

ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

OSCE MINSK GROUP AND THE WAYS TO RESOLVE THE UPPER -KARABAKH PROBLEM

Aliyeva-Mammadova Gunel

*Ph.D., senior lecturer of the department
«History of Asian and African countries»*

Baku State University

dedicated to all martyrs of Azerbaijan

DOI: 10.31618/ESU.2413-9335.2020.6.76.938

АННОТАЦИЯ

В 90-ые гг. XX века условиях нового миропорядка, после краха СССР, образования новых независимых государств на постсоветском пространстве появились конфликты (осетино-ингушский конфликт, Чеченская война, Нагорно-Карабахская война и т.д.), которые негативно отразились на политической и экономической ситуации этих стран.

Среди этих конфликтов по своим масштабам армяно-азербайджанский занимает особое место, так как этот конфликт не только региональный, он в любой момент может перерасти в мировую и поэтому является взрывоопасной.

ANNOTATION

In the 90th years XX century conditions of the new world order, after the collapse of the USSR, the formation of new independent states in the post-Soviet space, conflicts appeared (the Ossetia-Ingush conflict, the Chechen war, the Upper-Karabakh war, etc.), which negatively affected the political and economic situation of these countries.

Among these conflicts, on its scale, the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict occupies a special place, is not only regional; it can turn into a world conflict at any moment and therefore is explosive.

Key words: Upper-Karabakh, lobby, Armenia, Russia, USA, conflict, territorial integrity, foreign policy, domestic policy, OSCE.

Introduction

After the restoration of state independence and the coming to power of the national leader Heydar Aliyev, Azerbaijan Republic began to pursue an accurate policy aimed at building good-neighborly relations in the region and around the world. Heydar Aliyev's visionary policy led to the signing of the Bishkek Protocol (temporary ceasefire) in 1994.

In the era of globalization, Heydar Aliyev laid the foundations of the foreign and domestic policy of Azerbaijan, while taking into account national interests.

After Ilham Aliyev takes office, a new page begins on the issue of resolving the Upper-Karabakh conflict, Azerbaijan is entering a new phase of the struggle, and the country is launching an information attack, which was first launched by Armenia. The more success Azerbaijan achieves, the more Armenia becomes driven into a dead end and faces problems that create an economic and political crisis in the country, exacerbating the position of the aggressor state.

On May 8, 2008, the international campaign "Justice for Khojaly" was launched in order to intensify the agitation and propaganda activities of all state structures of Azerbaijan.

Speaking at a solemn meeting dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the Azerbaijani parliament, Ilham Aliyev noted that all infrastructure was destroyed in the occupied territories, the national heritage was plundered, and a war crime was committed against the Azerbaijani people - the Khojaly genocide [6].

Literature review

The Upper -Karabakh problem is very relevant, as it has not been studied objectively in foreign literature

enough. The war arose due to the claims of Armenians on the historical territories of Azerbaijan. Armenian historians, falsifying historical documents, tried to prove the ownership of the territory of Upper-Karabakh and many other historical territories of Azerbaijan to Armenia. However, we, as scientists, are obliged to show the world the truth, relying on facts, real events, without inventing fables.

The purpose and objectives of the study

The aim of the work is to study the possibilities of resolving the Armenian-Azerbaijani Upper-Karabakh problem within the framework of the OSCE Minsk Group, in the foreign policy of the co-chairing countries, the prospects of the geostrategic partnership of Azerbaijan with the USA, France, Russia (with the countries co-chairing the OSCE Minsk Group), the impact of the Upper-Karabakh problem on events in the South Caucasus region.

The methodological and theoretical basis of this article was the work of domestic and foreign authors, affecting the Armenian-Azerbaijani Upper-Karabakh problem. In these studies, conceptual provisions of the international problems of the current period are developed, which allow a comprehensive approach to the issue of resolving the Armenian-Azerbaijani Upper-Karabakh conflict.

Study results and discussion

Today, the OSCE Minsk Group, co-chaired by Russia, the United States and France, is engaged in the resolution of the Upper-Karabakh Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict.

At first, after the restoration of state independence, the Azerbaijani government did not seek to establish

relations with Russia, which very clearly affected both the economy and foreign policy of the country.

Heydar Aliyev came to power, Azerbaijan began to establish good relations with Russia, which led to the development of the economy and increased state revenues, as well as to the activation of the settlement of the Upper-Karabakh problem by Russia. The key to resolving the problem around Upper-Karabakh is in the hands of the Russian Federation. Russia, as a natural ally of Armenia, has more chances of any pressure on Armenia, the country, all state institutions that are in the hands of Russia.

