

President of Russia  
Vladimir Putin:  
Friends, ladies  
and gentlemen,

Good afternoon.

I am at your service.  
I think there is no  
need for long opening  
remarks since  
everyone is familiar  
with the topics  
of discussion  
in general: strategic  
stability, cyber  
security, regional  
conflicts, and trade  
relations. We also  
covered cooperation  
in the Arctic. This is  
pretty much what we  
discussed.

With that, I will take  
your questions.

Question: Good  
evening,

Perhaps, you can  
name the topics that  
were discussed  
especially closely?

In particular, Ukraine is of great interest. In what context was it touched upon, was the situation in Donbass and the possibility of Ukraine joining NATO discussed?

One more thing: before the talks, there were great expectations about the ambassadors of the two countries returning to their stations in the respective capitals. In particular, your assistant, Yury Ushakov, said that this was possible. Have these decisions been made? How did the talks go in general?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: With regard to the ambassadors returning to their stations – the US

ambassador  
to Moscow,  
and the Russian  
ambassador  
to Washington, we  
agreed on this matter,  
and they will be  
returning to their  
permanent duty  
stations. When  
exactly – tomorrow  
or the day after  
tomorrow – is a purely  
technical issue.

We also agreed that  
the Foreign Ministry  
of the Russian  
Federation  
and the US State  
Department would  
begin consultations  
on the entire range  
of cooperation  
on the diplomatic  
track. There are things  
to discuss,  
and an enormous  
backlog [of unresolved  
issues] has piled up.  
I think both sides,  
including  
the American side, are  
committed to looking

for solutions.

With regard to Ukraine, indeed, this issue was touched upon. I cannot say that it was done in great detail, but as far as I understood President Biden, he agreed that the Minsk agreements should be the basis for a settlement in southeastern Ukraine.

As for Ukraine's potential accession to NATO, this issue was touched upon in passing. I suppose there is nothing to discuss in this respect.

This is how it was in general terms.

Question: Mr President, you said strategic stability was one of the topics.

Could you tell us in more detail what decisions were made on this issue? Will Russia and the United States resume or start talks on strategic stability and disarmament, and, in particular, on the New START Treaty? Do they plan to start talks on extending New START, perhaps revising its parameters or signing a new treaty altogether?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin:  
The United States and the Russian Federation bear special responsibility for global strategic stability, at least because we are the two biggest nuclear powers – in terms of the amount of ammunition and warheads,

the number of delivery vehicles, the level of sophistication and quality of nuclear arms. We are aware of this responsibility.

I think it is obvious to everyone that President Biden made a responsible and, we believe, timely decision to extend New START for five years, that is, until 2024.

Of course, it would be natural to ask what next. We agreed to start interdepartmental consultations under the aegis of the US Department of State and the Foreign Ministry of Russia. Colleagues will determine at the working level the line-up of these delegations, the venues and frequency

of meetings.

Question: Hi, Matthew Chance from CNN. Thank you very much for giving me this question.

First of all, could you characterise the dynamic between yourself and President Biden? Was it hostile or was it friendly?

And secondly, throughout these conversations did you commit to ceasing carrying out cyberattacks on the United States? Did you commit to stopping threatening Ukraine's security? And did you commit to stop cracking down on the opposition in Russia?

Vladimir Putin: I will begin with a general assessment. I believe

there was no hostility at all. Quite the contrary. Our meeting was, of course, a principled one, and our positions diverge on many issues, but I still think that both of us showed a willingness to understand each other and look for ways of bringing our positions closer together. The conversation was quite constructive.

As for cyber security, we have agreed to start consultations on this issue. I consider this very important.

Now about the commitments each side must make. I would like to tell you about things that are generally known, but not to the public at large. American sources – I am simply afraid to mix up



the names  
of organisations (Mr  
Peskov will give them  
to you later) – have  
said that most  
cyberattacks  
in the world come  
from US cyberspace.  
Canada is second. It  
is followed by two  
Latin American  
countries and then  
the United Kingdom.  
As you can see,  
Russia is not  
on the list of these  
countries from whose  
cyberspace the most  
cyberattacks originate.  
This is the first point.

