

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/69/24  
28 November 2024

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of Belarus

**STATEMENT BY  
THE DELEGATION OF BELARUS AT THE 93rd JOINT MEETING OF THE  
OSCE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION AND  
THE OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

26 November 2024

**On the Helsinki Final Act**

Signed in 1975 in a challenging politico-military environment, the Helsinki Final Act laid the progressive foundations for international relations in the Euro-Atlantic area, not least in the field of security, for decades to come. Its ideas and principles geared towards peaceful coexistence and building genuinely good-neighbourly relations have lost none of their relevance for our times either.

The Helsinki Final Act was able to lay the groundwork for dialogue between East and West, and help to reduce tensions and establish co-operation in the military sphere, despite all the differences that existed in the Cold War period. That document made a significant contribution to the development of a new security model, emphasizing, on the one hand, the indivisibility of security and, on the other, the task incumbent upon every State without exception, namely to strengthen international peace, security and stability.

It was the Helsinki Final Act that envisaged for participating States the practice of notifying one another of major military manoeuvres involving land forces, the exchange of observers to attend military manoeuvres and visits by military delegations in order to expand contacts between armed forces. These decisions, which constituted a truly new, revolutionary vision of security, would go on to be implemented successfully.

Unfortunately, at present, dialogue and co-operation in the politico-military sphere have completely given way to unjustified unilateral militarization of the European continent. NATO member States continue to increase the personnel strength and offensive strike capabilities of their national armed forces and to build up the military presence of NATO Allied Forces, including near the borders of Belarus.

This process represents nothing less than a deviation by a number of States from the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, including the principle of the indivisibility of security that was solemnly proclaimed therein and subsequently enshrined in a series of fundamental OSCE documents.

It bears asking why these mechanisms failed. The answer, in our view, is obvious. The architecture that emerged did not take into account, in full and equal measure, the interests of all its participants, and therefore the existing politico-military toolbox could not avert the crisis in the European security system, which has spilled over into open armed confrontation in the region. The seeds for this, though, were sown as

early as 1999 with the bombardment of Yugoslavia in violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions and with NATO's eastward expansion.

As a result, we are faced with the gravest crisis in regional and international security. Against this backdrop, a transformation of the global geopolitical landscape is under way. It is a painful but inevitable process. The breakdown of the existing world order signifies a transition from a monopolar structure to multipolarity, a transition from the European security model, which has failed to prove itself, to the construction of a Eurasian security architecture, which is being created on the basis of equality, justice and full consideration of the principle of the indivisibility of security.

We should like to draw the attention of our esteemed colleagues to the fact that Eurasia is now actively developing its own structures, such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, the Collective Security Treaty Organization, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia, which deal, among other things, with matters of security and stability.

At the high-level international conference "Eurasian Security: Reality and Prospects in a Transforming World" held last year in Minsk, Belarus launched a discussion on the prospects for building a new Eurasian collective security architecture. In that connection, Belarus put forward an initiative to develop a "Eurasian Charter of Diversity and Multipolarity in the Twenty-First Century".

The Charter initiative is meant to help build a just order in Eurasia based on the principles of indivisible security, equality, mutual respect and co-operation. The parameters and principles for the functioning of a security architecture in the Eurasian space, along with a strategic vision of multipolarity in an updated system of international relations, could be set out in that document.

It is high time for all of us to move away from political prejudices and destructive stereotypes and start building a dialogue, step by step searching for common ground and rapprochement. Today there is an urgent need to create a common space of trust and co-operation, for States to be brought together not against some adversary, but for the sake of a common goal in order to avoid a fatal breakdown of civilization.

At the same time, we believe that the Helsinki Final Act has not forfeited its potential for Europe either. What is more, the provisions enshrined in that document are so balanced, comprehensive and universal that they could be successfully drawn upon by other countries around the world and by international organizations.

Belarus urges the OSCE participating States to creatively and responsibly rethink, in view of the changes that have occurred in the world, the ideas of the Helsinki Final Act regarding means and mechanisms for safeguarding international and regional security. Building a new system of collective regional security that meets the requirements of the times would allow us to return to a depoliticized dialogue and to constructive co-operation in the politico-military sphere.