

Brussels Forum

March 20, 2015

Zero-Sum? Russia, Power Politics, and the post-Cold War Era

[audio gap ends 08:35:35]

Video Clip: --violations in Eastern Europe have destroyed any real momentum. For both Europe and the United States, Russia's recent actions raise a real concern regarding the trajectory of power politics in the post-Cold War era.

Given the current destabilization of the Donbas and annexation of Crimea, how do Russia, Europe, and the United States start down a path of de-escalation? What developments would constitute mile markers or goals to signify the relationship is on a path to acceptable normalcy? Is there room for cooperation with Russia on issues ranging from combating terrorism to reaching a nuclear deal in Iran? How do we move beyond the zero-sum conversation between Russia and the Euro-Atlantic countries?

Unidentified Female: Ladies and Gentlemen, please welcome Mr. David Ignatius from *The Washington Post*.

Mr. David Ignatius: Thank you. Thank you very much. While our panelists take their seats, I want to give the briefest introduction. The title of this session really says it all. Zero-Sum, Russia, power politics and the post-Cold War era. Is it really the case that we have entered a zero-sum world in U.S., NATO, Russia

relations in which one side wins and one side loses? Or do we still have the possibility of finding accommodation, finding ways out of this quite dark situation of the last year?

I hope we'll talk in our conversation today about how we got here, the extent to which the events of the last year have been inevitable or were the result of mistakes that were made and can be reversed. I hope we'll talk about whether Ukraine itself has to be a zero-sum game, whether it's possible, as Zbigniew Brzezinski said, to imagine a future Ukraine that looks east and west at the same time, that is at once in a comfortable relationship with Russia and with Europe, and if so, how would we get there.

I hope we'll talk about NATO should respond to current events and whether NATO can work with Russia to find the exit ramp that President Obama so often has described in this crisis, which would take you out of zero-sum world into a different world.

I'll just close this introduction by saying that I found it quite chilling, in the sense of falling out of the world in which the Brussels Forum was created ten years ago, a world that was optimistic, back into the language of the Cold War. As I read about President Putin's question during the days of the Crimea events, whether Russian nuclear forces should be put on alert because of the possibility of some western [audio gap 08:38:52 through 08:42:23]

--the radio station. A whole part of the country and declare, as has happened in eastern Ukraine, that they're fighting for their rights. How does NATO respond to that? Is that an Article IV issue, if the country decides that its sovereignty is threatened? How would you answer that?

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: NATO is ready to defend all allies against any threat. And we see now an increased threat standing from the concept of hybrid warfare. But I would like to underline that hybrid warfare is nothing new, and hybrid warfare is about the combination of military means and non-military means. It's about covert actions and overt actions and it's about deception. And actually, I think that the first form of hybrid warfare we know is the Trojan horse, so it has--we have seen it before. But the new thing is that it's larger scale, it's taking place close to our borders, so we have to focus more on the concept of hybrid warfare and that's exactly what we are doing.

For instance, reduced warning time, deception, increases the importance of readiness preparedness, and that's the reason why we are increasing the readiness and preparedness of our forces.

Deception also increases the need for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance and that's the reason why one important element of the readiness action plan is to increase our intelligence capabilities. And the special operation forces might be extremely important in a hybrid situation.

So this is part of the adaptation which we now are undergoing, is to also increase our ability to fight hybrid warfare.

Mr. David Ignatius: We'll come back to the question of hybrid warfare and how to respond, but I want to turn to Federica Mogherini, who is the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs, the chief EU diplomat for this audience. It is a point of special pride for The German Marshall Fund that she is a graduate of the Marshall Memorial Fellows program, which is central to what GMF is. We're glad to see our graduates going to high places. And--

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: That's why it's named high representative.

Mr. David Ignatius: You can't get any higher for a German Marshall Memorial Fellow. I want to ask you, you just had a summit meeting of EU leaders here in Brussels yesterday.

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: And today.

Mr. David Ignatius: And today, also. And you were talking about many of the issues that are connected to our panel. And I want to ask you about two, and I want to start with the question of the Minsk II Agreement, that in theory, was going to deescalate the situation in Ukraine.

And I want to ask you for a progress report on how Minsk II is going, what areas are solid, what areas are not, what violations you see. And then the question that I know you discussed, what about sanctions? What about additional sanctions?

What would trigger them? What about reduction of sanctions? What's the situation where this famous exit ramp might be possible in terms of reduced sanctions?

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: First of all, let me say that we had two days European Council, and I find it significant the fact that yesterday we discussed about Ukraine and Russia, but today we discussed about Libya. And I think we should keep this in the framework because we don't have only--

Mr. David Ignatius: Let's come back. Give us a Minsk II answer, and then we'll come back to Libya.

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: And let me also correct you, if I can. I wouldn't refer to Minsk II. I would refer to the agreement that was reached in Minsk on the package of implementation measures for Minsk. We have only one Minsk agreement. I think there is someone here in the room, a secretary general of the OSCE sitting there, I see sitting there, that could give us a very good report on the implementation and the monitoring of the implementation when it comes to the main, two main starting points of the agreement: the ceasefire and the withdrawal of heavy weapons.

The European Union is exactly supporting the OSCE in monitoring this in different ways. If you want, I can go into other details. But it's also doing another thing that is included in this package of implementation measures. While we are speaking here--

Mr. David Ignatius: Just give us an overall, is Minsk--

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: Working?

Mr. David Ignatius: Is Minsk in its current version working or not?

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: Let me share what I discussed with President Poroshenko in this respect. So I take that fight. The situation is much, much better than it used to be, not perfect yet. So you don't have a white or black picture, you have a situation that is much better than before the meeting in Minsk and the agreement in Minsk even if with some violations.

And I think that we need to concentrate more and more on the measures we have to make, put in place to make it work on the ceasefire, also on the implementation of measures that need to be done on the Ukrainian side, reforms and reform of the constitution, local elections and so on, and also what refers to European Union role.

While we are speaking now, there is a trilateral dialogue, European Union, Russia and Ukraine on gas, exactly in this hour, here in Brussels. And the same, we are starting, restarting on the implementation of the trade agreement. So there is, there are steps in the right direction. It will definitely take more political will, more time to have a complete, positive picture. I hope we will get there, but it's not now.

Mr. David Ignatius: And what about sanctions? What was the sanctions discussions?

