

DEFEATIST DISCOURSE AND ITS ROLE
IN THE DEFEAT OF NAGORNO-KARABAGH
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE STATEMENTS
OF THE OSCE MINSK GROUP) *

ՀՏԴ 8/81՝4

DOI: 10.52063/25792652-2023.4.19-100

ANI TAMAZYAN

European University of Armenia,
Chair of Applied Linguistics, Researcher
Eurasia International University,
Chair of Languages, Communication and Pedagogy, Head;
Yerevan, Republic of Armenia
ani1tamazyann@gmail.com
ORCID:0000-0001-7483-9042

This article investigates the impact of defeatist discourse on the outcome of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict, focusing on the statements made by the OSCE Minsk Group.

The research aims to present the linguistic units employed in the statements of the OSCE Minsk Group, constituting elements of a defeatist discourse that exerted influence on the trajectory of the conflict, culminating in the ultimate defeat of Nagorno-Karabakh.

The objectives encompass the identification of defeatist discourse patterns within the statements of the OSCE Minsk Group, examination of their potential ramifications, and comprehension of the role such language may have played in the defeat of Nagorno-Karabakh.

To achieve the objectives set a synthesis of theoretical insights and an in-depth analysis of defeatist discourse within the statements of the OSCE Minsk Group was employed.

Based on the results of the study, we can state that the defeatist discourse, characterized by a focus on principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, linguistically worked against the claims of the self-determination principle made by Armenia.

Keywords: *discourse, defeatist, diplomacy, OSCE Minsk Group, international relations, modality, deixis.*

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 18.10.2023թ., գրախոսվել՝ 03.11.2023թ., տպագրության ընդունվել՝ 30.12.2023թ.:

Introduction

The failure of the OSCE Minsk Group and the 44-day war, the blockade of the people in the Artsakh Republic (In the context of our research, we will refer to the region as the Artsakh Republic rather than using the term Nagorno-Karabakh."), **ethnic cleansing of the Armenians** are some of the reasons for the outcomes of the communication that has gone beyond its papers.

The discourse from the perspective of pragmatics (information representation and interpretation, persuasiveness of the language) used in the documentation of the OSCE Minsk Group, becomes evident when we undertake an analysis of its pragmlinguistic markers, and see that the discourse was not solution-oriented, or at least, on the speech and discourse level, it was not solution-oriented for Armenia and the Artsakh Republic.

Understanding the elements of the defeatist discourse, which, in our opinion, was one of the reasons for the failure of the OSCE Minsk Group activities, is essential as it may provide valuable insights into the dynamics of international negotiations and conflict resolution. It is essential to recognize that discourse analysis, as a component of pragmlinguistics, provides valuable insights into the dynamics of international negotiations and conflict resolution.

Our research endeavors to investigate and validate this hypothesis, which is intrinsically linked to the erroneous implementation of pragmlinguistic tools, leading to the aforementioned unfavorable outcome. The overarching motivation behind this research is to identify and elucidate these markers, thereby preventing the Republic of Armenia (RA) and its diplomats from repeating similar mistakes in the near future or at least selecting a new language repertoire for building Nagorno-Karabakh discourse in the future.

Thus, defeatist discourse, embedded within political and diplomatic communication, played a pivotal role in the catastrophic outcomes of the OSCE Minsk Group's efforts for Artsakh and Armenia. This discourse, characterized by its stark absence of solution-oriented language, significantly contributed to the inability to secure a workable resolution for Armenia and the Artsakh Republic. Consequently, it necessitates a comprehensive analysis of its pragmlinguistic components to prevent its recurrence in the Republic of Armenia's diplomatic pursuits.

In this context, it is vital to understand the features of the defeatist discourse and the way it was developed in the OSCE Minsk Group documents.

Theoretical Background

Before delving into depth about the essential elements of political and diplomatic discourses as parts of a single whole, it is crucial to introduce our interpretation of the term of the discourse, as, in our opinion, lack of this specification hinders, blurs the further understanding of this notion when applied to a specific context or situation.

Discourse can simply be seen as language in use, or as Arutyunova stated, it is a speech, which is immersed in life (Arutyunova 136). Thus, any update of the life, may bring a new shade to its content, and, a new interpretation of it. In this respect, Brown and Cook's and Arutyunova's statements or approaches resonate. By 'language in use', we mean the set of norms, preferences, and expectations which relate language to context. Discourse analysis can also be seen as the organization of language above the sentence level. The term 'text' is, sometimes, used instead of the term 'the discourse'. The concept of discourse analysis is not restricted to the study of formal properties of

language; it also takes into consideration what language is used for in social and cultural contexts. Discourse analysis, therefore, studies the relationship between language (written, spoken – conversation, institutionalized forms of talk) and the contexts in which it is used. The main point that is relevant here is that it should be coherent with the text. In this respect, we truly agree with Cook (Cook 6-7) who describes discourse as language in use or language used to communicate something felt to be coherent which may or may not correspond to a correct sentence or series of correct sentences. There are several reasons to agree with his statement: In fact, Cook emphasizes function over form and acknowledges the real-world dynamic, which is much more important than the grammatical structures that are used to convey this or that meaning. His position, which is logical in my perception, is a successful expression of the meaning, which is relevant in this particular situation. Nothing is rigid in the language when it is applied to life that is, used in a specific situation. Finally, Cook prioritizes the social aspect of the language, which plays an important role in transmitting meanings and thoughts in the communication between the interlocutors.

