from the mid 19th century settled finally in the village of Kiulasor²⁸.

²⁴ The State Central Archive of the Republic of Armenia (the SCA RA), f. 90, list 1, f. 43, p.7, 1071.

²⁵ "The Acts...", vol. VII., p.619.

²⁶ I.M. Ghazaryan. Immigration of Armenians from Persia to the Armenian District in 1828. - "Lraber" of the Social Sciences AS Arm. SSR, 1957, N7 (in Russian).

²⁷ I.Shopen, "The Historic...", p.640-641. See also "A Description of the Armenian migrants," p.94. A.I.D.Eritsyan, "All-Armenian Catholicosate...", p.333 and other sources.

²⁸ "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", part IV, I, Tiflis, 1884, p.286 (in Russian).

Later, due to new migrants, the number of the Syrians increased and they divided and settled in the villages of Kiulasor, Dvin-asori, Gyul-asori and Arzni. The most part of the migrants settled in the Garni (-Basar), Karpi (-Basar), Darachichak (Tsakhkadzor) and Aparan mahals.

According to the cameral statistics, the population which migrated from Persia to the Armenian District was distributed in the following way in conformity with inhabited localities (see table 1).

Table 1.

The settlement of the Pers-Armenians by inhabited localities²⁹

The place of residence	The number of inhabitants
Erevan	1715
Nakhijevan	1110
Ordubad	182
Krkh-Bulakh mahal	1043
Garni-Basar mahal	5359
Vedi-Basar mahal	1069
Sharour mahal	1757
Alinja-tchai mahal	1051
Daralagyaz mahal	2838
Agulis mahal	183
Sardarapat mahal	356
Zangi-Basar mahal	2360
Karpi-Basar mahal	2897
Surmalu mahal	1459
Aparan mahal	2018
Daratchitchak mahal	3535
Nakhijevan mahal	4507
Mavazi-Khatun mahal	1146
Ordubad mahal	76
Belevi mahal	899
Total	35,560

A certain part of the migrants, while moving, suffered much and settled in Karabakh. They settled in hot places and unfruitful lands.

²⁹ I.Shopen, "The Historic...", p.635-642.

In a short time the Armenians in Karabakh as well as other places got used to local conditions and tilled the ground in villages and mainly practiced craftsmanship in towns.

A certain part of the Armenian population passed from the Persian domination to Georgia.³⁰

Not all Armenians emigrated from Persia. I. Shopen supposes that, not counting the Armenians living in other places of Persia, only from Iranian Azerbaijan emigrated 1/3 of the Armenians.

2. Afflux from Western Armenia

On September 2, 1828 the Adrianople Treaty was concluded between Russia and Turkey. Akhalkalak and Akhaltskha were joined to Russia together with Anapa and Poti. In his report written to the tsar (October 10) Paskevitch drew his attention to the fact of importance of the Christian population's emigration from Turkey, noting that, if they remain there, they will become victims of the arbitrariness of the Turkish authorities. Paskevitch asked the tsar's permission to settle these migrants in Georgia and the Armenian District.³¹

The tsar gave his permission for the movement of 10,000 western Armenian families to Eastern Armenia and their settlement there.

A special Committee was established for organization of the resettlement from Western Armenia. It had to occupy itself with the questions of the resettlement of the Armenians from Western Armenia and their guardianship.

The resettlement was carried out in the state lands and if there was not enough space the monastic and manorial lands were used. While deciding the place of settlement, together with the wish of the settlers the character of their occupation, the natural and climatic conditions of their former places of residence and other conditions had been taken into account.

³⁰ "The Acts...", vol. II., p.276, 584, 585.

Ibid. p.830.

The mass resettlement from Western Armenia was organized in two stages.³² The first was in October 1829, the second in May 1830. During the first stage were resettled 60,000 and during the second - 35,000 people. Thus, only in the 1828-1830s 140,000 people forcibly moved from Persia and Turkey and resettled in the Eastern Armenian and Georgian regions.³³

In 1829-1830 the Armenian population of Erzurum and its region, Upper and Lower Basen, Khnus, Derjan, Bayazet, Alashkert, Diadin, the town of Kars emigrated.³⁴

A part of the migrants spent the winter of 1829 in the villages of Lori, Pambak, and in the spring of 1830 moved to Akhaltskha. 5,000 of the Armenian 7,298 families, willingly settled in Akhaltskha and its region, 1,050 families in the Borchalu distance and the suburbs of Tsalka (here settled also 600 Greek families from Kars), and the rest - in the distances of Pambak and Shoragyal. 2, 264 families that moved from Kars settled permanently in the Pambak and Shoragyal distances, 200 families in the *mahal* of Talin. 4,215 families that moved from Bayazet and its *pashalik* settled permanently on the shore of Lake Sevan (mainly in Bayazet), Bash-Aparan and 67 families that moved from Ardahan settled in Akhaltskha.

The Immigration Committee by a special order of General Paskevitch undertook corresponding measures for settling in the free state lands of the Sevan basin those (who came in 1830 from Bayazet and its surrounding region) who wished.³⁵

The number of those who resettled from Western Armenia in Eastern Armenia outnumbered the expected quantity. That is why first it was supposed that all of them had to settle in the state lands. In reality, 1,600 families, particularly, in the Akhaltskha *pashalik*

were settled in the free lands which before that belonged to the Turks. Those lands the former owners sold at low prices and immigrated to Turkey.³⁶ Mostly the craftsmen settled in Akhaltskha.³⁷

Thus, the most part of those who emigrated from Persia settled in the Armenian District. Those who came from Western Armenia and settled here were in number only 21,666. Their settlement distribution is the following (see table 2)

Table 2.
The Settlement of the Armenians from Western Armenia in the Armenian District by inhabited localities, 1829-1830

The place of residence	The number of settlers	The place of residence	The number of settlers
Erevan	48	Sardarapat <i>mahal</i>	65
Krkh-Bulakh <i>mahal</i>	331	Aparan <i>mahal</i>	6,857
Surmalu <i>mahal</i>	1,342	Daratchitchak <i>mahal</i>	3,263
Karpi-Basar <i>mahal</i>	476	Gyokchay <i>mahal</i>	8,557
		Daralagyaz <i>mahal</i>	727
Total			21,666

Thus, owing to immigration from Persia and Turkey the population of the Armenian District, according to cameral registering data from 119,650 (1827) reached 164,450³⁸. According to the same data, the specific weight of the Armenian population more increased, than in the Nakhijevan khanate and the Ordubad region. The Armenian population constituted 56.7% in the khanate of Erevan, 43.8 % in the khanate of Nakhijevan, 34 % in the Ordubad region.

As far as it concerns the whole of Eastern Armenia, according to data of the cameral registration, its population increased from 198,000 (1827) to 272,000 (1831).³⁹

The specific weight of the Armenian population increased not only because of immigration, but also of the emigration of the

³² N.A. Nefedev. A Look at the Armenian District, St.Petersburg, 1839. A Survey of the Domains of Russia. - "Magazine of the Ministry of Internal Affairs", 1831, Book 5 (MMIA) (in Russian).

³³ "The Acts...", vol. II, p.830.

³⁴ M. Darbinyan. The Migration of Western Armenians to the Armenian District and Adjacent Territories in 1828-1829, - Historical-Philological Magazine, N2, Erevan, 1974 (in Armenian).

³⁵ The SCA RA, f. 90, list 1, f. 43, p.885.

³⁶ Ibid., f. 44, p.336-337, "The Acts...", vol. VII, p.849-850.

³⁷ "The Acts...", vol. VIII, p.183.

³⁸ I. Shopen, "The Historic...", p.542, 642.

³⁹ "Traber" of the Social Sciences of the AS Arm. SSR, 1971, N11, p.23.

Persian and Kurdish population from the limits of the Erevan and Nakhijevan khanates. For example, it is known that after the capture of Erevan, in 1827, 800 families which were under the guardianship of *khans* Ali and Husain migrated into Persia.⁴⁰ Khan Asker with 60 families emigrated and settled in the Kars *pashalik*.⁴¹

In 1827 of 2,984 Kurdish families only 847 families remained to live in the limits of the Armenian District, the rest emigrated to Turkey and Persia.⁴²

These facts show that after Eastern Armenia joined Russia twice as many people emigrated from Turkey than from Persia. It is explained by an unbearable state of the Armenians living under the domination of Turkey, which used against them the policy of savage methods of social and national oppression, which would bring to the extermination of Armenians in their native land.

Despite the colonial policy of the tsarist rule, the Armenians moving to Eastern Armenia were settled in the state free lands. They were free of taxation during six years and three years from the *zemstvo* taxation. Much archival material testifies the help, though tiny little, given migrants by the local authorities in the form of food, grain, building materials.

In view of it a certain interest present the General-major Behbutov's written orders to take care of the acute needs of the migrants who settled in the Aparan, Nor (New)-Bayazet and Daratchitchak. In 1828-1831 the population of the villages Bash-Aparan, Ghondagsaz, Satchlu, Jangitapa, Karpi, Kalatchi, Bazartchai⁴³ of the Aparan mahal, and of the villages Gavar, Kulal, Mahmed-Aghalu of the Sevan basin received some help.⁴⁴

Behbutov ordered to transport grain from Sardarapat and logs from the forests of Ghazakh and Shamshadin to the villages of the Sevan basin and Dartchitchk.⁴⁵

Other documents testify simultaneously the hard material conditions of the displaced people and local population, the lack of

land and water, the difficulties of cultivating the soil. There were no draught animals, milkers, instruments, sowing grain, dwellings. These were endless needs and anxieties. Meanwhile the number of displaced people increased and again reached a great height during the years of the following Russo-Turkish and the barbaric massacres committed by the Turks.

In 1853-1856 during the Russo-Turkish war the Russians temporarily captured Kars. From the letter written in 1856 by General Mouraviov to General Khrelov followed that many Armenians the Christians' emigration had wish to emigrate from Western Armenia, especially from Kars, as followed from the letter: "Approving general-lieutenant Behbutov's order in connection with the migration of the Christians, I allow to organize the migration also afterwards, but at the same time I ask you to keep this process under control in order it to be within reasonable limits and without giving an incentive".⁴⁶

Complications appeared in connection with the settlement of the displaced persons. A part of them settled in Talin⁴⁷, and the rest on shore of the Black Sea. Because of complications which arose owing to the question of the settlement, in 1861 4,000 families displaced from Western Armenia were allowed to settle in the Stavropol Territory.⁴⁸

⁴⁰ "The Acts...", vol. XI, p.313.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² "The Acts...", vol. XII, p.1389.

* On March 21, 1828, the *Armenian Province* (*Haikakan Marz* in Armenian, *Armianskaia Oblast'* in Russian) was formed in Eastern Armenia, formed of the territory of Erevan and Nakhijevan. In the 1840 the title of "Armenian Province" was removed as a result of numerous administrative reorganizations carried out by the tsarist government, and the Transcaucasian territories were placed in the Georgian-Imeretian and the Caspian provinces respectively. The territories of Erevan, Alexandropol and Nakhijevan districts were among 11 districts which formed the Georgian-Imeretian province.

In 1849 Transcaucasia underwent a new administrative reorganization. Together with other provinces, on June 9, the Erevan province (including territories of Erevan, Alexandropol, Nor Bayazet, Nakhijevan, Ordubad) was formed on the basis of the former "Armenian Province" and the territories of Alexandropol. In the course of time the Akhikalak police district was separated from Alexandropol.

In 1862 Lori was brought in the Tiflis province. In 1867 the Ordubad and Nakhijevan territories were united. A new district of Etchmiadzin was formed.

⁴⁰ The SCA RA, f. 133, list 1, f. 409, p.30.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² I. Shopen, "The Historic...", p.541.

⁴³ The SCA RA, f.90, list 1, f. 440, p.1-4, f. 446, p.1-20.

⁴⁴ Ibid., f. 437, p.137, 142, 154, 180, 199, f. 440, p.1-4.

⁴⁵ Ibid., f. 437, p.202-203.

In 1831-1873 the population of Eastern Armenia* mainly increased due to the natural growth, although immigration played a sizable role. In 1859 the population of the Erevan province reached 264,500 and in 1873 - 547,700⁴⁹ of which 54.4% constituted the Armenian population.

Many of the Armenians continued to express a desire for removal from Western Armenia to Eastern Armenia. For example, the head of the central department of the Caucasus Viceroy in his report on March 27, 1873 to the tsar wrote that, according to the facts of the Russian ambassador in Constantinople, 5,000 Armenians (1,000 families) from the Erzurum vilayet asked a permission to emigrate to Russia.

Drawing the tsar's attention to their diligence, gardening and agricultural experience, he asked to grant them appropriate land for settlement.⁵⁰ In this connection, according to a document sent from the Alexandropol district to the Erevan military department's governor, 1,000 families could be settled in the Alexandropol district, giving them lands for gardening and agriculture.⁵¹

At that time immigration diminished. The reason was neither the adaptation of the western Armenians to the situation in Turkey, nor the reforms. On the contrary, the atmosphere was becoming more and more heated.

The reasons of diminishing of the displaced people's number, at that time, are explained by the state of affairs in Eastern Armenia, and first of all by the lack of the land, as well as the colonial policy

From 1888 to the end of World War I the province of Erevan included the districts of Erevan, Alexandropol and Nakhijevan, Nor Bayazet, Etchmiadzin, Surmalu, Sharour-Daralagyaz. The Eastern Armenian region of Zangezur mainly populated by Armenians, was brought in the district of Gandzak, and the districts of Alaverdi and Jalaloghli were brought in the province of Tiflis (T.Kh.Hakobyan. *Outlines of the Historic geography of Armenia*, p.387-405, in Armenian).

⁴⁹ "The Acts...", vol. XII, p. 1321. "A Collection of Facts about the Caucasus", vol. V, Tiflis, 1879 ("The Lists of the Populated Areas of the Caucasian Territory According to Data of 1873", part I, without page-marks, in Russian).

⁵⁰ The SCA RA, f. 133, list 1, f. 1125, p.1.

⁵¹ Ibid., p.4.

of the tsarist Russia. For example, in the course of decades population increased in the village of Gavar of the Sevan basin.

Parallel to it increased the number of the peasant homestead, but the size of the plough-land given to the village remained yet on the level of 1829-1830. The policy of the tsarist rule to populate Transcaucasia, including Eastern Armenia with the Russian resettlers must also be taken into consideration (see Chapter II of this book).

All these, emerging from the colonial policy of the tsarist rule, in its turn, told on that policy in new forms. The Erzurum consul of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Empire in his secret letter (May 24, 1873) to the military Governor reported that the western Armenians had only an aim to migrate to Russia. But it had not corresponded to the plans of the monarchy, so their request was simply denied. As for the migration of 6,000 Armenians from Shoragyal to Russia, their case was postponed under the pretext of examination by the government. General-adjutant Ignatevitch was charged with this case.⁵²

In the course of time the migrants from Western Armenia settled mostly in the southern coastal zone of the Black Sea, the Caucasus and other places of Russia, where the Armenians settled centuries before.

In the second half of the 19th century the tsarist government itself showed interest in the settlement of the Black Sea's southern coast by the Armenians. The mere interest of the tsarist rule was not the settlement of the Armenians in those regions. It didn't proceed from the colonial policy of the Russian Empire.

The real reason for the decision about the settlement of Armenians on the Black Sea's southern coast was to give an impetus to the cultivation of cultivars. For a long time it was impossible to populate with the Russians the Black Sea's southern coast. They were not acquainted with the cultivation of the local cultivars.

Still in 1865 a special committee was formed for the purpose of settlement of those regions. The committee approved the project presented by two Armenian agronomists, according to which it was decided to invite Armenians from Western Armenia, Greeks,

⁵² Ibid., p.6.

Serbian and Croats from the Balkans, and also Germans from Southern Germany.

A question was brought up for discussion about developing of new territories, as well as cultivation of wide ground areas left by the Abkhaz migrants who in 1868 migrated from Sukhumi to Turkey.⁵³ The development of new territories was connected with great difficulties. It was necessary to deforest, clean of bushes and solve the problem of roads and drinking water.

In 1869 the first Armenian villages appeared on the Black Sea's southern coast. In the course of time their number increased. Eyewitnesses write that the poor Armenian migrants from Western Armenia "settled in the villages populated by their compatriots and especially relatives where they could take refuge and find a work. One or two years living in this way, at their free time, they would travel over the uninhabited environs, explore it and choose a convenient place for dwelling. After serving for their masters one or two years they would save money. Then one would buy a cow, other an ox and then appeal for settling down."⁵⁴

Local authorities distributed these ground areas per capita. In this way new Armenian villages appeared along the ravines. With great eagerness the inhabitants turned these lands into cultivated areas, felled trees, cleared away bushes and fenced. These tillable acres were vast and the peasants cultivated cereals, rice, tobacco-plant and other valuable cultivated plants.⁵⁵

The tsarist regime was not interested in the question of populating Eastern Armenia by displaced Armenians.

After the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, when Russia was forced by the Treaty of Berlin to withdraw its troops and cede occupied territories to Turkey, the disappointed Armenian population appeared in a deadlock. They had either to emigrate, or resign themselves to the Ottoman revengefulness.⁵⁶

Many Armenian families from Alashkert, Bayazet and elsewhere joined the retreating Russian troops. In September 1877 many Armenian (1856), Greek (39) and Ezid families left with the Russian troops from Bayazet for Erevan province.⁵⁷

Because of the lack of an appropriate place for their settlement, it was found purposeful to settle them in the provinces of Terek and Stavropol. The Russian authorities found it possible to settle in the state territories only 1,000 families.⁵⁸ 2,856 Kurdish nomadic families had to be made settled.⁵⁹ According to the cameral registration of 1873 the total number of the Kurdish families who lived in Erevan province reached 28,421 the most of which lived in the districts of Surmalu (11,174), Erevan (7,588) and Alexandropol (2,999).⁶⁰ According to the household registration of 1886, the number of Kurds increased by 5,741 people. In the course of the war, some of the Kurds left for Turkey.

The tsarist government put artificial obstacles but was unable to stop the wave of the displaced persons. It is testified by many facts preserved in the archival record⁶¹. The Armenians living in Erzurum, Van, Kars, Ardahan and other places started to migrate. After the great migration from Erzurum (1829-1830) the Armenians from Diarbekir, Van, Mush and other places again settled there.⁶² Then they had a desire to move to Eastern Armenia.

The Russian military leaders (particularly, general Lazarev), the local Armenian religious and public figures could by no means prevent and hold back the Armenian population from the idea of migration.⁶³ They considered that the migration brought grist to the Turkish policy's mill. The Turkish misanthropic policy in Western

⁵⁷ The SCA RA, f. 94, list 1, f. 207, p.8, 17-18, 32, 65, 67.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.507.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.508.

⁶⁰ "The Russian geographic Society," the Caucasian department, The Proceedings, Tiflis, 1884, 1891, vol. 13, N1-2, p.13-15.

⁶¹ The SCA RA, f. 94, list 1, f. 207, p.18-19 f. 208, part 1, p.176-181.

⁶² "Masis" (a newspaper), Constantinople, 1878 (according to the book by J.Kirakosyan: "The Bourgeois Diplomacy and Armenia", 1978, p.318, in Armenian).

⁶³ J. Kirakosyan, Op. cit., p.318-319.

⁵³ M.Akhov. Russia..., p.47-49.

⁵⁴ K. A. Borozdin. "The Migrants...", p.154-155.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p.155.

⁵⁶ A.K. Jivelegov. Armenians..., p.8.

Armenia was focused on extermination and deportation of Armenians. According to data published by "Mshak" (1878, N170), in September 200,000 Armenians moved to "new Russian lands in Armenia" from the *sanjak* of Erzurum.

We think that the number of 200,000 is a bit exaggerated, but it is close to the reality. They settled in the region of Batumi, which joined Russia as a result of the War of 1877-1878, a considerable portion in other places of Eastern Armenia and the Transcaucasus, and partially in Russia.

A part of displaced people settled in Erevan province. Until the end of 1877 2,563 people permanently settled in different villages of the region of Etchmiadzin, 2,476 in the region of Nor Bayazet, 1,126 in the region of Erevan, 595 in the region of Surmalu, 263 in the region of Alexandropol, 40 in the city of Erevan.

According to data of 1879, the number of the displaced persons in the Shoragyal region of the region of Alexandropol reached 1,173⁶⁴. A part of migrants that took refuge in the regions of Etchmiadzin and Surmalu were Kurds and Ezids.⁶⁵ Among the migrants from Turkey were also Aisoris who settled in Erevan province and Kars district.⁶⁶

The number of migrants who settled in different regions varied not only owing to the arrival of their new caravans,⁶⁷ but also as a result of movements within Erevan province. Despite the fact of wandering from place to place, the migrants were not provided with plough-land holdings of appropriate size. As a result of that in 1880 the migrants of various villages that settled down in almost all regions appealed to the authorities to increase plots of arable land given to communities.⁶⁸ In their petitions they asked to be transferred to such regions of the province which would satisfy their demands at the cost of the state free lands.

⁶⁴ The SCA RA, f. 94, list 1, f. 207, p.89, 145-159, 199-210, 296-301, f. 208, part 1, p.174.

⁶⁵ Ibid., f. 207, p.303-304, f. 423, p.19-30, 97-113.

⁶⁶ Ibid., f. 504, p.444.

⁶⁷ Ibid., f. 207, p.89-142, 145-162, 199-210, 303-304, 335-349.

⁶⁸ Ibid., f. 423, p.43-51, f. 247, part 3, p.622-623.

The greater part of the migrants settled down in the district of Kars which formed a part of the Russian Empire as a result of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878. The local authorities, as in other cases, during first two months rendered assistance to those migrants who were devoid of means of survival.⁶⁹

Throughout April and May of 1879 the heads of the regions of Surmalu and Nor Bayazet in their reports addressed to the governor of Erevan province informed that the displaced Armenians who settled in their regions lacked a means of living and lived in extreme poverty. They asked the governor to grant monthly 3 rubles aid per capita.⁷⁰

The migrants were provided with logs and other kinds of timber in order to build huts for shelters. The families settled in *mahals* which were near forests had no problem with timber.⁷¹ They were provided with the prescribed state norms. The regions far from forests were in extreme need and had serious problems. Particularly, the forests of Erevan province did not suffice to satisfy daily increasing want of the population. Consequently the local authorities often applied to the corresponding organs of the province of Elisavetpol for timber.⁷² In the 1880s there was only 152,996 *desyatin* forest area in Erevan province.⁷³

In June 1881 the migrants settled in the village of Gyoaldara (in the region of Nor Bayazet) began building their huts. They built the walls but were unable to roof. For that purpose each family had been supplied 20 rubles, but there was no timber. That problem was solved with great difficulty at the expense of the forests of the province of Elisavetpol.⁷⁴

In 1878-1879 the migrants that settled in Erevan province were rendered material assistance at the rate of 40,000 rubles: 30

⁶⁹ Ibid., f. 207, p.4, 6, 7, 30, 75-82, 144, 166, 168, 230, 233, 250-291, 357, 405, f. 208, part 1, p.153, 174.

⁷⁰ Ibid., f. 207, p.85-88, 144.

⁷¹ Ibid., f. 614, p.34-36.

⁷² Ibid., f. 614, p.34-36, 127.

⁷³ "A Code of Materials ...", vol. III, Tiflis, 1888, p.43.

⁷⁴ The SCA RA, f. 94, list 1, f. 127, p.154-155.

thousand rubles were distributed in 1878 and the rest - 10,000 rubles in 1879.⁷⁵ In the 1880s the displaced population from Western Armenia continued to be provided with scanty help.⁷⁶

Thus, because of the mass migration from Western Armenia the population in Erevan province and the district of Kars increased quicker than in the Armenian communities of the Transcaucasus and the Russian Empire on the whole. Suffice it to say that in 1872-1886 the average yearly increase of the population in Erevan province made up about 28 people per 1,000 population.⁷⁷ As at that time mortality was rather high, so it couldn't be only the result of the natural growth. Owing to such rapid growth Erevan province became the second in the Transcaucasus by the density of population after the province Kutaisi. There lived 38 people in each *verst*, while in Erevan province - 27, in the province of Tiflis - 22, in the province of Baku - 21, in the Black Sea province - 5 people.

Kars district also was sparsely populated. There lived 8 people in each *verst*. It is explained by the fact that in 1878, after the district of Kars was included in the Russian empire a large part of the Turkish and Kurdish population of the district migrated to Turkey.

According to the archival data, from August 1878 until August 1881 82,760 people migrated from the district of Kars to Turkey.⁷⁸ In 1882 39,000 Turks lived in Kars district. Their number was three times as much before Kars district was incorporated into the Russian empire. Later, a part of them returned. They showed displeasure because instead of rent in kind they had to pay the money tax. At the same time no longer they were subject to the draft. The population of the district of Kars increased as because of the migration of the Armenians and Greeks from Western Armenia, as well as the

⁷⁵ Ibid., f. 207, list 231, 291, 357, 405, 692, f. 208, p.63, 174, f. 614, list 283, 285, 286.

⁷⁶ Ibid., f. 207, part 3, p.796-817, 819, 829-830, f. 501, p.287, f. 502, p.2, 12-13, 16-18, 20-21, 52-54, 66, 68, 244, 248, 317, f. 504, part 2, p.327, 390, 460,461, f. 614, p.81, 82, 84, 102, 117-118, 127, 189.

⁷⁷ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1888", Tiflis, 1887, part I, p.83-84 (in Russian).

⁷⁸ "A Collection of Materials...", N38, Tiflis, 1908, p.120-129; "The Russian geographic Society," the Caucasian department, Tiflis, 1882/1883, vol. VII, N1-2, p.182, 197.

presence of the Russian troops and sectarians. The number of the Armenians in 1882 increased three times as much in comparison with 1878 and numbered 31,500 people, but the specific weight of Armenians in the structure of the population still was small.

The mass migration to Eastern Armenia took place also in 1894 and 1896, during the tyranny of Abdulhamid, in the years of the mass massacres of the innocent Armenian population. As a result the Armenian population increased not only in Eastern Armenia, but also in other places of the Transcaucasus.

Materially needy state and growing from day to day indigence made them wander from place to place. They were devoid not only of dwellings but also of their daily bread, bed, footwear and clothing. At the beginning of the fall of 1896 the Armenian migrant families starving and half-healthy appeared in the streets of Baku, wandered and went begging.⁷⁹

Benevolent societies were organized in Erevan, Tbilisi and Baku in order to help the Armenian migrants.

In 1896 the Tiflis Benevolent Society undertook the work of organizing the cheapest meals for Armenian migrants in several dining-rooms. The Tiflis Benevolent Society by means of donations gave some material help to the migrants who found shelter in the provinces of Tiflis, as well as Erevan. The help was expressed in different ways: they paid rents, bought beds, overcoats, underwear, compassionate allowances, organized funerals, helped with medicines, paid for the medical treatments. The Armenian migrants in Akhalktekh, Akhalkalak and Batumi also were rendered this kind of help.⁸⁰

According to data of the 1896 registration, only about 1,000 displaced families in the region of Surmalu lived in extreme need. A great number of the displaced people found shelter in the cities and towns of Erevan, Kars, Vagharshapat, Batumi, Kaghzvan, Alexandropol and their regions. Poor conditions reigned everywhere. From May 1 to June 1, 1897, according to the Resolution of the

⁷⁹ Aghar Ter-Hakobyan. The Armenian Migrants in Baku and Their Return, Baku, 1902, p.14 (in Armenian).

⁸⁰ The SCA RA, f. 28, list 1, f. 360, p.73, 74, 101, 103, 114, 134-136.

Tiflis Benevolent Society, 580 displaced persons were given the compassionate allowance, traveling expense, rent and money for the one month food.⁸¹

The work of the benevolent societies was particularly active in those years when the number of migrants extremely increased. In 1905 the benevolent society in Tiflis received 8,200 rubles from the chancellery of the Viceroy of the Caucasus for distribution among the Armenian migrants from Western Armenia. A part of this sum was spent for the needs of the orphans.⁸² The migration from Western Armenia continued also in the first decade of the 20th century and reached its culmination during the years of World War I.

At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century the population also increased in the Transcaucasus and, particularly, in Eastern Armenia due to the Russian settlers.

The settlement of the Transcaucasus by the Russians was dictated by the colonial policy of the tsarist regime, as well as the rise and development of capitalist relations. On this point it is worthy to get acquainted, on the whole, features with the process of the colonization of the Transcaucasus by the Russians.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE RUSSIAN SECTANTS IN EASTERN ARMENIA

From the end of the 18th century, Armenians were not alone in migrating from Turkey to Russia. They were joined by the Slavic peoples as the Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, as well as others - Jews, Mordovs and Greeks. A part of them, particularly, Jews and Greeks settled on the Black Sea's southern coasts and in the Transcaucasus.⁸³ Russians, Ukrainians, Kazan Tatars, Persians (from

⁸¹ Ibid., p.13, 86-96.

⁸² Ibid., f. 81, p.40.

⁸³ V.V.Obolenski, *International and Inter-Continental Migrations*, M., 1928, p.105 (in Russian).

Iranian Aderbaigan-Azerbaijan) and others also migrated to the Transcaucasus. During the 19th century the majority of those who settled down in the Transcaucasus were Armenians.

Owing to that fact, at the beginning of the 20th century (according to the census of 1913) more than 22% of the whole population (7,400,000) of the Transcaucasus constituted Armenians. A part of them migrated from Western Armenia, but, as Russian authors wrote at that time, such a migration did not correspond to the interests of the Russians.⁸⁴ The colonial interests of the tsarist Russia are meant here. K. A. Borozdin writes: "... now we have not only Russified the region, but in positive meaning, we increased its population with Armenians".⁸⁵

At the end of the 19th century the European nationalities also constituted a large number. It worried the Russian government. That is why the tsarist government began to implement certain stimulating measures to populate the Transcaucasus with Russian peasants.⁸⁶

From the end of the 19th century the increase in the Russian population was especially peculiar for the Transcaucasus. First of all it was a result of the Russia's government policy of colonization and pursued the aim of reinforcement of the southern borders of Russia. Many years ago the Black Sea's southern coasts and Transcaucasia were conquered by Russia.

The settlement of the Caucasus by the Russian resettlers started in the 1830s. In 1835-1852 100,000,000 rubles were spent for the protection of the Black Sea's coast and establishment enterprises there. Meanwhile, in the course of time, there settled in all 4000 people.⁸⁷

But the resettlement became complicated and it later temporarily stopped because the Russian government was not quite ready for the resettlement, as well as due to the Crimean War of

⁸⁴ K. A. Borozdin, "The Migrants...", p.131.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 57, p.10.

⁸⁷ Iv. Dukmasov, "About the Settlement of the Black Sea's coast of the Caucasus by the Cossack Troops", M., 1887, p.25.

1853-1856.⁸⁸ Formerly the tsarist government pursued merely defensive aims. From the second half of the 19th century the strategy of the colonization of the land was pushed forward. In 1862 twelve Cossack *stanitsas* (villages) were founded in Tuapse.⁸⁹ The tsarist authorities considered the settlement of the land by the Russian colonists as the only way to secure the territories conquered by Russia. On the other hand a problem was set to popularize the Russian culture.

The project of the Russianization of the Caucasus, particularly, the Transcaucasus, was connected with serious complications. The problem was not solved on a voluntary basis. The attempt to settle the land by the Russian soldiers was also unproductive. The detachments of married persons were organized with the garrisons in the Transcaucasus. The Russian soldiers married the Russian women who were taken there at the expense of the treasury. The married soldiers were given clothing, rifles and bullets. They were also granted vegetable gardens.⁹⁰ In this way some inhabited localities were also established in Eastern Armenia.⁹¹

On October 20, 1830 the tsarist State Council passed the first legislative act about the settlement of the Transcaucasus by Russian resettlers.⁹² According to its articles, the expatriated Russian sectarians had to populate Transcaucasia. Accordingly, those engaged in heretical preaching were considered criminals by the court order. They were conscripted and sent to the Caucasian corps, but those who were unfit for the military service were settled in the Transcaucasus.

The heresy came to birth from the beginning of the 19th century and spread among a considerable portion of the *Great*

⁸⁸ "A Review of the Migration Work" ("The Caucasian Calendar of 1916" Tiflis, 1915, p.99) (in Russian).

⁸⁹ "The Russian geographic Society," the Caucasian Department, The Proceedings, Tiflis, 1906, vol. 25, N7, p.3.

⁹⁰ "A Collection of Materials...", N31, Tiflis, 1902, section II, p.102 (in Russian).

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² "Complete Set of the Laws of the Russian Empire", vol. V, 1830, N 4010 (in Russian)

Russian common people. The Molokans, Doukhobors, Jewish proselytes and Iconoclasts deviated from the Russian Orthodox Church and spread the heresy. Their teachings were against the Russian Orthodox Church and, according to the Russian authorities, their existence was considered contrasting with the Orthodox Russian population. The Russian authorities "cleansed" Central Russia of these elements and exiled to the Transcaucasus – "the exile of recalcitrants".

The tsarist regime solved two problems by banishing the sectarians. First, the Transcaucasus was settled by the Russians. Better conditions were created for them than for natives. In this way the tsarist rule reinforced its positions in the Transcaucasus. Second, the tsarist government prevented the spread of the heresy in Russia proper, which was considered harmful.

It is necessary to note, that initially the settlement of the Transcaucasus by the sectarians pursued not so much a strategic or colonizing aim, but rather the aim of "cleansing" Central Russia of the sectarians.

In this connection large groups of the Russian population belonging to the Molokan, Doukhobor, Jewish proselytes and the Iconoclast sects were banished from the central Russian cities and provinces - Tambov, Samara, Saratov, Penza, Voronezh, Orenburg, Yenisei, Tavricheski, Besarabia and others to the Transcaucasus.⁹³

In the 1880s there were 78 Russian villages in the Transcaucasus, besides the villages where the Russians lived side by side with other nationalities.⁹⁴

The Russians were prohibited to practice heresy or to propagate it. Later, that kind of persecution was ceased.

In this way, the colonization of the Transcaucasus and, particularly, Eastern Armenia started in the 1830-40s. Meanwhile, until 1889 the resettlement generally lacked a certain system and had a sporadic character in the Transcaucasus.⁹⁵ On March 10, 1866 a set

⁹¹ "A Memory Book of the Erivan Province of 1900", Erivan, 1902, section IV, p. 143 and some other sources (in Russian).

⁹⁴ "A Code of Materials...", vol. II, Tiflis, 1887, p.3 (in Russian).

⁹⁵ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1916", p.100.

of regulations about the settlement of the Black Sea's coasts was published. According to a corresponding article of the Regulations the resettlers were given the right of land tenure on the basis of communal principles.⁹⁶ But despite the efforts of the Russian government, it became impossible to settle the Transcaucasus by the Russian settlers. That is why special people were sent to Turkey to invite Armenians and Greeks. However this measure was also unproductive, because people were not provided with adequate dwelling and living conditions. They slept in the open air in rainy or cold weather.

On 23 December, 1870 the Congress of the heads of the village communities discussed the question of the expediency of giving land to small landowners or big landlords. In order to stir a permanent interest in this question the Congress decided to grant the land to small landowners. But, again after all these efforts it was very difficult to populate the area with Russians, because they were not acquainted with gardening, vegetable-growing, wine-making and beekeeping. They were acquainted only with the cultivation of the grain.⁹⁷

The main difficulty to settle the Black Sea's coasts by the Russians and the impossibility of the land tenure was also connected by the lack of water and roads.

They were not accustomed to the local climatic conditions. The fever was widespread.⁹⁸ Because of that, the most part of the Russian settlers returned home. After 1897, when the new law about the settlement of the Black Sea's province was published, wide works were initiated. Resettlement was launched only after ground areas had been made ready for that. A special land surveying group was sent to the Caucasus with that end in view. Until 1906 the group put to rights 1,700,000 *desyatin* of the state land of which 835,000 *desyatin* were ready for the settlement.⁹⁹ In the course of its activities

⁹⁶ *Iv.Dukmasov*. "About the Settlement of the Black Sea's coast...", p.6, The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 57, p.11.

⁹⁷ *Iv.Dukmasov*. Op. cit., p.8-9.

⁹⁸ The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 57, p.11.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*.

the group prepared 44 ground areas ready for settlement.¹⁰⁰ During 1905-1914 1,126,000 rubles were assigned for the purpose of the road-building works.¹⁰¹

The resettlement of the Russians in the Transcaucasus started after 1899, when the tsarist law of July 13, 1889 about the resettlement of the peasants and nobles on the state lands in Siberia was also applied to the Transcaucasus.¹⁰² In the first place, it was aimed to populate the steppes of Mughan and Mil, secondly - the steppes of Shirvan, Salyanski, Jeyran-Chalali, as well as of Shirak and Sardarapat in Eastern Armenia.¹⁰³ The settlement was realized along the edges of the roads, on the vast coastline territories and in the most fertile lands.

First of all those landless peasants who earlier found temporary shelter as tenants or "other inhabitants" (i.e. peasants not belonging to the Cossack class but living in the Cossack regions) in the Cossack villages of the North Caucasus were resettled in the free lands¹⁰⁴. They migrated from the regions of the Terek and Kuban and to some extent were accustomed to the climatic and economic conditions of the Caucasus. By the permission of the authorities, together with them were also resettling from the central regions of the Russian Empire those whose economic state was not stable. For example, from 1905 until the end of 1911 besides "other citizens" (2,373 men) many migrated to the Black Sea's region from the central Russian provinces.

Thus, until the end of 1911, the extent of the lands ready for the resettlement in the Caucasus was 511,972 *desyatin* instead of 214,617 in 1905. In December of 1911 45,864 *desyatin* were settled, of which 34,548 *desyatin* were populated with 34,694 people (in 290

¹⁰⁰ "The Russian Geographic Society," the Caucasian Department, The Proceedings, Tiflis, 1906, vol. 25, N7, p.3.

¹⁰¹ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1916", p.104.

¹⁰² "The Caucasian Calendar of 1913", Tiflis, 1912, section IV, p.326.

¹⁰³ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1916", p.99-100.

¹⁰⁴ The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 57, p.11; "The Caucasian Calendar of 1913", Tiflis, section IV, p.328.

villages).¹⁰⁵ In 1908-1912, not counting the soldiers, 8,326 Russian families (numbering 55,000 men and women) were settled in the Caucasian territory. Most of them settled in Transcaucasia: the province of Baku (11,515), the province of Tiflis (3,204), the province of Elizavetpol (2,987), the region of Sukhumi (2,036), the district of Kars (1,566).¹⁰⁶

Before that, in 1905-1908 yearly settled 2,000 men. Later, resettlement continued. Until 1915 the former Russian resettlers, partially, as well as the local population were granted 543,867 *desyatins* which consisted of 80,786 plots, 78 % of which were given to the resettlers. Funds were invested for the purpose of the development of their allotments, increase of the relief, house-building, improvement of their spiritual and educational institutions, road-building, water-supply, agronomic help, test fields, organization of forest plantation, improvement of the livestock and poultry, the supply of good seed stock of wheat and cotton.¹⁰⁷ Various societies and village communities helped to build the manufacturing enterprises of local importance (e.g. mills, ginneries and the manufacture of raw material processing) for the Russian resettlers.¹⁰⁸

According to the statistic sources, the total number of the Russian population increased sharply in the period between 1886 and 1913 from 122,257 to 598,851, i.e. the increase constituted 489.8 % and its specific weight in the total number of the Transcaucasia's population rose four times.

The Russians were settled in Eastern Armenia by the same methods as generally in the Caucasus.¹⁰⁹ They inhabited localities of Jalaloghlu, Kamenski, Rus Herher, Novopakrovka, Privolnie were

founded in the region of Bortchalu by the formation of the married persons' detachments attached to the garrison regiments.¹¹⁰ The province of Erevan was populated with the Molokans, Doukhobors and the Russians belonging to other sects that were banished from the above-mentioned provinces of Central Russia.¹¹¹

A number of Russian inhabited localities were founded in the province of Erevan. In 1834 Vorontsovka and Simyonovka were founded which later (1835, 1838 and 1846) increased owing to a new influx of resettlers. In 1834 Constantinovka and Elenovka were founded (which increased in 1836, 1838 and 1846), in 1842 - Nikitino (increased in 1843 and 1847), in 1847 - Voskresenovka, in 1859 - Nadezhdino and other Russian settlements.¹¹² For a long time many of their inhabitants were free of taxes.¹¹³

A part of the Molokans that settled in Elenovka and Alexandrovka later moved to the region of Kaghzvan.¹¹⁴ V.Dpvitski wrote:

"We heard many interesting answers to the question about their ancestors' native land. Some of their ancestors were refugee soldiers, some from Siberia, some escaped the serfdom and others broke out of prison. First they resettled on the Black Sea's coast, which recently joined Russia... Such newcomers were registered and got passports in Anapa, Kertch and other cities and came from there as legal persons."¹¹⁵

The Russian sectarians became permanent residents of the province of Erevan and their total number in the 1850s reached 3,561.¹¹⁶ In the 1880s the Russian villages of Novo-Mikhaylovka, Alexandrovka, and Nikolayevka in Lori were founded.¹¹⁷ Later, the

¹⁰⁵ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1913", Tiflis, 1912, section IV, p.331, 333.

¹⁰⁶ "A Survey of the Migrating in the Caucasus During Five Years, 1908-1912", St.-Petersburg, 1913, p.6.

¹⁰⁷ The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 57, p.11; "The Caucasian Calendar of 1916", p.102, 104.

¹⁰⁸ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1916", p.104-105.

¹⁰⁹ D.Mouradyan, V.Martirosyan. From the Chronicle of joining Eastern Armenia to Russia, Teghegagir, N12, Erevan, 1957; A.Kh., Haytayan. Russian Settlers of Armenia in 1830-1920, Erevan, 1989 (both in Armenian); V.G.Tounyan. Eastern Armenian as a part of Russia, Erevan, 1989 (in Russian).

¹¹⁰ "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N31, Section II, p.102.

¹¹¹ "A Memory Book of the Erivan Province of 1900", Erivan, 1902, Section IV, p.143.

¹¹² The SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 378, p.33, f. 1130, p.21, 23, 24.

¹¹³ Ibid., f. 364, p.1-7, f. 365, p.1-9, f. 366, p.1-9, f. 367, p.1-9, f. 368, p.1-4, f. 660, p.2-3.

¹¹⁴ "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N38, Section I, p.237.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., N21, Tiflis, 1896, p.177.

¹¹⁶ The SCA RA, fund 133, list 1, f. 2382, p.24.

¹¹⁷ "A Code of Materials...", vol. II, p.2.

khutors and villages of Dilijan's Mikhaylovka, Bazartchay, Borisovka, Soukhoy Fantan ("dry fountain"), Inner Akhta, Karyakinskin and Sharinski (in the district of Alexandropol) were founded.

The colonization was relatively intensive in the district of Kars. In 1886 the total number of Russians settled in the province of Erevan reached 4,152 (only 3,200 Russian sectarians lived in the region of Lori, which was included in the province of Tbilisi)¹¹⁸. The number of the Russians in the district of Kars reached 10,700 (6,200 Molokans, 4,500 Doukhobors and the rest belonged to another sect).¹¹⁹ They settled in the villages of Blagorodnoye, Darovka, Novo-Petrovka, Odintsovo, Orshanka, Romanovo and in some others. Later, the Orthodox Russians also settled in the district of Kars (partially in the province of Erevan too). They were mainly Russian retired servicemen, whose number gradually increased especially in the district of Kars. In 1908-1912 28,199 *desyatins* of plots of arable land were distributed among the Russian settlers in the province of Erevan, and 42,509 *desyatins* were distributed among the Russian settlers in the district of Kars.¹²⁰

Thus, the Russian sectarians settled in those regions of Eastern Armenia (picturesque landscape of Lori, the western and north-western coasts of Lake Sevan, along the Erevan-Sevan-Aghstafa route) which climatically resembled their native places. These places stood out for their rich Alpine meadows and pastures, forests and free ground areas, which are a very important environmental condition for cattle-breeding and plant cultivation. The researchers of the way of life of the Russian sectarians in the Transcaucasus noted that they did not settle in plain areas not only because of the hot climate but also on account of not being acquainted with plant

¹¹⁸ "A Code of Statistic Data about the Population of the Transcaucasian Territory, Derived from the Family Lists of 1886", Tiflis, 1893 (without page numbering); "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N 31, Section II, p.104.

¹¹⁹ "A Code of Statistic Data...", "The Caucasian Calendar of 1891", Tiflis, 1890, Section I, p.228.

¹²⁰ "A Review of the Migration Work", p.24.

cultivation.¹²¹ The Russian settlements in Eastern Armenia (as well as in the whole of Transcaucasia) were founded mainly along the central roads. It had a military as well as economic importance. The Russian settler got a chance to secure for himself a job. In the short course of time the trade turnover along the route of Julfa-Erevan-Aghstafa was mainly centralized in the hands of the Russian coachmen. The Russian four-wheeled coaches within the limits of Eastern Armenia transported not only industrial cotton and other agricultural products, petroleum and salt, but also served foreign trade amongst Russia, Turkey and Persia within the limits of the province of Erevan and the district of Kars.

The state free and best lands populated by the Russian resettlers were allotted once in 5-7 years. There were no landless persons with the exception of Vorontsovka and Novo-Mokhaylovka, which were founded on the manorial lands. In the course of time the peasants bought these lands from the landlords and privatized.¹²²

In the course of the foundation of villages, during the allotment of the lands, the expected migration and the natural growth of the population were taken into account and additionally were allotted lands at the rate of 30%. The Russian population was granted the best lands. Usually, the per head norm of the Russian settlers was twice or thrice as many as the per head norm of the local Armenian population. Besides, their lots constantly increased at the expense of the cutting down of the lands of the local population.¹²³

The terms of tax exemption for the Russian resettlers were longer, than for the Armenian migrants. Usually, for the resettlers in new lands the period of exemption from taxes was six years.¹²⁴ Those who migrated to Transcaucasia voluntarily were granted longer terms of exemption from taxes - for the sectarians eight years, for the orthodox ten years. If a sectarian was converted to the orthodoxy the exemption term it would be prolonged for 25 years.¹²⁵

¹²¹ "A Memory Book of the Erivan Province of 1902", Section IV, p.144.

¹²² "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N31, Section II, p.112, 113.

¹²³ T. Avdalbekyan, Agrarian Question in Eastern Armenia, p.163-233.

¹²⁴ "The Acts...", vol. VII, p.171, 332.

¹²⁵ T. Avdalbekyan, Op. cit., p.198-199.

The colonial policy of the tsarist government also became apparent in other ways.

Some researchers rightly noticed that together with the negative sides of the tsarist colonial policy there was "a positive innovation brought by the Russian resettlement in the economic and cultural life of the local population".¹²⁶

The local population learnt from the Russian sectarians their specific way of vegetable-growing. Before that e.g. they did not cultivate cabbage and carrot in the province of Erevan. Various sorts of vegetables cultivated by the Russian resettlers in Lori, as well as pickle were sold in the markets of Tiflis, Alexandropol, and Kars. Like the Russian resettlers the local population in many villages began to use the Russian four-wheeled *telega* (wagon). A considerable portion of the population in the regions of Lori, Dilijan and Akhta followed the Russians and they in their turn took after the local population in housekeeping and specific features of the way of life. Take for example the Russian resettlers in comparatively high parts of Lori. They began to practice gardening. The apple-tree, pear-tree, cherry-tree, plum-tree became especially prevalent. In Lori the Russian settlers began to practice the three-field system, fertilization and twice a year plowing of the soil, washing out the seeds, horse breeding, intensive dairy farming on the basis of stock farming. Cheese and butter made by them stood out in Transcaucasia for their high quality and cleanness.

In the 1860s a number of factories of the cheese manufacturing industry worked in the Russian villages of Lori. Their yearly production was about 163,800 kg of cheese and 16,380 or 32,760 kg of butter.¹²⁷

The Russian sectarians also exemplified for the outward appearance of their villages and dwellings. They built their houses along both sides of the wide and straight road, painted with white chalk. Their houses had wide yards.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ A. L. Badalyan, The Population of Armenia Since It Joined Russia Until the Present. - "Proceeding of the AS of the Arm.SSR", 1959, N3, p.52 (in Russian).

¹²⁷ "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N 31, Section II, p.122-123.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p.104.

Specialists, studying the way of life of the Russian sectarians, especially stressed diligence, honesty, materially relative well being of the Molokans, as well as of the Doukhobors.¹²⁹

The Russian resettlers of the province of Erevan preserved their traditions and were different in the way of life. The poor or the rich had his winter and summer good or bad clothing. In winter they wore *valenki* made by them (felt footwear), fur-coats made of the clothing of sheep or goat. They did not resign even the sledge. They got used to new conditions and in the initial period their difficulties connected with the resettlement and the bitterness of banishment and living apart from their family were lightened.¹³⁰

In spite of the discriminate policy of tsarist government, from the very beginning tight friendly relations were established between the local and the Russian population, as a consequence of that everywhere reigned the atmosphere of mutual warm relations.

The Russian sectarians were in better material conditions in the province of Erevan, than their compatriots in their Motherland. But the rise and further development of capitalistic relations in Transcaucasia displaced the Russian sectarians who were engaged in agriculture and carrier's trade. Together with new settlers the peasantry grew poor and left for the developing towns and cities of the region in order to find jobs. In 1913, 36,200 Russians lived in the province of Erevan and the district of Kars.

Thus, the population of Eastern Armenia increased not only because of the immigrating Armenians, but also due to the resettlement of the Russian population.

¹²⁹ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1891", Section I, p.227.

¹³⁰ "The Transcaucasian Sectants in Their Family and Religious Private Life", St. Petersburg, 1885, p.2.

CHAPTER THREE

THE GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN 1828-1918

1. General growth of population

After unification of Eastern Armenia with Russia together with the mechanical growth of population its natural increase became a very essential factor, which had especially important significance in 1831-1876. During that period the role of immigration was small and the population increased merely owing to its natural factor.*

The high birth rate was a characteristic feature of demographic processes in Eastern Armenia. But it was accompanied by a rather high death-rate. Accordingly, the natural growth of the population was a modest one which brought a very quick change of generations. The natural growth of the population in the course of decades did not outnumber 14-15 per 1,000 population, in conditions of the high birth rate. The table 3 gives an approximate picture of this fact.

Table 3.

The Natural Growth of the Population in the Province of Erevan in 1886-1913¹³¹ (per 1,000 population)

Years	Birth	Mortality	The natural growth
1886	32,2	16,9	15,3
1897-1900	-	-	14,0
1901-1905	-	-	11,1
1906-1910	33,5	22,0	11,5
1911-1913	33,8	18,5	15,3
the average 1904-1913	33,0	20,6	12,4
of which			
males	17,5	10,8	6,7
females	15,5	9,8	5,7

* We are obliged to note that there is a lack of truthful data that would separately characterize natural and mechanical changes, especially taking into account that immigration had a permanent character and favored to the growth of the population's number of and its natural change.

¹³¹ The Table is compiled on the basis of calculations according to the corresponding data published every year in "A Review of the Province of Erevan", 1900-1914 and "The Caucasian Calendar", 1904-1914. The calculation of 1886 is based on the data of the 1886 family registration and the archive materials (the SCA RA, fund 113, list 1, f. 420, p.61-62).

Thousands died because of poor social and economic conditions, periodically repeated famine and infectious diseases, practically in the absence of medical treatment. Scarcely a little more than a half of infants reached the age of capacity. It happened that the general number of deaths was almost equal to the number of the new-born in some regions. In 1897-1913 the population increased more than 206,5 in the province of Erevan because of the natural component. The mortality of men was comparatively lower than that of women. In Table 3 the mortality among men and women is calculated per 1,000 population.

The number of men outnumbered the quantity of women in Transcaucasia (and generally among the peoples of the East) including the Armenian population. That is why in Table 3 the death factor of women is shown higher than that of men. But if we try to calculate the death factor of each sex per 1,000 population, we shall notice that between 1904 and 1913 in the province of Erevan yearly 202,7 men and 209,9 women died per 10,000 population.

According to a widely spread opinion the great number of men as compared with the number of women in the East, as well as the high death rate of women is explained by poor living conditions of the population, especially of women. At the end of the 19th century the famous demographer and statistician Ju.E.Janson wrote:

"The main reasons determining the number of men and women in the structure of the population are motivated by social, more exact, by economic and legal conditions. Wherever the level of economic development is not high and the people live a nomadic, pastoral life, the number of women is small. Their number is also small among the agricultural people who have an extensive economy".¹³²

We think that such a widely spread approach is correct, but imperfect. The mortality of women is not the only reason for a difference in the number of men and women.

¹³² Ju.E. Janson. A Comparative Statistics of the Population, St. Petersburg, 1892, p.80.

As we have noticed, the mortality of women only slightly exceeds that of men. It couldn't result in a notable difference between the number of men and women, if the birth rate of boys weren't higher than that of the girls. For example, according to the same data, in 1904-1913 the number of the new-born boys was 170 and the number of deaths 103 per 10,000 heads of the population (average annual), i.e. the natural growth was 67. Meanwhile, correspondingly 155 girls were born and 98 died and their natural growth was 57, i.e. 10 persons less. First of all, the greater number of the born boys, in the course of time resulted in the increase of the number of men. Simultaneously we can see, that more men died than women per 10,000 heads of the population.

In the course of the 19th century among the Eastern peoples, as compared with the number of the women, the predominance of the number of men was also explained by other reasons, e.g. during the census or registrations by miscalculation of the number of women in some places, including Eastern Armenia, the presence of soldiers which did not constitute the organic part of the population. As compared with the men the small number of women was also explained by insufficient registration of the new-born and the mortality of girls, because, as has been noticed by the contemporary authors, men as "tax-payers" had more significance than women.

If we take into consideration the fact that in 1873-1913 the natural increase was 13-14 people per 1,000 heads of the population in the province of Erevan, it will follow that in the course of those 40 years about 310,000 people resettled from Western Armenia and found permanent residence in Eastern Armenia. It means that yearly 7-8 thousand displaced Armenians from Western Armenia settled in the province of Erevan. But during that period the annual average was 8-10 thousand people migrating from the province of Erevan to Transcaucasia and other places of the Caucasus. It follows that the number of the immigrating people was about 16-18 thousand.

Owing to the migration and the natural factor during the period of 1827-1913, i.e. about 86 years the population of the province of Erevan increased nine-fold: from 119,700 in 1827 to 1,071,600 in 1913. It was also influenced by the change of the

borders of the province of Erevan. The number of the Armenian population increased and reached 608,000 in 1913. Its specific weight constituted 56.7 % in the general number of the population.

The number of the Armenians also increased in other regions of Eastern Armenia, especially in Lori and Zangezur. The population increase, mainly due to the resettlement, was more tangible in the district of Kars which was near the border of Western Armenia. In 1886 174,000 people lived there. In 1897 this number reached 290,700 and in 1913 - 382,700 as is seen in table 4:

Table 4.
The population of the province of Erevan and the district of Kars by regions (1831-1913) (thousands)

	1831	1873	1886	1897	1913
1. The province of Erevan including	1164,2	547,7	670,4	29,6	1071,6
Erevan region		96,1	113,6	150,9	202,3
Alexandropol region		107,0	135,7	165,5	230,7
Etchmiadzin region		83,0	100,6	124,3	147,1
Nakhijevan region		69,1	84,0	100,8	135,6
Nor Bayazet region		73,2	103,6	122,6	172,4
Surmalu region		58,5	71,1	89,0	98,3
Sharour-Daralagyaz		51,8	61,8	76,5	85,2
2. The district of Kars including			174,0	290,7	382,7
Kars region			76,9	134,1	171,6
Ardahan region			43,6	65,8	93,0
Kaghzvan region			34,2	59,2	79,1
Olti region			19,3	31,6	39,0

According to the 1897 census 13.5% of the population of the Kars district migrated from Turkey and became permanent residents of the district. (As we have noticed, a certain portion of Turks and Kurds who lived in Eastern Armenia migrated to Turkey).

As far as it concerns the population growth in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia, the facts testify to the following: in 1827 it had only 97,000 population, in 1831 - 161,700, while in 1897 the number of population reached 797,900 and in 1913

- more than 1,000,000. During that period the Armenian population increased about 22 times. While in 1832-1913, the population increased 2.74 times within the limits of the Russian empire.

Eastern Armenia attracted the Armenian population of Western Armenia not only by comparatively better material conditions and well-being, but mainly because life was guaranteed there. The Armenian population under the protection of the Russian power got a chance of taking refuge and living a peaceful life.

Since the second half of the 19th century the process of the natural growth and migration of the population coincided with the abolition of serfdom and the formation and further development of capitalistic relations in Russia, as well as economic expansion in the Caucasus. Such conditions predetermined movements of the population in Russia, as well as in Transcaucasia. The wave of these movements together with other peoples also included the migrating Armenian population of Transcaucasia, as well as from Western Armenia.

Before World War I the growth of the Armenian population in Transcaucasia, on the whole, was quicker than in Eastern Armenia, and, particularly, in the province of Erevan and the district of Kars.

2. The urban population

Armenia mainly was an agricultural country. Until the first decades of the 20th century population mainly lived in rural areas and was employed in agriculture. In 1913 10.4% of the province of Erevan lived in towns.

At the time of joining Russia there were three cities in the Armenian district; Erevan, Nakhijevan and Ordubad.

Erevan was an administrative centre. In the course of time the Armenian population diminished there and the number of Persians and Tatars sharply increased. As for Nakhijevan and Ordubad, which once were towns with mostly Armenian population and the centers of brisk trade in historic Armenia, they already had a population with dominating foreign element. It was not only a result of populating

these towns with Tatars, Persians, Turks and Kurds, but also because of the policy of the forcible deportation of Armenians. During Persian domination Gavar [later *Nor (new)* Bayazet] became an uninhabited town.

The urban population increased after Eastern Armenian had become a part of Russia. The number of Persians and Turks diminished (see table 5)

Table 5.

The urban population of Eastern Armenia
before and after joining Russia

Cities	1827	1831
Erevan	9,700	11,463
Nakhijevan	4,360	5,470
Ordubad	3,262	3,444

Immigrants mostly settled in rural areas and during the first years of becoming a part of the Russian empire the specific weight of the urban population decreased in Eastern Armenia: from 10.2% in 1827 to 8.4% in 1831.

In the course of time until the third quarter of the 19th century the population increase was not high in Eastern Armenia. First of all it is explained by the fact that accumulation of capital was not much in the cities of Eastern Armenia. Trade capital, because of its small volume, as well as not finding a sphere of application, did not turn into productive capital. On the other hand, Erevan and Nakhijevan did not play a great role in foreign commerce with Russia, Western Europe and Asia (particularly, Turkey). Such commercial and economic contacts were mainly realized by means of Alexandropol. Erevan played a transit role in trade relations with Persia. The reason was the lack of means of communication and insufficient mobility of the labour force, patriarchal life, customs and water-shortage. The later did not allow increase in the commodity production in agriculture. In the course of half a century (1831-1886) the population of Erevan increased only by 3,275. While at the beginning of the 1830s, Erevan with its population was the third city in Transcaucasia.

Alexandropol was a trade junction of foreign commerce between Russia and Turkey. Since the beginning of the 1860s and it

had become the most populated city of Eastern Armenia and remained so until World War I.

Gyumri (Kumayri) was a small inhabited locality in 1830. In 1837 Alexandropol fortress was founded and Gyumri was renamed Alexandropol. It was put on the list of the towns of the Georgian-Imeretian province.¹³³ After formation of the Erevan province Alexandropol became a provincial town of the Erevan province. From 1840 it enjoyed rights of the region town¹³⁴.

A customs house was founded in Alexandropol. *Nor (new) Bayazet* became a town in 1850 and its population in 1850-1886 trebled due to the resettlement of Armenians from Western Armenia (mainly from Bayazet). At the same time, the urban population of Nakhijevan and Ordubad increased slightly although Nakhijevan, in its turn, was a junction of commerce between Russia and Persia.

In the 1850s Persian goods worth about 1,500,000 rubles in silver arrived through the Nakhijevan customs house.¹³⁵ The Armenians of Nakhijevan had already run a centuries-old lively trade with the merchants of Russia (mainly Novgorod) and European countries (Leipzig, Hamburg, Trieste, Marseilles and other cities).

During the years of the Persian domination Nakhijevan continued to keep its role of the important commerce junction, because it was situated on the Tiflis-Tabriz commerce route. The Persian rulers of Erevan and Nakhijevan ran a lively trade with Tiflis, importing from there a considerable portion of luxury and silk goods for their harems. But during the years of the Persian domination trade declined to a certain extent. It was connected with the fact that the agricultural products of Eastern Armenia, mainly cotton and silk, did not enter the sphere of commerce. They were turned over to *sardar* at low prices.

After Eastern Armenia joined Russia the role of Nakhijevan in foreign commerce remained intact, but domestic trade declined because the demand for luxuries diminished among the rich Persians and the members of their families. However, the slow growth of the population of Nakhijevan was explained not only by this reason, but also was connected with not creating of any manufacturing branches and slow development of handicrafts.

¹³³ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1846," p.47.

¹³⁴ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1850," p.33.

¹³⁵ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1850," Section III, p.70.

The migration of population from Persia to Eastern Armenia gradually ceased, while the population of Alexandropol and Nor Bayazet continued to increase owing to the resettlement of the Armenians from Western Armenia.

In the last decades of the 19th the situation changed in Erevan province. The Russian demand for cotton manufacturing had an impact on cotton-growing and the general development of commercial agriculture. This, in turn, stimulated the population growth of the Erevan province. Expansion of the scale of production of cotton and cognac alcohol contributed to the increase of trade capital.

The cotton produced in the province was exported to Russia. The main thoroughfare was the Erevan-Sevan-Aghstafa highway. It also contributed to the population increase. Commercial agriculture, in its turn, increased the need for agricultural implements, which were mainly made in the town workshops.

The number of the merchants busy in retail and wholesale trade also increased. Commercial agriculture strengthened the pauperization of the village. Masses of peasants devoid of land and property sought employment and livelihood in cities. These factors contributed to the acceleration of the growth of the Erevan population. Meanwhile the growth of the population of Alexandropol slowly diminished (see table 6).

Table 6.
The growth of the urban Population in Eastern Armenia in
1831-1914¹³⁶

Cities	Years					
	1831	1850	1866	1886	1897	1915
Erevan	11463	12815	12801	14738	29006	51286
Alexandropol	-	11280	16337	24230	30616	51874
Nakhijevan	5470	4500	6251	6939	8790	8934
Ordubad	3444	4156	4596	4199	4611	5717
Nor (new)						
Bayazet	1346	2560	4511	7488	8436	14748
Kars	-	-	-	3939	20305	30514
Total	20377	35311	41496	61533	102314	163013

¹³⁶ I. Shopen, Op. cit., p.646, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1864", p.48, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1864", p.48, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1850", p.33, 34, 36, 38, 69, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1852", p.439, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1853", p.93, "The Caucasian Calendar of 1917", p.214-221.

In 1886-1897 the population of Erevan province and the district of Kars almost doubled and in 1897-1915 it increased by 60%.

Suffice it to say, that in 1886-1915, on the whole, number of the increased urban population of Eastern Armenia 36.7% fell to the share of Erevan, 27% to the share of Alexandropol and 27% to the share of Kars. In 1914 the share of the urban population in Erevan province was 10.4 % of the total number of population and in the district of Kars it was 12.4 %.

Before World War I the Armenian population in Transcaucasia increased quicker than generally in Eastern Armenia and, particularly, in Erevan province and the district of Kars.

PART TWO **THE POPULATION'S EMPLOYMENT IN THE** **19th CENTURY**

CHAPTER FOUR **THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM AND THE** **ARMENIAN POPULATION IN TRANSCAUCASIA**

1. The territorial movements of the population

Since the second half of the 19th century the process of the natural growth and migration of the population in Eastern Armenia had coincided with the abolishment of serfdom and the origin and development of capitalistic relations in Russia. Along with the conquest of the Caucasus, all these circumstances predetermined movements of the population in Russia and Transcaucasia. The wave of these movements among other peoples considerably included the migration of the Armenian population as from the Transcaucasus, as well as Western Armenia.

First, the abolishment of serfdom and the penetration of the commercial capital in the countryside awakened colonial outlying districts of Russia, including Transcaucasia out of their age-long drowsiness. The latter, owing to its natural rich resources that long ago had already attracted attention of the Russian and foreign capital, since the end of the 19th century had been involved in the sphere of the world commodity circulation.

At the end of the 19th century capitalism was forming on a firm basis. The economic development of Transcaucasia lumped and fell much abreast of the industrial centers of the great state.

Second, the level of capitalistic development of certain provinces of Transcaucasia, Tiflis and Baku rather surpassed the average level of the Russian empire.

At the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century the industry experienced a rapid development. In 1901 all industrial enterprises, which were under the control of the manufacturing inspection, were located in the province of Baku. Their total number

in Transcaucasia grew from 177 in 1914 to 902 in 1914,¹³⁷ and the number of workers increased 6,2 times.¹³⁸

In 1914 more than 65 of these industrial enterprises and more than 82% of employed workers were in the province of Baku.¹³⁹ It was evidence of comparatively high level of concentration of industrial production.

Because of inexhaustible resources of oil in Baku, low organic structure of capital, as well as the availability of permanent reserves of the labour force as a consequence of the "surplus" population under conditions of monopoly prices, very high profits were secured in the oil industry.

The rise of the oil industry which accompanied the low organic structure of capital resulted in a permanent increase of the number of employed workers. In 1916 the number of workers in the oil industry almost doubled. It grew from 26,600 in 1900 to 52,000 by 1916. Owing to the rapid growth of capital Baku became one of the large industrial centers of Russia.¹⁴⁰ In 1864-1897 its population grew eight times, the oil production grew and reached the level of 667,000,000 *poods* in 1901 taking first place.¹⁴¹ Extractive and related branches rapidly developed also in Georgia and Eastern Armenia. The oil of Baku, the manganese of Tchiaturu, the copper of Alaverdi and Zangezur brought the world fame to Transcaucasia. The production of the manganese of Tchiaturu was more than 30% of the world production.¹⁴² All the manganese of Tchiaturu was exported. The copper production of Alaverdi and Zangezur gave 1/3 of the production copper in Russia.¹⁴³

¹³⁷ A.Sumbatzade. Industry of Azarbaijan in the 19th century, Baku, 1964 (in Russian).

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ P.Gugushvili. Manufacturing Statistics in Transcaucasia in 1864-1920. - "The Proceedings of the Institute of Economics AS of GSSR", vol. X, Tbilisi, 1957, p.265 (in Russian).

¹⁴⁰ B.Akhundov. The Formation of the Petroleum Industry of Azerbaijan. - "Materials to the 5th International Congress", p.76.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² "Cooperation in the Transcaucasus", I, section II, Tiflis, 1921, p.283.

¹⁴³ "The Proceedings of the First Transcaucasian Economic Conference", p.I, Tiflis, 1923, p.26-27.

Capitalism also penetrated the remote Armenian village. Small farms lost their former stability. The habitual bases of the socio-economic life of the village shuttered. The slow process of differentiation in the village gained a more intensive character. It became perceptible the formation of the class of kulaks and usurers on the one hand and the poor section of the population on the basis of complete decay and pauperization of former small proprietors on the other hand.

The patriarchal peasants, deprived of land and grown to beggary, were awakened of age-long drowsiness and went into manufacturing industry. They became wage labourers, leaving their native land. This section of impoverished peasants being forced out of the village became the main source of replenishment of the industrial centers' labour force in Transcaucasia. The reform did not provide many Armenian peasants with a plot of land.

The movements of population were intensified by the decaying peasant economy based on small production. The former stagnated, closed and immobilized life of the population was giving way to a mobile life. The ranks of unemployed people increased in villages and cities because of those who reached and had not only to earn their living but to lighten their families' material burden too.

The process of the dispossession of land in the Armenian village was caused not only by intensive rooting of the capitalistic relations, but also stratification of families and the formation of new ones. The split of patriarchal families was accompanied by the split of their land and property. The most part of the new formed families were deprived of their lots and of the chance to earn a living in their patriarchal house. Commerce increased, particularly, the land trade.

It is true that capital also accumulated in the copper mines of Zangezur and Alaverdi and some manufacturing firms of Erevan province, but the stratification of the Armenian village was more intensive than the capital accumulated in Eastern Armenia. The copper mines of Zangezur and Alaverdi were unable to absorb all working hands which were forced out of the Armenian village as a result of the stratification.

The class which possessed money (i.e. commerce and usurious stratum) was directed at the industrial centers of the Transcaucasus and grew into the industrial bourgeoisie. The agricultural character of the economy of Armenia and the low pace of the industrial development determined employment. The speed of the natural growth of the population, including those who reached, surpassed the pace of the national economy. The breach between supply and demand for labour force resulted in a "surplus" of population and the only way out was seasonal employment away from the countryside.

In such conditions the labour force flew over the borders of the province mainly to the places of the forming Armenian bourgeoisie and its capital. The movements of the population took place parallel to overcoming the national barriers. The developing cities got a fresh impetus and the young labour force concentrated there. It was a regular process, which left no evidence to indicate general numbers. As a result, we have no direct data about the Armenian villages, regions or the seasonal employment away from the village by the end of the 19th century. We have only some official data according to which the actual sizes of the seasonal employment were smaller than they likely were in reality.

From this point of view the economist A. Badalyan is correct in not trusting the facts brought forward by Danilovitch who studied these questions. According to his article the annual number of the people engaged in seasonal employment was 10-15,000. He took as a basis the number of passports received by peasants. As noted A. Badalyan, most of the displaced people left with a certificate of the village elder.¹⁴⁴ A study of some sources¹⁴⁵ brought him to a conclusion that in Zangezur the number of persons engaged in seasonal employment by 1884 was 28-30% of the male population at and in Daralagyaz, accordingly was 55% by 1903.

There are indirect facts about a substantial scale of seasonal employment of the population away from the Armenian village in "The Caucasian Calendar" and the all-Russian census. They indicate how the seasonal employment imprinted on the territorial

distribution, different branches of the structure and employment of the population's gender and age. The increase of the urban population which mainly took place at the expense of the seasonal employment away from the village in Transcaucasia resulted in the disintegration of the normal ratio of the gender and age structure of the urban and rural populations.

