

FSC.DEL/12/10
28 January 2010

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

Delegation of France

**STATEMENT BY MR. DIDIER GONZALEZ,
CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM, AT THE MEETING OF THE
OSCE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION**

27 January 2010

**In response to the Russian presentation on the draft treaty on
European security**

France wishes to thank the Russian delegation for its explanations and comments regarding the draft treaty on European security distributed by Russia in December 2009.

We were pleased to receive this text, which marks a contribution by Russia to the debate on the future of European security. That document rightly focuses on the security challenges encountered in a globalized and interdependent world and on the need for co-operation mechanisms to better deal with them. The Russian proposal comes at a time, 35 years after the Helsinki Final Act, marked by profound political change on the European continent and in its strategic environment. Old conflicts remain unresolved while new threats have emerged in Europe and still others, outside Europe, which affect the security of the continent.

In this context, France is prepared to study within the framework of the Corfu Process the proposals that Russia has submitted for consideration by its partners. The holding of a dialogue within the OSCE on the future of European security has already produced a first step, following the conflict in Georgia, towards the restoration of trust among participating States. But we must go further than that and complete, indeed improve, the existing mechanisms for responding to the threats of the day.

The importance of these issues seems to us to fully justify the convening of a new OSCE summit meeting in 2010. By solemnly reaffirming the value and relevance of the common principles and commitments undertaken by the OSCE participating States, such a meeting would make it possible to demonstrate the existence of a genuine security community and, in particular, to take the necessary decisions to confront the erosion of the tools at our disposal for arms control.

The Forum, which has a mandate to discuss all questions of a politico-military nature, is for its part well suited for discussing a draft of this kind. Such a discussion will of course make sense only if it takes place within the framework and under the impulse of the Corfu Process, in keeping with the ministerial decision adopted in Athens. As is evident from its concept document, the Kazakh Chairmanship has quite rightly decided to follow the path laid

out by the Greek Chairmanship, to which I should once again like to pay tribute for the insight it showed in this regard. We must therefore endeavour to co-ordinate closely the discussions in the Forum with the informal dialogue at the level of permanent representatives.

As for the draft itself, I shall merely raise a number of questions of a preliminary nature. To begin with, I note that this document deals only with “hard security”, whereas we are agreed, at least since the Charter for European Security, that we should address “the human, economic, political and military dimensions of security as an integral whole”. What is more, the draft treaty on European security would create *ex nihilo* a mechanism for resolving differences and conflicts among the parties (articles 5 to 8) that at first sight does not take account of the OSCE’s conflict prevention and conflict management mechanisms, thus raising the question of this draft’s compatibility with the existing mechanisms and confidence-and security-building measures. In particular, the system of “solidarity”, provided for in article 7, that would allow a State to regard an armed attack against another party as an attack against itself and that would authorize it to react militarily on the grounds of legitimate defence while awaiting a decision on the matter by the United Nations Security Council raises some doubts. As for the binding information system introduced under article 3 of the draft, this would greatly undermine an approach to security that has thus far been based on confidence and would replace the flexibility that has guided our relations in this area with an inquisitorial and formalized approach.

To summarize my thoughts, I would say that the Russian draft on which we have just heard a presentation raises in its preambular section the right questions but does not provide, among its provisions, the answers that France expects. We are naturally prepared to give consideration, together with Russia and the other participating States, to the best ways of responding effectively to the security challenges that we are faced with today.

I would ask you, Madam Chairperson, to have the text of my statement attached to the journal of this meeting.