

131st Bergedorf Round Table

Russia and the West—Opportunities for a New Partnership

June 24th–26th, 2005, Potsdam/Berlin





CONTENT

Picture Documentation	1
Participants	20
Summary	21

Protocol

Welcome	22
I. Russia and the Integration of Europe	23
1. Europe's Borders	24
2. The Crisis of the EU	30
3. Russia Under Putin	40
II. Goals and Instruments of Cooperation	44
1. Russia and the EU: Strategic Options	47
2. The Four Common Spaces	59
3. Touchstones of Cooperation	65
III. The Role of Bilateral Relations	84
1. Historic Dimensions	86
2. Bilateral vs. Common European Foreign Policy	90
3. A Special Relationship Between Germany and Russia?	94

Annex

Participants	106
Map	113
Recommended Literature	114
Glossary	116
Index	130
Previous Round Tables	133
The Körber-Foundation	143
Imprint	144

INITIATOR

Dr. Kurt A. Körber

CHAIR

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Eichwede,
Director, Research Center Eastern Europe,
University of Bremen

SPEAKERS

Elmar Brok, MdEP,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, European
Parliament, Brussels
Ambassador Vladimir Chizhov,
Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian
Federation, Moscow
Ambassador Prof. Dr. Vasili Likhachev,
Deputy Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Federation Council of the Russian Federation, Moscow
Dmitri Rogozin,
Chairman, "Rodina" Party, Chairman, "Rodina" Faction,
State Duma, Moscow
Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble, MdB,
Deputy Chairman for Foreign and Security Policy and
European Affairs of the CDU/CSU Faction, German
Bundestag, Berlin
Dr. Manfred Stolpe,
Federal Minister for Transport, Construction and
Housing, Berlin

PARTICIPANTS

MinDir Ulrich Brandenburg,
Deputy Political Director, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Rt. Hon. Stephen Byers, MP,
House of Commons, London
Dr. Judith Gebetsroithner,
Member of Cabinet of Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner,
European Commission, Brussels
Sergey Generalov,
President, "Industrial Investors" Investment Group,
Moscow
Dr. Thomas Gomar,
Head of Russia/CIS Program, Institut Français des
Relations Internationales, Paris

Prof. Dr. Ruslan Grinberg,
Director, Institute for International Economic and
Political Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
Dr. Fiona Hill,
Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies Program,
The Brookings Institution, Washington D.C.
Dr. Jörg Himmelreich,
Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the
United States, Washington D.C.
Prof. Dr. Sergej Karaganov,
Deputy Director, Institute of Europe, Russian Academy
of Sciences, Moscow
Dr. Irina Kobrinskaya,
Executive Director, Foundation for Prospective Studies
and Initiatives, Moscow
Ambassador Vladimir Kotenev,
Ambassador of the Russian Federation in Germany,
Berlin
Sergey Kulik,
Head of Department of Relations with the European
Union, Administration of the President of the Russian
Federation, Moscow
Dr. Rainer Lindner,
Research Unit Russian Federation/CIS, German Institute
for International and Security Affairs (SWP), Berlin
Dr. Thomas Paulsen,
Managing Director, Bergedorf Round Table, Körber
Foundation, Berlin
Alexander Rahr,
Program Director, Körber Center Russia/CIS, German
Council on Foreign Relations, Berlin
Ambassador Janusz Reiter,
President, Center for International Relations, Warsaw
Prof. Dr. Karl Schlögel,
European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder)
Carl-Andreas von Stenglin,
Office of President Richard von Weizsäcker, Berlin
Ambassador Dr. Ernst-Jörg von Studnitz,
Chairman, German-Russian Forum, Berlin
Michael Thuman,
Foreign Editor, DIE ZEIT, Hamburg
Dr. Dmitro Vydrin,
Director, European Institute of Integration and
Development, Kiev
Mary Burce Warlick,
Director, Office of Russian Affairs, US Department of
State, Washington D.C.
Dr. Klaus Wehmeier,
Deputy Chairman of the Executive Board, Körber
Foundation, Hamburg
Dr. Richard von Weizsäcker,
fmr. President of the Federal Republic of Germany,
Berlin

SUMMARY

Russia's role in Europe was the focus of the 131st Bergedorf Round Table. Can the vision of a strategic partnership between Russia and the EU become reality? Or is a "cold peace" on the cards, with a renewed separation into blocs and competition over spheres of influence?

Russia and European Integration: Russian participants predicted that the EU crisis after the draft European constitution's rejection by the French and Dutch people would inhibit a common European foreign policy and a closer political union for a long time to come. Representatives of the EU and its members, on the other hand, said improving Europe's foreign policy effectiveness was both necessary and feasible, and that the EU's crisis was only temporary.

Goals and Instruments of Cooperation: Participants agreed that Russia was no longer seeking EU membership, in contrast to the early 1990s. Instead, Russia was seeking partnership "on an equal footing," both in light of the EU's reluctance and Russia's goal to build up a functioning nation state. Some voices criticized as utopian the idea that a transformed Russia might converge with a different EU over the middle term, while others rejected it as undesirable given the two sides' differing values. The controversy over the "four common spaces" as a foundation for EU-Russian cooperation defied national lines. Participants from both sides praised the "four spaces" as a successful compromise that offered a flexible framework to further develop ties. Yet other analysts, politicians, and businesspeople from east and west said the agreement lacked substance, real goals, and clear schedules.

The Role of Bilateral Relations: Russian politicians emphasized that, in the absence of a credible European foreign policy, negotiating with Brussels makes little sense and that bilateral talks produce much better results. This camp also accused the EU of disregarding Russian concerns such as Kaliningrad, and new EU members such as the Baltic states, which they said are pursuing anti-Russian policies. Berlin and Paris, on the other hand, are reliable and serious partners, they added. Participants from EU states demanded that national policies towards Russia always be embedded in a European context that would include the interests and sensibilities of smaller EU states. Others underscored the central importance of a transatlantic framework for policy toward Russia. The idea that Germany, given its longstanding and tumultuous historical ties with Russia, might constitute a bridge between Russia and the rest of Europe, was greeted with skepticism by voices from other EU states, but was broadly welcomed by the Russians.

The Protocol contains an edited and authorized version of the participants' oral contributions.

PROTOCOL

Welcome

von Weizsäcker



I welcome you all warmly to the 131st Bergedorf Round Table on “Russia and the West” here in the historic Cecilienhof palace. The negotiations among Stalin, Churchill, and Truman here more than 50 years ago marked the beginning of the bipolar era, the Cold War, mutual assured destruction by nuclear weapons, and the superpowers’ proxy wars in many parts of the world.

Today, other challenges define global politics. After the demise of the Soviet Union, the West’s relations with Russia are no longer determined by rivalry. That does not mean that they are free of conflict. Cooperation, as in the fight against terrorism—just recall Russia’s unrestricted solidarity after 9/11—stands in contrast to differences over issues such as the war in Iraq and how to approach Iran. To Russia’s indignation, Western politicians and media criticize Russia’s conduct in Chechnya, press freedom, or the Khodorkovsky trial. The recent agreement between the European Union and Russia to build up four “common spaces” proves the two sides’ willingness to cooperate. Simultaneously, the integration efforts of the EU and Russia on the territory of the former Soviet Union show signs of rivalry. The close relationship between German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and Russian President Vladimir Putin is controversial, both in Germany and within the EU. The political opposition is not alone in sharply criticizing Germany’s Russia policy and demanding a franker exchange with Moscow, as well as a closer alignment of German policy within that of the EU.

The Bergedorf Round Table has a long tradition of seeking dialog with Russia. In 1970, the first Round Table in St. Petersburg, then Leningrad, took place and many more followed. It now aims to provide a snapshot of today’s relations between Russia and the West, and explore ways of forging a new partnership. We do so at a time when some claim Russia has lost its sense of strategic goals, and when the EU has fallen into a crisis after the French and Dutch rejected its draft constitution.

It was August when Stalin, Churchill, and Truman held their talks, but it can’t possibly have been as hot as it is today. Whether their consultations were characterized by reciprocal listening and learning is a matter for the historians. Our discussions will surely be so characterized, thanks not least to the moderation of Wolfgang Eichwede.

I. Russia and the Integration of Europe

We will be examining our topic of “Russia and the West” in three sections. In the beginning we will gain an overview of the history of Russian ties with Europe and the West. In this context we will also come to discuss Europe’s borders and the current situations of Russia and the European Union.

In the second section we will turn to concrete instruments and fields of cooperation between Russia and the EU. We will look specifically at the four common spaces, individual regions such as Kaliningrad and Eastern Europe, and the roles of institutions including NATO, the OSCE, and the Council of Europe.

The third section will explore what role bilateral relations between Russia and individual EU states can and should still play. In this context we will look in particular at German-Russian relations.

First, Mr. Stolpe will sketch the present state of relations between Russia and the West and put his findings into a historical and geopolitical context.

Since 9/11 at the latest, many people believe that the world has again become a dangerous place. More dangerous than during the Cold War and without hope of global peace. Memories of old horrors fade, replaced by new ones.

Yet those who lived through the time of the Cold War, like I did, know that it was a twofold nightmare. Eastern Europe was a place where people were subjugated and states spied on their citizens. Its isolation further impaired the people’s right to self-determination. Social stagnancy spiralled into economic decline and ecological destruction. The threat of nuclear annihilation was omnipresent. Europe’s security rested on a balance of terror. Suspicion between the two blocs constantly obstructed any cooperation.

We live today in a better Europe of freedom, openness, and partnership. But we also face new problems. International terrorism, joblessness and social inequality frustrate people, and trust in democracy is waning.

European integration is also mired in crisis. The European Constitution was rejected by voters in France and the Netherlands and opinion surveys show a majority of EU citizens oppose continued enlargement. A new division is threatening to open up in Europe, this time running straight through the West. I am confident that the EU will make productive use of this crisis. Tony Blair, who many say is responsible for the failure of the EU’s budget negotiations, addresses problems candidly and has opened a needed discussion over the EU’s competencies. We must succeed in making the EU more effective at its core.

Eichwede

Stolpe
presentation

After the end of the Cold War’s nightmare ...

... we are today threatened by international terrorism and the crisis of democracy.

Pride at democratic rebirth
unites East and West.

Stolpe



There is true reconciliation
between Germany and Russia

The current state of relations between the EU and Russia is encouraging. Victory and defeat in 1945 long estranged Russians and Germans. Only recently have we learned that memories of war can also be a unifying element. Chancellor Schröder found the right words on May 8 in Moscow. He said it was “practically a miracle” that, 60 years after the indescribably bestial Second World War ended, German and Russian veterans were celebrating the occasion together. In this case, the word “reconciliation” was truly appropriate.

The Russian sacrifice in
the Second World War gave Germany
a chance for a new beginning

The Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War has taken a central position in the Russian identity and it is also rightly a foundation for Russia’s European sense of itself. It was only the sacrifice of Russians and other Soviet peoples which gave the Germans a chance at a new beginning. Not even Stalin’s reign of terror and the millions of lives it claimed can undermine this fact. At the same time, it is essential in a Europe where law rules, not least out of respect to the EU’s new eastern European members, to remember the Stalinist repression and to call it the crime that it was.

Also unifying us is a common history of striving towards democracy. The dissidents of the Soviet Union and the uprisings in the Soviet satellites were important because they paved the way for Perestroika and the democratic revolution of 1989. Pride at democratic rebirth unites East and West and brings us closer together, regardless of national differences.

As a European power, Russia has a special role. That is why Germany is pursuing the idea of a strategic partnership that the European Union has since endorsed. This partnership consists equally of a political, an economic, and a social dimension.

Germany sees itself as a bridge between
Russia and the European Union

In light of its history, Germany sees itself as a bridge between Russia and the European Union. We want to intensify the dialog between Russia and the EU—and NATO—in the interest of political stability, durable security, and economic prosperity. The chances have never been better and we would do well to prevent new tensions and divisions. During critical times, we should recall what we have attained. That helps us gain a sense of where we are, both in the dialog with Russia and relations within the EU.

Europe’s Borders

Eichwede

Whenever people discuss Russian-European relations, the topic of Europe’s borders is always raised. When one isn’t talking about institutions such as the EU

Europe is not a continent, but a civilization.

Chizhov



that have definite membership criteria, but just about Europe, the question arises: where does this Europe begin? Where does it end? And does Russia belong?

People have long been trying to pinpoint both Europe's borders and Russia's relationship with Europe. Some choose a geographic approach, others a historical, economic, or political one. I say we should locate the borders in terms of civilization because Europe is not a continent, and neither the European Union nor the Council of Europe capture its essence. Europe is a civilization.

In this context I would like to point out the contribution of earlier Russian generations, often forgotten today, in spreading European civilization. Look to the East: Russians brought European civilization all the way to the Pacific coast and the borders of China. Geographic names of Russian origin still exist in Alaska, Canada, and northern California. Or take the West: Why was it so important that Peter the Great provided Russia with access to the sea in the North, and thereby, and through his reforms, threw open the famous window to the West? It was because the Europeans wanted to close that window.

Ever since the 13th century, Slavic civilization has been facing European aggression. The victory of Alexander Nevskii, Prince of Novgorod, at the battle of Lake Chudskoje (Peipus) in 1242, ended the Teutonic Knights' eastward expansion. In the early 18th century, the Swedish King Karl XII sought to join forces with the Turkish sultan to establish what Pilsudski would later call the Baltic Sea—Black Sea buffer zone. It was supposed to block Russian access to the sea. King Karl's decision to invade the Russian heartland and Moscow led, as we all know, to his decisive defeat at Poltava in 1709, which forever ended his expansionist hopes.

Russian and European history are inseparable, and, since all attempts to permanently cut off Russia from Europe have, fortunately, failed, such ambitions will have no chance of success in the future.

Ms. Kobrinskaya, is Russia part of Europe?

Of course Russia belongs to Europe. There are differences for sure, but these exist at least as much among the individual member states as well.

There is no doubt that Russia is an important part of Europe. Anyone reviewing the history of the last few centuries sees immediately that Russian and European history are inseparable.

Chizhov

Russians contributed in spreading the European civilization

All attempts to block Russia's access to Europe have failed

Eichwede

Kobrinskaya

Schäuble

Russia is a part of Europe ...



... but it will never become
a member of the EU

On the other hand I cannot imagine that Russia will one day become an EU member, and I sincerely doubt that our Russian friends can imagine that either. Therefore I think we should strictly separate the question of Europe's borders from the issue of EU membership. Russia belongs to Europe to a certain extent, but Russia is more than a part of Europe. Russia is a global power that extends far beyond Europe.

Schlögel

Russia definitely lies in Europe. At the same time it reaches all the way to the Pacific and is therefore a Eurasian power. That's what makes it so difficult to find a definition. In any case, there's not much to be gained from playing this semantic game because the decision to join the EU is determined by completely different considerations, and to belong to Europe you don't have to be an EU member. The phrase bandied about during the 1980s and 1990s, that the states of East and Central Europe were "returning to Europe," was more than negligent. Poland, Hungary, and the Czechs, for example, were always part of Europe, not only once they were accepted into the EU.

Lindner

Russians might live Western-style,
but they are not Western

Russia may belong to Europe in its self-image, but not to the West. It is often forgotten that many Russians still consider the "West" the enemy. The Russians might live Western-style, but they are not Western—many personally and openly embody this curious paradox.

I also think that the Russian identification with Europe varies according to what part of Russia one is talking about. Russia remains a transcontinental state with limited means of controlling its more remote regions. Europe's borders should certainly remain open towards the east, but Europe ends where people no longer identify with Europe.

Byers

Berlin and London are closer
to Moscow than to Istanbul

The frontiers of Europe are what the people of Europe want them to be—and by that I do not mean the political elite, but the people of the continent of Europe. I am convinced that the citizens of Berlin, Paris, Amsterdam or London have more in common with the citizens of Moscow than with those of Istanbul because they share a history with Russia, as they do with Ukraine.

Brandenburg

When speaking of Europe's borders, the question arises of who determines these borders. All nations interested in joining or only those who are already members?

The current feeling within the EU of belonging together in Europe is, in any case, not a reliable gauge. It was already overtaxed during the last round of enlargement, but then adjusted amazingly. EU citizens consider their neighbors more European when they have more contact with them. We can see that in the example of Ukraine. The country came significantly closer to Europe through its Orange Revolution. Many West Europeans previously had no idea of Ukraine, which was far more foreign than Turkey, which many knew from their holidays and Turkish neighbors. That's what we were talking about at the 129th Round Table in Lviv only a few weeks before the Orange Revolution. Now many see Ukraine completely differently.

It would also be wrong to equate the borders of Europe with any kind of historical borders because the EU has already gone beyond some of these.

Europe's borders can be defined in terms of geography, politics—such as through membership in the Council of Europe—or culture. In the latter, various highly contradictory historical borders overlap. However, the Balkan conflicts early in the 1990s broke out along the line dividing the old Ottoman Empire from Habsburg Austria, or between the Catholic and Protestant lands on one side and the Orthodox world on the other. These kinds of identities run far deeper than we in the West were willing to accept for a long time.

The borders of the EU do not completely correspond to any of these old boundaries. They are determined by clear criteria that include not only the fulfillment of certain conditions by accession candidates, but also the EU's ability to absorb new members.

Of course the EU's political borders are not the same as those of historical Europe. The nomenclature of the national territories has little in common with Europe's borders. A city such as Istanbul is without a doubt a European city, but that does not make Turkey a European state.

I agree, Istanbul might still be a European city, but other traditions dominate the rest of Turkey. Even the capital Ankara is far less European and much more Asian and Islamic.

Allow me to add one more comment on Europe's borders. Already now, Europeanization has progressed farther beyond the borders than even the boldest strategists

Reiter

The feeling of unity is further evolving in Europe

Brok

The EU's borders are determined by its ability to absorb new members

Schlögel

Chizhov

Istanbul might be European, but already Ankara is Asian and Islamic

Schlögel

The Russians are already in Europe,
just like the Turks.

Hill

expected. I'd recommend that, instead of going to Brussels, all those present visit Berlin's main bus station at the Radio Tower. There, one's first glance takes in the great commuting movements between Berlin and Minsk, Kaliningrad, Moscow, or Saratov. Lines like Eurolinie or EasyJet have spawned vigorous commuter and tourist traffic between Odessa and Vienna, for example. An international migration of great dimensions is in progress, which I consider more than positive. The shopping tourists, the hundreds of thousands of small-time traders who travelled in the 1990s between Saratov and Istanbul, for example, had a tremendously stabilizing effect during times of crisis. Europe's people do not wait for new visa regulations to be approved.

Borders in Eurasia dissolve
through migrants and tourists

I would like to encourage the EU's planners not to forget Europe on the ground, Europe on the move, when thinking about borders in terms of action plans. Even by helping citizens to take advantage of today's travel possibilities, the borders in Eurasia will dissolve all on their own. Why is it still not possible to fly direct from Berlin to Lviv? Why do I have to wait six weeks for a visa when I want to visit a colleague in Kazan? It's a scandal.

Hill

Mobility at the grassroots level indeed determines the borders of Europe. Borders are shaped by the people that move around irrespective of political boundaries, be it legally or illegally. They are shaped when people choose with their feet, they are shaped by workers, traders, and, last but not least, by tourists. I was amazed to see the plethora of Russian tourists in Berlin and to hear Russian being spoken everywhere. Yes, the Russians are already in Europe, just like the Turks. Europe is already mixed up, and some internal borders already suggest a broader Europe.

Himmelreich

Integration can only be successful if migrants
are willing to adapt to foreign cultures ...

Allow me to make a skeptical comment. Of course it's a fascinating idea that, on the basis of an objective migration of, say, Turkish and Russian people to Berlin, we are already seeing European integration far beyond the frontiers of the EU. Yet integration consists of more than having people on the move. The decisive element of real integration, it seems to me, is the migrant's willingness to enter foreign cultural, legal, and social environments and at least accept their basic rules. Ultimately, the readiness of citizens in whose midst the migrants settle to accept new people is also important. We therefore have to ask to what extent this migration process is accompanied by the willingness to take on foreign cultures. I see some ethnic groups in Berlin that have trouble accepting the rules essential for coexistence that are found in our constitution, for example regarding the



equality of men and women. Neither do all immigrants to Germany contribute to the Europeanization of their home country just because they live here. What counts is how much they're willing to integrate. There are many examples of this, but also many examples to the contrary. Reducing one's observation solely to the objective existence of migration as you do, dear Professor Schlögel, disregards an important element of the integration process, namely the migrant's subjective, deliberate willingness to integrate, and describes only a part of reality.

Let me also add a note of caution. It is of course great that people embrace the possibility of moving freely within Europe in their daily lives, be it as tourists or as workers. But I would like to remind you that labor mobility can become a problem when people fear to lose their jobs because of foreign competitors. Pavel the Polish plumber, the man who takes honest French plumbers' work away because he accepts lower wages, was probably the most influential character in the campaign against the European constitution. Mobility is positive, but Europe needs a strong economy to absorb all those people on the move.

Now that you have expressed yourself so positively regarding the chances of mobility, Mr. Byers, I would like to invite you to create the conditions for mobility within the EU by bringing about British accession to the Schengen agreement.

