

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2025-2-28>

THE POSITION OF MAJOR POWERS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DURING THE SECOND KARABAKH WAR

Gulgun Quliyeva,

*PhD in Political Science, Lecturer at the Department of Diplomacy and Processes
Modern Integration, Baku State University (Baku, Azerbaijan)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3466-4951

Gulgun2004@mail.ru

Abstract. During the Second Karabakh War the positions of powers and international organizations were important factors influencing the course and outcome of the conflict. Their positions were mainly based on political, economic, and geostrategic interests. Currently, one of the most pressing issues in the world political arena is the Nagorno-Karabakh issue. After the collapse of the USSR, the Azerbaijani state managed to restore its independence in 1991. In the First Karabakh War of the last century, due to the lack of a strong, regular army of the newly independent Republic of Azerbaijan and the inability to establish a strong central government system, the Republic of Azerbaijan was defeated in the war and 20% of our lands were occupied by the Republic of Armenia. Although the Republic of Azerbaijan appealed to international organizations to resolve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem and tried to resolve the conflict peacefully, the Republic of Armenia, which ultimately occupied the lands of the Republic of Azerbaijan, has repeatedly hindered our just cause. International organizations and the world community have remained silent on the lands of the Republic of Azerbaijan, which have been under the enemy's control for nearly thirty years. The Republic of Azerbaijan has done its best for a peaceful resolution of the conflict for almost thirty years. During this period, the Armenian government has demonstrated an uncompromising position against Azerbaijan. At the same time, no progress has been felt on the Nagorno-Karabakh issue.

The victory of the Republic of Azerbaijan in the Second Karabakh War transformed Azerbaijan into a strong, developed state in the political world, had a positive impact on other areas, and in addition, reminded other pro-Armenian regional states that the Republic of Azerbaijan is an extremely powerful state both at the political table and on the battlefield. The article discusses the position of major powers and international organizations during the Second Karabakh War.

Key words: War, conflict, international organization, victory, region, victory, position, arena, influence, support, principle, current, vandalism, etc.

Relevance of the topic. In 2020, as a result of the Armenians' violation of stability in our frontline territories and the creation of provocations, the situation on the frontline has become tense and the Second Karabakh War has begun. On September 27, 2020, the Azerbaijani army launched a counter-offensive operation against the provocations committed by the Armenians. During the 44-day Patriotic War, as a result of the patriotism and courage of the Victorious Azerbaijani Army, we have managed to liberate most of our occupied lands. The victory and triumph of the Republic of Azerbaijan in the 44-day Patriotic War have formed new ideas in the regional states. There were different approaches of the world states to the Second Karabakh War. At the beginning of the Second Karabakh War, all the world states and their media focused on the South Caucasus region, and the Nagorno-Karabakh issue became the most relevant topic in the global media and political tables.

Degree of learning the problem. The war has just ended and a peace treaty has not yet been signed. Although a considerable amount of literature has been published on the historical roots of the issue, it was difficult to express this opinion after the war. It can be said that there is little material on the topic, most of it is internet material. The Second Karabakh War: The Chronicle of Victory” This book, authored by Nazim Mammadov, a Doctor of Historical Sciences and a veteran of the First Karabakh War, tells the story of the victory achieved in the 44-day Patriotic War.

The publication highlights the importance of the war for the country, the region and the world, the glorious path of our brave sons, as well as the construction work carried out in Karabakh in the post-war period. TED.AZ - Technology, Science

Karabakh is Azerbaijan! – 44-day II Karabakh War” Electronic Database This electronic database, prepared by the employees of the National Library of Azerbaijan, includes official documents related to the war, a list of liberated territories, information about our martyrs and other important information. Users can benefit from this database in virtual mode. [catalog.gomap.az+1millikitabxana.az+1millikitabxana.az+2Science.gov.az+2millikitabxana.az+2](#). “Homeland Simurgs: Heroes of the Second Karabakh Patriotic War: Book I” This publication reflects the bravery of the sons of the homeland who showed heroism in the Second Karabakh War. The book presents information about the bravery of the war participants and the combat paths they took.

Level of investigation of the problem. The emergence of the Nagorno-Karabakh issue dates back to the beginning of the last century. The main cause of the conflict was the illegal territorial claims of the Armenians to the territory of Azerbaijan, which is recognized by its own history and international law. Although the Nagorno-Karabakh problem occurred between Armenia and Azerbaijan, one of the main subjects of the problem was the lack of justice here due to the large number of claims written in Armenian sources that were not reflected in international law and were not recognized by the international community. It is undeniable that most of the information about the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict was written in the Republic of Azerbaijan.

