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Rose Gottemoeller: Dear guests, I’m very, very pleased to have the opportunity to introduce to you today, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergei Viktorovich Lavrov. Welcome, welcome to the center, we are so pleased to have you here, Minister. I’ll just say a few words of introduction, although, certainly, the Minister needs no introduction, being a very well known and successful Russian diplomat, having risen very fast in his career in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Beginning from 1972 at the USSR Embassy in Sri Lanka and continuing throughout the ensuing decades to rise to the rank of Director of the Department of International Organizations and Global Problems in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, and then serving as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation from 1992 to 1994, when he went to New York to become the permanent representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations, and becoming both a stalwart, of course, proponent of Russia and the Russian Federation’s policy there, but I know, a very worthy opponent of other members of the P-5, and very worthy partner, as well, in many an important area of international policy. Minister Lavrov has the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation, he has been decorated with many state awards, and we are indeed honored, sir, to have you here with us today. We look forward to your remarks, thank you very much (applause).

Sergey Lavrov: Thank you very much. Dear ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, dear friends, … is the anniversary of the political relations between the United States and Russia, like any other Jubilee, makes us look back into the history, but I would like to not only talk about the history rather than the current state of the US/Russian relations, the status of which, there is no hiding it, in both countries, makes people concerned and likewise there is a concern throughout the world where the state of relationship of our history is important. First, the lessons of history are important, taking into account that there is nobody who might say he is indifferent toward what is going on between our countries, I shall try and focus upon the most important thing. Our countries, our people have different historic, spiritual, philosophic experience, despite the fact that we are kin and the fact both Russia and the
United States have deep ethnic societies, they have a diversative cultures and traditions, each of us made our own way in creating national statehood. Differences in strategic and political areas also are reflected substantially upon the development of long-term specific interests in both countries, but nevertheless, gradually over … and discovering each other, opening each other up in the course of historic development we were able to find many things in common, we were able to find out that the wish to become free are similar in both countries, both nations became great pioneers and explorers, discovering and developing vast territories both nations were able to demonstrate perseverance and entrepreneur ship, both nations were able to go through a devastating civil war and heal the wounds, the tribulations that we have to go though always strengthened our will and independent natural spirit. Maybe not all may remember that the national hero of the United States is one of the prenators of the American Marine, played, Paul Jones was the counter admiral of the Russian fleet and the co patriot of the great Russian general Alexander Savorov in the siege of the Turkish fortress and Paul Jones came up with this aposwald to interact between various nations to combat Turkish pirates. When the battle in common is fought against the English claim, the Russian authorities supported them; Catherine the second not only rejected the plea from the kind to help her suppress that rebellion but in her ledgers (letters?) many times states the Russian so the American common is predicting then the victory similar to our situation repeated … civil war in .. these days, neither monarchy and solidarity or anything helped it and that’s where the deep roots national interests were the same, but the way this question is being, you know, veer this way, the deterrence of the … of Russian and the current conditions is something totally different with that historical parlay because that is the term that became fashionable again in the politilogical language.

Now the terms of Russia as… to somebody means that nothing has changed over the past few years, is essentially, it is suggested that we should mechanically strip light of one of the current world division of the structure of international relationship that evolved as part of the western devised during cold war era, but what I think about what objective may be in deterring the development of Russia these days and I should note the kind of Russia which is given up an ideal issue but the imperial ambitions about from giving up on all of this in favor of pragmatism and common sense why anybody should deter the country which has concentrated upon its internal development and without any shyness one should say does it in a very good way. Internal strengthening, in natural way converts itself into strengthening our international positions of Russia, pursues outside of it the policy which is an extension of its domestic policy, we, I hope have very realistic and quite coherent objective in the international arena which is maintaining it’s special stability as the main
condition to be able to resolve the patient development of our country and a
natural evolution in the international relationship towards freedom and
democracy if one is to idealize what I would have ascribed as ideological
inertness which has led the United States to a concept of a transforming
diplomacy, we find quite a big gap in-between the United States and Russia in
terms of our foreign ambitions. And that is, I believe, the majority of the
problem is hidden. As you know, Russia has more than enough of an
experience of (frivolition, privolition, tribulation?) , the whole of the twentieth
century of our historic systems has been spent on it, the kind of century which
became a purgatory for the whole of the European civilization, which was
trying to overcome evil by exiling various, as what you call, evils and devils of
different types of liberal and thinking, so today Russia after everything that
happened would never sign under any idolage co-project but …is not going to
borrow such projects from outside, so what is the sense in deterring the profit
of the country which really wants nothing much, including, it wants to trade,
like many of our counterparts do and really and have succeeded a lot by
applying our natural ability and advantages, we are growing in our investments
and human resource and are expanding our efforts in transferring …cronics
into the progressive way of development: our economics requiring no type of
perimeters is growth very much comes from the growing internal consumption
and demand. We also think the overall trend in having many transnational
corporations appearing inside the new economic structures of Russia as
opposed to the Soviet Union as an open country. We are not attempting to
close ourselves from anybody and there is no need for anybody to open us, it’s
not us who are building war today, virtual between different countries as well as
political one inside the countries. We are against artificial barriers in the
international communications, we are for eliminating these barriers in our
relationships with the European Union, so what may produce a more sound
guarantee and this against an unpredictable development in any country.
