

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-PC.DEL/91/25
11 December 2025

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 97th JOINT MEETING OF THE
OSCE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION AND THE
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

26 November 2025

**Agenda item: Security Dialogue
Subject: Helsinki Final Act 50 years**

Distinguished Co-Chairpersons,

We categorically reject the attempts by the “dual” Finnish Chairmanship of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) and the OSCE Permanent Council to impart a confrontational tone to today’s Security Dialogue on the 50th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. We consider such an approach to a significant date at a time of crisis for the OSCE to be unacceptable. Finland has not hesitated to use this anniversary to promote its own national agenda, which is laced with overt Russophobia. This is a continuation of the actions of the Finnish Chairmanship-in-Office, which throughout the year has done everything in its power to keep the Ukrainian issue afloat in the three dimensions to the detriment of normal thematic work and has taken a number of non-consensus steps that directly violate the Chairmanship’s mandate and the Rules of Procedure. As a result, the OSCE is continuing to lose its significance as the main platform for discussing issues related to security and stability in Europe.

We consider any attempt to use the exalted position of a chairing country to undermine the consensus principles underlying the work of the OSCE to be inappropriate. We call upon future chairmanships to strictly observe their mandate, which unambiguously obligates them to act on behalf of all the participating States and to take the whole spectrum of opinions of participating States into account in their actions (Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 8 of 2002).

Distinguished Co-Chairpersons,

This year marks the 80th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War and the Second World War. This date serves as a reminder of the enormous price paid for peace by tens of millions of citizens of the USSR, Europe, North America and Asia.

A central milestone in consolidating the post-war realities on the basis of the Yalta-Potsdam agreements was the signing 50 years ago in Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and

Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). Today, Western countries are trying to downplay the leading role our country – then the USSR – played in the Helsinki process and misrepresent the tasks set by the Soviet leadership. They are categorically accusing us of undermining the security system in Europe while grossly distorting the facts.

In reality, the leadership of the USSR understood from the outset that the Soviet people, who had endured the horrors of war, needed to be assured of lasting peace in the qualitatively new conditions of bloc confrontation. The USSR had proposed the creation of a system of collective security in Europe as early as 1954. However, this initiative had been rejected by the former allies in the anti-Hitler coalition. Later, in the second half of the 1960s, it was the Soviet leadership that had pushed for the convening of a conference on security and co-operation in Europe with a view to developing a common European security system. But it took a great deal of political upheaval, including the risk of nuclear Armageddon during the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, before NATO came to realize the need for such an agreement.

The 1975 Helsinki Final Act was the fruit of compromises and the Herculean work of myriad politicians and diplomats. We remember our predecessors – the heads of the USSR delegation, Viktor Maltsev (during the multilateral consultations in Helsinki on the organization and agenda of the CSCE) and Anatoly Kovalyov (during the second phase of the CSCE). At that time, the task of ensuring comprehensive and equal security for all was placed at the centre of the efforts to overcome confrontation. Strict adherence to the Helsinki principles would have guaranteed peace and development for all the signatory countries. However, it soon became clear that our country and the West had different goals in mind when launching the Helsinki process.

The USSR believed that its principal task was to achieve security guarantees and conditions for peaceful development with the aim of obtaining mutual recognition of the inviolability of the European borders as they were drawn up at the end of the Second World War. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Andrei Gromyko, noted: “The consolidation and inviolability of borders in Europe is the main outcome of my efforts... If European countries refuse to abide by the Helsinki agreements and start violating them, ... war will break out in Europe again.” These words proved prophetic.

As has now become clear, the West did not take the commitments made at that time seriously, and instead used human rights as a tool to undermine the system of government and the social fabric of socialist countries. The NATO and EU countries themselves considered it a burden to respect the Helsinki principles, yet they forced others to selectively implement them. Judge for yourselves.

Western countries have always proclaimed the sanctity and inviolability of the principle of “territorial integrity”. If this is so, then please explain why the contours of State borders in 1975 and 2025 look so different. Suffice it to recall how this principle was violated with the unilateral secession of Slovenia and Croatia from Yugoslavia in 1991 and the recognition of their independence, first by Germany, in defiance of EU and NATO discipline, and then by the West as a whole. How many States have collapsed or been destroyed since then?