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: And sanctions are related to this because we have decided yesterday night that the lifting of the sanctions or keeping the sanctions will be linked only to the full implementation of the Minsk Agreement. So the decision of the heads of state and government is that in the coming months, as you know we don't have to take decisions in these days because the sanctions we have in place are expiring at the end of July. Before the end of July, we will make an assessment of where we are with the implementation. The Minsk Agreement foresees that the control of the border, for instance, goes back to the Ukrainian authorities by the end of the year, if everything goes well. I would expect that sanctions will be linked to this and so would not be lifted before the full implementation of the Minsk Agreement, but the decision formally will be taken later on.

Mr. David Ignatius: Let's, we'll come back to Libya and maybe Iran, but I want to give our Russian guest a chance to respond to a number of comments that have been made. So I want to introduce Konstantin Kosachev, who is the chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the Russian Federation Council, who is with us today.

And as I told him before we came out here, I want to ask Mr. Kosachev the question that I find people ask in every conversation I attend about Russia in Washington or around the world, and that is: How does President Vladimir Putin

look at the world? Does he have, as he's said, a sense that the end of the Soviet Union was the catastrophe of his lifetime? And is he trying to build back some of the power and prestige that was lost? How does that translate in the current crisis in Ukraine? How does President Putin, the millions of Russians who obviously support him, how do they view this in terms of Russian national interest?

So maybe you could begin there, and then we'll go to some other questions.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Thank you, David. One, I would definitely prefer to speak about millions of Russians rather than Mr. Putin because Mr. Putin represents people not just as a president of Russia, but he is a very wise man, understanding perfectly well how people in Russia feel about things happening around Russia.

And if we go back to the history a little bit, I believe that when the Cold War was starting to get over, many things happened, and many documents were signed. I believe that when the Cold War was starting to get over, many--

[audio gap 08:51:05 to 08:51:39]

--CSC at that moment, now it's not OSC but CSC, is mentioned frequently, and the Council of Europe is mentioned frequently, three of them. How many times is NATO mentioned in that document describing the future arrangements of security policy in Europe? Not a single time. How many times the European Union



mentioned, the European community at the moment? Just once, in the paragraph describing the economic cooperation in Europe.

So neither NATO nor the European Union were part of a deal made at that moment by the Soviet Union and other states, the United States of America included, for the future Europe. What started to happen next because many people think that all troubles are related personally to the current president of Russia, Mr. Putin. We could make good deals with Mr. Yeltsin, and as soon as Mr. Putin arrived, we cannot make any good deals any longer.

This is absolutely false description. Russia definitely has changed, but it has nothing to do with the personalities. During the '90s, Russia withdrew all military bases from Eastern Europe; withdrew all military bases from former Soviet republics, with exception of bilateral agreements regulating that; moved all or essential forces away from the European part of Russia, out to Siberia, behind Urals.

We never started any military operation anywhere. We laid down our military bases in Vietnam and Cuba and so on and so forth.

Mr. David Ignatius: Yeah, just--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: What did, what did NATO do? Just a second. What did NATO do? I would not describe how NATO expanded, I would not describe how NATO did not ratify the adopted CSC Treaty and the other things.

One thing which was crucial: the 24th of March, 1999. I do not know how many people will remember it. What was the date? The 24th of March, 1999, in the first time in the history of modern Europe, NATO started to bomb a European country, at that moment an integral country, Yugoslavia, started to bomb it for the reason, Mr. Milosevic rejected NATO to deploy forces in the part of this country. So if you could call something an occupation of a part of an independent European state, I would call the Kosovo, I would recall the Kosovo case for them. So Crimea, the Ukrainian crisis is definitely not the first tragic episode in the modern history of Europe.

Mr. David Ignatius: With respect, I think you've given us a clear sense of the sense of grievance that Russians view this history since the end of the Cold War, and I think that's a clear answer to my question.

I do want to ask you, looking at the immediate crisis that we face, that Russia faces, the West faces in Ukraine, whether a zero-sum outcome, in other words one side wins and one side loses, is inevitable or whether some kind of compromise, like what's envisioned in Minsk, is possible? Could - would you be comfortable, would the people you speak for in Russia be comfortable with Ukraine that at once looks east to Moscow, to Russia, and looks west to Europe? Can you live with that?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Well, it is definitely not inevitable. And Russia all these years proposed, both to NATO and to the European Union, to do something together. The first Ukrainian crisis was about gas, natural gas. Everybody would remember here that the Russian proposal initially had always been, all the time, let us sit together, the European Union, Ukraine and Russia, and talk about that. The answer was no, this is about us, and Ukraine, this is about us and Russia, and we will not discuss it in a trilateral format.

Later on when we had other problems with Ukraine, our message, like the annexation agreement, for example, our message to the European Union again was let us sit together and from the very beginning start talking about the future problems, which may arise in case this association agreement enters into power. The answer, unfortunately, was no thank you, Russia has nothing to do with it. We will speak about that with Ukraine. So Russia was excluded from the talk--

Mr. David Ignatius: I mean, that's how we got here. What about now?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Same goes for now. We are in the Minsk process. We are very interested in having this process finalized and then very unhappy to see the linkage that was created yesterday by the European Union, the implementation of the Minsk Agreements vis-à-vis sanctions because I am afraid that there is at least one country in Europe, and now I mean Ukraine, which is in conflict with Russia, which is probably not interested in having these Minsk

agreements implemented for the simple reason: as soon as they are implemented, Russia is out of sanctions. And I am afraid that at least certain force in Ukraine will start to create additional problems for the Minsk agreements, for the Minsk process, just for the simple reason they want to keep Russia inside of sanctions.

So this linkage provokes certain problems in the future, which we definitely would like to avoid.

Mr. David Ignatius: Let me turn to our American representative, Victoria Nuland, who is assistant secretary of state for Eurasian affairs, who is a leading conceptualizer and implementer of U.S. policy. And I want to begin, Madam Assistant Secretary, with a question again that would come up in any discussion group in Washington, or I dare say anywhere else now, and that is the question of whether the United States and other allies should be providing defensive weapons, but lethal weapons, to Ukrainian forces that are facing in their southeast a continuing military threat?

This has been a debate that's gone back and forth in the administration. It's well-known there are different points of view within the administration. Maybe it would help if you just sort of took us into the, you know, the virtual situation room, and just what are the arguments that you hear in favor of doing this, and then at the end of the day, why has the president, as he said publicly, decided that this isn't appropriate U.S. policy?

