

The Newsletter is based on the radio programme broadcast on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2015, produced by the Foreign Policy Association of Moldova in partnership with Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES). The programme is broadcast on the Radio Moldova public channel and on the Vocea Basarabiei Radio. The programme is part of the FES/APE "Foreign Policy Dialogues" Project. The content can be reproduced by mentioning the source.

# NEWSLETTER

MONTHLY BULLETIN • MAY 2015 • NR.5 (110)

## Synthesis and Foreign Policy Debates

The materials are realized by Lina Grau, foreign policy expert and programme coordinator with APE.

### TOPICS OF THE EDITION:

1. **„The EU and the East in 2030“.** A new FES report is trying to anticipate possible developments in future relations between the EU, Russia and the Eastern Partnership.
2. How Moldovan experts see the future of relations between the EU and Russia and the developments in their neighbouring countries.
3. **Reinhard Krumm:** Moldova has all the possibilities to become member of the EU sometime. It all depends on Moldova.

#### The last period has been marked by several important events in Moldova.



The Moldovan Prime Minister Chiril Gaburici and his Romanian counterpart, Victor Ponta, signed in Chisinau the Memorandum on Moldova's Energy Security, which provides for expansion of the gas and electricity networks from Romania to Moldova. Until 2018, there will be built the Ungheni-Chisinau and Onesti-Iasi pipelines as well as the Isaccea-Vulcănești-Chisinau, Iasi-Ungheni-Straseni, and Suceava-Balti electrical interconnections. The cost of the project is estimated at 750 thousand euro.



On May 21<sup>st</sup>, the Ukrainian parliament cancelled a number of intergovernmental agreements on military cooperation with Russia, including the agreement allowing Russia to transit its troops stationed in Moldova via Ukraine. The Tiraspol leader, Yevgeny Shevchuk, said the measure is intended to pull the military peacekeeping troops out by force from Transnistria. The chairman of the defence committee of the Russian State Duma, Vladimir Komolodov, said that Russia "will not abandon Transnistria and Moldova".



The Prime Minister Chiril Gaburici asked to initiate a criminal investigation on the concession of the Chisinau airport, given the fact that in 2013 the decision on concession was taken on the basis of erroneous information. The Prime Minister believes that some of the money withdrawn from the Savings Bank, Unibank and Social Bank has been transferred to the account of the Avia Invest company, which took out the lease on the Chisinau International Airport. "At that time, the businessman Ilan Shor was Chairman of the Board of the Savings Bank, Unibank and Avia Invest. Funds have been illegally transferred to the account of the Avia Invest company, which caused big damages to the public interests." Ilan Shor is under house arrest in connection with the investigation of the case of the three banks, but this did not prevent him from getting registered for local elections from June 14<sup>th</sup>, running for mayor of Orhei.



At the opening of the Riga Eastern Partnership Summit on 21-22 May, the European Commission President, Jean-Claude Juncker, said the summit "is not about enlargement," but "we must ensure that each participating country has a European perspective". The civil society representatives from Moldova, Ukraine and Georgia have filed a symbolic membership application to the EU countries.



Donald Tusk, the European Council President, made it clear that he came to Riga with three simple messages: "The European Union is not intimidated, despite the war started last year. The European Union supports its Eastern partners. The Eastern Partnership is now the priority of the entire Europe, not only of the Central and Eastern Europe as it was five years ago."



The German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, said the European Union's partnership with the six eastern European countries is even more important given the crisis in Ukraine. Speaking in the Bundestag, Merkel said the European order has been shaken by the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia and the fights in eastern Ukraine. "We will continue to support our eastern neighbours, which are trying to create democratic societies based on the rule of law." Commenting on the fears that the Eastern Partnership could cause a deep rivalry between the EU and Russia, the German Chancellor repeated that "the Eastern Partnership is not an instrument of EU enlargement. Therefore, we should not raise expectations that we will not be able to meet".

## „The UE and the East in 2030. Four scenarios of the relations between the EU, Russian Federation and the EaP countries“



The year 2014 has brought the deepest crisis in the relations

between the EU and Russia since the end of the Cold War. The Ukrainian

conflict has questioned the basis on which the EU Eastern policy has been built so far. Apparently, the EU found it impossible to reach the Eastern Partnership countries (EaP) - Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine – and establish, at the same time, a strategic modernization partnership with the Russian Federation. One of the lessons learned is that the EU policy approaches towards its eastern neighbours cannot be viewed independently of each other.

