

Who sabotaged Nord Stream, and why does the media remain silent?

By Frank , 17 April 2026

Who sabotaged Nord Stream, and why does the media remain silent?

A summary of the interview between Patrik Baab (Gegen den Strom) and Professor Ola Tunander (Oslo Peace Research Institute)

Professor Ola Tunander, senior researcher at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), has analysed the destruction of the Nord Stream pipelines for many years. In an extensive interview with journalist Patrik Baab, Tunander presents evidence that does not point to a small group of Ukrainian divers on a sailboat, but to a long-planned operation led by the United States – possibly an act of state terrorism.



A 40-year history of American opposition

Tunander begins with history. As early as 1981, the Reagan administration was furious about a gas pipeline between the Soviet Union and West Germany. CIA director Casey, Defense Secretary Weinberger and National Security Adviser Dick Allen wanted to stop the pipeline. According to Allen and his deputy Tom Reed, they actually succeeded in causing an explosion on that pipeline in 1982. But the Germans and Soviets continued, and the pipeline became a basis for dialogue between Europe and the Soviet Union – which helped end the Cold War.

But important figures in the American security elite never accepted this. Dick Cheney (Defense Secretary under George H.W. Bush) wanted to break Russia into pieces. After 2000, when Nord Stream was proposed, Cheney and his protégé Victoria Nuland strongly opposed it. Condoleezza Rice said on German television in 2014 that Germany should shift its energy dependence from Russia to the United States – replacing cheap Russian gas with expensive American LNG. From 2016 onward, the

US began massive LNG production.

The pipeline had to go.

Even John Bolton, National Security Adviser under Trump, said that Trump had the pipeline “on the table” but could not make a decision. Trump later claimed that he made the decision – and Biden merely approved it.

What the Poseidon aircraft reveal

Tunander turns to hard evidence: American P-8 Poseidon reconnaissance aircraft.

Two Poseidon flights are crucial. One from Keflavik (Iceland), one from Sigonella (Sicily). During the Baltops exercise in June 2022, these aircraft operated over the Baltic Sea.

But more importantly:

- On 23-25 September 2022 (days before the explosion on 26 September), a Poseidon from Sigonella repeatedly flew at night over the Bornholm area.
- On the night of the explosion, a Poseidon from Keflavik took off two hours before the blast, arrived over the explosion site one hour after the explosion, was refuelled by a tanker aircraft from Spangdahlem (Germany), and then patrolled the area for four hours before returning to Iceland.

Tunander's conclusion:

This was planned in advance. The tanker rendezvous was arranged before the explosion. The Americans knew exactly when and where it would happen. They monitored the aftermath – possibly to detect whether a Russian submarine could be blamed.

The sonobuoy as a detonator

Seymour Hersh had argued that a sonobuoy, dropped from a Poseidon aircraft, could send a coded signal to activate timers on explosives placed earlier. Tunander adds a new detail: a Hercules aircraft from Sigonella flew days before the explosion to the Andøya air base in northern Norway (where Norwegian Poseidons are stationed) and returned with something. That something, Tunander suggests, was the coded sonobuoys.

The Baltops exercise and American deep-sea divers

During the Baltops exercise in June 2022, American Navy deep-sea divers from Panama City, Florida – specialists in deep diving, not mine clearance – were present. A German journalist (Thomas Röper) had a source on a NATO ship who reported that these divers had disappeared for an extended period, which caused concern. After the exercise, American aircraft flew from Ronneby (Sweden) to Rota (Spain) to Norfolk (Virginia) to Panama City, Florida. Tunander says this fits Hersh's claim that the explosives were placed during Baltops, with timers set to go off months later.

The “Ukrainian sailboat” story as plausible deniability

Tunander dismisses the sailboat story as a cover story. He notes that a small sailboat with six people (including a woman) visited ports on Rügen, Bornholm and southern Sweden, flying a Ukrainian flag – “making itself very visible.” Why would real operatives attract so much attention?

Moreover, at the same time (21 September 2022), three large US Navy vessels – including the Kearsarge, a 250-metre amphibious assault ship – were in that exact area with their AIS transponders switched off. A Danish rescue vessel from Christiansø approached them and received no radio response. These ships left the Baltic Sea shortly after the explosion.

Norway in an awkward position

Tunander reveals a striking detail: the Baltic Pipe – a new Norwegian-Danish-Polish

pipeline – was inaugurated on 27 September 2022, the day after the Nord Stream explosions. This pipeline is a direct competitor to Nord Stream. The Norwegian prime minister had announced that he would take part, but cancelled five days beforehand – citing budget figures. Tunander suggests that he was probably informed of the planned explosion during a visit to the US (where he was briefed by the US Secretary of the Navy aboard the USS Gerald Ford). He could not take part in a celebration of the destruction of his competitor.

What did Olaf Scholz know?

Tunander returns to the notorious Biden–Scholz press conference on 7 February 2022, where Biden said: “If Russia invades, there will be no more Nord Stream 2. We will bring an end to it.” Scholz stood beside him and smiled. Tunander says: “I have never seen anything like it. An American president saying that he will destroy your energy security – and the German chancellor standing next to him saying that we are working closely with the US.”

State terrorism or an act of war?

Tunander clarifies the legal distinction. The Nord Stream insurer (a state-owned company) argues that if this is state terrorism, it must pay compensation. If it was an act of war (for example carried out by Ukraine as a belligerent party), it does not have to pay. The US and its allies prefer the “Ukrainian sailboat” story because it shifts US legal liability elsewhere. Tunander calls it state terrorism.

Conclusion

Tunander’s evidence – historical, aviation, naval and logistical – paints a coherent picture: the destruction of Nord Stream was not a rogue operation by amateurs on a sailboat. It was a long-planned, high-capacity operation carried out or directed by American special forces and intelligence services, with military exercises as cover, with the knowledge of Norway and possibly Britain, and with a carefully constructed false-flag narrative to provide plausible deniability.

Tunander argues that the mainstream media have systematically suppressed this evidence.

<https://youtu.be/SQpUt1fOGG4>