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Well first, David, just to say that on this particular subject, not of defensive security support but of lethal weaponry, the president has not made a decision. You're right, it's a hotly debated topic in Washington. It's a hotly debated topic transatlantically because one of the great strengths of our approach, our response to the Ukraine crisis, our response to Russia's aggression in Ukraine, has been that the countries of Europe and the United States and Canada and our G7 partners have been very united, and so it's important in any decisions that any of us make about how we're going to support Ukraine, whether it's economically, politically or in security terms, that we also discuss across the Atlantic.

First let me say that the United States has provided significant security support to Ukraine throughout this crisis, almost \$120 million worth. We're getting ready to start training Ukrainian forces in Western Ukraine. We are providing things like counter-fire radar batteries that allow them to see where they're being fired on, night scopes, the kinds of things that will allow them to be more capable.

With regard to whether you take that to a more lethal level, on the side of those who favor, there's the Ukrainian government request itself. They are asking for more support to defend themselves. There's also the fact that we've seen, month on month, more lethal weaponry of a higher caliber, of more sophistication, poured into Ukraine by the separatist Russian allies, and it's, you know, now

getting to the level where the kinds of equipment that the Ukrainian forces are confronting are much more sophisticated than what they have.

So the question becomes if you are facing a T90 tank with a T72 tank, ought you to have anti-tank weapons to at least level the playing field. If you are facing smirch artillery, which can go 20 kilometers with your own local artillery, should you have some capability against that? That's the argument in favor.

The argument opposed is that clearly, this would constitute an escalation on the battlefield. Would it be responded by further escalation on the part of Russia such that the whole thing becomes more bloody, more violent? And those who suffer most are the people of Ukraine.

So that is the debate. It is a fair fight. Obviously our first hope right now as High Representative Mogherini said is to see the Minsk agreements fully implemented, to see a full cease-fire, to see a full pull-back of heavy weapons, to see real politics begin in the East, real elections, not fake elections like the kind we had in Crimea, or appointing of Russian proxies, so that those elected leaders can begin to enjoy decentralized powers that Kyiv has now offered: local policing, rights of free language, rights to keep a lot of their tax dollars, rights to make their own economic agreements. And then can we get that border closed?

Mr. David Ignatius: Just to make sure--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Kyiv has not provided this form yet. They speak about that, but it's never done. And they reconfirm. It's just promises and this promises are preconditioned by there are many other things. So people in fellow system Ukraine feel uncertain about whether they will be able to make deals with Kyiv or not.

Victoria Nuland: Konstantin, it's just counter-factual. The Ukrainian Rada in September passed the special status law the first time, which granted huge amounts of independence and decentralized power to the East. But there was the condition that there had to be elections under Ukrainian law. Instead of that, there were fake elections in November that were not recognized. Now they've offered it again. The Rada earlier this week passed an even enhanced package. So the question is are the separatists courageous enough to stand for election under Ukrainian law and then they will have the right to make their economic deals, to have their own police, to decide what language is spoken out there inside Ukraine. That's what Moscow has always said it wanted for those people. That's what when Secretary--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Absolutely.

Victoria Nuland: --Kerry was negotiating with Lobrov (ph) in the winter--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: But you--

Victoria Nuland: --they offered--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --agreements. There is a road there. A dialogue to be started on the thirtieth day after the cease-fire is in power. Do they have this dialogue as for now? Is it initiated by Kyiv? No. There is no dialogue at all, just you have to take it or leave it. It's not a position which leads us to a political--

Mr. David Ignatius: But Konstanin, on the specific question that Victoria asked, would the separatists, the forces in Southeast Ukraine be prepared to stand for elections, so that they had power under the sovereignty of an overall Ukraine of which they were part? Are they prepared for that? Is Russia prepared to support that?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: I do not represent here these people. And I would love to see a situation where they have agreed among them about any possible solutions and ways out. And I believe that Russia would be happy to support any agreement reached between the conflicting parties. So, if the Minsk agreements include certain steps to be made, step-by-step, they are to be made step-by-step. They are not to be interpreted additionally, the way it is done now by Kyiv.

Mr. David Ignatius: So I want to close off this little colloquy which I told the panelists before we started that I wanted them to interrupt each other, and they took me up on it. So, I want to ask Victoria to close this out by just responding to what Konstantin said. Do you hear in anything that he's said, a pathway toward



confidence-building, toward greater dialogue, toward a structure that would reinforce what has been a pretty fragile Minsk structure?

Victoria Nuland: Absolutely. I mean, I think the number one thing is for Russia to stop sending arms over the border so that we can have real politics. Have a real cease-fire. Look, what Kyiv has offered is its own package of decentralized power. After an election, if those elected want to have a different kind of relationship, an enhanced relationship with the federal government, they'll be able to participate in a broader process, which is going on all year in Ukraine, which is the redrafting of their Constitution where decentralization across the country is very much on board.

But what Kyiv is not prepared to do is negotiate the future of the country with a bunch of guys installed by Moscow. They've got to be elected.

Mr. David Ignatius: So, I want to turn back to Secretary General Stoltenberg, and I want to take you back to what I thought was the central question of the previous panel, which was whether NATO's collective self-defense commitments are fully credible in a period where the time it required to mobilize NATO forces even with the improvements remain long in a period where hybrid warfare blurs the both--your clarity about what's happening on the ground, your ability to attribute actions to others, and then the request for Article 5 support. Just would like to hear you talk about what worries you as an incoming Secretary General

about how to make this commitment that the members of this alliance will--are prepared to defend each other's security in an increasingly dangerous world. How do you make that commitment more believable?

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: Well, I guess aren't answers to say that I'm worried, because people should be worried in a difficult world. But at the same time, I'd like to say to you that I'm impressed. But why by what I've seen since I came to NATO headquarters in October. Because what has really impressed me is the ability of NATO to adapt. And that's actually the strength of NATO, is that we are able to adapt when the security environment is changing.

And then, NATO is the strongest alliance in--military alliance in history. We have been able to provide deterrents, protection all of all allies for more than six decades. And we did so by focusing on collective events for 40 years, since 1949 to the end of the--since--to the fall of the Berlin Wall in '89.

And then we focused for many years on crisis management, Afghanistan, Kosovo, and those challenges. Now we are in the process where we have to both focus on crisis management in the south, but at the same time, refocus and increase our focus on collected events. And that's exactly what we are doing.

Mr. David Ignatius: Let's take a very specific practical example of the threats of 2015 for which NATO, you know, may not be fully prepared. And that's a cyber attack. Can you imagine a cyber attack triggering an Article 5 request by

the country that was attacked to NATO and can you--how would NATO respond to that? I mean, imagine a completely disabling attack, where the electrical system goes down, the ability to communicate goes down, and the country says, we're under attack. How would NATO, on your current structure and doctrine, respond to that?

