

Navigating Great Power Competition: Global POVs

Wednesday, July 16, 2025 - 12:45 PM ET/10:45 AM MT

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PIDuWsna9Ag&list=PL7fuyfNu8jfP8TWSJzPCsyScNGwbW6xbQ&index=12>

Speakers

- Elbegdorj Tsakhia, Distinguished Visiting Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University; Former President and Former Prime Minister of Mongolia
- Claudia Ruiz Massieu, Congresswoman, Chamber of Deputies of Mexico; Former Foreign Minister of Mexico
- Balázs Orbán, Political Director for the Prime Minister; Member of Parliament, Hungary
- Hina Rabbani Khar, Former Foreign Minister of Pakistan; Chairperson of the National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee
- Moderator: Jim Sciutto, CNN

Jim Sciutto

Thanks so much. Niamh, and thanks so much to all of you. I spent a lot of time in the great power space, not just writing about it, reporting on it, but but in many of the fronts of this great power conflict, in Ukraine and Taiwan, in the Middle East and also in the technology fronts of this, cyber, space, drone warfare, et cetera. I'm particularly glad in our conversation today to have voices from parts of the world that we don't have often enough commenting on this, because we tend to favor the northern hemisphere in particular countries, perhaps you're familiar with this phenomenon, so I'm glad to have the folks we have with us here today. I want to begin with a big picture question, one of which is, do you agree with the framing of a great power conflict with China and Russia allied on one side, and their smaller partners, Iran, North Korea and others and the US and its Western allies, or Democratic allies on the other and do you agree? And I want to quote from one of the panelists yesterday, a line that really stood out to me. Thórdís Gylfadóttir, Icelandic foreign minister, who said that when you look at Ukraine as a front of this great power competition, that it is literally a test of everything that we stand for, and the we in that sentence being the folks on this side of the frontier of great power competition, I might begin with you if I can, Elba George, because you mentioned to me prior that Mongolia is the only democracy between Russia and China, and I hadn't thought about it the framing in that way. But do you agree that this is a conflict, that there's essentially a dividing line down the planet, right, and a meaningful conflict in terms of values, investment in a rules based, international order, et cetera? Is that an accurate framing and a fair framing?

Elbegdorj Tsakhia

Thank you. I'm really happy to be part of this great gathering, and thank you for inviting me. And I think when it comes to great power competition, of course, during cold war, that was kind of the bipolar, and now it's very different, and we all know, and also, there is a new player and technology AI. And you know that my country is only democracy since 1990 between Russia and China, and I was one of the leaders of the democratic revolution, and I was one of the CO drafters of our democratic constitution in 1990 and I see that even a small country, I think

resistance is possible. You know, between Russia and China, keeping that liberal order and government is quite challenging, but we know that Russia and China has also its weak spots. And when, when it comes to China, of course, there are issues. China is not tested power since Vietnam War, and also those authoritarian states usually afraid of their people's voice. And that's, that's one thing. And during my prime ministership and President, I met President Xi and Putin around three dozen times, each of them. And I actually have no illusion. And thank you.

Jim Sciutto

Hungary in Europe has often been a contrary voice on Ukraine, as relates to other fellow NATO allies. Do you and also offering itself as a mediator between the West and Russia on Ukraine war and other places that they come into contact. Do you agree with the framing? Do you? Do you and do you find yourself on one side or the other?