However, among foreign countries, the countries that are most knowledgeable about Nagorno-Karabakh are the countries neighboring Azerbaijan. Although they are not among the neighboring countries, in terms of source, we can mention the names of authors from Western countries. The approaches of Western countries to this conflict are completely different from each other. Canada, France, the Netherlands, etc. It is possible to see that the authors of these countries are openly partners with the Armenians in their Works (10.Armenia-Azerbaijan clashes). Since the Armenian lobbies in these countries are strong and these countries are opposed to Muslims, instead of approaching the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict impartially and freely, they have acted as partners in the groundless territorial claims of the Armenian aggressors. The works of some Western countries, including British and Italian authors, have made somewhat more objective comments on this issue than the authors of the other countries I have listed.

In the topics that Turkish and Azerbaijani writers have developed about the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, they are in favor of resolving the Nagorno-Karabakh problem peacefully and with full sovereignty within the framework of the law in accordance with international legal standards. Because the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict is a major problem for Azerbaijan. Also, the close relations with the brotherly country Turkey give reason to say that Azerbaijan and Turkey are two states, one nation. In this regard, they clearly saw in the enemy states that Turkey is with the Azerbaijani people in the peaceful return of our historical lands and in the face of world powers.

The goals and objectives of the article. The resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem between the Republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia, which are the states of the South Caucasus, is of great importance for the future of both the regional states and the future of the South Caucasus. In the article, I have tried to provide detailed information about the Karabakh war, its historical roots, causes of its emergence, subjects of the conflict and its consequences, the causes and consequences of the outbreak of the Second Karabakh War, the foreign policy pursued by Azerbaijan during the Second Karabakh War and after the end of the Second Karabakh War, etc.

The goals and objectives of the article. In the article, I have tried to provide detailed information about the Karabakh war, its historical roots, causes of its emergence, subjects of the conflict and its consequences, the causes and consequences of the outbreak of the Second Karabakh War, the foreign policy pursued by Azerbaijan during the Second Karabakh War and after the end of the Second

Karabakh War, etc. One of the most important factors is that the article reflects extensive information on revealing the positions of the regional states on the war after the 44-day Patriotic War, examining the future effects and interests of this conflict for the Karabakh region and our country, and analyzing it from both a political and economic perspective.

Considering the geopolitical changes in the South Caucasus, I believe that it will have a positive impact on the future relations of the Republic of Azerbaijan with the European Union. After Azerbaijan became a victorious country, certain changes took place. The Republic of Azerbaijan had already earned the title of a victorious state in the political arena. Many secular states congratulated Azerbaijan on the occasion of the victory. Azerbaijan had already increased its respect in the international arena. Other states, local and foreign companies were already investing in the liberated Karabakh zone. One nuance I would like to emphasize is that the foundation of our Azerbaijan's beautiful future and beautiful destiny was laid as a result of the resolution of the Karabakh problem, which sits like a mountain in the hearts of the Azerbaijani people. From now on, Azerbaijan will continue to conduct its own domestic and foreign policy in relation to any situation that may arise in the South Caucasus in the future.

Methods. During the research, the methodology of comparative analysis among sources related to the topic, and in general, the analytical research method, was used. Depending on the tasks set in the research, methods such as generalization, progress from abstract to concrete, historical-comparative and systematic approach, analysis, synthesis, induction and deduction were used.

Main part

The Second Karabakh War – the Patriotic War or Operation Iron Fist. On the morning of September 27, 2020, as a result of a large-scale provocative operation by the Armenian Armed Forces, intensive shelling from heavy artillery and mortars, Azerbaijani army positions and civilian settlements along the front were targeted. In response, the Azerbaijani military command launched a rapid counterattack operation to neutralize the threat posed by the Armenian army and ensure the safety of the civilian population. The escalation of hostilities prompted Armenia to declare martial law and general mobilization, while Azerbaijan imposed martial law, a curfew, and partial mobilization. The conflict quickly escalated into what became known as the Second Karabakh War. Amid the escalation of violence, numerous countries and international organizations, including the United Nations, have called for an immediate cessation of hostilities and urged both sides to de-escalate tensions and return to the negotiating table (Məmmədov, 2022: p.203).

On September 29, the UN Security Council held an emergency meeting on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh. Despite attempts to establish a humanitarian ceasefire through the mediation of the International Committee of the Red Cross and Russia, which officially entered into force on October 10, the ceasefire has been repeatedly violated as a result of terrorist acts targeting civilians by the Armenian Armed Forces. This led to the suspension of the exchange of wounded and prisoners between the conflicting parties. The Republic of Azerbaijan, which lost 20 percent of its territory during the First Karabakh War, has made extensive diplomatic efforts to implement the resolutions of the UN Security Council (İsmayıl Musa, 2010: p.593). These resolutions, in particular, demanded the unconditional withdrawal of the occupying forces from Azerbaijani lands after the signing of the Bishkek Protocol in 1994. Over the years, Azerbaijan has attempted to hold peace talks with the Republic of Armenia through various international organizations.

