

THE BALTIC FORUM'S 12TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

**THE EU AND RUSSIA IN 2007:  
NEGOTIATING A NEW RELATIONSHIP**

25 – 26 May, 2007  
Maritim Park Hotel, 1 Slokas str., Riga

**Panel discussion  
THINKING DECADES AHEAD: IN SEARCH OF A GLOBAL VISION FOR EUROPE**

**Eldar Mamedov:** How is Europe likely to evolve in the future? Will it remain a vaguely defined geographical entity with no global reach, or will it become a value-based community? In this context, what are the borders of Europe, and should the borders of Europe equal borders of the EU? Two countries are especially relevant for this discussion: Turkey and Ukraine.

**Dace Akule:** As you well know, today Europe is both a value-based community, and it is located in one geographical location, namely Europe. This is not only what the current treaties say, this is also what the European Constitution says; and this is also what people say: they believe that only European countries can join the union. But the perspective of a Turkish EU membership in sight, what according to some EU member states is rather questionable (especially now, with a new French president being against), one could actually easily say that Turkish EU membership actually strengthens the values-based element while geographical location is becoming less important, as only a small part of Turkey is geographically in Europe. The EU in the future will, I think be a more value-based community. The question then, of course, is not only what values is it based on? But also which countries could still join the EU. As to the basic values, democracy, rule of law, human rights, pluralism, protection of minorities and market economy - I don't think these values are going to change radically. I also think Europe will continue to place where different religions (and here I oppose what the previous speaker said), not just Christianity, but also Islam (especially when the Balkan countries and Turkey will join the EU) can co-exist. The EU could also enlarge to include Ukraine. Why not? I think that for many Europeans it is also a question whether such countries as Switzerland and Norway wouldn't join at some point. When you talk to Norwegians, they do not understand why they have abide by EU standards while they have nothing to say to influence these standards. The basic principle for the EU membership in the future would be that the member states want to achieve something together and that the people of these countries want that, too. I am still talking about possible EU membership for countries that are actually in Europe, or are bordering the EU. So even if the value element will be strengthened, the political borders of the Union will still be important. But they will expand. It will still be a geographical as well as a value-based community.

**Сергей Караганов:** «Перед тем как ответить на вопросы дискуссии, я должен обратить ваше внимание на два вопроса. Я являюсь большим поклонником публицистического таланта Максима Шевченко, но я не согласен с двумя вещами. Первое, он дал оценку ЕС, которая не соответствует действительности, поэтому не заблуждайтесь, что так думают в России. ЕС как раз ныне и построен, чтобы преодолеть предыдущий интеграционный проект – завоевание войн и т.д., и все, на чем строится ЕС - есть отрицание его европейской истории и этим он как раз и заметен. Кстати говоря, ЕС создал с помощью Латвии совершенно уникальную вещь, которая называется поствоенные вооруженные силы, вооруженные силы ЕС не приспособлены для войны и не могут воевать.

И вторая проблема, о которой я должен высказаться, уважаемый господин Шевченко, сказал, что Россия так думает, Россия так не думает. Официальная позиция России ровно 100% обратная, выраженная президентом. Он говорит, что с ЕС мы хотим дружить, сближаться и т.д., но государственные каналы говорят ровно противоположное президенту. Это очень хорошо, это показывает, что в России демократия не мертва. Но это не критика, это действительно меня радует.

И теперь по поводу дискуссии. ЕС основан не на европейских ценностях, а постевропейских. Критивизм, преодоление опоры на силу, преодоление национального государства означает преодоление европейского населения. Каким оно будет через 10-15 лет, мы тоже не очень знаем. Ценности надо менять. Это первое.

Второе, географические рамки ЕС вещь бессмысленная, устаревшая давным-давно. ЕС может формально остаться в нынешних географических рамках, выйти за эти рамки, но Европа имеет уже некое иное понимание, чем это было когда-то. И это очень обширный вопрос, к которому, к сожалению, я не могу сейчас обратиться.