Balázs Orbán

First of all, thank you very much for for having me. I'm coming from a country which is well integrated into the Western structure. We are members of NATO, members of the European Union, but also having a strategy which is based not on block formation logic, but on the idea of connectivity. So we are working together with the Chinese on the Belt and Road Initiative. We are members of observing members of the Turkic states organization. And I think this is, this is an this is very important for us, because a realist based, national interest driven foreign policy should look like this in modern times. And then I understand that there is a there is a great power rivalry. I understand that the Chinese thinkers politicians and the American thinkers and politicians, they look each other in that way. But there are at least 190 other countries. They are not great powers, and they don't want to they don't want the Third World War. And they are not happy with the with the rivalry idea, and they they are not happy with the block formation logic, what, which is actually pushed by the liberal, liberal thinkers and politicians from the western part of the world, because and the framing itself, I disagree with it very much. To describe the word that there are the good guys and the bad guys, democracies and auto presses and like, you know, what about the Gulf countries, for example, they are democracies considered because they are good guys now. So, you know, it's like, it's not a good framework. And when I keep hearing, for example, Francis Fukuyama or some other thinkers, when, when they are mentioning that, you know, The End of History will come. We just have to prepare for the ultimate battle between democracies and and and autocracies, and we have to stick together and isolate ourselves from the others. This is, this is first. I'm coming from a post communist country. So this is the Marxist term. So Marxism is communism is coming. We just have to wait until that, and we just have to win the final battle. And I think it's quite scary, because if you start to describe the word like this, that there are the good guys and there are bad guys, and the bad guys should be punished and destroyed based on moral ideas, then how you preserve peace and how you preserve the stability of a new world order. Because the world order is changing, whether we like it or not. There are new powers coming up. There are some, some unfortunately declining, like the European power is declining. So I think we should rather focus on figuring out a different framing, not so hostile towards each other, but more friendly. Because the challenge of our generation will be about how to preserving peace in this very tensionous environment.

Jim Sciutto

I suppose the question is, is it? Are there steps too far in your view, for instance, violating another country's borders or attempting to absorb another one. Are there is the idea of choosing your own representatives, a value that Hungary, as a member of the EU and NATO, sees as having intrinsic value and something worth fighting for. Is it just a matter of what works for you, works for you, what works for us, works for us.

Balázs Orbán

You know, I think these moral aspects are very important, and I have my own moral aspects. You know, I'm an elected politician by the Hungarian people, so my job is to represent their interest at home and on the international stage. I think that's also a moral position. What I see that currently in Ukraine, you mentioned Ukraine in a question, there is a proxy war between Russia and the West in Ukraine. And this is not good for my country. I think it's not good for Europe, because economically, we are declining. Energy prices are skyrocketing, inflation, high interest rates and so on and so on. So Europe is already losing on this conflict, so I think my moral responsibility, I'm not questioning any others decisions. Ukrainians have the right to fight. That's their decision. But my idea would be that, you know, if something is bad for my country and my people, then I should be against it. And this is why the Hungarian, Hungarian Hungarian position on the war is a little bit different. We are just talking about restoring communication ceasefire. Try to solve the conflict. The sooner solve it. It will would be the better for for, I think my country, definitely, but for many countries as well

Jim Sciutto

Do you and I hesitate to use the word middle powers, because that suggests a sort of agreed upon hierarchy of nations. But as a nation outside the Russia, China, US, kind of Nexus, but still very much a close ally and trading partner of the US. Do you find that countries such as Mexico feel a pressure to choose sides? And is that a pressure that you would rather not face?

Claudia Ruiz Massieu

Well, first of all, there is a struggle between great powers to define who's going to be the hegemony in the coming years, and that's a struggle that's going to take time, and that's a struggle that's putting everyone else in the world in a very, let's say, cautious or difficult position for Mexico being the only country that has a 2000 mile border with the US that has that is part of an economic integration process has been very successful with the US and Canada, but that also has close ties with, of course, with Latin America and the Caribbean, but with the Global South. That puts us in a unique position. We have, and I have to say, most of Latin America as well have taken an active, non aligned stance in this in this conflict. We're determined not to choose sides. That's what we're trying to do, not, you know, we don't see it as a zero sum stage. As yet, we have been, each of us, depending on our historical and geographical and national interest perspective, dealing with both the US and China, particularly from different from a different point of view, but trying to have ties with both and depending on our unique perspective, how deep those ties go for Mexico, there's no Question, the US is our largest trading partner, our natural resources management, our security, our human mobility issues

have to do with a common approach, or at least an understanding with the US, but we are not in a position to choose sides, and we're going to very much be in accordance with all the other Latin American countries on this regard, not choosing sides, but cultivating productive relationships with both and being active in the international arena in order to increase and our our room for our for maneuver, and Not, you know, being forced to pick sides by going to war, in effect, with Mexico in a trade context.

