

**General Assembly  
Security Council**Distr.: General  
2 April 2019

Original: English

**General Assembly  
Seventy-third session  
Agenda item 34  
Prevention of armed conflict****Security Council  
Seventy-fourth year****Letter dated 28 March 2019 from the Permanent Representative of  
Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General**

I am writing in response to the letter dated 1 March 2019 addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations ([A/73/795-S/2019/231](#)), which contains false assertions and a distortion of the facts, similar to those made in the previous letters circulated by Azerbaijan on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

The official position of the Republic of Armenia on the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has been expressed and reiterated on numerous occasions by the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Armenia has been constantly expressing its commitment to and support for the peaceful settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict under the auspices of the Co-Chairmanship of the Minsk Group of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

I am transmitting herewith the comment made by the Spokesperson of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia on the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process on 9 March 2019 (see annex).

I kindly request that the present letter and its annex be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34, and of the Security Council.

*(Signed)* Mher **Margaryan**  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representative



**Annex to the letter dated 28 March 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General**

**Comment by the Spokesperson of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process (9 March 2019)**

The rhetoric used in the recent statements by different high-level Azerbaijani officials regarding the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict settlement has significantly toughened. It is deplorable, that these statements specifically stress the use of force or threat of use of force, the possibility of the solution of the conflict by the military means, resolving to maximalist and non-constructive stance. The Co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group have also reflected on these in their recent statement. The numerous constructive statements voiced by the Armenian side, including by the Prime Minister still remain unheeded by Azerbaijani side.

We hear from Baku, that “the force factor has always been and will remain on the agenda,” “military factor plays a crucial role for the solution of the conflict,” “might is right” and so on. Moreover, amid the announcement of the preparation of the meeting between the leaders of the two countries, Azerbaijan launches offensive military drills that have not been notified in compliance with the requirements of the international commitments.

While in his remarks in the European Parliament the Prime Minister of Armenia underlines that culture of dialogue, tolerance and compromise should prevail in our region, Baku threatens to prepare its population not to peace, but to the resolution of the conflict by other means.

Such rhetoric, as well as statements based on the maximalist, non-constructive approaches do not contribute to the creation of an environment conducive to peace. Armenia has reiterated on numerous occasions that it doesn’t accept such approaches, as well as the threat for coercing the negotiations under the barrel of the gun.

Armenia has been consistently voicing its commitment and support to the peaceful settlement of the conflict under the auspices of the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmanship, in which the security and status of Artsakh are our priorities. The fact that the peace process has not been suspended after the Velvet Revolution in Armenia, but moreover, received new dynamics is a vivid evidence of our commitment.

Creating an environment conducive to peace, introducing risk reduction and incident prevention mechanisms, and confidence-building measures, as it was set forth during the Dushanbe meeting, as well as previous meetings in Vienna and Saint Petersburg, continue to remain substantive.

---