

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

Type of Document & Title	Date & Time	From	To	Content
<p>Diptel</p> <p>RUSSIA/UKRAINE: UKRAINE PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS – FIRST RUSSIAN REACTIONS [DIPTTEL 1408642]</p>	<p>27.10.14 13:05</p>	<p>British Embassy Moscow</p>	<p>FCO</p>	<p>President Putin spoke about Ukraine in his 24 October televised annual address to the Valdai discussion club in Sochi. He said that Russia had pressed for discussion about Ukraine’s Association Agreement “in an absolutely civilised manner, providing obvious arguments and pointing out possible problems. No-one would listen to us. And no-one would talk to us. We were simply told: it is none of your business. Instead of a difficult but, I stress, civilised dialogue, it has all ended with a coup d’etat. The country has been plunged into chaos, with the economy and social sphere destroyed, with the country plunged into civil war with enormous casualties. Why?”. Putin claimed that former Ukrainian President Yanukovich had agreed to the demands made of him, and the only explanation of his removal was that “those who organise colour revolutions left, right and centre cannot stop themselves”. Elsewhere Putin said “Revolution is bad. We’ve had it up to here with revolutions in the 20th century. Evolution is what we need”. He also admitted in his speech that Russia had helped former Ukraine President Yanukovich flee from Ukraine to Russia via Crimea, following a personal plea from Yanukovich to Putin.</p>
<p>Diptel</p> <p>RUSSIA/UKRAINE: ELECTIONS – RECOGNITION ALL ROUND [DIPTTEL 1408687]</p>	<p>28.10.14 16:59</p>	<p>British Embassy Moscow</p>	<p>FCO</p>	<p>Putin in Valdai</p> <p>6. Putin had already trailed Russian recognition of the 2 November elections in his comments at Valdai on 28 October (our Diptel 1408676). He claimed that the Minsk Agreement stipulated that they should be held “not under Ukrainian law, but in co-ordination with it”. He continued “this was done on purpose, because nobody in the Southeast wants to hold elections in line with Ukrainian law”. This was impossible whilst people in the region felt under threat from Kiev, and that before any rapprochement could be considered troops needed to be withdrawn. He claimed that there had been agreement that elections would be held by 3 November, but this had been amended to 7 December “without consulting anyone, including the people in the Southeast”, and now people simply thought “they cheated us again, it will always be this way”. Finally he said that “if Ukraine wants to keep its territorial integrity, and this is something we want as well, they need</p>

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

				<p>to understand that there is no sense in holding on to some village or another, this is pointless”, noting that troops should be withdrawn and then dialogue could start.</p> <p>7. In his speech, Putin repeated his view of the causes of the crisis which he said started purely from economics, not politics, with the EU’s attempt to integrate Ukraine economically without taking into account Russia’s views: “such steps, made without any prior arrangements, touch on the interests of many other nations, including Russia as Ukraine’s main trade partner. A wide discussion of the issues is necessary”. He said Russia had “not agreed to this, no-one wanted to listen to us and no-one wanted to talk”, but that the EU “simply told us: this is none of your business, end of discussion”, and that it all came down to “government overthrow; they plunged the country into chaos, into economic and social collapse, into a civil war with enormous casualties”.</p> <p>8. Turning to the peace process in southeast Ukraine he said “agreements were reached, but neither side complied in full [sic]” and that he thought “full compliance by both sides might be impossible”. He cited the withdrawal of militia and Ukrainian army forces: neither side had done what they agreed. Nevertheless, Russia was in favour of “complete compliance with Minsk by both sides”, but in his view Kiev showed no desire to resolve the issue peacefully, through negotiations. On Russian influence with the separatists, he said it was “very difficult for Russia to induce the people of Southeast Ukraine to fully comply with all the agreements” as “they keep saying the authorities in Kiev do not comply fully either”. Finally, he noted forcefully that “if, God forbid, anyone is again tempted to use force for the final settlement of the situation in Southeast Ukraine, this will bring the situation to a complete deadlock”.</p>
<p>Diptel</p> <p>RUSSIA/SYRIA/ISIL: RUSSIA’S POLITICAL COALITION [DIPTTEL 1408717]</p>	<p>29.10.14 14:55</p>	<p>British Embassy Moscow</p>	<p>FCO</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>Putin critical at Valdai of US’s “erroneous, ill-conceived and unprofessional” ISIL policy, but considers work on Syrian chemical weapons to have been positive.</p>