The deep crisis in relations between the European Union and the Russian Federation has raised fundamental questions about the EU policy towards its eastern neighbours. How will the relations between the EU, the Russian Federation and the Eastern Partnership countries look like in the future? What scenarios are plausible and likely? To find answers to these questions, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung has invited 20 experts from 12 countries to jointly develop potential trajectories for the EU and its eastern neighbours. The group developed four scenarios outlined in a new FES report “*The EU and the East in 2030*”, which is trying to anticipate possible developments in the future relations between the EU, the Russian Federation and the EaP countries.

Four scenarios have been presented at a roundtable in Chisinau, which try to identify together with the participants how the EU could make the most positive scenarios possible and prevent the negative ones from happening. The experts in Chisinau have discussed how they should position themselves and act so that Moldova doesn't remain in a grey area of uncertainty.

## Scenario I: Shared Home

*All Europeans share one home — for pragmatic reasons*

After a “lost decade” characterised by political crises and economic stagnation, the EU and Russia focus on shared interests from 2020 onwards. A new free trade agreement also integrates the Eastern Partnership countries, who are no longer forced to decide for or against either side.

## Scenario II: Common Home

*Europe is home to nations bound together by common values*

A deep economic crisis in Russia leads to democratic and economic reforms that clear the way for improved EU-Russia relations. As new global powers rise, Russia and the EU join forces not only to resolve conflicts in Europe, but also to counter common threats.

## Scenario III: Broken Home

*The European home lies in ruins*

The current confrontation between the EU and Russia continues up to 2030. A relative successful authoritarian modernisation in Russia and the energy transition in the EU give both sides the opportunity to act independently. The countries in the common neighbourhood, which are the objects of intense EU-Russia competition, form a zone of instability.

## Scenario IV: Divided Home

*Europeans live next door, but apart from each other*

The EU and Russia are locked in a stalemate: significant deterioration is prevented by continued economic interdependence. Improvements, however, seem impossible due to widespread mistrust. No political and economic transformation takes place. Europe increasingly loses touch with the new global power centres.

# Four scenarios for Relations between the EU and the East in the opinion of Moldovan experts

**Sergiu Ostaf: The EU preferential treatment of Russia should not get that far as to consider it the only important neighbour**

**A**ccording to Sergiu Ostaf, director of the Human Rights Resource Center (CREDO) in Chisinau, the *Common Home* - in which Russia and the European Union co-exist harmoniously - is the most preferable and at the same time, the least feasible scenario. The chance of its materialization is only 10 percent. The *Shared Home* scenario would be the most likely development in the region in the coming decades, with a probability of realization of 45 percent, believes Sergiu Ostaf. A worse evolution, but also quite realistic, is the *Broken Home* scenario. Here's how the expert explains it:

■ **Sergiu Ostaf:** *Shared Home* is a scenario in which there is economic cooperation between the two entities -the EU and the Russian Federation -the pragmatic interests being very high. At the same time, there is some degree of understanding and partnership that tolerates and accommodates the differences.

Currently, in my opinion, the EU and the Russian Federation find themselves in the *Broken Home* scenario, where there is fierce competition, the practical differences on both sides being treated as threats. And, of course, in this case the situation in the region plays an important role. In addition, those events or incidents play an inflammatory role in the hostile relations. In my opinion, the EU should



find ways in order not to be influenced to stay in this scenario of the *Broken Home*, although it is a very realistic scenario. The EU should build on the opportunities in order to redefine the relationship with the Russian Federation within the *Shared Home* scenario.

In my opinion, namely this last scenario – *Shared Home* – in the long-term, requires fewer military, economic and other resources and we can say it's one of the most stable scenarios. The second most stable scenario is that of the *Broken Home*.

Why *Shared Home* is the most realistic scenario and with the most stable situation? Firstly, because, in my opinion, there will be no economic collapse of the Russian Federation. This

will not happen, because China and Asia will take over the role of the technological source which is currently played by the EU and to some extent, by the USA. So, Russia will be technologically and economically more integrated with Asia and China, in particular, and there will be no economic downturn because the

technology transfer will be substituted by those countries. In addition, China and Asia don't insist very much on changing the value system or on the development and strengthening of democratic institutions, which is more compatible with the Russian interests. So even though there will be some negative economic growth, it will not be significant.

