



ARMENIAN LEGAL CENTER
FOR JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHT



International and Comparative
Law Center-ARMENIA

REPORT

for

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY INTO THE
DESTRUCTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN
NAGORNO-KARABAKH**

2026

WRITTEN EVIDENCE SUBMISSION

Parliamentary Inquiry into the Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh

1. This written submission is respectfully presented to the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh convened by the International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute, in cooperation with the All-Party Parliamentary Groups on International Law, Justice and Accountability and on Armenia. It consolidates our organisation's documentation, legal assessment, and monitoring findings concerning Armenian cultural and religious heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh. It also sets out the principal obstacles to verification, summarises the applicable legal framework, and identifies practical pathways for protection and accountability.
2. Our organisation has carried out continuous documentation and legal assessment of the condition of Armenian cultural and religious heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh since 2021. This work intensified following the 2020 armed conflict and, more significantly, after the mass displacement of over 100,000 ethnic Armenians in September 2023.
3. Our methodology combines review of publicly available high-resolution satellite imagery, open-source verification techniques, expert consultations in heritage conservation and international law, systematic analysis of official communications from Azerbaijani authorities, and testimonies from displaced community members. These sources are complemented by legal materials prepared in the context of international advocacy. We also rely on documentation contained in our policy brief, *Cultural Genocide in Artsakh*, which presents verified evidence of systematic destruction and alteration of Armenian cultural heritage sites and analyses the applicable international legal framework governing cultural property protection.¹
4. Our findings demonstrate that, since 2021, significant Armenian cultural heritage sites—including churches, monasteries, cemeteries, historic villages, and epigraphic monuments—have been systematically damaged, destroyed, reclassified, or altered in ways inconsistent with international standards for the protection of cultural property. Independent monitoring platforms using satellite imagery confirm physical destruction of multiple heritage sites and settlements previously inhabited by Armenian communities.
5. These findings are reflected in documented incidents across Nagorno-Karabakh which illustrate various forms of impact, including direct military damage, post-conflict alteration, demolition of cultural landscapes, and removal of Armenian inscriptions. While each incident has its own factual context, the overall picture that emerges is of repeated and continuing harm to identity-bearing cultural heritage.

6. The Republic of Azerbaijan has not been held accountable for the systematic destruction of Armenian cultural heritage in the Nakhichevan region.² The absence of meaningful international consequences has contributed to a pattern that appears to be repeating itself in Artsakh following the 2023 displacement. Armenian villages, cemeteries, churches, and historical artefacts continue to be destroyed or altered. Such actions facilitate denial of the longstanding Armenian presence in Artsakh and create conditions that obstruct the possibility of return.
7. The destruction of churches, accompanied by efforts to reinterpret or deny their Armenian origins, suggests a broader attempt to erase cultural identity and rewrite historical narratives in support of territorial claims. On our assessment, this pattern is not adequately explained as incidental damage or isolated misconduct. Rather, the convergence of destruction, alteration, and reclassification points to sustained practices that sever the connection between a people and its historical homeland.

Documented impact on specific sites

8. Particular damage has been documented at the following sites.
9. The Church of the Holy All Saviour (Ghazanchetsots Cathedral) in Shushi is a nineteenth-century Armenian Apostolic cathedral. It was bombed twice on 8 October 2020, with the second strike reportedly involving precision-guided munitions.³ Multiple international observers reported the absence of military targets in the vicinity, and Human Rights Watch characterised the attack as a possible war crime. After Azerbaijan assumed control of Shushi, the cathedral underwent further alteration, including removal of religious symbols, demolition of a cross-shaped window, and removal of a crucifixion sculpture. Subsequent “restoration” works reportedly altered architectural features in a manner inconsistent with established conservation standards and the monument’s historical identity.⁴ Satellite monitoring later confirmed destruction of gravestones in the adjacent cemetery.
10. St Hovhannes Mkrtych Church (“Kanach Zham” or the “Green Church”) in Shushi is a nineteenth-century Armenian church reportedly destroyed following the 2020 conflict. In July 2021, Azerbaijani authorities denied its Armenian affiliation and initiated steps to reclassify it as Russian Orthodox. The adjacent clergy residence was converted into a café.⁵ The reclassification represents not only physical transformation but also an apparent attempt to reshape the monument’s historical identity.
11. The Church of Vankasar in the Askeran region is a seventh-century Armenian church and a notable example of early medieval cruciform-domed architecture. It reportedly underwent alteration under Azerbaijani control. Monument Watch documented the removal of Armenian inscriptions and destruction of a cross relief on the western entrance.⁶ The loss of epigraphic elements constitutes irreversible damage to historical evidence and undermines the authenticity of the monument as a source of cultural and historical knowledge.
12. St Hambardzum Church in Berdzor was, according to satellite imagery, completely destroyed after Azerbaijani control was established.⁷ Video footage circulated online shows soldiers mocking the

demolition. Official narratives subsequently described the structure as “illegal”, notwithstanding its significance to the local Armenian community and its evident role as a place of worship and remembrance.