Jim Sciutto

Is it your view that the US under President Trump has actually weakened its position in great power competition by reducing those alliances which were seen and it used to be, in a bipartisan way, as a strength in great power competition to keep your allies close.

Claudia Ruiz Massieu

Well, there's no question that all old alliances have been put to a test by the new administration in the United States, and what we thought were, you know, paradigms, and were the rules that we had all agreed to, and that gave us certainty in how to navigate our relationships and our challenges are being put into question. But in that sense, there's also reality, and reality is often, you know, weightier than than other considerations, and I would say the US has lost the trust of long time allies in France. But that does not mean that those allies in France are ready to, you know, take meaningful steps away or back from having a deeper relationship with the US. I think most of us are trying to diversify our relationships, whether it is in trade or other instances, diversification without alienating the US.

Jim Sciutto

I hear that so often. I hear from Canadian officials involved in trade talks. You hear it from EU officials quite publicly, Hina. You heard Belarus describe the Ukraine war. And this is this is true in many respects, as a proxy war between the US and Russia. There are those who describe the most recent military clash between India and Pakistan as to some degree, given the weapons systems that were used on both sides, where does Pakistan fit into this, into that competition, and where do your interests lie?

Hina Rabbani Khar

okay, so I'm not in a contest for popularity over here, so whatever I say is likely to be deeply unpopular. Because I think, okay. First of all, I would question your saying that Pakistan, India, conflict, in some ways, was representative, because of technology, of a proxy war, because if it was Chinese technology on one side, there was also American technology on the same side, which is Pakistan, and then there was French, American and many other European technologies and Russian technology on the other side. So I think it's the people who won or not won the war. Okay? I completely disagree with this framing, and as someone who, as Foreign Minister between 2010 to 13 had been schooled by the liberal order about the lack of wanting to compete in a world where others were more efficient. Let them be. Let your industry die. It's fine. Do not put any more money in military spending, even if you have a hegemonic power you know, on your doorstep, on your ease, which might attack you anytime, because those were not the values. Those were not the things. That was not how the world was emerging. The world

was this great place where we could all coexist peacefully, right? So when we consider the time of today, and we act as if we had no choices, I tend to disagree with that, because I have seen in the last 10 years with a bit of alarm and a great deal of disbelief as to how we have chosen, in some ways, competitive conflict over co existence, because, in my assessment, for the reasons of continuing to retain hegemonic power or hegemonic status, rather than for the good of the world. Because if we were really grappling or competing for the good of the world, we would be talking about who's going to police the world. We'd be talking about how we're going to take care of AI. We going to be we would be talking about lethal autonomous weapons, which we see in war theaters all over. We're going to be talking about who's going to lead to climate change. Those are the threats that the world is facing. So we're not competing for leadership. In some ways, we are competing for the continuation of hegemonic power. And some other competitors are now emerging. So the emerging, the emerging power, be it not militarily, in my in my view, because we all know that the US is still at top in terms of its military spending, and the next 11 countries or so do not equate to the spending that the US does, whether it's does it efficiently and efficiently. And I think this whole march towards wanting the world to divide itself between camps is so ancient, it's almost reversal of everything civilization has taught us and everything that we learned as humanity post World War Two. So we're in this cycle of unlearning I do not know for what I genuinely cannot explain to myself, to my countrymen, and so Pakistan really chooses to be a country. And by the way, I do want to say that the impact of this competition, or whatever you want to call it, I look at it as containment, is not only within the Western Hemisphere. I believe in our region. In the last 10 years or so, India's movement away from the region and it's, you know, belligerence towards the region is a direct result of the impunity that has been provided to a country like India because of the China containment factor. So this has a huge impact all over the world. And I believe if we go in the direction that we're going, we are marching towards an age of unpeace that we're seeking out ourselves.