Теперь о том, может ли ЕС стать крупным игроком в мире, а вернее Европа крупным игроком в мире. Если ЕС пойдет по нынешнему пути, то он станет релевантным. Если ЕС будет релевантным и будет иметь будущее, то он, конечно, выйдет за свои рамки, все зависит от того, какие будут отношения с Россией. Если мы будем развиваться параллельно, что не плохо, то ЕС будет деградировать, Россия будет в ложном положении, если мы договоримся о стратегическом союзе, а не о стратегическом партнерстве, что является полной глупостью, хотя государство стремится к отношениям стратегического партнерства с ЕС, то, конечно, ничего не будет. У нас пока пауза, которая затянется лет на 5-7 до тех пор, пока Россия не определится и пока ЕС не преодолеет свое нынешнее состояние разброда и шатания, может быть, примет какой-нибудь документ, который формально позволит сказать, что он вышел из кризиса, а реально это произойдет лет через 5-8. Если речь пойдет о попытках создания дальнейшего федеративного государства, то тогда ЕС обречен. Если будут сделаны мудрые шаги – это координированная политика, когда все движутся своими путями, но координируют друг друга, а не общая внешняя политика, когда Таллинн, Люксембург и Бухарест определяют, что делают все остальные, тогда ЕС имеет возможность занимать сильные позиции в отношениях с Россией и в отношениях со всем остальным миром. Если Союз будет идти по нынешнему пути, то Россия будет не заинтересована тесно сближаться с ним. Пока мы находимся в ситуации, когда российская политика, сказав себе, что мы хотим сближаться с Европой, с такой Европой мы сближаться не можем. Спасибо».

**David Král:** I would argue that today the EU already is a value-based community, especially in the new member states that went through the accession process (but also in the other countries) we have seen this impact that the EU has had on changing the over-all political, social and economic environment in these countries. I absolutely subscribe to what Dace said, that the basic European values which we agree on will remain the same. Democracy, rule of law and human rights – these are the basic determinants. We have also seen the complications that might come when other things pop in such as Christianity. During convention on the future of Europe there was a very heated debate on whether there should be any reference to Christianity in the Constitutional treaty. I think we will have to stay there. At the same time, I would like to point out the fact that we should not identify the European Union with Europe. There are other European international organizations, such as the council of Europe that nobody talks about. Still it remains a highly relevant institution. If we will look, for instance, at the European Convention on human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the work of the Strasbourg Tribunal, we see that they actually are doing quite a lot of work in terms of making sure that the member states respect the obligations arising from the European Convention on Human Rights. At the same time, it is not only EU members that are members of the Council of Europe; it is a much larger body comprised of many other countries that are not in the EU yet. I think there is a minimum common denominator on

basis of which we can claim that Europe is already today a value-based community. What I think will change quite dramatically in the future is the nature of Europe, which is going to become much more plural. It is, actually, one of the strongest things about Europe and the EU and it is already reflected in the Constitutional Treaty. "United In diversity" is what makes Europe strong. In the future we will be confronted with the issues such as integration of third country nationals and so on.

On the definitions of borders of Europe, there have already been some attempts to at least try to define borders in the South, where we somehow naturally agree that it is the Mediterranean. In the West we have the Atlantic Ocean, so there is no problem (no one would realistically think that the United States will ever apply for the EU membership). Where we have a real problem is in the East, and my answer would be that no, we do not have to define the borders of Europe at this stage. Why should we? We have not defined the final stage – we do not know whether the EU is going to be a federation in ten years, or whether it is going to be much more intergovernmental than it is today. It is what makes the whole project so attractive; it keeps this idea of borders blurry and it gives the EU leverage over its neighbours. I think it is good this way.