13. St Sargis Church in Tsar, dating to 1297, contained unique Armenian inscriptions, including the term “hamadki”, a regional land measurement recorded only in Artsakh. Under Azerbaijani control, the church’s cross and inscribed stones were reportedly removed.⁸ Such actions permanently eliminate historical documentation embedded within the monument itself.
14. Mokhernes village and surrounding monuments were documented as including residential homes, educational facilities, and multiple cultural sites, including the Okhty Drni monastery. Satellite imagery from 2024 confirms near-total destruction of the village and substantial clearance of the built environment.⁹
15. Karin Tak village, previously inhabited exclusively by Armenians, has reportedly been demolished. Satellite imagery indicates destruction of homes and essential community infrastructure.¹⁰
16. Gandzasar Monastery, first documented in 949, has been subject to public narratives challenging its Armenian origins, alongside similar claims concerning Dadivank, with attribution instead to “Caucasian Albanian” heritage.¹¹ These narratives raise concerns because reinterpretation of identity is often a precursor to physical alteration, repurposing, or removal of Armenian inscriptions and other features that establish provenance.
17. Tatavik Monastery has been reported as deteriorating following Azerbaijani control, with narratives attributing the site to non-Armenian origins. Diplomatic visits have framed ongoing works as “restoration”, raising concerns about whether interventions preserve authenticity and protect identity-bearing elements.
18. The Church of the Holy Mother of God in Mekhavan was documented by BBC journalist Jonah Fisher as having been completely demolished, despite official claims that its fate was unknown.¹²
19. Saint Yeghishe Church in Mataghis, a nineteenth-century church, has been associated with video footage showing vandalism of interior religious icons, including a depiction of the Last Supper, accompanied by statements indicating deliberate desecration.¹³
20. Taken together, these incidents indicate a pattern of hostility directed towards Armenian cultural heritage. This hostility manifests both in physical destruction and in measures that remove, conceal, or contest Armenian identity markers, including inscriptions, crosses, and historical narratives.

Intangible cultural heritage and burial rights

21. The destruction extends beyond monuments to include serious interference with burial practices and

funeral rites. The right to bury one's dead is deeply rooted in cultural and religious tradition and is widely recognised as an aspect of human dignity. It includes the right of family members to perform funeral rites and to maintain access to graves.

22. In January 2025, jointly with the Armenian Legal Center for Justice and Human Rights, we published *Resting in Uncertainty: The Struggle for Proper Burials in the Aftermath of 2023 Azerbaijani Aggression*.¹⁴ The report documents 46 temporary burials following the 19 September 2023 military operation.
23. Families were compelled to bury loved ones in mass graves or private courtyards under emergency conditions. Armenian tradition requires grave visitation on the seventh and fortieth days and annually thereafter. Displacement has prevented families from observing these rites, and satellite documentation indicates that multiple cemeteries have been destroyed or damaged.
24. The European Court of Human Rights has recognised that funeral rites and burial arrangements may fall within Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. On that basis, denial of access to graves and continued uncertainty about remains can engage the right to respect for private and family life. Azerbaijan's refusal to return remains, where it occurs, compounds the suffering of families and may amount to continuing interference with dignity and family life.
25. The International Court of Justice ordered Azerbaijan in December 2021 to take all necessary measures to prevent vandalism and desecration affecting Armenian cultural heritage, including cemeteries. Continued destruction of burial sites therefore raises serious concerns regarding compliance with that order.
26. The denial of burial rights is not merely a heritage issue. It strikes at the most fundamental dimension of human loss and mourning and directly affects the social and religious practices through which communities sustain identity across generations.