The number of boys was dominant in cities and of girls was dominant in villages and such a disproportion became an accompanying regularity of the developing capitalism. The ratio between the numbers of male and female population was not much distorted in those cities of Transcaucasia where industry and allied industries were not developed and they were not administrative centers and had no garrisons. Meanwhile the number of the male population was higher in the developing large cities, but in the countryside where the level of the seasonal employment was high, the number of the female population prevailed as compared with the cities.

Since the formation of the capitalistic relations in Transcaucasia a great difference between genders in the most active labour age had been observed in Tiflis and Baku, Erevan and Alexandropol, though it was also characteristic for other cities. There is no doubt that this phenomenon was a result of the development of capitalistic relations and manifestation of population mobility.

At the beginning of the 20th century the decomposing rural population occupied itself with seasonal employment out of the province as well. The part of those who were engaged in seasonal employment and remained in the province also carried out some agricultural work together with industrial work. Those who left the province occupied themselves with different works depending on the place where they would go.

The Armenians engaged in the seasonal employment mainly worked in the sphere of industry in Baku,¹⁴⁶ commerce and temporary waged jobs and in the domestic service in Tiflis. Those

¹⁴⁴ "Trabers of the Social Sciences of the AS RA", 1953, N5, p.60 (in Armenian).

¹⁴⁵ "Nor Dar", 1885, t. 139 (in Armenian).

¹⁴⁶ The research work (1909) revealed that Armenian workers mainly worked in the qualified spheres of industry. Among the researched groups of the workers 24.7% were unskilled workers, 2.2% apprentices, domestic staff 6.7% (A. Stopani. The oil-industry worker and his budget, Baku, 1916, p.5, in Russian).

who went to the province of Elisavetpol occupied themselves with seasonal agricultural works.

Poor and landless peasants from mountainous and sub-mountainous regions occupied themselves with seasonal agricultural works in Erevan province. They looked for jobs in late spring and summer in the villages of the Ararat valley. Those peasants who occupied themselves with seasonal agricultural works out of the province as well as in it came back to their houses when the season ended. For the most part they did not take their families to the places of their seasonal employment.

The research work of the materials from Baku revealed the fact that the most part of the workers did not go there for the urban life or for permanent settlement. They went there looking for a seasonal job. That is why, mostly, they kept their ties with the village. It was strongly reflected not only among the Armenians, but also others who were engaged in seasonal employment.

According to data published by A. Stopani, only 16.1 % of the workers occupied in the oil-industry did not keep their ties with the village. The rest of the workers had their household or a plot of land in the village. There were even families which moved to cities, but did not give up their ties with the village and continued to hold their plots. There were also families the most part of which remained in the village, but had no possession there.

The significance of unmarried persons among those who broke their ties with the village was higher than who left families in the native land and lived alone in the places of seasonal employment. It is worthy to mention that only 3 % of the singles and 30 % of the married living in Baku had no ties with the village.

The seasonal occupation reached the high level on the eve of the First World War in Erevan province. It was the result of the increase of the landless peasants and impoverished stratum of the village, the rise of taxes, the deepening of the commodity-money relations, the extreme need of money in the village family and the rapid growth of the cities and towns in Transcaucasia.

According to the census sources, during three years prior to World War I, about 119,500 people left Erevan province for seasonal employment. Only 37.5% of them remained within the limits of the

province. About 5% of the seasonal workers went abroad (see table 7)

Table 7.
Seasonal employment in Erevan province in 1912-1914¹⁴⁷

	Years		
	1912	1913	1914
1. A number of villages which were left by peasants for s.e. ¹⁴⁸	828	861	853
2. Total number of the seasonal workers, including	37,033	48,742	33,777
a. within the limits of the province	14,547	17,446	13,007
b. away from the province	20,368	29,159	19,091
c. abroad	2,118	2,137	1,679

Seasonal occupation was especially characteristic for the population of the mountainous regions of the regions of Alexandropol, Nor Bayazet, Etchmiadzin and Nakhijevan of Erevan province.

Besides, a higher portion of the population for seasonal occupation went away from the Sevan basin, Ghazakh, Ijevan and Dilijan to the agricultural regions of the province of Elisavetpol, from the mountainous regions of Erevan province and the region of Etchmiadzin to the villages of the Ararat Valley, from Alexandropol and Lori-Pambak mainly to Tiflis. The able-bodied citizens of Zangezur, Sharour-Daralagyaz and Kapan went to the oil regions of Baku and Grozni¹⁴⁹. The population of the Shirak plateau partly replenished the army of craftsmen of Alexandropol and partly looked for jobs in the Ararat Valley. Only the population of the Ararat Valley kept away from the seasonal occupation. On the contrary, at the high time of the agricultural works people from the mountainous and sub-mountainous regions of the region went there for a seasonal job.

¹⁴⁷ "A Survey of the Erivan Gubernia of 1912," Erivan, 1913, p.14; "...of 1913," Erivan, 1914, p.16; "...of 1914," Erivan, 1915, p.17 (in Russian).

¹⁴⁸ Seasonal employment is given in an abbreviated form s.e.

¹⁴⁹ "The Economic Bulletin of the Armenian SSR, 1923", N2, p.23; "The Economic Bulletin of the Armenian SSR, 1927", N4, p.8.

The seasonal employment was also high from Transcaucasia, especially Armenian villages. It is testified by the following numbers. In 1913, according to the urban statistic data, the number of newly arrived Armenian population was 42,619 in Baku, including 12,950 from Mountainous Karabakh, 9,454 from Zangezur, 9,143 from Shamakhi, 6,770 from Erevan province, 1917 from Gyokcha, 1,187 from Nukhi, 1,198 Ghazakh.¹⁵⁰

Thus, as a result of the development of capitalistic relations and deepening of the social stratification in the village the process of seasonal employment began. Peasants hoped to find jobs and live in towns and cities. Directions of the population's movements and the sources of the labour force's formation for the capitalistic manufacturing industry were determined by the irregular development of capitalism in Transcaucasia.

As far as Eastern Armenia was not characterized by a great impetus and high level of the industrial development, Transcaucasia had to exceed Eastern Armenia and, particularly, Erevan province and the district of Kars by the growth of the Armenian population. The most part of the migrating population from Western Armenia first settled in Eastern Armenia. In the course of time they joined the peasants who were reduced to beggary and dispersed with them in the Transcaucasus and the North Caucasus.

At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries the Armenian population especially increased on the Black Sea's coasts, as well as in other regions of the North Caucasus and the Transcaucasus. It coincided not only with the completion of the economic conquest of the Caucasus, but also with the rapid growth of capitalism in the Transcaucasus. As a result of it the Armenian population increased in the provinces of Baku, Tiflis and the districts of Batumi and Sukhumi. A clear picture of that is given in table 8.

¹⁵⁰ "A Survey of the Erivan Gubernia of 1912, p.14; "...of 1913," p.16, "...of 1914", p.17.

Table 8.
Armenian population in the Caucasus in 1886-1913¹⁵¹

Provinces and regions	1886	1897	1913
Baku province	55,459	52,233	116,910
Elisavetpol - , -	258,324	292,188	377,596
Erevan - , -	375,700	441,000	607,717
Tiflis province with the region of Zakatala	194,131	196,189	392,683
Kars district	37,094	73,406	112,469
Kutaisi province with Batumi district and Sukhumi region	16,399	24,043	35,032
The Black Sea province	970	6,282	15,443
Daghstan district	1,054	1,636	1,205
Kuban - , -	13,095	13,926	
Terek - , -	13,721	11,803	54,106
Stavropol - , -	4,709	5,385	
The whole of the Caucasus	970,656	1,118,091	1,713,169
Including			
Transcaucasia*	937,107	1,079,059	1,642,415
The North Caucasus	33,549	39,032	70,754

Thus, in 1886-1913 the Armenian population in Erevan province increased by 161.8% and in the Transcaucasus, excluding Erevan province and Kars district, the increase of the Armenian population was 185.9%. In 1897-1913 the Armenian population in the whole of the Caucasus increased by 153.2%.

It is clear that during 15 years, when mortality was high, such natural increase of population would be impossible (the average annual 2.9%). It was a result of the active movements of population as is testified by the fact that the average growth of the population

¹⁵¹ The Table is compiled on the basis of "The Statistic Statute Book," "The Caucasian Calendar of 1914", p.110-141; "The First General Census" concerning corresponding provinces and the materials of the 22d Table of the Yearbook.

* According to the administrative division of tsarist Russia, Transcaucasia also included and region. The population of Transcaucasia in this Table and further is considered except for the population of the Black Sea province and Dagestan region.

throughout the Russian empire was 1.6%, in the Caucasus 1.4%, in the Transcaucasus 1.85%, in Erevan province and Kars district 1.75%, in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia 1%. Meanwhile, during that period the average annual growth of the Armenian population in Erevan province and Kars district was 2.25%.¹⁵²

The Armenian population number was high in some Transcaucasian provinces, towns and regions. It was a result of immigration from the mid-19th century from Western Armenia and Persia, as well as because a part of Eastern Armenia was in the limits of Tiflis and Elisavetpol provinces. The movements of the Armenian population in Transcaucasia, in particular at the beginning of the 20th century, increased its role in Transcaucasian provinces (see table 9).

Table 9.

The specific weight (in percentage terms) of the Armenian population in the provinces of Transcaucasia¹⁵³ (except for the Black Sea province and Dagestan region)

Provinces	1886	1897	1913
Tiflis province (with Zakatala region)	22	18,7	17,7
Erevan province	56,04	53,2	59,5
Baku - „ -	7,78	6,31	10,08
Elisavetpol - „ -	35,43	33,3	32,9
Kutaisi district	1,8	2,3	2,6
Kars	21,31	25,3	29,14
On the whole in Transcaucasia	22,9	21,9	22,56

The movement of population from the rural areas and underdeveloped towns to the cities developing in a capitalistic way

¹⁵² Calculations are based on the following sources: "The Statistic Statute Book," "The Caucasian Calendar of 1914", p.110-141, as well as corresponding volumes of the materials of "The All-Russian First General Census" of 1897.

¹⁵³ The Table is compiled on the basis of the 22d Table of the corresponding volumes of "The All-Russian First General Census" of 1897 and the materials of "The Caucasian Calendar of 1914" (p.110-141).

was determined by the irregular development of capitalism in different provinces of Transcaucasia. Rapid development of the petroleum industry and other branches of production in Baku attracted the attention of the landless and impoverishing peasants, as well as craftspeople of the towns of the North Caucasus, European Russia, Ukraine, Iranian Aderbaigan and Armenia. According to the census of 1897, 63.9% of the populations of Baku and Gandzak provinces were born outside their borders. The contemporary authors write:

After the opening of the Baku-Tiflis line of the Erevan railway the peasants from Karabakh, Shamakhi, Tiflis, Gandzak, Erevan and other places ran to Baku... Thousands and tens of thousands of Armenian families from different corners of the Caucasus leaving their native land, patriarchal honest works gradually dispersed from Transcaspien countries to the farthest areas of vast Russia.¹⁵⁴

In September many men went to Baku and Transcaspien regions to earn their living. The following year they returned home at the time of field work.¹⁵⁵

The development of capitalism in the Transcaucasus conditioned an unprecedented growth of the population, particularly, in Tiflis and Baku. In 1850-1886 their population grew incomparably quicker than the entire urban population of the Transcaucasus.

In 1886 35.6% of the urban population of the Transcaucasus lived in Tiflis and Baku. In 1914 it grew and reached 43.3%.

In the first half of the 19th century the largest city in the Transcaucasus was Tiflis. In the third quarter of the 19th century Tiflis temporarily became the second after Baku in population. But, at the end of the century Tiflis outnumbered all towns of the Transcaucasus and again had the largest population. In 1886-1897 its population doubled. At that time none of the cities of Transcaucasia experienced such a development as Tiflis. 32.6% of the growing urban population of the Transcaucasus took place in Tiflis. In 1897-

¹⁵⁴ Ghazar priest Hovsepyan. The Essays about the Utian and Muslim Armenians, Tiflis, 1904, p.26 (in Armenian).

¹⁵⁵ "A Collection of Materials for a Description...", N25, Tiflis, Sect. II, p.38.

1914 the growth of the population of Baku, though it outnumbered that of Tiflis, the latter outnumbered by 35% in absolute value of the growing population.

In 1897-1914 Tiflis accounted for 35.7% of the growing urban population of the Transcaucasus, Baku accounted for 26.5%. In that period the urban population of Erevan province showed very little increase. In 1886 the urban population in Erevan province constituted 8.6% of the total number of population, in the district of Kars only 5.1%, while in Tiflis province 16.1% and in Baku province 19.6%.

According to the census of 1897 the urban population in Tiflis province increased and constituted 21.4% of the total number population of the province and in 1914 it was 29.2%, accordingly in Baku province it was 20.6% and 29.6%, while in Erevan province, accordingly, 11% and 10.1% (see table 10)

Table 10.
The urban population of the Transcaucasus in 1830-1913¹⁵⁶

	1830-1834 only men	1850	1873	1886	1897	1913
Tiflis	11,581	30,814	78,445	159,590	344,629	
Baku (without oil field regions)	4,582	7,431	15,105	86,611	111,904	248,812 ¹⁵⁷
Erevan	6,135	12,815	11,938	14,738	29,006	29,366 ¹⁵⁸
Shushi	5,566	2,724	24,552	26,806	25,881	42,569 ¹⁵⁹
Alexandropol	1,744	11,280	19,976	24,280	30,616	51,316
Gandzak	5,059	12,996	18,505	20,294	3,625	56,305
Kutaisi	3,893	2,725	12,741	22,643	32,476	57,917
Batumi	-	-	-	14,803	28,508	38,615
Shamakhi	5,566	19,558	25,087	22,139	20,007	27,527
Akhaltskha	5,864	9,951	-	16,116	15,357	23,924
Nakhijevan	2,900	4,500	6,877	6,939	8,790	8,945
Ordubad	1,800	4,156	3,489	4,199	4,611	5,655
Nor Bayazet	-	2,560	5,363	7,488	8,486	13,290
Kars	-	-	-	3,939	20,805	30,086

¹⁵⁶ I.Shopen, Op.cit., p.646, Z.Korkotyan. The Demography of Erevan... p.37 (in Armenian), "A Collection of Facts about the Caucasus," part I, "The First General Census", part 61, p.1; part 64, I, St.Petersburg, 1900, p.1-3, part 69, p.1, part 71, p.1, "The Statistic Statute Book," "The Caucasian Calendar of 1915", p. 220-256 (in Russian).

¹⁵⁷ In 1913 the population of Baku along with its industrial area was 334,000 (The Town Council of Baku, "The Census of Baku in 1913," part III, N3, p.2-3, Baku, 1915; part III, N1, p.2-3, Baku, 1916, in Russian).

¹⁵⁸ At the end of 1913, according to the archive materials, the population of Erevan was 32,000.

¹⁵⁹ At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century Shushi, the pearl of Mountainous Karabakh, was the third city of Transcaucasia by its population (after Tiflis and Baku). In 1886 56.7% of the population were Armenians, in 1916 53.3% of 41,100 inhabitants ("The Caucasian Calendar of 1917", Tiflis, 1916, p.193). In 1888 not a single Armenian was left in this town which once had active economic and cultural contacts with the countries of Asia and Europe. In 1916, 21 newspapers and magazines were published in Shushi, including 19 in Russian and 2 in Armenian. In 1988 none of them was published there.

These figures show only one side of the phenomenon and they do not reflect the stratification of the Armenian village in Transcaucasia. Besides, they do not reflect its population's movements, as well as the process of the growth of the urban Armenian population in Transcaucasia. The point is that from the earliest times Armenians were dispersed also in other regions of Transcaucasia. After formation and further development of capitalistic relations in Transcaucasia the former patriarchal and national barriers existing between the village and town were broken. The differences in the ratio of the rural and urban population in various provinces of Transcaucasia expressed the differences in the level of the development of capitalism in their towns. Undoubtedly it did not reflect the intensity of stratification of the rural population of the provinces or the level of industrial development of their dominant nationality. The fact was that capitalism, because of the commodity-money relations, attracted the stratified rural population to the towns and cities in spite of national identity and residence. If we try to make an idea about stratification of the rural population on the one hand, and the growth of the urban population (*ad exemplum* of the urban population of the Transcaucasian Armenian provinces) in Eastern Armenia on the other hand, we shall come to wrong conclusions. Thus we shall be unable to give a real picture of the movements of the Armenian population.

In the towns of Eastern Armenia, as compared with other towns and cities of Transcaucasia, the urban population's slow growth and low specific weight, as well as the number of population were explained by a slow development of capitalist relations, a narrowness of human services, a low level of communications and the character of employment of the population. Commerce had a substantial scale in the province of Erevan. However, it was one-sided being restrained by the agricultural occupation of the population in some towns. The urban population's higher proportion had met the needs in agricultural products of their native towns as

well as others. The Armenian population of the Transcaucasus was characterized by high indices of the increase.

It was not the only problem. The Armenian population of Transcaucasia was characterized also by the high level of concentration in towns. It was reflected in the highest indices of both the urban share in the Armenian population of Transcaucasia and the Armenian urban population as compared with other nationalities.

In 1886 the urban population of Transcaucasia constituted more than 11.3% of its general number and at the end of 1914 it reached 18.9%. During that period the share of the urban population among the population of Transcaucasia was 19.8% and about 29.8% accordingly

The facts of the above-mentioned tables also reflect the third regulation. In 1886-1914 the Armenian urban population on average showed slower increase than the whole population of Transcaucasia. The high indices of the increase had Russians and Georgians. In the course of time the urban population increased in Russia more than 4.9, in Georgia - 3.0 and in Armenian - 2.7 times. As a result, from 1886 to 1914 the specific weight of the Armenian urban population among the urban population of Transcaucasia slightly diminished from 40.1% to 40%.

While, the reality is that in absolute meaning each% of the increase of the Armenian urban population is numerically higher than that of the Georgians and Russians. That is why, in spite of the fact of comparatively quick increase of the Georgian and Russian urban population, about 39.8% of the increasing urban population of Transcaucasia fell to the share of Armenians. Speaking clearly, in 1886-1914 the population of Transcaucasia increased by 766,814 of which more than 305,338 (about 40% of the Transcaucasian population) were Armenians.

The Armenian population was concentrated in the cities of Transcaucasia of that time, where they even had absolute numerical superiority (see table 11).

Table 11.

The specific weight of the Armenian population in the towns of Transcaucasia in 1886, 1897, 1914 and 1916¹⁶⁰

	1886	1897	1914 January	1916 January
Tiflis	47.7	29.5	37.6	43.1
Baku	28.3	17.0	23.0	23.8
Erevan	48.5	43.2	52.9	72.6
Alexandropol	94.6	71.1	87.9	88.0
Gandzak	43.9	35.9	20.0	21.0
Kutasisi	10.5	3.9	3.1	3.2
Batumi	23.4	24.0	25.5	27.6
Kars	63.0	50.0	83.9	84.1
Shushi	56.7	55.7	52.7	53.3
Akhaltskha	64.6	59.2	75.8	71.3
Gori	40.0	20.3	26.9	39.4
Dushet	57.1	18.3	42.8	44.6
Sghnagh	55.2	28.2	50.9	50.8
Telavi	81.9	74.9	70.5	70.5
Sukhumi	12.9	13.5	12.3	13.3
Shamakhi	17.9	12.6	35.5	16.3
Nukhi	18.0	16.9	15.0	15.3
Nakhijevan	29.4	25.7	29.5	29.8
Nor (new)-Bayazet	99.2	95.4	95.3	97.3
in Transcaucasia	40.1	30.3	39.9	36.3

Armenians have lived in Georgia for a long time. For certain periods of time there lived more Armenians than Georgians in some towns of Georgia, including Tiflis. According to statistics in 1701 14,500 Armenians and 2,000 Georgians lived in Tiflis.

In 1834 the Armenian population increased in Tiflis and the number of Armenians was 17,148 and the number of Georgians was 3,500. In 1886 the number of Armenians was 37,420 and the number

¹⁶⁰ Table 11 is compiled according to data of the following sources: "The Statistic Statute Book," "The First General Census..."; "The Caucasian Calendar of 1915", Tiflis, 1914, p.218-256; "The Caucasian Calendar of 1917", Tiflis, 1916, p.180-221.

of Georgians was 21,257, in 1897 the number of Armenians was 47,133 and the number of Georgians was 41,151, in 1914 the number of Armenians was 129,573 and the number of Georgians was 69,563.

According to the census of 1897 Russians outnumbered Armenians. The number of Russians was 47,599, the number of Caucasian Tatars was 5,557, the number of Jews was 3,668 and the number of other nationalities (Lezghins, Ossetins and etc.) was 14,482 in Tiflis.¹⁶¹

In the first decades of the 20th century the specific weight of Armenians and their absolute number increased in Baku. At the beginning of the 20th century qualified Armenians along with Russians constituted the main body of workers in the petroleum industry.

As for Gandzak - the whole province was a part of historic Armenia.

The high level of concentration of the Armenian population in the towns and cities of the Transcaucasus on the one hand and the scantiness of the urban population in Eastern Armenia on the other hand predetermined the character of employment of the Armenian population within and outside the province.

2.The Armenian population's employment in the Transcaucasus

The character of employment of the population, which comes from socio-economic conditions of Union, is a very important index reflecting the level of economic development of each country.

Industrially developed countries are characterized by a high level of involvement of the population in the works of industrial character, while the main occupation of population in agrarian countries is the production of agricultural goods. In countries with highly developed industry a higher proportion of the population is

¹⁶¹ "A Collection of Facts about the Caucasus", vol. II, Tiflis, 1872. "The Lists of the Populated Areas of the Caucasian Territory", vol. IV, part I, without page-marks), Tiflis, 1879; "A Collection of Facts about the Caucasus...", vol. IX, Tiflis, 1885 (without page-marks).

involved in the most advanced branches of industry, which predetermine the process of the scientific and technical progress and serve as a material basis. The structure of employment of the population, in its turn, characterizes the productivity of the use of the labour force (e.g. the rise of employment in the services sector and the field of culture is evidence of the development of country and productively better use of labour force).

In spite of the development of some branches of industry and its rather high concentration, Transcaucasia, as a whole, at the end of the 19th century, was an agrarian region, with one-sided and underdeveloped agriculture. The domination of hard hand work resulted in the low level of development of productive forces and the use of very primitive productive means in industry and agriculture. The greater part of the population was occupied in agriculture. There was a combination of pre-capitalist and capitalist relations. The sector of service was not developed. Moreover, the spheres of education and health were in a backward state.

According to the census of 1897, 7-8% eligible workers were employed in the service sector. The most of them were private employees, servants and unskilled workers. In some provinces, particularly, in rural areas, the picture was rather pale. The specific weight of gainfully employed rural population occupied in agriculture was expressed by a lower index in their general number, than that of their family members on the Transcaucasus scale. While in towns (i.e. among the population occupied in the spheres of industry, construction, commerce, communication) the situation was quite opposite. The specific weight of eligible workers and servants in those spheres was expressed by higher index in their general number, than that of the family members in their general number.

Indeed, if gainful employment was 64.1% of all gainfully employed population, the corresponding index of their family members was 85.2%. While 12.2% of gainfully employed population was occupied in industry and construction, their family members constituted 4.9% of non-gainfully employed population in the Transcaucasus. These indices in the spheres of industry and trade

correspondingly were 8.7 and 4.9%, and among consumers and private employees were 9.7 and 2.7%.

The same, with an evident difference, is reflected in some provinces of Transcaucasia, as well as among various nationalities living there. These differences were particularly observed among Armenian population¹⁶². Such phenomenon in villages, comparatively with towns, first, was a direct reflection of comparatively high birth level, and the presence of a third generation in the family.

Second, it is explained by a known fact, that the greater part of the urban population occupied in commerce and industry were field men, who in the most able-bodied age became wage labourers earning their daily living. A part of them were unmarried girls. They were servants.¹⁶³

Thus, the high specific weight of Armenians throughout the entire population of Transcaucasia was not accompanied by corresponding value of gainfully employed population. As has been mentioned, in 1897 22.2% of the whole population of Transcaucasia constituted Armenians (the Russian army not taken into account). While among the gainfully employed population their number was 19.5%. The gainfully employed population constituted a particularly low percentage in rural areas and agricultural works.

In 1897 20.5% of rural inhabitants of Transcaucasia were Armenians, meanwhile among gainfully employed population they constituted only 16.7%, and in urban areas correspondingly 32.5% and 28.8% (see table 12).

¹⁶² Each 100 Armenian gainfully employed men occupied in industry of Transcaucasia on average had 176,7 members of family, in commerce and transport - 219,7, in agriculture - 605.

¹⁶³ More than 26% of gainful women were private employees, servants and unskilled workers in Transcaucasia.

Table 12.

Gainfully employed population in Transcaucasia and their dependants (according to the materials of the census of 1897, besides military men)

		Gainfully employed	Family members	Family members per 100 head of the gainfully employed population
1.	Population in Transcaucasia, including	1,092,059	3,757,974	344,1
	a) without Armenian population	879,037	2,896,700	329,5
	b) Armenian population	213,022	861,274	404,4
2.	In rural areas of Transcaucasia, including	829,171	3,368,312	406,2
	a) without Armenian population	691,011	2,644,694	382,7
	b) Armenian population	138,160	723,618	523,6
3.	In the towns of Transcaucasia, including	262,888	389,662	148,2
	a) without Armenian population	188,026	252,008	134,0
	b) Armenian population	74,862	137,654	183,8

It was explained by

1. The larger size of the Armenian family (more number of children and the presence of the third generation) in comparison with the European, Russian and partially Georgian families.

2. The presence of the population which came from Persia and different places of the Caucasus and Kazan to Transcaucasia in search of jobs. Many in this group did not have families.

3. As compared with Europeans, Russians and partially Georgians a small number of Armenian women were occupied in waged labour.

These data relate to the end of the 19th century. Meanwhile in the second decade of the 20th century the picture changed.

Intensification of leaving in search of a job resulted in reduction of the families of the Armenian urban population. At the beginning of the 20th century Armenians along with the Caucasian Tatars (Azeri-Turks) had the highest average composition of families in the Transcaucasus, but it yielded to Russians and Europeans in towns. As a result of that the average number of the members of the families of the Russian and European workers occupied in petroleum industry were 4.0 people, while of the Armenians - 3.5, the Kazan Tatars - and Lezghins - 3.6, Caucasian Tatars - 3.1, Persians - 3.4.¹⁶⁴ Suffice it to say, that only 25.8% of the Baku petroleum industry workers had families who were mainly Russians and nationalities which arrived from Europe.

The married Armenians and Georgians constituted 46.6%, but only 25.3% lived with their families. Russians and Europeans, accordingly, constituted 79.2 and 73.7%.

There were many married workers among the Kazan Tatars, Persians, Lezghins and Caucasian Tatars, but they lived without their families. Half of the Armenian workers were not married and only a quarter of the married lived with their families in towns. The Armenian workers lived without families mainly for the reasons of low wages, being single, and young age. But the workers of the above-mentioned nationalities were without families mainly because of low wages and being far away from their native lands.

The rate of the gainfully employed population was high in those Transcaucasian provinces which received seasonal labourers, as well as, more or less used the female labour force.

The regulations reflected in the structure of the population of Eastern Armenia greatly influenced the Armenian gainfully employed population. For example, Erevan province and Kars district had the lowest indices of the gainfully employed, on the whole, number of population. Meanwhile the specific weight of the Armenian gainfully employed population in other provinces was higher not only in relation to the average index of Eastern Armenia, but also the corresponding index of the population of some provinces of Transcaucasia, particularly, in relation to the male population. It is

¹⁶⁴ A. Stopani. Oil-field..., 1916, p.30 (in Russian).

explained by the number of people leaving Armenian provinces and villages in search of employment. A higher part of the Armenian men left for other provinces without their family members. In relation to Baku and Kutaisi provinces, which were characterized by notable specific weight of the gainfully employed in the population's total number, the specific weight of the gainfully employed among the Armenian population exceeded the average index of those provinces. The number of family members per 100 gainfully employed was about 295 in Baku province, and among Armenians was 178. Those numbers correspondingly were 338 and 170,4 in the province of Kutaisi (see table 13).

Table 13.

The specific weight of the gainfully employed population in the provinces of Transcaucasia (according to the materials of the census of 1897, excluding servicemen and in percentage terms in relation to the general number of population)

	Gainfully employed population of Transcaucasia			The number of family members per 100 gainfully employed	Including Armenians			The number of family members per 100 gainfully employed Armenian population
	men	women	total		men	women	Total	
Baku province	23.4	1.9	25.3	294.8	34.2	1.9	36.1	177.9
Elizavetpol -,-	19.6	1.4	21.0	376.4	16.9	1.3	18.2	450.7
Erevan -,-	16.0	1.0	17.0	488.0	15.1	1.0	16.1	524.5
Tiflis -,-	23.5	3.3	26.8	273.4	21.7	2.4	24.1	315.2
Kutaisi -,-	20.6	2.3	22.9	338.2	35.8	2.8	38.6	170.4
Kars district	17.3	1.1	18.4	445.3	18.1	2.3	20.4	390.9
Total in Transcaucasia	20.5	2.0	22.5	344.1	18.3	1.5	19.8	404.3

The Armenian urban gainfully employed population was also characterized by low indices as compared with the average of Transcaucasia. 42.7% of the urban population of Transcaucasia constituted gainfully employed, meanwhile the gainfully employed among the Armenian population of Transcaucasia constituted only

35.2%, although the Armenian gainfully employed had higher indices in some provinces of Transcaucasia. The percentage of the Armenian gainfully employed population was lower in comparison with the average of Transcaucasia, but it was higher in the works specific to towns and cities, particularly, in industry. For example, 18.7% of the gainfully employed (excluding military men, rentiers and pensioners) were occupied in the branches of industry, commerce and transport in the whole of Transcaucasia (the Armenian population excluded), but among its Armenian population it was 29.7%. The Armenian gainfully employed were 29.7% of all involved, meanwhile only 16.9% of the Armenian population was occupied in agriculture. Involvement in industrial works was high in towns. Armenians were 28.5% of the gainfully employed population in the towns of the Transcaucasus.

The involvement of the Armenians was very little in the urban and rural branches of transport and communication. Transport was divided mainly into two parts – mechanical and non-mechanical (carting). The first mainly included Russians, Jews, representatives of European and other nationalities, the second – the Kazan Tatars, Caucasian Tatars and Armenians. Most of the Molokans, who came from Russia to Eastern Armenia, settled along the highways and were occupied with carting.¹⁶⁵ "But soon blew a whistle, Erevan railway started its work, the cargo began to move in a new direction... the coachman again had to become a farmer."¹⁶⁶

The Armenian population made up a great percentage in industrial works in Baku and Tiflis. According to data of the Bureau of the Oilmen Congress, 29% of the workers occupied in the petroleum industry were Armenians. In 1913 there were 124,800 workers and white-collar workers in Baku. 17.2% of them were Armenians.¹⁶⁷ On the eve of World War I the total number of workers, including Armenian workers, was increasing in the petroleum industry of Baku and on the Apsheron peninsula. During

¹⁶⁵ Ju. Medzikhovski. A Short Essay of *Novobayazet uezd* of Erivan province. St. Petersburg, 1908, p.142 (in Russian),

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ "The Census of Baku in 1913," part I-IV, N III, Baku, 1916 (in Russian).

those years twice as many Armenian workers were employed in the petroleum industry and its attendant spheres in Baku, than in 1913 (5,126 workers) in the industry of a part of Eastern Armenia (nowadays the territory of the Republic of Armenia).

World War I had a negative influence on the Baku petroleum industry along with other branches. A large number of enterprises ceased their productive activity while others reduced the volume of production. Unlike the pre-war situation, when many were attracted by the Baku petroleum industry and its branches, during the war many workers lost their jobs, because of reductions in these spheres. They were deprived of their jobs because of the degree of qualification and nationality. First of all reduction of the unqualified workers was caused by narrowing of the volume of production. They were mainly Persians, the Kazan Tatars and Lezghins. According to the detailed research of A.Stopani, the workers of European nationality and Russians were notable for the degree of their qualification. 50% of the general number of these workers was qualified. 14.8% of the workers of the Armenian and Georgian, 7.8% of the Kazan Tatar, 4.3% of Lezghin, the Caucasian Tatar and Persian nationalities were qualified. There were substantial differences in their wages owing to the disparity in qualification, age (younger) requirement and other reasons. The average annual salary of the European worker (who had a family) reached 965,5 rubles, the Russian worker - 737,6 rubles, the Armenian worker - 660,8 rubles, the Persian worker - 658,0 rubles, the Kazan Tatar worker - 620,9 rubles, the Lezghin worker - 564, 3 rubles, the Caucasian Tatar worker - 512,9 rubles. The average annual salary of the single worker was 50-60% of that of the married worker.¹⁶⁸ The Baku oil-industry worker's average annual salary was 31.7% higher than in Russia as a whole (without taking into consideration professions). As compared with Western Europe, the salary of the workers in Baku was very low. The annual salary of workers in Belgium (44.7%), France (64%) and Germany (38%) was higher than in Baku. In 1905 the salary of the American pipe-line workers was 233% more in comparison with the average salary of the workers of the same kind

of factories in Baku.¹⁶⁹ At the same time, in conditions of more annual working days, the length of the workday of the Baku workers was shorter as compared with Russia and the countries of Western Europe. There were 332 workdays in the industry of Baku, 280 - in Russia, 302-308 - in the countries of Europe. The amount of the working time in Baku was 13.6-17.2% lower than in Belgium, Holland, Germany and Switzerland, as well as 5.9-8.7% lower than in France, the USA and England. The weekly fund of the working time of the workers of the Baku oil-industry region was 88.6% of the analogous fund of Russian workers.

During the years of the rule of the Musavat national bourgeoisie workers also lost their jobs because of the national discrimination. From this point of view, particularly, the number of Armenian workers reduced. In 1916 the number of workers in the Baku petroleum industry was 52,000, but in 1919 it was only 28,000. In 1915 the number of Armenian workers was 8,620, but then it reduced to 2,458. Though Russians and Persians were leaving Baku for their native countries¹⁷⁰, there was not a great reduction in their number. The number of the Lezghin workers was also sharply reduced.

Armenian workers were actively involved in wage labours of other towns in Transcaucasia, particularly, in industry, where worked mainly skilled workers. In Tiflis, about 70% of the workers of eight tobacco factories were Armenians. The number of Armenians working in the industry and ports of Batumi, as well as the North Caucasus was not small. Many Armenian workers were busy in construction works of the Tiflis-Kars (from 1895) and Alexandropol-Erevan (from 1899) railways. In 1896 10,000 workers worked in the rail-way construction, including refugee workers (mostly peasants) who nearly escaped Turkish massacres of 1891-1895 in Western Armenia and found a shelter in Eastern Armenia.

At the beginning of the 20th century the involvement of the Armenian population in the industrial works of Transcaucasia was

¹⁶⁸ A.Stopani. The Oil-Industry..., p.14.

¹⁶⁹ A.Stopani. Wages and Workday. Baku, 1910, p.24-26 (in Russian).

¹⁷⁰ G.Pitchikyan. The National Economy and Cooperation in Armenia, p.95 (in Russian).

increasing, while its number was smaller in agriculture, than that of other nationalities (with the exception of Russians and Jews). Let us not forget, that 60% of the employed population of Transcaucasia was busy in agriculture, not taking into account military men, rentiers and pensioners. Along with the members of families this social group formed 80.6% of the whole population.

As compared with the Transcaucasia average index the Armenian population was less involved in the agricultural works. On the contrary, the specific weight of the Armenian gainfully employed population was higher in the agriculture of towns. In Transcaucasian towns 7% of the gainfully employed urban population (with the exception of Armenians) were involved in agricultural occupation. 8.8% of the gainfully employed Armenians were in same employment. It is mainly explained by the agricultural character of employment of the urban population in the Armenian provinces.

PART THREE **THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE POPULATION** **IN THE 20th CENTURY**

CHAPTER FIVE **REPRODUCTION BEFORE WORLD WAR II**

1. The process of reduction of the population during World War I

During the years of World War I the Armenian people along with many other peoples of the world experienced unspeakable trials. However the Armenian people suffered, particularly, inhuman trials. The Armenian people directly faced the peril of complete annihilation because of the Genocide committed by the Turkish barbarians in Western Armenia and their disastrous raids in Eastern Armenia. The Turkish government used the war as a pretext for realizing its long-planned crime: the annihilation of all Armenians living not only within the borders of the Turkish state, but also outside of it.

The Turkish government realized all kinds of the premeditated misanthropic mass extermination. The whole population was exterminated without regard to gender and age. Those who hardly survived, mainly women and children, fell a victim to starvation, epidemics and the attacks of Turkish bands.

Hundreds of thousands of Armenians were exiled and perished in the deserts and camps of Mesopotamia and the heavy waves of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Thus, 2,000,000 peaceful and defenseless Armenians were massacred in the Ottoman Turkey and exiled. It was the first Genocide in the world.

The Minister of Internal Affairs of Turkey Talaat wrote savagely in one of his telegrams: "It is necessary to put an end to the existence of Armenians, however cruel are undertaken measures. Do not pay any attention to the age, gender and remorse."¹⁷¹

¹⁷¹ Genocide of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, Erevan, 1965, p.9 (in Russian).

The Turkish regular troops continued massacres pursuing the displaced and helpless refugees who hurried in the direction of Eastern Armenia. Breaking through the rings of the Turkish troops the surviving Armenians settled in Eastern Armenia. A part of the population living near the border of Eastern Armenia could escape physical extermination. The Armenian, Syrian and Greek population of the regions of Basen, Nariman, Diadin, Bayazet, Karakilisa, Alashkert and Bashkale of Western Armenia, as well as of the Tabriz, Khoy, Salmast and Urmia regions of Persia migrated to Eastern Armenia.

According to the incomplete statistic survey data of January 30, 1915, in a short time, the total number of the migrants from Turkey and Persia and generally the number of the Russian subject refugees reached about 67,000 of which 50,000 were Armenians.¹⁷² Their greater part (60,500) settled in the regions of Erevan, Etchmiadzin, Nakhijevan, Surmalu, Sharour-Daralagyaz, Alexandropol, Kars, Kaghzvan and Akhalkalak.¹⁷³ A little later, these migrants were joined by the Armenian population from Van, Mush and Sasun. They fought and broke through the rings of the Turkish regular troops and at the cost of many fatal casualties crossed the Russian border and settled in Eastern Armenia.

Along with the assault of the Turkish troops many Armenians also left the regions of Kars, Surmalu, Nakhijevan, Alexandropol and Kaghzvan and gathered in the rest of the regions and towns of Eastern Armenia. It is supposed that in 1916 the number of migrants from Western Armenia in the Caucasus reached 350,000 of which 200,000 took refuge in Eastern Armenia.¹⁷⁴

Turkish troops twice conquered the regions of Nakhijevan and Alexandropol. Almost the whole of the Armenian population of the region of Nakhijevan (more than 52,000) emigrated. Almost 1/3 of the population of Alexandropol also emigrated. The situation was

¹⁷² See the CHA RA, f. 126, l. 1, f. 1, p.936-1368, f. 2, p.557-928 (in Armenian).

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Z.Korkotyan. From the White Massacre to the Red Construction, p.31 (in Armenian).

deteriorated by the Alexandropol earthquake in 1915 when many remained without shelter. 15,000 people migrated abroad, particularly, to the North Caucasus. Later, their greater part returned and settled in the town of Leninakan (Gyumri) and its region.

The exact number of the population which during the years of World War I migrated to Eastern Armenia is not clear. But, it is possible to get some idea about population movements and its national structure on the basis of published and archive materials. According to some data, the number of migrants from Western Armenia to Eastern Armenia was 500,000 or 600,000. Besides, it is supposed that from the former Armenian provinces of tsarist Russia migrated about 150,000 people to the Republic of Armenia, 113,326 people from Kars district, 32,686 people from Surmalu region and 3,977 people from Ardivin region.¹⁷⁵ The tide of migration swallowed up a considerable portion of the Armenian population of the Transcaucasus. The intercommunal clashes between Armenians and Tatars and pogroms committed by the Tatars against Armenians (1905, 1907, 1918-1920) in the Transcaucasus were added to the calamities of the imperialistic war. The tides of migrants couldn't take refuge in Musavat Azerbaijan. Moreover, it became a big centre from which Armenian population was deported. According to the incomplete archival data, during intercommunal clashes 235,000¹⁷⁶ (199,000 were urban population, a part of which later returned) Armenians emigrated (not all regions of Elisavetpol were taken into consideration) from Azerbaijan. The main part of them settled in Eastern Armenia and the rest went to the North Caucasus via Georgia. The greater part of the Armenian population of the provinces of Gandzak and Baku took refuge in mountainous regions.¹⁷⁷ In the course of the Musavat rule along with the Armenian population other nationalities also emigrated. In 1918-1919 the total

¹⁷⁵ The CSA RR, f. 130, l.197, f.38.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p.36.

¹⁷⁷ G.Pitchikyan. "The National Economy and...", p.96.

number of population of Azerbaijan diminished by 401,000 people.¹⁷⁸

Refugees from the regions and towns of Erevan, Etchmiadzin, Surmalu, Akhalkalak and Akhaltskha, as well as the districts of Batumi and Kars went to Russia and Middle Asia.

Thus, Eastern Armenia, where many Armenians, Greeks and Aisoris from Western Armenia took refuge, later, in its turn, became the centre from which emigration took place, because of the assaults of the Turkish troops and starvation. The caravans of refugees migrated towards the North Caucasus and partially Ukraine via Georgia. Many of them saved themselves in the regions of Krasnodar and Stavropol, as well as the Don steppes. Meanwhile, poverty and starvation reigned in Russia and mass resettlements were expected.

According to a report of the representative of "Kavevak",¹⁷⁹ which is proved by a telegram of an agent of the Central Evacuation Bureau sent to G.V.Tchetcherin, the Commissar of Foreign Affairs of Soviet Russia, about 400,000 Armenians were deported to the North Caucasus, because of famine and Turkish aggression. 20,000 of them were naked and starving children. The representative of "Kavevak" noted in his telegram that starvation will have horrible results.¹⁸⁰ Not all of the refugees were lucky to reach the North Caucasus and Ukraine. A part of them fell a victim to famine and epidemics. The number of migrants who took refuge in the North Caucasus reached 150,000 of which 130,000 were Armenians, the rest - Greeks and Aisoris.¹⁸¹

The Armenian population moved to the North Caucasus via Georgia, where during that period 14,000 Armenians from Western Armenia took refuge.¹⁸² They settled in comparatively sparsely

¹⁷⁸ Materials of the Economic History of Azerbaijan (to the 5th International Congress of the Economic History), p.19.

¹⁷⁹ "Kavevak" ("Caucasian evacuation") - a Soviet establishment which was busy with the questions of resettlement of population.

¹⁸⁰ The CSA RR, f. 123, l.42, f.2, p.44.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p.43.

¹⁸² "Zarya Vostoka", N 1371, 5.01.1927.

populated rural regions of Eastern Georgia. Later, there were about 25, 000 Armenian, Tatar and Esid refugees in Tbilisi.¹⁸³

It is quite understandable that not a single word can be spoken about the population increase. In the course of 1914-1920 the sharp decrease of population was accompanied by the increase of its mortality. In 1919 more than 30% of deaths were because of epidemics, 20% deaths happened of other infectious diseases, 21% were caused by infantile diseases¹⁸⁴. Only during 1919, 20-25% of Erevan's population died.¹⁸⁵

According to the approximate calculations of the statistic Z.Korkotyan, between 1914 and 1919 the population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia decreased by 600,000. Their greater part fell victim to war, famine and epidemics, the rest of them emigrated.¹⁸⁶ This number, probably, is larger.

The situation was the following: a mass immigration on the one hand and emigration, accompanied by the growth of mortality and baby bust on the other hand. The negative trends were decisive that is why in conditions of the presence of the huge masses of refugees the population of Eastern Armenia sharply decreased.

Thus, during the rise of Soviet power in Eastern Armenia the total number of population constituted 720,000, which was less than in 1913 (1,000,000).

2. The high growth of population before the Great Patriotic War

One of the main specific features of reproduction of the population of Armenia in the 1920s was the high rate of natality and mortality accompanied by the consolidation of the dispersed Armenians in Armenia.

At the same time, in the 1920s immigrants for the most part were those who earlier emigrated from the southern regions of Armenia to Iran. Immigration continued, but no exact calculations

¹⁸³ CHA RR, f.123, l. 42, f. 108, p.31.

¹⁸⁴ Z.Korkotyan, Op. cit., p.38.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p.32.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p.39.

were made from December of 1920 to the end of 1921. Those were troubled years and many things had spontaneous character. So it is difficult to appeal to the exact figures.

In an archive document it is mentioned that only during January of 1921 thousands people, who earlier emigrated from Armenia, repatriated and settled in their native tumbledown villages. The commissioner of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (PCIA) in order to help refugees of the Nakhijevan-Sharur region of Armenia on January 11, 1921 informed the higher authority that:

A great number of refugees concentrated in the villages along the rail-road from the temporary border (the Ararat station) as far as Nakhijevan and they move in the direction of Erevan.¹⁸⁷

At the end of the December of 1920 29,000 refugees concentrated in the regions of Bash-Norashen, Shahtakhti and Sadarak. At the beginning of the January of 1921 15,000 refugees gathered in the village of Sadarak.¹⁸⁸ From the middle of 1921 the Council of the People's Economy undertook all measures to give an organized character to immigration to the Armenian SSR from the neighboring Azerbaijan SSR. It is necessary to mention that the resettlement of the population had great importance for the Soviet state. It was elaborated and directed on the basis of the resolutions of the All-Union Central Executive Committee (CEC) and the CEC and the Council of People's Commissars (CPC) of each Soviet Republic.

It was stated in a report (January 16, 1921) that "aid posts were established..." for the refugees, "carts were rendered for transportation of the feeble and sick people... In Zangi-Basar Azerbaijani refugees have been placed along with Armenians and they are on friendly terms."¹⁸⁹ The Azerbaijani refugees in their appeal to the Revolutionary Commissariat of Ghamarlu wrote that "in Maku and Persia they were not received in such brotherly manner by the local population, in contrast, they were completely robbed."¹⁹⁰ "60-70% of refugees turned into virtual skeletons, even losing their human image. Their hands, feet and faces were covered with bruises.

¹⁸⁷ The CHA RA, f. 123, l. 42, f. 86, p.17, 19.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., l. 42, f. 1, p.41.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p.27.

They were naked and barefooted, wrapped in old, dirty rags and straw material."¹⁹¹

According to some data, from January 8 1921 to 28 19, 000 refugees settled in the regions of Zangi-Basar, Vedi-Basar and Garni-Basar along the Persian border. Their life conditions were very hard, they wore light clothes and needed help. There were Armenians from Western Armenia who in 1918 immigrated from Van to Bagdad.¹⁹²

In the November of 1921 according to the resolution of the plenary session of the Congress of the representatives of the evacuation official organs of the Central Evacuation Department of the Transcaucasus and the Caucasian Bureau, the central evacuation organs had to organize the resettlement, distribution of the resettled people and provide them with food and medical aid in the republic. But everything remained unrealized.

The movements of refugees within the limits of the Transcaucasian republics could be done by the previously elaborated plan. According to that plan the local evacuation organs would develop self-dependent activities.

The republican evacuation organs were realizing the movements from one Transcaucasian republic to another or out of the Transcaucasus by approbation of the Transcaucasian central evacuation organs. In reality they had a spontaneous character.

According to the resolution (January 30, 1923) of the Presidium of CEC of Armenia, concerning the reception, displacement, settlement, resettlement, allotment and their service demands, the Central Evacuation Department of the People's Commissariat of the Internal Affairs was reorganized into the Department of Immigration. Practically the reorganization took place from April 20.

During first years of the 1920s refugees emigrated from the North Caucasus. These were those who earlier emigrated from the regions of Kars, Alexandropol and Nakhijevan of Eastern Armenia and now were returning back to Soviet Armenia. Some of them were settling with their kinsmen and relatives, others were dispersing in

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p.30.

¹⁹² Ibid., f. 38, p.22.

different regions of the republic, increasing the number of landless peasants in villages and the number of jobless in towns and cities. They were coming back to Armenia via Georgia, the way through which was very inconvenient. Sometimes, there was a need to stop temporarily the work of the resettlement of the Armenian population in order to decide the question of providing them with transportation. In this connection on April 2 1921 the deputy head of the Caucasian Evacuation Department from Moscow sent a document "About the situation of the Armenian migrants in the North Caucasus" by which drew attention of the plenipotentiary of the Transcaucasian Federation in Soviet Russia S.Ter-Gabrielyan at that very important question. The Caucasian Central Evacuation organs took the question of care of refugees into their hands. It was noted in the letter: "Certain People's Commissariats, of course will do everything possible in their regions, but it is necessary to have a centre in Moscow which will unite this work, speed it up and find necessary resources."¹⁹³

The organization of the resettlement of the Armenian population from the North Caucasus was complicated by the fact that it was impossible to provide the population with housing, plots, employment and food.¹⁹⁴

Until then many (more than 200,000)¹⁹⁵ immigrants were concentrated in badland regions where they were not provided with plots or the opportunity to earn a living. For this reason the process of the resettlement of the Armenian population from the North Caucasus was stopped, as the economic state of Soviet Armenia was so poor that it was unable to receive any new groups of immigrants. In accordance with the decree of July 14, 1922 of the Presidium of the All-Russian CEC, immigration within the limits of the Russian Federation was temporarily halted due to a lack of means, food, farm implements and dwellings, as well as the dysfunctional state of the railroad network. Each republic of the Transcaucasus, in its turn, had a resolution prohibiting unregulated immigration. For example, the Council of the People's Commissars of Georgia, in order to prevent spontaneous immigration to Georgia, resolved on May 2, 1922 "to

¹⁹³ Ibid., p.44.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., f. 178, l. 1, f. 12, p.61; f. 123, l. 42, f. 11, p.10.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, f. 123, l. 42, f. 122, p.42.

declare closed the borders of Georgia" and give the refugees permission to enter and move within the limits of Georgia only by the order of the Central Evacuation Department of Georgia according to the previously confirmed personnel lists.¹⁹⁶

Soon after, as the result of deepening agricultural overpopulation and joblessness, an opposing trend negatively influencing the growth of population became temporarily obvious in the republic. As a result, there was a gradual decline in the number of immigrants from other republics while, at the same time, there occurred a general increase of emigration from the republic, particularly, by people of working age who were engaged in seasonal work. Until 1923 a considerable number of Armenian emigrants desired to return to Armenia from the North Caucasus. However, from the middle of 1923 the situation changed. The stabilization of the economic state of the North Caucasus, a solution to the problem of Armenian migrant employment and the strengthening of contacts with the local population through newly acquired Russian language skills on the one hand, and the presence of immigrants who did not receive plots and the population having insufficient arable land, as well as the employment difficulties in the Armenian SSR on the other hand, not only stopped the process of repatriation from the North Caucasus, but to some degree turned it in the opposite direction.

In 1922 the number of repatriates, particularly, from Mesopotamia and partially from Iran on the one hand, and the RSFSR on the other hand, was 9,192 (there was no registration of those who repatriated from other regions of the Transcaucasus). These repatriates settled mainly in the regions of Hrazdan, Vedi-Basar, Ghamarlu, Bash-Garni, Ghordughulu and Basargetchar. By 1925 the number of repatriates had reached 16,943. Between 1922 and 1929, 20,300 Armenians were repatriated. During the 1930s the trend of growth in the population of the Armenian SSR continued, particularly, between the years of 1934-1936. Between 1920 and 1940 the number of the repatriated Armenians reached approximately 75,000.

¹⁹⁶ The CHA RA, f. 130, l. 6, f. 197, p.11.

From the middle of the 1920s population growth in Armenia increased due to the consolidation of repatriated Armenians and in combination with a natural population growth as a result of an increasing birth rate and (later) a declining death-rate. In the mid-1920s the birth rate was 51.5 live births per 1,000 population (see table 14).

Table 14.
Natural growth of the population in the Armenian SSR, 1923-1940¹⁹⁷

Year	Birth rate	Death-rate	Natural growth
1923	38,0	12,8	25,2
1925	51,5	16,2	35,3
1930	57,0	17,7	39,3
1935	42,4	12,9	29,5
1940	41,2	13,8	27,4

In a short time, from the end of 1921 until the All-Union census of 1926, due to natural and mechanical growth, the population of the Armenian SSR increased by 22.3%. By the middle of the 1930s it had reached the general population level that had lived in the same territory in 1913.¹⁹⁸

The birth rate of the population is measured by means of two indexes. One is the birth rate per 1,000 population (the general rate). The other is the number of births per 1,000 of total number of women involved in different fertility age groups (the special rate)¹⁹⁹. The general rate is unable to characterize the real level of the birth

¹⁹⁷ "Soviet Armenia in 50 years", Erevan, 1970, p.36 (in Armenian), The CHA RA, f. 163, l. 2, f. 9, p.89.

¹⁹⁸ V.Khojabekyan. The population of Armenia and its Employment, Erevan, 1979, p.201 (in Armenian), CHA RA, f. 130, l. 5, f. 1332, p.4.

¹⁹⁹ Fertility is a potential ability of women to give birth to children and that is caused by biological and social reasons. In this case, delivery is the realization of the ability or the concrete number of one woman's children. According to the world statistics each woman during her life, on average, may have 12-15 children and bearing age conventionally is defined 15-49 age group. The most active age of fertility may include young women. In the pre-war period that age group included women aged 16-39, after the war those aged 21-35 and nowadays mainly women aged 21-29.

and the death rates of the population, or to reveal the real causes of their instability. For this reason the special rate is used to give a more accurate picture of these phenomena.

According to data of 1939 the fertility rate of the most fertile (16-29) age group of women was low. If, according to the census of 1926 the age group of 16-24 constituted 15.6% of the total number of women, by 1939 it was 13.3%. During 1937 fertile women under the age of 25 constituted 41.1% of the total number of fertile women. However, in 1940 this percentage declined to 35%.

Table 15.
The absolute number of the fertile women in the Armenian SSR according to age groups²⁰⁰

Years	Fertile mothers under 25	Fertile mothers over 25
1937	24,059	34,054
1938	21,355	34,407
1939	20,163	33,159
1940	19,806	35,371

The decline of the number of women under the age of 25 was accompanied by a decline in the special index of the birth rate. This was caused by changes in the social and economic life of the republic; due in particular to the fact that the age of marriage increased. Meanwhile, as shown in table 16, during the years between 1937 and 1939 the birth rate indexes of women over the age of 25 was decreasing significantly more slowly, and remained at a high level.

Table 16.
The number of children born per 1,000 of total number of women by age²⁰¹

Years	Women under 25	Women over 25
1937	196,4	278,0
1938	160,5	273,1
1939	157,3	258,7

²⁰⁰ The CHA RA, f. 130, l. 4, f. 1553, p.5.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

3. The demographers of Azerbaijan falsify the facts

The poll of 1926 revealed that approximately 80% of 234,900 Azeri-Turks,²⁰² Persians and other Muslims who earlier emigrated from the province of Erevan to Azerbaijan and Iran returned and settled in their former localities²⁰³. Some part of these emigrants had perished during the military actions as a result of the aggression of Turkish and Musavat troops in 1918-1920.

The surviving part of the Armenian population that had emigrated from the towns of the Republic of Azerbaijan during the years of Musavat rule later returned to the Azerbaijan SSR. However, approximately 90% of the Armenian rural population that had emigrated from there established permanent residence in the Armenian SSR. Some Muslims also emigrated from Erevan province. At first the number of Azeri-Turks was small in the province, but the demographers of Azerbaijan exaggerated that number by falsifying facts. According to their "calculations", "Later the number of Azeri-Turks in the present territory of Armenia considerably increased and reached 575,000, constituting more than a half of its population. But because of the purposes of nationalistic policy, more than half of the one million Azerbaijani population was annihilated or banished."²⁰⁴ Thus we see that falsification of data had been presented from the first step of these "calculations".

According to the published statistical sources and archive documents, in the pre-Soviet period the total population in the area, corresponding to the present territory of the Republic of Armenia, never reached 1,150,000, so it is quite impossible to say that the half of the population ("575,000") constituted the Azeri-Turks. Suffice it to say that in 1913 1,000,000 lived in the above-mentioned territory. As regards the province of Erevan, according to data of "The Caucasian Calendar" (which was published every year), the

population in 1914 was 1,014,000; in 1916 - 993,782 and in 1919 - 1,000,677.

The point is that from 1918 until the December of 1920, under the influence of massacres periodically organized and perpetrated by Turkish and Musavat troops during their intervention in Armenia, the Azeri-Turks and other Muslims emigrated from the country. Armenians, being the objects of these massacres, defended themselves. As a result, Muslims also perished. Consequently, more than 200,000 (not 575,000) Azeri-Turks, Persians and representatives of other nationalities migrated from Armenia. This was not the fault of self-defending Armenians, but due instead to anti-Armenian policy and war provoked by the Musavat government and Turkish occupants. The statement of the demographers of Azerbaijan is not truthful. How could a massacre of the Azeri-Turks of such a substantial scale be carried out by the first Republic of Armenia, which at the initial period of its existence was squeezed within the limits of 9,000 sq. km. and, being then in the jaws of famine while at the same time having to fight against invading Turkish troops and Musavat bands? Let's not forget that in 1918-1920 the Musavat bands and the Turkish occupants themselves organized mass massacres of the Armenian population in Baku, Shushi, Nakhijevan and in a number of regions of Azerbaijan. As a result Armenians were unable to return to their former localities. With the establishment of Soviet power Azerbaijan annexed Nakhijevan and Mountainous Karabakh. The demographers of Azerbaijan shed "crocodile tears", using falsehood and lie, the whole arsenal of Turkish diplomacy, and under the cover of exaggerated declarations and ingratiating words, blame the Armenian people for the genocide and the "annexation demand" of the "territories" of Azerbaijan. Not a single word is said about the massacres of the Armenian population, murders of children, women and old men, round-ups and the display of a herd instinct by the Azeri-Turks between 1918 and 1920.

In the course of more than seventy years the government of Soviet Azerbaijan carried out a policy of planned massacres, deportations and sadistic actions against Armenians. In contrast the

²⁰² They are also called "Azerbaijanis" (don't mix with original Azerbaijanis of Iran) in official documents of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods.

²⁰³ CHA RA, f. 197, l. 6, p.37, 48, 49.

²⁰⁴ "Bakinski Rabotchi" ("The Baku Worker"), 11.07.1990 (in Russian).

demographers of Azerbaijan falsify the facts and blame these violations on Armenia. They transform reality, changing the place of actions and the roles of their authors. As far as "the actors" and "acting heroes" are the same persons, these demographers "stage an excellent play" of falsehood. Moreover, the grandchildren of the occupants of Mountainous Karabakh and Nakhijevan, the political figures of Azerbaijan and adulterating demographers, often express "sorrow" that they could not similarly annex Dilijan, Zangezur and Meghri. They declared shamelessly that Armenians "... the reflectors of the annexationist ideas need a territory without its native Azeri population...".

The Azerbaijani falsifiers continue: "It is well known and it is well proven by documents that after establishment of Soviet power in the Transcaucasus a considerable part of Azerbaijani lands, occupied by Dashnaks, remained within the borders of the Armenian SSR. At the beginning of 1920 the Armenian region of Dilijan was formed of the southern area of the Azerbaijan region of Kazakh. A greater part of Zangezur passed to Armenia. The regions of Meghri and Zangezur were herein formed. It is necessary to note that because of the surrender of the territory adjacent to Meghri to Armenia, the region of Nakhijevan was artificially cut out of Azerbaijan."²⁰⁵

What aboriginal people does the case in point relate to? Who does not know that between the 16th and 18th centuries very small groups of the Turkish nomadic tribes invaded and settled in Zangezur²⁰⁶ and Mountainous Karabakh²⁰⁷? Later, during the years of the Persian rule their number increased in Zangezur. They settled there as conquerors. Conqueror can never be a native people. Let's not forget that this also is a manifestation of genocide. This is not surprising, because voluntary methods of raising falsehood at the state level are practiced in Azerbaijan.

Secondly, the demographers of Azerbaijan declare Zangezur and Dilijan to be Azerbaijani territories. Their declaration,

²⁰⁵ "Bakinski Rabotchi," 11.07, 1990, p.1-2 (in Russian).

²⁰⁶ Siunik was one of the 15 regions of the kingdom of Great Armenia.

²⁰⁷ The mountainous part of Artsakh. Artsakh was one of the 15 regions of the Armenian kingdom of Great Armenia.

undoubtedly, is based on the fact that according to the tsarist administrative division the territories of Zangezur and Dilijan were parts of the province of Elisavetpol (Gandzak). This is evidently true. But, in this case the demographers of Azerbaijan pass over in silence two very important facts. The territory of the province of Elisavetpol is a part of historic Armenia. The tsarist administrative division was not based on the principle of national identity. The administrative division of provinces was a conventional one and had no historical relation to the national belongings of the regions of the province. According to the same principle, the Armenian regions of Lori and Javakhk' were included in the province of Tiflis. When the demographers of Azerbaijan violate these principles and take as a basis the tsarist administrative division, they are inconsistent. The region of Nakhijevan was a part of the province of Erevan. The region of Nakhijevan²⁰⁸ has been unlawfully annexed by Azeri-Turks.

The demographers of Azerbaijan falsify also the number and structure of the population. They write: "In the course of decades the Armenian nationalists and their ideologists speculate about the theme of the genocide of the Armenian people but during many years persistently keep silent and hide the facts of the gross distortion of rights of the Azerbaijani population, as well as pressure and crime committed against it in Armenia. The official disinterested statistics are a conclusive documented proof of this. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century 407,400 people (including more than 250 thousand Azeri) lived in the province of Erevan, later, the most part of which constituted the Armenian SSR. The Azeri-Turks constituted almost a half of the total number of the population (49.2%) in Erevan."²⁰⁹

To what extent do these figures correspond to reality? How do they "serve" for such "scientific" generalizations and accusations full of insults? It is quite evident from "the official disinterested statistics."

During, the period mentioned by the Azeri-Turks, i.e. the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, truthful and

²⁰⁸ The territory of Nakhijevan was one of the central regions of Great Armenia.

²⁰⁹ "Bakinski Rabotchi," 11.07, 1990, p.1-2 (in Russian).

accurate data is contained only in the very rich and many-sided statistical materials of the all-Russian census of 1897, which was published in many volumes. The 71st volume, relating to the province of Erevan, has 189 pages and was published in 1905 in St. Petersburg. It clearly shows in its 25 tables that in 1897 the population was 829,556 people²¹⁰ and not 407,400 people as has been "baked" by the false demographers of Azerbaijan, the advocates of "the official disinterested statistics", who present the falsehood as a reality. There are many kinds of falsehood. Is it possible to show the fabricated number of the population twice as low in order to present the Azeri-Turks' exaggerated specific weight in the general number of the population of the province of Erevan. Perhaps the Azerbaijani demographers "through misunderstanding" confuse the province of Erevan with the present territory of the Republic of Armenia. It does not matter. The situation does not change. According to the same census of 1897, 797,893 people lived in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia.²¹¹

It is clear that all data quoted by the demographers of Azerbaijan is fictitious. First, according to the census of 1897 not "more than 250,000 Azeris", but "240,328 Muslims" lived in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia. Second, it is known that the general number of the population in the Russian census statistics is presented according to religious identity. Meanwhile all Muslims living in Armenia (and not only in Armenia) are presented by the Azerbaijani demographers as Azeris, neglecting the fact that the term "Azeri" is an artificial one and at that time the Russian statistics used the term "Caucasian Tatars" who were of Turkish origin. Along with them there also lived Persians, Kurds and Turks (who belonged to the Muslim religion) in Armenia as national minorities. So, in this case the falsehood constitutes not 10,000, but tens of thousands people.²¹² In the same way the demographers of Azerbaijan falsify the numbers connected with the ethnic structure of the Erevan province's population, they purposely do not mention that in 1897

merely 29,006 people lived in Erevan, of which 12,516 were "Muslims." Simple arithmetic shows that the Muslims' share (but again not "Caucasian Tatars") in the population of Erevan constituted 43.1%, which the Azerbaijani demographers present as 49.2%. These demographers are not acquainted with a simple calculation of percentage. A higher portion of this 43.1 per cent constituted Persians, Kurds, Tats, Lezghins and other peoples living in the province, as well as in the city of Erevan. Many in Azerbaijan, as well as the former president of the USSR, M.Gorbachov, under pretence of presenting "special rebukes" concerning the national policy carried out in Armenia, often referred and expressed serious anxiety as regards the diminishing percentage of the Azeri-Turks in the population of Erevan in the 1970s as compared with the beginning of the 20th century. In 1897 the total number of Erevan's population was 29,006²¹³, which remained almost unchanged until 1913 when it increased only by 300. Later, during the years of World War I and international strife (1918-1920), instigated by the anti-Armenian forces, the share of the Muslim population decreased.

At the beginning of the 1920s one of the characteristic features of the reproduction of the population was the consolidation of dispersed Armenians. In the course of the following decades the population of Erevan increased not only in a natural way but also because of the mechanical growth of the Armenian population. Owing to that, in sixty years Erevan became a city with a population of 1,000,000. In these conditions the specific weight of Azeri-Turks diminished because their number increased not mechanically, but due only to natural growth.

Between 1948 and 1952 the number of Azerbaijanis (Azeri-Turks) in Soviet Armenia actually decreased because approximately 58,500 Azerbaijanis emigrated from Soviet Armenia in an organized way and resettled in Soviet Azerbaijan²¹⁴. They took from collective farms (kolkhozes) their share of property and drove it to Azerbaijan. The adulterating demographers of Azerbaijan and political figures, playing politics, falsify facts concerning the question of the

²¹⁰ "The First All-Russian General Census...", "Erivan Province," p.2-3.

²¹¹ Z.Korkotyan. The Population of Soviet Armenia..., p.183.

²¹² V.Khojabekyan. People's Deputies Elected from Azerbaijan Falsify, - "National Economy of Armenia," 1990, N 11, p. 44-60 (in Armenian).

²¹³ "The First General Census...", "The Erivan Province," p.52-53.

²¹⁴ "Materials of the Economic History of Azerbaijan", Baku, 1970 (in Russian)

organized emigration of Azeri-Turks from Armenia in 1948-1952 and present the events in a distorted way. According to their interpretation, after the Great Patriotic War, in 1948-1952, more than 100,000 Azeri-Turks were deported from Armenia "under an impudent pretext" of cleansing a territory for the repatriated Armenians "on the initiative of Stalin and Mikoyan". In addition to this outrageous lie these forgers write that many of the deported Azeri-Turks died as a result of unbearable conditions of life.²¹⁵

These Azerbaijani demographers regard themselves as "scientists" but do not want to take the trouble to make reference to "Materials of the Economic History of Azerbaijan" published in Baku in 1970. In one of the articles (written by Azerbaijanis themselves) of this book is noted that the matter does not concern "the cleansing of a territory in Armenia for the repatriated Armenians", but rather is about the request of the government of Soviet Azerbaijan (1946) addressed to the central government in Moscow to organize the resettlement of Azerbaijanis from the Georgian SSR, the Armenian SSR and the Soviet republics of Central Asia to the lower basins of the Kur and Arax rivers in Soviet Azerbaijan so that they could cultivate and irrigate new lands. The central government complied with the request.

The Azerbaijani "scientists" do not take into consideration the fact that in 1946-1947 the repatriated Armenians had already settled in Armenia where appropriate.

It is noted in the above-mentioned book published in Baku that during those years only from the Armenian SSR 58,000 Azerbaijanis were displaced to Azerbaijan,²¹⁶ but it doesn't bother them to exaggerate the figures which were mentioned and published by themselves in 1970 and to bring these numbers to 100,000. Moreover, it is presented as "Stalinist deportation", not to Siberia, but to the Azerbaijan SSR, their native land. About these "100,000" Azerbaijanis and "their deportation" speak also the former president

A.Mutalibov²¹⁷ and some "demographers" who pass over the real facts in silence and make deliberate generalizations.

The Candidate of Economics, K.Mamedov parallel with many other misrepresented facts makes a great effort to convince the world that according to the censuses of 1939 and 1959 the total number of Azeri-Turks in the Armenian SSR decreased by 17.7%²¹⁸ because of the policy of deportation regarding Azeri-Turks. The reduction, undoubtedly, is a reality. But why did it happen? It is necessary to give Mamedov (who is inclined to believe that he is a demographer) as well as his colleagues a piece of good advice that before writing anything it is important to get acquainted with the published literature. It is possible that Mamedov has been acquainted with the above-mentioned publications of his colleagues. For them it is not advantageous to mention these publications. Otherwise this artificial pyramid built on an unsteady base will collapse.

It is necessary to mention that the greater part of 58,000 Azerbaijanis who emigrated from Armenia to Azerbaijan between 1948 and 1952 did not adapt to local conditions. Families were intentionally divided: half of them stayed in Azerbaijan, while the other half, without difficulty, returned to Armenia and settled there. When they returned, they again joined kolkhozes, but without bringing back the property that they took away with them. The resettled families, bribing the Soviet authorities, divided into several parts, with each getting a separate plot of land (larger than Armenians) attached to the house. They built comfortable houses and became the owners of large flocks. Materially, on the whole, they led a more self-sufficient life than that of the Armenians. For example, the Azeri-Turks settled in the regions of Vardenis and Krasnoselsk of the Armenian SSR were occupied with stock farming and sheep breeding. Many of them had flocks with more than two to three hundred sheep. In winter they drove these flocks to Azerbaijan and sold mutton at a high price. For this reason, between the censuses of 1959 and 1970 the number of Azeri-Turks increased by 40,000, i.e. from 107,700 to 148,200. No other single national minority had such

²¹⁵ "The Baku Worker," 11.07. 1990, p.1-2; "The Union", N38, 09.1990; "The Youth of Azerbaijan", 27. 03.1990 (all in Russian).

