

УДК 327.8

**ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL COMPETITION
TRANSCAUCASIAN COUNTRIES IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THROUGH
THE PRISM OF POLITICAL INFLUENCE**

**АНАЛІЗ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ КОНКУРЕНЦІЇ
ЗАКАВКАЗЬКИХ КРАЇН У МІЖНАРОДНИХ
ВІДНОСИНАХ ЧЕРЕЗ ПРИЗМУ ПОЛІТИЧНОГО
ВПЛИВУ**

Madjidov E. N.,

Azerbaijan Tourism and Management University,
Phd student in international relations Azerbaijan
University of Languages, Instructor in department
of Regional studies (Azerbaijan), e-mail:
madjidov_elshan@mail.ru

Маджидов Е. Н.,

Азербайджанський Університет Туризму
і Менеджменту, докторант з міжнародних
відносин Азербайджанського Університету Мов,
Інструктор відділу краєзнавства (Азербайджан),
e-mail: madjidov_elshan@mail.ru

The article provides a comparative analysis of the opposing positions of Azerbaijan and Armenia through the prism of the political influence of these countries in the international arena for a deeper understanding of political tensions in the South Caucasus. The author notes that the theoretical basis of this analysis can be joined by the realistic paradigm of international relations in the works of A. Walfers. As a methodological basis, a comparative method, public opinion polls and document analysis were used.

The conclusions drawn in this article can be a starting point for understanding the pros and cons of each side, as well as for using in adjusting state policy and more flexible adaptation of Azerbaijan to the ever-changing realities of world politics.

Keywords: influence, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Nagorno-Karabakh, lobbying, diasporas.

Проводиться порівняльний аналіз протилежних позицій Азербайджану і Вірменії через призму політичного впливу цих країн на міжнародній арені для більш глибокого розуміння політичної напруженості на Південному Кавказі. Автор зазначає, що теоретичною основою цього аналізу може вступати реалістична парадигма міжнародних відносин робіт А. Уолфєрс. Як методологічна основа був використаний порівняльний метод, опитування громадської думки та аналіз документів.

Висновки, отримані в цій статті, можуть стати відправною точкою для розуміння плюсів і мінусів кожної зі сторін, а також для використання в коригуванні державної політики і більш гнучкої адаптації Азербайджану до постійно мінливих реалій світової політики.

Ключові слова: вплив, Азербайджан, Вірменія, Нагорний Карабах, лобювання, діаспори.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Introduction. According to the representative of political realism – Arnold Wolfers, force is the ability of an actor to change the behavior of other actors through coercion, while influence is its ability to change this behavior by means of persuasion [9, p. 200]. Despite the fact that in many political literatures, influence and soft power are considered as close, and sometimes interchangeable concepts, there is a significant difference between them. If soft power in the theory of neoliberalism implies a voluntary approach of the actor to the values and culture of another actor, the influence achieves this goal through active efforts and good organization.

For an objective comparison of the level of international influence of Azerbaijan and Armenia, it

is advisable to consider this topic through the prism of the activities of non-governmental efforts of these countries. The list of priorities of Azerbaijan's influence category can include:

– Recognition by the world community of events in Khojaly as an act of genocide against the Azerbaijani people;

– Creation of a good imagination about Azerbaijan as a reliable and peace-loving state;

– The attraction of foreign investments to the Azerbaijani economy

– The settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

The list of priorities of Armenia includes:

a) recognition as a historically indisputable fact the existence of «Great Armenia», b) the recognition of the thesis of the antiquity of the Armenian people, c) the recognition by international community the events of 1915 as an act of genocide, d) the recognition of the separatist Nagorno-Karabakh regime as an independent state, e) Armenia's withdrawal from economic isolation and f) attracting foreign investment to the Armenian economy.

The organization of diaspor system of Azerbaijan and Armenia

Khojaly is recognized as an act of genocide by such countries as Mexico, Pakistan, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Peru, Honduras, as well as the states of Massachusetts, Texas, New Jersey, Georgia, Maine, New Mexico, Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana and Arizona [10]. Among these states, we have to note such prominent states as Massachusetts and New Jersey, which, together with the state of California, are considered to be the largest concentration of Armenians. Recognizing the events in Khojaly as an act of genocide in two of the three states where the Armenian diaspora is particularly strong can be considered as one of Azerbaijan's victories over Armenia.

