

---

# OSCE Minsk Group : Mediator Or Side ? - Analysis

Azeri Press Agency - 17/3/2008

---

The most unexpected point of the UN vote on Occupied Territories of Azerbaijan is certainly that OSCE Minsk Group co-chairs - US, Russia and France, which are directly involved in the problem, voted against the document.

In fact the document demolished illusions around the solution of Nagorno Karabakh conflict and clarified the issue. The question is that OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs directly involved in the regulation of Nagorno Karabakh conflict voted against the resolution, which is recognizing territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and demanding solution of the conflict on the basis of this principle. It provokes a fair question: "If OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs votes against the resolution, which recognizes territorial integrity of Azerbaijan, how objective mediators can they be?" One of the interesting moments is that the co-chair countries did not only vote against, but also actively campaigned against the adoption of this document. This situation clarifies two important results:

1) OSCE Minsk Group co-chairs are not neutral mediators, they are concrete SIDES. Their position coincides with the position of occupier Armenia, but not Azerbaijan, whose rights have been violated as a result of the conflict.

2) Solution models proposed by the co-chairs cannot be based on the principle of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. Their position shows that co-chairs are trying to solve the conflict not on the basis of territorial integrity, but on the principle of self-determination, or mixed formula of both principles.

Both results show that OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs will lose confidence of Azerbaijani community. Even without that, the community has no simple attitude to the Minsk Group, which couldn't achieve any result toward the solution of the conflict over the years. However the Minsk Group Co-Chairs lost sight of one factor- their position in the UN General Assembly has complicated not the situation of Azerbaijan, but OSCE Minsk Group.

Certainly one of the decisive moments of regulation process, not depending on the results, will be preparation of both communities for the compromises. The Co-chairs have made statements on this issue for many times and underlined the importance of public communities in Azerbaijan and Armenia for the compromises. In current situation, the co-chairs are restricting Azerbaijan's opportunity to make a compromise and not giving a chance to the community to accept existing compromises.

Logic is simple - if the mediators do not recognize Azerbaijan's territorial integrity, avoid the settlement of the conflict basing on this principle, the society will reject any proposal of the co-chair countries, thinking that their proposals meet Armenia's interests.

Thus, the co-chairs, with their position in UN General Assembly expose the society's confidence to risk.

Can Azerbaijan refuse mediation mission of OSCE Minsk Group? It does not seem real after the adoption of the resolution in UN. Even the resolution supports the activity of OSCE Minsk Group and Deputy Foreign Minister Araz Azimov said Azerbaijan was interested in continuing the process of negotiations with mediation of OSCE Minsk Group. But assessing both the resolution and official

statements, we come to the conclusion that Azerbaijan wants important changes in the negotiations.

However, if Azerbaijan really wants to achieve progress in the process of negotiations and make use of the essence of the resolution adopted in the UN General Assembly, then it should lay down a concrete condition before the co-chair countries - settlement of the conflict within the framework of the countries' territorial integrity should be determined and the negotiations should be carried out basing on this concrete principle. The resolution adopted in the UN General Assembly enables to lay down such a condition. The further stage of the negotiations on the settlement of Nagorno Karabakh conflict depends on the acceptance of this condition by the co-chairs. It is not convincing that the result of the negotiations, which do not base on the principle of the countries' territorial integrity, will differ from the hitherto results.

---