Now the second point.  
In 2020 we received  
10 inquiries from  
the United States  
about cyberattacks  
on US facilities –  
as our colleagues  
say – from Russian  
cyberspace. Two  
more requests were  
made this year. Our  
colleagues received  
exhaustive responses  
to all of them, both

in 2020 and this year.

In turn, Russia sent 45 inquiries to the relevant US agency last year and 35 inquiries in the first half of this year. We have not yet received a single response. This shows that we have a lot to work on.

The question of who, on what scale and in what area must make commitments should be resolved during negotiations. We have agreed to start such consultations. We believe that cyber security is extremely important in the world in general, for the United States in particular, and to the same extent for Russia.

For example, we are aware of the cyberattacks

on the pipeline company in the United States. We are also aware of the fact that the company had to pay 5 million to the cybercriminals. According to my information, a portion of the money has been returned from the e-wallets. What do Russia's public authorities have to do with this?

We face the same threats. For example, there was an attack on the public healthcare system of a large region in the Russian Federation. Of course, we see where the attacks are coming from, and we see that these activities are coordinated from US cyberspace. I do not think that the United States, official US authorities, are interested in this kind of manipulation. What

we need to do is  
discard all  
the conspiracy  
theories, sit down  
at the expert level  
and start working  
in the interests  
of the United States  
and the Russian  
Federation.  
In principle, we have  
agreed to this,  
and Russia is willing  
to do so.

Give them  
a microphone – part  
of the question  
remained  
unanswered.

Remark: That's  
correct and thank you  
very much for coming  
back to me, sir.

So, there were two  
other parts  
to the question.  
The first one is: did  
you commit in these  
meetings to stop  
threatening Ukraine?  
Remember the reason  
this summit was called

in the first place,  
or the timing of it, was  
when Russia was  
building up lots  
of forces close  
to border.

And the second part  
of the question, third  
part of the question  
was: did you commit  
to stopping your  
crackdown against  
the opposition groups  
inside Russia led  
by Alexei Navalny?

Vladimir Putin: I did  
not hear that part  
of the question –  
either it was not  
translated, or you just  
decided to ask  
a second question.

With regard to our  
obligations regarding  
Ukraine, we have only  
one obligation which  
is to facilitate  
the implementation  
of the Minsk  
Agreements. If  
the Ukrainian side is  
willing to do this, we  
will take this path, no

questions asked.

By the way, I would like to note the following. Back in November 2020, the Ukrainian delegation presented its views about how it was planning to implement the Minsk Agreements. Please take a look at the Minsk Agreements – they are not a confidential document. They say that, first, it is necessary to submit proposals on the political integration of Donbass into the Ukrainian legal system and the Constitution. To do so, it is necessary to amend the Constitution – this is spelled out in the agreements. This is the first point. And second, the border between the Russian Federation

and Ukraine along the Donbass line will begin to be occupied by the border troops of Ukraine on the day following election day – Article 9.

What has Ukraine come up with? The first step it proposed was to move Ukraine's armed forces back to their permanent stations. What does this mean? This means Ukrainian troops would enter Donbass. This is the first point. Second, they proposed closing the border between Russia and Ukraine in this area. Third, they proposed holding elections three months after these two steps.

You do not need a legal background or any special training to understand that this has nothing to do with

the Minsk  
Agreements. This  
completely contradicts  
the Minsk  
Agreements.  
Therefore, what kind  
of additional  
obligations can Russia  
assume? I think  
the answer is clear.

With regard to military  
exercises, we conduct  
them on our territory,  
just like the United  
States conducts many  
of its exercises on its  
territory. But we are  
not bringing our  
equipment  
and personnel closer  
to the state borders  
of the United States  
of America when we  
conduct our exercises.  
Unfortunately, this is  
what our US partners  
are doing now. So,  
the Russian side, not  
the American side,  
should be concerned  
about this, and this  
also needs to be  
discussed, and our  
respective positions



should be clarified.

With regard to our non-systemic opposition and the citizen you mentioned, first, this person knew that he was breaking applicable Russian law. He needed to check in with the authorities as someone who was twice sentenced to a suspended prison time. Fully cognisant of what he was doing, I want to emphasise this, and disregarding this legal requirement, this gentleman went abroad for medical treatment, and the authorities did not ask him to check in while he was in treatment. As soon as he left the hospital and posted his videos online, the requirements were reinstated. He did not appear; he disregarded the law – and was put

on the wanted list. He knew that going back to Russia. I believe he deliberately decided to get arrested. He did what he wanted to do. So, what is there to be discussed?

