



**საერთაშორისო კონფერენცია  
ეროვნულ-განმათავისუფლებელი და ანთისაბჭოთა  
მოძრაობა კავკასიასა და  
აღმოსავლეთ ცენტრალურ ევროპაში**

**მოსხენებათა თეზისები/ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS**

**International Conference  
NATIONAL-LIBERATION AND ANTI-SOVIET MOVEMENT  
IN THE CAUCASUS AND EAST CENTRAL EUROPE**

**ედვნება 1924 წლის აჯანყების 100 წლისთავს  
On the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the 1924 Georgia Uprising**

**ოქტომბერი 3-5 October  
თბილისი/Tbilisi  
2024**

მხარდაჭერები / SUPPORTED BY:



ივ. ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის  
სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი  
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University



Mioszowski  
Centre

მიეროშევსკის ცენტრი  
Mioszowski Centre



შოთა რუსთაველის საქართველოს ეროვნული  
სამეცნიერო ფონდი  
Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia

პროექტი განხორციელდა შოთა რუსთაველის საქართველოს  
ეროვნული სამეცნიერო ფონდის მხარდაჭერით  
[გრანტის ნომერი CS-II-24-036]

The project was supported by Shota Rustaveli National  
Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG)  
[grant number CS-II-24-036]

**Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University**

**International Conference**

**NATIONAL-LIBERATION AND ANTI-SOVIET  
MOVEMENT IN THE CAUCASUS AND EAST  
CENTRAL EUROPE**

**On the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the 1924 Georgia Uprising**

**ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS**

**October 3-5  
Tbilisi  
2024**

**Łukasz ADAMSKI**

*Mieroszevski Center, Poland*

## **THE DILEMMAS OF POLISH POLITICS TOWARDS THE SOVIET UNION, 1939-1945**

The double German and Soviet aggression against Poland in September 1939 led to the exile of the Polish government and armed forces in France and later in the United Kingdom. Poland declared itself at war with both Germany, which occupied 48% of Polish territory, and the USSR, which occupied 52%. However, the outbreak of the German-Soviet war in June 1941 and pressure from Britain to regulate relations between Poland and its new ally, the Stalinist USSR, presented the Polish government with a political dilemma. Either agree to sign an agreement normalising relations, allowing the formation of a Polish army in the USSR and the release of Polish citizens from Soviet gulags, in a situation where the USSR clearly refused to confirm the validity of the 1921 border and to withdraw its claims to the territory of the Polish state occupied in 1939, or not sign and risk political marginalisation in the anti-Hitler coalition. In the years that followed, the dilemma of what position to take on the border issue was compounded by a second dilemma – what position to take on the USSR's demands that undermined the very essence of Polish sovereignty, such as e.g. the reorganisation of the government to exclude those politicians who were most critical of the USSR – 'pro-fascist forces' in Soviet nomenclature. Finally, there was a third dilemma – to what extent could the Polish government afford to criticise British and American policy towards the Soviet Union, which was generally regarded as short-sighted.

Different Polish political forces took different positions on this dilemma.

This paper attempts to discuss the rationale behind each of these positions, based on the information available at the time to both opponents and supporters of the policy of compromise with the USSR.

*Kari ALENIUS*

*University of Oulu, Finland*

## **THE FINNISH WAR OF INDEPENDENCE AGAINST BOLSHEVIK RUSSIA, 1918–1920**

This presentation systematically analyzes the key elements of the Finnish War of Independence: the goals and resources of the parties, the impact of the broader strategic situation, the most important operations, and the essential content of the peace treaty.

The Grand Duchy of Finland was the first region to declare independence from the Russian Empire in December 1917. Bolshevik Russia formally recognized Finland's independence, but it still did not give up its expansionist policy against Finland. The recognition was intended to support the Finnish extreme left, which started a rebellion against the democratic government in Finland in January 1918, following the example of the Russian Bolsheviks. The goal of the Finnish extreme left was a socialist Finland that would be in close cooperation with Soviet Russia, but the real goal of Lenin's government was to restore Finland to Russia.

The fiercest phase of the Finnish War of Independence occurred in the spring of 1918. The main parties were, on the one hand, the Finnish extreme left, which received significant support from the Russian Bolsheviks, and on the other hand, the non-socialist groups supported by Germany. The period of lower intensity warfare extended from the summer of 1918 to the autumn of 1920, in which Finnish volunteer forces tried to have parts of East Karelia freed from Bolshevik rule and annexed to Finland – for cultural reasons, as Karelians are linguistically and ethnically very close to Finns.

The Finnish War of Independence ended with the Tartu Peace Treaty between Finland and Soviet Russia in October 1920. Nevertheless, Soviet Russia immediately violated the treaty when, despite its promise, it did not grant national autonomy to the Karelians who remained on Russian territory. As a result, the Karelians started an uprising in 1921–1922 with the support of the Finns, which, however, failed.

**Lala A. ALIYEVA**

*Baku State University, Azerbaijan*

## **“CREATION” OF HISTORY AND HISTORICAL MEMORY IN THE SOVIET AZERBAIJAN**

The main goal of the proposed research paper is to analyze the role of history writing in a new collective identity construction, applying Ernest Gellner’s theory of constructivism. Since historical memories under the pen of historians become part of collective memory writing history can play considerable role in the new identity construction.

Mainly, this paper focuses on the creation of national history of Azerbaijan under the Soviet authorities, making a brief historical overview on the Tsarist Russian period and then shifting to the short living independent Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (1918-1920). It tries to find the answer to the question of how colonial authorities tried to influence national thinking via writing history. Dependence on the Soviet Union, which not only limited possibilities of forming independent policies of Azerbaijan and deformed its historical development, but also Soviet authorities attempted to influence national thinking via writing history.

Further, guided by postcolonial discourses of identity, the research examines re-writing of national history in decolonized Azerbaijan. One of the major objectives of the research is to compare Soviet history writing with in decolonized Azerbaijan and to clarify features of postcolonial identity in the case of Azerbaijan. Scrutiny on the issue shows that challenge between belonging to the Turkic world and Azerbaijani self-determination as an independent nation, is a main feature of postcolonial history writing in Azerbaijan.

Methodologically, this study is based on historical and postcolonial approaches, being interdisciplinary in nature.

**Irina ARABIDZE**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Institute of History and Ethnology, TSU, Georgia*

## **THE TASKS OF THE GEORGIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE 1980S**

In the 1980s, the national liberation movement in Georgia was strengthened by the revival of church life, which began with the enthronement of Ilia II (Shiolashvili) as the head of the church in 1977. During this period, the expression of the Georgian Church's position was entirely entrusted to this one individual. Archival materials confirm the patriotic aspirations of Catholicos-Patriarch Ilia II even before he was chosen as the head of the Georgian Church. These aspirations were manifested multiple times during his tenure at relatively lower clerical ranks, in his speeches at the time of his consecration as Catholicos-Patriarch, and in his later sermons. All of this led to the gathering of young patriots who yearned for spiritual revival around the Georgian Church. The Catholicos-Patriarch, and through him, the Georgian Church, influenced the formation of the aspirations of representatives of the national liberation movement. The article discusses the contribution of the Georgian Church to the struggle for national independence, which was expressed in the effort to raise patriotic feelings and national consciousness among Georgians. It involved advising the faithful on the importance of protecting the unity of Georgia and preserving the Georgian language, culture, morals, customs, and traditions. To explore this issue, I used the sermons, speeches, Christmas and Easter epistles, official letters, and personal correspondence of Catholicos-Patriarch Ilia II. I also referred to the memories of several representatives of the national liberation movement and members of the congregation from that period. During this same period, one of the significant tasks of the Church was to achieve recognition of the autocephaly of the Georgian Church, which dates back to the 5th century, and the title of its leader (Catholicos-Patriarch)

by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The Georgian Church had been striving for this recognition since 1917, and the issue was successfully resolved in January 1990. A regrettable event in the life of Georgia and its Church was the lack of unity within the national liberation movement. In the article, I attempt to identify and analyze the reasons behind this disunity. The national liberation movement culminated successfully on April 9, 1991, with the restoration of Georgia's independence. The contribution of the Church of Georgia is important in this.



