

**A.Menteshashvili**

## **“Security and Foreign Policy in the Central Asian and Caucasian Republics”**

### **Abstract**

This work consists of 8 Chapters and contains in total 53 pages.

It is made on the basis of the critical analysis of the materials which were obtained by the author in the scientific libraries of Ankara, Tashkent, Moscow and Tbilisi.

As a result of the conducted researches, the author came to the following conclusions and recommendations:

- 1.The more the economical situation in Russia is deteriorated, the faster its political authority decreases in the countries of Central Asia (Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tadjikistan, Kyrgyzstan) and Transcaucasia ( Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia);
- 2.The vacuum, created by this circumstance should be filled by the western countries and in the first turn by the USA, Great Britain, France, Germany. For this purpose, the West should more energetically pull the Republics of the Central Asia and Transcaucasia towards their own or oriented to the West the international and regional structures, so that to affect directly the internal political situation in the CIS countries;
- 3.The significant coincidence of the political and economical interests has resulted in the establishment of the alliance within the CIS, taking the title GUUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Moldova), in which the main role is played by “the Caucasian tandem”: Azerbaijan-Georgia;
4. The great significance in the creation of stable, controllable political and economic medium in Transcaucasia is attached to the receipt of the permanent and effective support from the West;
5. It is not excepted, that in future GUUAM might be transformed into the more serious structure with the united military and industrial complex. Here, the specific role is allotted to the Ukraina, which has powerful military and industrial potential and presents by itself the specific interest for NATO;
6. The military cooperation has become necessary under the reason of the increasing confrontation of Russia with NATO. From one side, the countries of GUUAM are cooperating with NATO, from the other side, NATO has not any obligations to assist them in the case of crisis circumstances;
7. For the GUUAM countries various ethnoconflicts are typical, therefor the military mutual assistance for them acquires the particular importance. With this purpose, the adoption of the solution in Baku, on January 21-22, 1999, on behalf of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova to create the united peace-making battalion for settlement of regional and international security will promote to the cooperation with UNO, OSCE, and with NATO in accordance with the rogram “Partnership for Peace”
8. Entry of Georgia and in future of Azerbaijan and Armenia into the European Council and in perspective into NATO will favor the establishment if the atmosphere of security and stability on the Caucasus.

Proceeding from above said, the author considers that if the settlement of ethnoconflicts by peaceful means in the researched regions will not give the due effect, then the interference of the international peace-making forces under the aegis of NATO or UNO will probably be necessary.

**Albert Menteshashvili**

**SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY IN  
CENTRAL ASIAN AND CAUCASIAN  
REPUBLICS**

**Tbilisi**

**1 9 9 9**

**CHAPTER I**

**FOREIGN POLICY OF UZBEKISTAN AND SECURITY ISSUES  
IN THE CENTRAL ASIA**

Uzbekistan, one of the leading states of the Central Asia, being independent since December 29, 1991, has a significant influence in the geopolitical processes taking place in the South after disintegration of the former Soviet Union. It is much conditioned by the central geopolitical location of this country in the region, by its history, as well as by the specific political course of Uzbek administration. This administration is trying to assert special way of state development.

Serious factors defining the specificity of national development and foreign political priorities of the country are the following: incongruity of the increasing in the number population with the vital space; deficiency of water resources or the water supply problem (the deficiency of water complicates the inter-state relations in the region); Uzbek communities dispersed in the neighboring republics, its significant natural resources (common mineral-raw material potential of Uzbekistan by the foreign experts has been evaluated in the amount of 3,3 trillion dollars).

Besides, announcement of deideologization of economic relations, priority of economy over policy, i.e. impossibility of nationalization or confiscation of investors property respecting the political motives, influences the stabilization of situation and choice of foreign political course.

The Afghan crisis has a pernicious effect on outer position of the country. Already in 80-ies in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan began to appear the signs of penetration of Islam fundamentalism, which was spread from Afghanistan and Iran through the persons coming from the Southern republics, who served in 40 Army or worked as specialists by economic contracts

in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA). Whereas, main tenets of new Islam differed greatly from the traditional understanding of this religion by local population <sup>1</sup>.

Developments in the neighboring Tajikistan made the administration of Uzbekistan to apply the definite repressive measures in regard to Islam organizations and Muslim clergy <sup>2</sup>.

In the hands of Uzbekistan President I. Karimov the absolute power is concentrated <sup>3-4</sup>. Here the regime of individual administration is strengthened maximally. In the opinion of western reviewers the present regime in the country by its essence is totalitarian and antidemocratic <sup>5</sup>.

The Uzbek administration, adjusting gradually strategic partnership with the West, has to take into account the recommendations to preserve at least the resemblance of democratic institutions. USA, taking care of its image, in its turn is also interested in conducting certain modernization of strict political system, constructed by the President of the country I. Karimov, in order to exclude the possibility of social cataclysms in the country with which they link their interests in the Central Asia. On the eve and after the Karimov's visit in USA in June 1996 in respect to the desire of American party several political prisoners were released <sup>6</sup>.

In the opinion of western analysts, Uzbekistan in the Central Asia for present is the most attracting the West attention country, as it more than the other states of the region shows the self-dependence and demonstrates the independence from Russia. They yield to the opinion, that namely Uzbekistan has the most of the chances here to become powerful and authoritative state. In the West they count on Uzbekistan as a strategic ally, serious political and military support in realization of Central Asian strategy, connected with the competition for resource redivision of the world.

For the last period the American political accents has shifted from Kazakhstan, which is more under the influence of Russia, on Uzbekistan. Many West analysts pay attention on that the degree of mutual interests of USA and Uzbekistan has grown to such an extent, that authoritarian style of I. Karimov's administration is no more a serious obstacle for strengthening the bilateral relations <sup>7</sup>.

In geopolitical aspect Washington considers Uzbekistan (mainly in connection with Turkey) as a serious counterweight to Russian influence in the Central Asia, the restraining factor of the interests of Russia and China, a certain barrier on the way of spreading of Islam

fundamentalism. These opinions correspond with the interests and policy of Uzbek administration, which is more than ready to cultivate this image. The recognition by Washington of the Uzbekistan leadership among other Republics of the Central Asia is considered by the Uzbek administration as a testimony of American guarantees, that for Tashkent keeping distance from Moscow shall appear painless.

The President of Uzbekistan considers the western support as defining for his regional ambitions. According to "Washington Times", during his visit to Washington (June 1996) I. Karimov said: "We especially hope for USA support in strengthening of our independence, evolution process in the field of reforms, realization of big projects"<sup>8</sup>. The efforts of Uzbek leader on rapprochement with the West were appraised in America. He was awarded a medal "For the Leading Role in Establishing the Cooperation and for Striving for Freedom"<sup>9</sup>.

The evidence of mutual interests in the military-political field and of the issues of providing the security, became the signing between two parties of the Memorandum on Understanding in the field of military cooperation and establishing of the joint Committee for Conversion and Reprofilation of Uzbek Defense Enterprises with the help and under control of USA.

The society of the country considers the adherence of Uzbekistan to the NATO program "Partnership for Peace", which took place on July 13, 1993, in this context. It is characteristic, that Uzbek administration considers NATO as the factor for providing of peace and stability, regional and national security, the most important condition for maintenance of national independence and sovereignty. For present participation of Uzbekistan in said program is being realized on the third stage of partnership on basis of elaborated for the Republic individual program. This phase provides for practical realization of rapprochement of national military forces with NATO structures.

Uzbekistan having signed with NATO an agreement on information exchange and regime of providing its security, joined the NATO code of behavior, the issues on mounting of the direct line for coded communication between NATO and military structures of Uzbekistan, at acceding of the Republic to the multilateral treaty of the states parties to said program on the status of their military forces were elaborated.

In August 1996 the Uzbekistan troop took part in exercises “Cooperative Nagget-95” and in August 1996 the sub-unit of Uzbek military forces participated in military trainings “Cooperative Ospra-96” (both of the trainings were held on the territory of USA). In the framework of this program by NATO educational institutions the assistance for preparing of the Uzbek military cadres is rendered.

Pointing out the importance of rapprochement with NATO, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uzbekistan A. Komilov underlined, that the participation in CFP program corresponds completely with the national interests of Uzbekistan”. During the visit to Tashkent in March 1997 of the NATO General Secretary K. Solana the readiness of Uzbekistan for expanding of the cooperation with the North Atlantic Alliance was confirmed.

USA and other countries of the West take steps for creation in the Republic of the influencing structures by developing a large number of information-propaganda bodies, non-governmental and private funds having wide connection with political parties and public movements. The Vice-president of USA A.Gor declared, that “USA attaches strategic importance to Uzbekistan which occupies the central place in the region from the point of view of our interests. Taking into account the proceedings in the Republic, the future of the Central Asia, we connect our perspectives with and are intending to be supported by Uzbekistan in the first place”. The relations with Israel are also improving <sup>10</sup>.

The political administration of Uzbekistan rejects sharply the foreign political idea of N. Nazarbaev on Eurasian Union and proceeds actively with strategic partnership with USA and NATO <sup>11</sup>. Besides, the competition for leadership Central Asian region has developed between the two states. Uzbekistan due to its economic and cultural-historical potential claims on the role of integrating center in subregion spreading its influence not only on the new states of the Central Asia, but on Afghanistan as well. In the opinion of political observers of Russia, after gaining of the independence Uzbekistan plainly and unequivocally began to curtail the connections with Russia, conducts such a political and economical course, which has a frank anti-Russian direction on the leading force in the Central Asian region and carries out ambitious policy as in solving of the internal problems, so in relations among neighboring states (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan), with which has a number of unregulated issues and inter-pretensions of

economic, as well as ethnoconfessional character. The Russians accuse Karimov for trying to solve the problems from the position of force, that becomes a potential source for destabilization in the region and a threat for the Russian interests in the South direction.

It can be assumed, that the positions of Russia in Uzbekistan have been significantly weakened as in political, so in trade-economical aspect. The discriminative conditions are created for the activities of Russian firms. The publications having anti-Russian contents are quite frequent in which the Russia is blamed for “imperial ambitions”, for hindering of “the development of independent Uzbekistan”, etc.

In the country the gradual process of Russian speaking population exclusion from leading, highly paid or prestigious posts. The level of every day life conflicts increases.

The local observers inform about mass departure of Russian population. The main reasons of Russian population mass departure are the unsatisfactory material maintenance of the population, demotion of Russian population status, conducting of nationalistic cadre policy by the administration, non-existence of perspectives for growth of the persons of non-aboriginal nationality, insufficient and unequal conditions for education, fear for the future of their children, weakening of information-cultural contacts with Russia.

Uzbekistan in difference from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is categorically against the entry in unitary custom union with Russia.

At the same time, the old connections and objective needs in mutual markets continue to retain bilateral contacts in operation. The main document of agreement-political character between the two states are the Agreement on Basis of Inter-State Relations, Friendship and Cooperation (May 30, 1992) and the Declaration on Development and Deepening of Comprehensive Cooperation Between Russia and Uzbekistan. For Uzbekistan Russia continues to be a priority country for economic and trade cooperation.

The Uzbekistan part has proposed to recognize Tashkent in any form as having “special responsibility” for the situation in the region under the condition of receiving from Russia of the material and financial aid on preferential conditions. Such a proposal apparently cannot be accepted by the Russian party, as granting to Uzbekistan any economic or political advantages

can be ascertained as encouragement of its ambitious intentions on leadership in the region and signifies a quite transparent hint to intercept the Russian interests in the region.

The special attention of Uzbekistan is paid to joint actions in Tajikistan with Russia and other Central Asian states <sup>12</sup>. The conflict in this country, as well as the military actions in Afghanistan affect directly the vitally important interests of Uzbekistan, that is why Tashkent in this direction took steps as of force, so of political character, directed on seeking for regulation of conflict situations and prevention of its expansion onto the Uzbek territory. At the same time, considering the specific interests of Uzbekistan in Tajikistan, it cannot be excluded that after advancing of intertajik reconciliation process the Uzbek party shall begin to seek for the possibility of unilateral strengthening of influence in this country.

Thus, according to all the indices Uzbekistan shall conduct its own strategic course in the region and in the international field, in the frames of which to the development of Russian-Uzbek relations shall be given as usual very narrow corridors and limited capabilities. The present situation can change to the best only under influence of economic success of Russia and positive proceeding of its large-scale economic projects in other countries of the Central Asian region. But yet Uzbek-Russian relations become gradually strained. In the beginning of February 1999 the government of Uzbekistan declared, that they refuse to participate in the “Treaty on Collective Security of CIS” (TCS). At the same time, it was underlined, that “Tashkent does not agree with Russian military activity in some of the CIS countries”. In their comments Moscow reviewers reproach Uzbekistan for the steps taken for the last time, that have led to destabilization, for example, in the beginning of November 1998 from the Uzbek territory to Leninabad district (Tajikistan) invaded the fighters of Colonel Khudoiberdiev and made the real slaughter. Tajikistan directly pointed to the fact, that Uzbek structures were to be blamed for the revolt. In his speech the President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov refuted these accusations and declared, that in suppression of the revolt in Leninabad district took part the sub-units of 201-st Russian division <sup>13</sup>.

The head of the Main Board of International Military Cooperation under the Ministry for Defense of Russia Colonel-general Leonid Ivashov refuted the accusations of Uzbekistan



and said, that Russia conducts “ ... restrained policy and reduces the extent of military activity especially within the territory of CIS and adjacent to the frontier regions”<sup>14</sup>.

At the same time, the Russian General declared, that some states of CIS “... increase the number of maneuvers enlisting the NATO, among them near the borders of Russia”. The general Tried to shift the blame on “apparent power-policy of USA”, on “increase of NATO aggressiveness”, which is expanding the area of its responsibility and wants to change international-legal norms established among the states. The Russian General also added, that Russia requires “more agreed actions against the USA dictate”. L. Ivashov assured, that the Treaty on Collective Security is not a document on military union of states, and is only aimed on formation of collective security system, that this document provides for political, economical and military measures for prevention of aggressive aspirations against any country party to this document.

Moscow is trying to explain the refusal of Uzbekistan to participate in the Treaty on Collective Security” (TCS) of CIS first of all for its discontent with the situation in Tajikistan, as well as with Russian policy in this Republic. It must be noted, that the first signs of discord between Moscow and Tashkent in the Tajik issue were marked immediately after disintegration of the USSR. Then in Tajikistan broke out the war between the governing North clan, its ally in the South, on the one hand and enemies in the South and East - on the other hand<sup>15</sup>. Tashkent counted on more developed North of Tajikistan and on large local Uzbek community, which during the war was on the side of progovernmental army. And, finally, Moscow and Tashkent intensively supported in neighboring Afghanistan the opponents of Islam movement “Taliban”, which controlled the Afghan-Uzbek and Afghan-RTajik frontier. Tashkent cooperated with Moscow, but requested to reduce its military presence in Uzbekistan.

