

Brussels Forum

March 22, 2015

Mystery Session

Ms. Karen Donfried: ...the caffeine buzz in the room, that's great. And to really prepare us for Nik Gowing, I first want to introduce one of the co-chairs of our congressional delegation and ask him to come forward and that is Senator Christopher Murphy of the wonderful state of Connecticut.

Mr. Christopher Murphy: Well, thank you very much, Karen. Thank you all for having me here. We have a good U.S. delegation. You got to here from Senator Sessions, my good friend, and Representative Issa yesterday and I'm pleased to just be able to offer a few brief welcoming remarks from the U.S. delegation.

I think about how much has changed in the brief period of time that I've been in the United States Congress. I got the House of Representatives in 2007, served three terms there and now I'm United States Senator from Connecticut. When I got to the House of Representatives, the American economy was spilling into an economic meltdown and there was talk as to whether we were ever going to emerge from what we call The Great Recession and, at the moment, members of Congress when they thought about foreign relations were reserved for Iraq, Afghanistan and the Middle East. There just wasn't enough space in your brain at

that moment to be able to really invest in parts of the world where we weren't at war.

And eight years later so much has changed. The American economy is stronger than ever. More robust job growth than we could have ever imagined. A healthcare system that is on its way to being fixed in just a year and a half we have taken a 25 percent chunk out of the people that don't have insurance in our country. Energy independence is a reality, not just a dream for us. And reinvestment in the transatlantic relationship, members of Congress coming to Europe at a greater pace than at any time since I've been in the Congress, a new European reassurance initiative that's real and will continue. And so just in the period of time that I've been there, I've seen so much change. But the tension that we're having now, and this is the only point that I'll make today and I know you've been talking about it in various ways over the course of this session, is about what role the United States Congress plays in setting this new direction with respect to foreign policy.

For 10 years I think Congress abdicated its responsibility over the course of the Iraq war to be a co-equal (inaudible) with the president and a lot of critics of President Obama say that, you know, he's not leading in the world in the way that we would like, that he's not asserting American power in the way that we used to and the irony, of course, is that Congress makes it hard for him to do that because

we don't give him the tools with which he needs to succeed. We don't appoint ambassadors. We don't staff up the State Department. We don't approve new rules of the IMF that would bind us closer together with our allies.

And then we take steps that are counterproductive. We insert ourselves for the Executive in trying to negotiate directly with foreign powers, inviting people to speak before the Congress without even notification or authorization from the president and so we're having a really important, and at some times problematic debate, about how the United States Congress steps back into what was a very long and I would argue disturbing breach when it came to the Congressional responsibility to be a co-equal branch on foreign relations and so this is why these kind of forums are so important, to have members of Congress come here and engage proactively.

I'm proud of the fact that in a crisis, the Congress has, in a sense, rediscovered the importance of this transatlantic relationship. I'm proud of the fact that we've put time and resources back into this endeavor but we have to square that conversation with the space that this president needs with which to lead and we've got to understand that there's a whole new set of resources that we need to provide him with. You've talked a lot about Russia here today. I'm sure you've talked a lot about ISIS as well.

We're playing a fundamentally different game than they are and this is not just about a conversation with respect to military support against ISIS or for the Ukrainians. It's about a whole set of diplomatic and economic tools that the United States and the transatlantic community don't have today to try to push back on the influence growing out of Russia, growing out of the Middle East.

So I'm glad to be here with you, pleased to be part of the conversation, look forward to these final few panels. Please continue to invite U.S. delegations back. Thank you very much for having me.

Ms. Karen Donfried: Thank you so much, Senator Murphy. That was inspiring and it's wonderful to have the members of Congress who made the time to make this trip to Brussels here. And now I'm going to turn the floor over to Nik Gowing and there are lots of ways I could introduce him but the most fitting is that Nik belongs to the very select group of people who have been at every single Brussels Forum and I will say that the Nik was the one who set the bar extremely high in year one with a style that you brought to this forum so it's wonderful to be turning the floor back over to you, Nik.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thanks, Karen. Well, good morning everybody. There is no panel. As I warned you yesterday, you are the panel and this is a mystery session because I don't know which way it's going to go and you have put on the agenda a lot of ideas and I wouldn't want to be in Nicola's shoes or Karen's shoes,

trying to bring together a conference at this time because there are so many issues. How do you gel them together? So this is really your opportunity not to say this should have been on the agenda but these are the kind of ideas which still need a lot of thought and are perhaps going to hit us far quicker than anyone expected. I remind you what we said yesterday about the fact that much of the Brussels Forum last year was not about what has happened in the last year, the extraordinary events.

Now this is something of an experiment so your feedback afterwards would be great. We've got about 55 minutes and a lot of you have responded on the BF Connect app, which has allowed me to work out the kind of things that are on your mind. This is about new ideas. It is about now. I'm not going to be prescriptive at all because you are creating the prescription for what needs to be on the agenda, about ways to move forward, things that need to be thought about and because we've got the young professionals here, the next generation if you like, we need to hear from you as well because it could be that you're leaping over many of the more normative thoughts you've been hearing from here, even though everyone is accepting that things are very different.

Now can we, Daniel, put up on the screen my log of what is going to happen because what I want to do in the first 20 minutes or so is use those of you who have already spoken through the public comments to put on the agenda things that

you're concerned about and then for the last half an hour, we'll have an open house more plenary, which is designed for you to build on whatever subjects you think are appropriate either here or not here.

Now has anyone got a major idea that they want to put on the agenda which they haven't bothered to put on the website or onto the BF Connect? I don't see any hands going up yet. Right. Well, let me move ahead first because I've got a list which is pretty long. It stretches to a whole page, there it is, of those of you who've put on the agenda a lot of issues already and I'd like to go to Monika LeRoy first of all. Again, I'm trying to create a certain kind of order here for the kind of things which will help frame each of the more detailed drill downs later in this session. Monika, where are you, please? You are in the room, aren't you? Great. Okay, Monika, the microphones are going to have to move very fast during this because I'd like another microphone to go to (inaudible). Now Monika, you're from Canada. What's on your agenda?

Ms. Monika LeRoy: I want to ask a really simplistic question but breaking down over a few examples in the past year and the question's ultimately: where is leadership coming from these days? If you look at what's happening with ISOL, the world slowly watched that situation escalate. No one really wanted to intervene until it was almost too late and so now we're facing a different kind of conflict that we have to engage in. We look at the way the Ebola crisis developed last summer.

