

**Chairmanship: Iceland****633rd PLENARY MEETING OF THE FORUM**

1. Date: Wednesday, 26 January 2011

Opened: 10.10 a.m.

Closed: 11 a.m.

2. Chairperson: Ambassador S. Skjaldarson

Prior to taking up the agenda, the Chairperson expressed condolences to the Russian Federation with regard to the bombing at Domodedovo Airport in Moscow on 24 January 2011. The Forum then kept a short silence in honour of the victims. Hungary-European Union (with the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Montenegro and Turkey; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, San Marino and Ukraine, in alignment) (FSC.DEL/31/11), Canada and the United States of America also condemned the attack and expressed condolences. The Russian Federation thanked the Forum for its expressions of sympathy.

3. Subjects discussed – Statements – Decisions/documents adopted:

Agenda item 1: GENERAL STATEMENTS

(a) *Recent developments in the Tskhinvali region:* Georgia (Annex 1), Russian Federation (Annex 2), United States of America, Hungary-European Union, Canada

(b) *Financial contribution to the MONDEM Programme in Montenegro:* Norway, Chairperson, FSC Co-ordinator for Projects on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (Hungary)

Agenda item 2: SECURITY DIALOGUE

None

Agenda item 3: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) *Update on the OSCE Communications Group*: Chairperson of the OSCE Communications Group
- (b) *Matters of protocol: Cyprus*, Chairperson, Sweden
- (c) *Organizational matters related to the OSCE Workshop to Identify the Proper Role of the OSCE in Facilitation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540, to be held in Vienna on 27 and 28 January 2011*: Representative of the Conflict Prevention Centre
- (d) *Organizational matters related to the twenty-first Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting, to be held in Vienna on 1 and 2 March 2011*:  
Chairperson

4. Next meeting:

Wednesday, 2 February 2011, at 10 a.m., in the Neuer Saal



**633rd Plenary Meeting**

FSC Journal No. 639, Agenda item 1(a)

**STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF GEORGIA**

Mr. Chairperson,

I would like to inform the Forum about recent actions undertaken by the Russian Federation against Georgia, aimed at further destabilization of the occupied Georgian regions and the whole South Caucasus.

Unfortunately, the aggressive policy of the Russian Federation has not changed even after the Georgian President's peaceful initiative and the declaration on the non-use of force, which has been unambiguously supported by the international community.

On 24 January 2011, the Russian Federation's so-called fourth military base in the occupied Tskhinvali region of Georgia was reinforced by the tactical operational missile launch system "Scarab B", also known as "Tochka-U". According to its technical specifications, this system is capable of accurately bombarding objects up to a range of 120 km.

I would like to remind colleagues that it was with "Tochka-U" systems that Russian armed forces completely destroyed the city of Bamut (Republic of Chechnya) and eliminated its peaceful population. The ballistic missiles of this system can be equipped with cluster warheads or nuclear warheads.

It needs to be emphasized that the militarization policy being carried out by the Russian Federation in the occupied Georgian territories is acquiring an unprecedented intensity. In December 2010, an artillery battalion equipped with Smerch multiple-launch rocket systems with a range of 70 to 90 kilometres was stationed in the vicinity of Tskhinvali, Georgia.

On 11 August 2010, the commander of the Russian air force Alexander Zelin announced the deployment of the S-300 anti-aircraft missile system on the territory of occupied Abkhazia.

In combination with the ongoing reinforcement of illegally deployed Russian military bases in the occupied Georgian regions, hostile rhetoric from Moscow, and Russia's unwillingness to pledge the non-use of force, these facts clearly indicate the intention of the

Government of the Russian Federation to launch further aggression against Georgia and also to cause large-scale instability in the Caucasus and the Black Sea regions.

Mr. Chairperson,

We strongly encourage the international community, international organizations and partner countries to take active and effective measures in order to compel Russia to end its aggressive policy against Georgia and avoid the further escalation of an already tense situation on the ground. It is essential that Russia make the commitment to the non-use of force towards Georgia and that it start implementing the 12 August ceasefire agreement.

Thank you.

I would like this statement to be attached to the journal of the day.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Forum for Security Co-operation**

FSC.JOUR/639  
26 January 2011  
Annex 2

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

---

**633rd Plenary Meeting**  
FSC Journal No. 639, Agenda item 1(a)

## **STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

In response to the statement by the delegation of Georgia regarding information on the deployment on the territory of the Republic of South Ossetia of an operational-tactical “Tochka-U” missile-complex division, we should like to make the following statement.

First of all, we have no confirmed official information on this subject. In any case, however, the presence in South Ossetia of Russian military servicemen is for purely defensive purposes and is intended exclusively to protect the population of that country against possible new military adventures on the part of Tbilisi. The Russian military presence in the Republic of South Ossetia represents no threat to Georgia itself, provided of course that the Georgian authorities do not once again decide to embark on aggressive actions.

We are also compelled to react to a series of other statements by the Georgian delegation and to the passages it has quoted from a statement published a few days ago by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia, in which mention is made in particular about Russia’s pursuit of a policy allegedly aimed at “destroying the Georgian State” and at “large-scale destabilization in the Caucasus and the Black Sea region as a whole”. It is even awkward to comment on assessments of this kind. If they truly reflect Tbilisi’s views as to what is happening around Georgia, this can only cause concern, considering that this kind of distorted perception of reality can result in irrational and extremely dangerous actions, as already happened in August 2008.

We would also underscore that persistent attempts to portray Russia as a potential aggressor totally twists the situation inside out, in line with the expression “to turn something upside down”. It is appropriate at this point to recall that Russia has never attacked Georgia, has not opened fire on its peacekeeping forces and has not used multiple rocket launchers to shell peaceful residents. All of this was exactly the other way around.

And finally, the Georgian statement again contains the words “occupation” and “the need to end the occupation”. We already advised our Georgian colleagues at the last meeting to leaf through some textbooks on international law in order that they might gain a better understanding of the situations in which similar definitions can be used and those in which they are absolutely inappropriate. Since our opponents have failed to heed that advice, we shall take the liberty of reminding them that the concept “occupation” is defined, specifically,

in The Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Convention of 1949. In accordance with those documents, occupation presupposes the temporary presence of the armed forces of one State on the territory of another State under the conditions of a state of war between them. In this situation, authority over the occupied territory is exercised by the military command of the occupying State. There is nothing like this either in Abkhazia or in South Ossetia. In both these young democratic countries, the country's own legislative, executive and judicial authorities are in full operation and political parties are actively at work. The people in Tbilisi cannot but be aware of this.

The question arises, why then does the Georgian Government attempt time after time to speculate on this account? The answer is obvious: the word "occupation" carries within it the negative propagandistic charge that Tbilisi needs and is totally in line with its foreign policy positions, which are aimed not at a realistic policy but at propagandistic confrontation. With this kind of approach by the Georgian authorities, there is no point in hoping for a rapid and reliable normalization of the situation in the Trans-Caucasus, and this can only cause regret and concern.