In referring to Europe's borders we should use a functional definition that adapts to whatever aspect of Europe we may be talking about at the moment. The Europe we refer to in political life consists of parts that only partially correspond.

Take the OSCE, formerly the CSCE. It embodies a profoundly European attitude of the early 1970s. At that time the Europeans, pledging that a war should never again be allowed to happen, established an independent space for formulating policy—something that has yet to take place in Africa or Asia. Then there's the European Community, which is not the same as either the OSCE or the Council of Europe. What all these approaches have in common is the European frame of mind, of which democracy and human rights are integral components.

In our discussion we should avoid one mistake above all, that of mixing up one with another. We have to be clear about what the various European institutions can do and what their profiles are. The common denominator in the OSCE, for example, is relatively low, while in the European Union it's quite high: Whoever doesn't accept it cannot join it. That could become a problem for, say, Turkey.

Byers

... and if the economy is strong enough to absorb the migrants

Brok

von Studnitz

Europe consists of different frameworks

... such as the OSCE, the Council of Europe and the EU

Thumann

While the borders of Europe remain uncertain ...

... the criteria of accession to the EU are definite

The idea of Europe is as ambiguous as its borders are indeterminate. Just where Europe ends, whether at the Urals, at the Bosphorus, or at the Iraqi border, remains uncertain even after extended historical and cultural analysis. Neither can one definitely say whether Ukraine, Russia, or Turkey belong to Europe. In the end, it is always an individual, political decision.

Happily, the EU has one definite yardstick by which to measure applicant countries: the law. States wishing to join this community of laws must adopt the *acquis communautaire* in its entirety. That remains the case even after the failed constitutional referendums in France and the Netherlands, and the anti-European rhetoric that accompanied them.

At present Russia does not give the impression that it wants to accept the EU's body of laws. On the other hand, neither has it been invited to do so by the Europeans.

Rogozin

Discussions on the geographic borders of Europe are useless

Is Russia European in terms of politics and culture?

Ever since I've been a politician, I have experienced discussions on whether and to what extent Russia is part of Europe and where the borders are. Every time someone quotes, in a grave voice, De Gaulle's dictum of a "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals," I am reminded just how useless these abstract discussions are. To this day, I have no idea what this fine slogan actually means. Should perhaps Russia detach the region beyond the Urals and cede it to China?

As far as politics and culture are concerned, I'd say Russia is thoroughly European. I would even call it Europe's radical version. Every European idea has become an axiom in Russia. European monarchy became the absolute monarchy of Russian Tsarism, while European socialist ideas became an attempt to establish communism through revolution with collectivization and persecutions that killed innumerable people. Even capitalism has had to assume its most radical form in Russia, as a brutal and uncontrolled oligarchic capitalism. With a beautiful regularity, Russia radicalizes European ideas ad absurdum.

The Crisis of the EU

von Weizsäcker
The EU is in need of a common foreign policy ...

More important than the constantly asked and never conclusively answered question of the EU's borders is the state of the Common European Foreign and Security Policy. This policy barely exists, was touched upon only slightly by the draft constitution, and never substantially promoted. Its success is, however, vital



to the EU's survival. Only through a common security and foreign policy will we one day find out what Europe's borders really are.

The EU had a common foreign policy towards Ukraine and must have one towards Turkey. We Europeans are surrounded by half a billion Muslims, not the Americans. Therefore we have to do our part in making sure our Muslim neighborhood moves ahead with the times. That, for now, is a challenge for our common foreign and security policy. We should leave aside for later the consequences for border issues. Another challenge for the common foreign policy is the western Balkans. We must finally understand that doing nothing will be much more expensive for us over time than the decision to support these countries over the long haul and to give them a perspective. Looking away is easier only at first glance. We cannot wait for the Americans to intervene again in the coming decades as a substitute for us to guarantee peace and human rights in the Balkans.

We should also work to solve the countless tasks of a common foreign policy not only because it will bring us further in the question of Europe's borders but also because it is the only way we can attain an appropriate standing with the United States. The transatlantic relationship will have been secured only once the EU and the USA see each other as equal, individual, loyal partners and not as a conglomerate of more or less willing states that can be played off against one another. Even the British experience repeatedly that the more they conduct real European policy the more influence they gain with the Americans. If the British voice is to be heard more strongly in Washington, they must contribute more to strengthening a common European foreign and security policy. We can only applaud that Tony Blair recently raised these same issues.

In any case we recently saw that the Americans do value Europe's enlargement policy as a kind of "soft power" that complements their own "hard" power. Still, they ignore the possible consequences for the EU when they demand that we should accept not only Turkey, but also Georgia, Israel, and other countries on the United States' geopolitical agenda. Here too, it is essential that the EU finds a common position.

Today, a common European security and defense policy could be just as effective as a pragmatic foundation for further European integration as the supranational control of the coal and steel industries was effective in preventing war at the outset of the EU's history.

... for instance towards
Turkey or the Balkans

Only an externally strong EU
will be taken seriously by the USA

Chizhov

The European security and defense policy
can be the foundation for further integration

The European Union will never become a more effective political unit in the game of world powers if we fail to put aside our national egos.

von Studnitz



von Studnitz

If we do not succeed in finding a greater common denominator in foreign and security policy than before, we will fall back to the level of individual nation states. The European Union will never become a more effective political unit in the game of world powers if we fail to put aside our national egos.

Europe must to be able to make use of force, if necessary

A second thing to keep in mind is that Europe's failure, for instance in the Yugoslav crisis, could be traced back to the Europeans' disunity over the use of force. Afterwards they turned to the Americans to ask for help. That, essentially, was a declaration of bankruptcy, because soft power without hard power, carrots without sticks, is rarely enough. Europe still has a lot to learn in this respect.

Karaganov

I am rather pessimistic: In its search for a new identity, the EU will be distracted for at least the next five years from its objective of becoming established as a foreign policy power.

Himmelreich

Despite its crisis, the EU needs to strengthen its foreign policy momentum

That is exactly what cannot be allowed to happen. Now that France and the Netherlands have rejected the constitution, the EU cannot be allowed to lose its foreign policy momentum. The foreign policy challenges facing the EU externally will not wait for the EU to become effective. On the current basis of the Treaty of Nice, which requires unanimity among the 25 member states, decision-making within the EU is extremely difficult and leaves open the danger that the EU could lose its effectiveness in important foreign policy issues. In no way should the member states become so embroiled in an intra-European debate that they neglect the challenges now facing the EU. Therefore, the few institutional elements of the constitutional treaty, such as an EU president elected for an extended period or a European foreign minister, should be rescued. Of course that will not automatically give us a common foreign and security policy, but at least the conditions will have improved.

Reiter

The EU can develop its foreign policy with the constitution

Happily, in the current crisis there is a consensus not to endanger the Common Foreign and Security Policy. We need it urgently, so that, together with its new members, the European Union can be taken seriously as a global actor and can be a strong partner for Russia. I do not think it was surprising that the EU has not had a brilliant record in terms of foreign policy, because previously unimaginable political spaces, including potential for making mistakes, opened up after the end of the Cold War. Yet we must learn from these mistakes. Luckily we can continue working together through intergovernmental conferences without the constitution having to take effect.

We have to make Europe more effective in the area of foreign policy.

Brandenburg



The fact that Europe is in a state of flux at the present time actually provides us with a unique opportunity to develop our foreign policy. We have a chance to rethink our priorities and develop the EU's external relations accordingly, for example its relationship with Russia.

I can share only at a very general level your optimism about a Europe of nation states that develops its policies toward Russia. When we look at the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the ESDP in practice, one sees that Europe's effectiveness has been compromised by its lack of institutional coherence. In Macedonia, for example, I recently saw how seven different institutions of the European Union operate parallel to one another in this small country without any coordination, among them the EU Special Representative, the European Agency for Reconstruction, the EU Police Mission PROXIMA and the EU Monitoring Mission. We want to and have to make Europe more effective in this area. Only in this way can Europe take on the political responsibility for the economic power that, with a population of 450 million and a third of the world's GDP, it simply is. That is an important goal of the constitution. An institutionally weakened European Union is not a better partner. Our counterparts in Moscow know that.

Of course we need a more efficient institutional structure, but I would first like to pass the criticism of EU external policy, whether kept in general or directed at our conduct toward specific countries, on to the right address. The external policy of the EU is the policy decided by the member states in the Council of Ministers. In this respect, the lamenting that the development of external policy has been curtailed by the failure of the constitution and its plan for a European foreign minister sounds, to me, rather like crocodile tears. The common foreign minister would still be beholden to the council of 25 individual foreign ministers with their 25 different conceptions and special relationships. He still could only implement what the Council agreed on.

European foreign policy is obviously not only the EU's external policy, no matter how much some in Brussels would like to see that happen, and it never will be. A reasonable EU foreign policy combines the foreign policy of the member states with that of the EU. Whether it is communitary or intergovernmental is not the main question. If it's done right, the combination is sufficiently flexible and functions well, such as in negotiations about Iran's nuclear program, where important

Byers

The EU's crisis allows for a renewal of the relationship with Russia

Brandenburg

No, institutional shortcomings limit Europe's effectiveness!

Gebetsroithner

With or without a foreign minister—the EU can only do what the Council decides

Schäuble

We need a combination of the EU's foreign policy with that of the member states



European states, working both together and in coordination with the European Commission, represent the interests of all. We also observed a thoroughly successful European policy towards Ukraine. Integrated foreign policy also means that European unity and transatlantic partnership may never be seen as competing goals. Anyone—meaning also our French friends—who considers European unification as an alternative to Atlantic solidarity will ultimately only divide Europe.

Gebetsroithner

Brussels does not want to monopolize the common foreign policy. We only want the member states to use their bilateral relations coherently and in the interest of common policy.

Kobrinskaya

Russia's strategic way of thinking can be an example for the EU's external policy

Russia's way of thinking could be useful to Europe in devising a joint external policy. Russia is, by necessity, a land of strategic thinking, because otherwise, surrounded as it is by innumerable neighbors, it could never survive.

The EU could, for example, define its enlargement policy mainly along security considerations. The issue of Turkish membership would, in this way, present itself in a new manner. At first glance Turkey would have to still wait a long time for membership because its membership in NATO guarantees security. If, however, one were to factor in the possibility of a military coup, then Turkey would have to be granted accession sooner than, for example, Ukraine or other East European countries.

Gomart

Russian strategic thinking is still based on territorial integrity

I fully agree that the EU lacks strategic thinking. But Russian strategic thinking is still based mainly on territorial integrity, and there are good reasons to consider this view outdated. I do not know who should learn from whom, but a dialog is definitely needed to reconcile these differing concepts of foreign policy.

Eichwede

The crisis of European foreign policy, many think, is part of the greater crisis of the EU. I would like to see an EU-Russian discussion about the EU crisis: Is it a fundamental crisis or one of the many breathers on the way towards European integration? What caused the crisis? How will the Union overcome it? And if not, what will become of the EU?

Rogozin

The EU is in a state of crisis ...

For the moment the EU has lost sight of its objectives and is simultaneously overburdened by enlargement and confronting a stagnant constitutional process. It is therefore undoubtedly in a state of crisis.

The people of Europe do not want a closer political union within Europe, but a new relationship which builds on historic ties.

Byers

The EU is no doubt going through a period of crisis as a result of the rejected referendums in France and Holland. There is a saying in the Middle East: “When the oven is hot many cooks come into the kitchen.” The European Union’s oven is cold if not icy at the moment and all the cooks have walked away from the kitchen. Therefore, we need political leaders who identify a new way forward. I commend the way advocated by Tony Blair in his speech in the European Parliament on June 23rd: we must create a Europe that is able to face the global challenges.

The purpose of the EU was quite clear for Europe’s citizens during the second half of the past century, but I doubt whether we have yet decided what the goal of the European Union of 25 really is. The votes in France and Holland prove that the people in Europe are not sure about this goal and skeptical about the recent development of the EU. The French and Dutch debates about the referendum focused not only on unemployment and the need for economic reform, but also on national identity and culture. Many people there felt—as many do in the United Kingdom—that their identity as a nation state was under threat. The people of Europe are saying: We do not want a closer political union within Europe, but a new relationship which builds on historic ties. If the EU wants to overcome its crisis, it should decide not to deepen its political integration but to develop its ties to states like Russia and Ukraine.

Mr. Byers, you have demanded a new definition of the EU after 50 years and even suggested what this new definition might be. Yet what you have said in mellifluous words and under the banner of the new is actually only a repetition of what the British delegate to the 1955 Messina Conference said before he left.

The answer today cannot be any different from what it was then: It would be senseless to reject deeper integration by referring to the political challenges facing the EU, no matter how beguiling it may seem. The greater the challenges, the more institutional effectiveness and authority we need. Anyone with no authority to fight unemployment cannot fight it, and without efficient decision-making mechanisms one cannot make successful policy. Institutional development is not an obstacle, but a prerequisite for us to rise to our current challenges, especially in an EU of 25. When Tony Blair demands less political integration for the EU of 25 he is calling for the end of the EU as a political project, regardless of what he might say to the contrary.

It also seems to me that you have succumbed to the same temptation as have many others, namely to interpret the referendums in France and the Netherlands

Byers

... which makes the British initiative for reorientation so important

Europe’s citizens feel threatened by a loss of national identity

Brok

The British are wrong ...

... if they think that the EU could face its tasks without further integration

Everybody interprets the failed referendums as a confirmation of his position

as a confirmation of what one always wanted to say anyway. Allow me, as proof, to turn the argument around: France did not vote against, but for a stronger social Union, against Europe as an agent of globalization and for a Europe that protects from the effects of globalization, meaning a strong and politically and economically integrated Europe. Whether one shares these opinions or not, one can regard the French vote at least as much as a vote for greater integration as calling it, as you have, a protest against integration.

Also, France voted against more enlargement, not for it. Therefore we should not take on board Turkey or any more countries from Eastern Europe. Their accession perspectives were the straw that broke the camel's back. We did not manage to demonstrate to the people the political advantages of enlargement.

Chizhov

In the referendums, the EU citizens protested against the enlargement of 2004

I suspect that with their negative votes, the French and Dutch people did not so much reject the constitution as vent their general frustration about the enlargement of 2004. Not one EU country held a referendum last year over enlargement. Instead, people were now expected to vote on a text that no one had really read. So it shouldn't come as a surprise that this text was rejected by many.

Gebetsroithner

No, they turned against the accession of Turkey

I think the negative outcome of the constitutional referendums had less to do with the accession of ten new members because they have fit in quite well. The real problem was and remains Turkey. Unfortunately we have never openly discussed this issue; it always remained a project for elites, and no one bothered to show the people the advantages that Turkish membership could bring.

Gomart

For the French, an even more important reason was the protest against Chirac

I agree that EU enlargement was not explained sufficiently to the citizens, and Turkey no doubt played an important role. But the negative referendum in France was also due to domestic problems—the “French model” with ten percent unemployment and a very interventionist state—and to the fact that President Chirac has lost several elections without political consequences.

Rogozin

The citizens voted against the EU's bureaucracy

The outcome of the referendum in France is only too understandable as a protest against the bureaucratisation of the EU. Although the people are in no way fundamentally opposed to a unified Europe, we will wind up at a dead end again and again if we do not learn to speak to the people, voters, and tax payers in a language they understand and communicate values they can comprehend.

The European bureaucracy is many times worse than Russia's.



Rogozin

The European bureaucracy is many times worse than Russia's. The Russian one is itself indescribably horrible, yet Brussels show us day in and day out how things should not be done. Mr. Brok, you will certainly corroborate my experiences in Brussels from my days as commissioner for Kaliningrad: This bureaucracy is not only huge, it is also fragmented within itself. The commissioners not only sit in different buildings, but each commissioner works in his or her own little world without coming into contact with any other commissioner. One can only despair at how decisions are reached within the European Commission.

One indication of how oblivious Brussels is to reality is its language, a horrible diplomatic mumbo-jumbo that the average citizen understands no better than the language of birds. In one document, for example, a demand is made to "nuance the modalities of the dialog format." What on earth does that mean? How can modalities be nuanced? Or take the four common spaces that Mr. Chizhov has negotiated. The average European would get lost in these four spaces. He cannot even find his way around one space. And then he even has put in his hand some road map that then completes his confusion. What the people understand, on the other hand, is the language of nationalists like Jean-Marie Le Pen. That Pawel, the Polish plumber, will soon take away the job of some simple Frenchman is something the man on the street can comprehend.

Mr. Rogozin has vividly shown that for him, the path out of the crisis leads through a vigorous struggle against the EU bureaucracy. I would be interested in hearing what other paths out of the crisis our participants see.

Mr. Rogozin, I sympathize with your frustration at the EU bureaucracy. If Berlaymont is the Kremlin of the European Union, so to speak, then Europeans and Russians should work equally hard to cut back their bureaucracies.

If I may, the bureaucracy in Brussels was not invented by the Commission. It was forced upon us by lawmakers in the European Parliament and the Council.

Let's leave that aside for now. In any case I reject any criticism of bureaucracy that threatens to descend into populism.

Of course Europe must win over people's hearts and minds. Yet we should not interpret the EU's current crisis in a way that would make the European Union's future directly dependent on the momentary state of popular opinion. It was

The EU's mumbo-jumbo cannot be understood by an average citizen

Eichwede

Brok

Gebetsroithner

Brok

Europe's elites need to further set goals and win people over



good and will continue to be so that in Europe opinion makers and elites set goals, publicize these goals, and win people over to support these goals. We cannot leave everything to be determined by the headiness of the moment.

Schlögel

I doubt that the strategists and elites are the masters of European integration and, indeed, that they should be. Actually they only react to integration processes that are taking place without them; it would at least be the best if they reacted as intelligently and promptly as possible.

Schäuble

Brussels is far from reality

Mr. Brok, you have rightfully defended Brussels against unwarranted accusations, but in doing so you coined the expression of Berlaymont as the Kremlin of Brussels, and it is not without merit. Whoever has worked long enough in the UN complex on the East River thinks it is the whole world, and whoever has worked long enough in Brussels is prone to think it is Europe. That is at least the impression the visitor gets, so in that respect I must admit that Mr. Rogozin has a point in saying the rejections of the constitution in France and the Netherlands was not least an outcry against the Brussels bureaucracy's estimation and indeed overestimation of itself.

Byers

At least, the political elites should not lose contact to what the people of Europe think about the EU, which I fear they have often done and still do.

Reiter

We have to clarify ...

I think that to overcome the crisis of the EU we have to redefine European solidarity for the EU of 25, both in political and financial terms. Also, both the decision-makers and the people must have a clear picture of what Europe stands for and for what it is responsible.

Gebetsroithner

... who in the EU is responsible for what

It's true that we finally have to grapple with the discussion over competencies. Numerous politicians constantly demand that the EU return to concentrating on its core areas and keep out of national affairs. Any politician can endorse a demand as vague as that. But if we look at it in detail, we see that the discussion of core competencies has never been honestly conducted. I would welcome it if the propagandists of keeping to core competencies would for once make the effort of saying what they think those competencies are.

Kobrinakaya

First, the EU—meaning politicians and bureaucrats equally—should decide whether so-called European values or security considerations determine who can

We can learn from Russia's resistance to chaos.

Schlögel



join the club. Only once they have made this decision will they be able to convey the European idea to the voters.

Russia needs a strong European Union as a partner. Earlier, Russia—or the Soviet Union—contributed in a negative way to European integration because the Soviet threat provided an incentive for integration. Today, I believe the Europeans would be well advised to develop a common energy and transportation policy towards Russia. Russia's infrastructure is, for example, of great importance for Europe's trade with Asia. If the Europeans are forced to act in concert toward Russia in this case, then Russia will once again support European integration, this time in a positive way.

Russia is a huge land that without a doubt is part of European civilization and draws on a centuries-old tradition of peaceful coexistence among various cultures and religions, with the exception of Chechnya. This tradition can be of great use for Europe. If the EU states decide today to return to their nation-state values, Russia's experiences can be of real value to them. That is because Russia is building up its own nation state, and is doing so by making huge efforts.

In my opinion the EU's crisis is a distant echo of the greater changes in Europe, the transformation that Russia must overcome and which is pulling in its wake the whole European Union.

I ask myself, therefore, what the EU countries could learn from what has been going on in Russia and East Europe. I think we can learn first that it is possible to keep one's nerve in practically hopeless situations; and second, that people can still help themselves once the state has lost its authority. If we look at what Russia has managed since the early 1990s, then there is little reason for hysterical overreaction in Western Europe. We can learn from this resistance to chaos and the special abilities it fosters.

One question in this context: How do you see the future of the EU? Will only rudiments exist in ten years or will it be a stronger union?

The EU's future might well lie in expansion without further integration, which would mean the end of the dream of the United States of Europe and the continuation of EU enlargement.

The European Union will never revert to a loose association of competing nation states, not under the British presidency nor in the future.

Schlögel

The EU has to accomplish a transformation ...

... and can use Russia as a point of reference

Eichwede

Karaganov

The EU will not further its integration

Reiter

Yes it will! Integration will not end ...