**Viktor Makarov:** When we discuss Europe, we often forget that Europe is not only about government, treaties, those big projects and power play. It is also about people, about Europeans. You only have Europe when you have Europeans. You only have Europe when you have populations that call themselves Europeans. Talking about borders, we should distinguish between the borders of the EU and the borders of Europe. Regarding the borders of Europe, it is very simple. There is no such border. It is impossible to define. It is very flexible and contingent entity, which is perfectly OK. It can also change, which is good. Regarding the borders of the EU, I guess, we are going to see a much more complicated structure within the Union. We are going to see a EU in several speeds, a Union in circles. Some countries are going to opt out of certain cooperations. So, the EU is going to become (a) bigger and (b) a more complicated structure. At the same time, it has to retain its ability to take decisions. So far, as we have seen, the EU has managed to enlarge and to remain an entity that can act politically. We have seen a change towards more solidarity and towards more effective policies. So, I would not put too much emphasis on the mistakes and short-term failures. During its 50 years, The Union has achieved a lot.

Now, regarding values. There can be no EU without values. Without them there is no point in having an EU. I think that you can talk about if not special European values, then at least about special European standards for those values. One of these is something that Igor Yurgens touched upon today speaking about need for more social responsibility. The EU is probably the region in the world that has been most successful in offering its populations a decent society, a combination of freedom, including political and economic freedom, and social security. We can discuss details of particular economic models that exist in the EU, but at least Europe has been an amazing laboratory of social integration. Europe has developed democracies that are free of shortcomings of democracies in other countries such as the US, and I think we should recognize that this is an achievement. There are very high democracy standards, and Europe should insist on retaining these standards. We cannot tell every country in the world to adhere to the European standards, but, on the other hand, we could say: if you are ready to live up to these standards, you are welcome. And here we come back to the issue of borders. Can we deny Ukraine EU membership when the day comes and Ukraine is a fully democratic country with a market economy? No, we cannot. Can we deny EU membership to Byelorussia, when the day comes? No, we cannot. Can we deny Turkey membership in the EU? My answer is: we cannot. The moment Turkey fulfils the requirements, we have to say: yes, in one way or another Turkey has to become a member of the Union. Why? Because Turkey, admittedly, aiming at becoming European in terms of values. So, my answer is: there should be value standards, and the EU has not been very successful in implementing those standards, also on its inside. We can discuss how much the EU can demand from non-EU countries, but the EU should certainly do more to ask its members to be really committed to such values as democracy, protection of minorities and

freedom.

**Susanne Peters:** Are there borders for Europe? Not at all, and there should not be. For example, if I think of Israel, I would not like to exclude the option that one day Israel could join the EU. There is at the moment a lot of debate on whether Israel should join NATO. So, it might, in the long run, be a good option for Israel to join the EU. We should not exclude Muslim countries such as Turkey. At the same time, we should defend ourselves. Europe is based on very clear-cut separation of church and state, and we have to defend it vigorously. For example, living in France, and presenting this position, I get a lot of criticism, but I was very much in favour of the French government's decision to ban headscarves for Muslim girls in schools. There has been an uproar in Europe, but I think it is a very good idea that religious symbols are not allowed in schools. I think we should be very clear here. And if we are clear on this, we can allow Muslim countries to join – when they have done their homework, of course. It is still up to Turkey to do its homework, and I think it is important not to give away the stick, not to give Turkey membership too early. I think they are not quite there yet. But we should not lose Turkey because, because we need it as a bridge to the Islamic world. Geopolitically, it is very, very important to have Turkey onboard, so we should not discourage them too much.

As to borders, I think Europe has turned into a fortress. I find it absolutely appalling and shameful that every couple of months boat people are drowning in the Mediterranean. If they do not die right away, and there are being sent back to a very sad destiny of economic hardship. As a European and as a German I find it very, very embarrassing that we do not help these poor people and to see the fortress that Europe has become. I think we should open up our borders a little bit again, open up to immigrants.

**Eldar Mamedov:** No discussion on the future borders of Europe can be relevant without discussion the relationship between the European Union and Russia. Approximately a year ago the former British ambassador to Moscow Roderic Lyne came up with an almost revolutionary idea that, in due time, and after all the necessary reforms, Russia should be admitted as a full member of the EU. Yet, just yesterday I was listening to the prominent Russian leader Garry Kasparov, who foresees an evolution of EU-Russia relations along the lines of the EU-Chinese relations. This means much economic cooperation, economic interests, but no talk whatsoever about integration based on common values and principles. The question is: is Russia's integration into the EU wishful thinking or a realistic prospect?