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: The basic message is that NATO is ready to defend all allies against any threat, and that one--that an attack on one ally is an attack on all 28. Then we see that the world is changing. And therefore, for instance, we are addressing both hybrid, as I mentioned, but also cyber threats. We are doing something more--we are focusing on how we can increase our own ability to defend NATO infrastructure, but also helping allies with increasing their capabilities to defend their own--

Mr. David Ignatius: But a cyber attack on one would be viewed as a cyber attack on all and responded to as such?

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: Any attack on any ally is something that we are responding to. Because we are defending all allies against any kind of attack. And then, of course, we will assess, we will address any kind of attack.

Mr. David Ignatius: Konstantin.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: May I ask you a question? Are you going to bump a country, which is supposed to be behind the cyber attack against a NATO member state?

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: So, there are--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Are you going to bump it? Or are you going to start the cyber attack this country?

Victoria Nuland: Is this a planning question, Konstantin?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: No. No. I just want to have NATO as transparent as possible. Because sometimes we do not have answers, and we have to take our own security measures for the simple reason--

Victoria Nuland: It was. Yeah.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: No. For the simple reason, we do not understand perfectly well the intentions of NATO in certain cases. Because NATO, this is big reason--big difference between NATO and Russia. NATO is involved in many military operations outside of NATO which creates a certain security risk for any country in the world. This is why I'm asking the question what would happen in case a certain member state of NATO would declare Russia with or without reasons does not matter, would declare Russia as a country behind a cyber attack.

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, let's--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: What would happen then?

Mr. David Ignatius: Let's get Jens' response, because it's, you know, cyber is the frontier and it's really complicated to know who did it, to know, you know, what to do about that. What is your thinking? Without giving us the planning memo. Or--

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: So we--

Mr. David Ignatius: --give us the planning memo later.

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: --will do what's necessary to do to protect all allies. And of course, then we have to protect also those who are attacked by cyber attacks. But I'm not saying--I'm not going to tell you exactly how we're going to do that, because we're going to do that in a way which enable us to protect all allies. And that's the main message. And we will know when it happens, and we will respond in a proportionate and (inaudible) way.

(crosstalk)

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --is unpredictable. And we have to be prepared for any possible development.

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, so we really are back to the Cold War. You know, strategic ambiguity. I remember reading, you know, Dr. Brzezinski and Dr. Kissinger. We all know the values of not being just sure what the other side would do. And maybe we are back to that world, where you're going to say, you know,

you can't be sure how we'll respond, and Secretary General will say, we can't be sure how we'd act.

Victoria Nuland: David, as a planning matter, can we ask Konstantin how Moscow would respond if it thought it had been cyber attacked by one of the NATO countries?

Mr. David Ignatius: I think he just--I think he just did.

Victoria Nuland: He's not going to.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: No usage of military force. Definitely not. This is my absolutely clear answer. I'm not entitled to give that answer, but this is my conviction that that be would the answer of Russia.

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: But the big difference is that we are the defensive alliance. You are sending troops into neighboring countries.

Victoria Nuland: Yes.

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: And you are violating--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: We are not sending troops into neighboring country.

(crosstalk)

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --believes we do. Mr. Breedlove believes we do. But we do not.

The Hon. Jens Stoltenberg: But you sent troops into Crimea.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Present evidence. You know, I would recall the discussion in Munich recently. Many of people here were there. You would remember how Mr. Poroshenko presented five or six passports. Russian passports for the audience. The same day, the Russian minister of foreign affairs sent an official request to the Minister of Foreign Affairs from Ukraine. "Please. Give us any details. Names. Numbers. Copies. Anything." Until now, there is no answer. So everybody believes there (inaudible) evidence but that was not in evidence. Same goes for very many other reports delivered by Mr. Breedlove as Americans who are very much in favor of proving that Russia is involved. Russia is not involved with regular forces in southeastern Ukraine.

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, we will come back to this, but I want to turn to the Senior Diplomat in the room, the High Representative, and I want to ask, Federica, to--any--

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: I don't have the proof. So.

Mr. David Ignatius: --thoughts that you have on this but, more broadly, before this session began, we talked as a group about seeing if this conversation could include the question of how you knit this world, which is ripping, we can hear it ripping, knit it back together. And--

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: We're not going to that direction here.

Mr. David Ignatius: No. This conversation I'm just, no. You can just pick up the fabric as it rips. But if you'd like to speak to that, and also, we talked earlier about Libya, and I'd love what the latest is about the Iran talks, if you want to tell us.

The Hon. Federica Mogherini: Yeah. You know, I think this is the 10th anniversary of the Brussels Forum, right? And it would be good if we could also understand the format is challenging. Think of how the Brussels Forum could look like in 10 years. And I hope, I guess, we won't be doing this again in 10 years.

This is the big question for me: How do we think our relationship can develop? Because I--maybe it's for a generational issue--I don't give up to the idea that we overcome and we overcame and we overcome the Cold War thinking. Otherwise, Europe would be torn and the borders around Europe would be torn also in 10 years from now.

Ukraine, I think, means literally a frontier, right? It would be good if we could go back sometime once we managed to implement fully the Minsk Agreement to understand how we can live together. Because we are neighbors and you don't change geography. This is one of the few things you don't change: your parents and your neighbors.

And I will give you news. The European Union is for Russia the first trading partner and the first investor.



How do we think in 10 years from now we will relate to each other? I mean, I have the European answer. I would like to have the Russian answer. European Union was always approached based on cooperation inside its border and outside. And we have developed a sense of partnership and cooperation also with Russian federation in the last 10, 15 years.

And the big question we have, strategic question we have, is, is what's happening Ukraine the end of this or is it something we can discuss? My point of view, a violation of international law. Something that can be overcome with the restoration of the international law and principles and peace in Ukraine and to restore the integrity of Ukraine and we can go back to cooperation. Or is that time over and we have to think of something different from the Cold War? Because we will never get--

Mr. David Ignatius: Well said. Well said.

Honorable Federica Mogherini: --that kind of it or--

Mr. David Ignatius: Konstantin, what's your answer?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Well said. Thank you very much for that comment. You use the words "I have the European answer; I would like to see the Russian answer." We are Europeans, we in Russia. We are not aliens and Europe is also our continent. So you and nobody else, you don't have the European answer; you have the European Union answer.

