

Brussels Forum

March 18, 2016

Plenary #1: A Grave New World: Future Global Security Challenges

Ladies and gentlemen please welcome from CNN and the Daily Beast Ms. Kim Dozier.

Dr. Karen Donfried: So Kim is our wonderful moderator for the next section and you'll see in the program it's called "A Grave New World." That is not a misprint. It wasn't supposed to be a brave new world. But a grave new world. And before Kim invites her panel up, we do have a short video that we wanted to share with you. So we'll go to that first.

Video: In an increasingly interconnected world, today's transatlantic security challenges are multifaceted, widespread, and dynamic. Ongoing instability in the Middle East and North Africa, destabilization in West Africa, Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, and simmering tensions in south and east Asia all serve as palpable examples of this [audio gap 01:02:40 - 01:02:44] Transatlantic partnership and its existing security architecture. How can Europe, the United States, and their global partners engage more effectively to deal with hybrid threats and unconventional challenges like climate change or cyber security? How can the transatlantic community best manage and mitigate current crisis while anticipating emerging threats, challenges, and opportunities?

Ms. Kim Dozier: Thank you and welcome. I want to thank our panelists for joining us, Secretary General Stoltenberg, Senator Jeanne Shaheen, and President Ilves of Estonia who is stepping into the breach as an EU Minister Mogherini is in another equally important meeting. So I want to begin with a word of warning and a word of hope. The warning is this will be a fast paced and interesting dialogue because otherwise I will hopefully politely and with humor interrupt you rather you are world leader on the stage or in the audience. And a word of hope. You know sometimes these meetings end up with just doom and gloom. Yes, we're facing dire times. But that's when you're tested whether an individual, a family, or a family of nations. So as we puzzle through some of these difficult issues let's think about resilience and ways to make things work while things seem to be falling apart. With that I'm going to open with two questions for the audience. Word cloud first. What is the one word that comes to mind when you think of the transatlantic relationship? So if you are interacting with the app you can answer. I already know from our panelist what at least one of them wants to see up there. Two, this is true. Distant consensus, values, okay. Well what at least two of our panelists had hoped to see was the world NATO. So, the second question that I wanted to ask the audience--it's a Q & A, a multiple choice and it's also in the app. What is the leading threat facing the transatlantic relationship? Russia, ISIS, refugees and migrants, or the

economy. I realize this may be the first time some of you are looking at this section in the app. That's okay. I can just take over and decide which one I'm going to lead with. Give a seven more seconds for an answer. Five, four, three, two, time is up. The economy. Not the one any of us expected. So let's open with that. Is there anything that the security relationship can do to repair the direction the economy is going right now?

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: Security that is the debatable [audio gap 01:06:33 - 01:06:38] both of course inside NATO where we all have a little stability. But perhaps even more important it creates stability around NATO, the more we are also able then to promote economic development and also more to be focused on [audio gap 01:06:56 - 01:07:04].

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: You know, I think it's the same issue that we're seeing in the United States as we look at what's coming out in this election. In the United States, the anger and frustration of voters and it's I think very much a piece of what's going on in Europe and around the world. We're all affected by globalization. The world as we know it is changing and people are anxious about that because they don't know what that means for themselves and their families. It's why TTIP and the United States but you're seeing it here in Europe too in terms of the concerns that have been expressed about TTIP as among the population. So I think it's understandable that people are concerned about the economy and what we need to do certainly in the United States and I think transatlantically is, if there is such a word, through the transatlantic partnership is to think about a strategy for how we're going to respond to people's economic concerns. Job training and education means that we've got to work [audio gap 01:08:09 - 01:08:19].

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: But NATO is fundamental and it is what keeps the United States here and makes Europeans think about the United States a big part of the debate today. But since 1949, I mean Europe and the U.S. have been tied through NATO. Now then we get to learn how much Europe is concerned about security and I think that has returned. Since living in this kind of bubble of the piece dividend for 25 years we all thought that no one had to spend money on defense. That everything we had achieved, Woodstock, peace, love, and understanding and now it turns out to join Russia. I mean I think that's shocked a lot [audio gap 01:09:09 - 01:10:36]. I think existential that may be too strong word. But first of all we are seeing for the first time since Khrushchev nuclear saber rattling. You know threats even to Sweden that if you join NATO you might have a problem, nuclear problem. That is clear. The undermining of the post-World War II security structure, foundations from the UN charter to the Helsinki Final Act to the Paris charger saying you don't change borders through military force. I mean we've basically seen that violated. So there again existential, I want to add to that the failure of the U.K. and the U.S. to support the Budapest Memorandum and allowing Russia to do what it did and not stand up for the territory integrity of Ukraine. When Ukraine gave up the third largest nuclear arsenal in world in

exchange for this means that it's a long term dilemma and for--50 years from now you still may have a problem convincing let's say Estonia gets a nuclear weapon. And in 50 years you will say, "You're going to guarantee our territorial integrity." No. So and finally I would say what is what I find right now dangerous is the support for financings. Occasionally hard core extremists' parties, the right wing populous that are anti-immigrant, anti-ego, leading to a strengthening fetiparous tendencies in the urban. All those are genuine threats. Now to talk there about restoring its legitimate place is like--

Ms. Kim Dozier: And yet Secretary General you have in some of your recent remarks spoken of a hope of restoring a positive relationship with Russia. You have talked about their role at the UN security council in the securing a nuclear deal with Iran. Do you see any rays of light? And warning we're gonna move on to Ukraine from this.

