

UDC 32

**THE ACTIVITY OF RA DIPLOMATIC MISSION IN THE SOLUTION  
OF SOME PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH THE TRANSFER  
OF THE MILITARY PROPERTY, DELIVERY OF WEAPONS  
AND AMMUNITION FROM GEORGIA TO ARMENIA**

**A. Ghazaryan**

*Ph.D. in chair of Armenian history,  
ORCID 0000-0001-2222-3333,  
e-mail: artakghazaryan@rambler.ru,  
Armenian State University,  
Yerevan, Armenia*

**Abstract.** The movement of Armenian diplomatic mission associated with the conveyance of the military property, transfer of Armenian officers in Tbilisi and other various issues hasn't been explored up today yet. Also, the actions of diplomatic missions were different. Since the revelation of Independence a lot of movements were made in order to solve current issues, yet the strategies of Georgian specialists were very unique.

**Keywords:** Georgian government; diplomatic missions; Armenian soldiers; military forces; existing issues.

The activity of RA diplomatic mission connected with the delivery of the military property, ammunition, transfer of Armenian soldiers in Tbilisi and the solution of other problems hasn't been investigated up today yet.

On behalf of Georgia the manipulation of this problem was very vital for RA has truly noticed Djamalyan in his report " ... After the declaration of Independence of their country and also when Tbilisi became the capital of the new formulated state Georgian leaders drastically refused to recognize the rights of their neighbors on the existing general state property ...".

The activity of diplomatic mission was diverse. Since the declaration of Independence a lot of efforts were made to solve the existing problems, but the tactics of Georgian authorities was quite different.

In the applications which were addressed to the Ministry of foreign affairs by A. Djamalyan on July 26, 1918 (N 47, 51) those questions were initial. "The defense of Armenian warehouses of the National council is in the first place. On the first day, after the departure of Armenian council, the local authorities partially involuntary and by the order of the center appointed a guard in one

place and sealed the warehouse in another place".

In the questions raised by Djamalyan the most essential problem was the liquidation of nearly 1000s of officers and soldiers. On July 26, 1918 (N61) Djamalyan sent a message of protest to the Ministry of foreign affairs of Georgia, emphasizing the facts of systematic exploitations and frequent occupations of the Armenian properties by different officials.

He also pointed out the fact that such kind of trespasses on Armenian property weapons and kit can make a pressure on the Armenian society. In his request he demanded to inform the authorities to refer to all the property of RA indisputably inviolable thus mentioning that such arguable questions should be informed the Armenian diplomatic mission by the Ministry of foreign affairs of Georgia beforehand.

There were also facts that the head of transportation vehicle service Odishelidze had occupied the train- bathroom- hairdresser's belonging to Armenian national council which once was serving the Armenian army was almost ruined by the order of General Chief of the Georgian army. It was said that the property of Armenian army which was kept in in Kakheti Street was transferred to

Georgian unit-stores; guards were appointed in vehicle garages belonging to Armenian national council.

By the order of Tbilisi garrison chief they forbade to hand the unit-stores, weapons and clothing belonging to Armenian junior officer school to RA. It was a violation of rights of the national Armenian establishments. Djalyan considered that the steps of Georgian government were illegal and hostile. Informing the Minister of FA about it he initially thought that those facts were rather the results of will fullness of the lower rings of authorities than the activities of upper authorial bodies. He asked for the order, saying that all the property belonging to RA must be considered Armenian and undoubtedly all the arguable problems should be agreed upon beforehand.

Considering all these to be illegal he demanded to avoid all the trespasses connected with RA property. (5) But Georgian authorities continued these extremities thus intensifying the situation. From the report (N 157) November 1, 1918 given by the separate commander of guardian companionship at diplomatic mission on November 25 in Mantashyan district, the Georgian criminal military detachment arrested several soldiers of Armenian army by the leadership of ensign Djordana. They arrested junior officers Melik Avetisyants and Kh. Karapetyan presenting false accusations. They informed about the fact that there were permanent robberies and thefts in Mantashyan's warehouse adding that the guardians who had been appointed there by the commander of Armenian corpus were disarmed.