However, the peace process has faced significant challenges, exacerbated by the rise to power of Nikol Pashinyan in Armenia following the 2018 “color revolution.” Pashinyan’s administration has adopted populist rhetoric, including slogans such as “Karabakh is Armenia, period,” which has further complicated efforts to reach a peaceful settlement. Moreover, Pashinyan’s provocative actions, such as unauthorized visits to occupied Azerbaijani territories, have undermined trust and hindered progress in the negotiations. The period after Nikol Pashinyan came to power in Armenia was marked

by the continuation of provocative actions and statements by Armenian officials, further intensifying tensions in the region. In March 2019, Armenian Defense Minister David Tonoyan, during an official visit to the United States, made a provocative statement calling for a “new war for new lands.” (Quliyeva Nərgiz, 2024: p.156). This rhetoric was manifested in a number of military provocations along the line of contact. One notable incident in July 2020 was an attempt by units of the Armenian Armed Forces to storm favorable positions in the Tovuz direction of the Azerbaijani-Armenian state border using artillery fire. However, their attempts were unsuccessful.

On September 25, 2020, Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev made a video address to the 75th session of the UN General Assembly, highlighting the deaths of Azerbaijani servicemen and one civilian as a result of Armenian provocations. He also highlighted the serious damage to civilian infrastructure. President Ilham Aliyev further stated that from July 17 to September, more than a thousand tons of military equipment were transported to Armenia by military cargo planes. Following these events, Assistant to the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Head of the Foreign Policy Department of the Presidential Administration, Hikmet Hacıyev, issued a statement condemning the flagrant violation of the ceasefire regime by the armed forces at around 06:00 on September 27. As a result, the Azerbaijani Armed Forces launched counter-offensive operations to prevent further Armenian terrorism, and martial law was declared in the republic. During these battles, Azerbaijan made significant progress with relatively few losses.

Having initially liberated several villages and a strategic bridge from occupation, the Azerbaijani Armed Forces achieved a major victory on October 22 by completely liberating Karabakh's southern border with Iran. On October 23, Azerbaijani forces continued their advance towards the Lachin corridor. The Lachin corridor served as the main highway connecting the self-proclaimed entity in Karabakh with Armenia, making it a vital supply route for Armenian forces. Seizing control of the corridor would effectively cut off the flow of fuel, ammunition, and military supplies from Armenia to the occupied territories. Azerbaijan used a variety of tactics, including artillery bombardments, mortars, direct fire, or guided missiles, to target Armenian military positions and capture convoys during daylight hours.

As the conflict progressed, Azerbaijani armed forces achieved significant territorial gains, liberating Jabrayil on October 4, Fuzuli on the 17th, Zangilan on the 20th, Gubadli on the 25th, and the strategically important city of Shusha on November 8th. During the 44-day war, the Azerbaijani army made extensive use of Harop-type strike vehicles, including the Zarba drones, which were produced in Azerbaijan jointly with Israel, and other UAVs, such as the Bayraktar TB2. The Bayraktar TB2 drones alone played a significant role in destroying Armenian military equipment worth about a billion dollars. The drones were used for a variety of purposes, including delivering precision strikes on enemy equipment and personnel, as well as directing artillery fire and conducting reconnaissance operations. As noted by Russian military expert Pavel Felgenhauer, the use of drones gave Azerbaijan a technological advantage (7. Azərbaycan Respublikası ilə Rf arasında müttəfiqlik qarşılıqı fəaliyyəti haqqında Bəyannamə). Despite being in a situation of almost equal military power, the Azerbaijani army's use of advanced drone technology has significantly contributed to its success on the battlefield.

The recapture of Shusha from occupation during the Patriotic War will truly be remembered as a historical moment in the conflict. Shusha, an important stronghold and symbolic center of Karabakh, presented unique challenges for liberation due to its natural fortifications and the presence of entrenched enemy forces. The decision not to resort to airstrikes and heavy artillery bombardment in order to avoid civilian casualties and minimize destruction, despite the tactical difficulties it presented, demonstrates a commitment to ethical conduct in war. The choice of hand-to-hand combat tactics underscores the bravery and determination of the Azerbaijani soldiers and officers who embarked on the difficult mission to liberate the city.

