

The OSCE Secretariat bears no responsibility for the content of this document and circulates it without altering its content. The distribution by OSCE Conference Services of this document is without prejudice to OSCE decisions, as set out in documents agreed by OSCE participating States.

FSC.DEL/293/26
30 July 2026

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY
MS. IULIA ZHDANOVA, HEAD OF THE DELEGATION OF THE
RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS ON MILITARY
SECURITY AND ARMS CONTROL, AT THE 1144th PLENARY MEETING OF
THE OSCE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION**

29 July 2026

Agenda item: Closing session under the Georgian Chairmanship

Mr. Chairperson,

We congratulate you on the conclusion of your Chairmanship of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC). We welcome the Organization's Secretary General, H.E. Mr. Feridun H. Sinirlioğlu, and note the valuable signals of support for the work of our politico-military platform.

We take note of the statement by the Director General of the Directorate for Security Policy, International Organizations and Euro-Atlantic Integration of the Georgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Archil Karaulashvili, on the outcomes of the current session. At the same time, we are obliged to express our deep disappointment that this statement was marred by politically tinged attacks against the Russian Federation and one-sided assessments of the security situation, which is unacceptable for a participating State aspiring to hold the OSCE Chairmanship-in-Office in 2027.

In particular, emotionally charged remarks were to be heard from Georgia today about some sort of "occupation". We should like to begin by dwelling on what has been overlooked by the delegates in Tbilisi, namely the Georgian authorities' aggressive policy, going back many years, towards their counterparts in Sukhum and Tskhinval, which has resulted in several armed conflicts instigated by Georgia against Abkhazia and South Ossetia. These culminated in the operation against South Ossetia launched by the Saakashvili regime during the night of 7 to 8 August 2008, cynically and tellingly code-named "Clear Field". During this attack, an assault was launched simultaneously on the positions of the Russian peacekeepers. The fact that the attack was unprovoked was later confirmed – notably in the report of the International Fact-Finding Mission established under the auspices of the European Union to investigate the causes of the conflict in the Caucasus and headed by the Swiss diplomat Heidi Tagliavini.

In the face of an ongoing direct threat to the lives of Russian citizens in South Ossetia, the Russian leadership, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, took the decision to force Georgia to sue for peace. This move saved the entire South Ossetian people from certain destruction. Subsequently, in line with its policy of defending the peoples of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the Russian Federation recognized the independence of these two countries, as did several other members of the international community.

We would remind you that, within the framework of the International Discussions on Security and Stability in Transcaucasia, a direct dialogue of equals is being facilitated between the Georgian Government on the one hand, and the authorities in Sukhum and Tskhinval on the other, with a view to achieving a post-conflict settlement of their relations. It is essential to ensure the security of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in a lasting manner by having Georgia provide legally binding guarantees that it will not use force against them, and by initiating the process of demilitarization and subsequent demarcation of the Georgian-Abkhazian and Georgian-South Ossetian State borders.

Mr. Chairperson,

As we can see, this latest phase in the FSC's work is drawing to a close against the backdrop of continued deterioration in the regional security situation. The European ruling elites' destructive course aimed at total confrontation with Russia and escalation of the Ukrainian conflict is becoming further entrenched.

In view of the crisis in Europe provoked by EU and NATO countries, it is out of the question to talk of any kind of trust in the military sphere. Instead of pursuing professional dialogue at the FSC, these countries prefer to ratchet up tensions by disseminating hostile narratives about Russia and distorting the essence of fundamental OSCE documents on confidence- and security-building measures and military security.

Behind the OSCE's back, the North Atlantic Alliance is preparing for an armed clash with Russia, for which purpose it is using Ukraine. This "square" on the global chessboard (which is precisely how that country is perceived in the West) allows the bloc to buy time to build up its own "military muscles", serves as a testing ground where modern weapons and military equipment can be trialled in combat conditions, and furnishes Europe with the knowledge and skills required to conduct military operations in novel circumstances. And it is the Ukrainian people who are paying the price for this "business project", having become hostage to the profit-hungry corrupt officials in Kyiv's Bankova Street and the Euro-Atlantic political elites.

Over the past few months, we have been witnessing the ongoing amalgamation of the European and Ukrainian military-industrial complexes with a view to further production of military goods intended, primarily, to inflict maximum damage on our country. Western countries are not only helping Ukraine to expand its production capacity within its own borders, but are also seizing the opportunity to set up additional production lines in EU Member States, which are arming themselves to the teeth, too, as they openly prepare for possible hostilities against our country.

In order to brace the European public for additional expenditure and further involvement in the conflict, the authorities of European countries are lulling the local population with fairy tales about the front-line situation shifting in Ukraine's favour and the effectiveness of the strategy to wear Russia down, including through strikes on port infrastructure and ships transporting oil and grain. The global economic consequences of these decisions, including their impact on the global food market, appear to be the least of our Western colleagues' concerns.

But there are still thoughtful anti-war voices in Europe. In particular, a group of doctors and other healthcare workers from Belgium expressed, in a recently published open letter, their dissatisfaction with the galloping militarization of all areas of life and with the attempts to make them and the rest of the population believe that war is inevitable. They rightly point out that the local authorities are opting for an arms race

rather than diplomacy, that these are doing all they can to maintain the illusion that it is possible to control the consequences of a potential conflict, to ensure that people are prepared and to minimize the damage.