**Mikheil BAKHTADZE**

*Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

## **THE CONQUEST OF SOUTH CAUCASUS BY SOVIET RUSSIA (1920-1921)**

On the morning of April 27, at 00:05, four armoured trains of the XI Red Army set off in the direction of Baku. At the same time, in the morning, armed demonstrations of the Bolsheviks began in Baku itself. The political elite of Azerbaijan decided not to resist the Bolsheviks and handed over power to the Revkom.

On May 1, 1920, the first small clashes took place also on the Georgian-Azerbaijan border. During the first days of the battle, the enemy had the upperhand. He occupied the Red Bridge and invaded the territory of Georgia for 5-6 verses.

On May 12, was carried out a powerful attack, as a result of which the enemy left the borders of Georgia. Georgian units continued their attack. Military operations were already taking place on the territory of Soviet Azerbaijan. On May 18, the commander-in-chief, General Kvinitadze, received an order from the chairman of the government to stop military operations.

On November 29, the Armenian Bolsheviks announced the creation of the Soviet government in the city of Ijevan, and on December 2, the government of the Republic of Armenia announced that it would transfer military and civilian power to the Commander-in-Chief. General Dro was appointed to this position. Together with the representative of Soviet Russia in Yerevan, he issued an order announcing the establishment of the Soviet government in Armenia.

On the night of February 11 to February 12, 1921, several units of the armed forces of Soviet Armenia and the XI Army launched an attack against Georgia.

On February 16, the XI Army of Soviet Russia started military operations against Georgia.

On February 18, the units of the Red Army tried to take Tbilisi, but failed. Began the battle for Tbilisi, which lasted one week. Despite the fact that the enemy did not succeed, the Commander-in-Chief of the Georgian Armed Forces, General Giorgi Kvinitadze, considered that the defense resources of Tbilisi were exhausted and ordered to leave the capital.

On March 4-5, the Georgian armed forces tried to carry out a counter-attack in the Khashuri-Osiauri region, but they did not succeed.

On March 10, units of the XI Army captured Kutaisi.

On March 13, the Commander-in-Chief General Kvinitadze arrived in Batumi, there already were members of the government and the constituent assembly.

On March 17 and 18 in Kutaisi, as a result of negotiations between the representative of the government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia and the representatives of the Georgian Revcom, the military operations were stopped.

With the defeat in the 1921 war, Georgia lost not only its independence, but also the territories that the Soviet government transferred to neighboring states.

**Thierry BERICHVILI**

*French Cultural & Friendship Association with the Georgian People,  
Georgian Historical and Cultural Center of Leuville, France*

**FROM THE INVASION OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC  
OF GEORGIA BY MOSCOW'S ARMED FORCES  
TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL  
UPRISING OF 1924**

After more than a century of occupation by Tsarist Russia, the forces of the Georgian Nation first created the conditions for revolution, then for building a democratic and social state for the Georgian Nation. Unfortunately, after 34 months of experience and tangible achievements, as well as significant democratic progress, Democratic Georgia was invaded by Bolshevik Russian troops following a fierce six-week struggle.

Immediately, the main Georgian political force, the Social Democratic Party of Georgia, organized the people's resistance to this military occupation. First with its allies, the workers' unions and cooperatives, then with other Georgian political forces. All this resistance work and daily struggles were coordinated with the Republic's government-in-exile, which, having been mandated during the last session of Parliament, continued the fight in all forms from abroad for the restoration of the independence of Democratic Georgia.

From the first day of foreign occupation to the first day of the National Uprising, the popular and democratic forces resisted, protested, and fought against the foreign military forces and the state structures that Moscow tried to establish. These movements were primarily organized to regain lost independence, but also for the very survival of the Georgian people, against the systematic plundering of the country, for the defense of their language, for the preservation of their institutions, against the dismemberment of the country, for democracy, and the right to exist.

The first movements and confrontations clearly demonstrated the Georgian people's determination to recover what they had fought for over so many years and with so many sacrifices. For four years, under the leadership of the Social Democratic Party, preparations for the National Uprising took place.

**Tetiana BORIAK**

*Vilnius University, Lithuania*

## **FORMS AND SCALE OF PEASANT RESISTANCE IN UKRAINE: FROM COLLECTIVIZATION TO HOLODOMOR**

In 1929 mass collectivization began that meant liquidation of private property and liberal economic mechanisms. Resisting it, twenty million of Ukrainian peasants demonstrated a variety of strategies: active and passive forms of resistance.

“Terroristic acts” (113 in the first half of 1928; 302 in the second half; 1396 in 1929; 2779 in 1930) meant arsons, murder of party and DPU activists, elimination of authorities from a village with further creation of peasant own organs of power.

Revolts and uprisings were especially active in 1930 (4098, 1/3 of all-Union revolts). Almost 15,000 of individuals arrested for fierce resistance to collectivization and de-kulakization were deported by May 1930. Female uprisings were part of this movement. Peasants also resisted transferring of grain from their villages and attacked granaries.

Leaflets (1211 cases in 1930) could be treated as a transitional form between an active and a passive form of resistance.

There were passive forms of resistance: selling/leaving of households; escaping to the cities and Donbas mines; bribing the village authorities; sabotage; writing petitions.

Leaving of collective farms (41200 of households) and mass uprisings (923) in the first half of 1932 were probably the push for the decisions that orchestrated the famine. Disarmed and exhausted by repressions and starvation, peasants turned to new non-armed individual forms of resistance in the end of 1932–1933. These were: allotment of food by the village authorities to starving co-villagers; feeding of kulak kids; refusal to become a member of a searching brigade; refusal to enter a collective farm.

Thus, by the beginning of WWII amount of rural population in Ukraine in total amount of population dropped from 81,8% to 63,3%. Besides, in 1933 more than 500,000 of Ukrainians were purged in Ukraine.

**Alexandre DAUSHVILI**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Institute of History and Ethnology, TSU, Georgia*

## **ANTI-SOVIET PARTISAN MOVEMENT (1921-1923)**

Immediately after the violent establishment of Soviet power in Georgia, an anti-Soviet partisan movement started in various regions of the country, the cause of which was the dissent of the overwhelming majority of the Georgian people. From the very beginning, the movement attracted the attention of the international community (we are talking about the statement of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom R. MacDonald, and others). The anti-Soviet partisan movement has not yet been studied monographically, but some publications highlight various aspects of the partisan movement, and the stages of its development (I. Kacharava, K. Shelia, U. Bluashvili, O. Janelidze, A. Daushvili, K. Tsengua-shvili, T. Endeladze, and others).