Grinberg

... but the EU will be strengthened
by this crisis

Many Russians and the Russian media comment on the EU's crisis along the lines of a German adage that says, "Schadenfreude ist die schönste Freude (nothing feels better than the misfortune of others)." They also predict a return to national currencies and the EU's impending demise. I would advise against such forecasts, not only because they are in bad taste, but also from personal experience. After my university days I wrote an article welcoming the collapse of the Werner Plan for a European economic and monetary union. I was evidently wrong, given the success of the second attempt at an EU and the emergence of the euro.

I do not think the EU will fall apart; on the contrary, it will strengthen its position. Perhaps a new centripetal tendency will develop among eurozone countries towards the EU's new members. However, the eurozone itself will neither fall apart nor give up its common currency. I think that in the longer run Brussels will be a more important address for Russia than Berlin.

Stolpe

I think it is quite fortunate that our Russian friends can experience the European dilemma here for themselves and speak with us about it. This Bergedorf Round Table is like a big family.

Russia Under Putin

Eichwede

The Russian members of our extended family have their own problems. Mr. Rogozin, what shape is the Russian Federation in?

Rogozin
presentation

Russia will stand at a crossroads when president Putin's term ends in 2008. After our development has followed the pattern of the 1990s until today, a new political era will begin in 2007 and 2008.

A new political era will begin with
the presidential elections in 2008

Putin and his administration have no answers to central problems, and even if they have a program, the Russian people don't understand it.

Putin's primary goal is to double the country's GDP. Disregarding for a moment that only 1% of all Russians even know what that is, most people have no idea of how doubling it would affect their lives.

Putin neither has a concept for Russia's
economic order nor for its foreign policy

Whether Russia becomes a liberal or a social market economy remains an open question. Putin also has no idea of how Russia's future geostrategic alignment should look. Should we look toward China, the United States, or the EU?

The horror of the Beslan hostage-taking shook Russia to its foundations. At the time, Putin admitted that Russia was weak, and that the weak would get the boot.

Russia finds itself in a reactionary phase,
in which everything new
is snuffed out from the start.

Rogozin

I agree with the diagnosis, but in my opinion the response was wrong. Putin wants to replace direct election of Duma deputies through proportional representation, and the electability of governors through appointment. Our weakness comes not from elections, but from the corruption that penetrates all our structures, in the nepotism and patronage politics that put incompetent people in positions of responsibility, and in our failed Chechnya policy.

I also think the influence of the state in the mass media is something intolerable and in need of immediate cessation. Reporting on state television is still determined by so-called temniks. These are the instructions given by the presidential administration to journalists on what and whom they are to report about. The opposition is allowed air time only when its momentary interests are the same as the government's. When that's no longer the case, there is no more reporting at all about certain people, as I personally found out. Or, the opposition is discredited, as happened to my Rodina party, which was accused of being xenophobic and nationalist whenever it attacked the government's social policies. The only thing missing is for us to be accused of anti-Semitism.

The trial of oligarch Mikhail Khodorkovsky and his oil company Yukos, into which Putin put so much effort, was a show trial against a scapegoat and it bypassed the actual problem.

Oligarchy, as a form of rule through illegally acquired riches, is without a doubt extremely dangerous for Russia's social and industrial development. The oligarchs amount to a false and criminal bourgeoisie that enriches itself through contacts in the government and among relatives, and therefore profits from corruption and the plunder of Russia's wealth. Yet the breakup of Yukos had nothing to do with fighting oligarchy. Any big Russian corporate head could have been accused of the same crimes Khodorkovsky went on trial for. Khodorkovsky was singled out only because he supported the Yabloko Party and the Communists. I can say this with a clear conscience because Rodina never received money from Khodorkovsky. His conviction was aimed at frightening the other oligarchs from supporting the opposition.

Influence-taking in the media and the Khodorkovsky trial are two symptoms of Russia's crisis. We find ourselves in a reactionary phase, in which everything new, promising, and sensible is snuffed out from the start. And why? Because the politicians in the president's entourage fear losing power after the next election. If Putin, after two terms in office, is forbidden by the constitution from standing again—and I believe him when he says he has no interest in another term—then

Freedom of press only exists on paper ...

... and the judicial system is used as a political instrument—example Khodorkovsky

Putin's entourage would do anything to remain in power

they might have to face a corruption trial with him someday. That is why they want to silence the opposition now. To do so they are even making a deal with the Communists, who depend on the presidential administration for their funding.

Kobrinskaya

Putin does have some success with the economic modernization of Russia

Putin's chief aim is to modernize Russia, not to democratise it. He wants to push through Western standards and modernize Russia's economy as quickly as possible by joining the WTO and working together with other Western institutions. As much as one might wish for more progress in democratisation, modernization is truly urgently needed. Putin has made remarkable progress in this area.

Generalov

President Putin took some useful steps recently, too. In reaction to the Ukrainian nationalizations, he shortened the statute of limitations for privatisations, thereby ending the discussion over the privatisations' legitimacy. The Russian business community was very grateful to him.

Schlögel

I would be very happy if European reporting on Russia included all that has been established and cultivated, even in the current crisis. One month ago I had the chance to climb around the Moscow City construction site, which is four times as big as the Potsdamer Platz site was ten years ago. Back then tourists from around the world climbed into the Info-Box information center and marvelled at the gigantic project. All we hear about Russia is its authoritarianism and corruption, even though, despite all its regrettable aspects, the country is developing a remarkable dynamism. In the sciences, too, one can currently observe a kind of anarchical reconstruction which, in part at least, is producing outstanding results.

Eichwede

Mr. Rogozin, you raised a particularly urgent problem that burdens Russia's relations with the EU and the United States, namely, the Chechen conflict.

Rogozin

Putin has no idea how to end the Chechen war

The Russian administration has no idea how to end the Chechen war. Meanwhile public interest in the conflict is falling, as the people have simply become inured to the constant flow of disasters from the region.

One can assume that there are agreements in Chechnya between the Kremlin and part of the Chechen separatists that would make it possible for them to become legal and keep their weapons. Yet that would not improve the situation in Chechnya because hostages continue to be taken and the money for rebuilding Chechnya keeps flowing into murky channels. Blood revenge has become one of

Chechnya is a black hole affecting Russia's internal development as well as its relations with the EU.



Gomart

the most popular ways of solving problems. A whole generation in Chechnya has come of age knowing nothing but tanks, liquidated villages, a corrupt elite, and compromised Islamic teachers. That is why these people are joining the terrorist Jamaat group, the Islamists, and the Wahhabis. The Kremlin watches these developments idly while supporting the current power elite in Chechnya.

Frankly, I haven't been to the North Caucasus in 15 years and without having seen it for myself, I don't want to say anything about Chechnya, which is always used so readily as a litmus test for the question of whether Russia is clearly democratic or undemocratic.

I would like to talk about something that I know from my own experience, which is the fearful dialectics that was set in motion with the massacres in Beslan and the Northeast Theater. Ever since these events took place, the cancer of terror reaches ever deeper into Russian society.

It makes me worry when colleagues and friends are suddenly unable to speak about certain things because they have to respect this or that, just like during Soviet times. I don't want anything to happen to them just because they said something. I also don't want the liberation of Russian society during the 1980s and 1990s to be turned back. These small things move me, not the definition of European identity or the four common spaces or Russia's geopolitical orientation.

Chechnya is and will remain a big obstacle for the relations between Russia and the EU. Russia is at war in Chechnya. This conflict is a black hole affecting Russia's internal development that constitutes a major stumbling block for its relations to partners like the EU that emphasize democracy and rule of law when dealing with internal discord.

Europe should feel that Chechnya is as little a hindrance to EU-Russian cooperation as Russia considers the conflicts in Northern Ireland or Cyprus to be. I dare say that it is not Europe's position that Chechnya represents an obstacle. Our practical cooperation is not the least bit hindered by it.

Schlögel

Since the massacres in Beslan and the Northeast Theater the cancer of terror penetrates the Russian society

Gomart

Chizhov

Chechnya does not at all hinder the EU's cooperation with Russia

II. Goals and Instruments of Cooperation

Eichwede

This afternoon we will be talking about relations between the EU and the West with Russia. In doing so, we should keep in mind the broad lines and options for integration policy as well as the concrete agreements upon which EU-Russian cooperation is based: the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and, above all, the concept of the four common spaces. We will come to speak of the possibility that rival integration efforts coming from the EU and Russia could be causing problems for the post-Soviet region; and of the advantages and drawbacks that various political cooperation forums present, whether the OSCE, the Council of Europe, or NATO. We will also spell out the Russian and EU positions on specific issues, including transit regulations for Russians in Kaliningrad, or the energy dialog, as it has become known. Mr. Brok has graciously agreed to outline the present state of cooperation between the EU and Russia. Later, Mr. Chizhov will introduce us to security policy cooperation within the four common spaces. Mr. Brok, are the four common spaces our entranceway to a common European house, or how would you describe the future of EU-Russian relations?

Brok
presentation

The “Common European House”
as the guiding principle for
Russia’s relations with the EU

For me, the idea of a common European house remains a guiding principle for relations between the European Union and Russia. Helmut Kohl coined the phrase at a dinner speech in the Kremlin in 1983. Mikhail Gorbachev then gave the idea its actual importance. He declared, in his speech on the 40th anniversary of the Council of Europe’s founding, that the Soviet Union had a goal of erecting a common European house, the foundations of which would be democracy, respect for human rights, and the rule of law. Former US President George Bush took the idea one step further when he said in 1989 that there could be a common house only when all its inhabitants could go freely from room to room.

Yet what is the situation at the level of day-to-day politics? The EU’s relations with Russia are not based on a possible Russian accession, but on a strategic partnership complementing the European Neighborhood Policy.

Today, the concept of the four spaces is the basis for EU-Russian relations. The EU-Russia summit of July 31, 2003 agreed to deepen cooperation within the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement in four common spaces: domestic security, external security, trade, and science and culture. After two years of tough negotiations, Russia and the EU agreed on road maps towards establishing the four common spaces at this year’s May 10th Moscow summit. These road maps define common goals and lay down medium-term perspectives. The summit marked a

The concept of the four common spaces
defines the goals of EU-Russia relations ...



welcome change in EU-Russian relations, which had been quite frosty since the two sides met last year in The Hague.

Not all points of contention could be cleared away, however. No solutions were found, for example, to the problems of visa-free travel for Russians to the EU, repatriation of illegal migrants, and elimination of fees for European airlines flying over Siberia to destinations in Japan or China.

The disputed border between Russia and Latvia also needs attention. The border agreement with Estonia was signed in late May but has yet to be ratified. Here we should work to build trust because issues involving borders and ethnic minorities are particularly important because of their psychological aspects. Prompt Russian signing and ratification of the border treaties could remove much anxiety in these countries and make the minority issues easier to deal with—thus putting to rest some big worries in Moscow as well.

The European Parliament supports the establishment of the four common spaces. In May the Parliament passed a resolution that recognizes Russia's potential as a strategic partner of unique significance. Russia is not only the EU's fifth-biggest trading partner and one of its most important energy suppliers, but also an important collaborator in security policy, fighting international terrorism, and in soft security issues, such as environmental and nuclear threats; trafficking in drugs, weapons, and humans; and organized, trans-border crime. We welcome in particular Russia's willingness to work together with us in resolving regional conflicts in Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Nagorno-Karabakh.

The Parliament calls on both the Commission and Russia to take the necessary concrete steps to attain the ambitious goals of the four common spaces.

In trade, we need agreements in the areas of environment, telecommunications, transport, and energy. The need for legal security is fundamental in all areas to establish a good climate for foreign investment. The European Parliament also supports negotiations towards establishing a free-trade zone immediately after Russia joins the WTO.

The second space includes freedom, security, and law. Progress here should not be limited to visa relaxation. Tangible progress on Kaliningrad is also part of this space. The region could become a model project for visa-free travel. Other topics for discussion are strengthening democracy, rule of law, and independent media. For the EU, which is not least a community of values, human rights are of course centrally important, although we do not have to emphasize their significance to the Russians in particular.

... but does not offer solutions to problems like visa-free travel or illegal immigrants ...

... or the border disputes with the Baltic States

The Commission and Russia now have to agree on economic cooperation ...

... visa regulations, the question of Kaliningrad, democracy and the rule of law ...

A common European house is impossible
without a foundation of democracy.

Brok



... inner security ...

Given the global threat terrorism poses, inner security can no longer be separated from external security. Today's terrorists come from country A, are trained in country B, hide out in country C, whereas the leadership is located in country D and the actual target is in country E. Here we have to work together without delay to overcome trans-border problems. The EU, Russia, and America can succeed only if they cooperate. Purely national anti-terrorism laws restrict, at most, the freedom of a country's own citizens.

... and external security

In the third space, that of external security, we have important common interests, the first of which involve the frozen conflicts in the Caucasus and Transnistria. Furthermore, Europeans and Russians should think more about what they could contribute to promoting peace in Iraq. Meanwhile in Iran a fundamentalist president has just been elected. Neither the United States nor the three European foreign ministers can solve the problem of Iran's nuclear program alone. The transatlantic partners must cooperate constructively with Russia here. Russia has access to particularly important channels of influence in Iraq and Iran that we must incorporate much more strongly in our strategies. In the Mideast conflict, the Quartet of the EU, UN, United States, and Russia must finally agree on effective cooperation because they can only give credible development and security guarantees when they do so together.

Research and culture are important aspects
of Russia's relations with the EU

In the fourth area of research, education, and culture, I would consider founding a European college in Moscow as an important step in winning over young people to our common values and ideals. In any case we should not underestimate the importance of innovation and stronger cultural relations.

As for democracy, a whole series of different perceptions still exist between the EU and Russia. We must acknowledge the unique problems caused by the transformation of a country as huge as Russia. Yet the vision of a common European house and a stable and durable partnership with the EU are impossible without a foundation of democracy and rule of law.

The EU must bring three things into line: first, the goal of establishing a common zone of stability and freedom. Inseparable from this is, second, the recognition that no European state is capable of achieving this goal alone. Third, a European Union of this kind must be a community of values. If we reach these three objectives, the Union will be able to develop stable relations with Russia without Russia having to become an EU member.

Russia and the EU: Strategic Options

Thank you very much for this overview of the primary challenges and concrete political problems facing the Russian-EU relationship. I suggest we devote ourselves first to the more sweeping issues. How do you see the current relationship between the EU and what should we work towards—rivalry, partnership, strategic partnership, or integration?

Afterwards we will examine in detail the concept of the four common spaces and discuss objects of possible cooperation, such as Kaliningrad, the frozen conflicts in the immediate neighborhood of the EU and Russia, competing integration efforts in the post-Soviet region, or energy issues. Mr. Rahr, how does the EU-Russian relationship look, and how should it look?

Relations between the EU and Russia are determined by three factors: First, the transatlantic relationship, which is in deep crisis; secondly, the development of the EU as a political union is an important determinant which, two months ago, also fell into crisis. Thirdly, we are seeing a transformation process in the continent's east which is reshuffling the political deck—I need only mention the word Ukraine. What might EU-Russian relations look like in the future, for example in 15 years? I would like to sketch out two alternative scenarios that we discussed at the Petersburg Dialog's "future workshop."

The first model, the transatlantic, assumes a close alliance between America and the EU. In this case, the EU would still have a common security agenda with the United States toward the Middle East and the so-called rogue states. A loose partnership would exist with Russia and Ukraine covering, for example, energy issues. This model certainly corresponds more closely to the ideas and wishes of a majority of the German and European elites. According to opinion surveys, more than three-quarters of all Germans consider repairing transatlantic relations the most pressing problem for Germany's foreign policy.

Allow me now to present an alternative model for the year 2020. The Americans and the Europeans have a strategic partnership, yet cannot find common ground any more in many economic and security issues because the Europeans no longer support the American security agenda and economic competition between the two is increasing. There is no more alliance in the sense that we know it. For the Europeans this model offers the scenario of an enlarged Europe in which Russia and Ukraine provide the necessary raw materials—I do not consider the supply

Eichwede

Rahr

In 2020 Russia and the EU could ...

... either maintain a loose partnership ...

... or the EU, Russia and Ukraine converge into an enlarged Europe

2020: A changed Russia converges
with a changed European Union.

Rahr



of energy from the Middle East to be as secure as others do. Simultaneously these countries can become important pillars of European security policy. Perhaps the terrorist threat really will force us to close ranks with the Russians. East Europe needs the European Union more and more as a partner for modernization, which leads to an integration without special emphasis on European values. Establishing an energy alliance that respects the interests of the transit countries and strengthening the OSCE (including the establishment of a European Security Council) could be an expression of this integration. Finally, the partnership between Russia and EU-Europe as a common project for the 21st century could even encompass a joint anti-missile defense system, which would be a huge confidence-building step. Some might call such ideas dangerous Eurasian dreams, but I can imagine the world in 2020 will see a changed Russia converging with a changed European Union.

Intellectual games notwithstanding, I think that a durable strategic peace is possible only by engaging Russia and the other post-Soviet states with EU Europe. We need a strategy of engagement in place of a mere neighborhood. It doesn't have to be complete integration in the form of membership, but the EU would be well advised to revive its original concept of a "wider Europe" instead of the bureaucratic talk about "neighborhoods".

Sometimes I ask myself whether we realize the historic opportunity Russia is now presenting us. In his speech to the Bundestag in September 2001, President Putin offered to combine Russia's wealth in natural resources with the technologically more advanced EU region. I interpret that as an offer of establishing a new kind of coal and steel union. The energy alliance is the first step in this direction. Can you tell me any time in the last 300 years when an offer of this magnitude was on the table? Russia, which despite its Slavic and Orthodox traditions is incontrovertibly a European state, wants to become a constructive part of European civilization. Political implementation would be extraordinarily difficult, but letting this opportunity pass by would be irresponsible, I think.

There has never been a greater opportunity
to integrate Russia into Europe

Reiter

In the relations with Russia, the EU
must not put aside its values

Distinguishing between a community of values and interests will not work, no matter how attractive it might appear for Russia. The EU represents its interests within a framework that the Union, as a community of values, determines. The two cannot be separated. And that applies in particular to our relations with Russia. Towards Pakistan, for example, conducting a purely interest-based policy and leaving values aside might work under certain conditions and within a limited scope. Russia, however is such a close and important partner, and the EU so en-

The EU should not only support individual groups of self-styled democrats in Russia.

Grinberg



twined with Russia, that separating the EU's values from its interests there would be practically impossible.

Russia's troubled relations with the Baltics constitute a challenge to the EU's solidarity. The EU's strength has always been the equal incorporation of smaller member states and must remain so.

Evaluating human rights, democracy, and civil society in Russia, the Europeans apply their own criteria. That is not very productive. Of course, Russia has a lot of areas to catch up in, after all, we are a very young and therefore fragile democracy. Consequently, our country might well still display authoritarian tendencies. Yet real life is progressing beyond the wood-cut categories of "democratic" and "undemocratic," and Russia's developmental path is difficult to predict. The EU would do well to support all institutions of civil society instead of just a few individual groups of self-styled democrats.

To me it seems problematic when the *acquis communautaire* is automatically taken as the sole foundation of identity and values in an enlarged Europe. First, the values of Russia and other non-members should also be respected here, and secondly, values and democratic principles were never as decisive for European integration as the EU sometimes claims these days. The founding of the EEC in 1957, for instance, had very pragmatic reasons, namely to prevent a new conflict between Germany and France by transferring control of the coal and steel industries to a supranational institution.

Mr. Karaganov, what does Russia want from the EU?

During the romantic phase of its political revolution since 1989—I am still waiting, incidentally for the counterrevolution that every successful revolution requires—Russia opted very emphatically in favor of Europe. We even wanted to become a member of the EU and NATO. As Prime Minister, Vladimir Putin was the first political leader since the days of the Tsars to state the goal of leading Russia into the circle of European nations, which became known as the Europe First strategy.

This strategy is now being questioned for two reasons. First, only now is Russia beginning, in terms of domestic politics, to walk down the path of a functioning nation state, a path the EU member states took 40 or 50 years ago and have since already partially exited in favor of supranational integration. In this way the dif-

Grinberg

With their norms of democracy and human rights the Europeans apply the wrong criteria to Russia

Chizhov

Eichwede

Karaganov

After 1989 Russia wanted to join the EU ...

... but today the construction of a functioning nation state is the center of attention

The Russians dream
nostalgically of lost greatness.

Kobrinskaya



ferences between the EU and Russia will grow larger, until someday when Russia again closes that gap. Second, Russia feels rejected by the EU.

Kobrinskaya

I think integrating Russia into the EU would be difficult simply because this would represent a psychological problem for the Russian people. After World War II the German people recognized their culpability and were willing to relinquish some of their national sovereignty. Now, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian people are resentful and dream nostalgically of lost greatness. There will be a lot of convincing to do before they are willing to integrate with supranational structures. More than 70% of the Russian population wants their motherland to play the part of a great power, yet less than a quarter are willing to make personal sacrifices for it.

Still, a majority of the people support closer relations with Europe, and not only because they expect Europe to bring economic advantages, quicker modernization of the state, and more security.