Honorable Federica Mogherini: I have the European answer.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: And I would prefer that we all--

Honorable Federica Mogherini: And you can add the Russian federation answer.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --would try to start working on that European answer. Because as for now, you all the time speak about how happy Europe is with the European Union and with NATO, the way what is good for General Motors is good for America. But what is good for NATO is good for NATO but not for the whole Europe. What is good for the European Union is good for the European Union but not necessarily for the whole Europe.

We need to have an inclusive agenda for future Europe.

Mr. David Ignatius: I need to make sure I'm understanding--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: The whole Europe with Russia included because as for now Russia is excluded.

Mr. David Ignatius: Are you asking--you seem to be asking for Russia--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: We are not literally (inaudible) with NATO or European Union.

Mr. David Ignatius: --a Russian (inaudible) over European--you're saying Russia is part of Europe so we get to--we have a vote in what Europe decides, if I'm hearing. Victoria, can you straighten this out for me?

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Well, we're obviously not European, although many of us are from European stock. But what binds us as a community and what we hoped we would be able to add Russia to in all the years after the Cold War and which many people in this room have worked on, was a set of common values.

And what we want--what we hoped is that Russia too would want to live in a world where you can't change borders by force, that Russia would want to live in a community where the individual rights of every human being are respected no matter who they love or what color they are or who they worship. Where media would be free, where we would be able to make open free trade, low tariff, deals with each other.

That is what binds the United States to the countries of the EU and NATO. That is what was the basis of all of the work we did in the '90s and the aught years to try to work with Russia, whether it was the NATO-Russia Council, whether it was the Russia-EU collaboration on economy, etc.

Honorable Federica Mogherini: Strategic partnership.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Strategic partnership. But in the context of a Russia that is not interested in those rules of the road, then we're obviously constrained in how much we can do together. We'll still try to do as much as we can--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: David.

Mr. David Ignatius: Yes.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: --but we will protect and partner with those who want to join in that basic human compound.

Mr. David Ignatius: I want to, can I say before I turn to you, I want to ask you to focus this a little bit more. There is a very specific way in which the world of partnership, dialogue, cooperation is unraveling in ways that are dangerous for your country, for Europe, for the United States, and that is the way in which key arms control agreements, that were the product of generations of work through the d'état years are beginning to come undone. The conventional forces in Europe agreement seems to be basically in, you know, a meeting last week was a complete failure. People walked away. The efforts to get a new start agreement that would have additional cuts in strategic weapons, much discussion of that several years ago. President Obama clearly interested in that. No action on that.

And now to me, most worrisome, are accusations on both sides that medium-range nuclear missiles, the so-called INF Agreement which was really the foundation stone of the d'etat, the end of the Cold War, that that's now coming in question. So I want to ask each of you, please, briefly to address the specific way in which we are slipping back into the world of the Cold War as these arms control agreements begin to unravel. Konstantin, if you would start.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: We are definitely, absolutely in favor of keeping as many arms control agreements in power as possible. CFE Treaty. We have

experts here and we all remember how they adopted the CFE Treaty. It was rectified by Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, four countries. None of them belongs to NATO. Not a single NATO member state, rectified, adopted CFE Treaty.

So now we still have the original text, the original CFE Treaty, if we still have it, where the Baltic states are a part of the Leningrad military district of the Soviet Union. This is the text we have and we tried to save. The adopted treaty was the way out. The option was ruined by the refusal of NATO countries to rectify it, to let it enter into force. This is not our responsibility, sorry.

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, what about INF?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: ABM Treaty. You know how--

Mr. David Ignatius: Let me ask about INF.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --the United States of America did about ABM Treaty. Shall we not speak about--

Mr. David Ignatius: That's a whole--ABM is a whole different set of--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: --(inaudible) solidarity.

Mr. David Ignatius: --issues. Let's talk about INF--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: But it is so important.

Mr. David Ignatius: --which is right here in Europe.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Please address that question to Victoria about ABM Treaty, the (inaudible).

Mr. David Ignatius: I'll ask her but I want to ask you about INF.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: INF Treaty. We are definitely in favor of keeping it and definitely we will do our best in order to keep it. There are certain questions from the American side towards Russians. There are certain questions from Russia towards Americans. I am not an expert on that. As far as I understand, there are questions which are to be clarified. We need to have discussions about that and I believe we need to confirm on both sides that we want to have this treaty to be in power. This is my absolute conviction.

Mr. David Ignatius: Federica, do you have thoughts about this aspect of our slipping back toward the Cold War?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: It never left (inaudible)--

Honorable Federica Mogherini: There is no slipping back.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: (Inaudible) in agreement.

Honorable Federica Mogherini: I mean, the history is gone. We have to look forward. I mean, the world has changed. We are now focusing so much on this; I understand this is the issue of this session. But we are not focusing on the fact that we shared some security threats. Proliferation, terrorists, destabilization all around the Mediterranean, Middle East. Afghanistan is still there. I mean, in a

transition but we shouldn't--I mean, two years ago we were focusing only on this year of transition in Afghanistan and we turned the page too quickly on the crisis and we don't see the crisis coming. Africa? Huge threats we share.

The win-win situation could come only if we manage to make the common interests emerge and try to act in a responsible way. And obviously, the security architecture around our continent, Europe, our continental Europe, is a major interest we share. And I skipped the question on the Iranian nuclear file. I didn't want to skip the question but--

Mr. David Ignatius: Please.

Honorable Federica Mogherini: But this is one of the issues where, for instance, the cooperation between Russia, the European Union, the U.S. and others--China--is working and is fruitful. As well as, for instance, on the Middle East peace process we will need to sit down together and try to restart. On the Syrian chemical weapons situation last year. Other issues: (Inaudible) is something else on which we can work together in the U.N. Security Council. We have other challenges we could work on.

And to be completely sincere, I think that the old set of efforts that was done in the recent years, the New Start Agreement, for instance, of disarmament and (inaudible) agreements, it would be really a historical mistake to throw that away. Because, again, it's not a matter of going back to the Cold War. The world is not

bipolar anymore; it's not multipolar, either. It's just no order. We should try and find a way of defining some sort of order. And it's already two decades we have wasted after the end of the Cold War without doing any kind of design of world order. Maybe it's time to do it.

Mr. David Ignatius: Yes. Do you have thoughts in the--that is a very useful bridge to what knitting back together would look like, the identification of areas of common interest, and working on those. For example, is NATO, in trying to find ways to share intelligence either as a group or through member countries with Russia, with other countries that affected by violent extremism in the Middle East, are there examples where you're working in that direction as opposed to the more confrontational issues we've been discussing?