With regard to the people like him and the systemic opposition in general, unfortunately, the format of a news conference precludes a detailed discussion, but I would like to say the following. Look, I think I will not say anything complicated, it will be clear for everyone. If you find it possible to objectively convey this message to your viewers and listeners, I would be very grateful to you.

So, the United States declared Russia an enemy and an adversary. Congress did this

in 2017. US legislation was amended to include provisions that the United States must maintain democratic governance rules and order in our country and support political organisations. This is in your law, US law. Now let's ask ourselves a question: if Russia is an enemy, what kind of organisations will the United States support in Russia? I think not the ones that make the Russian Federation stronger, but the ones that hold it back, since this is the goal of the United States, something that has been announced publicly. So, these are the organisations and the people who are instrumental in the implementation of the United States' policy on Russia.

How should we feel about this? I think it is

clear: we must be wary. But we will act exclusively within the framework of Russian law.

Question: Pavel Zarubin, VGTRK.

I wanted to continue with this subject. We still see that the Americans keep talking about the so-called political prisoners in Russia. Did you discuss the matter of Navalny at all during your talks with President Biden? In what manner did you discuss it, if at all?

Here is one more important topic. We are all aware, of course, that, let's say, a new stage in Russia-US relations after President Biden took office began with a very harsh statement aimed at you. Have you settled this matter

in any way?

Thank you very much.

Vladimir

Putin: President Biden touched upon the matter of human rights and those who, as they believe, represent these issues in the Russian Federation. Yes, we talked about that at his initiative. This is the first thing.

Second, regarding harsh statements. What can I say? All of us are aware of these statements. President Biden called me after that and we discussed the matter. I accepted his explanation. He also suggested that we meet – it was his initiative. We have met, and, as I have already mentioned, we had a very constructive conversation. I saw

once again that President Biden is an experienced person, which is absolutely obvious. Our face-to-face discussion lasted almost two hours. It is not with all leaders that such a detailed conversation can be held face to face.

As for all kinds of accusations, you may recall that his predecessor was asked the same question, and he evaded answering it. The incumbent US President decided to reply in this manner, and his reply was different from Mr Trump's answer.

Generally speaking, responsibility for everything that takes place in our countries ultimately rests with the political leadership and top officials, that is,

regarding who is guilty of what and who is the killer. You see, people, including the leaders of various organisations, are killed in American cities every day. You can barely say a word there before you are shot in the face or in the back, regardless of who is nearby, children or other adults. I recall a situation when a woman left her car and started running, and she was shot in the back. All right, these are criminal matters. Take a look at Afghanistan: as many as 120 people were killed there in one blow; entire wedding parties were wiped out. Yes, this could have been a mistake; such things happen. But using drones to shoot people who are obviously civilians in Iraq – what was that? Who is

responsible? Who is the killer?

Or take human rights. Listen, Guantanamo is still open. This is contrary to all imaginable rules, to international law or American laws, but it is still functioning. The CIA prisons that were opened in many countries, including in Europe, where they subjected people to torture, – what is this? Is this respect for human rights? I don't think so, do you?

Hardly anyone in this room will agree that this is how human rights must be protected. But this is the existing political practice. Taking into account this practice and knowing that this was done and can still be done shapes our attitude to what I have mentioned here,



and to the people who receive foreign funding to protect the interests of those who pay them.

Question: Murad Gazdiev, RT.

I have a question about the Arctic. You mentioned that you discussed it.

The United States and its allies have been accusing Russia of militarising the Arctic for a long time. Just recently, in May, we heard US Secretary of State Antony Blinken voice his concern over the actions of Russia's military. What exactly did you discuss?

Vladimir Putin: Yes, we discussed this issue in a broad format and in some detail. This is a highly important

and interesting issue as the development of the entire Arctic region and the Northern Sea Route in particular has tremendous economic significance for many countries in the region and beyond it.

