



Helsinki Citizens'  
Assembly Georgian  
National Committee

# Vector 4Peace

№ 29 24/12/2015

## Persons and Attires can tell much

The Russian-American negotiations in Moscow can correct a paradigm of development of the international relations a little. The USA was interested in the Russian-Turkish confrontation. The separate agreements between Erdogan and Medvedev in August-September, 2008 limiting influence of not regional players in the Black Sea Caspian Basin – burst. The Russian-Turkish "honeymoon" is over.

Further escalation may lead to serious problems. Turkey didn't receive notable counterstrike and it can create important precedent –it is possible to thrash Russia. For the USA this is a situation which is quite acceptable. They can be indulged also with a slight mediation.

On the other hand, Ankara, having felt support from NATO, and also support from the countries of the Islamic military block,



decided to bring Moscow to its knees. According to the YourNewsWire portal, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Chavushoglu on air of one of the Turkish TV channels declared, - "If it is necessary, we with NATO and regional allies will be able to occupy Russia less, than in 7 days".

Other theses from the head of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs were also full of threats and open aggression. Among other things on air such phrase was heard: "We call upon Russia, one of our largest trade partners to sit silently, but we warn that our patience isn't boundless".

On December 17 in Istanbul the meeting of Ministers of Defense of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey took place. The parties discussed prospects of the tripartite relations and actions in the sphere of defense and a situation in the region.

At the informal level, the head of society of "Borchala" Zalimkhan Yaqub claims that "growth of the Russian-Turkish conflict, participation of NATO and others in it is inevitable. The place of Azerbaijan in this conflict - Turkey. What advises us and all Turkic world Turkey we must do it. In all options Azerbaijan and Georgia have to be near Turkey". It actually the threat directed to the address of the Georgian government. In case if Georgia isn't active, this organization created for the purpose of provoking the irredentist moods among Azerbaijanians of Georgia will take the appropriate measures.



Actually, in case of conflict escalation, Georgia can appear as its hostage. For this reason, the Prime minister of Georgia Irakli Garibashvili expressed special concern in possible escalation of this conflict.

Soon visit to Turkey of the President of Ukraine prepares. So, for Russia 2016 will be a year of serious problems on South.

At the same time, the USA is more concerned with increasing role of China in the Black Sea Caspian Basin. China manages to advance dexterously projects both in southern and in the northern direction. Together with Turkey, China supported integration of Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Georgia into the joint five-sided project, having left Russia on a process roadside. And on the other hand, the Russian Federation allows China to put milliard investments into port infrastructures of the Black Sea. Turkey continues to conduct with China negotiations on purchases of

ballistic missiles which are not very pleasant to NATO partners. Turkey anyway benefits from these negotiations as creates a necessary background for creation of the atmosphere of goodwill from Celestial Empire.

Thus, the USA should take measures for restoration of balance of forces which don't change in their advantage. The military base which builds China in the African country of Djibouti, specifies that China intends to become the leading sea power in the world. Also it is system and purposeful actions which can't but disturb Washington and London.

Apparently, in the Syrian direction, there is a new corridor of opportunities for rapprochement of positions of the USA and the Russian Federation. The Russian jets already struck ISIS positions in favor of supporters of opposition to Assad.

Therefore, the Russian Federation made the wise decision not to be limited to support only authorities of Syria and, thereby, strengthened the level of legitimacy of the further stay in this country. Most likely, direct support of Assad will lie down on

shoulders of Iran. Assad, under assistance of the Russian fighters, took off for Iran.

However, in the Ukrainian direction, the situation looks more difficult. Zones of the section of economic, military and political influence between Moscow and Washington – aren't predetermined. Despite occupation of territories of Ukraine, Russia suffered strategic defeat here, having lost the probable and closest ally.



---

## What we can get next year?

### *Roman Rukomeda*

The next year has all chances to become the most dangerous year on a global scale since the beginning of the 21st century. Pretty soon, conflicts of varying intensity may erupt in or come back to many of the post-Soviet states, as well as the Middle East and Central Asia. Putin's Russia is in the center of a new global confrontation. The path of force is the only chance for it to equalize its influence with the West.