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

				<p>Putin on Syria at Valdai</p> <p>1. President Putin gave his first public comments on the US coalition and the fight against ISIL in his 24 October speech to Valdai (our Diptel 1408676). He branded US policy in the Middle East, and particularly Syria, as ‘erroneous, ill-conceived and unprofessional’. Putin said the Kremlin had no intention of joining the US-led effort, which he thought would ultimately backfire: ‘Acting unilaterally and then looking for allies and setting up a coalition after everything has been done - this is not a way to reach an agreement, is it?’. He pointed instead to the Russia and US work on Syrian chemical weapons as a positive example of collaboration.</p>
<p>Diptel</p> <p>RUSSIA: PUTIN AT VALDAI: ‘RESPECT THE BEAR’ [DIPTTEL 1408676]</p>	<p>28.10.14 10:50</p>	<p>British Embassy Moscow</p>	<p>FCO</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>President Putin sets out his view of the world and its problems to the Valdai Conference. In highly critical language he describes the de-stabilising and self-interested role of the US and ‘its satellites’. He says Russia has no intention of being expansionist or isolationist, but its interests must be respected. He sees the Eurasian Economic Union as a powerful regional organisation to interact with others. He is prepared to work with the West on improved legal mechanisms to underpin international relations, and in specific areas including nuclear disarmament.</p> <p>Detail</p> <p>1. On 24 October President Putin set out at length why he thought the world was “less safe and unpredictable” to the 11th Valdai International Discussion Club, an annual meeting of prominent invitees from 25 countries. He thought the theme for the session (“The World Order: No Rules or a Game without Rules”) accurately described the “historic turning point’ the world had reached. He argued, however, that it was not Russia which had torn up the rule book with its illegal annexation of Crimea, but the United States which had abused its position as sole superpower to trample over international norms and the interests of other states. (His specific remarks on Ukraine are reported separately.)</p>

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

			<p>Foreign policy and the ‘uni-polar’ world</p> <p>2. Putin asserted that the US had been responsible for a gradual unwinding of many of the post-WWII institutions and legal frameworks, which had been based on “the fact that this system’s founding fathers had respect for each other, did not try to put the squeeze on others, but attempted to reach agreements”. Declaring itself the “victor” of the Cold War, the US had ruled the world for two decades by “unilateral diktat”: imposing its own models which had increased conflict; spread chaos; and instead of fostering democracy supported neo-fascists and Islamic radicals.</p> <p>3. As a result the current system of global and regional security had become “seriously weakened, fragmented and deformed”. International law had been forced to “retreat over and over by the onslaught of legal nihilism” with “arbitrary interpretations replacing legal norms”. The US and its “satellites” tried to present their policies as the view of the entire international community. For Putin, the US had used its control of global mass media to “portray white as black and black as white”. Where states had “refused to submit”, the US had taken measures including “force, economic and propaganda pressure and meddling in domestic affairs” and had used “supra-legal” legitimacy to justify “illegal interventions” or “topple inconvenient regimes”. He claimed “we have increasing evidence that outright blackmail has been used with regard to a number of leaders. It is not for nothing that ‘big brother’ is spending billions of dollars on keeping the whole world, including its closest allies, under surveillance.”</p> <p>4. Putin cited specific grievances on terrorism and US policy in the Middle East. Western support to the mujahedeen in Afghanistan had spawned the Taliban and Al Qaeda. He claimed that prior to 9/11 the West had provided “information, political and financial support to international terrorists’ invasions of Russia (we have not forgotten this) and the Central Asian states”. Libya had been pushed to the brink of breaking apart and was now a terrorist training ground, and only strong leadership had saved Egypt from the same fate. In Syria, the US and its allies had started directly financing and arming rebels and mercenaries, leading to the rise of ISIL, which had also</p>
--	--	--	--

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

				<p>drawn recruits from an Iraq the West had left in ruins, and which got funding from selling oil and from a narcotics trade in an Afghanistan the West had failed to control. In short, the West kept making the same mistake over and over, and was now fighting the consequences of its own policies.</p> <p>5. Putin refuted allegations that Russia was trying to establish its own empire, encroaching on the sovereignty of its neighbours. These were “groundless”. Russia simply wanted its own interests to be taken into account and its position respected. He dismissed as ‘fairy-tales’ the idea that Iraq, Libya and the former Yugoslavia had been handled within the framework of international law. “This means that some can ignore everything, while we cannot protect the interests of the Russian-speaking and Russian population of Crimea. This will not happen”. And he insisted repeatedly that the annexation of Crimea was justified by the UN Charter’s provisions on self-determination and the ICJ decision on Kosovo, where self-determination did not require the approval of a country’s supreme authority.</p> <p>6. Summing up his grievance against the US, Putin recalled the saying “whatever Jupiter is allowed, the ox is not”. “The ox may not be allowed something, but the bear will not even bother to ask permission ... it [is] the master of the taiga (i.e. its own habitat), and I know for sure it does not intend to move to any other climatic zones – it will not be comfortable there. However it will not let anyone have its taiga either. I believe this is clear.” “We want others to stay out of our affairs and to stop pretending they rule the world. That is all. If there is an area where Russia could be a leader – it is in asserting the norms of international law.”</p> <p>Domestic situation and economics</p> <p>7. Touching briefly on the domestic situation, Putin thought “pressure from outside, as has been the case on past occasions, will only consolidate our society, keep us alert and make us concentrate on our main development goals”. Russia had no intention of “choosing some kind of closed development road, trying to live in autarky”, and remained open to dialogue.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