The hopes of Uzbekistan, that the new structures of the administration shall be built on wide Tajik-Uzbek base did not come true. In fact, to the power in Tajikistan came one southern clan. But they were not able to reach the agreement with Islamists. The southerners wanted to guide the country by the secular way and Islamists - by the Islam. Actually, the Islamists claimed for new redivision of the power in the Republic. In the neighboring Afghanistan the Talibs took under the control 90% of the territory, including the Afghan-Uzbek border. This process

worried Tashkent. In the opinion of Russian politologists, the Islamization, which is understood in different ways in the various regions of the Republic, is more capable to deepen the disintegration, than to create its real counterweight. Nevertheless, the detriment of the secular system of power in Tajikistan affects indirectly Uzbekistan. Even in Tajikistan the Islamists will find the common language with the governing southerners and consolidate the country, the authoritarian regime, where the Islamists shall have the important part, shall not suit Uzbekistan. The solidarity with Afghan Tajiks and Tajikistan from the side of Uzbekistan Tajiks excite apprehension among the leaders of Uzbekistan, this shall cause the shifting of foreign political attention of Dushanbe in the national issue from Afghanistan (where the majority of the world Tajiks live) onto Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan considers as the ideal variant restoration in Dushanbe the former communist nomenclature. But Tashkent understands well, that it is impossible. The military presence of Russia prevents Uzbekistan from using as the means for influence such trumps as: 1) its military and economic potential; 2) dependence of Dushanbe on Uzbek gas; and 3) pro-Tashkent sympathies of the significant part of the Republic population. That is why, Uzbekistan refused to approve the Treaty on Collective Security of CIS (TCS of CIS). Many political reviewers in Moscow are sure, that Uzbekistan hardly wishes the departure of Russia from there. Then Tashkent willy-nilly shall have to interfere in the business, pulling through which shall become very difficult. The Moscow political reviewers hope, that the Tashkent opposition to the "Treaty" conceals the desire not to do this, but to urge Dushanbe and Moscow standing behind it, to make serious corrections in its Tajik policy.

What kind of conclusions can be made from the above mentioned?

1. The open challenge to Kremlin from the side of Karimov testifies for the deterioration of relations between Moscow and Tashkent; 2. Secession from the Treaty on Collective Security of CIS as a protest against Russian policy is announced for all the world; 3. It is a paradox, but it is a fact - that the Treaty gave a crack in Tashkent, where in 1992 it was signed (officially it entered into force in April 1994) by all 9 countries - members (it was not signed by Ukraine, Moldova and Turkmenistan). It was in force till April 1995; 4. Uzbekistan was the first state, which declared about refusal on prolongation of the main military-political document of CIS; 5. Already in February some of the Moscow political reviewers were not excluding, that

the example of Uzbekistan would be followed by the other countries (in the first place Azerbaijan, indignant with Russian-Armenian military cooperation); 6. Demarche of Karimov may become a precursor of straining the relations between Moscow and Tashkent even more; 7. Russian-Uzbekistan contradictions in the Central Asia splashed out on the surface (for example, in Tajikistan); 8. Tashkent blames Moscow in supporting the Tajik President Emomali Rakhmanov, whom the Karimov people call “the chairman of kolkhoz” and “the marionette of criminal clans”<sup>16</sup>.

It is possible, that Uzbekistan shall not limit with secret support of the anti-Rakhmanov opposition and shall become a sponsor for armed revolts, like the acts of Mahmud Khudoiberdiev. It is interesting, that official representatives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Russia (Minister for CIS Affairs B. Pastukhov, B. Berezovskij) refused to make comments.

After the act of terrorism on February 16, 1999 against the President of Uzbekistan I. Karimov declared, that his administration shall take arms against those, who are trying to turn Islam into the tool of political struggle and use it to achieve their own aims. He accused militant Islamic groupings in aspiration of “block-heading” Uzbek youngsters and underlined the readiness of administration to oppose it strongly. Islam Karimov informed, that Uzbekistan every year spends 20-25 million dollars on education of the youth abroad, in the Universities of developed countries, in order to save them from corrupting influence and religious fanaticism. In the Republic were established and are conducting their propaganda several religious parties<sup>17</sup>.

At taking speech before the ambassadors of more than 50 states and journalists, the President of Uzbekistan accused for recent act of terrorism in Tashkent the persons connected with extremist religious groupings. He characterized them as “religious fanatics”, which were trained in Chechen Republic, Afghanistan and Tajikistan. Later I. Karimov began to assert that the act of terrorism in February in Tashkent was organized by movement “Hezbollah”<sup>18</sup>, with this he challenged the Teheran, which protects this organization. From the point of view of Moscow analysts with his declaration I. Karimov created a serious symptom of new geopolitical opposition in region. It is commonly known, that Uzbekistan, as well as Iran, claims for the role of super-power in the region. Though, in difference from Iran leaders, I. Karimov stands for the secular model of development for his Republic and fights actively the Islamists out of its borders,

in the first place in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. At the same time Tashkent is trying to unite Turk language people of the Central Asia. If Uzbekistan decides to break off its strategic relations with potential partner in the South, then it shall inevitably spoil the relations with Turkmenistan, which has the most close contacts with Iran.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. "Sodruzhestvo NG", N2, 1999 (Russ.)
2. Op. Cit.
3. Fierman W. Political Development in Uzbekistan: Democratization? Conflict, cleavage, and change in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Ed. by K. Dawisha and B. Parrot. Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 390.
4. FBIS-SOV, 14 October, 1994, pp. 48-53.
5. "Asia and Africa Today", N 7, 1999, pp. 8-10 (Russ.).
6. Op. Cit., p. 9.
7. Op. Cit., p 10
8. "The Washington Times", June 1996.
9. "Asia and Africa Today", N 7, 1999, p. 9 (Russ.).
10. Hunter Sh. T. Central Asia Since Independence. L., 1996, p. 144.
11. Op. Cit., p. 11.
12. FBIS-SOV, 14 October, 1994, pp. 48-49.
13. "Nezavisimaja gazeta", 4 February 1999, p.1 (Russ.).
14. "Nezavisimaja gazeta", 11 February 1999, p.1 (Russ.).
15. "Izvestija", 4 February 1999 (Russ.).
16. "Izvestija", 25 February 1999 (Russ.).
17. Etnicheskie i regionalnie konflikty v evrazii, Kn. 16, M., 1997, p.123 (Russ.).
18. "Nezavisimaja gazeta", 4 March 1999 (Russ.).

## **CHAPTER II**

### **SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF KAZAKHSTAN**

After disintegration of the former USSR the geopolitical significance and the role of Kazakhstan being on the junction of Asia and Europe and performing the role of inter-regional connecting link have considerably increased. Economic, military and political interests of the country characterize the

Republic as central-regional state actively establishing its independence and influence in the regional and international affairs.

The leaders of the state consider the creation of favorable foreign conditions for the development of the Republic as sovereign independent state as the main task in field of the foreign policy.

Among the CIS countries of the Central Asian region Kazakhstan pretends to the leading place, contesting it with Uzbekistan. The main milestones in this policy are as follows:

- Transition from the single-sided orientation towards Russia to the extension of economic, political and military bonds with the western countries;
- Desire of the country leaders to develop comprehensively the interactions first of all with strong and rich world countries which are ready to render Kazakhstan assistance in realization of its economical, military and political interests;
- Provision of the national security on the basis of the economical growth and balanced availability of Russian, western and regional influence;
- Establishment of the effective system of the collective security in the geostrategic environment of Kazakhstan and active participation in formation of the global world order.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, the Russian analysts note some unfavorable for Russia trends arising in this direction.

One of the most important foreign-policy priorities for the leaders of Kazakhstan is strengthening of the comprehensive cooperation with the USA to which the role of the strategic partner is given. The plans of entering world community, the international political, financial, economical and military institutions including NATO and structures are connected exactly with Washington.

The main purpose of the strategic rapprochement with the USA is obtaining the American guarantees for providing national and regional security. By the opinion of its leaders, Kazakhstan being stressed in the geopolitical space between the two nuclear states - Russia and China will experience threat to its territorial integrity and independence primarily from their side, as it was before.<sup>2</sup>

Another external danger is seen by the authorities in the military conflicts near the frontiers of the Republic (Tadjikistan, Afghanistan) which can be transferred to its territory.<sup>3</sup>

This is why, the Charter of the Democratic Partnership in which such guaranties are supposed, signed by the two presidents in Washington (1994) is specifically valuable. The both parties intend to develop mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of defense and to conduct regular consultation on the problems of security.

In the USA the relations with Kazakhstan are considered as a part of the American central-Asian policy in which the role of one of the strong points in the strategy that is called to establish a new world order is assigned to this country.

The most attractive in this respect is the rich in oil and gas poorly developed Caspian region.

The region is assigned the role of the main power store for the next century. It being known that Kazakhstan became rather concerned partner of this process. In the case of dividing the Caspian Sea to the national sectors, the share of Kazakhstan will be 4,5 milliard ton.<sup>4</sup>

The main interest of the USA is defined by the common geopolitical significance of the region, its importance as the zone of the increased risk for the global stability, where it is necessary to deter the interests of Russia and China.<sup>5</sup>

As a strategic orientation Kazakhstan has also defined its relations with the European partners of the USA, among which it cooperates most fruitfully with Germany, France and Great Britain. Kazakhstan is becoming the so-called “bridge” between “the old continent” and the countries of Asian-Pacific region. The interest towards the European Union is connected with the hopes to install into the Kazakh society the democratic values of the western type. Such an ardent wish to become “the part of the civilized world” is accounted by political workers as the readiness of the Kazakh authorities to follow lead of the policy of the advanced western countries.

At the Asian direction their priorities are the searches of the ways of attracting considerable financial and technological resources of the Asian continent for the needs of Kazakh economy. With this, Kazakhstan is sure that it is Asian-Pacific region (APR) that will take the leading position in the development of the modern world in the next century.

In this scheme China is considered as the pole of strength and powerful economic center.

The fact of signing in Moscow in April, 1997 of the Agreement about the confidence on the former Soviet-Chinese frontier of 7500 length (the signatory parties - from one side Russia, Kazakhstan Kyrgyzstan, Tadjikistan and from another side - China) is ascertained by Kazakhstan as its serious diplomatic success.

In the Arab West Kazakhstan is trying to cooperate with the most wealthy and influential countries (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Oman and other countries of the Persian Gulf) first of all in the sphere of trade, transport, oil extraction and oil processing.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, their role in the world fuel and energy balance and availability of large credit and financial capabilities are taken into account.

In the Middle East the preference is given first of all to the relations with Turkey. The main reasons for such a choice are: the attractive model of economic and political development; account for the financing and economical assistance in the decision of the different problems of the Kazakh economy; availability of historic ties, cultural and language community, considerable volume of the trade and economic cooperation<sup>7</sup>; regular political dialogue on the high level Turkey plays a great role for Kazakhstan as the channel of transport communications with the exit to the Mediterranean Sea. To a certain extent Turkey is considered as a potential market for Kazakh raw and goods.<sup>8</sup> The important

point is also the wish of the political elite of Kazakhstan leaning against Turkey to show Russia and other CIS countries their possibilities for maneuver and choice the partners for economical projects which surely strengthens their positions.<sup>9</sup>

The attitude of Kazakhstan to the cooperation with Iran is restrained and considered with looking back to the USA. The ties with Iran are mainly restricted to trade and economical sphere, though Kazakhstan will not renounce to use the potential of this country as a perspective market and the alternative variant of the exit to the world communications.



As concerns west and NATO, Kazakhstan considers “Partnership for Peace” (PFP) as a possibility of the real integration into the transatlantic structures of security and reliable guarantee of the interests of the state sovereignty protection.

By the words of President of the country N.Nazarbaev, the participation of his Republic in the program of PFP gives hope for the future of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state. The supreme leaders of the Republic have repeatedly confirmed their resolution to fulfill the obligations proceeding from the participation of Kazakhstan in this program. From the same position Kazakhstan approaches the activity of OSCE considering it as a main instrument of the preventive diplomacy on the whole territory of the former USSR.

On the international scene Kazakhstan more than once showed its own approach to the decision of the international issues which did not keep with the channel of the allied relations with Moscow.

Not long ago by the initiative of Nazarbaev the central-Asian alliance (CAA) comprising Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan was established. The strategic orientation of this Alliance is economic, military and political interaction of the three states. At the summits of the three Ministers of Defense the problems of “separate”, independent from Russia military cooperation are, for example, considered.

The efforts of the Kazakh leaders play not the least role in establishing the block of Presidents of the newly independent states having the obvious anti-Russian orientation.

Generally speaking, the relations with Russia are based on the Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation (May,1992) formally having the allied character <sup>10</sup> and also on the Declaration on the Extension of the Russian-Kazakh cooperation (January, 1995); apart from that, Kazakhstan signed the agreements on the military cooperation, customs and payment unions and other important documents defining the bilateral interaction. Kazakhstan is a party of the Agreement on the Collective Security of CIS and was actively speaking in support of the creation of the united armed forces; it is also a party to the quadripartite Agreement between Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Russia and

Kazakhstan have the Agreements on the unification of army, on the united usage of the military objects and bases, on the protection of the frontiers, etc.

Meanwhile, the relations of the parties for present are ascertained as unfriendly, especially after the fact when the territory of Kazakhstan was declared the territory of Kazakh nation.<sup>14</sup> In fact the condition of the policy of ethnocratization of Kazakh state and discrimination of the Russian-language population is meant. In 1994 the Prime-Minister of Kazakhstan said that there was no Russian Diaspora in Kazakhstan in the country, but only the citizens of the Republic, irrespective of their nationality.<sup>16</sup> This has become the cause for migration of Russian and other persons of non-Kazakh nationality. The most complicated was the status of Cossacks which were severely oppressed by the authorities right up to the repressive measures of criminal, psychological and information character. They did not expect the change of the President's policy. The Government promised to acknowledge their rights, if they changed their symbolism and protected Kazakh borders from the possible attacks of Russia.<sup>15</sup> Such a policy results in the aggravation of the tension on the ethnosocial ground.<sup>11,12,13</sup>

The discontent of Russia is caused by the rapprochement of Kazakhstan in the military and political spheres with the Western countries; by the opinion of Russians it changes the geopolitical and geostrategic situation in the central-Asian region for the unfavorable for Russia state and can be ascertained only as the break the principles of alliance and partnership. In 1993, during his official visit to the USA N.Nazarbaev said that Russia threatened the interests of Kazakhstan not only in economical, but also in military respects and that Russia had nothing to do with space-launch complex Baikonur and Semipalatinsk testing ground which were declared the ownership of Kazakhstan.

