**John Torpey** 00:04

Welcome to International Horizons a podcast that brings scholarly expertise to bear on timely international issues. My name is John Torpey, and I'm director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. This podcast is an interview with Federica Mogherini, former High Representative of Foreign Affairs and security for the European Union on the topic of transatlantic relations after the Trump administration. It was originally held via Zoom on January 27th 2021, as our annual Otto and Fran Walter Memorial Lecture. The event was organized by the European Union Study Center, a project of the Ralph Bunche Institute, of which I also serve as director. It was co-sponsored by the Institute of European Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Center for West European studies/EU Center at the University of Washington, as well as by the Baltic American Chamber of Commerce. We are grateful to our colleagues in the Jean Monnet in the USA Network for helping to promote this event.

**Robin Garrell** 01:21

So Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining us today. I'm Robin Garrel and the president of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. And it is my great pleasure to welcome you to the 2021 Otto and Fran Walter Memorial Lecture with Federica Mogherini, hosted by our European Union Study Center. The Graduate Center is the primary doctoral granting institution of the multicampus City University of New York, the nation's largest urban public university. This year we celebrate our 60th birthday. The Graduate Center is the home of Nobel and Pulitzer Prize winning scholars, and we are dedicated to fostering research that advances the public good. We host more than 30 centers and institutes that explore some of today's most pressing issues, through provocative conversations and groundbreaking research. Our home in New York City, one of the world's most cosmopolitan cities, encourages a wide mix of ideas and viewpoints on a broad range of domestic and international issues. The European Union Study Center is directed by today's host and moderator John Torpey, a professor of sociology and history. The Center encourages a rich exchange of ideas by bringing together scholars and professionals from the US and Europe. Today's event is part of a series of lectures and conversations that the center will hold throughout the year. Today's event features Federica Mogherini. She is the rector of the College of Europe, and co chair of the United Nations High Level panel on internal displacement. Positions she assumed in early 2020. Prior to that, for five years, Ms. Mogherini served as the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and security policy, and as Vice President of the European Commission. Prior to joining the EU, she served as the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs and international cooperation, and as a member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies. I'd now like to introduce the vice president of the Otto and Fran Walter Foundation, Martha Peak. We are very grateful to the Walter foundation for its generous support of this annual lecture series. Miss Peak will introduce today's speaker, will say a few words about the late Otto and Fran Walter, their interests and the foundation's commitment to supporting programs like this one. Welcome, Marty. And thank you again to everyone for joining us today.

**Martha Peake** 03:55

Thank you so much. Dr. Otto L. Walter was born in Munich, and entered the bar in Germany just in time for his law credentials to be stripped from him on account of his religion. As a result in the mid 1930s, he fled Europe and found a new home in New York City. 20 years later, he had saved enough to go to law school a second time, requisite to entering the bar in this country. Upon graduation, he started his own law firm, and he did well in his legal career. During his lifetime Otto and his wife Fran became philanthropist. And Otto never forgot where he came from, or what had happened in his home country. He was well aware that the possibility of fascism can crop up anywhere. And he made it his life's work to promote peace and humanitarianism, across neighborhoods and across national borders. It is in this spirit, that during his lifetime, Dr. Walter underwrote a European Union Study Center annual lecture, designed to increase conversation and understanding between Europeans and Americans. And since Dr. Walter's death in 2003, the charitable foundation that bears his name has been delighted to continue this work and to amplify our relationship with the Graduate Center. And in this small way, help support the work of increased transatlantic mutual understanding. Thank you so much for being here.

**John Torpey** 05:29

Thank you, Martha Peak. Thank you so much for those kind remarks. I want to thank Robin Garel. The recently arrived president of the Graduate Center for her support of this event. My name is John Torpey. I'm director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies and of the EU Study Center. I therefore also want to thank Merrill Sovner, Associate Director of the EU Study Center, Eli Karenty and Hristo Voynov of the Ralph Bunche Institute team for all their help in making this event possible. I especially want to thank the Otto and Fran Walter foundation for their steadfast support of the activities of the EU Study Center at the Graduate Center and of the annual Europe day lecture in particular. Yes, we had originally planned to do this back in May, but shall we say, events overtook our plans. Still, this is normally a festive occasion. So I urge you if you're so inclined, and in an appropriate timezone to grab a glass of Prosecco while you enjoy the conversation. I now want to express our special thanks to further Federica Mogherini, for taking the time to be with us today. Thank you all in Zoom land for joining us. And let me take this opportunity to remind the audience that if you have questions for the Q&A at the end of our interview, you may insert them along the way in the Q&A. But the chat function is disabled for this event. Thanks again Federica Mogherini, rector of the College of Europe.

**Federica Mogherini** 07:07

Thanks to you. It's great to be with you. And the only regret is that we're not together in person in New York. But it's great to be able to celebrate Europe's day with some with some delay, or what's some anticipation together with you. And looking forward so much to this exchange today. And thanks again for the invitation and for having set this up even in a virtual landscape we are obliged to respect these days.

**John Torpey** 07:34

Right. Well. Thank you very much. Thanks again for doing this. So let me turn to the questions that I have for you. I think almost everyone would agree that it's been a difficult four years for transatlantic relations with the last US administration. Indeed, German Chancellor, Angela Merkel argued that Europe would have to learn to proceed more on its own and could not rely on the US as a partner, as it once almost reflexively had. So to what extent has Europe begun to go its own way in fact. And in what areas do we see Europe and the US diverging?

**Federica Mogherini** 08:16

I think, yeah, undoubtedly, there has been some difficulties in this last four years. We had difficulties in previous decades also. So in the history of transatlantic relations, it was not a complete novelty. But previous tensions or disagreements were always limited to single issues, single policy decisions. Even relevant ones -- think of the war on Iraq, where the transatlantic community was definitely not on the same page -- But before the Trump administration, I would say that both in the United States and in Europe, there was a general sense of being on the same side of history on general terms. And there was, as you mentioned, a natural reflex to consult each other, to coordinate actions, sometimes even to have a division of labor. And for sure, to work on all security and foreign policy issues and obviously, investing consistently in our common Alliance, NATO.

**Federica Mogherini** 09:17

With the Trump administration this has dramatically changed. And for Europeans, it has been particularly a shock, I think, because it came just after a time; especially a couple of years, last years of the Obama administration, when we managed to work together across the Atlantic with great results and big achievements. Think of the Paris Climate Change Agreements that was really literally done by the United States and the European Union working closely together. The Iran nuclear deal and also in the UN Framework, the Sustainable Development Goals. So we were coming at a peak of multilateral successes somehow led by the transatlantic partnership. And for sure, these last four years have been of a completely different nature. Is there something good in it? I have to say, and I believed in the transition, because I was in office as the EU High Representative, exactly from 2014 to 2019. So I've seen the transition, let's put it this way. I've lived firsthand the shock and I've repeated, I think, an incredible number of times that regardless difficulties, we were still friends and partners. But undoubtedly, the difficulties were there.