Rahr

There are individual voices within Russia's political elite that are open to a limited abdication of political authority over the longer term. At the moment it is unimaginable that Russia would partially transfer authority for its military or political decisions to a supranational body. On the other hand, Putin once said that Brussels could one day become the capital of all Europeans. Yet no one is preparing the people in the least for this kind of prospect. I therefore think that Russia is pursuing a kind of dualism, that together with the EU, Russia should construct Europe's architecture in the 21st century.

Grinberg

Russia should not strive
to attain EU membership

Some oligarchs—whose influence has, incidentally, recently been weakening significantly—claim Russia has but one choice: to join the EU or defer to China. Even leading politicians and other members of the Russian elite argue along these lines, and not while drinking tea or vodka, but officially. I, on the other hand, am convinced that Russia not only has no chance of joining the EU, but moreover should not strive to become a full member. Nevertheless, Russia is indisputably committed to European values and strives for close ties in the areas of economy, science and technology and security.

Gomart

Russia's policy towards the EU is determined by its demand to be treated on an equal footing, its anti-*acquis communautaire* attitude and its arrogance toward

Russia does not have a reliable partner—
not even the EU.



Generalov

the EU in the area of security. On that level, only NATO is considered an equal partner.

Today, Russia faces great challenges, especially its demographic development, the border conflicts in the Caucasus and Central Asia, and the fear of Chinese expansion. In the worst case scenario, Russia will be facing collapse in 20 to 30 years. Because we have no reliable partners or allies—not even the EU—we Russians have to rely all the more on our sovereignty and our own strength. That necessarily comes at the expense of democracy in our country, and acceptance to supranational institutions such as the WTO meets increasingly with criticism. While Russia's big corporations see themselves as part of the global economy, smaller and mid-sized companies look only to the domestic market. In this situation, Russia has no other option but to develop into an independent, central power.

Mr. Generalov, your vision of a looming demise that Russia must avert alone and without any allies seems to me a clear indication that, despite demographic and various other threats, Russia need not dejectedly give up its role in Europe and become just one of many European countries. Your country is and remains an important part of Europe while remaining an important part of Asia. If one keeps in mind that Russia belongs to Europe, yet stretches beyond Europe as a world power, then perhaps it was not only romantic ardour that moved Russia closer to NATO and the European Union. Perhaps it was a thoroughly sensible perspective that would do justice to Russia's twin significance as a European country and global power.

The extent to which the Eurasian power Russia turns toward EU Europe depends primarily on Russia itself. This is where factors such as democracy and rule of law come into play. Instead of just referring to the OSCE, we should use it and strengthen it. The Council of Europe's latest report on Russia has determined that in recent years, democracy, rule of law, and media and electoral freedoms have not improved. These kinds of developments in Russia can hardly be considered an opening up towards Europe.

What effects will the 2008 Russian presidential election have on Russia's strategy towards Europe?

It would be wrong to expect policy toward Europe to be turned on its head by the presidential election coming in 2008, depending on whether a rightist or leftist

Generalov

Today, Russia has to rely on its sovereignty and its own strength

Schäuble

Russia is part of Europe, but, as a world power, stretches way beyond Europe

The extent to which Russia turns towards the EU depends on Russia itself

Eichwede

Rogozin

The Russian people and the Russian leadership want closer ties with the EU.

Kulik



candidate wins. That is because the proponents and opponents of closer ties with the EU are distributed among all parties, both right and left. There are leftist pro-Europeanists and leftist isolationists as well as rightist ones. My own party, Rodina, which can be considered left-of-center, supports close ties with the EU.

Kobrinskaya

The consequences of the presidential elections in 2008 for Russia's EU policy are hard to foresee

It's true that it will hardly matter for Russia's relations with the EU whether the right or the left comes to power in 2008 because there are pro-European forces on both sides of the political spectrum. Poland is a perfect example of how a country can continually move closer to Europe despite changing governments with varying political tenets.

Kulik

The most recent survey by the Levada Institute shows 78% of Russians supporting expanded relations with the European Union, without wanting membership. Both the Russian people and the Russian leadership want closer ties with the EU.

Eichwede

Russia therefore wants to come closer to the EU, but not become a member. Mr. Karaganov, you said earlier that Russia feels rejected by the EU. How do you judge the EU's conduct?

Karaganov

The EU is not prepared for a convergence with Russia

The EU is in no way prepared for a convergence with Russia. Early in the 1990s with the Treaty of Maastricht, the EU put its relations with Russia on the back burner and lent them greater importance only later in the decade. Today, however, it has become clear that Russia is not part of the EU's idea of the New Europe. Not that we do not regard ourselves as Europeans or that the West disputes our European character. Politically, however, even Ukraine after the Orange Revolution is considered a more European country. That is unjust, and I think my old Ukrainian friend Dmitry Vydrin would agree, because, at most, Ukraine lies closer to Europe only geographically. Ever since it has become clear that there is no European perspective for Russia within the EU, all summits and negotiations have remained practically devoid of content and seek only to maintain a friendly atmosphere. This culminated in the establishment of the four common spaces, which are completely vacuous and represent only a declaration of friendly intentions. Russia is not being integrated into the European project.

Gebetsroithner

I disagree. Of course we cannot work with Russia in building up the EU because Russia is not a member and does not want to become one. And naturally Russia

Russia is very much a part of the greater European project.

Gebetsroithner



had no say in the EU's integration of the Baltic states because that was a matter between the Union and its accession candidates. However, Russia is very much a part of the greater European project of the EU's relations with our common neighbors.

But Russia's wish for an equal partnership between the EU and Russia in building up Europe in the 21st century is something the EU wants just as little as does the United States.

I doubt that the EU will have a proper policy toward Russia as long as it fails to coordinate the four common spaces with the new neighborhood policy. And to be honest, I think that such a coordination will be very hard to achieve. The EU does not really have a Russian policy and probably will not have one any time soon.

I must forward the allegation that the European Commission has no real Russian policy to those who are really responsible for it. The EU has a strategy only insofar as its member states permit.

The Commission should voice this allegation a bit more audibly.

As far as I can tell representatives of the European Commission say so every chance they get, but perhaps not loudly enough.

The European Union, just like the United States, does not seem to regard Russia as a strategic partner. That is shown by the hesitancy with which visas are awarded, or by criticism of human rights violations, which is much more vehement compared with Turkey. Also, the wave of nationalizations or, more accurately, the rollback of privatization in Ukraine does not seem to particularly worry the EU. Had this taken place in Russia, an absolute uproar would have ensued.

The European Union needs good relations with Russia. It needs a strategic partnership with this big and important neighbor. Obviously this neighbor has problems, but who doesn't? And despite our concerns, despite our necessary criticism that I clearly formulated earlier, I want to emphasize: a stable, democratic, and economically strong Russia is in our deepest interest. A partnership of this Russia with a reformed, economically revived Union would have enormous potential. I would

Rahr

Gomart

In the foreseeable future the EU will not develop a coherent Russian policy

Gebetsroithner

von Weizsäcker

Gebetsroithner

Generalov

Schäuble

The EU wants a strategic partnership with a stable, democratic and economically successful Russia

Russia and the EU are in danger of falling
into the ranks of second-class powers.

Karaganov

like to ask the Russian participants what kind of partnership they are seeking between Russia and the EU. It is important to us that you clearly articulate your expectations.

Generalov Of course, all Russia's problems would be solved most effectively through a strategic partnership. The business community hopes that our politicians recognize this and act accordingly.

Rogozin I can hardly bear listening anymore when Europe is called Russia's strategic partner. In Russia, Angola is called a strategic partner just as much as is South Africa or Bulgaria. That is a compliment, not a definition. Of course, the EU really is a strategic partner, the only one in economic matters. Russia conducts 56% of its foreign trade with the states of the EU, and only 5% with the United States.

In military matters, on the other hand, our attention is directed mainly at the US because the EU has no uniform policy regarding Iraq or Afghanistan. To become a strategic partner here, the EU must first develop a common foreign policy.

Kobrinskaya I think the EU can also profit from a partnership with Russia because Russia extends into Asia. In contrast to the stagnating EU, this region will continue to grow dynamically and gain in importance. When the focus of the world shifts to Asia and the transatlantic axis is replaced by the transpacific axis, all lines of communication will pass through Russia.

Karaganov
Russia and the EU can only implement their
foreign policy ambitions in alliance
with each other

A strategic partnership is important for both sides. Both Russia and the EU are threatened by growing instability in much of Central Asia and the Caucasus. Moreover, both are in danger of falling into the ranks of second-class powers. Demands in Russia that we must finally again become an autonomous and sovereign great power are unrealistic, given our falling population, shrinking gross domestic product, and demographic pressure from China. Meanwhile, as the EU searches for a new identity, it will also be distracted from its goal of becoming established as a greater world power for at least the next five years. Both sides can make their foreign policy ambitions happen only in alliance with each other.

Eichwede If both sides are interested in partnership, why are reciprocal relations so difficult? Or aren't they?



The relations between Russia and the EU are in a state of crisis at several levels. First, their internal situation: the future of the European project is as unclear as Russia's future internal development and geopolitical orientation. Second, their lack of consensus: Russia and the EU were unable to agree on a common strategy for Ukraine even though such an agreement would have been of utmost importance. Third, their standing in the post-Soviet area: even though the EU and Russia might still think they could call all the shots if only they could agree on a common strategy, they are no longer the sole political actors in the region. In Georgia, for example, Turkey plays an important role, and the United States is a major actor in Ukraine.

Relations between Russia and the EU are hampered in no small way by deficits in communication. I think most politicians in the EU have yet to understand that Russia does not want to be integrated in the EU according to the EU's norms. Russia wants to meet the EU as an equal partner. Many voices in Russia to be taken seriously say unmistakably that, given its mentality and culture, Russia will never decide to become just one country among many in the EU. What we in the EU need is better understanding of Russia, to understand Russian attitudes and react to them appropriately.

On the other hand, understanding of Europe in Russia also needs improving, through a European college or a long-overdue Europe ministry. In Russia there are still far too many prejudices against and mistaken opinions of the EU.

As you talked about perceptions, I would like to differentiate between two perceptions which we tend to mix up. When we say that the EU has problems in its relations with Russia, what we mean is that we have a problem with Putin's Russia. The tendencies we see as negative are not structural parts of Russia, they result from a development of Russia under Putin during his second term as President.

Actually, I am quite optimistic. A few years after the Potsdam Conference in this room, as we know, NATO was founded in 1949. The motive behind it has been famously and very undiplomatically formulated as "keep the Americans in, the Russians out, and the Germans down." Today in Europe, we are seeing, in a way, the opposite tendency, to "keep the Americans out—they don't care much anyway, keep the Russians in and the Germans up."

Gomart

Lindner

Russia wants a partnership at eye level

Byers

Chizhov



Himmelreich

The EU's partnership with Russia must not go at the expense of the transatlantic relationship

If I may, cooperation between the EU and Russia can and should never ignore the effects of that relationship on ties with the United States, even though Russia plays a completely different, i.e. more important role for the EU than does the United States. Whether it's Iran, Central Asia, the South Caucasus, Iraq, or the fight against terrorism, the first step for the EU has to be to define its own position. As unlikely as it is that they could all be solved by Russia and the USA alone, Russia and the EU should never succumb to the hubris that they could master them by themselves either. It is no coincidence that the title of our Round Table is "Russia and the West" instead of "Russia and the EU." We need a trilateral approach, despite the difficulties that three-way relationships usually have. Getting Russia on board with the West—something that is in Russia's own best interest—will be one of the near future's great challenges to foreign policy and diplomacy. Stabilizing the South Caucasus is impossible without constructive contributions both from the Russians and the West. Should the trilateral approach fail there, it would have immediate effects on the North Caucasus and therefore Russia's stability itself. Also, the importance of getting Russia into this trialog cannot be overemphasized given the increasing competition from China and India for Russian and Central Asian energy resources. This trialog naturally assumes that Russia is willing and able to part company with its old mindset of a Soviet-era superpower with imperialist claims to its near abroad.

Gebetsroithner

When it comes to problems like Iraq or Iran, it's true that the EU and Russia often find a common line more easily than the EU and USA. As important as it is to remember the transatlantic dimension, agreement between the EU and Russia in such issues must be seen positively, and we should promote it and very purposely work toward it.

Generalov

The level of trade between Russia and the US proves that we are not a very important partner for America.

Rogozin

I think the crises of the EU and the CIS are giving us a wonderful opportunity for a new beginning. If, after the collapse of the CIS, Russia's leadership no longer knows whether to align itself with Europe, China, or the United States, and the EU is likewise mired in aimlessness, the East—with Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus—and the West, meaning EU-Europe, could turn a new page of mutual relations and create a unified Europe.

Our overarching goal must be Russia's transformation into a functioning democracy and market economy.

Warlick

If the Union takes the British option of continuing to expand without further integration, it should offer Russia a perspective. It is in the EU's interest to anchor Russia to Europe. We do not need a formal membership, but we must feel part of the new Europe. A strategic alliance, initially in security and later expanding to other areas, would give Russia the clear objective it wants to see.

The United States does, indeed, not necessarily see Russia as a long-term economic partner. The level of trade between the US and Russia is miniscule, it is equivalent to US trade with Costa Rica. Therefore, the economic relations between Russia and Europe are of much greater importance and the EU should stress this dimension even more.

The US would like to expand its trade with Russia, because we believe that a strong trade and investment partnership will greatly foster our relations in general. It would be misleading to judge the strength and importance of the commercial relationship between the US and Russia purely by its current levels in comparison with current Russian trade with the EU. The European markets are located at Russia's front door. As to US investment in Russia, we have worked to expand our energy relationship, but the Yukos-related events of the past two years have raised investors' concerns about the security of their assets in Russia. But there are also signs of hope. A reduction in Russian aircraft tariffs for example, a US priority in the negotiations regarding Russia's accession to the WTO, could significantly boost our trade relationship.

Our overarching goal must be to make Russia's transformation into a functioning democracy and market economy a success, because only that can guarantee stability. Therefore, we favor Russia's integration into as many European and global multilateral institutions as possible. We supported its integration into the G7—now G8—and support Russia joining the WTO and eventually the OECD as it meets the necessary criteria. The commitments accompanying Russia's integration into these institutions will help it on its way toward reform. Accession will and must depend on the fulfillment of specific criteria. The speed of integration into various institutions will therefore vary and, in each case, depend on Russia's willingness to make progress and take necessary steps.

Let's turn our attention to the future: Will Russia and the EU put their respective difficulties behind them and open a new chapter in their relations?

Karaganov

Hill

The USA does not take Russia seriously as a partner, as the level of trade shows

Warlick

Eichwede



Byers The fact that Europe is in a state of flux at the present time provides us with a unique opportunity to develop the EU's relationship with Russia. The United Kingdom wants to make the relationship with Russia one of the key priorities for our presidency. We want to use this defining moment of the EU to build on and improve our relationship with Russia in a very practical way. There is a common agenda in the area of security and the fight against terrorism, in the area of energy supply, of trade and also of infrastructure and transportation. Substantial progress in these areas will demonstrate to the citizens of the EU how beneficial a good working relationship with Russia is for both sides.

Schäuble Dear Mr. Byers, I welcome this announcement just as much as the remarkable speech Tony Blair gave in the European Parliament. I am looking forward to seeing the British presidency implement these statements. You will certainly have us on your side.

Lindner
Instead of planning integration the
EU and Russia should devote their time
to solving their problems together

Whether the EU pushes ahead with political integration or not, I am convinced that given today's common foreign policy challenges, integrating Russia in the EU would hardly be the best choice. Integration always means a loss of steering capability, especially in the immediate aftermath. Given the demographic disaster that will hit both the EU and Russia in the coming years, or in light of the threatening situation in Iran, we have neither time nor resources to integrate Russia. It is much more important for us to solve these common problems as partners.

Stolpe You're absolutely right. Practical cooperation in solving real problems is currently the EU's foremost priority. It results in greater understanding and possibly more integration.

To give an example from my immediate field of work as transportation minister, the Four Axis Project, as it's called, is a collaboration by the German, Polish, Belarusian, and Russian railroads to optimize administrative and technical procedures for the main rail corridor to the CIS, the Berlin-Warsaw-Minsk-Moscow-Nizhny Novgorod line. The growth of freight traffic along this line present huge opportunities for savings and improving efficiency. Also under serious consideration is using the Trans-Siberian Railway from Vladivostok to Moscow and connecting railways for freight traffic from East Asia to Western Europe, which would opening up a substantially faster route compared to shipping.

Russia and the EU finally
see each other as strategic partners.

Likhachev

To prevent tanker accidents we have agreed with the Russians voluntary accompaniment by EU pilots in the Baltic Sea. It is voluntary because otherwise we would have had the reciprocal obligation of providing Russian pilots for all EU ships heading through the Dardanelles. Even though transport routes are seldom in the spotlight, one should not underestimate what is going on here in real and symbolic progress.

Exactly eleven years after signing the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement on June 24, 1994, Russia and the EU are finally beginning to see each other as strategic partners.

Russia's relationship with Europe is, without doubt, still a particularly emotional one. The way in which the Russian participants here at the table ask certain questions about Europe over and over again, either with one another or to the others, reminds me a little of some characters in Dostoevsky who, after returning to St. Petersburg from Baden-Baden, start every day with a conversation about the situation in Europe—what the weather is like, what political winds are blowing, and what people live there. But let's take a rational look at the situation.

But the days of fulsome declarations of love and confidence, followed by the resulting profound disappointments, are over. Let us hope that, instead, a time of pragmatic and concrete action is beginning. I, for one, see great successes and possibilities, for example in the energy dialog. On the one hand we have lost important opportunities. Time was wasted both in setting up the joint commission on Kaliningrad and in the decision to make the European navigation system Galileo compatible with Russia's Glonass.

Today, the EU and Russia can much better gauge their joint perspectives and take on responsibility as strategic partners. I am optimistic that the Russian Federation and the EU will integrate their strengths, so as to no longer remain isolated poles in the new world order, but become a united pole that brings its influence to bear on global problems. The path there is laid down in the road map to the four common spaces.

The Four Common Spaces

Let's turn now to the oft-mentioned four common spaces. Mr. Brok has expressed doubts that we can enter the common European house through these four spaces. Mr. Karaganov even called them declarations of intent with no substance. Mr.

Likhachev

Still, Russia's relationship with Europe is an emotional one ...

... but now a time of pragmatic partnership is beginning

Eichwede

The document on the Four Common Spaces
has no content whatsoever.

Karaganov

Chizhov, as one of the Russian delegation's leaders in the negotiations, how do you see them? And Mr. Karaganov, is there really nothing good about this agreement?

Chizhov

The four common spaces are a good framework for Russia's cooperation with the EU

The approval of the four common spaces shows that the European Union's crisis is not fundamentally throwing EU-Russian relations into question. On the contrary, current problems in the EU and the world can be addressed only within the framework of closer cooperation between Russia and the EU. Globalization has opened up unimagined possibilities on the one hand while, on the other, exacerbating existing problems and creating new challenges. Moreover, Russia's and the EU's—certainly positive—reciprocal dependence is only increasing.

At the May 10th Moscow summit this realization prompted the approval of road maps for four common spaces between the EU and Russia, the establishment of which had already been agreed on in May 2003, well ahead of EU enlargement. Separate schedules regulate cooperation for the coming years in the four areas of economics, external security, justice and inner security, and education, research, and culture. The road maps also give our cooperation a tangible framework that stretches beyond the initial 10-year period of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and the EU's Wider Europe strategy.

Karaganov

The four common spaces lack any substance

I admire you, Mr. Chizov, as chief Russian negotiator and all the diplomats involved. We now have a document even though there is absolutely no substance between the EU and Russia, since we lack concrete cooperation. How was it possible to create something wonderful out of nothing? These 67 pages of vague text are even harder to read than the European Constitution and have no content whatsoever.

Generalov

There is no timetable ...

What I miss in this document is a realistic plan for implementation. I chose to work in the business community instead of in politics because in business, one can achieve real results with real projects. I doubt whether that will be possible within the framework of the four common spaces. The goals are clear, but the means and the time frame remain unclear. Yet establishing a common economic space is precisely where these aspects are essential.

One sees in the document that private business representatives were insufficiently involved in its negotiation. At the summit in The Hague in November, the EU did not think it necessary to invite European business leaders to talk to the many such leaders from Russia who were present. A European business friend



even told me that EU representative had explicitly advised him against attending because, they said, it wouldn't be worth his while. The Western press often says that all business circles in Russia are run by the Kremlin. It seems to me that this remark would fit the EU much better than Russia. These kinds of experiences only strengthen euroskepticism in Russia, even among Russian business leaders. And the road map lacks specific deadlines.

Mr. Generalov's remarks were so illuminating that I feel confirmed in my preference for recruiting managers rather than politicians for the party apparatus of Rodina.

A concrete agenda is missing from relations between Russia and the EU. Instead of coming up with a business plan for expanding our cooperation we compose full-length declarations of intent over four spaces and road maps, wrack our minds over new formulations, and thereby keep ourselves busy with irrelevancies. We are falling into the EU trap of producing endless rafts of paper instead of coming to grips with real problems.