The article, based on a comparison and verification of primary sources (the archive of the Shisakhkom – the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs of the USSR, memorial materials, communist and Georgian foreign press), examines the process of the formation of the anti-Soviet partisan movement in different parts of Georgia (Kakheti, Kartli, Svaneti, South Georgia, Megrelia, Achara, Abkhazia), its regional features, the deployment of partisan detachments, the routes of their movements.

The nature of the relationship, the specifics of their cooperation, and the specific results of the anti-Soviet partisan movement with anti-Soviet political parties (National Democratic Party, Social Democratic Party, etc.) have been established.

The characteristics of the formation of partisan detachments, their numbers, national or regional composition, age, and social status, as well as their daily life were revealed.

We deliberately focused on studying the strategy and tactics of conducting combat operations by partisan detachments, the speci-

fics of supply, obtaining weapons, the positive and negative aspects of their relationships with the population, etc.

The policy of the Soviet government regarding the anti-Soviet partisan movement, the forms and methods of counteracting it by the government, the positive and negative aspects of the activities of special purpose units (“CHONI/FSP” – Forces of Special Purpose), the main organizers and fighters against the anti-Soviet partisan movement (Beria, Kvantaliani, Tsereteli, Eristavi, etc.) are clarified.

The paper examines the phenomenon of “Cholokaevshchina”, its features, and the features of the fight against it. This detachment of partisans became the main driving force of the people's uprising already from 1924.

Finally, we provide the paper with an assessment of the anti-Soviet movement (from the point of view of Soviet and post-Soviet positions). We conclude that the anti-Soviet partisan movement, which began its activities in different regions of Georgia immediately after the establishment of the Soviet power, stood out for its scale and wide distribution, but expectations from the 1924 uprising were much greater than the factual results, which is why the uprising failed.

**Rusudan DAUSHVILI**

*Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

## **AN ECHO OF THE DEFEAT OF THE 1924 UPRISING IN EXILE**

The suppression and repression of the August 1924 uprising greatly angered Europe. The press of various directions responded to it, the brutality of the Bolsheviks was condemned by European states, socialists, the League of Nations and other international organizations.

Suppression of rebellion in blood found a great response in emigration. In November of the same year, the “Caucasus Liberation Committee” was created on the basis of the confederation with the participation of Georgians, Azerbaijanis, and North Caucasians. The “Prometheus (Amiran) Club” founded in Warsaw in 1925 also led the struggle of the Caucasians. After the 3 Caucasian nations, Ukrainians and Turkestans were added. When the issue of Russia's admission to the League of Nations came up, “Prometheus” promised to save all the Soviet oppressed nations, it was signed as “Prometheus Front” and since 1934, it systematically prepared notes and memoirs for the sessions of the League of Nations and mentioned the problems of the enslaved nations of 53 states.

In order to continue the struggle in emigration, it was initially possible to unite 4 political forces in the “Common Front” in 1925 – Social-Democrats, National-Democrats, Socialist-Federalists, Socialist-Revolutionaries. Young people created a non-party patriotic organization “Momovali”. In 1925, it was called “White George” (Tetri Giorgi) and became a powerful movement.

Georgian emigration celebrated religious, Georgian national holidays, celebrations, anniversaries. The impetus for celebrating the mourning and tragic dates was the repression of the occupying authorities in Georgia and the shooting of the Damkom military center in 1923. Then they started celebrating the anniversaries of



the occupation of Georgia – February 25 and the August 1924 uprising. The date of the defeat of the August Uprising was celebrated for the first time by the Society of Georgian Emigrants in Prague and a resolution was adopted at the meeting on August 31, 1925, the anniversary of the Uprising. In February 1926, at the special meeting of the Georgian Society of Paris, it was decided to celebrate the "Day of Mourning" on August 29 every year in the first week of the year.

Before the Second World War, this tragic event was celebrated every year everywhere there were Georgian communities (Paris, Berlin, Munich, Prague, Warsaw, etc.). They paid funerals, invited Caucasians and representatives of the peoples of the former Russian Empire, foreign friends. At the meetings of the community, they spoke with words and memories, performed funeral music, the hymn "Glory" of the independent sakrtvelo, received resolutions and appeals to international organizations. On this day, articles, brochures, and lists of those who were shot and died during the uprising, as well as those who were exiled and captured in the prison of Metekhi, were published.

**Otar JANELIDZE**

*Ilia State University, Georgia*

## **AUGUST UPRISING OF 1924 IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE WIKIPEDIAS**

100 years have passed since the national uprising of August 1924, which was directed against the Bolshevik regime for the salvation of Georgia. This important historical event had a certain international resonance at the time. The public opinion of Europe expressed goodwill towards occupied Georgia and expressed solidarity with the unbroken will of the country that was fighting for freedom and irreconcilable with the conqueror. This was also caused by the fact that the Georgian people faced the Soviet-Bolshevik empire, which was a great challenge for the Western states.

The August armed uprising covered almost all of Georgia. The rebels took Senaki, Samtredia, Vani, and others. But overall, the uprising failed. The members of the Parity Committee were arrested and put on trial. The Soviet regime severely punished the participants in the uprising. According to official information, about 800 people were shot, although the real number of those shot reached 5-6 thousand. Political parties fighting for the independence of the state were subjected to brutal repression, as well as many people suspected of having ties to the rebels.

Among modern advanced high-level technologies, the global computer network Internet stands out, uniting about 5.5 billion web pages. One of the most widely known websites is Wikipedia.

Although Wikipedia does not have a scientific character and purpose, it is so widespread in the network Internet, that it has long become a global phenomenon and contains inexhaustible material on any topic. Wikipedia is one of the most popular websites in the world and is actively used as an information reference.

Today, Wikipedia exists in more than 300 languages, including Georgian, and up to 172 thousand articles have been uploaded (the

largest English-language Wikipedia includes up to 7 million articles). The number of Wikipedia users worldwide reaches 16 billion per month and is among the top ten most visited websites.

Wikipedia, or the so-called free encyclopedia, is considered a bad reference in science and is rarely cited as a source in scientific works. However, publishing an article on this site, especially in different languages, significantly increases awareness of a fact or event, the identity of its participants, and, finally, the country where this fact or event took place.

The report will examine how the August Uprising of 1924 is presented in Wikipedia of more than 10 countries and will focus on the shortcomings and inaccuracies that must be corrected.

**FROM THE HISTORY OF ALLIANCE OF  
“THE DETACHMENT OF GEORGIAN OATHS”  
WITH THE CHECHENS AND INGUSHS (1922-1924)**

The history of the Georgian-North Caucasian relationship dates back centuries to the depths. During the long coexistence, these peoples, like any neighbouring peoples, were both good neighborly relations and confrontations.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire, the military-political cooperation of the Georgian and North Caucasian peoples resumed, which became especially intense since the end of 1917. The Georgian Democratic Republic and the Mountainous Republic were Strategic Partners.

After the occupation of Georgia, as the Soviet regime pushed for the efforts to consolidate their power in Georgia, an underground opposition movement emerged.

