

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/988/25
25 September 2025
ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Delegation of the Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY
MR. MAXIM BUYAKEVICH, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE 1535th MEETING OF THE
OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL**

25 September 2025

On the increasing military involvement of certain NATO and EU member States in further confrontation in and around Ukraine

Mr. Chairperson,

I shall start with an update of the figures for the crimes committed by the Kyiv regime. Just during the week of 15 to 21 September, attacks by Ukrainian forces on the civilian population resulted in 145 civilian casualties, of whom 121 people were injured, including three minors, and 24 people were killed. All in all, the Ukrainian armed formations fired at least 3,139 munitions at civilian objects on Russian territory over those seven days, including rockets from 122 mm multiple rocket launchers, artillery shells of 152 and 155 mm calibre (some of them with cluster warheads), mines and grenades. The enemy also actively used unmanned combat aerial vehicles and small arms.

The overwhelming majority of the weapons being used by the Ukrainian armed forces to conduct strikes on the civilian population are manufactured and supplied by Western countries, which are accomplices in these crimes. The attacks have targeted emergency medics, residential buildings, petrol filling stations and civilian vehicles in Crimea, the Zaporozhye, Belgorod, Samara, Kherson and Bryansk regions, and the Lugansk People's Republic. The territory of the Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plant came under fire from the Ukrainian armed forces, posing a direct threat to nuclear safety. On 16 September, artillery fire struck an area near the plant's fuel storage facilities.

The Russian Investigative Committee is looking into the strikes on Novorossiysk and Tuapse by Ukrainian drones that took place on 24 September. The consequences were tragic. According to the most recent data, two people were killed and 16 injured in Novorossiysk. Residential buildings were damaged, including the city's eponymous hotel.

All this is a chronicle of deliberate terror – not “battlefield mistakes”, but a conscious tactic of intimidation of the civilian population. Each of these facts is direct proof of the terrorist nature of the Kyiv regime and its Western patrons, which are supplying weapons for the killing of civilians.

One would have thought that the Chairmanship-in-Office and the relevant OSCE executive structures, above all the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, ought to react to such crimes

– after all, impartiality and the defence of OSCE principles are laid down in the rules of their work. However, a shameful “media silence” lingers over our Organization. Yet, the Finnish Chairmanship does not miss a single news opportunity that can be exploited against Russia. By way of example we may cite the joint statement of 29 August by the OSCE Troika, a communiqué that is a stain on the Organization on account of its unprofessionalism and that is steeped in hatred towards one participating State. Why is this so?

Mr. Chairperson,

We are not even waiting for you to reply today – everything has already been explained in detail by the President of Finland, Alexander Stubb. His recent “tell-all” interview with *The Guardian* reveals with crystal clarity the essence of the radical anti-Russian alliance’s position. This was not simply a case of stating one’s private opinion, but a programmatic manifesto of the “Coalition of the Willing”, of those willing to drag out the conflict at any price. The Finnish President articulated a cynical narrative: Russia’s interests are not only ignored but are even declared to be non-existent when discussing so-called security guarantees for Ukraine. We are, in effect, being openly told that their goal is not peace but to use Ukraine as a staging ground for further escalation, followed by transition to a direct military clash between NATO and Russia.

We can see perfectly well how this strategy is being put into practice. On the one hand, Russia and its citizens are being completely dehumanized. It is being knocked into the heads of Europeans that Russia is capable of nothing but atrocities and that it is impossible to come to an understanding with our country in a civilized manner. On the other hand, people in the West are being systematically led on to believe in the inevitability of a military clash with Russia. The inhabitants of European countries do not as yet want to fight, but it would seem that everything has already been decided for them. The course that the “old-world” elites are manifestly steering today can only be described as a trajectory of suicidal militarization. Consciously cutting itself off from Russian markets, cheap energy resources and real areas of co-operation, Europe is painting itself into the corner of a profound economic crisis. The only thing that is being actively developed is the military industry. Forward-looking civilian businesses are hastily relocating across the ocean. Many companies simply cannot hold out – they are closing down their factories and laying off their workers. Citizens are taking to the streets of major cities – in France, for example – to protest against declining living standards. The number of corporate insolvencies in leading EU economies is reaching all-time highs, having increased by 22.5 per cent in Germany between 2023 and 2024 and by 17.4 per cent in France and 8.9 per cent in Italy over the same period. In other EU countries, geopolitical adventurism is coming at an even higher price: Greece recorded the greatest increase in such insolvencies at 42.5 per cent, followed by Ireland (32 per cent), while their number also rose in Spain by 23 per cent.