**Federica Mogherini** 09:59

The positive side of it is that Europe has learned not to give the United States for granted anymore. If I can use a metaphor, I think that Europeans were used to consider themselves the union partner, or the little brother or sister with someone else that at the end of the day would have taken care for good or for bad, because we were also complaining sometimes about US policies or positions. But somehow we could relax; the pilot was not here, the pilot was taking care of the flights of the roots of the safety of the flights. We were contributing, but we were happy to let somebody else drive or fly.

**Federica Mogherini** 11:24

With the Trump administration, I think, Europeans realized that they have to take responsibility. They have to play autonomously in some issues. They have to defend their own interest and also their values. I think in particular, when at the time Secretary of State Tillerson mentioned that the US foreign policy would have not been guided by human rights principles anymore, Europeans realized that they had to take the lead on the human rights oriented foreign policy globally. Europeans realized, somehow, that they had the responsibility also towards the rest of the world. Because more and more countries were turning to the European Union for partnerships on issues that before were naturally a field of partnership between these third countries and the United States. In the absence of a cooperative United States, many turned towards the European Union. I think that never, as in those four years, the European Union has concluded as many trade agreements, for instance, or partnership agreements with the rest of the world, from Canada, to Japan, to Australia, you name it, and New Zealand.

**Federica Mogherini** 12:36

We have found out our power somehow in our responsibility. So I think that yes, indeed, Europeans and the European Union specifically, has learned to act autonomously, but has kept this instinct of preferring to act together. And so I hope that now we manage to keep as we move towards a different kind of partnership and relationship with the Biden administration. I hope we in Europe manage to keep a sense of responsibility, and also an awareness of the power we have not giving up the idea that if needed, we can act autonomously. And at the same time preserving or restoring a natural partnership and cooperation with the United States. On one particular thing, I believe the Europeans realized that they have this power, but also the shortcomings and the loopholes we were facing. And that is the Iran nuclear deal. Maybe we can talk about that more in the coming hour, but that was the moment when Trump announced that the United States would have stepped out of the agreement. That was a moment when Europeans realized that they had a global responsibility and even a responsibility towards parts of the United States to keep the agreement alive, even in the absence of a presence and a commitment from the US administration. And it worked, to a certain extent.

**Federica Mogherini** 14:04

But then we realized that our autonomy was missing one fundamental element. And that was the instrument of the capacity to protect the European investments, or trade relations from the extraterritorial impact, for instance, of the US sanctions. This is something we've experienced both in the case of Iran, but also with Cuba, where the policy from the Obama administration to the Trump administration was dramatic. And also there, Europeans kept the course, capital relations and commitment with the with Cuba. But we realized that our financial system was exposed so much to the US one, that our autonomy in the financial sector was seriously limited. So I think that this might be the next chapter. Just to get ready in case things go wrong again, or get difficult again. So that's, for instance, we can use the Euro as a currency worldwide for global exchanges, something that at the moment is not really used. Think of the oil trade that is done completely on dollars. I believe that this is going to be the next chapter for the European Union autonomy. But politically, we realize that, yes, we have responsibility, and we can stand on our own feet. But again, we prefer not to do it, we prefer to work in partnership, especially with the United States.

**John Torpey** 15:33

Right. There are certain ways in which everyone is expecting, I think the Biden administration to restore the good old days of committee and brotherhood between the Europeans and the Americans. And he's bringing many of the people that came from the Obama administration into the new administration with him, some of them go back indeed to the Clinton administration. And one can sort of understand perhaps that desire for certain kind of stability and a return to old, comfortable ways. But I wonder whether there aren't also certain pitfalls in that kind of approach. The world is not the same world that existed when those administrations were in power. And one wonders whether there might not be a need for new views of things, a new orientation to the world. And the Brexit situation is obviously one of the most significant ones that suggests that we're in a kind of different context. So how would you address that question?

**Federica Mogherini** 16:42

I think there's the perception of, or the comfort zone, that's this idea of return to the golden age or to the past, or just back to normal, is very tempting, obviously. And I think the surface of things suggests that there is a certain tendency to give reassuring messages, I found, for instance, the speech of the inaguration day very reassuring, very comfortable, and not surprising. Maybe not so exciting as one could have imagined, but extremely solid and extremely reassuring.

**Federica Mogherini** 17:26

But I think that beyond the surface. The real point is that there is no back to normal that is even imaginable possible, because there is no normal, and the world has completely changed; even in this last year, has completely changed. If we had this conversation in January last year, it would had been a completely different world, and we wouldn't have had it online but in presence. And if you look at the world of five, six, even four years ago, it's a completely different world. So I think that the Biden administration will have a mix of reassuring messages and reassuring symbolism, including the choice of some [staff]. I think of the State Department that is obviously one of the main focuses we have in Europe, where we recognize friends -- let's put it this way -- and friends that know Europe well. But also, I think that there will be no back to normal in the policies, because in the meantime, some things, for good or for bad, have changed in the reality of the world. Some things have changed because of different factors: Think of the pandemic, think of global change, and climate change as a priority, that for sure, four or five, six years ago was already there, but not before.

**Federica Mogherini** 18:47

But then there are also some of the choices. For instance, that the Trump administration has taken that change, in reality, the landscape in which the new administration is called to take decisions and take action. Think of the decision, for instance, to withdraw troops from Afghanistan. I guess that the new administration will have to start to carefully define and understand together with the NATO allies what to do with that, because in certain issues, especially in the military domain, it is not irrelevant to the starting points you are in. And you cannot take decisions on the basis of theoretical principles only; you have also to see what is the damage control conditions you have to put in place in some cases. So I think we will not have a comfort zone to go back to. I think that the domestic US political dynamics will also not allow that to happen completely. I guess that President Biden and the administration in general will try to start from or focus on the less controversial, less dividing more bipartisan steps in foreign policy; at least to start with to try to mend the harsh divisions from the past.

**Federica Mogherini** 20:19

I guess they will have to take the time also, because this transition has not really taken place. So I think we will have a slow redefinition of the framework we have. And I guess and I hope that the European Union and Europe in general and the United States will sit down together and go through priorities, maybe redefine also respective roles that might be issues on which this administration might not be willing to lead, but might be happy to have others leading and support. I think maybe of the Middle East, or North Africa, where we desperately need to work together, but not necessarily we need the US to be in the driving seat, but we need us to be present and on board.