So, what dishes has the major war monger from Moscow on his "New Year's menu"?

In the first place, there is a possible continuation of the conflict against Ukraine in Donbas with varying intensity, amid ongoing occupation of Crimea. Putin is not inclined to comply with the Minsk agreements, aware that Western sanctions will not be lifted during the next six months anyway. Meanwhile, the oil and gas prices will continue to drop, zeroing Russian reserves in 2016, with the prospects of facing an economic collapse and social

disaster. Thus, the Russian troops are unlikely to withdraw from Donbas in the coming year, given no force majeure within the Russian Federation occurs. Aggression on their part, as well as the stance of the militants from "DPR" and "LPR" will be sporadic due to the various circumstances within these separatist enclaves and their relations with Russia. Since the Kremlin sharply reduced funding, the militants may try to initiate negotiations with Ukraine to find a model of conflict resolution. In any case, as far as the Kremlin controls the situation within Russia, Putin will not order its troops out of Ukraine.

Another point of a possible conflict in 2016 can become Nagorno-Karabakh. Moscow would be beneficial from pushing Armenia and Azerbaijan toward military confrontation. This can halt the construction of a new TANAP gas pipeline aimed to transport Caspian gas to Europe. Provoking a new war in the Caucasus, Russia may try to resume hostilities against Georgia, in order



All of the Kremlin's potential scenarios mentioned above are based on economic motivation – to prevent the creation of new energy and transport corridors around Russia, which will damage its economy, directly or indirectly. But of course, Putin also has geopolitical motives.

We shouldn't forget about the possibility of increased provocations against the Baltic and Scandinavian states. While Russia wouldn't dare to directly attack NATO troops recently deployed in the Baltic bridgehead, it is still quite capable of trying to mark the "red line" in Finland or Sweden. By the way, the Scandinavian countries may not be ready for an Erdogan-style response and may not dare to shoot down a Russian jet or sink a submarine, which would violate their sovereign borders. Moreover, there is a danger of a hybrid war in Latvia, where the lives of thousands of ethnic Russians living in the Baltic States may be thrown in the furnace of a potential conflict.

Perhaps, Syria and the neighboring areas will remain the hottest conflict zone. Despite the triumphant statements by U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry on arrangements with Putin on the issue of Assad's surrender, Russia is likely to sink deeper into the Syrian conflict.

Unfortunately, the United States still fails to realize that Putin will keep fighting on all fronts until the moment he loses power. The war will stop not when Assad leaves, but when the world coalition (led by the U.S., as it's the most powerful player in

military terms) stops the Kremlin dictator before he starts a global armed conflict.

Iraq may become another potential flashpoint of conflict around Syria. No wonder Moscow has repeatedly stated its intention to help the Iraqi government in the fight against ISIL. In fact, if the Kremlin enters Iraq and sets up military bases, it is most likely to use them to attack the oil fields in the Persian Gulf. Thus, the conflict can reach a new level of escalation if Russia enters Iraq and, suddenly, the militants without insignia start attacking oil platforms in Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Kuwait. By the way, according to some information, Yemen has been trying to launch a couple of missiles at the Saudi oil fields. The attempt failed, but the Kremlin is unlikely to give up. In the case of a military scenario unfolding in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. will be forced to come to the aid of Saudi Arabia, regardless of the "softness" of the U.S. President's stance. Once again, this may further complicate the situation.

A separate story is a potential confrontation between Turkish and Russian forces in Syria and around it. This can occur in the air, at sea or on land. All necessary equipment for full-scale battles has already been deployed in the conflict zone. The question now is only the time and the event which may spark the hostilities if the parties don't slow down the escalation.

Thus, next year can be a time of the big fire and chaos. Only one thing needs to be done, not to let it happen - to eliminate the Kremlin "merchant of war", who is unable to stop. A simple analysis shows that the

Kremlin still has a very large field for the potential game of indirect military confrontation with the West, under the cover of its nuclear shield.

"Owner" of the Kremlin has not to forget that at this time wakes up the another Power that can dramatically reshape the political map of the world ...