We have seen that the second scenario – *the Common Home* - stipulates that Russia will be economically practically kneeled and as a result of this substantial economic decrease, the development paradigm of the Russian Federation will be totally rethought. For this reasons, I think the scenario of the *Common Home* has little chance to succeed.

Why the *Shared Home* is the most plausible scenario? There is a profound difference in the development paradigms. Another important argument is that the *Shared Home* scenario requires the least resources to be maintained as the Asian model will make it more influential than the European or American democratic models.

However, we may fail to move towards the *Shared Home* scenario and remain in the scenario that at the moment, is achievable in the short term – that of the *Broken Home*. When the Russian elites find ways of mutual integration with Asian countries, particularly with China, and becomes highly dependent on China, the latter will try to use the Russian Federation as a field of confrontation with the EU and the USA. Russia will then be not necessarily at the mercy of China, but its policy will be greatly influenced by China and Asian policy in this area. This is undesirable, including for Russia. When Russia is influenced more by the economic processes, it will become more dependent on China's interests and China will use the opportunity to confront the USA and the EU through other countries, for example, via Russia.

Now, what should the European Union do in order to avoid the *Broken Home* scenario and move towards a better scenario – that of the *Shared Home*? I have already said that, in my opinion, the *Common Home* scenario, even though it is most desirable, yet it is not achievable. So what should the EU do in order to avoid the other scenarios – *Broken Home* or *Divided Home*? In my opinion, the EU should build a distinct identity, with an important military and diplomatic component and with a distinct identity from the USA policy and identity. The relations with

Russia should have an important focus on the engagement with the Russian Federation.

What would this engagement mean? The EU should give privileged status to the Russian Federation, which means that Russia should be taken into account within the multiple problems existing in the region. That's the reality as Russia is having a very pragmatic policy which is based on its interests. In this sense, the EU should respond with a commitment that meets at least a good part of the Russia's considerations or concerns.

The EU is a very complex construct and allows for parallel multilateral engagement with various actors. A good example of this is when the Nordic Council has de facto integrated the Baltic States, even formally these countries were still outside the EU at that time. In this sense, the EU has sufficient instruments to launch various dimensions and sub-dimensions of integration, through various partnerships, of the countries bordering the Russian Federation, thus de facto, succeeding in facilitating the building of democratic institutions in countries such as Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine. In a decade or more, this transformation will de facto create new realities on the ground and this new situation will allow for a very different construct at the EU level.

And, of course, the EU should engage strongly with Asia in order to prevent possible influences of China or China's desire to confront the EU through Russia. This is what the EU should do, in my opinion.

What should the EU not do? The first issue is highly visible - the EU should not, in any case, focus only on the domestic problems. For solutions, in most cases, exist when the construct

is growing and developing. If we focus too much on internal issues, they certainly could weaken the respective constructer. The opportunity for growth and development is always the best way to prevent domestic problems. We should rather seek joint opportunities than identify internal differences. These two paradigms allow us to focus on common opportunities rather than on problems and differences that we have in the EU.

The second important aspect is that the EU should not, in any way, treat the Russian Federation as if it's the only important country in the EU neighborhood. The preferential treatment of the Russian Federation should not go that far.

And the last point, I think the most stable solution for all stakeholders is the *Shared Home*, which requires the fewest sources – military, energy, economic, elite interests...

The most difficult solution to maintain is the *Common Home*, because it entails an enormous internal transformation. The second most difficult solution based on the volume of resources required is the *Divided Home* - a very negative scenario, and, secondly, in order to implement it, there is need for many military and economic resources of the parties concerned. So, I think that including for this reason this scenario is very unlikely.

## **Julian Groza: The best solution to counteract the Russian influence is to focus on building an effective state**

**Julian Groza, the former deputy foreign minister and currently program director at the Institute for European Policies and Reforms says that all four scenarios are realistic and can be placed consecutively, one after the other. "It seems that we are already in one of these scenarios," says Julian Groza.**

**Julian Groza:** I believe that the starting point of the relationship between the EU and the Russian Federation was the *Common Home*. You know the story of the "common space between Russia and the EU" and that of the modernization agreement.

Then the idea that resembled the *Shared Home* scenario came. I remember that before the Vilnius Summit there were very heated discussions with the European Commission and the Eastern Partnership countries when preparing the statement. The Commission was asked by some EU member states, including Germany, to come up with this idea of a free trade zone from Vladivostok to Lisbon. President Putin also tried to promote this idea. Thus, the EU has tried to embrace Russia and engage it into a dialogue.