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: Sorry?

Ms. Kim Dozier: And warning we're going to move on to the subject of Ukraine from this.

H.E. Jen Stoltenberg: My message is that Russia is our neighbor. Russia is going to remain and Russia is going to be our biggest neighbor in the foreseeable future. So therefore we have to develop a relationship to Russia and we have to do that based on two strands or two tracks. One is built on strength. We need to be strong. We need to be credible. We need to deliver the necessary deterrence. We need to have strong defense. And we are also now implementing--we are therefore now implanting the biggest and the strongest reinforcement of collected defense since the end of the Cold War because we see a more assertive Russia. We don't see any imminent threat against any NATO ally. But we see a more assertive Russia being responsible for aggressive actions in Ukraine. And today through the illegally annexed Crimea. But at the same we have to be able to strive for a more constructive and cooperative relationship with Russia because that is in our interest. And there is no contradiction between strong defense and political dialogue. Actually I believe that as long as we are strong, as long we are firm, as long as we're predictable, we can also engage with Russia on different political arenas. We have seen it when it comes to the Iran nuclear deal and we have seen it in other as we have seen it as least partly in Syria and me or my own experience as Norwegian politician was that in Norway we developed actually even during the coldest part of the Cold War a pragmatic working relationship Russia where we cooperated on energy, on fishery, on economy, on many other areas. Not despite of our membership in NATO, but because of our membership in NATO. We had the strength and the confidence enabling us to engage with Russia. So when the United States for instance engaged with Russia in many different areas, it's not because United States is weak. It's because the United States is strong. So as long as we are strong we can engage with Russia seeking a more cooperative relationship.

Ms. Kim Dozier: And yet today we've had words back and forth between Moscow and the EU over Crimea. The Minsk agreement doesn't seem like it's anywhere near to getting honored. Do you think that it needs to be dropped and we need to move to something else? Do you think there's any chance that the fighting will stop with reports from General Breedlove that there have been increased incidences along the line of control?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: The Minsk agreement is the best possible way towards a--negotiate a peaceful solution to the crisis in Crimea. And I think it's very dangerous to start in a way to not try to implement the Minsk agreement.

We have seen an increased number of violations of the cease fire, but the answer to that is not to give up to try to implement the Minsk Agreements but just to reinforce our efforts to have full implementation of the agreement. Meaning that we have to see withdrawal of heavy weapons. We have to continue to push forward that the national service have full access to the area, so they are able to monitor the implementation of the Minsk Agreements and we have to continue to support the efforts of different nations trying to implement the agreements, but also, to push forward reforms in the Ukraine.

And I can see no other way because in the long run, there has to be a negotiated political solution to the conflict in Crimea.

Ms. Kim Dozier: I was going to say to play devil's advocate is something we often argue with, our poor press attaché at the State Department. We hear this, we hear everyone saying, "But Russia agreed to this and therefore must do what it said it's going to do." And you just keep saying the same thing over but we don't see action. Russia, arguably, has found success with saying it's going to go along with international agreements, but then doing something else on the ground.

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: Well, we have seen actions. We are seeing economic sanctions from The United States, from EU, from other countries and I think it's important that we continue with the economic sanctions. And we have also seen its inactions because what NATO now does when it comes to increasing our collective defense, is (inaudible) response to the aggressive actions of Russia and Crimea. We have triple the size of the NATO response force. We have established a high-readiness joint task force and we have increased our military presence in the eastern part of the alliance as a guarded response to what Russia did in Crimea, eastern Ukraine.

So there has been actions, economic actions, military actions. But we have to then combine those actions with the political efforts to try to implement the Minsk Agreements and again, there's no contradiction between economic sanctions, military strengths and the strong, which to try to pursue a political path to implement the Minsk Agreements.

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: Thank--can I--I want to add to that. I agree with that but we've got to then continue to take action against Russia where we can, to try and hold their feet to the fire. So the talk about letting sanctions lapse at the end of this period I think is letting Russia off the hook for what they've done. And so we need to do that. That's why the United States is talking about increasing the European Reassurance Initiative four-fold in this budget cycle because we are concerned about showing the kind of strength that you talk about, and reassuring our allies, like Estonia and some of our eastern partners, that we are concerned about what's happening and Russia's influence along the eastern border of Europe.

And, you know, again, that's why I think we've got to look at where we can weigh in, in a way that can [audio gap 07:04:31 - 07:04:35] with Minsk, too, that they're the ones who are the problem. Well, they certainly have to reform and they have corruption issues. They've got a lot of issues they have to deal with. They've made some real progress on that. But Russia needs to be held accountable, too.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: Well, I mean, Russia is a--has invaded a country, so, I mean, we can--

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: Well, it has. Absolutely.

Ms. Kim Dozier: I was just going to ask, if hearing that, you have a front-row seat, like it or not, to what is happening? You've got Russia just on the other side of your border. Some think tanks have estimated that your country and your neighbor, Latvia, could be overrun in 72 hours, should Russia choose to follow the same acts it did with Crimea and Ukraine. I know, I'm depressing you.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: No, no, you're not. I mean, basically, I think it's just--its--that's true but people forget what Article V means, that if you're going to go and invade us then you're going to have to worry about more Minsk, you know. I mean, it's not as if just it's locally isolated. So, I think, I mean, there's a lot of sort of--

Ms. Kim Dozier: So is there enough pushback though?

