

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

September 29, 2008

Most recent argument of the super-states

PanArmenian.net http://www.panarmenian.net/details/eng/?nid=932

The principle of territorial integrity of a state is gradually becoming the most recent argument in the dispute of competence to recognize the self-declared republics in the post-Soviet territory. Appealing to the world community and playing on different approaches and contradictions between the chief players, mini-mother countries of the former USSR are trying to confirm their right to this or that territory. Especially persisting in the verification of this fact are Azerbaijan and Georgia . The issue became even more painful after Kosovo's declaration of independence, as South Ossetia , Abkhazia, Transnistria and Nagorno Karabakh have no less authority and claims for recognition of their independence than the Albanians of Kosovo had.

The right of the strongest has been prevailing in international community lately; it has replaced both the principle of territorial integrity and the right of nations to self-determination. On the whole, it has always been so, but refusal of this or that ethnic group to live as before has become more relevant lately. Former unrecognized republics of the CIS had all gained independence except for Kosovo, which was offered it not long ago in spite of all the objections of sober politicians against making such an ill-considered and far-reaching step. And now we have what we have: chaos in the Caucasus region, harsh statements of super-states about immovability of borders of former USSR countries, which collectively result in new tensions. Recalling the recent history we can't but acknowledge that borders as such did not exist between the former USSRrepublics. There had been a random /subjective/, administrative division based on the pretensions and significance of this or that region. We have the same picture now, only in place of the Soviet Union appear the United States, EC and the Russian Federation.

Saakashvili's ill-considered and spontaneous step aimed at «restoration of Constitutional order in Georgia» instantly changed the priorities and called into question 10 basic principles of the Helsinki final Act on security and cooperation in the Europe of 1975. An interesting detail should be mentioned here: in 1991 the South Caucasian states refused the succession of Soviet republics and as a model for their new states they chose the independent republics of the Transcaucasia of 1918. It is quite unlikely that current leaders of Georgia and Azerbaijan are unaware that in 1918 South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Nagorno Karabakh and Nakhijevan were not part of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (ADR) or Georgia. If we view the territorial integrity from the historical point of view, both ADR and Georgia must be considered aggressors. However, much has been changed since then "World War II, breakdown of the USSR, end of the «Cold War». And current statements of such kind are made solely for political reasons. The South Caucasus must be «torn off» from Russia at any rate. Besides, it would be more preferable to carry the Baku oil to Europe bypassing Russia, and, naturally, Armenia... But how efficient would this policy be,



Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

taking into consideration the rather inflexible position of Russian leaders?

By the way, the USA never speaks about the territorial integrity of Serbia , Iraq , and Kuwait realizing the consequences quite well. The same is true about Russia : Moscow is unwilling to enter into a dispute with Baku over Nagorno Karabakh. Unlike Mikhail Saakashvili, Ilham Aliyev is a sober politician and he will enter into a war only when he is a 100% sure of his victory. Thus, a new war is not expected in the region as long as there is no 100% of confidence in success. And though no one knows when the suppositions of Ilham Aliyev will grow into confidence, we should enlist the support of world leading power-holders. On the other hand, conflicts in distant countries are not in the center of attention of the world powers: crisis in the USA considerably shook the position of chief advocate of democracy George Bush and his Vice-President Dick Cheney.

However, it would be appropriate to mention that after the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and USA in 1993, Washington recognized the Soviet Union exactly with its then-existent borders and not with the expanded borders, which Russia acquired after the treaty signed with Hitler in 1940. Basing on the above mentioned, after the USSR breakdown the USA took its stand against all the self-declared post-Soviet republics. This is exactly what the Russian Federation is doing today, grounding the presence of its «peacemakers» in the territory of Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transnistria. In this respect Nagorno Karabakh is simply left out it is too small to be considered Russia and too independent.

Karine Ter-Sahakyan «PanARMENIAN.Net» analytical department