**Federica Mogherini** 21:11

So I think that there will be a sort of mapping of priorities, of sharing notes of where where to start from; what kind of approaches to take. And I hope we'll see some effective coordination there. But I don't think that there will be a simple going back to the comfort zone as before; there might be elements of friction. But what will change -- and this is a comfort zone, a positive one for Europeans -- is the change in attitudes overall. What we've suffered the most in Europe, and not only in Europe -- because I know that a critical and difficult element for many in the world has been the four years of the Trump administration -- is the logic; the general attitudes towards international relations was a zero sum game one.

**Federica Mogherini** 22:10

So the the President was clear, I win, and I want you to lose. That is the point. And this has never been the traditional approach of the United States and its foreign policy. The United States has always understood that investing in partnerships and cooperation worldwide was the best investment on its own safety, prosperity, even economic interests. And so, as always invested in partnerships and multilateral approaches. In this respect, I think that yes: there will be going back to before, that has always gone this way regardless of republican or democratic administrations. The US approach has always been one of reaching out to partners and working together. I think that in that respect, yes, the by default approach will be a partnership and cooperation approach rather than a confrontational one or a competitive one, which is the thing we've suffered the most.

**Federica Mogherini** 23:14

And in a very basic manner, sometimes diplomacy is also based on very basic things, as Kissinger was saying the telephone number. Now, the telephone number of Europe is clear. In this last four years, we have wondered what was the telephone number of Washington DC? Or maybe there was no one picking up the phone? For sure that is gone. I am sure that now the consultation, the exchange of the ideas and informations will be constant and, and smooth. So there would be someone on the other side of the Atlantic to talk to. We might not agree on everything, but that is normal; that is absolutely fine. But the message America is back i think is the most reassuring one we heard.

**John Torpey** 24:04

Right. I'm glad to hear that the phone will get answered now. That's certainly reassuring. But one area in which it seems to me there is something of a divergence between the US and the European Union has to do with China. And, you know, the Trump administration presented a relatively combative face to China, to relatively bipartisan approbation, I would say, for certain good reasons. But I think the European position has been much more, so to speak, welcoming -- you think about the purchase of the port of Piraeus, what's happened in [The Port of] Trieste along the same kinds of lines -- I mean, there's a sort of welcoming of the Chinese into the European space in a way that I think is sort of inconceivable in the United States. So I wonder if you can talk a little bit about how you think the Europeans see China, and how that may differ from the way Americans see China? And what are the implications of that for the relationship?

**Federica Mogherini** 25:17

That's one of the I think, key issues on which it will be urgent and important to have a transatlantic dialogue. And I think this has been already raised, somehow, during this this weeks. I know that the European Union delegation in Washington has already signaled the interest of having a dedicated US-EU-China dialogue; not a trilateral dialogue, a dialogue between the European Union and the United States on their China policies respected.

**Federica Mogherini** 25:50

I think that today, the perception that is there, on both sides of the Atlantic, is that of a divergence approach towards China. In reality, I think this is not so diverging as it can be perceived, but this perception is the result of recent history. If you allow me to share an anecdote on that:

**Federica Mogherini** 26:17

When I was in office, there was a certain moment when relations between the European Union and China, just after Trump took office, were extremely tense. The European Union and China had regular summits at the top level, and we had one of the most dramatic and aggressive summits on conclusive conflictual. Really a moment of despair, I would say, on something that was extremely conflictual between the European Union and China -- on top of the many other things that are extremely conflictual between the European Union and China -- such as human rights issues. But on that particular case, it was about overproduction of steel. And it was an issue on which the United States had a stake. And the European Union turned towards the United States, basically, trying to get support for a common policy so that our positions, and our requests, have a level playing field with China. Also including, not only overproduction of steel, but also access to trade and investment, could have been more successful. And avoiding to have a European Union only approach to this issues, which were stuck in a very difficult negotiation.

**Federica Mogherini** 27:51

And exactly that moment, the Trump administration not only didn't join the European Union in reaching out to the Chinese and trying to pass the same messages that we were asking for -- or we were really looking for a different kind of attitude of the Chinese authorities, but actually chose not that moment, where European Union was facing difficulties on steel with China -- to introduce measures against the European Union on steel production. And then the Chinese turns towards us, the Europeans, and and told us, "are you sure these are your friends? because actually, they are attacking you much more than we are." And you have to take in mind that that moment of shock, that was at the top level, was confronting prime ministers and presidents of the 28 of the time, and not only the leaders of the European Union, introducing the Europeans a feeling of being exposed.

**Federica Mogherini** 28:53

Our shoulders were exposed. The American allies and friends were actually including the European Union in a list of foes; we were perceived as a threat, and we will together in the same alliance in NATO. How can a military ally can be perceived as a threat? And sanctions were introduced on the scene production in Europe, from the United States, on the basis of a security assessment. That moment, was a moment that was quite a dramatic moment and was a moment where the Europeans realized that in their negotiations with China, as difficult as they were, they were alone. And this created a different mindset, this creative difference, I would say even psychological attitude. The Chinese obviously played with it. That's obvious. So I'm sorry if I if I reconstructed a little bit of background, recent history, but you have to take that in mind to understand how relations between Europe and China developed from that moment onwards. Because in that moment, it was Europe, and not the US, carrying the flag of those being hard on China, and then realize that we were alone in doing this. And you have also to keep in mind that Trump was often moving his position towards China from "will make a great deal" to "your enemies forever," which was not really a consistent message to read in Europe.

**Federica Mogherini** 30:24

Having said that, from that moment onwards, the relations between the European Union and China developed in in a very complex manner. I would say that, in some fields, the European Union and China are real partners. And for sure, this is not the case for the United States today. But I tell you the truth, some of the things we have done, regardless of the United States, regardless of the Trump administration in these years, like for instance, trying to preserve the nuclear deal with Iran, we couldn't have done that without China. All the work on climate change, we couldn't have done that without China. And on some files, China was a partner in the moment when the Trump administration was not. Having said that, I think the European Union has taken a very pragmatic approach, very transparent and saying: "Okay, there are some issues, again, the nuclear file, climate change, issues on which we can work with China; we have to work with China. There are other files on which we are competitors, clearly competitors; trade, investments. And then there are other files, on which we are the European Union" [The European Union] even uses the term system systemic rivals; on which there is no way in which the European Union and China can agree. And the Human Rights fight is for sure, the first of those, but not only that.