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: Well, I think the--I mean, there are two issues. One is that we have to recognize that we live in a new security environment which the past--rules of the past 70 years do not necessarily apply anymore. You know, you've invaded a country. And we're letting--and we cannot let that just go by, as some countries in the EU are perfectly willing for--in pursuit of [unintelligible] are willing to do, maybe. I mean, at least they give these notions.

But that's a real bad, slippery slope and we all need to work against that.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So with that, I'd love to invite a couple of questions from the audience before we move on to another topic. Sir, I saw your hand first. Can you wait until the microphone gets to you? This

gentleman in the back row. And identify yourself and your affiliation. Oh, and could you please stand up so I have some company?

Mr. Daniel Fried: I'm Daniel Fried. I'm the Sanctions Coordinator of the Department of State. On the issue of the western response to Russia's aggression in the Ukraine, the European Union deserves credit for a sustained strategic response that went well beyond what many skeptics thought was possible, and went well beyond, I suspect, what the Russians predicted Europe would do.

On the basis of a combined western response, we have probably halted further Russian aggression in Ukraine, laid the basis for Minsk, and now the task seems to us in the Administration--and thanks also for the support from the Congress, because America's speaking with one voice on this. If the Ukrainians pull themselves together on their domestic reforms and we keep the pressure on Russia to fulfill Minsk, which it now is not--it is not doing at the moment, we have a chance of a genuinely good outcome, which is an independent, free Ukraine, which is not a bad place to be in any foreign policy dilemma.

So NATO can do its thing, which is the right thing to do and it's a big shift. Europe and the United States are doing their thing. As foreign policy problems go, the possibility of a decent outcome is sometimes is as good as it ever gets, so this is not a bad place to be, so--if we keep it up.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So--and your question?

Mr. Daniel Fried: Oh, my question--

Ms. Kim Dozier: Just in brief. Really brief.

Mr. Daniel Fried: I--my question is to the Europeans here. Are you confident, particularly President Ilves, that Europe will maintain the sanctions and roll it over when it comes time at the end of July, assuming Minsk has not been fulfilled?

Ms. Kim Dozier: Thank you.

Mr. Daniel Fried: Because that's a critical element of our strategy.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: It looks that way because there's nothing positive--there are no positive developments to grab on to.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So can I ask one more question from the front row on this side? Gentleman in the gray suit. And again, please stand up and identify yourself, if that's okay.

Congressman Mike Turner: Yes. Congressman Mike Turner (inaudible) a member of the Armed Services Committee. And, Mr. President, I'm a big fan of yours. I appreciate your clarity in which you discuss Russia's actions. I do have to disagree with you with respect to The United States' obligations with respect

to the territorial integrity of Ukraine. As you know, we did not agree to maintain the territorial integrity of Ukraine. However, as the Secretary General did indicate, both the EU and the United States undertook sanctions to punish Russia and its actions to violate its agreement, to similarly recognize its territorial integrity.

As the moderator mentioned, there's been a recent RAND study that did not bode well for--they did a military exercise of what would occur if there was a conflict over the Baltic's. And in that, The United States, you know, looks to those vulnerabilities and as the Senator has indicated, is putting for the European Reassurance Initiative, \$3.4 billion to try to address some of those deficiencies that were addressed in RAND.

But as the debate occurs in the Senate and the House, of course the question becomes, well, what will Europe do? So Secretary General, how do you see Europe responding if The United States comes forward with its European Reassurance Initiative for an American Reassurance Initiative, to match or increase to help backfill some of those deficiencies they found in the RAND study?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: What I expect that European allies are going to do is that they're going to make good on what they decided (inaudible) ways. So that was to increase defense spending, enabling them to step up. And as I've always said, they have started to do so, many of the European allies.

So for instance--so first of all, the European Reassurance Initiative launched actually Poland a couple years ago. It's extremely important because it shows that the U.S. is really committed to the security of Europe.

And I remember when I was first approached to become the Secretary General of NATO, many people told me that the U.S. was now in a process of leaving Europe. That's not true. The U.S. is actually increasing its presence in Europe. That's of great importance, and therefore, I also strongly welcome the proposal to quadruple the amount of money spent on this European Reassurance Initiative.

But then, of course, the onus is on the Europeans. They have started to make some very important steps. They are in the lead of this new speed of force. More and more European allies have started to increase defense spending and we decided, at our Defense Ministerial Meeting in February in NATO, that we will increase our military presence in the eastern part of the alliance with multinational forces. Meaning that, of course, we hope that there will be U.S. forces there but also other European nations have to contribute forces to multinational presence in eastern part of the alliance.

And this is--and what we need is a combination of forward presence of forces. We have already started to deploy more forces or to have more exercises, more air policing, more presence of NATO forces in the

eastern part of the alliance but also increase our ability to reinforce, if needed. And that's the reason why we, for instance, have tripled the size of the NATO response force.

We need more of this and that's one of the main issues we are going to address at our summit in Warsaw in July. But it's--we have already started to move and we need to move further.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So as one U.S. official just put it to me at UCOMM, it's about making all of those nations, especially along the border, porcupines rather than lambs when it comes to swallowing them whole. But one of their complaints, as we turn to another subject, is that as they reach out to various different European NATO members to do some of these exercises, that many of the troops that they would like to exercises with are engaged in the refugee and migrant flow, or engaged in counterterrorism operations against ISIS and other extremist violent movements.