Russia become part of the overall agreement that property in the market must
constitute the foundation for political and economic way of life and there is no
need, no doubt that we are in the better beginning of this way, we’re far from
being ideal but the direction has been set and set unequivocally.

Russia sometimes … is being accused of its natural role in the global
energy industry by the energy marked iliteralness is something that we have to
take for granted and based on the Russian initiative a year ago, a principal
balance of interest was found amongst all the participants in the energy market,
although everywhere in the world the energy in Russia is viewed as a strategic
industry and nowadays in particular, because we have to be confronted by a
negative foreign reaction to the objective strengthening of their countrys
economy inside, but I would like to underscore something that many times was
mentioned by their President and the prime minister, Russia hasn’t violated not a single of it’s commitments or obligations in its relationship with the buyers or consumers of our energy resource in any conflict of the supply of hydrocarbons. Sometimes in energy industry there is a situation when the control of the governments or the access to the resources has been counterweight by focusing the advanced technologies in the hands of the parli-transnational companies so that is a condition for an equal and direct based upon competitive advantages of each of the sides which are unified by common cause of satisfying the energy requirement of the world economy. Today in the international politics, global challenges and threats are in the forefront, which do require also a global response. And such response cannot have been found by the most broadest possible international corporation and I would risk to note that under such circumstances traditional cumbersome so called obligating binding alliances like sacred unions against anybody wont be able to resolve the situation. The multitude of interests and possibilities to participate the respective international efforts, led to a development of a network and diplomacy, the network and diplomacy had an obtual means for the different governments to interact in different laboratorial multireactual formats in the interests of resolving common objectives. I think it’s quite logical for a diplomacy to be developing this networking method not one which has been produced by private companies and civil societies. To our estimates the upper floor of the new International system is the immerging in multipolarity, this is in fact a reality which is very difficult to argue against and when President Vladimir Putin, in Munich, was saying that a single port world didn’t happen, he simply stated something that is given and I’m sure that developing inter-governmental relationship through the hierarchal system is not realistic. The new system of multi international relations is not a hierarchy, it’s not an orderless … movement, the existence of two or more many players in international politics would lead to the need to coordinate activities and the ability to come to an agreement. There is no confrontational definition in multipolarity there is an incentive to look for a stable …in of interests, international relations today have come to a threshold where simply the cause of the need to prosper, to maintain security in the twenty-first century, to delay further the resolution of the progress that have filed up is wrought with very severe ramifications unfortunately not having dealt with the existing problems, the international community is sub creating new one, the inertness of the unilateral response has received a second wind, as a result we see the dead end situations and broken pottery which really wont bring the result we need. Security is something that you cannot store for the future, it is inevitable life process which today really exposes the truth about the daily bread, but is it right to international relations or in normal type of relationships and the
corporation with many states including problematic nations or the pariah states as they are sometimes called, being able to involve all of the nations into the style will be able to bring about the true security and safety for today and for the foreseeable future. This is not just a one of activity, it is something that you’ve got security, it requires constant effort, everyday effort and collective efforts, particularly accue to the problem to overcome the results of the cold war in Europe the blocked type of policy has been governed here for quite sometime based upon the deterents of the type and approach and even now we are sometimes confronted by something which is impossible to interpret other than an attempt as somebody was saying to create a senitary card arm to the west of the Russian borders, favoritism, in this part of Europe brings about a very unhealthy environment the growth of nationalistic mood and sentiment has being intarished which could within itself a major threat and … so the current European union are problems of the European policy in general cannot be resolved without taking into account the interests of the United States as well as without the constructive relationships in the future with Russia based upon mutual trust, instead of this, certain still someway are trying to deter Russia and so in this sense in this light we view the situation to expand NATO in violation of the previously given assurances and most of that means would not happen. Now, international the course aimed at expending NATO is being justified by the need to disseminate democracy, but their statement about the membership in NATO is a something only a pass into the cloud of impratic nations, currently is being and now is to fall then from a serious (series?) countries of the criteria of riddens(?) of this and that country to undergo an examination toward democracy is only one riddens(?) to fall in the wake of somebody else’s policy. As far as the CIS is concerned, I guess that nobody has any doubt that Russia possesses substantial, and I would say, basic and fundamental resources