

FSC-PC.DEL/28/09  
16 September 2009

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY MR. VLADIMIR VORONKOV,  
DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PAN-EUROPEAN  
CO-OPERATION OF THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF  
RUSSIA, AT THE JOINT MEETING OF THE OSCE FORUM FOR  
SECURITY CO-OPERATION AND THE  
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

15 September 2009

Madam Chairperson and Mr. Chairman,  
Distinguished colleagues,

I should like to thank both chairmanships, the Greek and the British, for organizing today's event. It is a pleasure to see in this hall colleagues and friends with whom one has already had the opportunity to work in a constructive fashion.

In my statement I shall touch on three key issues having to do with certain aspects of Russia's present-day foreign policy philosophy and its view of the role of the OSCE, relations between the "Corfu Process" and President Medvedev's proposal on the drawing up of a Treaty on European Security, and also the set of Russian proposals on following up the results of the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference (ASRC).

We were extremely impressed by the fact that the distinguished representative of the United States of America cited many of the points raised by Sergey Lavrov, Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the Review Conference, particularly as regards the desire to understand and fully comprehend the concerns of particular countries and to try together to find ways of properly dealing with those concerns.

Permit me at this point to draw your attention to the programmatic article by the President of the Russian Federation entitled "Go, Russia!", posted on 10 September of this year on the Internet site "Gazeta.ru". This material is of great importance in that, perhaps for the first time, President Medvedev has set out his comprehensive view of the prospects for the development of Russian society. To some degree, this publication deals with the OSCE as well, particularly with respect to the atmosphere of tension that occasionally arises in this Organization.

Specifically, I shall deal with two points raised in the article. First of all, touchiness, conceit, complexes and distrust must be eliminated *on a reciprocal basis* from Russia's relations with the leading democratic countries. Secondly, the modernization of Russian democracy and the formation of a new economy will be possible only if Russia takes

advantage of the intellectual resources of post-industrial society. Without any complexes, openly and pragmatically. The question of the harmonization of our country's relations with Western democracies is not a matter of taste or of any personal preferences. Russia is extremely interested in the convergence and interpenetration of our cultures and economies, but, I repeat, on a basis of reciprocity.

I would recommend to my colleagues that they carefully read this article, an English translation of which has been posted on the President's official website (Kremlin.ru).

Someone might ask: What is the point of mentioning here President Medvedev's article and the Russian idea of concluding a Treaty on European Security? The answer is: because our proposal regarding a comprehensive document of this kind is based on the foreign policy philosophy approved by the President, to which I earlier referred. We are proposing that a discussion be started on the problems of "hard" security, based on the understanding that, as the events in the Euro-Atlantic region in recent years have shown, the regulatory arrangements in this area are not working satisfactorily and are not only not having the effect of bringing countries closer together, but are frequently moving them further apart. If we are able to provide a harmonious basis for relations between the participating States of the OSCE in the area of "hard" security, then by so doing we shall have restored the confidence on which, in turn, the other dimensions of co-operation and the prosperity of our countries' peoples depend.

In our view the idea of a Treaty on European Security has turned out to be a topical one and one that is both needed and viable. Important political-science and political forums in the Euro-Atlantic area have involved themselves in the work to draw up this treaty. In addition to the OSCE, our partners in the Russia-NATO Council have spoken of their intention to conduct a dialogue on this subject, and we are also discussing it within the Russia-European Union consultation format.

As for political scientists and politicians, the influential Brussels-based East-West Institute has spoken out in favour of this Russian initiative, and a few days ago the Carnegie Foundation announced its interest in contributing to the discussion of the idea of a treaty along these lines. At the Geneva forum, thanks to the efforts of the Swiss Government and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, a substantive discussion was also held that might result in the launching of the Chambasy Process. A number of Russian political-science forums are also prepared to take part in work concerned with the European security architecture.

Clearly, all these discussions and their possible results will reveal to what degree the OSCE is capable of realizing its potential as a forum for political dialogue and the adoption of decisions on the most important issues of co-operation and of making its contribution to this pan-European discussion.

The Russian proposal regarding the drawing up of a Treaty on European Security and the Greek "Corfu Meeting" initiative are mutually overlapping but not mutually replaceable approaches. The difference is simple: The Treaty on European Security is a document drawn up with the involvement of all the international structures of the Euro-Atlantic region, while the "Corfu Meetings" are discussions within the framework of the OSCE covering a broad agenda that includes the enhancement of the Organization's effectiveness and its three "baskets".

We are grateful to the Greek Chairmanship for the “Corfu Process” that it has launched. We shall participate actively in that process, sending experts from Moscow to the meetings. We trust that the informal discussions begun in Vienna on all aspects of the OSCE agenda will help to correct the imbalances that exist in the Organization’s work and will breathe new life into it.

In that same context, I should like to reaffirm the Russian proposal for the convening in 2010 of a meeting to bring together the leaders of NATO, the Collective Security Treaty Organization, the OSCE, the European Union and the Commonwealth of Independent States to compare the security strategies applied by each of these structures. This would be an important step towards the creation of a single and indivisible security space in the Euro-Atlantic region and for making operational the Platform for Co-operative Security.