In February 1922, Kaikhosro/Kakutsa Cholokashvili (1888-1930), a former colonel in the Georgian army, was arrested by the Soviet secret services on charges of “counter-revolutionary activities” in the town of Signaghi in his native Kakheti, but fled and went to the mountainous Pankisi Valley, where he formed a group of followers known as “The detachment of Georgian Oaths”.

For more than in 1922-1924 “The detachment of Georgian Oaths” operating in Georgia had contacts both with Kists (uniting term of Chechens and Ingushs in Georgian language) of Pankisi Valley and with Chechens and Ingushs, living in the North Caucasus.

After the Bolsheviks crushed the uprising in Khevsureti (1922), by taking refuge in the mountains of eastern Georgia and Chechnya and Ingushetia, Kakutsa and his militants held out for two years. Revenge murders by Soviet secret executioners made him a nation-

nal hero. Foreign diplomats reported that the “Chelokaev case” caused a lot of trouble for the Bolshevik commanders.

In August 1924, Cholokashvili again left his mountain retreat to join a anti-Soviet uprising in Georgia. He took command of the largest insurgent unit operating in eastern Georgia. Pursued by Soviet troops, Kakutsa escaped several times before conceding defeat. Cholokashvili and 26 associates settled in France.

Thus, the Kists from the Pankisi Valley, together with Georgian patriots, fought heroically against the Soviet regime.

**Łukasz KAMIŃSKI**

*Ossoliński National Institute, Poland*

## **THE POLISH EXPERIENCE OF OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM FROM TODAY'S PERSPECTIVE**

The paper will outline the main forms of defiance against communism in Poland after 1945: from armed resistance, through various forms of social resistance, mass social protests, to organised opposition activity. Particular attention will be given to the 1980s and the experience of the Solidarity movement, as well as to those forms of resistance that had a greater significance from an international perspective. The formation of the memory of Polish anti-communism and its impact on the contemporary identity of Poles will also be presented. The author will also attempt to address the issue of the extent to which the memory of communism and resistance against it shapes the Poles' perception of Russia today.

## **GEORGIAN PUBLIC AND POLITICAL OPINION ABOUT THE 1924 UPRISING**

The 1924 uprising has been the focus of attention of Georgian historiography in recent decades. Many sources, memoirs, documentary materials from security and party archive funds have been published. The topic of our research is the attitude of political and social circles of Soviet Georgia and Georgian emigration towards the uprising. Based on later memoirs, contemporary periodicals of the era, and archival material, different and conflicting views are shown.

the assessment of the 1924 uprising in modern Georgian historiography is not rarely fed by the ideological visions and subjective attitudes of the minority. It is important to consider the contemporary sources of the era when working on this issue. It is relevant to evaluate the thinking of people with different positions and to explain the external factors causing their position.

The main question posed in the presented report – what was the essential difference between the views of the Soviet Georgian society and the representatives of the Georgian emigration. How Soviet propaganda and the security system worked to shape public opinion. To what extent did this affect the current political processes and globally, what type of impact did it have on the recent history of Georgia.

Empiricism method is used in the research to solve the scientific problem. Based on the printed material (journalism, memoirs, speeches), the attitude of the modern society of the era towards the 1924 uprising is analyzed, both before and after the uprising. Different views on emigration are evaluated using the comparative method. The reason for this difference, influencing factors.

Georgian public and political opinion about the 1924 uprising is different and contradictory. In many cases, this opinion was formed not independently, but as a result of external influences.

**Erik LEE**

*Independent Researcher, UK*

## **THE AUGUST UPRISING: A CROSSROADS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL LEFT**

The August Uprising: A Crossroads for the International Left The visit of Socialist leaders from across Europe to Georgia in 1920 set the stage for what was to come. Less than two years later, when Social Democratic and Communist leaders met in Berlin to discuss unity and cooperation, it was the same Social Democrats who had been on that delegation who torpedoed all hopes of reconciliation between the Second and Third Internationals. Their hostility to the Bolshevik dictatorship had been growing ever since Karl Kautsky wrote his first articles condemning Lenin and his party – only days after the Bolshevik coup d'état. When the Soviets successfully – and bloodily – crushed the August 1924 uprising in Georgia, it triggered condemnation from the Left. In some cases, such as the British Labour Party, which was then in government for the first time, that condemnation was followed by acceptance – and silence. The visit of British trade union leaders to Georgia later that year marked a low point. But the leaders of most Social Democratic and labour parties, including those on the left of that movement, were furious with the Soviet government and saw the massacres in Georgia by the Cheka as the final blow. By chance, it fell upon Kautsky, the sworn enemy of the Soviet regime, to draft the position of the Labour and Socialist International, which had been founded a year earlier. Kautsky's draft committed the world's Social Democrats to supporting armed resistance to dictatorship, as had happened in Georgia. It was a turning point. After that, there would be no further talk of unity between the international Socialist and Communist movements. Two decades later, the Socialist International was re-launched in Frankfurt and its founding declaration read as if it had been written by Kautsky himself in the aftermath of the August Uprising in Georgia. The Social Democrats were now using a new term – democratic socialism – to describe their world-view and to distinguish themselves from the Communists.



**Gor MARGARYAN**

*Yerivan State University, Institute of Oriental Studies, N A S RA, Armenia*

**Tiruhi BAYBURDYAN**

*Gehard S. A. F. NAS RA, Armenia*

## **ANTISOVIET MOVEMENTS IN AZERBAIJAN IN THE 1920-1930'S**

After the establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan, despite the Soviet authorities' attempts to find support in the ranks of former officials and officers, as well as attempts to suppress Musavat's influence in Azerbaijan, anti-Bolshevik unrest began soon, in 1920, in various parts of Azerbaijan – in Ganja, in Baku, in Lankaran, not without Turkish support, with the aim of overthrowing the Bolsheviks and taking power. The Soviet authorities, clearly realizing the strategic and economic importance of the region, immediately began to suppress these unrests.

In Baku, the uprising was suppressed using armored trains, whose successful actions brought the railroad tracks under Bolshevik control. Musavat's forces were unable to act in an organized manner and undermine the railroads.

Particularly interesting is how Soviet historiography presented the importance of Azerbaijan's oil reserves passing into Bolshevik hands. In a telegram of April 27 to V.I. Lenin from the Revolutionary Military Council of the 11th Army it was reported: "From now on, multimillion oil reserves are out of the hands of the international bourgeoisie and have become the property of the proletariat".

In the same way, after a short resistance, the riots in Elizavetpol/Ganja and Lankaran were suppressed. In Lankaran, Turkish influence was active, as the uprising was led by a Turkish officer, Yusif Jamal bey.

Soviet authorities throughout the 1920s were confronted with the growing influence of Musavat. Although the organization ope-

rated covertly and underground, it had one great advantage – some of the intellectual milieu, the intelligentsia and the affluent stratum had close ties with Musavat members.

The main problem was that schools and education had not yet become Sovietized, and the vacuum was filled by teachers trained in Turkey, or people read Ottoman literature, which could not but affect the general mood.

Turkey played an important, albeit hidden, role, especially as some of the Musavatists had fled and operated from Turkey, and there were pre-revolutionary pan-Turkist publications, pamphlets and textbooks coming from there.

This did not go unnoticed, and soon, starting in 1927, the Soviet authorities launched a new phase of the struggle, emphasizing the rise of pan-Turkist sentiment, Musavatism and separatism.