**Federica Mogherini** 32:04

So the Chinese didn't like it, our way of defining the complexity of our relationship, but then they lived with it. And I remember that once a high level official in China, one of the top level officials in China, told me "you know, we don't like the European Union in many respects, but at least with you, we know what we get." There's a certain level of predictability. For the Chinese culture is one of the essential elements of negotiating. So even things that we don't like about your positions on China, such as human rights issues. Every time I went to China, I always met with human rights activists, and that was accepted. And that was a must for us. But the Chinese recognize that with the European Union, negotiations could be serious. And there was the capacity to differentiate sectors on which competition or even conflict was very hard, and other issues on which cooperation was possible.

**John Torpey** 33:12

So, China might be seen as a kind of source of division, or at least divergent views from the outside. But we've also just recently observed a major division from, so to speak, from inside, that is to say, the departure of the UK from the European from the European Union. The New York Times reports this morning that there are tensions and conflict over the distribution of vaccines that are produced in where you are, in Belgium. But there are many other kinds of implications, obviously, of the departure of the UK from the EU. So I wonder if you could comment a little bit on how that's working out? And what are the implications for transatlantic relations?

**Federica Mogherini** 34:05

Yes, but first of all, it has been for us, I think, a very sad moment -- and including for many British people I know at all levels in institutions and outside of the institutions in academia. -- Our professors here at the College of Europe or even we have an increasing number of students at the College of Europe from the UK, which is an interesting signal of the fact that the younger generations want to reinvest in a possible commitment in the future with the European Union for the country. But the ones that are saddened the most, actually, are the British about how the story went. It was a quite a dramatic choice on the European Union side, and it was also quite a dramatic negotiation afterwards. And I would say until the very last second, a few weeks ago, the risk of not having an agreement over Brexit was exposing, first and foremost, the United Kingdom, but obviously also Europe and the rest of the world to a very risky scenarios.

**Federica Mogherini** 35:13

Luckily, there has been an agreement at the end of the day. But still, the points that remain opened, many of relevance, need to be further negotiated, and are of critical importance. And the way in which the negotiations will continue will determine the future of many sectors, and in particular, the economic cooperation; the business environment. I think of all the data protection fire that is exposing businesses and the financial sector in the UK, to the risk of big damages and losses if negotiations don't go well with the European Union on, especially on on data protection. But also on other things.

**Federica Mogherini** 35:55

I believe that on the European perspective, if you go back in your memory to 2016, that was indeed quite a dramatic year, you remember that the overall narrative was that the Brexit referendum would have led to the end of the European Union. Many were referring to this as being the beginning of the end, and that many other European Union member states would have somehow emulated the UK, and would have chosen to go the same way with a referendum and exiting the union. And actually, the contrary happened. At the moment I had no doubt this would have been the case; I found myself from a country that from time to time, cyclically plays with the idea of getting out of the union or being very hard on the union. But one thing is to use the rhetoric of the anti-European feelings in the public discourse, which is dangerous, I believe, but another thing is to get out for real. And all the other Europeans have seen how difficult and painful and how many consequences this has for a country like the UK. Probably a country that we perceived all as being one of the strongest and most stable of the European Union. And for a country like the UK, it has been so painful and difficult, including on domestic dynamics. Because seen from Europe, what is self-evident is that, what is at stake in the future of the UK is the unity of the kingdom, with now Northern Ireland, and Ireland having to discuss how to work together, and possibly a referendum on the unity of the islands in the future. Scotland's wishing to have a referendum on how to join the European Union alone.

**Federica Mogherini** 37:50

So the United Kingdom is not united anymore around this issue. And if a country as solid as the United Kingdom faces so many difficulties in getting out of the European Union, imagine what a nightmare it would be for all the others. I think it had a deterrent effect on all the other Europeans. And I think the union is much stronger today, actually, even if we miss the UK. That is much stronger today than it used to be because everybody has realized what there is to lose if they go that way. On transatlantic relations I guess that the new administration will take a very pragmatic approach. The United Kingdom is a key ally. First of all, for security reasons, for the United States. [UK] is part of NATO, an important NATO ally. [Another reason] is that our historic and even family ties, if I can put it this way, with the United Kingdom, and business and trade relations that are relevant -- but still not as relevant as the ones that the United States has with with the European Union, which remains the most important interlocutor across the Atlantic -- So I think there will be, again, very good relations with the European Union, with single European Union member states, and good relations with the UK.

**Federica Mogherini** 39:13

And I think in the UK, Boris Johnson is someone extremely pragmatic as well. And I think that what's already known: the discourse the narrative that he uses on the US administration is different than the one he used before. And everything is being recalibrated somehow, because, again, considerations of how relevant it is to transatlantic relation, including with the UK, are predominant. And again, for relations between the European Union and the UK, the better they will be, the better it will be for all of us, and also for the rest of the world. These are things that are determined on both sides of the of the channel in this case, and not only Atlantic. And still we have a long way to go to find a truly cooperative, full picture or full framework; we still miss some pieces of the puzzle.

**John Torpey** 40:17

Right. Well, it's gonna take a while to sort itself out, no doubt. So now here's a question regarding a country that is in a certain sense, both in and out, that is, it's not in the European Union, but it is in Europe, at least in part, and that is Russia. Russia has been a complicated sort of actor during the years of the Trump administration. Everyone knows that Trump had an odd kind of deference to Mr. Putin, and yet, it's in the news at the moment, mainly because of the re-arrest of its leading dissident who returned from Germany after recovering from a poison attack. So I guess the question is: How should the United States and Europe act and sort of deal with Russia in the in the coming period?

**Federica Mogherini** 41:15

First of all, I've seen that President Biden has called Putin, I think yesterday. And I think this has been a very important and good move in the moment when, as you said, so many demonstrators and protesters are being arrested in Russia. A telephone call coming from not only Brussels, and the European capitals, but also from Washington is a relevant step. But also, as far as reports tell us, to discuss the expiry of the New START treaty, and how to prolong the effects of arms control agreements between the United States and Russia. And I think this is a signal of an extremely importance and a hands on approach that this administration can have in our relations with with Russia. This is for sure, not an administration that needs time to get started. For sure. They didn't have the transition period properly used, but it's all people that know the fires already, and that in the first calls, are not going to have around the introductory calls. I think they're down to business from day one. And with Russia, this is extremely important.