Jim Sciutto

Are you making the case in effect, for a spheres of influence model. In other words, you do it like as you like it in your backyard, we'll do it as we like it. And art, which, by the way, is an equally antiquarian right approach to the world. I'm not saying it history moves in cycles, as you know, but, but are you making a case for that? As you know? There are some in this country, including Trump himself, who has, at times, not just by words, but also by actions, made a case for that, that approach, that balance of power,

Hina Rabbani Khar

no, actually, not at all making the case for spheres of influence. You know what I'm making a case for. I'm making a case of, you know, universality, of what used to be called the international law based order, and was then called the rules based order, and there was no competition that it's international law based order, rules based order. And now let's say even rules based order, the universality of that. So what that means is, if your ally does something which is against human rights or something else, and you sanction them with the same you know, you sanction them equally as you do when your enemy, or who you view as your enemy, does it, and allow me to also in contesting for unpopularity, also say the way these wars were waged, both on Iraq and Afghanistan, and the interventions in Syria, Libya, etcetera, etcetera, have not left a lot of

confidence for the bearers of the liberal world order. So when you step in, we sit here and believe that the autocrats of the world are threatening our great liberal order. It's not them who are threatening it. It's how we actually conducted ourselves in how we disabused or abused human rights liberal values, everything that we do within our geographical borders tend to be very, you know, and not have the same actions when you're outside of her. It's almost as if they're people of lesser God and all of it, I would maybe want to, you know, sort of summarize in one line, which is that all men are equal, but some are more equal than others, and if that continues to be the case, others have ears, so they can hear what you say when you talk about great values, but they also arise, and they can see what you do also, and that has created a lack of credibility, which predates, by the way, in my assessment, President Trump and his coming to power.

Jim Sciutto

Claudia, I search for you nodding. I feel you have a response, and then I'll come to you.

Claudia Ruiz Massieu

No, no, I totally agree. I would say going back to your question with regards to the Ukraine as an example of how countries in Latin America see what's happening in the world in this great power struggle, of course, everyone agreed in Latin America, I'm talking About that it was something we had to condemn. But how did we condemn it? In the region, we all voted in the UN to condemn with the language used by the UN resolution, but individually, the countries varied in how they condemned it. Few straight out said, I condemn the invasion of the Ukraine, but everyone agreed, and we and we do that because there's safety in not safety, but there's a secure sense of security when you go back to the principles and the universal principles that you were talking about. And one of those principles is territory, integrity and sovereignty, and when we go to that place, to the principal place, it's easy for all of us to agree that there was an aggression to the Ukrainian territory, and that, as you know international community, we have to condemn it. But how strongly we condemn it, how strong the language we use that varies from country to country. So it is easy for us to agree within the UN framework, but not, you know, not as easy to navigate that individually vis a vis our own relationships with those great powers. So I think that's one of the of the issues that are facing middle powers in the terms that we're talking about them in this panel, and in that sense, I think we all benefit from having those universal rules principles that bind us together, because Those principles and rules help us navigate our differences in size strength, might economic power or military power, and that is, I think, the issue that makes this current struggle between the great powers and the new order that's going to emerge an opportunity for mid sized powers or emerging powers or emerging countries, because it is an opportunity to try and be part of the definition of what that new world order is going to be like. Is it going to be more inclusive or representative of different countries and regions? More sustainable? And that's in all our interests, but it's definitely in the interest of middle powers and middle countries, not necessarily for the great powers.