Do you know what I would do? I would approach the matter like a businessman, sit down at the negotiating table, take a piece of paper and divide it into two columns. On the left I would put all the disputed issues, such as Kaliningrad, visa questions, energy dialog, and infrastructure. Then, both sides would make statements on the matters, and then in the right column we could write down people and deadlines for getting to the problems solved. We will never make progress any other way.

I think it would be naïve to try to solve political problems with business plans. Given the complexity of our political challenges, many problems today can only be put on the back shelf to be solved later.

The road maps for the four spaces do not include any time plan, because the EU refused to set any. I would have welcomed a time plan, but my negotiating partners said that as long as the future of the European Constitution remained unclear, they could not enter into any time commitments. That did not leave much room for negotiation.

I doubt that the EU refused to discuss a schedule for the four common spaces because of the constitution crisis. It was our opinion that, given the appropriate

Rogozin

... and as a concrete agenda of cooperation the four spaces are of no use

Grinberg

Chizhov

Gebetsroithner

The four common spaces offer a flexible structure for the EU-Russian cooperation

political will, the four spaces offer just the flexible structure that we need to make substantial progress. We do not need any deadlines or new, institutionalized cooperation forums. We need the willingness to do constructive work.

Kulik

Mr. Rogozin, you would like to completely redefine our relations with a blank sheet of paper at the negotiating table. I know that there are proponents of such an approach in academic circles. But I have not yet heard any constructive and concrete ideas from them. Alternatives should always have a sound intellectual basis, though, especially when such important matters are concerned. So far, I see no alternative to the existing mechanisms of solving problems and creating new impetus for further improving our relations.

Rogozin

Of course it isn't easy to solve real problems. But remaining on an abstract or global level reminds me of an old Soviet joke about a collective farm. At the general meeting, two questions are on the agenda, first, construction of a cow-shed, and second, building up Communism. After it becomes clear from the discussion that acquiring the necessary building materials for the cow-shed will be difficult, the chairman of the collective stands up and says, "Comrades, since we don't have the building material for the cow-shed, I think we should proceed directly to building up Communism."

Karaganov

I think the problem of negotiations over the four common spaces is rather in our disagreement over what way we should go, and therefore we spend the time haggling about irrelevant things.

Gebetsroithner

I would very much like to build the cowshed first. And if there's not enough building material, let's at least take care of the cows together. What I'd like to see from the Russian side is concrete suggestions for solving concrete problems.

Gomart

What will follow when the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement expires in 2007?

I agree that the agreement on the four common spaces is of limited use without benchmarks and a timetable. A clear schedule is indispensable especially if we think of the expiration of the EU's Partnership and Cooperation Agreement in 2007.

Brandenburg

We will discuss in due time what will replace the current Partnership and Cooperation Agreement after it runs out in 2007. Should we extend it in its current



form or replace it with something new? Some elements will be outdated because of Russia's accession to the WTO.

I would, however, like to throw a more positive light on the EU's relations with Russia and on the road maps to the four common spaces. With nobody—not the US, Canada, or Ukraine, or the states of the European Economic Space—does the EU have a more closely-structured network at all levels, than with Russia. We have to exploit this advantage to make the relations between the EU and Russia more effective.

The critics of the four common spaces underestimate the noble intentions that are expressed in this document. This is a road map that is meant to point the way. As a Chinese proverb says, "Do not be afraid of going slowly. Be afraid of standing still." In this sense, the concept of Four Spaces is a success.

I think that adoption of the road map for creating the four common spaces marks the presentation, after 24 months of difficult talks, of a solid and pioneering political document. Perhaps it includes too many declarations of intent and not enough concrete regulations. Yet it opens the way to a cooperation that do not want to call "integration" or "partnership," but "integrative cooperation."

Allow me to highlight three positive aspects of this document. First, it continues in the tradition of the successful Helsinki Final Act of 1975, in which signatory countries entered into commitments that are still binding today.

Secondly, the road map includes references to existing international treaties that both Russia and the EU have adopted. These references support the road map's normative mechanisms.

Third, practically every line of these complex constructions works toward establishing target norms, orientation norms, and possibilities for verification to which the justice systems of the EU and Russia will both have to converge on. That is something truly decisive and very positive. Yet one cannot expect Russia to simply transplant EU law. That would be an illusion. Instead, the goal should be a kind of synthesis on the basis of international law, respecting the sovereignty of both sides. This is all the more important as the Russian legal system has not yet completely matured and will continue to change as more and more reforms are put in place, not to mention when Russia joins the WTO next year.

The road map points the way toward integrative cooperation between the EU and Russia, permits the two partners to coordinate with each other, and gives

Grinberg

Likhachev

The Road Maps of the four spaces allow for "integrative cooperation"



them additional international weight, whether in resolving conflicts, stopping WMD proliferation, or discussing human rights issues.

von Studnitz

You touched on a crucial subject. While Russia expects its integration with the EU to be based on a synthesis of Russian and EU law, the EU can and will of course not depart from its *acquis communautaire* that has been adopted by 25 member states. Russia and the EU should not try to base their cooperation on agreements below the level of the *acquis communautaire*, but try to achieve common goals on a higher level.

Kobrinskaya

I think the term integrative cooperation within the framework of the four spaces is a very helpful one because it is neutral and makes possible thinking about the perspectives of EU-Russian relations. The shape of the agreement—a road map for four common spaces—has, to my mind, several advantages.

Firstly, delays in one space do not automatically cause delays in others. The cooperation progresses at an appropriate pace. Incidentally, the fact that there is no conditionality of a possible membership can also be seen as an advantage.

Secondly the document demonstrates that Russia is a special partner of the EU. It distinguishes Russia from the rest of the EU's new eastern neighbors, with whom the usual action plans within the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement were agreed, through a separately negotiated and singular concept of cooperation.

The road map for the four spaces does not, however, answer the question of where Russia will stand in its relations with the EU in 10 or 20 years. That answer will have to be provided by Russia itself.

Kulik

As for the road maps, all relevant ministries and experts took part in the negotiation process, and these papers are an objective compromise with our EU partners. A negotiation is a two-way-street. Now, it is time to fulfil the paper's requirements.

Likhachev

It is important that we should develop joint mechanisms to monitor the implementation of agreements we have already reached. Currently that is still a weak point—there is no control by the people, politicians, or business. I suggest that at the Russian president's coming summits with the EU troika, progress in implementation be regularly examined. Also, in the Commission for Inter-

The four common spaces characterize
Russia as a special partner of the EU

So far there are no mechanisms to monitor
the implementation of the agreements

The UK will make the EU's relationship with Russia a key priority for the British EU presidency.

Byers

parliamentary Cooperation we should establish a body that would monitor implementation by the executive, in order to give the parliaments a stronger voice.

We might have a good roadmap to the four common spaces, but do we also have the right vehicle to go along that road? I fear that this vehicle is almost stalled. Therefore, I think that Tony Blair's intention to make the EU's relationship with Russia a key priority for the UK's presidency is of such great importance. Russia will have an opportunity to contribute to these relations within the frameworks of the G8 when it will take over the presidency from the United Kingdom next year.

Byers

Touchstones of Cooperation

After we examine the strengths and drawbacks of the four common spaces in general I would like to open a discussion of their individual aspects.

Eichwede

Allow me to make some remarks on security cooperation within the four common spaces. The respective road map combines the directives of Russian foreign policy with elements of the European Security Strategy of 2003, which is barely remembered today. Therefore it amounts to an ideal conceptual platform for discussing a joint foreign and security strategy between Russia and the EU for the 21st century. Russia has discarded many prejudices left behind from the Cold War in the interest of establishing a security policy cooperation based on mutual interests. Allow me to sketch out some areas of this cooperation.

Chizhov

presentation

Security cooperation within the four common spaces comprises ...

One area, I believe, would be in fighting terrorism. It is a cornerstone of European cooperation and an essential element of both the external and domestic security common spaces. The catastrophic events in New York, Madrid, Beslan, and Moscow all demonstrate that the world has become less secure in recent years. This endless wave of terrorist attacks has been made possible because, in fighting terrorism, we do not coordinate our efforts enough. The terrorists exploit that mercilessly. Therefore, Russia is making every effort to convince its international partners how necessary it is to adopt unified standards in fighting terrorism. We are counting on close cooperation with the EU, both in continuing to develop international law and the UN's anti-terrorism measures, and in blocking terrorist access to weapons of mass destruction and narcotics trafficking, especially in Af-

... the fight against terrorism ...

... the solution of the frozen conflicts in
Transnistria or the South Caucasus ...

... and better military cooperation

Kobrinskaya
In the field of security NATO is
Russia's most important partner

ghanistan. We hope that Russia's G8 chairmanship in 2006 will provide additional impulses for cooperation in these areas. Even before assuming the chair, we would like to approve a joint paper with the EU on a strategic partnership in WMD non-proliferation, with which we could further develop the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, which was begun at the 2002 G8 summit in Kananaskis.

Russia also wants to join hands with the EU in addressing the so-called frozen conflicts in our common neighborhood. On its own, the EU would not be able to achieve much in Transnistria, the South Caucasus, or in Central Asia. However, joint peacekeeping missions to these regions will be impossible as long as Brussels alone decides whether and how long to send them while refusing to allow Russia to participate in their planning and subsequent leadership. As a result, we had to decline taking part in peacekeeping and policing missions several times—the police mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina being the only positive exception. We have often asked the EU what it might have against a Russian-led mission with EU participation, but never received an answer.

Indeed, military cooperation in general between the EU and Russia should be better coordinated, not least with regard to the European Defense Agency. A start here could be direct contacts between representatives of the Russian Defense Ministry and their European counterparts from the EU Military Committee and the EU Military Staff.

We also need better coordination in protecting civilians, the importance of which was shown vividly by the tsunami disaster in South Asia, the Central European floods, and the wildfires in Southern Europe. Russia has accumulated wide experience and considerable capabilities in fighting natural disasters and other catastrophes.

Also, the fora of our security policy cooperation, i.e. regular meetings between Russia and the EU "troika," talks among experts, and working-group level contacts, are definitely viable. Yet we must make sure that clear mechanisms actually translate the results of these consultations into coordinated action. Only then will our cooperation rest on a new foundation.

At present the EU's security policy potential is insufficient to constitute an equal partner for Russia. That is why Russia maintains close ties with other institutions, primarily NATO. Russia and the EU can work together effectively on external security policy only through NATO or the OSCE, the UN, and the G8.



Anyone can agree to fight terrorism together. Yet even trying to define terrorism hits upon many unresolved issues. There are profound differences between the EU and Russia here. On the one hand we are of course very grateful that the Russians are willing to find a solution to the frozen conflicts. However, we are disappointed again and again because of Russia's frequent hesitation during concrete projects or its backtracking on the subject of cooperation within the OSCE.

Happily, the Russians are especially interested in cooperating in conflicts in our common neighborhood. The Union must shape its policy in this region more coherently and make sure it is taken seriously as a player. Russia is its equal partner in this effort.

Examples of functioning multilateral cooperation can be found in Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, the Middle East, and Iran. An EU representative for Central Asia will soon be appointed. We are ready to work with Russia to end the conflicts in the South Caucasus. In Georgia, the EU is the number two donor after the United States. In Transnistria and Moldova there can be no solution without Russian participation—both conceptual and practical—nor without the EU playing a part either.

One of the crisis points in external security today is dominating the headlines: Iran's nuclear program. Will Russia and the EU find a common line here?

The election of the radical Islamic mayor of Tehran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, as President of Iran, is a great foreign policy challenge that we can rise to together. In Iran the Council of Guardians may have the last word, especially in important foreign policy issues. Together with the country's new, significantly more radical government, however, this body will be even less willing to compromise when it comes to Iran's nuclear policy. This could produce a manifest crisis in the near future. The three chief actors in resolving this crisis are the United States, the EU, and Russia.

A specific question is directed at each of these actors. The first question is pointed at the EU: How willing are you to refer the crisis to the Security Council and thus hold up your side of the possible consequences, meaning economic sanctions? The second question is for the United States: How much sense does it make to be diplomatically represented toward Iran for decades by Switzerland and to reject all direct contact? The third question is for Russia: At what point would you

Gebetsroithner

Brandenburg

Cooperation with Russia works in Kosovo, in Kyrgyzstan ...

Eichwede

Thumann

... and hopefully in the case of Iran

EU diplomats in Georgia seem to me
like tourists seeking adventure.

Chizhov

be willing to break off civilian nuclear cooperation with Iran, as a means of applying pressure? Russia has the strongest non-military leverage in Iran at its disposal in this cooperation and the threat to stop it.

Chizhov

How can the West possibly complain
about the election of Ahmadinejad?
These were free elections

Everyone in the West seems quite shocked at the outcome of the vote in Iran. Yet permit me to ask one basic question. Weren't these the free and fair elections that the West has always been demanding? Western democrats can actually only be satisfied at the election of this candidate and say, 'That's democracy in action,' right?

Secondly, I think that Mahmoud Ahmadinejad won this election not primarily as a fundamentalist, but as a populist, and the blame rests with the counterproductive Western pressure on Tehran. So think well about what your reaction will be if, on the basis of free and fair elections in Uzbekistan, a fundamentalist wins instead of Islam Karimov.

Eichwede

Another conflict in the area of external security is closer: the Russian border with Georgia. Russia accuses the Georgians of not doing enough to prevent terrorists from infiltrating into Chechnya through the Pankisi Gorge.

Himmelreich

Russia blockades the OSCE's efforts to solve
the Russian-Georgian border conflicts

The OSCE would be a very suitable instrument for solving the problems in securing the Russian-Georgian border. Yet its mandate was not extended because Russia was unwilling to extend the OSCE border monitoring mission. I fear that establishing additional diplomatic instruments and searching for new formulations within the four common spaces will not help us move forward as long as we do not converge in the substance of foreign and security policy beyond expanding economic relations. The political will for such steps seems to be missing at present.

Chizhov

In Georgia, the EU's contributions
are negligible

As for Georgia, border protection is the responsibility of every independent state. Because there are definite weaknesses in Georgia's border controls, we support the proposal to improve training of border guards with the help of the OSCE. Yet, EU diplomats seem to me in this question like tourists seeking adventure. I hope that, in my frankness, I am not offending them, but isn't it true that EU representatives are moving around in a dangerous region without wanting to take responsibility for whatever is happening there, or even for themselves? If the EU wants to protect the Georgian border with its own personnel, just as Russia does on its side of the border, we would gladly oblige. We can certainly negotiate more easily with the EU over conditions in the Pankisi Gorge than with Georgian



President Saakashvili. Yet it does not seem to me that the EU is ready to take on that kind of responsibility.

The entire post-Soviet region is a proving ground for EU-Russian relations. Will we be seeing competition for spheres of influence, will we succeed in harmonizing our integration models, or even develop new, joint approaches?

Russia is a pole of attraction for its neighborhood. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians work there, many more than in Hungary or Poland. And in spite of Georgia's European aspirations, the 25% of its GDP created by Georgians working abroad is generated mainly by the 500 thousand to one million Georgians working within Russia. Eurasia's economy is still tied to Russia in many ways and Russia does already have an alternative economic space at the grassroots level, irrespective of the political crisis at the top in the CIS.

Russia might be integrated with its post-Soviet neighbors through the many Georgians working in Russia, in the use of Russian as the lingua franca, or in the fact that all these countries have Russian-language TV stations. Yet Russia's social system has lost any attractiveness it may once have had. Moscow can force breakaway CIS states back into its orbit only through massive intervention. The revolutions in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan illustrate that clearly enough. The populations in the states of the post-Soviet region have integrated with Russia out of objective necessity, yet feel little attraction to Russia. Trade between the EU and the United States has also risen steadily since the early 1990s without the two societies feeling any more sympathy for each other than in 1991.

Russia's landmark economic integration with the post-Soviet region is not adequately reflected in political relations. Although the economic existence of a majority of the people in the post-Soviet region depends on the money earned in Russia, this fact does not improve political relations in any way. Georgia is a good example. Perhaps the experts have a point who say Russia should stop selling its energy resources at discount prices and therefore indirectly invest in countries from which no political returns can be expected.

I might be the only one in Moscow who opposes ending the discounts on energy and commodities supplies to those CIS states that are turning toward the EU and

Eichwede

Hill

The Eurasian economy is closely integrated with Russia

Himmelreich

Kobrinskaya

Grinberg

Important political camps in Russia regard the post-Soviet region as a Russian sphere of influence.

Lindner



Should Russia end the discounts on energy supplies to the post-Soviet region?

rejecting full-scale integration with Russia. I think that in the long run such measures would hurt Russia even more than the recipient countries.

Lindner

We are seeing competing tendencies in the post-Soviet region, with equal amounts of cooperation and competition between Russia and the EU. The question is which of the two will gain the upper hand.

I could imagine that competition would increase. The chairman of the Duma's foreign relations committee, Konstantin Kosachev, has for example called it Russia's sacred duty to help the states in Russia's neighborhood. As other Russian politicians, he has avoided actually recognizing these states' independence. This shows that important political camps in Russia still regard the post-Soviet region as a Russian sphere of influence.

Likhachev

Of course Russia is pursuing its own interests towards the CIS states. Yet we unconditionally recognize Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and the other countries as sovereign states.

Lindner

Belarus might cause a conflict between Russia and the EU

Belarus will be the test case for whether Russia and the EU are capable of cooperating in external security matters. If the Lukashenko regime keeps coming under pressure and its repression of both the population and foreign actors increases, the country could become a focus of contention and competition between Russia, the EU, and the United States. I hope that timely negotiations will help avert such a scenario.

Rahr

Russia is now experiencing the second phase of its empire's collapse in the post-Soviet region. Let's be honest, the CIS is at an end. Russia is now cooperating only with Belarus and Kazakhstan. Ukraine is practically in the West. In the Caspian region, the Americans became established as the dominant power at the latest when the Ceyhan pipeline began operating.

Russia is watching the West advance its interests in the post-Soviet region and is thinking of revising its relations with these states as a result. Moscow has understood that it can not reintegrate its neighbors forcibly. The Kremlin watches Western cooperation with political NGOs full of suspicion. Russia is afraid of even more "revolutions."

The European Union should demonstrate to Russia, for instance through offers of far-reaching energy agreements, the advantages to be had from cooperating

In Russia, there is an irrational fear of supposed EU integration designs.

Gebetsroithner



with the EU. That way Brussels would show Russia both another way to converge with the West and an alternative to thinking in terms of influence zones.

Europeans often say Russian imperialism is coming back to life. Utterly irrational fears exist toward any kind of efforts at integration in the post-Soviet region, even toward negotiations over cooperation in aviation and space travel, or the textile industry. Given the dominant position of Russia—70% of the post-Soviet region’s potential lies in Russia—this integration is already hard enough to implement even though it makes sense for everyone involved. The increasing primitiveness of the region’s economies is in no one’s interest, while all would benefit from reviving the scientific and technological potential from Soviet days. Every post-Soviet state can decide independently what alliance it wants to join. Yet until it reaches that point, i.e. that Ukraine joins the EU, it will be in everybody’s interest to see its economic structures stabilized and strengthened, in part through close cooperation with Russia.

I’m very surprised to hear your diagnosis of the EU’s “irrational fears” of supposed Russian integration efforts in the post-Soviet region. My experience is, much to the contrary, an irrational Russian fear of supposed EU integration designs. Believe me, if we wanted to integrate these states in our common neighborhood we would be asking them all with open arms to seek membership. We are not doing that because we are not following a policy of removing states from the Russian sphere of influence. All we want is that our common neighbors be able to decide for themselves in a free and democratic manner what political system and foreign policy they want. I might add that in our contacts with the common neighbors, our mantra to them is “get your relations with Russia in order.” That has resulted in plenty of criticism, for instance from our Ukrainian partners, who have more than once accused us of cowardice towards the Russians.

One should not force the countries of the former Soviet Union to choose between Russia and the EU. Instead, we should make sure together that the integration processes remain compatible, and that they progress toward establishing a united Europe without dividing lines.

The third article of the preamble to the road map of the four common spaces lays down the objective of moving forward together through an intensive dialog, without requiring that either the EU or Russia dispense with their own initiatives.

Grinberg

The integration of Russia with the post-Soviet region would be of advantage for everyone

Gebetsroithner

Let the countries of the post-Soviet region decide freely on their political orientation!

Chizhov

The relationship developing between Russia and Turkey might become strategically very important.

Hill



This article of the preamble is a golden compromise achieved at the end of long and difficult negotiations. It was disputed until the very last moment.

A functioning integration with both the EU and Russia is the best way to safeguard stability. This is not a zero-sum game in which one side loses and the other wins; but one in which both sides win.

Warlick

In the long run, a fusion of the EU's Common Economic Space and the Single Economic Space encompassing Russia would seem to be an attractive outcome from the perspective of the US.