You were hearing reports and people crying out for help back in April and May and then the international community didn't decide to act until September before there was a major effort to come back so it was a lot of cleaning up a mess that could have been prevented if we'd intervened earlier. I think Libya right now is the perfect example of the next crisis that we're going to be seeing develop. The international community intervened. They walked away. Everybody looked at the situation on the ground knowing that the militias were going to continue to be a problem. Nothing really happened to resolve it and then we are facing yet another similar conflict where you have some of European countries are starting to call for action but no one really wants to deal with it yet so it hasn't really become a crisis. So looking at major situations like this that are continually happening and the international community's just really slow to respond, where should we be looking to for leadership these days?

Mr. Nik Gowing: Can you help provide an answer given where you work because you're inside an institution which should be thinking over the horizon. I'm actually doing a research project on thinking the unthinkable. What do you think the answer to your question is?

Ms. Monika LeRoy: I think it's exactly what this Forum's here for. It's greater integration between the western allies. There's a conversation about like-minded, about Canada and the U.S. and the European countries coming together

but look at the response to Ukraine. You still see a significant separation between where Canada stands and where Europe stands and where U.S. stands.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But what about the business of leadership to understand and appreciate the enormity of what is changing? Isn't that the question you're asking? Is leadership able to cope with it, the level and the volume of stuff which is on the agenda now?

Ms. Monika LeRoy: I would think that someone has to take on that role of leadership because if no one is, if no country is going to, if no group is going to, if no alliance or coalition is going to, then we're going to continually be responding when it is directly affecting our own safety.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Let's put it on the agenda there, therefore it's the first page. (Inaudible) can I come to you next? The microphone here, you have it, and also get the microphone to Orysia Lutsevych from Chatham House. Where are you, please? Back there. Right, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello. My question was about basically looking for our own blind spots, what these are and it's the blind spots I think that make it difficult for us to read the virtual space because we've been talking throughout this Forum about finding new tools to deal with new challenges and trying to find new ways to tackle things that we're not really equipped to do and I think the blind spot is basically coming from a comfort zone in the sense that what



really threatens, I think, the transatlantic core of a liberal world order is not necessarily those who challenge our norms, be them powers like Russia or marginal groups like ISIS but our own blind spots because the comfort zone, I think in a sense, is still lingering on from the 1990's euphoria of that liberal world order's triumph. But although we tend to acknowledge that, you know, those were an exceptional 20-odd years and they're over, we still haven't really moved on on how to engage our norms in a different way and I think, you know, with the virtual space, I had a discussion about this with General Kimmitt at (inaudible) about 10 years ago and I think we really haven't moved on from that discussion much in the sense that today we have a terrorist organization like ISIS that's actually behaving like a traditional one with a political goal in a geographical space but they recruit in a virtual space like Al-Qaeda and in this morning's session we talked about how they are able to reach out to societies, to groups, where people do not feel the legitimacy of the societies and the governments they live in so my suggestion is basically three things. The first thing is we must try to find a way in European societies to combat Islamophobia and make it a hate crime like anti-Semitism and find a way for Europe's Muslim societies to feel inclusive, not just call them when something goes bad, Tariq Ramadan also made this point.

And the second point is we have to try to understand relationships that are being formed outside the transatlantic box and try to understand why they're

happening and try to engage with those rather than dismiss them. For example, I was at a conference two months ago in Istanbul about the new silk road and they were very high level representative from China, from Serbia and throughout the conference I didn't hear NATO or EU or transatlantic mentioned once. And finally, I think we have to find new ways to engage our values.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Now let's try and keep intervention short at this stage because I asked you to speak after Monika because of another thing you said in your note to me, which is by and large, leaders only hear what they want to hear and this is about the new non-normative realities and so that's one of the reasons why I wanted you to speak at this time.

So leadership blind spots. We only hear what we want to hear, as opposed to thinking out of the box maybe. Let's go to Orysia next, please, followed by Gitte Lillelund Bech please, wherever you are. You are here? I hope everyone's here. Are you here? Anyway, Orysia, please.

Ms. Orysia Lutsevych: Thank you, Nik. Thank you so much. I think it's a little bit time for good news because it has been quite a gloomy Forum in terms of uncertainty and security disorder and...

Mr. Nik Gowing: But you wanted to talk about the role of civil society and the positives there.

Ms. Orysia Lutsevych: Absolutely and I think this is good news because if you look at, for example, the case of Ukraine and when we look at it through the prism of geopolitics and of course conflict, we forget that Ukrainian state, of course, is fragile and has never been weaker but Ukrainian society is speaking up very much and I think this is a very strong consolidating power, people who are sharing democratic values. And as I was sitting here, I was wondering where is our democracy support agenda? Where are these voices that we used to here in the '90s in central and eastern Europe saying we need to support inclusive decision making and not just be a binary, you know, a state to state or multinational and I still feel that the Forum is not inclusive enough in bringing these new voices, crowd sourcing, you know, social entrepreneurship. These people are changing Europe, the world, as we sit here so I do believe that it's time to renew the democracy support agenda in the region, not to shy away and not to give up to Russian containment of democracy that it is trying to do in the region and, believe me, it has a grip. It has a grip because people see this as a tool to improve their lives. Thank you.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But let me just press you even further about the crisis of trust as you wrote about in your note and also the inverting of the power because of the nature of connectivity.

Ms. Orysia Lutsevych: Well, absolutely. I think that a lot of people feel disenfranchised from decision making, from official institutions. If you look, for example, in Ukraine who people trust, it's the church, it's NGO's and the Parliament is on the last place so I do believe that we as people who a lot of us here are decision makers in official institutions should think about how we open up institutions of these voices and not just to listen but also to participate and to influence decision making.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. There's a direction of travel here because I want to now go to Gitte, you're over there, and followed by Sonja Licht, please. Where are you, Sonja? At the back. Let me underscore that all the contributions so far have been from women. That's important.

Ms. Gitte Lillelund Bech: Well, thank you so much, Nik. My name is Gitte. I'm from Denmark. I'm really concerned about the younger generation and how do they see the value of the transatlantic relationship because now we have the young professionals here, they've joined us, and I hope that some of you will skip in and give your point of view on the transatlantic relationship. But if I look around, I'm sorry to say, we have a lot of gray hair in here and therefore I think it's important to have the discussion about how to engage. I can tell you...