Mechanisms used to assess conditions since April 2022

27. Since April 2022, our organisation has assessed the condition of cultural heritage sites in Nagorno-Karabakh through a triangulated approach combining testimonial evidence, open-source monitoring, and independent third-party verification. Taken together, these methods enable a consistent evidentiary record even in the absence of sustained on-the-ground access.
28. First, until the September 2023 forced displacement, Armenian communities continued to live in Nagorno-Karabakh. A significant share of our information therefore derives from first-hand testimonies by displaced residents, including photographs, videos, and location information preserved during displacement. In our fact-finding report, *The Artsakh Blockade and the Forced Displacement of the Population*, we collected testimonies from 83 displaced persons, many of which include direct observations about the condition of churches, cemeteries, and other community heritage sites

immediately prior to and during the displacement.¹⁵

29. Second, we have systematically monitored Azerbaijani official communications and media reporting. Following the 2020 conflict, various administrative buildings, cultural sites, and community structures were altered, dismantled, or repurposed, and some of these actions were publicly documented in broadcasts and official statements. We have archived and analysed relevant material as part of our verification process.
30. Third, we rely on independent satellite and academic documentation. Caucasus Heritage Watch conducts high-resolution satellite monitoring and has reported patterns of damage and destruction affecting cemeteries and other heritage sites. ACLED has recorded approximately 80 incidents involving destruction or damage to historical and religious sites associated with ethnic Armenians in the region. Monument Watch, an independent academic platform, systematically records and analyses the condition of cultural monuments and has produced detailed documentation of alteration and destruction. These sources provide time-stamped comparative analysis that can corroborate testimonial and open-source evidence.
31. We consider that we have obtained reliable documentation from multiple independent and corroborating sources regarding the condition of Armenian cultural and religious sites in Nagorno-Karabakh. Our assessment draws on three mutually reinforcing streams of evidence: first-hand testimonies and supporting materials from displaced residents; systematic monitoring of publicly available Azerbaijani official and media sources; and third-party satellite and academic documentation produced by specialist monitoring organisations, including Caucasus Heritage Watch, ACLED, and Monument Watch.
32. While access to the territory for independent, on-the-ground verification remains restricted, the convergence of these sources provides a consistent evidentiary basis for the pattern of destruction, alteration, and reclassification documented to date. This approach is widely used in environments where physical access is limited. Its credibility is strengthened where independent streams align in time, location, and observable impact.

Obstacles to verification and the lack of independent access

33. The principal obstacle to independent verification is the lack of physical access to Nagorno-Karabakh for international technical missions and monitoring bodies. Verification of cultural heritage destruction, alteration, or appropriation typically requires on-the-ground assessment by conservation specialists, archaeologists, and other technical experts. Despite repeated initiatives since 2020, comprehensive missions have not been permitted to conduct independent inspections.
34. UNESCO's attempts to deploy a technical mission illustrate the problem. On 20 November 2020, the UNESCO Director-General indicated readiness to send an independent mission under Article 23 of the

1954 Hague Convention with the objective of assessing significant cultural property and developing a preliminary inventory. On 11 December 2020, the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict issued a declaration noting that reported damage was difficult to assess under prevailing circumstances while reiterating the Director-General's readiness to establish a mission. UNESCO officials publicly stated that a formal response from Azerbaijan was still awaited, despite repeated approaches.¹⁶

35. In February 2022, international diplomatic engagement created expectations that a mission might proceed, yet the effort did not translate into sustained, unhindered access. After the September 2023 military operation and subsequent displacement, UNESCO renewed requests to assess the condition of Armenian cultural heritage, but the mission has continued to be blocked. Restrictions affecting international organisations and media presence have further constrained independent scrutiny. As a result, most monitoring has had to rely on remote sensing, open-source verification, and testimony rather than in situ technical inspection.
36. A further, related obstacle is the absence of conditions enabling safe and secure return, including short-term return for cultural and religious purposes. Without mechanisms that allow displaced communities to access heritage sites, cemeteries, and graves, community-based observation and documentation remain severely limited. A durable return framework is therefore relevant not only to humanitarian and property rights, but also to verification and preservation of cultural heritage.
37. In this context, the US-mediated Washington Declaration signed on 8 August 2025 set out a broad political framework for peace. However, there have been no meaningful steps to ensure return in safety and dignity for those displaced in September 2023, or to restore property rights in a manner that would enable routine cultural access.