Hill

There is the danger that the Russian-Turkish duo will turn against the EU

I would like to draw your attention to another area. The new relationship developing between Russia and Turkey might become strategically very important. Three years ago, I heard favorable comments about Turkey from Russian politicians for the first time. Today, three million Russian tourists visit Turkey on an annual basis; Russians have displaced Germans as the largest tourist group within Turkey and the trade between Russia and Turkey amounts to about 15 billion dollars. Within the next decades, this relationship could prove to be a transformative one for the region just like the Franco-German relationship was after the Second World War. To appreciate the significance of their rapprochement, just think about how many wars Russia and Turkey fought against each other. It is in the European Union's interest to see to it that this relationship is not a negative one directed against an EU that has rejected both Turkey and Russia. We need a positive relationship based on the insight that Turkey and Russia are part of a much larger common endeavor in everybody's neighborhood.

Eichwede

Ukraine could be the place where EU and Russian power collide most directly. What kinds of developments can we expect from this country?

Karaganov

I think an EU perspective is very important for Ukraine, to give the country some orientation after its revolution.

Reiter

I would also say it's dangerous to reject a country that is earnestly seeking a rapprochement with EU. That's a situation with a great deal of destructive potential.

Warlick

The US would like the EU to be as supportive as possible toward neighboring countries that express an interest in joining the Union. A membership perspective for

The integration of Ukraine into European structures is the sole guarantee against devolving into a feudal democracy.

Vydrin



Ukraine, for example, would have an important stabilizing effect that we would welcome very much.

I think the decisive thing is to let all European states decide for themselves—in line with the CSCE Final Act—how they want to align. If we take this aspect seriously, we can no longer think in terms of influence spheres.

At a conference in the Livadya Palace in Yalta one week ago, I heard completely different opinions on the subject of Ukraine than the ones here that recommend EU membership. In that room, where, as here, Stalin and Churchill negotiated with the United States over Europe's future, Ukrainian politicians sat together with lawmakers from the Duma. The Russians argued that only a rapprochement with Russia, and not integration with the EU, could bring prosperity to Ukraine. Europe, they said, stands for restrictions in trade, in legislation, in finance, in accounting and bookkeeping, and many other areas.

The Russians do not understand that the Ukrainian elites absolutely want to integrate their country into European structures not least because of these restrictions. Just as for Romania, this is for us the sole guarantee against devolving into a feudal democracy, in which political, economic, and criminal clans manipulate the instruments of democracy to their own advantage. Ukraine will accept many short-term inconveniences because of the willingness of the country's elite to accept democratic restrictions for an EU perspective in return.

If, however, Ukraine's path to Europe remains blocked, the positive developments under the new leadership, such as the abolition of the humiliating customs controls at Kiev airport—will sooner or later change into their opposites. The still-weak political elite will not have the strength to resist the temptation of using its power for its own gain.

A majority of the Russian elite appears not to comprehend that Russia would profit from Ukrainian EU membership. The Russian-Ukrainian border region is currently a hotbed of corruption where, through the illegal exploitation of Russian oil and gas supplies, 90% of the black-market money in Ukraine and half of the total in Russia is generated. This black market obstructs normal economic development in both countries, and an end to corruption in Ukraine through EU accession would serve the interests of both countries.

The Russian minority in Ukraine would also benefit from EU accession, because Europe often represents the interests of ethnic Russians in other countries

The US wishes for an EU membership perspective for Ukraine

Brok

Vydrin

Russia points out the advantages of a rapprochement with Russia for Ukraine

Russia would profit from Ukraine's accession to the EU, because Russia suffers from the corruption in Ukraine as well ...

The Euro-Atlantic prince
will betray the Ukrainian girl.

Rogozin



Ukraine would be an advocate
of Russia's interests in the EU

better than Russia itself. When I was a professor at the Slavic University in Kiev, it was Germany, not Russia, that gave me the necessary money to buy Russian textbooks and computer software. And whereas in the 26 meetings between Presidents Putin and Kuchma the issue of the Russian language was not raised once, the European Commission has already warned President Yushchenko several times since his term began four months ago to protect the Russian language.

Finally, Russia can gain an advocate within Euro-Atlantic structures if it supports Ukraine's European integration. That is because, sooner or later, Ukraine will join the EU and NATO with or without Russia's support. If Russia helps Ukraine now, Ukraine will later look after Russia's interests in return. If, however, Russia torpedoed Ukraine's efforts and gloats over its difficulties—as during the difficult negotiations on joining the WTO—then Ukraine will one day position itself as an adversary of Russia within the EU structures. We hope that that will not be the case.

Kobrinskaya

Even if Ukrainian EU membership helps Russia and does not impair Russia's friendly relations with the EU, I still object to this veiled attempt at blackmail, that either we support Ukraine's EU bid now or get branded as a feudal democracy in which there are only economic gray zones instead of a proper national economy. The Russian experience has shown that the EU path is not the only one that leads to democracy and a market economy. Moreover I think that membership in the WTO would suffice to bring Ukraine onto the right track, even without EU membership.

Vydrin

I was speaking about Ukraine, not Russia. Ukraine's interest is not directed at its neighbors but solely at preventing Ukraine itself from becoming a feudal democracy. I do not want to tell Russia what to do.

Rogozin

Russia also had an Orange Revolution, and it took place in 1991. At that time Russia was a young girl that dreamed of its Euro-Atlantic prince. But when the prince betrayed the girl, she slowly turned into an old spinster. Please do not take it personally, Mr. Vydrin, when the old spinster warns her young Ukrainian sister against the Euro-Atlantic prince. This false prince will disappoint you too.

Grinberg

I think a joint Russian-Ukrainian economic region is still feasible and expedient. First, Russia must implement a macroeconomic development plan that does away

with the laissez-faire, laissez-aller of the last fifteen years. If this plan is conceived so that the Russian-Ukrainian economy complements that of Europe, and that both become a globally competitive economic actor together, the EU could profit as well as keep its economic standards. Secondly, Russia would have to keep providing Ukraine with cheap energy.

While we're on the subject of Ukraine, I'd like to point out a regrettable weakness in the EU Commission's New Neighborhood Policy. Morocco may be as important a partner as Ukraine, but I think it's scandalous to use the same instrument towards both within the New Neighborhood Policy. The EU must give states that cannot become full members differentiated but substantial alternatives that fit these countries' geographies, cultures, economies, and political systems.

Does the EU have a stringent concept for its neighborhood, Mr. Thumann?

Outside the EU there are fifteen states that call themselves European. Despite its many partnerships and neighborhood programs, the EU has yet to devise a unified, attractive program to engage these neighbors. Under all circumstances we must avoid giving these countries the impression that, through their partnerships with the EU, they are being treated as second-, third-, or fourth-class states. Instead we must emphasize the advantages and gains in prestige that these agreements bring.

Mr. Thumann, the EU's present neighborhood policy meets countries' needs more than adequately. We work out action plans with the countries in question, the substance of which should not be reduced to accession and the date thereof. All these countries have a need for substantial reforms, especially regarding the convergence with the EU's body of laws. We will have made great progress once these countries get down to seriously implementing the action plan's reform programs instead of constantly asking emotionally whether the EU wants them or not.

Whenever someone complains that accession is not the action plan's end product, my answer is that the end of a temporary partnership agreement is not the end of the partnership itself. The successful conclusion of a joint project results in the partnership's continuation.

If one looks at the partnerships in practice one sees that, unfortunately, the EU's partners have little to show in concrete terms. They all constantly say that

Brok

The Neighborhood Policy uses the same instruments towards Ukraine and Morocco, which is completely inadequate

Eichwede

Thumann

The EU is in need of a coherent Neighborhood Policy

Gebetsroithner

But the Union absolutely has an adequate Neighborhood Policy!



they're willing to do anything, but—and I say this honestly and undiplomatically—not much happens in practice. There are hardly any points in the action plans that we could already check off as completed.

Chizhov I fear the EU's concept for an enlarged Europe and a new neighborhood was originally supposed to turn Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova into a kind of buffer zone between the European Union and Russia. Through our productive dialog with Europe, that concept has since changed, I'm happy to say.

Eichwede Another problematic area for EU-Russian relations is in three states that have already become EU members: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Russia says Russian minorities there face discrimination and there are border disputes.

Chizhov
The border conflicts with the
Baltic states are not Russia's fault

A fair solution has already been reached with Lithuania and the respective border treaties have by now been signed, ratified, and entered into force. The negotiations with Latvia had been progressing excellently until a supplemental declaration that was unilaterally adopted by the Latvian government voided the substance of the border agreement. Latvia let its opportunity slip away. With Estonia, we did sign the treaties in Moscow on May 18—along the lines of the Lithuanian example—which laid down the national borders as well as boundaries in the Bay of Narva and the Gulf of Finland. Yet the Estonian parliament unilaterally supplemented the treaty with several references—unacceptable for Russia—to various political documents and a no longer valid treaty from the year 1920. As long as these supplements remain, we cannot proceed further and the State Duma cannot ratify the treaty—but as soon as they are removed, agreement is immediately at hand.

Eichwede Another source of dispute is the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad, which has been making headlines because of the planned meeting among Putin, Chirac, and Schröder on the occasion of the city's 750th anniversary celebrations.

Rogozin
The EU does not care for the Russian
visa and transit problems

Kaliningrad is a problem of great importance for Russia that should have been resolved long ago. Because the area around Kaliningrad became an enclave after the Soviet Union's collapse, the unobstructed access of all Russian citizens to the region has become an administrative problem.

Admittedly, Russia did not pursue the matter with the necessary emphasis for a while, and when President Putin appointed me as his special commissioner for

The negotiations over Kaliningrad were like a bad soccer game with lots of useless passes.

Kotenev

Kaliningrad, there was not much time left. In difficult negotiations during which the EU representatives displayed a startling arrogance while acting indifferently towards the matter, we managed to produce a document of initial steps that we could agree on.

This agreement from 2002, which was supposed to be an interim agreement, has since been redefined by the EU as a permanent settlement. Fine, Russian citizens no longer have to stand in line in front of the Lithuanian embassy to pay money for a visa, but what happened to the plans for an express train that would bring Russian citizens without a visa from Kaliningrad to Moscow or St. Petersburg?

The Russian public's disappointment over the indifference of the EU is one reason why supporters of the European Union are dwindling while the ranks of Russian nationalists are swelling.

Taking part in the negotiations over Kaliningrad, I felt like I was in a bad soccer game with lots of useless passes. Brussels refers us to Vilnius, Vilnius refers us back to Brussels, and so on.

Changes like the Baltic states' EU accession and then to the Schengen Agreement produced a completely new situation almost overnight, without Russia being consulted even once. We were offered talks—not negotiations—only after the fact, and these are still going on today.

If you take into consideration the stubborn transit problems and Poland's rejecting a project for an Eastern European transit network, you could ask yourself whether the EU is really interested in solving the problem at all. The Kaliningrad special economic zone is an interesting project that both sides could benefit from, but given the EU's attitude I think the "flourishing landscapes" promised by Helmut Kohl are still a far-off prospect for Kaliningrad.

As Commissioner for Kaliningrad, Mr. Rogozin was hardly a political tourist. He conducted very tough negotiations with the Commission, the Council, and the European Parliament. As early as 1999, Russia proposed to the EU the establishment of a special commission on the Kaliningrad question, consisting of representatives of the executive and judiciary branches. Yet this commission was founded only five years later, at the Hague summit in 2004. The EU wasted a full five years.

Mr. Rogozin referred to his experiences during the 2002 negotiations over the transit agreement with the EU for the Kaliningrad region. These agreements are

Kotenev

Likhachev

The EU delays the solution of Kaliningrad's problems

Brandenburg



Kaliningrad's situation is not that bad and the EU is absolutely willing to cooperate

more or less functioning, even if there are still problems in freight transit and other issues that Russia and the EU have to solve. It would be good for us to cooperate if only to avoid more reporting like that in the Russian press for months during the summer of 2002. There were threats that Russia would build a nuclear reactor on the Lithuanian border if the European Union didn't give in. Many felt like it was the Cold War all over again. Particularly shameful was the accusation that the Germans were pursuing hidden irredentist goals. This kind of polemics was of no use and does not correspond to the state of our mutual relations.

Gebetsroithner

The situation in Kaliningrad is not as bad as some say, nor is the European side doing nothing. Freight traffic into Kaliningrad has increased by ten percent, transshipping volume by 27%. The EU is also ready to provide funding for the socio-economic development of Kaliningrad. Yet without Russian recommendations on how to use the money, our hands are tied.

Solving these problems does not require a constitution or a foreign minister. We can also cut red tape in Brussels without such reforms. On the other hand, nobody is preventing Russia from, for example, finally establishing attractive conditions in Kaliningrad for foreign investors.

The reason that issues surrounding Kaliningrad are not progressing as we would like is not because the EU is failing to provide the right structures for cooperation. The problem is that we have spent our time in fruitless discussions over what groupings we should meet in.

(Protests from the Russian participants)

Gebetsroithner

No? That was certainly my experience.

Brok

Kaliningrad is an example of how individual problems can hamper general relations. Yet the region could also be a trump card for the EU's partnership with Russia. I still think the idea of turning Kaliningrad into a special economic zone is a promising one. If the EU and Russia manage to work together in this limited field, it will become a beacon for relations in general. We must make absolutely clear that nobody is questioning Russia's complete sovereignty over Kaliningrad and other parts of the Russian Federation. On the other hand we must demand understanding that the intensive and difficult negotiations over transit and visa issues are inevitable because we cannot impair the Schengen eligibility of Kalin-

ingrad's EU neighbors. I hope the EU can successfully mediate between its new member states and Russia to remove the emotionalism that has often hampered these negotiations.

The EU should devote more attention to passenger traffic. Up until now, with EU financing, it hasn't been working all that badly. In the second half of the year the European Commission wants to audit, which is only right when the project is as expensive as this one. Yet the objective cannot be to leave the burden of payment with others. The EU would be unjust to make Lithuania cover the financing, but even more unjust to put it all on Russia's shoulders. After all, we did not create the current problem with the transit to Kaliningrad. We think it is only appropriate that the EU continue to take care of the financing.

Our national interest for the future can be formulated as follows: When Lithuania joins the Schengen Agreement as scheduled in 2007, there should be no deterioration of transit conditions for Russian citizens thereafter.

That puts us right in the midst of the inner security space. Visa issues are a problem in places other than Kaliningrad. The word Schengen is not especially popular in Russia, is it, Mr. Rogozin?

Indeed, if a greater Europe is to be made attractive to Russians, they must come to sense the values for which the EU stands. The freedom of movement promised in the aftermath of the 1991 revolution, for example, never really happened. On the contrary, first Russians could no longer travel freely to Czechoslovakia, then no longer to Poland, Bulgaria, and finally not even Cyprus. The EU and the Schengen Agreement are directly responsible for that.

Many Europeans complain about how complicated it is to obtain a visa to Russia. Yet Russian citizens are confronted with similar or greater difficulties in the EU states' embassies. If we really want a free Europe without borders, we must pay attention to these practical problems. It is no coincidence that Schengen is something like a dirty word for most Russians. If we are going to speak of a unified Europe, then we should first deal with this issue, because it affects millions of people. During the negotiations over the road maps for the four common spaces, this crucial point remained disputed until a compromise formula was agreed, but the issue still awaits a practical solution.

Chizhov

Transit conditions for Kaliningrad must not deteriorate

Eichwede

Rogozin

The Schengen Agreement limits the freedom of travel of Russian citizens

Chizhov

Russia is a more reliable energy provider
than Iran or Saudi Arabia.

Chizhov

Eichwede Let's move on to the third space, that of economic cooperation. A particularly important topic in this context is the energy dialog.

Likhachev
The EU-Russian energy dialog
is a success story ... One only need look at a few figures to appreciate the extent of our cooperation in the energy dialog. Today, up to 30 percent of the EU states' oil demand and 48 percent of their gas needs are covered by deliveries from Russia. The EU's concept for its strategic development foresees those numbers reaching up to 70 percent by 2015. We can say then, that we have already successfully walked down this road.

Chizhov I see a genuinely dialectical contrast in the energy dialog: the interest in expanding economic cooperation with Russia is opposed by the fear of dependence. Realistically, the proportion of Russian oil and gas in the European Union's imports will keep increasing for the next 15 to 20 years. Interpreting that as an increasing gap in energy security would, however, be nonsense. Europe will always be dependent on energy imports, if not from Russia, then from Iran or Saudi Arabia. Compared to these countries, whose futures seem somewhat uncertain, Russia is a reliable provider. Should the deliveries be interrupted some day, it would probably be the fault of the transit countries, not Russia.

Kobrinskaya
... but the strong reciprocal dependencies
in energy policy will become a problem I think that reciprocal dependencies in energy policy will become a problem over the middle to longer term. Just as Europe is trying to dismantle its overwhelming dependence on Russian energy, Russia also wants to move into other markets than the EU, for example into East Asia.

Rogozin During the 1970s and 1980s Russia painfully experienced how exporting oil and gas leads to dependency on global market prices. A wealth of natural resources does not by itself make a great power, and Russia has always been and will always be more than the world's petrol station.

I think the European and German phobia of becoming too reliant on Russian gas and oil is misplaced. Mutual reliance between amicable partners can be a very positive thing. There is also a kind of reciprocal dependency among the states of the EU, and also among the NATO states. The simplest example of mutual dependence is marriage: giving up some personal freedom in order to achieve a new quality together.

Of course, depending on the wrong people can have negative consequences. When I was chairman of the Duma's committee on international affairs, I criticized



the dictatorial regime in Turkmenistan—and soon afterwards received a phone call from Gazprom. The management told me that, unfortunately, Gazprom could not build a gas grid in my constituency, because, in light of my recent criticism of Turkmenistan, doing otherwise would jeopardize the company's good relations with its Turkmen gas providers.

Mutual dependency between Germany or the EU and Russia, in the field of commodities, technology, investment, financial capital, and human resources, is something positive. We are not Turkmenistan and president Putin is, despite all criticism, not Turkmenbashi.

Pipelines are very expensive, and once they are built, they increase mutual dependency. Russia learned a hard lesson with Turkey after the construction of the Blue Stream gas pipeline. Gas relations between Russia and Turkey have improved the Russian-Turkish relationship, but Turkey has proven to be the more powerful partner in some respects. The Turks were able to renegotiate the already agreed-upon price by renegeing on their long-term contract with Russia. To some degree, Turkey held the Russians hostage. Russia's dependence on revenues from oil and gas sales is one of its major sources of weakness. Most of Russia's manufacturing industry that has developed well over the last years is also tied to oil and gas. For example, the production of railway cars has risen because Russia needed railway cars, in the absence of pipelines, to transport oil to China.

The Russians are very aware that their dependence on oil and gas is a weak spot and are currently debating about how to diversify the Russian economy. Energy was important for pushing the Soviet Union towards change because it was its economic Achilles heel: when energy prices dropped dramatically in the 1980s, that affected the whole of the Soviet economy.

Today, Russia is very dependent on Europe as its major consumer. Although China has changed the calculations in the entire global energy market, there are no pipelines to China. Building them would take a long time, and the Chinese have not even made up their mind about who to buy oil and gas from in the long term.

Therefore, as long as Russia has not completed a major reorientation of its export market to Asia, we should focus on an energy dialog not just between Russia and Germany, but on a much broader footing within Europe. During the Soviet period, cooperation between the Soviet Union and especially Germany in the sphere of energy was an important feature of détente. We should make much

Hill

Pipelines increase the producers' dependency on the consumers

Is it really in Russia's interest to see the OSCE die a slow death through the Russian blockade?

Thumann

more of the energy dialog within the European Union's four spaces with Russia. Perhaps it even ought to be an issue of its own instead of just being a part of one space, given its importance to Russia's long-term development.

Rahr

The EU member states are divided in energy matters

The EU is divided in energy matters regarding Russia. The Ceyhan pipeline has, for the first time, broken the Russian monopoly in the Caucasus. There is an alternative to the project of a northern pipeline in the Baltic region that's favored by other states: bringing the GUAM, the alliance of Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova, more strongly into play. The Union is in no way certain how it should act.

Eichwede

We will return to energy issues in our discussion of bilateral relations of EU states with Russia. I would now like to focus on a peripheral issue that we have often touched upon in our discussion of the four common spaces: alternative forums of cooperation. I'm thinking above all of the OSCE, NATO, and the Council of Europe. Mr. Chizhov, what role does Russia envision for the OSCE?

Chizhov

Russia wants to strengthen the OSCE as a forum of equal dialog

Russia is counting on the international order and is therefore working with the EU to strengthen the Council of Europe and the OSCE. For 30 years, the OSCE—originally the CSCE—has been playing a central role in promoting de-escalation in Europe. Important initiatives against weapons smuggling and human trafficking have been enacted under its aegis, it has helped resolve regional conflicts while promoting democracy.

Yet the future of the OSCE depends on whether it can rise to today's challenges. Russia wants to see the organization end its one-sided policies towards states outside the EU or NATO and thereby put to rest one of the last vestiges of bloc politics in Europe. The OSCE must once again become a forum of balanced political dialog among nations. To do this it will need a new approach toward security policy while enhancing also the organization's economic dimension.

Thumann

But Russia does nothing to strengthen the OSCE, on the contrary

Russia and the EU have a good opportunity to move forward together in security matters in eastern Europe and the Caucasus. The OSCE is a very important—and proven—instrument. On the other hand, Russia has been very critical of OSCE missions in the past. Is it really in Russia's interest to see the OSCE die a slow death, as is now happening through the Russian blockade?