Discussing this problem of discourse, Foucault concluded that discourse should be called “a set of statements as they belong to the same discursive formation” (Foucault 117).

This refers to the broader systems of knowledge, power, and social practices that govern how statements (or utterances) are made, understood, and legitimized within a particular cultural or historical context. For Foucault, discourse not only constructs knowledge but also defines power relations and establishes societal norms. Thus, M. Foucault goes further in his explanation of the discourse as a social element, by focusing on the communicative aspect of the language, or “the language in use”. We can affirm that Foucault's definition is broader, looking at patterns, systems, and structures of knowledge production and dissemination. Discourse, therefore, is understood not as an infinite and indivisible commonality of utterances, but as a text in its dynamics, constituted by a certain number of utterances, for which it is possible to define “a set of conditions for existence”. Moreover, discourse is not an ideal or timeless form with its own history. The concept of discursive practice introduced by M. Foucault is important for understanding the essence of discourse, i.e., it is a set of anonymous historical rules of conversation, which is always defined relatively to the time and communicative space. He writes that discursive practice as a condition for the utterance function is established in a given era and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic space. The question of discourse boundaries is rightful. The discourse of politicians and statesmen concentrates around the supporting concept of power and creates a context that describes the actors, their actions, and the objects under discussion, circumstances, time, and the place of events.

To gain insight into diplomatic discourse, it is essential to examine background information regarding the term “diplomacy.” Diplomacy according to Earnest Satow, is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states extending sometimes also to their relations with vassal states; or more briefly still, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means (Satow 6). In the Diplomatic Dictionary, diplomacy is seen as an official activity of a given state's organs of external relations in pursuing through peaceful means the objective and task of its foreign policy and in protecting its rights, its interests as well as those of its citizen's abroad (Diplomatic Dictionary 459).

Diplomacy has always been actual, yet this is an area where the conflicts meet their pacific solutions. During the centuries diplomacy's forms, models, and conducting ways have changed by adapting them to the new system of the world. ‘Diplomacy at its

essence is the conduct of relationships, using peaceful means, by and among international actors, at least one of whom is usually governmental. The typical international actors are states, and the bulk of diplomacy involves relations between states directly, or between states, international organizations, and other international actors (Cooper, Heine et al). Consequently, many organizations conduct diplomacy, for which diplomacy is the main instrument to find effective and pacific solutions. Diplomacy, inferring from the given definitions, is an effective tool or instrument that nation-states employ for the maintenance, and promotion of peaceful relations on the international scene. Whereas politics is defined as the activities of the government, members of law-making organizations, or people who try to influence the way a country is governed (Cambridge Dictionary). The above-mentioned definitions provide an insightful perspective on diplomacy, evolution, and its significance in international relations.

Indeed, these definitions underscore the peaceful and skillful aspects of diplomacy. However, the Diplomatic Dictionary situates diplomacy within the framework of a state's formal and organized endeavors to interact with the international community. We can affirm that diplomacy has a peaceful and adaptive nature and there is a clear distinction between diplomacy and domestic politics, reinforcing the idea that diplomacy is a specialized tool for managing interactions among sovereign states and other international actors, ultimately contributing to peaceful coexistence and conflict resolution.

Diplomatic discourse, which encompasses the language and communication used in international relations, takes on a unique form. It prioritizes formality, etiquette, and protocol, focusing on negotiation and compromise as the primary means of reaching mutually beneficial agreements. Unlike political discourse, which often involves persuasion and argumentation, diplomatic discourse centers on finding common ground to achieve outcomes that benefit all parties involved. In this evolving landscape, the influence of digitalization adds a new layer of complexity and opportunity to diplomatic interactions within international organizations like the OSCE.

Diplomatic discourse is a nuanced and vital component of international relations, characterized by its formality, precision, and focus on negotiation and diplomacy. Various authors have contributed to our understanding of diplomatic discourse and its role in shaping diplomacy.