				<p>8. In particular, Putin hoped that Western business communities would take a “pragmatic approach” to Russia, despite “unprecedented pressure” from their governments. He rejected claims that Russia was turning its back on Europe for new Asian partners. Russia’s policy of increased engagement with the East was recognition of Asia’s increasing role in global economics and politics, and Western states were taking a similar approach.</p> <p>9. The “politically motivated” sanctions had been only “a hindrance” for Russia, but more seriously they had damaged “the foundations of world trade, WTO rules and the principle of inviolability of private property”. Together with “the well-known Cyprus precedent” [COMMENT: the Cyprus bailout package of 2013, which Russia argues was designed in Brussels to hit Russian investors disproportionately], sanctions had strengthened the desire of third countries to increase their economic and financial sovereignty and protect themselves from risks of outside pressure. Putin argued that the US had therefore “cut the branch they are sitting on”, with sanctions undermining the liberal model of globalisation which had primarily benefitted Western states.</p> <p>The future and Russia’s offer</p> <p>10. Turning to the future, Putin thought Ukraine would not be last conflict arising from the current situation. The “next real threat” was the destruction of current systems of arms control; we were “sliding” into times when only the threat of mutual destruction prevented conflict, and not mutual guarantees. Again, the US was, he argued, the belligerent: it had launched the process by withdrawing from the anti-ballistic missile treaty and working towards global missile defence. Many states now saw no option for protecting sovereignty other than their own nuclear bombs. He also highlighted the threat of ethnic, religious and social conflicts. But here he said the West had tried to “use regional conflicts and design ‘colour revolutions’ to suit their interests, but the genie escaped the bottle”.</p> <p>11. Despite his resentment of the West, Putin said he remained ready to work together. It was “incredibly important and necessary” to agree on “fundamental things”. He pointed to positive</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

				<p>results on Syrian chemical weapons, “substantive dialogue” on the Iranian nuclear programme, and work on North Korean issues to “solve local and global challenges”. On arms control he was “ready for the most serious, concrete discussions on nuclear disarmament - but only serious discussions without any double standards”.</p> <p>12. In Putin’s view the answer was international relations based on international law, and more multilateralism, with business, civil society and expert involvement. It was not a “greenfield”: the UN was irreplaceable, and the OSCE was playing a “very positive role” on Ukraine. He saw the need for “a new version of interdependence” by creating “powerful regional organisations and developing rules for their interaction”. Cooperation between them would add to global security. He was unclear why the EU had refused to start a dialogue with the Eurasian Economic Union – “what is so scary about it?” But we needed to end diplomacy by “spheres of influence, local deals, or somebody’s complete global domination”. The post-WW2 system needed to develop so it was capable “of keeping the world’s current problems within certain limits and regulating the intensity of the natural competition between countries.” “To create a balanced system of interests and relations ... we only have to show some respect.”</p> <p>Media and commentariat reaction</p> <p>13. The speech was broadcast in full on Russian television, and on the front pages of most newspapers. Commentary focussed on the strong anti-American rhetoric, and Putin’s accusations that the West was responsible for creating many problems today including Islamic terrorism. Nezavisimaya Gazeta thought the speech showed Putin was trying to split the US from the EU, with the aim of creating an anti-American bloc. But many papers also acknowledged Putin’s offer for more co-operation, with liberal business broadsheet Vedemosti saying the speech showed Putin wanted to compromise.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FOI 0089-16– Schedule of Information

Document attached to email DRAFT EUROPEAN SECURITY ARCHITECTURE	20.04.15 08:08	Sian MacLeod	Paul Akwright, Peter Jones, Dominic Schoeder, Angus Lapsley and FCO Officials	Putin sought again to seize the initiative in Valdai in 2014: “we must resolve the dilemma between the actions of the international community to ensure security and human rights, and principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of any state”
---	-------------------	--------------	---	--