So I'd like to--we'll go back to questions again in a little bit, but I'd like to open up with that question. The refugee and migrant issue. Turning refugees away makes one question your very founding principles as a nation and as a body. Where is your humanity? Aren't NATO and European Union nations supposed to stand up for the oppressed? And yet, the critics say it could change our culture and bring down our economy.

So what is your current position on how it's being handled?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: The important thing now is that we are seeing a renewed effort to try to find a comprehensive approach and agreement between the European Union and Turkey. And I think that's the most promising initiative I've seen over many months and hopefully, they will agree today. And then we will have a better, more organized response to the biggest and most challenging migrant and refugee crisis Europe has seen since the end of the Second World War.

The most important thing we can do is, of course, to address the root causes, so all the efforts to try to find a way to end the turmoil, the fighting, the killing in Syria is of course addressing the root causes of the migrant and refugee crisis.

And NATO, the coalition fighting ISIL, we are, in different ways, doing our part in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in North Africa and the Middle East. So we are to continue those efforts but they may be, I want to say, long term efforts. So in the meantime, we have to address on a more short-term, immediate challenges here in Europe.

And there, NATO is playing its part in a way that we decided to assist and to help the European Union with coping with the migrant and refugee crisis in the Aegean Sea. We actually made the decision within 48 hours after the request was put forward on our table and we deployed the first ship 24 hours after the



decision was made. So it was NATO at its best able to react very quickly. Now there are seven NATO ships in the Aegean Sea. They are monitoring, collecting information and sharing that with the Turkish Coastguard, the Greek Coastguard and with the European Union Border Agency, Frontex. NATO ships not push back the boats with the migrants of the refugees, but what we will do is to help the local authorities, the European Union to deal with it in a better way than they have been able to do so far, and we are a kind of platform for increasing the cooperation between Greece and Turkey and the European Union. And it's one important building, looking at a more comprehensive approach.

Ms. Kim Dozier: I was going to say, and yet Amnesty and UNHCR are both saying that forcing refugees to go back to Turkey, which has a mixed human rights record--

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: No. I mean, this is--look. We are facing an existential issue in all of Europe right now. I mean--those--I mean, even, I think, that some of our refugee agreements will be under threat. The number of refugees coming--and it's not just Syria. I mean, you've got thousands of people who were coming across your border recently, very few of them from Syria unless they are ones who had, you know, permanent residence permits in Moscow, who then came illegally across your border with their--with their living permits torn out. We have seen several thousand come into Finland across the Russian-Finish border. We have--we are in winter so we don't have these massive numbers of people coming across the Mediterranean because it's just not really--but last summer, the summer before. So what we are seeing are--we see a m--we have--we're seeing a massive movement of people, some of whom are legitimate refugees. Some of whom are just saying, this is our opportunity to go to rich Europe finally at last. This is putting social services in a number of countries under severe stress. You know, obligations--international obligations will be thrown out when you--if you end up with populous taking power. We'll say that we're taking--adopt an anti-immigrant stance, who take--I mean, who are exploiting l--

Ms. Kim Dozier: Are you discussing populous who might be elected in the United States?

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: No. I'm talking about populous living in virtually every single European country today. I mean, we have the (inaudible). We have (inaudible). We have (inaudible), you know, (inaudible). I mean, these are--they all adopt an anti-immigrant position. We have them in their lesser known other parties in smaller countries. They are hostile. They tend to be anti-EU. They tend--I mean, their views on minorities sometimes are very, very dubious.

Ms. Kim Dozier: Point--point--

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: So this is a much bigger threat than just simply, you know, NATO stopping people between Turkey and Greece. It's a big threat.

Ms. Kim Dozier: Point taken. Some good points there. And so, Senator Shaheen, I want to put you on the spot. Not only are these all valid or at least important points that people in the region are voicing feeling, but we've had the U.S. Director of National Intelligence and other U.S. officials saying that this refugee flow is being weaponized. That it is meant, possibly, to cause instability across the European Union, and that ISIS is also using it, the so called Islamic State, to put cells here. Should more be done to keep people where they are? [audio gap 01:04:29 to 01:04:31]

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: Well, certainly General (inaudible) has said that he thinks that Russia was using refugees as a weapon. And the United States, if you are watching our Presidential election you know that immigration is an issue in the United States, and that we have been struggling with that as well. But we are the biggest supplier of humanitarian aid on the refugee crisis, and we will continue to do that. and I think we need to take more refugees in the United States. The President has said he wants to do that, but ultimately what we've got to do is deal with the root cause of the problem, as the Secretary General said, and that is to resolve the civil war in Syria, and to address the other challenges across the Middle East that have--and North Africa, that have people fleeing into Europe and trying to get some place where they can either avoid conflict or have a better life. And that's not a short-term solution. That's going to be a long-term challenge, but we've also got to engage the Arab nations, the moderate Arab nations in helping us solve this issue because we're not going to be able to do it ourselves if we don't have the Middle East also engaged with us.

Ms. Kim Dozier: May I invite some questions from the audience about this subject? Sir, I see--not--not yet. Okay. This gentleman right here who I actually stepped on at one point. The microphone is coming your way.