²¹⁶ "Materials of the Economic History of Azerbaijan", p.19.

²¹⁷ "The Union", N38, 09.1990.

²¹⁸ "The Youth of Azerbaijan", 27. 03.1990.

an increase in Armenia. The number of Azeri-Turks grew by 13,000 between 1970-1979, while the number of Armenians and Russians diminished in Azerbaijan and Georgia.

Thus, when in 1988 Azerbaijanis immigrated to Azerbaijan, a certain number of them already had houses and property in Azerbaijan and did not become homeless refugees although those in Azerbaijan erroneously insist that there were "one million homeless migrants, living in tents". This is essentially an imaginary number. A detailed analysis shows that the number of Azerbaijanis that emigrated from the lands liberated and controlled by the Republic of Mountainous Karabakh, the proper Republic of Mountainous Karabakh and the Republic of Armenia from 1988-1990s was not 1 million, but rather 500,000 (300,000 from the liberated and controlled lands, 40,000 from the Republic of Mountainous Karabakh, and 160,000 from RA). In other words, the false numbers are the double of what they should be.

Thus, between 1948 and 1952 Azeri-Turks emigrated from the Soviet republics of Armenia, Georgia and Middle Asia to the Azerbaijan SSR by the request of the first secretary (of that time) of their Central Committee, M. Bagirov, who sent letters with a request to the first secretaries of those republics. He previously received the approval of Joseph Stalin to start developing long-fallow lands in the lower basins of the Kur and the Arax.

It is ridiculous, but a question nonetheless emerges. Could an alien civilization exist in the centre of Armenia? Was the creation and existence of another people or an alien culture possible in the heart of the Armenian people? What is the logic of presentation of the Armenian culture of Nakhichevan and Artsakh, the unique monuments bearing the stamp of the Armenian masters, Churches and *khatchkars* (stone-crosses) as Azerbaijani, or their destruction? The historical truth, that Nakhichevan is one of the central regions of Great Armenia, is neglected.

It is not out of place to mention that 45 to 50 years ago the "magnanimous" leaders of our republic, without any compensation, "genially" gave 52 hectare of plough-land in the border area of Ijevan and Ghazakh as a gift to the neighboring republic for the

purpose of building a reservoir. Later, the request of the leadership of the Armenian SSR to the leadership of the Azerbaijan SSR to cede 2-3 hectare for the purpose of construction of an airport was refused.

In 1929 our very "far-sighted leaders" gave pastures stretching to the south-east of the Vardenis mountain as a gift to the neighboring republic. It was a vast territory, which like a wedge was driven between Vardenis, Martini and Zangezur. There at a height of 2,500 meters above sea level Aralitchk splashes, as if a piece cut off from the Lake Sevan, with its blue and sweet water. What a divine beauty! During summer months Azeri-Turks grazed about 1,000,000 sheep and 100,000 cattle in these rich Alpine meadows. According to an agreement, Azerbaijan was presented with these pastures (now back in the territory of the Republic of Armenia) in exchange for use of the pastures of the Kur-Arax valley for the cattle from Armenia in winter. It never happened.

All kinds of fabrications are invented in order to disguise and consign to oblivion the traces of the Turkish and Azerbaijani specific methods of the conquest of the Armenian territories, extermination and deportation of Armenians from their cradle - the Armenian Highland. According to the "inventors" of such insinuation, the best way of defense is the attack. So they attack. The initial principle is not scientific history, but a false "construction of history". This historical fiction was invented in order to falsify and distort the real history by means of adjusting it to their goals. According to this fabrication, the territories of historical Armenia, the regions of Gardman, Artsakh, Nakhichevan, and the greater part of the present territory of the Republic of Armenia, are historically constituent parts of Azerbaijan. They falsely represented the population of Caucasian or Albania proper as the ancestors of Azeri-Turks without mentioning the historical sources or falsifying them. They included within the territory of Caucasian Albania (Albania proper) not only the present-day Azerbaijan, but also parts of the Republic of Armenia, Artsakh and Utik.

4. The real picture of the ethnic cleansing's policy towards the Armenians in Nakhijevan

The sadistic policy of the Musavat and later on the Soviet governments of Azerbaijan and the Nakhijevan ASSR in 1918-1920 as regards the Armenian population of Nakhijevan is a vivid expression of the deportation of the Armenian population along with many other facts.

It is quite well known that Nakhijevan was one of the central regions of Great Armenia and included mainly the districts of Nakhijevan and Goghtn of Vaspurakan province, as well as the districts of Ernjak, Tchahuk and partially Kovsakan of Siunik province and the district of Sharur of Ayrarat province. This is the reason why, when in 1828 Eastern Armenia joined Russia, Nakhijevan along with its districts first became a part of the Armenian Oblast and then a part of the province of Erevan.

Being one of the central regions of Great Armenia, Nakhijevan played a very important role in the fate of the Armenian people. St. Mesrop Mashtots went to Goghtn for preaching Christianity and opened there first schools based on the teaching of the Armenian alphabet invented by him (405 AD). The Armenian region of Nakhijevan, historically rich in cultural traditions, fell in the 8th century under the domination of the Arab caliphate then again was restored as a part of the Armenian Kingdom. Later, Nakhijevan was attacked by the Seljuk Turks. In the 13th-14th centuries the Nakhijevan region was an integral part of the Armenian princedoms of the Orbelyans of Siunk and the Zakaryans. Until joining Russia, Nakhijevan remained under the rule of Persia.

Under foreign rule Nakhijevan always was a place of emigration. I. Shopen wrote: "Disastrous destructions that always tore up their (Armenians-V.Kh.) unhappy Motherland... had to make the most part of the native population to emigrate."²¹⁹ Armenian settlements were founded in Nor Nakhijevan, the North Caucasus and the Crimea. The Nakhijevan migrants constituted a large part of these settlements. Permanent wars and marches resulted in

considerable losses of the Armenian population of Nakhijevan. A part of them were killed, another part was forcibly assimilated or deported. Others moved to neighboring regions. At the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century the region turned into an arena for the Turkish-Persian wars and was almost completely devastated. The Armenian population was mainly deported to Persia or partially exterminated during Turkish and Persian campaigns which followed each other.²²⁰ In 1604 Shah Abbas I deported more than 60,000 Armenians to Persia from Eastern Armenia, mainly from the Ararat valley and Nakhijevan. In fact these regions were devastated.²²¹ In spite of all that, in the course of time the number of Armenians of the region was restored. The second half of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century were characterized by the strengthening of the orientation of Eastern Armenia toward Russia, whose southern borders had already stretched to the Caucasus. The expansion of the Russian empire to the south threatened the integrity of Persian northern borders and determined the policy of Persia in this region. Persia undertook the settlement of the region of Nakhijevan, as well as generally of Eastern Armenia by Muslims. I. Shopen wrote: "Reinforcement of Tatars in certain regions of the Armenian Highland... was merely conditioned on political reasons. The danger of Russia's threat made the Persian government strengthen the most reliable Muslim element in the border areas of the state."²²²

The renewed Russo-Persian war (1826-1828) made worse the state of the Armenian population of the Nakhijevan region. During military operations, which took place with variable success, a considerable number of the Armenian population of Nakhijevan fell victim to the war.²²³ Persians blamed Armenians for the obvious Russian orientation and direct involvement in military operations.

²¹⁹ History of the Armenian People, vol. 4, Erevan, 1972, p.95-107 (in Armenian).

²²¹ I. Shopen, Op. cit., p.706.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ "The News of the Caucasian Military Region", N 37, Tiflis, 1914, p.21-37 (in Russian).

²¹⁹ I. Shopen, Op. cit., p.706.

Armenians left their houses for the North Caucasus and the regions of Transcaucasia, which became a part of the Russian empire. For this reason the specific weight of Armenians varied between 15 and 20%.

After the end of the Russo-Persian war the regions of Nakhijevan and Ordubad were conquered by the Russian empire. During one year, in 1828-1829, 45,000 Armenians²²⁴ immigrated to Eastern Armenia of which about 12,000 settled in the region of Nakhijevan.²²⁵

According to the cameral registration's data, the number of Armenians among the general number of residents in the Nakhijevan region increased and constituted 41.2%.²²⁶ Soon many deserted villages were revived. In the 40s of the 19th century the number of villages in the region reached 230, despite the fact that the number of deserted villages was rather high, about 50 villages.²²⁷

The town of Nakhijevan was notable among other towns of the region for "being populous and marvelously built, having about 30,000 constructions."²²⁸

After the formation of the province of Erevan, the region of Nakhijevan, of the former Armenian district, was divided into the regions of Nakhijevan and Ordubad, which in 1867 were again united constituting one region.

These administrative reorganizations, along with other reasons, were conditioned on peculiarities of the region's ethnic structure. The prevalence of Muslims played a decisive role for a separation of the region of Nakhijevan, when the Armenian district was abolished. The policy of the Russian empire towards national minorities was conducive to it. Current opportunities and the growth of the national consciousness of the more organized Armenian element contradicted the interests of the empire. That is why every

possible thing was done in the region for the influx of the settled and nomadic Tatars.²²⁹

On the whole, practically, conditions were created for consolidating the Armenian population in the region of Nakhijevan and that brought to an increase to its number in the region. At the end of the 19th century the Armenian population of the region almost doubled, in spite of the fact that the number of the Muslims (from now on - Tatars) increased by more than 2,6 times.²³⁰

The peculiarities of the growth of the Tatar population's number were affected by that fact that in 1897, during the First General Census in the Russian empire different Muslim peoples were classified along with the Tatars. It was due to the commonness of the faith and kinship of languages. According to data of the cameral registration of 1829-1832, in Nakhijevan region there were registered 29 nomadic peoples with total number of 7,300.²³¹

In the total number of the population of Nakhijevan region the specific weight of Armenians diminished and in 1897 constituted 34.4%, while after the Nakhijevan region's conquest by the Russian empire, the share of Tatars grew from 58.8% to 63.7%.²³² Later, till the fall of the Russian empire the rate of growth of the Armenian population increased. Before World War I Nakhijevan (a part of Armenia) was one of the regions of the province of Erevan. From 1897 to 1916 the number of the Armenian population increased 1,5 times more and the number of the Tatars rose by 108.7%.

These trends of the change of the region of Nakhijevan were caused by the socio-economic development of the region determined by the growth and activation of the Armenian national capital on the one hand and the policy of the Russian empire in complicated international conditions on the other hand. In that period, the Russian empire's policy was directed toward the strengthening of Armenians who were the most reliable Christian element in conditions of direct Turkish threat and the renewed military operations on the Caucasian

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ I.Shopen, Op. cit., p.599-642.

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1850", Tiflis, 1849, section III, p.69.

²²⁹ "A Code of Materials...", vol3, p.2, Tiflis, 1888, p.67.

²³⁰ "The First General Census...", "A Memory Book... 1902", p.52.

²³¹ I.Shopen, Op. cit., p.638-639.

²³² "The First General Census...", "The Erivan Province," p.52-55.

front. During that time the absolute quantity of the growth of the Armenian population exceeded that of the Tatars three times more. It constituted almost 17,000. As a result of that the number of Armenians appreciably rose in the total number of the population of the region of Nakhijevan and reached 40% in 1916.²³³ World War I and the following events - the fall of the Russian empire, the formation of the national republics in Transcaucasia (1918), clashes and massacres because of international dissention and the Turkish aggression essentially reduced the number of the population of Nakhijevan region. In 1918-1920, during the raids of the Turkish occupants and the Musavat bands, the Armenian population of Nakhijevan, which had increased considerably as a result of the forced movement of Armenians from Western Armenia, twice had to leave the region for other places.

In 1920, after the second Turkish invasion and massacres, the Armenian population of Nakhijevan had to leave their native land and became refugees.

As a direct result of the Moscow treaty (March 16, 1921) signed by Soviet Russia and Turkey, the occupied Armenian territories were ceded to Turkey and Nakhijevan was given to Soviet Azerbaijan. This unjust treaty was signed with the active participation of Stalin in spite of the fact that Nakhijevan earlier was proclaimed a constituent part of Soviet Armenia, as indeed it should have been because Nakhijevan originally was a part of Armenian. Thus, the conclusion of such a treaty without consent and at the expense of Armenia was one of unprecedented cases in the history of diplomacy.

By the demand of Turkey a special article was included in the Moscow treaty, according to which "Azerbaijan was obliged" not to cede Nakhijevan to the third state, i.e. Armenia. What an irony! The Nakhijevan region that never was a part of "Azerbaijan", by the dictate of Turkey, was given to Soviet Azerbaijan.

The Nakhichevan (Nakhijevan) Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was established on February 9, 1924 as a part of Soviet Azerbaijan.

²³³ Ibid.

It is necessary to touch on the problem of Nakhijevan and the Artsakh Armenians from the point of view of the direction of international conventions. According to these principles, a nation is not deprived of the right to ownership of its historic territory if it was robbed of that territory in consequence of genocide and deportation. In the case of Nakhijevan the Armenian population was deported under the direct threat of the white and red genocide.

According to statistics, in 1917, 53,900 Armenians (40% of the total number of population)²³⁴ lived in the ancient Armenian region of Nakhijevan. According to the census of 1926, a fifth of the Armenian population remained (11,276).²³⁵

The point is that in 1920 after the second Turkish invasion and massacre, the Armenian population of Nakhijevan had to abandon its native land irretrievably.

One of the forms of the genocide in Azerbaijan was the creation of a situation, at a critical juncture of international conflicts, when the deported Armenian population wouldn't be able to return to its homeland. All kinds of obstacles were created by the authorities who passed unlawful and unconstitutional acts preventing the return of the Armenians to their native places. This happened with the Armenians that migrated from the regions of Gandzak and Nakhijevan to the Republic of Armenia. In 1921 after the annexation of Nakhijevan by Soviet Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijani authorities prohibited the Armenian refugees (who during the massacres of 1918-1920 left their houses and properties) to return to their birth-place, though their houses were empty, doors locked, and land uncultivated. Notwithstanding the Nakhichevan (Nakhijevan) Central Executive Committee's (CEC) preliminary agreement, the Azerbaijani CEC and NCEC passed many special resolutions²³⁶ imposing bans on the return of the Armenians to their native places of residence in Nakhichevan. The Chairman of the Soviet of the

²³⁴ "The Caucasian Calendar of 1917", p.215-221; "The Number and Structure of the Population of the USSR", Moscow, 1984, p.126 (in Russian).

²³⁵ "All-Union Census of the Population of December 17, 1926", Brief reports, N 4, Moscow, p.127-128 (in Russian).

²³⁶ The CHA RR. f. 130, l. 6, f.197.

Peoples' Commissars Mousabekov in his telegram (June 24, 1922) addressed to the Chairman of the Soviet of the People's Commissars of the Armenian SSR informed that according to Azerbaijani CEC, the "mass entry into the territory of Azerbaijan"²³⁷ is prohibited.

Later the principle of such prohibition was further deepened and all obstacles were created to stop the return of Armenians. For example, in the report (November 18, 1926) of the Transcaucasian CEC, addressed to the Azerbaijani Soviet of the People's Commissars, it was noted that "Azerbaijan mastered the principle of prohibition and it is so essential that this principle of prohibition is utilized by it in the whole of the Nakhijevan Autonomous Republic where the problem of migrants... acquired the most acute character and there it needs measures of practical and concrete regulation, more than anywhere."²³⁸

According to the evaluation of the legal commission of the Transcaucasian CEC, "the actual state of the migrant's affairs... is that Azerbaijan, on the whole, didn't receive Armenian refugees who left its borders during the period of Soviet power. On the contrary, those of the Turkish refugees who did not want to stay in their new settlements returned to Armenia."²³⁹ Moreover, "proceeding from the legislation of Azerbaijan, which withdrew from its land legislation the notion of "migration" and replaced it with the notion of the "settling" of the native people," it is possible to presume that this republic "in fact disregards the problem of migrants"²⁴⁰ in spite of the fact that a problem was posed by the prospective plan of Azerbaijan, "to invite new settlers from neighboring republics."²⁴¹

In 1922-1926 refugee Armenians from Nakhijevan sent numerous petitions to the governments of Azerbaijan and Nakhijevan concerning their return to their former places of residence. There was no answer and so they appealed to the corresponding government bodies of the Union. On March 11, 1925, the Chairman of the

Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union Rikov visited Nakhijevan. After this there were some changes in the practice of the Transcaucasian CEC in the resolution of the problem of migrants. Rikov condemned the Azerbaijani government for creation of "complete Soviet disgrace."²⁴² Some resolute steps were undertaken in order to abolish that government. Some representatives of the government were executed by shooting. After that Armenian refugees protested with greater force. Proceeding from this new development they expressed themselves more freely and evidently and acted more resolutely.²⁴³ On March 21, 1925 the collective report of the refugee Armenians' representative group, describing the events that resulted in the emigration of the overwhelming majority of the Nakhijevan Armenian population and the grave condition of migrants declared that they wanted to return the homeland and that the Nakhijevan Autonomous Republic had resources to receive them. The authors of the report presented data about the situation in different villages, which in former times were inhabited by Armenians. For example, according to the presented list that the village of Aliabad in 1917 had 600 Armenian families, Aprakunis - 300, Hajivar - 200, Gyuzhut - 250, Jagrat - 600, Eakhan - 250, Ghazanchi - 400, Karakhanbeklu - 350, Tazakend - 240, Tmbul - 500, Shahnamud - 350. There were mentioned scores of other Armenian villages.²⁴⁴ (The authenticity of this information is also proved by the data of "The Caucasian Calendar of 1917").²⁴⁵ The applicants noted that all those villages were ruined and that some groups of Armenian and Turkish families now lived there.²⁴⁶ They appealed to the Transcaucasian CEC "to take under its control the problem of migrants and distribution of plots."²⁴⁷ A copy of that document was sent to the Chairman of the CEC of the USSR M.I.Kalinin. According to the accepted order, the CEC sent the report signed by M.I.Kalinin to the Azerbaijani CEC for closer examination. As a result, the problem remained unsolved for another

²³⁷ Ibid., f. 123, l. 42, f. 8, p.13.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Ibid., l. 50.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., f. 130, l. 6, f. 197, p.52.

²⁴¹ Ibid., p.53.

²⁴² "Zarya Vostoka" ("The Dawn of the East"), 12.03.1925 (in Russian).

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p.66.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., p.53.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., p.66.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p.67.

year. On June 26, 1925 the same group handed in a special application to Rikov. They blamed the new leadership of the Nakhijevan Republic for persecutions, as well as "incapacity, conservatism, ignorance and national animosity against Armenians,"²⁴⁸ declaring that "the present administrative system of the region has the same negative attitude towards the problem of migrant Armenians as the previous Council of People's Commissars."²⁴⁹

The inquiries of the Transcaucasian CEC to the Azerbaijani CEC restarted only on March 26, 1926. It was noted in the resolution of the Azerbaijani CEC (May 6, 1926) that "with the purpose of the equal distribution of plots... and because of a shortage of land in the Nakhijevan ASSR it is prohibited to resettle there those who want to receive plots for agricultural works and accordingly the Land People's Commissariat is advised to allot land only to those who moved to the republic before April 1, 1925"²⁵⁰ his resolution was only for the uninformed. After all, before April 1, 1925 not a single Armenian could settle in the Nakhijevan ASSR because of the fact that from 1922 this "territory" of the Azerbaijan SSR was closed to migrants. Furthermore, Nakhijevan was a border zone and before April 1, 1925 no one could settle there without a residence permit. Thus, everything was done in order not to solve the problem of the return of Armenian refugees. Before the establishment of the Soviet power 400 people lived in the Armenian village of Ghazantchi. They were displaced from their native village and 14 Turkish families (who migrated from Zangezur) were settled there. After numerous petitions containing request for giving back the village to its actual owners, the CEC formed a neutral commission headed by the political chief of the border department, Danilenko, in order to solve the problem. Hasanov (a Turk) and Ohanov (an Armenian) were the members of that special commission, which got acquainted with the case. In August of 1925 a decision was made about the return of the Armenians to the village of Ghazantchi. The decision was approved

by the Nakhijevan CEC and sent to the Transcaucasian CEC. On November 3, 1925 it was conformed by the small presidium and was presented to the big presidium of the Transcaucasian CEC for the final approval. The Transcaucasian CEC sent the complaint to the Azerbaijani CEC for preliminary examination, which on December 12, 1925 adopted a decision according to which the displacement of the Turkish families was considered impossible. The Azerbaijani CEC charged the Nakhijevan CEC "to reconsider the decision of the special commission from the point of view of its annulment." On December 23, 1925 the joint meeting of the Nakhijevan CEC and the Council of the People's Commissars agreed with the decision of the Nakhijevan CEC and as a result the petition of the Armenians of Ghazantchi was rejected.²⁵¹

On June 12, 1926 the problem of the Nakhijevan refugees came to the end, when in answer to the Transcaucasian CEC's renewed inquiry the Azerbaijani CEC answered, presenting extracts from two decisions. One of them was the decision adopted by the Azerbaijani CEC on April 26, 1926, which reads as follows: "Taking into consideration that petitioners for a long time were in Tiflis²⁵² and there is a lack of plots in the Nakhijevan ASSR, as it is seen from the data of the distribution of land there, so being based on the decree N 5 of the Azerbaijani CEC, the petition of petitioners is rejected."²⁵³ On May 29, 1926 the Azerbaijani CEC adopted a decision which reads as follows: "Taking into consideration that because of shortage of arable land the peasants of the Nakhijevan ASSR are not well-provided with necessary quantity of land for agricultural employment, and feel a great need for land, so resettlement of any number of migrants in the Nakhijevan ASSR will result in creation of hard conditions for local peasants, as well as taking into consideration the decision of the Azerbaijani CEC adopted on May, 1925 about "prohibition of resettlement of those in

²⁵¹ Ibid., p.69.

²⁵² As early as March 27, 1925 the Transcaucasian CEC received the petition of the representatives of the refugees from Nakhijevan who lived in very hard conditions in Tiflis. Their petition was about their return to their native land.

²⁵³ CHA RR, f. 130, l. 6, f. 197, p.72.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., p.68.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., p.10.

the Nakhijevan ASSR who want to receive plots and allotment of land only to those who moved to Nakhijevan before April 1, 1925.²⁵⁴ The Azerbaijani CEC made the following decision: "It is necessary to consider correct the rejection of the petitioners' written request by the Nakhijevan CEC that is set forth in its decision (April 26, 1926) and regard impossible immigration of the Nakhijevan refugees living in Tiflis to the Nakhijevan ASSR."²⁵⁵ However, these declarations and resolutions were baseless. For example, according to the official reference book of the Nakhijevan Central statistical department, in 1917 the villages of Aliabad, Abrakunis, Hajivar, Kaput, Karakhanbeklu, Tazakend and Tmbul had approximately 2,340 families, while in 1925 merely 690 families remained. That is to say the number of families decreased more than three times.²⁵⁶ Though data is not complete, such was the situation in Nakhijevan.

According to the report "The problem of the migrants in the Transfederation" sent by the legislative commission of the Transcaucasian CEC to the Council of the People's Commissars of the Transcaucasus, the provision of the Nakhijevan ASSR with land creates objective conditions principally for getting back the refugees and providing them with plots.²⁵⁷ In 1926, the new Azerbaijani leadership finally prohibited the Nakhijevan Armenians from returning to their uninhabited places - to their villages and houses which had already turned into ruins.²⁵⁸

Thus, the requests and dreams of the Nakhijevan Armenians to settle in their uninhabited villages and their own houses remained unrealized. There were created not only obstacles on the path to the return of the Armenian refugees to the Nakhijevan ASSR, but also every possible thing was done to drive away the remaining Armenian population from Nakhijevan.

The displacement of the Armenians, as a result of the policy of socio-economic and national discrimination, was characterized by

its consistency and "high organization." In 1970 the share of Armenians in the population of the Nakhijevan ASSR already was 2.9%, but in 1979 it was 1.4% i.e. merely 3,400 people.²⁵⁹ During 1926-1979 in conditions of general growth by 229.2% of the population of the Nakhijevan ASSR the Azerbaijani population increased 2.6 times and in contrast the Armenian population decreased 3.3 times. After the events of 1988 there probably lived merely 1-2,000 Armenians. There remained only 2 villages of the 44 villages which had existed in the Nakhijevan region before the establishment of the Soviet power.

The Nakhijevan ASSR was situated in the border zone. This is why the entrance of Armenians there was prohibited (even with respect to the cultural affairs).

Meanwhile the territory that did not stand out for socio-economic development was intensively, closely and one-sidedly connected with the Armenian SSR. The peasants (Armenians and Azerbaijanis) of the Autonomous Republic sold the production of their homestead land and obtained the majority of their manufactured goods in the Armenian SSR.

The consistent policy of deportation of the Armenian population was accompanied by the destruction of monuments of history and culture of the Armenian people. First, the historians of the Azerbaijan SSR declared as their property a part of the historical territory of Armenia. They then claimed the Armenian historic monuments and cultural values as their own. Meanwhile it did not prevent their religious leaders from stirring up the Azerbaijani people to declare "sacred war" against unique architectural monuments representing historic value. One must ask, if these are the heritage of the Azerbaijani culture, why are they destroyed so barbarously? In summer of 1975 the Church of St. Trinity (the 7th century) was destroyed under the pretext of construction work. As is known from historic sources many Armenian princes were burnt by the Arab conquerors in that Church in 705 AD. In October 1987 the main Armenian cemetery of Agulis was destroyed. About 400 medieval

²⁵⁴ "Bakinski rabotchi," 06.05.1925.

²⁵⁵ CHA RR, f. 130, l. 6, f. 197, p.73.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., p.99.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., p.79.

²⁵⁸ "Bakinski Rabochi", 06.05.1925.

²⁵⁹ Overall Results of the All-Union Census of 1970, vol. IV, Moscow, 1972, p.13 (in Russian).

tomb stones with 100 inscriptions were broken. These tomb stones had great historic-ethnographic value.²⁶⁰

Marvelous creations of Armenian architects were destroyed: the Churches of St.Karapet (John Baptist, the 10th century) (in Abrakunis), St.Astvatsatsin (the Holy Mother of God, the 12th century) (in Metsop, present-day Badamlu) and other old Churches as in Nakhijevan, as well as in Mountainous Karabakh. At the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st were barbarously destroyed 3000 stone-crosses (*khachkars*) of the cemetery of Jugha (Julfa).

5. The demographic processes in the Autonomous Oblast of Mountainous Karabakh

Azerbaijani historians adopted the policy of coarse falsification of the history and culture of the Armenian people. They especially attacked violently Artsakh and Nakhijevan, declaring them "Albano-Azerbaijani" regions. Meanwhile the Greek, Roman and Armenian written sources clearly indicate that the right bank territory of the Kur river – Artsakh and Utik with their Armenian population from the very beginning till their joining the Russian empire (1813) were the essential parts of Great Armenia. In reality, Mountainous Karabakh constitutes a part of the ancient Armenian province of Artsakh. From the first half of the 6th century Arstakh had been a part of the Ervandid Kingdom. Later, Artsakh and Utik were organic parts of the Kingdom of Great Armenia in the time of the reign of Tigran the Great. According to "Ashkharhatsoyts" ("The Geographic Atlas") Artsakh was the 12th province of Great Armenia. In spite of these indisputable realities, the Musavat government which established itself in Azerbaijan (1918-1920) tried to annex Mountainous Karabakh and Nakhijevan by military force.

In 1918-1920 the Musavat invaders were unable to subdue the people of Artsakh by military force in spite of the fact that for rather long time the region was besieged from four sides and cut as from the outer world, as well as from the native people of the Republic of

Armenia. For a long time the defense of Artsakh was headed by the Armenian National Council.

In 1918-1920 the Musavat government was unable to annex Mountainous Karabakh by military force.

In April 1920, with the establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan, nothing was changed in the former Musavat policy of the annexation of Mountainous Karabakh by Azerbaijan. The chairman of the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan N.Narimanov demanded, with the support of Stalin, unconditional incorporation into Azerbaijan of Mountainous Karabakh, Nakhijevan and Zangezur. This aggressive demand by N.Narimanov was "grounded" by the motivation of preventing further "strengthening" of "Dashnak Armenia" and protecting the Soviet power in Azerbaijan from "discrimination."

It is necessary to note that on the second day (December 1, 1920) of the establishment of Soviet power in Armenia, when the explanation of contribution to "the Dashnak strengthening" disappeared, the Baku proletariat, in the person of the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan, sent a special declaration saluting the establishment of the Soviet power in Armenia and recognizing Mountainous Karabakh and Nakhijevan as integral parts of Soviet Armenia. Before that, on November 30 1920 the Revolutionary Committee of the Azerbaijan SSR recognized the right of free self-determination of the Armenian population of Mountainous Karabakh.

The declaration (December 1) of the Azerbaijani Revolutionary Committee greeted J.Stalin, S.Ordzhonikidze, S.Kirov and a number of the Armenian state and party figures. On the basis of this declaration, according to the decision of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia (June 3, 1921) on June 19, 1921 the Revolutionary Committee of Armenia published a decree in "Sovetakan Haiastan" ("Soviet Armenia") proclaiming Mountainous Karabakh as an inseparable part of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia.

But the chairman of the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan, N. Narimanov, who signed the declaration, sent to Soviet

²⁶⁰ "Grakan tert" ("Literary Paper"), 17.12.1987 (in Armenian).

Armenia, as well as took part in the adoption of the decision of the Caucasian Bureau's plenum (June 3, 1921), later spoke against the decision for the reunification of Mountainous Karabakh with Soviet Armenia. He threateningly contended that inasmuch as "anti-Soviet groups" were becoming stronger the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan would decline all responsibility if the problem were not solved in favor of Azerbaijan.

On July 4, 1921 took place the plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia with participation of Narimanov and Stalin, too. After hearing the problem the plenum decided by a majority to reunify Mountainous Karabakh with Soviet Armenia. Narimanov made complaints against the decision and demanded to reserve the problem for the discussion in the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia. Although the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia decided to yield to the demand of Narimanov, but suddenly the next day, on July 5 again was summoned the meeting of the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia and it was decided in a totalitarian spirit to join Mountainous Karabakh to Azerbaijan. The question was not brought up for discussion and voting. It was clear that the meeting was summoned and decision adopted in conditions of the bargain between Stalin and Narimanov and under the pressure of Stalin. Thus, on July 5, 1921 Stalin and Narimanov realized rather easily the annexation of Mountainous Karabakh.

There is no precedence in the world diplomacy's practice when border questions between the sovereign republics were decided not by diplomatic negotiations but rather by party resolutions. Consequently, in 1988 the complaint of the people of Mountainous Karabakh against such a resolution was simply based on the fact that the party organ had no right to adopt it. Only after seven decades the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR was able to register (February 13, 1990) that "... The fate of Mountainous Karabakh was decided by the voluntary resolution (July 5, 1921) of the party organ - the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist

(Bolshevik) Party of Russia, which had neither constitutional nor legislative rights. It was realized by a subject that had no right to interfere in the nation-state construction of another state. Consequently, it became apparent as a rude act of meddling in the internal affairs of another Soviet sovereign republic and because of that the principles of the national self-determination were violated. The will of both the Armenians, constituting 95% of the region's population, and Soviet Armenia were not taken into account."

On February 13, 1990 the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR made the following resolve: "By the resolution concerning Mountainous Karabakh (July 5, 1921), the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Russia violated the right of self-determination of the Armenians of Mountainous Karabakh and annexed a part of the Armenian SSR, thus the Armenian people was divided into two parts and considered as deprived of legal right, out of the international law and illegal."

In the course of seven decades the policy of the national persecution and discrimination in the social, economic and political spheres of the Armenian population's life was carried out in Mountainous Karabakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) and other parts of the Azerbaijan SSR which were densely populated by the native Armenians. During that time the policy of persecutions against the Armenian population was accompanied by many unsolved problems in social and economic life, which in turn counteracted the process of socio-economic, as well as demographic development.²⁶¹

The policy of violation and discrimination of the national rights of the Armenian population of Mountainous Karabakh was realized through deportations and the region's Azerbaijanization. It was the direct continuation of the policy of the Azerbaijani leadership during decades.

After becoming a part of the Russian empire, until 1917 the Armenian population constituted an overwhelming majority as compared with other nationalities. Before the establishment of the Soviet power, in 1918-1920, during clashes as a result of international strife the total number of population declined in

²⁶¹ "Izvestia", 18.04.1987, "Selskaya zhizn", 24.12.1987 (in Russian).

Mountainous Karabakh. In 1913 the population was 176,000 in the present territory of Mountainous Karabakh. In 1926 it decreased to 125,300.²⁶² At the same time the specific weight of the Armenian population considerably increased in the total number of the population of Mountainous Karabakh. In 1921 it was 94.4%. Such increase was connected with the following reasons. First, in 1918-1920 Mountainous Karabakh remained independent in spite of continuous attacks of Musavat forces of Azerbaijan. Secondly, by conquering a number of the neighboring territories of Mountainous Karabakh populated by Armenians, the Azerbaijani Musavat government organized the massacre of the Armenian population. Those who survived took refuge in Mountainous Karabakh. On the whole, Mountainous Karabakh, as well as the whole of Armenia suffered great losses.

However, a group of geographers in Azerbaijan, without mentioning any reliable statistic source (it has become a tendentious habit), wrote in the newspaper "The Baku Worker" ("Bakinski rabochi") as if in 1921, at the moment of its passing of Mountainous Karabakh to Azerbaijan, the majority of the region's population consisted of Azerbaijanis.²⁶³

Committing such falsification, they try to "explain" what was the reason of the substitution of the resolution (July 4, 1921) of the Caucasian Bureau of the CC C(B) PR by the resolution of July 5. However, as usual, there is a lack of simple logic. They never ask themselves whether it was possible to grant to the region scarcely populated with Armenians the status of the *Autonomous Oblast* as a part of the Azerbaijan SSR.

During first years of the establishment of the Soviet power in Karabakh, the situation, to some extent, contributed to the stabilization and growth of the population. It mainly took place owing to the natural growth of the population. However, it was not a long process. After annexation of Mountainous Karabakh by the Azerbaijan SSR the emigration of its population began. Sometimes it

quicken and acquired a substantial scale and sometimes slowed, becoming moderate, but, on the whole, resulted in decreasing of the specific weight of the Armenian population in the *Oblast*.

The outflow of the Armenian population from Nagorno-Karabakh during the years of World War II was accompanied by natural growth, which resulted in a trend of the absolute growth of the Armenian population, although it did not get a large coverage. According to the statistic materials published in the Azerbaijan SSR during the censuses of 1926 and 1939, the Armenian population increased by 18.9%, i.e. from 111,700 (1926) it reached 132,800 (1939).²⁶⁴ In that period the total number of the *Oblast's* population increased from 125,300²⁶⁵ to 150,800 or grew by 20.3%. Consequently the specific weight of Armenians in the total number of the *Oblast's* population decreased and in 1939 was 88.1%. Meanwhile, during those years Mountainous Karabakh, as well as Soviet Armenia were characterized by rather high birth rates and natural growth. In 1940 the Armenian SSR was the first in the USSR by the level of the birth rate and the natural growth of the population and exceeded the Azerbaijan SSR (per 1,000 population).²⁶⁶ Almost similar difference was observed between the levels of the natural growth of the population of Mountainous Karabakh and the Azerbaijan SSR. However, those years were the "most moderate" years characterizing the reproduction of the Armenian population of Mountainous Karabakh. At that time, although emigration continued, every second Armenian had opportunity to remain in the *Oblast*.

²⁶⁴ The All-Union Census of the Population of 1959, Azerbaijan SSR, Moscow, 1963, p.140-141 (in Russian).

²⁶⁵ Though the data concerning NKAO's population (1926) are incorrect in the mentioned sources, but here and in further comparisons we are obliged to use them, because these figures are mentioned in the sources published in Azerbaijan. The fact is that materials concerning the census (1926) of the *Oblast's* population were falsified. According to the archive materials, the total population of NKAO by the census of 1926 was 140,100 of which the Armenian population was 125,500. The Armenians constituted 89.6%, the Muslims - 10% (14,000), the Russians - 0.4% of the population (see The Archive of NKAO, f. 2, N 1/7, p. 44, 57).

²⁶⁶ The National Economy of the USSR during 70 years, Moscow, 1987, p.406-407 (in Russian).

²⁶² NKAO 50 Years in the Friendly Family, Stepanakert, 1973, p.32-33 (in Russian).

²⁶³ "Bakinski rabochi", 07.06. 1989.

CHAPTER SIX

CHARACTERIZATION OF MORE EXTENSIVE REPRODUCTION OF THE POPULATION AFTER THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR (1946-1980)

Since the end of the Great Patriotic War six stages have been fixed in the reproduction of the population of Armenia.

The first stage characterizes the post-war decade, when the high growth of population was accompanied by the repatriation of the Armenians from Diaspora.

The second stage began from the mid-1950s and ended in the first years of the 1960s, the characteristic feature of which was the high natural growth of the population.

The third stage included the period from the mid-1960s until the mid-1970s when the natural growth of the population proceeded in conditions of the decline of the birth and death rates.

The fourth stage, the period from the second half of the 1970s until the end of 1980s, when the reproduction of the population was characterized by the high birth accompanied by the mortality's decrease.

The fifth stage begins from the earthquake and continues until the first two years of the 1990s. During the earthquake the birth rate declined shortly, then, on the contrary, it increased, and then kept declining.

Then started the processes of the emigration and deportation of the population. At the same time radical changes took place in the political and social and economic life of the Republic of Armenia. It resulted in the decline of the rate of population's reproduction. The fall of the birth rate and evolutionary increase of mortality became characteristic features of the demographic processes in the Republic of Armenia.

Thus the reproduction of the population in Armenia enters the sixth stage which in its turn, we shall see, is divided into several phases.

1. Repatriation

Until the end of the 1950s the process of the reproduction of the Republic's population was essentially influenced by the repatriation of Armenians. As has been mentioned, between 1920 and 1940 the number of the immigrating Armenian repatriates reached about 75,000. In the period of time between the censuses of 1926 and 1939 more than 10% of the increasing population in the Armenian SSR fell on the Armenian repatriates. At the same time, after the Great Patriotic War, during two years Armenia received and settled dozens of thousands of Armenians repatriating from different foreign countries. The mass repatriation started from 1946. During a short time, from June till October, 18,801 families found shelter in Armenia. In 1947 the number of the repatriated Armenian families increased by 8,521. Until the end of 1947 the total number of the repatriated Armenians was 86,500. At that time it was more than 7% of the total number of the population of the Armenian SSR. The repatriation included mainly the Armenian population from Syria, Lebanon, Greece, France, Bulgaria, Rumania, Iran, Egypt and other countries (see table 17).

Table 17.

The total number of the Armenian repatriates by country²⁶⁷

The country from which they arrived	1946	1947	Total
Syria and Lebanon	19,253	12,985	32,238
Iran	20,597	-	20,597
Greece	4,974	13,241	18,215
France	-	5,260	5,260
Bulgaria	4,383	-	4,383
Rumania	1,738	-	1,738
Egypt	-	1,669	1,669
Palestine	-	1,250	1,250
Iraq	-	856	856
USA	-	151	151
China	-	16	16
Total	50,945	35,428	86,373

²⁶⁷ Table 17 is compiled according to the following data: CHA RR, f. 362, l. 2, f. 25, p.1-3, 7-8, f. 28, p.30, f. 50, p.7-17.

The place of settlement was decided according to the character of their profession. 36,000 of the total number of the repatriates (1946-1947) were capable of working. 11,400 were able to work in agriculture, 3,200 were tailors, 3,600 were shoemakers, 3,000 builders, 1,800 were metallurgists, 1,900 weavers, 1,500 drivers and of other professions (physicians, artists, actors and etc.).²⁶⁸ A part of repatriates arrived already grouped in artels.²⁶⁹

The professional training of the repatriated workers was organized in manufacturing firms. At the same time serious measures were undertaken in the direction of the organization of education of their children and liquidation of illiteracy of the adults. More textbooks were published for that purpose.

Repatriation continued during next years. In the course of 1950s, although the number of repatriates declined, in the 1960s, yearly 3,000 Armenians on average repatriated, because of the revival of the process. From the 1920s and further about 225,000-230,000 Armenians repatriated from 27 countries. Then, the repatriation extinguished. The repatriates brought with them foreign culture from the developed countries, as well as conduct and the way one lives which at that time were misapprehended. However, much was learnt from our compatriot repatriate craftspeople brothers.

Later, some of the repatriated were greatly sorry. Even some of them desired to go back. But it had already been late. The iron curtain of that time meant everything.

Many were persecuted by KGB (the Committee of the State Security). They were banished and exiled to Siberia. Why? They repatriated with honest aspirations and reasons, but very often, they were qualified as "foreign spies" and banished from Armenia by KGB. The KGB always persecuted them keeping in fear and

²⁶⁸ Ibid., f. 2, f. 45, p.1.

²⁶⁹ For example, a part of repatriates from Bulgaria occupied themselves in the artels of metallurgists, shoemakers and pharmaceutical chemists. They continued their activities in Erevan, Leninakan (Gyumri), Stepanavan and Nor (new) Bayazet. The repatriated transport workers from Iran with their lorries were very useful in construction of houses for repatriates (the CHA RR, f. 362, l. 2, f. 5, p.12).

trembling, exiling many to Siberia. A part of them died there, another part became invalid... Only a few of them were lucky to survive and return home.

The people had a rich experience of the fear and trepidation. Only a decade earlier, in 1937 without any trial many were thrown into prisons, exiled to Siberia "beyond the barbed wire," to GULAD and other camps. Hardly one or two of thousands of people came back.

The most part of the repressed or imprisoned persons were intellectuals, the cream of Union: Eghishe Tcharents, Aksel Bakunts, Gurgen Mahari, Aghasi Khanjyan, Sargis Kasyan, Sahak Ter-Gabrielyan, Gevorg Atabekyan, Sargis Lukashin, Alexander Bekzadyan, Vladimir Kasparov, Aramais Erznkyan and many others.²⁷⁰

It was dictated by the will of Joseph Stalin and Lavrenti Beria.

The repatriates were horrified by the deportation of hundreds of Armenian families from Armenia and Georgia. In 1949, one night they witnessed this horrible scenery. It took place suddenly and without any warning. These deportees, not being able to take necessary things, were entrained in goods wagons and, getting tormented, were exiled to Siberia. In future they were rehabilitated along with the victims of 1937. Alas it was already late...

Later, the children, grandchildren, as well as the relatives of the repressed were permanently persecuted. Many of them became well known in society.

It is quite comprehensible that the Armenian population's reproduction had the negative seal of these circumstances.

2. Favourable process of natural growth of population

The end of the Great Patriotic War was accompanied by a baby boom in Armenia. The demography of Armenia occurred in two phases.

The first phase included the postwar period and finished at the beginning of the 1950s, as a result of mass demobilization.

²⁷⁰ About it see in details the book of H.Karapetyan "The People of Great Struggle", in two volumes, Erevan, 1963, 1967) (in Armenian).

Thousands of newly married or still unmarried young men went to the front. Many of the married went to the front either before they had children, or they had a few of them. A part of them were fortunate enough to return home. This sharply increased the marriage and birth rates. After the War reproduction returned to normal in many families and the number of born children increased also in the families which had a few children whose fathers returned home from the front. It resulted in the increase of the birth rate even in the elder groups of high fertility. The second phase of the baby boom began in the mid-1950s and continued till the mid-1960s. During that period the whole of Europe experienced a baby boom.

In post-war period a number of tendencies²⁷¹ became apparent which resulted in a permanent increase of the absolute number of the born children. In 1960 the absolute number of the born children reached about 75,000 in the Armenian SSR. It was the highest number of new-born children (which was repeated in 1986 on a substantial scale) in the Armenian SSR, as well as generally in Eastern Armenia in the 20th century, as is seen in table 18.

Table 18.

The birth and death rates, the natural growth in the Armenian SSR (per 1,000 population)²⁷²

Years	The number births	The number of deaths	The natural growth	Before one year old of 1,000 children died
1940	41,2	13,8	27,4	119
1950	32,1	8,5	23,6	69
1960	40,3	6,8	33,5	50
1965	28,6	5,7	22,9	37
1970	22,1	5,1	17,0	25,4
1975	22,4	5,5	16,9	30,6
1980	23,0	5,5	17,5	26,2
1985	24,1	5,9	18,2	24,8
1990	22,5	6,2	16,3	18,6

²⁷¹ A.Ya.Boyarski. The Population and the Methods of Its Study. A Collection of Research Works, M., 1975 (in Russian).

²⁷² The Table is compiled on the basis of the data from "Soviet Armenia in 50 years", p.36, "Armenia in Figures, 1990", (a statistic collection), Erevan, 1990, p.22 (in Armenian), "The USSR Population, 1987", (a statistic year-book), M., 1988, p.166-167; The Demographic YB 1991, M., 1991, p.62 (in Russian).

That period was characterized by the rise of general, as well as special indices of the birth rate of population.

At the end of the 1950s the mortality's reduction was a certain factor contributing to the population growth. As regards 1955, owing to the reduction of mortality, the natural growth of the population increased by 3 (per 1,000 population).

At that time, as for the population increase owing to immigration, it also was expressed by high index. The only difference was due not to the repatriation of Armenians, but the movements of the Armenian population from the Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Georgia. From the end of the 1950s, as a result of the agricultural intensification of the plain and mountainous regions of Azerbaijan and Georgia, a part of freed resources moved to the Armenian SSR. It was stimulated by the foundation of new towns and widening the old ones connected with the exploitation of new deposits in the Armenian SSR, as well as considerable reduction of the population reaching the age of capacity. Armenian students eager to get higher and secondary-vocational education in their mother tongue constituted a great part of people arriving in Armenia from those republics. Mostly, after finishing their studies they worked in the Armenian SSR. In part, it would gear up other members of their families to move to Armenia for permanent residence.

The third phase of population reproduction of the Armenian SSR included the period between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s, when the natural growth of population took place in conditions of decrease of the birth and death rates.

The research of the fertility's age rates reveals partially the reasons of its decline in the mid-1960s in our republic. The rate of population reproduction and the general birth rate began to vary as a result of the change of the population's age structure. The change of the specific weight of women of the age of fertility in the total number of women on the one hand and unfavorable ratio of the age groups of women of the fertility age had a serious influence on the general birth rate.

The population reproduction also depends on the normal correlation of the number of the fertility age women and men. If the

process of population reproduction is not distorted for emergency reasons, particularly, because of war, necessary correlation of the number of men and women is preserved for guaranteeing the society's normal reproduction. The economic damage caused by wars is recovered in a shorter time than the demographic damage. The war results in the decrease in the number of population and its age (as well as gender) structure and not only at that period, but periodically and continually.

The Great Patriotic War resulted in the increase of the specific weight of elderly people in the population of the Armenian SSR for a rather long period of time. It resulted from the increase of their absolute number, as well as the decline (decrease of the birth rate, increase of infant mortality, decrease of the male population because of the participation in the war) of the specific weight of other age groups. The normal course of the reproduction of population was disrupted and the number of women exceeded the number of men. During the time of the Great Patriotic War the level of the birth rate dropped off sharply. This also influenced the reproduction of the population in the 1960s, when the children born in the years of the war reached the marriage age.

From the mid-1960s the women born in war-time entered their most fertile age. From that moment went down the specific weight of the women of the fertile age. Even their absolute number decreased. In that period changed the age ratio of the women of the fertile age in favour of the age groups including low fertility. The share of the women of the most fertile age (20-29) in the total number of the fertile age women went down from 41.2% in 1959 to 25.5% by 1970, i.e. with respect to 1959 it decreased by 38.2%. The number of 25-29 years old women decreased by 24% in urban areas, meanwhile it decreased by 50% in the countryside. Armenian SSR was the second republic in the USSR, after the RSFSR, having such decreased ratio in the countryside. The share of the women aged 35-49 grew from 25.5% in 1959 to 36.2% by 1970. At the same time the marriage rate dropped off and the absolute number of the new-born children reduced. Suffice it to say that marriage rate per 1,000 population decreased from 11.2 in 1960 to 7.3 by 1970. It means that as

compared with 1960 the registered marriages in 1970 decreased by 5,000 and the number of the new-born children decreased by 19,000 (55,700 children were born in 1970), meanwhile, during that time the total number of population grew by 663,000.

The decline in the number of the new-born children is explained by the changes in the age structure of the population, as well as the changes in the social and economic conditions. It resulted in the decline of the fertility rates (special rates of fertility) of almost all female age groups. The age structure change, which is a result of merely demographic factors, may bring to the rise of the general birth rate in the case of comparatively favourable structure of the fertile age female population. However, the special rates of the fertility, which have revealed and will continue to reveal the tendency of decline, will result in the lowering of the general rate until the formation of the optimal level of the birth rate. It will be determined by the transition to the regulated birth regime. Demands of life dictate married couples to have as many children as they wish. It may happen in such changed conditions when infant mortality will be minimized.

Thus, the special rates of fertility also dropped off. The number of the new-born children per 1,000 women declined almost in all age groups of the fertility. In the Armenian SSR, the absolute number of the new-born children per 1,000 women aged 25-29 as compared with 1958-1959 was 69.8%, of the women aged 30-34 was 52%, of the women aged 35-39 was 43.4% by 1971-1972. These figures decline in higher age groups. At the same time the fertility of women aged 24 was 5-6 times higher than of those at the age under 20, and 1.5-2 times higher than of those aged 35-39.

The tendency of decline of the birth rate's special rate is not relevant to the age structure and is explained mainly by socio-economic factors.

In the 1970-1980s, of the factors affecting the level of the birth rate, an increasingly decisive roles were played by increasing demands made to the young generation which would enter social production, the rise of employment of women, as well as of the degree of urbanization, the specific weight of the urban population

and cultural-educational level, the improvement of conditions of life. Improvement of medical care, reduction of infant mortality, ability of intra-family regulation of the number of family members, the level of the share of wives in regulating the family budget, growth of demands in relation to education and taking care of children and many other factors until now have not been revealed in research works on demographics. All these also played an important role.

It is quite natural that the increase of a demand for scientific attainments had an influence on the marriage age of young couples, as well as during their life on the number of their children. It was also stimulated by the permanent growth of the number of women in social production. As a rule young married women have more children.

Until 1990s comparative development of the social productive forces, undoubtedly, resulted in the absolute, as well as comparative increase of the limits of the time budget necessary for the needs of personal development by the reduction of the working time and the increase of the extracurricular time. Besides the rise of needs and the increase of variety of their satisfaction, the increase of the necessary time grew quicker than the extracurricular time. Simultaneously, the comparative reduction of the working time on the society's scale was accompanied by the increase of the integral working time (pass on to the ten-year secondary school, the increase of the students in the network of the vocational education, as well as of the time of training, the enlargement of the network of the secondary and high educational institutions, etc.) necessary for entering into social production. Thus, along with the relative reduction of the integral working time relatively increased as the extracurricular time, as well as the total fund of the integral time necessary for preparation for entering into social production. All these were accompanied by the rise of the level of the socially normal average intensity in conditions of the time's unchangeable budget. Meanwhile, scientific and technological advance more and more intensified the process of retraining of the engineers and workers to become proficient in engineering and technologies, acquiring new professions and raising the level of their skill. Moreover, after childbirth the need of

preservation of the former quality was also very important for women because of temporary giving up their work in social production. Along with of the educational qualification's rising were also increasing the intellectual needs of people. The problems connected with the childbirth were not bounded by maternity leave. New, additional troubles were yet to come. Woman recently confined, along with social production, every day had to look after the child, run the house in order not to lag behind of the social environment. As a matter of fact a day is limited by 24 hours. So, the reduction of the number of children was the only thing to do.

Thus, scientific and technical progress resulted in a certain contradiction between the satisfaction of increasing various material and cultural needs, as well as the necessary time for new demands aimed to enter social production on the one hand and the stable budget of human being's time on the other hand.

It is important to note that the age of the working women in the course of time was becoming younger. Women of the most fertile age studied and began to work. It had a certain influence as on the marriage age, as well as on the question of having three or four children. That's why at the postwar time the age of marriage was delayed. In 1914 the average age of the girl's marriage was 17, in 1930 it was 20.3 and in 1940 it was 22.6. In 1926, 73% of the total number of getting married women was girls under 20 and at the same time more than 36% were under 18.²⁷³ In 1926, 19.2% of the total population of the Armenian SSR was educated and only 3% of the getting married women. The high level of the birth rate was explained by that fact too.

In 1950 the average age of marriage was high. It was explained by the fact that a large part of girls who became marriageable during the Great Patriotic War got married mainly after the War. However it was a short period which later didn't have a notable influence on the question of prolongation of the marriageable age. Because of that the average age of girls' marriage became lower.

²⁷³ "Soviet Armenia in Figures. A Reference Book. 1923-1927", Erevan, 1928, p.29.

Anyhow, in the postwar period the technical progress was the main cause of prolongation of the marriageable age when it became necessary to have adequate qualification in social production, after acquiring a profession. Relative percentage of the girls (under 19) getting married was higher in the country-side, than in towns.

It is obvious that marriageable age couldn't constantly be prolonged parallel to the rising of demands for entering social production. Marriages, probably, for ever will include the basic age (20-29) of those who at present are getting married. Although the technical progress is already unable to prolong the age limits (that age is the most favourable for guaranteeing the reproduction of the population also from the biological point of view), it will result in the diminishing of the family's average size (by means of decreasing of the average number of children born by woman during the whole of her life) along with the changes of other socio-economic phenomena.

It is necessary to note that from the second half of the 1960s new trends appeared from the point of view of rejuvenation of the age of the marriage of women. In the special literature it was interpreted as a new regularity that could be revealed later too. We think that such supposition is baseless. It was a temporary phenomenon in the demography affected by the consequences of the War.²⁷⁴

Thus, the new demands presented to the production resulted in the prolongation of the marriageable age of main part of women. Early marriage, which was preserved to some extent in the republic, mainly in its countryside, as a rule, resulted in the increase of the number of children begotten during the woman's life. Meanwhile, the woman's participation in the social production and the necessity of getting education resulted in decrease in the number of children. The educational qualification, character of employment, domicile, social status and environment, as well as other factors had a certain influence on the fertility of women. According to the census of 1970 there were 2.9 children per one mother in the Armenian SSR. However, the proportional distribution of the number of children per

one mother was different in towns (2.53) and the countryside (3.48). The number of children, as a rule, decreased in family as compared with the rise of the educational qualification of mothers. Social environment and the character of employment have a certain influence on the average number of children. That is why the women with the highest educational qualification, on average, had more children in the countryside, than in towns. At the same time, the wives of collective farmers, workers and employees, who were engaged in individual subsidiary economy, as in towns, as well in village had almost the equal number of children.

Mothers with high educational qualification lived mainly in towns. In spite of the fact that mothers with low educational qualification occupied themselves mainly with manual labor, every mother in the countryside, on average, had one child more. Meanwhile, for women engaged in intellectual labour this difference, on average, constituted 0.5 child.²⁷⁵ This difference was less among those mothers who were engaged in individual subsidiary economy, although they had more children in the urban, as well as rural areas, than in social economy. Every woman engaged in individual subsidiary economy, on average, had 3.6 children (3.4 children in town and 3.7 in countryside).²⁷⁶

For women one of the reasons of appearing periodically out of the social production was a large number of children. Although among the women engaged in individual subsidiary economy, with formation of corresponding conditions, the desire to work in social economy increased parallel to the rise of the number of children.

Another factor of decrease in the number of children in families which was connected with the development of productive forces was an intensive growth of the urban population owing to the development of the republic's industry. Town and village differ in the character of their production consequently they also differ in the complexity of labour. On the whole, for training of the agricultural production worker is needed less time, than for training of the industry worker. When those women who were engaged in

²⁷⁴ See in details: V.Khojabekyan. The Modern Problems of the Reproduction of the Population and Labor Resources of the Armenian SSR, p.31-32.

²⁷⁵ The Results of the All-Union Census of 1970, vol. VII, p.453 (in Russian).

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p.451.

agriculture after some interval returned to social economy, mostly, in a short time they could recover their former qualification. However, it was rather difficult to do the same for those who were engaged in the industrial work.

The family's size was more dependent on its budget in towns than in rural areas. Every new-born child had direct influence on the family income per capita among the urban population. While, in countryside, any new-born child had a slight influence on the family income per capita. The family budget of the urban population was also influenced by the fact that the woman (recently confined) for a certain time didn't take part in the formation of the family budget and income. The situation was not the same in the countryside.

Comparatively high level of the medical care helped to regulate the birth rate in town to some extent. At the same time it was connected with certain difficulties in many rural areas.

Until the mid-1970s obvious differences between the levels of the birth rate in town and village were conditioned on the character of the historical and socio-economic peculiarities. However, in 1965-1976 the general birth rate among the rural population lowered quicker than in towns. Because of that the levels of birth rate of village and town drew together. In 1965 there were born 107 more children in the countryside than in towns per 10,000 of the total population of the Armenian SSR. Later this difference sharply diminished and in 1980s constituted merely 5-10 children. It was explained by the age structure of the rural population, character of the agricultural production, rise of its mechanization and degree of complexity, as well as by the change in the socio-economic conditions, customs and social environment of village. The number of workers and employees increased in the structure of the rural population. The number of population engaged in agriculture decreased.²⁷⁷

In the Armenian SSR a certain part of workers and employees lived in village. Rapprochement of the production and living

conditions of village and town resulted in the smoothing of the levels of the birth rate of their population.

At the same time it is necessary to take into consideration that in the 1980s the main direction of the movements of the population of the Armenian SSR was from village to town and plain regions, as well as from small towns to cities. During that period the level of the birth rate rose. First of all it was explained by a traditional conservatism of women moving from village to town. They had comparatively larger families than those in towns, but their families in their new places of dwelling were smaller than in villages. The influence of the social environment surrounding married couples on the formation of the idea of the regulation of the family's size and consequently having children took place not at once but gradually. Second, those who were moving from village to town were mainly young, i.e. they were at the most fertile age. The movement of youth from village to town, in its turn, after some time, resulted in the lowering of the age indexes of the birth rate in village. It diminished in village also because of other factors, such as changes in the cultural and educational level and age structure of the population. In the 1980s the specific weight of the able to work people in the rural population's structure began to lower because of the young manpower drain. In the course of the 1960-1990s towns "rejuvenated" while the mountainous rural areas "grew old." As compared with the urban areas, a quicker fall of the birth rate's level in rural areas probably was affected by the above-mentioned and other factors.

In the 1970s the lowering of the special birth rates was also explained by the improvement of the medical care and generally of living conditions. Along with some other factors it resulted in the reduction of mortality. A high probability of the children's surviving was an important guarantee of the conscious regulation of the stabilization of the household's average size.²⁷⁸ Continuous lowering of the infant mortality gave a possibility to have a desired number of children in the family. Meanwhile, only a part of new-born children

²⁷⁷ The Population of the World. A Reference Book, M., 1974, p.71 (in Russian).

²⁷⁸ N.Pisarev. The Population and the Labour in the USSR, M., 1966, p.144 (in Russian).

survived till a certain age because of bad material conditions and insufficient medical care. In such conditions the low birth rate was not enough to guarantee not only broadened but even simple reproduction of the population. For example, in 1913 only 80% of the new-born children reached the age of one. According to the death rate only a half of children survived and reached the age of 15-20. Our calculations show that every married couple had to have 2.81(1939), 2.33 (1951) and 2.13 (1970) children in order to be able to preserve simple reproduction of the family, i.e. to have 2 children who would reach the age of 30.

We see that the mortality's decrease (which was connected with the development of the productive forces), in its turn, conditioned the lowering of the number of children in households. Therefore the level of the development of the productive forces and the character of production are in indirect coupling with the level of the birth rate of the population and have an influence on it through the above-mentioned factors.

Such a high specific weight of children in the structure of the population of the Armenian SSR was explained by the high birth rate, as well as the sharp reduction of infant mortality. The young generation increased because of the infant mortality's reduction on the one hand and the mortality's reduction in old age increased aging of the population on the other hand. There is a principal difference between the infant mortality and the old people's mortality from the point of view of the reproduction of population. The former is merely the loss of many persons, the latter, in fact, is the loss of one person.

Thus, those born at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s reached the age of marriage in the middle of the 1970s and from that time the absolute number of the new-born children began to increase gradually. At the same time the reduction of mortality was one of the main factors of the growth of the population. It resulted in the prolongation of the expected average length of life owing to which the natural growth declined slower than the level of the birth rate. In the 1970s the mortality's reduction which accompanied the sharp reduction of the birth rate softened the tendency of the decline of the natural growth.

In the course of the 1980s, particularly, until 1987-1990, the reproduction of the population of the Armenian SSR was characterized by rather good figures. Owing to the yearly increase of the number of the women reaching the age of fertility²⁷⁹, the general index of the birth rate rose and consequently the absolute number of children increased. For a certain time it took place as a result of the preservation of the stable level of mortality and the rise of the specific weight of the aged people in conditions of some growth of the general index of mortality. From the middle of the 1970s those who were born before the 1960s reached the age of marriage. The birth rate increased because their number was great. In 1986 the birth rate reached its height and for the first time in the history of the Armenian SSR was registered the highest baby boom – 81,192. Unfortunately, during many decades in future, probably, such baby boom will not be repeated once again.

This time is almost repeated the same regularity as it occurred from the 1950s till the second half of the 1960s, but in other figures, which were analyzed above.

The absolute number of the children born in 1986 and high birth rates were affected by the fact that women aged 20-24 constituted a great percentage in the total number of women of the age of fertility and on the contrary, the specific weight of those included in the rest of the age groups was small one. Meanwhile, the birth rate per 1,000 women of the age group of 20-24 was 2 times more than the age group 25-29, three times more than the age group under 20 and aged 30-34, eight or nine times more than the age group of 35-39 and eighty or a hundred times more than higher age groups.

My projections based on the beginning of the 1980s estimates suggested that from 1987 the birth rate curve had to turn and until the middle of the 1990s the birth rate would decrease. During those years the children of those who were born during the time of war would

²⁷⁹ As has been mentioned above, the fertility is a potential possibility to have a child. Every woman uses this possibility in a peculiar way. The fertility is realized by delivery. Women regulate the family's size in the civilized world.

reach the age of fertility.²⁸⁰ Indeed, in 1987 78,500 were born, in 1988 74,700 were born and 1989 75,250 were born in Armenia. The number of children born in 1987 as compared with 1986 decreased by 2,700 and in 1988 by 6,500. Thus, if in 1970 the birth rate was 22.1 per 1,000 population, in 1985-1986 the birth rate constituted more than 24.0. In 1989-1990 this general birth rate lowered and was 21.6. It sharply fell in the 1990s. These negative changes might not be explained only by today's hard conditions.

All the factors resulting in the decline of the birth rate nowadays in the republic will be revealed and assessed in the following chapter. We shall predict the ways of the tension's softening. Before analyzing these problems, let's touch the question of regularities concerning the able-bodied population.

3. The able-bodied population

The reproduction of the able-bodied part of the population is one of its very important characteristics. The indices of the quantitative change of the able-bodied population do not coincide with the indices of the reproduction of the population. High or low rates of the reproduction of population after some time result in the change of the number and age structure of the able-bodied population. The change of the population's number is conditioned directly on its natural growth in the given year. The change of the able-bodied population is conditioned only on the variation of the population of that age at the rate of the difference in the number of those who reach the able-bodied age and those who retire. It has an impact on the number of the able-bodied population and gender-and-

²⁸⁰ The demographic picture of the Armenia's population for the period of 1979-2016 was projected under my guidance and by the methods elaborated by me on the basis of the assessment of the factors of the socio-economic and demographic developments and the exposure of their directions, tendencies and regularities. However, unfortunately, today it is an history and has only a methodological significance and there might not be any word about its application, because of great emigration from Armenia which started at the beginning of the 1990s.

age structure without exerting any influence upon the general number of the population. However, the specific weight of the able-bodied population, on the whole, structure of the population may rise or lower also because of high and low rate of the natural reproduction of the population at the given moment, as well as the change of the number of the population of the pension age. That is why in different periods of population reproduction the specific weight of the able-bodied population in the total number of population constantly varies (see table 19).

Table 19.
The population in the territory of the present Republic of Armenia's
in 1897-1989, including the able-bodied population
(male aged 16-59, female aged 16-54)²⁸¹

Years	Total (thousands)	Including		The able-bodied population in the total number of population (in percentage terms)
		urban	rural	
1897	797,900	97,000	700,900	...
1913	1,000,100	104,000	896,100	...
1920	720,000	122,000	598,000	...
1926	881,300	167,100	714,200	48.9
1939	1,282,300	366,400	915,900	43.7
1959	1,763,000	881,800	881,200	52.2
1970	2,491,900	1,481,500	1,010,400	48.2
1979	3,037,300	1,999,100	1,038,200	57.3
1989	3,304,800	2,222,200	1,082,600	56.2

The comparatively high specific weight of the able-bodied population is explained by the high natural growth of the population in the Armenian SSR in 1926-1940. Meanwhile, the low birth rate during World War I and World War II made an impact on the able-bodied age only at the end of the 1930s and from the middle of the 1960s until the first years of the 1970s.

At the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s the high birth rate, as well as the lowering of the number of those who reached the able-bodied age resulted in the sharp decrease of the

²⁸¹ Table is compiled on the basis of the census statistics of corresponding years.

specific weight of the able-bodied population in 1970. During that period the general increase of the population exceeded the general increase of the able-bodied population.

The absolute number of children born until 1960-1965 was 2-2,5 times more than the number of those who reached the working age. In 1970 a sharp decrease of the able-bodied age in the population's structure was the result of the smaller number of those who reached the able-bodied age, as well as the rise of the specific weight of children in the population's structure. From the second half of the 1970s the absolute number of the able-bodied population reached and then exceeded the absolute value of the absolute growth of the population. That is why from the middle of the 1970s the population of the Armenian SSR took the path of such a phase of reproduction when its able-bodied population increased constantly. First, the children born in the middle of the 1950s and during first two years of the 1960s (this was a period of the high birth rate) reached the able-bodied age. Second, those who participated in the Great Patriotic War were gradually retiring. That generation constituted a small part of the population. Consequently the transition to the working age had more intensive character, than the retirement's process. As a result of it, the absolute figure of the population of the working age preserved its value at the expense of the reduction of the number of those who were leaving that age group. Third, this process, beginning from 1966-1967 was accompanied by the decline of the absolute number of the birth rate.

Thus, in different periods the variations of the specific weight of the working age population are a direct echo of the regularities in the development of the population. In the periods - 1966-1973 and 1988-1995 - when dominant role in formation of the working age population was played by the generation born during the Great Patriotic War or their children, the specific weight of this sector of the population lowered. At the same time decreased their absolute number as compared with the previous decades. And on the contrary, during those decades when the able-bodied age was formed by an high birth rate generation, the portion of the able-bodied age rose in the structure of population, and this portion rejuvenated (1955-1965, 1978-1990). The population of the able-bodied age will rejuvenate also in the period of 1998-2005.

CHAPTER SEVEN

INTERNAL MIGRATION WITHIN ARMENIA, 1913-1990

International migration had an effect on the process of internal movement of people in Armenia. Revelation of the directions of internal migration and factors influencing population reproduction in town and village is also interesting from the point of view of understanding the trend of evolution of population reproduction.

The process of modern urbanization in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia began together with the problem-solving of the industrial development of the republic, when new towns, cities and industrial centers were built. This phenomenon was also dictated by the growth of the republic's population and some other specific peculiarities.

Internal movements of the population had a great impact on the process of the natural growth of the republic's population.

Let's analyze these processes.

1. The causes of migration from rural areas.

During several decades, the rural population was a very important factor in the process of the increase of the urban population along with the natural growth. The regulation of the movements of the rural population is a component of the agrarian policy. Currently it is urgent connected directly with the agrarian sphere and further social-economic development of village on the one hand and, conditioned on them, the regulation of the population's movement from village to town on the other hand.

The agrarian policy's realization had a certain impact on the movements (along with its forms and methods) of population from village to town. These movements were also influenced by the reconstruction of the branches of national economy on industrial basis, particularly, establishment of new contacts between industry

and agriculture.²⁸² The mechanization of the agricultural production's processes and social-economic developments in village had an unbiased result in a new redistribution of the labor force among other branches of agriculture and national economy. In the first place it touched the agriculture and industry and, particularly, the agriculture and other social spheres of village and other productive branches.

All this was in a correlated relation to the population's urbanization when the economic and cultural life concentrated gradually in cities. Towns and villages were also involved in the process of the economic and cultural development. Social progress becomes a cause of urbanization, at the same time being its effect. Economic developments and urbanization had an impact on the character of the population's employment resulting in the transformation of the employment's sectoral structure. The influence of urbanization was mediated by several economic factors among which a decisive role belonged to the industrial development. To wide extent the industrial development assumed not only a development of the industrial sector but also the technical reconstruction and rearmament of all branches of industry and national economy. Industrialization had an impact on urbanization in many ways.

First, in a certain historical period the urban population increased and the professional qualification structure changed. Second, the character of employment of the rural population and way of life changed and the urban type of employment and way of life dominated. Third, the standard of education of the population rose in the urban and rural areas. There were also changes in its social and professional structure, character of employment, way of life and generally many other phenomena affected by the level of the development of productive forces. However, this development was rather behind of the process of the capitalist countries' development being far away from them by its level and coverage. Fourth, the population's mobility increased which resulted in territorial

movements. Fifth, the character of settlement changed which had several negative consequences in peculiar social and economic conditions, particularly, resulting in the outflow of the population from the mountainous and sub-mountain regions and its concentration in plain areas, especially, towns and cities.

In the course of time the movements of population assumed objectively a bilateral character - from village to town and from town to village. Analyzing the question from the historic point of view it becomes obvious that always was dominant the movement from village to town. The objective process of these phenomena was often distorted and accompanied by subjective factors in the course of historic development of the country. These factors resulted negatively in the process of social-political and general economic developments.

