

By **Invitation** | Russia and Ukraine

Jeffrey Sachs on why neutral countries should mediate between Russia and Ukraine

The American economist writes as part of a series debating the wisdom of peace negotiations

Neither Russia nor Ukraine is likely to achieve a decisive military victory in their ongoing war: both sides have considerable room for deadly escalation. Ukraine and its Western allies have little chance of ousting Russia from Crimea and the Donbas region, while Russia has little chance of forcing Ukraine to surrender. As Joe Biden noted in October, the spiral of escalation marks the first direct threat of “nuclear Armageddon” since the Cuban missile crisis 60 years ago.

The rest of the world also suffers alongside, though not on the scale of the battlefield. Europe is probably in recession. Developing economies struggle with rising hunger and poverty. American armsmakers and big oil firms reap windfalls, even as the overall American economy worsens. The world endures heightened uncertainty, disrupted supply chains and dire risks of

nuclear escalation.

Each side might opt for continued war in the belief that it has a decisive military advantage over its foe. At least one of the parties would be mistaken in such a view, and probably both. A war of attrition will devastate both sides.

Yet the conflict could proceed for another reason: that neither side sees the possibility of an enforceable peace agreement. Ukrainian leaders believe that Russia would use any pause in fighting to rearm. Russian leaders believe that nato would use any pause in fighting to expand Ukraine's arsenal. They choose to fight now, rather than face a stronger foe later.

The challenge is to find a way to make a peace agreement acceptable, credible and enforceable. I believe that the case for a negotiated peace needs to be more broadly heard, first to spare Ukraine from becoming a perpetual battleground, and more generally, as beneficial for both sides and the rest of the world. A strong argument can be made for involving neutral countries to help enforce a peace settlement that would benefit many.

A credible agreement would first need to meet the core security interests of both parties. As John F. Kennedy wisely said on the path to the successful Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union in 1963, “even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.”

In a peace agreement, Ukraine would need to be assured of its sovereignty and security, while nato would need to promise not to enlarge eastward. (Although nato describes itself as a defensive alliance, Russia certainly feels otherwise and firmly resists nato enlargement.) Some compromises would need to be found regarding Crimea and the Donbas region, perhaps freezing and de-militarising those conflicts for a period of time. A settlement will also be more sustainable if it includes the phased elimination of sanctions on Russia and an agreement by both Russia and the West to contribute to the rebuilding of war-torn areas.

Success may well hinge on who is included in trying to find and enforce peace. Since the belligerents themselves cannot forge such a peace alone, a key structural solution lies in bringing

additional parties to the agreement. Neutral nations including Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa have repeatedly called for a negotiated end to the conflict. They could help to enforce any agreement that is reached.

These countries are neither Russia-haters nor Ukraine-haters. They neither want Russia to conquer Ukraine, nor the West to expand nato eastward, which many see as a dangerous provocation not only to Russia but perhaps to other countries as well. Their opposition to nato enlargement has sharpened as American hardliners have urged the alliance to take on China. Neutral countries were taken aback by the participation of Asia-Pacific leaders of Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand in a summit last year of supposedly “North Atlantic” countries.

The peacemaking role of major neutral countries could be decisive. Russia’s economy and war-making capacity depend on continued strong diplomatic relations and international trade with these neutral countries. When the West imposed economic sanctions on Russia, major emerging economies, such as India, did not follow suit. They did not want to choose sides and have

maintained strong relations with Russia.

These neutral countries are major players in the global economy. According to the imf's estimates of gdp at purchasing-power parity, the combined output of Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa (\$51.7trn, or almost 32% of world output) in 2022 was larger than that of the g7 nations, America, Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy and Japan. The emerging economies are also crucial to global economic governance and will hold the g20 presidency for four years in a row, as well as leadership positions in major regional bodies. Neither Russia nor Ukraine wants to squander relations with these countries, making them important potential guarantors of peace.

Moreover, many of these countries will seek to burnish their diplomatic credentials by helping to negotiate peace. Several, including of course Brazil and India, are long-time aspirants for permanent seats on the un Security Council. The possible architecture of a peace deal could be an agreement co-guaranteed by the un Security Council with several of the major emerging economies. In addition to the countries

mentioned above, other credible co-guarantors include Turkey (which has skilfully mediated Russia-Ukraine talks); Austria, which is proud of its enduring neutrality; and Hungary, which holds this year's presidency of the un General Assembly and has repeatedly called for negotiations to end the war.

The un Security Council and the co-guarantors would impose un-agreed trade and financial measures against any party that breaches the peace agreement. The implementation of such measures would not be subject to veto by the breaching party. Russia and Ukraine would have to trust the fair play of the neutral countries to secure peace and their respective security goals.

It makes no sense for the fighting to continue in Ukraine. Neither side is likely to win a war that is currently devastating Ukraine, imposing massive costs in lives and lucre on Russia, and causing global harm. Major neutral countries, in conjunction with the un, can be the co-guarantors to begin a new era of peace and rebuilding. The world should not allow the two sides to continue a reckless spiral of escalation. ■

Jeffrey Sachs is an American economist, an adviser to three un secretaries-general and president of the un Sustainable Development Solutions Network. He advised the economic teams of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma. He advocated large-scale Western assistance to support the post-communist market transition, but this was not accepted by Western governments.