Applicable international legal framework and assessment of compliance

38. The protection of cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh is governed by a dense body of international humanitarian law, international human rights law, and specialised cultural heritage instruments. The core treaty framework includes the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its 1999 Second Protocol, together with relevant UNESCO conventions addressing cultural property and illicit trafficking. Human rights protections relevant to cultural heritage include the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. These intersect with protections under the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols, including prohibitions on extensive destruction of property not justified by military necessity and safeguards for places of worship and historic monuments.
39. Compliance is currently assessed largely through indirect and remote means because independent

technical missions have not been able to carry out comprehensive inspections. In practice, assessment therefore relies on satellite imagery analysis, open-source verification, archival media review, and testimonial evidence, supplemented by legal analysis of state obligations and, where relevant, interim measures and judgments of international courts.

Risks of violations and avenues for accountability

40. In light of the incidents documented above, there is a substantial and continuing risk of violations of the 1954 Hague Convention and related instruments. In several instances, the reported facts are consistent with actual violations. Demolition of churches, cemeteries, and historic settlements; alteration that removes identity-bearing features such as inscriptions and crosses; and repurposing or “reclassification” of religious sites engage obligations to respect cultural property and to refrain from hostile acts directed against it. Where alteration is undertaken in order to conceal or destroy cultural, historical, or scientific evidence, additional concerns arise under the Second Protocol.
41. Accountability for intentional destruction or alteration of cultural heritage may arise through international criminal law, state responsibility mechanisms, and human rights frameworks. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court classifies certain intentional attacks against buildings dedicated to religion or historic monuments as war crimes in both international and non-international armed conflicts. The ICC’s judgment in *Prosecutor v Ahmad al-Faqi al-Mahdi* (Timbuktu) confirms that intentional destruction of protected cultural sites can ground individual criminal responsibility and reparations.
42. In parallel, state responsibility may arise where a state fails to prevent, investigate, or punish destruction of cultural property protected under treaty obligations or customary international law. Inter-State disputes concerning compliance may be brought before the International Court of Justice where jurisdictional bases exist. At the regional level, the European Court of Human Rights can assess interferences with Convention rights where cultural destruction affects family life, religious practice, property, or access to an effective remedy.
43. UN Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017) situates the protection of cultural heritage as a matter relevant to international peace and security and calls for enhanced international cooperation against unlawful destruction and trafficking.

Preventive measures and longer-term protection

44. Preventive measures should prioritise independent access, transparent documentation, and sustained institutional engagement. A first step is coordinated engagement with UN bodies and UNESCO, including petitions requesting urgent action and the deployment of independent fact-finding missions to Nagorno-Karabakh. Such missions should include technical experts in conservation and archaeology, together with independent academics and civil society representatives capable of producing

methodologically rigorous and publicly credible reporting.

45. A second preventive measure is proactive dissemination of verified information concerning the condition of cultural and religious heritage, including in response to conferences, exhibitions, and publications that promote historically contested narratives. Academic integrity and professional ethics are essential. Where experts are invited to participate in heritage-related events that may serve political objectives, civil society and academic institutions can encourage adherence to scholarly standards, transparent sourcing, and avoidance of misrepresentation.
46. Finally, the absence of international recognition mechanisms can create practical gaps in oversight. Where heritage sites have not been nominated for international inscription, external monitoring and protective attention may be weaker. Azerbaijan's repeated refusal to nominate Armenian heritage sites for inscription has compounded the challenge of sustained international scrutiny.

Current position on access for independent experts and international bodies

47. At present, no UN fact-finding missions or independent monitoring missions have been able to access Nagorno-Karabakh in a manner that would allow comprehensive on-the-ground assessment. UNESCO has repeatedly sought access to conduct an inventory and assessment since its November 2020 proposal for an independent technical mission. The European Parliament and other international actors have called for unhindered access, yet these requests have not resulted in an operational mission.
48. In the absence of access, organisations have had to rely primarily on satellite imagery and eyewitness testimony, as acknowledged in UNESCO's own statements regarding the difficulty of assessing the full situation under current circumstances. The access problem, including the sequence of delays and renewed requests, is addressed above.

Engagement with Armenia, Azerbaijan, and international organisations

49. Our engagement has faced practical constraints. Domestically, public statements by Armenian officials have indicated concern that sustained advocacy on cultural destruction may be viewed as complicating the peace process. In that environment, meaningful governmental partnership on this issue has been difficult.
50. With respect to international organisations, including UNESCO, our organisation has not yet undertaken direct institutional engagement specific to cultural heritage protection beyond public advocacy and reporting. Our principal contribution to date has been the preparation and dissemination of the policy brief on cultural genocide in Artsakh, drafted with the Armenian Legal Center for Justice and Human Rights, and circulated through professional and civil society networks.