In this respect general collectivization played certain role. Initially it had an adverse impact on the process of movement from village to town. Owing to some factors, for example, development of labor-intensive sectors, creation of new branches and generally many other factors widening the sphere of the application of labor softened and gradually ceased the movement from village to town. And on the contrary, some other factors (e.g. the agricultural production's mechanization, education of youth in towns, widening of opportunities to get a profession and qualification, conditions in industry and construction works for getting although not sufficient but higher wages than in village) resulted in intensification of the movement from village to town. It acquired a sharper character in towns because of an unprecedented widening of the spheres of the labor's application. These contradictory processes causing the population's movement from village to town, though developed simultaneously, but in the first years of collectivization mostly dominated the process of widening of the sphere of the rural labor force's application. Lack of agricultural machines kept wide the sphere of the application of the labor force. That's why in a short time diminished the outflow of the population from village to town. Meanwhile, in the course of time it intensified in proportion to the increased supply of village with agricultural machines.

²⁸² See in details: V.Khojabekyan. The Agrarian Policy and the Movements of the Rural Population, Erevan, 1989 (in Armenian).

In the first years of the collectivization softening of intensity of the labor force's movement from village to town is explained as by the above-mentioned objective factors, as well as subjective ones. Very often the authorities of collective farms banned the population to leave collective farms and even undertook administrative measures up to the proscription from the collective farm, not allowing using pastures for livestock and not giving homestead land, etc. These measures of the authorities of collective farms were explained by a fear of not meeting the demands of the rural economy in labor force. Such attempts to hinder population to leave collective farms were condemned and a problem was set to provide towns with free labor resources by collective farms. However, as a matter of fact, the scale of leaving collective farms for towns increased.

At the same time during decades collective farmer was devoid of the right to be the master of his labor force. He didn't have a passport; he couldn't leave the village without a permission and stay a long time in another place. The only document certifying his person was a reference given by a country council. It gave a peasant right to leave temporarily his native village.

According to different sources, during the first years of collectivization the demand for labor force was already not satisfied in many seasonal branches owing to the reduction of the outflow of the population from village to town. It was not explained by diminishing of the outflow from village but a large-scaled development of industry in towns and cities. Even when the population's movement from village to town had increased, the demand for labor force again was unsatisfied. During the first years of collectivization, for a short time, the rate of the outflow of population from village to town decreased, meanwhile its absolute quantity exceeded the previous years' quantity. Moreover, during the first years of industrialization and general collectivization the growth of the urban population at the expense of migration reached a higher level than it was during the previous years.

Later, the developing industry, construction activity and other branches of economy still couldn't meet the demands for the labor force, although the number of people leaving villages in an organized

way, according to economic contracts made with the collective farms, increased and the rural young people became the main source of the labor supply's replenishment.

Organized selection of the labor force was accompanied by constantly increasing uncontrolled migration. It was stimulated by the migrants' interest. In conditions of controlled selection, regardless of their will, they had to do a certain work and get a profession not corresponding to their aspirations. Meanwhile, in conditions of uncontrolled migration, individuality was free in the question of receiving an education and acquiring profession.

All forcible measures and violations, which accompanied the collectivization, had their negative impact on the scale of the rural population's migration, as a result of the consequences of the cult of the individual. Meanwhile general collectivization and the New Economic Policy (NEP) applied in the USSR revived agriculture at a certain extent. This policy gave a certain opportunity to small producers. Peasants, taking the free economy's advantage, overcame the threat of famine in the country. As far as land belonged to the state, relations between producer and landowner were based on commodity-money relations. The landowning peasants knew what to produce and how to realize it. They could see the limits of costs, profits and the state rent and taxes. The peasants, organizing agricultural production, were the owners of the result of their work. They realized its distribution and sale, appointing the scale of production, accumulation and realization keeping in mind the surety of the expanded reproduction and the corresponding net profit. The state enforced a rent and taxes without interfering in the economic activities of peasants. Commodity-money relation between the state and peasants found their reflection in the sale of agricultural products and agricultural machines and instruments. Peasants were granted credits by the state in order to buy all necessary machines and instruments. Besides, the state helped peasants with agronomic advices and veterinary services on the basis of the equivalent commodities exchange. At the same time NEP, to a certain extent, prevented Stalin from the establishment of his unlimited power, as well as the centralization of all economic levers in his hands. For that

purpose he needed the centralization of the national economy and the realization of sole leadership in the sphere of production and distribution, as well as formation of large-scale enterprises, realization of general collectivization, extermination of *kulaks* as a class which together with middle peasantry farmed on individual basis. Such a decentralized state of agriculture didn't satisfy the hierarchic principles of the top-down sole administration. It resulted in the idea of the general collectivization by the method of "forced" violation instead of the declared "voluntary" method.

From the mid-1920s although petty marketable production was accompanied by a tightened fiscal policy, the state didn't give an opportunity to dispose of the surplus product accumulated in agriculture. It was necessary to invent such a method of the agricultural management that would be regulated from above according to instructions from the centre. It was considered very important to deprive peasants of the right to command the results of their work and break the link between real manpower expenses and costs of production. The limits of necessary and surplus produce had been seen in conditions of private production. The collective system obscured those limits. In the course of time a social-psychological atmosphere was worked out and gradually became dominant: the results of production, owing to the efforts and means (apart from land) of the collective producers, were "controlled" by them only theoretically. Every toiler learnt from his long experience that his produced output didn't belong to him. For the producer it lost its real, specific and perceptible character and became an abstract output. The whole surplus product together with a part of necessary output by a "good will" of the landowner (the state), without any difficulty, turned into its property. The formal declaration of the produced output to be collective property was the first step of the property's transformation. Individuals were not considered to be its owners. The second step of the property's transformation was made easily by the collectivization. The concept of such transformation was the following: if the property belonged to a small group "what would hinder it to become a property of larger collective, the state property.

Collective is a collective, what is the difference between the collective or state property."

Meanwhile, in the process of general collectivization, together with *kulaks* the most part of middle peasants were considered as an "obstacle." It resulted in the policy of extermination of *kulaks* as a class which deprived not only *kulaks* but also a large part of middle peasants of land, agriculture and other kinds of agricultural works. Many of them were exiled to Siberia. It resulted in reduction of the rate of the expanding of the fertile soil and all branches of stock-breeding. At the threshold of general collectivization, in 1928, the number of cattle in the USSR was 60,100,000, including 29,300,000 cows. In 1933 their number reduced and correspondingly constituted 33,500,000 and 19,400,000. During that period the number of sheep and goats reduced from 107,000,000 to 37,300,000 and the number of pigs reduced from 22,000,000 to 9,900,000.²⁸³ Decades were needed to recover the herd of cattle.

In the 1930s, during the years of collectivization, particularly, the crises in the production of the stock-breeding produce increased as a result of the cult of the individual.

Because of the policy of deportation of *kulaks*, 3,000,000 of them were deprived of the opportunity to be occupied in agriculture in the USSR. It had also an indirect influence on the reduction of the number of the rural population. The members of families of millions of people, who were exiled to Siberia, had already been unable to continue their life in village in conditions of persecutions. For that reason 15,000,000 people left village in the USSR, according to materials published nowadays.

Migration of population from village was also affected by the forcible methods of realization of general collectivization. Turning the property gained by individual labor forcibly into the "collective property" was a violation of the working people right of private ownership. The opposite step which is realized nowadays also doesn't proceed from the interests of society.

As the primary accumulation was done under compulsion and violence, just in the same way the general collectivization was

²⁸³ "The National Economy of the USSR during 70 Years," M., 1987, p.243 (in Russian).

accompanied by violence, compulsion and exile. Single families escaping collectivization for a long time suffered under heavy taxation and were obliged either to become collective farmers or to leave everything and go to town.

In a short time collective farms appeared in a crisis as in the sphere of agricultural production, as well as demographically, because their economy was not based on economic estimate. A large part of people, which for many centuries occupied themselves with agricultural works, left rural areas.

Acting administrative-commanding methods wouldn't stimulate the development of the agricultural production. Although the land, which was the state property, was attached to collective farms for cultivation, collective farmers remained in dependent relations with the landowner (the state). Consequently, the landowner (the state) could take back the land and command it according to its will. Neither asking the will of producer, nor taking into consideration the climatic conditions it also could in a one-sided way order from top the pyramid of power (by means of the hierarchic network of the agriculture management) what and how to cultivate, what kind of crop rotation to apply and how to supply the harvest (still not reaped) to the state at very low prices. The rights of the producer were violated; the requirements of equivalent exchange (objective economic laws specific to commodity production) were broken. An equivalent barter between industry and agriculture gave its place to an economically groundless unequal exchange. The latter was reflected in purchases of the agricultural products by the state at very low prices, the groundless economic tax and rent policy on the one hand and monopoly high prices of means of production sold to collective farms, collecting payment for reclamation or agricultural works by means of machine and tractor stations on the other hand.

There was no economic estimate. The state collected payments at very low prices for the works of machine and tractor stations according to contracting and as state obligations. In that way the state collected the most part of production as payment in kind. Frequently, the most part of collective farms were even unable to store up seed-stock for the next year. However, in spring the state would give to

collective farms seed grain as a "help" on conditions that in return it would get a rise in autumn.

According to the of specialists, collective farms during their existence, every year until 1954 supplied products to the state at the prices lower than their real value. Almost a quarter of the supplied products the state managed to get without any payment. At the same time until the 1970s the Soviet state buying the agricultural products at the prices lower of their real value yearly centralized in its budget approximately 43-54 billion rubles as income-tax and circulating tax. Besides, as a result of constant rise of the prices of the means of industrial production, which were sold to collective and state farms, the state realized an additional profit at the rate of 8-12 billion rubles²⁸⁴. It is not a secret that from the very beginning peasants understood that they were unable to live in collective and state farms. They worked the clock round but when the agricultural year had been over they received scantiness. Their only hope was subsidiary farming.

How could be guaranteed the reproduction of the labor force in such conditions? While from elementary text-books of economics it is quite well known that the source of the reproduction of the labor force is the whole necessary product as well as a part of the surplus produce. Necessary compensation costs for the labor force's reproduction include necessary means for recovery of the physical and intellectual energy of workers in order to restart the next day the same activity in a normal healthy state. They have to take care of the costs needed for their household's reproduction in order to secure their labor force and household's broadened reproduction. In many cases there couldn't be a word about compensation of the costs of the labor force's reproduction in collective and state farms. Peasants, who during centuries, from generation to generation remained devoted farmers now were estranged from the land and willy-nilly left village for towns although their life was not improved much there too. The only difference was that once a month they were paid a salary, but hardly could make both ends meet.

²⁸⁴ "Literary Paper", 08.03, 1988 (in Russian).

To some extent individual subsidiary farming was a support for peasant. He heartily cultivated a plot of land attached to his house and was occupied in stock farming. Although the rate of income in individual subsidiary farming was higher than in the collective farm, but the proceeds from individual subsidiary farming were not enough to cover necessary expenses for his labor force's broadened reproduction. At best they could guarantee simple reproduction.

During the cult of the individual the existence of the individual subsidiary farming, in part, made the collective farmer to have a corresponding participation in the collective farm's production. However, the individual subsidiary farming couldn't play fully its role because of the following reasons.

First, the size of the homestead land was subjected to constant cutting down. If one of the able-bodied members of the family didn't participate in the works of public economy, because of an "unreasonable excuse", in that case the homestead land was cut down. Second, providing the cattle with fodder was a great problem. Third, the policy of heavy taxation made peasants repeatedly to decrease the number of livestock. Often they tried to get out of such situation. The tax policy greatly contributed to it. Peasants occupied in individual subsidiary economy had to pay an income tax. The tax for cattle-breeding products had to be paid in kind, 100 liter per cow or equivalent quantity of butter. Each family, notwithstanding the number of livestock had to pay as a tax 46 kg meat (in live weight this figure is almost doubled). Each family usually had one cow, there were also some families which had two or four cows, as well as families which had none. At the end of the year it turned out that those families which possessed one cow had to hand over to the state the calf of that cow. However, there were unproductive years, so unsolvable problem arose and even simple reproduction of the livestock appeared to be threatened.

Each family had to pay 75 eggs, two goat and sheep hides and wool, without taking into consideration whether the family possessed any hen or sheep.

Such a tax policy of economically ungrounded methods to nationalize as the additional, as well as a part of the necessary product did a great harm to the peasants and agriculture as a whole.

In the 1930s-1940s the most part of the population lived in the country. Their main source of living was the individual subsidiary farming. They needed finances. Collective farms, at best, would pay wages in kind. The family budget could be increased only by selling a part of the produce of collective and individual subsidiary farming. During that period the peasants, mostly, faced great difficulties in converting their agricultural products into cash (as nowadays). First, because of lack of the developed transport network the peasants were unable to transport their products for sale in towns. Second, the peasants couldn't be away from the collective production for a long time. At the same time the agricultural products were sold with great difficulty in the kolkhoz markets where almost all were sellers and only a few were customers. The peasants were not accustomed to trade so they sold their products at low prices. They could not wait as long as their products would be sold. Besides, they were not allowed to be absent for a long time from collective farm works, so they were unable to keep their products while being in the kolkhoz markets. Peasants somehow got rid of their products made by their own sweat and which were very valuable for them. They needed cash for the payment of taxes, buying manufactured goods and clothes, stationery for children and other permanent needs.

From the mid-1950s although former taxes for individual subsidiary farming were liquidated, the prices of agricultural products rose and difficulties connected with their sale disappeared, the problem of covering the needs in many agricultural products became tangible gradually in towns and cities. Anyhow, a lot of fuss and trouble of the pre- and postwar 6-7 years connected with selling of agricultural products in kolkhoz markets had been overcome and peasants could sell those products at rather high prices without any difficulty. The demand for agricultural products increased because of the growth of the urban population. The state did not collect income tax any more from individual subsidiary farming. So, the expended labor, as well as the produced output almost, on the whole, stood as a necessary production. However, the limits of the individual subsidiary farming were reducing. During the years of the cult of the individual and later, the years of stagnation it happened because of some reasons.

First, the planned norms of the land put at the individual subsidiary farming's disposal were decreasing. It was a result also of turning kolkhoz into *sovkhoz*. It is known that the norms of plots given to the workers and non-manual workers of *sovkhoz* were smaller than that of kolkhozniks (collective farmer).

Second, the number of livestock of the individual subsidiary farming was decreasing. It happened in two ways. First, on the one hand, cattle-breeding was prohibited by law in towns, on the other hand, decrease in livestock of the individual subsidiary farming occurred in the country for lack of fodder. Second, in the course of time young country-folk gradually were losing their interest in the individual subsidiary farming, particularly, cattle-breeding. It was connected especially with youth's new way of living and social-economic changes in the country which was greatly influenced by the rise of the educational and professional level of youth, as well as the development of non-productive branches and the increase of involvement of youth there. Besides, new sources of profit and shadow economy had also their share in this process.

Although deepening commodity-money relations became an important condition for further development of the individual subsidiary farming, a wish to devote themselves to the traditional work of cattle-breeding gradually became extinct among youth. The former generations of many families, fathers and grandfathers produced the most part of vitally important agricultural products and at the same time made a sale of a considerable marketable surplus. On the contrary, in the period of stagnation, the rural youth was not producing agricultural production and became merely its consumer. Almost all families were engaged in the individual subsidiary farming. However, on the whole, the rural population decreased in two aspects - percentage ratio and absolute number.

The rural population had higher natural growth than the urban population and at the same time was an important source of labor force. For example, in the 1960s the natural growth of the rural population outnumbered the urban population by 10 people per 1,000. Under such conditions the rural population had to exceed the urban population by the growth's ratio. However, things were quite

different. In the 1970-1980s the number of those who had left village outnumbered twice the number of those who moved in the opposite direction. In 1970-1979 the rural population's natural growth was 184,400, meanwhile the rural population increased merely by 27,000.

In the years of the cult of the individual and then of stagnation one of the reasons of the rural population's outflow was the injustice in the distribution's sphere. "The distribution according to the labor" was a slogan which could not find an adequate economic grounding. In part, the distribution was distorted by subjective reasons. First, collective farmers could not use fully their earnings. Second, gradually formed and developed rural bureaucracy (on all levels of the state hierarchy including governing economic and party spheres) and members of their families who broke away from the production of the material welfare profited more from them than their real producers. This phenomenon was typical for all other branches of collective economy. Persons who were temporarily charged with the collective property had a great opportunity to make use of it. Although the producers "were charged with" the collective property (it was an external characteristic of this phenomenon), it was not distributed in their favor. The leaders of the command-administrative system and a large part of those who together with them were engaged in different machinations in the field of production and consumption gained of such an unjust distribution. They misappropriated values earned by the workers and collective farmers, as well as collective property.

These vicious methods of distribution, especially in the years of stagnation, resulted in externally not expressed ill-disposed attitude to the physical work. Such attitude was explained by vicious methods of remuneration of labour. Besides, those who were engaged in physical work had no unearned income. Meanwhile, those who didn't do physical work had unearned income and rich way living.

Such an impersonal attitude to physical work resulted in avoidance of it by a part of youth which acquired even a shade of regularity. Even the glorification of the physical work by media, fiction, cinema and all other means of information, as well as

encouragement of some of the young people didn't help. For long youth couldn't work devotedly in agriculture, because the simple reproduction of their work was not guaranteed, besides, they worked under some compulsion. In the years of the cult of the individual many left the village because of such compulsion.

Vicious methods of the work's payment and the gradual rise and even encouragement of laziness when there was no exactingness, turned gradually into a trend of social evil which resulted in many other unacceptable phenomena. It is necessary to say that collective property became an important source of some people's unearned income. The policy of sharp deviation from the real costs of goods was applied instead of improvement of the economic mechanisms and foundations of legislation which would stimulate the labor productivity's increase, as well as equal application of law. It was, on the sly, an evil which justified the shadow economy's reinforcement.

An extremely great role must be attributed to the expanding of the network of ten-year general compulsory secondary school education, as well as secondary technical training and higher education. However, together with it, everyone who received a "school-leaving certificate", in spite of the fact whether possessed knowledge which would correspond to the required level, claimed for a workplace for which educational qualification was demanded. Meanwhile, in reality the manual low quality works were not abolished, they were not everywhere yet mechanized completely. In national economy a large part of works was done by hand. The ten-year secondary educated young people had no desire to occupy themselves with manual works.

The national economy presented many applications for such workplaces which partially were false demands. Such inconsistency between demand and supply resulted in the higher wages in the sphere of the common labor and manual works, because otherwise these workplaces would remain vacant. The supply of highly qualified specialists (heavy expenses are needed for manpower training) is higher than the demand. It relates to the highly qualified specialists in the fields of science and engineering, medicine, pedagogy (some spheres), agriculture, as well as some professions of

skilled workers. That is why unqualified workers were highly thought of by the others, meanwhile the wages of highly qualified specialists decreased. It was explained also by the level of the factual training of the highly qualified manpower in proportion with the increasing demands which found their reflection in the system of payment realized in relation to that group of population. For example, the number of doctors could be less and the level of medical service higher. It might happen as with the rise of the demand presented to the professional qualification of physicians and the increase of the maintenance staff's number, as well as application and usage of achievements of science and technology. The same may be said about science. Or else, let's take the sphere of industry. In the course of decades there worked 80-85 technicians with specialized secondary education per 100 engineers with higher education. Thereupon many engineers with high education held free workplaces of technicians. From year to year the network of extra-mural courses and night classes widened. This kind of education was not justified and the manpower trained in that way almost didn't meet the production's demands. The size of the specialized manpower training's network had to be regulated only according to the demands of the national economy.

Thus, during the years of stagnation, the trends of the extensive development and needless widening of the educational network resulted in a certain inconsistency between comparatively high level of knowledge acquired by young people entering the sphere of production and still technically low equipment of the certain sections of production. There was also certain inconsistency between high level of the technical basis in many sections of production and low training of a large part of young people entering the life. Most of those who had only secondary education started their working activities not having any profession. At the same time manual work still played a great role in conditions of all-round mechanization and automation.

2. The factors of the urban population's growth

Between 1913 and 1990 the urban population increased about 22,8 times in conditions of the increase of the population 3,5 times in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia. Together with the natural growth, the main source of the increase of the urban population was rural population. During that period the latter increased merely by 21.4% in spite of the fact that it was generally characterized by higher natural growth. At the same time the growth of mid-size and big towns in Armenia took place at the expense of small towns. Economic, social and cultural life concentrated in cities creating different complications in the spheres of ecology, transport and consumption. The following table gives an idea about the population's centralization in towns and cities in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia (see table 20).

Table 20.

The rate of the growth of the population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia (1913=100.0%)²⁸⁵

Years	The whole population compared (%) with 1913	The rate of the growth of the urban population	The specific weight of the urban population (%)
1913	100.0	100.0	10.4
1926	88.1	160.7	19.0
1939	128.2	352.3	28.6
1959	176.3	847.5	50.0
1970	249.2	1425.0	59.5
1979	303.1	1916.4	65.8
1989	330.2	2277.0	67.7

The urban population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia increased, especially after World War I, particularly, in the 1960s, when together with reconstruction and unprecedented growth of its old cities and towns new ones were founded. In a short time they became important industrial and social centers. Before the war the increase of the rural population was higher as compared with

the urban population. In postwar period the inverse process took place. In 1959-1989 the average increase of the urban population rather outnumbered the corresponding figures of the previous decades (see table 21).

Table 21.

The average annual increase in the towns and villages of the Republic of Armenia (thousands)²⁸⁶

Years	Towns and urban-type communities	The rural inhabited localities
1926-1939	15.3	16.3
1939-1959	25.8	-1.7
1959-1970	55.6	11.8
1970-1979	56.5	3.1
1979-1989	37.6	4.1

In 1959-1989, according to the censuses' data, 88.2% of the population increase fell to the share of towns. From 1950 to 1960 the urban population increased by 350,000. During next three decades (1959-1989) this number constituted more than 475,000 per decade. The movement of population from the rural to urban areas together with the mechanization of the processes of production was conditioned on the scarcity of the plough-land. Big-scale expansion of the national economy's branches played an important role in urban areas, particularly, some development of the non-productive spheres. The same may be said about the opportunities of acquiring a profession. In the mid-1970s the selected researches of the Central Statistic Bureau of the Armenian SSR showed that 26% of those who came to towns were looking for a better job, 16% wanted to continue their education. 65% of those who came to towns and 70% of those who left towns were aged 16-29. The movement of the population over 25 was determined by the problem of seeking employment and those aged 16-19 wanted to continue their education. Young people aged 16-19 constituted 90% of the general number of those who came to towns for getting education.

So the movement of the population included its most active working age. The scientific-and-engineering progress and commitment to the improvement of the labor force's productivity

²⁸⁵ This and following tables are compiled on the basis of the censuses.

²⁸⁶ The table is compiled on the basis of censuses.

dictated objectively releasing from agriculture and involvement in non-agricultural spheres of the young labor force and at the expense of it the urban population's growth. However, as some researches had noticed, there was introduced a narrowness in solving this question which resulted in unwanted changes of the rural population's age structure. It restrained the development of the agricultural production, as well as the rural population's reproduction.

The growth of the urban young population at the expense of the rural population (according to the criteria of those times, it brought to the improvement of the use of the labor force in non-agricultural branches) resulted in the gradual growth of the labor's productivity in agriculture. The young labor resources released of agriculture were replaced by the aged. According to the census of 1970, the number of aged under 29 was less (by 138) and over 40 was more (by 100) per 1,000 employed population in agriculture than in industry.

At the same time, in 1959-1989 the urban population increased also because of the rural populated areas' renaming as towns, as well as the natural growth of the urban population. At first it was dictated more by organizational reasons than the change of employment. A large part of these towns didn't play an urban functional role. For example, there were no industrial enterprises in these towns and the population was occupied mainly in agriculture.

The renaming of rural inhabited localities as towns turned into the main factor of the growth of the urban population. Later the situation completely changed: migration and the natural growth became the main factors of the increase of the urban population.²⁸⁷ It is testified by table 22.

The urban population's growth was obvious under such conditions. According to the census of 1926, on average, it was 8,000 per town, in 1939 - 20,400, in 1959 it increased more and was 25,200, in 1970 - 29,1, in 1979 - 35,000 and in 1989 - 40,700.

Such averaged data of the Armenian SSR's towns reflect the main and generalized trends of the sources of the urban population's growth and formation.

²⁸⁷ For the detailed analysis of this question see V.Khojabekyan, B.Asatryan. The Demographic Aspects of Urbanization in the Armenian SSR, p.54-67 (in Russian).

The change of the urbanization role of townspeople in the formation of the urban population was determined mainly by the peculiarities of the social and economic development. In this regard the following factors were decisive for the process of urbanization: industrial development and the rate of industrialization, the creation of the zones of health protection and health resort towns, manpower training of specialized secondary and higher education and their concentration in cities and towns, the formation and development of administrative functions in some populated areas, especially, regional centers.

Table 22.
The growth of the urban population in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia in 1913-1989²⁸⁸ (thousand)

	1913- 1926 ²⁸⁹	1926- 1939 ²⁹⁰	1939- 1959	1959- 1979	1970- 1979	1979- 1989
The growth of the urban population	68,1	199,3	515,4	599,7	545,0	370,4
at the expense of						
-natural growth	4,1	55,0	161,0	263,1	262,0	320,5
-migrants	14,1	122,3	326,4	261,0	223,0	49,2
-rural						
because of						
renaming of						
populated areas as						
towns	49,0	22,0	28,0	75,6	30,0	3,4
The same in						
percentage	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
at the expense of						
-natural growth	22,3	27,6	31,2	43,9	51,3	86,5
-migrants	-	61,4	63,3	43,5	43,6	12,6
-rural						
because of						
renaming of						
populated areas as						
towns	77,7	11,0	5,5	13,6	5,1	0,9

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p.57.

²⁸⁹ In 1926 in four towns of the Armenian SSR in 1913 lived 118,100 people.

²⁹⁰ According to the natural growth of the population in 1939.

Undoubtedly, all these changes were reciprocally connected with the demographic development of the above-mentioned populated areas. The formation of urban areas would be impossible without a certain number of a population which, of course, had no clear quantitative limit. For example, the towns with different functional significance (with the exception of administrative centers) had no definite limit of the number of population. In the 20th century 54 towns and urban-type communities were formed in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia. At the beginning, the decisive role in turning rural inhabited localities into towns belonged to the presence of manufacturing production there (until 1939). Later, particularly, in 1959-1979, it was dictated by the necessity of acquiring some administrative functions. During those years the regional centers of the Armenian SSR turned into urban settlements. The demographic factor – the quantity of the population of such settlements was not neglected.

The social and economic development's trends and directions conditioned on the ratio's change of the natural and migration factors' role in the urban population's growth. The industrialization's high rate resulted in the rise of the migration's role in the population's general growth. Poor opportunities of employment in agriculture also played a role in this question. Labor resources could not be realized fully because of high natural growth the rural population. A part of them were those who were torn away from agriculture. Meanwhile, non productive branches could not involve fully this remainder of the rural population. The low level of the mechanizing of the agricultural works in many branches (cattle-breeding, wine-growing, tobacco-cultivation, vegetable-growing and gardening), limited opportunities of commanding methods of distribution of the agricultural products in the system of collective and Soviet farms were important factors of the rural population's migration.

Until the 1979 Census migration was an important factor of the growth of the urban population. If between the 1959 Census and the 1970 Census migration constituted 43.5% in the increase of the urban population and between the 1970 Census and the 1979 Census

migration constituted 43.6% , correspondingly 43.9% and 51.3% fell to the share of the natural growth. However, during that time, when the value of the natural growth exceeded the number of the population migrating to towns anyhow there were years when the number of the rural population migrating to towns was more than the natural growth of the urban population. From 1959 the half of the population of the Armenian SSR fell to the share of the urban population. However, only in 1968 the absolute value of the urban population's natural growth exceeded the absolute value of the of the rural population's natural growth, whereas the absolute number of the urban population outnumbered the rural population 1,34 times more.²⁹¹

Since the 1980s situation had changed. Between 1979 and 1989 the natural growth of the urban population of the Armenian SSR became a decisive factor of the growth of the urban population. Migration of the rural population also contributed to the natural growth of the urban population, however, it had less and rather short impact on the natural growth. The migrating rural population, getting accustomed to urban conditions, after all, imitated urban families and differed not much from town-dwellers. Meanwhile, until 1990 as a result of such migration the birth rate diminished more in the rural areas than it increased in urban areas at the expense of that factor. It was explained by the fact that young population migrated mainly from the rural areas.

In 1981-1990 the migration of the population was mainly taking place from the remote mountainous regions to towns and flat rural inhabited localities. Thus the population of many mountainous regions by the level of aging was nearing the level of the European countries.

The figures of table 23 show that in 1979-1989, 86.5% of the urban population's increase fell to the share of the natural growth, 12.6% - migration and only 0.9% - the renaming of the rural inhabited localities as towns. However, the changes that took place in the 1990s had a completely new impact on the internal movements of the population.

²⁹¹ The Population of the USSR, 1987, p.14, 124 (in Russian).

* * *

Until the 1990s the national structure of the population underwent a considerable change in the present territory of the Republic of Armenia. It was quite obvious that the number of Armenians increased and all Azerbaijanis emigrated. Later, together with Armenians the number of Russians, Kurds, Ezids and other nationalities decreased as a result of unfavorable social and economic conditions (economic crisis, unemployment, poverty) in the republic.

Table 23.

The national structure of the Armenian SSR in 1926-1989²⁹²

Nationalities	1926	1939	1959	1970	1979	1989
The whole population	881.3	1282.3	1763.0	2491.9	3037.3	3304.8
Armenians	743.6	1062.0	1551.6	2208.3	2725.0	3083.6
Azerbaijanis	84.0	130.9	107.7	148.2	160.8	84.9
Russians	19.5	51.5	56.5	66.1	70.3	51.6
Kurds, Ezids	15.3	20.5	25.6	37.5	50.8	56.1
Other nationalities	18.9	17.4	21.6	31.8	30.4	28.6

The 1989 Census was incomplete, but since that time much has changed. In 1990-1991 the population's growth of the Republic of Armenia was a result of the deportation of the ethnic Armenians from Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh and the positive remainder of migration between the former republics of the USSR and Armenia in 1990-1991. However from the end of 1991 the negative remainder of the population of Armenia became a characteristic feature as regard international migration. Together with other factors it had a great impact on the natural growth's process of the population of Armenia. The absolute number of the population decreased. After presenting international movements (1913-1990) these problems will be analyzed in detail in subsequent chapters.

PART FOUR THE DEMOGRAPHIC TENSION AT THIS STAGE

In the last decade of the 20th century, particularly, since 1988, the processes taking place in the sphere of demography of the Republic of Armenia have had their impact on the regularities and future trends of the natural growth, distribution and intensification of the population migration streams. Under the pressure of natural disaster and hardships of written and unwritten military laws the Republic of Armenia, in fact, is facing another catastrophe. The natural growth of the republic's population gradually decreased, the birth rate declined (in 2002 there were 4,500 less births than in 1990), the death-rate increased, migration reached a threatening scale. In other words the demographic situation of the republic underwent negative changes. Undoubtedly, it may be considered as a direct consequence of the present social-economic and geopolitical situation.

At the same time, such processes are conditioned on some factors of the objective and subjective character in the republic. These following factors have influenced the birth and death rates: the age structure of the population, wars and blockades, earthquake, social-economic conditions, negative residue of migration.

What an impact had these phenomena on the birth and death rates in the period under discussion?

²⁹² The table is compiled on the basis of the censuses data.

CHAPTER EIGHT

REASONS FOR THE DECLINE OF THE BIRTH RATE

1. Variations in the age structure of Armenia and wars.

On the whole, regularities in the development of a population are formed under the influence of historically molded demographic processes. These processes, at any given moment, act independently, as well as in reaction to the socio-economic conditions of the society. The birth and death rates, family size and structure, as well as migration rates of a population are greatly influenced by the age structure of the population, which is itself formed in relation to external changes and movements, including war, natural disasters, epidemics etc.

These factors have an impact on the age structure of the population in correlation to the specific weights of subgroups of the population; children, youth and the elderly. If a population is characterized by a young population, all other conditions being equal, there will be a high birth rate. Such was the situation in Armenia until the end of 1980s. However, since 1992, for a number of reasons, the birth rate of Armenia has been declining and is expected to continue to decline.

According to official data birth rate in Armenia fell from 22.5 per 1,000 in 1990, to 10.1 per 1,000 in 2002; the death rate was 8 per 1,000 and the natural growth rate was 2.1 per 1,000 population.²⁹³ A detailed picture of the birth and death rates is seen in table 24.

²⁹³ The absolute numbers of the birth rate and mortality, as will be shown at the end of this book, even if correspond to reality, however their indices are far from reality, because these indices were calculated on the basis of the number of residents, according to the statistic data. In fact, a part of the population is in a process of emigration.

Table 24.
Natural growth of the population of the Republic of Armenia from
1885-2002²⁹⁴

	1985	1990	1993	1995	1998	2000	2002
Natural growth:	18.2	16.3	8.4	6.4	4.3	2.7	2.1
Urban areas	16.5	14.4	6.6	4.9	3.6	2.2	2.0
Rural areas	21.8	20.6	12.3	9.6	5.6	3.6	2.3
Birth rate:	24.1	22.5	15.8	13.0	10.4	9.0	10.1
Urban areas	21.8	20.4	13.9	11.5	9.7	8.4	10.1
Rural areas	28.8	27.3	19.8	16.2	11.8	12.2	10.0
Death-rate:	5.9	6.2	7.4	6.6	6.1	6.3	8.0
Urban areas	5.3	6.0	7.3	6.6	6.1	6.2	8.1
Rural areas	7.0	6.7	7.5	6.6	6.1	6.6	7.7

The birth rate of the population of Armenia is mostly significantly influenced by changes in the age structure as well as the rate of urbanization and movements of the population. Demographic development indices²⁹⁵ are expressed by birth rates, which together with gender and age structure show the level of demographic development.

Between 1991 and 2002 the changes that took place in the age structure of Armenia greatly influenced the country's birth rate. This was not only the result of the "aging" of the population and new social-economic conditions, but, equally important, the effects of World War II.

World War II had a negative impact on reproduction, as during that period, as well as from the mid-1960s until the mid-1970s and

²⁹⁴ The Demographic Year-Book, 1991, p. 62 (in Russian). Armenia in figures, 1990, p.22. The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia, 1993-1994, p.15. The Social-Economic State of The Republic of Armenia, 1999; The Ministry of the State Register and Analysis of the Statistics of the RA, Erevan, 2000, p.121; The Social-Economic State of the RA in 2000, Erevan, 2001, p.133; The Social-Economic State of RA in January-December of 2002, Erevan, 2003, p.150 (all in Armenian).

²⁹⁵ L.I. Valentey, A.Ja. The Foundations of Demographics, Moscow, 1989; R.Pressa. The Population and its Study. A Demographic Analysis, Moscow, 1966 (both in Russian).

from the end of the 1980s until the mid-1990s, because those persons who were born during World War II reached the marriage age (and again when their children and grandchildren reached the age of marriage)²⁹⁶

In 1986, as compared with 1991-1998, there was a decrease in the absolute number of women aged 21-24 and then 25-29, as a result of World War II. The population segment that included the highest number of persons of reproductive age (20-29), continued to decrease in 1987. This process had to continue till the end of the 1990s, i.e. the absolute number of newborns had to decrease depending on variation in the number of women of child bearing age. It would be followed by an increase of the birth rate owing to the rise of the number of women reaching child bearing age. However new phenomena had a negative impact on the birth rate of the population, mitigating the role of absolute numbers of women of child bearing age, thus decreasing the expected general number of newborn children.

Still in the first decade of the 21st century the influence of World War II on the reproduction of the population will be reflected in an undulating way and then this influence will become extinct.

Currently the role of factors forming regularities and irregularities in the population growth of Armenia, are greatly influenced by the present state of affairs in the republic, particularly, the undeclared war by Armenia's neighboring country, the unending blockade, etc. The war had an impact on the gene pool not only now, but will continue to do so in the future. Thousands of patriots sacrificed their lives fighting in self-defensive regiments. Consequently the normal process of population growth and the creation of new generations were disrupted. In addition, the years of 1991-1992 also resulted in the loss of peaceful, unarmed populations in the border zones, as many people were obliged to leave their

²⁹⁶ See in details in the previous chapters of the present book and my former publications, particularly "The Population of the Armenian SSR and Modern Problems of the Reproduction of the Labour Resources," p.15-131, "The Population of Armenia and its Employment," p.315-338 (both in Armenian). Bevölkerungswachstum und arbeitskräfteressourcen, Berlin, 1983, S. 7-43.

native village and settle in towns, flat areas and foreign countries as refugees. This also resulted in a decrease of births. The process of the change of the specific weight of different age groups of the indigenous population is shown in table 25.

Table 25.
The number of the indigenous population of the Republic of Armenia by age groups²⁹⁷

	(thousands)			Percentage of total population		
	1979	1989	2001	1979	1989	2001
Total population						
by age group	3037,03	3304,8	3213	100	100	100
0-4	322,1	375,5	196,1	10,6	11,4	6,1
5-9	296,8	335,6	258,5	9,8	10,2	8,0
10-14	320,2	291,8	325,4	10,5	8,8	10,1
15-19	383,1	278,1	313,6	12,6	8,4	9,8
20-24	332,0	280,6	267,5	10,9	8,5	8,3
25-29	239,4	329,6	222,6	7,9	10,0	6,9
30-34	149,3	292,2	204,6	4,9	8,8	6,4
35-39	152,4	216,1	244,3	5,0	6,5	7,6
40-44	198,1	131,5	276,1	6,5	4,0	8,6
45-49	171,1	136,5	211,5	5,6	4,1	6,6
50-54	159,0	174,8	153,8	5,2	5,3	4,8
55-59	71,7	154,3	80,1	2,4	4,7	2,5
60-64	58,1	136,3	147,3	1,9	4,1	4,6
65-69	65,3	55,7	118,7	2,2	1,7	3,7
70-79	86,7	78,3	162,2	2,9	2,4	5,0
80 and above	29,2	36,5	30,6	1,0	1,1	0,9

²⁹⁷ "Armenia in Figures, 1990", p.20. The data of the census of 2001. The Results of the census of 2001 of the Republic of Armenia (figures of the Republic of Armenia), National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia, Erevan 2003, p.226-228. The population statistics do not reflect correctly the real number of population, because the census had not taken into consideration the fact that hundred of thousands (migrants) were out of Armenia, but continued to remain registered in the republic.

2. Demographic consequences of the Spitak earthquake

The earthquake of 1988 in Spitak had a grave impact on the process of reproduction of the population of Armenia²⁹⁸ both directly and indirectly. In addition to an official estimate of 25,000 deaths the absolute birth rate decreased as a consequence of serious social, psychological and economic conditions in the disaster zone. Besides, the earthquake had an indirect influence as it wiped towns and villages off the map, together with their populations. In addition to deaths, residents of all generations were maimed or traumatized. These residents included those persons having already finished their reproduction years as well as those who were yet to begin families. The natural processes that normally provided for the succession of generations were disrupted in all age groups. The reestablishment of a normal process of generational rejuvenation in Armenia will take time.

After the earthquake, during 1989-1990 the absolute number of children increased in Armenia. In 1989 were born 75,250, in 1990 were born 79,882 children. In the first year following the earthquake 543 more children were born than were born in 1988. The following year there were 4,632 more children born than in 1988. Yet from 1987 the republic had entered a period of decrease in the number of newborns. This period of declining births in Armenia was interrupted for two or three years by the earthquake. The post-earthquake rise in the absolute number of newborns for Armenia as a whole came to an end in 1990. However the increase in births in the earthquake region (known as the disaster zone) continued until the end of 1992. In 1988, 6,768 children were born in Shirak region, in 1990 there were 8,467 births. In 1991 there were 8,681 children born, and in 1992 there were 7,467 births. In 1988 7,460 children were born in Lori region. In 1990 there were 8,304 births, in 1991 - 8,021, and in 1992 there were 7147 children born in the region. This picture of the

²⁹⁸ See in details: "Economy", magazine, 1993, N3-4, p.5-8 (in Russian). V.Khojabekyan. "Interesting, Very Interesting Demographic Regularities". - "Hayasatan", 21.1.1991 (in Armenian).

increase of the number of the newborns is much the same in the Armenian towns of Gyumri and Vanadzor.

Increased population reproduction after wars, natural disasters, epidemics and mass death among populations is a well known global regularity. It occurs as a conscious activity of self-reproduction. Increases in birth rates often take place even in very unfavourable social-economic conditions, mainly dictated by moral and psychological reasons. After the earthquake, under the influence of new social-economic conditions, new patterns of reproduction were formed. At the same time new psychological factors appeared that resulted in an increase of couples having children. Consequently the process of a sharp increase in the population in the Spitak earthquake zone can be considered a result of the influence of this global phenomenon, formed as a result of new social-economic conditions and reflected in the population's psychology.

Indeed, the great disaster of December, 1988 was followed by a period of the recovery of human losses, as proven by statistics. The demographic behaviour of the regional population was expressed in the rise of the marriage index in extremely hard conditions. Before the earthquake the marriage index (the number of married couples per 1,000 population) showed a trend of reduction. In 1980 it reduced by 7.8 and in 1990 by 8.0 people. The marriage index first rose among girls aged 16-19. Early marriages resulted in earlier births. The number of marriages in the age group of 20-24 increased owing to marriage for the first and even second time. Many young men and women lost their spouses and some time after the disaster married again. Many families found themselves facing the problem of the complete or partial loss of their families. At the same time many children were crippled and became invalid. Parents replenished their families with new births in order to compensate for the losses as a result of the earthquake.

It is interesting to note that in 1990 the highest increase of birth rates and natural population growth in the country was registered in Spitak and the region of Spitak where the epicenter of the earthquake had occurred. For example, from 1985 until 1990 while Armenia's natural growth (per 1,000 population) fell from 18,2

to 16,3²⁹⁹, there was a natural population increase from 28 to 34,2 (per 1,000 population) in the town of Spitak. This trend was observed in many remaining towns and villages in the disaster zone. This trend was observed in many remaining towns and villages in the disaster zone. In this period an increase in the natural growth rate of towns and villages outside the disaster zone occurred in only three regions; the towns of Artashat, Martuni and Meghri. This increase in the birth rate of Armenia's disaster zone had a significant influence on the general index of the republic's natural population growth.

The Spitak earthquake disaster became a factor in the formation of a subconscious behavior of women in the disaster zone to increase the number of children in small families. It also stimulated women, considered their reproduction period finished, to rethink their decision. These processes, although for a short period, resulted in the rise of the birth rate in all age groups of women of reproduction age in the republic. Starting in 1991 the birth rate had begun to decline in Armenia. However, since 1993-1994 the disaster zone has had a higher index of reduction than the average of the republic. For example, in 1997 the absolute number of newborns in the regions of Shirak and Lori constituted 58.3% of the 1992 birthrate, while the average index was 62.6%. Consequently the specific weight of the children born in those regions reduced (from 20.7% in 1992 to 18.3% in 2002) in the number of children born in the republic.

From 1993 the reduction of the number of new born children is explained by a sharper social-economic tension, particularly, in towns. Housing remained a serious problem, social polarization deepened and social tension increased. The number of people who remained insecure added to that stratum of the population that was already socio-economically at risk. Also affected was the region's labor force, with high unemployment, fierce competition for jobs, and decreased wages as a result of the availability of cheap labour. The public health system disintegrated.

According to official data, in 2000 the level of the registered unemployment was 11.7% (the natural level is accepted as 4-6%) in the republic. In Shirak region it was 23.3% and in Lori region it was 17.1%.

The reduction of the birth rate in the disaster zone is explained also by emigration. According to our calculations 42-45% (250, 000-260,000 people) of the population of Shirak and Lori regions emigrated between 1989 and 2002. Fifty percent fewer children were born in 2002 than in 1992, as the majority of those people emigrating were young and in their most productive age for childbearing.

The process of population reproduction will be distorted for many years to come by the consequences of the earthquake, the war and blockade. They dramatically influenced on the demographic situation and social behavior of the population of Armenia.

Thus, a difficult and serious situation has developed in the republic and, particularly, in the disaster zone. This situation requires realization of an active demographic policy in the republic. This policy, on the whole, must be applied gradually in the republic and must address the problems and needs of orphans and broken families of the earthquake disaster, as well as the residual problems of remaining family members of those who perished or were disabled in the war, as well as the families of army recruits.

It is difficult to imagine the prevention of the demographic catastrophe without the policy of the state care. First, it is necessary to contribute to the solution of the problems of social care of motherhood and childhood by the policy on the state level.

Second, it is necessary to gradually put the population's reproduction cycle back into its ordinary rhythm. A special policy must be applied with respect to youth reaching the marriage age, particularly, those people who were shocked by the extraordinary phenomena (war, earthquake, deportation, horrors of genocidal action). On this point, it is necessary to give the new forming, needy young families a credit for building houses. The terms and amount of the credit's repayment may be conditioned on the number of the born children. Thus after the first-born it is better not to collect 20% of the given credit, after the birth of the second child it is better not to

²⁹⁹ "The Demographic Year-Book, 1991," p.62 (in Russian); "Armenia in Figures, 1990", p.22 (in Armenian).

collect another 25% of the given credit. Thus continuously, for each newborn it is necessary to increase not redeemable part of the credit, prolonging the term of the repayment.

Third, it is necessary to regulate and slow the population's movements in the republic, particularly, population migration from towns, the disaster zone, the border outlying districts and mountainous regions by economic strategies.

Generally speaking, it is very important to provide housing to homeless families in the zone of disaster. That work is in the course of development. It is necessary to remember that in the towns of that zone many families lived in carriages and pupils went to their lessons in damaged schools. At the same time, it is necessary to pay attention to the seismicity of new building projects and newly erected buildings securing a corresponding control of their norms. The cleanness of towns, their sanitation must be addressed.

Priority should be given to the creation of employment in the zone of disaster, particularly, towns. In this regard it is expedient to reduce communal rent (paid by many families in the zone of disaster) by one half (electricity and water charges, real estate tax) compared with the average rent in the republic. For the purpose of the reduction of the population's movement from rural areas it is necessary to double the farmland of each family at the expense of reserve lands, especially taking into consideration the young and new forming families.

3. The impact of emigration of Azerbaijanis from the Armenian SSR and the deportation of Armenians from the Azerbaijan SSR

The reduction of the general birth rate (especially in the rural areas) was also conditioned by the emigration of Azeri-Turks from the Armenian SSR. Although during that period 2,7 times more Armenians were deported from the Azerbaijan SSR than was the number that emigrated Azeri-Turks from the Armenian SSR, it had a negligible influence on the natural growth of the population, especially in rural areas. Moreover, fewer deported Armenians were settled in border areas than the Azeri-Turks who emigrated from the

rural areas of Armenia in 1988. However, Armenian women had lower fertility. In its turn, this had an impact on the birth rate of the rural population as well as to some degree on the general growth and the number of the family members.

It is necessary to note that above-mentioned contingents of population differed in their social-economic character. For example, most of the Armenians deported from the Azerbaijan SSR were urban dwellers with a high level of education that had finished their participation in the process of natural reproduction. Meanwhile Azerbaijanis were a mostly low educated and younger rural population (90%) who, compared with the local Armenians, were characterized by higher birth rates.

The role of social-economic factors.

From the mid-1980s the trend of a declining birth rate was also affected by social-economic factors that resulted in the formation of a new average family size in Armenia. Between 1960-1990, parallel to the sharp change in the age structure in the republic, the rise of demands for educated young people for waged labour, as well as the costs associated with the upbringing, care and education of children, together with the degree of urbanization and other factors as mentioned above, resulted in a new average family size. As high birth rates were gradually reduced families became smaller. The main reason of the decrease in the number of family members was the reduction of the fertility rate (see table 26).

The fertility rate in 1958-2002³⁰⁰

Table 26.

Years	Urban	Rural	Total
1958-1959	3.6	6.0	4.7
1965-1966	3.0	5.2	3.9
1969-1970	2.7	4.4	3.2
1975-1976	2.5	3.7	2.8
1980-1981	2.1	3.0	2.3
1985-1986	2.3	3.2	2.6
1987	2.2	3.3	2.5
1988	2.3	3.0	2.5
1989	2.4	3.0	2.6
1990	2.3	3.3	2.6
1991	2.3	3.2	2.6
1992	2.1	2.9	2.3
1993	1.7	2.5	2.0
1994	1.5	2.2	1.7
1995	1.4	2.1	1.6
1996	1.4	2.0	1.6
1997	1.3	1.8	1.5
1998	1.2	1.6	1.3
1999	1.1	1.5	1.2
2000	0.99	1.02	1.01 ³⁰¹
2001	0.97	1.06	1.0

³⁰⁰ "The Women and Men of Armenia" (a collection), Erevan, 1999, p.12 (in Armenian). In November 1997- November 2000 the NSS carried out the women polling in the rural and urban areas for more accurate definition of the productivity indices. The data of the NSS concerning the indices of the pre-migration and the polling periods almost coincide. The productivity index is lower than the current statistic calculations because the ratio of newborns and aged 15-49 was taken as a basis. In spite of the fact that the absolute number of newborns is a real one, but a higher part of women is in the migration's process. Later we shall notice that as a result of such incorrect calculations the birth and death rates per 1,000 newborns are lower.

According to this polling, the productivity index turned out to be higher. "During three years preceding the poll the integral productivity rate was 1,7 children per woman. This rate is lower than the productivity level needed for securing the reproduction (which is a little more than 2,0). The productivity levels of rural female population and consequently their integral indices are higher during their whole reproductive life compared with the urban female population (2,1 to 1,5)" (see "A Survey of Demographic and Health Problems of Armenia, 2000", Erevan, 2001, p.83, in Armenian).

Urbanization also affected family size. The high birth rate was gradually reduced. According to data of 1987 the third and following children in the family constituted 25.3% of all the newborn infants (families having four and more children constituted 6.6%).³⁰² During 1989-1990 those mothers who had three or more children were of a great number. This has been explained as compensation for earthquake losses. Currently the number of these mothers is sharply declining (see table 27).

Table 27.

Classification of newborn infants in Armenia according to their succession³⁰³

Years	Total of newborns	Mothers giving birth to 3 and more babies	
		Newborn babies	Newborn babies (in percentage)
1985	80306	19742	24.6
1990	79882	24226	30.3
1991	77825	22077	28.4
1992	70581	17094	24.2
1993	59041	12681	21.5
1994	51143	10949	21.4
1995	48960	11494	23.5
1996	48134	11730	24.4
1997	43929	10854	24.7
1998	39366	9560	24.2
1999	36502	8294	22.7
2000	34276	7484	26.8
2001	32065	6080	19.0
2002	32229	5222	16.2

³⁰¹ Calculations of the gross and net indices of the birth-rate are important. The gross index on average shows the number of girls born by one woman. The net index shows the number of infant girls born by a woman who reached the age of their mothers. These are very important indices characterizing the reproduction of the population. These indices accordingly were 1.130 and 1.077 in 1980, 1.238 and 1.186 in 1985, 1.277 and 1.237 in 1990, 0.798 and 0.780 in 1995, 0.585 and 0.573 in 1999, 0.498 and 0.491 in 2001. The best coefficient is in the case when the ratio of the gross and net indices reach 1. It means that the mortality is low relatively. For example, the ratio of the gross and net indices was 0.95 in 1980, 0.96 in 1990, 0.96 in 1999 and 0.985 in 2001.

³⁰² The Population of the USSR, 1987. - A Collection of articles, p.296 (in Russian).

³⁰³ The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia, 1993-1994, p. 15, The Social-economic State of the RA in 2000, p.133 (both in Armenian)

Table 28.

Live births per 1,000 women by the age groups³⁰⁴

Years	age groups							
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	15-49
1958-1959	37.6	200.6	264.1	2204.4	1154.9	668.0	16.4	159.2
1965-1966	47.3	226.2	225.5	149.1	87.8	35.4	10.2	122.4
1969-1970	41.2	213.3	164.2	123.8	67.6	23.8	5.1	92.9
1975-1976	38.7	208.7	160.4	81.4	43.2	15.1	2.1	83.8
1980-1981	45.0	204.3	132.4	56.3	21.4	6.9	1.4	85.2
1985-1986	57.0	236.5	132.3	60.3	19.5	4.4	0.6	91.3
1987	56.0	240.7	131.3	55.5	19.3	5.4	0.5	88.5
1988	61.5	234.4	126.7	52.3	18.7	4.4	0.3	84.7
1989	66.2	226.6	134.5	65.5	23.0	4.7	0.3	89.7
1990	69.1	223.9	131.3	68.8	24.9	5.5	0.4	88.0
1991	75.5	222.4	124.9	62.9	23.8	5.2	0.3	84.3
1992	82.5	207.5	104.1	50.8	20.1	4.3	0.4	74.4
1993	77.0	176.9	80.5	38.8	15.7	3.7	0.4	60.8
1994	68.0	149.5	70.0	34.5	14.5	3.6	0.2	51.6
1995	56.2	141.7	73.6	35.2	15.4	3.3	0.3	48.5
1996	53.3	137.8	76.6	34.0	14.3	3.5	0.2	47.0
1997	43.3	129.3	69.6	31.7	13.3	3.3	0.2	36.9
1998	34.6	117.9	63.2	28.0	12.4	3.1	0.2	37.4
1999	29.8	112.1	58.5	24.6	10.8	2.8	0.2	34.2
2000	27.3	103.2	53.7	23.5	10.6	3.0	0.2	31.7
2002	23.4	97.8	49.2	21.6	9.2	2.5	0.3	29.3

Reduction of the birth rate has sharply decreased the age rates of the birth rate of women in separate age groups, as well as on the whole. 105-110 babies fell on average to the share of 100 women of the fertility age compared to 215 necessary for the population's reproduction.

From the 1980s births were mostly "accumulated" in that group of mothers who gave birth to the first and second babies.

There are also other circumstances. For example, in families having many children, mother together with care the means earned by the socially useful work shares with more members of the family. Thus, with every new baby born to a family, total household income is divided among one additional family member. Meanwhile, mothers, sharing with more family members the means earned in the socially useful work and social production, do not get an adequate compensation from the society.

Since 1991 in particular the birth rate has radically changed in the republic. The special birth rates of women in almost all age groups fell. If decades before the active age of fertility included women aged 20-39, later the limits of that active age gradually narrowed, now mainly comprising women of age 20-24 years.

Data shows that for a long period, 1958-1992, the birth rate (with slight variations), increased only in the age groups of women aged 20-24. Since 1993 the birth rate has sharply declined in all age groups (see table 28).

Research on changing patterns of birth rates as a consequence of changes in political and social-economic conditions beginning of the 1990s, as well as the identification and evaluation of the factors influencing these regularities, are of great scientific interest. The impact and character of these factors have changed as a result of political and social-economic changes in the republic.

Between 1991 and 2002 new social-economic conditions had a great impact on Armenia's demographics, particularly, the transition to new property ownership policies, new methods of management, and the effects of "market therapy." During this period the natural growth of both urban and rural populations was influenced by these changes, which often having similar influences, at the same time differed with place-specific conditions. Changes taking place in

³⁰⁴ Family and Children in Armenia. A Statistic Collection, Erevan, 2000, p.16 (in Armenian).

social-economic life are connected with distortions of the multi-property and the reproductive structure of economy, the rooting of new economic methods and generally the current process of the market relations, which have left their contradictory impacts, on the whole, process of the population reproduction in Armenia.

Generally, families in Armenia are becoming smaller. The material and social precariousness of much of Armenia's population, including severe polarization, unemployment, low wages, high prices and growth of the republic's socially insecure population have resulted in the dramatic decrease of the birth rate between 1993 and 2002.

Table 29.
Absolute number of births and deaths in the Republic of Armenia
(thousands)³⁰⁵

Years	(thousands)			Deaths
	Total	Births		
		Town	Village	
1970	55,7	31,7	24,0	12,3
1975	62,9	39,4	23,5	15,5
1980	70,3	44,0	26,3	17,1
1985	80,3	49,3	31,0	19,6
1986	81,2	50,1	31,1	19,4
1987	78,5	47,7	30,8	19,7
1988	74,7	47,6	27,1	35,6
1989	75,3	47,9	27,4	20,8
1990	79,9	50,2	29,7	22,0
1991	77,8	48,4	29,4	23,4
1992	70,6	44,0	26,6	25,8
1993	59,0	35,3	23,7	27,5
1994	51,2	30,0	21,2	24,6
1995	48,9	29,1	19,8	24,8
1996	48,1	29,4	18,7	24,9
1997	43,9	26,9	17,0	23,9
1998	39,4	23,8	15,6	23,2
1999	36,5	22,5	14,0	24,1
2000	34,4	21,4	12,3	23,8
2001	32,1	20,3	11,7	24,0
2002	32,2	20,8	11,4	25,3

³⁰⁵ The Population of the USSR, 1987, p.124; The Demographic Yearbook, 1991, p.224 (both in Russian); The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia, 1993-1994, p.15, The Social-economic State of the Republic of Armenia in 1999 (both in Armenian).

CHAPTER NINE A GENERAL PICTURE OF THE DEATH RATE

1. Although death rates in Armenia are rising for some groups, the crude death rate remains one of the lowest in the world

At present time another factor influencing variations in the reduction of the natural growth rate of the republic's population is connected with the increase of the absolute number of the deceased persons, as well as the rise of the death rate. From the mid-1980s the general death rate (per 1,000 population) showed a gradual rise. The death rate rose from 5.4 in 1970 to 6.6 in 1995, reaching 7.9 in 2002.³⁰⁶ These rates were the result of the Spitak earthquake and the undeclared war by the neighbouring republic, as well as the population's age structure and social-economic conditions. For example, in 1985 the absolute number of deceased persons in the republic was 17,100. In 1988 it was 35,600 and in 1993 it was 27,500. After 1994 the death rate stabilized and the average annual constitutes 24,500.

In the 1970s the sharp reduction in mortality resulted in an unprecedented increase in Armenia's population. In 1970 the crude death rate decreased by 3.4 people compared with 1950.³⁰⁷ It means that general number of the population increased so much.

³⁰⁶ The Population of the USSR, 1987, Moscow, 1988, p.38 (in Russian). The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia, 1993-1994, p.14; The Social-economic State of the RA, 2000, p.133; The Social-economic State of the RA, 2002, p.150 (all in Armenian).

³⁰⁷ For the detailed analysis of the problem of the death-rate in the Republic of Armenia see "The Expanded Reproduction of the Population and the Use of the Labour Resources of the Armenian SSR in 1966-1985," vol. 1, p.44-47, vol. 3, p.297-312; V.Khojabekyan, B.Asatryan. The Demographic Aspects of Urbanization in the Armenian SSR, p.151-171; V.Khojabekyan, Yu.Vase, R.Shefer. The Demographic Problems and the Reproduction of Labour Resources, Erevan, 1983, p.48-52 (all in Russian). V.Khojabekyan. The Modern Problems of the Reproduction of the Population and Labour Resources of the Armenian SSR, Erevan, 1976, p.37-46; V.Khojabekyan, V.Tovmasyan. The Death-rate of the Population of the Armenian SSR and Its Regional Specifics, - "Lraber of the Social Sciences," 1988, N11, p.3-15; V.Khojabekyan, V.Tovmasyan. The Changes and Specifics of the natural Movement of the Population of the Republic of Armenia, - "Economics," 1993, N 3-4, p.3-16 (all in Armenian).

Thus, one of the important factors of the growth of the population of Armenia was the reduction of the mortality. It resulted in prolongation of life expectancy owing to which the natural growth of the population took place slower than would prompt the birth rate.

Since 1970 until now Armenia has been characterized as a country with the lowest death rate in the world. This has been explained by the youth's high and old persons' low shares in the general number of population and relatively good level of the health service. However the crude death rate, as a rule, gives little idea about mortality in the different areas of the country or economic regions, or insight into and the natural growth of the population. For example, a high death-rate per 1,000 population may be the result of two factors: the relatively high share of old persons (as an expression of longevity does not have an essential influence on life expectancy) or the high death rate of infants and young persons. The latter has a considerable impact on the natural growth of the population, as well as life expectancy.

2. Infantile mortality

Since the 1990s the crude mortality rate of Armenia has started to resemble that of other developed countries. A slight increase in crude mortality was accompanied by a reduction in infant and juvenile mortality. Changes in Armenia's population structure occurred not only because of a decline in infant mortality, but also because of an increase of life expectancy. In 1970 the infant mortality rate was approximately 25.5 per 1,000 born. By 1990 that number had fallen to 18.6. In 2002 it was 13.4.

Table 30.
Death rate of infants under one year in Armenia in 1970-2002
(per 1,000 births)³⁰⁸

Years	Infant mortality rate	
	Girls	Boys
1970	25	26
1975	28	32
1980	25	28
1985	24	26
1990	16	20
1995	13	16
1996	14	17
1997	13	17
1998	13	16
1999	13.4	17.2
2000	13.6	17.4
2001	12.3	17.5
2002	10.8	15.6

In comparison, the infant mortality rate in Armenia was much lower than in Central Asiatic countries. For example, in 1999 the infant mortality rate for Turkmenistan was 25.4. In Kirghizia the infant mortality rate was 22.7, in Kazakhstan - 20.7, in Uzbekistan - 20.2, in Tajikistan -19.4, in Armenia -18.6, in Moldova -18.2, in Georgia 17.9, in the Russian Federation -16.9, in Ukraine -12.8, in Byelorussia 11.5. The average statistical death-rate constituted 17.1 per 1,000 newborn infants in the USSR. It was very low in the Baltic republics. In 2002 the death rate constituted 15.6 infants in Armenia, including 13.6 girls and 17.4 boys.

The lowest infant mortality was registered in Japan. In 1986 under one-year-old mortality per 1,000 newborn infants constituted 5 in Japan, 6 - in Sweden, 7 - in Switzerland, 8 - in Netherlands, France and GFR, 9 - in GDR.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁸ "The Women and Men of Armenia." A Statistic Collection, Erevan, 1999, p.20; The Social-economic State of the Republic of Armenia in 2002, p.146 (both in Armenian).

³⁰⁹ "The National Economy of the USSR in 1988. A Statistic Yearbook", Moscow, 1989, p.663; A Collection: "10 Years of CIS (1991-2000)", Intergovernmental Statistic Committee of CIS, M., 2001, p.109 (both in Russian).

Research of the death rate of the population of the Republic of Armenia allows us to say that the main reasons of infantile mortality can be divided into several groups of childhood diseases; respiratory diseases, infectious diseases, gastrointestinal diseases, perinatal deaths (see table 31).

Table 31.

Infantile mortality (under 1 year) in 1985-1998
(percentage of total deaths)³¹⁰

	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1996	1998
Total deceased	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Respiratory	43.4	25.7	23.5	26.3	25.9	21.8	17.1
Gastrointestinal	2.2	1.2	1.9	1.6	0.8	0.1	-
Birth defects	10.6	13.9	15.3	12.5	12.1	12.2	18.1
Perinatal ³¹¹	22.5	32.8	34.1	30.7	35.6	46.0	47.6
Accidents - Poisoning/ traumas	3.7	3.1	3.8	4.5	3.7	2.8	1.7
Infectious	15.4	19.6	17.7	20.6	17.0	11.5	11.7
Other diseases	2.2	3.7	3.7	5.8	4.9	5.6	3.8

The low level of the infantile mortality in Armenia is conditioned also by such a specific factor as the stability of conjugal ties. The divorce rate per 1,000 population of the Republic of Armenia is the lowest one in the world. In 1970-1995 the divorce rate varying around 1, in 1996-1997 around 0.5, in 1998 it was 0.4, in 2002 it was 0.5. The general number of the divorced persons constituted 4,347 in 1990 and 1,683 in 2002. In 1990 the average divorce rate in the USSR was 3.3, the highest divorce rate (4 people) was registered in Latvia.

As a rule married couples that have fewer children divorce earlier. A considerable number of divorced people marry for the second and even third time. Families with many children are stable. This is explained by different reasons. For example, notwithstanding

³¹⁰ Calculations are based on the data of "The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia" contained in "The Collection of 1993-1994" (p.18) and the current statistic data.

³¹¹ The perinatal period includes the period from the second week of pregnancy until the 7th day of the newborn.

their bad relations, married couples discuss their problems and after some time forgive injuries and decide in favour of the family's stability. Parents always think that after getting divorced and married again their children would stay under "the care" of a step-mother or a step-father. After all senses they come to a reasonable solution based on the idea not to leave children without their own parents. Parents feel more freedom in their future actions if there is one or no child in the family. The tense labour routine of mothers also secures large families against divorce. In such families their labour hours together with the social workday continues at home. In addition to household chores the child care and upbringing is also a mothers' duty. Such women are rather out of the large social community and spend more time in their everyday family life.

Together with the preservation of national and historically formed traditions, the real reasons of comparatively small number of divorces in the Republic of Armenia are the social environment, wedding ceremonies, and a desire to beget a child soon after getting married, a moderate use of spirits and smoking by youth, particularly, young women. Spirits and smoking not only have a negative effect on the newborn infant but are disastrous for families. The use of alcohol results in family quarrels and makes parents indifferent to the care of their children, as well as feeling of the conjugal liability, bringing to a more resolute decision to get divorced.

It is known that diseases and deaths of the children of divorced women or of those who live out of marital intercourse, because of the unregulated life and excesses of their mothers, as a rule, are more by 20-25% than in stabile families. The differences are more vivid as regards accidents, the diseases of cardiovascular system and digestive apparatus. In the absence of marital relations or their interruption the mortality of the mature age people, as well as infants rises. The family researches show that the infantile mortality is higher among those who were born out of marital relations or whose parents were divorced.

Because of emigration the number of divorces has also increased, although the Armenian people used to have one of the lowest levels of divorce in the world. This is explained by the fact

that Armenian families have traditionally been large because of numerous children.

3. Life expectancy

The high specific weight of the aged in the population structure results as in the high death rate, as well as the change of the character of diseases and the age structure of deceased people. Until the end of the 1980s the number of the "old" population was considerably low in the total number of the republic's population compared with the capitalistic countries of Western Europe and the republics of the European part of the USSR. That's why the crude death rate in those countries was 9-13, but they were characterized by the low infantile mortality.³¹² Meanwhile, high mortality was first of all conditioned by the high infantile mortality rate in developing countries, because the "old" population constituted there a lower percentage, than in Armenia. Compared to developing countries Armenia was characterized by a lower infantile mortality rate. The reduction of the death rate on one pole of the age groups predetermined its rise on the other pole of the population in Armenia. It also reflected on other indices including the birth rate, as well as life expectancy of the population.

The reduction of the infant mortality (which results in the life expectancy's prolongation) after some time brings about a shift in the age structure of the population in favour of the aged. When the infant mortality is high, the high birth rate is accompanied by high death-rate and "the ranks of people decrease not attained their old age", because of insufficient living standard and the lack of medical care in the countries with low level of the development of productive forces.

This is why the share of the aged declines in the general number of the population (and consequently in the death rate). The number of the aged people is very small in such countries. Meanwhile, the increase of the population's life expectancy results in the increase of the specific weight of the aged in the general number of the deceased.

In 1986-1987 the Armenian SSR had the highest life expectancy in the USSR owing to the low infant mortality. The

averaged life expectancy was 69.8 years (65.8 for men and 73.8 for women) in the USSR, while in the Armenian SSR it was 73.9 years (71.0 for men and 76.2 for women).

Life expectancy is the average total number of years which a person of a given age could be expected to live, if the rates of mortality at each age were those experienced in that year.³¹³ The death rates of different age groups will determine the crude mortality rate of the total population. Life expectancy is not influenced by age structure differences.

The life expectancy in Armenia is presented in the following table.

Table 32.

Life expectancy in Armenia, 1958-2001³¹⁴

Years	Town		Village		Total	
	women	men	women	men	women	men
1958-1959	70	66	72	68	71	67
1969-1970	---	---	---	---	75	70
1979-1980	76	70	76	69	76	69
1989	73	68	74	68	75	69
1990	73	68	75	68	73	67
1991	---	---	---	---	76	69
1992	75	68	76	69	75	69
1993	74	68	74	68	74	68
1994	75	68	75	69	75	68
1995	76	68	76	70	76	69
1996	76	69	76	70	76	69
1997	77	70	77	70	77	70
1998	78	71	78	71	78	70
1999	75	70	76	71	75,5	70
2000					75,4	70
2001					75,9	71

The highest life expectancy for female was registered in Latvia in 1986-1987. It was 76,6 years for women. In 1990 the life

³¹³ UK 2004. National Statistics. The Official Yearbook of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, London, 2004, Glossary, p.505.

³¹⁴ "The Family and Children in Armenia". A Statistic Collection. Erevan, 2000, p.14; "The Social-economic State in the RA in 2000," p.146 (both in Armenian).

³¹² "The National Economy of the USSR, 1988," p.659 (in Russian).

expectancy was 69.2 years (64.2 for men and 73.8 for women) in the USSR, 70.4 years (67.4 for men and 73.3 for women) in Armenia, as the second in the USSR. In 2001 the life expectancy was about 75.9 years for women and 71.0 years for men. Meanwhile, the lowest rate of life expectancy was registered in the Central Asiatic republics (particularly, in Turkmenistan).

4. Territorial, gender and age peculiarities of mortality

Researches on territorial variations of the population of Armenia show that the gap between death rates of the urban and rural populations was narrowing in 2000. In 1990 the death rate of the rural population of the republic was greater by 10-15% than in the urban areas (in 1990 it was accordingly 6.7 and 6.0 per mil). In 1993-1994 these rates were almost equal. In former times differences were mainly conditioned by higher social-economic and cultural development, more favourable labour and life conditions, as well as young age structure (replenished also by the rural youth) in urban areas as compared with rural areas.

The death rate was seriously influenced by the Spitak earthquake of 1988 in different regions. The death rate sharply rose in the zone of the earthquake.

It was natural that the earthquake's negative after-effects on the death-rate were also felt during the following years. This was caused by a rise of psychological tension and the growth of the death rate due to physical severe injuries and other factors.