**Federica Mogherini** 42:41

For Europeans, I would say that the two or three key elements here will be first a common approach on Ukraine with the United States -- between the European Union and the United States -- because to tell you the truth, in this last four years, the European Union has been the one supporting the survival of Ukraine; in the reform sector, in the resilience mode, that they have tried to develop. Imagine that there has been no other country in the history of the European Union, that has received a larger package of support, and financial support from the European Union ever. Ukraine is the single country that has received the largest envelope of financial support from the European Union in this last six years. So this to give you a sense of, I would say, hope and expectation that from now on, we will share the burden. We often talk about sharing the burden of our security. Europeans have often felt that security is not only military investments; sometimes even humanitarian expenses can be an investment in security, or climate change can be an investment into security. And in this case, for us Europeans, supporting financially the Ukrainian agenda and the Ukrainian reforms and the survival of Ukraine as a country, has been part of our investment in security. And again, this is not part of the GDP percentage was spent on military equipment, but it is part of our collective security.

**Federica Mogherini** 44:26

So I think that's on our side, there is an expectation on the European side. There is an expectation that from now on, consultation on Ukraine and how to deal with that conflict will be done properly between the European Union and the United States. I think that [another] expectation is that on the entire non proliferation and arms control file, there will be a very active US; active and coordinated with the Europeans position. I have to say on this, [that] the Iran nuclear deal, may be the Korean fire, the presence of Wendy Sherman in the State Department -- if confirmed, obviously -- give Europeans a hint of the fact that this is going to be for sure on the agenda. And on these files relating to Russia is not irrelevant; both for the bilateral relations between the entities, between the United States and Russia, but also on arms control and nuclear non-proliferation. A dialogue between the United States and Russia is indispensable; there is no way to substitute it because of the nature of the military presence -- part of it from the past, but part of it also, for for now. -- So I would expect that this would be key or at least present in the talks.

**Federica Mogherini** 45:59

And also on some other issues where for Europeans it will be extremely important to coordinate with the United States in the Security Council. This has not happened that much from in the last years, if at all. The European union member states that our permanent members now are less because the UK left. But between the UK and the European Union member states present in the Security Council of the United Nations for sure, they will be, and they will continue to be, a form of coordination on the key files. I think of the Middle-East peace process, I think of Syria, I think of main conflict and crisis that we have around the world, all over Africa, Ukraine itself. And I think that having the United States coordinating with the Europeans, not only with the Europeans, but mainly with the Europeans in the Security Council, will also make a difference on the outcome of some global negotiations on security issues.

**John Torpey** 47:02

So you've raised the question of European security, which is inevitable in a discussion of Russia. But it raises the question of NATO, and which you've mentioned in passing, but not really gone into any detail about. And famously, the first secretary general of NATO and Lord Ismay said: "NATO was created to keep the Soviets out, the Americans in and the Germans down." But that world is in many ways gone. Right? There may be a concern about keeping the Americans in on the basis of the experience of the last four years, but I guess it raises the question: What is the contemporary relevance of NATO? And how should it be structured going forward?

**Federica Mogherini** 47:51

Yes, I think, personally, it is one of the reasons why I am so happy to see this administration coming in. Because I've seen with my own eyes, how NATO has suffered in this last four years for a lack of engagement, or even for lack of consistency or clarity from the US administration. I was present at the NATO Summit in Brussels, where Trump sent up opposing messages -- completely different messages from literally from one hour to the other -- And leaders in the room got completely lost on what the real intentions of the United States were; on the Alliance, on the future of the Alliance. And for a military alliance, this is particularly serious and heavy, because there is nothing as precious as predictability in the military domain. And we've always sensed and seen that the Pentagon has always struggled to keep a face of consistency and engagement. And then from time to time, there was a different message coming from a different cellphone number and they continue to use the Kissinger metaphor, sending contradictory messages.

**Federica Mogherini** 49:14

So if the Europeans have a feeling of relief for the, for the new administration, I think that NATO has a feeling of relief, even more than the European Union. Because as you mentioned, this is a moment for NATO to rethink its mission, its core identity, I would say, and DNA. It is true that some traditional security threats are still present and currently need attention: Not only keeping the Americans in -- I have no doubt that the United States will stay in. Again, because the United States has a solid Pentagon, and this has always been also in this last four years, and militaries are serious people who normally don't play with words, if they do it, it's because there's a clear intention behind that -- But the risk of an aggressive Russia, including territorially aggressive Russia, for Europeans is a real risk. We have countries that have long borders with an aggressive Russia. We have countries in Europe that are presently experiencing conflict, and war on their own territories: think of Ukraine, think of Georgia. I mean, it was just 2008, when we had the major crisis in Georgia, it's not that long ago.

**Federica Mogherini** 50:48

There is in Europe, a perception of the threats that still can come from that side. And so we need to keep for sure, the traditional approach of territorial defense for which NATO is absolutely irreplaceable. But in the meantime, NATO is, in this moment, looking at how to reinvent and to update its own mission on the new security threats that sometimes are even more worrying than the traditional ones. [For instance] Climate change. For the first time, a military alliance like NATO includes climate change as a security threat. And this administration will for sure be the best partner and ally to invest in that action -- and I'm sure John Kerry will do an excellent job on this -- but also cyberattacks; hybrid threats. The entire domain of how the digital world can become or can turn into security threats. How can our data be manipulated for use that is not appropriate? And how can that lead to a security threat for our countries, for our societies even? So I think that in this reflection about what does it mean security today, for a military alliance, as well as for the more traditional ones; Russia, but also Afghanistan, where we are together still. I think that having the Biden administration in office and engaged will be 100% making the difference for NATO, Europeans are on board.

**John Torpey** 52:32

Thank you. I want to ask one more question, and then I'll open it up to quick questions and answers from the audience. So I want to encourage people in the audience to send in your questions now using the Q&A function. But one last question from me, concerns a country that is, again, sort of not exactly in, but might once have been in, and that's Turkey.

**John Torpey** 52:58

For a long time, it was sort of taken for granted that Turkey was a candidate member of the EU and sooner or later, it would meet certain benchmarks and milestones and would be admitted. And that now seems, in many ways, a kind of a distant past; Turkey has gone in a very different direction, it's sort of turned away from Europe, it's a regional and in some ways, as the Germans would say, above regional kind of power. But its interest in joining the European Union seems to have waned, and Europe's interest in letting them in also seems correspondingly to have waned. So I wonder how you see the relationship with Turkey developing. It's, after all, such an important country in that part of the world.

**Federica Mogherini** 53:47

And also this, [for] who sits in in the White House, in State Department and the Pentagon is not irrelevant. Because talking about NATO, Turkey is not only a neighbor for Europeans is also partially an European country, but it's also a key NATO ally. And if you think of all the work we have been doing in the past on Syria, for instance, without Turkey in NATO, things would have been different. Not to mention the fact that we still have a conflict ongoing in Cyprus.