The declaration of N.Nazarbaev at the meeting with journalists in Alma-Ata concerning the necessity of the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the territory of Tadjikistan, Armenia, Georgia caused the great dissatisfaction of Russia.

The problem of oil and gas complex of Kazakhstan is a subject of specific interest of Russia. The attempts of Kazakhstan to find the alternative ways for transit of its own power carries with the help of the western investors do not meet the economical interests of Russia.<sup>12</sup>

The Russians think that the establishment of the greatest world oil corporations in Kazakhstan ensures the provisions for conversion of the region into the zone of specific interests of the west with the all proceeding from that negative consequences for Russia. Finally, there is a specific position of Kazakhstan together with Azerbaijan in the problems of the legal status of the Caspian Sea and development of oil-fields in the shelf of the Caspian Sea, which think that such a position creates the danger of conversion the region into the zone of active opposition and competition.<sup>27</sup> Thus. the leaders of Kazakhstan conduct the policy of flexible balancing both on the regional and global levels. Just that very policy of not simple actions and discrepant, steps sometimes is more complex from the point of view of perception and understanding its roots. The main role in the development and trends of the foreign policy of the country is played by the political and economical elite of the country.<sup>22</sup> The representatives of this elite help to form and to direct the foreign policy of the country. In his speech in the Parliament at the end of March 1999 President N.Nazarbaev said: we will not return to the epoch of dictation of the state and centralized orientation of economy.

We have done our choice and no crisis whatever will make us give up this choice<sup>23</sup>.

#### REFERENCE

1. "Asia and Africa Today", N7,1998, p. 8 (Russ.).
2. Hunter Sh.T., Central Asia and Its Neighbors – "Central Asia since Independence" Foreword by Brouxup M.B., Published with the Center for Strategic And International Studies Washington, D.C. Westport, Connecticut, London, 1996.
3. Hunter Sh,T. Intra-CIS Relation-Central Asia since Independence, Foreword by M.B. Brouxup. The Center For Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., L.1996.
4. Cherniavsky St. Russia Caucasian Strategy of Washington – "International Affairs" M., N 1 (Russ).
5. "Asia and Africa Today", N7, 1998, p. 9 (Russ.).
6. Hunter Sh.T. Op. cit.
7. TDN, 29 October 1994.
8. Country Report, 3- rd Quarter, 1994, London, Economist Intelligence Unit. 1994.
9. Winroaw G. M. Turkey in Post-Soviet Central Asia. The Royal Institute of International Affairs. Russia and CIS Programme. 1995.
10. Hunter Sh. T, op.cit
11. Anderson J. The International politics of Central Asia. Manchester University Press. Manchester and New York, 1997. , pp. 139-140.
12. "Kazakhstanskaia Pravda", 25 August 1989; 9 September, 1990.
13. Kazakhstan: Realities and Perspectives of Independence. Ed. Kozhokin Y.M. , Moscow: Russian Institute of Strategic Research, 1995,(p.179.
14. "Zavtra". N 19, 1994; Izvestia, 12 April 1994.(Russ).
15. Al-Kode, N12 1994.
- 16."Nezavisimaya Gazeta", 2 April 1994 (Russ)..
17. "Sovietskaya Rossia" 13, February, 1993 (Russ).
18. "Pravda", 19, February 1993 (Russ).

19. "Edinstvo" N 6 1994 (Russ).
20. "Argumenty I Fakty", N 40 1993 (Russ).
21. Open Media Research Institute, 154, 9 August 1996.
22. "Central Asia and the Caucasia" Socio-Political Journal, N1 ,1998, Switz., p.79-80 ( Russ)
23. "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", 1 April 1995, p.5.(Russ).

### **CHAPTER III**

## **NEUTRALITY OF TURKMENISTAN IN THE SYSTEM OF SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN COUNTRIES**

After acquiring independence the leaders of Turkmenistan began to define its foreign-policy conception corresponding to the new geopolitical conditions in which the country found itself and to its long-term state interests.

The emergence of the new geopolitical picture in the Central Asia and regional system of economic cooperation - Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) put forward before the independent Turkmenistan the task of searching its own place and role therein.

Significant natural resources and advantageous geographical position opened before Ashgabad wide geopolitical capabilities and allowed to make a fresh glance to the foreign-policy priorities of Turkmenistan, to determine newly its geopolitical place both in the Central Asian region and in the world as a whole.

In the new terms Turkmenistan is going to realize its foreign-policy strategy in order to establish first of all its regional status as an independent and a self-supporting state.

As a foundation of the foreign-policy course of Ashgabad the idea of the state neutrality was laid up which was acknowledged by the international community.

The choice of such a position has defined a number of factors including:

- indifference of Russian politicians and departments to the destiny of Turkmenistan;
- insolvency of CIS system which demonstrates its helplessness and destructiveness, being in fact more disintegrating one than the uniting one;
- the watchful relationship of Ashgabad to Turkey in connection with the appeals of the nationalistically inclined Turkish politicians to unification of Turki to the "Great Turan" under the slogan

of panturkism, and the pretensions of Ankara to the role of the elder brother in the new Turki language space;

-the danger of fundamentalist pressure of Iran which in its turn, not without reason, considers to break through its international isolation with the help of the Central Asian neighbors;

-the proximity of the dangerous seats of stresses in Afghanistan and Tadjikistan, the unwillingness to be involved in international ethnic and religious conflicts.<sup>1</sup>

By the present time the neutral status of Turkmenistan is acknowledged by 185 world states - the unprecedented case in the UNO practice. December 12 is a national day - "Neutrality Day" in Turkmenistan. In December 27 all the necessary amendments have been entered the Constitution.<sup>2</sup>

The leading western countries ascertained the declared by Turkmenistan neutrality as a serious political step towards withdrawal from the sphere of the Russian influence, as the decision to conduct the unaffected by Moscow policy, and consequently informal, but actual invitation to the west to participate in the division and use of the local natural resources. Thus, Turkmenistan became an object of active regional and global policy.

In the foreign-policy strategy of Turkmenistan the three leading policy directions can be marked: Russian, regional and western, each of them having its own value and conditionality<sup>3</sup>. Such a balanced approach of President S. Nijazov to definition of foreign-policy priorities shows the far-reaching strategic consideration: to break through to the world markets independently by attracting great foreign financial investments to oil and gas industry and to infrastructure ensuring transportation of power carriers. The main role in choosing a foreign partner for the leaders of Turkmenistan is not the political interests, but the advantage, the reliability and the prospects of the concluded contract, its economical output.

Upon the Turkmenistan withdrawal from the sphere of the Russian influence its leaders are more and more wishing to develop cooperation both with the countries of the region and with Western countries which in their turn also show their growing interest to economical rapprochement with Ashgabad.

The greatest preference in the external ties is given by the Turkmen leaders to bilateral international contractual relations, bilateral integration into the various economic spheres.

After acquiring independence Turkmenistan began its re-orientation towards the Western countries as well as towards Turkey and Iran which are seeking to strengthen their influence in the region. Now in Turkmenistan over 500 enterprises with foreign investments are working which were established by means of more than 400 firms from 50 and more countries.

The great interest to development of cooperation with Turkmenistan is showed by France. During the visit of President S.Nijazov to Paris in 1996 the parties have signed the package of bilateral agreements in which a memorandum about the strategic partnership up to year 2000 can be marked out. Turkmenistan has the similar document only with Russia.

French companies show a specific interest first of all to the oil and gas complex of the country. The development and extension of gas potential of Turkmenistan at a great extent establishes its foreign policy with Iran and Russia. Turkmen-Iran cooperation in many aspects is accounted for by the proximity of the two countries, the tradition of centuries-old historical and civilization communities, concentration of the compact group of Turkmen population in the North of Iran.<sup>4</sup> Besides, Turkmenistan as a young independent state is vitally interested in strong and authoritative allies and reliable partner. The inclination of Iran interested to overcome really a certain political and economical isolation is also obvious. It is Iran which is the main consumer of Turkmen oil.<sup>5</sup> In 1997 this country imported 52% of the oil extracted in Turkmenistan<sup>6</sup>.

During the current visit of S.Nijazov to Teheran in July 1998 the agreement about transportation of Turkmen oil to Iran ports of the Persian Gulf was gained.<sup>7</sup> At his official visit to the USA in April, 1998 S.Nijazov said about the advantage for gas transportation by pipe-line laid on the bed of the Caspian Sea.<sup>8</sup> At the same time it is the first turn of the powerful transit gas line to the Europe via Iran and Turkey having created the first precedent of the Turkmen gas output to the rich western markets with the gradual refuse from the insolvent market of the CIS countries. The problem of insolvency and debts of the CIS countries against the deliveries of Turkmen gas will remain rather acute.

The active technical and economical cooperation is supplemented with the interaction on the key problems of the regional and world policy, intensive contacts of the leaders of the both countries. Thus, during the year after the elections President of Iran, C.M.Khatomi has met his Turkmen colleague for four times.<sup>9</sup> The role of Iran as an authoritative regional state exerting active though

sometimes negative influence over the modern political processes is well known in Turkmenistan. Ashgabad tries to neglect the support of Iran for terrorism at the international level and the active efforts for development and production of weapons of mass destruction. In spite of the utter displeasure of the Iran leaders Turkmenistan develops its relations with Israel, particularly in the oil and gas sphere, where the both countries are actively cooperating in realization of the project of gas infrastructure reconstruction. The Turkmen President not once told that his country desires to attract the experience of Israel in establishment and use of high technologies including the sphere of oil and gas exploitation.<sup>10</sup>

It is necessary to dwell on the Turkmen-Turkish relations which are based on the common languages and customs and to ascertain the degree of the Turkish influence over the process occurring in the Republic. The relations of these countries are developing both in the frames of the regional cooperation (ECO) and on bilateral base.

In the initial stage after Turkmenistan acquired independence Ankara made the best use of the desire of Ashgabad to strengthen its sovereignty in practice. Turkey was one of the first countries that acknowledged its independence, opened in Ashgabad its Embassy, began to develop actively all the forms of cooperation, always emphasizing historical and cultural unity and proximity of the two countries.<sup>1</sup> With this, Turkey conducts too active policy of joining Turkmenistan to the western values, its involvement to the market relations, creating common cultural and information space. The programs of the Turkish broadcast and television are received in Turkmenistan, the Turkish printing production is disseminated there. When advancing the problem of spiritual unity Turkey actively uses Islam which has in Turkmenistan rather deep roots in everyday life. And though Ankara itself is rather anxious about the Islamic activity, still it helps Ashgabad to begin the construction of the great mosque and the Turkish Cultural Center. Under the official line some ecclesiastic enlighteners, mullahs and teachers of medrese were directed to the country.

It is necessary to mark that the revival of Islam which came with the Turkish wave found a response also with the leaders of the country. In particular, President S. Nijazov has undertaken Hegira to Mecca after which the obligatory study of the principles of Islam was introduced in the secondary schools in Turkmenistan.<sup>12</sup>

Bilateral ties, especially at the initial stage, due mainly to persistence and activity of Ankara were developing rather vividly. The appropriate agreement and judicial base for bilateral relations was established, the consular convention, the protocol about the consultations between foreign-policy ministers and other ministers and offices, the memorandum about the further development of cooperation (June 20, 1994), about trips without visas for the citizens of the both countries (for all the categories of the citizens validated since July 20, 1995), etc. were signed. Turkey plays the second place (after Iran) in the volume of trade with Turkmenistan having in this sphere the positive balance.<sup>13</sup>

Turkmenistan stands up for the normalization of the situation in Afghanistan solely by means of the political methods, speaks on inadmissibility of interference with the other state matters. Being anxious about possible aggravation of the situation on its southern boarder Turkmen leaders are attentively watching the course of military operations between the opposite alignments. In order not to be involved into the events in Afghanistan, Ashgabad maintains relations with talibs, with the group of General R.Dustom and with Tadjiks of Akhmad-Shakh Masud. At the same time, substantially big Turkmen community residing in Afghanistan was taken into account. The Turkmen consulate is opened in the administrative center of the western Afghanistan - Gerate. During the last time at talibs' approach to the Turkmen's frontiers Ashgabad intensified the unofficial contacts with them on the arising problems of the boarder. In October-November the Turkmen party deported the significant part of Afghan refugees penetrated to the southern part of the Republic. Additional measures have been taken to fortify the state frontiers and to strengthen its protection. However, Turkmen did not allow talibs to transfer the part of their troops to the North of Afghanistan via the Turkmen territory. At the same time they agreed to deliver combustible and lubricant materials to Gerat.

The relations with Russia experience some complications, though Russia and Turkmenistan are interested in close and multilateral cooperation.<sup>14</sup>

However, for the present foreign-policy course of Turkmenistan, the certain remoteness from Russia and CIS is typical and is caused by its new political status as an independent and neutral state and also by the desire of Ashgabad to acquire its place and role in the region, to use the revealed geopolitical capabilities and rich natural resources.

Though Turkmenistan did not reject in a whole the establishment of the union of Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in March, 1996, still it thought it impossible to accede to this



union. Ashgabad takes a specific position practically on the majority of the questions concerning CIS whether they are in economic, law-making or defense sphere.

Russia has the long-term interests in Turkmenistan which are defined by geopolitical position of the country in the Central Asian region and its status of the neutral and on the whole friendly to Russia state. Turkmenistan, with its policy of neutrality, can become for Russia a useful connecting link between Russia and some countries of the region.

The compromise of Turkmenistan with Russia looks inevitable, because Russia is as previously controlling the main transportation routes from Turkmenistan.