**Ashot MELKONYAN**

*Institute of History, NAS RA, Armenia*

## **THE ANTI-SOVIET STRUGGLE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ARMENIA'S INDEPENDENCE IN 1920-1921**

After winning the civil war, Soviet Russia intensified its foreign policy in the Cis-Caucasus in the spring of 1920. After Sovietizing Azerbaijan at the end of April, the troops of the 11th Red Army invaded Artsakh, then Syunik and Nakhichevan.

The Armenian government, caught in the joint Kemalist-Bolshevik struggle, was forced to hand over power to the Bolsheviks without bloodshed through the Armenian-Russian agreement signed in Yerevan on December 2. However, the Armenians of Syunik, led by Garegin Nzhdeh, not only overthrew the Soviet regime in October-November but also declared the region an independent state under the name "Autonomous Syunik" at a congress convened in Tatev Monastery on December 25.

In mid-February 1921, the anti-Soviet struggle spread to the capital, Yerevan, too. The Armenian Revolutionary Committee fled, and legal power was restored under a new government headed by Simon Vratsyan, the last prime minister of the First Republic. This government, known as the "Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland," cooperated with Autonomous Syunik in the anti-Soviet struggle and established ties with the Democratic Republic of Georgia, the last independent state operating in the Cis-Caucasus. Although the forced Sovietization of Georgia at the end of February complicated the situation in the region, the "Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland" managed to maintain its independence until April 2, 1921. On that date, military units of the occupying Red Army returned from Georgia and recaptured Yerevan.

Members of the Armenian government, many military personnel of the Armenian army, and notable intellectuals moved to Syunik. On April 27, 1921, "Autonomous Syunik" was re-proclaimed

as “Mountainous Armenia”, and on June 1, it was declared the “Republic of Armenia”. The struggle against the Bolsheviks in Syunik persisted until mid-July. During this time, Garegin Nzhdeh and his comrades-in-arms, realizing that the region would inevitably become part of Soviet Armenia, crossed the Araks River and sought refuge in Iran, eventually finding sanctuary in other countries.

## **THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND GEORGIAN POLITICAL EMIGRATION (1950s)**

In the early 1950s, leaders of the “American Committee for the Fight Against Bolshevism”, an organization created by the United States Intelligence Agency, reached out to the emigration from Soviet republics, promising them assistance and support in the fight against Bolshevism. Gaining the support of the United States was significant for Georgian political emigration; however, it required certain concessions, as the U.S. did not recognize the unconditional restoration of Georgia’s independence after the overthrow of the Bolshevik regime. Instead, it offered the emigrants the right to self-determination as defined by international law. Opinions within the Georgian political emigration regarding the right to self-determination were divided. Some (mainly the National Democrats, affiliated organizations, and individuals) believed that by agreeing to the right to self-determination, they were abandoning the Independence Act of May 26, 1918. Another group (the Social Democrats and Socialist-Federalists) believed that making this compromise in exchange for cooperation with the United States was justified. In the early 1950s, this was one of the most relevant topics in the history of Georgian political emigration fighting for Georgia's independence, encompassing many aspects. This issue is also noteworthy in terms of the attitude of the United States government towards the sovereignty of the republics within the Soviet Union. Did U.S. foreign policy consider the dissolution of the USSR, or was it only aiming to change the Bolshevik regime? At that time, the U.S. recognized the independence of only the Baltic states and supported the federal state created as a result of the Russian February Revolution of 1917. Moreover, it favored the Russian emigration, as the strategy pursued by the U.S. implied the

disintegration of the Soviet Union from within, focusing on the large Russian-speaking population and emigration. The debates around the right to self-determination clearly highlighted the Russian emigration's stance on the national issue. They did not recognize changes to the borders of the Russian Empire and aimed solely at the defeat of the Bolshevik regime. Consequently, they found the U.S. proposal to implement the principle of self-determination on Soviet territory after the Bolshevik regime's defeat unacceptable. Due to the disagreement on the issue of self-determination, the U.S. Intelligence Agency's project to create a "unified anti-Bolshevik front" by uniting Soviet emigration did not materialize. This initiative was meant to be one of the directions of psychological warfare conducted by the United States during the Cold War, aimed against the Bolshevik regime.

**Andrzej NOWAK**

*Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History,  
Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland*

## **RUSSIAN-SOVIET IMPERIALISM AND ITS POLISH LESSON (1918-1921)**

Poland, reconstructed in 1918 as independent state after more than a century of partitions, due to its geopolitical place on the way between Russia and Germany became instantly a target of both ideologically and strategically motivated offensive plans of the new, Soviet Russia.

The author analyses main motives of these plans and their discussion within the Politbureau of the Bolshevik Party (Lenin, Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin), as they developed between the first assault to the West (the end of 1918-beginning of 1919), and the second military effort to get “over the dead body of the White Poland” to Germany in the summer 1920.

The importance of failures of these two offensives is measured against the global revolutionary-imperial concepts of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin, as well as the changes these failures produced in the Soviet strategy for the next decades. How Polish successful defense influenced imperial policy of the Soviet Russia in Transcaucasia and in Asia is another important aspect of the analysis based on archival sources from Moscow, Warsaw, London, and New York.

**Gocha PHERADZE**

*Tinatin Tsereteli Institute of State and Law, TSU, Georgia*

**A HISTORY OF DEVOTION TO THE HOMELAND  
AND INGRAINED LOYALTY:  
THE LEGACY OF WARLAM TCHERKEZISHVILI  
(Dedicated to the Patriots Who Fell in the 1924 Uprising)**

The conspiracy of 1924 represents yet another heroic chapter in Georgian people's steadfast struggle for liberation throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. It stands as a crucial extension of the epic resistance that began in response to the dissolution of the Kingdom of Kartl-Kakheti by the Russian emperors on December 18, 1801, and its subsequent reconstitution as a Russian province on September 12, 1802. From the outset, members of the Tcherkezishvili family, part of the Kakhetian nobility, were actively involved in the relentless resistance against colonial rule. Their participation in the armed uprising in Kakheti from 1812 to 1814 led to the exile of five members of Warlam Tcherkezishvili's family to Siberia.

Subsequently, Warlam, on his way to Russia for his studies, met with a fate akin to that of his relatives due to his anti-government activities. Nevertheless, the profound spirit of allegiance to his homeland, ingrained in his heritage, remained steadfast despite the tortures at the Peter and Paul Fortress or the harshness of exile. Having escaped from Siberia to Europe, this patriot dedicated the ensuing sixty years (!) of his life not only to the national liberation movement, but also, the international socialist cause, leaving an indelible mark on both. At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, his internationally renowned anti-Marxist works, including '*Pages of Socialist History*', '*The Forerunner of International*', and '*Doctrine of Marxism*', were published successively in Paris, New York, London, Brussels, and Berlin. Despite his engagement in these



intellectual pursuits, he remained unwavering in his dedication to his homeland, never neglecting it for a single day.