Berridge highlights the precision required in diplomatic language, emphasizing that diplomats must use language with exactitude, particularly when negotiating agreements or treaties. This precision is essential to avoid misunderstandings and to ensure that diplomatic communication is clear and unambiguous. Baylis and Smith (2001) note that diplomats must maintain a neutral stance in their communication. They are representatives of their countries, and their words carry significant weight. A diplomat's neutrality is essential to ensure constructive dialogues and prevent any perception of threats or disrespect during diplomatic exchanges. Frowe (2016) further reinforces the idea that diplomats must remain neutral. Their role is to act as intermediaries and facilitators, seeking common ground and compromise in international relations. This aspect is fundamental to the peaceful resolution of conflicts and the establishment of diplomatic agreements. In the study of diplomatic discourse, Anisimova emphasizes the importance of specific terms, concepts, and documents used in diplomatic communication. These serve as the foundation for effective communication and information exchange within the diplomatic sphere. Thus, diplomatic discourse, in fact, is a nuanced field of communication that requires a unique combination of precision, cultural sensitivity, neutrality, and understanding of specific terms and concepts.

In the theoretical field, however, diplomatic discourse constitutes the specificity of the analysis of the interactions among nations. This discourse acts not only as a mediator in case of conflicts but also as an articulating interest. Thus, understanding diplomatic

action in the field of political communication needs to consider factors such as the economic, social, and cultural contexts of the involved parties, the macro positioning of the country, the location, and the occasion where speeches are addressed. The fundamental factors of communication analysis comprise verifying whether they are mediatized by journalistic frames or made entirely available through government or international organizations' communication channels (Pimentel, Panke 64).

Consequently, along with numerous methods, means, and forms of implementation of the foreign policy of any state, diplomatic documents play an important role in the development of bilateral and multilateral relations and the establishment of international relations. In the diplomatic sphere (as in any field of human activity), there are specific terms, concepts, and specific documents through which the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, consular offices, and foreign bodies of foreign relations of diplomatic missions are in communication, i.e. information exchange.

Diplomatic discourse serves to convey information to institutions during diplomatic communication. Participants of communication must comply with the regulatory norms of speech practice, as they declare the position of a particular country in the field of international relations.

Diplomatic discourse is described as a more negotiation-oriented form of communication. Diplomats are required to maintain precision in their language, with an emphasis on specific details concerning potential agreements or treaties (Berridge). This level of precision is critical, considering that diplomats must navigate the intricacies of cultural differences, while also being attuned to the sensitivities that may arise from their words (Baylis & Smith). In this context, the requirement for diplomats to remain neutral is underscored by authors like Frowe (2016) to ensure constructive dialogues and prevent threats or disrespect in diplomatic interactions.

Persuasive language plays a pivotal role in the diplomatic discourse. Rhetorical devices such as metaphors, analogies, similes, hyperbole, understatement, and irony are instrumental tools used to enhance the persuasiveness of arguments and shape decisions.

The term "defeatist discourse" is widely used in everyday language to describe a pattern of communication and thinking that promotes negativity and hopelessness. In the diplomatic communication, it is essential to consider the context in which it is used and the specific behaviors or statements being referred to when discussing defeatist discourse.

Although we can encounter with various of research or articles on the Internet where some phenomena are discussed within the framework of language of defeat or defeatist discourse like this one for example "The new National Security Strategy provides a major marker of the Biden administration's intent to move away from the language of defeating and destroying terrorist groups"¹.

Nevertheless, unlike certain established academic concepts, the term "defeatist discourse" lacks a universally recognized definition. Instead, it serves as a descriptive term employed to characterize a particular form of communication or mindset. Therefore, in the course of our research, we will strive to construct a definition and outline its key features.

Defeatist discourse refers to a way of speaking or thinking that focuses on pessimism, hopelessness, and a belief that a situation is doomed to failure or that one's efforts are futile. It is characterized by a negative and resigned outlook, which can be detrimental to individual motivation, group morale, or societal progress.

¹ Retrieved from <https://www.newamerica.org/future-security/blog/abandoning-the-language-of-defeat-is-harder-than-you-think> (Accessed 20/09/2023)

This type of communication typically focuses on highlighting the obstacles, problems, or failures while downplaying or dismissing potential solutions, opportunities, or positive outcomes. It can be contagious, spreading a sense of futility and discouragement among those who are exposed to it. Defeatist discourse can have a detrimental impact on motivation, problem-solving, and collective efforts to overcome challenges. Defeatist discourse refers to a pattern of communication characterized by an overwhelmingly pessimistic outlook. It involves expressing a belief or attitude that situations, challenges, or goals are bound to fail, and it often leads to a sense of hopelessness, resignation, or discouragement. Defeatist discourse can manifest in various contexts, such as personal conversations, public discourse, or within organizations.

