

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/1206/25  
6 November 2025

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY  
THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION  
AT THE 1541st MEETING OF THE  
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

6 November 2025

**In response to the report by the Director of the  
OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights**

Madam Director,

We have taken note of the report presented by you and should like to share some observations.

The only impression left by the activities of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) is one of profound disappointment. The ODIHR has “starred” in virtually all the anti-Russian initiatives of the Western alliance countries, above all in the context of the Russian special military operation in Ukraine.

Such behaviour is quite unacceptable for an OSCE executive structure whose mandate was adopted not by a coterie of countries but by all the participating States.

In unison with the Finnish Chairmanship, the ODIHR is publicly propagating non-consensus, highly confrontational approaches. The role of an “honest broker” assigned to Finland was obviously too big for that country. In our view, all that the Finnish authorities have managed to “achieve” in the human rights dimension can only be described as a complete and utter fiasco.

In that regard, you were ill-advised to heap praise on the Swedish Chairmanship of the Human Dimension Committee, for Sweden, under the pretext of following the priorities set by Finland, systematically gutted the work undertaken in the human dimension. Instead of discussion of the most sensitive issues falling under the third “basket”, we were offered a demonstrative “Ukrainization” of the agenda coupled with disregard for other topics.

We concur with you that “we cannot choose which rights to protect, or apply our commitments selectively.” However, the ODIHR continues to ignore such issues as growing neo-Nazism, surging statelessness and flagrant violations of the rights of the Russian and Russian-speaking population by Western alliance countries, and to disregard social and economic rights, such as the right to freedom of movement and people-to-people contacts, children’s rights and the rights of migrants and refugees.

Nor can we make sense of your enthusiasm over the recent Warsaw conference, which you described as “not only a success in terms of participation and engagement, but also in terms of substance”. Our opinion of that ersatz event is common knowledge – we shall therefore not repeat ourselves.

According to the data that you yourself provide, by no means all OSCE participating States attended the conference. Yet, you somehow presume to extrapolate the trends that you noted in the course of that non-consensus event to the entire area of responsibility of our Organization.

You assert that “across our region, civic space is shrinking”, and also that “when civil society is silenced, democracy weakens.” What about, though, the way that Russian community organizers who sought to take part in the conference had their visas revoked? Are you deliberately excluding from your field of vision any “reprisals” against non-governmental organizations (NGOs) advocating positions that differ from Western ones? At the same time, those that are opportunistically classed as “the right NGOs” face no restrictions whatsoever.

The upshot is that the ODIHR and the Polish authorities follow a selective principle when championing the rights of civil society – something that you so zealously rail against.

All this once again corroborates the need to relocate the OSCE human dimension events and the ODIHR headquarters, moving them out of Poland.

Madam Director,

It is not quite clear how “multilateralism and principled dialogue” can be furthered by your denunciations of our country in connection with the Russian special military operation. You simultaneously disregard completely the realities of the current situation, above all the Kyiv regime’s crimes. A few days ago, it was reported in the media that the Ukrainian armed forces’ “fighters” – ideological successors of the Nazi death squads – had butchered some 300 civilians in the town of Sudzha in the Kursk region. Significantly, Volodymyr Zelenskyy personally hands out decorations to these neo-Nazis. As for his “fighters”, they do not even bother to hide the Nazi symbols on their insignia. I have a question for the whole room: where are the outraged comments and assessments from the ODIHR to be heard?

It is our understanding that the head of an OSCE executive structure should be guided by positions agreed on by all the participating States. And that he or she should not engage in the preparation and dissemination of odious reports under extrabudgetary projects funded by a certain group of States looking to get the result they want. The interim reports drafted under the “Ukraine Monitoring Initiative” do not stand up to scrutiny in terms of their content. Moreover, the latest such report once again confirms that the ODIHR – evidently in line with the tenets you are advancing – has no intention of even just trying to take an objective approach when assessing events.

Madam Director,

Election monitoring continues to occupy an important place in the ODIHR’s service offering. Unfortunately, its performance in that area remains far from perfect, despite the concerns voiced by Russia and several other countries. We have repeatedly flagged the continuing imbalance in the geographical distribution and scope of ODIHR observation missions, along with the arbitrary and unfair sorting of OSCE participating States into “mature” and “immature” democracies. Similarly, we have pointed to the inconsistency of its election observation methodology, which a number of countries and the ODIHR itself are unjustifiably trying to portray as some kind of “gold standard”.

Moreover, the ODIHR continues to sully its reputation as an authoritative international body tasked with safeguarding the rights of observers. At a recent Permanent Council meeting we already spoke about the decision taken by the Moldovan Central Election Commission on 21 September of this year to deny accreditation to all 16 short-term observers from Russia – a truly unprecedented step. However, in this case, too, you opted to stay silent, even though the Moldovan authorities' actions are a direct blow to the image and credibility of the ODIHR.

Let us move on now to the ODIHR's "successes" in combating hate crimes. In that regard, you single out its "achievements" in the area of data collection. And yet your work is one-sided and biased. The same is true of the ODIHR's annual report on hate crimes in the OSCE area. We would remind you that, in 2021, our country refused to officially transmit data to the ODIHR following an egregious display of disrespect towards Russia by the Office's senior management, who referred to information submitted by Russian government agencies as "unreliable". In addition, there are a great deal of other questions regarding the ODIHR's activities – ranging from questions about the methodology and sources used to collect data, to questions about how the Office arbitrarily interprets its mandate in the field of hate crime.

Madam Director,

As we can see, a reconsideration of the principles underlying the work of the structure headed by you and of its general thrust – and indeed of the OSCE human dimension as a whole – is long overdue. We have presented our proposals to that effect on a number of occasions. We are willing to continue discussing them further.

Thank you for your attention.