

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/1056/22  
14 July 2022

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY  
MR. ALEKSANDR VOLGAREV, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF  
THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE 1382nd MEETING OF THE  
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

14 July 2022

**On the report under the OSCE Moscow Mechanism**

Mr. Chairperson,

To begin with, I should like to thank you for the fact that, this time round, you and your team did acquaint yourselves with the Moscow Document of 1991 and decided to hold the current discussion during a “regular” meeting of the Permanent Council, as actually stipulated, rather than a special meeting, as was the case in April. We hope that, as the next important step, you will study the mandate of the Chairmanship-in-Office as set out in Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 8 (MC(10).DEC/8) adopted in 2002 – the need for compliance with this decision is something to which we regularly draw attention.

Mr. Chairperson,

The Russian Federation’s position regarding a historical vestige like the Moscow Mechanism is well known: the latter is an obsolete instrument that does not correspond to contemporary realities and needs. The conclusions of reports prepared under its framework do not carry political or legal weight for Russia and many other countries. And there are good reasons for this.

Consider, for example, the methodology used to put together this so-called document. It is so flimsy and primitive that one somehow feels almost embarrassed to comment on it. In the main, it is a compilation of suspect material from Western news agencies (CNN, the BBC, Associated Press, *The Guardian*) and several other media outlets, together with so-called statements by non-governmental organizations such as Human Rights Watch and Médecins Sans Frontières. There are, it is true, occasional references to official Russian sources, but the compilers of the report did not bother to quote them properly. This applies, in particular, to references to the Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation. In contrast, there is a profusion of propaganda from the Kyiv regime – not one page is free of such propaganda.

Throughout pretty much the whole report, the so-called experts luxuriate over the inventions by the former Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights, Liudmyla Denisova, about some perverted atrocities allegedly committed by Russian military personnel. These woeful specialists were even unfazed by the fact that the lady in question was dismissed by the authorities in Kyiv for her scandalous peddling of false, preposterous “information” that was not backed up by anything whatsoever. Incidentally,

Ms. Denisova herself admitted that she had manipulated unverified information about alleged crimes by the Russian military – such an admission is to be found, in particular, in her interview with the media outlet *Livyi Bereh* on 3 June. She “felt”, you see, that the Western alliance’s support for Ukraine was beginning to falter and so she decided to make things up. In so doing, she evidently gave expression to some outlandish fantasies of her own.

It is utterly outrageous that this “trio” of so-called experts do not even try to create a semblance of objectivity and impartiality. Without compunction, they openly sympathize with the Kyiv regime, which eight years ago unleashed a civil war against its own population. This manifests itself in the citation of assurances by Ukrainian officials about how the Ukrainian Government is scrupulously observing the norms of international humanitarian law – assurances that are effectively being used to justify the numerous crimes by the Ukrainian armed forces in Donbas. To these experts I would say: you are not sitting at a card table, where it is customary to trust the word of a gentleman. You undertake to discuss serious and sensitive matters of a kind where relying on “sworn” assurances is, to put it mildly, insufficient. One gets the impression that the numerous videos in which Ukrainian neo-Nazis brutally torment, torture and kill Russian prisoners of war live on camera have been seen by the whole world except for you.

The same pattern may be observed in the excessively bold “logical” conclusions, the dubious historical parallels, the groundless accusations against Russia and the banal fake stories that we have been hearing weekly from representatives of a number of participating States when they address us. Do you believe that by circulating them – even after they have been debunked – it is possible to create an alternative reality?

We deeply regret that on this occasion, too, the so-called experts lacked the necessary professionalism, including analytical skills and systematic thinking, to put together a genuinely unbiased picture of what is happening. This blind pandering to double standards will rebound both on your reputation in academia and on the interests of all participating States.

We should like to address the instigators of this venture separately: the use of the long-obsolete Moscow Mechanism and, what is more, its abuse for unsavoury purposes, as we have been seeing over the past few years, are discrediting the OSCE as a platform for professional political dialogue. In this way you are persistently trying to undermine the Organization’s reputation and to turn it into an “interest group”-type club. We would remind you that all participating States have equal need of the OSCE.

Thank you for your attention.