Although there are still no advances in resolving this problem, nevertheless a noticeable intensification has occurred on the part of the Russian Federation after the coming to power of Vladimir Putin.

The USA, as a superpower of the world, is also making its contribution to the settlement of the Armenian-Azerbaijani Upper-Karabakh conflict, although the US government is not in a hurry to resolve this conflict. With all this, it will be appropriate to note that among the co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, the United States takes a relatively neutral position.

The activity of France, as a co-chairing country in the OSCE Minsk Group, is of particular importance to us (if we also take into account the peculiarity of relations between France and Armenia). Constant monitoring on the frontline and the participation of France in this process proves the importance of this conflict in the foreign policy of France, especially since recently bilateral relations between Azerbaijan and France have been developing in all areas (economy, military-technical cooperation and culture).

The April events of 2016 in the political arena once again show the importance of a speedy resolution of this conflict, both for the region and for the whole world, as these events caused a great resonance on the world stage.

Today, the Armenian-Azerbaijani Upper-Karabakh conflict occupies the minds of prominent representatives of countries around the world, it also allegedly occupies an important position in the foreign policy of the OSCE Minsk Group co-chairing countries, but at the same time, these states are primarily involved in implementing projects that are in the interests of these countries, what is natural.

Despite all of the above, the close economic and political relations of Azerbaijan with Russia, France and the USA, the national leader of Azerbaijan Heydar Aliyev expressed his dissatisfaction with the activities of the OSCE Minsk Group back in 1998, when the co-chairs (Russia, France, USA) put forward a third settlement proposal Upper-Karabakh conflict is the idea of creating a "common state" (before that, two more - a "package" - in June 1997, and then a phased - in September 1997). The third proposal was completely contrary to international law, since today in no country in the world there is such a thing as a "common state" [1, p. 887].

Therefore, since 1999, a direct dialogue established between Azerbaijan and Armenia on the settlement of the conflict, although the Minsk Group

also remains the main figure on the addressing of the Upper-Karabakh problem [4, p. 852].

In this regard, it will also be appropriate to quote some foreign and Azerbaijani experts on the activities of the Minsk Group.

For example, Vyacheslav Smirnov, director of the Institute of Political Sociology, a Russian political scientist, said about the activities of the Minsk Group: "When we talk about an alternative to the OSCE Minsk Group, we need to understand that creating any other mechanism will take time and a lot of effort. The OSCE Minsk Group is interested in freezing the conflict, and its activities are ineffective and inconclusive, at least for the entire duration of the conflict, the co-chairs have not moved a single step. It is clear and justified that the Azerbaijani side is not satisfied with such a long-term freezing of the status quo. However, not the fact that any other international mechanism will be able to change the situation."

Associate Professor of the Department of International Relations in the Post-Soviet Space of St. Petersburg State University, professor, Russian political scientist Niyazi Niyazov said in an interview: "The OSCE Minsk Group, being the main negotiating platform, is obliged to maximally effectively influence the peace process in the whole and the aggressor torpedoing him in particular.

However, it is obvious that the OSCE Minsk Group co-chairs are figures representing the interests of the co-chairing countries, which are ready to conflict in the international arena on many other issues of world politics, but not in the case of the settlement of the Karabakh conflict. Just in this case, they act from a single position, making efforts so that the conflict remains frozen for as long as possible. In my opinion, this happens due to a huge number of reasons, including theoretical approaches to the issues of war and peace that prevail in the political field of these countries, and the upholding of their interests, and the desire to have in their arsenal of diplomacy an instrument of political pressure on official Baku to receive, in turn, from him concessions in the economic and political spheres. Azerbaijan is not just not satisfied with the activities of the OSCE Minsk Group to resolve the conflict, but is ready to abandon its services and start looking for other ways to resolve the Karabakh conflict, including the use of force to resolve the issue" [7].

Former Presidential Plenipotentiary Envoy for Upper-Karabakh, who led the mediation mission of Russia in 1992-1996, co-chair of the OSCE Minsk Group from the Russian Federation Vladimir Kazimirov in an interview with the newspaper "Независимая газета" on August 25, 2003 said: "... a new search for a solution to the conflict is needed a full-fledged format for stable negotiations: teamwork at a high level, regular rounds while respecting confidentiality are not "pretentious", sometimes supported by meetings of top officials. Of course, it is important to use the agreements worked out earlier: not to start negotiations from scratch. The best would be the level of special representatives in the rank of ministers (say, "ministers without a portfolio")." In response to the words of V. Kazimirov, the former Minister of

Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan T. Zulfugarov answered: "Indeed, after 1997 there was no format for negotiations, since meetings of the heads of state are not negotiations in the full sense of the word. As a rule, they mean a discussion of general issues and concepts, and not some basic documents that can become a full agreement. As practice shows, the summits did not lead to concrete results ..." [8].

