



PC.DEL/612/10  
22 June 2010

ENGLISH only

**Statement by the Delegation of Azerbaijan  
at the Working Session II  
of the 2010 Annual Security Review Conference**

Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I would like to thank our distinguished keynote speakers for the very interesting presentations. This is exactly the case when keynote presentations encourage the participants to react and provide a lot of food for thoughts, which, unfortunately, impossible to cover within an intervention.

What we liked very much in written version of Ambassador Hill's presentation is that he tried to make a retrospective analysis of the OSCE toolbox on conflict prevention and resolution. In this regard, I would like to remind that at the beginning of the Corfu discussions on the today's topic the Azerbaijani delegation, if my memory serves me well, has been perhaps the only one noting that new proposals on strengthening the OSCE conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms had to be assessed and elaborated based on the analysis of functioning of the existing ones and whether they had been efficient or had not in resolving protracted conflicts.

One might agree with Ambassador Hill that the current set of OSCE mechanisms and procedures that address conflict prevention and resolution are not the result of well-organized conceptual scheme, but grew out of *ad hoc* responses to fast moving, often unexpected and cataclysmic historical events. However, it is our firm belief that this assertion is not about our shared principles regarding relations among the OSCE participating States. There is no doubt that the OSCE principles on interstate relations are the result of the conceptual approach and based on the international law. On the other hand, we still remain convinced that the OSCE has everything to be successful and effective, except for implementation of its decisions and observance of its commitments.

It is necessary to acknowledge that if one constantly has territorial claims, ignores the very basic principles of interstate relations, enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act,

Charter of Paris and the UN Charter, and uses the armed force for the acquisition of territories, conducts an ethnic cleansing, in these cases, to be frank, we do not think that only blaming the Organization's toolbox would rescue the role of the OSCE in conflict settlement.

In this regard, let me reiterate that the principles and norms of international law, as envisaged in the Helsinki Final Act and UN Charter, constitute the very background for the conflict settlement.

Settlement of conflicts should be based, first of all, on the exclusion of any territorial claims, change of internationally recognized borders of states and annexation policies. It should be based on constructiveness and pragmatism. It should bring us to creation of security environment for peaceful co-existence of communities, which were affected by the conflict.

Therefore, such settlement would bring up an opportunity for development of economic, infrastructural and other areas, giving the communities in these areas a real sense of normal life and a real value of cooperation. Against this background they would be enabled to get more objectivity and to develop objective approaches to the solution of very sensitive issues. So, normal conditions for objectivity should be established, which will get those parties to peaceful, lawful and democratic consideration of matters of their interest. But that starts with security gap. So, if we unfold the process from its logical end up to the beginning and we shall get the normal life and objectivity to consider sensitive issues as the final desired result of this process, in the beginning we inevitably, unavoidably would have to deal with withdrawal of armed forces, the problem of deployment of peacekeepers, disengagements, rehabilitations of territories and other hard security issues.

In conclusion, I will allow myself to come up with a remark regarding to the posed question, by Ambassador Hill in his written presentation, on the characteristics of the Minsk process that have made it easier to sustain relatively united mediation efforts, although, as it has been rightly mentioned, without progress in settlement.

Azerbaijan has from the very beginning supported this process since it is most interested in soonest settlement of the conflict, restoration of its territorial integrity, alleviation of dramatic human suffering of conflict-affected population and their return to their homes as well as establishment of stability and security in the South Caucasus. We have consistently proved our intention, unlike others, not simply by words, but by our deeds. Our position towards the latest proposals by the Minsk Group Co-Chairs is another evidence of our support to the mediation efforts. Despite the fact of occupation of one fifth of its territories over two decades and all heavy burdens of the conflict imposed upon Azerbaijan, we have been demonstrating patience and remain committed to the peaceful settlement of the conflict. Here, while searching for the answer to the question, with due regard to

the efforts of the Minsk Group Chairs, one should take into consideration this fact as well.

I thank you Mr. Moderator.