Stagnation in the questions of the military cooperation is marked as before. In 1997 the government of Turkmenistan allotted only 1,5% of the requested sum to its Ministry of Defense for effecting the military purchases in Russia. The fulfillment by Turkmen party of the contracts pertaining to the military and technical cooperation became impossible in such conditions. The particular importance for the provision of the security of both countries lies in the common protection of the frontiers of Turkmenistan, and also in the coordination of the works of the special service for the struggle against drug business and crime. There are rather a lot moot points between Russia and Turkmenistan in their bilateral relations, in the first turn - in the oil and gas sphere. The director of "Gazprom" even said lately: "Ashgabad all the same will crawl up on its knees".<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, it is the lack of pliability of Russia in the questions of transportation of Turkmen gas to the foreign markets that makes Ashgabad accelerate the development of pipe-line transportation. By the declaration of S.Nijazov Ashgabad would only greet the Russian investments to the development of oil and gas deposits in the Caspian Sea and "... in any time the doors in Turkmenistan are open for Russia".<sup>16</sup>

Meanwhile, Ashgabad pays great attention to adjusting the valuable and versatile dialogue with the other members of the world community as well. In the west, the most active partners of Turkmenistan are: Germany, France, England.<sup>17</sup> As a whole the share of the countries of the European Union in 1998 made about half of the investment program of Turkmenistan.<sup>18</sup> As concerns its relations with the USA, in the first years after Turkmenistan acquired independence, the USA kept away from that country under the reason of violation of human rights. In the west and in the USA much is written about the violation of human rights and the totalitarian character of the authorities in Turkmenistan. This

is why the visit of S.Nijazov to the USA was severely criticized in this country. The fact of reception of Turkmen leader by B. Clinton was considered by the press, in particular, as the encouragement of “certain variety of the active museum of the Soviet totalitarianism and Stalin’s cult of personality”.<sup>19</sup> However, as far back as 1993 the USA provided Turkmenistan the most-favored nation treatment in trade. Since that time the volume of the financing of the USA projects in various spheres of economy has rapidly increased and has a real prospect for the further growth. Currently Turkmen-American relations are dynamically developing in the oil and gas sphere as well. The decisive and effective impetus to the development of Turkmen-American relations was given by the first official visit of S.Nijazov to the USA in 1998 which probably convinced President of Turkmenistan of the necessity of the further rapprochement with west. It is noticeable that the USA in fact realizes the plans of implementation and control over the situation in this rather important for them country hoping to neutralize the political activity and to reduce maximally the role of Iran in this region.<sup>20</sup>

By the opinion of the Russians Washington when achieving the development of the advantageous geopolitical terms for realisation of the Central-Asian Pipe-line (CAP) is trying with the help of Russia to stabilise the situation in Afghanistan on the basis of consolidation with the authorities in the country the talibs’ movement and then to effect technical and commercial part of the project without Russia.

Russia is very jealously watching the attempts of the USA to attach Turkmenistan to the military bonds of west in the meantime via the NATO program “Partnership for Peace” (PFP). The important link on this way became the visit of the Secretary General of NATO Mr. H.Solana to Ashgabad in March, 1997. The leaders of the country treated his visit with discretion, though did not exclude the probability of extension of military cooperation of Ashgabad with the USA and NATO. President S.Nijazov agreed to consider in the nearest future the prepared project of agreement about joining of Turkmenistan to PFP, but gave to understand that the reaction of Moscow for the awaited extension of NATO to the east is to be taken into account.

For the last time the number of American military delegations visiting Turkmenistan has increased. At present Turkmen-American military relations are on the stage of study and analysis of the perspective spheres of cooperation. The following directions are defined as possible: preparation of the staff for Turkmen Army, consultative assistance in the questions of construction and improvement of the

structure of the armed forces and frontier troops, planning of the military budget. The representatives of the USA and NATO express their readiness to help Ashgabad in annihilation of the out of date Soviet ammunition which is being stored in the warehouses of the Turkmen Army.

The specialists from the USA coastal guard conduct the works on the development of Turkmen separate frontier troops for the protection of sea coast. In the frames of the developed by the Americans the International Program "IMET" preparation of the military staff for Turkmenistan is effected for which in 1996 220 thousand US dollars have been assigned. In 1997 the USA increased its expenses for training military specialists of Air Force of Turkmenistan completing their number up to 50 men a year. The Americans organized in the Ministry of Defense English language courses for the potential candidates who would study in the NATO training centers. Apart from that Washington pays for the education of the children of the influential Turkmen officials in the USA considering them in future as the state elite oriented to west and as the contingent for the joined work and the bonds through them in Turkmenistan.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, during the last years against a background of the growth of the role of oil and gas factor the broad development of the economic and political relations of Turkmenistan with foreign countries are noticeable, the specific weight of the west being more and more increasing. The prospects of the Russian analysts concerning the fact that "partnership with the western oil companies will inevitably result in the deterioration of the relations (of Turkmenistan-V.M.) with Iran..."<sup>22</sup> are not at all confirmed. It is probably accounted for by the fact that the European countries did not support the economical sanctions of the USA against Iran and when realizing the political dialogue with Iran they are more and more involved in the cooperation in the sphere of oil and gas at the regional level. The further normalization of the relations of Iran with the European Union connected with the extension of the political dialogue will ensure the successful development of the trilateral cooperation in oil and gas sphere under the scheme: Turkmenistan-Iran-European countries.

On the other hand, Iran is not politically interested in deterioration of its relations with Turkmenistan. Iran considers that in the case of the successful cooperation with the western companies the Iranian territory without any doubt will become one of the transit route points for the export of power carriers to the world markets. At the same time Turkmenistan itself is not likely to overestimate the prospects of its cooperation with Iran. To our opinion, the process of

the development of the relations of Turkmenistan with the west will inevitably play the constraining role in the Turkmen-Iranian dialogue, and in some degree in Turkmen-Russian dialogue, because the comprehension of the fact that the cooperation with west, in the first turn - with the USA in the long-term plan is more important for the country in political, technical and economical sphere is growing in Turkmenistan. In the USA's aspiration to restrict the Iranian and Russian influence in the Central-Asian region the specific role is allotted to Turkmenistan.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. "Asia and Africa Today", N7,1998. p.13 (Russ.).
2. M. Ochs, Turkmenistan: the quest for stability and control. - Conflict, cleavage and change in Central Asia and the Caucasia. Ed. by K. Dawisha. Cambridge University Press, 1997 p.351-352
3. "Asia and Africa Today", N8,1999, p.12 (Russ.)
4. Central Asia and the Caucasia Socio-political Journal, N1 1998, Sweden, p.54 (Russ).
5. "Turkish Newsletter", vol,98, 30, April,1998 N6
6. Asia and Africa Today, N4,1997.p.33.
7. Keihan ("Teheran"), 6, July 1998.
8. Iran ("Teheran"), 7, July 1998.
9. "Neitralniy Turkmrnistan" 10,July, 1998 (Russ).
10. "Neitralniy Turkmrnistan" 3,July, 1998 (Russ).
11. Anderson I. The International Politics of Central Asia. Manchester University Press. Manchester and New York 1997, p.193.
12. "Asia and Africa Today", N9,1998,p.11,12 (Russ).
13. Winrow G.M. Turkey in Post-Soviet Central-Asia. The Royal Institute of International Affairs,L,1995, p.32.
14. Hunter Sh.T. Central Asia since Independence. Foreword by Maric Bennigsen Broxup. Published with The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C. Weyport, Connecticut, 1996, p.117.
15. "Izvestiya". 29 January, 1998 (Russ).
16. "Neitralniy Turkmrnistan", 13 August, 1997. (Russ).
17. "Nezavisimaya Gazeta" , 20 May, 1998 (Russ).
18. "Neitralniy Turkmrnistan", 9 May, 1998 (Russ).
19. "The Washington Post", Friday, April 24, 1998.
20. "Turkistan Newsletter", vol.98-142, 22 August, 1998.
21. "The New York Times" April 23, 1998.
22. "Asia and Africa Today", N10,1996, p.56 (Russ.)

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ARMED CONFLICT IN TAJIKISTAN AND SECURITY ISSUES IN THE CENTRAL ASIA**

In contrast to interethnic conflicts in Caucasia, the civil war in Tajikistan had an inner-ethnic character. Tajikistan leaders were not able to prevent the civil war in the country.

The armed conflict in Tajikistan is the most long by time among the local wars taken place within the territory of the former USSR. The civil war, which began in this Republic in 1992, has been going on more than 5 years and came to an end by signing in Moscow on June 27, 1997 of “Common Agreement on Establishment of Peace and National Consent”. Though many problems were left unsolved. They create preconditions for preservation of tension and instability in the Republic<sup>1</sup>.

The conflict began in Dushanbe between the supporters of the President Rakhmon Nabiev, who had been the first secretary of the Communist Party from 1982 to 1985 in Tajikistan, and representatives of opposition from the “Islam Party of Tajikistan Revival” and movement “Rastokhez” (“Revival”)<sup>2</sup>. The opponents demanded to provide for political and religious freedom. The supporters of the government were defeated and from complete crushing were saved by interference of 201st Motor Rifles Division of Russia.

In separate regions of the country dominated one or another clans. In the North Tajikistan (Khotjenskij) ruled Uzbeks, in the central Tajikistan - kuljabians, karategians, gissars, and the South Tajikistan - pamirians, originating from East Iran<sup>3</sup>. In the country the definite clan specialization was maintained: for example, kuljabians served in army and militia, karategians occupation was business, etc. As they say today every region is busy with its activities: Pamir - defends, Kuljab - dances, Kurgan-Tjube - ploughs, Dushanbe - produces, Khojent (Leninabad) - governs and trades.

The intellectuals never had a decisive role here. They are divided into traditionalists (praising the past and traditional values and order) and Europaised - oriented on social-democrats. In difference from the first two the clergy grew up slower and in Soviet epoch was concerned only with survival. But soon the Tajik faction acceded to All-Union Islam Party of Revival (IPR), and in October 1990 the Tajik clergy was registered as a Republic organization<sup>4</sup>.

The victory of opposition in Dushanbe marked the beginning of the civil war first stage, which went on from May to December 1992.

On basis of three subethnoses kuljabian-gissar-uzbek coalition the opposition established the “Popular Front”, the political aim of which was the restoration of the constitutional order”.

The Chairman of the Supreme Soviet becomes Emomali Rakhmanov - the former Director of “Sovkhoz” and Field Commander of Popular Front. In President’s absence he is the Head of the State.

On the second stage of the civil war (January 1993- March 1994) inner-Tajik conflict is internationalized de jure. In Moscow on May 25 1993 the Agreement on Friendship, Cooperation and Inter-Assistance between Tajikistan and Russia is signed. According to the Agreement on the territory of Tajikistan the Russian military and Federal Frontier Service (FFS) units are present. They took part in the conflict, supported the government of E. Rakhmonov. The subsections of FFS conducted military operation in fact, preventing the attempts of various opposition armed formations to penetrate into Tajikistan<sup>5</sup>.

The Collective Peacemaking Forces (CPF) of CIS were created consisting of Russian Army by 90%, plus subsections from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. To Tajikistan arrived peacemaking forces of UN and OSCE, as well as the Mission of International Red Cross and Red Half-Moon, which undertook the assistance for refugees. Their number reached to 1 000 000 persons. 20% of Tajikistan population was found abroad in fact.

Up to the end of 1993 in the Republic heavy fighting was going on, in result the larger part of the armed groupings of opposition together with dozens of thousand peaceful inhabitants were forced out to the territory of neighboring Afghanistan.

During the war the accelerated consolidation of the opposition was going on. the democratic movement lost its main part of social base and was pressed by the Islam Party of Tajikistan Revival (IPTR). The base of United Tajik Opposition (UTO) became the movement of Tajikistan Islam Revival (MTIR), which was headed by the leader of Tajik clergy kazi-kolon khoji Akbar Turajonzade. IPTR, “Rastokhez”, Democratic Party of Tajikistan (DPT) and “Lal Badakhshan”<sup>6</sup>. At the end of 1993 in Moscow was created the Coordinate Council of Tajikistan Democratic Forces in CIS, which joined UTO. The “Government in Exile” was formed, headed by Said Abdullo Nuri, which at the same time was the Chairman of UTO. His

Deputy Chairman in UTO - Akbar Khoji Turjonzade, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the "Government in Exile"<sup>7</sup>.

The third stage of the civil war (April 1994 - September 1995) was marked by relative stabilization of E. Rakhmonov government, that enabled him to deal with the number of problems. He agreed to begin negotiations with UTO, that meant to recognize the political opponent de facto.

In summer 1994 the draft of the new Constitution was published, and at the end of the year the referendum and the president elections took place. E. Rakhmonov became the President<sup>8</sup>.

Only at the end of 1996 the negotiations started, that began to bring he concrete results. The serious military failures and strengthening of the inner opposition made the government of E. Rakhmonov and its main sponsor Russia to activate efforts for achievement of political regulation, on which Iran insisted. On December 11 at the meeting held in Afghan city Talukan the main provisions of political regulations were elaborated, and on December 24, 1996 in Moscow Emomali Rakhmonov, Said Abdullo Nuri and the special representative of UN General Secretary Gerhd Ditrh Merrem signed the political agreement completed with the protocol. UTO recognized the existing political and state order of Tajikistan, as well as status of E. Rakhmonov as the President. The Commission for National Reconciliation (CNR) was established on proportional principles, the Commission should act during the one-and-a-half-year transaction period. The volume of its functions included the return of refugees and reorganization of the state body<sup>9</sup>.

The regulation of conflict situation in Tajikistan became the main issue of the meeting in the capital of Kyrgyzstan Republic Bishkek between Emomali Rakhmonov - the President, Said Abdullo Nuri - the Leader of United Tajik Opposition and the representative of UN General Secretary Gerhd Merrem, which was held on 16-18 May 1997. At this meeting was reached the agreement on disposition in Dushanbe of UTO armed formations in the amount of 460 persons, and also 40 persons for guarding of the members of the Commission for National Reconciliation<sup>10</sup>.

On June 27, 1997 the President of Tajikistan Emomali Rakhmonov and the Leader of UTO Said Abdullo Nuri at the presence of the President of Russian Federation Boris Eltsin signed the common agreement on establishing of peace and national reconciliation in the Republic. It assumed the negotiations and fixed the responsibilities of the parties on fulfillment of earlier agreements, aimed on gradual and complete regulation of the conflict. The document was also signed by the Head of MIA of the countries observers at inter-Tajik negotiations - Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and Russia, as well as the representatives of UN, OSCE, the Organization of Islam Conference<sup>11</sup>.

Many observers, giving comments to the signing of the common agreement on peace marked, that the conflicting parties have agreed on peace, but it does not mean, that they have refused their program aims. One - is for building of Islam state, the others - for preservation of secular, democratic. In this issue the consensus, of course cannot be achieved.

On July 14, 1997 the President E. Rakhmonov signed the act on mutual forgiveness following the leader of the opposition Said Abdullo Nuri. There one could read, that all parties and organizations, being the members of UTO, also other parties and public organizations, if they take arms during their political activities shall carry the responsibility. In the framework of practical conduction of the document all the war prisoners and prisoners should be released.

In the middle of July 1997 the mass repatriation of Tajik refugees from Afghanistan began. The governmental army of Tajikistan together with the subsection of collective peacemaking forces were responsible for the refugees passing along the Tajik territory to their permanent residence<sup>12</sup>.

A counterweight to fragile agreement can become the discord among the supporters and opposition of the government. In the country one part of the opposition is oriented on Said Abdullo Nuri, the other - on the other leader Khoji Akbar Turajonzode, who was appointed on the post of the first Vice-premier in Tajikistan government<sup>13</sup>. It was not all so plain with Dushanbe. Publicly supporting the President, the Commander of separate brigade for quick reaction Mahmud Khudoijberdiev was against disposition in Kurgan-Tjubinskij region of the armed Tajik opposition subsections, which were to be dislocated here from Afghanistan. According to the unofficial data, he was supported by the other commanders.