In violation of the principle of the “non-use of force or threat of force”, in 1999, the so-called defensive alliance of NATO unleashed a war against Yugoslavia, more precisely against Serbia, without a United Nations mandate. The reason was the fabricated reports of massacres of Kosovo civilians by Serbian troops. The war resulted in thousands of civilian casualties, cynically described as “collateral damage”. Have you forgotten about that, too?

What about the principle of the “peaceful settlement of disputes”? Do you remember how in 1995, despite mediation attempts by the OSCE and third parties in the ethno-national conflict between Croatia and

the Republic of Serbian Krajina, Croatia rejected a peaceful solution and proceeded to launch Operation Storm, essentially resorting to ethnic cleansing?

Perhaps you should also be reminded of how the West trampled upon the principle of the Helsinki Decalogue on “non-intervention in internal affairs”? How EU and NATO countries financed and organized a coup d’état in Kyiv in February 2014 and then installed a puppet regime there that serves the interests of Western elites by throwing its own citizens on to the fire of geopolitical confrontation? Having emerged from the ruins of Ukrainian sovereignty, the nationalist leadership in Kyiv has completely destroyed the norms of the Helsinki Decalogue pertaining to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Only you do not want to see or hear this.

Today, the Finnish Chairmanship has placed the principle of the indivisibility of security at the centre of the discussion. Let us recall that, following the Helsinki Final Act, this principle was reaffirmed in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, which states that “the security of every participating State is inseparably linked to that of all the others.” In 1999, the OSCE Summit in Istanbul adopted the Charter for European Security, which emphasizes that participating States “will not strengthen their security at the expense of the security of other States”. It is worth recalling here the statement made by Finnish President Urho Kekkonen in Helsinki in 1975: “In recognizing the indivisibility of security and our mutual interdependence we also admit that the responsibility of each participating State is being equalized.”

Today, neither the Chairmanship nor the panellists have mentioned how Western countries have fulfilled their share of the responsibility for ensuring the indivisibility of security.

Contrary to the promises made to the Soviet leadership and the concerns expressed at the highest level by the Russian Federation, they continued to expand the military bloc eastwards, to the detriment of the interests of our country and many other States. In the OSCE, we were simply met with a refusal to engage in serious discussion with us on any measures that might mitigate, at least to some extent, the negative consequences for security arising from the Alliance’s expansion. Instead, NATO members strengthened their military strike capabilities near Russia’s borders, effectively triggering a further rise in military tensions.

We proposed that the existing problems be resolved by concluding the Treaty on European Security, which provided for the principle of the indivisibility of security being made legally binding, in 2008. But, as in the 1950s, the collective West blocked the initiative.

Meanwhile, NATO countries were dismantling European conventional arms control mechanisms, banking instead on gaining a free hand and achieving overwhelming military superiority.

They discredited the Vienna Document 2011 on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures by attempting to use it as an instrument of information warfare against Russia.

They tore up agreements in the field of arms control, including the Treaty on Open Skies, or created unacceptable conditions for their implementation by the other party, as was the case with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty). The United States of America simply had no need for the adapted version of the CFE Treaty, as it would have forced it to disclose its troop movements across Europe into the Persian Gulf zone in preparation for the aggression against Iraq, and would have stood in the way of Russia being squeezed out of the near abroad, and of the military and strategic assimilation of the region by the Alliance. In this connection, our country was forced first to suspend its participation in the Treaty and then to withdraw from it completely, also in view of the accession of Finland and Sweden to NATO (which, incidentally, was done unilaterally without a referendum – such is democracy).

For our part, we did everything in our power to make the principle of equal and indivisible security in the Euro-Atlantic area legally binding. In 2021, President Vladimir Putin proposed the development of serious long-term legal guarantees that would rule out any further eastward expansion of NATO and the deployment of weapons systems posing a threat to us on Russia's western borders. But in Washington and Brussels, they once again arrogantly refused, stating that no one had the right to impede NATO's expansion, including the drawing of Ukraine into the Alliance.