Mr. Youssef Amrani: Thank you. I am Youssef Amrani from Morocco. I have a question for the Secretary General of NATO. Don't you think that today in view of the challenges in the south NATO should reshape its instrument? NATO should have a new vision towards the Saudi Mediterranean's and beyond? Don't you think, second question, that EU and NATO should coordinate for more coherence in their policies towards the south, essentially? Because the neighborhood policy today is--haven't reached the results. And precisely insist on the beyond because the challenges beyond--facing--security challenges facing the region are not only in Europe. Of course, I understand the priority to look East, but don't you think that NATO should now look a little bit south with newer policies, newer instrument despite the (inaudible) ongoing today with (inaudible).

Ms. Kim Dozier: And that is something we have talked about, the pull on NATO between looking east and looking south. So how--what grade would you give yourself?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: So we have to be able to do both because NATO does not have the luxury of choosing between either being concerned and focused on the challenges and the threats emanating from the south or responding to the challenges emanating from the east. We have to do both at the same time. I don't think, actually, we need to reshape our vision when it comes to our cooperation with the countries in North Africa, the Mediterranean region. But we have to do more to turn that vision into reality, and the odd thing that, of course, NATO has to be ready to manage crisis, to deploy forces, combat forces as we have done before in Afghanistan, in the Balkans and Libya and so on. But I think we should be much more focused on how can we prevent crisis and how can we stabilize countries, and how can we project stability without always deploying large number of combat forces. And this is about enabling the countries in the region to defend themselves to stabilize their own countries and to stabilize the region. And in the long run it is better that they are able to do it themselves instead of us deploying large number of our forces. And I just returned two days ago from Afghanistan, our biggest military operation ever with 140,000 combat troops at the most. Now we have 13,000 troops who are training, assisting the Afghans and we have built the Afghan army of 350,000 capable [inaudible] personnel, and now we are, for instance, building an Afghan air force. So we should do much more of that in countries like Afghanistan, but I think we also should, for instance, do more of what we start this month, training of Iraqi officers, and we should work with the--with countries in the region which are stable, like, Jordan and Tunisia, and we should support them now and not wait until they are under even more pressure than they already are. So defense can pass the building--build local capacity, train, assist otherwise. That is really a tool which should be used much more than it has been used so far.

Ms. Kim Dozier: But of course the question with that is capacity for continuing that. And the U.S. paid a large part of that price tag for Afghanistan. So how much can NATO carry on.

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: It is extremely much more expensive to fight the war than to prevent the war, and that's a big paradox. That when, you know, you go into war, you spend a lot of money. But when you ask for some money to try to prevent the war or to--for instance, it's much cheaper to have 13,000 people, U.N.--NATO troops in Afghanistan training an army of 350,000 Afghans than to have 140,000 NATO troops. And in the long-run it's better to have 340,000 or 50,000 Afghans defending their own country instead of us deploying 150--40,000 NATO troops. So, of course, we have to be able to do both. We have to be able to deploy forces also in the future, but they should do much more to try to enable countries themselves to protect themselves and us, I should say, helping them instead of fighting their wars.

Ms. Kim Dozier: Mr. President, you have been waiting.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: Two brief things on NATO and EU. I mean, 21 years ago we had an article Out of Area, Out of Business by Senator Lugar. We--that assumed the peace, love, dove Woodstock

model that you didn't do--(inaudible) anything in homes you had to go out of area. We've seen the results of that, and here we are. We're back in area. On--the other problem that has been--I mean, I'll say this now, but I think what has been hugely disappointing on the EU side has been the reformed response of the neighborhood countries. We have put a lot of effort into that unlike what happened post '89, '91. The response on the neighbor--from the neighborhood countries, more on the east, has actually been--well, it's not been sufficient, and one of the results is with new crisis coming in with the migration crisis, with--and so forth is that these countries are falling off of the radar screen, and it's not only migration that's to blame. They must bear part of the responsibility for failure to do the kinds of things that Europe has asked them to do.

Ms. Kim Dozier: I can see from some of the expressions in the audience there will be a couple of people wanting to chat with you about that afterwards. Ma'am, over there.

Ms. Kerry Buck: Thank you. I'd like--Kerry Buck, I'm Canada's ambassador to NATO. I'd like to go back to the refugee migrant issue right now and draw a link to Margaret MacMillan's opener and Dr. MacMillan, I apologize if I give a piracy of what you said, but if globalization prompts fears, people revert to their sect, their tribes, their race. A logical conclusion of governance is to put up walls. I am wondering if terrorists might have more effective ways of getting people across borders than integrating their folks into migrant flows. I know they have more effective ways of getting people across borders. So in managing the migrant crisis, is there a different way in the short-term to manage the migrant crisis that doesn't put up walls around Europe, that doesn't do something that might actually stoke those protectionist fears.

Ms. Kim Dozier: And great question. Just one point that I feel that I have to make from UNHCR's perspective. They say a lot of these people, the majority of them are refugees, and the use of the word migrant, which I find myself using as well--I can see you nodding--is mislabeling them. That we--

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: That' --I'll tell you, that's nonsense. Well, I mean, when you have--I mean, I know in the case of one of our neighboring countries, they were trying to take refugees, they ran away in the Frankfurt airport when they find out that you would be in the European sort of distribution network and you would be sent Estonia. And they look--I know a third country up in our region where they said we'll take you. And they said, how far is--how far are you from Germany? And these are people who are legitimate refugees. So, I mean, this is a far more complex problem than the kinder statements that some of these organizations are making. And I don't think these organizations understand these risks that right now exist with Europe really changing its whole entire take up until now because--and not because of the danger of refugees, but the fear of right-wing populous parties coming to power. And I think this needs to be understood. The fear is not in liberal democratic societies that we can or cannot absorb this many

people. The fear is that the nasty organization groups that are parties, that are in our countries are gaining massively in support. That is the driver, not the fear of the refugee. And I think the discussion in this case is wrong. I mean, the topic is not migration.