Mr. Nik Gowing: There's a lot less at the moment than there was earlier.

Ms. Gitte Lillelund Bech: That's true. But one example is if you go to a Danish high school, you will find a lot of young students and they like to discuss about what's happening in Europe, what's happening with Ukraine and so on and so forth but this about having the transatlantic relationship and how do we actually, in Europe, share the same values with United States, with Canada and so on and so forth. They don't discuss that and they don't see it and I don't have the answer on how to solve this but I'm quite sure that it's not only in Denmark we have this situation so what can we do? And, please, the young ones in here, maybe you can skip in and say some good recommendations to what we could do.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But let me press you, do you think they even recognize what you're saying?

Ms. Gitte Lillelund Bech: The young generation in here, yeah, I think so.

Mr. Nik Gowing: I could do a vote but I'm not going to embarrass anybody.

Ms. Gitte Lillelund Bech: I'm quite sure but maybe also touching upon what the previous speaker said, maybe all of us being at the Brussels Forum, we really value the transatlantic relationship but the ones that don't value it, they are not here so we actually don't have their voices to be heard in this room. I'm sorry.

Mr. Nik Gowing: So I'm creating a direction of travel here. Thank you very much for putting that on the agenda and let me do a slight handbrake turn but into an area which is similar. Hanna Shelest, where are you please, on again, media,

again, information about empowerment and that's the kind of thought that you've put on the agenda which is beginning to build a very clear impression of this direction of travel.

Ms. Hanna Shelest: Thank you. The question of the role of the media in the crisis situations as we have now not only in Ukraine but it seems to me the Ukrainian crisis just crystallized several of the issues that we were talking a lot in different countries.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But you'd accept that it's a very different media space as the General in the last session were making very clear.

Ms. Hanna Shelest: Exactly. Because what I will put it, it was not just through all of the media but the disinformation that is spread and the gossips and how all over it's like the epidemia. We usually got some information that was spread, not always checking what that is and as a result, we are quite aware of the not responsible media and not attaching media as our additional positive instrument and we have so many representatives of the media here in the hall, yeah, and we see they're very strong positions, I mean, civil position first of all and political positions but when it is the crisis situation, it seems that the level of the responsibility of the media is falling down and we allow the channels like Russia Today or Life News to put the fake news to which we are ready to believe and to which we are quite reluctant that their representatives are coming with the weapons

so it seems to me that we dismiss the role of the media to the (inaudible) instrument of negative rather than positive changes that we can bring to every topic of the agenda that we have.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But let me press you on that because of what the last contribution was about, about the next generation and understanding how the next generation is consuming its digital information. Try and gel what you just said with this new challenge and whether you think it's being reflected in a Forum like this.

Ms. Hanna Shelest: It seems to me that it is really the problem because the young generation is reading less and less news and prefer the social network. That is great because it is quicker but sometimes it is much easier to use these networks for the disinformation and for manipulation of the information, for creation some fear or panic in the societies rather than to bring analysis and thinking. We're used to the short messages rather than for the deep strategic thinking about which we were talking at the very first day and it's always happened and, at the same time, for young generation because most of them can use more languages and more tools, we definitely expect to be more open-minded for this information and to check it as much as possible sources not to believe only the internal country, for example, information.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Let's move on, Sonja Licht, where are you?

Ms. Sonja Licht: Yeah.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Over there? Yeah, you've got the microphone, good.

Sonja, because again, moving in a direction of travel, you're talking about what you call the rising demographic deficit, not just Europe...

Ms. Sonja Licht: Democratic.

Mr. Nik Gowing: ...but elsewhere.

Ms. Sonja Licht: Democratic deficit.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Okay. Yeah, you're right, I wrote it down wrong.

Ms. Sonja Licht: It's okay.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thanks.

Ms. Sonja Licht: Yes. Well, I must say that a few years ago we in central and eastern Europe but I would say also in western Europe were very surprised how few people go to vote in America and we never thought that this is going to happen to us but it does and it does on several levels. I would like, for example, to remind you that in the last elections for the European Parliament in Slovakia, one of those countries that was dying to become part of the EU as is my country today, 13 percent of people went to vote so something is very wrong not with the people but with the institutions that should be the epitome of democracy and I am worried that exactly because of this, in fact the populism is on the rise. I must quote (inaudible) who a few days ago said that since there is so much mistrust in (inaudible) political and others, people in fact even those who want to win the next



election, turn into anti-elitists, such as, for example (inaudible) and someone will see how much they will succeed to (inaudible) like that but all in all, a huge democratic deficit in institutions.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Okay. Well, given where we started with leadership, understanding the new realities, what's your view with your perspective on whether leaderships get this credibility of the elites because, again, it's part of this direction of travel which is coming out from many of the points which are raised.

Ms. Sonja Licht: I think they have a major problem in communicating with each other and with their citizens and I do agree with my colleague from Chatham House, we have to go back to wonder whether a real dialogue between leaders and citizens can be established. I believe that type of dialogue is absolutely needed because otherwise I don't see that the leadership is going to change. Too much wasted interests and not enough understanding for common issues.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. That's a very important question. Can there be dialogue between the next generation and the current elites? Let's try and open that up before we have to conclude. So that's really important what you put on the agenda. Can I get Engy, please, to talk about the challenge of social inclusivity and also what you're seeing from your position in human rights here? Yeah, please, yeah. Yeah. Sorry, I was trying to point. There's a microphone for you.

Ms. Engy Abdelkadar: Thank you so much. Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Engy Abdelkadar. I am an attorney and professor with a passion for international human rights and a particular focus on religious freedom in minority faith communities, both in the United States as well as Europe and around the world and I just want to thank GMF for making this Forum possible. It has been such a rewarding experience. I am part of the young professional contingency and this has been a phenomenal, memorable time this past week. My question relates to further enhancing economic interests, security interests, as well as political effectiveness by pursuing new strategies and possibly laws that ensure that religious, racial, ethnic, and other diverse communities are given an opportunity to contribute to those fears, and I'm going to provide two specific examples. First, that research indicates that innovation leads--is often times directly related to greater diversity in the work place, still in too many countries around the world, including the Transatlantic community, these diverse individual are experiencing pervasive employment discrimination, which adversely impacts our financial interest. In addition in the United States, which is my country of origin, research--academic research has shown that the American Muslim community has played a critical role in countering violent extremism by engaging in self-policing tactics by providing counter narratives to those provided by terrorist groups as well fostering and contributing to collaborative partnerships with law enforcement officials. So,

the role of diverse communities can and--makes sense. It's intuitive that they would be critical to countering violent extremism. Still we have religious freedom violations which can include violent hate crimes, which are at times lethal, impacting members of Muslim communities. It can include employment discrimination, it include vitriolic political rhetoric, it can include codified--legally codified exclusionary practices by some of our governments, that only serve to stigmatize, marginalize, alienate, and further disempower this very community. So the question is, what new strategies and laws can we pursue that will incorporate these communities to guarantee greater diversity and inclusive practices and policies in the transatlantic community? Thank you.

