

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.

PC.DEL/70/23
26 January 2023

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY
MR. MAXIM BUYAKEVICH, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE 1408th MEETING OF THE
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

26 January 2023

In response to the address by the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Esteemed colleagues,

In less than a month, this room will host the winter meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. We hope that, despite the differences, the work of legislators will take place in a constructive atmosphere and will foster mutually respectful dialogue. We firmly believe that platforms for professional communication are where we need to look for keys to the solution to many problems. The forthcoming meeting is an opportunity to seriously discuss worrying trends and try to find common ground.

In that context, we should like to express our confidence in the conscientious attitude of Austria – as the host country of the Assembly’s winter meeting – in fulfilling its international obligations with regard, above all, to ensuring the unimpeded access of all participants to the event and adequate security guarantees. Russia would highly appreciate a balanced and responsible approach of this kind.

Ms. Cederfelt,

Once again, your address was frankly disappointing. The points you made are not about peace or the obvious need to work together in a depoliticized way to find compromises. They reveal a confrontational approach and an unwillingness to compromise. This is regrettable. It seemed to us that altogether different signals are required today from the President of an authoritative parliamentary structure. Well, history will put the record straight, as it has done many times before.

As far as your report is concerned, it contains repeated references to some “European security order”. I do not wish to upset or demotivate anyone in this room, but you are using a concept that does not exist. It is a chimera – a well-known pendant to the no less objectionable concept of a “rules-based order”. We call for an end to the imposition of a distorted picture of the world and the reduction of complex international processes to a primitive formula of confrontation between “democracies” and “authoritarian regimes”. Stop fooling everybody – the responsible players understand well the aim of Western States to undermine the UN-centric architecture, erode the norms of international law and fragment the global political space. It is for this very reason that you have long since sacrificed the ideas of equality and the rejection of dividing lines.

We are forced to recall that the OSCE principle of the indivisibility of security inevitably imposes its own logic: security either exists for all participating States or it does not exist for anyone. It is unfortunate that we have been living for some time now in the second part of this paradigm and are not making a collective effort to find a way out of the European security crisis. The real causes of this crisis are known to lie in the perennial claims to global dominance by the United States of America, the absorption of Eastern Europe by the Western alliance, and the drawing of the NATO military infrastructure closer to Russia's borders.

We cannot help but note, Madam President, the excessive, yet completely perverse, attention you are paying to the Ukrainian issue. Attempts to manipulate the cause-and-effect relationships between events do not stand up to criticism. You persist in painting a picture of the undermining of foundations that supposedly began on 24 February 2022 with the start of the special military operation, which has had, if we follow your text, an "incalculable impact on peace, security and co-operation in every corner of the OSCE region".

To put it bluntly, we are disappointed by such a primitive presentation of the current international political crisis. It is clear that the problems that led to it have accumulated over the years and even decades and were not caused by the actions of Russia. The longer the West refuses to understand this, the longer the crisis will last, and the longer the security situation will maintain its tendency to escalate and become increasingly volatile for the entire OSCE area.

We should like to emphasize something that should have come out, but was missing from your address. The current events in Ukraine – and you are well aware of this – are a consequence of the reckless neocolonial expansionist policy of the collective West to turn Ukraine into a tool for achieving the West's geopolitical plans. Everything that is happening is the result of the coup d'état in Kyiv in February 2014, which was orchestrated, funded and organized from abroad and has led to armed confrontation in the east of Ukraine and the wholesale suffering of millions of civilians.

The West kept silent and did not seek the truth when, immediately after the bloodshed in Kyiv, neo-Nazis – "for the glory of Ukraine" – burned people in Odessa, opened fire on a peaceful demonstration in Mariupol, organized a military operation against the civilian population to suppress dissent and industrialized torture and extrajudicial executions. Those responsible for all this have never been punished. On the contrary, they were labelled as some kind of "fighters for dignity" and were widely praised in the West, which, by the way, contributed to the subsequent integration of inveterate neo-Nazis from the nationalist battalions into the armed forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other security agencies of Ukraine in the course of reforming the law enforcement system. It was the Western alliance that organized their military training, armed them, and encouraged their participation in punitive operations against the civilian population. Finally, it began an active military assimilation of Ukraine, over whose territory NATO even managed to practise strikes against Russia during military exercises.