Warlam Tcherkezishvili and Ilia Chavchavadze, two long-term allies, appeared to have delineated their spheres of influence. While Ilia labored indefatigably within Georgia, Warlam Tcherkezishvili, as a political émigré, pursued parallel objectives across Europe. From the 1870s onward, Warlam's endeavors encompassed the publication of articles in European journals and newspapers that exposed the oppressive nature of Russia's colonial rule, advocated for Georgia's autonomy at the 1907 Hague Peace Conference by invoking the 1783 Treaty, actively contributed to the formation and activities of Georgian political parties and associations abroad, and campaigned for the restoration of the Georgian Church's autocephaly. Upon Georgia's attainment of independence, he returned to his homeland and, despite ideological divergences with the Menshevik government, engaged vigorously in every progressive initiative for the nascent Georgian state. His contributions included securing international recognition and fostering its development and consolidation, notably through the establishment of the first Georgian university. Even at the venerable age of 75, in February 1921, this sagacious individual took up arms to fight at Kojori-Tabakhmela.

Following the Soviet occupation, Warlam Tcherkezishvili found himself, once more, in political exile, this time in the misty realm of Albion. The legend has it that in his final moments, as if all other languages receded from his memory, his indomitable spirit reemerged alongside his native Georgian. Concerning his remains, after Georgia regained independence, their location was eventually determined. Under the auspices of Tbilisi State University, efforts are now underway to repatriate them from London to his homeland, ensuring that he is accorded the dignity he so richly deserves.

**Jaba SAMUSHIA**

*Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

## **THE STRUGGLE OF THE GEORGIAN EMIGRATION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION IN THE 1920s-30s**

In April 1920, the Bolsheviks occupied Baku, leading to the dissolution of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. In November-December of the same year, the Red Army seized Armenia. On 25 February 1921, the Bolsheviks took control of Tbilisi. The governments of all three republics were forced into exile, beginning their struggle for the liberation of their homelands. One of the pivotal phases in this struggle was the “Promethean” movement, which emerged in Europe.

The Georgian Historical Archive houses more than 30 files, documenting all phases of the joint struggle of the Caucasian peoples in exile. These include hundreds of different types of documents – memoranda, correspondence, official records, information on Azerbaijani politicians, obituaries, and more. These materials are invaluable sources for understanding the history of Caucasian emigration in the 1920s and 1930s, particularly with regard to the study of the Promethean movement. A significant portion of this material has been published and analysed by G. Mamulia. However, this paper focuses on documents that remain unpublished.

The Georgian Historical Archive contains the correspondence of prominent leaders of the Promethean movement with their Georgian counterparts. Although our Azerbaijani colleagues have recently published the personal correspondences of Rasul-Zade and Topchibashi, these do not incorporate the materials held in Georgian archives. The inclusion of these documents will not only enrich existing works on the lives and careers of individual politicians but also expand our understanding of the Promethean movement as a whole.

Also of significance are the materials preserved in the archives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs concerning the journal *Prometheus* and the Promethean movement. This archive, formerly held by the KGB and CPSU, contains intelligence information that was systematically collected. From the outset, Georgian emigration was under the surveillance of Soviet intelligence. Reports by Soviet agents are stored in the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs' archive. In a secret report dated December 1926, Firumov, an appointee to the Soviet diplomatic mission in Paris, describes the activities of the Caucasian emigration, including its close ties with the Polish government. It appears that, through its operatives in Paris and Istanbul, the Cheka was able to intercept personal correspondence as well. Notably, the military organisation created by the Georgian émigrés, aimed at uniting military personnel in exile and establishing an intelligence network within Georgia, warrants particular attention.

In conclusion, it should be emphasised that the Georgian émigrés did not cease their anti-Soviet efforts even after the failed uprising of 1924. They actively collaborated with émigrés from various countries and sought to form a unified national liberation front against the Soviet Union.

*Tengiz SIMASHVILI*

*Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia*

## **SOVIET REPRESSIONS AND "RED TERROR" IN TELAVI AND SIGHNAGHI DISTRICTS (MAZRA) IN 1924**

**(According to Archival Materials)**

The results of the August 1924 uprising in Telavi and Signaghi Districts (Mazra) turned out to be quite tragic. It is established from the archive materials that the local authorities of the Soviet government showed terrible cruelty and executed people from different social strata who were not acceptable to them, well-known to the society of that time, on the charge of participation in the 1924 uprising.

Newly found archival materials speak of the horrors of the "Red Terror" carried out in August-September 1924 in Telavi and Signaghi Districts (Mazra) by local Soviet Political police – so-called "Troika Cheka". Many people were tried and sentenced to death without proving any guilt of by the decisions of the "Troika Cheka".

Today, almost 100 years later, it is very difficult to reconstruct the complete picture of the tragic events of August-September 1924. However, the materials preserved in the archives and the memories of contemporaries, as well as the information preserved in the form of oral histories, allow us to reconstruct the chronology of the Soviet repressions in Telavi and Signaghi Districts (Mazra)

The Soviet authorities started arresting completely innocent people in the city of Telavi in late August and early September 1924. People prepared to be shot were taken to the Telavi District (Mazra) prison, which was located in the inner western territory of the "Batoni Castle" in Telavi. At that time, the District (Mazra) prison in Telavi and the Soviet political police – the Cheka's successor, the "Politburo", were located near each other in the center of Telavi. The "Politburo" was located in the former three-story ex building of

nobleman Jandieri, on the opposite side of the western gate of "Batoni Castle". Some of the arrested were executed in this building, while the other part was executed in the so-called "Gigo Gora" ("Gigo's Hill") located east of Telavi. In addition to archival materials, this fact is confirmed by so-called three-line Soviet rifles bullet heads, which were found in the walls in the former building of the "Pilitbiuro" and from the ground on the "Gigo Gora" ("Gigo's Hill").

It is also clear from the archival materials that the Soviet authorities were not satisfied with shooting innocent people and began to evict unwanted people and families from the villages using cruel methods. In a number of villages of Sighnaghi District (Mazra), even physical destruction of innocent people took place.

## **THE STATUS OF GEORGIAN LANGUAGE AND THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN THE 1970s**

There are about 5,500 languages in the world, including 700 major ones. There are less than 200 nations. Nationality finds spiritual energy in language. The essence of a nation is also manifested in language.

On 1 October, 1918, the National Council adopted a law declaring Georgian language the state language, which was later reflected in the Constitution of the Democratic Republic.

During the Soviet regime, pressure on Georgia started with Georgian language. The books were demanded to be published only in Russian. Despite this, it happened so that in the 1970s in the Soviet Union it was possible to receive education in national languages only at the universities of Tbilisi and Yerevan.

For certain reasons, Georgian language received the status of the state language in the Soviet constitutions of Georgia, which was later opposed by Moscow.

In the mid 1970s, cardinal changes took place in the world politics, which were associated with convening the OSCE Meeting in Helsinki in 1975. According to the adopted act, control over the protection of human rights was strengthened, which contributed to dissident movement, including in Georgia.

The Georgian intelligentsia played an important role in the national movement, which, excluding radical forms, tried to evolve the society through spiritual purification.

In 1978, the protests of Georgian youth and intelligentsia flared up with renewed vigor, which was associated with the abolition of Georgian language status as the state language in the Constitution of Georgia.

The protests yielded results. The Kremlin backed down. The status of Georgian language was restored in the constitution. This victory meant that the end of the Soviet empire was near.