Nik Gowing: Thank you very much indeed. Now my choice of speakers so far has not been influence by the next contribution which is going to be about the future role of women. From Xenia Dormandy whose head of the Academy at Chatham House, this is actually happen simply because most of the contributions have come from women, I don't know what the men have been doing but they've seen the future. Xenia Dormandy.

Xenia Wickett: (Inaudible) more than 50 percent of the population--more than 50 percent of those graduating from university and now women, Christian Lagod was in India last week and talked about the fact that India's GDP would be growing at 1.5 to 2.5 percent faster if there was more female population--female

participation into the labor force. You look at the challenges that Japan has in terms of its demographics and yet there's a very, very low level of participation by women. There's a whole set of challenges we face looking to the future. You look about--look at the fact that if we invest in our development funds to women they tend to get spent on things like education, health care, food, etc., etc. So the question in terms of an opportunity if you will, is what would happen, how would it be transformative if women were participating in the work force at higher levels than they are today?

Nik Gowing: I find this scary because I remember the UN development report of 2003, keep the microphone for a moment Xenia, I remember the UN development report of 2003 talking about the need to see the potential for women. I was in Egypt last week for that amazing investment conference, and there the sense that women are simply not being recognized as an enormous resource, from you position Chatham House do you see any change, do you see significant change?

Xenia Wickett: Well, I mean--dare I say it, I've been coming to this Forum for five, six years look around the room for those of us who were here five, six years ago it is a very, very different crowd today, both in terms of youth, yes we have a different group, but in terms of women I think 30 percent of the people here are women. So yes there's absolutely a change. What I'm interested in is if you

look 10 or 15 years down the road if you could get better inclusion, how would the world be transformed in so many areas?

Nik Gowing: Again before you sit down because you are now doing work in the Chatham House Academy to develop new leadership skills. Are you seeing an equality there of opportunity for women?

Xenia Wickett: I think you can't, you can't create a board brush. Do we all, does GMF, do others think about the fact that you want diversity and when you talk about diversity you mean diversity of age, you mean diversity of gender, you mean diversity of religious make up, you mean diversity of culture. Yes, we all think about these things very hard. What we also know is certainly not happening pervasively around the world. It's not happening here you look at the tech industry anybody who reads the American papers will see that in the tech industry very, very low percentage of women who are engaging. So, you can't make some kind of board brush statement.

Nik Gowing: All right thanks Xenia. Now David Jones without actually having a word beforehand from the young professionals I was told that you have a significant amount to say or at least a headline about African American education. Particularly education for women and also diversity as well and the opportunities which are not being realized at moment which need to be recognized.

David Jones: Lot of pressure as the first man to speak. Thank you for that.

So actually well--honor the leadership of the women who have spoken just expand upon many of the things they've said I represent an office, the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for African Americans, and have the pleasure of serving President Obama in ensuring that we do all we can to fill gaps for the communities that as Xenia spoke of are often neglected and ignored. So whether we're talking about women, whether we're being as inclusive as possible in talking about LGBTQI individuals or whether we're acknowledging that all throughout the world it's often the case that darker people have least access to opportunity we have more work to do, and so three things that have been really important for us that I think should be included in this conversation again are one, we framing the narrative. We have to find new ways to have these conversations to move past the things that have not allowed us to be able to see each other before. The second thing, you talk here a lot about this issue. The second thing we need to do is have these conversations earlier I appreciate the inclusion of the youth but these conversations need to start well before we acknowledge the young professionals there's a lot of tensions, there's a lot of assumptions that have been made and so we need to do a better job of integrating in that way. And then the third thing is to make sure we're being as inclusive as possible in terms of establishing and

building new communities and so it's nice for us be able to come and participate in these conversations but my question is, what do we do when we go back home?

Nik Gowing: What's the challenge there? Where do you see the resistance? Is it mind sets? Is it denial? Is it convenience? Is it overload among those who have to take decisions and embrace the enormity after Africa--after what Africa now faces a massive demographic challenge.

David Jones: I think it's, C, all of the above. And I think we should highlight that there are people who continue to persistence by other challenges and how complicated and interrelated they all are but it's all of them, but I think that if nothing else--what I appreciated especially last night demonstrated in some of the Night Owls, is that people are willing dig in and do the tough work.

Nik Gowing: Okay, now I should tell you that Ian Lesser is sitting here I think, and he's going to be sharing the next session off to the next coffee break, you drink a lot of coffee here. About where the Brussels Forum will be in 2025 this is about now so many of these things can be addressed then. This is a sequence of two sessions so we're not going to resolve a lot of these things but we are putting them in the agenda not least because everything is moving amazingly fast, and what I want to do there's several points now about Europe. And the concerns there particularly let me go to Todd Lindbergh, where are you Todd? Please over there. Can I come to you because you've made a point about really being very

provocative is Europe going to have a new relevance anymore and then I'd like to go to Dhruva Jaishankar, please.

Tod Lindbergh: Well I think--we've all come through a period in which we had a very positive story to tell about the integration of Europe central and eastern Europe. We talked about Europe poll free and at peace. I just asked the question, does that have policy relevance in our discussion nowadays? And if it does not what can we say as a concise transatlantic statement of what we are about and what we're doing. I think that's become a difficult question and I think the changing security environment is something that's very much contributed to it.

Nik Gowing: Tell us more then. Why are you saying relevant--relevance? It's just a vast number of people in Europe and so many relying on it, not least for trade and political consensus.

Tod Lindbergh: Well now, you know, my point is not about the relevance of Europe. Europe remains very relevant...

Nik Gowing: Would you say any relevance anymore:

Todd Lindbergh: The question was the policy relevance of this matter of Europe poll free and at peace. Is that really what motivates us? In some sense the to this answer is yes but it's not a guide post in a way that's directed us eastward in a way that directed us for more rather than less integration, and one wonders what replaces it?