**Dace Akule:** For me this question is: whether we mean Russia's integration into the EU, or Russia's integration as closer cooperation and better relations with Europe? Better and closer cooperation is possible and welcome, even if, when we look at the exchange between Putin and the EU Commission's president, it seems a little bit foggy; I think I am one of those optimistic Latvians who believe that the relations between Russia and the Union can improve. As for Russia's EU membership, I would say that this is a rather irrelevant idea today. I think, most of us would agree that Russia has problems practicing some of the EU values, including the rule of law, human rights, freedom of speech and civil society. Having said that, I am very aware and totally agree that many European countries have to do a much better homework than they do now, particularly with regard to anti-discrimination and tolerance. We have problems with that in Latvia, too. Of course, Russia, just like Europe, can improve its performance in these areas; if Russia does so, then there is no reason for us to say that Russia cannot actually join the EU. The question is: why should Russia join an EU which in the decades ahead would be comprised of 30 countries and where Russia would have to obey by EU's qualified majority voting, being overruled by overvoted by small countries such as Latvia or Spain? Why should Russia obey by rules while it can make them itself? So, yes, better relations and closer cooperation, and I am very hopeful that we will reach that, but for the next 20 years, no Russia's EU membership.

**Sergey Karaganov:** It's not only that Russia should change. Europe should qualify. Let me remind you that Europe is collectivist, socialist, underliberal. Thanks God, it is overcoming its

adherence to nationalism and nation-state. Russia is moving in the opposite direction. It is becoming a liberal capitalist state, it is restoring a nation-state. It is restoring its Christian roots while Europeans are desperately trying to avoid mentioning the Christian roots of Europe, which is a shame, by the way. It might be that Europe will develop into an effective economic machine and a free space for its citizens, but at the same time, it would become illiberal, more influential on foreign policy and other issues. Russia in the meantime will reach new levels of growth, new sophistication of its political system. Then we will decide. Let me assure you that, although I love Europe, personally (I love the European culture and consider myself a European), I am appalled at (thankful, but appalled) what you have been doing. I am thankful for the fact that Europe has overcome its tragic history of fascism, communism, of state nationalism, wars... It was the worst continent on Earth. In terms of brutality towards its own citizens, nobody since early Middle Ages, since Genghis Khan, has done these things to our citizens, only we Europeans. I am glad that Europe is expanding. Eventually, hopefully, the Baltic countries and others will become more European and we will have less problems with them. But, Europe has to show that it is vivacious, vivid, that it is an engine of growth. Hopefully, you will go in the direction that the British have shown during the last decade with their spectacular growth. And Sarkozy aims at that, too. I am not sure if he is going to succeed, but if he does, then, Europe will probably become a much more effective machine, and then it will not only be a cultural magnet, not only a place to travel, but also an engine of growth. Then, of course, Russia will be looking toward Europe in a different way. At this juncture, we would like to live together, to trade, to travel, to lift restriction for travel, but at the moment, no one in Russia would think of becoming a part of the EU, even theoretically.

**David Král:** In order to be consistent with what I said in the first part, when I said that the borders of the EU should be open, I should also say that these borders should be open to Russia as well. The thing is that, at the moment, I see no signal of an intention from Russia to send any signs of wanting to join the EU even in the future. I think that the self-perception of Russia is that it is a power on its own and that it wants to be on par with Europe rather than to be part of it and, frankly, at the current stage of affairs I also cannot imagine not only the Russian political elite, but also the Russian population wanting to share power with other members of the union. A prospect that I can envisage is that there will be a similar kind of arrangement between Russia and the EU in the time to come that we have with Switzerland and Norway at the moment – something like the European economic area. This, by the way, would mean that Russia probably would have to adopt some of the European standards anyway. That's what Norway and Switzerland are doing. This kind of giving up sovereignty is not as obvious as it would have been as a member. I also have to manage the comparison between Turkey and Russia. I think, in Turkey there has been this long process in which the political elites have been committed to this course. Coming back to what Dace said, that Russia does not fully meet the EU standards, of course, we know that Turkey does not do either. The main difference is that Turkey has been for a very long time committed to the European course. In Russia, I do not see that at the moment. But, at the same time, Turkey is a special case. We now see the diminishing support for the EU, the population becoming more reluctant to play as Europe whistles.