应邀参加 | 俄罗斯和乌克兰

杰弗里·萨克斯谈为何中立国家应在俄罗斯和乌克兰之间进行调解

这位美国经济学家在辩论和平谈判的智慧的系列文章中写道

俄罗斯和乌克兰都不可能在他们正在进行的战争中取得决定性的军事胜利：双方都有相当大的致命升级的空间。乌克兰及其西方盟友几乎没有机会将俄罗斯赶出克里米亚和顿巴斯地区，而俄罗斯也没有机会迫使乌克兰投降。正如乔·拜登在 10 月指出的那样，螺旋式升级标志着自 60 年前的古巴导弹危机以来首次出现了 "核大决战 " 的直接威胁。

世界其他地区也在同时受到影响，虽然没有战场上的规模。欧洲可能正处于衰退之中。发展中经济体在饥饿和贫困加剧中挣扎。美国的军火商和大石油公司获得了暴利，即使是在美国整体经济恶化的情况下。世界忍受着高度的不确定性、供应链的中断和核升级的可怕风险。

每一方都可能选择继续战争，认为自己对敌人有决定性的军事优势。至少有一方的这种观点是错误的，而且可能是双方都错了。一场消耗战将对双方都造成破坏。

然而，冲突可能因为另一个原因而继续下去：双方都没有看到达成可执行的和平协议的可能性。乌克兰领导人认为，俄罗斯会利用任何战斗的暂停来重新武装。俄罗斯领导人认为，北约会利用战斗的任何停顿来扩大乌克兰的武器库。他们选择现在战斗，而不是以后面对一个更强大的敌人。

现在的挑战是找到一种方法，使和平协议可以接受、可信和可执行。我认为，需要更广泛地听取通过谈判实现和平的理由，首先是为了避免乌克兰成为一个永久的战场，更广泛地说，这对双方和世界其他地区都有好处。可以提出一个强有力的论据，让中立国家参与进来，帮助执行一个将惠及许多人的和平解决方案。

一个可信的协议首先需要满足双方的核心安全利益。正如约翰·F·肯尼迪在 1963 年与苏联成功签订《部分禁止核试验条约》的道路上明智地表示，"即使是最敌对的国家也可以依靠它们接受并遵守那些符合其自身利益的条约义务，而且只有那些条约义务。"

在一项和平协议中，乌克兰将需要得到其主权和安全的保证，而北约则需要承诺不向东扩张。（虽然北约将自己描述为一个防御性联盟，但俄罗斯肯定不这么认为，并坚决抵制北约的扩大。）在克里米亚和顿巴斯地区，需要找到一些妥协，也许在一段时间内冻结这些冲突并使之非军事化。如果解决方案包括分阶段取消对俄罗斯的制裁，以及俄罗斯和西方国家同意为受战争破坏地区的重建做出贡献，那么它也将更具有可持续性。

成功与否很可能取决于谁参与了寻求和执行和平的努力。由于交战方本身无法单

独建立这样的和平，一个关键的结构性解决方案在于让其他各方加入协议。包括阿根廷、巴西、中国、印度、印度尼西亚和南非在内的中立国家已多次呼吁通过谈判结束冲突。他们可以帮助执行任何达成的协议。

这些国家既不是仇恨俄罗斯的人，也不是仇恨乌克兰的人。他们既不希望俄罗斯征服乌克兰，也不希望西方向东扩张北约，在许多人看来，这不仅是对俄罗斯的危险挑衅，也许也是对其他国家的挑衅。由于美国强硬派敦促北约对付中国，他们对北约扩大的反对更加尖锐。去年，日本、韩国、澳大利亚和新西兰等亚太领导人参加了所谓的 "北大西洋 "国家的峰会，这让中立国家大吃一惊。

主要中立国家的媾和作用可能是决定性的。俄罗斯的经济和战争能力取决于与这些中立国家继续保持强有力的外交关系和国际贸易。当西方对俄罗斯实施经济制裁时，主要的新兴经济体，如印度，并没有效仿。他们不想选边站，一直与俄罗斯保持着牢固的关系。

这些中立国家是全球经济中的主要参与者。根据 IMF 对按购买力平价计算的 gdp 的估计，2022 年阿根廷、巴西、中国、印度、印度尼西亚和南非的产出之和（517 万亿美元，占世界产出的近 32%），比美国、英国、加拿大、法国、德国、意大利和日本这七个国家的产出还要大。新兴经济体对全球经济治理也至关重要，它们将连续四年担任 g20 主席国，并在主要区域机构中担任领导职务。俄罗斯和乌克兰都不想浪费与这些国家的关系，使它们成为和平的重要潜在保障者。

此外，这些国家中的许多国家将寻求通过帮助和平谈判来擦亮其外交资历。有几个国家，当然包括巴西和印度，长期以来一直希望获得联合国安理会常任理事国的席位。和平协议的可能架构是由联合国安理会与几个主要新兴经济体共同担保的协议。除上述国家外，其他可信的共同担保人包括土耳其（巧妙地调解了俄乌会谈）；以其持久的中立性为荣的奥地利；以及担任今年联合国大会主席并多次呼吁通过谈判结束战争的匈牙利。

联合国安理会和共同担保人将对违反和平协议的任何一方实施未商定的贸易和金融措施。这些措施的实施不会受到违反协议方的否决。俄罗斯和乌克兰将不得不相信中立国家的公平竞争，以确保和平和各自的安全目标。

在乌克兰继续战斗是没有意义的。任何一方都不可能赢得一场目前正在破坏乌克兰的战争，给俄罗斯带来巨大的生命和金钱损失，并造成全球伤害。主要的中立国家与联合国一起，可以成为共同担保人，开始一个和平与重建的新时代。世界不应允许双方继续肆无忌惮的升级。 ■

杰弗里-萨克斯是美国经济学家，曾任联合国三位秘书长的顾问和联合国可持续发展解决方案网络主席。他曾为苏联总统戈尔巴乔夫、俄罗斯总统叶利钦和乌克兰总统库奇马的经济团队提供咨询。他主张提供大规模的西方援助以支持后共产主义的市场转型，但这并没有被西方政府接受。