Over the last year, we have passed through the *Broken Home* scenario. Now we are on the doorstep of the *Divided Home*. These scenarios are consecutive. As regards the relations between Russia and the EU, I believe we must first see what Russia has in mind and what the EU objectives are. I believe the objectives are different and going in opposite directions.

Russia perceives itself as an emerging power, led by Putin who has the feeling of rebuilding a strong Russia. «The most tragic development of the twentieth



century was the collapse of the Soviet Union,» said President Putin. The first decision he took when he came to power was to change the national anthem of the Russian Federation. This is the project of Mr. Putin - to rebuild the Soviet Union in a different way.

The EU, on the other hand, is interested in stability, prosperity, especially in its neighborhood. And the EU has come up with the idea of helping the Eastern Partnership countries to be more stable, more developed, more modern. Russia has also been offered this opportunity, but Moscow has refused it.

Russia understands very well how the EU operates. Russia is integrated into the business and investment activities. It knows the EU weaknesses and strengths and I believe Russia is trying to take advantage of them in pursuing its goals. I think the basic principle that drives Russia is very old – "Divide et Impera" ("divide and rule"). Russia is trying to take advantage of the EU weaknesses seeking to support the opposition forces of the extreme right or left in the EU - Greece, Spain, France - including financing parties. Russia is learning very quickly how to use soft power – it practiced the same tools

that the EU and the Western world tried to use in order to promote prosperity and development. Russia uses the same tools to promote its interests and expand its influence over the former colonies.

I think Russia is rather successful in pursuing its objectives. While the EU believes Russia is part of a game and playing by rules, believing it is about a football match, Russia is actually playing rugby, if not box.

So what should Moldova do in this situation? Moldova is at the crossroad of the Western and Eastern civilizations. This fact is reflected also internally - if we look at the polls, they suggest Moldova is divided along geopolitical lines. We have also seen lately that the Europeanization idea has been discredited. At present, only 39 percent of Moldovans believe the country should join the EU. I do not think this is a realistic figure - I think this reflects more the protest mood of the society and the growing interest of Russia in the region.

I have mentioned that one of these tools is soft power - Russia is supporting NGOs, directly and indirectly, having also a strong propaganda on television. At

least 30 percent of Moldova's population speaks Russian, some people still being nostalgic about the Soviet Union. In addition, the church is playing a big role in this process. The church in Moldova is subordinated to the Russian patriarchy and we have seen the statements of the Russian patriarch, saying the church should be used to promote the interests of the Russian Federation. This influence is reflected in the various myths and lies about the EU propagated by the church. For example, some priests were saying that if Moldova signed the Association Agreement with the European Union Moldovans will have to become Catholic and abandon the cross.

What should we do in this situation? The best and the most sustainable solution would be to focus on building the state – strengthening the rule of law, fighting against corruption, advancing with the judicial reform and promoting

the economic development. The political elites should be more accountable to the citizens and not be trapped in geopolitical debates during the election campaigns.

Yes, the Russian factor had a very important effect because of the propaganda. On the other hand, we should not blame only Russia for all the major problems of Moldova. Russia is interested in having weak states in its neighborhood and countries that are plunged in chaos and that cannot find their identity. On the other hand, the EU wants the opposite – it wants us to be established and developed as this would be in the interest of all international partners.

We cannot escape from this context, as we will remain with these two civilizations- the Western and the Eastern- around us. We must find our place in these two civilizations. We must

use the best tools that have proven their viability and this instrument is the European integration. We have seen how the European integration has positively influenced Poland, Romania, and the Baltic states, therefore we should apply the same mechanism.

So the best solution for Moldova would be the European integration –not as a geopolitical choice, but as an instrument of modernization. At the same time, we should convince the EU of our will to transform. And maybe, one day, we will join the European Union.

At the same time, we should convince Russia that it is not about antagonizing it but about trying to capitalize on the opportunities so that Moldova becomes stronger and more developed, which would be also in the interest of the Russian Federation.