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: But looking back to the point that you were raising because I was in Europe in October when--at the beginning of the huge influx, and I talked to a number of people who were fleeing into Europe. And they divided themselves into two categories, those people who were coming for a better life, and those people who were fleeing conflict. And the people who were fleeing conflict, the Syrians, primarily, they wanted to go home. You know, they wanted to go back to a country where they can make a living and have--raise their families. I didn't hear that from the migrants who were here from Africa, even people from Afghanistan, who, in many cases, were fleeing conflict, they were--they wanted to come because they wanted a better life. But for the people who want to go home, we need to help them get their country back.

Ms. Kim Dozier: Mr. President, I would say that your argument means that we should cater to the fear and hatred within our societies rather than showing them there is a way to incorporate, there is a way to honor our international agreements, and protect these vulnerable populations.

But all of that would be to ride roughshod over the original question, which the Canadian ambassador posed. Is there a better way--

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: Yes.

Ms. Kim Dozier: --to handle this.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: There is. I mean, it's been done before. And this is one of the things that I miss here. I mean, if you take the amount of money that [inaudible] spent in 1945 to '47 on 25 million refugees in Germany, half of which were from outside Germany, the rest were displaced. How much they spent in all of Europe, you do--you calculate the under-expenditures, put them into €2015, it's €50 billion, the money spent. €50 billion. We are spending €3 billion on the refugee issue right now.

It was a massive refugee crisis post-World War II. Yet, and was solved, it was dealt with. The amount of money, the sum of these countries, again, converted from 1945 U.S. dollars, because it was dollars, to contemporary euros, was huge. I mean, Italy got 5 billion itself. Poland got 5 billion. Even little Austria got €1.5 billion in contemporary money.

To solve the problem, and it was paid by outsiders. Right now, Europe is rich. It has money. But it is not committing the resources to the problem that it should. We put 283 billion to Greece, to solve its insolvency. We put 3 billion on the entire refugee crisis. That's what, I mean, that requires commitment,

but it also requires leadership on the part of European leaders. I mean, say we're going to really deal with this rather than a blame game and they're at fault, and they're at fault.

But, on the other hand, I say again, the fear in European capitals is not the refugees, but the effects of refugees.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So, I would like to pivot to one of the last major topics that we wanted to touch on, which was the threat of Islamic State, physically to the people of Europe and beyond, but also the threat of the reaction to it changing culture and turning people into it's all about us and we've got to keep the outsiders out. Feeding into the kind of movements that the President has been talking about. So, how would you best combat ISIS within Europe and keep them out? What's the best way to inoculate Europe from them and their influence?

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: Well, as an outsider, it's easy for me to say, right? But, I think the best way we provide for security in Europe in the Transatlantic Partnership is by being strong, and that means including some of the things the Secretary General talked about. But it also means being unified, having an approach and a strategy for how to respond that people have bought into, so that right now as I'm looking as a member of Congress at the challenges Europe is facing, there are a lot of them. You know, in addition to the refugee migrant crisis, and the fiscal challenges that you faced with Greece and some of the other countries, the Russian threat on the eastern border, and Ukraine, and then ISIS, and the violent extremism that they are spreading, what we hear in the United States is--and I'm sure you could probably say the same thing about us, but that there's not a unified response, that there are divisions within Europe that I find a concern because I think [audio gap 07:35:32 - 07:35:34] all these fronts.

And so, I think that's one of the things that we need to think about. Oh, and of course I forgot (inaudible) while I'm talking about the threats to the EU and Europe.

So, thinking about how we can better cooperate on all of these fronts is something that I think is our best protection.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So speaking of cooperating on fronts against ISIS, now there's already a coalition combatting ISIS within Syria and Iraq. But they're growing 5 to 7,000 estimated within Libya. Do we need a NATO response there?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: We need to do many different things at the same time. And I think that the important thing is that we are working better together, both as NATO, but also with the European Union and with governments in the region. When it comes to Libya, NATO stands ready to help Libya build [audio gap 07:36:37 - 07:36:44] if there is such a request to do so from a unity, legal government in Libya.

So we are not planning for any big military operations or combat operations in Libya, but we are ready to help a government in Libya if it's possible to establish such a government based on the efforts and negotiations which are going on now.

And we have seen some progress, and hopefully we have a government in Libya which is at least the first steps towards creating a more stable Libya where we can then work with that government in fighting ISIL.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So, as with Afghanistan, you'd rather have 10,000 NATO troops on the ground training rather than a larger number fighting.

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: Again, it's very hard to believe exactly what is--what will be needed in the future in different countries in the Middle East, North Africa. But we--

Ms. Kim Dozier: But feel free to make predictions here. We don't--

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: No, so meaning that we have to be ready to deploy large number of forces also in the future if that's the only possibility, if that's what's needed.

But my main message is that when it comes to fighting, for instance, ISIL, that is much better if we are able to build forces in the region.