Quite often, OSCE representatives carry out monitoring on the front line, which do not make any significant changes to the conflict settlement process, therefore, the Minsk Group co-chairing countries should put more and more pressure on aggressor Armenia.

Usually, "monitoring is carried out by the personal representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office and two or three of his field assistants on both sides of the front line. Monitoring is coordinated with both sides of the time and place, and therefore, there is no shooting at the time of observation by the OSCE representatives," said Azad Isazade, a military expert at the Institute for Peace and Democracy [9].

The author of the book "Victory of Azerbaijan in the Cold War with Armenia" Chapay Sultanov writes: "At the end of October 1993, the Chairman of the OSCE, Swedish Foreign Minister Margareta af Ugglas visited the region in order to stop military operations. At a press conference, she stated that the Armenian side assured her that she would not take offensive actions. Before she left the region, when the Armenians captured Zangelan. The OSCE did not make any harsh statements to Armenia - everything became completely clear - the OSCE is playing its game!" [5, p.291].

Thus, unfortunately, the Minsk Group does not play the role of protecting and implementing the principles and norms of international law, but only slows down the process of resolving the Upper-Karabakh conflict, thereby contributing to an even greater escalation of tension in the region, which is beneficial for Armenia, as to the aggressor and the co-chairing countries that respect only their state interests, at the same time, the co-chairs use the conflict as a lever to put pressure on the most powerful country in the South Caucasus - Azerbaijan, a country has long been able to "do the weather" on the political front of the region.

The Upper-Karabakh problem, which is the focus of the attention of leading world politicians, is one of the key issues in the South Caucasian policy of the USA and countries of Western Europe. The conflict dragged on for so many years because of "double standards," thanks to which the co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group (USA, France, and Russia) are introducing their interests in the South Caucasus region. It is noteworthy that at the same time each of the countries protects not only its political, but also economic interests. The Upper-Karabakh problem is a deterrent to the even greater development of Azerbaijan, which is already the state leader in the region.

After the declaration of independence of Kosovo, the Armenian invaders tried to nullify the attempts of Azerbaijan to restore the territorial integrity of the country and use the secession of Kosovo for their own

purposes. However, a properly structured policy of the Azerbaijani government nullified the hopes of the occupation regime of Armenia.

For the settlement of the Upper-Karabakh problem, not only direct dialogue (between the presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia), but also the diplomatic activity of the Azerbaijan state as a whole is of particular importance.

Over a long period of history, diplomacy has been of particular importance to many states. If we take into account the realities of modern international relations, it will not be difficult to imagine how much the significance of the diplomatic activity of any country is growing. In general, the powers realized that the presence of conflicts in the Caucasus gives them an opportunity to introduce into the region and manipulate its development. The preservation of conflicts in the regime of "neither war, nor peace" attached urgency to the peacekeeping efforts of the world community [10].

The statement of the British government after the occupation of Agdam is important for Azerbaijan, since this statement is another evidence of Armenian aggression: "The UK government strongly condemns these invasions of Azerbaijan, which pose a serious threat to the prospects of the Minsk CSCE peace process" [3].

Along with this, in 1998, a book entitled "Ethnic Cleansing Continues. The war in Upper-Karabakh. Upper-Karabakh and Azerbaijan «which openly sets forth pro-Armenian crazy ideas in the House of Lords of Great Britain. For example, Count Shannon says: "The ancient Armenian kingdom extended from the Mediterranean to the Caspian. This was the territory for which the Assyrian, Persian, Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman empires constantly fought. In recent history, there was the 1915 genocide. This fact, quite convincingly confirmed by the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Whitehall, was condemned by all the leaders of the Allied countries that won the First World War. However, in 1918 they did nothing, because Turkey said: "You need us in the fight against Bolshevism." She repeated the same thing in 1945: "You need us in the fight against communism. By the way, could we join NATO?" Turkey's position remained similar after the collapse of the USSR, when it declared: "We provide an excellent export market" [2, p. 95].

Findings

The position of the Armenian lobby, which resorts to everything in order to prove its fictitious, lying position, is obvious in this speech. History proves that the policy of Armenians is not subject to change and is far from objective. Does this mean that we are not safe from the next brutal, aggressor attacks of the Armenians, for the realization of manic claims on the original Azerbaijani territories, for the appropriation of our traditions, customs, and our cultural heritage?

Apparently Armenian storytellers, namely, Armenian "scientists" are engaged in composing fairy tales, forget that good and truth triumph in fairy tales, because fairy tale is nothing but a reflection of real life.