Nik Gowing: All right, let me ask you to take the microphone forward to Christoph (phonetic) from Martial Peace because actually you go even further Christoph, you actually talk about Europe about to unravel. Is the EU about to unravel? Let's have the microphone here and then go to Dhruva, please.

Christoph: Yes that's very much on my mind at the moment we are talking single issues like Ukraine, like Greece and so on but the more--much more fundamental question is, is EU Europe the European Union as we know it about to unravel and the second question is that situation comparable to U.S. history between 1776 or after the Declaration Independence and the next 25 years. Against all probabilities at that time the U.S. manage to form a Union, to form a military, a currency, to defend their new political structure and prevail. The European Union's also have a very young political structure even if we think we know it for a lot of time. And the EU is now under similar threats, war, currency crisis, lack of inter-unity. And it seems that the question whether the European Union prevails or unravel depends on preconditions which the EU is not able to control. Greek accept, depends on the behavior of the Greeks. British accept, depends on (inaudible). The Ukraine and the war coming closer to European borders depends on the behavior of Vladimir Putin. Of course we have influence they are good policies and bad policies to what's Greece. They are good policies and bad policies to what's the United Kingdom and also to the Ukraine and to Russia. And in the

same way is true whether Greece leaves the Euro zone or not, whether UK leaves or not, whether Putin takes Mariupol and other cities who are--that is not the decision whether the European Union will exist or not exist but it will be a much weaker union, a union which has no trust to itself and has also less attraction. And then the question is can we learn anything from the American exile after independence what make sure that we stay together and the U keeps its power and attraction.

Nik Gowing: All right that's why you used the word unravel I think. Let me go to Dhruva next and also Roderich Kiesewetter. Where's Roderich? Okay where's Dhruva, please at the back.

Dhruva Jaishankar: Thank you Nik.

Nik Gowing: Because you're talking--this is where the word I used early demographic realities and the challenges. We're on Europe at the moment putting a lot on the agenda.

Dhruva Jaishankar: Yes, in the previous session Steve Clemons asked what the challenge was for the transatlantic relations. And 50 percent of you polled--said it was the economy. At one level this is somewhat strange conclusion to draw. The U.S. and Europe are still the most prosperous societies on Earth. The realities of the west and Europe in particular are slipping into a state of post-industrialization and Europe much more so than the United States and this means a world beyond

manufacturing it means new (inaudible) relations, it means less militarized societies, and this is in a strange way uncertain, scary and new territory for any society really to go into. Post-industrialization is--effects and is effected by politics, by economics, by social trends, but demographics are really (inaudible) intertwine with post-industrialization. And how does Europe escape this fate? One that might be a comfortable future but is also in some ways perhaps a stagnant future. Perhaps it is one that is--in which Europe is less relevant. And immigration, education, entrepreneurship, take logical change are all parts of the solution. I'm not sure what the recipe is for that. And there're no easy solutions I think--I don't think that anybody even the collective power of this room would be able to come up solutions for this. But and certainly when politics are taken into consideration it makes the challenge all the more direct.

Nik Gowing: So really you're saying these issues are really not being gripped. Whether or for the future?

Dhruva Jaishankar: I would say that yes.

Nik Gowing: All right. Ian there's a very important pickup for you I think there. Roderich then what I'd like to do in the last 15 minutes or so, you can see there's a lot in the agenda, I'd like to ask you to just come in with any thoughts you've got on any of these points. Again we're not going to resolve any of them

but we want to put them on the agenda as programs and projects are conceive for the next few months and couple of years. Roderich.

Roderich Kiesewetter: Thank you very much indeed. (Inaudible) from the German Parliament. I have two issues on the European Union. First of all, on the enlargement policy sometimes the EU is giving the appearance as being the only actor, for example on the west (inaudible) not taking into account that we are competing there with Saudi Arabia, with Turkey, with Russia but also with some very relevant issues, like organized crime which nation overarching.

And the second, it is inter-related. The second issue is the structures of the European Union. We have a commission being under revision, yes, that's true. However, the commission is not transparent enough. Look at TTIP. And the commission is not completely controlled by a parliament. So, if we would like to enhance the roll of the European Union, we really need a stronger view on our current structures to be able to include more member states in the future, in the long-term, but also to be more reactive and responsive regarding our structures. It's needs stronger rolls for the European parliament, and a better definition for the roll of the council and the commission. Thank you.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Great, thank you. Now, who is burning--I can see one hand going up. I hope you're not burning. But I hope--and two or three. What other

things have we not put on the agenda which we should have put on the agenda, and had you sent me a message, I would have already set it up to now.

So, let me take here, and to here, and then we've got about 15, maximum 20 minutes. Can I ask you to keep your remarks to no more than a minute, please.

Iter Turan: All right. My name is Iter Turan from Istanbul Bilgi University. Let me first just say a little thing about the distinguished parliamentary from Germany (inaudible). He suggested that they were competing against Turkey. I was under the mistaken impression that Turkey is negotiating a membership. Maybe like to think about that. But--

Mr. Nik Gowing: Can we keep it--can we keep on these points, which will be--

(crosstalk)

Mr. Nik Gowing: Is there anything else specifically?

Iter Turan: Actually the point I was going to make about--was about democracy and that it is not working because we're trying to export the system to other countries that has a significant number of shortcomings itself. And one of the major problems is that essentially the current leadership, because of the changes in communication technologies among other things, is constantly trying to respond to immediate challenges, and has--doesn't have enough time to formulate long-term

policies. And will respond to needs for long-term policies only when crises break out.

Mr. Nik Gowing: You come from a country where the former Prime Minister tried to kill or remove Twitter.

Iter Turan: I do not necessarily take pride in that, nor essentially support what he is doing. In fact, I--

Mr. Nik Gowing: But there is a clash between politics and the new digital reality in your country.

Iter Turan: This is true in all countries. They don't necessarily all react to it the same way.

Mr. Nik Gowing: They don't try and--they don't try and--

Iter Turan: --not necessarily persuaded that leaders in more democratic environments are less concerned about the outcomes, and try to find ways of coping with it.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. You've made your point. Please. Who's got the microphone here? Right, please.