In the opinion of Federal Frontier Service former Director A. Nikolaev, the documents signed in June 1997 in Moscow, are quite large-scale to provide for the political conditions for stabilization of the situation in the Republic, though as the General A. Nikolaev declared “without Russian border-guards Tajikistan would not exist as a sovereign state”<sup>14</sup>.

The military-political situation in Afghanistan influences negatively the situation at Tajik-Afghan border, and Russia in this region has not only the military contingent, the “vital interests”, that is why the Russians are trying to act not in their traditional force manner, but more “delicately” - notes the Head of the Center for Strategic Development of Russia A. Gusher. “Russia”, - declared A.Nikolaev,- “for the first time has the possibility to act in regard to Tajik-Afghan not straightforwardly, but with the help of the CIS Central Asian countries concerned with the stabilization in the region”<sup>15</sup>.

The peacemakers have stopped the war in Tajikistan for present, together with the border-guards they prevented temporarily the armed break-through from the side of fighting Afghanistan. They stayed in Tajikistan for four years and according to the Russian politologists dealt successfully with the problems. The conflict shall maintain the slowly progressing character, and in the nearest future its termination is less possible. Thus, The destabilizing Tajikistan influence on the Central Asia region in the whole shall not change.

In spite the fact, that the civil war in Tajikistan cannot be considered as finished and the possibility of actions renewal is not excluded, the main results can be seen apparently. The war, as it could have been foreseen, did not solve the contradictions characterizing the Tajik society before its beginning. The most of them it just deepened.

The new administration in Tajikistan on the territory under their control established more authoritarian regime, than that against which the opposition began its fight. The Islam movement not only survived, but it was armed and turned into the leading force of the whole opposition.

The significant obstacle on the way of ethnic consolidation is the stable hostile climate between Kuljabin and Karateginian subethnoses. During the civil war it acquired extreme forms, as the both parties applied the mass genocide. The analogue situation is between Kuljab and Pamir subethnoses<sup>16</sup>.

The post-crisis stage in Tajikistan resulted in new problems. The society of the country is not confident, that the reconciliation process has acquired irreversible character<sup>17</sup>.

Though, inspite of seizing the military activities and the started political regulation process with the opposition, the economic situation of Tajikistan is still hard. It is clear, that without the foreign assistance and investments the country cannot overcome the crisis independently and begin the restoration process.

Here should be marked the certain changes in the crisis solving approach in Tajikistan after coming to the power of E.M. Primakov. On February 23-24 1999 the Minister for Foreign Affairs I. Ivanov arrived to Dushanbe, held the speech before the soldiers of 201st division, where he underlined the priorities of Russian policy in regard to this country and the whole region. The Russian Minister had private talks with the President Emomali Rakhmonov. Before this were meetings with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tajikistan Talbak Nazarov and the Leader of the opposition Said Abdullo Nuri and the special representative of the UN General Secretary in Tajikistan Jan Kubbish. They discussed the fulfillment of the agreement on regulation of inner Tajik conflict, which in the opinion of the opposition is carried out only for 30%. Besides, the serious issues were considered, such as the regulation of the situation in Afghanistan, the Tajikistan position in respect to Uzbekistan, etc<sup>18</sup>. The visit of I. Ivanov to Tajikistan had one more purpose - to prepare of the President Emomali Rakhmonov's visit to Moscow. They discussed not only the wide package of agreements, which shall be signed, but the significant increase of Russian military presence, even establishing of a big military base.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. Gusher A. Tajikistan; Voina I Mir. - Asia and Africa today, N3, 1998, p. 6 (Russ.)
2. ITAR-TASS, 29 July 1992; Central Eurasia (hereafter FBIS-SOV), 12 May 1992, pp. 59-60; Moscow News, 14 April 1993.
3. Attkin M. Thwarted democratization in Tajikistan - "Conflict, cleavage, and change in Cnetral Asia and the Caucasia. Ed. by K.Dawisha and B. Parott. Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 285.
4. Gusher A. Tajikistan; "Asia and Africa today", N3, 1998, p. 9-10 (Russ.)
5. Stolitsa, 1992, No 32 (August), p. 4. (Russ.)
6. Atkin M. "Tajikistan: Ancient Heritage, New Politics" in Nation and Politics in the Soviet Successor States, ed. I. Bremer and R.Taras, Cambridge University Press, p. 362.
7. Komsomol'skaja pravda, 23 March 1991, p. 2. (Russ.)
8. Asia and Africa Today, N3 1998, p. 10.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid, p. 11.

13. Zviagelskaya I. Tajikistan. Poezdka na vojnu - "Asia and Africa Today", N.6 1998, p. 17.
14. Gusher A. Tajikistan . . . , p. 12.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., p. 13.
17. Zviagelskaya I. Tajikistan . . . , p. 21.
18. "Nezavisimaja gazeta" 25 February 1999 (Russ.)

## **CHAPTER V**

### **SECURITY ISSUES AND PRINCIPAL GUIDELINES OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF ARMENIA**

After declaring independence in September 1991<sup>1</sup> and obtaining the recognition of the leading countries of the world community, the Republic of Armenia was adopted to the United Nations Organization (UN) and the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Like other Republics of the former Soviet Union, the young state was given and is still being given a financial and material support from the countries of the west and International Financing Organizations (World Bank), International Monetary Fund (IMF), etc.<sup>2</sup>

The development of the relations of Armenia with the countries of the west is influenced upon by the two factors. The first - is the desire of Russia not to miss the control over the new independent states of Transcaucasia (including Armenia), and the second - is the interest of the various corporations of the western countries to take part in the extraction and transportation of the Caspian and Central Asian oil.

Due to the great-power foreign policy of Russia, Armenia was involved into the severe opposition with Azerbaijan and Turkey on the problems of Nagorni Karabakh. As a result, Armenia was completely economically isolated from the outer world. Having occupied the part of Azerbaijan territory, Armenia made it undertake the transport and economic blockade against Armenia, which is still maintained after the cessation of hostilities.

After provoking the national conflicts in Georgia (Georgian-Abkhazian and Georgian-Ossetian) and petrifying the transportation from the neighboring Georgia, Russia forced Armenia to apply to her for the assistance. At the same time, not without the help of Russia, the

leaders of Armenia began to establish and then to extend the economical cooperation with its second southern neighbor - Islamic Republic of Iran, the isolation of which is considered by the American scientists as unreasoned and unproductive <sup>3</sup>, urgently creating for this purpose the necessary transport infrastructure.

The western countries highly estimate the desire of Armenia to establish the market economy model.

The interest of the western countries (including Turkey) towards Armenia was caused by its proximity to the rich oil and gas sources of the Caspian Sea. They consider Armenia as a potential transit state for the delivery of oil and gas to the west.

The problems and contradictions in the relations of Armenia with the western countries can not be considered out of touch with severe international competition for the new "Silk Route" by which oil and gas from the Caspian Sea region will be transferred to the industrial countries of the west. For Armenia and its Government the regular contacts with the high rank persons of the western countries are very important (for example, the visit of the President of Armenia Mr. Ter-Petrosjan to the USA and his meetings with B. Clinton (1994) and vice-president A. Gore (1995), during which the principal foreign-policy aims and common political priorities for the two states have been outlined <sup>4</sup>. Among them the most important are the following:

The quickest attainment under the aegis of the OSCE of the peaceful settlement of the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan under the active participation of the USA as a party to Minsk Group of this organization.

Common search for the ways of the solution of the problem of ensuring the regional security of the whole Caucasia, including Transcaucasia and first of all Armenia and the other states of the region.

Development of the all-round cooperation on the versatile basis between the countries of the region which, is prevented by the continuing Karabakh conflict and the absence of the mutually admissible compromise proposals on its cessation;

intensification and diversification of political, economical, military, scientific, cultural and other ties between Armenia and the USA in the different fields after the complete and final cessation of Armenian-Azerbaijan conflict and upon the stabilization of the situation in Transcaucasia as a whole;

extension of cooperation of Armenia with the western countries beyond the boundaries of the Transcaucasian region in the frames of NATO program "Partnership for Peace", accepted by the initiative of the USA, etc.<sup>5</sup> The development of the relations of Armenia with NATO can play the main role in the extension of the cooperation with western countries. This was told about during the summits of the Secretary General of NATO Mr. H. Solana in Yerevan (February 1997 and September 1998) with the leaders of Armenia. During the negotiations the problems of the status and perspectives of the development of the Armenian Armed Forces were discussed and the wide capabilities for the development of the ties between NATO and Armenia and were noted, though the political commentators of Russia insist that Armenia does not approve the extension of NATO to the east. In order to please Russia the leaders of Armenia often repeat that they will hardly give up their historical partnership with Moscow.

One of the factors preventing the development of Armenian -American relations is the problem of Nagorni Karabakh, in which the USA takes more favorable attitude towards Azerbaijan, as foreign analysts say. The American diplomats persuade the Armenian colleagues that the foreign-policy course of the USA on the Armenian direction will be developed successfully only on the conditions of the peaceful settlement of Karabakh conflict. Armenian-American rapprochement is also prevented by the political and economical ties between Yerevan and Teheran.

By the opinion of the American political figures, the peaceful settlement of the Karabakh conflict will promote the development of the favorable for the national interests of the USA trends in the foreign policy of Armenia, strengthening of the Armenian-American ties,

and the refusal of Yerevan from the outdated, stereotyped pattern about an eternal friend in the North.

From its side, Armenia, in spite of the strong interest in economical and financial assistance of the west, adhered to the balanced foreign policy. It had a desire to develop the relations with the USA on the basis of conducting a decisive course of the market economy development and not to aggravate these relations because of the available disagreements even on the serious issues.

At the same time, the political elite of Armenia understands that without the lean on Russia it is impossible to ensure the strategic interests of the country: to attain the compromising settlements of Karabakh problem which would consider the interests of Armenian side, to preserve the real independence of Armenia, to increase the role and significance of their country both among neighboring countries and in its relations with western states, including the USA.

In order that Armenia achieved these aims Russia suggests its leaders the idea of strengthening their military ties with Russia by purchasing the military technique (pursuit planes, tanks, etc.) from Russia. The intergovernmental Agreement with Russia, signed in August, 1997 is very important in this respect.

As concerns the relations of Armenia with Iran, they have deep historical roots. Though the holy leader of the Islamic revolution in Iran - Khomeini considered the USSR as the enemy number 2 (after the USA ), the disintegration of the USSR - by the words of the President of Iran Ali Akbar Rafsandjani - did not make them glad.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, Teheran recognized the new independent states of Transcaucasia only some time later after learning the opening of Moscow. Armenia and Iran exchanged Embassies pursuant to the Agreement of February 9, 1992. Iran gave its consent to deliver natural gas to Armenia and to the transit of Iranian goods via the territory of Armenia. Iran, in which 24% of the population makes the local Azerbaijanians<sup>7</sup> gave its consent to undertake the mediator obligations for the cessation of the bloody conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan.<sup>8</sup>

With this purpose the Minister of the Foreign Office of Iran Ali Akbar Velajati visited both countries in February, 1992. “ The problem of Karabakh should be settled only by the peaceful way... Iran is ready to undertake the obligations of the mediator”. He disproved the rumors about the fact that Iranian hirelings were fighting on the side of Azerbaijan.<sup>9</sup> After the meeting with the President of Armenia L.Ter-Petrosjan, Ali Akbar Velajeti said that Iran did not see the obstacles for the development of bilateral mutually beneficial relations in the political and other spheres . He also expressed the hope that Armenia and Azerbaijan would come to an agreement and seek the ways to the peaceful solution of the problem.<sup>10</sup>

During his appearance in September, 1996 President L.Ter-Petrosjan when reviewing the foreign policy of the Republic for the last six years, said that four years before the relations with Iran had started from the zero point, but then the country had become the first economical partner of Armenia. President said that the relations with Iran were not limited to economy, but spread also to the political sphere.

In December, 1996, during the summit of the first vice-president of Iran Khasan Khabibi with L. Ter-Petrosjan, the guest particularly emphasized the significance of strengthening bilateral ties with Armenia. L. Ter-Petrosjan, from its side marked the friendly relations established between the two states. He also expressed his satisfaction with the balanced policy pursued by Iran in the region.

During the official visit to Iran in June,1997, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Alexander Arzumanjan said that Yerevan attached special importance to the development of the relations with Teheran<sup>11</sup>. During his negotiations with the leader of Iranian diplomacy Ali Akbar Velajati, the Armenian Minister highly estimated the role of Iran in settling the regional conflicts. He called to the extension of the ties between the two countries and to the activation of multilateral cooperation, in particular between Iran, Armenia, Turkmenistan, Georgia and Greece. From his side, Velajati emphasized the readiness of Teheran to promote the most speedy solution of Karabakh problem<sup>12</sup>. The Iranian Minister said that Karabakh crisis did not meet the interests of either country.

In November, 1997, there was the visit to Iran of the leader of the Government Body of Armenia, Minister on the Operation Section - Shagen Karamanukjan, who had meetings with the President of Iran - Khatami, Minister of Oil - Bizhan Zangane, Minister of Economy and Finance - Khussein Namazi, Minister of Foreign Affairs - Kamil Kharazi and Minister of Building - Mohammed Said Kia.

The problems of restoration of peace and stability in the region and the economic cooperation between the two countries were being discussed on the regular grounds.

It is necessary to mark the circumstance that during the last period the contacts between Iran and Armenia have a stable tendency to extension. The ties are strengthened not only on the level of the leaders of the states, the governments and the Parliaments. The more wide range of subject are becoming their participants. So, in August, 1997, by the invitation of Ministry of Foreign Office of the Islamic Republic of Iran the Head of Democratic Party of Armenia Aram Sarkisjan visited Iran for 10 days. During his visit he was meeting the executive officials of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the representatives of the Ministry of Economy and the Armenian commune. At his press-conference, when reviewing his visit, Aram Sarkisjan expressed his opinion that the formation of the political-economical axle Iran - Armenia-Russia will ensure avoidance in future of the threat of the single-pole world, the dictate of western countries in the region. He also said that the official Teheran thought inadmissible the presence of the peace-making forces armed contingent of NATO in the region under the obvious participation of Turkish armed forces.

Soon there will be elections to the Parliament in Armenia, which - by the words of its speaker Khosrov Arutjunjan - will be the last chance for Armenia to be integrated into the European structures.

