

Challenges to the New World Order

Ramiz
Mehdiyev

Abstract

This article examines the South Caucasus region after the collapse of the Soviet Union, with new formed cooperative strategies, developed international law frameworks, and legal principles and norms imprinted in international conventions. In this regard, author examines Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) peace mission in Armenia-Azerbaijan Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. At the same time, author argues that Armenia opted out of regional projects and is among the poorest countries in the region. The country faces a demographic problem; people immigrate to foreign countries in hopes of finding jobs and better life. Finally, author shows how Azerbaijan economic growth has stimulated the development of the national economy based on strong grounds – purchasing power of the population has increased, unemployment has decreased, the social protection system got revised, rule of law has built a trust strong enough to lead to increased domestic and foreign investments.

* Dr. Ramiz Mehdiyev is an academician and Azerbaijani politician who serves as the Head of the Administration of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

The collapse of the Soviet Union was a precondition to the start of a new era in world history and a transition to a new system. It is well known from history that such major events resulting in the change of the current system lead to the reconfiguration of the international system and the emergence of new states. This is observed along with a change in the dangers and risks and an emergence of new challenges. Of course, two polar world systems with their numerous parameters have moved towards a realistic trend in international relations led by pragmatic theorists and put forth as an option to ensure international peace and security. The balance of power, in view of the possibility of nuclear mutual self destruction, became the main concern in maintaining stability in the international system. At the same time, notwithstanding the ideological differences, new cooperative strategies were formed, international law frameworks were developed, and legal principles and norms were imprinted in international conventions. International relations and their regulatory mechanisms are always evolving. The new world order being formulated is multi-polar and multilateral. This gives not only multiple means to each state to ensure security, but also to discuss their concerns in international venues. Contemporary

international mechanisms seek to put forward cooperative strategies, focus on national security and merge common efforts into a single framework to eliminate transnational dangers and risks based on mutual interests.

We should not forget Friedrich Nietzsche's characterization that "State is the Name of the Coldest of All Cold Monsters".¹ States protect national interests. However, the contemporary international framework includes the idea of "liability" and demands that heads of state make decisions based on wider considerations.

At the same time, truly global concerns affect every person on earth and raise a large number of questions about the future of humanity. Global warming and frequent natural disasters are related to human activity, and its rampant exploitation of nature. Increased responsibility in economic relations and a review of existing economic mechanisms is a necessity after the global financial crisis.

While it is impossible to achieve solid outcomes in a short time, understanding the effects of existing problems, and their dangers for future generations, increasing individual responsibility of people's attitudes

¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ainsi parlait Zarathoustra*, Paris, Gallimard, 1971.

and taking adequate measures to address problems are the first duties of any state and its citizens. We are not wrong to state that time is the best judge, since the solution of a number of issues and the formation of international institutions requires time. Today our burden is to ensure adequate functioning of those mechanisms.

This necessitates the evaluation of national interests in a new context, adapting state policy to modern reality and taking into account moral factors. Our objective is not to deny the features of realism theory and achievement in the development of a new moral paradigm in international relations, but to draw attention to the benefit of a different perspective toward humanity.

Moral factors do not comprise the foundation of diplomacy, but objectives fixed by the national moral environment, cooperation mechanisms that strengthen mutual trust and confidence, and working together to reach common objectives are products of wiser, more rational thinking.

Experience proves that thoughts once considered idealistic or utopian can become relevant in different historical contexts. Notwithstanding that human beings are naturally violent,

as Machiavelli believes, the transmission of democracy into a universal political doctrine is the new form of Immanuel Kant's call for perpetual peace in Europe. The development of democratic institutions helps in solving interstate conflicts with mutual compromise and differentiates national interests from special interests, and allows for their adaptation to societal demands, especially legal principles and norms. However, we should not forget that society is divided into various groups and the objectives of these groups contradict each other. If this is reflected in different programs in the background of a fight among political powers divided into various ideological trends in internal policy, it results in armed conflicts which complicate their foreign policy solutions. There are cases when national interests of a state demand the achievement of peace, while the ruling party prefers to keep a conflicting situation in order to remove existing difficulties in domestic policy. Let's look at the following indisputable fact: Armenia's position in the Armenian-Azerbaijani Nagorno-Karabakh conflict exemplifies the contradiction between the interest of the ruling party and the national interest.

The adequate response of the UN Security Council to the capture of Ku-

wait by Iraq in August 1990 made it possible to review the international law called the “political law among nations” by Montesquieu² as the main element of a new world order. However, the development of subsequent events, in particular, the continuation of regional conflicts for an extended period of time, demands the reexamination of these views. It should be noted that the existence of unsolved conflicts in the South Caucasus, giving the region’s immense geopolitical importance, is the source of a major threat to regional peace and security.