On February 1 2010, in the Ugandan capital Kampala, at the VI session of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, within the company of «Justice to Khojaly» the heads of parliaments of 51 countries adopted a resolution recognizing the Khojaly massacre as genocide [4, p. 7]. It is worth noting that each anniversary of the Khojaly genocide is celebrated in more than 100 countries of the world where are organized different events, documentary films, photo galleries, reports and conferences on this topic.

The key role in spreading a favorable image of Azerbaijan abroad belongs to the Azerbaijani diasporas and the Heydar Aliyev's Fund. According to the Azerbaijan Republic's Law «On State Policy towards Azerbaijanis Living Abroad» Azerbaijani diaspor include Azerbaijani citizens and their families living abroad, former citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan or the Azerbaijan SSR and their families, not belonging to these categories but referring to Azerbaijan for ethnic, linguistic, cultural and historical reasons [1]. As we can see, this formula is quite extensive and can mobilize 50 million Azerbaijanis around the world.

The influence of the diaspora also determines the strong organization, coordination, experience

and ideological proximity to the population of the host country. If we consider the organization of the Azerbaijani diasporas in the form of a pyramid, then the first step is the community of Azerbaijanis in cities and regions; the second stage is the centers for coordinating the first stage; the third stage is the centers responsible for coordinating the Azerbaijani diasporas in several countries united by a common feature; the fourth stage is the World Azerbaijan Congress; and at the top of the pyramid stands the Council of Coordination of Azerbaijanis in the World, that located in Azerbaijan. The vertical organization of the activities of diasporas allows interconnected analysis of various political and social processes in the host countries and carry out a single strategic course on the basis of this. Another advantage of vertical organization is the complete coincidence of the goals and objectives of the state policy and the policies of different Azerbaijani diasporas.

Unlike our vertically built organization, the Armenian diasporas operate horizontally, decentralized, in the form of peripheral management. However, it should be noted that this fact should not be interpreted as a hint of lack of organization and coordinated activities of the Armenian diasporas. On the contrary, diasporas having common tasks and pursuing common goals act fairly smoothly and actively with each other. However, when it comes to unity with state policy, then from time to time conflicts of interests are possible. For example, the non-pragmatic approach of the Armenian diasporas to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and their pressure on official Yerevan in practice leads to economic isolation of Armenia from regional projects.

Comparasion of sides' influence in USA

According to the United States Census Bureau, 438,366 ethnic Armenians lived in America in 2014 [11]. Despite the fact that the total number of Azerbaijanis in the United States varies between 700,000 and 1 million, the Azerbaijani diasporas are far behind the Armenian diasporas in terms of efficiency and coordinated activity. The influence of the diaspora does not so much depend on the total number of its members, but on the ratio of the size of the diaspora to the total population. Guided by this, we can conclude that despite the superiority in numbers, the total number of the Azerbaijani diaspora does not constitute even one percent of the US population. Meanwhile, the Azerbaijani diaspora in Georgia, despite the fact that it is inferior in size to the US diaspora, nevertheless, due to the small number of the Georgian population, it is considered the largest ethnic diaspora after the Georgians themselves.

Unlike the Azerbaijani diasporas, the Armenians have been successfully operating in the United States since the beginning of the twentieth century. Due to the efforts of the Armenian lobby, President J. Carter in 1978 became the first president to recognize the events of 1915 as an act of genocide. R. Reagan appointed California State Attorney J. Dockbejan as his advisor in the election campaign. To support the candidacy of B. Clinton's opponent – B. Dole in the presidential elections, the Armenian diaspora and lobbyist

organizations organized two charity events in which they raised over 500,000\$. The financial support of the Armenian diasporas represented by K. Kerkorian and G. Hovnanyan provided material assistance to B. Dole's family fund in the amount of 4.5 million \$ [6, p. 102, 104, 112]. It is also worth mentioning that many representatives of the Armenian diasporas have influential positions in such newspapers as the «The New-York Herald», «The New-York Times», «The Los-Angeles Times», «The Washington Post». Also K. Oskanian was the president and editor-in-chief of the «New-York Press Club» newspaper in 1842 [6, p. 132].