There are some features of the defeatist discourse we would like to focus on concerning our research:

- A defeatist discourse is typically marked by a consistently negative perspective on various aspects of life, challenges, or circumstances. People with this mindset tend to expect the worst outcomes and often dwell on potential failures.
- Diplomatic documents that acknowledge defeat typically include language that explicitly or implicitly conveys a willingness to compromise or make concessions. This can involve phrases such as "in the interest of peace," "in a spirit of cooperation," or "in order to find common ground."
- Diplomatic documents may contain language that recognizes the differences or disagreements between parties. Phrases like "acknowledging our differing viewpoints" or "recognizing our limitations" can indicate a diplomatic setback.
- Modal verbs like "may," "could," and "might" are often used to express uncertainty and indicate that certain outcomes are not guaranteed. For example, "We may consider revisiting this issue in the future."
- Diplomatic language often employs softening and polite expressions to cushion the impact of defeat. This can include phrases like "with all due respect" or "regretfully, we were unable to reach a consensus."

In this context, in fact, defeatist discourse is characterized by the failure to foster a resolution that could have averted the tragedy of the war, the subsequent blockade of the Artsakh Republic and the ethnic cleansing of the Armenian people. The shortcomings in diplomatic discourse became a stark reminder that the words chosen in negotiations can reverberate far beyond the conference rooms, ultimately impacting the fate of nations and their people.

The failure of diplomatic efforts, exemplified by the inability of the OSCE Minsk Group to broker a sustainable peace agreement and the eruption of the 44-day war in 2020, underscores the profound impact of diplomatic discourse. The repercussions of diplomatic miscommunication extended far beyond the confines of diplomatic papers and meetings. Rather, the language used in negotiations held the power to shape the destiny of nations, affecting the lives of countless individuals.

Thus, from our perspective, defeatist discourse within diplomatic discourse refers to a specific aspect of communication and negotiation in international relations. It is characterized by a pessimistic and negative approach to diplomatic efforts and negotiations. Within this context, it involves expressing a belief or attitude that diplomatic endeavors are likely to end in failure, potentially leading to a sense of hopelessness and discouragement. This type of discourse can undermine the effectiveness of diplomatic

initiatives and hinder the ability to reach mutually beneficial agreements or solutions in the realm of international diplomacy.

To assess the defeatist discourse of the statements and reports of the OSCE Minsk Group, we should also introduce what it is and how it is relevant to the overall framework of the Nagorno-Karabakh discourse in general.

The OSCE Minsk Group was created in 1992 by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (now the OSCE) to provide a platform for peaceful negotiations over a complex conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the Nagorno-Karabakh region. It is co-chaired by three major international powers: France, Russia, and the United States. The Minsk Group operates under the framework of the OSCE, a regional organization focused on security and cooperation among European and Eurasian countries. The primary function of the Minsk Group is to act as a mediator between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The co-chairs were supposed to facilitate direct negotiations between the two parties and work to promote dialogue and compromise¹.

In the framework of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, the OSCE Minsk Group's statements and reports are integral components of diplomatic discourse. These official documents serve as essential tools for the international community and involved parties to gauge the progress and dynamics of the conflict resolution process.

In the context of a defeatist discourse, the OSCE Minsk Group is often portrayed as emblematic of diplomatic failure and the inability of the international community to bring about a resolution to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. In our analyses, we will provide examples of how defeatist discourse was demonstrated in the statements of the OSCE Minsk Group.

The ramifications of defeatist discourse transcend language and diplomacy; they are embedded in the historical and political narrative of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. By investigating and addressing these linguistic elements, future diplomatic endeavors can be better equipped to avert repeating the mistakes of the past and forge a path toward lasting peace and resolution. This study seeks to unravel the complexities of defeatist discourse and its role in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, ultimately shedding light on how the power of words can determine the destiny of nations.

Analysis

Within our paper we dwell on the analysis of two recent statements from the OSCE Minsk Group, which in our opinion are crucial for a comprehensive analysis of defeatist discourse and their role in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, as they provide a current and relevant perspective on the conflict's dynamics and the potential impact of communication on its resolution.

In their March 1, 2019 statement, the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group (Igor Popov of the Russian Federation, *Stephane Visconti of France and Andrew Schofer of the United States of America*) *welcomed the commitment of Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev and Armenian Prime Minister Nikol Pashinyan to meet soon under the auspices of the Co-Chairs. The Co-Chairs, working closely with the two foreign ministers, have been making preparations for this important leaders' meeting, which will be the first direct contact between the two leaders conducted under Co-Chair auspices.*

The Co-Chairs underline the importance of maintaining an environment conducive to productive discussions and continue to assess positively the recent lack of casualties on the front lines. The Co-Chairs also welcome some initial steps being taken in the

¹ Retrieved from the official website of OSCE <https://www.osce.org/minsk-group/108306> (Accessed 25.10.2023)

region to prepare the populations for peace and encourage the sides to intensify such efforts. At the same time, the Co-Chairs reiterate the critical importance of reducing tensions and minimizing inflammatory rhetoric. In this context, the Co-Chairs urge the sides to refrain from statements and actions suggesting significant changes to the situation on the ground, prejudging the outcome of or setting conditions for future talks, demanding unilateral changes to the format without agreement of the other party, or indicating readiness to renew active hostilities.