---

## Expert Meeting "New Threats to Security in the Black Sea Caspian Region"

On December 18-19 in Tbilisi took place the working meeting of experts "New Threats to security in the Black Sea Caspian region". The meeting was held within the international program "Universities for Peace" and its main organizers were Helsinki Citizens' Assembly/Caucasian Institute for Regional Security, Fund of Friedrich Ebert, Giresun University, University of St. Grigol Peradze.

The meeting was held on December 18, in day of memory of the President of Czechoslovakia, and after the Czech Republic - Václav Havel, one of founders of the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly. The difficult geopolitical situation in the Black Sea and Caspian transe region, caused by the unresolved conflicts in the Caucasus, deepening of the conflict in the East of Ukraine, escalation of military operations in Syria, escalation of the Russian-Turkish relations was the main motive of meeting.

The expert working meeting was held for the purpose of definition of possible new threats,

also research of the corresponding methods of their prevention and development of cooperation in difficult conditions. During a meeting work on inventory of old and new resources for control of the international escalation was also carried out.

The meeting was opened by the Director of Southern Caucasian regional bureau, Fund of Friedrich Ebert Yulia Blezius who emphasized importance of consolidation of efforts of analytical community for the solution of problems of safety, development and advance of the initiatives directed on intensity de-escalation in Black Sea and Caspian transregion.



The cochairman of the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, the winner of the Award of Olof Palme, the winner of the award of Marshall of the EU and the USA, the Winner of the award of the Netherlands Helsinki Human Rights Committee, Arzu Abdullaev emphasized that from four principles of the Helsinki agreements today rather effective work is carried out in economic area. As for international legal, military-political and humanitarian areas, in each of them gross violations take place. It was underlined that on the eve of the 40 anniversary of the Helsinki agreements, it is necessary to create New Helsinki process.

Experts noted need of diversification of the international peacemaking formats and increase of their efficiency. Critical evaluation of the Minsk processes (on settlement of the conflict in the East of Ukraine and on Nagorno-Karabakh), and the analysis of prospect of increase of their efficiency. Concerning the Minsk process on settlement of the conflict in the East of Ukraine it was noted that many decisions were made on its way, without due preparation. According to the Russian experts, the Minsk negotiations can promote "freezing" of the conflict and this state, on their estimates, at the moment is acceptable for all parties. Representatives of Ukraine criticized both negotiation

process, and its decisions. Experts noted interrelation between process of advance of NATO to the east and today's actions of Russia in the former Soviet Union.

The question of war in Syria, escalation of the Russian-Turkish relations, threats of distribution of Islamic fundamentalism in the Black Sea and Caspian region was especially raised. In particular, in case of coming to power of extremists in Afghanistan, the situation in the countries of Central Asia, namely in Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan can sharply become aggravated.

During discussions participants of the meeting discussed development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation of experts of Georgia, Turkey, Ukraine and the Russian Federation for formation of the initiatives directed on control of escalation and advance of the international security and stability. Work of experts will be continued within "The international laboratory of an assessment of the conflicts and peacemaking processes", and also the international network "Universities for Peace".

One of multilateral peacemaking format is cooperation of municipalities, in particular, at a meeting the initiative of carrying out an



international conference in the cities of Georgia - Poti and Kutaisi and accordingly in Luhansk and Donetsk was put forward.

Within the international program "Universities for Peace" the Giresun University and University of St. Grigol Peradze, can become a venue of conferences of the universities divided as a result of the conflicts in Ukraine and in the Caucasus.

Considering that appearance of new geopolitical players (in particular the policy of China) in the region have impact on stability, participants of the meeting offered carrying out the following conferences "New Realities and Non Regional Players on the Black Sea".

Experts noted need of carrying out joint research on assessment of activity of ISIS and probability of destabilization of a situation in the Caucasus.