Jim Sciutto

So sanctity borders is one that's clearly being challenged today. The war underway today is one attempting to absorb an entire country. The other one is self determination, and given you took

part in a country claiming that right and Mongolia democracy is it's had its ups and downs, but it but it survived since 1919 90. Do you listen? This comes down to a fundamental philosophical values disagreement that goes back many centuries. But do you believe that self determination is a I don't want to ask the philosophical question, universal, right, but, but in the context of this great power competition, listen, you look at folks on either side of the divide. Two systems. On the other side do not have self determination and and while imperfect, the countries, and I'm not saying good guys, bad guys on the other side do is that universal. Is it worth fighting for? Is it in the interests of those defending it

Elbegdorj Tsakhia

when it comes to great power competition? I think there are two things really important. And one thing is building that alliance and keeping that alliance, and I think it's equally precious as Moon Landing and also other thing we have to keep our enduring commitment to freedom. I really believe that God has planted in every human heart the desire to live free, even that desire crushed. That rise again. When we talk about the building alliances, I think we need think about the people. If you build alliances with the people, that's actually Long live. And you know, politicians come like a seasoned birds come, they go, but people are stay. If you are committed to their rights, to human rights, to democracy, to freedom, that alliance usually live longer in Mongolia, like a democratic, small democratic example, when Putin announced a big mobilization. I called video call. I called, I made video message. I said, Please don't go, go for the mobilization. You know, come to Mongolia, those military age men, you come to Mongolia, and through Mongolia you can escape. And more than 100,000 military age people escape that mobilization. I think if there is one man, one less man with gun against Ukraine, it's our contribution to the peace in Europe. And that's that's really important. But when it comes to the leaders, I know that Putin one time claimed that showing that Imperial Russian map and saying that Ukraine was their part, or something that I actually found out during that time, great Mongolian empire map. And I wrote Twitter during that time, and I said, after Putin's talk, I found Mongolian historical map. And I said, Don't worry, Mongolia is peaceful and free nation. And that tweet actually reached more than 12 million people worldwide. Please follow me on exactly and there are ways I think human voice is the most important innovation all other innovations we invented. Still, that's very important. When I was in office, also in Mongolia, we talk not only for our freedom, we talk for the freedom other people, I had a chance to lecture at Kim Il Sung University in North Korea, and they agreed on one condition, and they said, Mr. President, don't mention three words. They say human rights, democracy and market economy. But I did not mention those three words, but I titled my lecture, no dictatorship lasts forever. And actually that lecture cost me my meeting with the Kim Jong Hoon. But in a freedom activist in South Korea, they picked up my lecture, and they flow using the air balloon to the north, I think you have to keep that commitment to freedom and to Alliance. You know, human rights, freedom things. When I in 2000 I studied in John F Kennedy School of Government. During that time, great joy. John Nye was a dean of our school. I learned during that time, you know, that soft power thing, it actually talks about power of attraction, power of attractiveness as a human being, we attract to each other. You know, America always associated American attractiveness always associated with freedom. With Freedom when America comes, usually that country, that continent, Europe

and other countries, became free. That's the universal and you have to keep that commitment. That's really important. I mean, listen third,

Jim Sciutto

as you know, there are challenges to that today in our own country, I might if I can, because I want to get your responses, and I'm sure you have thoughts, but But ask it from a slightly different angle, does the portions of the rules based international order, right? This kind of catch phrase that relate to rule of law. Right? Is that a universal interest? Right? In that it serves everybody. It just folks will often make the point that free shipping lanes in Asia helped grow China's economy much as they did America's economy. And we're seeing today a challenge to we're seeing the cost of the loss of free shipping lanes in the Red Sea, right? That matters to a lot of people, ships sinking in the Red Sea, in the strait. Is that something worth defending? And do you see one side of that divide as being a better champion of the rule of law than another? I'll start with you only because I was looking at you, but

Balázs Orbán

thank you. You caught me, because before I became a politician, I I was living with constitutional law, and so I was I was studying rule of law. What does it mean? And I think we all agree in this room that without rule of law, no country can be successful. But what does it mean? Exactly? We use it as a universal term, or we pretend that it has a universal meaning, but it hasn't. So when it's quite a modern expression Albert, when dice, a British constitutional lawyer brought back this expression in the late 19th centuries, and he was saying that rule of law can only exist in in the United Kingdom and nowhere else, because that's a that's a that's A concept which fits only for the Brits, and we use in a translation. For example, there is a German word reichstadt, and if you say in English rule of law, then they translate it to German as Reichstag. But it's like a state, but it means like a state based on law, which is different than rule of law. So it's like, even from the wording, it's understandable. When the Germans started to use the word Reichstag, they meant something different. It was important for them, but it had a different meaning. Well,

Jim Sciutto

let me give you a concrete example. So if you disagree with your government, are you more likely to go to prison in China and Russia or fall off a balcony there than here concrete.