13

#### **REFERENCE:**

1. Nora Dudwick.: Political transformation in postcommunist Armenia: images and realities - "Conflict, cleavage and change in Central Asia and the Caucasia". Cambridge University Press,1997, p.82
2. "Asia and Africa Today" N 4, 1998, p.8 ( Russ).
3. Z. Brzezinski, B.Scowiroft and R. Murphy. Differentiated Containment, Jahangir Amuzegar Adjusting to Sanctions - "Foreign Affairs.vol.76 N7, 1997,pp 20-41



4. Vasjutovich V.P. The Place of Armenia in Geopolity of the USA - Armenia: the Issues of the Independent State. Kozhokin Ed. E.M. 1998 p. 371 (Russ).
5. Op. cit., p. 372.
6. Iran After the Revolution: Crisis of an Islamic State. London and New York: I.B. Taurus, 1995, p.102
7. Kurtov A.A. Armenian-Iranian Relations, "Armenia: the Issues of Independent Development". Edit E.M. Kozhokin, M., 1998 p.401 (Russ).
8. "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", 20 February 1992 (Russ).
9. INFO-TACC. 25, February 1992.
10. Op. cit.
11. Republic Armenia, 18 June 1997.
12. Kurtov A.A., Op.cit., p. 372.
13. "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", 1 April 1999, p. 5 (Russ).

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONFLICT BETWEEN ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN AND THE ISSUES OF NAGORNI KARABAKH**

The conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan for Nagorni Karabakh <sup>1</sup> remains critical. Iran failed to play a part of mediator settling it under activity of the west. In this conflict Turkey's interest coincide with the ones of Azerbaijan. Blaming Iran, Russia and the West in pro-Armenian orientation, Turkey supports the policy of equal approach to the participants of the conflict, which according to S. Demirel's point of view might turn into a conflict analogous to Arab-Israel one.

Karabakh conflict began on February 20, 1988, when the Soviet of People's Deputies of the Autonomous Region of Nagorni Karabakh has taken the resolution about the leave of the region from Azerbaijan and their join to Armenia.<sup>2</sup> Soon Armenian-Azerbaijan opposition took the form of the armed conflict, which was going on the territory of Nagorni Karabakh (NK) for more than three years (1992-1994). In May 1994, under the consent of all the conflicting parties and under the mediation of Russia the agreement about introducing the fire cessation regime was concluded <sup>3</sup>. The negotiation process in the frames of Minsk group OSCE was activated <sup>4</sup>, all the parties confirmed their readiness to settlement of the conflict by political methods, on the basis of compromise.<sup>5</sup>

In summer, 1997 the Minsk group OSCE, presented by Russia, the USA and France, offered as the basis for the further negotiations on settlement the package variant, which provided for the NK withdrawal into the boundaries and the status of 1988 (the creation of monoethnic autonomy was supposed).<sup>6</sup> Besides, no accurately formulated guarantees of reliability have been offered, the fate of Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan has not been defined.

The variant was rejected by Armenia and Karabakh.<sup>7</sup>

Further to that, the project of step-by-step settlement of the conflict by the following scheme was presented by the mediators: at the first step Karabakh withdraws its troops from the territories under its control, then the problem of the return of the forcibly migrated Azerbaijan persons is settled and at the last step - the problem of NK status. Armenia, in the name of President Levon Ter-Petrosjan expressed its readiness to assume as a basis of conflict settlement these proposals of the mediators basing on the postulate that a compromise is inevitable and neither party could be a winner for defector.

Nagorni Karabakh Republic (NKR), the people of Armenia and Diaspora when considering the imposed variant as a disastrous for Karabakh, developed the campaign on torpedoing these proposals of the mediators and severely criticized the position of the President of Armenia. The counteraction of the opposition and the people to the policy of Ter-Petrosjan resulted in his retirement. As the President of Armenia was elected ex-president of NKA Robert Kocharjan, who has taken the position of settlement of the conflict that could ensure the interests of NKA. The accession of Kocharjan to power was considered as the victory of "party of war".<sup>10</sup>

The negotiations process is suspended at present. The people think the situation as deadlock. The parties expressed their preparedness to discuss the new initiatives of the mediators.

NKA and all the Armenian people including Diaspora rejected the variants of settlement of Nagorni Karabakh conflict offered by the Minsk group of OSCE. They think that

these proposals are not compromising. What is the point of concessions, what is a balance, of “tractability” of the parties?

The State Counsellor on foreign policy of Azerbaijan Vafa Guduzade in his interview to newspaper “Panorama” in Summer, 1997, basing on the new mediators proposals defined the frames of the compromise for Azerbaijan as follows:

1. The Armenian party shall clear out 6 regions of Azerbaijan, in which the Azerbaijanian refugees and migrants return, with the following clearing of such cities as Shusha and Lachin and Azerbaijanian regions of the same name.

2. The Azerbaijan party shall open the communications, i.e. shall release the blockade of Armenia and Karabakh;

Establishment of the civilized conditions with full observance of all the human rights for the Armenia minority of the Karabakh zone of Azerbaijan on the basis of the deferential respect to its national specificity, guarantee of its safety on the basis of the guarantees of the Constitution of Azerbaijan; the people of Karabakh will be the independent citizens of Azerbaijan Republic and will be able to go wherever and whenever they wish.

The people of Karabakh think that the Azerbaijanian compromise is an absolute doublet of the project of the Minsk group with the only difference that “the establishment of the civilized conditions” is named by the mediators as the status definition in the frames of the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

By the opinion of Armenians such formulation of “tractability” approximately looks like that: “give up everything, your history, your juridical rights, rights common to all mankind, his gained right, and we, from our side, promise to behave ourselves well”. By their opinion, there it is not at all a compromise, the question is only about the one-sided concessions, which should be adopted by the Armenians of Nagorni Karabakh. Such a variant of settlement is named by them as: “a way to self-annihilation”. Moreover the people of Karabakh present the following arguments:

1. Under the determination of the status of NK in the frames of the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan the interference or non-interference with the internal life of NK shall be qualified by them as the internal affair of Azerbaijan and no internationally acknowledged status of NK shall be valid for this argument.

2. “the liberation” of the territories under the control of Karabakh army and the return of NK into the boundaries of 1988 creates the backgrounds for the anklave existence of NK that will not enable Armenia to perform the mission of the internationally acknowledged guarantor of NK safety;

3. the reduce of the armed forces of NK and the increase in the length of the line of contact will improve the strategic position of Azerbaijan, upset the currently existing balance between the opposing parties and result in great complications under the necessity to repel the possible aggression from its side.

The NK authorities understand the effectiveness of this process in quite another way. It could be high only in case of Baku’s consent to the direct negotiations with Stepanakert. At present, NKR is ready to discuss:

1. The withdrawal of the troops from the territories under the control of NKR Army to the extent, in which the connection of NK with the outer world will be provided.

2. Any form of the relations with Azerbaijan excluding subordination of NK to Azerbaijan, i.e. being the recognized subject of the international law - the state formation with reduced authorities (it is necessary to note that Armenians in Azerbaijan are the bearers of State system alongside with Azerbaijanians: AzSSR was established as a Soviet Socialist Republic of Mussulman and Armenians, which is recognized by the political motivation of NK transfer to Azerbaijan - “proceeding from the need of establishment of peace between Mussulmen and Armenians”. The decree of the Central Executive Committee (CEC) of Azerbaijan concerning the formation of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region (NKAR) defines the national-state formation of Azerbaijan as “ the common state union” of Mussulmen and Armenians. And at last NKAR was established as a form of the Soviet State system.

### 3. Return of Azerbaijan refugees and migrants to the places of their earlier residence.

From the point of view of the NKR leaders only this approach to settlement of the conflict can provide guaranteed existence of the indigenous Armenian population of Artsakh (the ancient name of Nagorni Karabakh). During the negotiations process the diplomacy of NKR not once put forward some concrete variants of the bases for the future status, which were already applied in the world practice. Thus, the readiness was expressed to consider the status of the state with the limited legal subjectiveness following the example of principality of Liechtenstein, San-Marino Republic; or based on the specific contractual relations, like the relations between Nepal and India, Western Samoa with New Zealand, Monaco with France. During the last time the Armenian diplomats as a model of the possible NKR status refer to the variant of the state system of the Principality of Andorra, where the independence is limited by the control from France and Spain.

NKR rejects all the attempts of the Minsk Group of OSCE to bisection of Nagorni Karabakh from the Azerbaijan side by means of equalizing of the status of indigenous Armenian population of Artsakh and its Azerbaijanian minority, because such a desire is defined by the intention to attain the transformation of the Armenian Nagorni Karabakh into the dualistic Armenian-Azerbaijan formation with the possibility of its further breakdown by the Cyprian model or its liquidation. Thus, after his visit to NKR in April 1998 being a member of the delegation "Christian solidarity", the member of the House of Lords of the Great Britain Mr. Gilton described in his memorandum 15 reasons, under which the people of NKR will never accept the form of government of Nagorni Karabakh from Azerbaijan. Here are three of them:

- it is still vivid the memory of the genocide of Armenians in Turkey in 1915, when practically all the Armenian population of Turkey was liquidated.
- it is still vivid the memory of pogroms and slaughters of the Armenian population in Azerbaijan: in Baku, Kirovobad, Sumgait and other populated settlements in 1905, 1918-

20, 1988, 1990. Only in 1988-90 years over 350 thousand Armenians have left Azerbaijan.<sup>8</sup>

- it is still vivid the memory of persecutions of Armenians in Nakhichevan where in 1917 Armenians made over 40% of the total number of the population, whereas in 1987 only two Armenian villages were remained in Nakhichevan.<sup>9</sup>

The people of Karabakh consider the problem of settlement of the NK conflict as the matter of life and death for the Armenians populating this territory for many centuries and proceeding from this, consider that the basis for the settlement should become the guarantee of their existence with regard to all the above-mentioned aspects.

It should be noted that as soon as the number of foreign companies cooperating in the extraction of oil resources of the Caspian Sea, its position towards Nagorni Karabakh and Armenia will become more and more severe. In May 1997 President of Azerbaijan Geidar Aliev said that Nagorni Karabakh was the land of Azerbaijan and should remain as Azerbaijanian. For the people of Karabakh, by their opinion, the most advantageous is to preserve the existing condition with the subsequent international acknowledgment of Karabakh as independent subject.<sup>10</sup>

The Karabakh party sees the clear definition of its status and guarantees of its observance in the common package adopted by Minsk Group, including the following principal provisions: return of the territories and guarantee of safety for the people of Karabakh. Thus, the Armenian party as a whole agrees to the proposals of the Minsk Group, whereas the Karabakh population insists on the package of the problem decisions, denying step-by-step settlement.

Meanwhile, Russia considers that Karabakh has turned into the strong independent political factor in Transcaucasia and is not a mere element of Russian- Azerbaijanian or Russian-Armenian relations.

**REFERENCE:**

1. On September 2, 1991, before the disintegration of the USSR and after its leaving by Azerbaijan, the Nagorno -Karabakh Republic was declared (according to the constitution of the USSR and on the basis of the right of nations to self-determination). The territory of the former NKAR and the Armenian

population of Shaumjan Region of Azerbaijan was included in the territory of NKR. In December of the same year in NKR the national referendum took place, as the result of which over 90% of the population of the Republic voted for its independence. The State Defense Committee, which undertook to guide the Republic, has organized the armed opposition to Azerbaijan aggression. Since 1992 the regular army was being formed, which was finished in May of the same year. During two years the armed forces of NKR have managed to liberate over 50% of the occupied by Azerbaijanian troops territory of NKR, to take under control the part of Azerbaijanian territories in order to secure the NKR population against the possibility of the new aggression, to ensure the safety of the transport and air communications with Armenia.

2. By the opinion of the Armenian historians, Karabakh("Black Garden") is a constituent part of Historical Armenia, and its Armenian ethnos is its aboriginal population. Before 387 year (the first division of Armenia) Karabakh was a part of Armenia, and after that it entered the Caucasian Albania (see: Oriental Studies, II Ed. by Albert Menteshasvili, Tbilisi, State University, 1964, p.37.) Azerbaijanian historians consider that Karabakh is an Albanian region and Azerbaijanians are the heirs of the Albanian people which adopted Islam and that Karabakh was always the Albanian region (see Bunjatov, "Review on the sources on the history of Azerbaijan", Baku. 1964, I.P. Mamedov, "Political history and historical Geography of the Caucasian Albania", Baku. 1986.

3. "Diplomaticheskij Vestnik", May N 9-10, 1994 (Russ.).

4. La Caucase des independances. La Nouvelle doune, Dossier, Constitutie par.C. Muradian P., 1993.

5. "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", 17 May 1994, Ibid., 19 May.

6. "Segodnia", 10, June, 1997 (Russ).

7. Mitjaev V.G. Conflict of Karabakh. "Armenia: the Issues of Independent Development". Ed. by E.M. Kozhokin. M., 1998, p. 346 (Russ.).

8. Republic Armenia 9. October 1997; "Obshchaia Gazeta" 3 October 1997; "Otkrytaia Politika" N10 October 1997 (Russ).

9. "Centraljnaia Azia i Kavkaz" N1, 1998, pp. 131-135 (Russ).

10. "Asia and Africa Today", M.,1998, N4, pp. 11-12 (Russ).

## **CHAPTER VII SECURITY IN CAUCASIA AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF AZERBAIJAN**

Having declared the independence on August 30, 1991, Azerbaijan was recognized by USA on December 25 after disintegration of USSR<sup>1</sup> on June 7, 1992. On the post of the President was elected the Chairman of Azerbaijan Popular Front Abulfaz Elchibei, who succeeded on this post the leader of Communist Party Aiyaz Mutalibov. A. Mutalibov was the adherent of acceding Azerbaijan to CIS, preservation of contacts with Russia<sup>2</sup>, which suppressed the meeting in Baku on January 20, 1993<sup>3</sup> in blood. In result there died 120 local residents<sup>4</sup>.

Azerbaijan is among the number of countries, which gradually are trying to keep distance from Russia.

The process of formation of new independent states in the new system of international relations is not yet finished. Number of outer and inner factors influence it positively, as well as

negatively. For Azerbaijan such are: large resources of hydrocarbon raw within its territory, its neighborhood with Russia and Iran, strategic position of the Republic as gates of West to the Central Asia and important part of transcontinental "Silk Route", which must connect Europe with Far East.

The oil factor is one of the main reasons of growing interest and attention to it from the leading countries of the world. On the other side competition for control on oil resources of the Caspian basin and Baku effect negatively the stabilization process of inner political and foreign political position of Azerbaijan state.

In the opinion of the specialists the Caspian basin by resources of oil and gas occupies second place after Persian Gulf.

Though raw resources and strategic importance of v strengthen its international positions, at the same time are the reasons for hidden struggle of the world and regional states for influence and control in the region. This contest is revealed in the first place in claims for larger portion in the concluded contracts, in the second place in drawing up the Caspian basin legal status, and in the third place, in determining of oil transportation route to the world markets.