Researches on infant mortality in Armenia bring out the following peculiarity. Before the disaster of 1988 infant mortality always was lower in the towns and cities of the republic than in rural areas. This was also connected with the low level of the services sector, particularly, in medical care in rural areas. Differences were greater in the public health sector, especially medical care for women in childbirth and children. However, from the end of 1988 the infant mortality in urban areas of the republic prevailed over the infant mortality of the rural areas. This was a direct consequence of the earthquake, together with geographic (the strongest blow of the disaster fell on the urban population), economic (first of all were

reconstructed the rural areas because they demanded small expenses and short terms of construction) and moral-psychological (viability of the rural population) reasons. The situation worsened also because of the hard social-economic conditions especially in the republic's urban areas. It is illustrated by changes in the structure of infant mortality. Currently 50% of deaths in infants occur as perinatal mortality. Serious shortcomings in the system of preventive health care, the tense moral-psychological state of the population, the rise of problems of common character and insufficient quality of food from the end of the 1980s resulted in the high level of the death rate caused by infectious and bacterial diseases. However, since 1993 the crude death rate has had a trend to decrease.³¹⁵

The death rate of men compared with women was higher in the republic's population. In 1980-1981 the death rate of men was 5.9 and the death rate of women was 4.9 people. In 1990 they were accordingly 7.24 and 5.91. In 2001 they were accordingly 8.5 and 7.3. It follows that with the general rise of mortality, the difference between death rates of men and women rose from 1 in 1980, to 1.33 in 1990 and reached 1.2 in 2002.³¹⁶ This phenomenon occurred mainly as a consequence of the complexity of the work and social activity of men, as well as the influence of some inner and outer negative factors on their organism. In recent times the burden was on the male muscular system. Later the neuropsychological tension of their organism increased. That is why the structure of the death causes of men has changed. Fatal cases resulting from accidents and traumas yielded to so-called generative diseases: cardiovascular collapse, hypertension, etc. Currently the labour burden again falls on muscular system, especially in rural areas because work is done mostly by hand.

The vital capacity of women as compared with men is higher because of genetic peculiarities too. Women are more enduring to

³¹⁵ V.Khojabekyan, V.Tovmasyan. The Changes and Specifics of the Natural Movement of the Population of the Republic of Armenia, - "Economics," 1993, N3-4, p.3-16 (in Armenian).

³¹⁶ The Population of the USSR, 1987, p.338; A Demographic Yearbook, 1991, p.26 (both in Russian); The Social-Economic State of the RA in 2000, p.133, The Social-Economic State of the RA in 2000, p.150 (both in Armenian).

unfavourable conditions of life. Difference in the death rate of different sexes is observed from the first year of life during which 20-25% more boys die than girls. Global statistics testify that the birth rate of boys outnumbers the birth rate of girls in almost all countries. During the second or third year of life the number of boys and girls is leveled because of high mortality. From 1970 until the present (per 1,000 live births) 3-4 more boys died than girls in Armenia. For example, in 2000 8.9 girls and 11.3 boys were born per 1,000 population. Meanwhile the death rate of children under the age of five years was 12.9 for girls and 18.4 for boys.

The highest difference between the death rates of men and women is evident in the 16 to 30 age group. This is connected with the mortality of men caused by traumas, accidents and bad conditions of work. It is not a secret that mainly men are occupied in dangerous and hot shops, outdoor and underground works. The mortality of men is high also in the age group from 50 to 60. Men of that age die mainly because of diseases of circulation of the blood, respiratory tract and tumors.

5. Causes of mortality and seasonality of death

There is a rise in death rates of the elderly in developing countries, as fewer children die in infancy and life expectancy increases. Thus the death rates of elderly persons can be seen to contribute more significantly to the crude death rate as infant mortality falls (see table 33).

Table 33.
The death rate of the population according to the classification of the causes of death (mortality per 100,000 people)³¹⁷

	1990	1992	1993	1995	1998	2000	2002
All causes	620.4	700.7	736.9	660.9	661.6	627	788.6
(including tumor diseases) Tumors	99.9	99.1	96.1	91.9	101.1	104.7	131.7
Circulation of the blood	305.9	360.6	390.5	358.0	325.0	344.8	432.4
Respiratory tract	50.3	45.9	44.9	42.6	32.2	35.9	45.2
Digestive apparatus	21.1	24.1	27.8	23.8	21.6	21.5	30.6
Accidents, poisonings traumas	55.6	69.3	62.8	45.4	34.9	28.6	33.4
Infectious and bacterial	13.0	14.5	11.0	9.4	8.0	6.8	7.6
Other causes	74.6	87.2	103.8	89.8	138.8	84.9	107.7

Causes of death differ sharply by age group. This is especially true at the extremities of the age structure of the population. The main causes of death of in the Republic of Armenia are diseases of circulation of the blood (more than 50%) tumors (more than 15%), diseases of the respiratory tract as well as accidents. Compared with other causes of death, which had only a slight trend of decrease in 1990-2002, deaths caused by the diseases of circulation of the blood and tumors have been increasing. From 1980 deaths caused by the

³¹⁷ The Statistic Yearbook of Armenia, 1993-1994, p.19; The Social-economic State of the RA in 2000, p.135; The Social-economic State of the RA in 2002, p.150 (in Armenian). As may be seen, calculations are done on the basis of the resident population per 100,000 people. It is not so correct because a considerable portion of the resident population is in emigration. Meanwhile the number of deceased persons is less in reality. It will be correct to present the absolute number of deceased persons. The mortality of population, according to these data, in 2002 constituted 25,315 including infectious bacterial (247), tumors (4,230), the system of circulation of the blood (13,882), respiratory tract (1,453), digestive apparatus (982), accidents, poisonings, traumas (1,073), suicides (77), murders (69).

diseases of respiratory tract (77 per 100,000 in 1987, 50.3 per 100,000 in 1990, 45.2 per 100,000 in 2002) decreased. This decrease is connected mainly with circumstances resulting in the lowering of atmospheric pollution. The number of consumptive patients increased. Prevention of tuberculosis demands a greater apportionment of limited funds appropriated for public health.

On the other hand, these specificities in the structure of mortality were accompanied by a regularity observed in the seasonality of mortality caused by the energetic crises which originated in the 1990s. The change of the mortality's intensity depending on seasons testifies clearly to the limited means of the society to protect human life of the negative influences of environment. The interseasonal type of mortality was reflected in a transition from the summer death cases to their accumulation in winter. From 1988 to 2002 death rate was higher in winter than during other seasons in the Republic of Armenia.³¹⁸ This index grew a little mainly with regard to Erevan where the mortality was high especially in winter months owing to the climatic conditions.

Due to the sharpening of the social-economic tension and as a result of conditions of life in rural areas in the Republic of Armenia it may be supposed that for the years immediately these differences ahead will grow and, on the whole, the trend of the mortality's accumulation will be intensified, i.e. the transition to the interseasonal type still will not take place.

From the seasonal point of view the same picture of the age structure of mortality and the structure of diseases, with slight differences, is observed also in some regions of the republic. In fact, until the beginning of 1990 had been formed almost the same situation of the mortality, which is specific for the countries with average economic development and life expectancy.

During last years, the trend of a growth of the death-rate of population in Armenia which will continue also in the nearest future is determined by three groups of factors: 1. Socio-economic, 2. Political and 3. Demographic.

The first and second groups of factors are reflected in the worsening of conditions of life, the third group is reflected in the changes of the age structure - the increase of the aged in the population of the Republic of Armenia at the present stage of the demographic development. On the whole, a reduction of the absolute number of the infantile mortality and the infantile mortality in the first year of life has not been a result of improvement of the public health service and consumer service. These data do not reflect a real picture of the infantile mortality, as many infant deaths in the first year of life are not registered.

³¹⁸ V.Khojabekyan, B.Asatryan, Op. cit.

PART FIVE
THE PRESENT STAGE OF MIGRATION AND
THE REDUCTION OF POPULATION

CHAPTER TEN
THE CHARACTER AND TYPES OF MIGRATION

Mobility is a peculiar feature of population, in which people move from one location to another with the purpose of working or living. In international literature these movements are defined by the term "migration", which is of a Latin origin (*migration*) and means an administrative-territorial displacement, resettlement or migration. Migration is also a specific feature of many other species of the animal kingdom, especially birds that form flocks and fly to warmer countries and then return.

The migration of population may be within a state, as well out of it. As we have noticed, migration within Armenia was expressed by movements between villages and towns and cities, within towns and villages or to external territories. Outer movements included many kinds of displacements of population from one country to another.

This may be due to differences between levels of economic, social, natural geographic (climate, relief, cleanness of urban-industrial environment) biological self-reproduction and spiritual development, favorable and unfavorable conditions of life, vital activities of the population and other factors.

The voluntary migration of population usually takes place usually under the influence of foregoing factors. Mostly it has a limited character. Meanwhile, during wars, natural disasters, ethnic conflicts, massacres, religious persecutions, forceful economic recessions and crises, pollution of the environment, and other causes of emergency character, forced migrations or resettlements become dominant. In this regard, forced migrations or deportations were specific features of the movements of Armenian population. During last centuries mass movements were a constant characteristic of the population of Armenia. Only during the 20th century did many forced

migrations fell to the share of the Armenian people. The most tragic was during World War I as a result of the Genocide committed by the Turkish barbarians in Western Armenia and their follow-up disastrous raids in Eastern Armenia. This period was then followed by migrations during years of civil war and collectivization, during the repressions of 1937 and 1949, after the Spitak earthquake (1988) and during genocidal actions against Armenians in Azerbaijan (from 1988).

At the beginning of the 1920s Eastern Armenia was flooded by masses of refugees. This was also a period when the process of repatriation of Armenians started, which began at a large scale in the 1930-1940s. In the 1920s the League of Nations founded the office of the General Commissariat in Armenia (as well as in Russia) under the direction of Fridtjof Nansen with the purpose of helping migrants. During 1925-1928 the Commissariat provided great help to refugees, organized resettlements in the territory of the republic, and helped them with to find employment in agricultural sector. Forced migration received an incentive after the collapse of the Soviet Union. All Armenians were deported from the places of their permanent residence in Azerbaijan, forced by genocidal, military and other compulsive methods at the cost of heavy human losses. A part of the Armenian population of Mountainous Karabakh together with the Armenians from the border areas also had to emigrate. Ranks of the refugees were replenished partially by the Armenians from Central Asia, the North Caucasus and Georgia.

In wide sense, the problem of the migration can be discussed in special literature with relation to four aspects: irretrievable, seasonal, pendular and causal.

The irretrievable migration is a territorial replacement from one place of residence to another, which is accompanied necessarily by the change of permanent residence. The migrant registers his/her departure from permanent residence and gets registered in the new place of residence.

Over the centuries irretrievable migration has been a permanent phenomenon for Armenia. Because of many factors (earthquakes, wars, the aggression of neighbouring states and invasions of nomadic tribes, epidemics and etc.) in the course of centuries (especially the last tragic centuries) a part of the population

of Armenia was dispersed throughout the world and to almost all continents, as new communities were founded in many countries.

World War I was a critical moment in the history of the Armenian Diaspora when hundreds of thousands of Armenians barely escaped the Genocide and took refuge in different corners of the world. After the horrors of the Genocide the largest part of the cradle of the Armenians, Western Armenia with its three-million population turned into a small community located in Constantinople. Once densely populated areas of Eastern Armenia (Utik, Nakhijevan, Javakhk and others) were annexed by foreign states, either completely lost their native Armenian population or suffered severe violations and injustice. From 1988 the Armenian community of Azerbaijan was subject to genocidal horrors and actions.

The irretrievable migration from the peripheric mountainous and rural areas resulted in an unprecedented growth of the urban population, as well as the number of plainsmen.

During decades the population of the Armenian SSR increased as a result of immigration of the Armenian population (especially of the youth) from the neighbouring republics.

Seasonal migration includes mainly the able-bodied population. In this type of migration people leave their permanent residences for other places for short periods of time. After the season is finished they return home. During the period of the 1970-1980s thousands of young Armenians from the Armenian SSR were involved in the process of seasonal migration. Since the beginning of the 1990s until now this process has become more and more obvious. Many Armenians still migrate seasonally to perform seasonal employment in other countries.

Pendular migration includes the movement (the departure and arrival of workers or students) of a labour force between neighbouring inhabited localities. For example, every day hundreds of thousands of workers, students, the sellers of agricultural products and others come to Erevan or other towns and cities of the republic and then return home. For the same reasons many town-dwellers leave for the neighbouring regions. The same is observed between regional centers, towns and rural inhabited localities.

Causal migration includes persons leaving their permanent residence for different reasons: business trips, medical treatment in health centers or holiday homes and going to the country. Formerly

this form of migration included those who were leaving for summer resorts, health centers, holiday homes, pioneer camps, business trips, short-term studies and etc. From the 1990s causal migration involved mainly those who during those years, left the republic for winter resorts, far and near foreign trade, business trip, medical treatment and rest in health centers or holiday homes of the republic. As is noticed, this form of migration is more complex than other forms and is characteristic of all social-demographic groups, and age groups.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

DIRECTIONS OF THE STREAMS OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

1. The migration processes with distant foreign countries

Intensive movements of the population, together with natural growth, had an essential impact on the process of its reproduction from the positive and negative point of view and influencing the formation of the indices of the birth rate and death rate. Every time it was determined by the reproductive behavior of migrants as regards the local population, the sex and age structure, directions of the streams, social-economic conditions and other factors.

Before the collapse of the Soviet system the Armenian SSR was connected with the far and near foreign countries by means of the migration of the population. Movements of population between the Soviet republics in post-Soviet period transferred into migrations between independent republics.

External movements of the population are related directly to the formation of the international labour market, as well as the deepening of the process of economic, political, cultural integration on the global scale. On the one hand, it is expressed by the forms of intergovernmental relations in the world economy, on the other hand, immigration and emigration of the population in each country.

During a long period of time, from the 1920s until the end of the 1970s and then in 1988-1991 immigration prevailed the interstate migration processes of the Armenian SSR with foreign countries. Together with a high natural growth of the population it had a positive impact on the process of its growth. Formerly immigration

had almost a voluntary character. Armenians repatriated from foreign countries for preservation of their ethnic identity. They immigrated to Armenia also from neighbouring Soviet republics for studies and work. After the USSR's collapse began the process of Armenians' repatriation as a result of forceful displacements and deportation. There appeared a great number of refugees in Armenia.

Chronologically the processes of the external migration of the Armenian population are divided into several stages.

The first stage included the years of World War I when on the one hand refugees escaping the extermination committed by Turks in Western Armenia hurried to Eastern Armenia, on the other hand, a part of them together with the local people of other nationalities sought refuge in other countries.

The second stage included the 1920s when many dispersed Armenians repatriated to Armenia. People of other nationalities (who were forced to leave Armenia during the Turkish aggression in 1918-1920) also returned back. The consolidation of the Armenian intellectuals in the Armenian SSR from foreign countries, as well as other republics of the USSR was also a peculiar feature of that time.

The third stage included the 1930s.

The fourth stage had a mass character and it began after World War II, including the period from 1946 until the mid-1960s. Until the end of the 1970s it lost its mass character.

The fifth stage began with 1979 and it was a period of the external migration which was dictated by social-economic factors. It was often interlaced with political reasons and sometimes it was a way to escape the state persecutions (State Security Committee). From the very beginning there was no mass emigration of the population from Armenia. It was not encouraged by the state. Moreover, the state carried out a policy of forbidding the emigration.

The sixth stage of the external migration with Armenia began at the beginning of the 1980. The number of emigrating and immigrating people is balanced to some extent; moreover, immigration sometimes outnumbered emigration resulting in the slightest positive balance of the general migration.

From the second half of the 1980s the external migration with Armenia entered its seventh stage when many Armenians immigrated.

Nowadays the eighth stage is in the process. The specific feature of this stage is the following: since 1992 an unprecedented

increase of the emigrating population has been displayed constantly to the far and near foreign countries resulting in a misbalance and the increase of the negative balance and quantity of the external migration of the population.³¹⁹

During the years of the Soviet system the emigration from Armenia to the distant foreign countries reached its zenith in 1987-1989 (see table 34).

Table 34.
The migration dynamics of the population of the Armenian SSR during 1980-1991 (thousands)³²⁰

Years	Immigrated			Emigrated		
	Total	including		Total	including	
		from other republics of the USSR	from the far foreign countries		to other republics of the USSR	to the far foreign countries
average annual in 1980-1982	15,2	14,3	0,9	18,5	16,1	2,4
average annual in 1983-1986	22,7	22,0	0,7	30,4	29,5	0,9
1987	32,9	32,3	0,6	43,3	37,3	6,0
1988	30,0	18,5	1,5	48,1	35,4	12,7
1989	29,4	28,6	0,8	37,0	28,0	9,0
1990	17,6	16,9	0,7	19,9	13,6	6,3
1991	23,0	22,3	0,7	20,0	12,4	7,6

³¹⁹ These problems were discussed also in V.Khojabekyan, Migration in Armenia; V.Khojabekyan. Migration processes in Armenia. - "Migration," Moscow, 1997, N4, p.29-32 (in Russian).

³²⁰ These and further calculations were made on the basis of the National Statistic Committee of the Republic of Armenia. Table neither reflects the number of migrants whose directions of migration had not been known, nor expresses the processes of the Armenia's migration with Azerbaijan that took place from 1988. Together with it, these data do not reflect correctly the real situation because they include only those who registered their departure and got registered again. Later we shall see that everything is quite different. Particularly, it concerns the migration processes with the counties of CIS, because the borders are open, entrance is free, the passport regime has been weakened and as a consequence most of migrants are left out of the registration in the border checkpoints.

From 1988 many Armenians were deported from different regions of the Azerbaijan SSR and took temporary refuge in the Armenian SSR. During 1989-1990 many of them emigrated from the Armenian SSR. The most of them did not get residence permit in the Armenian SSR, because of various obstacles coming from the centers of the USSR with the purpose of their return. Later, as we shall see, the emigration's wave included also the permanent population of Armenia.

Thus, the official data concerning the emigrating population from the Armenian SSR must be generalized on the basis of tens of thousands of refugees who first, without any obstacle, settled in other republics of the USSR, mostly in the RSFSR, and then emigrated abroad, as well as hundreds of thousands of the permanent residents of the Armenia.

2. Migration between the Soviet republics

As we have noticed, a positive balance was a characteristic feature of the migration processes of Armenia with other Soviet republics. However, from the 1980s till the events of 1988 the emigrants outnumbered the immigrants. During 1990-1991, as a consequence of aggravated international relations, a positive balance of the population's migration again characterized Armenia, even if migration with Azerbaijan is not taken into account.

Initially, the affluxes of the positive balance of the migration with Armenia together with the republics of Azerbaijan and Georgia started from the RSFSR and, partially, Ukraine. Armenians came from Russia (mainly from the North Caucasus, particularly, New Nakhijevan, and the Black Sea's coasts) to Armenia for the purpose of continuing studies, as well as to settle in the Motherland. At the same time, many young Armenians left Armenia for continuing studies in big teaching and educational centers of the RSFSR and Ukraine. On graduation from Universities and Institutes they were appointed to any establishment or institution of the USSR as specialists. Some returned home, not many continued their education

being admitted as post-graduates or entering the high qualification courses. Anyhow, in the course of time the positive balance of migration with other republics changed into negative for Armenia (see table 35).

From the mid-1970s started seasonal employment from the Armenian SSR to the RSFSR and Ukraine. It played a crucial role in the questions of changes of the sizes, directions and character of the migration of population between the Armenian SSR and other Soviet republics. Seasonal migration was conditioned by some factors.

Table 35.
The migration of the population of the Armenian SSR with other republics of the USSR (1980-1987)³²¹

Republics	immigrated		emigrated	
	Total	from urban built-up areas to Arm. SSR, in total (%)	Total	from Arm. SSR urban built-up areas, in total (%) ³²²
Russia	53,4	79.0	90,2	70.5.
Ukraine	10,6	87.1	15,4	79.6
Uzbekistan	2,0	78.9	2,9	69.0
Byelorussia	1,1	81.6	1,7	80.7
Kazakhstan	2,7	70.7	3,3	56.5
Georgia	17,0	84.4	12,0	73.2
Azerbaijan	27,2	77.7	27,9	42.3
Lithuania	0,2	82.6	0,5	72.0
Moldovia	1,6	94.3	1,5	92.8
Latvia	0,4	85.5	0,8	80.9
Kirghizia	0,3	85.1	0,4	76.8
Tajikistan	0,4	84.7	0,4	75.7
Turkmenistan	0,9	79.0	1,2	62.4
Estonia	0,3	81.6	0,5	82.5
Total	118,		158,7	

³²¹ Table is compiled on the current statistic data. Table 35 neither includes those migrants whose migration directions had not been known, nor those who had left for seasonal employment.

³²² The difference falls on the share of rural inhabited localities.

First, this historic stage coincided with an unprecedented growth of the number of the full legal age group of the population. Indeed, during the 1976-1980s there were 20,000 more people became of the legal age, ready for labour activity in three-million Armenia than in sixteen-million GDR. Meanwhile, governing bodies of the republic, solving the perspective planning problems of the national economy, as usual, proceeded from the demands of that time, neglecting the forthcoming situation.

Second, people employed in housekeeping and personal subsidiary plots applied for work in the state and collective farms. Meanwhile, in the 1970s employment was down in the state farms.

These two moments resulted in a serious problem when the supply of a great number of the republic's population (70/72,000 youths and girls annually became of the full legal age, ready for labour activity, as well as scores of men and women were vacated of housekeeping and personal subsidiary plots), who had a desire to work in the state farms, exceeded a demand for new employments. This contradiction resulted in seasonal employment.

Third, those who looked for seasonal employment left Armenia for the RSFSR (particularly, the North Caucasus, Ural and Siberia), Ukraine and Byelorussia. At that time more new employments were created in those regions than their labour resources could supply. For years new employments remained not demanded. Seasonal employees from Armenia were mainly employed in construction, principally agricultural construction. It is necessary to note that the demand for labour force was a false one in those republics. Low planned programs and an illusion of "the securing of full employment" served as an excuse for such phenomenon.

Fourth, material interest played a certain role based on the method of a brigade lease contract for organization of construction work in the regions of seasonal employment. It was an effective means of stimulation, because workers were paid for the fulfilled works according to the contract concluded beforehand.

Thus, because of the simultaneity of these four factors seasonal employment that originated at the beginning of the 1970s

gradually widened and reached yearly the scores of thousands people for whom it became an habit, then turning into an indication of the irretrievable migration. There were founded streets and quarters inhabited by Armenians in many places of seasonal employment.

As before, as well in the 1970s the intensive process of the emigration of the Armenian population continued. There were various reasons. A decisive role belonged to the agricultural overpopulation in Azerbaijan and Georgia, availability of employment in urban areas of Armenia at the beginning of the 1980s, as well as secret and open displays of the policy of discrimination against the Armenian population in Azerbaijan which also forced the urban population to move. The permanent source of emigration from Azerbaijan and Georgia were young people leaving for the purpose of getting education in Armenia. On graduation from University and Institutes many of them did not go back to Azerbaijan and Georgia. Moreover, getting employed and housed they created certain conditions for their families to resettle in Armenia. However, during 1984-1985 the movement of population with Azerbaijan created a negative balance for Armenia, because the number of Azerbaijanis emigrating from Armenia slightly increased, but then in 1986-1987 rather decreased, slightly outnumbering the immigrants. According to the census of 1989, of 1,000 Armenian inhabitants of Armenia 869 were born in Armenia, 91 were born in Georgia and 82 were born in Azerbaijan,³²³ of 1,000 Armenians living in the USSR 559 were born in Armenia, 69 were born in the RSFSR, 114 were born in Georgia, 132 were born in Azerbaijan.³²⁴ It testifies also to the intensity of the movements of the Armenian population.

From 1988 the national factor dominated in the population's movements between the republics of the USSR. Undoubtedly, as before it played a role in emigration of Armenians and Russians from Azerbaijan to Russia and other places of the USSR. According to the data of the questionnaire interrogation (1991) of the Statistic Committee of the Russian Federation, each third person that was a former USSR citizen that immigrated to Russia and participated in

³²³ "The Demographic Yearbook of 1991", p.326-329 (in Russian).

³²⁴ Ibid.

the public opinion poll cited aggravation of ethnic relations as the cause of emigration from Azerbaijan. 70% of the emigrants from Azerbaijan, 63-65% from Tajikistan and Georgia, 53% from Lithuania, 50-51% from Uzbekistan and Armenia, 46-47% from Latvia and Kirghizia, 36% from Moldova immigrated into Russia for the reasons given above.³²⁵ In 1988-1990, as a result of current events, immigration to Armenia became vivid which included Armenians living in Azerbaijan, Georgia and other republics of the USSR.

3. The population's movements on the eve of the collapse of the USSR

The processes of Armenian migration were greatly influenced by such intermingled incidents of the end of the 1980s and later as genocide committed in Azerbaijan, open international dissensions, military-political events, natural disaster and social-economic tensed situations prompted by other negative phenomena.

They resulted in

1. The mass deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan which began with the Sumgait tragedy of 1988 and later acquired large scale mass character;
2. Emigration of Azerbaijanis from Armenia;
3. Immigration of Armenians from other republics of the USSR to Armenia;
4. Emigration of a part of the Armenian population from the zone of disaster because of the earthquake in Armenia;
5. From the end of 1991 the Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan emigrated from Armenia;
6. Constant emigration of the residents of Armenia.

Movements of population initially resulted in the increase of the number of immigrants in Armenian. In 1988-1990 the number of the deported from Azerbaijan and immigrated population to Armenia

from other places of the USSR was 2,7 times more than the number of the emigrated population from Armenia.

Since 1992 emigration of the Armenian population from Armenia to the far foreign countries has been evident, on the contrary, only a few immigrate. Such course of events, undoubtedly, is explained by the fact that the number of persons wishing to emigrate increase, in spite of the fact that the governments of western countries (particularly, England, Germany, France, Austria, Belgium, Poland, Netherlands, Denmark and others) make certain demands regarding the immigrating population. There are prohibitions (ignorance of language and other reasons) on getting jobs.

The mass migration with the former USSR republics and the far foreign countries was explained by same reasons with the only difference that some persons had enough funds to leave for the far foreign countries but many others, particularly, young people had no means to leave for the Russian Federation or other countries of the CIS. The crime committed on October 27 1999 in the National Assembly (Parliament) of the RA, as well as some other criminalities again made for the increase of the number of the emigrating population.

Which are the reasons of the population's migration, directions of the migration's streams? What was their scale and effect on the total number of the population?

a) Deportation of the Armenians from the Azerbaijan SSR

To say that the genocide and persecutions of ethnic minorities in Soviet Azerbaijan was prompted by the Karabakh movement would be to sin against the truth and the historic reality. The facts testify that the national policy realized by Azerbaijan was the logical continuation of the genocide of the Armenians committed by Turks. Let's not forget that parallel to the genocide committed in Western Armenia the similar crimes of inhuman brutality towards Armenians were also committed in the Armenian populated regions annexed by

³²⁵ "The Labour Market in Russia," Edited by K.Mikulski, Moscow, 1995, p.38 (in Russian).

Azerbaijan as well as in some regions of Eastern Armenia occupied by Turks.

In 1918-1920 the state of the Armenians in Baku, Gandzak (Ganja), Shushi, Nakhijevan and other places was the most unbearable. At that time the Armenian population was brutally massacred in Azerbaijan by the Turkish bands and Musavat gangs. In September 1918 the massacre of the Armenian population of Baku continued three days and nights. Thousands of peaceful, unarmed Armenian inhabitants were killed, captivated during band raids and disappeared completely.

Only times differ. There is no difference between the forms of misanthropy, barbaric and bloodsucker methods put in action with the purpose of genocide and wretched crimes.

In September 1918 the number of those killed during three days of massacre in Baku reached about 30,000,³²⁶ several hundred Armenian women and young girls were raped and kidnapped.³²⁷ Wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters were raped near the dead bodies of the massacred men. Mothers and daughters were raped in the presence of each other. On September 21 1918 "Pravda" informed in an article titled "The Tragedy of Baku": "...The Turkish and Musavat soldiers began the massacre of Armenians in the suburbs of the city - in Ermenikend and Black town, where the Armenian population is completely exterminated. Then massacres spread in the central streets of the city. The streets were swarming with thousands of Turkish soldiers who broke in alarmed and horrified houses, stabbed with daggers, killed by pistols' fire, shot down in the streets and threw down from the upper floors of many-storied buildings.

The next morning the bodies scattered in the streets were gathered and taken away by lorries. The next day the massacre was recommenced."

³²⁶ E.Sargisyan. Turkey and its Aggressive Policy in the Transcaucasus. Erevan, 1964, p.418 (in Armenian).

³²⁷ A.Yapujyan. The Heroic Struggle of Bagu and the Answers to its Defeat, Cairo, 1973, p.120 (in Armenian).

The state and political leaders of Azerbaijan directly inherited the political genocidal course of the Musavat rulers. The genocide realized in Azerbaijan was planned for decades and was dictated by the sinister policy of "Azerbaijan only for Azerbaijanis".³²⁸

This policy was «cherished» by all leaders of Azerbaijan without exception. Not accidentally the correspondent of «Druzhba Narodov» B.Kholopov wrote: «It happened to hear from the former Azerbaijani leaders about the necessity of formation of a unified nation in the republic». ³²⁹ Owing to such policy many nations and nationalities, as well as ethnic groups were assimilated here. They were assimilated by forceful methods, through creation of unfavourable conditions for them, as well as violating constitutional rights of the nation during censuses, falsifying real statistic data and the census itself. Kurds and Talishes, Tats and Lezghins, Daghestanians and Iranians, Tsakhuris and Avars and other national minorities were assimilated in this way.

During the «peaceful» years preceding 1988 it seemed skin-deep that the assimilation of different nationalities and ethnic groups belonging to the same religion was reaching its final stage. Meanwhile, violations committed against national minorities the real were more powerfully unmasked in reality. According to the census of 1926, there were 77,300 Talishes, 41,200 Kurds, 37,300 Lezghins, 28,400 Tats, 19,100 Avars, 15,500 Tsakhuris, 9,500 Persians in Soviet Azerbaijan.³³⁰ Inasmuch as these peoples like Azerbaijanis were characterized by a high natural growth and weak mobility, at present, all of them, on the whole, should number about one million. However, according to the census of 1979, the Azerbaijanis from 1,438,000 in 1926 reached 4,708,800, but the Kurdish, Talish, Persian and Tsakhuri nationalities were not mentioned in the census. The number of the Tat nationality, instead of an increase, lowered from 28,400 in 1926 to 8,800. In 1989 their number was 10,200. As for the Talish nationality, in 1926 their number was 77,300, but in the census of 1979 not a single Talish was mentioned and according

³²⁸ «Druzhba Narodov», 1989, N2, p.184 (in Russian).

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Transcaucasian SFSR in figures, p.6-7 (in Russian).

to the census of 1989 their number was 21,200.³³¹ According to the materials of the census of 1979, there were only 158,000 Lezghins in the Azerbaijan SSR. Either it is an evidence of the assimilation of all these peoples, or during the censuses they were forcibly registered as Azerbaijanis, or there were created such conditions that people of these nationalities changed their national identity.

Historian A. Abbasov, approaching to the problem from this point of view, wrote: "Continuing process of the natural assimilation (is underlined by me-V.Kh.) of the Azerbaijani Kurds entered its final stage still at the end of the 19th century. It is connected with the fact that Kurds by their religion (Muslims), economic traditional way of life (sheep breeding) were very close to Azerbaijanis... At present, in fact, Kurds do not differ from Azerbaijanis by their way of life and culture."³³² A. Abbasov and others³³³ offer such argument for the "scientific basis" to prove, on the one hand, that assimilation of national minorities was a natural phenomenon in Azerbaijan and on the other hand, to reject the fact that assimilation of national minorities was realized by preliminarily elaborated plan, forcibly and with persecutions.

A. Abbasov mentioned that Azerbaijan stood out for the ethnic diversity and it is difficult to determine their number, "because many of them preserving their mother tongue in everyday life, consider themselves Azerbaijanian and accordingly are registered in passports and censuses."³³⁴

According to A. Abbasov "the number of Kurds living in Azerbaijan is not mentioned in the Reference book" of the census of 1979, "perhaps, because of neglect of the trend of their decrease."³³⁵

The national minorities' assimilation in the Azerbaijan SSR was closely interlaced with the use of violence against the Christian population and first of all with the active policy of deportation of the Armenian population from their places of residence. In different

times this policy was realized in different forms. During the years of the cult of the individuality and stagnation they became apparent mainly under the influence of the following causes: violation of national rights, invasion on national dignity, application of discriminative policy, as well as such methods of a premeditated distortion of the natural development of national, social and political processes which had not even been applied in any colonial country during the whole history of colonization.

On account of such "status", Muslim nationalities were compelled to assimilate and Christians to deport, because the attempts to assimilate them were in vain. On numerous occasions if deportation was even externally of a voluntary character, anyhow, at the heart of it was a compulsion. Never a question occurred, how did during nine years, between the censuses of 1970 and the 1979 the number of Azerbaijanis in the Azerbaijan SSR increase 25% (93,000)? At the same time the number of Russians decreased from 510,000 to 475,000 and the number of Armenians decreased from 483,000 to 475,500. However, in reality the numbers of Russians and Armenians decreased more.

Let us also remember some legal offences against Armenians that found expression in the Soviet press.³³⁶ These facts reflect the Azerbaijani leadership's intolerant attitude as well as the Muslim religious fanaticism of not small number of Azerbaijanis towards Armenians before the 1988 "Karabakh events". The total population of Azerbaijan from 6,028,000 in 1979 reached 7,029,000, i.e. during 10 years increased 1,000,000. But during that period, together with Armenians the number of Russians and other national minorities continued to reduce. From 1970 to 1989, i.e. till the events of 1988-1990, tens of thousands Russians left the Azerbaijan SSR.

Before the Sumgait tragedy, the geography of distribution of the Armenian population deported from the Azerbaijan SSR to other republics of the USSR had rather changed, because of the policy of national persecution and discrimination against Armenians. The Armenian refugees, who settled in different regions of the USSR and

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² "Kommunist of Azerbaijan", 1989, N2, p.86 (in Russian).

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Ibid.

³³⁵ Ibid., p.83.

³³⁶ "Izvestiya", 18. 04. 1987, "Selskaya Zhizn" ("The Village Life"), 24.12.1987 (in Russian).

particularly, the North Caucasus, were from Nagorno-Karabakh, Baku, Kirovabad, Shahumyan, Shushi, Shamkhor, Dashkesan and Khanlar.

That was the period of "peaceful" development, when relations with the Armenian and Russian specialists slightly differed, although cautious policy towards them often yielded to violation of their national dignity. Such relation was explained by the great need of specialists in the developing national economy training personnel in the Azerbaijan SSR. Meanwhile, the number of Azerbaijani specialists was very small in the fields of engineering, as well as science, education, public health, culture, arts, architecture and many other intellectual spheres. In accordance with the formation of the Azerbaijani specialists a new policy was used regarding specialists of other nationalities.

Mainly the Armenians became an insurmountable barrier in the way of the creation of "one united nation" and further pan-Turkist plans in Azerbaijan. This is why in order to get rid of the Armenians, sometimes also the Russians, the barbaric methods of ethnic "cleansing" were planned and put into action.

This was the "logical" basis of the immense hatred and hostility towards Armenians that the agent provocateurs in Azerbaijan did their part to flame.

The policy of depriving the Armenian population of its rights, and the pressure and persecution against them, which lasted dozens of years, entered a new stage in 1988 with the Sumgait tragedy, when all methods and forms of genocide were used. The use of weapons in an organized manner against a peaceful, unarmed population - the aged, women and children-made the deportation of the Armenian population inevitable. At the preceding stage of deportation the white genocide was committed without using any weapon. The characteristic feature of the following stage of deportation was the red genocide.

It was a specific way of expression of the policy of genocide, when as a result of genocide the deported people have had no desire to return and settle in former places of residence. Let every normal citizen for a moment imagine himself as an Armenian refugee whose

children were tortured, wife and daughter were gang raped by bandits, publicly treated with contempt, property was plundered, house was set on fire... It would be horrible to experience for the second time such a hellish nightmare. The fact that it was real genocide had been proved by massacres, application of bloody methods of cannibalism, as well as that it was planned and directed from one centre. As a result of deportation the natives were banished from their homeland. The loss of the motherland was a direct consequence of genocide.

During three horrible days of massacre innocent Armenian people were killed. Armenians were tortured, women and young girls were gang raped by bandits in front of one another, publicly treated with contempt, and thrown out of windows. Murderers barbarously played ball with the decapitated heads of their victims. Officially thirty-two people were tortured to death. In reality more women and men were tormented, hundreds were wounded and mutilated.

17,000 Armenians who lived in Sumgait became refugees. They could hardly escape of carnage. Those who were lucky to rich Baku paid dozens of times more to fly away from Azerbaijan. It was a continuation of the genocide of 1915 at the threshold of the 21st century.

Sumgait was a planned experiment as the first step towards a large-scale genocide. Its organizers tried to test the attitude of the central Soviet authorities, legal authorities and media. The experiment passed the examination. The butchers of the Sumgait and subsequent events were passed over, their crime remained in the shadows and it was not defined as brigandage and didn't receive political condemnation. This inspired the butchers and pushed them to commit new crimes.

From February 28, 1988, the Sumgait genocide continued in the streets for three days and nights. If it were not organized from the center, what were the party, state, Soviet and law enforcement authorities doing in Sumgait and nearby Baku? Were they only in the role of observers? Why were disconnected the telephone-lines only of Armenians? Why were specified their addresses? Who made cold steel? Were the Azerbaijani authorities uninformed of these events? Was it a result of the "lack of information" or "complicity"? Perhaps,

both... Further events showed that massacre was organized by a special plan and had one center. The republican and probably central authorities had an active participation in it. Otherwise how is one to explain the conduct of the central Soviet authorities and personally of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR M.Gorbachov expressed in the Sumgait trial and during subsequent events. Was not it intentional to divide the Sumgait case among 10-12 courts?

Sumgait showed that each step of the criminals would remain unpunished, so it was a signal for them that the proper time had come for the extermination and deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan. After Sumgait, M.Gorbachov expressed an "anxiety" for the Armenian population's fate in Azerbaijan. Indeed, was it an "anxiety" or "nervousness" and perhaps a threat, it is difficult to say today. But one thing is clear that his "anxiety" was understood quite well in Azerbaijan.

Yes, subsequent developments in Azerbaijan ripened, protected by the hushing up of the Sumgait genocide by the central Soviet authorities and personally M.Gorbachov by "not noticing" the gradual escalation of the ethnic cleansing in Azerbaijan and by the policy of their false "justification".

Sumgait gave birth to the deportations, which in the course of time greatly expanded and got bloody and barbaric character. The genocide of Armenians in Azerbaijan and their deportations after Sumgait included several stages³³⁷. Each new stage of genocide

³³⁷ Some publications reveal the deportation of the Armenian population from Soviet Azerbaijan on the basis of rich materials. The authors describe the process of the genocide in the Armenian-populated areas of the Azerbaijan SSR, apply to the texts the lists of victims in all inhabited localities (Sumgait, Baku, Kirovabad, Nagorno-Karabakh, Shushi, Hadrut, Khanlar, Shahumyan, etc.), as well as write about the social-economic consequences of the aggression and bombardment of Nagorno-Karabakh (see I.Movsesova. Vandalism in Baku, Erevan, 1991; I.Movsesova. Armenians in Baku. Way of Life, Erevan, 1998, both in Russian; V.Khojabekyan. "Artsakh at the Hour of Test", Erevan, 1991; L.Melik-Shakhnazaryan. The Military Crimes of Azerbaijan against the Peaceful Population of the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, Erevan, 1999, both in Armenian).

started with massacres and deportation. During relative pauses between massacres deportation continued on a small scale.

On November 21-22, 1988 the second stage of genocide began in Azerbaijan. The whole Armenian population of Azerbaijan was swept into the vortex of the wave of the genocide.

The third stage of the genocide started in July-August 1989.

In January 1990 the Popular Front together with the ruling authorities of Azerbaijan realized a new genocide, which became the fourth and final stage of the deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan. Sumgait "gave birth" to Baku.

From January 13, 1990, for seven days, blood-thirsty bands passed from quarter to quarter in Baku setting Armenian houses on fire, killing children and women with all kinds of weapons, torturing and raping without consideration of age. The property of the persecuted was robbed and divided among bandits in the presence of the tortured Armenians. Those who were lucky escaped this hell wounded, barefoot and half-clothed. No one cared about the property earned during many years by the sweat of his brow. The atmosphere was poisoned. The stench and immoral environment became unbearable. A child born of an Azerbaijani father renounced his mother and shot her down because she was an Armenian woman. He was taught by his "religious" and "intellectual" leaders.

In a week, from January 19 the massacre of the Armenians was followed by the massacre of Russian families, women and children.

Azerbaijanis keep silence about the fact that before the Soviet troops entered Baku, they created a situation that resulted in many deaths and the deportation of tens of thousands of Armenians and Russians from Soviet Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijani leaders, the central media and TV would try to present these barbaric actions as a burst of revenge of "homeless refugees" who emigrated from Armenia (according to their words, "they were banished") and till that time "had no shelter" and were wandering homeless. They also explained all this by a desire of Azerbaijanis to communicate with their "compatriots" (although, till that moment only one family had expressed such desire) in Iran, or the impossibility of the usage of meadows. Finally, they tried to

explain all this by the Karabakh movement, blaming the Karabakh national liberation struggle as the main cause of all brutalities committed by Azeri-Turks.

The central authorities of the Azerbaijan SSR provoked this bloodshed. The Azerbaijani militia cooperated with the Popular Front. The Union authorities, protecting the principles of federation, instead of realizing their obligations, were giving instructions equally to the beast and its victim. During one week the blood was shedding in the streets of Baku, but the TASU was announcing the news how the Avanesovs' family killed two Azeri-Turks (?) with an axe. Thus the central media blamed this Armenian family in provoking enraged mob, but in reality the Avanesovs fought for self-protection against the invaders. In reality the Popular Front provoked mobs to exterminate Armenians in Azerbaijan. It was well prepared action in Baku which can be seen from the speeches of some deputies delivered in the second session³³⁸ of the joint meeting of two houses of the Supreme Soviet on February 19, 1990. The deputy V.V.Bakatin noted that the massacres in Baku started on January 13 just "after the meeting. By the addresses distributed beforehand, the mob consisting of 5,000 men went to plunder and kill the Armenian population." Everything is clearly expressed in these words.

A schoolmistress from Baku who became a refugee wrote in an article published in "Uchitelskaya gazeta" ("Teachers' gazette"): "Extremists were perfectly organized and the same can not be said about the local authorities. At the end of last year all over the town, as if with the purpose of distributions of the food coupons the house management's offices demanded from all residents to fill in additional questionnaires. It was also necessary to mention the nationality. When massacres began, the extremists had the exact addresses of the Armenians, Russians and mixed families. It was a deliberate nationalistic move."³³⁹

³³⁸ The meeting was beyond close doors and in a published shorthand account of the session it was not included, but the newspaper "Avangard" published the shorthand of the sound recording of the session with partial shortenings in the Armenian translation.

³³⁹ "Uchitelskaya gazeta," January, N5, 1990 (in Russian).

The Baku bloodshed started after the meeting of January 13, when the former first secretary of the Central committee of the Communist Party of the Azerbaijan SSR, Vezirov met the representatives of the Popular Front and expressed his solidarity on the occasion of realization of their plans. His speech delivered at that meeting was transmitted on television. He called the whole people to unite and punish the Nagorno-Karabakh people, mentioning that the root of all evil was Nagorno-Karabakh that is why it was necessary "to annihilate the den of evil". With that end in view Vezirov grounded the idea of the necessity of formation of "one fist" in order to act jointly. Enthusiastically appealing to the people Vezirov said: "We must move the enemy out of our way, as we had banished the Nagorno-Karabakh's regional committee of the party, the Committee of Special Administration and many others. No one can close our way. Be sure, the center is in our hands."

Was not it so in Sumgait, then Aghdam? In 1988 the Sumgait genocide and the Aghdam massacre started at the moment when the first secretary of CC CP of the Azerbaijan SSR, K.Bagirov visited Sumgait and Aghdam and left several hours before the bloody events began.

The authorities declared the state of emergency and the Soviet army units entered into Baku only when the Soviet power's existence was threatened there. Even before the news of the massacre of the families of the Russian officers became widely spread the central government blamed both nations for violations and demanded from them to stop the bloodshed without condemning the Azerbaijani bandits. From experience of those years it is quite clear that the Centre interfered in events after everything was forcibly done and finished by the Azeri-Turks. The leaders of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan and the bandits and even the session of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan acting under their leadership gave a hostile reception to the delayed decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR about bringing in Azerbaijan the Soviet army units.

Azerbaijanis keep silence about the fact that before the Soviet regiments entered Azerbaijan, Baku was in such a horrible state that many innocent people were killed there and tens of thousands

Armenians and Russians were deported from the Azerbaijan SSR. During those days 150 Armenians were brutally killed.

On February 19, 1990, during the joint plenary meeting of the third session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR E.M.Primakov underlined in his speech the following: "... we faced a concrete situation in Azerbaijan - the Armenians' massacre in Baku which resulted in dozens of victims and during a few days tens of thousands of Armenians were deported... In Azerbaijan we have faced such a situation when the local authorities were paralyzed and the Popular Front of Azerbaijan formed a military unit and armed groups that encircled the army and the regiments of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA). We have faced both the destruction of the border technical system and forcible opening of the border (200 km.) with Iran. All these actions were also done by an order of the Popular Front...

The army regiments had a task to redistribute and protect the local population's security. But the roads and rail-ways, together with special troops of MIA, which had already been in Baku, were blockaded. Without technique and the means of transportation these troops were unable to move. All this happened in a city, where literally a day before people were massacred and identified and unidentified dead bodies still were found. All this occurred in Baku, where governmental buildings were blockaded and roads were enclosed by the order of the People Front... The frontier was opened by those who desired to have large military forces in conditions of preparations for large-scale military operations... The Popular Front of Azerbaijan decided to demonstrate its power in this way, checking the firmness and stability of the authorities... Thousands of lives of the peaceful population were saved at the cost of the lives of soldiers and officers killed in action against the assaulting groups. Is not it a blasphemy? Yes, not only assaulters were killed, but also innocent people. But on whose conscience does their death lie: the soldiers that fired in response to the fire of the assaulters or those assaulters who concealed themselves in the houses?"³⁴⁰

The news spread widely that thousands of people, women and children perished under the chain tracks of tanks. Meanwhile, according to data presented at the same session, the youngest person that died during the first three days was a boy of 14 years who was among the assaulters... the eldest woman, born in 1915, died of massive heart attack, but was buried as a victim of chain tracks. At every step a lie and falsification."³⁴¹

The Popular Front got ready not only for carrying out massacres and deportations, but also for opposing the military regiments, neutralizing the forces of MIA of the USSR and using the possible way of cooperation with the Azerbaijani MIA. Toward this end they activated all means to arm themselves with all kinds of weapons. They seized weapons and fighting equipment from the military garrisons and storage facilities of MIA of Azerbaijan. It became something common the seizure of weapons, wrecking of the radar stations, the forcible takeover of communication facilities, etc. So, during the days of massacre the Popular Front of Azerbaijan had such means of taxi stations which were supplied with radio stations and moved across the city and sent messages from each place.³⁴² According to data brought in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, during a week they built fortifications along the frontier (200 km.) and in Baku (60 km.) which were linked by the KrAZ and KamAZ dump-body trucks; tankers were put between them. These barricades were fastened by welding. The bottles with gas mixture were prepared and all these were kept by the assaulters. There were from 70 to 700 assaulters on such barricades.³⁴³ During the joint plenary meeting of two houses of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR the facts were announced which testified that the Popular Front located its snipers, assaulters and powerful searchlights in the children's polyclinic knowing quite well that soldiers would not shoot at that building. "The soldiers had not yet entered, when by the order of the leaders of the Popular Front the searchlights were switched on and a severe fire shot at soldiers who were drafted from the regions of

³⁴⁰ "Avant-guard," Erevan, 07.03.1990 (in Armenian).

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴² Ibid.

³⁴³ Ibid.

Rostov and Krasnodar for attending fighting equipment. First four soldiers were killed here and paratroopers wounded. Naturally, when troops entered into Baku there were shootings from all windows. It was possible to doubt whether peaceful residents were shot by paratroopers. As far as there were shootings from all side who knows who wounded people?"³⁴⁴

Moreover, "a woman addressed a request to a sergeant of MIA: "Help me, I am afraid to enter into a dark side street." He accompanied her, but at the first corner he was stunned, dragged into a flat, blindfolded, bared, and then thrown into a cemetery with a loop on his neck. But the sergeant survived, gathered strength and could get out of that loop."³⁴⁵

These and analogous incidents are represented in Azerbaijan in a very simplified manner. Meanwhile, the only criterion of the assessment of moral norms became sadism for the leaders of the Popular Front and their followers. No one regretted for anything that happened in Baku. Moreover, there were meetings of protest with the purpose of burdening others with the blame of vandalism committed by them.

It is strange that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan protested against the state of emergency declared in Baku. According to V.V.Bakatin, "... It is incomprehensible to me why, for example, they did not protest before it... It is incomprehensible why the government and the Supreme Soviet of the republic did not complain when massacre took place in Baku?"³⁴⁶

The rulers and media of Azerbaijan did not mention antihuman atmosphere that reigned in the republic from January 13 to 19. The Popular Front, the Azerbaijani government, the Supreme Soviet and the Azerbaijani permanent mission were diplomatically aggressive in order to disguise the previous days' barbaric crimes. They were not satisfied with vandalism committed against the Armenians and their deportation from Azerbaijan. The Azerbaijani agents did everything to organize actions against Armenians in different places of the

former USSR. They spread anti-Armenian information to stir up hatred of the local population against Armenians.

The attitude of the central government to the anti-Armenian policy in Azerbaijan, concealment of the openly committed vandalism, numerous attempts of the laying the whole blame of crimes on the innocent Armenian people, as well as the avoidance of responsibility for transgression resulted in the blockade of the Republic of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. In 1990 the state of an undeclared war against the Armenian people by Azerbaijan followed by clashes along border zones.

It is obvious that until the middle of 1990 all this happened under the guardianship of the leading centre of the USSR, even very often by its scenario, but that cooperation did not get an open form. As soon as the Armenian parliament did not react positively (from the middle of 1990 till the middle of 1991) during the referendum about remaining a part of the USSR (Armenia did not take part in the referendum of March 21, 1991), the alliance of Azerbaijan and the all-Union center got open character.

A fabricated scenario about violation of the sovereignty of Soviet Azerbaijan as if done by the Armenian "assaulters" was elaborated by purposeful efforts of the Azerbaijani leadership and adopted by the Central Committee of the Union. All this falsification was followed by the joint military operations of the regiments of the Soviet army, MIA, KGB and Azerbaijani OMON (riot squad) together with Azerbaijani assaulters, which resulted in the deportation of the peaceful and unarmed population from the regions (Karabakh Martunashen, Getashen, Berdadzor, Shahumyan) and inhabited localities and more than twenty villages of NKAO. It was the fifth stage of the deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan. The specific feature of this stage was an open usage of the joined regiments of the central Soviet and Azerbaijani military forces in a punitive operation under the name of "Kolco" (ring). So, in the spring of 1990 the process of the deportation of the Armenian population from the territory of Azerbaijan was almost completed and the region of Nagorno-Karabakh had already been drawn into that vortex. Hundreds of Armenians were killed and wounded by

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Ibid.

tank, helicopter, automatic and machine-gun fire of the regiments of the Soviet army, MIA, KGB, Azerbaijani OMON (riot squad) and Azerbaijani assaulters. The Armenian village of Artsvashen was razed to the ground.

And what's about Khojalu? It is a part of historic Armenia. On February 25-26, 1992, members of the Armenian emergency volunteer corps fighting in the regiments of the Artsakh self-defense during the operation of liberating Khojalu opened a corridor for Azerbaijanis. But the armed bands of Azerbaijanis fired at their compatriots. It was a real massacre. In order to throw dust in the world community's eyes Azerbaijani authorities falsifying the Khojalu events misrepresent them as a genocide committed by the Artsakh fighters. Distorting reality they wish to discredit the Armenian people and to relegate Sumgait, Baku, Kirovabad, Khanlar and other massacres to oblivion. But not only Armenians, but also Azerbaijanis testify that ascribing the Khojalu massacre to Armenians was a falsified invention. For example, ex-president of Azerbaijan A.Mutalibov clearly noted in an interview published in "Nezavisimaya Gazeta" ("The Independent Newspaper", April 2, 1992): "As those Azerbaijanis of Khojalu, who were saved, witnessed, these things have been organized in order to find a reason for my resignation. Some forces acted to discredit the president. I don't think that Armenians, who treat such events in very organized and competent way, would allow Azerbaijanis to get documents exposing them acting like fascists. The corridor allowing people to leave was opened by the Armenians. So, why would they have had to fire? As soon as the military equipment surrounded Khojalu it was necessary to bring the population out... I gave such orders. But why it was not fulfilled is not clear to me."

Indeed, as A.Mutalibov testifies, the Khojalu brigandage was prompted by the intrigue of changing the power in Azerbaijan.

After all, the massacres that started in 1988 turned into the state policy in Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan launched a large scale war against Nagorno-Karabakh and thus began the sixth stage of the massacres and deportations. The specific feature of this stage was not only the real war between the hostile sides but also the massacre and

deportation of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh. The deportation involved in its vortex new caravans of refugees from the regions of Martakert, Stepanakert, Askeran, Hadruth, Martuni and a dozen of inhabited localities of Karabakh.

On the whole, in 1988-1995 419,000 refugees were deported from Azerbaijan including 360,000 from Azerbaijan SSR and 48,000 from Nagorno-Karabakh, as well as 8,000 from Abkhazia, 1,500 from Chechnia, 900 from Uzbekistan, 600 from Tajikistan and other places. 381,500 of these deportees took refuge in Armenia including 72,000 forcible replaced people from the border zone with Azerbaijan.

In 1992 72,000 deportees and refugees emigrated to other countries for a permanent abode.

In January 1998 the number of deportees from Azerbaijan was 316,000 and the number of refugees from Nagorno Karabakh was 48,000 in the Republic of Armenia. 64,000 of them temporarily migrated to other countries and 252,000 remained in Armenia. Besides, 11,000 persons from Abkhazia, Chechnia and the CIS have had the refugee's status or equated to it.

However, hundreds of thousands of deported, homeless Armenians, who hardly escaping massacres, lost their houses and property and till the present have not found a final shelter. They neither have a house and work, nor a stable source of living.

b) Nine of ten born babies were future refugees in NKAO

During the Great Patriotic War together with other peoples of the USSR hard days fell also to Nagorno-Karabakh's lot. These years of heavy struggle had a negative impact on the reproduction of the Armenian population of NKAO. Tens of thousands of young men were drafted to defend the USSR, almost a half of them perished in the war. Not a single people living so far from the battlefields had given so many victims as the Armenian people living in the Armenian SSR and NKAO. As a result of that and the constant increase of the outflow of the population of NKAO the number of

Armenians rather decreased and in 1959 was 110,100 (less than in 1926). The number of Azeri-Turks continued to increase as a result of the natural growth, as well as owing to the influx of Azeri-Turks into Nagorno-Karabakh. Consequently, the share of the Armenian population in total number of the population of NKAO rather decreased constituting 84.4% in 1959. During the following years the outflow of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh increased. Between the censuses of 1959 and 1979 the Armenian population increased only 11,000, on the contrary the absolute growth of Azeri-Turks was higher. Meanwhile, Azeri-Turks were only 13.8% of the total number of the population of NKAO. At the same time the level of the natural growth was rather high. In 1961 the birth rate was 40.5 per 1,000 population; meanwhile the natural growth was 33.3 people per 1,000 population. Nagorno-Karabakh yielded to Azerbaijan SSR in these rates.

During following years the natural growth of the population of NKAO had a tendency to decline as a result of the reduction of the birth rate on the one hand and the increase of the death rate on the other hand (see table 36).

Table 36.

The birth and death rates and natural growth³⁴⁷ of the population of NKAO in 1951-1987 (per 1,000 population)

Years	Birth rate	Death-rate	The natural growth
1951	31,4	9,4	22,0
1960	38,0	7,2	30,8
1961	40,5	7,2	33,3
1965	34,6	6,6	28,0
1970	27,6	6,9	20,7
1975	23,5	8,0	15,5
1980	25,1	7,0	18,1
1985	24,1	7,7	16,4
1987	25,2	7,4	17,8

³⁴⁷ "Achievements of Soviet Nagorno-Karabakh in 40 Years in Figures," A collection of articles, Stepanakert, 1963, p.39; "NKAO 50 Years in the Friendly Soviet Family," Stepanakert, 1973, p.36 (in Russian).

Some decrease of the natural growth of the population of NKAO is explained by the changes in the social-economic conditions, as well as, the outflow of young people. It resulted in "aging" of the Armenian population of the region, especially striking is the death. For example, if in 1970-1986 the death-rate was 6-7 people per 1,000 population in Azerbaijan SSR, at the same time it was 7.5-8 people in NKAO. The general state of the growth of the Armenian population worsened extremely in the period between the censuses of 1970 and 1979, when in conditions of the growth of Azeri-Turks by 137,1% the Armenian population increased only by 101.7% or twice. During those years only one of ten Armenian inhabitants remained in NKAO, the remaining nine left for the other regions of the country. According to the census of 1979 162,200 people lived in NKAO including 123,100 Armenians (or 75.9% of the total population). It is suffice to say, that from 1939 to 1979 in conditions of rather high natural growth the Armenian population of NKAO decreased by 10,000 (see table 37).

Table 37.

The number of the population of NKAO and the national structure in the years of censuses (thousands)³⁴⁸

	1926	1939	1959	1970	1979	1989
The whole population including Armenians	125,3	150,8	130,4	150,3	162,2	189,1
in percentage terms						
Azeri-Turks	111,7	132,8	110,1	121,1	123,1	145,5
in percentage terms	89,1	88,1	84,4	80,6	75,9	76,9
Russians	12,6	14,1	18,0	27,2	37,3	40,6
in percentage terms	10,1	9,3	13,8	18,1	22,9	21,5
	0,6	3,2	1,8	1,3	1,9	1,9
in percentage terms	0,5	2,1	1,4	0,9	0,8	1,0

The absolute growth of the Armenian population was lower, than that of the Azeri-Turks, although in 1926 Armenians by their number 9 times were more than Azeri-Turks. It is clear that it was a result of the constant outflow of the Armenian population and the

³⁴⁸ "NKAO 50 Years...", p.33; The Number and..., p.126 (in Russian).

influx of Azeri-Turks. Meanwhile, if there were created normal conditions in NKAO for the reproduction of the Armenian population and their national dignity were not violated, even in conditions of some outflow the Armenia population there would be 350/400,000 in 1989. In 1926 the population of NKAO was 5.4% of the total population of the Azerbaijan SSR, but according to the census of 1989 it decreased to the level of 2.7%.³⁴⁹

Thus, according to the official statistic data, in 1926-1979 the Armenian population of NKAO increased 110.2%³⁵⁰ and the number of Azeri-Turks increased about thrice.³⁵¹

Despite the fact that NKAO remained an agricultural region (in 1979 the urban population was 44% of the total population)³⁵² as a raw adjunct of Azerbaijan, however, first of all the region was characterized by an essential decline of the Armenian rural population. From 1923 to 1979 the rural population of NKAO reduced by 61,000.³⁵³ The absolute reducing number of the rural Armenian population prevailed over the mentioned 61,300, because it included also the population of the villages populated by Azeri-Turks whose number continuously increased. During that period scores of Armenian villages were destroyed. This process continued also during the next years.

After Sumgait (1988) and following events the groups of refugees from the densely populated Armenian areas of Azerbaijan SSR settled in NKAO with their relatives, in their native land. Because of that, according to the census of 1989, the specific wait of the Armenian population of NKAO rather increased. It is necessary also to note that after the census this percentage rather declined because of the intensive house-building for the new resettled Azeri-Turks in the regions populated by Azeri-Turks.

³⁴⁹ TSFSR in Figures, p.4-5. The data of the census of 1989. (in Russian).

³⁵⁰ If we take into consideration the archive materials relating to the data of the census of 1926, we shall see that according to data of the census 1979, the Armenian population during that period decreased by 2,400 people.

³⁵¹ "NKAO 50 Years...", p.33; "The Number and...", p.126 (in Russian).

³⁵² "The Number and...", p.14.

³⁵³ "NKAO 50 Years...", p.33; "The Number and...", p.126 (in Russian).

Thus, as a result of massacres realized step by step in Azerbaijan the number of refugees increased and in 1989-1994 this process accelerated owing to the events in Nagorno-Karabakh. Deported Armenians fled to the Armenian SSR (later Republic of Armenia), the USSR (later the CIS) and other foreign countries. According to the official data, in 1988-1994 48,000 Armenians from Nagorno-Karabakh first came to the Armenian SSR and then a part of them emigrated to the Russian Federation and other countries.

The problem was partially completed due to the victory of the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, which drove away the enemy from weapon emplacements, military positions, frontiers, and secured a relative peace for the population. Thus were liberated native Armenian lands.

All places of habitation and the property of the refugees were captured by Azerbaijan. Together with banished Armenian population they are of larger size than the territories liberated by the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh with the purpose of defense, as well as the number of Azeri-Turks that emigrated from these territories. Let's remember that according to the census of 1979 216,000 Armenians lived in Baku, 17.5% (more than 40,400) of the population of Kirovabad, 58.7% of the population of Sheki, more than 96% of the population of the town of Shahumyan, the whole population of Vardashen, a considerable proportion of the population of Khanlar, 8.7% of the population of Mingeaur, 7.2% of the population of Sumgait were Armenians. The same picture was in rural areas. In 1979 Armenians constituted 63.2% of the population of the region of Shahumyan, 23.9% of the population of Dashkesan, 18.2% of the population of the region of Khanlar, 9.2% of the population of the region of Vardashen, etc. And today...?

c) Emigration of the Azeri-Turks from the Armenian SSR

The deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan had an irretrievable impact on the movements of population in Armenia. The deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan some time later was

accompanied by an emigration from Armenia. It included completely all Azeri-Turks living in Armenia. It is necessary to emphasize that the emigration of Azerbaijanis from Armenia was a result and direct consequence of the Azerbaijani policy of the Sumgait genocide and mass deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan. Thus, the emigration of 160,000 Azerbaijanis from Armenia was on a voluntary basis. They were not deported from Armenia. Armenians did not attempt a genocide of Azerbaijanis in Armenia. There was no pressure on Azerbaijanis to leave Armenia for Azerbaijan. On the contrary, often local, state and economic officials, and the Armenian population in general, did everything to stop emigration. It is an undeniable reality that the Azeri-Turks living in Armenia emigrated after two stages of the deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan (Sumgait, then Gandzak, Khojalu, Dashkesan, Khanlar, etc.).

All facts are falsified in Azerbaijan, including the events of 1988-1990. A group of People's deputies of the USSR from the Azerbaijan SSR made a statement ("About the forced displacement of Azeris from Armenia") and addressed it to the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (October, 1990). They wrote: "In our days, eventually started a new turn of the genocide of the Azerbaijani people. A criminal, merciless and well-planned action was realized. Unbridled attacking groups of Armenian extremists being encouraged by the republican and local authorities banished about 200,000 Azeris from their native lands, depriving them of their flats and property."³⁵⁴

Falsification has no limits, so one step after these 200,000 turn into "almost 300,000 Azeris who lived in Armenia before 1988..."³⁵⁵

Besides, in 1989 the number of Azeri-Turks was presented to the world 160,000 by Azerbaijan and then it became 165,000. For example Glushkov writes: "160,000 Azeris left their permanent residence, more precisely, were deported from Armenia."³⁵⁶ In 1990 A.Mutalibov mentioned 165,000 in an interview with the correspondent of the weekly paper "Sojuz."³⁵⁷

³⁵⁴ "Bakinski Rabochi," 23.09.1990 (in Russian).

³⁵⁵ Ibid.

³⁵⁶ "Bakinski Rabochi," 23.08.1989 (in Russian).

³⁵⁷ "Sojuz," N38, 09. 1990 (in Russian).

The main problem is not the number of the emigrated Azeri-Turks. Without any shame they bring accusations against Armenians. They never ask where was organized the first massacre in 1988-1990, how deportation became a "norm" of life and was admitted to "citizenship". It has been already said that massacre and deportation on February 27-29, 1988 became a "norm" of life by the Sumgait genocide in Azerbaijan, they became of large scale from December 21, 1988 by the torture and forcible displacement of the Armenian population in Gandzak, Shamkhor, Khanlar, Dashkesan, Kasim-Ismailov, Baku and other places. In a short time the deputies of the USSR from Azerbaijan had forgotten about everything. They had forgotten that from November 21, 1988 Armenians were obliged to take up self-defense in Gandzak, because during several days women, children and old people were blockaded in the Armenian Church. They had a narrow escape with the help of armed detachments of Soviet soldiers. The deportation of Armenians was carried out merely by military pressure. On November 27, 1988, a week after these deportations and nine months after the Sumgait massacre of Armenians, the leaders of Azerbaijan organized the emigration of their compatriots from Armenia. When Azerbaijanis emigrated, they took their property with them, in many cases exchanging urban and rural apartments, while the deported Armenian population of Azerbaijan had been massacred and robbed. So, the beginning of the events of Sumgait (February, 1988) and Gandzak (November, 1988) was put in Azerbaijan when not a single Azerbaijani family had moved from the Armenian SSR. But it did not hinder the Azerbaijani deputies and demographers to tell shamelessly a lie: "... cruelty reached such point that the only way of their escape was left the snow-capped gorges, where the scores of naked people, first of all children, sank into the grave there. And those who at the cost of suffering reached Baku, Sumgait and Gandzak were unable to restrain their indignation."³⁵⁸

First, Azeri-Turks were not banished from Armenia. Second, this "tragic" tale has been invented in order to "balance" it with the barbaric actions committed in Azerbaijan.

³⁵⁸ "Bakinski Rabochi," 23.09.1990 (in Russian).

Thus, falsifying the reality, they explain the massacres in Sumgait and Gandzak by "fit of anger of Azeris living in Armenia." They are not stopped by the fact that during the events in Sumgait and Gandzak Azeri-Turks lived in their houses in Armenia. But when the emigration became large scale, regardless of events developing in Armenia, the transportation of Azeri-Turks was organized by means of big lorries which arrived from Azerbaijan. The photos of lorries with Azerbaijani license plates which arrived for transportation of their fellow countrymen to Azerbaijan are kept till now in the departments of MIA of Vardenis and other regions. As far as it was a large scale emigration and Azeri-Turks were short of lorries, they resorted to the help of the collective and state farms of the Vardenis villages. The largest families were provided with two or three lorries. The Armenian population helped the emigrating Azeri-Turks. Much work was done to load the whole property of Azeri-Turks and deliver safely to the places of destination. According to special regulations of the district committee of Vardenis the economic-administrative authorities took care of settlement of accounts and payments of the emigrating collective farmers, workers and employees. They received compensation for their damaged houses and properties caused by the earthquake.

On the contrary, Armenians were treated barbarously in Azerbaijan and because of that hundreds of them fell victim to the genocide committed by the Azeri-Turks under the leadership of the Popular Front. Armenian women and children were thrown out of the windows of the high-rise buildings, hanged and burnt down.

The emigration of Azeri-Turks first of all was provoked by fanatic provocateurs from Azerbaijan. Later they regretted greatly for that.

The emissaries from Azerbaijan and their local protégé propagandists provoked Azeri-Turks to leave Armenia for several reasons.

1. The organizers of the Armenian genocide in Sumgait wanted to disguise and conceal from the world the white massacres committed before that against Armenians, as well as the carnage planned and organized in our time.

2. The provocateurs from Azerbaijan needed to create such situation in Armenia under pretence of which they would launch further savagery against the Armenian population. All attempts failed to create such situation in Armenia.

With the purpose of throwing dust in eyes of the world community, disguising and falsifying events the Azerbaijani provocateurs organized small-scale emigration of their compatriots from the Armenian SSR but presented those dozens of times more. They wanted to create an illusion that their compatriots left their houses and became refugees because of their persecutions and hostile treatment in Armenia. They spread false information about burning of the houses of Azeri-Turks and their persecutions. The Azeri-Turks themselves did some provocative actions burning a number of abandoned houses, braking their windows and throwing stones into windows.

But the most part of the Azeri-Turks emigrated voluntarily taking with them the whole of property and most of Azerbaijanis exchanged their apartments for those left by Armenians who were deported from Azerbaijan SSR. There were single instances of forcible emigration of Azeri-Turks, but these remained unnoticeable.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE MOVEMENTS AFTER INDEPENDENCE

The collapse of the USSR had an essential impact on the movements of the population. The unstable state of the whole country and, particularly, in Transcaucasia had heavy consequences for the processes of migration of the Armenian population living in different republics of the former USSR. Daily new directions of the Armenian population's migration appeared; particularly the deportees from Azerbaijan and a considerable portion of the suffered population from the zone of disaster took refuge in Russia and Ukraine.

The refugees that settled in rural areas of the border zone together with a part of the local population emigrated in 1990-1992. During that period, armed attacks and bombardments organized by

the neighbouring country not only diverted peasants from agricultural works, but they had to migrate to other places. Emigration from the border zone intensified also because of shutdown or reduction of industrial enterprises in the regional centers. Although the production of these regions had agricultural character, however there were small factories of the watch and electro-mechanic production, as well as processing of the agricultural production (dairy industry, winery and tinned food and fruit juice factories).