**Federica Mogherini** 54:26

So there are issues and elements of friction on which the positioning of Washington will make a difference, will change the course of actions and perceptions. Personally, [I think] it's interesting. I was discussing just today with with a Turkish student. We have many Turkish students that joined the College of Europe. Because the younger generation is very much interested in seeing if the possible accession of Turkey to the European Union is not on the distant past, but also the distant future. They are interested in looking at the possibilities of revitalizing the path that could eventually potentially lead Turkey to enter the European Union. It seems so improbable and unlikely today. But if the 2025, 30 years old generation starts reflecting on this and preparing for this, we might have a chance to have a different Turkey in the future.

**Federica Mogherini** 55:36

For the European Union, I think that it was clear at a certain moment thatTurkey took a different path. In particular, on human rights and rule of law; these have been the turning points. The moment when Erdogan started to deviate from the common traditionally set of, by the way, principles and standards that we share in the Council of Europe -- because there's not only the European Union, there's the Council of Europe of which Turkey is a member -- that is mainly focusing on human rights and rule of law, the role of judiciary and respect of parliamentary minority. I mean, these are the most serious elements that have taken Turkey away from from the European part of the European Union accession path. This might be reversible in the future, formally, Turkey stays a candidate country, but again, negotiations are suspended and I don't see any possibility of revitalizing them, unless and until there will be a radical change of attitudes on the issues of human rights and rule of law in Turkey.

**Federica Mogherini** 56:43

Having said that, I also think that a positive agenda with Turkey, beyond the perspectives for membership to the European Union, is possible and desirable. First of all, because we're neighbors, first of all, because we share some of the security threats of our region; in the Mediterranean in the Middle East. But also, because as I mentioned, the Cyprus issue at a certain moment will require to be solved. And it cannot be solved without Turkey actively contributing to solving it. And so, I hope this is not something impossible to happen in the future, I hope that a US administration might help us in the context of considering Turkey as a key NATO ally to define a new kind of environment, a new kind of atmosphere in which a little bit more cooperation and a little bit less of confrontation is possible with Turkey. And again, it's not just between Turkey and the European Union, it's between Turkey and, I would say, what we traditionally referred to as the Western world. This is not an expression I like, but it synthetizes well the set of values we live for. It was more difficult to use this expression a few weeks ago, but now it's safe again. So at the moment, when it comes back, I would say to the community of values that we've always shared. I think that, again, both the perspective of coming in the Union and also a more cooperative approach in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean, starting from the Cyprus issue, might be very much possible and desirable.

**John Torpey** 58:23

Okay, thank you. Maybe now we can turn to some questions from the audience. The first one is as follows: From a European perspective, does the prospective appointment of Tony Blinken and especially Victoria Nuland suggests that the US might return to the regime change business? And how would a more anti Russian American policy be received in Europe?

**Federica Mogherini** 58:52

I didn't define the previous US policy as a regime change approach. I think that some lessons of the past have been learned. Some thinking has been done on some of the limits or the mistakes. We might have done together, including from the European side, in some moments, for instance, on Russia.

**Federica Mogherini** 59:23

Well, first of all, the European Union still has sanctions on Russia, actually tougher than the United States. So at this stage, the EU policy on Russia is much tougher than the United States one. So, I don't think that this will be perceived as a problem. If the United States take a stronger stance on Russia, it will actually be welcomed. But, I think that in the European Union and Europe in general, we have realized one thing that I think our our friends and starting from Tony Blinken and Victoria Noland also might have reflected upon in this in these years. And this is the fact that, for instance, when you think of Euromaidan -- one of the demonstrations in Ukraine in early 2014 -- In that moment, the narrative that Russia was playing was that the Europeans and the Americans were pushing Ukraine to a choice: on one side or the other; you can be either with Russia or with the West. And for a country with a social and ethnic and linguistic composition, and even religious composition, as Ukraine, as many other Eastern European countries, this approach of choosing sides is problematic. Because history -- and even literature or or poetry, or as I said, religion -- makes it so that pushing for choice can be easily manipulated or instrumentalized by the Russian Federation for aggressive purposes.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:01:07

And I think that from that moment we realized [about Russia instrumentalizing the situation for aggressive purposes], [and] at least in Europe, we changed the narrative and our partnership with what we call our Eastern partners: Ukraine, but also Moldova, Georgia, but even Armenia, Azerbaijan, or Belarus. [Ours was] an approach, not of of telling them: "you need to choose if you're friends of Russia, or your friends of Europe." It's an approach that says: "These are this is our set of values." , "This is how our democracies work.", "This is how we empower our civil society" , "This is our guaranteed independence of the judiciary", "This is how we guarantee that our media sector is free and independent", "This is what we can do together to try and start reforms, but also economic investments and trade relations between the European Union and your country", "This doesn't imply becoming an enemy of Russia", "This doesn't imply breaking all the ties you have with Russia, but this is what is on our sides; this is clearly what is on the table from our side." And avoiding to enter into the binary choice discourse.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:02:18

I think that this narrative has proven to be much more productive in practical terms, allowing these countries that want to reform, that want to have a more European standards oriented society,economy and institutions, to engage in that process without allowing Russian Federation to use the identity arguments inside the societies themselves. I don't know if I managed to express myself properly, but I think that this has been a thinking that for sure, in Europe has developed. And I think that the same kind of reasoning might have happened also in some of our American friends.

**John Torpey** 1:03:01

Thank you very much.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:03:03

This is true only for countries in the east of Europe, but also in Central Asia, that are experiencing exactly the same kind of dynamic: a search for reforms and investments on the model of the European style, without breaking completely the cultural identity ties, starting from the language ties, with what has always been.

**John Torpey** 1:03:33

Right. So could you please address how the EU uses migration partnerships as part of the foreign policy? How does the EU reconcile the human rights violations directly connected to EU migration deterrence, particularly, in the Mediterranean and Africa?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:03:54

What a question... This has been one of the files on which I have personally suffered the most during my years in office. I think there's no mystery because I think I said it even publicly a couple of times. First of all, on a personal note, when I arrived in Brussels, I resigned as an Italian Foreign Minister the day before starting in Brussels. So I was coming straight from the member state that was at the time more exposed to migratory flows. And I I was shocked when I arrived in Brussels finding out that migration for the European Union was a purely internal fight; there was no external competence on migration put in place whatsoever, as if migration was happening from...where?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:04:53

So, we started developing partnerships with countries of origin and transit. For me, there were two aspects here, and there still are. On one side, I think Europe has been not living up to its own standards, when it came to respect of human rights and promotion and protection of human rights related to the management of migration and refugee flows. I personally felt a deficit on the European side on that. And that created to me some consciousness problems.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:05:34