And I met with the King of Jordan recently, and his main message is that we should never make this into a fight between the west and the Muslim world. We should actually, also, support the Muslims, which are the front line fighting ISIL. And they are more efficient in the long run than we will be.

But then it may differs from country to country. Sometimes it's perhaps just about training. Other times it's a combination of NATO being present with, for instance, air forces or collision forces. And then they doing the--delivering the ground forces. That may vary, but the important thing is that we have to do much more when it comes to enabling them to fight ISIL.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So in the interest of making headlines for the forum, you wouldn't describe to us what you would send to Libya in your ideal world?

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: Because I have stopped, what you say, being in a business of making headlines, so I'm going to (inaudible). It's a very strange thing.

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: But we haven't been all that successful at nation-building when we've tried to take the whole job. And so we do need to think about how the governance issues, how to work with countries and provide them the support that they need to build their countries.

Ms. Kim Dozier: So, with the couple of minutes we have left, I think we've got about 10 minutes left, I'd like to ask a couple more questions. Josh, back there, and again, please stand and identify yourself, and ask a question.

Josh Rogin: Good afternoon, I'm Josh Rogin with Bloomberg View in Washington. Thank you for your time today. I'd like to turn back to something you said, Mr. President. You said there were thousands of Muslim migrants coming from Russia over the Finnish border. That strikes me as a particularly inelegant path for Syrian refugees. I'm wondering if it's your analysis that Vladimir Putin is intentionally deporting, moving thousands of Muslim migrants into Europe as part of a plan to strategically destabilize Europe.

I've heard U.S. defense officials say privately they believe this represents a new threat called the weaponization of migration. Do you agree with that? And for the Senator and the Secretary General, do you also recognize this, and is there a plan to respond to that if it's so?

And last, Mr. President, we heard that there's a deal between EU countries and Turkey to give them back tons of refugees in exchange for certain perks and privileges, and undisclosed monies. Can you give us all the details of that, please? Thank you.

H.E. Jens Stoltenberg: Well, on the last, I can't give any details because they're currently meeting. At least they were when I came on stage. So I don't know where that is.

Well, it's not only Finland. I mean, it was actually--there was a far greater number of people coming across on bicycle across the Russian and Norwegian border, because--anyway they would come and then they would have their passport or their visas or permanent residence permits ripped out of their passports so they couldn't be sent back.

Now, do you want to call weaponization instrumentalization, I would prefer, I mean, it thinks kind of minor sort of more appropriate term, but in any case, there's something very fishy going on. Yes. And the number of, I don't know the total number, I think there was 7,000 in Finland, I don't know how many were in Norway, but in any case, that's very funny. It is not exactly, you're kind of looking for a new home turf in a like--in a country similar to where you're from.

And of course, they were not all Syrians, although some of them have been long-term residents of Syria, which gives you an idea of who they supported. Or who they were with, in this sort of political scene. Because they probably wouldn't be opponents of Assad and being--hanging out in Moscow. Of course, all the other countries they came from.

So in any case, I'm not expert on the topic, I just know those details. I think it's certainly a topic for Bloomberg View to investigate further.



Ms. Kim Dozier: Mindful that the Secretary General has to get back to some of these meetings, do you all have something to add on that particular question?

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: First of all, I think we have seen that terrorists are able to come into European countries in many different ways. And that the migrant and refugee crisis we now see in Europe is first and foremost a humanitarian tragedy. And that's the main message.

And of course, it's--and I actually use the phrase migrant and refugee crisis, because some of them are migrants, and some of them are refugees. And they often--it's very hard to distinguish. Because seeking a better life, well, I think that's a very normal thing to do. And to flee a conflict or to do try get some kind of protection if you're living in a country with fighting, of course, that's very, very normal thing to do.

And that's also the reason why when NATO decided to help the European Union with coping the migrant crisis, we stated clearly that this should be in accordance within national law. (Inaudible) you cannot just send back people. There are procedures. There are regulations deciding how we can do that. And, of course, I don't think to speak on behalf of the European Union in Turkey, but as we all know, they are discussing not to close the borders, but to have a safer and more regulated way of getting migrants or refugees, sorry, into Europe.

So they will send back people from the Greek Islands, but then they will take from the refugee camps people who need protection. It's all (inaudible) but I think we have to just admit or to realize that this is a big, big humanitarian tragedy where we all have to respond according to international law.

The Hon. Jeanne Shaheen: And listen, I think I quoted General Breedlove earlier with talking about Russia using refugees as a weapon. And whether that's deliberate or inadvertent, Russia still achieves the same outcome. And I think Russia's going to look at agitating wherever they can to create disaffection in Europe along its eastern borders, and countries, whether it's through some of the nationalist parties that are coming up or whatever it is. But that's all the more important for Europe to be unified and for us to have a strong transatlantic partnership between the United States and Europe, because in addition to our military strength, that is the best deterrent we can provide, because we show people who might be looking at Russia that there is an alternative that provides a better life to people.

H.E. Toomas Hendrik Ilves: I'll even--just as Russia's role here, I think really what people ought to study more outside of Germany is the completely fake story of Lisa, a 13-year-old supposedly raped by refugees in Berlin. Now Lovrov going on onstage saying why is Germany coming up. It was a completely fake story. I mean talk about-- And there it is again. I don't want to say weaponizing, but that is instrumentalizing a tragedy in Europe and it was a fake story. And I mean that I think sums up the whole situation right now.