Honorable Jens Stoltenberg: So we have suspended our practical cooperation with Russia as the result of what we saw in Ukraine last spring. We continue to have open channels for political conflict. But let me just address in a way the fundamental question you asked in the beginning, whether this is a zero-sum or a win-win situation. And I can recall when I was a student and also later when I worked in the Norwegian Central Bureau of Statistics and I worked on economic theory and game theory. And then we learned about cooperative games and win-win situations and non-cooperative games and zero-sum outcomes or outcomes. And the main message then was that it all depends on the rules. If there



is--if you have the right rules and you have minimum trust then you're able to move from a zero-sum situation to a win-win.

And the problem now is that we don't have the rules. Or actually, we have the rules but they're not respected. And we don't have the trust. And that's the reason why we are moving from a win-win situation towards something which is more and more like a zero-sum, a game. And we cannot go back again to the win-win situation without enforcing respect for the rules. Because that's a precondition for trust and trust and respect for the rules is a precondition for win-win.

And this actually undermines both arms control, it undermines economic cooperation, trade, and it undermines security in Europe. So when NATO is so focused on the respect for basic rules like respecting the border of your neighbor, it's not the way to advance. It's not the very, what do you say, difficult rule. It's to see the border and to respect it. Then we focus on that because that's a fundamental for the idea of coming back to a situation where we can have a win-win situation instead of a zero-sum situation.

Mr. David Ignatius: Victoria, let me ask you for a final comment here and then I'm going to actually take the first question from the audience for you as well. So thoughts that you have on either this, to me, very worrisome unraveling of arms control in particular in the INF dimension, and then we'll turn to the audience.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: I agree with Jens that you can't have win-wins without trust. We all want win-wins. That's what we've devoted our professional lives to. That's what we need for our populations. But without trust you can't do it and without--and you're not going to have trust if you don't have truth. So when you have a country denying that it has troops in another country's territory there's no trust. When you have a country denying that it is testing a new missile that may not be compliant with INF, it's hard to have trust.

Our president has wanted to do not less arms but more arms control. He has wanted to cut strategic weapons further. I was sent out to Europe as his negotiator to try to do a daughter of CFE, to do a brand new conventional treaty. We couldn't get it done because Russia refused to talk about its forces that were stationed in Georgia and Moldova against the will of those governments. So we would love to do more but it requires trust, truth, addressing the situation as it is.

Mr. David Ignatius: I saw a question from the audience for you and I'm going to paraphrase it but if somebody will take ownership of this question, it was directed to you. And it was on this question of defensive weapons for the Ukrainians. And it essentially asks, is there something that--a continuation or increase in Russian shipment of weapons across the border, as our intelligence collects that information, that would change the balance in this decision, which has been pending now for some months? I hope I've stated that right.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Look, as I said, this is the president's decision to make. I think I laid out the considerations. Obviously, we're watching what happens on the ground. We're hoping for, working for the best outcome, which would be the full implementation of Minsk, which would make the whole question moot. But if that does not happen, if in fact we see a resurgence of aggression and violence, that'll change the calculation also.

Mr. David Ignatius: Okay. The first hand I saw was the gentleman here in the second row. And then I see lots of hands waving. I'll try to get to as many people as I can.

Mr. Roland Freudenstein: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm Roland Freudenstein from the Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, which is think tank of the European People's Party, not to be confused with People's Republic. Now, my question to Secretary Nuland, we heard in the previous session from Secretary Brzezinski about accommodation and ruling out NATO membership for Ukraine. Would that be acceptable on the basis of everything we've stood for after the end of the Cold War, countries free to choose their alliances? Wouldn't that be a return to spheres of influence and buffer zones? And one question to Chairman Kosachev. In the spirit of win-win and de-escalation that figures so highly in the description and title of this session, wouldn't it be a

brilliant idea for those Russian military planes that have been spotted near passenger flights to switch their transponders back on?

Mr. David Ignatius: That's--so let's put that--what about those transponders, Konstantin? That scares people.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: I'm not an expert on that. But as far as I'm informed by our experts, NATO aircraft do not switch on transponders in many cases either. Would you deny it? Would you say now that each and every NATO airplane does have an air transponder on? If you do say it now, I will go back to my experts. But as far as I am informed, this is more or less a common practice in both cases. I don't like it. This is dangerous. But it's not unique for Russia.

Mr. David Ignatius: Jens, do you want to respond to that?

Mr. Jens Stoltenburg: The aircraft under NATO command turn on their transponders. And for instance, all the aircraft we have in the Baltic air policing mission, they turn on their transponders.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: There are no cases of transponders switched off by NATO?

Mr. Jens Stoltenburg: Airplanes are under NATO...

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: This is important because I do have to ask my experts in that case.

Mr. Jens Stoltenburg: Planes under NATO command turn on their transponders.

Mr. David Ignatius: All right. That's...

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: We will--okay, I will check it out.

Mr. David Ignatius: That's the answer. I'm going to turn to the woman in the third row and then to Congressman (inaudible).

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: But there was a question to--

Mr. David Ignatius: Oh, sorry. Was there something, Victoria? Sorry.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: There was a question about Ukraine and NATO. It is the long-standing position of the United States across administrations, Republican and Democratic, that any Euro-Atlantic country has the right to choose its alliance, has the right to ask. That's a different matter than the hard work that a country has to do, representatives from many of the countries who have done it in this room, to meet the rights and responsibilities of membership. I think this is a false question to be discussing right now because Ukraine has so much work to do to strengthen and heal its economy, its democracy, its politics. And it is focused on that work, which is why President Poroshenko says the question's not at the top of the table. But as a general matter, absolutely.

Mr. David Ignatius: If that finishes Mr. Freudenstein's--yes, madam.

Ms. Theresa Fallon: Theresa Fallon, European Institute of Asian Studies. Since Victoria Nuland is also in charge of Eurasia, and I'd like to--to the whole panel, but Russia has never been weaker in modern history. Xi Jinping's Silk Road Initiative is an ambitious strategic vision for Eurasia. How do you see Sino-Russian competition in this region shaping up, especially now that Russia is so--with the sanctions and problems in Ukraine--it is unlikely that Russia will be content to be a satellite of China. So can we open this up a little bit to the broader geostrategic issues at stake here? Thank you.