of being able to maintain social, economic and another type of policy and so Moscow’s giving up on politicized trade and economic relations and switching over to the market based principals, what other convincing justification we can quote in confirming our riddens(?) to ensure the normalcy in the international relationships in this area. By the way, inside Russia, we’re even being confused that by going over to the market prices, Russia is pushing away it’s neighbors and then these neighbors are picked up by other big countries and against this background we are continually to be criticized that this process proves the Russian dictatorship. It’s a paradox, there are all of the conditions for the west and Russia to cooperate in that region but of course that incorporation would be based upon equal, respectful basis and respect, first and foremost to the serious countries themselves, who need to be helped in their final effort to create statehood rather than the current making them the actives of the geopolitical game with a zero result, the
mentality aimed at deterring Russia it will believe also face the one unilateral decisions of the … to create the anti-missile defense base, because the anti-missile defense base is a missing piece in the jigsaw puzzle, that is part of the global anti-missile defense system is chewed (shewed?) by directive states and now accidentally or not accidentally which is to be located round the perimeter of Russia. But as the President mentioned, in a very detailed way he spoke about it more than once, this is not even a politics, this is just arithmetic, so naturally our response to this challenge and this challenge is of a specific nature, would also be, have an atext which is equivval, but we would prefer joint work which was opposed by President Putin when meeting in Halengendam(?) with President Bush.

Teleptia Project, joint project when involving all the interests of parties, the European one in the first place by using …. Doborinskaya relay station in would have turned this project into an unnecessary one, (applause) it is quite a complicated and contentious one and is wrought with creating instability in Europe and they’re wrong, but a few people in Europe which are justifiably concerned with the possibility of the fact that if the anti-global defense system is located there it would create negative consequences for the international relations and as far that conventional arms reduction is something that we also view, we are very honest in our approach to this agreement which the matic purpose being equal security. The principal of equal security has been undermined with a disbandenment of the Warsaw pact with a simultaneous preservation and expansion of NATO despite various assurances and guarantees that have been given to us and an attempt to correct the situation, have been confronted with their rejection of the NATO members to rectify the … until all of the new conditions are adapted and has being explained by various predicts like the legal vaquero(?) and legal soundness in those statements is something that is very easy to see for those who are familiar with the process and who are familiar with documents that have been adopted at the Istanbul conference, which are very close to that in nature but maybe they have nothing in common with it and nothing to do with it, whatever is .. to really and to rectify that the Kremlin has been listed in the adaptation agreement itself, so by the way, my American colleagues, when we were talking about it to the question of why they are trying to think up any illegal link between the adaptation agreement ratification and this so called Istanbul commitments with respect to the Georgians, Moldavians etc. they said there is no legal connection, it’s a political connection, very honest answer, but very inadmissible. Unfortunately, the extraordinary conference in Vienna didn’t do any result, which was convened in Vienna under Russia’s initiatives in accordance with the _____ . This whole situation points to an attempt to reproduce the ___ kind of instincts and go back to the zero game results logic and so the state of affairs
with this agreement is an eloquent example of the fact that any element of the global or European security structure which is not based upon the political principals and mutual benefit cannot be stable, we are now reporting to you the that there is also the ex…(extraordinary?) contest to the President and you know the sequence of activities that the President himself has described in his statement to the federal assembly in order to save the agreement …partners, ___ to act together well, the President said that what we’re going to do I would only note that this situation in no way should be considered as the fact that Russia is trying to shun away from her problematic self arms control under the Russian, German and French initiative, I think in the fall of this year, there will be a special session convened of the LSPA dedicated to the security issues, at which the strengthening of the missions of confidence are going to be discussed and arms control and I think that the agenda should be broader, rather continued to argue(?) about something that is dying out ___ we don’t want to bred(?), I can assure you, and the door is going to be staying open and as soon as the agreement from NATO countries is ratified we would definitely be standing true in our commitments in accordance with the already ratified agreement by Russia on the adaptation of the agreement. It is regrettable that even is such a sacred and clear issue as the need to stop the arrival of the neornarscis and to stop offending the memory of the victims of narcissm, the position of some of the partners is being formulated and sheeped by the will to deter Russia and I’m not really ready to go into details about it because it’s hard to comprehend. The road to trust goes through open discussion and through in a direction which calls for cooperation from the very beginning, starting from the ___ or the threats and may I just to be ____ sorry(I think this was the apology of the translator, he missed something), and