Iter Turan: Yeah, thank you very much. I'm Jean-Michel Dartaguiette French MOD. I just wanted to make a comment on the allocation made by Sonja on the political system, the lax, and the abstention, the irates of abstention, especially in the UEF (sic).

The bad thing is that in Europe, we live in a system of where political parties have actually struggled and killed democracy. I will explain my point very briefly.

Before the votes were made by local landlords, so there were huge financial pressures, and that's why political parties were made, to ensure that those pressures were taken off the table. Now, you have political parties that you have to go through. You have to climb up all the way for those parties, and this is the best way to dilute and kill your original ideas.

And I think there's a way that's EUF and youngsters perceive political parties right now, and that explains the rise of the populace parties, because you be anything, anywhere, you can be put on a list in France, for example, they take people from all backgrounds, and all minority sessions, and that's one of it's--

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thank you very much, indeed. Now look. Let me just remind you the kind of things that are already put on the agenda. Leadership. Then, if I don't go too fast. Blind spot. What is heard? Crisis of trust.

Disenfranchisement. Next generation. Underpinning everything that we're talking about. The new nature of the media. The democratic deficit, as well. The rising populism. The counter-narratives. New strategies. Diversity. European Union. It's relevance. Unraveling. Demography. Transparency. And accountability.

I'd like to go back to where we started this with Monica and talk about leadership. And can I--can we go to Sandy Vershbow from NATO. Just your

reflections given where you work and the kind of challenges that NATO is facing, particularly representing the 28 nations. And you're a former diplomat as well.

What you see in terms of leaderships capacity to cope when you hear what Monica was saying right at the beginning.

Mr. Alexander Vershbow: Well, clearly we're all facing one of the most challenging security environments that I think in memory, going back perhaps to the post war period. Not just in the post-cold war period.

And so we, first of all, I think need to remember where we stand on some of these issues. We're sort of paralyzed by indecision on a lot of these things, because so crises are erupting at the same time.

But I think we--it does come back to leadership. U.S. leadership is critical. And--but U.S. leadership isn't enough anymore. Europe has to become a real partner of the United States. And that means, I think, coming together to come up with a transatlantic security strategy. I think, you know, NATO is doing its thing, the European Union is looking to develop a European security strategy. What we really is a transatlantic security strategy that addresses both the fundamental challenges in the east, where it's not just about deterring Russia. NATO is working on that. We have our readiness action plan. We're going to streamline decision-making. We're going to be able to deal with hybrid threats.

There I'm sure we're going to get there.



But how do we stay true to the vision of the Europe Hope Free and Peace (sic) when it comes to Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova? We need a strategy working with other institutions to build resilience, shore up the independence of these countries.

And then in the south, again, NATO doesn't have all the answers. We need a collaborative strategy that shores up those states that haven't failed. Defense-capacity building is where NATO fits in. But we have to help them build stronger institutions across the board, and that means we need a comprehensive transatlantic strategy that uses the institutions we have much more effectively. So you were saying European leadership--

Mr. Nik Gowing: You've given them an institutional response. If I may, can I ask you about literally the personal side, the human side, of dealing with the enormity of the end of normative thinking about Russia for example. And what you see, someone who's been in public service, dare I say for more than 30 years? About the real challenges given that, in many ways, that underpins everything, from the roll of the challenges for women, now, and also diversity and thinking out of the box about the new realities that are faced. And that's coming through from this discussion.

Mr. Alexander Vershbow: Well, I think--I was very impressed by the point made by Gitte Bech that we have a whole generation that--represented for the most

part in this forum, that needs to be brought into to this process, become part of the development of the transatlantic security strategy. They need to have a sense of ownership.

I think the transatlantic community has drifted apart. It's not coincidental, perhaps, that most of the foreign students in American universities are from Asia and not from Europe. We don't have the same sense of common experience, common agenda, common values. So I think there's a lot that can be done to stitch together again a true transatlantic community. And we have to work starting with the younger generation.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Now please, I'm going to go around as many as I can. We've got about 10 minutes. Please. So keep your remarks quick.

Ms. Natalia Koliada: Natalia Koliada, Belarus Free Theatre also representing We Remember Foundation that unites families and friends over those who are kidnapped and killed in Belarus.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Do you recognize a lot of these issues from your perspective in Minsk?

Ms. Natalia Koliada: Absolutely. The only thing that the last three days in Minsk, as we heard, there's a Minsk protocol, though this is not mentioned at all. And this is dictatorship in the center of Europe. And peace talks between Russia

and Ukraine, and EU takes place in the country where we have political prisoners. And this year, we have so-called political presidential elections.

But very sadly, Belarus is not mentioned in this particular regard. But I want to talk about pro-active and the reactive politics. Coming from a very personal experience, living in Belarus, and living near Russia, and Ukraine, it was absolutely clear in 2009, when Russia reacted to eastern partnership strategy that was presented by Poland and Sweden, and Russia reacted absolutely badly to it.

How was it possible for EU and American politicians do not reflect properly and be proactive, and make a proper analysis to prevent what we have now with Ukraine? And today we have military bases in Belarus. And exactly because of that particular situation.

My question is, how is it possible for Europe to exclude Belarus from that discussion?

Mr. Nik Gowing: Okay. That's a very sobering reminder of what was missed in the challenges on leadership. Let's--can we move the microphone? Who would like to come in, please. Here, first. Here first, and then pass it back it back. And we'll come to you. Please.

Man: I'd like to say something about ISIS and Russia. And one of the earlier sessions I was in, really important point was made, which I can't attribute, because it was done {04:09:59}. But about how ISIS and Russia were linked by the fact

that both had really lost in the globalization. They both lost out in a major way, which made them particularly dangerous, because they have nothing to lose.

And, that was an interesting idea for me, because how do you fight back against people who are prepared to--who need to bend the rules of international engagement, revel in abusing human rights in the case of ISIS, and in Russia, breach territorial integrity, and lie, frankly, just constantly.

And what I thought of were two things. In addition to hard power and sanctions, which must be tools on the menus, first of all, projecting weakness back at people is really important. I think if these people are trying to project strength and power, we need to expose them for what they are, which is weak, brittle, perverted, and annalistic in the case of ISIS. I think it's really important that in terms of trying fight back against recruitment, we show these organizations movements for what they are.

Mr. Nik Gowing: But let me ask you to go just one stage above that.

Man: Sure.