**Nato SONGULASHVILI**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Institute of History and Ethnology, TSU, Georgia*

**THE SOVIET REGIME AND  
GEORGIAN DISSIDENT MOVEMENT  
(Second Half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century)**

From 1921, the Georgian intelligentsia suffered a strong blow from the Soviet power. Georgian national forces had limited rights and, one might say, were deprived of the right to make a certain contribution to the development of the society's national consciousness. From the establishment of the Soviet regime in Georgia, everything national was persecuted, and the government tried at most to establish its own influence. It did not hesitate to resort to violent methods either. In the 1940s and 1950s, a certain revival was observed in the national movement, especially after Stalin's death. Although, Khrushchev and the then government officials tried to justify their power by criticizing the "Stalin cult" on 9 March, 1956, but the society, and especially its intelligent part, was no longer so easily deceived. It was clear to them that the new government was a continuation of its predecessor and would live by the old rules. However, they also clearly understood the need for the unity of national forces. The protest of young Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Merab Kostava against the existing government was aimed at preaching this idea. It can be said that their activity laid the foundation for the dissident movement in Georgia, which was revived in a new form in the 1980s.

*Jan SZUMSKI*

*Institute of National Remembrance (IPN), Poland*

**SOVIET OPEN-SOURCE INTELLIGENCE ON POLAND:  
AN OVERVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS  
STUDYING POLISH ISSUES IN THE SOVIET UNION  
IN 1921-1938**

In the Soviet Union the collection information on Poland – its economy, military, social and political life, as well as national minorities – was handled by diplomatic, intelligence, military and press organizations. Of particular importance were institutions affiliated with Bolshevik party structures and academic centers established to conduct research on Polish issues. In practice, they performed the functions of analytical centers, where assessments and expert opinions on the current situation in Poland were made primarily on the basis of open sources, exceptionally on documentation transferred from the Foreign Department of OGPU and Red Army intelligence. The resulting specialized publications were often studies for internal use. The prepared studies provided the Soviet technical, military and diplomatic elite with information on the current situation in the Polish Second Republic. These works were later used by the NKVD to prepare their own studies, which they used to repress the Polish citizens after the Soviet aggression on Poland on September 17, 1939.



*Irakli TSERETELI*

*Independent Researcher, Georgia*

## **GEORGIA'S INDEPENDENCE AND THE GREAT NATIONAL UPRISING OF 1924**

This presentation does not address the historiographical aspects of the 1924 Uprising. Instead, this pivotal event in Georgian history is examined within political, moral, and propaganda frameworks.

As freedom stands as the highest of all virtues, national independence is the ultimate and most complete expression of national freedom. A nation's dignity, pride, and self-respect find their most profound confirmation in national freedom and independence. Therefore, the historical, national, and political significance of the August Uprising of 1924 is rooted in the struggle for freedom and independence.

The Georgian people were defeated and the Uprising of August 1924 was brutally suppressed in blood by the Bolshevik aggressors; this was a great national tragedy. However, through this uprising, the Georgian nation expressed its will for liberty and independence with dignity and heroism. It demonstrated clear courage and a readiness to fight for the most noble of ideals – freedom.

It should be emphasised that among the nations subjugated by Soviet totalitarian Russia, the Georgians were the first to rise in rebellion against the Russian Empire in the name of freedom, national sovereignty, and independence. The Soviet Bolshevik imperial expansion deprived all conquered nations, including Georgia, of both independence and democracy, as the Russian Soviet Empire, also known as the USSR, was an anti-democratic, totalitarian state whose rule was founded on terror and the suppression of national and human rights and freedoms. Thus, the August 1924 Uprising represents a struggle for both independence and democracy. Alongside independence, the fight for democracy undoubtedly amplifies and significantly enhances the overall national and political significance of the Uprising, as well as its positive and progressive legacy.

**Anton VATCHARADZE**

*Institute for Development of Freedom of Information;  
University of Georgia, Georgia*

## **PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE GENERAL POPULAR UPRISING OF 1924: VANO ALIKHANASHVILI'S REPORTS**

According to his correspondence, in 1926, Vano Alikhanashvili authored a confidential report, intended only for Stalin and Makharadze. The report provides a detailed account of the attitudes towards the 1924 Anti-Soviet uprising and the methods of Soviet propaganda employed in its aftermath. This conference will focus on how an ordinary communist official characterized and evaluated the 1924 uprising and the propaganda tools used to shape public perception in Soviet Georgia. The propaganda efforts were designed to discredit the participants of the nationwide uprising, prevent future revolts, and justify the brutal wave of repression that followed.

The discussion will also highlight previously unknown details about the activities of the members of the government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia in exile – specifically, how the exiled government prepared for the uprising, identifying the key figures involved, and other related aspects.

Alikhanashvili's report begins with a chronological narrative of Georgia's first democratic republic, which he refers to as "the rule of the Mensheviks," and extends to his evaluation of the 1924 uprising. Little is known about Alikhanashvili beyond his involvement in the early 20th-century revolution and his tragic fate during the Great Terror of 1937. During the existence of the Democratic Republic of Georgia and its subsequent occupation, Alikhanashvili appears to have engaged in intelligence activities: initially working at the Manglisi headquarters of the People's Guard, later becoming active in Europe, and ultimately returning to write "anti-Menshevik" reviews while praising the Soviet regime.

Alikhanashvili's reports are preserved in the National Archives of Georgia but remain largely absent from scholarly discourse.

# სარჩევი

## Contents

### ლუკაშ ადამსკი

პოლონეთის პოლიტიკის დილემები  
საბჭოთა კავშირთან დამოკიდებულებაში, 1939–1945 ..... 3

### კარი ალენიუსი

ფინეთის ომი დამოუკიდებლობისათვის ბოლშევიკური  
რუსეთის წინააღმდეგ 1918–1920 წლებში ..... 5

### ლალა ალიევა

ისტორიის და ისტორიული მეხსიერების „შექმნა“  
საბჭოთა აზერბაიჯანში ..... 7

### ირინა არაბიძე

საქართველოს მართლმადიდებელი ეკლესიის  
ამოცანები XX ს-ის 80-იანი წლების  
ეროვნულ-განმათავისუფლებელ მოძრაობაში ..... 9

### მიხეილ ბახტაძე

სამხრეთ კავკასიის დაპყრობა  
საბჭოთა რუსეთის მიერ (1920-1921) ..... 11

### ტიერი ბერიშვილი

მოსკოვის შეიარაღებული ძალების მიერ საქართველოს  
დემოკრატიული რესპუბლიკის ოკუპაციიდან 1924 წლის  
ეროვნული აჯანყების მომზადებამდე ..... 13

### ტეტიანა ბორიაკი

გლეხთა წინააღმდეგობის ფორმები და მასშტაბები  
უკრაინაში: კოლექტივიზაციიდან ჰოლოდომორამდე ..... 15

### ალექსანდრე დაუშვილი

ანტისაბჭოთა პარტიზანული მოძრაობა (1921-1923) ..... 17

### რუსუდან დაუშვილი

1924 წლის აჯანყების დამარცხების  
გამოძახილი ემიგრაციაში ..... 19

### ანტონ ვაჭარაძე

1924 წლის საერთო-სახალხო აჯანყების საწინააღმდეგო  
პროპაგანდა: ვანო ალიხანაშვილის მოხსენებები ..... 21

## **ლუკაშ კამინსკი**

კომუნისტური დაპირისპირების პოლონური გამოცდილება  
დღევანდელი პერსპექტივიდან ..... 23