The US concerns regarding militarisation are absolutely groundless. We are not doing anything new there compared to the Soviet era. We are restoring the local infrastructure that was lost and demolished completely some time ago. Yes, we are doing this using up-to-date technology. We are restoring the military and border control infrastructure, and we are creating nature conservation infrastructure, which has never been done in the past. We are creating a relevant base

for the Emergencies  
Ministry, which will  
give us  
the opportunity  
to conduct high-seas  
rescue missions  
in case of emergency  
and to protect  
the environment.

I told our colleagues  
that I see no concerns  
here. On the contrary,  
I am deeply convinced  
that we can  
and should work  
together in this field.  
Just like the United  
States, Russia is one  
of the eight Arctic  
Council members.  
This year, Russia  
chairs the Arctic  
Council. Moreover,  
Alaska and Chukotka  
are separated  
by a well-known strait,  
with the United States  
on one side  
and Russia  
on the other. All this  
taken together should  
motivate us to pool  
our efforts.

The use of the Northern Sea Route is regulated by international law. In fact, there are two main laws: the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Polar Code, which consists of several documents and was ratified in 2017. I drew our partners' attention to the fact that Russia intends to fully honour these international legal norms. We have never violated anything.

We are ready to assist all the interested countries and companies in developing the Northern Sea Route. They say that the navigation season in the region now lasts six months without any problems. In reality, it is even longer, and navigation will become practically year-round due

to climate change  
and as we launch our  
new icebreakers,  
including the Lider.  
Russia has the most  
powerful nuclear  
icebreaker fleet which  
is in high demand  
here.

Let me remind you  
that the UN  
Convention  
on the Law of the Sea  
describes the legal  
regime in international  
waters, including  
internal waters,  
the inland sea,  
the territorial sea,  
the contiguous zone,  
the exclusive  
economic zone  
and the open high  
seas. An inland sea is  
located inside  
a country's territory.  
Then there is  
a territorial sea  
extending 12 nautical  
miles [from  
the baseline].  
The contiguous zone  
adds another 12  
nautical miles.  
A coastal state must

allow peaceful  
passage for ships,  
including warships,  
through its territorial  
sea. We do not  
oppose this concept;  
we fully support it.

The inland sea is  
covered by a special  
regime, and we don't  
have to provide  
anyone with any  
privilege here. There  
are five such inland  
sea spaces, if  
I remember correctly,  
including the Gulf  
of Ob, Yenisei Bay  
and so on. In all, there  
are five bays or gulfs.  
This route is almost  
1,000 nautical miles  
long – 960 nautical  
miles, I think. It is our  
sovereign right  
to allow or not to allow  
foreign ships to sail  
there. But we do not  
abuse this right,  
and we grant free  
passage to everyone.

We received 1,000  
applications last year.

As far as I know, we turned down just ten applications, mostly Russian-flagged ships that, according to our relevant oversight agencies, did not meet the Polar Code's requirements.

The Polar Code deals with the quality of various ships and stipulates the standards for them and their equipment.

If all of us, all concerned countries, including and, maybe, primarily the Nordic Council members work together to resolve all these issues, and some of them require additional examination, then I simply have no doubt that we will find all the solutions and troubleshooting options. I cannot see any problems that we could not resolve.

Question: Good  
afternoon, Mr  
President.

Good or at least fair  
relations between  
Russia and America  
have always been  
a guarantee of global  
stability and calm. Our  
relations today are  
such as you  
characterised them  
before this meeting.  
Mr Biden has agreed  
with you. Now you are  
saying: Mutual  
respect, sufficient  
calm and warmth  
have been  
the companions of this  
conversation.

Before the meeting,  
you were speaking  
about the “red lines,”  
the concept of “red  
lines” for Russia.  
The Americans clearly  
have “red lines,” too.  
Did you manage,  
at this meeting,  
to come to terms  
on not crossing these  
“red lines?” This



concerns everything  
in all matters –  
the “not crossing” that  
would improve  
or at least stabilise our  
relations.

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: I can  
tell you that  
on the whole we  
understand what our  
US partners are  
saying and they  
understand what we  
are saying, when we  
speak about the “red  
lines.”