## ***Vladimir Iastrebchiak: It is disputable whether we can in general use the word „home” in the relationship between the EU and Russia***

***The former chief negotiator of Tiraspol in the 5 + 2 negotiations over the Transnistrian conflict, Vladimir Iastrebchiak, is skeptical about the idea of using the word “home” for the relationship between the EU and Russia.***

First of all, in the scenarios presented today a lot of attention is drawn to the need for transformation of the Russian Federation. Certainly, that is true and there are certain trends in the Russian Federation, but from my point of view, it's really crucial to speak about the transformation in the European Union itself, as in my opinion, and the Ukrainian crisis proved it, the European institutions dealing with security and foreign policy have turned out to be less effective than they could be. For



example, for the Russian Federation and other countries, including the United States, it could be more effective to

deal with the United States or separate countries of the EU and not with the European institutions. And this is probably one of the most important problems- whether the European Union will be able to create effective mechanisms and systems of reacting to challenges.

The second aspect I would like to point out is that in the second scenario as well as in other scenarios, an important role is attributed to Mr Putin. This reminds me of the famous soviet statement: “When we say Lenin, we mean the Communist party and when we say the Communist Party, we mean Lenin.” I would say that to some extent it may be true, but Putin is just the leader of the Russian political elite and I am not sure if it is to expect crucial changes

after Putin's resignation as the history proved that after Lenin, Stalin comes. I am not sure this is the best option. That is why, in my opinion, it is necessary to think about mechanisms, ways of communication and cooperation with the current leadership of the Russian Federation.

Another point, I think that the EU should have an individual approach to projects and tasks. A good example in this sense is the situation with the Eastern Partnership as from my point of view, it's rather difficult to imagine how common options may be for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine or Moldova. To my mind, the EU should take separate decisions and steps towards the neighbourhood. If we speak about what the EU should do, as I have already mentioned, it should have an individual approach especially with regard to sensitive issues as sometimes the European officials can do more harm than anyone else to the European idea during their visits to the Republic of Moldova. That is why the EU

should abstain from universal scenarios and focus of designing individual measures and unique scenarios towards its neighbouring countries.

Speaking about scenarios, probably the best one is the *Common Home*, despite the fact that the word "common" remains probably the most disputable in the negotiations between the Republic of Moldova and Transnistria. No one knows what "common" means, but everyone supports this idea. Probably, this is because nobody understands its meaning. Unfortunately, and I will agree here with the previous commentator, the most realistic scenario is the *Shared Home*. Quoting Russian folklore, there is a crucial difference between the realist and the pessimist, as the pessimist thinks the situation will get worse, while the optimist thinks the situation may get worse. To some extent, I am an optimist, because even the title of these scenarios which contains the word "home" is very, very optimistic. From my point of view, we may speculate and argue that we have a home.

We have communications and pipelines but this doesn't mean we have a common home. I'm not sure we have it. Certainly, it is necessary to try to build it and this could be the most important task.

I would like to come up with some recommendations for the European Union. The first one is that the EU should define its identity and as I've already mentioned, this identity should be proved by real mechanisms in operating as an entity. If the EU fails to do it, I think it would be easier to continue the present practice of trying to reach agreements with certain and separate EU members states.

The second point, the EU should look for cooperation not only with the Russian Federation, but also with the Eurasian Union, because this will be sort of priority for the Russian leadership - to make this structure a real institution and subject of international relations and try to bring the relations with the EU not to the EU-Russia level but to the level of the EU and Eurasian Union.

## **Igor Boțan: The region in which we find ourselves must not remain a zone of exclusive interests of the Russian Federation**

**Igor Boțan, Executive Director of the Association for Participatory Democracy, is also of the opinion that it is unlikely that any of the four scenarios can be achieved in their pure form – rather the four scenarios will succeed one another. How optimistic or pessimistic the future will be depends on the order in which the scenarios will follow each other, says Igor Boțan.**

■ **Igor Boțan:** I'll quote from memory one of the European officials who said that the European Union is «an economic giant, a political mediocrity and a dwarf in security». At the same time, if we give a characteristic to Russia, it is a military giant and economic mediocrity.

The second very important point when we talk about scenarios is related to the motivation of partners or opponents. It depends on who has the initiative. I believe that the Russian Federation has a different motivation from that of the European Union. Russia is now very irritated and wants to restore the share it once had in the world and that makes it a leader of discontent with the existing order in this part of the world. It is Russia which took the initiative in our region and less the European Union.

I want to remind you that the conflict in this area began after 7 May 2009, when the Eastern Partnership was launched. It is true that Russia has been invited





as a very special and strategic partner of the EU to the EaP but it refused the proposal. We remember the approaches - Russia insisted that the post-Soviet space be «exclusive zone of Russian interests», while the European Union has proposed that this area be under «joint responsibility». For example, about 50 percent of Moldovan citizens are in favour of the European integration and 50 percent are advocates of the Eurasian integration. It is not correct for anyone to claim exclusivity in our space. And it is absolutely correct, in my view, to speak of a shared responsibility in this area.