Mr. David Ignatius: Who wants to address that? Konstantin, would you like to speak to--I certainly sense that Beijing is concerned about Russia's situation in Ukraine from my own visits there, most recently in December. Do you want to speak about Russia and Asia. You have an extensive dialog with Japan going on. What about Russia and Asia?

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Well, we are in perfect relationship with China. As for now, we never had as good relations with China as we have now. We do not have any contradictions with China on Ukraine. Yesterday, when there was an informal meeting of the Security Council discussing the situation in Ukraine, both Russia and China did not attend. This is another confirmation that we do not have at least some principal contradictions.

The current sanction policy towards Russia does create additional motivation for Russia to have other projects with China and other countries which do not sanction Russia. And I believe that when--if and when--when the sanctions are lifted up, it will be very difficult for many European and American companies to come back to Russia for the simple reason, these markets will be already taken. That's it.

Mr. David Ignatius: Congressman Issa. A microphone I'm sure will make its way to you tout de suite.

Mr. Darrell Issa: Thank you. Madam Secretary, I'll sort of play the U.S.-Russian relation, if I could for a moment. But not to leave anyone out, returning to cyber, I think the sort of, I'll call it false narrative of, you know, would you use kinetic energy if--or kinetic attack if somebody were to do a cyber attack, probably was a little over the top even by Russian-U.S. standards. But when we had recently a likely North Korean attack against the U.S., and quite frankly, oddly enough, China's connection to North Korea went down for a period of time. Some might call that a measured response. Neither confirming or denying it, aren't there in fact necessary measured responses that NATO, European Union, the United States, are going to have to develop and consistently let friend and foe alike know would be a reaction. And then Dimitri, I would only ask you--

Mr. David Ignatius: Konstantin.

Mr. Darrell Issa: --or Konstantin, I'm sorry. I apologize. I would only ask you one question, is...

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Who is Dimitri?

Mr. Darrell Issa: Yeah, we'll find him later. As the U.S. comes up--

Ms. Victoria Nuland: He just elevated you to prime minister, I think.

Mr. Darrell Issa: Which, as you know, can be fatal. So be very careful. But the--on your side, if Armenia were to launch a cyber attack, would you cut off their natural gas?

Mr. David Ignatius: Let's take, first, Victoria, and then Konstantin.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Well, first of all, Congressman, you've forgotten more than I'll ever know about U.S. capabilities in the cyber arena.

Mr. Darrell Issa: Not much.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Yeah, exactly. But just to elaborate on what Jens said earlier, the truth is that NATO collectively has already helped allies respond to cyber attack, whether it's helping them restore a network, move to other network, do the forensics to figure out what happened, harden, et cetera, with regard to counter measures, you know, there's a full menu of things one could think about. But we are obviously, as an alliance, trying to improve and perfect those kinds of things as the technology and the environment changes.



Mr. Darrell Issa: So measured response and kinetic attack was never on the table?

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Look, none of us is going to say, you do X and we'll do Y. That's just not the way it should work. But there are plenty of responses short of kinetic that would be impactful.

Mr. David Ignatius: Could I just jump in and ask, before we get to Konstantin, wouldn't there be some value, as Congressman Issa suggests, just from a deterrent standpoint, in greater discussion of what actions might provoke other actions? So that you wouldn't have a kind of, you know, you're not going to bomb a country that disrupts your electrical system. But what would you do? Wouldn't a greater public discussion, as was the case during the Cold War, to establish norms of deterrence, wouldn't that be useful?

Ms. Federica Mogherini: You don't manage to get out of this Cold War, right? I'm sorry, but I--

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, you're right.

Ms. Federica Mogherini: Because your--the starting point was the win-win and how do we get out of this. But my impression is that the questions themselves bring us back really to last century, last millennium.

Mr. David Ignatius: Well, let's--

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: David, you have to take it.

Mr. David Ignatius: (Inaudible) your point and being an atavistic 19<sup>th</sup> century person anyway, let me still ask--

Ms. Victoria Nuland: She says you're showing your age.

Ms. Federica Mogherini: No, no, no, no. No, sorry, I'm the senior diplomat here, so.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Get 21<sup>st</sup> century, David.

Mr. David Ignatius: Your marshal of an--

Mr. Darrell Issa: David, David. We will not use your wisdom and experience against her, nor her youth and inexperience against her.

Mr. David Ignatius: That's spoken like Ronald Reagan. If Jens has a thought, let me turn there.

Mr. Jens Stoltenburg: We have never exactly spelled out exactly how we will respond to different kinds of situations or attacks. But we have a history of more than six decades where everything that we have done is proportionate, it's defensive and it's completely in line with all of our international commitments. So just to look on our history and our record, I think you can just trust that the way we will respond to a cyber attack will be proportionate, it will be defensive and it will be in line with our international commitments.

Mr. David Ignatius: Helpful. Konstantin.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Well, I got a question about Armenia taking Russia and our possible response on gas deliveries. I would like to remind you then, that the year of 2008, when we had this deep crisis with Georgia and tanks were shooting at each other, Russian gas deliveries to Georgia were not interrupted for a single minute. They continued during the whole crisis and they continue as for now.

And this is absolutely something we will continue to practice because we do not--there is a common perception that Russia uses energy supplies as a weapon, political or economic weapon. This is not the case. We have certain problems with Ukraine but the problems were related to our commercial disputes. They were not related to our political disagreements. And I cannot imagine a situation when political disagreements may lead to a situation when we switch off the deliveries of natural gas to any country.

Mr. David Ignatius: So I'm going to take two final questions from hands that were raised right from the beginning. The woman here in the third row and then the gentleman there, yes, just under the BrusselsForum.org sign. So madam, let's collect these two and then we'll come back to the panel.

Ms. Niki Tzavela: My name is Niki Tzavela. I'm a former member of the European Parliament. Let's suppose that things go wrong and, in June, the European Union decides to extend the sanctions. We may end up with a

destabilized Russia. We have a destabilized Northern Africa. We have destabilized Syria and Middle East. Can Europe afford a destabilized Russia? This is my question.

Mr. David Ignatius: A powerful question. Let's get one more in the back and then we'll come back to the panel. If we could get a microphone back to the gentleman who's standing.