**Viktor Makarov:** I will start with the question Dace raised. It is really simple, and the answer is on the surface. Why might Russia want to join the Union. I think the answer lies in something MR. Chernishov mentioned earlier speaking about that elevator-producing factory. You want to produce elevators according to certain EU standards, in order to be able to export. Now that you have to abide by these standards, do you want to participate in setting these standards? You probably do. And how do you do that? You join a certain cooperation. Now, if you are engaged in 20, 30 or 40 different cooperation procedures, then in effect you are a member of the European Union. Let's forget for a second about how many stars there will be on the EU flag. In effect, you want to join because you want influence. That's the easy part of the answer. The other part is that Russia might want to join the EU because Russia is essentially an European country and a European society. Russian are Europeans who might already now, to a high degree, share European values. There is no way of saying that Russians somehow want less democracy, want less freedom. There are a number of studies

showing that the basic demands of the populations in Europe and in Russia are the same. People want freedom, economic security. These are European values. There is the matter of interpretation, the matter of achieving effective state action to implement these values. There is a matter of consolidation the public opinion on order to create a society that adheres to these values. And here I would say that the state of things in Russia is OK. If we just look at the state of things, of course, if there is any expectation that Russia could achieve all these things in a matter of ten years, these expectations are not realistic. My suggestion is: let's take the 20 years perspective and see what we can do, what Russia can do to help Russia develop in the direction that Russians themselves obviously want: economic prosperity, social security and stability, and political freedom. What we should be concerned about is the direction things are moving in, and here I am less optimistic at the moment. But that would bring us to a long discussion about Russian politics which I do not think we should take here.

**Susanne Peters:** Why would Russia want to join? I cannot really see a good reason for that. From the EU's point of view, it is just not feasible, just for the sheer size of Russia. Just speaking of how many votes Russia would have to get in the Council of Ministers, I could see a bit of opposition to such a big country, that would defend its own interests, to be let into the EU. And I also cannot see Russia submitting to hundreds and thousand of EU laws, regulations and directives. I just cannot see how a country like Russia would submit to that. Latvia knows, you have just completed the process, how tedious and tiring it is. I do not see why Russia would do it. And I would not like to see Russia getting drowned in the jungle of the EU's decision-making procedures. I would like to have Russia onboard in the future together with the EU, to take care of the global problems, global security. It was indicated in the opposition of Russia and the EU to the United States' war in Iraq. The EU needs Russia in the future to counterbalance the US hegemony, and Russia outside the EU would be much more powerful than Russia in the EU.

**Eldar Mamedov:** there seems to be a consensus in favour of a value-based and a more open European Union. The last question then is: what difference could such a Europe make as a global actor?

**Dace Akule:** What I am going to talk about is going to be based on a project PROVIDUS has implemented here in Latvia. It was called *The European Citizens' Consultations*, where randomly selected people from all the 27 EU member states were debating the future of Europe. They looked at what Europe they wanted to live in by 2020 and what the EU could do to achieve that Europe. The conclusions from this project that ended just weeks ago is that people want a stronger and a more united Europe, and that people actually want it to be more together, more united on issues such as environment, migration and social policy. Social policy, I am sure, will raise some eyebrows here, because the EU does not have much to say on that. People also want Europe to set an example for the world when it comes to environmental protection. That means that we care not only about what environment we live in here in Europe, but also about the environment in the world. How to achieve that? What and who and which institution will do that – that is not what people care about. They care about results and about achieving these results together. Here I have to go back to the prospect of EU enlargement, and I have to say that when people talk about the possible borders of Europe in the future, and whether it can be stronger, a lot of people talk about this concept of togetherness, or "us against the other". This is changeable, of course. Today I can be "the other", tomorrow I can be "one of us". For many Europeans in Western Europe it is still a bit strange to live together with these "new Europeans" from post-communist countries. Similar arguments can be made about the possible Turkish membership, but Turkey would one day join, just because the EU then will be stronger and able to achieve its goals. I do not think that the EU will change radically its goals regarding what it can do in the world. It will still be the biggest development aid donor; it will continue to promote its values, stand up for peace, but it will not change radically and its role will not change radically. It will be a stronger, but not a radically different Europe.