That is why, in 1988, the number of the emigration outnumbered immigration into Armenia. According to data registered in statistic sources, in 1988 the number of emigrants leaving for other republics of the USSR (not taking into account the migration with Azerbaijan) outnumbered the immigrants 124.0%, and in 1989, they were equal. Meanwhile, during the next two years occurred the inverse process, immigration outnumbered emigration, although in two cases the number of migrating population had a trend of reduction. In 1990-1991, the number of immigrants in Armenia outnumbered the number of emigrants 166.7%. In conditions of the increase of the emigrating population, from 1992 decreased sharply immigration and increased emigration. In 1993 compared with 1990 immigration decreased 5,2 times and emigration increased 1,6 times. In 1994-2002 the number of emigrants compared with the number of immigrants increased 5,1 times (see table 38). As may be seen, it was an expression of a heavy burden of the migration of the Armenia's population in 1988-1993, which had horrible consequences for the republic, because migration exceeded all norms. In its turn, it resulted in the employment of population, as well as many social problems.

In 1991-1993, some increase of the immigrants in Armenia from Georgia and some republics of Central Asia accompanied the increase of the number of emigrants from Armenia to newly independent states.

Table 38.
The movement of the population between the republics of the former Soviet Union and the present CIS and Armenia according to places of residence in 1988-2000 (without Azerbaijan), (thousands)

IMMIGRANTS														
	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998 2000	2001	2002	
From town to town	14,4	14,1	12,4	16,9	3,6	2,7	2,1	2,4	1,6	1,4	2,6	0,8	0,4	
From village to town	7,3	6,6	4,4	2,1	0,7	0,7	0,5	0,4	0,2	0,2	0,4	0,3	0,5	
From village to village	3,1	3,5	3,4	2,2	0,9	0,4	0,2	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,3	0,1	0,2	
From town to village	3,7	4,4	5,1	3,4	1,6	1,1	0,4	0,6	0,4	0,3	0,8	0,3	0,2	
Total	28,5	28,6	25,3	24,6	6,8	4,9	3,2	3,7	2,3	2,0	4,1	1,5	1,3	
EMIGRANTS														
From town to town	16,0	15,2	10,8	8,7	10,2	17,3	14,7	6,7	5,0	5,4	16,2	5,9	4,0	
From town to town	9,0	5,7	2,8	1,8	2,4	5,4	4,1	2,1	1,3	1,7	4,8	2,3	1,9	
From town to town	5,8	3,4	1,1	0,7	0,8	1,7	1,5	0,7	0,5	0,5	1,7	0,9	1,0	
From town to village	4,6	3,7	2,0	1,4	1,6	2,8	1,8	1,0	0,7	0,5	3,4	1,7	2,4	
Total	35,4	28,0	16,7	12,6	15,0	27,2	22,1	10,5	7,5	7,1	25,1	10,8	9,3	

Naturally, population migration as regards Armenia was intensive with those republics of the former Soviet Union, later the countries of the CIS, where lived many Armenians. According to the census of 1989, the total number of the Armenian population was 4,623,000 in the Soviet Union, including 3,083,600 in Armenia, 532,400 in the RSFSR, 487,200 in Georgia, 390,500 in Azerbaijan³⁵⁹, 54,200 in Ukraine, 50,500 in Uzbekistan, 31,800 in Turkmenistan, 19,100 in Kazakhstan and about 4,000 in Kirghizia³⁶⁰, etc.

The most intensive bridge of the migration of the population of Armenia continues to be the Russian Federation (see table 39).

The number of emigrants to Russia, particularly, the North Caucasus, Central Russia, Poolside (the Volga region) culminated. Suffice it to say that in 1988-2002 the share of Russia in these processes was 78.3% of emigrants from Armenia and 59.4% of immigrants to Armenia. Accordingly, 17.5% and 11.4% was with the North Caucasus, 4.7% and 4.5% with Central Russia, 6.5% and 4.0% with the Volga region and the rest with other regions of Russia. In 1988-2002 the total number of emigrants from Armenia to Russia outnumbered the total number of immigrants from Russia to Armenia 2,8 times.

In 1991 the remainder of the migration of Armenia with Russia changed temporarily in favour of Armenia. In 1991 152.5% more people immigrated to Armenia from Russia than in the opposite direction and it is explained by the following reasons.

First, the number of the refugees (that were deported to Armenia from Azerbaijan) migrating into Russia began to decrease.

Second, there occurred such unwanted events in the North Caucasus resulting in a small-scale emigration of the Armenian population. Indeed, before 1990 emigration from Armenia to the North Caucasus was about two times more (190.5%) than the number of those who migrated from there into Armenia. However, in 1991 the immigrants from the North Caucasus outnumbered

emigrants from Armenia to the North Caucasus 172.7%. Meanwhile, in 1992 this ratio grew again and was 324%.

Table 39.

The migration of the population of the Republic of Armenia with the republics of the former USSR in 1988-2002 (those migrants who had left in unknown directions are not included, migration with Azerbaijan also is not given) (thousands)

	Immigrated		Emigrated	
	Total	From urban areas (%) of the total	Total	To urban areas(%) of the total
Russia	56,6	76,5	160,3	80,2
Ukraine	10,1	82,9	26,1	82,6
Byelorussia	1,1	79,5	4,1	81,4
Uzbekistan	3,8	93,7	1,8	93,9
Kazakhstan	1,9	71,3	3,2	77,4
Georgia	17,2	63,4	5,7	72,5
Lithuania	0,3	90,8	0,4	90,5
Moldova	0,6	51,6	1,2	66,1
Latvia	0,6	95,5	0,5	95,0
Kirghizia	0,2	85,6	0,2	79,0
Tadjikistan	0,6	95,5	0,2	94,3
Turkmenistan	2,1	97,4	0,8	97,5
Estonia	0,2	98,3	0,2	95,2
Total	95,3	76,1	204,7	80,5

Compared with 1990, in 1994 the number of immigrants in Armenia from the Russian Federation decreased eight times and emigration increased about two times. Compared with 1991, in 2002 immigration decreased more than 15,3 times, meanwhile emigration decreased merely 6.8%. Nevertheless, these are only official statistic data. In reality emigration had more intensive character.

Georgia is on the second place (the second by immigration and the third by emigration) after Russia in migration relations with Armenia. This process had mainly one-sided character. In 1988-2002 the number of immigrants from Georgia to Armenia more than three times outnumbered the number of emigrants from Armenia to Georgia. At the same time, according to official data, the share of immigrants from Georgia in the total number of the immigrants from the other places of the USSR (then CIS) was about 18% and the

³⁵⁹ The number of Armenians in Armenia and Azerbaijan is not given correctly in the materials of the census.

³⁶⁰ "Sojuz," N32, August, 1990 (in Russian).

share of emigrants from Armenia to Georgia was merely 2.8%. The immigrants from Georgia were from the most densely populated by Armenians urban and rural areas (Tbilisi, Akhalkalak, Bogdanovka, Akhaltskha, Sukhumi and Gagra). Meanwhile, together with Georgians the representatives of other nationalities were migrating into Georgia from Armenia. Migration from Georgia to Armenia intensified after the events of 1988 and increased from year to year. In 1991, 2 times more people immigrated into Armenia from Georgia, than in 1988. Meanwhile, during that period the number of emigrants from Armenia to Georgia decreased three times. Together with that, the emigration of the Armenian population from Georgia, particularly the Republic of Abkhazia, reached its culmination in 1992, as well as in 2001, when during the Abkhaz events a few Armenians also perished.

Ukraine is on the third place by immigration and the second place by emigration in migration relations with Armenia. In 1988-2002 the total number of emigrants to Ukraine outnumbered the opposite stream more than 2,6 times. However, in 1991 the total number of the immigrants in Armenia from Ukraine outnumbered the opposite stream 144.3%. In 1992 the number of emigrants was 5,3 times more than the number of immigrants.

The next in the migration relations with Armenia is Uzbekistan. The number of immigrants in Armenia from the countries of Central Asia, particularly Uzbekistan, outnumbered the number of emigrants from Armenia to those countries. Until 1991, the number of immigrants increased slightly. During that time, the remainder of population migration in Armenia was estimated positively with Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. It is understandable, because from the above-mentioned republics immigrated into Armenia mainly Armenians living there, whose number undoubtedly was small. In 1988-2002 immigration from Uzbekistan outnumbered the emigration from Armenia more than two times.

The population's movements with Armenia were feebly marked with the republics of Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Byelorussia, Moldova and the Baltic countries. A small number of the Armenian population in these countries explains it. Meanwhile, the number of Armenians living in Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan was comparatively higher that is why these countries' population

movements with Armenia were more perceptible. The number of immigrants from Turkmenistan into Armenia until 1990 increased, but the number of emigrants from Armenia decreased. Armenians were repatriating other nationalities were emigrating. In 1988-2002 the repatriation from Turkmenistan to Armenia 2,6 times outnumbered the emigration. The number of emigrants to Kazakhstan 1,7 times outnumbered the number of immigrants.

In 1988-2002, 80.5% of the emigrants from Armenia to other republics of the former Soviet Union, later the countries of the CIS were from urban areas.

The processes of the migration of the former republics of the USSR with Armenia we do not analyze in their integrity in this part of this research work because of two reasons. First, the portion concerning the analysis of the movement of population between Armenia and Azerbaijan we analyzed in one of the previous parts. Second, the official statistic sources do not contain data about the directions of a larger part of the streams of migrants.

The physical insecurity of the population in the border zone of Armenia and Azerbaijan caused by the war, deterioration of the economic state of Armenia gradually became the main motivation of the emigration of Russians, Ukrainians, and other nationalities together with Armenians. It changed essentially the national structure of Armenia's population.

As usual, just at present there is no discrimination or hostility towards other nationalities in Armenia.³⁶¹

In 1988-1991, on the one hand, the tendency of a gradual decrease of the number of Armenians was observed in the total number of the emigrants to the republics of the former USSR (besides Azerbaijan), on the other hand, the movements of Russians, Ukrainians and other nationalities were slightly increasing. Emigration of the Russian and Ukrainian population was accompanied by immigration with the only difference that the latter had a tendency of decrease and the emigration had a tendency of increase (see table 40).

³⁶¹ Human Development Report, Armenia, 1995, the team of authors, National Coordinator Agabekyan A., Sponsor the United Nations Development Program, Erevan, 1995, p.38-39.

Table 40.
Migration of the Russian, Ukrainian, Georgian, Kurdish and Ezid
population in 1988-2002

	Immigrated				Emigrated			
	Russi- ans	Ukrai- nians	Geor- gians	Kurds, Ezids	Russi- ans	Ukrai- nians	Geor- gians	Kurds, Ezids
1988	2816	627	37	107	3420	660	59	46
1989	2810	577	69	64	6219	1294	83	145
1990	2055	403	54	74	4598	885	60	186
1991	1853	344	30	40	4358	659	58	135
1992	770	147	12	38	5001	931	25	132
1993	387	46	19	202	4390	673	50	1091
1994	205	48	20	218	2409	331	27	1027
1995	201	27	9	174	970	132	15	433
1996	154	34	8	98	728	108	8	269
1997	160	22	7	90	540	111	16	257
1998	131	21	7	108	457	98	7	304
1999	72	19	5	82	300	90	8	250
2000	94	11	8	59	352	58	11	337
2001	91	8	10	55	267	38	2	243
2002	87	6	3	97	293	33	3	260
Total	11886	2340	298	1506	34302	6101	432	5115
Remai- nder	-2416	-3761	-134	-3609				

The total number of the mentioned emigrating nationalities' representatives was three times more than the number of the immigrating representatives. The movement of the mentioned nationalities included mainly the urban population which is also a proof of more complex economic and social situation in towns. For example, in 1988-2002, 82% of the Russian emigrants settled in Erevan; the same quantity emigrated from towns.

85% of the emigrants from Armenia migrated from towns and the same quantity of emigrants settled in towns. The same may be said about other nationalities.

The number of the immigrating Kurds and Ezids is given in hundreds (except 1993-1994). On the other hand, 39% of the Kurds and Ezids settled in towns, 63,2% emigrated from towns and the same quantity settled in towns in other places.

During those years, together with the Armenian population deported from Azerbaijan began a new wave of the emigration of the

permanent residents (particularly from the mountainous and border regions) from Armenia, including also other nationalities.

In 1998 a book was published titled "The nationalities of Armenia"³⁶², which was translated into English and published in 1999. The authors of the book belong to different nations. They evaluated objectively the causes of emigration of representatives of their nationalities. They mention unanimously that from the 1990s the emigration of other nationalities was dictated mainly by the ethno-political conflicts in the Caucasus, social-economic and political hard conditions, favourable conditions for repatriation of some national communities to the countries of their forefathers and difficulties in getting education in mother tongue in Armenia. At the same time, on the basis of the facts, the authors underline that for centuries representatives of different nationalities lived with Armenians side by side.³⁶³

There are also some reasons specific for the given nationality living in Armenia. For example, Jews desire to leave Armenia for their ancestors' native land.³⁶⁴ The emigration of the Russian population together with social-economic reasons was connected with very low number of pupils in rural areas, because it was impossible to form a class and as a result of that the Russian schools were closed.³⁶⁵ The emigration of some Kurds is explained, for example, by the fact that they are Muslim Kurds whose relatives live in Azerbaijani villages, they have common families with Azeri-Turks, and their children attend Azerbaijani schools.³⁶⁶ It is proved by facts that emigrating Kurds continued to keep their relations with Armenia. Moreover, the bodies of Kurds, who died out of the republic, were brought and buried in Armenia.³⁶⁷

³⁶² "The Nationalities of Armenia", Erevan, 1998 (editors N.Oganesyan, A.Kosyan, V.Chatoyev) (in Russian).

³⁶³ Ibid., p.26-27, 34-42, 55-59, 65-66, 73-75, 86-87.

³⁶⁴ Ibid.: R.Varzhapetyan, R.Feller. "The Jewish Community," p.55-61.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.: I.Semyonov. "The Molokans in Armenia," p.78-87.

³⁶⁶ Ibid.: A.Sardar. "The Kurds in Armenia," p.71-77.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., p.73.

PART SIX
THE ESSENCE, CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES OF
MIGRATION AND INTERREPUBLICAN
MOVEMENTS

CHAPTER THIRTEEN
THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE
EMIGRATION

Armenia is facing the necessity of the elaboration of the social-economic and demographic policy of population migration.

Indeed, what kind of policy Armenia is going to apply in order to resolve the problem of the "remainder" population? What to do? Whether to encourage the emigration or vice versa to elaborate such social-economic program that would guarantee the "remainder" population to stay in the country. Taking into consideration the present social-economic situation and further positive changes in Armenia it is important to elaborate also the project enabling the immigration, settlement, employment, education of the children of those citizens who are out of Armenia as illegal emigrants.

Emigration is encouraged in the case when there is the "remainder" population and the given country is unable to provide it with an adequate employment, or the level of the salary of the labour force is lower of the average level of the living. The problems of housing, pension, compassionate allowance, the social protection of maternity and child-care and the education of children also play a role in the questions connected with emigration. That is why the programs of social-economic policy are corrected taking into consideration social-economic (including character of employment and demographic policy) orientation, as well as goals and principles.

In order to give an answer to the very problem it is necessary: (1) to reveal in details the causes of the mass emigration from Armenia; (2) to evaluate survivorship of the causes in order to find out which military-political, social-economic components of the emigration and immigration became useless and disappeared in new

conditions. Or what kind of new factors appeared that can play a decisive role as to secure the return of one portion of the emigrated population, as well as to prevent a new wave of emigration. They will serve as a basis to reveal to some extent trends of the population's international movements with Armenia. (3) It is necessary to reveal and evaluate the positive meaning of the population's emigration and negative consequences for the republic as regards social-economic, defense and demographic aspects. (4) It is important to ascertain the criteria of the working age population, the correlation of supply and demand for labour force, behavior of the labour market, the trends of the increase of the "remainder" population, the possibility of their correlation with the social-economic development of the Republic of Armenia. (5) It is also necessary to set up conditions for organization of a temporary labour migration.

1. Main causes

The causes of migration of the population of Armenia between the years of 1992 and 2002 may be represented briefly as follows. The Spitak earthquake, war situation, ceaseless blockades, deep crises accompanying economic chaos, dismantling of the national economy, impossibility to act at one's full potential, unemployment, lack of fuel, extreme need of everything, social tension and increasing number of socially insecure strata. These resulted in the population's polarization and all those who had the smallest hope to earn their living in other countries and support their families, or even those who had no hope started to migrate. Between 1991 and 1996 many considered emigration to foreign countries, for the reason of finding an employment, earning and living by zealous work, as the only way out to get rid of under-consumption, lack of electricity and cold, low wages, increasing prices, insurmountable and endless difficulties connected with guaranteeing the cost of living.

Together with this brief characterization the energy "crises" was the most decisive of the mentioned causes. The apartments, turned into frozen caves, were supplied with electric power by a "sliding" schedule, daily 2-3 hours. There were some residential areas that were not supplied with electricity in the course of several

days because of endless damages. Nowadays it has become clear that energy "crises" most likely was a provocation for those who wanted to put by millions. Otherwise, how it may be explained that although in 1997 was produced 290 million kwh less electric energy than in 1993 (the official statistics testifies that in 1993 were produced 6311,1 million kwh, and in 1997- 6021,1 million kwh), but there was no "sliding" schedule, everyone used electricity according to his opportunities. What did happen with the produced electric power, where did it go? Why did authorities push the people to ordeals? Whom did they punish? With whom did they square accounts - the people, opposition or, divine miracle of the creation, splendid Sevan, whose waters sharply subsided in the lake, or the forests of a woodless country.

Yes, it was in the winter of 1992-1993 when thousands of people that became vagabonds spent their night in airport "Zvartnots" where it was impossible to find a free space. Mother and child, woman and man, old and young with packed suitcases and babies clasped to their mothers breasts or wrapped in blankets, hurried quickly to leave the Motherland, to escape horrible conditions.

Who will give an answer to the people and be up in the dreadful court of history in order to be blamed not only for robbery, organized dismantling of the economy (just in those years many enterprises were locked, transport was almost stopped, ambulance cars couldn't render first aid, people were thrown outdoors, because apartments were very cold...), but mainly because one third of the 3,500,000 people left the Motherland, house and possessions, relatives and at present wander in foreign countries.

Who will give an answer for this white genocide, that babies born abroad are threatened to lose their national identity, because they are brought up in foreign environment, deprived of opportunity to get education and read literature in mother tongue, follow national traditions in art and way life. The result of such negative developments is assimilation which will not allow them to return home.

What have we done? Instead of an economic integration with other peoples we integrated by sacrificing the future of our children and destruction of the gene pool. If it is not genocide, so what is it?

It is possible to say unhesitatingly that this forced emigration of one third of the Armenian population first of all was the direct echo of the notorious energetic "crisis" and its consequences incited by provocations of the ruling party "Armenian National Movement" (ANM- HHSh, in Armenian). It cost the Armenian people dear. Price of that policy was the loss of a considerable proportion of the gene pool.

Together with the general review it is important to pay attention to the common and peculiar features of the emigration of permanent residents and refugees who had no registration, as well as those who got registration. The refugees emigrated for want of dwelling and employment, as well as because of more expressed social depression, some habits discerning them from the local population, an unsatisfactory command of Armenian and many other questions which hindered their integration with the local population. At the same time a close interosculation took place slowly but surely between a part of the refugees and permanent residents with preservation of some peculiarities.

Most of the deported Armenians were urban dwellers; many of them were representatives of intelligentsia and the elderly. At best they were settled in the border zone, rural areas. They were not employed by their profession to earn their living. There was uncultivated land on the one hand, and old people unacquainted with the cultivation methods, lacking in technical means, without availability, inclination and skill to service on the other hand. The problems connected with perspectives of giving children education in mother tongue. Many of the refugees couldn't find dwelling or employment. A part of them, in particular rural inhabitants, exchanged their dwellings with the dwellings of Azeri-Turks who emigrated from Armenia. But many were left homeless. There were several reasons which brought to such situation.

1) There were more Armenians deported from Azerbaijan than Azerbaijanis emigrated from the Republic of Armenia.

2) Because deported Armenians had smaller families, they left a disproportionately more number of apartments in Azerbaijan.

3) Ninety% of the Azerbaijani emigrants from the Republic of Armenia were peasants. Many of the Armenian refugees were unable to exchange their apartments because there were not enough in the Republic of Armenia. A large part of the Armenian refugees left their

apartments and property in Azerbaijan, together with their possessions and furniture, without receiving any compensation. A proportion of the Armenian urban dwellers who were able to exchange their apartments in Azerbaijan for others on the border and in mountainous rural areas (in particular Zangezur, Vaik', Vardenis, etc.) of the Republic of Armenia couldn't get used to the local conditions, including professions, so they moved to the cities or emigrated abroad.³⁶⁸

We agree with the point of view of Prof. Manasyan, according to which many Azerbaijani emigrants from Armenia cannot be classified as "refugees". It relates particularly to the Azeri-Turks who (a) while emigrating from Armenia managed to exchange their apartments for those left by Armenians who were deported from the former Azerbaijan SSR; (b) emigrated from Mountainous Karabakh and adjacent territories and took part in its blockade and war launched against it; (c) during the Spitak earthquake received material compensation for their ruined apartments.³⁶⁹

In the course of time social tension and narrowing of the sphere of employment became the main reasons of emigration from Armenia, involving also permanent residents.

From the beginning of the 1990s and further numeral superiority of supply as compared with demand in the labour market, as well as a considerable growth of jobless people became obvious with a tendency of increase. It occurred as a result of the unjustified reduction of former production capacities, as well as liquidation of uncompetitive plants which did not guarantee profitability.

Between 1991 and 1993 and further, first of all emigrated well to do stratum of society (10-12% of all emigrants), professional people (12-15%) and the persons of not high level of proficiency who were ready to do any work.³⁷⁰ Armenia is one of those rare

countries which stand out for the export of capital in conditions of weak means and low long-term investments. Meanwhile, from the point of view of the migration policy it is very important investments of the native capital, determination of their directions in the spheres of economy replacing each other, which together with high productivity guarantee a high level of employment. Outflow of capital occurred in the sphere of productive investment in conditions of lack of legislative norms and security; the risk of bankruptcy was great. It was prompted also by the low level of the sub structural system (the sphere of service, transport, etc.), inactivity in encouragement of business, the absence of the legislative norms of the labour's legal defense, an invalid and inactive tax policy together with the decline of production capacities.

Thus a considerable rise of the labour force's supply formed in the course of the fall of productive capacities and accompanied by the increase of the number of jobless, a sharp fall of the demand for labour force, the objective process of the rise of the number of the working age and economically active population together with the masses of the Armenian deportees from Azerbaijan, all this, faced the regressing and constantly reducing social production's barrier. For some period the labour force's supply stagnated then increased resulting in the mass emigration and unemployment. This process continues with the only difference that if during the chaotic years (1988-1993) of international migration the main factor of emigration were refugees and the population of the disaster zone and border areas, in the course of the last ten years the causes of emigration qualitatively changed. At present it has mainly an economic character and includes mostly permanent residents of Armenia. It is connected with the deepening of the disbalance in the labour force demand and supply in the course of formation of the labour market in Armenia, and the rise of the rate of participation of the Armenian working masses in the international labour market. A certain role belongs also to not comparable differences between the rates of growth of the volumes and the labour force's costs of the international labour market and the labour market of the Republic of Armenia.

According to generalized data of the NSC RA (1991-1998), the main reasons of the emigration from Armenia are represented in

³⁶⁸ M.Gabrielyan. Refugees beside us. - "Gitutyun" ("Science"), NAS RA, 30.8.1997, p.7 (in Armenian), G.Avakyan. The Refugees of Armenia: Social State and Adaptation, Erevan, 1966; L.Alaverdyan. How Refugees were rented. - "Golos Armeniia", "The Voice of Armenia" - an Independent newspaper, Erevan, 15.04.1994, p.1-2 (both in Russian).

³⁶⁹ Information-Political Bulletin "Dialogue". The Center of the Russo-Armenian Initiatives. M.-E., 1996, N 1, p.1-11 (in Russian).

³⁷⁰ S.Karapetyan. Labor Force and the Brain. Human Development Report. Armenia, 1995, p.48.

table 41. As is seen, men and women emigrate mainly according to the reasons specific for each gender and age.

The lack of employment and earning enough for satisfaction of cost of living is peculiar to men. Because of that 64,0% of emigrants were men and 36,0% – women. Instead, women emigrated for the purpose of union of families. Because of that 40,0 of emigrants were women and 8,0% – men. It is clear, because women followed their husbands. It speaks about the emigrants' firm decision to stay abroad and not to return.

Table 41.

The main causes of emigration from Armenia in 1991-1998
(in percentage)³⁷¹

Causes ³⁷²	0-19		20-49		50 +		Total	
	f	m	f	m	f	m	f	m
Lack of employment	4	3	31	50	17	45	24	46
Lack of professional work	1	1	4	5	2	5	3	5
Lack of earning enough for living	3	-	15	20	13	21	12	18
Social, moral-psychological unhealthy atmosphere	5	3	8	5	3	7	6	5
Unstable global-political situation	-	-	1	2	-	1	1	2
Lack of trust in the perspective of development of Armenia	-	-	4	5	3	2	3	5
Difficulties of business employment	-	-	1	4	-	4	1	4
Reunion of family	76	81	29	2	39	8	40	8
Others	11	12	7	7	23	7	10	7

The ninth horizontal is occupied mainly by women over 50 who emigrated because of other causes.

³⁷¹ The Men and Women of Armenia, p.10.

³⁷² The picture is almost repeated in the research works of next years, but the economic factor became the most topping.

The female and male numbers mentioned as emigrated, because of the "social, moral- psychological unhealthy atmosphere," are almost equal and not great. The same may be said about the sixth horizontal, which includes those who emigrated because of the "lack of trust in the perspective of development of Armenia."

A certain difference is noticed among the age groups of emigrants. Mainly men of the age of 20-50 and over emigrated because of the "lack of employment" and the "lack of earning enough for living." 50% of men and 31,0% of women aged 20-49 and 45,0% of men and 24,0% of women aged 50 and over emigrated because of the "lack of employment."

20,0% of men and 15,0% of women aged 20-49 and 21,0% of men and 13,0% of women aged 50 and over emigrated because of the "lack of earning enough for living."

Other sociological researches also testify that the majority of emigrants were young people. According to the interrogated people, the children of 42.5% of the emigrant families were abroad. 5.7% of families had two children, 13.1% - daughters, 18.8% - grandchildren, 11.3% - two grandchildren.³⁷³

Exhausting work (accompanied by the increased number of labourers) and irregular working hours (not limited by legislation) became widespread in some branches of the national economy (agriculture, trade, particularly, small trade and other sub-structural branches).

2. The role of the social-economic factors

International migration together with some positive aspects (from the social-economic point of view) had also negative results (distortion of the process of demographic development) for Armenia.

Positive aspects of international migration have been as follows:

1. Emigrants from Armenia mostly found some occupation in other countries. Thereby, most part of emigrants secured maintenance of family by their own earnings, saved themselves from unemployment and its negative social and moral consequences.

³⁷³ S.Mkhitaryan. Internal Migration in Erevan, p.8 (in Russian).

2. Emigration contributed to keeping body and soul together of a considerable proportion of the population and even supported their vital activity by sharing earnings with the relatives living in the Motherland. The earnings of the Armenian emigrants abroad, which dozens of times are higher than in the Motherland, are a very important factor to the increase of emigration and a hindrance to immigration.

3. It extenuated potential of unemployment, as well as a process of acute expression of social tension;

4. Emigration slightly reduced the further polarization of the population in the Motherland. Touching also the interests of the poor section of the population, emigration stopped the process of their complete impoverishing.

5. Emigration supported to some extent professional labour force and saved it from further disqualification and moral devaluation.

6. It prompted (although imperceptibly, but to some extent) the first steps of free enterprise in the Motherland, particularly, widening of the private trade's net, the sphere of service.

What negative consequences had emigration from the economic point of view?

1. It resulted in the outflow of domestic capital, which like a magnet attracted young people. Youth began to vibrate like a barometer regardless of the character of work, the level of qualification and professional skills. The population's emigration gave an impetus to further process of the outflow of capital. Because of the reduction of capital investments neither extended social reproduction nor simple reproduction were guaranteed. The scales of production narrowed and resulting in extreme polarization.

2. Emigration does not proceed from requirements of the defense and military might of the country. First of all, it included persons liable for call-up. Thus, their general number declined. Since 2010 it will be more perceptible, because at that time boys born at the end of the 1990s will become persons liable for call-up. Let's remember that army is one of the most important requisite conditions of the national security of the country. Emigration involves the

population of border zones, as well as those who are occupied in strategic branches of reproduction, particularly, "brains." is an irreplaceable damage to the intellectual potential of the Republic of Armenia.

3. Emigration causes damage to the country's economy, because, particularly, young people do not take part in formation of the gross domestic product (GDP). They produce it out of the Motherland, thus being out of the processes aimed at supporting the Motherland's existence, national security and development of national economy. It means that the Motherland has been deprived of the state budget income contributed by that section of home producers. Their contribution would be conducive to revival and expansion of economic reproduction, as well as social problem-solving.

4. Brain drain (emigration of eminently qualified specialists) was full of undesirable consequences for the Armenian society. Disqualification of the national labour market became obvious. Productivity of the home labour potential has been greatly endangered. Their professional qualification does not serve any more the interests of the Motherland, besides, from day to day disqualification of highly qualified labour force grows stronger³⁷⁴ and brain drain is directed to the spheres guaranteeing higher earnings. Lack of a perspective of the adequate job and earnings compels them to move to the lower qualification spheres of employment. Thus human capital is spent in vain, as well as slows down its accumulation because specialists turn to very simple but profitable occupations.³⁷⁵ At the same time, a part of the labour potential guaranteeing high productivity is consigned to oblivion as in the country, as well as out of it. Brain drain is profitable only for the countries where they migrated to, because those states without expenses for education and professional specialized qualification become the owners of specialists.

Every year the USA gains 80-100 billion dollars as a result of immigration of scientists and highly qualified specialists.³⁷⁶

³⁷⁴ "The Social-Political Bulletin of Russia," 1995, N2, p.7-8 (in Russian).

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

³⁷⁶ "Migration," M., 1996, N1, p.13 (in Russian).

5. Many, being deprived of professional occupation in the national market, lose their connection with the labour market.

6. The level of the production's organization, qualitative measures, productivity of the labour and competitive ability decline because of the above-mentioned reasons.

7. To a certain extent, society out of producer turns into consumer in the Motherland.

8. Many work the whole day and spend heartily much energy. Their work is very intensive and exceeds an average level of the socially regulated labour hours.

How long human organism may endure such tension? While labourer is young he can endure it. Young organism owing to its vital potential may sustain arduous duty of daily work lasting 12-14 hours. However, the vector of health, as well as labour activity of such people very soon declines. It is not a secret that those persons, who while young exhaust themselves with work with no fixed hours, become old earlier not reaching pension age. On the one hand society and person gain temporarily of such labour but later they lose much. In future such person, again in working age, is unable to work 7-8 hours a day set by labour legislation and his labour activity is lower than the socially normal average level. Many of such people change their work. They usually begin to work in such sphere which does not demand any professional skills, so prematurely they abandon active working life. It should be remembered that 4-5 decades ago owing to the great struggle of people the working week was reduced to five days.

3. Demographic consequences.

First of all, emigration has an impact on the population's gene pool in direct and indirect ways. As a result of direct impact the number of population decreases. For example, in 1991-2002 because of legal and illegal emigration the population of the Republic of Armenia decreased by 400,000. Indirectly it is influenced by the decline of the natural growth, because children are born in other countries. The low level of vital activity of the people also has an impact on the natural growth, particularly, reproduction of

population. There is constant increase of the absolute number of those people (and their share in total number of population) whose material well-being several times is lower than physiological norms. A part of them is beneath the low level of vital activity. Another portion (more than a half) has no opportunity to secure minimum living standard. Meanwhile, the gene pool is preserved by guaranteeing and improving a normal average living standard. It is a state problem and infringes on national interest. During next decades will be felt the damage to the nation's gene pool even if from the present the most active measures are undertaken.

Second, emigration results in a gender-age transformation of the native countries population, reduction of households, distortion of demand and supply in the marriage market. The number of boys is less than that of the girls and the average nubility was delayed.

Third, the age pyramid of the population also has changed. Because of the emigration of young people the population advances in age. The specific weight of the age population in the total number of population increases parallel to a decrease of the working and under age population. So the working age population also grows old.

Fourth, emigration resulted in decrease in the birth rate and the sharp fall of the number of live births per each woman.

Fifth, because of the mass emigration the process of normal reproduction of the labour force was interrupted, the chain links of the succession of generations was distorted.

Sixth, different social-demographic groups participated in the population's emigration. They differ also by their number and gender-age structure. Such an inappropriate participation of these social-demographic groups resulted in the qualitative structure's change of the republic's population, because many of the emigrants were eminent specialists leading scientific and technological advance. This selective function of population migration had a negative expression in Armenia.

Seventh, for working population emigration resulted in the growth of burden of care for jobless and those who were under their solicitude (consumers). That burden rose especially owing to pension age.

Eighth, temporary emigration turned into a basis of irretrievable migration. The problem of return is relative not only to positive or negative social-economic shifts in the Motherland, but also to the problem of assimilation of the emigrants through the loss of the Mother tongue, national culture, art, psychological image and other national values and formation of new values. The peril of assimilation threatens our compatriots, particularly, the rising generation. First of all it is relative to children, their school education and then mixed marriages. On the one hand immigrant is assimilated together with his customs, national peculiarities, on the other hand an assimilated citizen is born. They grow up and get their secondary education in quite another environment. For example, the Armenian children who took shelter in the countries of the CIS get their liberal education in Russian schools, and in other countries - in the mother tongue of those countries. When they return it will be difficult for them to get education in Armenia on the basis of foreign language. The code of thinking is changed, because the normal way of thought is distorted. So, this problem also needs clearing in the policy of immigration.

The process of assimilation is delayed in inhabited localities densely populated by Armenians. However, assimilation paves the way free and without violence, at the same time preserving some specifics.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

A NEW METHOD OF DETERMINATION OF THE MIGRANT POPULATION

Until now the migrants out of the republic and registered in other countries have been the problem at issue. They determined the directions, character and other regularities of migrations.

Meanwhile, the NSS has no exact data about the absolute number of the migrants who have left for the near and far foreign countries. A considerable portion of the migrants that left Armenia in 1991-2002 and now live abroad continue to remain registered in Armenia. Children born in such families are registered in their birthplace, irrespective of their parents' registration. That is why, between 1991 and 2002 the natural growth of the population was greatly influenced by unceasing waves of emigration.

So, having the approximate data about the number of population that emigrated from Armenia is the main problem. Therefore, it is necessary to use indirect data. However, there is lack for such data. Some proposed to take as a basis food coupons. But it is well known that the most part of the emigrants also got coupons. These were used by other members of household that stayed in Armenia, or neighbours and other relatives. Others offered to use the number of those who received vouchers in 1994-1995 in order to determine the number of emigrants. But the problem is that among those who received vouchers there were also many who were out of the republic and even there were some people who got double vouchers (the convicted ones and members of their families).

During those years, sometimes, the data of sociological research served as a basis for getting a probable number of the emigrated population. Undoubtedly, their results may give a certain notion about that number. However, the methods and scales of such researches are not accurate. For example, through the poll of the ground floor dwellers of some houses in some quarters of the city was "determined" the number of those who emigrated from those buildings and thus was revealed the number of the emigrants from Erevan. These materials were generalized and the number of the emigrants from the capital was "imagined."

At first sight it is clear that the ground floor dwellers would never be able to give an exact data. Second, the data expected from the limited number of buildings can not be typical for the city with the population of 1,500,000.

The data given by the offices of housing and communal services were not also correct.

The NSS of RA undertook researches to assess the scale of the movements of population, including movements by air, taking into consideration that it was the only means of transport for getting abroad.

The air traffic in 1992-2002, according to data of the central administrative board of the civil aviation of the Republic of Armenia, is reflected table 42.³⁷⁷

In 1992-2002 the number of those who left the republic by air outnumbered those who arrived by 643,900.

Table 42.

The air traffic in 1992-2002 (thousands)

Years	Arrived	Departed	The growth of migration (+,-)
1992	636,900	865,500	- 228,600
1993	689,900	831,000	- 141,100
1994	470,000	597,800	- 127,800
1995	469,500	507,000	- 37,500
1996	496,900	517,400	- 20,500
1997	473,600	504,900	-31,300
1998	415,300	439,700	- 24,400
1999	311,600	318,600	- 7,000
2000	292,700	318,400	- 25,700
2001	373,3	395,300	-22,000
2002	423,100	438	-14,900

³⁷⁷ Special inquirers were formed for the public traffic crossing the state border. For such check-points were chosen the airports "Zvartnots" and "Erebuni" in Erevan and the airport in Gyumri, the main international points (Erevan bus terminal and the square of "Erebuni"), the overland traffic frontier check-point in "Bavra." (see "On Survey of Passenger Flows of the Cross-Border of the Republic of Armenia. Ministry of State Register and the Analysis of the Republic of Armenia. Statistic Office of the European Community (Eurostat), TESIS, 1999, p.31).

The railway and motor-car traffic statistic materials are also important for the analysis of the number and structure of passenger flows of the cross-border of the Republic of Armenia. According to data of registration of the department of the "The railway system of the Republic of Armenia," the departing persons outnumbered the quantity of arriving persons by 13,300. That number was 13,600 according to data of the Department frontier troops (Gogavan, Bagratashen) of the Ministry of the National security of the RA, the custom-house of the Ministry of the State Income (Bavra) and the frontier post of Meghri.

Some hypotheses can be offered for getting an approximate number of the emigrants from Armenia (1991-2002). As a basis for such calculation can be the difference in the number of live births in 1990 and 1995. This difference was 31,000. The same method also may be applied regarding 1996-2002. A question may arise: what number of population would guarantee these 31,000 newborns? Besides, the decline of the birth rate was a result of emigration and the above-mentioned objective and subjective factors; for example, the echo of the wave of World War II, the earthquake, the war launched by Azerbaijan, deportation of Armenians from Azerbaijan, emigration of Azeri-Turks from Armenia, new social-economic conditions, etc.

Taking into account both the difference in the newborns' number in 1990 and 1995 and the refined impact of the above-mentioned factors on the birth and death rates, it was calculated that in 1990 as compared with 1995 had to be born 15,000-16,000 less children. The fact is that the above-mentioned factors to some extent neutralized each other. That is to say, in 1995 67,000-68,000 infants had to be born instead of 49,000 in the presence of 3,766,000 population. That difference falls to the share of the emigrated population.

What number of population would guarantee these 16,000-17,000 newborns? Toward this end let us use the following hypotheses.

1. In case of the birth of 16,000 more children, the number of the emigrated population from Armenia would constitute 900,000.

2. In case of the birth of 17,000 more children, the number of the emigrated population from Armenia would constitute 945,000.

In case of the first approximate assumption, in 1995 the population of Armenia would be 2,863,000. In case of the second approximate assumption that number would be 2,818,000. The medium of these numbers amounts to 2,835,000. This number probably is very close to the truth.

1. Let us assume that in 1995 the population of Armenia, in the absence of the mass emigration, was 3,766,000 as has been presented by the official statistics.

According to the previous assumption, and again taking into consideration the birth rate's trends, in 1995 the newborns' number may amount to (a) $49,000 + 16,000 = 65,000$, (b) $49,000 + 17,000 = 66,000$. Consequently, (a) 49,000 will be 75,4% of 65,000, and 75,4% of 3,766,000 population will be 2,839,600, (b) 49,000 will be 74,2% of 66,000 and 74,2% of 3,766,000 population will be 2,794,400.

Thus, according to this assumption, the number of the emigrated population from Armenia in one case would be 926,400 and another case - 971,600.

As we can see, we get very close numbers in the result of both assumptions. That is to say, the negative remainder of the population's emigration rate of Armenia in 1991-1995 was a little less than 1,000,000.

The same hypothesis has also been used for the period until 2002. Between 1996 and 2002, when the birth rate declined and constituted more than 32,300, the total number of emigrants for 1991-2002 will be approximately 1,350,000-1,400,000.

The fact is that the absolute data of the 1991-2002 newborns express correctly the real picture. As far as it concerns the birth and death rates per 1,000 population, as we have mentioned above, the official statistics present them on the incorrect initial principle. As a result, the birth and death rates mechanically were diminished. As we have noticed above, according to the officially published Collection, live birth rate in 2002 was 10,1, crude rate was 8,0 and natural growth was 2,1 per 1,000 population. In reality, these rates must be

calculated by means of subtraction of the emigrants from the population whose permanent residence is in Armenia, because the birth and death rates of the emigrants do not find their reflection in the official statistics of the country. In this case live birth rate will be more than 14, crude - 10 and natural growth - 4 per 1,000 population.

The numbers shown in the Collection of NSS are rather diminished and incorrect. Even such approach is very relative, because these data do not show correct numbers of the population, as well as of those who were born and registered abroad and then resettled in Armenia. It may happen, if during the same year the family with new born child returns back to its domicile. Such children fill up the list of children born during that year.

Those who die abroad, being permanent residents of Armenia, must be booked out regardless of the place of their burial, with the exception of those children who were born and died abroad but their parents were the citizens of the Republic of Armenia.

However, the natural growth of the population declined approximately 8 times during last 10-12 years (in 1990 it was 174 per 10,000, and in 2002 it was 22 per 10,000). It is a proof of a great emigration, particularly, of young people from Armenia. Notwithstanding the fact how many people left the country, 800,000 or 1,300,000, the fact of emigration is present. The growth of the emigrating population turned into a source of the decline of population which threatens the gene pool of the population of the republic. The population decreases because of the migration. An indirect effect of migration is the fact of the birth of children abroad who become citizens of foreign countries. All kinds of migration pave the way for turning migration into an irretrievable one. Other phenomena have been added to it resulting in a negative influence on the natural growth of the population.

Youth is the main reproducer as of the population, as well as social internal production and the creator of the national income.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

THE ESSENCE OF THE POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

1. Policy requirement

For a long time mass immigration was a permanent phenomenon in Armenia and on the contrary, the history of emigration from Armenia is a short one. That is why the state policy of migration was one-sided, including only immigration. Some elements of this policy originated from the 19th century and, particularly, the 1920s, and later were specified, elaborated and applied specifically according to the character of immigration at its goals at any given moment (repatriation, refugees, etc.). A policy of satisfaction of the requirements of repatriates, refugees and the victims of the Spitak earthquake for settlement, housing and employment, giving them long-term credits with amortization for building private houses, as well as promotion of a number of social and economic programs on education and culture based on humanitarian aid has been realized. Those having the refugee status enjoy the support of the international migration organizations. It's clear that such kinds of help may not solve the problems.

In 1988, first, the State Committee of Refugees was formed, then, in 1990 - the Headquarters coordinating and systematizing the works of local organs, republican ministries and departments. Later, in 1999 the Committee was reorganized into the Department of Refugees and Migration forming a part of the Ministry of Social Insurance.³⁷⁸ This Department realized the programs of material help together with regulation of the problems of housing and employment. These programs were realized by some international organizations (UNHCR, NFP, TRC, FAR, USAID and others) and the agencies of the government of the Republic of Armenia. The fund of the help of Armenia cooperated with USAID (the Agency of the International Development of the US) which financed the program.

37 countries of the world (the USA, Italy, Japan, Germany, France, Greece, and other countries) sent thousands tones of goods in

the framework of the humanitarian aid to help the victims of the Spitak earthquake and refugees from the zone of the Karabakh conflict, as well as needy families.³⁷⁹

Since the autumn of 1993 the World Food Program (WFP) has been realized in Armenia. Since the first distribution of help (1994) the organization has provided refugees, as well as needy families of the disaster zone, including the dwellers of temporary places of residence, orphans and families with more than four children, invalids and pensioners with 51,000 tons of goods at the cost of 39,900,000 dollars. In the spring of 1999 160,000 people were involved in the program. First, help was given to deported refugees from Azerbaijan and Nagorno Karabakh and refugees from the Armenia's border zones with Azerbaijan. For the realization of WFP, in 1998 twice as much food was provided as compared with 1997. In 1998 it constituted 4,000 tons and was realized for 390 programs. In 1992 the Armenian branch-office of the United Nations' High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) developed activities with the purpose of the organization of material help for refugees. Hundreds of thousands of Armenian refugees were given living essentials, such as food, medicines, fuel, etc. Until the end of 2002 the Armenian branch of UNHCF of the UN provided housing for 3000 refugees.

The problems of integration of the refugees with the local population, as well as their naturalization in the Republic of Armenia also were in the focus of attention of UNHCR. That is why the elaboration and adoption of the "Law about the refugees" in accordance with international norms is one of the most important tasks of the Armenian branch of UNHCR. The law almost corresponds to the spirit of the Genevan convention of 1951 "About the status of refugees."

Anyhow, these helps were not so perceptible in order to solve completely social demands of the refugees and the people of the disaster zone. Many of them lived in poverty, dwelling in carriages, hostels and no matter were, in socially insecure conditions. The

³⁷⁸ The problems of migration and refugees are

³⁷⁹ The Social-economic Situation in Armenia, Erevan, 1998, p.111-112 The Social-economic Situation in Armenia in 2000, Erevan, 1998, p.127 (both in Armenian).

rights of refugees have very often been violated. The results of sociological researches testify about it. 60% of the questioned persons blamed the government for those violations, 13% - the local authorities, 8.6% - the representatives of the UNHCR.³⁸⁰ Some publications have been devoted to the future and the process of adaptation of refugees living in Armenia. These materials include two directions that need solutions. First is about return home of refugees from Nagorno Karabakh. Second, the problem of naturalization of refugees.

It is necessary to bring together the state policy of immigration and real life according to international norms.³⁸¹ The problem is on the one hand the necessity of bringing back and providing our compatriots with housing and employment and on the other hand this problem touches the interests of those who emigrated from Armenia and were naturalized in a foreign country, but for some reasons want to return to the Motherland. According to imperfect data hundreds of thousands Armenians deported from Azerbaijan, as well as from the disaster or border zones of Armenia and its residents found refuge in foreign countries.

Even in conditions of an incomplete state policy on immigration it was not accompanied by an elaborated and acting state policy. On the other hand, the emigration of population occurred at once, acquired a large-scale character and an uninterrupted course, involving different strata and social groups of the population.

Narrowness of the migration policy in Armenia is expressed also in the fact that the state protects the rights and interests of the citizens of foreign countries but at the same time it has no program protecting the interests and rights of its citizens that emigrated from Armenia. There is no legislative act about forced resettlers from the

border zone. Indeed, the policy of the population's emigration can not be a copy or continuation of the policy of the former USSR. At that time emigration was under strict control, the rights of the people were violated and different obstacles were thrown in their way. The state kept under its strict control international tourism and official journeys.

Currently emigration and immigration, first of all, are conditioned by the individual will; everyone decides for himself. But it may turn into reality only in certain conditions when decisive role will belong to the state policy. So, the scale and character of migration must be resolved by the government basing on the national interest.³⁸² There are no obstacles in the questions of immigration and emigration, but to some extent the process took its course and developed spontaneously. Meanwhile, it is necessary by certain programs and corresponding social-economic, legal, legislative administrative policy to create such an unconstrained atmosphere and put in an action such mechanisms which will regulate and minimize unnecessary mass movements of the people. Clearly applied migration policy must combine the interests of persons and the state by taking into consideration the social-economic and demographic consequences of the migration processes. With that end in view the state must regulate the processes of migration - both immigration and emigration, contribute to the stabilization of the streams of migration, secure their purposefulness, predict concrete directions of emigration, reveal new directions, give organized character to the labour migration by intergovernmental bilateral and multilateral agreements, stimulate or hinder the process by economic instruments, change directions and regulate sizes without violation of freedoms and rights of people, moreover protecting them. Meanwhile, since 1988 the process, size and directions of continuous

³⁸⁰ L. Alaverdyan. Refugees on the Point of Centuries. "Golos Armenii," 24.12.1998; G. Poghosyan, G. Avakyan. Social Adaptation of Refugees, Erevan, 1998, p.26-27 (both in Russian).

³⁸¹ V. Khojabekyan. Management of Migration Processes in the Republic. International magazine "The Problems of Theory and Management's Practice," M., 1998, N3, p.68 (in Russian).

³⁸² There are very interesting proposals in the materials of the international conferences devoted to the problems of migrations. See "Migrationa and the migration Policy," M., 1992; "A Collection of International Legal Documents Regulating the Problems of Migration," M., 1994; "A Collection of Legislative Acts of the CIS and Baltic States on the Problems of Migration, Citizenship and the Aspects Connected with Them," M., 1996 (all in Russian).

emigration have not been regulated from the point of view of the interests of individuals and state. Indeed, it was impossible to regulate because this process of emigration was illegal, irregular and spontaneous and it was very difficult to elaborate and realize a certain migration policy. During the last decade the social-economic, geopolitical and other conditions did not allow to undertake such policy.

The migration policy is realized in each country according to its socio-demographic and geopolitical conditions, as well as their international relations. In this respect the migration policy is an important integral part of their social-economic policy. It is also influenced by their foreign policy.

The management of the movements' processes is the aim of the migration policy in order to overcome its negative consequences, leading it in a predictable direction. It is realized through elaboration and application of legal, economic, social, administrative, informative and other complex methods and instruments. An important role belongs to legal criteria, especially in the area of protection of human rights with the purpose of guaranteeing the legal control over intentions of the migrants to overcome obstacles or chaos which occur during migration. Spontaneous movements are full of negative consequences as for migrants, as well as the society and the country. At the same time, regulation of the migration processes is a specific sphere of the social-economic policy of the state.

2. Social functions

International labour migration is a movement of the able-bodied population from one country to another. It reflects the process of redistribution of labour resources among different sections of the world economy. In this respect economic functions play a certain role. The role of economic functions of the international movements of population (generally of emigration) in softening of the labour force emigration is the setting up a correspondence between material (means of production) and individual (labour force) elements. It may be reached by a gradual closing of a breach between these two

elements through creation of normal social and economic conditions. Finally, the problem must aim at securing a harmonic processing and development of these two elements of production.

There are countries with highly developed and significant elements of production. Their labour force is determined by high level of these countries' development. At the same time such countries carry out the policy of the population's active migration. Organization and realization of immigration, and first of all, of the active brain-immigration (the USA, Japan, Germany, Western Europe and other countries) turns to be the pivot of such policy.

The migration policy of such countries included also organization and encouragement of immigration of low qualified labor force. It is explained by the fact that material and individual elements of production are characterized by high level of development and there is a certain harmony between them. However, these countries are in need of the laborers of low qualification or without any qualification in traditional branches of production and services.

The second group of countries being on a certain level of development is characterized in accordance with the levels of development of these two elements of production. Meanwhile the specifics of the demographic development and the rate of the growth of production do not result in the formation of the "surplus" of population. Such countries are not in need of recruiting foreign labor force. Such countries are specified by usual processes of migration, without spontaneous streams of migration. The countries having an elaborated migration policy can regulate these processes. Almost all countries of Western Europe are among such countries.

The third group of countries is characterized by a low level of development and such peculiarities of demographic development that reproduction of the "surplus" of population becomes a usual process. Such countries have lesser opportunities to meet the requirements of supply of labor force. Armenia, entering a transitional phase, is classified among such countries, although in one's time it was characterized by rather high level of the productive branches and appropriate skillful technical and working staff.

It is apparent that the means of production are used insufficiently almost in all branches of economy (particularly, in industry, construction and agriculture). A part of these means is physically and morally devalued, another part is under threat of the same devaluation.

3. Social essence

Realization of the policy aimed at the solution of the problems of the improvement of the well-being and social development of population is the social essence of international migration of population. It is necessary to apply a purposeful employment policy based on importance of the social functions of migration in order to reduce social tension by opening new places, lessen the scale of unemployment and "surplus" of the population, create conditions for sharp reduction of emigration and securing the return of the citizens of Armenia who live illegally in foreign countries, encourage in an increase of the work productivity by the active policy of the use of economic and particularly, local resources, contribute to the growth of the living standard of population (the minimum value of labour force and wages as well as pension) by a reasonable policy of the putting into an economic circulation of the active economic and, particularly, local resources, to stop the process of further disqualification of the labour force, encourage in the development of small business by the protective policy defending interests of producer, soften the process of polarization of the society.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

INTERNAL MOVEMENTS OF THE POPULATION

During last years the social-economic and political changes also had a sharp impact on the directions, scales and course of internal movements of the population (see table 43). The unjustified policy of the increase of the urban population at the expense of the rural population has bankrupted. Undoubtedly, it is a positive

phenomenon. The process temporarily changed its direction in the opposite way, resulting in the increase of the rural population at the expense of the urban population. Village that once was a source of emigration, between 1991 and 1993 began to receive masses of population and on the contrary, town, changing its former function, turned into a source of migration to village. It was conditioned on the sharpening of the social-economic tension, particularly, being connected with the increase of unemployment. As compared with 1988 in 1992 the absolute number of the settlers in towns at the expense of the rural population decreased by 41.8% and in 1993 by 27.5%. Correspondingly, the number of the settlers in the rural areas increased by 157.2%, that is to say more than twice. Between 1983 and 1987, as compared with average annual, in 2002 the absolute number of those who moved from village to town reduced more than 5,6 times. Privatization of the land and other agricultural means of production resulted in changes of the directions of migration. There are many that are unable cultivate the land because of the lack of the technical means. The lack of means of transportation results in difficulties in the processes of both realization of agricultural products and competitive activities. Moreover, these difficulties increased from 1989 by the influx of refugees in rural areas, because they being deported from the urban areas of Azerbaijan by their professional skills were far from agricultural works.

Table 43.

Internal movements of the population in 1979-2002 (thousands)

Directions of emigration streams	1979-1982	1983-1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996-2000	2001	2002
	average annual	average annual											
From village to town	10,8	11,2	9,9	7,7	6,4	5,0	4,2	3,9	3,5	2,0	6,3	1,3	2,0
From town to town	9,9	8,5	8,1	8,8	8,7	8,0	6,2	4,8	4,4	3,2	11,3	2,0	2,3
From village to village	2,0	3,2	3,5	4,7	3,8	4,2	3,0	2,4	1,7	1,0	3,3	0,8	0,7
From town to village	1,8	3,6	4,4	6,0	8,1	12,3	9,6	7,9	4,1	3,3	12,8	2,2	2,7
Total	24,5	26,4	25,9	27,2	27,0	29,5	23,0	19,0	13,7	9,5	33,7	6,3	7,7

Indeed, migration of the rural population to the urban areas of the republic will not increase. The spheres of employment and housing are lacking in towns. From the end of the 1980s the guarantees of employment and housing were pushed into the background and from the 1990s were completely neglected. Such situation stirs up emigration.

The widening of the network of the institutes of higher education may play an important role in decrease in the scales of the population's movements in the republic. This positive process has also many negative results, particularly, many get diplomas of higher education without sufficient knowledge. It is first of all explained by the lack of teaching specialists, adequate literature and text-books, as well as the low level of teaching attainments and exactingness. In this regard cooperative, as well as state institutes of higher education springing up like mushrooms in towns and cities of the republic do not differ much.

From the 1990s the number of migrants from villages to towns has decreased and, on the contrary, from towns to villages their number has increased. For example, between 1979 and 1989 approximately 3,200 people migrated from towns to villages; between 1990 and 1993 that number reached 9,500. That movement was very small at the beginning of the 1980s. In 1988-1991 the increased number of migrants from towns settled in rural areas. Only in 1991 12,300 people migrated from town to village. Between 1996 and 2002 the process of migration from town to village decreased and constituted 2,500.

A number of factors influenced on the process of the changes of directions of migration: (a) hard living conditions in towns, (b) privatization of the land and means of production in agriculture, resulting in a temporary migration of the population from town to village. Completion of privatization also resulted in reduction of the internal migration's scales. However, it had a temporary character.

All these factors on the one hand resulted in the increase of emigration from the republic, and on the other hand opposed to the

process of internal migration (particularly, from village to town or from village to village) in the republic.

Irrespective of forthcoming changes in the economic, social and political life of the republic, the trends of an increase of population migration from town to village and of a decrease of population migration from village to town will not cease. Such processes are connected with completion of privatization in agriculture, although, only a small number of migrants from towns settled temporarily in village, because of a low level of agriculture.

Privatization of the land, cattle and other means of production resulted in formation of a small commodity production and even of the natural way of life. In its turn, this resulted in the decline of the movements from town to village. At the same time, the policy having no perspectives and fatal mistakes, together with a low level of mechanization of agricultural works resulted in formation of the extensive usage of the labour force in agriculture which gradually acquired a dominant character. In this problem has its share also privatization of the mechanical park. Mostly, it will be possible to cultivate a small number of plots of arable land put at the peasant families' disposal in flat regions. But cultivation of the plots of arable land in mountainous and submontane regions will remain a great problem for a long time. In such conditions peasants' labour may cover only their own demands. At the same time the output of agricultural commodity production will be very low. Meanwhile 67.0% of the republic's total population lived in towns.

Privatization had to be realized after some preparation, step by step, moderating proportions of the mass production of small machines and their import for the needs of agriculture.

The second are movements from town to town in internal migration of the republic. It is a bit less in number than the number of migrants from village to town. At the same time movements of the population from town to town have a declining trend. Between 1979 and 1982 in movements from town to town were involved 9,900 people, in 1982-1991 - 8,500, but in 1992-1995 their number reduced and yearly constituted around 4,600 and in 1996-2002 - 2,300. At the beginning of the 1980s their high number was conditioned on

availability of employment in the area of some professions in conditions of the Soviet system. At the same time the migrants could be provided with employment in other towns without any difficulty.

Big and small towns [Yerevan, Leninakan (Gyumri), Kirovakan-Vanadzor) grew at the expense of migrants from little towns and villages of Armenia. During the 1970-1990s, as well as earlier, the rate of the growth of the population of Yerevan exceeded the rates of the growth of the total population. The population of small towns grew quicker than the population of Yerevan. However, merely one percent of the growth in the absolute number of the Yerevan population exceeded 2.3 times the corresponding figure of small towns. During 1980-1999, because of that, 55% of the increasing urban population fell to the share of Yerevan. As a result, the share of Yerevan in the total number of the republic's population rose from 34.3% (1980) and reached 35.6% (1990), and from 45.9% to 52.5% in the total number of the urban population.

One may hardly find such towns which have been built or expanded on unusable plots of land, hills, ravines and edges of canyons in Armenia. Fertile lands, thousands of hectares of vineyard of the Ararat valley were destroyed and were founded factories and residential areas. New towns were mainly founded and old ones expanded in plain areas and submontane regions where the land could serve as a source of the gifts of nature.

Privatization gave impetus to use the fertile land of the Ararat valley for house-building. It causes harm to the republic's available land which is rather meager.

Before formation of the *marz* (district) system there had been 58 towns and urban-type communities in the republic. In 1980 66% of the republic's total population lived there, and in 1990 67.7%. Until the mid-1980s was put an end to 180 inhabited localities of the mountainous regions (let's remember that during the years of collectivization and formation of state farms villages were united and enlarged, many of the rural population left for towns, some mountainous villages were abolished and more than 500 villages disappeared). The migrating population was provided with a

corresponding employment in towns. At the same time they were given housing guarantees.

In 1988 64.8% of migrants from towns settled in other towns and only 35.2% settled in rural areas. Meanwhile, 73.9% of the migrant rural population settled in towns and 26.1% in other rural areas. Thus, in 1988 the urban population increased at the expense of the migrating rural population.

In 1988 18,000 people went to towns and 8,000 to villages. Only 15% of the population filling up the urban inhabited localities fell to the share other towns.

During following years the share of migrant rural population declined in the reducing number of those who settled in towns. And, on the contrary, the share of the urban population migrating from town to town increased in that number. In 1979 the share of migrating rural population was 52.2%, in 1988 47.8%, in 1991 38.5% and in 1992 40.4% in the total number of the migrant population settling in the urban inhabited localities. The specific weight of the population moving from town to town, correspondingly increased in conditions of their absolute number's decline. For example, in 1988 8,073 people migrated from town to town, in 1991 - 7,975, in 1992, - 6,236, in 1993 - 4,840 and in 1994 - 4,414. The number of settlers in the urban inhabited localities decreased as a result of the decline of the migrant rural population. As compared with 1987 (11,474) in 1994 the absolute number of the migrant rural population decreased 3,3 times (3,477). Between 1988 and 1991 the whole residue of migrant urban population settled in rural inhabited localities. At the same time their absolute number increased 2,5 times, from 4,957 reaching 12, 316. In recent years that number became insignificant.

The movements of population from village to village were not active. This process activated to some extent, particularly, during 1986-1991. For example, between 1979 and 1985 the average annual number of the migrants from village to village was 2,250, but during 1986-1992 it was 3,700. From 1993 a trend of the decline of that movement was observed and during 1996-2002 the average annual number was 600. Such changes are explained by several following reasons.

First, at the beginning of the 1980s migration included the population of peripheral mountainous regions. They, leaving their places of habitation settled in plain, even in submontane regions.

Second, from the mid-1980s until 1992 the main reasons of migration were the sharpening relations between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, the undeclared war by Azerbaijan and continuous aggravation of military situation in Nagorno-Karabakh. Border zones became the object of population migration. The above-mentioned figures refer to the persons who officially left their places of habitation and to the ones who had become registered. Throughout this period thousands of people migrated to the flat areas from the border zone. Later, their majority returned home and again their number was not registered in the list of migrants.

Third, in 1993 and especially in 1994 this decline in the number of the migrants from the border zone, (a) was explained by the armistice which included the border zones of Armenia and (b) by the completion of privatization. Those who lived in villages became landowners. At first it was unreasonable to leave the land, later it became something common. The migrants were mainly of young age. On the other hand those who moved from village to village could settle in a new place only after solving housing problem, because the process of privatization was completed there and that was the only way of becoming a landowner. However, only a few act in that way.

It is quite natural that in rural inhabited localities the streams of migration could have another picture.

First, as compared with 1988 the total number of the settlers in rural inhabited localities doubled in 1991 and from 7,968 reached 16,468 and in 1992 it was 12,529.

Second, the absolute number of the migrant urban population increased by 278.7%. Owing to that the share of the population moving to the rural inhabited localities in the total migrating population increased from 55.5% in 1988 to 74.8% in 1991 and reached 76.7% in 1992.

Third, the streams of the migrant rural population changed their directions. First of all the absolute number of the rural migrants

reduced. In 1988 68.4% of the migrant rural population settled in towns. In 1991 their number reduced constituting 54.8% and in 1992 it reached 53.9%. At the same time the share of migrant rural population from village to village increased. However, soon, the "remainder" population became one of specifics for the mountainous, as well as flat regions. As it was mentioned above, before privatization migration from mountainous and submontane regions to towns was something common, but privatization shortly sopped this process. Since the end of 1999 emigration of the rural population from Armenia has increased immensely.

Thus, regulation of internal migration of the population also is one of the most important problems of population migration policy. The problems of the regulation of internal migration and its softening in relation to all spheres of regulation of internal migration will be analyzed in the next sections of the monograph.

PART SEVEN

THE TRENDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POPULATION AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN THE FUTURE OF REPRUDUCTION OF THE POPULATION

1. Households will continue to reduce, the birth rate will decrease

Armenia enters into the 3rd millennium with overstrained forces. It will set its certain seal in the nearest future on the process of population reproduction and decrease in households.

It is well known that family is the smallest social cell of society which unites people leading joint life under one roof. It is formed on the basis of matrimonial and kindred ties and its members bear certain responsibility for each other. Family is the main unit of the reproduction, succession of generations and formation of the labour force. It has its own family budget with the sources of formation and expense items.

The population's development is accompanied by decrease in households.

Before the Great Patriotic War and even until the end of 1950s Armenian households were large in size owing to the fact that their members belonged to different generations (grandfathers and grandmothers, fathers and mothers, children, grandchildren and great-grandsons). Urbanization resulted in formation of new criteria which influenced on the number of household. The high birth rate gradually declined.

The censuses give exact data about households. According to the 1970 Census a household constituted, on average, 5 persons. 1989 - 4.7 and in 2001, according to some distorted data - 4.1.

Particularly, the average rural household reduced and from 5.5 in 1970 it reached 4.9 in 1989 and 4.4 in 2001.³⁸³

Later households reduced, especially connected with the decline of the proportion of the absolute number of mothers having three and more children in the total number of mothers, as well as a result of decrease in special indices of fertility and accordingly a sharp reduction of the number of children per a women. This problem was discussed in the previous chapter.

During the last decade the population's international migrations and various factors also had an influence on the size of families. This phenomenon always accompanied changes in demographic developments of the population of Armenia. However it became very specific, particularly, between 1990 and 2002.

The urban households' reduction because of the decline of live births is a continuous process. It is connected with more complex social-economic state of towns. The correlation of supply and demand has been distorted in the urban "marriage market." A part of marriageable young men has emigrated, another part is very cautious as regards the formation of a family and the problem of begetting children from the point of view of material security. It takes time to get married. That is why the average age of marriage is delayed. By the way, even formerly the average age of those who married for the first time was rather high. Between 1988 and 1989 the average age of young men who married for the first time was 26 and of girls - 23: respectively 26.8 and 23 in urban areas and 26.3 and 20.7 in rural areas. In 2001, the average age of young men who married for the first time was 26.9 and 22.8: respectively 27.1 and 23.7 in urban areas and 26.7 and 21.9 in rural areas.

It is possible that in future the caution of increasing the number of children will diminish and the distorted balance of supply and demand will be overcome.

In the 21st century improvement of social-economic conditions will result in family size and structure. It may have as negative as

well as positive influence on the household. Bettering of current living conditions of women will be in favour of society. Mainly women of the most fertile age are involved in small business and peddling. Centralization in this sphere may regulate their working day and change the gender structure in the portion of the population which is engaged in the trade with foreign countries.

Households will become smaller in rural areas because of a reduction in the number of births. The increase in the number of births sometimes will accompany this process, imparting to it the shade of a trend or absolute character.

Marriages were delayed in rural areas, the number of births declined sharply and since 2000 the decline in family size has become a reality.

Between 1991 and 1995 privatization became a decisive factor influencing the sizes of families in rural areas. However it had a temporary character. Many families had a trend to grow with the purpose of having an additional labour force in future. It made people to assess the size of family by new criteria, encouraging early marriages. But it couldn't last long because of the deepening polarization of the rural population.

It is necessary to create conditions for the enlargement of families. In the course of time the trend of limiting the number of children in village families gave place to a need of having many children. Every new baby was considered as a precondition for the family's replenishment with future labour force.

In future, it is necessary to create the necessary prerequisites for increasing legally the sizes of plots. The sizes of plots are determined legally by the sizes of families. Larger families request for larger plots. It was possible that their most part remained uncultivated. During the years of privatization everyone considered these plots as a specific capital which would become an article of purchase and sale.

It is necessary to create conditions for the increase of the additional production and the rise of agricultural commodity circulation. Currently, difficulties appeared in transportation of agricultural products to markets and their realization. This, in part,

³⁸³ The Resulting Information of the 1970 All-Union Census. The Armenian SSR, Erevan, 1987, p.290-291, see also The Resulting Information of the 2001 Census of the Republic of Armenia (Figures of the Republic of Armenia), pp.435-437 (in Armenian).

diminished interested motives of peasants in production of additional agricultural products. At the same time a member of family had to be engaged in the process of realization of agricultural products. Small families are unable to organize realization of their products in market.

It is necessary to encourage the productivity of farm commodities. Dissipation of the rural economy's resources was accompanied by disqualification of specialists. It affected badly the process of the agricultural productivity. At the same time commodity relations disappeared among mountainous, submontane and plain areas. A large portion of vineyards in the Ararat valley were turned into the fields of grain farming and building plots. Every family is interested, first of all, in production of daily agricultural food.

The effects of privatization and other above-mentioned factors were not long enough to encourage in the reproduction of the rural population. In the course of time big farms will appear instead of dissipated rural economy. Subsistence farming will give place to commodity production. The market, expanding its sphere, will support the rise of agricultural productivity; businessmen encourage the process of production, some not competitive will disappear, giving place to others. This process has already begun. And from just this moment interest about the size of the village family diminishes. The latter takes place in the Ararat valley also because of the limitation of plots, when parallel to the growth of families there is great lack of lands to be privatized. The growth of families and formation of new ones will result in the need of braking up of privatized lands.

Currently is also observed another trend which makes father perceptible the fall of the birth rate in rural areas. The fact is that some landowners appeared under a heavy load of cultivation of land, cattle farming and realization of agricultural products. They resign plots and ownership of land.

The level of birth rate, its decline and reduction of the sizes of families will be influenced by current hard social-economic conditions and difficulties connected with satisfying spiritual needs in village.

There is one more aspect of the problem.

For a long time new married couples live, as a rule, with the husband's parents. The size of an income of each member of family depends on the size of the family's budget. Aged members of family are interested in the work of children's mother, which will increase per head the income of family.

The sources of the village families' incomes and the aims and directions of their expenses differ from urban families and that is why they determine tight relations of new formed families with their aged members. First, the income of village families is formed of cash, as well as natural product. If not the former but the latter is almost realized completely by the family jointly. Second, new formed family uses equally agricultural production belonging to family, which is produced almost by the whole family. Third, they go to personal expenses only for clothes and luxury goods. Mostly, only a young man of the family goes to personal expenses. As far as it concerns long-term expenditures (house-building, furniture and utensils and domestic animals), the means for that purpose are used from the joint family budget. Meanwhile, the aged members of family represent less expenditure demands for the goods of personal usage, than young members. It does not come only from the fact that the aged members have fewer shares in the formation of the family budget. It is a result of very limited usage of modern clothes, shoes and luxury goods by them; they wear their belongings for a long time. All these above-mentioned factors influenced the relations between young and aged members in village families. Undoubtedly social opinion formed in the rural environment also played a role in the development of these relations.

The relations between new formed families and their parents developed to some degree in other way. Most part of new married couples can not for a long time live under the same roof with their parents, first of all, because of unfavourable housing conditions. An independent money source and daily expenses of each adult member of family also play important role in it.