specifically in this last item, the need to start everything from the joint analysis of threats is what we’re being refused without any coherent explanation. When speaking in Munich, President Putin invited all of our partners to join into a serious and argumentative conversation about the unsatisfactory situation that has evolved in the international relations, and I am sure that the time of the do know standards apply to Russia as the partner as a fall are no longer here, but if one continues that way it is impossible to resolve the problems of cooperation and if somebody was to refute the negative behavior by Russia, and why then there is a simultaneous expectation for our cooperation in ___ issues which are interested and that those who are try to refute us are interested and so you’ve got to select between deterring and cooperating and such issues as ___ session as well as the Jackson Bennet, infamous Jackson Bennet commandment which lost all of its grounds by the end of last year and with so many promise that were recommend to the past in all the different levels in the ___ administration and converse incentive and even in the Jewish community in the United States,
so against the globalizations and threats to security, there’s a big difference between cooperation and the lack of such between the collective activity and the need for every state or a group of states to act on their own. Russia is implementing and executing insur… possibility especially ____ nobody is going to do it for us but we don’t have any arrogance as well we don’t believe that our analysis is worse than somebody else’s. Cooperation with Russia is possible only upon the full equity level and respectful mutual interests and mutual benefit. In the US/Russian relationship there is a very powerful stipulizing factor of open and frank relationship between President Putin and President Bush and in case there is an equitable partnership that prevails in this relationship, I’m convinced then there really will be very few things impossible for our countries. What we should not allow is to turn the US/Russia relationship as the victims of the electoral cycles in both countries or to allow somebody else to make it that way from the outside. To go for it, or to allow it would mean to watch (wash?) hands went from the last interests of our nations and the interests of the global stability.

Commenting on international terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking the search for realistic and mutually acceptable ways to maintain climate and the nonproliferation to insure global energy security, development of space and many other things now why should all of these areas, which are already developing in terms of some practical cooperation, should be laid as a sacrifice to the deterring activities, we are unified with United States to prevent proliferation of the nuclear weapons, particularly in the middle east and in the Korean Peninsula. Lately together with the United States, we have actively been working over the implementation of the joint initiative to deter the terrorists acts that our presence both have come up with, the arrogance(?) in St. Petersburg and the number of which, number of participants have now exceeded fifty countries, so let us be fully open and candid, most important thing let me underscore that the Russia and the United States should treat each other as equitable partners, the different format of relationship for us is simply inadmissible. Now you should agree, very paradoxical and very tragic at the same time is that we used to understand each other better and be respectful of each other and respectful of each other’s interests during the Cold War era during the day taunt that was the positive time, part of the heritage that we have inherited from the Cold War and the one that we need so desperately today, but only in those days that was a respect based upon the negative basis, why cannot we do the same thing but that applied to the positive life. I think that it would be logical today to resort to the experience of those statesmen in both countries, who in those days were in power and that is where I see make sense in creating the Russian/American group for the public dialogue. Yes Russia, look into the future under the championship of Yevgeny Kremekov
and Henry Kissenger that Herb is supposed to convene for it’s first meeting in July in Moscow. President Bush and President Putin have actively supported that very useful initiatives and we are hoping that it will become another contribution into building partnership and equal partner-like relationship, we are not really trying to force ourselves into a status of (re?)equitable partner and the whole thing here is not an anti-American because there is no wider spread anti-American sentiment that can be find in another country, if you remember Cannon, it would be great for people not only to mention the quote his famous long table, telegram but also for his advice in terms of how the outside world should behave itself towards Russia in the post Soviet period of it’s development. He ___ about it and he was advising to maintain business with the postilith Russia without mentorship and without arrogance, nobody is trying to counter the tentative become leader but any country of the world if it is ready and it is capable and a for that, what we’re trying to say is that under current circumstances the formula of leadership can change very seriously and I would quote Mr. Kissenger, who said that the United States could have become the first among the equal ones in the new geopolitical situation but to become such means to be able to listen to others, to hear others, to be able to argue and argue on a well grounded basis and without negative the ability of others to make a contribution and that must be made part of the organic teamwork based upon not the ability to dictate your will but to be able to bring things under the common denominator for all of the parties involved, and that was the idea behind the great rebellion amongst the leading countries of the world when the situation around Iraq was developing....