Ladies and gentlemen,  
Distinguished colleagues,

Permit me to turn now specifically to a number of recommendations put forward at the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference.

We believe that in the area of arms control and confidence-building measures it would be useful to begin work on a “Programme for Immediate Action”, similar to what was done in 1993 and 1994. There is a need to update the Vienna Document on confidence-and security-building measures in the military area, which has not been updated since 1999. A modernization of that kind, in our view, would not entail a radical reworking of the entire text but rather, primarily, a reformulation of outdated and non-functional provisions and the elimination of obvious gaps, specifically by extending confidence-building measures to rapid-reaction and naval forces. In that same connection, pending the reaching of an agreement on the new wording, the Vienna Document in its present form must continue to be implemented in full.

We are firmly in favour of restoring the viability of the regime provided for under the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, using for this purpose the “package solution” that has already been worked out.

As far as the revitalization of the OSCE is concerned, the following steps could be taken. In the first place, a special meeting of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) might be convened to discuss the questions involved in future arms control and confidence-building measures in Europe as a follow-up to the Berlin meeting. The OSCE already has this kind of experience, going back to October 2007, when at the initiative of France, Germany and Russia a similar event was held. If an agreement is reached regarding a new meeting, it might provide a platform for a focused discussion of the idea of formulating a “Programme for Immediate Action”. Secondly, we could prepare in time for the Ministerial Council meeting in Athens a substantive decision on the future work of the Forum, focusing on arms control and confidence-building measures.

We agree with the conclusion expressed at the ASRC during the discussion of the subject of conflicts to the effect that, as demonstrated by last year’s events, the anti-crisis mechanisms developed in the OSCE are either not being applied or are not working. For example, the 1993 document “Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations” was

unwisely overlooked, while the mechanism provided for in Chapter III of the Vienna Document that was put into effect last year hardly lived up to anyone's expectations.

The main thing, however, is that we have been confronted with the application of "double standards" with regard to crises of similar nature. I am speaking here not only of the well-known analogy drawn between Kosovo, on the one hand, and Abkhazia and South Ossetia, on the other. We were surprised that a recommendation calling for a "more active role on the part of the OSCE in the Northern Caucasus" found its way into the report of the Greek Chairmanship summarizing the outcome of the Annual Security Review Conference. This proposal was in fact voiced in a number of statements, but was resolutely rejected by the Russian delegation.

In the first place, the Northern Caucasus is a territory of the Russian Federation, and we have not requested the OSCE to do anything about it. In the second place, other regions were also mentioned at that Conference that for some reason have not been included in the list of recommendations. And, in the third place, there are no conflicts in the Northern Caucasus. What we do have is terrorism, which we are combating on our territory in the same way that a whole host of our OSCE partners are doing on their territory. An interesting subject for discussion in the OSCE might be the question of how to interdict the external "feeding" of all this terrorist activity.

I shall not speak in any detail about the state of affairs with regard to the development of democracy in Georgia, but would advise all those present to study the report on that subject prepared by the national commissioner for human rights.

We have proposed that we begin formulating a single set of principles for the resolution of conflicts that could be uniformly applied in all crisis situations within the OSCE area. This would make it possible to avoid "double standards" and to assist in untangling conflict situations. We would propose that this work be begun simultaneously within the FSC and the Permanent Council, with the possibility that that work might be supplemented by discussions at political-science institutions.

We are also prepared to consider specific proposals on improving OSCE procedures and mechanisms in the area of early warning, conflict prevention and post-conflict rehabilitation.

During the Review Conference a proposal was made to introduce the practice of adopting conflict resolution decisions on a non-consensus basis. We regard as absolutely unacceptable any efforts to subvert the unanimity principle governing the adoption of decisions in the OSCE. The fact is that the consensus rule represents the embodiment of the sovereign equality of all the participating States of our Organization.

We are pleased that there was a constructive discussion at the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference on the way in which OSCE commitments in combating new threats and challenges are being implemented.

We agree with the proposals calling for the strengthening of the OSCE Secretariat's potential for combating terrorism and illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs, for enhancing the authority of the Security Committee of the Permanent Council and for stepping up co-operation with other international organizations.

We support the idea of formulating in time for the Ministerial Council meeting in Athens a substantive decision on further steps by the OSCE in countering terrorism. We would suggest that thought be given to the holding in 2010 of an OSCE political event on the subject of the prevention of terrorism.

Together with a number of other countries, we intend to propose a draft for a Ministerial Council decision on combating the threat posed by narcotic drugs. We favour continuing the practice of annual OSCE conferences on narcotic drugs in co-operation with authoritative international agencies.

We are prepared to work also along the lines of the initiative taken by Germany, France and Sweden calling for a decision at the Athens Ministerial Council meeting on co-operation in police matters within the framework of the OSCE.

In general, we favour enhancing the authority of the Annual Security Review Conference and propose that, beginning in 2010, its duration be extended to three or four days.

It is our hope that the 2009 Annual Security Review Conference and today's meeting will impart a fresh impetus to solving the problems that have accumulated in the area of confidence and security.

Thank you for your attention.