With reference to some contradictory recent public statements on the substance of the Minsk Group process, the Co-Chairs reiterate that a fair and lasting settlement must be based on the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act, including in particular the non-use or threat of force, territorial integrity, and the equal rights and self-determination of peoples. It also should embrace additional elements as proposed by the Presidents of the Co-Chair countries in 2009-2012, including: return of the territories surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijani control; an interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh providing guarantees for security and self-governance; a corridor linking Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh; future determination of the final legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh through a legally binding expression of will; the right of all internally displaced persons and refugees to return to their former places of residence; and international security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation.

The Co-Chairs stress their view that these principles and elements must be the foundation of any fair and lasting settlement to the conflict and should be conceived as an integrated whole. Any attempt to put some principles or elements over others would make it impossible to achieve a balanced solution.

The Co-Chairs are prepared to meet with the leaders and foreign ministers of Armenia and Azerbaijan at any time, and call on the leaders to resume negotiations in good faith at the earliest opportunity. Continuous and direct dialogue between Baku and Yerevan conducted under the auspices of the Co-Chairs remains an essential element in building confidence and advancing the peace process. The Co-Chairs will also continue to discuss, as appropriate, relevant issues with the interested parties directly affected by the conflict, recognizing that their views and concerns must be taken into account for any negotiated solution to succeed.

The Co-Chairs stress that they remain fully committed, in accordance with their mandate, to helping the sides find a peaceful solution to the conflict. The Co-Chairs also express their full support for the impartial and critical monitoring work undertaken by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office and his team¹.

In the above-mentioned statement from the OSCE Minsk Group, the Co-Chairs emphasize several key points and objectives as part of their ongoing diplomatic efforts to resolve a conflict. Let us delve into the statement in the context of the features and elements of defeatist discourse mentioned earlier. First and foremost, the statement underscores the necessity of considering all principles and elements as an integrated whole. This approach may be interpreted as prioritizing certain principles over others, potentially undermining the crucial aspect of self-determination. Furthermore, mentioning "international security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation" raises concerns about potential foreign military presence. This aspect might be viewed unfavorably from Armenia's perspective, as it could be seen as a challenge to right to self-determination. Additionally, the statement calls on the involved parties to refrain from taking actions that suggest significant changes to the situation. This could be perceived as discouraging self-determination efforts, implying that the status quo should be

¹ Press Statement by the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group on the Upcoming Meeting of President Aliyev and Prime Minister Pashinyan

maintained until further negotiations. Such an approach might be seen as contradictory to the principle of self-determination. Reiterating the point, the reference to "international security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation" may be seen as suggesting a potential foreign military presence, which could be concerning for Armenia in terms of the self-determination principle. Lastly, the statement encourages the leaders to resume negotiations in good faith at the earliest opportunity. This call for urgency might signal to Armenia that the current situation may not be sustainable in the long term.

Overall, while the above-mentioned statement does not explicitly state that it opposes the self-determination principle, certain aspects of the statement can be interpreted as unfavorable to Armenia's interests and self-determination goals.

Similarly, the below-mentioned statement also can be analyzed as a part of a stance that aligns with a position contrary to the Republic of Armenia's claims regarding the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

Statement in Response to the Reports by the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group, the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on the Conflict Dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference and the Head of the High-Level Planning Group As delivered by Ambassador Yevhenii Tsymbaliuk,

Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the International Organizations in Vienna, to the 1246 th meeting of the Permanent Council, 7 November 2019

We welcome Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group, the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on the Conflict Dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference and the Head of the High-Level Planning Group, back to the Permanent Council. Presentation of their reports today provides us with the opportunity to pay additional attention to one of the ongoing conflicts in the OSCE area, which continue to undermine security and stability in Europe. We thank speakers for informing on the recent developments in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Position of Ukraine on this issue has been clear and consistent: this conflict must be resolved based on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan within its internationally recognized borders, core principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Helsinki Final Act, and in line with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions. The firm mutual support, including within the international organizations, for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and Azerbaijan, has been in particular confirmed during the recent meeting of Foreign Minister of Ukraine Vadym Prystaiko and Foreign Minister of Azerbaijan Elmar Mammadyarov on the margins of the conference on the 10th anniversary of the Eastern Partnership, on 5 November in Stockholm. This mutual political support is complemented with practical steps aimed at observance of non-recognition policy for the occupied parts of the territories of our countries. On 27 September, the MFA of Ukraine has officially reminded the citizens of Ukraine on the necessity to comply with the national legislation of Azerbaijan while traveling to the occupied Nagorno-Karabakh region. In conclusion, let me reiterate Ukraine's support to the peaceful resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The ongoing high-level contacts between political leadership of Azerbaijan and Armenia, on which today's speakers informed us, are useful in this regard¹.