Using this advantage the Georgian authorities either took rough steps in managing RA property or permanently delayed the resolution of the problem. In the note (N 1555) sent to the Minister of FA of Georgia on November 4, 1918 Djalyan showed his strict dissatisfaction. From General Dolukhanyan's report he was informed about Akhmetelov's visit to Mantashyan's warehouse and his demand to hand him the whole property. He

witnessed as if it was the decision of the government. In response to this Dolukhanyan was ordered to declare that that the Ministry of FA of Georgia had no relationship with Armenian representatives connected with this problem. In response to Armenian protest Akhmetelov had an announcement about the categorical notification of the government to receive the warehouse. He was obliged to do it despite the mission's awareness of that problem. Unknown of the fact that the Georgian government had ignored numerous announcements about the inviolability of RA property; it was decided to manage the property without mission's agreement. Djalyan made a request to take urgent measures thus canceling the order of the chief of garrison. He also warned that no seals and locks from RA warehouses could be broken without his permission and awareness; otherwise his government would immediately be informed about that hostile step. (7) In the note (N 1580) directed to Yevgeni Gegechkori on November 6, 1919, the attorney asked for the support immediately to transfer the whole warehouse property to Yerevan. He asked to provide a special commodity rolling stock, to send a representative from the military ministry from the warehouses to the station in order to organize the transfer and uploading of the carriages. He added that Armenian mission himself would take all the expenses of the train transfer.

In the note (N 4740) on November 7, 1918 in response to November 6th application Djalyan was informed that it was impossible for the government to transfer the military property and clothing of Armenian units to Yerevan in a short time as the military situation in Borchali province was tensed. Gegechkori also stated that the transfer of Armenian military property and ammunition which was stored in Mantashyan's warehouses and other places of the town were very urgent. He asked RA government to send a representative to Tbilisi curfew department for a negotiation with the chief of garrison General-major Akhmetelov. (9) In

the notification (N 1612) directed to Yev. Gegechkori on November 8, 1918 Djamalyan informed about his awareness of November 7th note, connected with the transfer of ammunition, bullets, hand grenades and explosives to the special separated territory which was given by Georgian military ministry. He asked for an approval and permission to transfer the rest of property to Armenia. (10) In another note written by Djamalyan on November 15, 1918 directed to the Minister of FA of Georgia there was again a discontent connected with the RA property in the warehouses. They demanded to establish rules in the actions of Georgian garrison, to abstain from the searches, to permit Armenian officials and authorities to realize reviews and enlisting in the warehouses. (11). In the note (N116) written on February 20, 1919 directed to Minister of FA Djamalyan again showed his discontent connected with some cases which had happened in Mantashyan's warehouses on February 19. At that time some unknown people invoked the official orders of the government and transferred a part of property belonging to RA, thus violating the agreement which was gained during the conference held in January according to which the problem of RA property should have been immediately solved on behalf of two sides' jurisdiction.

Djamalyan demanded the removal of the RA property at once from Mantashyan's warehouses asking the military and political representatives of French and other countries for the support. R. Hovhannisyanyan truly noticed that despite all the efforts which were made by the diplomatic mission in Tbilisi and RA government the Georgian authorities refused the compensation for everything to Armenia 5 million fund Sterling kept in the banks, technical equipment, spare parts and trains, the part of general property of Transcaucasia former federal republic and also for the armament of the former Armenian corpus which was stored in Mantashyan's warehouses in Tbilisi. During the discussions with milita Ramishvili's moderation as the Minis-

ter of internal affairs didn't disrupt him to continue the confiscation of Armenian property. Newly born political passions were aroused to occupy the Union building, Shakhkhatuni's library, Topchyan's workers club and the reading-hall of the Alliance students' union in order to allocate it to Italian representation.

In order to expel the indignant people situated in the building they needed the assistance of armed military unit. (14)

Nevertheless the work of diplomatic mission was hard as often the top problems were connected with calling up Armenians, Armenian military officers and also disagreements between Armenians and Georgians.