Now, back to the most important thing - if the EU is a dwarf in terms of security, while Russia is a giant and in terms of economic development the situation is vice versa, it is evident that the security issue comes to the fore. We have seen that last year the regional security architecture was dramatically undermined and I am not sure it can be repaired. So, the partners have lost confidence in one another.

There is another extremely important factor – in the relationship between the EU and Russia a victim has appeared –Ukraine - that cannot be overlooked. And here another important factor comes into play- the United States. The USA and the Great Britain have signed

the Budapest Memorandum. As a major world power the USA cannot allow for the agreement to be undermined as no one will take the USA seriously if the latter having international obligations ignores a partner to whom it gave guarantees.

Regarding the European Union, it seems to me that it is somehow irresponsible towards Ukraine, which is a victim. As I said, Ukraine has become a victim because of the benevolent and well-intentioned actions of the EU. When the crisis in Ukraine started, the EU was not determined enough.

When the USA is accused of getting involved, everyone forgets that the USA is acting on the basis of a document based on which it has assumed certain obligations.

In the given situation, the partners - the EU and the Russian Federation – have to try to restore the mutual trust. I think it is nonsense what is happening today in the relations between the EU and the Russian Federation. Everyone understands that the Russian Federation is a very important actor and nobody wants isolation of Russia. But Russia has already lost its reputation, its economic prospects being bleak. And there is another factor – the way this country is developing. I am reading with great

interest the Russian philosophers who characterize Russia as «a country with recuperative development», ie when the country is always one step behind the global developments. Russia is a country with enormous potential, but by virtue of size and history, it always lags behind in development.

For us, the countries that are between Russia and the European Union it makes sense to be closer to the EU, because it is more advanced. Or we can align ourselves with those who remain in this «recuperative development,» but in that case we should be aware of our ultimate goals. And we know the ultimate goal from Mr Putin. Geopolitically, Russia wants to become a pole of multi-polar world; ideologically - a bastion of conservatism; and economically -it wants to build the Eurasian Union on the same criteria as the EU.

So, we know these parameters. In this case, my recommendation would be very much in line with what was discussed at the Prague Summit on 7 May 2009 - the area in which Moldova and Ukraine find themselves should be understood at least as an area of shared responsibility between the EU and the Russian Federation and all stakeholders should work together in order to overcome the difficult situation in the region.

## **Reinhard Krumm: Moldova has all the possibilities to become member of the EU sometime. It all depends on Moldova.**

**R**einhard Krumm, head of the Central and Eastern Europe Department of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, said the good governance is a prerequisite for getting closer to the European model and standards. The Republic of Moldova has real chances to become EU member at some point, but this depends on

*the will of the Moldovan political class and society in Moldova, says Reinhard Krumm.*

■ **Lina Grâu:** What are the most realistic scenarios of developments for the next decades? During the presentation of the FES report, you said that, most likely,

the reality will combine elements of the four scenarios developed by experts. Where is the place of Moldova in those scenarios? What is, in your opinion, the future of the European integration of Moldova?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** If we look towards



the future of a common Eastern European policy, we should distinguish between short-, medium- and long-term perspectives. A short-term priority is the peaceful settlement of the Ukrainian conflict so that Ukraine remains a sovereign country. Then it becomes more difficult.

The next goal is what we called during the Cold War «peaceful coexistence». This is already an ambitious goal for the present, because, unfortunately, things are not peaceful in Europe.

And then we have to think long-term. The experts mentioned during the presentation of scenarios that at present, a common home with Russia is not possible. But why not have that as a future goal. However, the European Union policy in relation to Russia cannot be thought apart from the relations with the states of the Eastern neighbourhood.

Let us recall Willy Brandt's New Eastern Policy in the 60s after the fall of the Berlin Wall and after the Soviet Union intervention in Czechoslovakia. The idea was to try a policy of change through rapprochement. Those efforts resulted in the Helsinki Final Act. Today things are somewhat similar- the situation is very difficult but one has to talk, even though it might be very unpleasant.