If there were any doubts, they were dispelled at that moment: NATO countries never intended to engage in an equal and mutually respectful dialogue with Russia. Their goal was to gain geopolitical dominance and weaken our country through the regime in Kyiv, which they brought to power in 2014 through a bloody coup d'état. This conclusion was later confirmed by Angela Merkel, François Hollande and Petro Poroshenko, who publicly admitted that their signatures to the Minsk agreements of February 2015, which were intended to end the conflict in Donbass unleashed by Ukraine, were needed only so that the Ukrainian nationalists could be supplied with weapons for war against Russia.

All this left us with no alternative but to launch a special military operation to ensure reliable security for Russia and to protect Russian and Russian-speaking citizens, whose rights, and indeed whose very lives, the Kyiv regime had openly set out to destroy.

Distinguished Co-Chairpersons,

It is evident that the participating States, and indeed the OSCE itself, are approaching the 50th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act with virtually nothing to show for their efforts.

Today, Europe once again finds itself on a cliff edge. The local elites have worked themselves up into a complete Russophobic frenzy, and the militarization of the continent is becoming essentially uncontrolled. Our predecessors knew what bloody war and the fires of Nazi concentration camp ovens were like. The current generation of European politicians, however, has no desire to remember history and is intoxicated by the idea of embarking on dangerous military adventures.

We see here how they are counting down the days to a head-on collision with Russia. The Chief of the Defence Staff of the French Armed Forces has called upon his fellow citizens to sacrifice their own children in the event of an armed conflict. The German Defence Minister has gone so far as to declare his readiness to kill Russian soldiers. Direct historical parallels come to mind: modern Germany, and indeed the whole of Europe under its current leaders, is degenerating into a bastion for the dehumanization of specific States and peoples. The situation is more than alarming, and the OSCE – in the absence of political will on the part of its Western participating States – is unlikely to be able to help in any way.

Against the background of the frenzied campaign against Russia unleashed by NATO and the European Union, the scope for meaningful work in the FSC – the OSCE's politico-military decision-making body – is shrinking like shagreen skin. Through the fault of the Ukrainian-Western camp, we are losing valuable experience in this Forum in the area of conventional arms control and confidence- and security-building measures. The very foundations of the Structured Dialogue on the current and future challenges and risks to security in the OSCE area, within the framework of which participating States had every opportunity to work towards de-escalating politico-military tensions in Europe, have been trampled underfoot. The West is responsible for the breakdown of this channel of communication as well.

If our opponents end up wiping out the Organization's potential, that will be their choice. The OSCE has already become sidelined from international processes thanks to their "efforts".

Today, the ideas of the sovereign equality of States and their mutually respectful dialogue are embodied in multilateral co-operation projects within the Collective Security Treaty Organization, the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia and other regional associations in Eurasia. There is no scope in these organizations for one group of countries to promote its own interests at the expense of the rest; the prevailing mood among participants is one of equal co-operation and the search for genuine consensus.

Russia sees the formation of a flexible and sustainable architecture of equal and indivisible security and co-operation in Eurasia as a strategic benchmark. The goal of ensuring indivisible security has proved unattainable in the OSCE, but it could well be achieved through the establishment of a pan-Eurasian architecture that is open to all countries of the continent. There will also be a place in such an architecture for countries in the European part of the continent that do not wish to be left on the sidelines. But they will certainly not be calling the shots. They will have to move away from dictates and get used to equality.

Russia does not refuse and has never refused to comply with the fundamental Helsinki principles. We know history well and would not recommend that our Western colleagues try to go through another Cuban Missile Crisis wake-up call so that they can finally start a serious conversation about ensuring politico-military security. We will not allow the Helsinki process to be subordinated to Western opportunism, we will remain opposed to the selective application of the provisions of the Final Act, and we will continue to seek the resumption of a dialogue of equals among the 57 OSCE participating States.

Thank you for your attention.