It is also worth noting that the Armenian diasporas and lobbying organizations are actively working to recognize the separatist Nagorno-Karabakh regime. In 2002 the delegations from Russia, France, USA, Great Britain and Italy participated as observers of the illegal elections of the separatist Nagorno-Karabakh regime. The US delegation included a State Department official, Washington Policy Group coordinator J. Hooper, as well as several congressmen and senators [12]. In 2002, Congress accepted the offer of A. Shif – the Congressman from California to provide financial assistance to the self-proclaimed NKR in the amount of \$ 30 million [6, p. 166].

Azerbaijan compensates its weak positions in the US legislative branch at the expense of the other two branches of government. One of the priority centers ensuring the observance of the political and economic interests of Azerbaijan is the American Business Council. This council includes such famous figures as J. Baker, H. Kissinger and Richard Cheney (Dick Cheney). It is worth noting that this council also included the late Z. Brzezinski. The management of the Council is composed of 12 people including the former Deputy Secretary of Defence, Richard Armitage; Deputy Secretary of Energy, William Wait and chancellors of big oil companies. The Council, which was established by the enterprise of oil companies, is currently cooperating with more than 55 oil companies [3, p. 48]. It is logical to assume that for such interest groups as the American Chamber of Commerce (uniting 27,000 state and local chambers, 200,000 firms and 13,000 business associations), the National Association of Industrialists (uniting 75% of industrial firms), the National Association of Small Business (including 500 thousand firms) and the National Federation of Independent Business (including 400 thousand firms) [5, p. 224] Azerbaijan is considered to be a more attractive country than Armenia. Based on this, cooperation with these interest groups is directly proportional to the influence of Azerbaijan and inversely proportional to the influence of Armenia.

Effective work with interest groups, professional lobbyist organizations, diasporas of the allied states give the results in practice. According to the «Porter amendment» of the House of Representatives of 1997, financial assistance for Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh was distributed in the proportions «7: 1», which in legal terms meant that the House of Representatives considers Nagorno-Karabakh as a separate region from Azerbaijan. However, due

to the combined work of the Azerbaijani side with the leadership of the White House and the State Department, the phrase «Azerbaijan and Nagorno–Karabakh» was replaced by the phrase «Azerbaijan, including Nagorno–Karabakh», and the ratio «7: 1» was deleted altogether [8, p. 19]. Amendment 907 to the «Freedom Support Act» prohibiting state assistance to Azerbaijan began to lose its relevance during the reign of B. Clinton, and during the reign of George W. Bush was generally frozen. In 2007 in the report of the State Department, Nagorno–Karabakh was considered as the territory occupied by Armenia. Despite the fact that this phrase, due to the efforts of the Armenian diaspora, twice acquired a neutral form, the State Department returned the original version at the end [8, p. 21]. It is worth noting that in four resolutions of the UN Security Council, the occupier did not have state identification. Guiding by this fact the report of the State Department should be considered a special victory for Azerbaijan diplomacy.

In contrast to the positions that Armenian lobbyist organizations have been striving for many decades, the Azerbaijani side has chosen the path of contractual cooperation with existing professional lobbyist organizations in the United States. Among others, it is worth highlighting the names of such lobbying organizations as «The Livingston Group» and «Worldwide Strategic Partners, Inc.», which achieved a meeting between President I. Aliyev and President George W. Bush, the adoption of the second legislative act on the Great Silk Road project in Congress and softening of American media positions on the 2005 elections in Azerbaijan [8, p. 21].

Comparison of sides' influence in Russia and France

An analysis of the comparison of the influence of the two states in Russia shows a significant superiority of the successes of the Armenian diaspora over Azerbaijan. Due to the efforts of the Armenian diasporas and lobbying, in 1995 the Russian Parliament adopted a declaration that recognized the events of 1915 as an act of genocide and crime against humanity. Note that, in contrast to mono-ethnic Armenia, Azerbaijan has never pursued a nationalist anti-Russian policy. According to Azerbaijani researcher M. Shukurov, if after the collapse of the USSR only a certain part of the 528 thousand ethnic Russians living in Azerbaijan left the country, then almost all of the 66 thousand Russians living in Armenia left this country [2, p. 47]. According to a survey conducted by the Levada Center on August 21–24 2015 among 800 Russians, 9% of participants supported the transfer of Nagorno–Karabakh to Armenia, 10% to Azerbaijan, and 42% of those polled were in favor of independence of the region [13].