All this was accompanied by a feigned effort to facilitate a political and diplomatic settlement. Certain Western leaders, who had volunteered to become co-mediators of this process on the basis of the Minsk agreements worked out with their participation, went on to flout United Nations Security Council resolution 2202, which endorsed the Minsk Package of Measures. The recent revelations of three of the four co-authors of the Package of Measures, the former leaders of France, Germany and Ukraine François Hollande, Angela Merkel and Petro Poroshenko, show that none of them intended to implement the agreed tasks, regarding them as an opportunity to buy time for their charges in Kyiv, arm the Kyiv regime to the teeth and prepare it for active combat operations against the residents of Donbas and neighbouring countries. At the same time, the implementation in good faith of United Nations Security Council

resolution 2202 would have been a genuine demonstration of respect for international law and OSCE principles.

The reason for the current state of affairs should be sought in the deceitful policy of certain leaders of Western countries – with regard both to Ukraine and to other subjects closely related to ensuring security in the OSCE area. Over a long period, they have systematically challenged the jointly agreed principles of our Organization, including the already mentioned principle of equal and indivisible security. From Yugoslavia to Ukraine. From Vancouver to Vladivostok. As long as their policies remain deceitful, Europe and the world can continue to expect new upheavals.

A few comments on the three dimensions of the OSCE's work.

Regarding the issue of counter-terrorism touched upon by you, we emphasize the leading role of States. We urge that effective measures be taken to curb the spread of terrorist ideology, cut off financial and material support for terrorists, and break the nexus between terrorism and organized crime. Due attention must also be paid to the phenomenon of foreign terrorist fighters. We consider it short-sighted and dangerous to replace the primary objectives of multilateral co-operation in combating international terrorism with the implementation of controversial non-consensus concepts, above all violent extremism.

Within the OSCE economic and environmental dimension, we believe it necessary to focus on relevant areas of work such as combating corruption, increasing energy efficiency and ensuring the transition to cleaner energy sources, developing trade and transport connectivity, including in the context of aligning integration processes in the OSCE area in the interests of forming a Greater Eurasian Partnership, and intensifying dialogue and co-operation in overcoming the negative effects of climate change. The destructive consequences that unilateral, restrictive measures imposed by a number of Western States have for the European and global economic systems and the prospects for further economic co-operation in the OSCE area warrant serious discussion.

In the human dimension, general security challenges such as the threat of neo-Nazism, discrimination against the Russian and Russian-speaking population, social and economic rights, protection of the linguistic and educational rights of national minorities and communities, and also freedom of movement, children's rights, the situation of migrants, elimination of statelessness, non-interference in private and family life, non-discrimination in sport, combating trafficking in human beings, including for the purposes of sexual exploitation and the removal of human organs, tissues and cells need to be considered separately.

We support the efforts of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly with regard to election observation in the OSCE area. Nevertheless, we call upon parliamentarians – and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights – to redress the geographical imbalance in this field, to pay attention also to electoral processes in States west of Vienna and to refrain from preconceived conclusions and double standards in assessing the will of the people. This could be facilitated by developing uniform standards for election monitoring in the OSCE, to which the Parliamentary Assembly could also make a significant contribution.

These examples, Ms. Cederfelt, illustrate the abundance of overlapping interests and pressing issues that could benefit all participating States if they were to explore them together. For our part, let me ask: what practical steps do you intend to take to return the OSCE and its parliamentary component to their true purpose as a platform for equal and mutually respectful dialogue and co-operation? If, of course, this is even still relevant for the current leadership of the Assembly.

Thank you for your attention.