On the half of 1920s Armenia was in a difficult military-political situation and the mission of diplomatic corps in Tbilisi was to obtain necessary weapons, ammunition and clothing for RA army as the creation of the army was very essential in that particular situation. It was clear from the telegram on May 11, 1920 sent by the Minister of FA Ohanjanyan to Bekzandyan who was a representative in Tbilisi at that and according to the information from their local representative in Gharakilisia, Georgian government began new bumps thus blocking the delivery of flour and oil. They said that Bolsheviks would do everything to organize the delivery of oil and flour themselves. In his response (N 611c) on April 17, 1920 directed to the Minister of FA of RA and RA diplomatic representation in Tbilisi, the chief of General headquarters Baghdasaryan was interested in the process of negotiations with Georgia to fasten the transit of military loads. All the possible methods were used. From the telegram of Poti council Turkyan written on September 5, 1920 directed to Bekzandyan and the military Minister was clear that the French steamship was arriving to the port loaded with bullets and guns. Also they gave information about the arrival of a French representative from Tbilisi to start the uploading. The consult asked Bekzandyan to give an order so that Georgian paths could accept

their carriages. He stated that they were blocked in Poti until the roads would open.

In another note a General-lieutenant Gamazov and Ter- Hakobyan demanded Bekzandyan to report Turkyan about the loaded goods. (17) As it became clear from the report (N 204) on May 18, 1920, written by General- Major H.A. Kishmishyan directed to the Military Minister on behalf of the assistant of Military Minister General Gedevanov, they had already investigated the suggestion of the Georgian government connected with a definite sum of money to obtain 10 million trident bullets in the Crimea.

At the same time it was said that the organization of that bargain should be done on behalf of Armenian side and the whole job must be realized under Armenian flag. They suggested supplying with necessary ships in Batumi and providing their transportation through the Georgian territory without any obstacles, on condition that the bullets which had been obtained in Poti should be equally shared between the two sides. General H.A. Kishmishyan reported T. Bekzandyan about it. (18) It was obvious that the RA diplomatic representation in Tbilisi was interested in both RA property and the transfer of the military loads. It's important to empathize that the latter had made efforts to involve Armenian soldiers and officers in the creation of the army in Tbilisi and elsewhere and to overcome the disagreements with Georgian authorities in that sphere. There were problems which never received their justified so-

lution connected with some circumstances and also hostile actions of the neighbor state.

#### **Bibliography**

1. Djamalyan A. Armenian\_Georgian wrinkle / Arshak Djamalean: Introduction and acquaintance. Kh. Stepanyan: ASPU after Kh. Abovyan, Yet., " Mitk" analytical center, 2011" pp.108-109, 112, 124:
2. See NA of Armenia (thus NAA), f.275, list 5, w.37, 1.4-5
3. See the same place, ANA , f.200, l. 1, w. 66, l. 15: w.67, p. 2: V.H. Virabyan, Armenian-Georgian Military- political relationships in 1918-1921 pp., Yet., Print YSU ., 2016.p. 138
4. See NAA, f.275, list 5, w.26, p.92: naa.200, l.1, w.61, p.2:
5. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w.61, p.2:
6. See NAA, f.200, list 1, w.67, p.23:
7. See NAA, f.275, l. 5, w.13, p. 15: NAA, f.200, l.1, w.67, p.20:
8. See NAA, f.275, l.5, w.31, p.107: NAA, f.200, l.1, w.64, p.25-25
9. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w.67, p.16:
10. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w.67, p.18:
11. See NAA, f.275, l.5, w.31, p.99:
12. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w.150, part 2, p.341, 344:
13. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w.150, part2, p.342:
14. See Hovhannisyan R. G. Armenian Republic, volume II. From Versaille to London, 1919-1920, Yet., " Tigran Mets" print house., 2014 p.192: See also " Ashkhataavor" , Tbilisi, November 15, 1919, p.: See A. Djamalyan Armenian- Georgian problem, " Hayrenik" , Boston , VI- VII, April,1928-april, 1929.:
15. See NAA , f.275 , l.5,w.211, p. 111-114:
16. See NAA, f.200, l.1, w. 37, p.37:
17. See NAA, f.275, l.5, w.211, p.213:
18. See NAA, f.275, l. 5, w. 209, part II, p.128-129:

© Ghazaryan A., 2019.