I must tell you frankly  
though: Of course, we  
have not gone as far  
as putting detailed  
emphases or dividing  
something. But  
keeping in mind  
the fact that during  
these consultations  
we have arranged  
to work both on cyber  
security and strategic  
stability, as,  
incidentally, [we have  
agreed] on joint work

in the Arctic  
and on some other  
dimensions, I think  
that all of this should  
gradually become  
a subject for our  
discussions and,  
hopefully,  
agreements.

Question: Mr  
President, thank you  
so much for taking  
my question.

President Biden has  
said that he would  
respond if  
cyberattacks from  
Russia do not stop.  
I am curious, what did  
he tell you? Did he  
make any threats?  
And a quick follow-up,  
if I may, sir. The list  
of your political  
opponents who are  
dead, prisoned  
or jailed is long. Alexei  
Navalny, his  
organisation calls  
for free and fair  
elections and an end  
to corruption, but  
Russia has outlawed

that organisation,  
calling it extremist.  
And you have now  
prevented anyone  
who supports him  
to run for office. So  
my question is, Mr  
President, what are  
you so afraid of?

Vladimir Putin: Let me  
reiterate what I said  
about various so-  
called foreign agents  
and individuals who  
are positioning  
themselves  
as the non-systemic  
opposition. I already  
replied to your  
colleagues – CNN, if  
I am not mistaken –  
but obviously the laws  
of the genre define  
what should be said  
when answering your  
question directly. Here  
you are, it will be  
my pleasure to do that  
again.

The United States has  
adopted a law, which  
says that the US will  
support certain

political organisations in Russia. At the same time, it has declared the Russian Federation its enemy and said publicly that it will contain Russia's development. This begs the question: What political organisations should the United States and other members of the Western community support in Russia, if simultaneously they bankroll them? It is clear that we, like the Americans in the 1930's, have declared them foreign agents. But their operations are not banned, they can work.

Organisations that have been declared foreign agents are not obliged to stop their operations. But if it is an extremist organisation, this is quite another matter. The organisation you

have mentioned  
openly called for mass  
riots and tried  
to involve underage  
people in them, which  
is illegal, contrary  
to Russian laws, and it  
also openly issued  
instructions on how  
to make Molotov  
cocktails for use  
against law  
enforcement officers,  
and also published  
personal information  
about police officers.

The United States  
recently had  
to grapple with  
the severe  
consequences  
of the events all of you  
remember, after  
the murder  
of an African  
American and the rise  
of the Black Lives  
Matter movement.  
I will not comment  
on this right now, but  
I would like to say that  
we watched  
the footage  
of pogroms, violations  
of the law and so on –

we feel  
for the Americans  
and the American  
nation, but we don't  
want the same  
to happen in our  
country, and we will  
do our best to prevent  
this from happening.  
Fear has nothing to do  
with this.

Would you like to add  
anything? Please,  
pass over the mike.

Remark: You didn't  
answer my question,  
sir. If all of your  
political opponents are  
dead, in prison,  
poisoned, doesn't that  
send a message that  
you do not want a fair  
political fight?

Vladimir  
Putin: Speaking  
of who can be killed  
or thrown in prison.  
People went  
to Congress with  
political demands after  
the election. Criminal  
cases have been

opened against 400 people, who face up to 20 or even 25 years in prison. They have been declared domestic terrorists and accused of other crimes. As many as 70 people were detained immediately after those events, and 30 of them are still under arrest. It is unclear on what grounds, because the US authorities have not provided us with this information. Several people died; a woman rioter was fatally shot by a police officer on the spot, although she was not threatening him with a weapon. What is happening in our country is also taking place in many other countries. I would just like to point out once again: we feel for the Americans, but we don't want the same to happen in our country.

Question: Good afternoon. Dmitry Laru, Izvestia newspaper.

Did you manage to make any arrangements with the US side regarding the repatriation of certain Russians who are serving their sentences in US prisons? If so, when can this take place?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: We discussed this matter. President Biden raised it with regard to US nationals who are in prison in the Russian Federation. We discussed this. Compromises are possible in this area. The Foreign Ministry of Russia and the US State Department will be working on this.



Question: Good afternoon.

Mikhail Antonov,  
Rossiya-1 TV  
channel.

