

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/1728/22
16 November 2022

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY
MR. MAXIM BUYAKEVICH, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE 1398th MEETING OF THE
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

10 November 2022

In response to the statement by the Permanent Representative of Canada

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I cannot but answer the legitimate questions raised by the esteemed Ambassador of Canada – so I will give a very brief response. I have no doubt that these questions are sincere, and I will answer them sincerely.

First of all, I shall address your claim that the “aggressor country” is making itself out to be a victim. Over the past two decades, in various venues ranging from the Munich Security Conference to the rostrum of the United Nations, from bilateral negotiation formats with the United States of America on strategic stability to multilateral formats such as the OSCE, we have constantly talked about the need for security guarantees in the light of the continuous expansion of NATO. We have never believed and do not believe in the defensive nature of this bloc, because even recent history has clearly demonstrated what the bloc’s operational zone is – the Middle East, Afghanistan, Asia and Europe. There have been bombings of Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya without a United Nations mandate, among other things. It is an aggressive military bloc that has been steadily approaching our borders over the past decades, creating a security imbalance in Europe.

At a certain stage, even though we tried to reach out to the United States and to those countries that are under its direct military command, which in this case includes all European Union countries and many others, the United States and the NATO bloc created an utterly unacceptable security situation for us in Ukraine by, figuratively speaking, “putting a dagger to our heart”. It was no longer a question of some abstract territories somewhere far away; it was a question of territories 800 km away from Moscow, some even closer than that, to which we had no other choice but to respond. And for this reason, last December, Russia initiated one last desperate attempt to offer the West a dialogue on security issues. We approached NATO, the United States and each individual country within the bloc. As a result, we received a mocking rebuff. It became clear to us that no one was going to take our interests into account at all. And the blame lies with the egocentrism, Madam Ambassador, of your State as well, which is an integral part of this remarkable Anglo-Saxon NATO trinity. Your interests beyond the borders of your State have led to what is now happening in Ukraine. That is the answer to your first question.

I shall now address your second question about the “rules-based order”.

Yes, I fully agree with you that, in order to determine the rules of the world order, one must rely first and foremost on the Charter of the United Nations and also on the Helsinki Final Act, and so on. But you are, in fact, counterposing your “rules-based order” with an order based on the Charter of the United Nations. So do not counterpose these things – say explicitly that you are referring to the same international order that is based on the norms of existing international law, then we will agree with you.

Thank you for your attention.