On the other side -- and this was mainly linked to the domestic political fights inside the member states -- this issue has always been so highly politicized, particularly by the right wing parties and their extreme right wing parties or governments, that sometimes you have the impression that they didn't even want to solve the problem because they needed to use the problem electorally. That was my impression from time to time and I found it extremely painful to see this in Europe. And I've always admitted that in Europe, on the migration file, on the refugee treatment, we have a lot and a long way to go to have full respect and for promotion and protection of human rights.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:06:24

On the other side, what we put in place and is still in place with countries of origin and transit, was on the contrary, something extremely valuable and positive. Because the the agreements that were established with the countries of origin and transit, were done together with the UN agencies. So it is all trilateral agreements between the European Union, countries of origin and transit, the UNHCR and the UN. In some cases, also including international NGOs. For instance, on the respect and the protection of particular categories of refugees and migrants, or even sometimes training local forces on how to protect human rights in countries where protection of human rights is not yet, let's put it this way, developed.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:07:19

And also trying to invest on regular channels on both sides; dismantling of criminal networks and criminal organizations, and developing local economic opportunities so that the flows of economic forced migration could be prevented. I think that the combination of this with a huge investment from an economic but also from a political point of view was positive. This is I think, [saying] that the external partnerships is exactly the way forward. And this is why the UN actually was very much happy to see the European Union engaging, finally, into this. Basically, a cooperation aimed at developing opportunities on the grounds and opening regular and legal channels for migration to come into Europe without putting these people in the hands of criminal organizations -- they traffic human beings as they traffic drugs or or arms. -- Of this actually, I've always been very proud. As much as I have not been proud of the way in which internally, in some cases, some European Union member States in particular, have treated migrants and refugees. I hope I've answered in a very transparent and open manner, or at least that this is his the answer to the to the question that was put.

**John Torpey** 1:08:45

I don't think our questioner could have cause for complaint with that answer. Thank you very much. So here's a very interesting question. When Angela Merkel steps down this year, how do you anticipate her absence will impact EU leadership? She's been there for 16 years. What next?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:09:06

Well. It's a German issue, but it's also an European nation. My impression, it's more than a guess, for sure she would be missed. But the European Union is such an structured complex, I would say a solid building, that for sure individuals are missed. But nobody is indispensable or irreplaceable. So for sure her leadership will be missed, in particular, I think her leadership will be missed in the EPP, in the People's Party in the conservative side of the political landscape in Europe, because she has been, for sure and still is, a point of reference for all those conservatives in Europe that have a very pro European stance. And that has created, somehow, a limit to the extreme right. She is one that, for me, has been the most forcefully pushing back the extreme rights attempts in Europe to come to the center of the political landscape; she has been the origin for that. After her, I hope that the conservative camp in Europe and in Germany will be as strong as she has been in pushing back this temptations of going more on the far right that have been present in other leaders in other countries. So more on the political dynamics on the party politics, she will be missed. On this fusional level, I think, yes, for sure she will be missed, but again, the structure and the architecture is solid enough to absorb anyone leaving. And I assure that there would be other leaders taking the place. But again, on the on the party politics sides, I think she will be missed.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:11:12

I'm talking as an observer, of course.

**John Torpey** 1:11:20

So you mentioned in your response to that question the far right. And a questioner asks about the role of transnational far right relationships and how they may affect the transatlantic relationship between the United States and the European Union. How does that work in terms of the impact that it may have on the relationship?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:11:47

It does, it does a lot. And I can tell you, in the years of the Trump administration, the extreme right in Europe was definitely not only growing, but feeling empowered, that is without any doubt. All across the European Union all across Europe, I would say, the extreme right political leaders have had a good point in saying "once Trump is in the White House, we can be in government." And they were because there's no taboo anymore; "all doors are opened, we can as well." And this was used in the political campaigns and in the electoral campaigns in all European countries, including ban on living in Europe for some time, advising far rights; extreme rights, movements in Europe on lateral strategies or political communication strategies without any problem. And if you scroll the Twitter accounts of the extreme right political leaders, you will find plenty of their picture with Trump before he became president or after that, in some cases. So for sure this is not over. (Somebody is calling but it's not me.)

**Federica Mogherini** 1:13:26

In the United States, the extreme right, or as the President mentioned, put it or described it in his inaugural speech, the white supremacy movement is alive and kicking and even literally kicking. And the scenes we have seen in Capitol Hill have been dramatic for Europeans because as Margrethe Vestager mentioned, "the last time we've seen scenes like this in Europe was in other times, and they set times were up in history." We know that there are links, we know that there are bonds, we know that they're going to support each other reciprocally. And this is an extremely worrying trend that I hope we will manage to counter in an effective manner, not only from an institutional point of view, not only from a judiciary point of view, because I think there are legal and judicial implications to these actions.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:14:33

By the way, today is the Holocaust Memorial Day. So let me also spend one word on this because I think that we have the duty and the responsibility to remember because it can happen again. And we've seen that awful things of the past can happen again, if we're not paying attention to preventing them from happening. But I think that's the main point. The main task or the main challenge we will hold out across the Atlantic and together with others in the world is to try to increase the antibodies that our society has, or should have, to react and to isolate and to respond to this kind of movements and to avoid that they can grow. Because it starts from from a societal movement or from a transnational movement, and then it comes up to this notional level. And again, even if in the United States today is not at institutional level, it can come back on this additional level in the United States or elsewhere in the world, including in Europe. And we have to be extremely careful to this possibility, because it's dangerous. We've seen it as dangerous for our democracies, even for our economies. If you want to be extremely pragmatic, most of all it is dangerous for our citizens and for the people of our countries.