You said you discussed trade with President Biden – it is probably the most positive agenda possible. Businesses in both countries are interested in development. What prospects do you see there?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: It is not up to us; it depends on the American side. We do not impose any restrictions. I think the US lost as much as Russia after certain restrictions were put on the economy and trade. Yes, it did have some effect on our development, so in this sense,

the United States partly achieved its goal of constraining Russia's development, but not critically. This is my first point.

The second point has to do with American businesses' interest. The largest delegation at the St Petersburg International Economic Forum, 200 people, was from the US. As a result of the restrictions, including for American companies, some Americans suffered losses and went out of business playing into the hands of their competitors from other countries; we talked about this. What was that for? It got them nowhere but brought losses.

Russia's trade with the United States is about \$28 billion, I think. In the first

quarter of this year, it grew by 16.5 percent. If this trend continues, I think it will benefit everyone. We talked about it.

Question: Ann Simmons, The Wall Street Journal.

Mr President, thank you very much for the opportunity to ask you a question.

You met with President Biden a few years ago when he was vice president. He said he looked you in the eye and he did not think you had a soul. You said, it means that we understand each other.

Please tell me, did you look him in the eye? And what did you see there? Did you see someone you can work with? Please

tell me, has President Biden invited you to visit the White House? If so, did you agree to go?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin:  
President Biden did not invite me to visit. I have not yet made any invitation either. It seems to me that the conditions need to be ripe for such trips, for such meetings, for such visits.

As for this 'looking into someone's soul' and seeing or not seeing anything there – this is not the first time I have heard this. To be honest, I don't remember that conversation, but I admit it could have somehow escaped my attention. But if you asked me what kind of interlocutor

and partner President Biden is, I can say that he is a very constructive and balanced person, as I expected, very experienced, this is immediately evident.

He recalled some things about his family, about what his mother told him – these are important things. They do not seem to be directly related to the subject, but they still show the level and quality of his moral values. That was quite endearing, and I did feel like we generally spoke the same language. This does not mean we have to peek into each other's souls, look into each other's eyes and swear eternal love and friendship – not at all. We defend the interests of our countries, our peoples, and our relations are always

primarily pragmatic  
in nature.

Andrei, you please.

Question: Andrei  
Kolesnikov, Kommers  
ant newspaper.

Mr President, have  
you got any new  
illusions following this  
meeting?

Vladimir Putin: I did  
not have any old  
illusions, and you are  
talking about new  
ones. Where did you  
take this line about  
illusions? There are  
no illusions, nor can  
there be any.

Question: Hello,

Pavel Remnev,  
Zvezda TV channel.

Mr President, I also  
have a couple  
of questions. Have  
you and President

Biden discussed  
global climate  
change?

My second question is  
about the US media.  
Quite recently, you  
were interviewed  
by NBC. Do you think  
it is fair that you grant  
interviews to the US  
media, while US  
presidents do not  
grant interviews  
to the Russian media?  
Do you find that these  
interviews have  
a positive impact, if  
your remarks are  
constantly distorted  
and, honestly  
speaking,  
the interviewers are  
not exactly polite?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: You  
know, what concerns  
distortions, innuendos,  
or, on the contrary,  
certain attacks, this is  
the practice of today's  
international relations.  
One can do nothing

about it, I am long used to this, and all of us have been living with this for decades.

As for who grants what interviews, this is decided by a relevant leader or side, if they want to bring some additional information across to people. We are seeking to do this and my interview with the US press is related precisely to this.

As for the Russian media activities in general, President Biden, for example, raised a question about the operation in Russia of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, which we have declared foreign agents. I had the impression that the members of the US delegation did not know that before that – we have just two media outlets,



Russia Today  
and Sputnik, working  
for foreign  
audiences – that  
before that the US  
side had declared  
them foreign agents  
in the United States  
and stripped them  
of their accreditation.  
What we did, we did  
in response.  
Moreover, Russia  
Today has been  
meeting all  
the demands posed  
by the US regulator  
and by US law. It is  
registering there  
in an appropriate  
manner, and so on,  
although they are  
confronted with quite  
a lot of problems  
regarding personnel  
employment, financial  
items, and so on.

There are no  
problems like this  
in Russia and,  
regrettably, the US  
media do not meet  
in full  
the requirements  
posed by the Russian

law.