Russia has no interest at all in a creeping demise of the OSCE. If we wanted the end of the organization, we would have long ago grown flowers on its grave. On the contrary, Russia helped keep the OSCE away from some certain failures, including the bizarre idea of sending OSCE election monitors to Iraq.

Chizhov

Today, the OSCE and the Council of Europe are in a state of crisis, and at the same time these institutions are becoming tangled up in quarrels over authority. Think of the disputes between the EU and the Council of Europe over which organization has greater authority in human rights issues, or of the contradictions in the development of the OSCE and the Council of Europe. Therefore I would recommend the establishment of a council for security and cooperation in Europe that would incorporate both major groups, namely states and international organizations. This council could help as an advisory organ in integrating its members' strengths while avoiding friction through infighting over authority.

Likhachev

How can we evaluate NATO's role as Russia's forum for communication with the West?

Eichwede

We welcome the coordinated—and therefore not competing—efforts of the UN, Russia, and NATO in building up durable security structures. Russia and NATO's constructive relations have since become an integral component of European and Euro-Atlantic stability. It follows that we are broadly satisfied with the work of the NATO-Russia Council, as President Putin and NATO Secretary-General de Hoop Scheffer reaffirmed yesterday in Moscow. As we intensify our cooperation with NATO, we pay tribute to the transformation processes this alliance is undergoing. It was with great interest that we acknowledged the Secretary-General's recommendations for strengthening the alliance's political dimension and intensifying relations with the United Nations, the EU, and Russia.

Chizhov

Russia's cooperation with NATO works quite well

NATO is probably the only organization which Russia takes seriously and relies on in matters of security.

Gomart

Russia is dependent on no one but itself. It will never join NATO, yet is willing to enter into an equitable partnership in the fight against the new threats we face.

Chizhov

III. The Role of Bilateral Relations

Eichwede

Let's turn now to bilateral ties and the role they play in Russia's relations with the EU. In conversations in Russia and Germany I've had the impression that many problems seem much more complicated in the context of EU-Russian relations than in that of German-Russian bilateral contacts. The question is: Are special relations, such as Berlin's with Moscow, a nucleus for closer ties with the whole EU or do they get in the way of an integrated EU foreign policy? Do personal friendships have a use or do they just result in all uncomfortable issues being put aside?

Mr. Schäuble, you are one of Germany's most experienced foreign policy experts, indeed THE foreign policy heavyweight of the CDU-CSU Bundestag faction, the faction which many analysts believe will lead Germany's next government after elections in September 2005. How should German foreign policy position itself towards Russia and within a European foreign policy and the transatlantic partnership?

Schäuble

It is my firm belief that integration must be the watchword of German foreign policy. Occasionally I'm old-fashioned enough to quote the preamble of our Basic Law. There it says to this day that the German nation is inspired by the desire to serve the cause of world peace as an equal partner within Europe. That is a consequence of Germany's history in the first half of the 20th century.

The efforts of the current government to gain Germany a permanent seat in the UN Security Council, establish "axes," or its talk of a "German path" is, in my opinion, damaging and ignorant of history.

A Christian Democrat-led government will ensure that German-Russian relations always remain within an EU context and a reliable transatlantic partnership instead of trying to build an "axis." As long as we're talking about geometric political constructs, then let's talk more about enlarging the Weimar Triangle of Germany, France, and Poland into a square that includes Great Britain.

From the German perspective, embedding German foreign policy into European external policy is the only viable path. Also, it alone makes stable relations with Russia possible. History has shown that special relations, especially when they're given names like "axis," become a source of mistrust, insecurity, and therefore of instability. Conversely it is in Moscow's interest to work together with all its European and transatlantic partners in the longer term, instead of putting its hopes into special relations with Germany or France. With time, the fruits of this kind of cooperation with Russia will be worth very much more than Chancellor

A Christian Democratic government
will embed German policy towards Russia
in a European context

Talking about “axes” is damaging and ignorant of history.

Schäuble



Schröder calling Putin a “crystal-clear democrat”—a statement that raised hackles in much of the world.

Although I would like to always see German foreign policy embedded in European and transatlantic terms, that of course doesn’t mean that we can no longer pursue a national foreign policy. European foreign policy must incorporate national and joint elements, and already does so with a considerable amount of success. Germany can and should make its specific contribution, through EU foreign policy, to make sure that Russia is irrevocably integrated into European and transatlantic structures.

What exactly can German-Russian relations contribute to the relationships of the EU and the West with Russia? I think that, first of all, Germany’s relationship with Russia can serve as an example of how one can create new opportunities out of the disasters of the past, out of a terrible shared history. The Germans had to learn how it’s done, but especially since the 1980s and 1990s we have seen some remarkable successes. German-Russian relations can contribute much to improving other troubled relationships, for example that of the Japanese and Chinese, or the Turks and Armenians.

Second, the EU’s Russia policy can also learn from Germany’s historic respect for the great power of Russia. Through our long and difficult common history, no one in Germany will ever regard Russia as an insignificant force, as Brussels sometimes tends to do. It could be felt, for example, during the negotiations concerning Kaliningrad. The condescending attitude of some EU officials and their conviction that they alone represent Europe understandably restricted Russia’s readiness to build up an open and constructive relationship.

However, respect does not rule out criticism when it is deserved. As essential as Russian cooperation may be to solve many global problems, we still cannot keep silent towards Russia’s crackdown in the Caucasus or the worrying developments in Russian civil society. This is the only way Germany can become a credible Russian partner in the long run.

European foreign policy can, therefore, profit in several ways from Germany’s specific relations with Russia. If we succeed in embedding Germany’s Russia policy firmly in a European and transatlantic framework, all those concerned will reap the benefits much more than through a German-Russian special relationship.

National and European foreign policies have to complement each other

Germany and Russia have learned to deal with their common history in a constructive way

Our national identities since the end of Europe's division are informed by interpretations of history.

Reiter



Historic Dimensions

Eichwede

You have raised three points: The necessity of putting German policy into a European and transatlantic context, the importance of German-Russian history, and possible German contributions to the EU's Russia policy. Let's start with the question of what role bilateral relations with Russia play in the EU's policy towards Moscow.

Reiter

All Eastern European countries have a difficult history that must be handled with sensitivity

There's always a historical aspect involved whenever one talks about bilateral or special relationships. We in Eastern Europe have special historical relationships all over the place. Everywhere one finds special common histories, clearly visible today in, among other things, the military cemeteries. Astoundingly, memories of the war are no less pronounced today than they were twenty or thirty years ago. Confronting history is the basis for determining what kind of future we want, because our national identities since the end of Europe's division are informed by interpretations of history. Old grudges and resentments resurface again and again. The only conclusion possible is to deal with these questions with particular sensitivity. We have mostly learned how to do this between Poland and Germany, but there is still a long road ahead before the same applies between Poles and Russians. Redefining Polish-Russian relations is currently Poland's biggest challenge. Yet Russia's willingness is, of course, also central.

European identity also consists of the ability to take a distanced view of one's own history

Attitudes towards one's own history are important evidence that one is part of Europe. The French historian Alfred Grosser has insightfully written that one of the traits that constitute European identity is the ability to take a distanced view of one's own history. Recently we succeeded in reopening an old military cemetery in Ukraine from the 1920-1921 Soviet-Polish War in a way that satisfied both nations. Whoever knows Ukrainian history knows how hard that must have been for the Ukrainians. But they were willing and helped their own cause most of all because they were demonstrating their own European character.

Schlögel

I think an open re-examination of our common history is essential for overcoming the crisis in German-Russian and EU-Russian relations, and so that Russia can return to the center of our interest, which is its deserved place. After a short period in the spotlight, it slipped back into the periphery early in the 1990s.

We must have the courage to talk about all the grudges, humiliations, and traumas that have punctuated our common history without making a political affair out of it. A place for communication has to emerge in Europe in which our countless, utterly divergent histories can be told. Many of these histories go beyond our power of imagination. To name but a few examples, it is appalling that a whole generation of young Russians that had to endure the forced collectivization and Stalinist repression of the 1930s was literally wiped out in World War II. Or take the history of the Baltics, which were caught between the fronts. Their historical experience has been one of seeing part of their population deported to Kazakhstan and another part murdered in German concentration camps. Sixty years after the war, we must be able to talk with one another without creating more misunderstandings. If we—and I do not mean so much the politicians as the families, the writers, the academics—are unable to talk about these things, then the future is dark. Because only once we put this century behind us will we have our heads free for other matters. That includes not only Russians and Germans, but for example the Poles as well.

Some call the Germans the world champions in confronting the past, the avant-garde of coming to terms with one's history. Without a doubt, much has taken place since 1945. Yet I would like to point out what great and deeply moving achievements in confronting a totalitarian past that the Russian people have made, and that before 1989. With all respect towards our writers, the Germans have yet to produce someone like Solzhenytsin who would have found the right words for Germany's drama. Mr. Schäuble's insight that Germany and Russia have been united through the common catastrophes of the world wars, and that valuable capital has been produced as a result, seems very important to me. And yet, this Russian-German history is always a part of European history. That is immediately apparent to anyone dealing with the topic.

It's true that a common history can provide the foundation for expanding bilateral relations, and I sincerely hope we can use this potential. Yet the falsification of history can just as easily impair relations.

For example I was recently very surprised by a prominent German politician who I otherwise think very highly of. He didn't know that the victory of the Red Army over Japan's Kwantung Army, and not the dropping of the atom bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, ended World War II. We also learned from the 60th anniversary commemorations of the end of the war in Europe that the tendency to

We must learn to talk openly about the tragic events of our history

Russia has made great achievements in dealing with its past

Kotenev

The Baltic countries tend to rewrite their history

The Baltic states completely rewrite history, especially that of World War II, with the EU's blessing.

Rogozin

rewrite history that we have long seen in Germany and other countries in so-called old Europe has now moved on into the new EU members, particularly the Baltics and in East Central Europe.

Rogozin I think it is very problematic that the Baltic states have completely rewritten history, especially that of World War II, with the EU's blessing. Japan is not the only place where the content of school text books is being changed. The same is happening in EU Europe. If history is but a reflection of what we currently think about ourselves and can be changed at any time, then I am growing increasingly skeptical over whether the classical and medieval history we have been taught really took place the way we read in encyclopedias.

Brok The 60th anniversary commemorations of the war's end also made clear within the European Parliament that the EU's member states have very different historical perspectives towards that time. For the new member states especially, the 8th and 9th of May did not mark the end of occupation, but merely a change in occupiers. These difficulties should not be allowed to interfere with constructive relations between the European Union and Russia. We Germans and the Russians, of all people, should take seriously these countries' worries and fears.

Byers
Conflicts can arise because of the careless use of symbols

Politicians have to be very aware of the importance of symbols—certain towns, for example—and diction in that context. It seems to me that the conflict about the history of the Baltic states or about the anniversaries of the end of the Second World War or of the city of Kaliningrad show clearly the potentials and the problems of building relationships on symbols of a shared history.

Rogozin The relationship between Russia and Germany was defined by fighting against each other in the two most horrific wars in world history. The millions of German soldiers' graves in Russia and vice-versa testify to that age. Another legacy is Russia's current demographic problems, which partially have their roots in the loss of the better part of a generation of men killed in battle. The most courageous, the most passionate men were the ones who died, those who attacked the enemy instead of cowering in the trenches. These men did not father any children to bear the next generation.

That is reason enough why German-Russian relations will always be special. They are guided by the mutual imperative of preventing new wars. The experi-



ence of the world wars is also a fundamental element of Russia's ties with Poland, France, and Britain.

The problems of Germany's and Russia's shared histories are indeed directly tied to the issues surrounding the special place for German-Russian relations in the EU's ties with Moscow.

Mr. Schäuble said that Germany has a deep-rooted respect for Russia. I can only confirm that through my own experience. For 60 years, I have experienced the Russian Question as one of survival, especially in the time before 1990. Remains of German and Russian soldiers are unearthed every week in Brandenburg. There alone, more than 400,000 soldiers were killed in 1945. Both countries have waged terrible wars against each other. Yet they have also kept reaching agreements over centuries and been each others' ally. There was not just the infamous partition of Poland in 1772, but also the ultimately successful Prussian-Russian alliance against Napoleon, which was sealed here in Potsdam exactly 200 years ago, in 1805.

Against the backdrop of this history, German-Russian relations must be characterized by mutual respect, pragmatic balancing of interests, and, I emphasize explicitly, respect for Poland. Since Germany and Russia have unfortunately been known to reach agreements over the head of Poland, it must go without saying that Russia and the EU members Germany and Poland should always meet at one level. The Germans have it a little easier in this respect because they have already gone through a decades-long learning process of dealing with equal partners within the EU. Perhaps they can pass on their experience to the Russians. Given Germany's unique historical responsibility, it must take the role of a mediator, of Russia's bridge to Europe. The close and friendly relationship between Germany and Russia could form the nucleus of a successful EU-Russian cooperation. For example, the German-Russian agreement in late 2004 to deepen transport ties has already born Europe-wide fruits, such as in the development of the German-Polish-Belarusian-Russian "Four Axes"-project.

The partnership with Russia is characterized by personal relationships. That is why the non-public governmental dialog is just as important as contacts between journalists, academics, and artists—or among associations, foundations, or cultural institutes. One example is the Petersburg Dialog, which has been organizing annual conferences since 2001 based on honest and equal cooperation. It is also an incubator for new ideas such as the "future workshop," which provides the decision-makers and opinion-leaders of tomorrow with a forum for discussion. Youth

Stolpe

Germany has a deep respect for Russia

Germany must be Russia's bridge to Europe

Germany's Russia policy should always be embedded within the EU's Russia policy.

Brok



exchange is something we need especially urgently. Various sponsors support a Hamburg branch office of the German-Russian Youth Exchange association.

I would like to pass on one recommendation to the EU foreign policy experts present, given the German understanding of the Russian mentality. Using checklists and ticking off bureaucratic requirements is just about the least suitable way of dealing with Russians I can think of. It is much more important to show Russian negotiating partners that one takes them seriously and makes an effort to win their trust. Only then should one turn to the minutiae of day-to-day politics. Believe me, anyone who has dealt with the Russians for decades will understand that these are no empty phrases or an attempt to shirk unpleasant talks. They are an important cultural insight.

Bilateral vs. Common European Foreign Policy

Eichwede

You see good German-Russian relations as a cornerstone for a successful EU Russia policy. Cannot too-close ties between individual countries also become a stumbling block for EU-Russia policy?

Reiter

The Russia policy of the EU member states should always be transparent

Mr. Schäuble rightly said that only a common EU policy can provide a sensible framework for the policies of its member states, yet that this does not constitute the end of national policies. What is important here is transparency.

I am puzzled why tensions emerge again and again in Polish-German relations, for instance because of the Baltic Pipeline. In Poland people feel completely misunderstood by the Germans, which is something disastrous for relations between two neighboring European nations. What is the use of political dialog and regular meetings at all levels if not to avoid such conflicts?

Of course there is room for national priorities within a European external policy. Because of Germany's centuries of common history and cultural ties, it has a special affinity for Russia. There's nothing wrong with one country paying more attention to Russia, the other to Ukraine. To put it in business terms, one buys more Russian stock, the other more Ukrainian shares. As long as these shares are being bought up by a European mutual investment fund, there's no problem.

Brok

German Russia policy, as Mr. Schäuble was right to point out, should always be embedded within the EU's Russia policy. Of course Putin wants good relations—most preferably special relations—with Germany and France. I would act the same

Germany is bound up in multilateral structures whereas Russia can operate much more freely in Europe and Asia.

Thumann

way in his place. Yet giving in to these overtures was—and here I agree with Mr. Reiter—a great mistake of German and French foreign policy. We will put aside the fears of smaller nations only once they feel that European integration has brought them on board the European vessel of decision-making, and not with the feeling that decisions keep being made over their heads.

You say that in Mr. Putin's place you would also seek special relations with Germany and France. I think that, as Mr. Putin, you would do so only if you were thinking exclusively in the very short term. Over time, these special relations generate mistrust among the member states that do not participate in them. This in turn would hurt Russia's interest in the strong and unified EU it needs as a partner.

The various emphases in the question of whether Germany and Russia should keep special relations has a lot to do with the traditions of German and Russian foreign policy. Even after reunification, Germany is strongly bound up in European and transatlantic structures. From the German perspective, then, there can be no exclusively bilateral relations—regardless of what a common EU foreign and security policy will look like in the future, with or without a European foreign ministry. Russia, on the other hand, can operate much more freely in Europe and Asia. This asymmetry also existed between the Soviet Union and West Germany.

This background illustrates particularly well why trust and cooperation are of the first importance. Simultaneously, Germany and Russia must constantly remind themselves that their cooperation could violate the interests of smaller countries in East Central Europe.

Germany and Russia have a broad foundation of bilateral relations that stretch beyond the interstate level. In the last 15 years, Germany has taken in about 2.5 million Russian citizens, from which a great amount of personal contacts have resulted.

Some 3.5 million Russians learn German—which is more than in the rest of the world put together. The Federal Republic is culturally present in 60 towns and cities in Russia, either as institutes, lecturers, or libraries. Trade relations show a similar story.

The good bilateral ties between Germany and Russia cannot and should not be replaced by relations between the EU and Russia. What we have done is hand

Gebetsroithner

Special relations generate mistrust

Thumann

Russia and Germany should not alienate the smaller countries

Brandenburg

Germany's outstanding ties with Russia ...

... are complemented by a multilateral Russia policy



over much authority to Brussels, just as our partners in the European Union have done. In these areas Russia has to negotiate with the EU. In the area of foreign policy, Germany also acts within a multilateral framework.

Of course, one cannot announce new ideas at a round table of 25 states and then expect these ideas to gain momentum. Here and only here is the place or diplomatic axes, triangles, rectangles, and other geometric constructions. During the crisis in Ukraine, for example, Germany worked closely with Poland and Lithuania, as well as France, to develop initiatives that could be agreed in consensus. On other issues we work together in other constellations, such as in the Weimar Triangle among Germany, France, and Poland, whose foreign ministers will meet tomorrow in Warsaw.

Rahr

In my opinion, individual EU member states could play a pioneering role through their particularly close ties with Russia. The fact that Germany has handed over its rotational turn in heading the G8 to Russia, meaning voluntarily moving back one place in the succession, seems to me an important sign of generosity that the Russians greatly appreciate.

A troika of Germany, France and Spain could be the core group of the EU's negotiations with Russia

The four-way summit in March 2005, in which a troika consisting of Germany, France, and Spain took the role of negotiating partner with Russia on behalf of the EU, was an important signal that a security dialog is feasible with Russia when led by a core group of European states without overstepping the bounds of NATO. Germany's and Poland's joint action during the crisis in Ukraine when they spoke for the entire EU was just as important.

Reiter

This would be like Poland assuming leadership of the EU's Morocco policy

I think the idea of a French-Spanish-German leadership trio for developing relations with Russia is absurd. I don't recommend that Poland take over leadership with Britain and Germany of the EU's relations with Morocco either, while leaving Spain out in the cold.

Gebetsroithner

Bilateral relations of individual member states should not be in competition with a common European foreign policy. Europe needs both. Special relations are good and necessary, yet must be used to further the aims of the common foreign policy. The foreign policies of the EU member states must, as Mr. Reiter justly said, be transparent enough so that smaller member states do not feel that the bigger ones are making policy over others' heads.

Europe has no common foreign policy.
Therefore, Russia will continue
maintaining its bilateral relations.

Karaganov

Every European power needs a Russian policy and a bilateral relationship with Russia. Moscow always feels more comfortable in bilateral relations with European capitals than in multilateral relations with the EU and with the administration in Brussels. Therefore, the Europeans have to find a proper combination of bilateral relations and relations between the EU and Russia. Bilateral relations should be used in order to improve the latter. Each country has its specific contribution to make.

For example, relations between Russia and France are based on old ties dating back from the imperial as well as the Soviet periods. Jacques Chirac pursues a pro-Russian policy aimed at stabilizing Russia as a strong pole in a multipolar world. Franco-Russian relations are mainly focused on security issues—in 2002 a Council for Security Issues was created and the Foreign Ministers and Ministers of Defense consult on a regular basis. In the economic area, German-Russian relations have been at the forefront.

Do our Russian participants see the future of Moscow's relations with EU member states mainly in Brussels or in Paris, London, and Berlin?

Russia has two very reliable partners in Schröder and Chirac. Their importance has only increased after the two negative referendums have put prospects for a common EU foreign policy farther into the future. Russia has a right to promote the country's interests, which includes using foreign policy lobbying. Not long ago a Brussels representative advised Ukraine to build up a lobby within the EU to better its prospects of becoming an EU member. Russia no longer has to seek a lobby because it already has its partners. If the EU should, someday, change its process of reaching foreign policy decisions, Russia will adjust and, perhaps, communicate exclusively with Brussels.

Europe still has no common foreign policy. Therefore, Russia will continue maintaining its bilateral relations with Germany, France, or Poland, instead of turning immediately to Brussels. As long as it seems the EU is going to develop into a league of states instead of a federation, you cannot expect us to negotiate with a European foreign minister who does not yet exist. Also, Germany may, through its European integration, be weaker in terms of foreign policy than during the time of Adenauer and Brandt, but it is still a foreign-policy power with which one can negotiate.