Despite the disappointing results for Azerbaijan, state and non-governmental bodies of Azerbaijan have been mobilizing the existing forces in try to turn the face of Russia from Armenia to Azerbaijan. According to surveys of the Russia Public Opinion Research Center – VCIOM among 1,600 people living in 130 localities in 46 regions of Russia, the 4% of Russians believe that in the Nagorno–Karabakh conflict Russia

should support Armenia, 2% Azerbaijan, and the majority of the respondents spoke in favor of Russia maintaining neutrality in this matter [14]. Similar polls of the «Public Opinion Foundation» conducted among 1,500 people living in 104 settlements of 53 subjects of the federation showed that 6% of the participants supported Armenia, 1% supported Azerbaijan, and 52% of respondents believe that Russia should not support any of the opposing sides [15].

Undoubtedly, one of the countries where the Armenian diaspora is acting successfully is France. On December 11, 1985, the Dashnak party, predicted the close collapse of USSR, and published its political manifesto in the Parisian newspaper «Hamq», in which «the creation of a free and united Armenia should include the Armenian territories established by the Sevra Treaty with the districts of Nakhichevan, Akhalkalaki and Karabakh». The authoritative French statesman Jacques Chirac, achieved recognition of the «Armenian genocide» and decided to build a monument to the «Armenian genocide» in Paris. It is also worth mentioning that the former Prime Minister of France Edward Balladgor is Armenian by nationality [7, p. 153–154].

Conclusion. The analysis of comparison of the international influence of the two states showed a relative superiority of Armenia over Azerbaijan. By organizing a strong diaspora and effective lobbying organizations in such powerful countries as the USA, France and Russia, Armenia was able to achieve recognition of the events of 1915 as an act of genocide. Note that the above countries are also co-presidents of Minsk Group of the OSCE and permanent members of the UN Security Council.

At the same time, Azerbaijan also achieved such significant results as the freezing of the 907th Amendment, the elimination of the Porter Amendment, and a more balanced attitude of Russia to the Nagorno–Karabakh conflict. Also note that the cultural and humanitarian projects of the Heydar Aliyev Foundation in France and the Vatican, the close cooperation of Azerbaijan with professional lobbying organizations contributes to the international development of Azerbaijan's influence.

References

1. 'Xaricdə yaşayan azərbaycanlılarla bağlı dövlət siyasəti haqqında', *Azərbaycan Respublikasının Qanunu*.
2. Məsud, Şükürov, 1999. 'Dağlıq Qarabağ münaqişəsinin tarixi-siyasi və ideoloji aspektləri (90-cı illərin I yarısı)', Bakı: «Qartal», 120 s.
3. 'Ramazan USLU and Dr. Sinan Kocaman, The Activities of The Azerbaijani Diaspora in The United States of America', The 2013 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings, Orlando, USA, p.46–50.
4. 'Азербайджанская Диаспора', 2010, Управление делами Президента Азербайджанской Республики, Президентская Библиотека, 100 с.
5. Гаджиев, КС., 2001. 'Политология', Москва: Логос, 240 с.
6. Галстян' Арег Степанович, 2015. 'Армянское Лобби в США: Формирование и Основные Направления Деятельности (1915–2014 гг.)', Дисс. ... канд. исторических наук, Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Национальный исследовательский Томский государственный университет», Томск, 253 с.

7. Рзаев, Камал, 1997. 'Правда и ложь о Карабахской войне', Баку: «Боз Огуз», 253 с.

8. Сучков, МА. 'Влияние лобби-групп на формирование внешней политики США на Южном Кавказе', *Международные отношения*, с.24.

9. Циганков, Павел, 2003. 'Теория Международных отношений', Москва: *Новая школа*, 320 с.