We have had a talk on this. I hope that in this sphere, too, we will be able to streamline this work by employing the good offices of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Question: Galina Polonskaya, Euronews.

We all saw that you shook hands with Joe Biden at the very beginning of the meeting. My question is: did you reach a new level of mutual understanding and, most importantly, a new level of trust with the US President? Do you consider it possible at this stage to reach a new phase in bilateral relations, when they will be

absolutely clear  
and transparent, that  
is, what both countries  
are striving  
to achieve?

Vladimir Putin: You  
know, Leo Tolstoy  
said once, there is no  
happiness in life, only  
flashes of it – cherish  
them. I believe that  
there cannot be family  
trust in this situation,  
but I think we have  
seen flashes of it.

Yes, please.

Question: Ivan Blagoi,  
Channel One.

The coronavirus  
pandemic is  
undoubtedly one  
of the most pressing  
issues for the entire  
planet. Did you  
discuss it  
at the meeting with  
the US President? If  
so, what are  
the prospects  
of working together

with the Americans  
on combatting this  
disease? Maybe  
the measures could  
include the mutual  
recognition  
of vaccines?

Vladimir Putin: We  
have touched upon  
this issue, but only  
briefly.

As you know, during  
the previous  
administration, we  
responded to the US  
request and even sent  
our equipment  
as humanitarian aid.  
The United States is  
a large and powerful  
country, and it was not  
that they did not have  
the means; they just  
needed ventilators  
urgently at that time.  
We supplied them,  
as you know, without  
seeking to make  
a profit. We are ready  
to cooperate in this  
area in the future, but  
we did not discuss

that in detail today.

Question: Three years ago, you met with President Donald Trump. After that meeting, relations between the two countries deteriorated even more. Is there anything that could prevent this from happening again? Have we hit rock bottom with our relations with the United States so that the only way is up?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: It is hard to say because all actions that led to the deterioration of Russia-US relations were initiated by the United States, not us. Members of Congress are quite inventive people, so I have no idea that they will come up with

next time.

Yes, please.

Remark: Alexander  
Gamov,  
Komsomolskaya  
Pravda.

I am not sure if you  
have heard, but we  
won against Finland,  
1–0.

Vladimir Putin: Great,  
congratulations.

Question: If we apply  
the same criteria  
to the Biden-Putin  
meeting, what will  
the score be?

And the second  
question. Before  
coming to Geneva,  
the Americans said  
almost every day that  
they would put  
pressure on Russia,  
on President Putin.  
Did you feel this  
pressure and how did

you counter it? I think the main question that Russia is interested in is how our President held up in Geneva.

I think that's enough questions.

Vladimir Putin: I think so too.

Remark: Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: There was no pressure even though the conversation was open, honest and without any unnecessary diplomatic deviations from the agenda. I reiterate, there was no pressure either from our part, or from their part, and this would have been pointless; this was not the point of the meeting.

What was the first part

of your question?

Remark: What score?

Vladimir Putin:  
The score. I believe  
that before  
the meeting, President  
Biden said that it was  
not a sports  
competition,  
and I absolutely  
agree. Why would we  
make up some score?  
The meeting was  
fruitful overall. It was  
meaningful, concrete  
and was held  
in a result-driven  
atmosphere.  
And the main result is  
these flashes of trust  
that I just mentioned  
in response  
to the question your  
colleague from  
Euronews had asked.

BBC News, please.

Question: Thank you.

Steve Rosenberg,



BBC News.

Mr President, Joe Biden is calling for stable and predictable relations with Russia. But it is believed in the West that unpredictability is a feature of the Russian foreign policy. Are you ready to give up unpredictability for the sake of improving relations with the West?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: You are a famous wordsmith who has reached a high degree of perfection in this field; this is to be envied. In the first part of your question, you said "it is believed in the West." In the second part, you asked if we are ready to give this up. If something is

believed in the West,  
this does not mean  
that it is true.

Let me begin with  
the first part of your  
question. You said it is  
believed in the West  
that Russia's foreign  
policy is  
unpredictable. Let me  
return the puck.

