

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador – Designate Matthew J. Bryza by
Senator Robert Menendez (#1)
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
July 22, 2010**

Question:

In response to questions during your hearing process, you stated that you initially expressed concern to the Azerbaijan Foreign Minister and began to gather additional facts, but that it was not until your first visit to the region almost three months later that you publicly condemned the desecration at Djulfa and reiterated with Azerbaijan's top leaders the serious concern of the U.S. regarding this issue.

Was this delay in speaking out against Azerbaijan's desecration of the Djulfa cemetery in any way based on your concern that publicly addressing this matter would somehow hinder diplomatic efforts to build trust in the region?

Was the decision not to include Azerbaijan's desecration of the Djulfa cemetery in the State Department's International Religious Freedom Report in any way influenced by a concern about the Azerbaijan government's potential response to having its actions documented in this manner?

Answer:

No. I issued a public condemnation of the Djulfa desecration on behalf of the U.S. Government on March 7 at a press conference in Yerevan during my first visit to the region following the tragedy at Djulfa. Reaction to the Djulfa desecration was not related to the pursuit of a negotiated settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. If confirmed, I will work actively through private negotiations, public statements, and site visits to press for the protection and preservation of Armenian religious and cultural sites in Azerbaijan. This would be in keeping with my previous visits while serving as Minsk Group Co-Chair and Deputy Assistant

Secretary to important sites such as the Ganzhasar Monastery and the archaeological excavations at Tigranakert, as well as my efforts with Georgia's top officials on protection and restitution of Armenian church properties in Tbilisi.

When compiling reports such as the International Religious Freedom Report and the Human Rights Report, the U.S. government documents factual events without consideration of the host government's reaction.

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador – Designate Matthew J. Bryza by
Senator Robert Menendez (#2)
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
July 22, 2010**

Question:

On February 6, 2007 you were quoted by AP, in opposition to legislation recognizing the Armenian Genocide, as saying: “a congressional resolution would be a tremendous blow to our bilateral relationship.”

Can you explain why you believe that a U.S. resolution recognizing the genocide in Armenia would harm our relationship with Turkey?

Answer:

My responsibility as an American diplomat is to represent the views of the U.S. government, on this and all subjects. In 2007, then-President Bush and his administration, including Secretaries Rice and Gates, strongly opposed House Resolution 106. President Bush stated: “I urge Members to oppose the Armenian Genocide Resolution now being considered by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. We all deeply regret the tragic suffering of the Armenian people that began in 1915, but this resolution is not the right response to these historic mass killings. And its passage would do great harm to our relations with a key ally in NATO and in the global war on terror.”

**Questions for the Record Submitted to
Ambassador – Designate Matthew J. Bryza by
Senator Robert Menendez (#3)
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
July 22, 2010**

Question:

Do you support the reinstatement of Nagorno Karabakh as a full participant in all aspects of the peace process?

You have said that, as part of the Madrid Principles, there will be "an expression of will," in your own words, "at some point" in the future, in order to determine the status of Nagorno Karabakh. Can you explain what you mean by "an expression of will," specifically addressing who will participate and exactly what question you believe would be decided by this "expression"? Also, please be more precise than "at some point" in explaining your view of the time-frame for such an "expression."

Answer:

As I said in my testimony, it is impossible to reach a mutually agreeable settlement without taking into account the views of the people who will be the subject of the agreement. The views of the Karabakhi Armenians are taken into account by the Minsk Group Co-Chairs through regular visits to Nagorno-Karabakh and meetings with the de facto authorities, among others. Their inclusion as a full participant in the peace process is a decision that must be made by the parties to the negotiations.

The only way to resolve the Nagorno Karabakh conflict is through a peaceful settlement which results in an agreement based on the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, particularly those related to refraining from the threat or use of force, the

territorial integrity of states, and the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, together with the elements first proposed by the Presidents of the Minsk Group Co-Chair countries on the margins of the 2009 G8 meeting in L'Aquila and reiterated by the three presidents June 17, 2010 in Muskoka. These elements include the return of the occupied territories surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh, interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh guaranteeing security and self-governance, a corridor linking Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh, final status of Nagorno-Karabakh to be determined in the future by a legally-binding expression of will, the right of all internally-displaced persons and refugees to return, and international security guarantees, including a peacekeeping operation. The specific modalities of this vote, including its precise terminology, the nature of the question to be decided, and the vote's timing all remain to be determined through further negotiations. While it is for the parties to agree to and further define these elements, the United States is committed at the highest levels to assisting with this effort.