Mr. David Kramer: David Kramer with the McCain Institute. Russia started the crisis with the Ukraine in 2013 not because Ukraine was going to sign an agreement with NATO but because Ukraine was prepared to sign an agreement with the European Union. So in light of that, I'd like to ask both the Secretary General and the High Representative, are they willing to state that both of your organizations remain open to the prospect one day, even if it's years down the road, for Ukraine, if it meets the criteria, to join both NATO and the European Union. But also, Mr. Secretary General, in Russia's military doctrine, NATO and its enlargement are considered the number one threat and danger to Russia. Is it time for NATO to announce and declare that Russia is a threat to us as well? Thank you.

Mr. David Ignatius: Those are two good questions. They're sort of the flip side of each other. Let me go down the panel. We'll start with Konstantin, if you would. The first is, you know, as sanctions bite, there's a concern about a

destabilized Russia, economic difficulties. Speak to the Russian future. And then there was a very provocative question from David Kramer which you may also want to respond to. And then we'll go down each of the panelists.

Dr. Konstantin Kosachev: Number one, we are definitely influenced by sanctions. But the damage is not crucial. And Russia will definitely survive, whether sanctions are prolonged or not prolonged. Russia is not isolated, we have many other economic partners and we will continue to live with or without sanctions. Though we are not happy about these sanctions, they have not brought any result in terms of influencing the decision making process in Russia, and they will not do it in the future either.

You are an expert, Mr. Kramer, and you understand, you know perfectly well that NATO as an organization was never declared in any Russian document as a threat. The expansion of NATO was classified as a challenge and threat, hypothetical threat towards Russian security and this is where we stand. NATO was never classified as a threat, and they have to be there and I do not believe that NATO needs to declare Russia as a threat. This is my counsel. Am I supposed to give another comment?

Mr. David Ignatius: No, I think that's clear, direct. Federica.

The Honorable Federica Mogherini: First, a destabilized Russia is not in the interests of the European Union, and I think of the world. Because the world we

live in is fragile, that was one of the questions of the lists asking if we were ready for major destabilization in the world while we're still recovering from an economic crisis. This is an issue, and it's an issue for Europe. Still, we decided more than one year ago that as there was no military mean to (inaudible) the process in Ukraine from the European perspective, the only way of putting pressure on Russia was the economic one. So I wish we could lift the sanctions soon, but it depends on the situation on the ground in Ukraine. And we are not going to way of putting pressure on Russia was the economic one. So I wish we could lift the sanctions soon, but it depends on the situation on the ground in Ukraine. And we are not going to (inaudible) this kind of principle. And I can guarantee, I am confident that, the European Union will keep its unity in the decisions on this respect, linking any decisions on sanctions only and purely to the situation on the ground in the east of Ukraine.

When it comes to the European perspective of Ukraine, this is not on the table of Ukrainian authorities. Victoria was saying very clearly we should focus all, also us, but also the Ukrainian authorities, more and more on the challenges they face internally now because the real point is the success of Ukraine itself, which is a challenge, and President Juncker stated in July, so even before taking office, that we're not going to have enlargement of the European Union in the next five years, and we have countries that are queuing up since 10 years now. So

imagine Ukraine. But we have a treaty, we have an article in the treaty that is very clear, and that is (inaudible). So in that respect there is no change of the European Union policy. But we have to be realistic and understand that the European perspective of Ukraine is always stated as it is in one article of the treaty, but the situation, the political situation we are facing, Ukraine is facing and the European Union is facing in supporting Ukraine in its transition, is focusing on something different at the moment.

Mr. David Ignatius: Mr. Secretary General.

The Honorable Jens Stoltenberg: When it comes to enlargement, I think it's very important to underline some fundamental principles. And that is also principles which are enshrined, for instance, in the Helsinki (inaudible) which all countries including Russia has subscribed to. And that is that every nation has the right to decide its own path. Including to decide what kind of security arrangements it would like to be a part of. So, for instance, whether Ukraine is going to be a member of NATO or not is first of all a question which Ukraine has to decide, whether they would like to apply. And if they apply, well, we will assess that application in exactly the same way as we will assess any other application for a NATO membership. And that will be a relationship between the aspirant country and the 28 allies. No other country has the right to intervene or to try to veto such a process. And that's a fundamental principle of the sovereignty of individual

nations. And it's something which also Russia at least subscribes to or supported when they signed the Helsinki Final Act.

Then I would like to underline that for me there is no contradiction between the idea of a strong defense and dialogue. A strong defense and accommodation. Actually, for me it very much works together. Because the only way we can have the confidence to engage with Russia, Russia's going to be a neighbor, it's going to be there, is to have the confidence and the strength which is provided by strong collective defense, the NATO alliance. That provides the basis for also in the future being able to reestablish some kind of cooperative relationship with Russia. So for me to increase our collective defense is not a contradiction to at the same time aspiring for a more constructive relationship, but it's a way to establish the predictability, the trust, which is needed for a more win-win situation in the future.

Mr. David Ignatius: Victoria, and I just want to say to those who I can't call on, I apologize. I just got a sign from the person who runs this, you know, a knife across my throat. So I apologize. Victoria.

Ms. Victoria Nuland: Well just in the interests of being provocative which is why Karen invites me to things--. Exactly, yes, yes. Very diplomatic diplomat. I would just recall an instance in 1993, more than one in fact, when then-President Boris Yeltsin of Russia raised with senior Americans the prospect of whether Russia would ever be welcomed as a NATO member if it applied. And I also



remember conversations when Medvedev was President when he was asking rhetorically, publicly, whether Russia should aspire to join the European Union. Because we were in that period of high economic integration. I would like to live in a world, I would like my children to live in a world, where more Russians would be asking themselves the question about whether their future knitted together with us, sharing our values, is in their interest. I would like to live in a world where more Russians had a chance to come and hear what we have to say, to attend our schools, and have an open debate, have that real debate. And what I worry about now is that we are foreclosing the very options that many of us spent our lives trying to work for. Which is a closer, transatlantic community truly from Vancouver to Vladivostok. And that's what we should aspire to. And I would like to hope that when we're doing the 25th year anniversary, that might look more possible.

Mr. David Ignatius: A powerful discussion that's going to continue the next two days. Those who weren't called on, we're going to have so many panels for you to jump into. Thank you, everyone, for being part of this. Thank you especially to the panelists.

Dr. Karen Donfried: All of those who weren't called on, we're going to have so many panels for you to jump into. Thank you, everyone, for being part of this. Thank you especially to the panelists.

Dr. Karen Donfried: All of us (inaudible) to thank David. And I don't know if people will take away a pessimism from this and a resignation to zero sum or in optimism and see hope for a win-win. But I know we all do thank our four panelists as well as David for moderating so expertly. And the coffee break is on. So.