The provided statement is a diplomatic communication that discusses the ongoing conflict in the Nagorno-Karabakh region.

¹ Statement in Response to the Reports by the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group, the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on the Conflict Dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference and the Head of the High-Level Planning Group

Let us analyze this statement in the context of defeatist discourse and the features mentioned earlier.

The statement begins by emphasizing that Ukraine's stance on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict is rooted in its support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan within its internationally recognized borders. This position aligns Ukraine with Azerbaijan's viewpoint and opposes the self-determination claims. Notably, the statement makes references to the fundamental principles outlined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Helsinki Final Act. These principles, particularly the importance of territorial integrity, are invoked to underpin Azerbaijan's position and challenge any claims of self-determination asserted by Armenia. Moreover, the statement underscores the mutual political support between Ukraine and Azerbaijan, highlighting their shared commitment to safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their respective nations. This mutual support extends to international organizations, further reinforcing a united front against self-determination efforts. In addition, the non-recognition policy is apparent in the statement, as it outlines practical measures aimed at implementing the "non-recognition policy for the 'occupied territories'." This policy involves refusing to acknowledge claims of self-determination or independence for the Artsakh Republic and urging citizens to comply with Azerbaijan's national legislation when traveling to the region.

Thus, we can state that, while the statement expresses support for the peaceful resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, it does so within the context of upholding Azerbaijan's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

If we analyze the two above-mentioned statements on the deixis level and modality level, we will have the following image:

- **Deixis Level:** In the given statements, deixis is used to refer to specific individuals, groups, and events, and it provides important contextual information. For example, the use of the phrase "Position of Ukraine on this issue" points to a specific country's stance, which is Ukraine. By explicitly stating "this conflict must be resolved based on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan," the passage aligns with the Azerbaijani perspective on Nagorno-Karabakh, which Armenia disputes. This expression of support for Azerbaijan's territorial claims and sovereignty can be seen as unfavorable to Armenia's interests in the region. Another example is the phrase "our territories", which is used to refer to specific geographic areas that the speaker (Ukraine) considers to be under its sovereign control. In this context, "our territories" may be interpreted as a reference to Crimea and Nagorno-Karabakh, suggesting that Ukraine claims these regions as its own. This can be seen as an unfavorable approach to Armenian interests, particularly in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, as it implies a territorial claim in favor of Azerbaijan, which has conflicted with Armenia over the status of the region. The term "occupied parts of the territories" implies that these areas are currently under the control of forces that Ukraine does not recognize as legitimate. This can be interpreted as an unfavorable view of Armenia's role in these regions, as it suggests that Armenia is occupying them rather than liberating them. The use of "non-recognition policy" reinforces the idea that Ukraine does not acknowledge the legitimacy of the situation in these territories, which aligns with an approach that is critical of Armenian interests.

- **Modality level:** The statements contain various elements of modality, reflecting the attitudes, beliefs, and levels of certainty held by the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group regarding the Artsakh Republic and the peace process. For example, the sentence *"the Co-Chairs urge the sides to refrain from statements and actions suggesting significant changes to the situation on the ground, prejudging the outcome of or setting conditions*

for future talks, demanding unilateral changes to the format without agreement of the other party, or indicating readiness to renew active hostilities” suggests that the Co-Chairs urge the sides to refrain from specific actions and behaviors, indicating a desire for certain outcomes and a belief that refraining from these actions is crucial. Or if we take the following part from the above-mentioned statement “With reference to some contradictory recent public statements on the substance of the Minsk Group process, the Co-Chairs reiterate that a fair and lasting settlement must be based on the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act, including in particular the non-use or threat of force, territorial integrity, and the equal rights and self-determination of peoples. It also should embrace additional elements as proposed by the Presidents of the Co-Chair countries in 2009-2012, including the turn of the territories surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijani control; an interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh providing guarantees for security and self-governance; a corridor linking Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh; future determination of the final legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh through a legally binding expression of will; the right of all internally displaced persons and refugees to return to their former places of residence; and international security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation” we will see that there are various expressions of modality, reflecting the Co-Chairs’ attitudes, beliefs, and levels of certainty regarding the principles and elements that should guide the Minsk Group process and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Similarly, this sentence “the Co-Chairs reiterate that a fair and lasting settlement must be based on the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act “indicates a high level of certainty and a strong belief in the necessity of basing the settlement on these principles. The use of “must” implies a high probability or necessity of adhering to these principles. Additionally, the use of “should” in the given sentence “It also should embrace additional elements as proposed by the Presidents of the Co-Chair countries” expresses a strong recommendation and emphasis on embracing these additional elements.