They demonstrated remarkable courage and resilience while operating in difficult terrain and engaging in close combat with enemy forces. The description given by a foreign journalist who witnessed the fighting in Khankendi paints a vivid picture of the tense and turbulent nature of the conflict. The conditions of the wounded Armenian soldiers and the evidence of hand-to-hand combat are a reminder of the high cost of the war for Armenia. The events surrounding the liberation of Shusha and the subsequent processes were indeed a significant turning point in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

On November 8, President Ilham Aliyev's announcement of the liberation of Shusha from occupation marked a major milestone in the war. The rapid capture of Shusha paved the way for the subsequent liberation of numerous other villages in the region, shifting the balance of power even further in Azerbaijan's favor. The signing of a Russian-brokered ceasefire declaration on November 10 marked the formal end of hostilities in the conflict zone. The agreement also provided for the liberation of several key districts, including Agdam, Kalbajar, and Lachin, without further bloodshed or casualties. The subsequent violation of the ceasefire on December 11, which resulted in the injury of an Azerbaijani soldier, highlighted the importance of the peace process and the continuing challenges of maintaining stability in the region even after the cessation of active hostilities.

Overall, Azerbaijan's military victory and the subsequent peace agreements reshaped the geopolitical landscape of the region and laid the groundwork for an unambiguous resolution of the long-standing conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

President Ilham Aliyev's decree on mobilization reflects the people's commitment to defending their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The victories over Armenian military provocations and the liberation of the occupied lands were celebrated as holidays in the country. The expressions of solidarity and support of Armenian.

The approaches and attitudes of major powers and international organizations to the Second Karabakh War were diverse:

A large part of the international community viewed the conflict as a threat to regional stability. However, the interests of each state and organization played a significant role in their positions. The Second Karabakh War also brought power dynamics in the international system and geopolitical interests in the region back to the fore.

Turkey. Turkey has been Azerbaijan's strongest supporter. Ankara has provided both political and moral support to Baku during the conflict. Turkish officials have repeatedly stated their support for Azerbaijan's territorial integrity. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's statement underscores Turkey's firm support for Azerbaijan in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Erdogan's call for the Armenian people to take ownership of their own government and future reflects Turkey's position that Armenia is the aggressor in the conflict (Second to Die. A Military Analysis of Second Nagorno – Karabakh). Foreign Minister Mevlut Cavusoglu's visits to the Azerbaijani embassy in Ankara, accompanied by Justice and Development Party (AKP) Deputy Chairman Numan Kurtulmuş, further underscores Turkey's diplomatic support for Azerbaijan. Çavuşoğlu's statement emphasizing the importance of Armenia's withdrawal from the occupied Azerbaijani territories reflects Turkey's position on the resolution of the conflict.

Great Britain. The UK's veto of a draft statement against Azerbaijan in the UN Security Council during the Second Karabakh War demonstrates its support for Azerbaijan's territorial integrity and Azerbaijan's position on the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict. By rejecting the draft statement, the UK defended Azerbaijan's rightful position in the conflict and opposed any measures that could undermine Azerbaijan's territorial integrity. This action underlines the UK's commitment to upholding international law and recognizing Azerbaijan's sovereignty over its own territories (Nagorno – Karabakh. THE international community must stop looking the other way). It also demonstrates the UK's role as a responsible member of the international community, respecting Azerbaijan's legitimate rights and interests while contributing to efforts aimed at achieving a peaceful resolution of the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict.

The United States. The United States has not taken an active position during the conflict, as it has focused more on domestic issues (the 2020 presidential elections). Washington has called on both sides to stop the conflict and return to the negotiating table. However, the United States, as a co-chair of the Minsk Group, has supported a diplomatic solution to the conflict. The statement by US Deputy Secretary of State Stephen Biegun emphasizes the importance of an immediate cessation of hostilities between Azerbaijan and Armenia during the Second Karabakh War. By calling on both sides to use existing communication channels and not to escalate tensions through inflammatory rhetoric, the United States is trying to facilitate a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

South Caucasus region. Although Moscow has tried to.

Russia. Russia has traditionally been a powerful player in the region, but it has maintained a neutral stance in the conflict, it has been somewhat close to Yerevan due to its alliance with Armenia. At the same time, Russia has called on both sides to resolve the conflict diplomatically. As a result, it has played a role in mediating the ceasefire agreement signed on November 10, 2020, and has deployed peacekeeping forces to the region.

Russian President Vladimir Putin's statements on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict emphasize Russia's role as a mediator, rather than a direct participant in military operations. Although Armenia is an ally of Russia within the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Putin has made it clear that he has no specific military commitments regarding Nagorno-Karabakh, as it is not part of Armenia's sovereign territory (NATO chief tells Turkey to help calm Karabakh conflict.). There have been reports of increased shipments of ammunition and military equipment from Russia to Armenia during the 44-day war. However, Russian authorities have claimed that the goods being transported were not weapons or military equipment, but rather construction materials intended for a Russian military base in Armenia. This claim suggests that Russia's support for Armenia during the conflict has primarily consisted of logistical assistance rather than direct military intervention.