Cultural rights of forcibly displaced communities

51. International law protects the cultural rights of forcibly displaced communities through intersecting regimes of human rights law, international humanitarian law, and specialised cultural heritage instruments. Article 15(1)(a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights guarantees the right to take part in cultural life, including participation in cultural practices and access to cultural heritage. Displacement interferes with this right by severing communities from places of worship, cemeteries, ancestral lands, cultural institutions, and the ordinary social life through which culture is lived and transmitted.
52. Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights safeguards the rights of minorities to enjoy their culture and practise their religion in community with others. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination requires equal enjoyment of cultural life and effective remedies where restrictions on access to cultural sites or practices are linked to ethnic or national origin. These protections operate both as individual rights and as collective rights tied to community identity.
53. During armed conflict, international humanitarian law imposes strict duties of care. The 1954 Hague Convention and its Protocols require respect for cultural property, prohibit hostile acts against protected sites, and oblige parties to avoid using cultural sites for military purposes. Customary humanitarian law likewise requires special care in operations to avoid damage to historic monuments, works of art, and places of worship. Serious violations may constitute war crimes.
54. Displacement-specific standards translate these guarantees into practical obligations. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement recognise respect for cultural identity and conditions enabling safe return and restitution. The Pinheiro Principles and the UN Basic Principles on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation emphasise restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition. These are directly relevant because restoration of cultural life often depends on access to homes, cemeteries, archives, and community institutions.
55. For Nagorno-Karabakh, these norms imply interlinked obligations: protection of cultural and religious heritage from destruction and alteration; independent technical assessment missions; non-discriminatory access to cultural and religious sites; preservation of identity and property documentation; accessible restitution and compensation mechanisms; and facilitation of safe, voluntary, and dignified return consistent with relevant international court measures. While the normative framework is strong, implementation remains constrained by access, monitoring capacity, and political will.

Best practice where physical access is denied

56. Global practice indicates that where communities cannot physically access their heritage, cultural continuity can be sustained through documentation, access-through-technology, community participation, and protective governance. High-quality digital archives, satellite monitoring, and coordinated technical review preserve knowledge for future restoration and accountability. Digitisation and reconstruction tools can maintain access to cultural memory even where sites have been destroyed. Diaspora and community-driven archives can enable displaced people to contribute family materials, testimonies, and narratives, forming remote museums and educational platforms. Where communities remain vulnerable, archiving must be security-sensitive and culturally grounded.
57. For Nagorno-Karabakh, these approaches can complement legal and diplomatic efforts by preserving evidence, sustaining cultural ties during displacement, and supporting future restoration planning where conditions permit.

Role of civil society and academia

58. Civil society organisations and academic institutions play an essential role in documenting, monitoring, and preserving evidence of cultural heritage destruction, particularly where international missions lack access. These actors combine satellite imagery, geospatial analysis, open-source intelligence, archival research, and structured testimony collection to produce verifiable, evidence-based assessments.
59. Academic institutions provide methodological rigour, technical expertise in archaeology and conservation, and peer-review norms that strengthen credibility. Civil society organisations complement this through community engagement, rapid reporting, and sustained evidence management. Platforms such as Caucasus Heritage Watch have set standards for satellite-based monitoring using before-and-after imagery, while Monument Watch supports long-term tracking and public transparency. These datasets can also support submissions to international bodies and courts.

Recommendations for long-term protection

60. Long-term protection requires an internationally supervised framework that combines monitoring, access, community participation, and accountability. A central recommendation is deployment of independent fact-finding and monitoring missions under the auspices of intergovernmental bodies such as the UN and UNESCO, mandated to conduct assessments, maintain inventories, monitor risks of alteration or destruction, and publish periodic reports. In parallel, access should be granted to independent academic and civil society monitoring platforms using satellite analysis and technical documentation. Long-term protection must also include the human dimension of cultural rights. Internationally supervised and security-guaranteed mechanisms should enable displaced communities

to conduct periodic cultural and religious visits, including pilgrimages and cemetery visits. Such access sustains living cultural links, supports observation of site conditions, and contributes to confidence-building and the eventual realisation of safe, voluntary, and dignified return.