At one of the speeches, Ilham Aliyev, referring to the Upper-Karabakh problem, said: "We are being

pressured behind closed doors to force an agreement to recognize the independence of Upper-Karabakh. We do not disclose many details, because there are rules of diplomacy. Azerbaijan will never agree to this. ”

List of references

1. Гасанов А. Современные международные отношения и внешняя политика Азербайджана. Баку: Şərq-Qərb, 2007, 903с. [Hasanov A. Modern international relations and foreign policy of Azerbaijan. Baku: Şərq-Qərb, 2007, 903s. (In Russ.)]
2. Кокс К., Айбнер Дж. Этническая чистка продолжается. Война в Нагорном Карабахе. Нагорный Карабах и Азербайджан. Парламентские дебаты в Палате лордов Великобритании. Иреван, Гитутюн, 1998, 106с. [Cox K., Aibner J. Ethnic cleansing continues. War in Nagorno-Karabakh. Nagorno Karabakh and Azerbaijan. Parliamentary debate in the UK House of Lords. Iravan, Gitutyun, 1998, 106p. (In Russ.)]
3. Официальный документ СБ ООН, № S/26184, 28 июля, 1993г. [Official document of the UN Security Council, No. S / 26184, July 28, 1993. (In Russ.)]
4. Современные международные отношения и мировая политика // под ред. Торкунова А. М.:

УДК 433
ГРНТИ 03.20

Просвещение, 2005, 990 с. [Modern international relations and world politics // ed. Torqunova A.M.: Education, 2005, 990 p. (In Russ.)]

5. Султанов Ч. Победа Азербайджана в «холодной войне» с Арменией. Баку: Чашыюглу, 2015, 388 с. [Sultanov Ch. Azerbaijan's victory in the "cold war" with Armenia. Baku: Chashyoglu, 2015, 388 p. (In Russ.)]

6.Ильхам Алиев: Нагорный Карабах не получит никакого статуса за пределами суверенитета Азербайджана // <https://haqqin.az/news/136439>

7.Что думают эксперты о работе Минской группы ОБСЕ? – ОПРОС // <https://news.day.az/politics/879839.html>

8.Президент Ильхам Алиев: Основной сферой деятельности Минской группы должно быть ещё большое давление на оккупационный режим Армении // www.trend.az/azerbaijan/politics/2804208.html

9.Мониторинги ОБСЕ в зоне карабахского конфликта стали бесполезны, заявили эксперты в Баку // <http://www.kavkaz-uzel.eu/articles/282383/>

10. Кулиев Г. Геополитические коллизии Кавказа // <http://www.ca-c.org/journal/cac>

СОБЫТИЯ В НОВОМ УЗЕНЕ В 1989 ГОДУ И ИХ ОТРАЖЕНИЕ В СМИ

*Альжанова Динара Амангелдиевна
Студент,
Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет
Волгоград, Россия*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье приводится характеристика межнационального конфликта, возникшего в Казахской ССР в 1989 году, а также анализ отражения данных событий в Советских СМИ.

ABSTRACT

The article describes the interethnic conflict that arose in the Kazakh SSR in 1989, as well as the analysis of the reflection of these events in the Soviet media.

Ключевые слова: межэтнический конфликт, Новый Узень, социальная напряженность, СМИ, политика.

Keywords: interethnic conflict, the Novy Uzen, social tension, mass media, politics.

В нынешнее время во многих регионах остро стоит вопрос межэтнических отношений. Эти отношения нередко перерастают в межнациональные конфликты. Данные конфликты способны возникнуть по огромному количеству причин, среди которых и межнациональные противоречия, и социальные условия жизни общества. Они происходили в прошлом, они происходят сейчас. Актуальность данной темы заключается непосредственно в том, что подобного рода конфликтные ситуации не покинули наше общество и изучение уже произошедших событий такого рода, возможно в какой-то степени, позволит учесть ошибки прошлых лет и правильно среагировать на конфликты, происходящие в наше время. Любое крупное событие обычно всегда

находит отражение в СМИ. СМИ создают информационное поле, в котором живет огромное количество человек, в какой-то степени даже влияют на мировоззрение людей. Соответственно, что они рассказывают и как это преподносят необходимо рассмотреть. СМИ, возможно, порой субъективны и актуальной проблемой является вычленение из их данных объективной истины, насколько это возможно.

Целью данной работы является рассмотрение конфликта в Новом Узене через призму средств массовой информации и выявление того, как газеты и телевидение освещали данное событие в 1989 году.

Задачей работы выступает изучение газетных статей, телевизионных программ