Italy. The adoption of documents condemning Armenia's policy of aggression, ethnic cleansing and genocide against Azerbaijan by municipalities such as Sepino and San Giuliano del Sannio in the province of Campobasso, Italy, and the City Council of Corbetta in the province of Milan, demonstrates international recognition of Azerbaijan's rightful position and support. These actions mean solidarity with the Azerbaijani people and condemnation of Armenia's actions during the conflict.

France. France has been close to Yerevan, particularly due to its historical and diaspora ties with Armenia. French officials have criticized Azerbaijan's military operations and issued statements supporting Armenia. However, France has proposed a diplomatic solution to the conflict (Armenia Azerbaijan Don't Attack Civilians).

France's call for an immediate cessation of hostilities between Armenia and Azerbaijan and a return to negotiations has demonstrated its concern about the conflict. However, there has been criticism of France's position, particularly in the wake of President Emmanuel Macron's September 30 statement that it is inconsistent with France's role as co-chair of the Minsk Group. In addition, the adoption of a resolution by the French Senate recognizing the "Nagorno-Karabakh Republic" has provoked protests from Azerbaijan and, further complicating the situation, it has become clear that France supports Armenia's illegal territorial claims.

Georgia. Georgian President Salome Zurbishvili called on the parties to reconcile and expressed her support for maintaining peace and security in the region. Meanwhile, former Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili reaffirmed his position on territorial integrity, saying that Nagorno-Karabakh belongs to Azerbaijan. During the conflict, Georgia banned the transportation of military weapons and ammunition to Armenia through its territory and airspace.

Serbia and Greece. There was information that Serbia was selling weapons to Armenia before and during the 44-day war. This caused discontent in Azerbaijan, which protested Serbia for selling weapons to Armenia. In addition, Greece clearly showed its support for Armenia during the conflict.

Germany. German Foreign Minister Heiko Maas has stressed the importance of Armenia and Azerbaijan ceasing the use of force and instead engaging in comprehensive peace talks. He called on both sides of the conflict to immediately end hostilities and expressed deep concern over the shelling of villages and towns.

Iran. Despite its geographical proximity and historical ties to both countries, Iran has tried to maintain a balanced stance during the conflict. Tehran has both expressed support for Azerbaijan's territorial integrity and maintained trade relations with Armenia. At the same time, Iran has been concerned that military operations could lead to tensions in areas close to its border. Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Saeed Khatibzadeh said Iran was closely following the military clashes between Azerbaijan and Armenia and stressed Tehran's readiness to mediate a ceasefire (Iran's Leader Says ALL Azerbaijani Territories Under Armenian Occupation Must Be Liberated). He rejected allegations that Iran was transporting military cargo from Iran to Armenia during the conflict and stressed that Iran had closed its airspace and land routes to prevent such transfers. People living in various cities in Iran celebrated rallies in support of Azerbaijan's victory. The liberation of Shusha and Azerbaijan's control of the border with Iran were particularly celebrated in cities such as Tabriz and Ardabil.

Pakistan. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan has called on Armenia to cease its military operations to prevent further escalation of the situation. Pakistan has reaffirmed its support for Azerbaijan's position on Nagorno-Karabakh, bringing it into line with the adopted resolutions of the UN Security Council. Pakistan has openly demonstrated its support for Azerbaijan during the 44-day war, standing in solidarity with its cause as a brotherly ally.

Kazakhstan. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan has stressed the importance of refraining from the use of force and starting negotiations, calling on all parties to take all necessary measures to stabilize the situation. Kazakhstan has expressed its readiness to assist in the peaceful resolution of the conflict through the platform of international organizations.

Afghanistan. The Afghan Foreign Ministry issued a statement on the tensions in the Nagorno-Karabakh region, stressing that Nagorno-Karabakh is internationally recognized as part of Azerbaijan. The statement called for an end to the occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Bosniak member of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Šefik Džaferović, and the leader of the Party of Democratic Action, Bakir Izetbegović, expressed their support for Azerbaijan, condemned Armenia, and compared the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh to the Bosnian war of 1992 and 1995.

Israel. The leader of the Yisrael Beiteinu party, former Israeli Foreign and Defense Minister Avigdor Lieberman, in an interview with the local Vesti newspaper, emphasized that Nagorno-Karabakh is rightfully Azerbaijani territory (International Community Reacts To Armenia-Azerbaijan Clashes). He emphasized that no UN member state, including Armenia, recognizes Nagorno-Karabakh as a sovereign entity. Lieberman claimed that their position is unambiguous from the point of view of historical reality, international law and the interests of the state of Israel. He expressed his support for the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and emphasized that the solution to the problem in the region is impossible without the restoration of this territorial integrity.

Hungary. The Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade stated in a statement that Nagorno-Karabakh is the historical territory of Azerbaijan and its borders are recognized in accordance with international law.