The family budget is formed mainly from two sources, salary and pension. Salary get mainly young members of family, pension or

cash benefit get the aged ones. As a result of this each member of family appears in a specific financial situation. It was determined by the daily expenses of personal character. At the same time the family budget also had to be formed for its daily needs, as well as purchasing necessities for the long-term use. Each family member in towns, unlike village families, spends money daily for personal needs. These expenses were limited within the scope of daily expenses of men (tobacco, alcohol and sometimes at leisure) in rural areas, but all members of town families daily need expenses (for a break, transport, luxury goods, day nursery and kindergarten, etc.) together with total family expenditure. Daily personal expenses grow quickly within the total family expenditure.

Thus, after marriage of young couples in towns the former total family budget splits with regard to the sources of formation, as well as expense items. On the one side is the budget of young members of family with their expenses, on the other side the budget of aged members. This process is stimulated by the separation of New formed families separate and get separate apartment. After having the first child mother faces the difficulty of housekeeping. The former day's work splits up between care for child and an additional time for housekeeping. Partially that time is prolonged at the expense of sleep. However care for child does not keep mother away from her occupation in works, because of hard living conditions. Mostly, mothers are unable to practice their profession and are deprived of independent life. Mothers-in-law help usually daughters-in-law to take care of the children and bring them up, as well as in housekeeping. However, daughters get into touch with their mothers more, than with their mothers-in-law. But as mothers and daughters, mostly, live separately in different parts of towns, soothe problem of help becomes very difficult.

Succession of generations also plays an important role in urban and rural areas. Each new generation has its own problems which do not correspond with the demands of the previous generation. Sometimes it results in certain contradictions, which are more expressed in towns than villages.

In the 21st century will be formed gradually a new average size of household. In past five or more, nowadays three or more and in

future one (even may be none) or two children may be considered an indication of the household's size. Each new family is waiting for the first child's birth with a sinking heart. In the 21st the attitude will remain almost the same in case of two or even more children in Armenian families. It will secure the family's reproduction because the latter is interested in it even without any additional encouragement. Meanwhile, in the case of the third and each following child (which secures more extensive reproduction of the family and touches upon national interests) the interest is weakened, particularly, because material concerns (the means needed for taking care of children and, on the whole, difficulties connected with their education) increase. Because mothers efforts to bring up children are irreplaceable, so the whole burden of housekeeping appeared to be on the shoulders of women. That is why the woman's engagement in social production resulted, to some extent, in underestimation of her role as a continuer of the human race. Woman is not only a labourer. She is first of all the mother. She presents society with its new member. Meanwhile, the time of care after child is not limited only by physiological vacation. It is followed by new difficulties. Mother continuously takes care and brings up the future main labour force of society at the expense of great efforts, sleepless nights and investment of additional means. At the same time mother is obliged to think about involvement of her work in the social production. And these difficulties (education, getting professional skills) are not small in number and take as much time and efforts as men spend. It follows that owing to their natural specifics and virtues women in terms of social duties are affected by an additional tension. A certain role is played also by unemployment and hard material conditions.

However, an absolute growth of living births is expected in Armenia as a result of the increase of the married couples. During the first decade of the 21st century key role in formation of families will belong to those born in the 1980s and the first years of the 1990s, because at that time the birth rate was high. Nowadays a part of them emigrated from Armenia, anyhow from the beginning of the 21st century the absolute number of newborn children will have an increasing trend.

With the growth of number of marriageable girls their age of marriage will become younger, although the age of boys' marriage, probably will remain the same as now. In 2007/8 the process will reach its climax and then gradually during the several following years the absolute number of newborn children will decrease. Decrease in the absolute number of those who had been born in the previous years, later will have a negative influence on the numbers of marriages and newborn children. During those years will get married those who were born in the mid-1990s. Between 1994 and 2002, around 30-50 thousand less children were yearly born, than during each year of the previous decade.

Thus, the processes of decrease in the household and then its stabilization from the 20-30s of the 21st century periodically will be accompanied by the increase or decrease of the number of the newborn children. The high birth rate of the 1980s, will find its expression variably during the first, the third and the fifth decades of the current century, at the same time showing the trend of gradual dying away.

On the contrary, the low birth rate of the mid-1990s will result in decrease in both the number of marrying couples and newborn children in the second, the fourth and the sixth decades of the 21st century, as well as under the influence of the migration's waves. God forbid!

2. Specification of interpretation of new-born babies' **"acceleration".**

During the last decade special indices of the birth rate declined in all age groups. This decline, most likely, may continue till the natural reproduction of the population is normalized along with the stabilization of the situation in the country. However, in the first decade of the 21st century the birth rate will show the trend of a revival, but without any optimal level. In the course of the first two decades of the 21st century the birth rate will be rather high as compared with the European countries, including general level of the birth rate of the population of the European portion of the Russian Federation.

In the future the birth rate may continue to decline to some extent in different age groups of women, but it may also increase in some age groups. The above-mentioned factors will influence on the fertility of women mostly in low and high age groups. This influence will be expressed by the decline of the marriage rate in the low age groups (under 20) and the reduction of the number of children during the whole life of women of other age groups. Later it may result in the decline of the birth rate. At the same time the process of the gradual stabilization of the birth rate will occur. This process will have another trend among the women of the age group of 23-29. Women will get married at that age as a result of scientific and technological advance and changes in the social-economic conditions in village. Probably, the birth rate will keep its former level or even may rise in the above-mentioned age-groups. It is necessary to take into consideration the fact that the women of that age give birth to their first and second children in the new formed families. Owing to this will weaken the trend of the decline of the general birth rate.

Expediency of marriage at the age of 23-29 and giving birth to children, first of all, is explained by an expectation of bringing up a healthy generation. That is why it is necessary to pay attention to the problem of acceleration of the new-born infants.

In the course of last decades the problems of acceleration of new-born babies and teenagers has been in the centre of attention of physicians, biologists, sociologists, demographers and philosophers. Nowadays babies are born with better physique,³⁸⁴ than their coevals³⁸⁵ decades before. This is connected not only with the improvement of the standard of living and medical care, but also with development of social-economic conditions and productive forces and other complex questions.

The analysis of the data concerning acceleration of population in the urban areas of Armenia show that babies born by women of the age group of 23-29 have normal physique. At the same time the specific weight of underdeveloped babies or babies with abnormal

³⁸⁴ "Literaturnaya gazeta," 13.05. 1973. "The Literary Newspaper" (in Russian).

³⁸⁵ According to statistic data, in 1962 the physique of teenagers differed (the height was more by 6.7 cm, weight - 2.2-4.7 grams, thorax - 3.0-4.8 cm) from their coevals in 1947.

physique is lower among infants born by them. The most part of babies with normal average weight belong to this age group of mothers. Comparative percent of heavy-weight babies born by women of the age group between 30 and 39 is higher than that of the age group of women under twenty. However, a higher share of newborn underdeveloped babies is specific for both age groups (see table 44).

Table 44.

The shares of the average weight, overweight and underdeveloped new-born babies per each age group of mothers³⁸⁶, 1972-1973

Age groups of women in childbirth	Under-developed (weight under 2499 grams)	from 2500 to 2999 grams	from 3000 to 3499 grams	from 3500 to 3999 grams	from 4000 to 4499 grams	over 4500
under 20	4,5	21,0	47,3	25,0	1,3	0,9
20-24	2,8	19,3	43,9	26,4	6,5	,1
25-29	3,1	1,9	40,9	33,5	8,5	2,1
30-34	4,6	12,1	41,8	28,3	10,7	2,5
35-39	6,5	11,8	34,8	29,3	15,4	2,4
40-44	-	4,5	28,4	29,9	28,4	9,0
45 and over	-	16,7	50,0	16,7	16,6	-
Total	3,5	15,5	42,1	28,6	8,5	1,8

The birth of sturdy children may not be explained only by the specifics of the age groups of women. Many other factors contribute to it: mother's health, the use of improved food and vitamins during her pregnancy, food allowance, proper timing of recreation and work, mobility of woman, frequency of giving birth to children.

According to an opinion of biologists and physicians, acceleration is determined by the whole complex of variability of the

³⁸⁶ These and other data about physique of new-born babies are estimated in the Institute of Economics of the NAS RA (under the supervision of the author of the monograph) on the basis of the materials of the Erevan Maternity-gynecological Institute, the archive materials of the 2nd maternity hospital named after Prof. Areshyan and corresponding policlinics of Erevan.

population's living conditions with some reservations: in different times various factors play a role in different countries and social groups. The scientists (V.Kanep, K.Segleniepe) of the Russian Federation are quite right considering that physical development of children is conditioned by some biological factors: biotic complex and environment, as well as socio-ecological factors (diseases, life expectancy, birth and death rates).³⁸⁷ V.Bunak connected the population's acceleration with the process of intensification (as a result of development of communication) of marriages between persons who were born and grew up in far away places. All these opinions, of course, need further research and scientific approval. However there are problems that may be investigated on the basis of the statistics.

Till now, the average weight of newborn babies has been the problem at issue. Meanwhile, the essence of the phenomenon may be explained on the basis of an analysis of statistic data. The case in point is not the average rate of the physical development of newborn babies. It is important to research the statistic data of the separate age groups of their mothers. Such study (table 45) has been done on basis of the archive materials related to the urban population of the Republic of Armenia.

Table 45.

Average weight and height of newborn babies in Erevan per age groups of their mothers (1940 and 1972/3)

Age groups of mothers	Average weight of newborn babies		Average height of new-born babies	
	1940	1972	1940	1972/3
Under 20,	3174	3288	49,59	50,02
20-24	3286	3316	49,70	50,08
25-29	3376	3427	50,17	50,12
30-34	3384	3415	49,95	50,28
35-39	3461	3414	50,24	50,46
40-44	3407	3364	50,24	50,69
over 45	3400	3303	50,20	49,83
Total	3336	3368	50,00	50,23

³⁸⁷ V.Kanep, K.Segleniepe. Acceleration of the development and health, "Medicinskaya gazeta" ("Medical Newspaper", 13.05.1973) (in Russian).

In different times the average weight of newborn babies mainly is influenced by those newborn babies of the female age groups which dominate in the total number of newborn babies. Owing to early marriages in 1920-1940 mothers of the age under 20 prevailed in the total number of the newborn babies' mothers, but between 1960 and 1970 mothers aged 23-29 prevailed because of prolongation of marriages. According to the data of 1970, 80% of women under 20 gave birth to her first child, meanwhile their children constituted 9.3% in the total number of newborn babies. Women age 20-29 give birth to 50% of children. 80% of newborn infants falls to the share of mothers aged 20-34. The second child also is given birth by the women aged 20-29, the third child by the women aged 25-29, the fourth and more children by the women aged 30-39.

Early marriage is characteristic feature for the countries with a low level of productive forces and most of those who get married for the first time are girls aged 17-20. In contrary, the age of marriage is considered to be 20-30.

Generally early marriage was widely spread in Armenia. In 1914 the average age of the girls who got married for the first time was 17, in 1930 it was 20,3, in 1940 it was 22,6 and in 1960 it was 24. In 1926 73% of those who got married were girls under 20, while from 1960 to 1970 70% of those who got married were at the age of 20-29.

Between 1920 and 1940 the average rates of newborn infants was defined on the basis of indices of physical developments of those who were born by women under 20-21. Nowadays these rates are determined according to the indices of newborn babies by women aged 23-29.

Thus, during the last decades the average indices of physical development of newborn babies were changed. Together with other factors, a positive influence on this process had the factor of late marriage. Owing to that, among the newborn babies' mothers mainly prevailed women belonging to that age group which had babies with normal weight.

Such assumption gives an explanation to the questions which till now have remained unexplained in special literature:

(a) earlier manifestation and quicker rate of acceleration in developed countries as compared with economically underdeveloped countries, (b) quicker rate of the urban population as compared with the rural population, (c) the reasons of the rate of acceleration among the population's portion which removed from the agricultural production to the industrial spheres of production.

In my opinion it is not well-founded the supposition according to which the fact of being more expressed the process of acceleration is explained not by an influence of social-economic conditions on the marriage age, but by noise, dense population, an influence of the environment on central nervous system, etc.

Such interpretation, probably, may give an answer to the question about further state of acceleration. The biologist A. Zeltser supposes that it will weaken. On the contrary, the philosopher Karsaevskaya notes that the process of acceleration will grow stronger. I suppose that such categorical statements are not correct.

In rural areas further increase of the marriage age and future inclination of wife to give birth to less number of children, probably, will result in the fact that regulations observed in the acceleration processes will occur among the population occupied in agriculture. A transition to a new, regulated form of population reproduction took place in the countries where early marriages are very rare. Owing to this, the processes of physical acceleration of newborn infants, probably, will decline. On the contrary, the process of acceleration of population will gain impetus in the countries where the birth rate is not regulated, as well as deep changes are expected in social-economic conditions, the birth and death rates, the growth of the urban population as compared with the rural population and some improvement in medical service and the social and educational spheres.

As far as it concerns the CIS countries acceleration will occur in different ways as in separate countries as well as in villages and towns. It will be more expressive in the countries of Central Asia and Azerbaijan (particularly, in rural areas), but gradually a new regime of the reproduction of the population will take place and the age of marriage will be delayed. Acceleration of newborn babies will not

take place in the European part of the CIS. According to studies of statistic materials, the first child yields to the following ones in the indices of physical development. Thus, it is possible to assume that in the Central Asian republics during the life of women the reduction in the number of children, to some extent will influence on the process of physical development of children.

3. The death rate will increase

In the 21st century the decline of the natural growth and its variability, together with other factors, will be influenced as by the increase of the absolute number of deaths, as well the rising of the death rate. At the same time some changes in the age structure of the population will also result in an essential change of diseases and the deaths according by the age structure. The smallest share among the total number of deceased persons together with teenagers will be those who died in their working age in spite of the fact that they constitute the largest portion among the age groups of the population. It is understandable that in future discovery of new medicines against some diseases will reduce the number of deaths in the working age groups.

It is supposed that the death rate of infants and teenagers will decline. Till the first quarter of the 21st century the trend of the death rate's decline of the children under one year will hold out. During several decades of the 21st century the decline of the infantile mortality's rate will slow down along with a small increase of the absolute number of newborn babies. It takes place under the influence of two opposite factors. The growth of the child care's and nursing possibilities results in acceleration of their death rates' decline. The growth of the birth rate has an opposite impact. However, the rate of infantile mortality's decline will become slower also as a result of reaching the lowest level of their mortality rate. Thus, the more infantile mortality reaches its lowest limit, the less become possible its decrease. The death rate may have an influence on the natural growth of population only by the increase of its general rate. Meanwhile, the death rate will decline in low age groups, particularly, among infants.

Owing to a gradual decline of the infantile mortality's rate changes the ratio of the age groups. In the future the share of teenagers will decrease in the total number of deceased persons. It is connected (a) with the decline of the infantile mortality's rate, (b) the decline of the specific weight of teenagers in the total number of the population, (c) the increase of the specific weight of the aging population in the total number of the population.

This analysis bring us to the following conclusions:

1. In the future, the deaths caused by children diseases will mainly be overcome and the death rate will reach its lowest level.

2. The rate of the reduction of infantile mortality will grow in rural areas, where the general death rate will rise quicker, than in towns, as a result of the aging population's increase and decrease in the birth rate.

3. Serious changes will happen in the population's age structure. Average life expectancy will be prolonged. It will result in essential changes in the age structure of deceased persons. The specific weight of the aging people will increase in the total number of deceased persons. The increase of their absolute number from the first decade of the 21st century will result in the rise of the general death rate. Because of that will grow the number of deaths caused by cardiovascular diseases.

4. A development of the productive forces and, generally, technical progress, in their turn, bring with them new diseases and some increase of the death rate. It will be obvious in those periods when the development of medical science will remain behind scientific and technical progress. The most intensive development of medical science under the influence of scientific and technical progress and virus prevention will rather change clinical course of some new diseases and prevent deaths caused by them. As a striking example may be the treatment of cardiovascular diseases. In the future it will be much more improved.

5. The death rate may increase also as a result of the rise of the intensity of work. It will especially touch the aged group of population.

4. Population will "grow old" and society's burden increase

During the 21st century the age structure of the population will undergo a certain change. The expected demographic changes will reflect those regularities which are specific for developed countries. It means that a decrease of the share of teenagers will be accompanied by an increase of the share of pensioners and working age people in the total number of population. Armenia will be characterized by the "aged" population.

A difference between such terms as "aging of population" and "old man" or "old age" is marked in the special literature on demographics. The "old age" is a statistic idea on the one hand, and "aging" is a dynamic idea on the other hand. The idea of "aging" of society is conditioned by the high level of the economic, social, scientific and technological and cultural development.³⁸⁸ From the end of the 19th century has begun aging of the population and that is typical of all developed countries.³⁸⁹

The high living standard and fundamental medical system are determined by economic development. In such societies, new born infants without essential losses pass to the next age groups, increasing the number of aging people in the population structure. The birth rate declines, as compared with the increase of the number of old people, and the death rate increases.

Different rates are used in the world demographic literature to characterize the "aging" of population.³⁹⁰ The idea of rates characterizing the share of old people (between the age of 60 and 65) in the total number of population is widely spread (J.Daric, A.Sauvy

³⁸⁸ "Population and Labour Resources." A Reference Book, Moscow, 1990, p.278 (in Russian).

³⁸⁹ Such countries as France, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, Dane, the United Kingdom, Luxembourg, the USA, Germany and other countries. The share of the working age population is rather high in their populations. The populations of Italy, Finland, Northern Ireland, Holland, Canada and of some other countries are aging. On the contrary, developing and economically backward countries are specified by a high specific weight of teenagers.

³⁹⁰ E.Rosset. "The Process of the Aging of Population," M., 1968, p.25. (in Russian).

- France, A.Koller - Switzerland and E.Rosset - Poland). The rate of the increase of the absolute number of old people is also proposed (W.Bickel - Switzerland). According to the Czech demographer Vladimir Srb, the share of children rather than the old people in the population structure may be better characteristic to determine the "aging" of society.

It is also proposed (E.Kern - Austria, L.Chevalier - France and O.Tulippe - Belgium) to determine the "aging" of the population by the correlation of the numbers of old people and the working age population, as well as according to the growth of the average age (O.Ventura - Argentina). J.Daric proposes to determine the "aging" of population by the following characteristics: (a) the number of old people per 100 adult population (working age), (b) the number of adults per one old person, (c) the number of old people per 100 teenagers, (d) the number of children per one old person.

E.Rosset has correctly noted that the last one can serve as a correct characteristic of the "aging", because it shows the increase or decrease of the number of grandchildren as regards the number of grandfathers. Thus the "rejuvenation" or "aging" of society may be revealed.³⁹¹

According to a classification proposed by United Nations, the population of a country is considered young in which the aged 65 and over constitute less than 4%. In the case when that share is 4-7%, the population is considered on the "verge of aging"; in the case of 7% and higher, the population is considered to be "grown old."³⁹²

According to the classification propose by E. Rosset, the population of a country is considered young in which the aged 60 and over constitute less than 8%. In the case when that share is 8-10%, the population is considered to be at the threshold of "aging"; in the case of 12% and higher, the population is considered to be "grown old." The latter, in its turn, is classified according to the following grouping: the population of any country is considered to be on the initial level of "aging" in which the aged 60 and-over constitute 12-14% of the population. In the case of 14-16%, the

³⁹¹ E. Rosset, p.19-37.

³⁹² "Population and Labour Resources." A Reference Book, p.279.

population is considered to be on the average level of "aging." In the case of 16-18%, the population is considered to be on the developed level of "aging."

According to the world medical organization 60-70-years-old are classified as aged persons, 75-89 - old persons, 90 and over - long-livers.³⁹³

The growth of the aging population, as a result of prolongation of life, remains the main indicator for determination of aging. It results in a decrease of the birth rate, which, in its turn, becomes a condition for the growth of the rate of "aging."

The aging starts from the working age, particularly, from the moment when the number of aged prevails in the working age group. This phenomenon is widespread in Europe and in many countries of the civilized world.

It is possible to notice that the population of Armenia during the 20th century had a young structure. Although at the beginning of 2000 the share of infants and teenagers (0-14) declined in the total number of population, however, till the beginning of the 1990s, the young structure of the population preserved owing to a high specific weight of the working age people in the total number of population. Meanwhile, since the end of the 1990s pension age has had a trend of increase (see table 46).

Table 46.

The age structure of the Republic of Armenia between the censuses of 1939-2001³⁹⁴ (the total population 100%)

According to each age group	1939	1959	1970	1979	1989	2001
1. Teenagers (0-15)	47.9	37.7	41.4	33.4	32.0	26.3
2. Working age (women aged 16-54, men - 16-59)	43.7	52.2	48.2	57.3	56.3	60.6
3. Pension age	8.4	10.1	10.4	9.3	11.7	13.0

³⁹³ Ibid.

³⁹⁴ Table is compiled on the basis of the census materials of the corresponding years. It is clear that till 1989 the working age was taken by an old calculation.

Until now average life expectancy in the Republic of Armenia has been mainly prolonged owing to the reduction of the infantile mortality. It serves, in its turn, as a factor slowing the aging of the population. This trend will continue until till the first decades of the 21st century. However, from the moment when (the 2025-2030s) the infantile mortality reaches its lowest level, the average life expectancy will not be prolonged owing to this factor. Meanwhile, the death rate of the elderly will be brought to the forefront. At the same time, during some years it will decline and the number of long-livers will increase. Although, at the present it also plays a certain role in the course of prolongation of life expectancy. Anyhow, the death rate will rise.

As far as it concerns the variations of the share of people aged 65 and over (which is a rate characterizing aging of the population) in the total number of the population, in 1959 it constituted 5.6%, in 1970 - 5.7%, in 1979 - 6.0%, in 1989 - 5.6% in 2001 - 9.7%.³⁹⁵ The last figure is higher, because migration was not taken into account.

The aging of the population started at once and was formed in two ways in Armenia. The first was a natural way (the birth rate decreases gradually and the number of the aged 65 and over increases) which was specific for the developed countries. The second way began with the great migration as a result of which the number of the aged 65 and over artificially increased in the structure of the population. The process continues and Armenia becomes a country with the "aging" population, because during the 21st century the age structure of the population will undergo a certain change. Forthcoming demographic changes will express the regularities which are specific for the developed countries. Emigration is also increasing in the case of Armenia. It means that a decrease of the share of infants and teenagers (0-14) will be accompanied by an increase of the share of pensioners in the total number of population. From the middle of the first decade of the 21st century will also begin the "aging" of the working age population.

³⁹⁵ The population of the USSR 1987, p.86; A Demographic Year-Book 1991, p.42 (both in Russian); The Results of the 2001 Census of the Republic of Armenia (Figures of the Republic of Armenia), p.226-228.

Thus, elaboration of the national program with respect to the aged population is the order of the day. It may be realized not only by an improvement of the public health service, development of the network of old people's homes and radical reformation of the whole system of health protection, but also involvement of the aged population in labour activity in accordance with their abilities, creation of moral support in work collectives, etc.

The problem of pension acquires a new significance in the light of the present discussion. It is necessary to note that until now the economic formulation of pension has been neglected. It is considered simply as a benefit paid from the funds of social insurance. Meanwhile it is necessary to differentiate between a benefit paid to various strata of society from the funds of social insurance on the one hand and different kinds of pensions and the long service pension on the other hand. The long service pension paid to pension age people is an appropriate compensation for surplus product produced by surplus labour in surplus working time.³⁹⁶ In fact, in the course of time these funds we accumulated in the national treasury.

The minimum and maximum limits of the long service pension will change. In each concrete case it must be fixed not according to the level of productivity of the period of labour activity of retiring generation, but in accordance with the level of productivity which coincides with the period of their retirement and is specified as having high opportunities. In this connection the long service pension must be paid also to those who had a little or no participation in economy, but brought up an appropriate number of children. These persons have done socially useful work bringing up a new generation of labour resources. Owing to their higher productive work will be created higher productive values thus a greater fund of the long service pension will be formed.

Thus, socially useful work must be in the basis of the long service pension, which is a compensation for the work of labourers

³⁹⁶ This problem for the first time was researched in my monograph "The Population of the Armenian SSR and Modern Problems of Reproduction of Labour Resources", Erevan, 1976, p.74-76 (in Armenian).

and their payments of taxes. In this case mothers who together with their work in social production brought up a number of children also have to get a long service pension. There must be a difference between the pension of those women who were active in economy but brought up fewer children and those women who were active in economy and, at the same time, brought up many children. The latter must get higher long service pension than the former.

According to the current legislation income-tax with a rebate is collected from those labourers dependent on whom for support are 4 and more unemployed persons. Is not it appropriate to give a right of income-tax with a rebate to those labourers dependent on whom for support are 3 and more unemployed persons. Till now this right has been given to the head of the family. It would be proper to give such right to women too. It would be appropriate if mothers' holidays were prolonged legislatively according to the number of brought up children.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

POSSIBLE TRENDS OF MIGRATION

An assessment of the migration situation will be incomplete, if the possible process of the trends³⁹⁷ of development of the international migration at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century and further are not projected.

³⁹⁷ The problem is analyzed to some extent in the following publications: V.Khojabekyan. "Migration Processes in Armenia". - "Migration," M., 1997, N4, p.29-32 (in Russian and English), V.Khojabekyan, Management of Migration Processes in the Republic. - International Magazine "The Problems of Theory and Practice of the Management," M., 1998, N3, p.68-71. "The Possibilities of the Regulation of the RA's Population Migration" - International Magazine "The Problems of Theory and Practice of the Management," M., 2000, N3, p.25-29 (in Russian). "Migration in a Transforming Society," "Annotated bibliography published in the countries the CIS. 1992-1999," Editor Zh. Zayonchkovskaya, M., 2000, see V.Khojabekyan's article between pp.41-58 (in Russian). S.Mkhitaryan. The Internal Migration in Erevan, p.39-52 (in Armenian).

A "residue" population will preserve and even increase at certain stages. First of all it is conditioned by an anticipated demographic state in the republic, as well as by the fact of availability of hundreds of thousands of Armenian illegal immigrants in foreign countries. The authorities of some countries make demand drastically these illegal immigrants to leave for their Motherland. At the same time, it is possible that near and far Armenian Diaspora may become a potential reserve for a "residue" population in the labour market of Armenia. Thus, the future processes of international migration in which a portion of the population of Republic of Armenia will be involved are dependant on a number of conventionalities which sometimes are unpredictable. The social, economic and geopolitical developments, the processes of formation of the world-scale labour market, rising of the world economy or general crises situation are in the basis of formation of such behavior of conventionalities in the RA and the countries that have relations with it. In this regard the policy of migration must reflect the interests of a single country, as well as of all those countries which are involved in it.

1. Regulation of migration

a. General directions of migration

The studies show that at the beginning of the 21st century the sources of the population's emigration from Armenia may be:

1. The forthcoming demographic situation.

From the mid-1990s Armenia entered such period of demographic developments, when

- the absolute number of the working age population increases,
- the pension age population decreases, resulting in the increase of the labour force supply
- since 1996 has been increasing the economically active population and it will continue till 2007

From the mid-1990s the increase of the labour force supply, resulting in tension in the labour market, has been connected with the 1980s generation entering into the working age.

The immense increase of the working age population will result in the rise of the specific weight of the working age population in the total number of the population, its (it grew old because of the great emigration in 1992-2002 from Armenia) rejuvenescence and the growth of the number of the active working age population. According to our projects, during 1996-2005 the average annual active working age population would be 1,350,000 people as compared with the average annual 1,000,000 people in 1986-1999. This figure has rather decreased because of the emigration; anyhow it will keep its high level.

At the same time the specific weight of the working age population will rise also as a result of a small number of teenagers and pensioners in the total number of population.

Tension of the present situation will increase in the labour market as a result of an increase of supply of the labour force, as well as because of a decrease of demand of economy for professional qualification and consequently moral devaluation of the professional qualification. It shows that the possibilities of emigration from Armenia will not be exhausted.

That is why a special attention should be paid to the problem of qualification and employment of the most part of the capable of working young population (2/3 of those who enter working age get professional qualification in foreign countries). It is necessary to elaborate a system of actions in order to secure their employment in modern enterprises which will have a competitive ability by culture and level of organization of work and production,³⁹⁸ as well as the quality of production. It is not by chance that devotion to their work and production of high-grade products are expressions of patriotism of each employee in Japan, Southern Korea and some other countries.

From the end of the first decade of the 21st century, probably, the population entering working age will be a little more than the pension age population. After 2008 young people born in 1993 will enter the working age. Yearly they are becoming less by 30-40,000 compared with those who were born in the 1980s yearly. Supply of

³⁹⁸ "Socio-Economic Bulletin of Russia", 1995, N2, p.8 (in Russian).

the labour force will decrease as compared with the previous decade. At the same time, those born in the 1940s will enter the pension age; their number is small because they were born in wartime. Thus, beginning with 2010 decrease in the rate of demand for work in the labour market will be accompanied by becoming less the vacant places of employment as compared with the previous years. However, tension will not keep its former acuteness in the labour market.

2. Development of the market economy based on the activity of different forms of property. It will result in liquidation of non-profit productions, limitation of the sphere of their activity and appearance of new profitable productions.

3. The use of the potential of intensive development of all branches of social production, objective process of scientific and technical progress, tendency to approach the world standards in that sphere, technological reequipment of the enterprises, their modernization and the process of radical transformation of the sectoral structure of the national economy. It will bring to competition, the growth of the labour's productivity, liquidation of some branches of production and the reduction of the number of employees. These developments will result in the increase of the number of unemployed people. There may appear also aged (over 50 years old) people among the unemployed population. A considerable part of them will not be able to solve the problems of retraining and acquiring a new qualification. The modernizing production will push them out of the sphere of production parallel to the narrowing of the scale of traditional productions and transformation of sectoral structure of economy.

4. Regional disproportion of the socio-economic development. Not only mountainous and border areas, but also small towns of the republic were characterized by one-sided development, particularly, heavy industry based on the processing of imported raw resources. These towns remain till the present as the main source of emigration.

5. Daily increase of the number of students in high educational institutions.

As we have noticed this number does not correspond to the demand of economy. Particularly is upset the balance of professional

qualifications received in high educational institutions and their demand in economy. Many graduates, not finding their place in life, will join the unemployed with diplomas. At the same time it is a factor of "brain drain".

6. In the future an intensive development of agriculture. It will be accompanied by an increase of the working age population and of those pushed out of the agricultural production, as well as formation of the "residue" of the population.

During 1991-1995 the situation in the republic sharply changed directions and processes of the population's internal migrations. It was a positive phenomenon. During several decades unjustified increase of the urban population at the expenses of the rural population receded. It was connected with the process of privatization in village, as well as the growth of socio-economic tension in towns. However, the movement of the rural population to the towns of the republic will not activate for lack of the labour field, low wages and housing problems.

The increase of the working age population resulted in a relative overpopulation. Thus again was activated the process of movement of the population from village to town and the village again has become a source of migration. The problem is the following. Internal migration turned into international migration. Instead of migrating from town to town within the republic, people immigrate into other countries, particularly, the Russian Federation, the USA and France. The problems of town-planning and ecology have arisen.

In the 21st century, parallel to the expansion of towns and constructing of new enterprises, preservation of the environment is very important problem. It is important to build unhealthy enterprises far from the housing estate. It is also necessary to unload Erevan of the industrial burden, encouraging their construction in rural areas and small towns. Take into consideration development of towns, it is important to plan in such way so in the future to avoid the fact of appearance of industrial enterprises in the territory of housing estates. The role of the state is very important in this problem.

It is necessary to encourage and give legislative privileges those businessmen who create favourable conditions for work and

transport network. In such conditions cities will attract not only rural, but also urban working age youth. At the same time, the emigration of the population from the country will be reduced and standard of life will rise.

b. Regulation of temporary export of the labour force **"remainder."**

The interest of Armenia dictates for the time being to integrate into the international labour market on the cooperative and state basis. It is one of the ways of getting out of the tensed situation reigning in the labour market.

The organization of the export of the labour force "residue" is also a very important step to form and regulate the domestic labour market.

The organization of the external labour migration, determination of the directions of migrations and their regulation are almost left out of the migration policy of Armenia and they may be a new phenomenon.

The enlistment and securing the directions of the migrating population must be the backbone of the policy of temporary export of the labour force from the republic. This policy will be aimed at solution of national problems and interests. Such emigration is very often considered as a means of getting rid of the population "remainder" or labour force "remainder." To some extent it is true, but it is very important to remember that country loses in all cases. Consequences of an unorganized emigration are disastrous. Undoubtedly, it is encouraging if people do creative work in their Motherland.

Two problems must be solved by the migration policy of the state.

First. Emigration of high skilled specialists and scientific cadres must be stopped or regulated without violating freedom of the individual by applying preventing means through economic instruments in order to create adequate economic and social conditions.

Second. Emigration must be realized in certain periods of time by means of the state regulated labour migration through conclusion agreements with other countries. It is necessary to take into consideration the domestic market's small capacity, as well as the fact that, in this way, it is possible to influence the domestic market, unemployment and social tension in order to weaken it.

Starting from the current and future interests of Armenia, the state and separate cooperatives (as it is in many countries) may mediate, direct and protect the population which temporary emigrated by the working contract. It may be realized in the following ways: (a) to enlist those who have a wish and send them to the corresponding countries, encouraging or, on the contrary, to change the migration streams' directions, (b) to control the fulfillment of the contract demands, according to which they must rise their education and work skills, (c) to organize education of students in foreign countries, on conditions that after graduation they will return home, (d) to secure their civil rights and social interests in the receiving countries, (e) to organize currency inpayments of the Armenian citizens' earnings (as to the state budget, according to the fiscal policy, as well as funds sent to their families), (f) to organize the migrants' return home after completion of the contract period.

There will be a need to license those offices which organize the export of labour force. There may be organized special departments or diplomatic representatives in the embassies of the Republic of Armenia managing the problems migrants in the receiving countries.

It is necessary to give an open and organized character to the international labour migration which will be based on the principle of respect of mutual interests. It is also important to take into consideration the realization of the agreements' demands concluded between the corresponding migration representatives of the Republic of Armenia and the Armenian and foreign employers.³⁹⁹ They must especially control.

- contract terms,

³⁹⁹ "The Labour Market in Russia: the problems of formation and regulation," p.92.

- preservation of the amount of a wage
- conditions of insurance,
- duration of working hours and rest-time,
- conditions of service safety,
- the amounts of dues payable from wages, their sources and amount of currency sent home,
- grant of taxation privileges for the encouragement of investments in the Motherland,

At the same time these organizations must: (a) participate in clinching working arguments between employers and labour migrants, (b) cover departure and return expenses of the labour migrants.

It may be noticed that in conditions of the regulated export of the labour force, together with social problems of the employees the protection of state interests of the country, which exports the labour force, is not violated.

In this case, participation of the migrating population in the development of the Motherland is taken into consideration. According to the contract, labour migrant account for their country within the limits of a corresponding legislative acts and taxation policy in the question of allotment of means from their earnings. At the present, Armenian migrants help materially only their families. These means are spent mainly with the consumer purpose, and only a limited amount of it is used in small business.

The world experience of the labour export testifies that different countries realize it in different ways. These countries are divided into three groups in a special literature devoted to this problem:

1. Countries where the streams of the international labour migration (ILM) are controlled by special national services and ministries (Turkey, Korea).
2. Countries where labour force for export is enlisted by private employers (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Tailand).
3. Countries where organizational mixed systems are used (Bangladesh, Pakistan).⁴⁰⁰

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid, p.88-91.

Some authors think that organization of ILM by private business undertakings is very productive in the case of realization of the corresponding means of the state regulation and control as regards activities with getting fix up in a job.

Meanwhile, Armenia may withstand competition only by offering cheap labour force (including intellectual). As a result, living labour costs in a produced unit are not high as compared with the developed countries, although it is relatively high because of the extremely low productivity of labour and, generally, unproductive outlay of the labour force. Currently, Armenia is characterized by a great potential of labour resources in the population's structure. Of course, through the state structures their greater portion may temporarily be involved in national economy of other countries and vice versa.

Because of a cheap labour force, some foreign employers try to organize a production of some sorts of goods. Thus they make a profit on the use of cheap raw resources, as well as low wage payments.

Armenia also has a great scientific potential and may be considered a good cooperation partner by with other countries. Any country may exchange with Armenia scientists, scientific programs, technologies, scientific production (license and a document, allowing to import and export). Armenia may organize joint enterprises and elaborate programs on the basis of the scientific workings of the Institutes, reciprocally getting acquainted with scientific and technical achievements, as well as organize educational cooperation aiming at raising the level of specialists' skills.

Thus, Armenia may participate in international division of labour also with its labour resources. The volume of this participation may be regulated by the state policy directed to raising the productivity of employment. Alongside with the above-mentioned other problems, the state must favour the following principles by its economic policy;

- securing the process of a temporary export of the high skilled labour force on the state level,

- creating corresponding prerequisites for the qualitative level of the labour potential to approach international criteria,
- elaboration of a strategic program of the temporary export and import of the labour force on an international scale, in order to create conditions for purposeful and mutually profitable labour and economic integration with other countries.

2. Possibility of immigration and its organization

Immigration is a specific feature of the migration processes of the population of Armenia. The trends of immigration in the near future of the emigrated population of the Republic of Armenia may be predicted by the following processes:

1. A gradual overcoming of the socio-economic tension in Armenia,
2. The process of the Karabakh conflict, the forms and conditions of its resolution,
3. In accordance with international norms, the process of applying of the migration policy with regard to the Armenian illegal migrants in the outside world,
4. In other countries,
 - the degree of the labour and social provision of legal migrants,
 - the absence of national and social discrimination or any kind of its expression,
 - the degree of realization of international norms of human rights and many other problems that may arise in different countries and in various times.
5. in the near future the world economic crises can not be excluded depending on the acts of terrorism (as it happened in the USA and the Russian Federation). In such cases, every country is eager to provide its population with employment, solving economic and social problems.
6. The interest of immigration to the Motherland from the far away western countries of the legal Armenian migrants and of those who have citizenship will have a weak and limited expression.

7. The situations in the labour market as a result of social-economic and political developments in the countries of CIS and, first of all, in the Russian Federation.

Undoubtedly, unexpected incidents sometimes occurring in the Russian Federation will have an impact on the course of events, influencing not only the mass immigration of the emigrated Armenian population, but also creating new social and economic complications.

(a). The source from which tens of thousands families get their income in Armenia weakens.

(b). Tension of unbalanced labour market increases. It is full of many other negative consequences.

(c). Cooperation between Russia and Armenia, reinforced by signing of the economic agreement, progressed, but these processes will go in an undesirable way if social and economic problems remain unsolved.

8. The size of the earnings of legal and illegal Armenian migrants is the main moderator of immigration.

9. The presence of apartments in the Motherland is an incentive factor of immigration. A considerable portion of legal and illegal Armenian migrants did not sell their apartments. However, there are many who sold their apartments.

At the beginning of the 21st, the Republic of Armenia, probably, will not have enough means create conditions for mass immigrants.

The following obstacles hinder immigration:

- a low living standard,
- weak opportunities to create new employments,
- a very low level of the labour force price and wages,
- tension of the labour market and the growth of unemployment,
- the process of professional disqualification,
- the weakness of the state budget in the question of solution of various social problems,
- a weak expression of the state guidance policy as regards native producers,

- the presence of many problems in taxation and custom spheres.

A special policy must be elaborated and applied in respect of the immigrants. The essence of this policy, first of all, must be directed to providing them with employment, solving their earning problem, encouraging their business undertakings, creating privileged conditions for their investments, etc. It is very important to develop education of children in Armenia. The middle and high grade children coming back home from abroad must continue their education in the language that they have learned there. During time they will learn their mother tongue.

10. It is important to elaborate a clear program of the population's integration. At the same time must not be abused the interests of the local population. It is very actual to elaborate the migration policy on the scientific basis in order to investigate the above-mentioned problem. Only in these conditions will be possible to elaborate such a state policy which will enable to influence the immigrating and emigrating population's structure, at the same time preserving professionally skilled potential.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE NECESSITY OF WEAKENING OF DEMOGRAPHIC TENSION

In the coming 15-20 years it will be necessary to improve demographic policies and to implement them through the legislative process. This should be done through centralized action and funded by monies collected for that purpose. These changes in demographic policies should proceed from the following principles:⁴⁰¹

1. The workday of women must be an hour shorter as compared with men in all spheres of waged labour.

⁴⁰¹ See V.Khojabekyan. "The Regularities of the Demographic Development of the Republic of Armenia at Contemporary Stage", - "Society and Economy," M., 1999, p.146-164 (in Russian).

2. After childbirth a two-year paid leave must be allowed for working women irrespective of the state or private sector of waged labour, or the size of family allowance. The size of paid leave must be determined according to average wages during the last five years, taking into consideration that at any given moment it must not be lower than an accepted minimum level of wages.
3. After childbirth, during maternity leave fixed by legislative norms, women desiring to continue waged labour must be paid the above-mentioned family allowance in addition to their whole salary. After each childbirth the seniority of women, having no desire to continue waged labour, must be allowed to be continued without any payment during four years after maternity leave.
4. While fixing the minimum size of each child's family allowance till his (or her) coming of age, it is necessary to proceed from a principle of keeping the income of each family member, according to officially accepted minimum living standards.
5. Family allowance of the third and each following child should be fixed as a norm by 40-50% more indices than is fixed for the first two children. In the disaster zone and border areas it is necessary to accept a 1,5-2,0 times higher family allowance, with rates according to the succession of newborn children (women having the third and the following children constitute a small number in the total number of mothers).
6. It is necessary to increase the one time grant of each newborn and to set, for the first child, a rate 5-6 times higher, for the next child 7-7,5 times the normal payment. For the third and each following child, there should be an increased one time grant by 30-35%, with growing rates.
7. It is necessary, before child's coming of age to increase three times (in comparison with the republican average level) the size of family allowance of children who lost their parents because of war or have only one parent, or whose parents are incapacitated.
8. It is necessary to increase by 45-50% family allowance paid for each child to women whose place of residence is higher than

- 1500 m. above sea-level (the case in point are maternity leave and one time grant). It must be different according to the succession of newborns, increasing family allowance by growing rates for each birth, taking also into consideration the height of inhabited locality. The size of family allowances should increase by 15-20% for each 200 m. of height starting from 1501 m. above sea-level.
9. Women having three and more children and living higher than 1700 m. above sea-level must be allowed to get a pension at the age of 55-60. There must be some principles of differentiation taking into consideration the number of children, settlement in the disaster or border zones.
 10. The minimum pension of women who worked formerly must be fixed by twice as many indices than of those who never were occupied in waged labour.
 11. Mothers having three and more children must be equated to waged labour and it is necessary to increase pension according to the number of children. Early pension and other privileges granted by the law of the Republic of Armenia to the mothers who gave birth to four and more children, probably, would be better to apply to women having three and more children, especially as their number will continue to decrease.
 12. It is necessary to grant plots from the state fund to the newly formed families in the disaster zone and border areas as well as homestead land, together with a corresponding credit for house-building and building material under privileged conditions.
 13. Mothers having three and more children must be granted a right of free transportation in the disaster zone and border areas. There must be a differentiation in child preschool establishments.
 14. Families building individual houses in the boundary areas must be granted credits on fixed conditions specific for the disaster zone. The term of repayment must be prolonged and interest reduced with each newborn child.
 15. Families occupied in the production of agricultural products in the mountainous regions must be granted the right of rent and income tax with a rebate. While granting target credit it is necessary to reduce the interest payment, prolonging the terms, taking into consideration every new birth.
 16. In future the birth-rate will be connected to the existence of necessary conditions for normal vital activity of the population of the Republic of Armenia. These conditions suppose not only prevention of the negative influences of global factors, but also a partial solution of some problems of social character:
 - a) Encouragement of a new, progressive public medical health service, including taking advantage of private, mixed and state forms. For example, treatment of cardiovascular system by performing an operation and training cadres. The same may be said about other spheres of medical care;
 - b) An increase of means in medical science;
 - c) An improvement of the territorial management of the public medical health service network;
 - d) Raising of the level of practitioners' skills.
 17. For the purpose of reducing infantile mortality it is important to restore and regulate the medical care network serving pregnant women, women in childbirth and newborns. In case of need children under 15 must be provided with free medicines.
 18. After childbirth, to preserve the two-year paid leave and seniority during four or five years it is necessary to improve the level of service in kindergartens, increasing the provision of means at the expense of the state. This need is dictated by the necessity to raise healthy children and society must be seriously concerned with this problem.
 19. Trade unions and all spheres of waged labour may support maternity and childhood in the period of the state budget's tension. The matter concerns are, on the one hand accumulation of means from the profits in production spheres, saved money from wage funds of budgetary financing and special funds, and on the other hand their goal-oriented realization.
 20. It is possible to create a special "fund of maternity," encouraging childbirth while supporting and encouraging mothers. Businessmen and employers, joint-stock companies, banks, trade objects, creative unions, the Armenian Church, different companies and organizations acting in the Republic of Armenia may also contribute to the realization of the demographic policy.

CONCLUSION

The growth and movements of population This

Armenological monograph is devoted to the approximately three-century-old history of the growth and movements of the Armenian population. It presents the demographic and social-economic processes in Armenia in the 19th and 20th centuries and offers a detailed demographic analysis of Armenia at the threshold of the 21st century.

Special attention is paid to revealing the present and past demographic peculiarities of the growth and movements of the population of the Republic of Armenia. They are examined as an immediate reflection of changes taking place in the economic, geopolitical and social life of the country.

The past, present and future of this problem is examined on the basis of a critical analysis of the newly discovered rich archives, statistical materials and sources.

Thus, the monograph is a demographic, economic and historic complex, many-sided and unique research work.

During its centuries-old history Armenia was often raided by foreign conquerors. From the late Middle Ages Armenia was an apple of discord between Persia and Turkey. Their barbaric raids ended not only in the robbery and destruction of the material and spiritual values created by the people, but also in terrible massacres - the most horrible harm caused by endless raids of barbarians.

Because of these raids the Armenian population diminished, the sex-and-age ratios changed as a direct or indirect cause of wars. During wars thousands of people were killed and trampled, while famine and infectious diseases caused by the wars claimed thousands more as victims. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of people, particularly women and children, were captured and driven deep into the countries of the conquerors, who increased their own population and improved their nations at the expense of the Armenians.

The 1639 war between Persia and Turkey ended with the final division of historic Armenia into *Eastern Armenia* and *Western Armenia*. This was the beginning of a difficult demographic period

for the Armenian people. The peril of extermination hung like the sword of Damocles on the head of the Armenian people. For centuries the conquerors pursued a policy of extermination - massacres, apostasy by violence and deportations - of the Armenians. This was accompanied by a policy of resettling Eastern and Western Armenia with foreign elements: Turks, Persians and Kurds. Because of that, already in 1828, when Eastern Armenia joined the Russian Empire, the percentage of the Armenian population had diminished.

The monograph includes four stages.

First, the key issue is the problems of the growth and migrations of the Armenian population of the Erevan, Elisavetpol, Tiflis (Tbilisi), Baku and other provinces, the Kars district (oblast), especially of their cities: Tiflis, Baku, Shushi, Gandzak (Ganja).

Second, special attention is paid to the movements in the population of the Erevan province including the Nakhijevan and the Surmalu regions, and the Kars district, the regions of Mountainous Karabakh, Gardmank', Zangezur, Gugark' and Javakhk' as integral parts of Eastern Armenia.

In time the Armenian population of Transcaucasia grew gradually and in 1913 increased considerably. It is enough to say that in 1886-1913 the Armenian population constituted 22,5-23% of the whole population of Transcaucasia and the urban population - about 40%.

For certain periods of the 19th and 20th centuries took place resettlements of the Armenian population from western part of the country to the eastern, especially after the Russo-Persian Treaty of Turkmenchai in 1828 and the Russo-Turkish Treaty of Adrianople in 1829. That was the beginning of the Armenian people's movement from Western Armenia to Eastern Armenia. On March 21, 1828, the *Armenian district (Haikakan Marz* in Armenian, *Armianskaia Oblast'* in Russian) was formed in Eastern Armenia. In the 1840s it was abolished as a result of some administrative changes in Transcaucasia carried out by the tsarist government. On June 9, 1849, the Erevan province was formed.

The Armenian population of Eastern Armenia also increased after the Russo-Turkish wars of 1853-1856 and 1877-1878. In 1878 some northern territories of Western Armenia came under the rule of the Russian Empire and were included within the boundaries of Eastern Armenia as the newly organized Kars district.

Subsequently resettlement of Armenians from Western Armenia to Eastern Armenia assumed a permanent character. The size of the forcibly resettled population especially increased in 1894-1896 as a direct consequence of persecutions of Armenians by the blood-thirsty sultan Abdulhamid. From the second half of the 19th century this process coincided with the formation and further development of capitalist relations in Russia as well as in Transcaucasia. This became an important factor in the growth and intensive movements of the Armenian population in Transcaucasia.

Eastern Armenia became dependent of the tsarist government, which led the "Great Russian" policy of subduing ethnic minorities and colonizing the Transcaucasian countries. Despite this the Armenian people's physical existence was guaranteed by Eastern Armenia becoming a part of the Russian Empire. The Armenian people, gradually releasing themselves from the bounds of eastern feudal despotisms, joined its fate with Russia and, to some extent free of national and social oppression, communicated with the progressive Russian and European culture. Meanwhile, Transcaucasia, including Eastern Armenia, was populated by the Russian colonists.

In 1915 more than 1,5 million Armenians in Western Armenia became victims of the brutal genocide planned and committed at the state level by the leaders of the Young Turks. Meanwhile, the Turkish authorities and almost the whole Turkish people, trying to turn barbarities of the janissary bands of the Young Turks upside down, falsifying history, rich archive materials in Turkey, Germany and other countries, as well as testimonies of witnesses, deny bitter truth - the Armenian Genocide. On the contrary, without invocation of real facts, they find Armenians guilty in committing genocide as regards Turks. Moreover, the countries which recognize the Armenian Genocide have been threatened by Turkey with breaking diplomatic relations. However, from day to day increases the number

of the countries recognizing the Armenian Genocide. The leadership of Turkey considers that only in the case of denying the fact of the Genocide by Armenians may be possible to establish good-neighbour relations. But our Armenian people will never do that.

It is not a secret that Turkey always behaves towards Armenia from a position of strength and not a single word about the return of the Armenian lands and, generally, history is said. Turkey always falsifies historical facts. It is impossible to establish economic, trade or diplomatic relations in such situation. Some weak contacts are in undeveloped state.

Restitution of the lands of Western Armenia is a national demand of several generations of the Armenian people living not only in Armenia, but also against their will in Diaspora. The resolution of the Armenian Question is left to the history and generations, and must be realized in a diplomatic way and not from a position of strength. In the course of time, perhaps, the authorities of Turkey and the future sensible generations of the Turkish people will condemn their ancestors (though it is rather unbelievable) for the Armenian Genocide and the conquest of the lands of historic Armenia.

Often, as so-called guarantee is mentioned striving of Turkey for becoming a member of the European Union and some break in foreign policy, particularly, its aspirations for getting an image of a civilized country in the world community's opinion. After becoming a member of the EU, Turkey will be obliged to submit to the foreign policy of the European countries.

Phantom hopes...

No "European policy" is able to disguise intolerance of Pan-Turkism regarding Christian Armenia, which is in the midst of the Islamic region. The policy of Turkey from a position of strength is based on its geopolitical situation, mutually beneficial economic and military-political integration with West. Owing to the opportunity offered by Turkey, the military bases of the USA and western countries are located not far from the borders of CIS. In this respect Turkey was of a greater interest for western countries than Armenia. The geographic position of a decisive factor in the process of the Soviet-Turkish relations, although one must keep in mind the policy of the USSR in relation to the Muslim world.

However, it is important to remember that Armenia was saved of the "claws" of Turkey by Russia and Soviet Union.

During World War I and then in 1918-1920 the forced resettlements of Armenians continued because of the aggressive policies and attacks of the Turkish occupants from the west and the Musavat bands from the east. After suffering numerous losses a considerable part of the Armenian population was forced to resettle in Eastern Armenia or escaped to Georgia and further north, as well as to the countries of the Near East, Europe and America with the hope of saving themselves.

Now even the population of Eastern Armenia lived under the threat of genocide. The very existence of the Armenian people on their ancestral lands was at stake.

During the years of establishment of the Soviet rule, on the one hand Turkey, unconditionally conquered territories of Western Armenia, together with the Kars district, the Surmalu region, the territories lying to the west of the Akhurian river, which formed the constituent parts of Eastern Armenia, on the other Soviet Azerbaijan with the active help of Turkey and Soviet power annexed the Nakhichevan region of the former Erevan province. The Gardmank province and Mountainous Karabakh of Eastern Armenia were also annexed to Soviet Azerbaijan. The Nakhichevan region, the Gardmank province and Mountainous Karabakh had never been parts of "Azerbaijan" before. It is very important to take into consideration that in contrast to Iranian Azerbaijan/Adarbaijgan (*Atropatene-Atropatakan*) there was no territorial idea of "Azerbaijan" in eastern Transcaucasia. It was created during the years of the Soviet rule. Meanwhile, Georgia was in possession of the Armenian region of Javakhs'.

By the tsarist administrative division provinces included any territory. The territories of historical Armenia with their Armenian population, including the Erevan province and the Kars district were parts of the Tiflis, Elizavetpol, Baku and other provinces. This is why in these provinces, especially in the cities and towns, Armenians constituted a considerable percentage of the population. At the same time, it is necessary to take into consideration that long before that there were many Armenians in Tiflis, Baku, Gyanja (Arm. Gandzak), Shushi and other big towns of Transcaucasia. When Soviet power

was established in Transcaucasia a considerable part of historical Armenia with its population was forcibly ceded to the Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Georgia. As a result there lived many Armenians in those republics. In 1980s about half a million of Armenians lived in each of them.

Owing to migration and the natural increase within the borders of the current territory of the Republic of Armenia, the population grew from 161,700 (1831) to one million in 1913. In the Kars district, 1886 population of 174,600 reached 382,700 by 1913.

During the years of World War I about 500,000 people from Western Armenia were forcibly resettled in Eastern Armenia. As a result, they joined the local population of more than one million that lived in the territory of present day Republic of Armenia in 1913. Meanwhile, in December 1920, at the moment of the establishment of the Soviet power, only 720,000 people lived in Eastern Armenia. This means that a considerable part of the population had become innocent victims of massacres and bandit raids. In this period and following years the death rate was high in Armenia. The death rate was high for children as well as adults. It is enough to say that less than half of the new-born infants reached the age of 10-12.

Third, the present general picture of the population and economics - from 1920 till now - is thoroughly examined.

Owing to the extremely high birth-rate (in the 1920s there were 56-57 births per 1,000 population) and the repatriation of Armenians from different parts of the world, in 1930 the population of Soviet Armenia reached 1 million, equal to the level of the pre-war time.

The population continued to increase both before and after World War II. Meanwhile, 600,000 young men from Armenia took part in the Great Patriotic War and the half of them became the victim of that war. 103 participants in the war were officially declared Heroes of the Soviet Union (fighter pilot Nelson Stepanyan, twice proclaimed a Hero of the Soviet Union).

There were 60 generals of Armenian birth among the military officers of the Soviet Union. This number includes General of the Army Hovhannes Kh. Baghramyan (the future Marshal of the Soviet Union, twice proclaimed a hero of the Soviet Union), Admiral of the Navy of the Soviet Union, Hovhannes S. Isakov, Marshal of

Aviation Sergey A. Khudyakov (Armenak Khanperyants), Hamazasp Kh. Babajanyan - the future Chief Marshal of the armoured forces and others.

In post-war years of 1946-1960 repatriation of Armenians to the Soviet Armenia reached a massive scale. It gradually decreased, though, because at the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s a considerable part of the repatriated was subjected to repressions and innocently died on the roads to exile, in the depths of Siberia and in the region of Altai.

Still, at different periods (1950-1962, 1977-1992) repatriation and an extremely high birth-rate was accompanied by the decrease of the death-rate. One of the important factors in the population increase of Armenia was the reduction of the mortality. It resulted in increase of the life expectancy owing to which the decline of the natural growth of population became slower than the decrease of the level of the birth-rate.

Much attention is paid in the monograph to the questions of the analysis of the high birth-rate in pre- and post-war times, the sharp reduction of the mortality (characterized as the lowest in the world) after 1970, early marriages, their high coefficient and the growth of fertility, as well as modulation in reduction of fertility and marriages at different periods. If in 1960 there were 75,000 births and in 1970 - 55,700, in 1986 the number of births was 81,200.

During the years of Soviet power there was a fivefold growth in the population of Armenia. But in 1988 the confrontation between Armenia and Azerbaijan began. Soviet Azerbaijan undertook an undeclared war against Soviet Armenia.

Fourth, the demographics and the social-economic state of Armenia at the threshold of the third millennium is examined. A prognosis is made about the main demographic trends and social-economic progress of the Republic of Armenia.

In particular, it is emphasized that the rooting of the new economic methods has left its certain contradictory impress as upon the role of the factors of the population's natural growth, objective laws forming under their influence and the expression of future tendencies, as well as upon the change and intensity of the directions of the waves of inter-territorial and inter-state migrations.

Thus, the growth of the population and its migrations, from the 19th century to the present day, and the future trends in the 21st

century, are for the first time presented to the reader's attention in the whole monograph.

Deportation of the Armenians from the Azerbaijan SSR and the emigration of the Azerbaijanis from the Armenian SSR To say that the genocide and persecutions of ethnic minorities in Soviet Azerbaijan were prompted by the Karabakh movement would be to sin against the truth and the historic reality. The facts testify that the national policy realized by Azerbaijan was the logical continuation of the genocide of the Armenians committed by Turks. Let's not forget that parallel to the genocide committed in Western Armenia the similar crimes of inhuman brutality towards Armenians were committed also in the Armenian populated regions annexed by Azerbaijan as well as in some regions of Eastern Armenia occupied by Turks.

In 1988-1990 the entire Armenian population living in Azerbaijan was deported, leaving huge areas, houses and property. By January 1, 1998, there were 316,000 refugees - deported people in Armenia from Azerbaijan, as well as forced by the Azerbaijani authorities resettled people from Nagorno-Karabakh (Mountainous Karabakh) (48,000).

The state and political leaders of Azerbaijan directly inherited the political genocidal course of the Musavat rulers⁴⁰². The genocide realized in Azerbaijan was planned for decades and was dictated by

⁴⁰² In 1918-1920 the state of the Armenians in Baku, Gandzak (Ganja), Shushi, Nakhijevan and other places was the most unbearable. At that time the Armenian population was brutally massacred in Azerbaijan by the Turkish bands and Musavat gangs. In September 1918 the massacre of the Armenian population of Baku continued three days and nights. Thousands of peaceful, unarmed Armenian inhabitants were killed, captivated during band raids and disappeared completely.

Only times differ. There is no difference between the forms of misanthropy, barbaric and blood-sucker methods put in action with the purpose of genocide and wretched crimes.

In September 1918 the number of those killed during three days of massacre in Baku reached about 30,000, several hundred Armenian women and young girls were raped and kidnapped. Wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters were raped near the dead bodies of the massacred men. Mothers and daughters were raped in the presence of each other ("Pravda", 21.09.1918; E.Sarkisyan. The Expansionist Policy of the Ottoman Empire in Transcaucasia, Erevan, 1962, p.393, in Russian).

the necessity of putting into action the policy of "Azerbaijan only for Azerbaijanis".

Let's not forget about the fate of the Nakhichevan Armenians in 1918-1926. In 1918-1920, during the raids of the Turkish occupants and the Musavat bands, the Nakhichevan Armenians twice left their native land – Nakhichevan-a part of Armenia, one of the regions of the province of Erevan. In 1920, after the second Turkish invasion and the mass massacres the Armenian population of Nakhichevan had to leave their native land and become refugees. As a direct result of the Moscow Treaty (March 16, 1921) the Nakhichevan (Nakhichevan) Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was established on 9 February 1924 as a constituent part of Soviet Azerbaijan. Thus the conclusion of such an unjust treaty, without Armenia's consent and at Armenia's expense, was an unprecedented case in the history of diplomacy. Just in the same way a part of Eastern Armenia - Mountainous Karabakh - was annexed forcibly by Soviet Azerbaijan. In 1921 after annexation of Nakhichevan by Soviet Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijani authorities prohibited the Armenian refugees (who during massacres of 1918-1920 left their houses and properties) to return to their birth-place, though their houses were empty, doors locked, and land uncultivated. Notwithstanding the Nakhichevan (Nakhichevan) Central Executive Committee's (CEC) preliminary agreement, the Azerbaijani CEC and NCEC passed many special resolutions imposing bans on the return of the Nakhichevan Armenians. The local Armenians repeatedly appealed to the Transcaucasian Federation and the authorities of the Soviet Union against such unlawful resolutions and actions.

But the resolutions of the CECs of the Transcaucasian Federation, the Soviet Union and the government were useless⁴⁰³. In 1925, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union Rikov, who visited Azerbaijan, condemned the Azerbaijani government for "complete Soviet disgraceful goings-on"⁴⁰⁴. The Azerbaijani authorities were relieved of their posts and persecuted, but in vain. Things were right there where they started. In 1926, the new Azerbaijani leadership finally prohibited the Nakhichevan

Armenians from returning to their uninhabited places - to their villages and houses which had already turned into ruins⁴⁰⁵.

Let us also remember some legal offences against Armenians that found expression in the Soviet press.⁴⁰⁶ These facts reflect the Azerbaijani leadership's intolerant attitude as well as the Muslim religious fanaticism of not small number of Azerbaijanis towards Armenians before the 1988 "Karabakh events."

In short, mainly the Armenians became an insurmountable barrier in the way of the creation of "one united nation" and further pan-Turkist plans in Azerbaijan. This is why in order to get rid of the Armenians the barbaric methods of ethnic "cleansing" were planned and put into action.

This was the "logical" basis of the immense hatred and hostility towards the Armenians that the agent provocateurs in Azerbaijan did their part to flame.

Because of this in peaceful years the number of Armenians, Russians and other nations diminished in Azerbaijan. At the same time, the number of Azerbaijanis in the period from the 1959 census (107,700) to the 1970 census (148,200) increased more than 40 thousand in Armenia. No other ethnic minority had such growth in Armenia. Between 1970 and 1979 the Azerbaijani population increased by 13,000.

One must remember, also, that between 1948 and 1951 the number of Azerbaijanis in Soviet Armenia actually decreased. The reason for this was that in 1946 the government of Soviet Azerbaijan appealed personally to J. Stalin in Moscow to organize the resettlement of Azerbaijanis from the Transcaucasian Soviet Republics of Georgia, Armenia and the Soviet Republics of Middle Asia to the valley of the Kur and Arax rivers in Soviet Azerbaijan so that they could cultivate and irrigate new lands. This demand was satisfied. Between 1948-1951 particularly from Soviet Armenia about 58,500 Azerbaijanis emigrated in an organized way and resettled in Soviet Azerbaijan (see a book published by Azerbaijanis: "Materials of the Economic History of Azerbaijan...", Leningrad, 1970, in Russian). As an aside, Azerbaijanis on collective farms

⁴⁰³ For more details, see The Central State Archive of the Republic of Armenia, fund 130, list 6, record 197.

⁴⁰⁴ "Zarya Vostoka" ("The Dawn of the East"), 12.03.1925.

⁴⁰⁵ "Bakinski Rabochi" ("The Baku Worker"), 06.05.1925.

⁴⁰⁶ "Izvestiya", 18.04.1987, "Selskaya Zhizn" ("The Village Life"), 24.12.1987.

(kolkhozes) measured their share of wealth in cattle and drove the cattle to Azerbaijan.

It is necessary to mention that the greater part of the 58,000 Azerbaijanis who emigrated from Armenia to Azerbaijan between 1948 and 1951 didn't adapt themselves to the local conditions and returned to Armenia. Families were intentionally divided: half of them stayed in Azerbaijan, while the other half came to Armenia.

When they came back, they again joined kolkhozes, but without bringing back the property that they took away with them. Their families divided into several parts, with each one getting a separate plot of land attached to the house. They built comfortable houses and became the owners of large flocks. Materially, in general, they led a more self-sufficient life than the Armenians.

The policy of depriving the Armenian population of its rights, and the pressure and persecution against them, which lasted dozens of years, entered a new stage in 1988 with the Sumgait tragedy, when all methods and forms of genocide were used. The use of weapons in an organized manner against a peaceful, unarmed population - the aged, women and children-made the deportation of the Armenian population inevitable.

Armenians were tortured, women and young girls were gang raped by bandits in front of one another, publicly treated with contempt, and thrown out of windows. Murderers barbarously played ball with the decapitated heads of their victims. Officially thirty-two people were tortured to death. In reality more women and men were tormented, hundreds were wounded and mutilated.

From February 28, 1988, the Sumgait genocide continued in the streets for three days and nights. If it were not organized from the center, what were the party, state, Soviet and law enforcement authorities doing in Sumgait and nearby Baku? How is one to explain the conduct of the central Soviet authorities and personally of M.Gorbachov⁴⁰⁷ expressed in the Sumgait trial and during subsequent events.? Was not it intentional to divide the Sumgait case among 10-12 courts?

⁴⁰⁷ The position of M.Gorbachov is introduced in details in V.E.Khojabekyan's book "Artsakh in the Hour of Trial", Erevan, 1991 (in Armenia).

Sumgait was a planned experiment as the first step towards a large-scale genocide. Its organizers tried to test the position of the central Soviet authorities, legal authorities and media. The experiment passed the examination. The butchers of the Sumgait and subsequent events were passed over, their crime remained in the shadows and it was not defined as brigandage and didn't receive political condemnation. This inspired the butchers and pushed them to commit new crimes.

Sumgait showed that each step of the criminals would remain unpunished, so it was a signal for them that the proper time had come for the ethnic cleansing of Armenians from Azerbaijan.

Yes, subsequent developments in Azerbaijan ripened, protected by the hushing up of the Sumgait genocide by the central Soviet authorities and personally of M.Gorbachov by "not noticing" the gradual escalation of the ethnic cleansing in Azerbaijan and by the policy of their false "justification".

During three horrible days of massacre innocent Armenian people were killed and 17,000 Armenians who lived in Sumgait became refugees. They could hardly escape of carnage. Sumgait gave birth to Baku, Kirovabad, Khojalu, Dashkesan, Khanlar and other massacres.

From January 13, 1990, for seven days, blood-thirsty bands passed from quarter to quarter in Baku setting Armenian houses on fire, killing children and women with all kinds of weapons, torturing and raping without consideration of age. The property of the persecuted was robbed and divided among bandits in the presence of the tortured Armenians.

In a week, from January 19 the massacre of the Armenians was followed by the massacre of Russian families, women and children.

Azerbaijanis keep silence about the fact that before the Soviet troops entered Baku, they created a situation that resulted in many deaths and the deportation of tens of thousands of Armenians and Russians from Soviet Azerbaijan. During those days 150 Armenians were brutally killed.

And what's about Khojalu? It is a part of historic Armenia. On February 25-26, 1992, members of the Armenian emergency volunteer corps fighting in the regiments of the Artsakh self-defense during the operation of liberating Khojalu opened a corridor for Azerbaijanis. But the armed bands of Azerbaijanis fired at their compatriots, as witnessed also the ex-president of the Republic Azerbaijan A.Mutalibov.

It is necessary to emphasize that the emigration of Azerbaijanis from Armenia was a result and direct consequence of the Azerbaijani policy of the Sumgait genocide and mass deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan. Thus, the emigration of 160,000 Azerbaijanis from Armenia was on a voluntary basis. They were not deported from Armenia. The Armenians did not attempt a genocide of the Azerbaijanis in Armenia. There was no pressure for the Azerbaijanis to leave Armenia for Azerbaijan. On the contrary, often local, state and economic officials, and the Armenian population in general, did everything to stop emigration.

Besides, when in 1988 Azerbaijanis immigrated to Azerbaijan a certain part of them had houses and property there. Thus they didn't become homeless refugees, although those in Azerbaijan erroneously insist that there are "one million homeless migrants, living in tents". Mostly, this is an imaginary number. A detailed analysis shows that the number of Azerbaijanis that in the 1988-1990s emigrated from the lands liberated and controlled by the Republic of Mountainous Karabakh, from the proper Republic of Mountainous Karabakh and the Republic of Armenia, was not 1 million, but a little more of 500 thousand (300,000 from the liberated and controlled lands, 45,000 from the Republic of Mountainous Karabakh, and 160,000 from RA). In other words, the false numbers are double what they should be.

When Azerbaijanis emigrated, they took their property with them, in many cases exchanging urban and rural apartments, while the deported Armenian population of Azerbaijan had been massacred and robbed.

There were more Armenians deported from Azerbaijan than Azerbaijanis emigrated from the Republic of Armenia. There were

2,7 times more Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan than there were Azerbaijanis who emigrated from the Republic of Armenia.

Because deported Armenians had smaller families, they left a disproportionately more number of apartments in Azerbaijan.

Most of the deported Armenians were urban dwellers. Ninety per cent of the Azerbaijani emigrants from the Republic of Armenia were peasants. Many of the Armenian refugees were unable to exchange their apartments because there were not enough in the Republic of Armenia. A considerable part of the Armenian refugees left their apartments and property in Azerbaijan, together with their possessions and furniture, without receiving any compensation. A proportion of the Armenian urban dwellers who were able to exchange their apartments in Azerbaijan for others on the border and in mountainous rural areas of the Republic of Armenia couldn't get used to the local conditions, including professions, so they moved to the cities or emigrated abroad.

Many Azerbaijani emigrants from Armenia cannot be classified as "refugees". Particularly (a) Azerbaijanis who exchanged their apartments for those left by Armenians who were deported from the Azerbaijan SSR and (b) those Azerbaijanis who during the Spitak earthquake received material compensation for their ruined apartments.

Emigration and decrease of birth rate Before the 1980s immigration was a characteristic feature in the demographics of Armenia.

In 1988 the mass deportation of the Armenians began from Azerbaijan, who miraculously escaped massacre and found refuge in Armenia. Subsequently a part of them emigrated to far and near foreign countries. A certain part exchanged their apartments with Azerbaijanis and found work in Armenia. But a considerable portion remained homeless and unemployed and began to emigrate from Armenia. The undeclared war carried out by Azerbaijan caused the Armenians from the border areas to emigrate.

