

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/873/26
21 September 2026
ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT IN EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT OF REPLY BY
MR. DMITRY POLYANSKIY, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE 1577th MEETING OF THE
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

17 September 2026

On the incident at Leipzig airport

Mr. Chairperson,

I should like to exercise my right of reply in connection with the statement by the representative of Germany and the declarations of support by her European colleagues.

On 26 September it will be four years since the Nord Stream and Nord Stream 2 pipelines, built to supply Russian gas to Europe, were ruptured in the Baltic Sea near the Danish island of Bornholm at a depth of 80 metres. Three of the four pipeline lines making up the two gas pipelines were rendered inoperable. In the time that has elapsed since this act of terrorism, the Danish and Swedish investigations have been wrapped up without arriving at any results. Only the German investigation, which is proceeding at a snail's pace, is still under way; the fact that it is ongoing provides Western countries with a pretext for preventing an international inquiry from being conducted, under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council, into this act of terrorism. It was not until the summer of 2026 that German investigators put forward a hardly convincing theory that only Ukrainian citizens were involved in the explosions. The real instigators of this crime, however, continue to remain behind the scenes, despite the fact that not only did they publicly admit to it right away, but they also revelled in what they had done for a long time afterwards.

One might be tempted to buy the claim that the German justice system, as a matter of principle, operates slowly and thoroughly examines all the facts before bringing charges against anyone, except that we regularly come across situations where the German investigators immediately name the alleged perpetrator. By mere coincidence of course, it seems that all such cases without exception involve accusations levelled at Russia. What happened in Leipzig in early August this year illustrates this trend most vividly.

I would remind you that on the evening of 4 August 2026, an unmanned aerial vehicle, believed to be laden with explosives, was discovered in the cargo area of Leipzig/Halle Airport, next to a Ukrainian Antonov cargo plane. The airport temporarily suspended operations. Later, on 14 August, another defective drone was found nearby with traces of hexogen.

By 1 September the German Government had already officially pinned the blame for this incident on Russia, with Federal Chancellor Friedrich Merz describing the accusations as “clear” and “able to hold up in court”. On the basis of this, there was an instant crackdown on Russia’s presence in Germany: the last of its consulates general, the one located in Bonn, was closed, as was the Russian House, a Russian centre for science and culture in Berlin.

The key question we are putting to the German authorities is quite basic: where is the proof? Where are the testimonies, the direct evidence and the expert opinions? If such a serious accusation is levelled against us, it should be backed up by solid arguments based on material evidence. However, such arguments do not and cannot exist. What we have heard in this room today merely confirms the political nature of the allegations, which were formulated from the outset as part of the German elite’s anti-Russian policy line.

According to the available information, even the intelligence services of NATO States expressed doubts about Russia’s involvement in the “Leipzig incident” and urged the German authorities not to jump to conclusions; however, these decided to escalate the situation.

Significantly, Germany’s ruling coalition – made up of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU)/Christian Social Union of Bavaria (CSU) and the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) – refused to comply with the opposition’s request to provide evidence of Russia’s involvement in the incident. I should like to quote an SPD representative, Sebastian Fiedler, who stated in this regard that “if the Federal Chancellor, if the Federal Interior Minister goes out to meet the press and says that Russia is behind this, ... then Russia is indeed behind it.” Just imagine how many investigations could be concluded in no time at all using this simple formula! Why, it is truly a major breakthrough in jurisprudence!

Meanwhile, the motives behind such actions by the German authorities are perfectly clear. They need to distract the population from the acute economic and social problems that Germany, cut off from cheap Russian energy resources, is facing because of the Russophobic short-sightedness of its authorities. And at the same time they also need to explain to the Germans why, in such circumstances, their last savings should go towards arming yet another neo-Nazi battalion in Ukraine.

It seems that all Federal Chancellor Merz and his team are capable of doing in response to their fellow citizens’ concerns is to promote the image of an “enemy” taking the form of Russia. In their pronouncements, they have no qualms about blaming Russia for the energy crisis that they themselves have triggered. Small wonder that German voters are beginning to give their assessment of this flawed policy at the ballot box, and that Merz’s approval rating has plummeted to an all-time low of 14 per cent.

Colleagues, we are under no illusions that the current German authorities will even so much as attempt to get to the bottom of the truth regarding the Leipzig incident, which, judging by all the signs, looks very much like a clumsily executed false-flag operation. And in this respect the Germans are by no means pioneers – they are clearly drawing on the experience of the British, who, having accused Russia without grounds in 2018 of “poisoning” the Skripals, have still not produced any remotely convincing evidence to support their version of events. And when our Embassy posed nearly 200 obvious questions to the authorities in London, highlighting glaring inconsistencies in their allegations, they simply classified the investigation. Indeed, their counterparts in Berlin have already acted in a similar manner, notably in the 2020 case of the poisoning of Alexei Navalny. The respective crude fabrications allegedly proving Russia’s involvement are still making the rounds.

We can quite safely say that the Russophobic elites in Europe nowadays generally do not, as a rule, take the trouble to provide evidence when levelling any accusations against Russia, however far-fetched they may be. A missile or a drone has gone down somewhere? Of course, it must be Russia’s fault, even if

these are Ukrainian missiles or drones. Has there been an explosion at some industrial plant? Of course, it must be the work of Russian agents – who else could it be? It is a convenient attitude, as there is no need to prove anything – quite in keeping with the method of Mr. Fiedler that I mentioned. We are therefore not surprised that Germany's unsubstantiated claims regarding Russia's involvement in the Leipzig incident were immediately picked up by its EU allies in an effort to cover up for one another.

What should we make of such baseless allegations? I think the answer is obvious. There are intergovernmental mechanisms and tools in place for conducting serious, professional investigations, but no one in Europe is even thinking of using them now. As for blanket accusations and provocations, you are free to indulge in these on your own as long as you like. To cite a well-known German proverb, "Lügen haben kurze Beine" ("Lies have short legs"). In other words, all that is hidden eventually comes to light. We would advise our German colleagues to heed this nugget of folk wisdom.

Thank you for your attention.