As concerns the already concluded contracts, the leadership without doubt belongs to the USA companies, the cumulative percentage of which is the largest and is three times more in comparison of Russia. The situation reflects the objective ratio of forces in oil business formed in the world<sup>5</sup>.

The policy of administration on developing of the oil deposits for strengthening of international positions of the country, as well as its whole economic development, is apprehended favorably by the society. Only from the side of separate representatives of communists and Islamists the accusations on selling the natural resources of country to the West are heard. As to the democratic opposition, it expresses discontent with some conditions of the concluded contracts (mainly, high income rate for the investors and their insufficient responsibility for maintenance of the deposit development terms). The national democratic opposition proposes to reduce the future yield of oil, to lengthen the oil production for longer terms of operation. It also considers, that after gaining the necessary experience and technology



from the West companies, Azerbaijan shall be able to conduct works on the rest deposits by own efforts.

Though, the strategy of administration is considered as argued, it enables Azerbaijan to be the leader in attracting of the investments and overtake other countries of the Caspian basin by supplying the own oil to the sales markets.

The position of Russia and Iran can be defined by two most important circumstances. First of all, in their sections the prospecting works were not conducted, or did not give the positive results yet. Secondly, understanding its present weakness and inevitable losing in favor of the West corporations in competition for the development of oil deposits up to the time, when they shall have the financial and technological facilities for changing of the balance in their favor. In practical plan such position of Russia is aimed on influencing of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, as well as transnational power corporations with the purpose to acquire additional concession and compensations for itself.

They were not able to play this card for a long time. Adoption of spectral principle by Turkmenistan left Russia alone, as the borders of Iran along the Caspian basin are already fixed by the international agreements and real interference of this country in the existing disputes could only advance the West states to more decisive support of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. In these conditions Russia began to demarcate coastal shelf with Kazakhstan along the middle line and in fact agreed to conduct negotiations and on division of the Caspian Sea on basis of spectral principle.

The most sharp struggle has developed around the transportation of Azerbaijan, as well as of the Caspian oil. Several variants are being discussed as such. The supply of earlier oil (5-10 mill. t.) is provided by the route Baku-Supsa (Black Sea port of Georgia) and Baku Grozny-Novorosijsk. In respect to the agreement concluded with Russian State Company Transneft, the first oil lot has began in October 1997. As to the works on Georgian section and building terminals in Supsa, they were carried out as scheduled and ended in 1998<sup>6</sup>.

The crisis situation in the North Caucasia (Chechen and Daghestan Republics) makes problematic the laying of the pipe-line route through its territory. Though, this route has other deficiencies. From Novorosijsk port for present every year is shipped 20-32 mill tons of oil. At

directing of the Caspian oil main stream to this ports the volume of loading can increase to 100 mill. tons and more, that creates excess ecological load on the region. From the other side, Turkey categorically objects against transportation of oil with tankers via the Bosphorus, as this threatens the ecology of such a large megapolis, as Istanbul. According to the planned schedule, the decision on the route of main oil pipe-line shall be taken for the end of 1998. The Iran direction is neglected due to the known reasons. In this connection the chances on approving of the route Baku-Tbilisi-Jeikhan (Turkish terminal at Mediterranean) increase. The circumstance, that as the main market for Caspian oil are the countries of Mediterranean basin in difference from Russia, which exports the oil itself, Turkey is going to purchase the significant part of the raw transported via its territory.

In addition to the main the experts evaluate attentively the perspectives of directing the part of the Caspian oil from Supsa and Novorosijsk terminals to Odessa (Ukraine) and further to the consumers of East and Central Europe countries, also to Burgos (Bulgaria) with further transportation to Greek Mediterranean port Alexandropolis. In case of Armenia- Azerbaijan conflict regulation is not excluded the variant of the main pipe-line route not via Georgia, but - Armenia and further to the Turkish port Jeikhan. Considering the declarations of Azerbaijan administration and leaders of the Baku main political forces, the preference is given to the Turkish route of the main pipe-line. Whereas not only economic reasons are taken into account, but the striving to acquire independence from Russia and develop the relation with ethnically close Turkey, as well as the West.

Loosing the struggle for the route of the Caspian oil transportation for Russia means not only economic losses, but - control on Transcaucasian region. Recognizing the weakness of its economic positions, Russia applies its military and political influence in the region, by means of expansion of the existing separatist movements in the region, ethnic conflicts, to make the TransCaucasia states be led by Russia.

In these conditions, in struggle to return Azerbaijan in military-political and economic orbit of Russia the reliance is made on Karabakh. The Nagorno-Karabakhskij Autonomous Region was formed in 1924. The movement for separation of this region and joining Armenia began in 1987. From 1988 the conflict acquired the armed character. In May 1992 a truce was

conducted<sup>7</sup>. The West states prefer to achieve the regulation of the conflict by means of compromises and concessions by the parties. Peace and stability in the region shall provide for the West the wide economic penetration. The Russian position is more complicated - neither peace, nor war suits it, the preserving of conflicts so, that it is able to play on contradiction of the parties is preferable. Though, it has made excess inclination in the direction of Armenia, including military agreement and secret supply of weapons for the sum more than 1 milliard dollars. Russia has blockaded Azerbaijan with reason of Chechen war, thus Russia lost all the levers of influence on Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan is the only republic in TransCaucasia, where the Russian military forces are not dislocated. The Russian forces were evacuated in May 1993<sup>8</sup>. Today the Russian diplomatic maneuvers are limited by the intention to make Azerbaijan accept the transitional regulation of Karabakh conflict and pay for this by accepting additional Russian military, political and economic claims. Azerbaijan does not accept the mentioned, the national-democratic opposition supports the government in this issue. That is why it is trying to develop relations with all the leading countries of the world and regulates the close partnership with such states as Georgia, Ukraine, Poland, which have experienced the press of Russian empire policy on themselves.

The difficult six years of independence gave Azerbaijan very hard lessons, but the country having stabilized the institutions of state power, is gradually strengthening its positions - as of the independent subject of international life. The historical development vector at acceleration of democratic and market reforms enables to estimate optimistically the perspectives of Azerbaijan Republic in XXI century.

As to the attitude of Azerbaijan towards the Agreement on Collective Security of CIS and dislocation within its territory the NATO base, the political reviewers of Russia think, that such a situation can lead to cardinal changes of geopolitical forces in TransCaucasia and the Caspian region<sup>9</sup>. Expressing the official point of view of Azerbaijan administration, the Minister of Defense General-Colonel Safar Abiev confirmed the possibility of dislocation in Azerbaijan the military base of Turkey, USA and NATO. According to Abiev, this is dictated by intention of Azerbaijan "to restore the military-strategic balance damaged by Armenia". Abiev considers Russia-Armenian military cooperation as serious threat for republic security and "that all the

Russian military equipment delivered to Armenia shall be used in Karabakh, if the Armenian military actions against Azerbaijan shall start again". The minister declared frankly, that during his visit to Turkey " was discussed the possibility of concluding the military union between Baku and Ankara, similarly to Russia-Armenian military agreement"<sup>10</sup>.

Baku made it clear, that Azerbaijan is not going to prolong the validity of the Agreement on Collective Security of CIS for 5 years term. The negative attitude of Azerbaijan towards the Agreement on Collective Security is connected with Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict, and leaving the Agreement shall be the response of Baku on Armenian occupation of 20% of Azerbaijan territory and supplying by Russia Armenia with rockets C-300 and aircrafts MIG 29<sup>11</sup>.

Besides, Baku has notified, that can close the Russian military object in Azerbaijan - a radiolocation station in the Gabalin region. This threat is more serious for Russia, than leaving the Agreement on Collective Security by Azerbaijan. The GRLS is considered as a protective umbrella of Russia on South-West direction. Thus Baku has a good means for influence on Moscow.

The NATO military base can be located in Azerbaijan only after closing of GRLS. For present Baku apart from political has economic reasons for closing of GRLS - the Russian party does not pay for the supplied power to the Azerbaijan party. If GRLS shall be closed temporarily, restarting the operation shall be very difficult.

That is why Russia cannot close GRLS and to dislocate it to the Russian territory is impossible. It must be built anew. But for building of such an object 10 milliard dollars are needed, such funds Russian party does not have and shall not have for 10-15 years.

Closing of GRLS is necessary for NATO and in the first place for USA and Turkey. Until this station is in Azerbaijan the military base of NATO shall not be located here.

The Russians think, that behind the leaving of the Agreement by Baku and the threat to close GRLS stands not only Baku's offense on Moscow, but long-term plans of the West, which is going to oust Russia from South regions of post-soviet space. This is understood in Moscow as well as in Teheran. If Russia is trying to interfere in the plans of West, by accelerating its military presence in Armenia, the Teheran is scoped on threatening declarations and increasing economic relations with Armenia<sup>12</sup>.

These days the former President of Iran the Chairman of Observers Board of the country, which is the supreme arbitrary and consultative institution of Iran, All Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani spoke against any intentions of creation NATO military base in Azerbaijan: “Azerbaijan administration must know, that possible occurrence of NATO base in the Caspian region shall be very dangerous and shall effect the peace”.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. “Asia and Africa Today” N 12, 1992, p. 7 (Russ.)
2. Ibid, p.8
3. “Moskovskij novosti” 12 August 1990 (Russ.)
4. “Bakinskij rabochij” 17 August 1990 (Russ.)
5. Musabekov R. Nezavisimi Azerbaijan: Neft i politika. - “Centralnaya Azia i Kavkaz”, N 1 1998, p.48.
6. Ibid, p.50.
7. Altstadt A.L. Azerbaijan’s struggle towards democracy - Conflict, cleavage and change in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Ed. by K. Dawisha and B. Parrett. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
8. Ibid, p. 128.
9. Musabekov R. Nezavisimi Azerbaijan: Neft i politika. - “Centralnaya Azia i Kavkaz”, N 1 1998, p.51.
10. “Nezavisimaya gazetta”, 25 February, N 34, 1999.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.

## **CHAPTER VIII**

### **SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF GEORGIA**

On April 9, 1991 the Supreme Council of Georgia adopted the statement on Restoration of state independence, and from August 24, 1995 the new Constitution declared Georgia a president republic<sup>1</sup>. The President elected for 5 years term, is the Head of state and executive authority. The state religion of Georgia is Christianity, Islam is professed by the part of Ajaria, Abkhazia population and in the regions of compact settlement of Azerbaijanians.

Independent Georgia conducts balanced and consecutive foreign policy. The geopolitical priorities of Georgia were significantly influenced by substantial power carriers of neighboring states - Azerbaijan and the Central Asian countries. Significant coincidence of political and economical interests caused the formation of alliance in CIS under the name GUAM (Georgia-Ukraine-Azerbaijan-Moldova), where the important role has the “Caucasian tandem” Azerbaijan-Georgia. In establishing of stable, controllable political-economical

environment in Georgia the significant meaning has the receiving of permanent and effective support from the West. At the end of January 1999 Georgia became a member of European Council<sup>12</sup>, acceding to the World Trade Organization is on agenda.

It is already apparent, that Georgia shall be an active participant of the “century project”, or one of the main participants in revival of “Great Silk Route”, in perspective connecting the West Europe with Asian-Pacific Ocean region by land. It is true that for achieving the aim there are many obstacles: nothing is clear yet with transportation of Caspian, what is more the Kazakhstan oil and Turkmen gas. Nevertheless, Georgia has fixed the important position, as without Georgia none of these routes shall be capable of full-scale functioning.

West orientation, striving to integration in European political and economic structures, is characterizing the foreign policy of Georgia. This orientation is a program provision of leading political forces, including the governing party, but other wise - this orientation hinders directly Russian military presence and solving of number of ethnopolitical and territorial problems. Loosing of Georgian spring-board by Russia is considered as surrender of positions in the South Caucasia. They see a real threat to preservation of the North Caucasia, where Chechen Republic is openly demonstrating its striving to independence.

The important role of Georgia in Caucasia began to be recognized in Eurasian corridor as well as in the West. Georgia participates in NATO program “Partnership for Peace”, whereas, after late change of frankly pro-Russian Minister for Defense in May 1998 for frankly pro-West, the contacts with NATO became real and intense: Georgia was visited By NATO General Secretary Javier Solana; USA, Great Britain, Greece, Turkey<sup>3</sup>, Ukraine are developing with Georgia military contacts. From July 1, 1998 Georgia by the forces of Department for Borders Defense controls its marine water area, though not completely - Abkhazia coast is a restricted zone for Georgian frontier-guards.

With land borders there are more difficulties. At the South borders, besides Ajaria Russian frontier-guards were changed with Georgian frontier groups.

But the largest problems are the Russian military bases on the territories of Georgia. They are only four: Vaziani - close to Tbilisi; Akhalkalaki - where the Armenian national

minorities live; Gudauta - in the North-West part of Georgia - Abkhazia, and a base in Ajaria Autonomous Republic, where the important Black Sea port Batumi is located. The dislocation regions of these bases have become alienated fragments of Georgian territory. During Karabakh conflict at this base the Armenian fighters were trained, and Armenian Army was supplied from here with arms and ammunition.

Base in Gudauta and dislocated within its territory airport played fatal role in military failure of Georgians at conflict in Abkhazia, when the separatists were permanently supported by Russia.

The local administration of Ajaria being in opposition patronizes Russian military divisions. As to the Vaziani base, there are serious suspicions that the military airport disposed at Vaziani base was used at planning and conducting of the act of terrorism against President Shevardnadze on February 9.

Whereas, there are no legal basis for Russian military bases on the territory of Georgia. The corresponding agreement was initialed by the Ministers for Defense of both parties in 1994, though the Georgian party mentioned, that the agreement shall enter into force only after restoring the jurisdiction of Georgia on the whole territory (in the first place - Abkhazia). In 1995 President Shevardnadze signed the agreement without any change for the better in the jurisdiction issue, but the agreement was not ratified by the Parliaments of Georgia and Russia, consequently it cannot be considered as entered into force.

In reward for its loyalty towards Russia Armenia half legally received from Russia additional weapons for 1 milliard dollars, which was a rough violation of agreements on flanking armament in Europe and corresponding quota of former Soviet Union countries. This resulted in breaking-up of fragile balance of forces in the South Caucasia and protest of Azerbaijan. Such a situation is threatening not only for Azerbaijan, but for Georgia as well, in particular, if we take into account, that the arms were supplied to Armenia via Georgian territory, which even was not aware of the fact. Thus, we can assume, that Russia is not going to surrender in Caucasia. The preserved Russian bases in the South Caucasia Russia is going to connect in one chain Stepanakert-Yerevan-Akhalkalaki-Batumi, in order to preserve the control at Georgia-Turkey border in fact, i.e. shall be in direct contact with NATO.