Gomart

The EU and Russia need a mix of bilateral and multilateral relations

Eichwede

Kobrinskaya

As long as there is no EU foreign policy, Russia will continue negotiating with Berlin and Paris

Karaganov

If Europe does not speak with one voice, with whom are we supposed to negotiate?

Kotenev If you want Russia to conduct its relations with the EU member states through Brussels, I must voice two objections. First of all, Marx wasn't all wrong in reminding people to keep the economic foundation of things in mind. And I can tell you, the representatives of big German companies I know see no possibility of conducting their business with Russia through Brussels.

Secondly, until Europe speaks with one voice, we cannot negotiate with Europe. Under these circumstances, it is still best for us to deal directly with Berlin.

Chizhov Henry Kissinger once asked sarcastically for the phone number of the foreign minister of Europe. Russia doesn't need that number, because Russia understands well that Europe is a multi-faceted construction that preserves its national institutions and structures while sharing responsibilities for those areas it believes it should. In continuing to pursue its legitimate national interests, Russia will work together with its partners at the national or European levels, according to where it believes it will find the most effective cooperation.

Rogozin Mr. Schäuble, I think that bilateral relations between Russia and individual EU states will always be necessary. Given our common history, it's the only possible way.

A Special Relationship Between Germany and Russia?

Eichwede Mr. Schäuble made clear that if the CDU-CSU wins power it will put the highest priority on a European embedding of German foreign policy. What do our Russian partners think about that?

Rogozin
Hopefully, a Christian Democratic government will not destroy the progress made in German-Russian relations

If the Christian Democrats lead the next government in Germany, they should keep in mind the potential of German-Russian relations and the great advances that have already been made in establishing stable ties. We cannot allow this progress to be simply rolled back, and especially not because of campaign rhetoric. If the conservatives come to power in Germany and, in 2008, the pro-European left in Russia, I hope relations will remain unaffected, much as in the Commutative Law, which states that changing the order of two addends will have no effect on their sum.

Kotenev Listening to Mr. Schäuble and other leading CDU politicians comment on German-Russian relations, I cannot help but feel that seven years in the opposition have



left their mark on the party. Recently these remarks seem to come less from foreign policy insight than from an opposition party's domestic politicking. I would like to remind you that the Christian Democratic chancellor Helmut Kohl initially alienated many Russians by comparing Gorbachev to Goebbels. Then, however, he nurtured a friendship with Boris Yeltsin that proved beneficial for both countries. The two men are still friends today and will soon meet again at the shores of Lake Baikal.

Criticism is a natural part of the German-Russian relationship, of course, but permanent criticism is not helpful. As an ambassador I have to deal with countless reports in the German media that criticize Russia's conduct toward its neighbors, both big and small. Wouldn't it be more important to make progress in the relations with the United States or the EU, or in issues of disarmament? At a CDU function last year I had to endure speech after speech dealing with Russia, the speakers practically raising their admonishing finger at me. I hope this will not become commonplace if the CDU forms the next German government.

Permanent German criticism of Russia is not helpful

I doubt that a Christian Democrat-led government would run matters very differently at all from the way they're handled now. Germany's foreign policy agenda is already determined to a large extent in Brussels, whether the issue is natural gas prices, WTO membership for Russia, or rights to fly over Russian territory.

Karaganov

I am pretty sure that a Germany led by the Christian Democrats will articulate its critique against Russia much more clearly and will no longer put so much emphasis on undisturbed special relations.

Gomart

Let's talk about concrete areas of German-Russian cooperation. How do our relations look at the moment, in detail? What works well, what could be better, and where is the greatest potential?

Eichwede

One problem for good bilateral relations is the image of Russia in the German media. The media here seem to talk about nothing else but Russia's problems even though business people and others who know Russia better have a completely different view. And it is cold comfort that reporting on the United States is also negative. As long as we deal with each other with such a lack of respect, the elites of our countries will never understand each other as well as we would like.

Kotenev

For all states, energy policy is
a powerful foreign-policy instrument.
Only German foreign policy is naïve
enough to fail to see this exploitation.

Himmelreich

Grinberg

The scientific potential of Germany and Russia
would perfectly complement each other

German-Russian relations have enormous economic potential. We already exploit this potential thoroughly and should continue to do so.

I also see great potential in the area of intellectual and scientific cooperation. Even under the Soviet reign of terror, a substantial pool of scientific expertise flourished in Russia. Russian reforms have neglected science, especially during the past 15 years. That has decimated our scientific potential so significantly that parallels to the devastating impact of the persecution and murder of German Jews in the 1930s in Germany unwillingly come to my mind. Yet we can still stop this process, and as soon as the corresponding political will is in place, I hope Germany can begin supporting our efforts. For Germany, cooperating with Russia in science and technology could be a way to keep its edge on the world market. That's because, as substantial as the Federal Republic's intellectual resources may be, they require supplementary knowledge capacity to remain globally competitive. In the meantime, Russia could profit from Germany's outstanding experience in industrial innovations.

Himmelreich

Germany sometimes forgets about *Realpolitik*
in its close relationship with Russia

I sometimes fear that Germany's nostalgia for centuries of cultural and historical association with Russia has caused the country to forget about the *Realpolitik* in this relationship. In Washington a few days ago, Henry Kissinger said that the struggle for energy reserves in the Eurasian region would probably resemble the Great Game of the 19th century. At that time, European states fought for influence in Russia's Eurasian areas and the Ottoman Empire.

I cannot understand why German foreign policy continues to support the one-sided dependence on Russian energy supplies instead of pushing for diversification. Tellingly, no German company took part in building the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline.

Gerhard Schröder and Vladimir Putin recently agreed on a plan to build a Baltic pipeline as an exclusively German-Russian project that would further increase dependence on Russian gas, both in Germany and the circumvented Baltic states and Poland. The long-term geostrategic consequences of these decisions are given far too little consideration in German foreign policy, when they are not ignored completely. Sometimes the government says the decision to build a pipeline was the private decision of the energy companies involved. That, of course, is only half the truth, as is documented by a preliminary agreement among the two governments to a German-Russian governmental framework pact that was then signed by the participating companies. Russia, China, the US, Turkey—energy policy is a



powerful foreign-policy instrument for all these states for creating dependencies or liberating oneself from them. Only German foreign policy is naïve enough to fail to see how these energy contracts are used for other purposes.

I consider the Baltic Pipeline to be a very important German-Russian project, during which one can, however, make a great deal of mistakes. In its importance it is comparable to the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline, which the Americans initiated in the 1990s and has just been completed. It will also be comparably expensive; estimates range from 2 to 3.5 billion dollars.

The decisive difference is that the Americans may have started the project, but have now been joined by five countries and thirteen international corporations. The Baltic pipeline, however, is a purely Russian-German project. It creates great mistrust in countries that are not participating. The pipeline should instead be built with other Baltic states participating. With the Scandinavian countries, with Poland, and the Baltic states, one could also inquire whether construction under the Baltic or on land through Poland might not be a better, more transparent, and more cost-efficient option.

The pipeline cannot be built as a zigzag through the Baltic for political reasons—but you certainly didn't mean that, did you Mr. Thumann?

No, I'm talking about creating mutual dependencies and avoiding one-sided dependency. In the Baltic pipeline, two countries are presently involved, Germany and Russia. Because the project certainly has great economic importance, I think it makes sense, from both the German and Russian perspectives, to include other recipient countries in Central and above all in Western Europe, to turn the pipeline into a truly European project.

We currently get about 30% of our oil and 40% of our gas needs from Russia. In the new EU member states, dependence on Russian imports is much greater; in some states it is nearly 100%. I have always regarded the pipeline as a commercial project. It will be built when there is demand for it and when it can be financed.

The Baltic pipeline is not just a question of *Realpolitik* and geopolitics, but also of economic interdependencies. It does not only make Germany more dependent on Russian energy, but also renders Russia more dependent on Germany as a consumer.

Thumann

The Baltic Pipeline is an important project during which one can, however, make a great deal of mistakes

Brandenburg

Thumann

Other Central and Eastern European states should be involved in the construction of the Baltic Pipeline

Brandenburg

Hill



Grinberg

The pipeline will not lead Germany
into a one-sided dependency ...

I believe that concerns over a one-sided Russian dependency on energy and fuel exports are exaggerated, because demand for Russian raw materials will remain strong for the foreseeable future. In the same vein, one should not be too worried about a one-sided German dependency on Russian supplies, given Russia's dependence on machinery exports from Germany that will even increase in the course of the modernization of the Russian manufacturing industry.

Chizhov

... and Russia guarantees energy
security for Germany

If Germany is interested in secure energy supplies, I would recommend building the Baltic Sea pipeline through as few transit countries as possible, because the fewer countries that can interrupt the flow, the securer the supply will be. Build the pipeline as was originally intended, under the Baltic Sea directly to the German coast!

Kobrinskaya

I cannot agree with Michael Thumann that the Baltic pipeline will lead to unilateral dependence. Russia already has experience with pipelines running through Poland. During the late 1990s we argued with the Poles for three years without result while seeing an extensive anti-Russian campaign in the Polish media. As long as countries such as Poland and Lithuania use external disputes with Russia for domestic political purposes, then Russia will think of its Turkish experiences when building the Baltic pipeline. We will pay attention not only to the costs, but also to the reliability of those taking part. During the course of our long common history, Germany has been, all in all, a very dependable partner.

Rogozin

There are two souls in my breast regarding the possibility that the Baltic pipeline project could yet fall through. As an opposition politician I am looking forward to the opportunity of criticizing the Russian government over the collapse of its grandiose plans. On the other hand, the building of this pipeline would be important not only for Germany and Russia, but for all Europe. Therefore the patriot and European in me wants to see this project succeed.

I think the European idea should prevail over selfish and closed-minded interests. It can also be very dangerous to take advantage of global powers' weaknesses and gleefully commenting on their misfortunes. A world power with a chip on its shoulder is apt to behave very disagreeably once it has overcome its crisis. Just think of Imperial Germany after World War I and the Treaty of Versailles. The humiliation was avenged only in 1940 once the French had signed their capitulation in the same train carriage as the German delegation did in 1918. Afterwards

We have to avoid the impression of a German-Russian-French axis at all costs.

von Weizsäcker

the site was blown up. Humiliations are incubators for future conflict, both in big and small countries.

The planned meeting between Putin, Schröder, and Chirac on the occasion of the 750th anniversary of Kaliningrad has raised tempers even more than the German-Russian pipeline project has. Are the big EU states Germany and France making bilateral policy with Russia while forgetting that they are part of the EU?

I am very happy that I can express my opinion of the celebrations in Kaliningrad in a position of complete independence. As a good friend of everyone, but also willing and able to criticize good friends, I must quite frankly say that, in this form, the meeting is a grave political mistake.

Haven't we yet learned that we have to avoid the impression of a German-Russian-French axis at all costs, even when all three countries have the same position on a particular issue? We should have learned as much from the US invasion of Iraq, at the very latest. I was glad for the French that they could use their opposition to the invasion to stand out for once as a permanent member of the UN Security Council. Yet watching the Germans stand by their side, call in the Russians as reinforcements, and then have to idiotically use the historically-loaded term "axis" as a name for the whole thing was so clumsy that one can only hope that the political public has a very short memory.

And now please tell me: Why, if Putin and Schröder meet in Kaliningrad, does Chirac of all people have to play the third man? Why, for good measure, are the next-door neighbors not being invited? Anyone who has recently travelled to Kaliningrad knows that the way there goes through Poland or Lithuania and that the fate of this former northern half of East Prussia depends primarily on these two immediate neighbors. If the Chancellor really wants to see progress in the area around the former city of Königsberg—and I am certain that he does—then it is absolutely inexcusable for Schröder and Chirac to meet with Putin in Kaliningrad. I wish not only that Germany and France would show more common sense, but also that stronger criticism would come from the British, who could make an important contribution here to a successful common European foreign policy.

It is indeed incomprehensible why the celebrations should be planned without inviting the neighbors. Not that Poland's pride has been hurt—there are more than

Eichwede

von Weizsäcker

The meeting of Putin, Schröder and Chirac at the 750th anniversary of Kaliningrad is a grave political mistake

Reiter

Chirac plays the role of the European consort at German-Russian meetings.

Rahr

Such meetings turn the policy towards Russia into a problem for the EU

enough state ceremonies in the world. Yet I consider this German-Russian-French exclusivity a political mistake. Especially now in a Union of 25, every EU member state should be taking pains to avoid the wrong political symbolism, which could turn EU-Russia relations into an inner problem for the EU itself.

Rahr

Two factions have been fighting in Russia in recent years. The one wanted to celebrate Kaliningrad/Königsberg's 750th with international participation. The others, who won out in a way, wanted to celebrate the 60th anniversary of Kaliningrad. The one side wants to open Kaliningrad and include the EU in projects. The other wants to turn Kaliningrad into a fortress against Western influence.

Putin wants to use Kaliningrad's 750th anniversary for reconciliation with Germany

Putin wants to put a stop to this dispute and dismantle the anti-European position. He sees a second gesture of reconciliation. After the 60th anniversary of the war's end, in which the German chancellor stood on Red Square next to Bush and Putin—in an act of great symbolism—now, for the first time, a German chancellor is to come to the old East Prussia. In the eyes of the Russians that is, in light of the trauma they went through, an extraordinary act of reconciliation. France's participation really is odd at first glance, but Chirac has often played the role of European consort at German-Russian meetings, for example in 2003 he even invited himself to the Petersburg Dialog.

The Kaliningrad celebration is also an attempt to rescue and again unify the EU's Russia policy which, for instance in issues of energy policy, is seriously threatening to split apart.

Brok

EU representatives should always be present at meetings of several EU members with external partners

Mr. Rahr, this three-way meeting will not rescue the coherence of the EU's Russia policy. It makes that policy all the more difficult. Coherence would be promoted, say, by inviting Lithuanian President Adamkus, Polish President Kwasniewski, or the EU Presidency to Kaliningrad. We should adopt as a principle that, whenever the larger EU states meet with foreign policy partners, representatives of the Commission or the EU Presidency be present as the voice of those not present. Besides the Baltics, Poland and the Netherlands also poured criticism on Putin, Schröder, and Chirac's meeting. The impression was one of the big two again doing business with Russia over the heads of the little states.

Rahr

Polish and Baltic anxieties of a German-Russian axis are unfounded

With all due respect to the anxieties of Poland and the Baltics, don't you honestly think that, given the membership of these countries of the EU and NATO, their worries are unfounded? Today they are 100% integrated into EU and NATO



structures. They are equal partners and, in an emergency, the Americans would protect the Baltics with nuclear weapons. The actual situation is so clear that the non-inclusion of the Baltics in invitations constitutes, at most, a psychological problem. It seems to me legitimate for a government head to weigh these negative psychological aspects against the positive psychological effects this kind of conciliatory meeting could have on relations with Russia.

One can and should expect that a big country like Russia to show sensitivity to the historical sensibilities of the small Baltic states.

After the Lithuanians rejected our invitation to come to Moscow for the 60th anniversary of the war's end, they now complain of not having been invited to Kaliningrad. You must admit that it is not very easy for us to sympathize with the Lithuanians' side of the matter. If we invite them, we're the bad guys, and if we don't invite them, we're put into a bad light all the same.

Kaliningrad's anniversary is not a bilateral affair. It is a Russian national anniversary that will be celebrated as such on July 1st to 3rd. It will also be used as an opportunity for a meeting at the highest level, among President Putin, Chancellor Schröder, and President Chirac.

However, no European heads of state concerned about the European Union would accept such an invitation without trying to bring in representatives of the neighboring countries. If we're going to keep the EU together, Schröder and Chirac must stop making agreements with Putin without consulting the smaller states. We should take seriously that the smaller states in the EU are afraid of losing their identities.

One might be justified in saying that the Kaliningrad festivities are neither a good framework nor a good time for a summit. But the meeting makes perfect sense if one considers the way that foreign policy is made in the EU. Let's be honest. Russia's conduct is a completely rational reaction to the fact that EU foreign policy is, to a large extent, bilateral foreign policy, and that the big member states play the leading roles.

When Putin, Schröder and Chirac meet in Kaliningrad to talk about the whole panoply of international issues, they reinforce the dividing lines within the Eu-

Schäuble

Russia should not offend the Baltic states

Kotenev

The Lithuanians are hard to satisfy

Chizhov

Brok

Kobrinskaya

Byers



ropean Union. After the divisions concerning the intervention in Iraq, we should try to build bridges instead of forming axes.

Chizhov

Can leaders of states not decide among themselves where and when to meet?

I still cannot understand how the upcoming festivities on July 3 could have caused such heated debates. Can't the leaders of sovereign states decide among themselves anymore where and when to meet? If memory serves me right, Schröder and Putin have met repeatedly without the Poles or Baltics feeling compelled to express at length their feelings about the choice of venue, or to explore the question of whether the meeting should be allowed to take place without them.

Brandenburg

Germany was very reserved regarding its official participation in the Königsberg anniversary on July 3rd. The invitation to the chancellor arrived only three weeks before the event was to take place. That was certainly no easy decision for the Russians. One should regard this late invitation as a gesture of reconciliation, which is doubtless the way it was meant.

Gomart

We should not see the summit in Kaliningrad as an exceptional event, but as an opportunity to improve the relations between the EU and Russia. Meetings between Schröder, Chirac and Putin have taken place several times and have proven quite useful. This format does not express disrespect for other members of the EU.

von Weizsäcker

Germany and France endanger their relationship with important partners

I only fear that, once again, Germany, Russia, and France have pursued a legitimate political aim through the use of political signals that are anything but useful for their cause. Reconciliation with Russia is definitely of primary importance and is a sign that Kaliningrad is being recognized as Russian territory, and that the European Union is committed to the welfare of this region. Still, the three-way summit endangers close relations with a whole series of other nations that are also of primary importance. The whole situation reminds me of the Iraq conflict. In any case, Mr. Rahr gave the matter a very pretty, even picturesque accent by calling France the European consort.

Schlögel

With a little more diplomatic feeling one could have prevented the important 750th anniversary of the grand city of Königsberg-Kaliningrad from sounding the wrong tone. This celebration should have been a celebration of unity.

Countries escape into political symbolism when there is no real political progress to be expected.

Lindner

I see the celebrations in Kaliningrad as evidence of countries preferring to escape into political symbolism when there is no real political progress to be expected. This kind of symbolic politics can also reopen old wounds—as it did in the 60th anniversary celebrations in Moscow—and we can only hope that the celebrations in Kaliningrad will not open additional wounds.

At this Bergedorf Round Table we saw that Russia's relations with Europe and the West are showing progress in many areas. Yet, we have also seen skepticism—whether the EU will last as a reliable negotiating partner, whether Russia is willing and able to be part of a constructive partnership, and whether the current instruments of partnership suffice. While the one side emphasizes that Russia has long ago become part of the West, Russian representatives complain that the EU does not want Russia to be part of the European project.

Allow me to add two personal remarks: First, seeing two countries that have caused each other so much pain now define themselves so closely connected culturally fills me with hope for the German-Russian relationship.

Secondly, I am certain that material interests cannot replace a common European vision. They can be only the foundation for cooperation, such as in energy. Some think that Russia and Europe are already so complex a construct that there can be no common, integrated vision. That more integration automatically means less identity. I would like to reply with a quote from a completely different context: More important than the rule of truth is the republic of ideas. In our Round Table we have experienced that the citizens of this republic are already here and engage each other in highly constructive discussions. Closeness brings more ideas, and helps both sides.

For 40 years now I have been taking part in conferences with the great state of Russia, 30 of which were in the Bergedorf Round Table, and I must say, our conference here in Potsdam was the frankest that I can remember in all these years.

Once again, we have seen how important a common European foreign policy is. Only once Germany embeds its special ties with Russia in this policy will we be able to adequately confront Russia, and only through a common European foreign policy will the EU become a partner that the United States takes seriously. I hope that Britain will contribute actively to further development of European foreign policy. Tony Blair took the initiative in developing the common foreign and security policy. Europe's foreign policy needs the British, their pragmatism, their

Lindner

Eichwede

German-Russian reconciliation raises hopes for the future

von Weizsäcker

The EU needs a common foreign policy, especially with respect to Russia

The challenges are so great that Russia,
the EU and the United States have no
alternative to comprehensive partnership.

von Weizsäcker



political weight, and their strategic competence. I hope that Tony Blair's political activity during the British presidency will implement the announcements of his truly impressive speech in the European Parliament, which was the speech of a truly passionate European.

It has also been made clear that despite all the problems and differences of opinion in the EU's relationship with Russia, we can and will continue to develop our partnership. The fundamentals are there, as is the political will on both sides, although perhaps not as much as we would prefer. Above all, the challenges are so great that we have no alternative to comprehensive partnership. International terrorism, transforming the post-Soviet region, the conflict with Iran or in Iraq, and ensuring energy security are challenges we can meet only when united. We can achieve prosperity and stability only once Russia, the EU, and the United States are ready to work together, truly and in confidence.