After the truce with Azerbaijan, the emigration of a part of the native Armenian population and representatives of some ethnic minorities from the Republic of Armenia took on a particularly

economic character. Together with the undeclared war and the blockade of Armenia by Azerbaijan and Turkey, the economic crisis, the energy crisis (1991-1996), and a deep depression in almost all spheres of production as a result of the self-willed and premature privatization played a role in creating the conditions that encouraged migration: the economic depression led to mass poverty and social polarization, low wages and mass unemployment.

In the next fifteen or twenty years it is necessary to realize the fundamental demographic policy that has been scrupulously elaborated upon in this monograph.

If the scale of emigration decreases sharply at the threshold of the new century, the absolute number of births is expected to grow due to the increase of the number of marriages. In the first decades of the third millennium the high number of births of the 1980s will play a decisive role in the formation of families. During that period 78-80,000 children were born annually. Although a part of them is out of the Motherland, at the beginning of the 21st century there will still be a tendency towards the increase of the absolute number of newborn.

The high number of births of the 1980s and the first two years of the 1990s at the first decade of the 21st century will, to some degree, enliven the births which will find expression with some modulation during the first and third, and fifth decades continuously taking the form of the reflection of the fading wave.

In future years the number of births may increase or decrease, but the tendency to decrease will continue because of negative balance of the migrant population numbering 1,300,000-1,400,000 of people in the late twentieth century. During the second, fourth and sixth decades of the new century there will be a decrease in the number of births. It will be the result of the small number of births from 1994 to the present day. Those who were born during this period will reach the marriage age during the second decade of the 21st century. The birth rate in 2002 was only 40% what it had been in 1990. In 1990, there were 80,000 births, while in 2002 there were only 32,200. This is explained by the emigration of young people, as

well as by the low marriage-rate, low birth-rate, and bad social-economic conditions, particularly low wages.

As a result of all these factors in 2002 live birth rate was 10,1 per 1,000 population and natural increase - 2,1 people. In 1992-2002 the negative balance of migration formed about 1/3 of the population.

Between 1970 and 1980 Armenia was characterized as a country with the lowest death-rate in the world; it is explained by low number of the deaths of infants and the youth's high and old persons' low shares in the general number of population. At the beginning of the 21st century the death-rate of infants will continue to decrease. In 1913 there were 204 infant deaths per 1,000 births, while in 2002 there were 14,0 deaths per 1,000 births. The overall death rate will increase per 1,000 population as a result of the increase of the share of the old people (because of the emigration of the young people and decrease in the number of births) in the general number of population.

In this research much attention is paid to the importance of lowering emigration, then stopping it and encouraging immigration. The complex examination of the problems in the labour market labour is the highest priority for lowering emigration. The trends of immigration are stressed. They may be projected by means of gradual overcoming of socio-economic tension in Armenia, the resolution of the Karabakh conflict in favour of the Republic of Armenia, the process of the migration policy as regards as the Armenian illegal migrants in foreign countries, the level of labour and social insurance of the legal migrants, non-discriminative national and social behaviour, the absence of the world economic crises in the given period, etc. The size of the wages of legal and illegal Armenian emigrants is stressed. For supporting immigration in the Motherland are important the revelation of deep socio-economic movements, especially economic progress, the rise of the manpower costs, the overcoming of the poverty and unemployment, the acquiring of the national values (language, culture, art, psychological image, etc.) by new generations of emigrants, creation of special conditions for those who would return back.

The question of the regulation of migration is the key issue of the monograph. The questions discussed may contribute to a better regulation of the labour market and purposefulness of the mobility of the territorial labour force, and the increase of births among the population.

It is in the interests of Armenia to be involved and integrate on a state basis in the international labour market during this period of migration. This is necessary in order to cope with the overstrained state of the labour market. It will help to minimize emigration and consequently increase the number of births.

Armenia thus may use its labour potential in the international division of labour. By measuring the labour potential, the state will then encourage the temporary export of a highly qualified labour force, create adequate preconditions for gradually raising the quality of the labour force to meet international criteria, and elaborate reasonable strategic policy for the emigration and immigration of the labour force on the international level.

The organization of the emigration of the population, the determination and regulation of the directions of the mass streams of people is almost left out of the sphere of the migration policy of the Republic of Armenia. To have such a migration policy would therefore be quite a new phenomenon. At the basis of the state policy of temporary emigration must be the enrolment of emigrants, and the regulation of the outflows and inflows of the population which would merely solve the national problems and pursue the national interests. Unfortunately, very often such emigration is considered the means to get rid of both the "extra" population and labour force.

The sphere of temporary emigration organized on the state level is also very important for the formation and regulation of the labour market in the country.

Both bad living conditions and social-economic factors together with substantial emigration influenced the birth-rate. The birth of infants is connected with unjustified high expenses and abuses, even in hospitals. The number of children decreases particularly because the youth, especially girls do not get married. The number of girls increases in the "marriage market" compared

with the number of boys. A certain number of girls get married late, or never. Boys, though late, get married willingly. Mainly they get married not with the girls of their generation, but with girls 5-10 years younger of them and these families have a small number of children. But the girls of the same generation, in most cases, do not become mothers.

Emigrant boys get married also with girls of other nationalities. For the Armenian girls, of course, it would be much better to get married with boys of Armenian nationality. But, however, the problem of marriage gains greater importance for them and the question of nationality of their future husband sometimes even becomes less important: whether they marry an Armenian or enter into a mixed marriage, in such cases their main desire is motherhood.

Because of emigration the number of divorces also increases, though the Armenian people used to have one of the lowest levels of divorce in the world. This is explained by the fact that Armenian families were large, with many children. Notwithstanding their bad relations, married couples discussed their problems and after some time forgave injuries. They always thought that after getting divorced and married again their children would stay under "the care" of a step-mother or a step-father. After all they would come to a reasonable solution.

But now, in certain sense, the process of family formation is quite different because divorce "is not a problem." It has become usual for divorced mothers to take care of their children.

A part of girls can't get married because they don't have a place in life and are very often jobless, deprived of chance to earn their living.

Even highly civilized nations, though small in number of population, with a certain educational level will remain standing not only through their culture, material and spiritual values, but also owing to the continuity of generations, their natural growth.

As a result of emigration the country is in a deep abyss
During the last 12-13 years Armenia has found itself in such a

situation that it is impossible to know the permanent population in the country or its demographic characteristics.

In the course of time Armenian communities appeared and existed in Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia, as well as in the USA, France, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Austria, Canada, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Egypt, India and other countries.

Because of emigration the number of Armenians in the Diaspora increased and new communities appeared in all parts of the world - in Western and Eastern Europe, Latin America, Arab countries, Africa and etc.

It would be possible to escape such developments if emigration (since 1988) were moderate, and regulated, without the tendency to increase. If the course of events were favourable, without the subjective interference of authorities, a part of legal and illegal emigrants, in the course, of time would return homeland. But as long as the situation in Armenia is not normalized, their return will be impossible.

Thus, first of all, it is necessary to think as soon as possible about the stabilization of the situation in the Republic. It is necessary to say that because of emigration the country is now in a deep abyss.

The point is that the accumulated capital didn't find a way to circulate because there was a bad business environment and a high risk factor for investment. Instead, the accumulated capital flew out of the country and like a magnet attracted the unemployed youth eager to earn living.

Emigration reached such proportions because those who came to power during the "reforms" were incompetent individuals who did not represent the interests of the Armenian people and only wanted to satisfy their selfish passions.

Among the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States privatization was first undertaken and realized in the newly established Republic of Armenia. Starting in the spring of 1991 agriculture was privatized, and then trade, then the service industries, unfinished construction projects, many small and middle sized enterprises (particularly food and light industries), transport and

communications, health, and some branches of the educational system.

Sometimes the transition to the market had positive results, particularly in the spheres of service and trade, and some branches of food and light industries. It is necessary to point out that some enterprises revived in Erevan, in the Lori region, in Kajaran and in other places.

According to the resolutions of the Supreme Council and the government of 1991 the final decision was left to the collectives of the agricultural farms. In different ways, the media propagated the usefulness of immediate privatization.

The idea was tempting because the peasants who had been plundered for decades, estranged from the land and unproductive, were now in reach of their long-cherished dream of becoming land-owners.

The hook was thrown with unpredictable consequences. Without long pondering some were tempted and swallowed the "bait", not taking into consideration the fact that because the agricultural machine parks were inefficient they would face difficulties connected with cultivation, rotation of crops, fertilization of soil, pest control, the high prices of services and their inaccessibility. Collective farms were frittered away, while the greater portion of the land remained uncultivated.

In this land-hungry republic, where in the past the working man fought with nature for the cultivation of a handful of soil, thousands of hectares of land now remain uncultivated for which people paid dearly. The country thus lost great material, spiritual and moral values.

Unprepared privatization did not lead to positive results in industry either. Many enterprises were privatized at symbolic prices, without clear goals. The state budget badly suffered not only because the sale of these enterprises at low prices, but also because these enterprises did not work. It was accompanied by the plunder of the privatized enterprises.

New industrial equipment, enterprises and construction projects were sold at low prices to the local private and cooperative

enterprises, and foreign corporations. Construction projects, transport, water-pipes and other things were also sold at low prices. A considerable part of the state and privatized industry (different machine-tools and equipment, conveyor belt systems, automatic and semi-automatic equipment) was cut up and turned into scrap-iron before exporting it on a private basis to neighbouring countries, particularly to Islamic Republic of Iran and Turkey. Some justify such an action by arguing that this equipment did not work anyway so instead of remaining idle it was necessary to sell it and put the money into circulation. However, I think that it would have been more reasonable to activate these industrial capacities to create new values with the help of corresponding economic incentives. In the nearest future, society will face a sad fact of being deprived of industrial capacities. How much will society have to spend in order to obtain scrap-iron after this mass expropriation?

Meanwhile, since 1991 copper and aluminum cables for trolley buses and trams, municipal electricity stations, telephone equipment, factories, together with copper and aluminum plates and dishes were collected and sent to Turkey. "Wicked tongues" say that the weapons and different kinds of bullets made in Turkey were used against Mountainous Karabakh and the Republic of Armenia.

This expropriation was done under the protection of the state. Parallel to the process of acceleration of redistributing wealth from the majority to a minority, the President, Supreme Council and National Assembly increased the number of laws in defense of privatization. It is incomprehensible to have on the one hand the expropriation of collective property, and on the other - protection and immunity of the rights of private ownership which originated on the basis of plundered property. This policy resulted in the polarization of the society: on one pole several dozen new millionaires appeared, on the other - a huge mass of the impoverished. The middle class was abolished.

The overwhelming majority of those being deprived of their accumulated capital filled the ranks of the poor and emigrants. New rich men become more so, while poor men become poorer and poorer. There is increasing and uncontrolled social tension.

Without any economic substantiation, the policy leit-motif of our day became the idea of immediate transition from the dominant form of state property known under the authoritarian system to the "heavenly paradise" of market relations, turning the republic's economy into an experimental field of plunder and the depletion of resources.

Nobody denies the necessity of making the transition to the market economy and market relations on the basis of different kinds of property. But why at once, so sweeping, in such a hurry, without any preparation, keeping off the beaten track, trying to be seen the first, by all means the first, with the boyish pride turning Armenia into an experimental field for others?

Up to now, the policy of economic reform has very often resulted in economic chaos because the regulatory role of the state was neglected for the sake of the transition. Industry does not work under conditions of a false "pseudo-market economy," and the market seems to be in "birth-pains." In such conditions, the more the national economy declines, the more the number of slogans about the hasty transition to market relations and the fruitless decisions and legislative acts are made. Meanwhile, the market for commodities is not established by resolutions or legislative acts, but by a process of objective economic development fed by its own inner resources. Because economic policy is not generally built on an accurate prognosis of reality, laws do not take into account the specifics of the economy's progress. On the contrary, this forced policy tries to direct the development of economy in a "desired" course, neglecting real opportunities. Such a policy, together with pressure on the economy, considerably harmed and still harms the objective process of the economic development.

Possessed by the itch to create a market economy, the western monetary policy has been blindly planted. This neglects the local specific conditions, particularly the real existence of state property created during the authoritarian system, as well as our national spiritual life and other peculiarities, which didn't justify the hasty transition to private property and pseudo-market relations on such huge scale.

Market relations were considerably harmed when Armenians put billions of rubles into state savings-banks and these savings were totally absorbed by state clans.

Because of privatization, first, all branches of the national economy were paralyzed. Industry, agriculture, construction and other branches of the economy suffered extreme degradation.

Second, unemployment reached an unprecedented high level - about half a million people. Because of the vague perspective, qualified professionals became disqualified from further work in their specialties lost their links to the labour market and their skills and thus. During this time, there has been no accumulation of human capital, which is senselessly wasted.

Some government officials considered state involvement in key issues of economic development to be an anachronism. They were of the opinion that the state's role not only diminishes but also disappears in conditions of privatization. Because of this they advised property owners to involve themselves with the questions of economic development. At the same time, some think that Armenia is a small country and its population must be successful not in the industry and science but in the service sector.

But this time, again, life with a bitter sarcasm, ironic smile and contempt proved that famous truth that the powerful social life of nation and overcoming of poverty may be reached only on a healthy economic basis.

Thus the capital that people accumulated for decades was presented to different people in very symbolic prices - often hundreds of rubles, drams and vouchers. At the same time, instead of serving the main goal of economic reform, resources allocated by the World Bank and the Euro-Bank have been frittered away by corrupt people. They do not seem to care that future generations will pay off these loans with interest. Because of defalcation of the international loans by certain clans the Republic has fallen into foreign debt that is being paid off with considerable interest, thus bringing the Republic to the verge of economic dislocation. A portion of these loans have been appropriated by the representatives of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. The big negative debit balance of the

foreign trade turnover and foreign debts of Armenia are the result of ill-considered, fruitless, mediocre, and perhaps deliberate economic policies carried out in the country.

How to keep the country from being sold by auction The decrease of the natural growth of the population and today's enormous emigration are the result of the tragic policy of the ruling party "Armenian National Movement" (ANM- HHSh, in Armenian) and their followers. Coming to power possessed by frenzy to accumulate millions, infamous newly baked politicians, coming to the power, led the Motherland in dangerous directions. They realized their longing by depriving hundreds of thousands people of daily means of subsistence. The thoughtless process of privatization that they managed led to unnecessary and terrible losses of national resources.

The polarization of society is an irrevocable reality. Poverty has become a general phenomenon. Meanwhile, a few notorious, corrupt people have been possessed by the frenzy to become millionaires.

Much is said today about the shadow economy, the part of the economy that avoids taxation. Even if these millionaires are not under trial, they are obliged at least to pay taxes. But they do not pay. And why aren't those resources in the hands of the newly baked millionaires taxed? Such individuals have acquired large private houses, expensive cars, furniture and other valuables through robbery instead of labour activity.

We are looking for a way out. Unless we remove HHSh-ism from social and political life, "reforms" will not succeed.

The large waves of emigration began because of the ANM's policies. This has had very negative demographic consequences for the Armenian people. Emigration still continues. Those who have committed these crimes must be denounced and condemned. It is necessary to extract political lessons from these experiences.

The fact is that today a part of the national wealth of Armenia, exceeding three or four times the gross domestic product, is saved in billions of US dollars in Swiss banks. These are stolen resources. We

do not even mention the millions saved in the banks of other countries.

The number of emigrants today increases again as a result of the privatization of several large industrial projects (ArmenTel, the Cognac factory, gold, pearlite and other deposits, water-pipes etc.), which were "presented" without any good reason to the representatives of foreign countries at very low prices.

The country is being sold by auction.

To keep up with the trends in the world Social policy must be directed to creating stable economic growth, which would then solve the problem of unemployment, stop the flow of emigration and subsequently revive the birth-rate.

It is necessary for the government to establish favourable conditions for the creation of new jobs in the Republic of Armenia. In particular, the national economy must be activated through the involvement of the inner economic resources of the Republic, the development of the most important branches of the national economy, pursuing strategic goals, and the realization of the state protectionist policy towards them.

It is necessary to raise labour productivity to the average world level. This will contribute to the export of high quality technical products, technological innovations and other goods of an intellectual nature, instead of the emigration of population. Especially taking into consideration the fact that the results of intellectual work may be exported to any country of the world at any moment, without regard to blockades.

The reconstruction of material damage is a matter of time. The danger of spiritual devaluation is irretrievable. Moreover, today's spiritual loss is far reaching, fraught with the horrible danger of throwing the country generations decades back in terms of knowledge, intellectual and spiritual abilities.

Civilized countries have entered the new century as embodiments of intensive scientific and technical progress, where each citizen is painstakingly shaped and armed with knowledge. Armenia is asleep. By our own will we appeared within the policy of

getting rid of such magnificent and lofty "concerns" adopted by the state.

It is necessary to save world famous spiritual values, their bearers and creators, and the generation that enters life - ready to mould and shape the 21st century. It is necessary to act responsibly with well-weighed policies that stimulate the creation of spiritual and material values, and not only put up with turning the country into one large service field.

At the beginning of the third millennium it is immediately necessary to focus efforts on those spheres of life that will secure the progress of society. Young people, the most important constituent part of society, are the torch of scientific and technical progress, the creators of the future.

Only this will save the society from emigration.

Резюме

Прирост и движение населения

Представленная монография - это арменоведческое исследование трехвековой истории закономерностей демографического и социально-экономического развития Армении в период с XIX-XX вв., а также обстоятельный прогноз их тенденций на пороге XXI в.

Особое внимание уделяется раскрытию особенностей воспроизводства и миграций населения Республики Армения как в прошлом, так и на современном этапе, рассмотренных в качестве непосредственных отголосков трансформаций в экономической, геополитической и социальной жизни страны.

На основе тщательного анализа богатого архивного материала, статистических данных и первоисточников, а также собственных разработок трактуется прошлое, настоящее и будущее проблемы.

Итак, данная монография - это исключительное, комплексное и многоплановое экономическое, демографическое и историческое исследование.

Армения на протяжении своей многовековой истории неоднократно становилась ареной военных действий чужеземных захватчиков. Начиная с позднего средневековья она была яблоком раздора между Персией и Турцией, нашествия которых завершались не только грабежом и уничтожением материальных и духовных ценностей, но и массовой резней населения - невосполнимым ущербом, нанесенным вследствие продолжительных варварских погромов.

На уменьшение численности армянского населения и изменение его поло-возрастного состава вражеские нашествия имели как непосредственное, так и косвенное влияние. Непосредственное, когда в ходе войн были преданы огню и мечу сотни тысяч людей. Косвенное, когда, во-первых, голод и эпидемии, парившие в эти годы, унесли тысячи жизней и, во-вторых, сотни тысяч, в основном женщин и детей, были взяты в плен и сосланы в глубь

страны, тем самым увеличив за счет армян численность своего населения и улучшив гены своей нации.

По окончании войны 1639г. между Персией и Турцией историческая Армения была разделена на Восточную и Западную. Наступает неопишимо тяжелый период в жизни армянского народа, когда угроза истребления как дамоклов меч нависает над ним. Ставшие нормой жестокие методы истребления армян - резня, насильственные выселения и вероотступничество - на протяжении веков сопровождалась политикой заселения как Восточной, так и Западной Армении чужеземцами: турками, персами, курдами, другими нациями и народностями. Вследствие этого - уже в 1828г., в период вхождения Восточной Армении в состав Российской империи, процент армянского населения снизился.

Исследование главным образом охватывает четыре периода.

Во-первых, в качестве стержневых рассматриваются проблемы роста численности и миграций армянского населения Закавказья, а именно Ереванской, Елизаветпольской, Тифлисской, Бакинской и других губерний, Карсской области и, в особенности, их крупных городов: Тифлиса, Баку, Шуши, Гандзака (Гянджи).

Во-вторых, особое внимание уделяется перемещениям населения Ереванской губернии, в том числе, Нахичеванского и Сурмалинского уездов, Карсской области, Нагорного Карабаха, Гардманского (в Елизаветпольской губернии), Зангезурского, Гугаркского и Джавахетского уездов как неотъемлемой части Восточной Армении.

Со временем численность армянского населения Закавказья увеличилась и уже к 1913г. ощутимо возросла. Отметим лишь, что в 1886-1913гг. оно ежегодно составляло 22,5-23 процента всего населения Закавказья, а городское население - около 40 процентов.

Отдельным периодам XIX-XX вв. стало присуще переселение армянского народа из Западной Армении в Восточную, в частности, в рамках Туркменчайского (1828г., между Россией и Персией) и Адрианопольского (1829г., между Россией и Турцией) договоров. 21 марта 1828г. в Восточной Армении образовалась Армянская область, которая вследствие административных измене-

ний в Закавказье, проведенных Царским правительством в 40-х годах XIX в. была упразднена, а 9 июня 1849г. - образована Ереванская губерния.

Численность армянского населения в Восточной Армении увеличилась также в 1853-1856гг. и в 1877-1878гг. - годы русско-турецких войн. В 1878г. некоторые северные территории Западной Армении отошли к Российской империи и были включены в состав Восточной Армении в качестве новообразованной Карсской области. В дальнейшем, принудительное переселение армян из Западной Армении в Восточную приобрело постоянный характер, став особенно широкомасштабным в 1894-1896гг., когда вследствие политики беспощадных гонений султана Гаида началась депортация армянского народа. А со второй половины XIX в. этот процесс сопровождался формированием и дальнейшим развитием капиталистических отношений в России и Закавказье, ставших важной предпосылкой роста численности армянского населения и активизации его миграций в Закавказье.

Восточная Армения стала зависимой от Царского правительства, проводившего великорусскую политику угнетения малых наций и колонизации области. Но, несмотря на это, актом присоединения Восточной Армении к России, у армянского народа появилась гарантия физического выживания, он постепенно сбросил оковы феодализма а, связав свою судьбу с Россией, получил доступ к передовой русской и европейской культуре и в какой-то степени освободился от национального и социального гнета Восточных деспотий. Закавказье, в том числе Восточная Армения были заселены русскими.

В 1915г. более 1,5 млн. армян Западной Армении стали жертвами беспрецедентного геноцида, осуществленного главари младотурков на государственном уровне по четко разработанной программе. Между тем, турецкие власти и почти весь народ, пытаясь поставить с ног на голову варварства янычарских войск младотурков, фальсифицируя историю, богатые архивные материалы как в Турции, так и Германии и других странах, а также свидетельства самих очевидцев, не только отрицают горькую истину-геноцид армян, но и умудряются голословно обвинить армян в гено-

циде турков. Более того, Турция угрожает разрывом дипломатических отношений с государствами, принимающими факт геноцида армян, однако из года в год увеличивается их число. Руководство Турции считает, что установление добрососедских отношений с Арменией возможно лишь в случае отрицания самими армянами факта геноцида. Однако наш народ на этот шаг не пойдет никогда.

Не секрет, что в отношениях с Арменией Турция всегда выступает с позиции силы: ни слова о возвращении земель и об истории вообще, если только не в искаженном Турцией виде, в противном случае и речи быть не может о каких-либо экономических, торговых и дипломатических отношениях, существующие же на сегодняшний день слабые контакты так и останутся в зачаточном состоянии.

Возвращение земель Западной Армении - общенациональное требование поколений армянского народа, проживающего не только в Армении, но и, поневоле, во всем мире. Армянский вопрос оставлен на суд истории и поколений и должен быть решен не с позиции силы, а дипломатическим путем. Кто знает, со временем (хотя в это трудно поверить) власти Турции и будущее здравомыслящее поколение турецкого народа осудят своих предков за геноцид армянского народа и завоевание земель исторической Армении?

Зачастую, в качестве так называемой гарантии приводятся безудержное стремление Турции стать членом Европейского сообщества и некий перелом во внешней политике, в частности ее старания выглядеть в глазах мирового сообщества цивилизованной страной. После членства она якобы будет вынуждена подчиниться внешнеполитическому курсу европейских стран.

Иллюзорные надежды...

Никакая "европейская политика" не в силах замаскировать нетерпимость панисламизма к христианской Армении, нарушающей целостность исламского региона и препятствующей ей. Политика Турции - с позиции силы - основана на благоприятном геополитическом положении, взаимовыгодной экономической и военно-политической интеграции с Западом. Именно благодаря предоставленной Турцией возможности военные базы США и Запад-

ных стран расположились в непосредственной близости к границе СНГ. В этом плане для стран Запада Турция всегда представляла больший интерес, нежели Армения. Географическое положение явилось решающим фактором и в процессе советско-турецких отношений, хотя не следует пренебрегать взвешенной политикой Советского Союза в отношении мусульманских стран. Тем не менее, неоспорим тот факт, что из "когтей" Турции Армении спасли Россия и Советский Союз.

Таким образом, принудительное переселение приняло широкомасштабный характер в годы Первой мировой войны и в 1918-1920гг. - годы захватнической политики турецких оккупантов с Запада и мусаватистских банд с Востока. Значительная часть армянского населения ценою больших жертв переселилась в Восточную Армению, другой же части чудом удалось бежать в Грузию и на север, а также страны Ближнего Востока, Европу и Америку в надежде выжить.

Настал черед геноцида населения Восточной Армении. Для армянского народа наступил роковой час.

В годы установления Советской власти, Турция наряду с Западной Арменией безоговорочно завладела частью Восточной Армении: Карсской областью, Сурмалинским уездом, территориями к западу от реки Ахурян, а со временем Советский Азербайджан при активном посредничестве Турции и Советского Союза - Нахичеванским уездом бывшей Ереванской губернии, а также Гардманским уездом и Нагорным Карабахом, который никогда и не был в его составе. Тем более, что территориальной единицы "Азербайджан" как таковой, не существовало вообще (в отличие от иранского Азербайджана); он был "сформирован" в годы Советской власти. Джавахетским же уездом завладела Грузия.

Согласно Царскому административному делению, губернии включали территории не по национальному признаку. Поэтому территории исторической Армении с армянским населением входили в состав как Ереванской губернии и Карсской области, так и Тифлисской, Елизаветпольской, Бакинской и других губерний. Это и явилось причиной увеличения численности армян, особенно, в городах этих Закавказских губерний. Между тем, следует отме-

тить, что задолго до этого много армян проживало в Тифлисе, Баку, Гяндже, Шуше и других крупных городах Закавказья, и когда здесь установилась советская власть, значительная часть исторической Армении насильственно была передана Советским республикам: Азербайджану и Грузии. Именно поэтому и в каждой из этих республик в 1980-х годах проживало приблизительно по миллиону армян.

На нынешней территории РА численность населения увеличилась как за счет иммиграции, так и естественного роста: с 161,7 тыс. чел. в 1831г. до 1млн. чел. в 1913г. В Карсской области соответственно с 174,6 тыс. чел. в 1886г. до 382,7 тыс.чел. в 1913г.

В годы Первой мировой войны из Западной Армении в Восточную было депортировано около 500 тыс.человек. В результате - более чем одномиллионное население, проживающее на нынешней территории Армении в 1913г., увеличилось за счет огромной массы беженцев. Между тем, в декабре 1920г., в период установления советской власти в Армении численность населения составила 720 тыс.чел., следовательно, значительная его часть была предана огню и мечу. В этот и последующие годы Армения характеризовалась чрезвычайно высокой смертностью. Особенно высока была детская смертность. Достаточно отметить, что до 10-12-летнего возраста доживало менее половины родившихся.

Третье, представлен обстоятельный анализ общей картины населения, начиная с 1920г. до наших дней.

Благодаря чрезвычайно высокой рождаемости (в 20-х годах на 1000 чел. рождалось 56-57 детей) и репатриации армян со всех уголков мира, численность населения Советской Армении в начале 1930г. достигла довоенного уровня - 1 млн.человек.

Естественный прирост населения сохранялся высоким до Второй мировой войны и после нее. Тем не менее, в годы Великой Отечественной войны из Армении на фронт ушли 600 тыс.чел., в основном молодежь, половина которых не вернулась. 103 участника войны были удостоены звания Героя Советского Союза (летчик Н.Степанян - дважды герой). В командном составе Вооруженных Сил Советского Союза служило 60 армянских генералов, возглавлявших крупные войсковые соединения, среди них: Генерал армии

И.Баграмян (впоследствии - Маршал Советского Союза, дважды герой, командующий фронтом), Адмирал флота Советского Союза И.Исаков, Маршал авиации С.Худяков (А.Хамферянц), А.Бабджанян (впоследствии - Главный маршал бронетанковых войск) и др.

Репатриация приняла широкомасштабный характер в послевоенные - 1946-1960гг. Впоследствии эта волна постепенно затухла, так как значительная часть репатриантов еще в конце 40-х начале 50-х погибла на дорогах ссылки: в отдаленной Сибири, Алтайском крае. Тем не менее, наряду с репатриацией, чрезвычайно высокая рождаемость населения на разных этапах (1950-1962гг., 1977-1992гг.) сопровождалась сокращением смертности, что и явилось одним из важнейших факторов роста населения Армении. Это привело к увеличению средней продолжительности жизни, благодаря чему и естественный прирост населения сокращался медленнее снижения уровня рождаемости.

В монографии представлен подробный анализ до- и послевоенной высокой рождаемости, причин резкого снижения уровня смертности начиная с 1970г. (Армения характеризуется наименьшей в мире смертностью), ранних браков и соответственно высоких показателей брачности и рождаемости, а также падения уровня последних на отдельных этапах. При этом, если в 1960г. родились 75 тыс., в 1970г.-55 тыс., то в 1986г.- 81,2 тыс.детей.

За годы советской власти население Армении увеличилось пятикратно. Однако... в 1988г. началось противостояние с Азербайджаном, вступившем в необъявленную войну с Арменией.

Четвертый этап - это демография и социально-экономическое состояние Армении на пороге третьего тысячелетия. Прогнозируются основные направления развития населения, а также социально-экономического прогресса Армении. Особо подчеркивается, что экономические реформы оказали и будут оказывать противоречивое влияние на роль факторов, а также формирующихся под их влиянием закономерностей и тенденций естественного прироста, на изменение и интенсивность потоков внутри- и межгосударственной миграции населения.

Таким образом, исследование процесса исторического развития населения и его миграций в XIX-XX вв., а также тенденции первой половины XXI в., в качестве целостной монографии вниманию читателя представляется впервые.

Депортация армян из Азербайджана и эмиграция азербайджанцев из Армении

Приписать геноцид и гонения против малых наций в Советском Азербайджане карабахскому движению означает согрешить против истины и исторической действительности. Факты свидетельствуют, что осуществляемая здесь национальная политика - это логическое продолжение геноцида армян. Не будем забывать, что одновременно с геноцидом в Западной Армении, подобное происходило и в населенных армянами районах, аннексированных Азербайджаном, а также на оккупированных турками некоторых территориях Восточной Армении.

В 1988-1990гг. из Азербайджана было депортировано все армянское население, оставившее огромную территорию и имущество. По состоянию на 1 января 1988г. в Армении насчитывалось 316 тыс. беженцев из Азербайджана, а также насильственно переселенных азербайджанскими властями лиц из Нагорного Карабаха (48 тыс.).

Азербайджанские государственные и политические деятели фактически унаследовали политический курс геноцида мусаватистских властей⁴⁰⁸. Осуществляемый в Азербайджане геноцид

⁴⁰⁸ В 1918-1920гг. положение армянского населения в Баку, Гандзаке, Шуше, Нахичеване и др. стало более чем невыносимым, оно истреблялось турецкими оккупантами и мусаватистскими бандами. В сентябре 1918г. в течение продолжавшейся в Баку три дня и три ночи резни, были убиты, без вести пропали и взяты в плен тысячи мирных, безоружных армян.

Разница лишь во времени, а варварство и жестокость методов геноцида и ужасных злодеяний те же.

Общее число жертв трехдневной резни в Баку в 1918г. достигало 30 тыс., а изнасилованных и похищенных армянских женщин и девушек - нескольких сот. Рядом с телами павших от меча мужчин насиловали их жен, матерей, дочерей и сестер. Мать и дочь были изнасилованы на глазах друг у друга. См."Правда" 21.09.1918; Е.Саркисян, Экспансионистская политика Османской империи в Закавказье, Е., 1962, с. 393.

разрабатывался десятилетиями и был продиктован необходимостью претворения политики "Азербайджан для азербайджанцев".

Не следует предавать забвению положение нахичеванских армян в 1918-1926гг., которые в период 1918-1920гг. - годы нашествий турецких оккупантов и мусаватистских банд дважды покидали родную землю - Нахиджеван (Нахичевань) - один из уездов Ереванской губернии, являющейся частью Армении. В 1920г. после второго турецкого вторжения и массовой резни, армяне были вынуждены навсегда покинуть свой родной очаг и стать беженцами. Вследствие подписания Московского договора (16 марта 1921г.) между Советской Россией и Турцией, 9 февраля 1924г. была провозглашена Нахичеванская Автономная Советская Социалистическая Республика в составе Советского Азербайджана. В истории дипломатии подобный несправедливый договор, без участия и за счет Армении, был беспрецедентным. Точно таким же образом, насильственно, Нагорный Карабах - неотъемлемая часть Восточной Армении - был передан Советскому Азербайджану. В 1921г. после насильственного присоединения Нахичевана к Советскому Азербайджану, азербайджанские власти запретили нахичеванским армянам, спасшимся от резни 1918-1920гг. и оставившим свои дома, вернуться на родину, хотя дома пустовали, двери были заперты, а земля необработана. Несмотря на предварительное согласие Нахичеванского Центрального Исполнительного Комитета на возвращение армян, Азербайджанский, а затем и Нахичеванский ЦИК-и своими многочисленными специальными постановлениями всячески воспрепятствовали этому. Армяне Нахичевана неоднократно апеллировали к руководству Закфедерации и Советского Союза...

Однако, постановления ЦИК Закфедерации, а также ВЦИК и правительства Советского Союза оказались безрезультатными⁴⁰⁹. В 1925г. во время своего визита в Закавказье Председатель Совета Министров СССР А.Рыков по этому поводу обвинил азербайджанское правительство за учиненное "повсеместно советское

безобразие"⁴¹⁰. Азербайджанское правительство отстранили от власти и отдали под суд, но тщетно, поскольку "воз и ныне там". В 1926г., согласно принятым новым азербайджанским руководством постановлениям, был введен окончательный запрет на возвращение нахичеванских армян в свои, уже опустошенные, поселения и разоренные дома⁴¹¹.

Следует отметить также отклики на страницах союзной прессы⁴¹² о ряде правонарушений в отношении армян, свидетельствующих о нетерпимости к ним властей Азербайджана, фактов проявления мусульманского религиозного фанатизма задолго до "карабахских событий" 1988г.

И так как именно армяне воспротивились и стали непреодолимой преградой не только на пути создания "единой нации", но и осуществления далеко идущих планов пантуркистов, необходимо было разработать и претворить варварские методы "очищения" республики от армян.

Вот где "логическое" основание разжигания ненависти и вражды против армян азербайджанскими провокаторами.

Именно поэтому и в мирные годы в Азербайджане сокращалась численность армян, русских и других наций. Между тем, численность азербайджанцев в Армении в период между переписями населения 1959 и 1970г. увеличилась более чем на 40 тыс., т.е. с 107,7 тыс. достигнув 148,2 тыс.чел. Ни одно национальное меньшинство в Армении не имело подобного прироста. В период 1970-1979гг. их численность увеличилась еще на 13 тыс.

Однако не надо забывать, что численность азербайджанцев в Армении уменьшилась в период 1948-1951гг. и вот по какой причине. В 1946г. власти Азербайджана обратились в Москву, лично к И. Сталину, с настоятельной просьбой организовать переселение азербайджанцев из Советских республик Закавказья: Грузии и Армении, а также из Средней Азии в Азербайджанскую ССР с целью освоения и обводнения земель Куро-Араксинской долины. Эта просьба была удовлетворена. В 1948-1952гг. только из Арме-

⁴⁰⁹ Подробно см.: Центральный государственный архив Республики Армения, фонд 130, опись 6, дело 197.

⁴¹⁰ "Заря Востока", 12.03.1925.

⁴¹¹ "Бакинский рабочий", 06.05.1925.

⁴¹² "Известия", 18.04.1987; "Сельская жизнь", 24.12.1987.

нии было организовано переселение 58,5 тыс. азербайджанцев (см. книгу, изданную азербайджанцами "Материалы по экономической истории Азербайджана..." Л., 1970г.). Причем, они вычислили свою долю имущества в колхозах в поголовье скота и перегнали стада в Азербайджан.

Отметим также, что большая часть из 58,5 тыс. эмигрировавших в эти годы азербайджанцев, не приспособившись к местным условиям, вновь вернулась в Армению. Семьи были искусственно разделены: часть осталась в Азербайджане, а другая - беспрепятственно вернулась в Армению.

По возвращении они вновь вступили в колхозы, но без возврата унесенного. С целью получения отдельных приусадебных участков семьи разделились, построили комфортабельные каменные особняки и стали владельцами больших стад овец. При этом, материальный уровень большинства азербайджанских семей был намного выше армянских.

Сумгаитские события 1988г. с использованием всех форм и методов геноцида стали новым витком десятилетиями продолжавшейся политики угнетения, гонений и лишения прав армянского населения. Следствием вооруженных нападений на мирное, безоружное население: престарелых, женщин, детей и мужчин стала неизбежная депортация армян. Армяне подвергались зверским пыткам, женщины и девушки - групповым изнасилованиям на глазах друг у друга, над ними варварски публично издевались, пытали, выбрасывали из окон, а потом головами обезглавленных армян играли в мяч. По официальным данным было замучено и убито 32 человека, однако реальное число зверски убитых мужчин и женщин было намного больше, а раненых и инвалидов - несколько сот.

Геноцид в Сумгаите, осуществленный 28 февраля 1988г., продолжался на глазах у всех три дня и три ночи. Если он не был организован и управляем центром, чем же тогда занимались партийные, государственные, советские и правоохранительные органы в Сумгаите и, совсем рядом - в Баку? Как же иначе объяснить позицию центральных органов советской власти, а также лично

М.Горбачева⁴¹³ как во время сумгаитского судебного процесса, так и в дальнейшем? Не было ли преднамеренности в "распылении" сумгаитского судопроизводства между 10-12 судами?

Сумгаит стал "генеральной репетицией" перед широкомасштабным геноцидом. Ее организаторы тем самым прозондировали позицию центральных органов Советского Союза, правоохранительных органов и средств массовой информации. Эксперимент выдержал экзамен. Палачи сумгаитских и последующих событий избежали правосудия, само злодеяние осталось безнаказанным, бандитизм не был осужден и не получил политической оценки, что, еще больше воодушевив вершителей злодеяний, подтолкнуло их на новые преступления.

Сумгаит доказал, что каждый последующий шаг преступника останется безнаказанным, настало время действовать и это самый удобный момент для депортации армян из Азербайджана.

Действительно, дальнейшие события в Азербайджане развивались под влиянием преднамеренной политики центральных органов власти Советского Союза и лично М.Горбачева, заключающейся в искусном умалчивании сумгаитского геноцида, "не обнаружении" дальнейшей эскалации напряженности в Азербайджане и "оправдании" их любыми средствами.

После ужасов трехдневной резни в Сумгаите 17 тысячам измученных армян каким-то чудом удалось бежать из города. Сумгаит породил Баку, Кировабад, Ходжалу, Дашкесан, Ханлар и т.д.

С 13 января 1990г. разъяренная банда разбойников семь дней подряд устраивала нападения на армянские районы Баку, сжигая дома, убивая армян, используя все виды оружия. Женщины и дети стали не только жертвами огня, но и страшных пыток и зверских насилий и, наконец, на глазах у замученных армян происходил дележ их имущества.

19 января, спустя неделю после массовой резни армян в Баку, то же самое произошло с русскими семьями, их женами и детьми.

⁴¹³ Позиция М.Горбачева детально представлена в книге В.Ходжабеяна "Арцах в час испытаний", Е., 1991 (на арм.яз.).

Азербайджанцы умалчивают, что созданная ими до ввода войск СССР в Баку обстановка привела к десяткам человеческих жертв и депортации десятков тысяч армян и русских из Советского Азербайджана. В эти дни мученической смертью пали 150 армян.

А Ходжалу, который был частью исторической Армении...

В ночь с 25 на 26 февраля 1992г. ополченцы, сражающиеся в армянских отрядах самообороны Арпах, при освобождении Ходжалу оставили коридор для азербайджанцев. Однако, вооруженные банды азербайджанцев открывают огонь по отступающим соотечественникам. Это была настоящая бойня. Пуская пыль в глаза мировой общественности и подтасовывая факты, власти Азербайджана преподносят события в Ходжалу как геноцид, осуществленный отрядами самообороны Арпах. Фальсифицируя действительность, они стараются скомпрометировать армянский народ и предать забвению зверства в Сумгаите, Баку, Кировабаде, Ханларе и др. О том, что бойня в Ходжалу приписана армянам, свидетельствуют и сами азербайджанцы. К примеру, в интервью бывшего президента Азербайджана Аяза Муталибова "Независимой газете" от 2 апреля 1992г. черным по белому написано: "Как говорят те ходжалинцы, которые спаслись, это все было организовано для того, чтобы был повод для моей отставки. Какая-то сила действовала для дискредитации президента. Я не думаю, чтобы армяне, очень четко и со знанием дела относящиеся к подобным ситуациям, могли позволить азербайджанцам, получить избобляющие их в фашистских действиях документы...Коридор, по которому люди могли уйти, армянами все-таки был оставлен. Зачем же им тогда стрелять?... Как только техника окружила Ходжалу нужно было эвакуировать население...Я такие поручения давал, но почему в Ходжалах их не выполнили, мне не ясно".

Действительно, как свидетельствует А.Муталибов, бандитизм в Ходжалу явился интригой для смены власти в Азербайджане.

Следует особо подчеркнуть, что, являясь непосредственным отголоском сумгаитского геноцида и широкомасштабной депортации армян из Азербайджана, эмиграция 160 тыс. азербайджанцев

из Армении носила добровольный характер. При этом, и речи не могло быть о депортации, попытках геноцида или насилия, напротив, зачастую местные государственные и хозяйственные органы и само армянское население всячески препятствовали эмиграции.

С 1988г., когда началась эмиграция азербайджанцев, многие из них уже имели жилье в Азербайджане и не стали беженцами, тогда как, в Азербайджане постоянно твердят о вымышленном "одном миллионе бездомных, живущих в палатках мигрантах". Из тщательного анализа данных следует, что численность азербайджанцев, эмигрировавших в 1988-1990гг. с территорий, освобожденных и контролируемых НКР, составила 300 тыс.чел., из самой НКР – 45 тыс.чел. и РА – 160 тыс.чел. Следовательно, в Азербайджане проживает не 1 млн., а немногим более 500 тыс мигрантов.

Азербайджанцы эмигрировали, взяв с собой все имущество, в большинстве случаев, обменяв квартиры, тогда как депортированное армянское население было обездолено и обескровлено.

1) В этот период из Азербайджана в Армению было депортировано почти в 2,7 раз больше армян, чем эмигрировало азербайджанцев из Армении.

2) Семьи беженцев-армян были малочисленными и поэтому они оставили больше квартир.

3) Большая часть депортированных из Азербайджана армян – это городское население, в то время как преобладающая часть эмигрировавших из РА азербайджанцев (90 процентов) – жители сельских поселений. Поэтому большая часть беженцев-армян не смогла обменять свои квартиры (причем, полностью меблированные) за отсутствием подобных в Армении, а депортанты, которым удалось осуществить обмен в приграничных и горных сельских районах республики, со временем, не приспособившись к местным условиям и характеру занятости, мигрировали в города республики и за рубеж.

И, наконец, многих эмигрировавших из Армении азербайджанцев не следует причислять к статусу "беженца". Это прежде всего касается:

а) тех азербайджанцев, эмигрировавших из Армении, которые свои квартиры обменяли с квартирами депортантов-армян из бывшей АзССР.

б) тех азербайджанцев, которым был возмещен материальный ущерб за разрушенное жилье во время Спитакского землетрясения.

Эмиграция и снижение рождаемости

До 1980г. для Армении была характерна иммиграция. В 1988г. началась массовая депортация армян из Азербайджана. Чудом избежав резни, они скопились в Армении. Впоследствии часть из них эмигрировала в страны ближнего и дальнего зарубежья, другая - смогла даже трудоустроиться. Однако, очень многие, оставшись без крова и места работы, эмигрировали из Армении. Необъявленная война со стороны Азербайджана также стала причиной эмиграции армян из приграничных регионов Армении.

Эмиграция же части коренного армянского населения, а также представителей некоторых национальных меньшинств из Армении после перемирия с Азербайджаном, носила сугубо экономический характер и была обусловлена рядом объективных и субъективных факторов. Наряду с необъявленной войной и блокадой Армении со стороны Азербайджана и Турции немаловажную роль сыграли также экономический и энергетический кризисы (1991-1996гг.), глубокая депрессия практически во всех отраслях производства как следствие своевольной и форсированной приватизации, уж не говоря о таких постоянно сопутствующих эмиграции факторах, как: массовое обнищание населения, его социальная поляризация, большие масштабы безработицы, низкая стоимость рабочей силы.

Необходимо в течение ближайших 15-20 лет целенаправленно претворять демографическую политику, тщательная разработка которой представлена в монографии.

Кроме того, если уменьшатся масштабы эмиграции, то в начале XXI века ожидается рост абсолютного числа родившихся за счет увеличения численности вступающих в брак и сведения к ми-

нимуму смешанных браков. В первом десятилетии третьего тысячелетия определяющее влияние на состав семей будет иметь высокая рождаемость 1980-х (78-80 тыс. детей в год). Несмотря на факт проживания части из них не на родине, тем не менее, в начале XXI в. увеличение абсолютного числа родившихся будет иметь характер тенденции.

В первом десятилетии XXI в. рождаемость увеличится за счет высоких ее уровней 1980-х и первых двух лет 1990-х годов, далее это проявится в виде затухающей волны в третьем и пятом десятилетиях.

В течение грядущих десятилетий рождаемость может как увеличиваться, так и уменьшаться, однако, ее снижение будет иметь характер тенденции по причине отрицательного сальдо миграции конца XX в., равного 1 млн.300 - 1 млн. 400 тыс.чел. Снижение рождаемости произойдет во втором, четвертом и шестом десятилетиях XXIв. Это обусловлено сокращением числа родившихся, начавшимся в 1994г. и продолжающимся по сей день, которые вступят в брачный возраст во втором десятилетии. Так, уровень рождаемости в 2002г. составил лишь 40% показателя 1990г.: 32,2 тыс. и 80 тыс. детей соответственно, что объясняется эмиграцией молодежи, низким уровнем брачности, социально-экономическим положением, особенно, низкой ценой рабочей силы. Вследствие этого рождаемость на 1000 чел. в 2002г. составила 10,1, естественный прирост -2,1чел. В 1992-2002гг. эмигрировала 1/3 населения республики.

В 1970-1980гг. Армения характеризовалась наименьшей в мире смертностью, что объяснялось низкой детской смертностью и малой долей пожилого населения, а также высокой долей молодежи. В начале XXI в. уровень смертности несколько повысится, однако останется невысоким, поскольку детская смертность будет продолжать снижаться. Если в 1913г. из 1000 родившихся до одного года умирало 204, то в 2002г.-14 детей. Вследствие увеличения доли пожилого населения в общей его численности (эмиграция молодежи, снижение рождаемости), смертность на 1000 человек увеличится.

В монографии дана исключительно веская аргументация проблем сдерживания эмиграции и последующего увеличения иммиграции. При этом, решение проблемы занятости станет залогом замедления эмиграции. Особо подчеркивается, что процессы иммиграции в ближайшей перспективе будут предопределяться снятием продолжительной социально-экономической напряженности в республике, решением карабахского конфликта с позиций Республики Армения, проведением миграционной политики, соответствующей международным нормам, в отношении нелегальных армянских мигрантов, уровнем социальной обеспеченности и занятости легальных мигрантов, отсутствием или какими-либо проявлениями национальной и социальной дискриминации, периодическими кризисами мирового хозяйства и другими факторами. Решающее значение приобретает величина заработка легальных и нелегальных армянских мигрантов за рубежом. Поэтому в деле обеспечения реэмиграции исключительная роль отводится государственной политике, способствующей экономическому росту, повышению цены рабочей силы на рынке труда, а также преодолению бедности и безработицы. Научно обоснован и представлен пакет мероприятий по проблеме "интеграции" поколений мигрантов за рубежом, у которых сложился иной менталитет, морально-нравственные ценности и, что самое главное, - изменились языковой код и мышление.

Итак, в работе подчеркивается, что регулирование миграции будет способствовать целенаправленности территориальной мобильности рабочей силы, увеличению рождаемости населения.

Интеграция с международным рынком труда на государственном уровне в процессе эмиграции продиктована интересами Армении и рассматривается в качестве одного из возможных путей выхода из критической ситуации на рынке труда, что позволит замедлить эмиграцию, уменьшить ее масштабы и тем самым увеличить рождаемость.

С этой целью в международном разделении труда Армения может использовать свой трудовой потенциал, определив размеры которого, государство должно способствовать временной эмиграции рабочей силы, создать соответствующие предпосылки для по-

вышения уровня квалификации до международных стандартов, разработать стратегическую политику эмиграции и иммиграции рабочей силы.

Организация эмиграции населения, определение и регулирование направлений массовых потоков — это вопросы, оставшиеся практически вне сферы действия миграционной политики Армении. Исходя из национальных интересов, основой политики временной эмиграции рабочей силы должны стать, прежде всего, набор мигрантов и определение направлений миграционных потоков. Подобная эмиграция зачастую рассматривается как средство освождения от "излишков" населения и рабочей силы. Временный экспорт рабочей силы на государственном уровне чрезвычайно важен в плане формирования и регулирования рынка труда.

Наряду с беспрецедентными масштабами эмиграции на уровень рождаемости определенное влияние оказали также ухудшение материальных условий жизни и социально-экономического положения в целом. Рождение ребенка связано с неоправданно высокими расходами и злоупотреблениями, в том числе, и в больницах. Численность детей уменьшается вследствие сокращения числа браков среди молодежи: на "брачном рынке" девушки в количественном отношении преобладают над юношами. Часть девушек выходит замуж поздно, либо вовсе не вступает в брак, что же касается юношей, они хоть и поздно, тем не менее, женятся, однако большей частью не на ровесницах (которым в основном так и не удастся испытать счастья материнства), а на девушках на 5-10 лет моложе; в этих семьях рождается мало детей. Юноши, находящиеся в эмиграции женятся и на представительницах других наций. Армянские девушки же выбирают замужество и, самое главное - счастье материнства, а вопрос о национальности мужа отходит на второй план, хотя лучший вариант - это брак с армянином. Некоторые девушки зачастую не могут выйти замуж из-за неустойчивости в жизни, отсутствия работы и жилья.

В условиях эмиграции стали частыми разводы, тогда как армянский народ характеризовался наименьшим их числом в мире, что объяснялось величиной семей и многодетностью. Никогда нездоровая обстановка в семье не может привести к скорому разводу,

так как супругов прежде всего волнует тот факт, чтобы их дети были окружены заботой обоих родителей, а супружеские неурядицы со временем забываются. В результате побеждает благоразумие. Но сейчас в определенном смысле процесс создания семей происходит иначе, и развод - не проблема, а ребенок на попечительство у матери - обычное явление.

Сила и стойкость малочисленных наций, независимо от уровня цивилизации, - не только в их культуре, материальных и духовных ценностях, но и естественном росте, смене поколений.

Вследствие эмиграции страна оказалась в глубокой пропасти

За последние 12-13 лет в Армении сложилась ситуация, не позволяющая определить реальную численность постоянного населения и представить соответствующую демографическую картину.

На протяжении лет армянские колонии уже существовали в странах СНГ: России, Украине, Грузии, в Азербайджане, а также США, Франции, Италии, Греции, Болгарии, Румынии, Польше, Египте, Сирии, Ливане, Иране, Ираке, Индии, Австралии, Канаде, и др. странах. Вследствие эмиграции, наряду с увеличением колоний в вышеупомянутых странах, возникли новые во всех уголках земного шара: остальных странах Западной и Восточной Европы, Латинской Америки, Арабского мира, Африке и т.д.

Если же, начиная с 1988г. эмиграция не носила бы спонтанный характер, увеличиваясь из года в год, подобного можно было избежать. При отсутствии же субъективизма властей, возможно, события разворачивались бы иначе: со временем часть как легальных, так и нелегальных мигрантов могла возвратиться на Родину. А сейчас их возвращение связано со стабилизацией обстановки в республике, так как вследствие эмиграции страна оказалась в глубокой пропасти.

Дело в том, что из-за отсутствия сферы применения и атмосферы уверенности произошел отток капитала из республики, как магнит притянувшего безработную молодежь в надежде заработать на хлеб.

Безусловно, эмиграция не приняла бы столь широкомасштабный характер, если в условиях "реформ" во главе государства не встали несостоявшиеся в свое время личности, которые интересам армянского народа предпочли свои собственные.

Армения первая в СНГ осуществила приватизацию. Весной 1991г. она была проведена в сельском хозяйстве, а далее охватила торговлю, сферу обслуживания населения, незаконченные объекты строительства, многочисленные малые и средние предприятия (в частности, пищевой и легкой промышленности), транспорт и связь, частично - здравоохранение и образование.

Действительно, переход к рынку иногда давал положительные результаты. Это прежде всего относится к сфере услуг и обслуживанию населения, отчасти торговле, а также некоторым отраслям пищевой и легкой промышленности.

Согласно законам о приватизации земли и скота, принятым Верховным Советом и Правительством РА в 1991г., право голоса оставалось за "коллективами" сельских хозяйств. Однако, в средствах массовой информации пропагандировалась необходимость безотлагательной приватизации земли и скота, обосновывалась ее "целесообразность".

Сама по себе идея была заманчива: десятилетиями расхищавшийся и отчужденный от земли сельский житель стоял перед осуществлением своей мечты - стать полноправным хозяином земли.

Однако избежать ловушки не удалось, несмотря на всю непредсказуемость последствий и ожидаемых проблем в связи с обработкой земли в условиях устаревшего машинного парка, реализацией продукции, севооборотом, осуществляемым в одиночку, нехваткой удобрений, борьбой против вредителей сельского хозяйства, высокими ценами на услуги и их практической недоступностью.

И если в прошлом в малоземельной республике труженик практически "отвоевывал" пядь за пядью земли, сегодня в условиях "распыления" колхозов, большая часть земли (а это тысячи гектаров), так и остается необработанной, за что очень дорого пошатился народ. Страна понесла огромные материальные, духов-

ные и моральные потери. Что же касается поголовья скота колхозов, оно впоследствии под видом "продажи" полностью было подарено имущим. Трудящийся народ оказался обездоленным, а весь скот был отправлен на бойню, вновь обогатив зажиточную прослойку населения.

Скоронапительная приватизация не дала положительных результатов и в промышленности. Причем, государственный бюджет сильно пострадал не только вследствие продажи многочисленных предприятий по символическим ценам и при отсутствии целевых программ, но и из-за простоев и раскулачивания. Установленная и еще не внедренная техника предприятий и строительных организаций, а также строительные механизмы, транспортные средства, система водоснабжения и прочее практически за бесценок были проданы частным лицам, кооперативам и иностранным государствам. Подавляющая часть как действующих, так и бездействующих производственных мощностей (различные станки, оборудование, поточные линии, автоматы и полуавтоматы) в виде металлолома по частным каналам была поставлена в соседние страны, в частности, Исламскую Республику Иран и Турцию. Некоторые считают поступок оправданным и "обосновывают" следующим образом: так или иначе оборудование простаивает, поэтому необходимо его продать в качестве лома, а сумму ввести в обращение. Думаю, благоразумие должно было подсказать, что необходимо посредством экономических рычагов обеспечить запуск этих мощностей и создавать новые ценности. Ведь в ближайшем будущем обнищавшему обществу будет уже не под силу приобрести подобное оборудование, пусть даже в виде металлолома.

Кроме того, начиная с 1991г. была осуществлена поставка медного и алюминиевого кабеля трамвайно-троллейбусного парка, городских и сельских электростанций, приборов, телефонного кабеля, а также купленного за бесценок у населения золота, серебра, медной и алюминиевой утвари в Турцию. "Злые языки" свидетельствуют, что изготовленные из них оружие и патроны были использованы в войне против Карабаха и Армении.

Начались хищения под покровительством государства. Параллельно процессу обогащения "избранных" на национальном

достоянии увеличивалось количество указов президента республики, а также решений Верховного Совета и Национального Собрания о защите прав частной собственности. С одной стороны - хищение коллективной собственности, а с другой - защита и неприкосновенность прав и интересов лиц, ставших собственниками вследствие грабежа. Подобная политика привела к сильной поляризации населения: на одном полюсе - несколько десятков новоиспеченных и всеобогашающихся миллионеров, а на другом - огромная армия истинных создателей национального богатства, пополнивших ряды неимущих и эмигрантов. Исчезла средняя прослойка, а усиливающаяся социальная напряженность стала неуправляемой.

Экономически безосновательным лейтмотивом современной экономической политики стала идея скачка, по мановению волшебной палочки, от преобладающих в эпоху тоталитаризма форм государственной собственности в "рай" рыночных отношений, сопровождающегося широкомасштабными хищениями в республике.

Никто не отрицает необходимость перехода к рыночной экономике и рыночным отношениям на основе многообразия форм собственности. Но почему так скоронапительно, необоснованно, и только на словах, с усердием быть обязательно первыми и мальчишеским бахвальством предоставляя маленькую, беззащитную Армению в качестве экспериментальной базы иностранцам.

По сей день политика "оздоровления" экономики, завуалированная переходом к рынку, игнорируя регулируемую роль государства в эволюционном переходе к рыночным отношениям, часто приводила к хаосу. В условиях псевдорыночной экономики производство бездействует, а на рынке наблюдается мнимое оживление. Причем, по мере ухудшения экономического положения активизируются лозунги "революционного" перехода к рыночной экономике, принимаются соответствующие безосновательные решения, законы и т.п. Между тем, потребительский рынок и сфера обращения формируются в процессе объективного экономического развития с учетом внутреннего потенциала, а не посредством решений и правовых актов. Экономическая политика в Армении осуществлялась без учета закономерностей логического развития хозяйства в

перспективе, напротив, направляла его в “желаемое” русло, пренебрегая реальными возможностями. Естественно, это обстоятельство, наряду с давлением на экономику, противоречит объективному процессу ее логического развития.

Форсированный, повсеместный переход к частной собственности и псевдорыночным отношениям не был оправдан, так как, находясь в эйфории построения рыночной экономики и слепо следуя западной монетаристской политике, полностью игнорировались местные условия и, в частности, наличие государственной собственности, созданной в годы советской власти, а также национальный менталитет и другие особенности. Кроме того, одним из препятствий на пути развития рыночных отношений стали также миллиардные рублевые денежные вклады населения в сберегательных банках, которые в процессе обмена на драмы^{*} полностью были присвоены государственными кланами.

В результате приватизации, во-первых, была парализована вся экономика. Промышленность, сельское хозяйство, строительство и другие отрасли пережили небывалый спад. Во-вторых, безработица достигла беспрецедентных масштабов - 500 тыс. чел., продолжается декавалификация рабочей силы, теряется ее связь с рынком труда, бесцельно растрачивается человеческий капитал.

Согласно некоторым руководителям, проблемы экономического развития - это прерогатива частного сектора, поскольку в процессе приватизации государству отводилась второстепенная роль. Вместе с тем, многие полагают, что в такой маленькой стране как Армения должны развиваться не промышленность и наука, а сфера обслуживания.

Но и на сей раз время с горьким сарказмом, “насмехнувшись”, подтвердило известную истину о том, что именно мощная экономическая база - залог социального развития населения и преодоления бедности.

Итак, накопленное в течение десятилетий национальное достояние по символическим ценам (часто за сотни рублей, драмов и ваучеров) было подарено “избранным”. С другой стороны,

предоставленные Всемирным Банком и Евробанком средства “распыляются”, расходуются нецеленаправленно и зачастую прикарманиваются, ложась тяжелым бременем на плечи будущих поколений. Большая внешняя задолженность государства, высокие процентные ставки погашения, привели республику в состояние глубокой депрессии. Это - результат деятельности отдельных кланов. Кроме того, значительная часть кредитов была присвоена самими представителями МБ и МВФ. Огромное отрицательное сальдо внешнеторгового баланса и внешний долг Армении - следствие недалекой, неразумной, а возможно и преднамеренно осуществляемой экономической политики.

Тогда как именно в результате претворения адресной социально-экономической политики возможно было избежать обнищания населения, снижение рождаемости не стало бы столь резким, а эмиграция не приняла спонтанный и широкомасштабный характер.

Спасти страну от аукциона

Сокращение естественного прироста населения, беспрецедентные масштабы эмиграции - все это результат деструктивной политики Армянского общенационального движения и их последователей. Бесславные новоиспеченные политики, возглавившие правительство, в погоне за наживой поставили под угрозу безопасность республики. Обездолив миллионы людей, они осуществили свою мечту. Проводимая в стране неподготовленная и форсированная приватизация привела к ничем неоправданному огромным потерям национального достояния.

Поляризация населения - свершившийся факт, уж не говоря о массовом характере бедности. А эти пресловутые расхитители со своими трескучими фразами уже вошли в азарт...

Сейчас очень много говорится о теневой экономике, находящейся вне сферы налогообложения. Однако, если эти миллионы не должны встать перед судом, то налоги платить они обязаны. Увы, этого не происходит. И почему не облагаются налогом их

^{*} Денежная единица Армении.

роскошные особняки и иномарки, мебель и другое награбленное имущество?

Ищем выход. Но пока во всех сферах политической и общественной жизни не освободимся от аоизма, “реформы” не достигнут своей цели.

Следствием политики АОД стала массовая вынужденная эмиграция армянского народа, влияние которой в демографическом плане оказалось сугубо отрицательным, а в социально-экономическом как положительным, так и отрицательным. Эмиграция все еще продолжается. Вершители этих чудовищных преступлений должны быть разоблачены и осуждены, а для общества это раз и навсегда станет уроком на будущее.

Дело в том, что сейчас только в швейцарских банках в миллиардах американских долларов находится часть национального богатства Армении, превосходящего ВВП республики в 3-4 раза. Это попросту результат хищений. Уж не говоря о миллионных банковских счетах в других зарубежных странах.

На современном этапе вновь увеличивающиеся масштабы эмиграции связаны также с фактом приватизации в течение последних нескольких лет ряда крупных производственных объектов и безосновательного “дарения” их по низким ценам иностранным гражданам (“Арментел”, Коньячный завод, золотые, перлитные и другие рудники, система водоснабжения и пр.)

Страна продается с аукциона.

Идти в ногу со временем

Одной из важнейших задач экономической и социальной политики РА, наряду с замедлением эмиграции и последующим увеличением рождаемости, является решение проблем занятости населения на основе устойчивого экономического развития, а также разработка национальной политики занятости и обеспечение благоприятных условий для ее претворения с целью создания новых рабочих мест. Задача - в оживлении экономики посредством мобилизации внутренних экономических ресурсов, приоритетном развитии отраслей, определяющих лицо национальной экономики,

а также отраслей стратегического назначения, и применении в данной сфере политики государственного протекционизма.

В этих целях необходимо обеспечить соответствующие условия для достижения международных стандартов в уровне квалификации трудового потенциала, что будет стимулировать экспорт “продукции” интеллектуальной деятельности (вместо “вывоза” умов), наукоемких технических проектов, прошедших испытательный срок, технологических разработок, плодов творческой мысли, которые в любое время могут беспрепятственно “вывозиться” в любую страну, не взирая на блокады.

Восстановление материального ущерба - вопрос времени. Духовное обесценивание - безвозвратно. Более того, каждая сегодняшняя потеря в духовной сфере чревата угрозой отставания на несколько десятилетий в уровне духовного и интеллектуального развития поколений.

В цивилизованных странах последовательно воспитывается вооруженный знаниями гражданин нового века - века мощного научно-технического прогресса. В Армении к решению подобных задач государство относится весьма инертно.

Необходимо спасти духовные ценности, имеющие мировое признание, их носителей и создателей, а также поколение, готовое стать гордостью XXI в., и с этой целью - претворять в жизнь тщательно разработанную политику, предотвратив попустительство в области превращения республики в широкое пространство сферы обслуживания.

В начале третьего тысячелетия все усилия следует направить на сферы, обеспечивающие экономический рост. Ведь именно здесь сконцентрирована движущая сила общества - молодежь - светоч научно-технического прогресса, творцы будущего.

В этом и спасение общества от эмиграции.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	23
PART ONE.....	31
THE POPULATION OF EASTERN ARMENIA IN THE 19 th CENTURY.....	31
CHAPTER ONE.....	31
THE START OF CARAVANS TO EASTERN ARMENIA.....	31
1. Repatriation from Persia.....	31
2. Afflux from Western Armenia.....	37
CHAPTER TWO.....	50
THE SETTLEMENT OF THE RUSSIAN SECTANTS IN EASTERN ARMENIA.....	50
CHAPTER THREE.....	62
THE GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN 1828-1918.....	62
1. General growth of population.....	62
2. The urban population.....	66
PART TWO.....	71
THE POPULATION IN THE 19 th CENTURY.....	71
CHAPTER FOUR.....	71
THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM AND THE ARMENIAN POPULATION IN TRANSCAUCASIA.....	71
1. The territorial movements of the population.....	71
2. The Armenian population's employment in the Transcaucasus.....	87
PART THREE.....	97
THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE POPULATION IN THE 20 th CENTURY.....	97
CHAPTER FIVE.....	97
REPRODUCTION BEFORE WORLD WAR II.....	97
1. The process of reduction of the population during World War I.....	97
2. The high growth of population before the Great Patriotic War.....	101
3. The demographers of Azerbaijan falsify the facts.....	108
4. The real picture of the ethnic cleansing's policy towards Armenians in Nakhichevan.....	118
5. The demographic processes in the Autonomous Oblast of Mountainous Karabakh.....	130
CHAPTER SIX.....	136
CHARACTERIZATION OF MORE EXTENSIVE REPRODUCTION OF THE POPULATION AFTER THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR (1946-1980).....	136
1. Repatriation.....	137
2. Favourable process of natural growth of population.....	139
3. The able-bodied population.....	152
CHAPTER SEVEN.....	155
INTERNAL MIGRATION WITHIN ARMENIA, 1913-1990.....	155
1. The causes of migration from rural areas.....	155
2. The factors of the urban population's growth.....	170
PART FOUR.....	177
THE DEMOGRAPHIC TENSION AT THIS STAGE.....	177

CHAPTER EIGHT.....	178
REASONS FOR THE DECLINE OF THE BIRTH RATE.....	178
1. Variations in the age structure of Armenia and wars.....	178
2. Demographic consequences of the Spitak earthquake.....	182
3. The impact of emigration of Azerbaijanis from the Armenian SSR and the deportation of Armenians from the Azerbaijan SSR.....	186
CHAPTER NINE.....	193
A GENERAL PICTURE OF THE DEATH RATE.....	193
1. Although death rates in Armenia are rising for some groups, the crude death rate remains one of the lowest in the world.....	193
2. Infantile mortality.....	194
3. Life expectancy.....	198
4. Territorial, gender and age peculiarities of mortality.....	200
5. Causes of mortality and seasonality of death.....	202
PART FIVE.....	206
THE PRESENT STAGE OF MIGRATION AND THE REDUCTION OF POPULATION.....	206
CHAPTER TEN.....	206
THE CHARACTER AND TYPES OF MIGRATION.....	206
CHAPTER ELEVEN.....	209
DIRECTIONS OF THE STREAMS OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION.....	209
1. The migration processes with distant foreign countries.....	209
2. Migration between the Soviet republics.....	212
3. The population's movements on the eve of the collapse of the USSR.....	216
a) Deportation of the Armenians from the Azerbaijan SSR.....	217
b) Nine of ten born babies were future refugees in NKAO.....	233
c) Emigration of the Azeri-Turks from the Armenian SSR.....	237
CHAPTER TWELVE.....	241
THE MOVEMENTS AFTER INDEPENDENCE.....	241
PART SIX.....	250
THE ESSENCE, CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION AND INTERREPUBLICAN MOVEMENTS.....	250
CHAPTER THIRTEEN.....	250
THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE EMIGRATION.....	250
1. Main causes.....	251
2. The role of the social-economic factors.....	257
3. Demographic consequences.....	260
CHAPTER FOURTEEN.....	263
A NEW METHOD OF DETERMINATION OF THE MIGRANT POPULATION.....	263
CHAPTER FIFTEEN.....	268
THE ESSENCE OF THE POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION.....	268
1. Policy requirement.....	268
2. Social functions.....	272
3. Social essence.....	274
CHAPTER SIXTEEN.....	274
INTERNAL MOVEMENTS OF THE POPULATION.....	274
PART SEVEN.....	283

INTERNAL MOVEMENTS OF THE POPULATION.....	- 274 -
PART SEVEN	- 283 -
THE TRENDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POPULATION AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM.....	- 283 -
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN	- 283 -
THE FUTURE OF REPRODUCTION OF THE POPULATION	- 283 -
1. Households will continue to reduce, the birth rate will decrease.....	- 283 -
2. Specification of interpretation of new-born babies' "acceleration".....	- 290 -
3. The death rate will increase.....	- 296 -
4. Population will "grow old" and society's burden increase.....	- 298 -
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN	- 303 -
POSSIBLE TRENDS OF MIGRATION.....	- 303 -
1. Regulation of migration	- 304 -
a. General directions of migration.....	- 304 -
b. Regulation of temporary export of the labour force "remainder."	- 308 -
2. Possibility of immigration and its organization.....	- 312 -
CHAPTER NINETEEN	- 314 -
THE NECESSITY OF WEAKENING OF DEMOGRAPHIC TENSION	- 314 -
CONCLUSION	- 318 -
Резюме	- 344 -

VLADIMIR E. KHOJABEKYAN

REGULARITIES OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROCESSES IN ARMENIA

IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES AND AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE 21st CENTURY

*The Press of NAS RA
Erevan, Marshal Baghramyan Avenue 24*