Returning to the issue of Russian military presence in Georgia, the so-called peacemaking forces in Abkhazia must be marked, which were dislocated from the beginning of 1994 along the river Enguri - administrative border of Abkhazian Autonomy in Georgia. One of the main functions of these forces is to support the safe return of Georgian refugees to their houses in Abkhazia. But they even did not intend to do so, but they provided for conglotation of situation “neither war, nor peace”, which is in the interests of Russia and gives the possibility to influence directly both conflicting parties<sup>4</sup>.

In concern, for the last period the administration of Georgia with the consent of West countries, decided to solve the Abkhaz problem by activating its efforts in UN, OSCE, other international organizations. Georgia hopes to solve the Abkhaz issue with their help. That is why in the Security Council of UN was established the “Club of Georgia’s Friends”, which has actively begun to work with the Georgia-Abkhazia regulation<sup>5</sup>.

In the opinion of Georgian observers, preservation of Russian military presence contradicts not only with political, but with economical interests of Georgia, as allows Russia to manipulate with the situation in the country. Along with increasing of the economical interest of the Wets, the political struggle for the influence in the region shall increase and whether Georgia shall become a buffer between Russia and NATO South flank or a bridge-head of one of the parties, depends on its outcome.

As to the ethnoterritorial problems, from September 1993 separatist administration of Abkhazia began ethnic cleaning and ousting of Georgians from Abkhazia. Five years ago the majority of ethnic Georgians made 45,7% of Abkhazian population (according to the census of 1989 the Abkhazians made 17,8%, Armenians - 14,6%, Russians 14,3%<sup>6</sup> of population). left their houses and became refugees ( more precisely - persons forced to migrate) in their own country<sup>7</sup>. According to the official data, the number of refugees, including the refugees from South Osetia (where the conflict was going on during 1990-92)<sup>8</sup> was 280 000 persons, that makes more difficult the social-economic conditions of life in the country.

The multilateral negotiations during many years around Abkhazia brought nothing, but disappointment as for refugees, so for Georgia in the whole. The issue concerning the status advanced by the Abkhazians remains to be an insuperable obstacle. The Georgian proposals on



maximal autonomy for Abkhazia in the framework of federal state are refused; Abkhazians demand Georgia-Abkhazian Confederation, which by Georgian administration is considered as lacking vitality. In fact Abkhazians are trying to gain time, protract the conflict regulation and prevent the restoration of post-war demographic situation in Abkhazia.

Otherwise, the separatist regime is not even interested in strict dosing of return even of the part of Georgians; in the first place, in order to change its felon image of ethnic clearing author, and in the second - due to the necessity of workers for overcoming the heaviest economic situation. Abkhazian people resources are insufficient for colonizing the lands left by Georgians, for restoration of agriculture, for attracting the tourists to this once blooming land. Though Gali region, where the Georgians earlier were 94% of population, is considered by Sukhumi administration as a change card in trading with Georgian administration with the purpose of gaining more advantages<sup>9</sup>.

For five years Abkhazians are talking with Georgians from the position of force, of course not own, but Russian. These negotiations showed absence of any prospect of such “dialogue”.

In the opinion of local opposition, the negative influence of Russia on the situation of the country has not been yet neutralized by increasing political-economic interests of Russia. The fright before Russia makes the West to be more restricted in their actions. In such a situation Abkhazia (and all of the Georgia) is not of a value, due to which the West would take strong steps. Such a situation shall be preserved until Georgia shall have its own military forces.

In difference from Abkhazia the situation in South Osetia changes for the better. This can be explained by, that after ending the war in Chechen Republic the situation in Caucasia has changed principally. The Chechen fighters, who participated together with Russians in Abkhazian conflict against Georgia, began to consider Georgia as a potential strategic ally, a neighbor, which is able to cooperate with them. The North Osetia, being the main support of Russia in the North Caucasia, shows more concern by weakening of Russia's positions in the region. Its leaders apprehend the opposition with Ingushes (and Chechens), as well as formation of aggressive Islam state. The North Osetia - Alania considers Georgia as a real

partner or even a protector. That is why Vladikavkaz advises the South Osetians to find their place in the frame of united Georgia.

In spite of the fact, that status problem is sharp in concern to the South Osetia, movement to restoration of mutual confidence and normalization are already real, the humanitarian contacts are increasing, the cooperation of non-governmental organizations and independent press are returning to normal, the refugees are returning, whereas, without any significant excess.

In connection with prolonged conflict regulation process in Abkhazia, the Georgian political reviewers think, that lines to regulation were defined by summary document of Moscow meeting of September 3, 1992 and by Agreement on Seizure of Fire and Control Mechanism of Its Observance of July 27, 1993. But Abkhaz party did not try to fulfill the provisions of said documents, as they never meant to recognize the separation of Abkhazia from Georgia and establishing of independent state.

The real capability of the conflict political regulation appeared in June 1995, when Abkhaz and Georgian parties at active participation of Russia, UN and OSCE prepared and signed the Protocol, defining the frames of future united state of Georgia in the borders of former Georgian SSR. But the Parliament of the self-declared Republic of Abkhazia considered the provisions of said Protocol "as contradicting with the interests of Abkhazian people" and "Constitution" of 1994. Namely such a policy of Abkhazian party has led to the protraction of conflict regulation process.

The Commission assumed that mass violation of human rights in Abkhazia "is mostly defined by the efforts of Agreement of CIS Heads and Resolutions of Russian Federation Administration N1304 of 1994. But it does not include the resolutions of OSCE, Security Council of UN, Council of CIS, denouncing the ethnic clearing conducted by Abkhaz party, the results of which are the mass wreck and force ousting of Georgian population from the places of permanent residence.

The resolutions of CIS Council of January 19, 1996 did not restrict and does not restrict rendering the aid to the population of Abkhazia in coordination with Georgian party. In

our opinion, one of the main reasons of conflict regulation protraction in Abkhazia are the consecutive disregarding and non-fulfillment of these resolutions.

In May 1998 in result of large-scale punitive operations of Abkhazian divisions about 40 000 Georgians, mostly who voluntarily returned to the Gali region, fled via the river Enguri to the neighboring Zugdidi region.

The force structures of Georgia repeatedly declared of their being not privy to the actions of armed formations “White Legion” and “Forest Brothers”. What is more in official announcements was clearly underlined, that Georgia does not accept the force regulation of the conflict.

When on July 1, 1992 Russia and Georgia established diplomatic relations, Russia recognized Georgia in the borders of former Georgian SSR. Georgia became the member of UN, OSCE, CIS and none of the listed international organizations never casted doubt on its sovereignty and territorial integrity. This concerns the European Council, the competent member of which Georgia became form January 1999.

In 1999 the Commission of State Duma of Russia for “promotion” of peace regulation of Georgia- Abkhazia conflict submitted to UN and OSCE the summary protocol of session of December 1998. The Commission consisting of the Communists turned everything upside-down and accused Georgia for Georgia- Abkhazian conflict. It hushed the real reasons of conflict and protracting of negotiation process explains by keeping the Abkhazian party away “form preparing of resolutions taken by UN, OSCE, CIS Council”. With this reason the Duma summons to attract Abkhazia to negotiations with the status of an observer. As to the peacemakers of UN consisting of Russian soldiers, the Commission proposes to show the “political will and wisdom” and extend the term of mandate.

On May 12, 1992 the elections of self-declared South Osetian Republic Parliament were held<sup>10</sup>. In the so-called Parliament there are 33 places, 4 of which are intended for Georgian population, which refused to participate in said elections<sup>11</sup>.

On December 10, 1998 in Strasbourg during the meeting of the Presidents of Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova (GUAM) was discussed the issue of regional security in Europe and assumed the necessity of more close military cooperation. Some experts do not

exclude, that further GUAM shall grow into a more serious structure with united military-industrial complex. Here the analysts give the special significance to Ukraine, which has a powerful military-industrial potential and is of special interest for NATO. On the one hand, the GUAM countries cooperate with NATO, and on the other hand, NATO has no obligations to assist them in crisis situation. Different conflicts are characteristic for GUAM countries, that is why the military cooperation for them acquires specific meaning. May be, this is caused by the resolution of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine and Moldova form a common battalion. This resolutions was adopted at the session of Defense Ministers of the countries on 21-22 January 1999 in Baku. Here the issues of regional and international securities, the necessity of conformity of approaches on cooperation of these countries in the framework of such international organizations of UN, OSCE and measures taken in accordance with NATO program "Partnership for Peace" were discussed. In result of the meeting the communiqué was signed, in which there were fixed: the adherence to the sovereignty principles, territorial integrity and inviolability of the borders, importance of further coordination of the efforts for adapting the agreement on restriction of typical armaments in Europe. At meeting they agreed upon conducting the joint trainings, consultations, scientific conferences, training courses for the staff.

In the opinion of analysts creation of peacemaking battalion aims at protection of future pipe-line Baku-Jeikhan and shall not have the mandate of Security Council of UN, NATO, etc.

The attitude of USA in respect to Georgia can be clearly seen from President B. Clinton's message to President E. Shevardnadze. The letter of American leader testifies the specific interest of USA in development of Georgia as powerful and independent democratic state. The super-states consider Georgia as their strategic partner. The views expressed in the letter are practically the program of bilateral partnership of Georgia and USA, as well as of cooperation in the frame of international organizations. As to the security and stability in Caucasia, the American President expressed the hope, that 1999 shall be the year of progress.

Held in Geneva the session of Coordinate Committee promoted the weakening of increasing tension between Georgian and Abkhazian parties, but did not achieve the necessary concrete progress. President Clinton summoned Georgia to continue the work on Gali Agreement, which provides for safety of returning of Georgian refugees to Gali region of

Abkhazia as the first stage of regulation. this is considered as a first step to “ the desired peace for everyone”. According to American leader, his country and other countries, friends of UN General Secretary are ready to assist the fulfillment of the Agreement as in political, so in financial aspects”.

The position Of USA and its President helped Georgia in considering the Georgia’s application on acceding to the European Council at the Parliament Assembly of the European Council on January 27, 1999. Becoming the member of said organization shall promote the security and stability in Transcaucasian region.

Nevertheless, in Georgia there are still many unsolved problems in regard of security. Among them in the first place is the problem of strengthening the state defense potential. The situation in Georgian Army in comparison with the last year has worsened - such a conclusion is contained in the report of the representative of International Advisors Group on Defense and Security General Hening Undarts. With the purpose of improvement of psychological atmosphere H. Undarts recommends the Ministry for Defense of Georgia to conduct the radical changes and release from the armed forces the pessimist officers and also the “persons not able to overcome the thinking inertia”.

According to the press the Minister for Defense of USA William Cohen is planning to visit Georgia in summer. During the visit shall be discussed the issues of rendering assistance in building of Georgian Army<sup>12</sup>. During his visit to Japan the President of Georgia E. Shevardnadze declared about the possibility of leaving the Agreement on Collective Security of CIS. According to the Head of Georgia - said Agreement is not capable of achieving the aims and Georgia in the perspective shall try to accede to NATO<sup>13</sup>. At the same time the local frontier divisions are formed and the Russian frontier-guards changed. According to one of the officials of MFA of Russia - the military bases in Georgia are of interest for Russia only by one aspect: they guarantee the access to military bases in Armenia<sup>14</sup>. Russia threatens Georgia, that if the Russian military forces leave Georgia this shall turn out in new conflicts. The Russian experts of strategic development cannot accept that in the strategic plan of Georgia’s development its leaders see by the support of USA and NATO countries<sup>15</sup>.

For the end of April in Washington Uzbekistan joined the regional organization of CIS members - Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Moldova - GUAM, which was established in Strasbourg in 1997. Now this organization is called GUUAM. Cooperation in the frames of this organization is not directed against third countries or group of countries. In the opinion of the Republic administration on the background of air operations conducted by NATO in Yugoslavia, can be assumed that aggressive separatism and ethnic cleaning shall not be left unpunished, as this shall create the new hotbeds of conflicts and tension.

#### REFERENCE

1. Slider D. Democratization in Georgia - "Conflict, cleavage and change in the Central Asia and the Caucasia". Ed. by K. Dawisha and B. Parrott. Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 157.
2. "Sakartvelos Respublika", 29 January 1999, p. 1, (Georg.).
3. With Turkey as direct bordering country have been established the good neighborly relations. After disintegration of USSR Turkey interested in Georgia concluded with Georgia several economic agreements and contracts (for details see "Asia: the role of key countries in international relations in 1990-ies, M., 1995 (Russ.); "Le Monde diplomatique". P., 14.10.1991; "Hurriet" 22.10.1994; "Milliyet" 23.10.1994; (Turkish); Oriental Studies, V, Tbilisi University Press . Ed. by A.M. Menteshashvili. 1996, pp. 62-63 (Georg.).
4. "Central Asia and the Caucasia " (Sweden), N1 1998 (Russ.)
5. Russian researchers from the Center of Strategic Researches refer to the "Bosnia scenario", when the initiative for conflict regulation from UN was transferred to International Contact Group, where the resolutions are taken by simple majority of votes.
6. "Vestnik statistiki" N 7 1990 (Russ.)
7. "Zaria Vostoka", 23 March 1990
8. Wright John F.R. The geopolitics of Georgia. - Transcaucasian boundaries. Ed. by John F.R. Wright, Suzanne Goldberg, Richard Schofield. Geopolitics and International Boundaries Research Center School of Oriental and African Studies. University of London, VCL Press, 1996, p. 142-143.
9. "Central Asia and the Caucasia" (Sweden), N1 1998.
10. For more details on roots of Georgia-Ossetia conflict inspired by Russia see the article of Julian Birch. The Georgian/South Ossetian territorial and boundary dispute. -"Transcaucasian boundaries"... University of London, VCL Press, 1996, pp. 151-153.
11. "Izvestiya", May 6, 1993, p.3.
12. "Nezavisimaya gazetta" 27 March 1999, p.5.
13. "Nezavisimaya gazetta" 01 April 1999, p.5.
14. Op.cit.
15. "Asia and Africa Today" N9 1997, p.9 (Russ.).

## **CONTENTS**

- Chapter I. Foreign Policy of Uzbekistan and Security Issues - p. 2.
- Chapter II. Security and Foreign Policy of Kazakhstan - p. 10.
- Chapter III. Neutrality of Turkmenistan in the System of Security and Foreign Policy of the Central Asian Countries - p. 15.
- Chapter IV. Armed Conflict in Tajikistan and Security Issues in The Central Asia - p. 23.
- Chapter V. Security Issues and Principal Guidelines of the Foreign Policy of Armenia - p. 28.
- Chapter VI. Conflict Between Armenia and Azerbaijan and the Issues of Nagorni Karabakh - p. 34.
- Chapter VII. Security in Caucasia and International Policy of Azerbaijan - p. 39.
- Chapter VIII. Security and Foreign Policy of Georgia - p. 44.