European Union. The European Union called on the parties to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict to cease hostilities, reduce tensions and strictly observe the ceasefire. In addition, the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Joseph Borrell, in a statement, called for the urgent resumption of negotiations on the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict under the leadership of the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs. However, some have criticized Europe for adopting double standards in its approach to the conflict, suggesting that it does not fully support

Azerbaijan's right to restore its territorial integrity as enshrined in international law. At the same time, it supported the resolution of the conflict within the framework of the OSCE Minsk Group. The European Union also called on the parties to the conflict to exercise restraint and cease hostilities. The EU focused mainly on humanitarian issues and criticized the impact of military operations on the civilian population.

UN. The United Nations (UN) has reaffirmed its support for the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan during the Second Karabakh War. The UN Security Council, citing four previous resolutions (822, 853, 874, 884), had demanded the withdrawal of Armenian forces from the occupied territories of Azerbaijan. However, the UN did not intervene directly in the conflict during the conflict. United Nations Secretary-General Antonio Guterres has stressed the importance of an immediate ceasefire by the parties to the conflict, de-escalation of tensions and a return to peace talks without delay. The organization announced on September 29 that it would hold urgent closed-door negotiations on a solution to the conflict.

The United Nations (UN) has reaffirmed its support for the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan during the Second Karabakh War. The UN Security Council, citing four previous resolutions (822, 853, 874, 884), had demanded the withdrawal of Armenian forces from the occupied territories of Azerbaijan. However, the UN did not intervene directly in the conflict during the conflict.

OSCE. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has called on both sides to cease the military conflict and restore peace in the region. The OSCE Minsk Group

The Minsk Group (co-chaired by France, the United States, and Russia) has been trying to mediate a peaceful resolution to the conflict for years. However, the group's activities have not yielded significant results during the war and have often been criticized. Azerbaijan has accused the Minsk Group of inefficiency.

Turkic Council. The Secretary General of the Turkic Council, Bagdad Amreyev, expressed his deep feelings regarding the military conflict in the occupied regions of the Republic of Azerbaijan. The Turkic Council called for the protection of the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and the inviolability of its borders recognized by international law, and stressed the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Armenian armed forces from all occupied territories of Azerbaijan (International Community Reacts To Armenia-Azerbaijan Clashes).

Historically, the use of the “scorched earth” tactic, which has been used by some armies during retreat, involves the destruction or looting of property and the deliberate setting of fires in order to render areas uninhabitable. The “scorched earth” tactic is considered a crime under Article 54 of Protocol 1 to the 1977 Geneva Conventions, a violation of the laws of war. Despite this prohibition, instances of this tactic have been observed in conflicts throughout history. In the context of recent events in Azerbaijan, Armenians are reported to have resorted to such tactics, leaving a trail of destruction behind as they retreated from liberated territories.

This includes the destruction of infrastructure, residential buildings and natural resources, as well as the indiscriminate targeting of civilian areas with ballistic missiles and cluster bombs. Cities and villages such as Fuzuli, Jabrayil, Zangilan and Gubadli are depicted with scenes of devastation, devastation and devastation. Armenia’s actions, including the deliberate targeting of civilians, have resulted in numerous casualties, including innocent children, women and the elderly. The atrocities and massacres committed by these aggressors demonstrate the seriousness of Armenia’s violation of international law and the urgent need to be held accountable for these actions.

The determination of the Azerbaijani people to return and restore their liberated lands speaks volumes about their steadfastness and unwavering loyalty to their homeland. Despite the devastation left by the retreating Armenian forces, Azerbaijan is making determined efforts to restore these territories to their former glory. The elimination of the long-standing status quo in the region and the start of reconstruction work in the liberated territories marks a decisive turning point in the Karabakh

conflict. Instead of dwelling on past grievances, Azerbaijan is focused on rebuilding and revitalizing communities destroyed by the war, and on starting new progress and development. Azerbaijan's swift and decisive victory in the 44-day war not only ended a thirty-year occupation, but also reaffirmed the principle that the strong determination of a people can overcome even the most profound injustices. As Azerbaijan looked to the future, it did so with confidence and optimism, guided by the resilience and determination that had led to its historic victory.

Conclusion. Azerbaijan has effectively demonstrated its legitimate ownership of Karabakh through various means, including diplomatic efforts, legal arguments, and the liberation achieved in the Second Karabakh War. Armenia's defeat in the conflict further strengthens this claim, and the support received from many countries around the world confirms the international recognition of Karabakh as Azerbaijani territory. Overall, the findings of the article highlight the culmination of Azerbaijan's long-standing struggle to return its occupied lands and establish its sovereignty over Karabakh. Although problems persist after the conflict, the recognition of Karabakh's status as an Azerbaijani territory is a significant victory for Azerbaijan and a step towards lasting peace and stability in the region. Indeed, Russia has historically exerted influence in the South Caucasus region, from the time of Tsarist Russia through the Soviet era.