**John Torpey** 1:15:58

Of course, needless to say, the images from Capitol Hill were shocking for most Americans as well. So apropos the Holocaust, we have a question concerning an institution that came into being after World War Two that was designed essentially to mitigate international conflicts of the kind that had just ended, namely, the United Nations. And the question basically is, what about the transatlantic partnership can contribute to strengthening the UN?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:16:32

Can do a lot. I think that number two, after the Secretary General of NATO, the person that is the most released from the change of administration might be setting the agenda of the United Nations. The United Nations have a lot of things to change, and definitely requires and needs, profound revisions, reforms, all aspects, and as many shortcomings. But as democracy, we've not invented anything better than that for the moment, and having the United States re-engaging in the UN and its agencies is key for the UN to work, for the UN to be financed, and for the European Union to have a partner to work with inside the UN system.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:17:34

What I can share with you is that in this last four years, many times, the European Union has had to jump in, and finance actions or agencies or even humanitarian needs. By the way, in some cases, humanitarian needs signaled by the World Food program, directed by a US citizen and also close to the president at the time, the European Union had to jump in and literally pay the bill that the United States was not paying anymore. Or keep agencies alive that were risking to die because of the withdrawal of the United States from their actions. And the UN system repeatedly, in this last four years, has turned towards the European Union to fill the vacuum that the United States had left.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:18:35

So now for sure, there will be the possibility to work together in the UN system. Again, not to keep it as it is, but to reform it towards a more effective UN system. But if you have an instrument like the UN, that needs to be reformed, but cannot be in this moment replaced because there is no alternative at the moment to that kind of organization. And actually, you have a growing need for global governance, not a diminishing one in the world of today; you see it with a pandemic, we see it with climate change. So you have an increased need for effective global governance, you have an institution that is old, but is in place. The EU and the United States coming together at this stage with others can be the only option for having an effective reform of UN system that can allow us to have the instruments to cope with and to deal with, and possibly to prevent, global crisis or global problems.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:19:37

Look at the pandemic. It was a self-evident need to have a global action on this because the virus knows no limits, no borders. It's not a national or local issue. And if you don't defeat it everywhere in the world, it will come back again to you. Even if you think you're immune, you have to solve it globally. So you need the UN to act effectively. And I believe really that the European Union and the United States can be the engines together of these reforms, and on the security and peace files have to work together in the framework of the United Nations. I think of Syria, I think of the Middle-East peace process completely forgotten, lost. I think of the many African conflicts that are so dangerous for many of us. I think of Libya, I think of all this Venezuela, all this forgotten crisis, on which, without a UN Framework and a US-EU cooperation, there's no way to see any solution at site.

**John Torpey** 1:20:51

Thank you. So one final question, which is essentially the merging of two questions that I have. And it has to do basically, with the EU's ability to influence democratic transformation and the enforcement of the rule of law in various parts of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, Belarus, Kosovo, Albania, North Macedonia, what what kind of tools does the EU have for countries that are not currently part of the EU aren't really going to be part of it anytime soon?

**Federica Mogherini** 1:21:25

Well, thanks for the question. It's an excellent one. There's a lot of instruments that the European Union has that are extremely powerful and effective, I believe. First of all, some of these countries that you mentioned, might, and I hope we'll get inside the union at a certain moment, are already in the process of negotiating their their membership. And this is the most powerful instrument for transformation in this countries. Because as you negotiate the accession to the European Union, first of all, you have access to a lot of funds that can finance the reform processes in all different sectors, in particular, the rule of law, judiciary, corruption, but also civil society and the rule of law in general. But also economic reforms; I think of infrastructure's connectivity.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:22:25

Literally, once you enter the process of negotiating accession to the European Union, you have an all set of standards to be met, processes, and timelines to get there and financial resources and human resources to accompany you on the road. So this is the most effective way to transform societies from within, with the buying, with the ownership of the population and the local leadership. So this is for sure the most transformative instrument we have in the European Union.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:22:54

But there are also other instruments that are extremely helpful and powerful. Well, one of the active ones, I believe, is the association agreements. It's what the European Union has signed with Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia, that includes in all cases, trade agreements; this includes agreements on economic cooperation on technical cooperation. Again, a very tight reform agenda, mainly on the public sector, but also on some parts of the private sector, and a lot of resources.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:23:29

The other countries that you mentioned Belarus, but also here I would refer to Armenia and Azerbaijan... Other are in the process of negotiating other kinds of agreements, or have already signed them, that are lighter in the sense that they're not associated to the European Union, but offer a framework of both economic cooperation, a society of people to people's aspects, exchanges, students exchanges, civil society and parliament's media, joint work and support to the international media sector to the independent media sector, for instance. Trade agreements, or customs agreements, that are beneficial for the societies twice. On one side, because they incentivize reforms, and sometimes they finance reforms. And on the other side, because they increase the economic relations and the trade relations with the European Union.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:24:34

And then even far away from Europe, I was mentioning Central Asia before. All the countries of Central Asia have some form of partnership or agreement with the European Union that includes some elements of those. And all of them are very much willing and looking forward to increase this level of cooperation because they're looking for diversification. They're squeezed between China and Russia, and they look for European standards to find a way out of this geopolitical game. And even if they are not geographically connected, or adicient to European Union Territories, they are all extremely interested in increasing level of partnership and cooperation. And this has always elements of transformative power when it comes to the forums, and again, in particular, I underline economic reforms, but also institutional, starting from human rights rule of law and judiciary.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:25:35

And also looking south -- sorry, and then I'll stop here -- at the southern shore of the Mediterranean, also with northern African countries and with Middle Eastern countries, the European Union has agreements and partnerships, structured ones, that have supported in this years, especially after the so called Arab springs. The reforms inside these countries, more or less successfully vary a lot from country to country. But in all these countries there are "association dialogues," and ministerial meetings and leaders meetings and summits. In between, there is an officials' work to reform profoundly different sectors of these countries.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:26:24

So there is a lot, there is actually much more than it is perceived, and it is seen and visible in place. And this brings me to saying something that I've always said -- and people normally looked at me as if I was completely crazy -- but if you took away the European Union and all its international engagements and instruments, if you took away all of this for even one day, only, the world would literally collapse. You take away all the humanitarian aid, all the development aid, all the trade agreements, all the human rights' dialogues, all the reforms, processes... if you took away all of that even for 24 hours, I couldn't count the number of people that would die out of it, or the number of processes that will stop. We don't sometimes realize it because we give it for granted. We've always done it, we continue to do it. And it's a life saving mode somehow for many. But I think this is really the most powerful instrument the European Union has; this transformative normative power also that is so precious for us.

**Federica Mogherini** 1:26:28

Indeed. Well, thank you very much. I want to say thank you so much to Federica Mogherini, the former High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union and currently rector of the College of Europe, where she's training future versions of herself, I think, and...

**Federica Mogherini** 1:27:53

So I hope that we will be able to welcome some of your students in a future in Bruges or in Warsaw. It would be great to see more, especially more American students joining.

**John Torpey** 1:28:07

I'm hoping to send my daughter, who's Belgian, but that's another conversation. I also want to thank the Otto and Fran Walter foundation for their steadfast support of this lecture series and of the activities of the European Union Studies Center more generally, Robin Garel president of the Graduate Center and everyone who helped make this event such a success. Thank you so much. And this will, by the way, be posted online in the very near future. I can't say exactly when but look forward soon. Okay, thank you all very much. Thank you to the audience for coming. And we look forward to seeing you again. Be well over there achieve with it.