In addition to the above-mentioned analyses we would like to mention phrases and elements presented as possibilities and desirability within the settlement, indicating a level of flexibility and preference in favor of the Republic of Azerbaijan: *“return of the territories surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijani control; an interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh providing guarantees for security and self-governance; a corridor linking Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh; future determination of the final legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh through a legally binding expression of will; the right of all internally displaced persons and refugees to return to their former places of residence; and international security guarantees that would include a peacekeeping operation.”*

Thus, we have attempted to identify different expressions that reflect the Co-Chairs’ attitudes, beliefs, and levels of certainty regarding the principles and elements that should guide the process. These elements emphasize the idea of flexibility and a preference that aligns with the interests of the Republic of Azerbaijan, including territorial control and self-governance.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a thorough analysis has revealed several pivotal findings, providing insights into the complex dynamics that played a role in the defeat of Nagorno-Karabakh, including the underlying defeatist discourse. The analyses have revealed the following critical points:

- The defeatist discourse, characterized by a focus on principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, worked against the claims of the self-determination principle made by Armenia.

- The defeatist discourse and the emphasis on principles like territorial integrity have eroded the self-determination claims of Nagorno-Karabakh. This has important implications for the future of Nagorno-Karabakh and similar conflicts worldwide.
- The geo-political landscape also played a significant role, as demonstrated by Ukraine's support for Azerbaijan. This further reinforced the defeatist discourse and weakened self-determination claims.
- We underscore the need to recognize and understand the impact of defeatist discourse in international conflicts. The analysis serves as a valuable lesson for Armenia and other nations seeking self-determination, highlighting the importance of strategic communication and discourse in diplomacy.
- The defeatist discourse has contributed to the defeat of Nagorno-Karabakh. The article provides valuable insights into the dynamics of international negotiations, emphasizing the need for strategic communication and a deep understanding of the role of discourse in shaping diplomatic narratives.

In light of these findings, it is imperative for Armenia and other nations pursuing self-determination to reevaluate their diplomatic approaches and narratives. Understanding the prevalent discourse and the international legal frameworks that support it is crucial in influencing global perceptions and achieving self-determination goals. By recognizing the role of language and discourse in international relations, nations can better position themselves in complex conflicts and work toward a more favorable outcome. This article serves as a significant contribution to the study of international diplomacy and conflict resolution, offering important lessons for the future.

REFERENCES

1. Анисимова, Елена. *О коммуникативно-прагматических нормах текста*. Москва. 1993.
2. Арутюнова, Нйна. *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва. Советская энциклопедия, 1990.
3. Baylis, John and Steve Smith, *The Globalization of World Politics, an Introduction to International Relations*. 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press, London, 2001
4. Berridge, Geoff. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Publisher: Palgrave Macmillan, 5th edition London, 2015
5. Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analyses*, Cambridge University Press, 1983 http://www.justinecassell.com/discourse/pdfs/brown_yule_chap1.pdf (Accessed: 01/09/2023)
6. Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/politics> (Accessed: 25/09/2023)
7. Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/politics> (Accessed: 19/09/2023)
8. Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/politics> (Accessed: 20/09/2023)
9. Cook, Guy. *Discourse*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. 1989, https://dokumen.tips/documents/discourse-guy_cook.html?page=8 (Accessed: 20/09/2023)
10. Cooper, Andrew et al. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*, OUP Oxford, 2013, <https://www.mofa.gov.bh/Portals/0/pdf/ExamMaterials2018/Diplomacy.pdf> (Accessed: 20/09/2023)
11. Diplomatic Dictionary, *Principle of Public International Law*, Vol.11 (1971), Moscow: Progress Publishers., 1971, p 459

12. Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Pantheon Books, New York, 1972
13. Frowe, Helen. *The Ethics of War and Peace*, London 2015
14. Press Statement by the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group on the Upcoming Meeting of President Aliyev and Prime Minister Pashinyan
https://www.osce.org/minsk-group/413813?fbclid=IwAR0wwgUZIZ_dpLqdCeHTJwrH_X_mX_32FM9j6BFjp7UtrIm3hu1XOq7J6Ng (Accessed: 20/09/2023)
15. Pimentel, Pedro et al. Diplomatic discourses: are they an object of Political Communication research?
<https://www.scielo.br/interc/a/m9qdrbnBkNNJn8JMm5CqSWL/?format=pdf&lang=en>
 (Accessed: 29/09/2023)
16. Satow, Earnest. *Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, 5th ed, (London and New York: Longman, 1979), p. 3.
17. Statement in Response to the Reports by the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group, the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on the Conflict Dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference and the Head of the High-Level Planning Group.
<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/5/b/438731.pdf> (Accessed: 25/09/2023)
18. Sterman, David. *Abandoning the Language of Defeat Is Harder Than You Think*.
<https://www.newamerica.org/future-security/blog/abandoning-the-language-of-defeat-is-harder-than-you-think/> (Accessed: 25/09/2023)