This influence is characterized by a variety of geopolitical and strategic interests, including control over key transport routes, access to natural resources, and regional security considerations. During the Second Karabakh War, Russia's involvement and influence in the conflict were evident, reflecting its continued interest in maintaining a presence in the South Caucasus. Russia's role as co-chair of the OSCE Minsk Group, which mediates the resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, further underscored its position as a key player in the region's peace process. In addition, Russia's military support for Armenia, as well as its diplomatic efforts to broker a ceasefire agreement, further demonstrated its involvement in the conflict.

The Russian-brokered ceasefire agreement, which effectively ended the Second Karabakh War, underscored Moscow's desire to strengthen its influence and maintain stability in the region. Russia, which played a central role in facilitating negotiations between Azerbaijan and Armenia, sought to protect its strategic interests by preventing the escalation of hostilities that could threaten regional stability (Quliyeva Nərgiz, 2024, s. 156). Overall, Russia's actions during the Second Karabakh War demonstrated its continued influence in the South Caucasus region and its continued efforts to defend its geopolitical interests in this strategically important area. The historical context you describe sheds light on the long-standing tensions and conflicts between Azerbaijan and Armenia, particularly over the Nagorno-Karabakh region. The division of the conflict into seven phases highlights the complexity and evolution of the situation over time.

Phase I: Emphasizes the historical displacement and resettlement of the population in the region, which coincided with the 19th century, characterized by the creation of a "new homeland" for Armenians. The annexation of Eastern Georgia by Russia in 1801 resulted in the acquisition of territories inhabited by Armenians, demographic changes, and the unification of Armenian communities in the region (Həsənov Əli, 2005, s. 294). This period marked the beginning of tensions and conflicts between Azerbaijani Turks and Armenians over territorial claims and ethnic identity, setting the stage for future disputes and conflicts.

The gradual expansion of Russian influence in the Caucasus further complicated the situation, exacerbating existing ethnic and territorial rivalries. Understanding this historical dynamic is crucial to understanding the roots of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the complex interplay of political, ethnic, and territorial factors that shaped its trajectory over time. By examining the historical context, policymakers and stakeholders can gain insight into the key challenges and complexities involved in seeking a solution to the conflict.

Phase II: The term “silent genocide” aptly describes the gravity of the events that occurred during this phase. The mass migration of Armenians to the Caucasus as a result of the uprisings in Turkey in the 19th century created considerable turmoil and violence in the region (Ermənistan –Azərbaycan Münaqişəsi, 2005, s. 209). The activities of the Dashnaktsutyun and Hunchak parties, which shifted attention from Turkey to the South Caucasus in the early 20th century, further exacerbated tensions and led to instability in the region. The term emphasizes the devastating impact of these events on the Armenian population and the wider region, and emphasizes the need to recognize and understand historical injustices.

Phase III: The crimes committed by Armenians against Azerbaijanis in 1918-1920, often referred to at the time as “national massacres,” indeed demonstrate the characteristics of genocide. These atrocities are not isolated incidents, but are part of a systematic policy of occupation and ethnic cleansing organized by the Armenian state. The deliberate targeting of the civilian population of Azerbaijan, the systematic destruction of communities, and the forced displacement of the population indicates a genocidal intent aimed at eliminating the presence of Azerbaijanis in the entire region. The recognition of these events as genocide is of great importance in terms of acknowledging the historical injustices committed against the Azerbaijani people and strengthening reconciliation and understanding in the region.

Phase IV: The events of 1948-1953, often referred to as the deportation of Azerbaijanis, were indeed forced exile in the true sense of the word. During these years, hundreds of thousands of Azerbaijanis were forcibly uprooted from their ancestral homelands, subjected to inhumane conditions, and resettled to remote regions. This mass displacement, organized by the Soviet authorities, resulted in great suffering, loss of life, and the destruction of entire communities. The term “deportation” fails to convey the full extent of the trauma and injustice inflicted on the Azerbaijani people during this period. In order to understand the lasting impact on individuals, families, and Azerbaijani society as a whole, it is important to recognize and acknowledge the gravity of these events as a form of forced exile.

Phase V: The period from the mid-1960s to 1989 can truly be characterized as the completion of the ethnic cleansing of Azerbaijanis from Armenia. During this phase, Azerbaijani Turks were systematically expelled from Armenian lands, resulting in the complete expulsion of Azerbaijanis from their ancestral lands. This process of displacement and expulsion was a gross violation of human rights and contributed to the ethnic homogenization of Armenia. It is important to acknowledge and condemn such acts of ethnic cleansing, which had a long-term impact on the affected communities and continue to shape regional dynamics today.