Mr. Nik Gowing: What is the overarching conclusion that you draw about some of these issues we've put on the agenda here, particularly leadership, able to understand the enormity, because as Monica says, we weren't even thinking about IS this time last year, until they attacked--

Man: Well, I think we've got a merge--that leadership can emerge from strange and dangerous places, and ISIS is showing a kind of leadership. I mean, it's reacting in a way to world order, in which it feels it can't react. So we have to be prepared to acknowledge that there are different kinds of leadership, and hit back in our own way and expose these people for what they are.

I mean, also, as well as exposing them, I think we need to work at how we can include the kind of people that they might gather as recruits in a world order. Make them part of--make them part of a successful globalized world, because that way we'll stop recruitment.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Please, over there. The lady there. Please, I can only just see you.

Woman: Thank you very. That was very exciting exercise. And, I appreciate the organization.

What I missed here is a bit of human dimension, and I think the added value of the conference on security and foreign policy arranged in the west should differ from the rest of the world. And--

Mr. Nik Gowing: What do you mean by the human dimension?

Woman: Human dimension. Let's take into--let's look at--

Mr. Nik Gowing: We're talking about women. We're talking demography. We're talking about generations.

Woman: No, no, no. Energy security. There was nothing about the--what's happening, the implications of the energy trade for the country producer, for the people, for the--on the other side, we have hundred political prisoners in the (inaudible). It's a price which the people pay for the priorities determined by EU and the western countries in general. And it's very interesting that the countries who are outside of the EU, like Norway, they have much greater influence in Normative area, in democracy promotion. And they manage to reconcile to irreconcilable agendas.

And I think it's time to review the energy security concept, and should take into account necessarily, because the fact that nobody mentioned at this conference the implications of the energy trade for (inaudible) which absolutely--and government who arrested last year the leading pro-European actors in the country because it was sure it could get away that. I think it should be in the focus next time. And we're much less lucky than (inaudible) because EU doesn't apply conditionality to (inaudible). Thank you.

Mr. Nik Gowing: I've tried to summarize it up there as values being abused. In other words, there being no balance which builds again on Belorussia as well. Right. We've got about 10 minutes to run. You've got the microphone, then we're going to move it across there. Please.

Carlos Alzugaray: Yes. My name is Carlos Alzugaray, I come from Cuba.

Although my age will tell you otherwise, I am a rookie here. It's my first--

Mr. Nik Gowing: But you do live in Cuba at the moment.

Carlos Alzugaray: I live in Cuba, of course.

Mr. Nik Gowing: How did you get here? No, I mean that physically. How--

Carlos Alzugaray: Through Frankfurt.

Mr. Nik Gowing: No--

Carlos Alzugaray: Through Frankfurt.

Mr. Nik Gowing: I--okay, because it's important as someone who's been to Cuba on many occasions, it's not an easy place to get from. Therefore, the normalization of relations with the United States makes it a lot easier. Now, give me that pejoratively.

Carlos Alzugaray: Thanks to the German Marshal Fund, I am here coming all the way through Frankfurt.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Good.

Carlos Alzugaray: The first time--

Mr. Nik Gowing: Germany.

Carlos Alzugaray: From Germany, yeah. My suggest you more attention be paid to the relationship of the transatlantic community with Latin America and Caribbean. I'm going to give seven reasons. I'm going to be very brief.

First the regional east. Part of the global south or part of the rest, if you want to use the west and the rest, but is it part of the global south that has more connections with the transatlantic community, cultural terms, identity terms. It plays a prime order role in the geography, because Latin America both faces the Pacific, and we have seen that in all the conversations about the TTP. But at the same time, it faces the Atlantic. It faces Africa. It contains the main passage between the Atlantic and the Pacific through the Caribbean basin, which by the way, includes the Gulf of Mexico and therefore connects the East Coast of the United States, the Gulf of Mexico, and the West Coast of the United States. It is the region of the world that is increasingly peaceful and integrated, as Dr. Brzezinski pointed out this morning. It has huge reserves of practically every important resource in the world. It has a cultural and social connection with Africa. and Russia and China are paying a lot of attention to Latin America and the Caribbean, as demonstrated for example, by the China CELAC forum, CELAC being the new cooperation organization in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thank you very much. And I think that's very much something raising the flag, if I may say, to the GMF, which is about the role of Cuba in the Atlantic dialogues coming up because of what has changed now and the enormous potential there as well as a place where peace is being made between the FARC and the government of Colombia. You've got the microphone next.



Fred Tanner: Thank you. Thank you, Nik. Fred Tanner from the OACE. I'd just like to combine a couple of points, like leadership, strategy, with the Europe whole and free. I like this point about whole and free and the question of policy relevance which leads to the question, actually, what's the end game? What's the endpoint we want to achieve? It's not a divided Europe. A good strategy is not a strategy which leads to a new division of Europe. We need, at a certain stage, to engage with Russia because we want to have European security not against Russia but with Russia. I think Dr. Brzezinski actually made that point in a different way on Friday at the very beginning. He said we need to accommodate Russia but also draw red lines, to be very clear where are the red lines. But I don't think we have spoken enough of where is common ground. Where can we start with Russia, not just outside, let's say Syria, Iran, but also in Europe to get eventually to this very nice vision of Europe whole and free with everybody on board.

Mr. Nik Gowing: I just want to press in the last five minutes. Who is burning to say something about the demographic deficit, the democratic problems, the problems of civilian power and citizen power and the challenge there is to leadership, these kind of critical issues. And I'm going to go to one or two in the next generation here, and there is a gentleman in back. But on these specific issues because we are looking for really seismic issues which have got to be confronted

which maybe go well beyond Ukraine, Russia, and the current problems of ISIS.

So this guy here and at the back, please, and come to you in a moment.

Male: Hi everyone.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Can you keep yourself very brief?

Carlos Menchaca: So very brief. I'm Carlos Menchaca. I'm a council member, local municipal government leader, and what we've done to transform-- and I'd love to see this more and more across the world, and it came from Brazil-- but participatory budgeting is a tool we're using where we're giving the public, our residents, whether they're documented or undocumented, even immigrants can participate in this process to make choices for municipal capital improvements to their streets, to their schools, to their parks. And we're engaging everybody.

And the immigrants are the ones that are coming out in full force and bringing their voice to government. We're not just saying we're going to open the doors of government. We're giving them an opportunity to do that, and I think we need to take a page out of ISIS and say this is all homegrown. And I think we need to use the same tools they are using to offer a whole new bold approach to all of this.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Wow, that sounds fascinating. Is it scaling up?