The US withdrawal  
from the ABM Treaty  
in 2002 was  
an absolutely  
unpredictable  
decision. Why was it  
necessary to do this,  
thereby destroying  
the basis  
of international  
stability in the field  
of strategic security?  
Then pulling out  
of the INF Treaty  
in 2019. Is this  
stability? Absolutely  
not. The withdrawal  
from the Open Skies  
Treaty, is this  
stability? There is  
almost nothing left  
in the sphere  
of strategic stability.  
Thankfully, President

Biden adopted an absolutely adequate decision to extend the New START Treaty for five years.

Or take the situation with Ukraine and Crimea – is it a song and dance situation? Was it for the sake of stability that coup d'état was supported in Ukraine after former President Yanukovich had agreed to accept all demands of the opposition? He was actually ready to step down and to hold new elections in three months. But no, it was decided to stage a bloody coup d'état, which has led to the consequences everyone is aware of, in the southeast of Ukraine and later in Crimea.

And you say we are

unpredictable? No,  
I don't think so.  
In my opinion, we are  
responding absolutely  
adequately  
to the arising threats.  
I believe that  
for the situation to be  
really stable we  
should coordinate  
the rules of conduct  
in all the spheres you  
have mentioned:  
strategic stability,  
cyber security,  
and the settlement  
of regional conflicts.

I think that it is  
possible to come  
to an agreement on all  
these issues; at least  
this is my impression  
after the meeting with  
President Biden  
today.

Let us give the floor  
to a foreign  
publication.  
Bloomberg, please,  
and this will be all.

Question: Ilya  
Arhipov, Bloomberg

News.

Mr President, the US imposed another round of sanctions very shortly after your meeting with President Trump in 2016. Did you receive any guarantees during your talks with Joe Biden today that no US sanctions would be imposed against Russia in the near future?

Regarding the results you have mentioned, when you said that there were signs of trust. Do you trust President Biden more to implement the initial agreements you discussed today? Are you positive that he will do this, because it is believed that the US state machine is showing more support for the US President's line now than during

Donald Trump's term?

And lastly, regarding what you said about consultations on cyber security and Ukraine. It's not clear to me if working groups on cyber security will be established. And the "red lines" you mentioned: have you marked them clearly for each other? Can you tell us about this?

Thank you.

Vladimir Putin: I have mentioned the "red lines" on many occasions. Understanding regarding this comes during negotiations on the key areas of interaction. There is no sense in trying to intimidate each other. This is not the thing to do when people meet to talk; otherwise, there is no

sense in meeting.

As for sanctions and economic restrictions, I have already pointed out that we are not aware of the domestic political mood and the line-up of forces [in the US], or rather we know, but we cannot fully understand the developments. Some forces are against improving relations with Russia, and others support this. I cannot say which of them will win.

But if steps are made after this meeting such as in 2016, which you mentioned, this will be yet another opportunity missed.

Please, and let's wrap it up.

Question: Good evening. Mr President,

thank you  
for the opportunity.  
I am Tamara  
Alteresco from Radio  
Canada in Moscow.  
You said to a couple  
of my colleagues you  
wanted unbiased, fair  
questions  
and coverage. I have  
a fair question for you.  
It actually comes from  
my nine-year-old  
daughter, who asked  
me before I left  
to come here: “What  
is the big deal with  
the summit?”  
And that’s quite  
a complicated answer  
for a nine-year-old, so  
I’d like you to explain  
to us, in your own  
words, Mr President,  
why is this relationship  
so complicated?  
And also, she’d like  
to know – and I’d like  
to know – why are  
young people not  
allowed to protest  
in Russia?

Vladimir Putin: It is  
just wonderful that  
your nine-year-old



daughter takes an interest in these matters. The answer is very simple. Just take a look around and say: "Do you see how beautiful our world is? Adult people, the leaders of two countries, the world's two largest nuclear powers are meeting to make this world a safe, reliable and prosperous place for all people on this planet. They will discuss the matters of horrible weapons, which we need to scale down and to coordinate common non-use terms. They will speak about environmental protection, so that all rivers and seas are clean, without floods and droughts, and so that all people on the planet have enough to eat no matter where they live. They will talk about healthcare, so that our children feel

well and are able  
to study and look into  
the future confidently.”

Ladies  
and gentlemen,  
I would be delighted if  
you covered our  
meeting today from  
this angle.

Thank you for your  
attention. All the best!