Phase VI: The years 1991-1994 are characterized by the occupation of Azerbaijani territories by Armenia, with the support of Russia (Məmmədov Nazim 2022 s 345). It highlights the asymmetric power dynamics in which Armenia exploited Azerbaijani vulnerabilities during a turbulent period marked by the collapse of the Soviet Union and internal instability in Azerbaijan. The occupation of Azerbaijani lands during this period constitutes a significant phase of the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, illuminating the complexities and historical grievances underlying the dispute.

Phase VII: This phase covers the period from 1994 to 2021. Since the end of the First Karabakh War in 1994, despite Azerbaijan's desire to resolve the conflict within the framework of international law and peace, Armenia's failure to adhere to international law and the Second Karabakh War in 2020 have resulted in disastrous consequences for both sides and a glorious victory for Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan's victory in the Second Karabakh War and the start of reconstruction work in our historical territories liberated from occupation are of great importance for the Azerbaijani economy. The restoration of highways to Karabakh and, most importantly, the existence of our land border with Nakhchivan are of great importance for Azerbaijan.

As it turns out, after a long historical longing, we returned to our historical lands. We have fought for the Karabakh region throughout history, at the cost of much blood. We would have been freed from the Khojaly genocide, which the world community turned a blind eye to, and from the provocations that the Armenians tried to commit against the Azerbaijani people, for one more day, and we would have given them their answers, which was manifested in the 44-day war.

We are still not ready for war, but when it is necessary, not only we, but the whole world resort to war. Negotiations are already underway for Zangezur-Derayaz, that is, the lands that are our right. In the future, Yerevan can be reclaimed. Why not? There should be no obstacles to our desire to reclaim our historical lands! Over time, everything will find its just solution, or we will restore this justice ourselves. **Let's live and see.**

References:

1. Ermənistan-Azərbaycan Mənaqişəsi: Təmmətnli elektron materiallar məcmuəsi. Azərbaycan Respublikasının Prezidentinin İşlər İdarəsinin Prezident Kitabxanası. Bakı: 2005. 394 s.
2. Həsənov Əli. Müasir Beynəlxalq Münasibətlər və Azərbaycanın Xarici Siyasəti. Dərslik, Bakı, 751 s.
3. İsmayıl Musa. Çağdaş beynəlxalq münasibətlər və Azərbaycanın xarici siyasəti. III hissə, Dərslik, Bakı 2011, 776 s.
4. Quliyeva Nərgiz. Birinci və İkinci Qarabağ müharibələri. Bakı 2024, 308 s.
5. Məmmədov Nazim. İkinci Qarabağ müharibəsi Zəfər salnaməsi. Bakı 2022, 464 s.
6. Azərbaycan-Rusiya əlaqələrinin regionun inkişafına təsiri: PERSPEKTİVDƏ NƏLƏR VAR? -TƏHLİL / -aztv.az, URL: <https://aztv.az/az/news/3673/azerbaycan-rusiya-elaeqelerinin-regionun-inkisafina-tesiri-perspektivde-neler-varmarktehlilmark>
7. Azərbaycan Respublikası ilə Rusiya Federasiyası arasında müttəfiqlik qarşılıqlı fəaliyyəti haqqında Bəyannamə / -president.az, URL: <https://president.az/az/articles/view/55498>
8. Azərbaycan Respublikasının Prezidenti, Ermənistan Respublikasının baş naziri və Rusiya Federasiyasının Prezidentinin Bəyanatı. 10 noyabr 2020 / -president.az, URL: <https://president.az/az/articles/view/45923>
9. Armenia/Azerbaijan: Don't Attack Civilians: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/09/30/armenia/azerbaijan-dont-attack-civilians>
10. Armenia-Azerbaijan clashes: How the world reacted: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/9/27/armenia-azerbaijan-clashes-world-reactions>
11. Iran's Leader Says All Azerbaijani Territories Under Armenian Occupation Must Be 'Liberated'. <https://caspiannews.com/news-detail/irans-leader-says-all-azerbaijani-territories-under-armenian-occupation-must-be-liberated-2020-11-4-0/>
12. International Community Reacts To Armenia-Azerbaijan Clashes: <https://caspiannews.com/news-detail/international-community-reacts-to-armenia-azerbaijan-clashes-2020-10-2-0/>
13. Nagorno-Karabakh: The international community must stop looking the other way: <https://www.shrmonitor.org/>
14. NATO chief tells Turkey to help calm Karabakh conflict: <https://www.bangkokpost.com/world/1996983/nato-chief-tells-turkey-to-help-calm-karabakh-conflict>
15. 7Seconds to Die: A Military Analysis of the Second Nagorno-Karabakh War and the Future of Warfighting: <https://cove.army.gov.au/article/book-review-7-seconds-die-second-nagorno-karabakh-war>
16. The Second Karabakh War: Russia vs. Turkey?: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/mepo.12529>