Carlos Menchaca: Oh absolutely. There were three council members. Now there are 23, and we're hoping that we take a whole part of the budget back to the people and let them make decisions. But that means that leaders like me, as council members all the way up to the President, need to start giving up their power. And that's the only way we're going to see change.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Fascinating. Here, and then the gentleman at the back.

Luis: I'm Luis, I'm coming from Portugal. We can speak about Russia, Ukraine, ISIS, we can speak about everything, but I want to speak about youth and the next generation that were speaking over here because we are always accused of or we don't read news or you don't engage in politics or we don't vote. It's always our guilty. But I also want to ask you, the people that are here running offices, do you really know if you are able to engage young people in politics, in business, or not? Because I think that we have plenty of ideas, plenty of thoughts. We want to work together with everyone. We can't build this gap between generations.

And we also want to boost the transatlantic relationship between young people, but not only to speak about business. Why we don't speak about startups, how to work together between venture capitals, between both sides of the Atlantic? We have American companies hiring young people from Europe. So my challenge over here is that we have to work together more times as GMF is doing here, but

working together in business, in politics, in national Parliaments and the European parliament.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thank you. We have four minutes left. Who's got the microphone? Have you got it there? And then we'll come here, please.

Pauns Vamenga: Well, I'm Pauns Vamenga from the Netherlands, a member of a city council, Eindhoven. And I would like to talk about what I think that leaders need in this year.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Do you see big deficiencies of leadership then?

Pauns Vamenga: Well, what I think is that, of course, we have these beautiful values within the European Union but also in the transatlantic area, but these beautiful values such as human rights, such as human dignity, such as pluralism, these are very beautiful values, but we don't apply them. We don't apply them, and I think there is something really important coming up. We should apply those very beautiful values which we have. I can remember that after the Second World War, we had this also had this problem, the Cold War between the West and the East. Basically, this was a war of ideas, and this war of ideas can only be won if you really believe in it, if you really apply it also and people really see the difference. Because what does it mean? What do those words mean? If we

are talking about it, if you write about it but we don't apply it, this word means nothing.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Do you feel under pressure now as a leader, an elected leader presumably, in your position in the Netherlands because of the way the public is now expecting you to be able to respond completely perfectly and in no time at all?

Pauns Vamenga: Well, I don't feel pressure because I try to lead, and this is the most important thing. I think there was a comment about populism. Leaders who try to say the best thing so that they can have as much votes that they can, but I don't think that leaders should do that. I think that leaders should show the example. They should lead. To me, to my opinion, leading means that standing for your values, standing for things which is important, like human rights, and really try to apply them.

Mr. Nik Gowing: All right. Thank you. Please.

Mr. Johan Verbeke: Yes. I'm Johan Verbeke. I'm the Belgian ambassador to the United States. I wanted to say something about the need for making our democratic model more resilient. I have the impression that...

Mr. Nik Gowing: Resilient without changing it.

Mr. Johan Verbeke: Resilient.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Without changing it?

Mr. Johan Verbeke: Keeping democracy as a standard value but make it more resilient, and I'm just going to give one single example. I find it rather dramatic, if not pathetic, that the Western world with the values which are our is impotent as we got a renegade, barbaric group like ISIS. We have been discussing here the position of Europe and United States vis-à-vis Russia, vis-à-vis China, but then again we forget that we work in those relationships from our democratic values and our democratic system whereas they can cut short of many of those issues. And then, of course, they get a competitive advantage, if I may say so. So it seems to me that we have to reflect one day or another on the transaction course of democracy as it is being run today.

The world is moving much faster than it was 30 years ago. We spoke about compressed time. The world is becoming much more complex than it was 30 years ago, and in order to face that complexity and act in real time, I think we have to revisit our democratic model. I'm not questioning democracy, but make it more resilient, more responsive to the real challenges out there. Thank you.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thank you very much, indeed. I've got time for one more intervention. Who's burning to say something? Please.

David Mahmoud: Thank you very much. David Mahmoud, (inaudible) officer at international (inaudible) organization, the European Human Rights Center. On the International Day Against Racism and Discrimination, my question will be regarding the largest minority in Europe but also at the same time, the most discriminated minority in Europe, the (inaudible). Undoubtedly, there is a huge gap between Rome and the rest of the population in this world, concerning, among other things, their fundamental rights, particularly in so-called Western Balkan countries or enlargement countries. So following the point for the enlargement procedure, my question will be what could the international community do more in relation to address pressing issue on one hand and obvious violation of basic fundamental human rights? Thank you.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thank you very much, indeed. I hope you feel this experiment has worked. I feel we've had a very rich series of interventions--I think we've had well over 20--and a lot of important ideas put on the agenda. I can flip through my little book here on ideas: leadership, blind spots, what is being heard, Russia, for example, in '08-'09. How did leadership no respond? A crisis of trust, disenfranchisement. What about the next generation? Are their views being really

embraced within leadership and the systems that are going to respond? Democratic deficit, rising populism, credibility of elites. Can there be dialogue? And I've misspelt "there." I apologize. I do write English properly normally. Make democracy more resilient and more responsive, counter-narratives, new strategies in diversity. And particularly with women, opportunity and skills. There are some fundamental challenges here which I hope we've put on the agenda for the German Marshall Fund through you, both whether you've got gray hair or you haven't got gray hair. This is about bringing generations together and showing the speed and pressure that there is for embracing many of these issues. Can I thank you all very much indeed for entering the spirit of this?

And please come back after coffee for Ian's pickup on this which is going to be Part Two of all these issues before lunch.

Ivan Vejvoda: And please thank Nik Gowing once again. Nik, thank you. Let me just say, as we transition to the coffee break that a lot of these issues that Nik mentioned that you were part of this discussion of are actually issues that we address at the German Marshall Fund through our policy work, though our leadership work, and through our civil society work. And we really try and enhance deepening those issues through very concrete actions and projects and policy and research work.



Again, to be continued, but I would say that this experiment, if we can call it that, this pilot with you, Nik, is something that we should repeat probably next year if you all agree. We will have a coffee break, and that leads us then, as Nik mentioned, into our final panel of Brussels Forum and of the day which is thought experiment looking at a Brussels Forum agenda in 10 years. At the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary, we look forward to 2025, so do please come back for that final session and the concluding remarks that Karen will be giving us. Thank you again.