■ **Lina Grău:** A year ago, everyone was saying that Moldova was the success story of the Eastern Partnership. Now, the experts say the European integration is no longer a priority, because the EU is not ready to accept new members, but also because the Moldovan political class is unable to conduct the necessary reforms. What to do with Moldova? Is the EU ready to offer a European perspective to the Republic of Moldova?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** Moldova has signed the Association Agreement with the EU, as well as Ukraine and Georgia. All three



countries want to move towards Europe. Membership is not the short term goal. Instead internal transformation has to be achieved, along the lines of good governance. I believe that the European perspective depends foremost on Moldova itself. Concerning its security Moldova has to understand its own location and the political situation in the countries around. This is the context we all should take into account. Good relations are key for a stable environment.

Let me give you an example. Joining the EU was very difficult for some countries. For example, in Poland, the political leadership has changed virtually every year during the association period. Because harsh measures had to be taken. This needs to be taken into account – there will be very tough

reforms to come. And not because the EU wants it, but because the country wants it. This process will be extremely difficult for the political leadership of Moldova, but you should follow the principle «we can do it, we want it and if we want it, we will do it by all means».

■ **Lina Grău:** Our perception is that our authorities are simply not capable or interested in promoting reforms, because they seem to be guided by personal and group interests, their goal being personal enrichment. In the negative scenario, in which Moldova does not advance with the reforms, what are the risks? Are there risks that the process will fail?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** Sure there are such risks. They have always been, including in the countries that joined

the EU. Integration is a difficult process, especially for the countries of the former Soviet Union. This is precisely why I said the political will and the will of the society are very important. Look at the Baltic countries. Or at Poland: The euphoria was amazing - the society understood that the process will be very complicated but it wanted very much a European future, because it felt that Europe is the common home. If there is such an attitude in your country, you will succeed.

■ **Lina Grâu:** Do you think Russia will agree with the implementation by Moldova of the Association Agreement with the EU and with Chisinau getting closer to the European Union, or it will have the same reaction as in Ukraine?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** It's a big question. We have seen in the recent developments in Ukraine, that Russia does not want to be side lined. Mistakes were made by all sides before the scheduled signing of the Association Agreement in November 2013. This should not be repeated in Moldova. Your country has signed

the agreement and now all efforts are directed towards fulfilling this agreement.

■ **Lina Grâu:** What is the role, in the context of getting closer to the EU, of the fight against corruption and justice reform?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** These are very important issues, because they are part of the association. These are very serious reforms, mostly good governance, as I have mentioned before. It is our experience and the conclusion drawn by the EU countries that good governance is an imperative condition for development. **Lina Grâu:** Is Moldova a European country in your perception?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** Yes. Look at the history. But the choice belongs to Moldova – if by identity and aspirations the Moldovan society will say, «Yes, we are Europeans and that's why we want to join the EU», then this is decisive.

■ **Lina Grâu:** How do you see the Republic of Moldova in 2030?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** Moldova - the

society and the state – has to decide where to go, being aware that the process will be a difficult one. It is as in any other thing - the first step is working hard and the second is continuing to work hard but also reaping the rewards and enjoying them. Let's see the things in a positive light - Moldova has all the possibilities to become at some point member of the EU. Twenty years ago this was unimaginable and now the subject is being discussed as something natural and there is even an Association Agreement with the EU signed. That is why everything depends primarily of Moldova.

■ **Lina Grâu:** Does this depend on the Moldovan society or political leadership?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** Both.

■ **Lina Grâu:** Does this also depend on the European Union?

■ **Reinhard Krumm:** It depends on how the EU develops and how the globalized financial and political world develops. Very hard to predict. First of all Moldova has to work on its own future.

The opinions expressed in the newsletter are not necessarily those of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) or of the Foreign Policy Association (APE).



**Foreign Policy Association (APE)** is a non-governmental organization committed to supporting the integration of the Republic of Moldova into the European Union and facilitating the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict in the context of the country Europeanization. APE was established in fall 2003 by a group of well-known experts, public personalities and former senior officials and diplomats, all of them reunited by their commitment to contribute with their expertise and experience to formulating and promoting by the Republic of Moldova of a coherent, credible and efficient foreign policy.



**Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)** is a German social democratic political foundation, whose purpose is to promote the principles and foundations of democracy, peace, international understanding and cooperation. FES fulfils its mandate in the spirit of social democracy, dedicating itself to the public debate and finding in a transparent manner, social democratic solutions to current and future problems of the society. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung has been active in the Republic of Moldova since October 2002.