WORKS CITED

1. Anisimova Elena. O komyunikativno-pragmaticseskix normax teksta [On Communicative-Pragmatic Norms of the Textnicative-Pragmatic Norms of the Text]. Moskva. 1993, (in Russian)
2. Arutyunova Nina Davidovna. Lingvisticheskiy enciklopedicheskiy slovar Moskva. Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia]. 1990. (in Russian)

ՊԱՐՏԱԿՈՂԱԿԱՆ ԽՈՍՈՒՅԹԸ ԵՎ ՆՐԱ ԴԵՐԸ ԼԵՆԱՅԻՆ ՂԱՐԱՔԱՂԻ ՊԱՐՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵՋ (ԸՍՏ ԵԱՅԿ ՄԻՆՍԿԻ ԽՄԲԻ ՀԱՅՏԱՐԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ)

ԱՆԻ ԹԱՄԱԶՅԱՆ

Հայաստանի Եվրոպական համալսարանի
 կիրառական լեզվաբանության ամբիոնի հայցորդ,
 Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի լեզուների, հաղորդակցության և
 մանկավարժության ամբիոնի վարիչ,
 ք. Երևան, Հայաստան Հանրապետություն

Սույն հոդվածն ուսումնասիրում է պարտվողական խոսույթի ազդեցությունը Լեռնային Ղարաբաղի հակամարտության ելքի վրա՝ հիմք ընդունելով ԵԱՀԿ Մինսկի խմբի հայտարարությունները:

Հետազոտության նպատակն է ներկայացնել ԵԱՀԿ Մինսկի խմբի հայտարարություններում կիրառված լեզվական միավորները, որոնք պարտվողական խոսույթի մաս են և ազդել են հակամարտության հետագծի վրա՝ հանգեցնելով Լեռնային Ղարաբաղի պարտությանը:

Աշխատանքի խնդիրն է վեր հանել ԵԱՀԿ Մինսկի խմբի հայտարարություններում առկա պարտվողական խոսույթի օրինաչափությունները և վերլուծել, թե ինչպիսի դեր են վերջիններս ունեցել Լեռնային Ղարաբաղի պարտության գործում:

Տվյալ հոդվածում առաջ քաշած խնդիրների բացահայտման համար իրականացրել ենք տեսական մոտեցումների և պարտվողական խոսույթի խոր վերլուծության համադրություն:

Ելնելով ուսումնասիրության արդյունքներից՝ կարող ենք փաստել, որ պարտվողական խոսույթը, կենտրոնացված լինելով ինքնիշխանության և տարածքային ամբողջականության սկզբունքների վրա, լեզվաբանորեն գործել է Հայաստանի կողմից առաջ բերված ազգերի ինքնորոշման սկզբունքի դեմ:

Հիմնաբառեր՝ խոսույթ, պարտվողական, դիվանագիտություն, ԵԱՀԿ Մինսկի խումբ, միջազգային հարաբերություններ, եղանակավորում, դեյիքսիս:

ПОРАЖЕНЧЕСКИЙ ДИСКУРС И ЕГО РОЛЬ В ПОРАЖЕНИИ НАГОРНОГО КАРАБАХА (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ЗАЯВЛЕНИЙ МИНСКОЙ ГРУППЫ ОБСЕ)

АНИ ТАМАЗЯН

*соискатель кафедры прикладной лингвистики
Европейского университета Армении,
заведующая кафедрой языков, коммуникации и педагогики Международного
университета Евразия,
г. Ереван, Республика Армения*

В данной статье, на основе содержания заявлений Минской группы ОБСЕ, исследуется влияние пораженческого дискурса на исход Нагорно-Карабахского конфликта.

Основная цель исследования – представить языковые единицы, использованные в заявлениях Минской группы ОБСЕ, которые являются частью пораженческого дискурса и которые повлияли на развитие траектории конфликта, в конечном итоге приведшего к поражению Нагорного Карабаха.

В задачи исследования входит выявление моделей пораженческого дискурса в заявлениях Минской группы ОБСЕ, изучение их потенциальных последствий и анализ того, как такие формулировки могли способствовать поражению Нагорного Карабаха.

Для достижения поставленных целей был использован синтез теоретических представлений и углубленный анализ пораженческого дискурса в заявлениях Минской группы ОБСЕ.

По результатам исследования можно констатировать, что пораженческий дискурс, характеризующийся ориентацией на принципы суверенитета и территориальной целостности, и в лингвистическом аспекте работал против претензий Армении на принцип самоопределения.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, пораженческий, дипломатия, Минская группа ОБСЕ, международные отношения, модальность, дейксис.