
Transcaucasia After NATO Summit In Bucharest : Cumulation Of Threats

Andrei Areshev

<http://en.fondsk.ru/article.php?id=1342> - 18/4/2008

Caucasia, Georgia, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Armenia, Karabakh, NATO At the summit in Bucharest in early April, NATO members were split over Ukraine's and Georgia's accession to the alliance, and it was decided to postpone their membership process till December. There could be no dual approach to the issue.

Some experts believe that the time factor will serve the purposes of Moscow and other countries of the "old Europe" which are against NATO's forced expansion. They think that by December Kiev and Tbilisi may face some problems that will make their NATO membership process less probable and even removed from the agenda.

If there were even slightest possibilities that everything would happen in such a way, we should find this process the most suitable for all sides concerned, and, first of all, for the peoples of Georgia and Ukraine, who are being persuaded by the mass media that the accession to the western military alliance will their countries prosperous.

Let us abandon our illusions. The process of NATO's eastward expansion has gone too far, and there's little doubt that in the long run Ukraine and Georgia will be given the green light to join the alliance. U.S., the ground slipped from under their feet in Iraq and Afghanistan, is now preoccupied with gaining control over the most important geopolitical regions in the post-Soviet territory- Ukraine, Transcaucasia and Central Asia, where NATO's first ever Special Representative for the Caucasus and Central Asia, Robert Simmons, had already arrived to demonstrate the Atlantic Alliance's willingness to expand its relations with the partner countries of those regions. In fact, Washington sees these territories as a springboard for their influence on Russia, Iran and China. That was not by chance that some politicians in Kiev have been insisting that some vast territories in Russia belong to Ukraine.

The current process of Ukraine's and Georgia's transition to NATO membership is not a hypothetic but a real threat to the Russian security. If we analyze the recent anti-Chinese hysteria over the August Olympic Games in Beijing, we may get a clear picture of what Russia is in for ahead of its 2014 Winter Olympiad in Sochi. The regions of Transcaucasia, integrated in NATO, Georgia in the first place (especially in case of successful annexation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia), will be serve the U.S. interests aimed at destabilization of the North Caucasus.

"Of course, Russia will take adequate measures to protect its interests, - Russia's Military Chief of Staff, Yuri Baluevsky, said.- It will be something more than just military measures". The sooner Moscow makes these steps, the better, as it is clear nowadays that the verbal protests do not work and won't stop NATO's eastward expansion.

It is very likely that Tbilisi dares to launch military aggression against Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Speaking at the mountain troops' training center in Sachkher (near Kutaisi) on April, 8, Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili boasted that the country had purchased a few billion dollars in arms deals. "Our lives are dedicated to the future unity of Georgia, and we

won't give up until Georgia becomes free and united. All our victories are before us".

Neither the Abkhaz people nor the South Ossetians or other national minorities living in Georgia and Ukraine need be explained that further integration of these two countries into NATO together with "consolidation" of the Georgian and Ukrainian "political nations" on the anti-Russian basis would only make their lives worse.

The signs of aggression are becoming more evident. Some Georgian political analysts say "Russia is pushing Georgia to launch a military action in Abkhazia". According to the head of the International Center for Conflicts and Negotiations, Georgy Khutsishvili, "Russia may take active steps and officially recognize the self-proclaimed republics or annex them and thus provoke a harsh reaction from Georgia".

In an interview with Estonia's daily "Postimees", Georgia's Prime Minister Lado Gurgenidze leaked a word, saying that Georgia was in principle prepared to recognize Kosovo. The official Tbilisi accused Estonian journalists of misinterpreting Gurgenidze's words but "Postimees" reporter Igor Taro, who conducted the interview with Gurgenidze, played the recording of the interview to prove that Gurgenidze had really made that statement. However, these words could be interpreted in another way: Gurgenidze wanted to say that Georgia could recognize Kosovo as the Albanian state soon after Tbilisi founded the solution to Abkhazian and South Ossetian issues as a result of a military operation. And a possibility of such an operation is becoming more real as Georgia receives informational and diplomatic support from Washington. The U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Daniel Freed has repeatedly promised that Moscow would face serious problems if recognizes Abkhazia and South Ossetia, while only the recognition of the two self-proclaimed republics (even in a form of bilateral defence agreements) would prevent Saakashvili from large-scale provocations and military campaigns.

The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh has also grown out of hand. A U.S. diplomat Matthew Bryza said at the summit in Bucharest that the talks on the status of the Nagorno-Karabakh should result in a bilateral agreement. It must be noted that Mr. Bryza meant not the negotiation process as such but the revision of the region's status, which presupposes concessions from Armenia. In order to make the new Armenian government more tractable, some pro-Western experts in Armenia, guided by the International Crisis Group, have spoken in favor of economic sanctions against their homeland.

Observers say the constructors of the "new world order" are aimed at presenting the "Abkhazian", the "South Ossetian" and the "Karabakh" precedents a direct opposite to the "Kosovo" issue. And a key role is assigned to NATO here. Neither the CIS nor the OSCE could set anything against this. Even Kazakhstan opposed Russia's decision to withdraw from the regime of sanctions towards Abkhazia, and this is only one of the examples of the existing differences between the CIS and the OSCE over the "frozen conflicts" in Transcaucasia.

The position of Iran, which is strictly against NATO's presence in the Caucasus, turns out to be a more significant factor in stabilizing the whole situation.

Too much depends on Moscow. Russia is expected to have a nerve to prevent new bloodshed in the region.