10. 'Xocalı hadisəsini soyqırım kimi tanıyan ölkələr – Siyahı'. <http://axar.az/news/44954>

11. 'Total Ancestry Reported, 2011 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates'. <http://ia601608.us.archive.org/26/items/2011AmericanCommunitySurveyAncestry/2011Acs.pdf>

12. 'Мнения делегаций зарубежных стран, осуществляющих наблюдение за ходом президентских выборов'. <http://www.karabagh.am/GlavTem/mnenija.htm>.

13. 'Опрос в России: Карабах чей?'. <http://ru.oxu.az/war/93819>

14. 'Россияне не поддерживают ни Армению, ни Азербайджан', *Опрос*. <http://ru.oxu.az/politics/131170>

15. 'Что думают россияне о карабахском конфликте?', *Опрос*. <http://ru.oxu.az/politics/127553>

References (transliteration)

1. 'Xaricdə yaşayan azərbaycanlılarla bağlı dövlət siyasəti haqqında', *Azərbaycan Respublikasının Qanunu*.

2. Məsud, Şükürov, 1999. 'Dağlıq Qarabağ münaqişəsinin tarixi-siyasi və ideoloji aspektləri (90-cı illərin I yarısı)', Bakı: «Qartal», 120 s.

3. 'Ramazan USLU and Dr. Sinan Kocaman, The Activities of The Azerbaijani Diaspora in The United States of America', The 2013 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings, Orlando, USA, p.46–50.

4. 'Azerbajdzhanskaja Diaspora (Azerbaijani Diaspora)', 2010, Upravlenie delami Prezidenta Azerbajdzhanskoj Respubliki, *Prezidentskaja Biblioteka*, 100 s.

5. Gadzhiev, KS., 2001. 'Politologija (Political science)', Moskva: *Logos*, 240 s.

6. Galstjan' Areg Stepanovich, 2015. 'Armjanskoe Lobbi v SShA: Formirovanie i Osnovnye Napravlenija Dejatel'nosti (1915–2014 gg.) (Armenian Lobby in the USA: Formation and Main Areas of Activity (1915–2014))', Diss. ... kand. istoricheskikh nauk, *Federal'noe gosudarstvennoe avtonomnoe obrazovatel'noe uchrezhdenie vysshego obrazovanija «Nacional'nyj issledovatel'skij Tomskij gosudarstvennyj universitet»*, Tomsk, 253 s.

7. Rzaev, Kamal, 1997. 'Pravda i lozh' o Karabahskoj vojne (Truth and lie about the Karabakh war)', Baku: «Bos Oguz», 253 s.

8. Suchkov, MA. 'Vlijanie lobbi-grupp na formirovanie vneshej politiki SShA na Juzhnom Kavkaze (The influence of lobby groups on the formation of US foreign policy in the South Caucasus)', *Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija*, s.24.

9. Cigankov, Pavel, 2003. 'Teorija Mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij (Theory of International Relations)', Moskva: *Novaja shkola*, 320 s.

10. 'Xocalı hadisəsini soyqırım kimi tanıyan ölkələr – Siyahı'. <http://axar.az/news/44954>

11. 'Total Ancestry Reported, 2011 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates'. <http://ia601608.us.archive.org/26/items/2011AmericanCommunitySurveyAncestry/2011Acs.pdf>

12. 'Mnenija delegacij zarubezhnyh stran, osushhestvlyajushhih nabljudenie za hodom prezidentskih vyborov (Opinions of delegations of foreign countries that monitor the presidential elections)'. <http://www.karabagh.am/GlavTem/mnenija.htm>.

13. 'Opros v Rossii: Karabah chej? (Poll in Russia: whose Karabakh?)'. <http://ru.oxu.az/war/93819>

14. 'Rossijane ne podderzhivajut ni Armeniju, ni Azerbajdzhan (Russians don't support Armenia or Azerbaijan)', *Opros*. <http://ru.oxu.az/politics/131170>

15. 'Chto dumajut rossijane o karabahskom konflikte? (What do Russians think about the Karabakh conflict?)', *Opros*. <http://ru.oxu.az/politics/127553>

* * *