In the context of the Russian-Turkish cooperation was highlighted the importance of continuation of dialogue of experts and Tbilisi is noted to become the center of holding these meetings. In the human rights direction the following directions of joint interaction were allocated:

- < The program of assistance to cooperation of human rights organizations of Turkey and Russia on protection of the rights of Russians in Turkey and citizens of Turkey in Russia;

- < Formation of the international group of monitoring of human rights in zones of armed conflicts;

- < Human rights assessment of terrorist and anti-terrorist operations;



Tourist infrastructure and tourism in general, being one of the major business directions in Black Sea and Caspian trans-region, very sensitively react to the conflicts, terrorist and anti-terrorist operations, and escalation of the interstate relations. At an expert meeting the idea of carrying out the Tourism and Peacemaking conference and creation of "Fund

of Peacemaking" by the organizations involved in tourism business was expressed.

Experts discussed also questions of information threats, in particular designations of territories on maps in the Internet space. For the purpose of discussion of the matter carrying out the international conference of cartographers "Information wars and cartography" is planned.



## International laboratory of evaluation of the conflicts and peacemaking processes

In conflict situations there are several parallel processes:

< The first - process of the conflict, participation of the parties in it with the declared conflict interests.

< The second - pseudo-conflict generation when definition of the entire system of the conflict by means of only one of fragments is done, which creates danger of oversimplification of its perception and interpretation and, as a result - pseudo-conflict generation.

< The third - "quasi-peacemaking" - reaction to the pseudo-conflict, as on a resource, on opportunity - as the mechanism of use of the conflict in political or other material and non-material interests. Formation and development of "colony" of the persons and groups interested in existence of the conflict and the pseudo-conflict.

< The fourth - "peacemaking" - reaction to the conflict, to the pseudo-conflict and to quasi-peacekeeping process. Recognition of these problems and aspiration of solving them.

One of the main and by the right of the fundamental reasons of insolvability of the conflict is the inadequate perception of its

contents and sociology. Processes of settlement of the conflicts are seen differently by representatives of the divided societies as a result of the conflicts. In the course of settlement the problem of definitions plays large role. There is a constant danger of renewal of military operations and strengthening of international tension in this geopolitical space. Some reasons of it:

< Lack of effective mechanisms of an evaluation of the conflicts and peacekeeping processes on their settlement (including negotiation processes).

< The gross blunders made by the non-governmental, state and international organizations at their involvement into these conflicts and into peacemaking processes.

< Lack of effective communications between the scientists, analysts and persons making decisions. Low level of professional and social responsibility.

< Lack of scientific examination of activity of statesmen and international organizations for settlement of these conflicts. They become subjects of the conflicts, being distributed among parties of the conflicts, serving these

parties. Thus they feed system of the conflict, but not system of peacemaking process.

**Purposes and tasks of laboratory:**

< Complex research of the factors promoting generation and escalation of the conflicts, and also the factors disturbing to the correct and effective organization of the corresponding peacemaking processes.

< Creation of effective "integrated system of diagnostics" allowing to catch discrepancies of structure and dynamics of development of the conflict together with the structure and dynamics of the control system of the conflict

< Assistance to development of communications between the scientific community and persons making decisions. Strengthening the role of scientific community in the process.

**Activity of laboratory:**

1. Inventory of the conflicts and their division by type, creation of a map of conflicts.
2. Research and inventory of the existing projects, programs and ideas on settlement or transformation of these conflicts. Creation of a database of editions and analytical or scientific articles
3. Researches of mechanisms of preparation of decisions (on management of the conflicts) and their implementation at the level of the non-governmental, private, state and international organizations. Analysis of a control system of process.
4. Development of the system of supervision, monitoring, the analysis and an evaluation of the conflicts and the accompanying peacemaking processes.
5. Development of the system of impact on decision-making on management of the conflicts and peacemaking processes.



6. Development of an effective mechanism of introduction of scientific development in this area with use of modern technologies.
7. Assistance to development of the international cooperation in different dimensions.

**Work of Laboratory can help:**

< to see real sociology of these conflicts, in particular, to define the real parties and subjects of the conflict – not grinding of sight of a political environment, and from the point of view of the scientific analysis more adequately;

< in activity correction, both of certain countries, and of international initiatives of settlement of the conflicts;

< to reduce risks at the organization of peacemaking policy;

< to involve the significant resources which still are not involved in settlement process;

< to have opportunity to diversify the existing negotiation formats and to pass from a condition of "quasi-peacemaking political processes" to actual peacemaking.