And this raises a logical question: what do the European leaders actually have to offer to the growing army of the unemployed in their countries? The only answer that appears to “glimmer” on the horizon is the old slogan about “Lebensraum” in the East, made notorious by a sad chapter of twentieth-century history.

At the same time, there is no letting up in the efforts to ideologically indoctrinate the Kyiv regime in the spirit of the calls made by Boris Johnson in 2022 to “just keep fighting”. Russia, in contrast, is presented with patently unacceptable demands that are akin to an ultimatum to capitulate. Their rejection by Russia is portrayed as evidence of our country’s alleged “intractability”.

We categorically reject the notion that it is Russia which does not want peace. That is a propagandistic ruse which has nothing to do with the genuine attempts by our country’s leadership to look, together with responsible members of the international community, for ways of achieving a sustainable

settlement. To be clear: not ways of achieving a temporary “truce” for the purposes of plying the Kyiv regime with weapons, or achieving unilateral security guarantees just for Ukraine.

The Russian Federation has consistently advocated the resumption of direct negotiations with Ukraine, the groundwork for which was laid in Istanbul. As President Vladimir Putin has repeatedly emphasized, a potential meeting at the highest level requires thorough and substantive preparation. It is with that goal in mind that we proposed raising the level of the delegations tasked with dealing with specific issues of a humanitarian, military and political nature. However, for over a month now we have received no response from Ukraine to the Russian proposal for the creation of working groups. What we are getting, instead, are theatrical pronouncements calculated to create the semblance of real work.

We are seeing attempts by our opponents to distort the very essence of dialogue on security. The principle of the indivisibility of security, enshrined in OSCE documents, is deliberately treated by them as an obstacle. Their accusations merely confirm that they regard security as a tool for holding Russia in check, rather than as a shared goal. After the talks in Anchorage, US President Donald Trump put forward a number of principles, including Ukraine’s renunciation of future membership of NATO and the discussion of territorial issues. However, Volodymyr Zelenskyy responded with a categorical refusal, dismissing, *inter alia*, the possibility of repealing the discriminatory laws on language. It is fair to ask how one can possibly conduct negotiations with a leader on whose territory a policy of banning the Russian language is being implemented – of banning one of the official languages of the United Nations and the OSCE.

Let us dwell in more detail on the topic of security guarantees. Students are regularly invited to the meetings of the Permanent Council and for them it will be extremely helpful to get a complete picture of what is going on.

Over many years, Russia consistently attempted in good faith to build a European security architecture. In 2008, we submitted to NATO a proposal for signing a Treaty on European Security – silence was what we got in response. In 2021, trying to avert an escalation, we sent the United States of America and NATO the drafts of two agreements on security guarantees – we were treated haughtily and our legitimate concerns were ignored. Now, though, it is being attempted to impose a primitive form of “cancel culture” on Russia, inviting us to date the start of the Ukrainian crisis to February 2022 and to forget about a key factor, namely the Western-sponsored anti-constitutional coup d’état of 2014, which was carried out despite international guarantees. Our Western partners hypocritically assert: “that is in the past; let us look ahead.” But without an honest assessment of the reasons for the crisis, it is impossible to move forward. We have the following fundamental question: why should the role of guarantors of Ukraine’s security be filled by the countries that organized that coup, the countries that for years have been plying the Kyiv regime with weapons and abetting a Nazi regime that is trampling on the rights of millions of Russian-speaking citizens? Such “security” is directed against Russia from the outset.

Our position is one of principle: any security guarantees must take into account the legitimate interests of all parties, including Russia. I recall that, in April 2022, the Ukrainian delegation itself put forward a document based on a neutral and non-aligned status for Ukraine – principles laid down already in its Declaration of Independence. It is these principles that back then provided the foundation for the international recognition of Ukraine.

Our country is open to dialogue, but only to honest dialogue on an equal footing that takes Russia’s vital security interests into consideration. If someone thinks it is normal to discuss security at our borders without our participation, well, that is not simply hypocrisy – it is a sure path to further politico-military destabilization. Such a reckless policy will have the gravest consequences first and foremost for the peoples

of Europe themselves. As for Russia, it is ready for any turn of events and capable of a commensurate response to all challenges, safeguarding in the process its security and sovereignty.

Thank you for your attention.