61. Cultural heritage safeguards should be embedded in wider political and legal arrangements, including clear prohibitions on alteration intended to obscure cultural identity, mechanisms for restitution and rehabilitation, and accountability processes for serious violations. Heritage protection should be treated not only as monument preservation but as an integral component of human rights, identity, and long-term regional stability.

Advocacy strategies and challenges

62. The most effective advocacy strategies have combined rigorous, data-driven documentation with sustained engagement of international legal and institutional mechanisms. Satellite imagery and geospatial analysis have been particularly impactful because they bypass access restrictions, produce time-stamped evidence, and counter denial narratives. Where combined with precise coordinates and archival comparison, satellite documentation strengthens evidentiary reliability and usefulness for legal and institutional submissions.
63. Advocacy is strongest where cultural destruction is framed within binding legal obligations, including the 1954 Hague Convention and its Second Protocol, relevant protections under the European Convention on Human Rights, and measures of international courts. Advocacy is also strengthened where tangible heritage loss is linked to direct human rights impacts, including interference with funeral rites, destruction of cemeteries, and denial of access to graves, engaging dignity, religious freedom, and family life. Structured reports and policy briefs prepared with transparent methodology and verifiable sources are generally more effective than reactive media responses, particularly where developed in collaboration with independent academic monitoring institutions.
64. Bringing the destruction of cultural heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh to international attention is constrained by information distortion, geopolitical sensitivities, restricted access, and limited enforcement capacity. Competing narratives are actively advanced through official statements, conferences, exhibitions, and media campaigns, which can shift attention away from present-day monitoring and create hesitation among international actors who view the issue as politically contested rather than grounded in legal obligations.
65. A further challenge is the acceleration of reported changes after September 2023, combined with continued absence of independent, on-the-ground verification. While satellite analysis and open-source verification remain credible, lack of technical missions is sometimes used to question findings or characterise them as incomplete. Domestic political sensitivities also limit governmental advocacy, leaving civil society to sustain attention without robust diplomatic backing.
66. Notwithstanding these constraints, continued evidence-based monitoring, careful legal framing, and

coordinated engagement with institutional mechanisms remain the most practical pathways for maintaining visibility and advancing protection and accountability.

References

- [1] International and Comparative Law Center (ICLaw), “Cultural Genocide in Artsakh” (Policy Brief).
- [2] Caucasus Heritage Watch, documentation regarding heritage destruction in Nakhijevan (including “Silent Erasure”).
- [3] Open-source video and reporting on the 8 October 2020 bombing of Surb Ghazanchetsots (Holy All Saviour) Cathedral, Shushi.
- [4] Monument Watch, alerts and documentation regarding post-2020 alteration and so-called “restoration” works at Ghazanchetsots Cathedral.
- [5] Monument Watch, alert and documentation regarding St Hovannes Mkrtych (“Kanach Zham” / “Green Church”), Shushi.
- [6] Monument Watch, alert and documentation regarding alteration of Vankasar Church, Askeran region.
- [7] Satellite imagery documentation and open-source materials regarding demolition of St Hambardzum Church, Berdzor.
- [8] Caucasus Heritage Watch and related monitoring on damage to St Sargis Church, Tsar, including removal of epigraphic elements.
- [9] Satellite imagery and Monument Watch documentation regarding destruction of Mokhernes village and surrounding monuments.
- [10] Satellite imagery and monitoring reports regarding demolition of Karin Tak village.
- [11] Monitoring and public statements challenging the Armenian origins of Gandzasar and Dadivank; Monument Watch documentation.
- [12] BBC reporting by Jonah Fisher regarding demolition of the Church of the Holy Mother of God (St Mariam Astvatsatsin) in Mekhakavan (Jabrayil).
- [13] Open-source video disseminated via Azerbaijani Telegram channels showing vandalism at Saint Yeghishe Church, Mataghis; related reporting.
- [14] ICLaw and Armenian Legal Center for Justice and Human Rights, *Resting in Uncertainty: The Struggle for Proper Burials in the Aftermath of 2023 Azerbaijani Aggression* (Report, January 2025).
- [15] ICLaw, *The Artsakh Blockade and the Forced Displacement of the Population* (Fact-finding report).
- [16] UNESCO statements and communications regarding the proposed independent technical mission to Nagorno-Karabakh under the 1954 Hague Convention (including remarks by UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture Ernesto Ottone).