## **ბონდო კუპატაძე**

ქართული საზოგადოებრივ-პოლიტიკური აზრი 1924 წლის  
აჯანყების შესახებ ..... 24

## **ერიკ ლი**

ავვისტოს აჯანყება: გზაჯვარედინი საერთაშორისო  
მემარცხენეებისათვის ..... 26

## **გორ მარქარიანი, ტირუპი ბაიბურდიანი**

ანტისაბჭოთა მოძრაობა აზერბაიჯანში  
1920-1930-იან წლებში ..... 28

## **აშოტ მელქონიანი**

ანტისაბჭოთა ბრძოლა სომხეთის დამოუკიდებლობის  
შესანარჩუნებლად 1920-1921 წლებში ..... 30

## **შორენა მურუსიძე**

ერთა თვითგამორკვევის უფლება და ქართული  
პოლიტიკური ემიგრაცია (XX ს-ის 50-იანი წლები) ..... 32

## **ანჯეი ნოვაკი**

რუსულ-საბჭოთა იმპერიალიზმი და მისი პოლონური  
გაკვეთილი (1918-1921) ..... 34

## **ჯაბა სამუშია**

ქართული ემიგრაციის ბრძოლა საბჭოთა კავშირის  
წინააღმდეგ (XX საუკუნის 20-30-იანი წლები) ..... 35

## **თენგიზ სიმაშვილი**

1924 წლის საბჭოთა რეპრესიები და „წითელი ტერორი“  
თელავისა და სიღნაღის მაზრებში  
(საარქივო მასალების მიხედვით) ..... 37

## **ავთანდილ სონღულაშვილი**

ქართული ენის სტატუსი და ეროვნული მოძრაობა  
XX საუკუნის 70-იან წლებში ..... 39

## **ნატო სონღულაშვილი**

საბჭოთა რეჟიმი და ქართული დისიდენტური მოძრაობა  
(XX საუკუნის II ნახევარი) ..... 41

## **გოჩა ფერაძე**

სამშობლოსადმი თავდადებისა და გენში გამჯდარი  
ერთგულების ისტორია ვარლამ ჩერქეზიშვილისგან  
(ედღვნება 1924 წლის შეთქმულებისას  
დაღუპულ მამულიშვილებს) ..... 42

## **იან შუმსკი**

საბჭოთა ღია წვდომის სადაზვერვო ცნობები პოლონეთზე:  
1921-1938 წლებში საბჭოთა კავშირში პოლონეთის საკითხის  
კვლევის აკადემიური ინსტიტუტების მიმოხილვა ..... 44

## **ირაკლი წერეთელი**

საქართველოს დამოუკიდებლობა და 1924 წლის  
დიდი ეროვნული აჯანყება ..... 45

## **ნიკო ჯავახიშვილი**

„ქართველ შეფიცულთა რაზმის“ ჩეჩნებთან და  
ინგუშებთან კავშირის ისტორიიდან (1922-1924 წლები) ..... 47

## **ოთარ ჯანელიძე**

1924 წლის აგვისტოს აჯანყება უცხოენოვან ვიკიპედიებში... 49

## **Łukasz ADAMSKI**

The Dilemmas of Polish Politics towards the Soviet Union,  
1939-1945 ..... 52

## **Kari ALENIUS**

The Finnish War of Independence against Bolshevik Russia,  
1918-1920 ..... 53

## **Lala A. ALIYEVA**

“Creation” of History and Historical Memory  
in The Soviet Azerbaijan ..... 54

## **Irina ARABIDZE**

The Tasks of the Georgian Orthodox Church in the National  
Liberation Movement of the 1980s ..... 55

## **Mikheil BAKHTADZE**

The Conquest of South Caucasus by Soviet Russia (1920-1921) ..... 57

## **Thierry BERICHVILI**

From the Invasion of the Democratic Republic of Georgia  
by Moscow's Armed Forces to the Organization  
of the National Uprising of 1924 ..... 59

<b>Tetiana BORIAK</b>	
Forms and Scale of Peasant Resistance in Ukraine: From Collectivization to Holodomor .....	61
<b>Alexandre DAUSHVILI</b>	
Anti-Soviet Partisan Movement (1921-1923) .....	62
<b>Rusudan DAUSHVILI</b>	
An Echo of the Defeat of the 1924 Uprising in Exile .....	64
<b>Otar JANELIDZE</b>	
August Uprising of 1924 in Foreign Language Wikipedias .....	66
<b>Nikoloz JAVAKHISHVILI</b>	
From the History of Alliance of “The Detachment of Georgian Oaths” with the Chechens and Ingushs (1922-1924) .....	68
<b>Łukasz KAMIŃSKI</b>	
The Polish Experience of Opposition to Communism from Today's Perspective .....	70
<b>Bondo KUPATADZE</b>	
Georgian Public and Political Opinion about the 1924 Uprising .....	71
<b>Erik LEE</b>	
The August Uprising: A Crossroads for the International Left .....	72
<b>Gor MARGARYAN, Tiruhi BAYBURDYAN</b>	
Antisoviet Movements in Azerbaijan in the 1920-1930's .....	73
<b>Ashot MELKONYAN</b>	
The Anti-Soviet Struggle for the Preservation of Armenia's Independence in 1920-1921 .....	75
<b>Shorena MURUSIDZE</b>	
The Right to Self-Determination and Georgian Political Emigration (1950s) .....	77
<b>Andrzej NOWAK</b>	
Russian-Soviet Imperialism and Its Polish Lesson (1918-1921) .....	79
<b>Gocha PHERADZE</b>	
A History of Devotion to the Homeland and Ingrained Loyalty: The Legacy of Warlam Tcherkezishvili (Dedicated to the Patriots Who Fell in the 1924 Uprising) .....	80

<b>Jaba SAMUSHIA</b>	
The Struggle of the Georgian Emigration against the Soviet Union in the 1920s-30s .....	82
<b>Tengiz SIMASHVILI</b>	
Soviet Repressions and "Red Terror" in Telavi and Signaghi Districts (Mazra) in 1924 (According to Archival Materials) .....	84
<b>Avtandil SONGULASHVILI</b>	
The Status of Georgian Language and the National Movement In the 1970s .....	86
<b>Nato SONGULASHVILI</b>	
The Soviet Regime and Georgian Dissident Movement (Second Half of the 20 <sup>th</sup> Century) .....	87
<b>Jan SZUMSKI</b>	
Soviet Open-source Intelligence on Poland: An Overview of the Academic Institutions Studying Polish Issues in the Soviet Union in 1921-1938 .....	88
<b>Irakli TSERETELI</b>	
Georgia's Independence and the Great National Uprising of 1924 .....	89
<b>Anton VATCHARADZE</b>	
Propaganda Against the General Popular Uprising of 1924: Vano Alikhanashvili's Reports .....	90

გამოცემაზე მუშაობდნენ:  
ლალი კურდღელაშვილი  
მარიამ ებრაელიძე

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის  
თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა

თბილისი, 2024

---

0128 თბილისი, ილია ჭავჭავაძის გამზ. 1  
1, Ilia Tchavtchavadze Ave., Tbilisi 0128  
Tel 995(32) 225 04 84, 6284/6279  
<https://www.tsu.ge/ka/publishing-house>