**Сергей Караганов:** «Во-первых, Европа оказывает огромное мягкое благотворное воздействие на мир, хотя это, конечно, явление очень не заметное, но оно существует. Теперь о будущем. Европа будет продолжать оказывать это мягкое воздействие, но влияние в мире будет уменьшаться, по крайней мере в ближайшие годы. Потому что сейчас Европа поглощает больше энергии, чем она производит во вне. Но это не означает, что Европа обречена на это. Если она захочет стать снова сильной и конкурентоспособной, то пока путь для этого есть. Для этого нужно объединение России и Европы, необязательно чтобы Россия вошла в ЕС, но нужен союз. Что может привнести Россия? Россия может привнести в него энергию, которой в Европе стало мало, Россия, не смотря на свою историческую усталость, до сих пор является сильной державой. Нас критиковали за Чечню, ужасная была война, безусловно, но ведь европейцы всюду критиковали французов и французы сдавались всегда. Они свою территорию отдали – Алжир, а теперь об этом жалеют, потому что это оказалась газовая кладовая. За это нас сильно критикуют, потому что мы не отдали и у нас все ресурсы остались. Осталась и «hard power» и готовность ее применить. Второе, что может лечь в основу союза, это обмен активами и энергетический союз, с которым сейчас борются со страшной силой все антиевропейские силы, в том числе и ближайшие формальные союзники Европы. Потому что если то, что предлагает Россия обменять, мы получаем часть европейских активов и соответствующее влияние, а европейцы получают часть наших активов по добыче и влияние, то получается союз, который усиливает «hard power» Европы. У России есть два вида «hard power», это восстанавливающая военная мощь и готовность ее применять, которая, к сожалению, снова играет роль в современном мире и будет играть, потому что будет дестабилизироваться. И второе – это энергетическая мощь, она превратилась благодаря тому, что европейцы так запаниковали по этому поводу, в «hard power», а была «soft power». Мощь России возросла за последние 6-8 лет не в 4 раза, а в 10 раз именно из-за этой паники. Но мы благодарны. Так вот если такой союз будет когда-нибудь сделан, думаю, Европа вместе с Россией восстановят свое традиционное влияние в мире. Соответственно, появится больше возможности влиять через мягкую власть. Если этого не произойдет, то Европа останется прекрасным островом, мы будем ее поддерживать, чуть-чуть сочувствовать и любить. Спасибо».

**David Král:** A couple of points. What difference can Europe make in the world? First, we should not be too ambitious. We've had some big visions. One of them, the Constitutional Treaty, has just failed. So, we should be modest in our goals. At the same time, we should continue carrying on processes that have been quite successful. I would first of all underline the enlargement; it has been extremely successful and I think we should not put the halt on this process. We should also focus on projects where Europe can bring a strong added value and take the lead. For instance, the environment, as dace mentioned. We should also focus on policies that have the strong backing of the populations. The time when the EU undertook projects without popular backing, the time of the so called "permissive consensus" is gone. We have to look for popular support. Even on things like common foreign and security policy there has been progress. It is sometimes reflected more outside the EU than in Europe itself. If we just look at where the EU has got missions these days it is everywhere from the Middle East to Indonesia. It is nothing to compare to the US, but we should not be too modest here. There is a positive backing from the population and we should cease this momentum. To dispute a bit with Mr. Karaganov, I think the EU is going to remain an economic power. Yes, we have problems at the moment; these problems are caused by the fact that the biggest EU economies have been performing poorly, especially in the Eurozone (Italy, Germany and France), but, at the same time, we should not forget that we also have the world's most competitive economies in Europe – the Scandinavian economies. I also think that the Baltics are on the right track. The potential is there and I would not be afraid to use it. I agree, however, that the key lies in the big economies because they are the drivers behind the economic performance of the Union as a whole.