“Despite the Minsk Group’s broad objectives, from the date of its establishment a short-term solution to the conflict has not been possible because of the weakness of the OSCE.”

The South Ossetia conflict demonstrated that these are not frozen conflicts: they can flare up again. The sensitivity of the existing geopolitical environment, strategy and objectives of states complicate the cooperation of divergent interests. Azerbaijan follows good neighborly policies with its adjacent countries and tries to develop cooperation for the common good. Nevertheless, it does not allow any other state to interfere in its do-

mestic affairs. Azerbaijan is a civil state, and religious is part of private life.

The “interstate” characteristic of the Armenian-Azerbaijani Nagorno-Karabakh conflict complicates its solution; meanwhile, specific questions arise in the legal-political realm. If war is annulled as a possible means of national policy, and the Charter of the United Nations eliminates all forms of use of illegal force, then how can Armenian troops occupy 20% of the territory of Azerbaijan? Of course, this demands wide analysis and it is a subject for a separate article. However, it should be noted that political will in the interpretation of legal principles and the application of existing mechanisms impedes enforcement of clear legal decisions. This delays an adequate evaluation of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the assessment of Armenia as the “aggressor” party within the UN Security Council. Such a step would help Armenia to demonstrate a constructive position in the peace negotiations, recognize the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, construct normal regional relations and benefit from development processes in the region.

In addition, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) peace mission became the

² Montesquieu, De l’Esprit des lois, Paris, Gallimard, Col. « Folio Essais », tome I, 2007, p. 299.

hostage of divergent interests of member countries. Notwithstanding having real opportunities, the pan-European organization neither gave a political evaluation, nor adequate reaction to aggression within Europe. Despite the Minsk Group's broad objectives, from the date of its establishment a short-term solution to the conflict has not been possible because of the weakness of the OSCE. The Minsk Group does not have any means of influence to fulfill its mission. Today the Minsk Group fulfils the mission of an ordinary negotiation mediator. The question arises: why was it necessary to set up the notion of aggression after discussions on the conflict had been held for almost two decades?

Today Armenia's leadership, represented by the "Karabakh clan" originally from Nagorno-Karabakh, does not want to withdraw from the original objectives fixed at the start of this undeclared war. It does not agree to compromise for the sake of staying in power, i.e. to the peace option agreed by both parties based on mutual concessions. Thomas Schelling notes the necessity of finding a common denominator and the last concession.³ This concession or goodwill aim is Armenia's return to a good neighbor policy and recognition of the territo-

³ Thomas C. Schelling, *The strategy of conflict*, Cambridge, Harvard University press, 1960.

rial integrity of Azerbaijan. Azerbaijanis and Armenians have been living in the same space and must live there today as well.

From this point of view, peace is the only status ensuring joint existence of both sides. Armenia opted out of regional projects and is among the poorest countries of the region. The country faces a demographic problem; people are emigrating to foreign countries hoping for work and a better life. The Armenian administration should understand that achievement of peace serves, first of all, their own interests and opens new economic prospects for them.

“Azerbaijanis and Armenians have been living in the same space and must live there today as well. From this point of view, peace is the only status ensuring joint existence of both sides.”

Azerbaijan, having benefited from its economic and geostrategic capacity has become the leader of the region. Internal stability, the exploitation of energy resources and the implementation of reforms contribute to economic diversity. In recent years, economic growth has stimulated the development of the national economy

on strong grounds - the purchasing power of the population has increased, unemployment has decreased, the social protection system was revised, rule of law was strengthened and trust in it increased domestic and foreign investments. Azerbaijan became a reliable target for foreign direct investment.

The economic policies of the state protected Azerbaijan from the negative effects of the global financial crisis. Gross domestic product increased by 9.3% in 2009, and rapid growth continued in 2010. This is, of course, very good performance during a crisis. It should be noted that during the same period there has been rapid growth in the non-oil sector. The currency reserves of the country in the first quarter of 2011 are more than USD 35 billion.⁴

Furthermore, the geographical position of Azerbaijan allows it to fulfill its historical mission between the East and the West and restore the world-famous Silk Road. The Baku-Tbilisi-Kars railway financed by the Azerbaijani Government develops the transport capacity of the region, helps it to become a new transport corridor for direct transportation between Asia and Europe at a profitable price.

Meanwhile, Azerbaijan is an unavoidable energy corridor.

It should be taken into account that the Southern Corridor supported by the European Union for transportation of the energy resources of Central Asian countries is being realized with the support of Azerbaijan. As a strategic partner to Europe, Azerbaijan expects European countries to play an “active and responsible” role in the solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Such an effort would help to overcome the challenges of a globalizing modern world and ensure peace and security for all of humanity.

⁴ <http://www.president.az>