Ms. Kim Dozier: Well it is now my role to sum up our panel, as I've just been given the warning with apologies to other questioners in the audience. I think we've heard today a lot of the problems that you all are dealing with and some of the fears driving some of the more negative suggestions to solve things. But you have to look at the reasons behind them or some of the solutions you've suggested won't work. With that on a more hopeful note, there are some solutions up there. Thank you very much.

Dr. Karen Donfried: Before we release you all for the coffee break, hold on just a minute. First I just want to join Kim in thanking both Kim for moderating but also our fabulous panel for what they contributed. And I think that one of the themes and Senator Jeanne ended on it, was Transatlantic Partnership. And you know, we talk about a world beyond disorder.

A clear antidote to that is partnership. And one thing the panel hit was that partnership in the context of NATO. And that's an issue the GMF has done a lot of work on, and I just want to highlight something that was released yesterday. We had put together an advisory panel on the NATO summit, and they came out with a terrific report yesterday that I just want to flag for folks. We've got it available here.

My second note on partnership is I started at the beginning by talking about how Brussels Forum cannot happen without our partners. And the last four partners I wanted to thank in front of all of you are our foreign partners. That is BP, Google, The OCP Policy Center and UPS. And again without the support of those four, our partnership would not be complete, so a very special thanks to them.

My final note on partnership is we have moderators who've been longtime partners. One of them is Nik Gowing. And as I flagged earlier, Nik is going to be joining us throughout to weave the narrative of the world beyond disorder. So I'm going to turn the stage briefly to Nik, and then we'll have a coffee break. Thanks.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Thanks, Karen. So don't go for coffee yet, because actually it's not me weaving it. It's really Robert Kaplan who's from the Center for a New American Security, which is bipartisan. And that's because the last session on Sunday is going to be what's called an epilogue. But actually we're doing the first of several to try and help you theme what is emerging.

And I want to pick up what Margaret was saying right at the beginning. We've got three or four minutes only. This is a kind of wiki-commentary, but we're not writing it down, Robert, about what Margaret said earlier about the danger of smugness, of complacency and the elites not getting it right, the unthinkable that are out there at the moment. This time last year, none of us were talking about the imminent migration crisis in Europe. None of us were really addressing the possibility of Russia engaging in Syria. And who six months ago was talking about the possibility of President Trump? Now I say that because

picking up what Margaret has said about the impossibility of many things happening in the speed of five weeks, you mentioned Margaret, for World War I after Sarajevo.

Robert, what's the view about the danger of incrementalism still very much underpinning the kind of discussion in conferences like this? In other words, thinking it's going to be a natural progression from what we know already.

Mr. Robert D. Kaplan: I think picking up from Dr. MacMillan where she mentioned the Hapsburg Empire, the Roman Empire. You know there was a great Austrian-Jewish novelist, Joseph Roth, who saw the coming collapse of the Hapsburg Empire and saw all the problems and evils of that empire. But that empire also represented cosmopolitanism, tolerance, respect for minorities, and what followed it was infinitely worse ultimately, culminating in World War II.

So I'd like to put it to you that a year from now, and these are just what ifs. To avoid tragedy, you have to think tragically. So thinking tragically, what if a year from now you were to have (inaudible). You would have a real Greek collapse, and you would have the loosening and erosion of sanctions against Russia without a quid quo pro from President Putin. And the European Union then would wither away. The U.S.-European relationship would weaken substantially.

And then don't assume that what follows this would be better. It could be infinitely worse as with the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire. You could have nothing but the dementia of ideologies and the retreat into populist nationalists.

Mr. Nik Gowing: So what about the mindset in this room about these unthinkable, these unpalatable, which now really have to be thought about maybe not a year from now but a few weeks from now?

Mr. Robert D. Kaplan: I think you have to think in terms of all the problems. And we heard about them in the bickering about the trade pact between the U.S. point of view, the European point of view, between the problems with the refugees. There's not just something. There's infinitely something worth saving here, which is the present order of the European Union, the west in a sense, which is North America married to the European continent, which still represents something with all of its problems. And therefore, people have to be brave. They really have to be brave, because what follows could be worse.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Margaret says smug and complacent, the danger of smugness and complacency.

Mr. Robert D. Kaplan: Yes. And smugness and complacency translates into national politicians elected by national electorates who know exactly what need to be done to fix the structural economic problems, for instance, but can't summon the political will to muster to do it.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Do you think current leaderships finally are up to it? Do you think they understand the enormity of what potentially is happening with these unthinkables and these unpalatables?

Mr. Robert D. Kaplan: I think they understand, but the nature of modern politics with the vulgarization of the media, the 24/7 news cycle, all of these politicians operate in an emergency framework just trying to survive the next news conference, the next press conference. And therefore they're less likely to take bold measures.

Mr. Nik Gowing: Alright Robert, for the moment. Now this is not designed to make you choke on your coffee or your tea. It's designed to try and make sure there's a theme emerging starting from what Margaret MacMillan was talking about earlier, to say this is bigger than those 24/7 issues and that needs to underpin some of the discussions which are happening based on history as well.

So Robert and I will be back from time to time whenever the time is available. You may have completely different views. We want to hear those as well, but this is us trying to provoke you a little bit at this stage. Enjoy your coffee.

Mr. Robert D. Kaplan: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.