Balázs Orbán

So it's like, I try to be concrete. There is a way of life. What We Hungarians admire. It's based on freedom, based on individual liberty, based on community based liberty. But there are other structures as well. So if you talk to other people, probably they would say they have different values. They want, they have a different mindset. They want a different functioning of the state. Is it, is it my job to be.

Balázs Orbán

Be to lecture them? Is it my job to to convince them that my way of life, it's how should be done by them? I don't.

Jim Sciutto

To your point, you're an elected member of parliament, and Prime Minister was elected as well.

Balázs Orbán

To your point, of course. Let me give - we are Western countries. It's a freedom based society. But there are different societies where there are different priorities. So my my question, which is important is, if we follow the liberal foreign policy agenda, why should we put on the top of the priority list? This because we experienced that there was a there was a foreign policy establishment which was very hostile towards Hungary for like years. There was an ambassador who was marching on the front line of the Pride Parade. They were sanctioning us because we were not in line with their Ukraine policies. Is it serving the interest of United States? They canceled to do a tax agreement between Hungary and us, and in the meantime, there is a tax agreement still between Russia and the US. They made the investment of American companies harder actually in Hungary. Does it serve the interests of United States? I don't think so. And we are here at this panel. We never met before. We never spoke before. Hungary is a NATO country, but not the biggest and the strongest one. Pakistan, important country, Mexico, important country. Mongolia, important country. We never spoke before, but we are in the same line that this description of the word based on so called progressive liberal principles is just not working. It's dysfunctioning. It's alien. It's alienating countries from each other.

Jim Sciutto

Well, one of those is debate, of course, I want to give Hina a chance to respond.

Hina Rabbani Khar

Yeah. Okay, so you know one thing, which is very, you know, left a deep mark. Was once Margaret Thatcher was asked about Lee Kuan Yew and, you know, Harry Lee, and she said that she had great deal of respect for him, because he was able to come up, look outside and think outside of conventional thinking. Okay, so allow me to say that I think in the west right now, what we have is this conventional thinking which is based on exceptionalism, which is rooted on past behavior, and not the current behavior or the behavior of the last decade and a half or so, and there's no introspection in terms of how different the application of the rules based order is, whether it is the sea lens or the upholding of WTO or the upholding of who or the upholding of UNRWA. So it is almost been so clear and glaringly clear, and this wasn't the case in the past. This has changed. This has happened in the last two decades, and I think there's a lot of room for introspection in terms of what has actually gone wrong, and much of that has been the lack of universal application of the same rules across the board. So when you say we are we feel very strongly about human rights, but only selectively. Then others, and I want to also say and break the myth of all the others don't like others have been taught and have actually bought your values more than you think. They are absolutely espoused to those values, but there are espoused to those values to be shared and implemented universally.

Jim Sciutto

universally. So I think that's well, to your point. I mean, listen, no one would claim the US is upholding the values of the WTO in the midst of a global trade war. Please. You both have thoughts and quickly, if you don't mind, I'm watching the clock. Yeah,

Elbegdorj Tsakhia

thank you very much. Niamh will kill me. You know, never encourage aggression. Never encourage invasion. If you gave that 20% of Ukrainian territory for the Putin's term, I think that will be signaled to China, take Taiwan forcefully that and because of that, I know that nowadays, authoritarian governments actually Alliance. That's not theory. Now it's fact. You know, North Korea becoming silently, silently, that ground force in Europe, already 10,000 14,000 now we see that news that they going to commit for more 30,000 military and plus Iraq, and working with Russia and China, silently working with Russia. And that's already battle tested, battle tested Alliance already there. It should be kind of the wake up call to the west, to the free world, like in 1957 that Sputnik things, you know, it should be wake up call. Don't encourage that innovation and aggression. And you have to keep that. I see that war is obsolete. You know, in Mongolia, we say that bad things in history actually teach, and good things in history actually teach. But when, when we see that from the history, war become obsolete, and we have to show those to those aggressors, if only

Jim Sciutto

Claudia, please.