However, the main beneficiaries of this active militarization – namely the local authorities and the owners of military enterprises – remain deaf to the appeals of their own people. Instead of diplomatic efforts, they are looking for ways to further cash in on the conflict, and countries are even beginning to compete for the right to cherry-pick from the ever-growing pile of military orders that are being placed. Not to be outdone by Canada with its proposal to establish a “Defence, Security and Resilience Bank” to finance arms production, the United Kingdom, in tandem with Finland, the Netherlands and Poland, is promoting its own initiative called the “Multilateral Defence Mechanism”. Anyway, it all comes down to the same thing, namely to set the wheels of the military industry rolling so that the profits from the sale of military goods will just keep flowing in.

We are raising this point in order to illustrate how Europe is gradually shifting from merely supplying the Kyiv regime with weapons to the creation of long-term mechanisms for military co-operation directed, above all, against our country. Meanwhile, our Latvian neighbours are already crossing the first “psychological barrier” by allowing the Ukrainian armed forces to use their territory and airspace for the conduct of attacks on Russian targets. At the same time, Latvia, in co-ordination with Estonia and Poland, is putting into practice plans to establish a “continuous, integrated system of fortifications” – the so-called Baltic Defence Line – by, *inter alia*, taking measures to lay mines along NATO’s eastern borders and to set up a “drone wall”.

We are obliged to note that, faced with the imperative of addressing the root causes of the security crisis on the continent, those in Europe are saying a distinct “no”, regardless of the attendant consequences, including consequences for the OSCE.

Perhaps the time has finally come to pause and reflect?

Unless this trend is reversed, then, instead of a legacy of achievements in the field of military risk reduction, those coming after us here at our Organization (which, by the way, is no longer being used by Western participating States as intended) will merely inherit reams of identikit statements by NATO and EU countries shot through with futile attempts to smear Russia. A meagre inheritance, indeed, from those who like to trumpet their moral and ideological superiority.

Mr. Chairperson,

Your watch at the helm of the OSCE’s politico-military decision-making body obviously coincided with a most challenging period. However, from the point of view of the Rules of Procedure, you sought to make efforts to foster dialogue, giving every participating State the opportunity to speak out and make itself heard.

The meetings during the spring-summer session were conducted in accordance with the FSC’s programme of work. Three Security Dialogues were organized on the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, focusing on strengthening compliance with its provisions and on conflict-related human rights violations, including in the format of a joint meeting of the FSC and the OSCE Permanent Council.

On the other hand, we note the failure to organize a meeting on the Code of Conduct. The blocking of that key event in the OSCE’s annual cycle over the past five years as a result of anonymous delegations acting behind closed doors constitutes an abandonment of diplomacy and deals a blow to the very foundations of the Forum, in particular to FSC Decision No. 12/11, which obligates the participating States

to conduct an annual review of implementation of the Code of Conduct. We categorically reject the attempts to “compensate” for the refusal by NATO countries and Ukraine to hold that event by considering exclusively humanitarian issues through the lens of the Code of Conduct. I must stress that our position is based on a precise and thorough reading of that document, of all its provisions in their interconnectedness. As for the attempts to interpret the Code of Conduct in a politically opportunistic manner that suits the propagandist advocacy agenda of several States, these attempts are diluting, if not downright undermining, the Code’s objectives and essence.

It is also telling that here, under the politico-military dimension of the OSCE’s work, the participating States have opportunities to de-escalate the situation, since the FSC was established for the purpose of dialogue on issues of “hard” security. We also have the corresponding frameworks for looking for ways out of the crisis, but Western countries are systematically ignoring them. They are trying to carve out a kind of comfort zone for themselves within the OSCE in order to avoid discussing awkward topics – thus, they hold “get-togethers” without the participation of Russia and Belarus, and organize verification conferences on the Vienna Document 2011 on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures exclusively for NATO and EU member States and their like-minded partners. At the end of the day, Western countries are in this way diverting the OSCE from its original objectives. They are taking deliberate, conscious steps that run counter to the very nature of a pan-European process that was launched more than fifty years ago precisely with the aim of building bridges between warring parties.

In this connection, let me say a few words about the efforts of the Norwegian Chairmanship of the Informal Working Group on the Structured Dialogue on the Current and Future Challenges and Risks to Security in the OSCE Area. We continue to oppose the breaking up of the Structured Dialogue into “small groups”, which are exacerbating the already deep divide in the OSCE, as this flies in the face of the Rules of Procedure, the relevant 2016 Hamburg Ministerial Council declaration and the principles of the Structured Dialogue itself. On that premise, we do not believe it is worth participating in this “flexible” format and will not recognize its outcomes. We continue to advocate strict adherence to the “Hamburg mandate”, which implies the participation of all 57 participating States without exception, as is only right and proper here at the OSCE.

We call upon the OSCE Secretariat’s Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) to assist the Chairmanships more actively in going about their tasks on the basis of the principles of impartiality, openness and accountability. The CPC is expected to contribute to the preservation of institutional memory regarding the FSC’s work and to engage accordingly with delegations. We are convinced that the Centre will be able to constructively leverage its experience and energy in order to bring the Forum’s work – and, more broadly, the politico-military dimension of the OSCE’s work – back into line with its mandate.

Our position remains unchanged. The Forum still has an important role to play in addressing politico-military security issues in the OSCE area. It is not too late yet for the Western participating States to ponder how the FSC can be strengthened as a unique politico-military platform operating on the basis of the consensus rule and the principle of sovereign equality of States. Otherwise, its value will shrink to zero and the Forum will be sidelined in international processes.

In that regard, a great deal of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the incoming UK Chairmanship. We expect our colleagues to work in a constructive spirit while strictly adhering to the Rules of Procedure. It is high time that the FSC was cleared of propagandistic chaff and its work focused on genuinely important issues pertaining to politico-military security in the interests of all 57 OSCE participating States without exception. We should like to wish the UK Chairmanship team every success in these endeavours.

Thank you for your attention.