**Viktor Makarov:** What we need is not as much hard power; what we need is strong societies. Here what Europe can do is to be an excellent example of how you create a decent

and free society and an effective economy. Europe can set an example of how you can transcend the national borders and nationalist thinking, cooperate on the regional level. What Europe has done in the recent decade is globalisation on a regional scale. What the world has a need for now is a way introducing global governance. Without \ global governance we will not be able to solve the really big issues in the world today. The Polish-Russian meat dispute is not the kind of issue we should really be concerned about. There are some more serious things. Here, Europe can be an example of how you transcend the national thinking and agree on a system of supranational governance that will allow you to survive. So, my answer is: what Europe can do is mostly by setting an example.

**Susanne Peters:** I want the EU to play a global role. I think it is on a good track with Iran, for example. Whether it is going to be successful is another question. At least intervention in the Iran issue by Solana has been very helpful. I disagree with Victor; I think that we do need hard power. Certainly soft power is a strength, but if you do not have hard power you are not being taken seriously by the US, and the US, for the next 20 years, will determine our global order. For the moment, the US State Department is broke, they have over-committed themselves in Iraq; they do not have money. Also for that reason they will stay away from the humanitarian intervention in places like Darfur. They just don't touch it, although there are strong groups in the US lobbying in favour doing something. In Europe, we have made a lot of progress with our European defence and security policy, but I think that we need to do much more so that we are able to take care of Africa. It will be difficult. But that something like Darfur, another genocide, can happen in 2007, and that there is so little awareness of that, is scandalous. I would like the EU to have hard power and I think we have enough checks and balances in the system so the EU will not become a played who is just defending its own interests globally.

**Sergey Chernyshov:** The EU has been a successful project first of all because it has demonstrated clear economic benefits for its members and the newcomers especially. To continue to play this role in the future, the EU has to change dramatically in economic terms. The way it responds to the challenges of the globalisation is not adequate to allow the EU to continue to play its role on the world stage. Whether it will happen or not, I do not know. But there is no other choice. The alternative is very dramatic. I strongly believe that in this future economic construction Russia has to play a role. Which role is subject to further thinking. It will take few years before we see the tendency, but we have a role in this new Europe. As such, as there is no other choice, the EU will continue to play its role and to demonstrate its unique success in the world of economic integration.

**Максим Шевченко:** «Спасибо за интересные высказывания, особенно хотел бы поблагодарить госпожу Петерс, которая подняла очень важную дискуссию о ценностях. На самом деле, мне кажется, что все остальное носит достаточно прагматический характер, но дискуссия о ценностях между Россией и Европой носит фундаментальный характер. Вы знаете, какие процессы сейчас идут в России, какое место занимает русская православная церковь в жизни страны, вы наверно видели акт объединения церквей, который фактически явился общегосударственным, общенациональным актом. В Европе такая вещь не мыслима сегодня, тем более что европейцы достаточно жестко нацелены на отделение религии от социально-политического пространства. Мы движемся в ином направлении, мы движемся в направлении, которое России указал Александр Солженицын. По крайней мере часть российского общества, к которой я принадлежу, движется в направлении на возвращение традиционной, в том числе религиозной этики в политическое и социальное пространство. Если мы способны будем услышать друг друга в этом диалоге, если мы будем способны договориться об этических принципах наших отношений, то, мне кажется, в этом залог нашего будущего развития. Потому что навязывать нам европейские и либеральные атеистические ценности, мне кажется, не получится, страна, прошедшая коммунизм, атеизм в том формате, в котором прошли его мы, больше возвращаться к этому не захочет не под каким видом, ни в виде тоталитаризма, ни в виде либерализма. Спасибо».