Claudia Ruiz Massieu

I'd like to say this when we talk about rule of law, or we talk about liberal democracy and its principles and values, and we talk about free trade and all these and rules based order being called into question, it is in no small measure, because of the misuse of these concepts And these institutions by great powers, and that has allowed, let's say, not liberal, not Democratic or illiberal countries, to call this system into question. And I mean, we've seen President Xi Jinping, which I respect and even admire in some things, but become the champion of free trade and multilateralism in some instances in past years. And that is because the US has lost a moral high ground as a human because of the way it has used and abused these institutions and because, and I called, and I say that not just in terms of the US, but all of all of us that believe in liberal democracy, that believe in free trade, that believe in globalization, because we sometimes forgot that all of these free trade and democratic institutions are a means to something, and they're not an end on themselves and their means for people to have better lives, to have their dignity recognized and upheld, to have more prosperity and to have more security, and we've lost sight of that, and that is why this system is being called into question. And the leadership, the US, leadership of this system, has been called into question because and I not only with this administration, but because of the abuse they have made of these institutions. I still believe in democracy. I still believe in human dignity and liberal democracy principles, and this is the way, but we have to rethink the new order that we want. We do not want to reinstate the old order, even I think it's better than what we have now, this uncertainty, but we have to start thinking about the kind of new world order that we want, and what's the

place going to be for all the countries that are part of international community. And rule of law, I think is essential for that officially

Jim Sciutto

we're over time. Do we have five minutes to go to the audience. Would you maybe two questions? One question, great. All right, so who's the lucky winner? You raised your hand first, brief, if you don't mind, and if you have someone in mind on stage, ask, really, I'll leave it pretty broad so anyone can answer. So obviously, we talked about Ukraine. I'm curious. Thank you so much for sharing your international perspectives with everything going on in the Middle East, conflict in Gaza, the strikes on Iran. What is your perspective from your perch on those happenings? Volunteers in 30 seconds?

Elbegdorj Tsakhia

I think yeah, if you are tallest boy in a class, you have a responsibility. America was tall boy in a class. Now we got another tall boy, China. And as Nelson Mandela said, most powerful weapon is to sit down and to talk. And that's really something. And just talk with the Chinese when you talk about that, keep that principles and you know, freedom is non negotiable when, when I meet xi, Jin, Ben or Putin, I usually say that, you know, in Mongolia, freedom is non negotiable. That belongs to people. Let's talk other topics. And they usually accept that you have to show to them where you are stand, where you can negotiate the people talk,

Jim Sciutto

Any quick final thought, please?

Hina Rabbani Khar

thought, please. It has broken away, or taken away, any remnants of soft power that existed. I cannot over project the impact of what is happening in the Middle East and people seeing this on live screen, children butchered, etc, and seeing most of the West standing on one side, and some countries now finally coming there, and the veto power being used, et cetera, that is the I cannot emphasize enough in the rest of the world, the credibility complete earthquake it has given on all the values which have been projected. And remember this, please we have when I say we, we mean everyone, or the world, the Western Hemisphere, mostly, and behind which countries like mine have also stood gone to war for human rights. In many, many countries where many, many people have lost lives, we have used economic sanctions, which have starved people for human rights and things like this. So when people see this type of butchery in some ways, right, there is an impact. And also, just want to say, at the end, I think the difference between even within the Western Hemisphere, how the younger adults are reacting to this and the older generation is so it's in some ways, the older generation is leaving for the younger generation something that they do not entirely agree.

Jim Sciutto

There's a clear difference generationally, not just on that conflict. Thanks so much to all of you spirit of conversation. Appreciate it. Thank you.