

Echange du Président de la République avec des étudiants de l'Université Yonsei.

Yoon DONG-SUP

Your Excellency President Emmanuel Macron, distinguished guests, and students and colleagues, it's my great pleasure to welcome you to Yonsei University. I do not think President Macron needs much introduction to this audience. He is a leader known around the world, and it is a real honor for us to welcome him to Yonsei today. This is a very meaningful occasion for our university community. President Macron's leadership has engaged many of the defining challenges of our time, and his presence here gives our students a valuable opportunity to think about the future with broad vision and deeper responsibility. I have heard that today's lecture has drawn tremendous interest from our students. That's why I believe the Yonsei students in this hall are truly fortunate.

They have the real chance to hear directly from a global leader and to be part of a moment that will inspire them for years to come. A university is not only a place of learning but also a place of encounter, where ideas meet, where generations connect, and where hope for the future is renewed. That's what makes today's remarks especially meaningful. Mr. President, thank you very much for being with us today here. Your visit is a great honor for Yonsei and a memorable encouragement to all our students. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in warmly welcoming His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic.

Emmanuel MACRON

Thank you so much, Mr. President. I imagine you can sit down.

Thank you very much for welcoming us. I want to thank especially those who started our national anthem, because I heard that just before your speech, and thank you for your presence today. I want first to apologize because we were late. We had a much longer discussion with your president, which is, in general, in this business, quite a good signal. It means that we have something to say, to share, and we brainstorm together.

I'm very grateful with him, and I'm really happy to be here with you today. I don't want to deliver a long speech. Perhaps I just wanted to share a few convictions with you and dedicate more time for Q&A and have a direct interaction if you agree.

I think the first question should be : why are you here ? My conviction is that our two countries, based on their students and young people, have many more things to do than what we are doing today.

We have much more in common. In the current global environment, we really have a common agenda. This is exactly what I wanted to start with and what I wanted to share with you. We are celebrating the 140 years of friendship and common relations. But the era which we started is quite different.

Why ?

We have wars : in Ukraine because of the aggression of Russia, now in Iran. A lot of instability. Obviously, a lot of threats, especially in this region. We were used to a global order based on some certainty, some stability, and, I would say, a guarantee of last resort. Let's phrase it like that. Everything is changing. Our societies are largely destabilized by some technological and anthropological changes. Probably we will return to that. We were hurt by a pandemic. We have a big destabilization of global trade. Overcapacities on one side, tariffs on the other side, and we are trapped in the middle. There is a doubt on the predictability of a lot of big powers in this world and how this international order can function.

My conviction is that in this very moment, democracies like South Korea and France, our republics, have a lot of things to do together. Based on this partnership, the democracies of the European ones, Canada, Brazil, India, have a common agenda. Let's try to simplify the situation. We do believe in democracy, rule of law. We do believe in the international order based on the Charter of the United Nations. We believe in science and innovation, and this is part of our common agenda. We do believe in climate change. I mean, we don't consider that climate change is a crazy idea. Based on science, it does exist and has to be fixed. We believe in trade and free and open trade. We believe in the capacity of our diplomacy to fix instabilities.

Okay, I stop that. 15 years ago, putting on the table these ideas was sort of a very candid approach. « Okay, what is he saying ? It's obvious ».

We are sharing that but with so many people. Just consider these key principles. I'm not totally sure it's shared by so many people today. The Europeans I mentioned, our democracies, Canada, you, some others in the region. We are not totally sure that when we speak about international order or climate change, this agenda is shared by everybody. Totally. This is why we have to do this and we have to do in common. We have to launch a new era based on new cooperations in order to deliver this agenda and implement our capacity to deal with these challenges. I think our objective is not to be the vassals of two hegemonic powers. None of these hegemonic powers, I would say. We don't want to depend on the dominance, let's say, on China, or we don't want to be too much exposed to the unpredictability of the US.

Having said that, this is why there is room, a space to build new cooperations between Korea and France in order to work together, in order to say : okay, we will innovate on AI, quantum, chips, space, renewable energy and nuclear.

We will work together on defense and security. We will work together on diplomacy from the Strait of Hormuz to the region and the challenge we have in Ukraine.

We can work together in order to deal with climate change and global health. Just to take two other examples. Having such an agenda shared by Korea, France, and bringing with us the other Europeans, Canada, Japan, India, Brazil, Australia, you start having a sort of third way. Those who don't want to be dependent on China or aligned by definition with the US. But this coalition of able and willing countries, believing in the few principles I mentioned a few minutes ago, and ready to work hard together in order to deliver on the basis of this agenda. This is exactly, for me, the agenda of the bilateral relation but the new era we should open. Obviously, this is the challenge of your generation.

The former generations, and mine is probably at the articulation between the two. But during decades, we had certainties. The global order was based on the post-World War II era, and by the way, after the war that your country had to deliver in order to preserve its independence and sovereignty. But during decades, we had a so-called stability based on this international order and the few certainties we had. It's up and down now. We should not just be passive in this new disorder. We have to build a new order. This one should be based on the cooperation between willing countries, those who do believe in cooperation or coalition of the independence, and we want to be independent. This is the challenge of your generation.

This is why I'm here.

I will stop here, because now I want to answer your questions.

Thank you.

Student

Bonjour. Je m'appelle Youngjae Cho and I'm a senior majoring in political science and international studies at Yonsei University. It's truly an honor to meet you.

To begin, I would like to raise a question that reflects a broader perspective.

Nowadays, it seems like international cooperation is becoming increasingly fragmented.

In this context, how would you view the future of international cooperation on major global challenges, such as climate change, biodiversity, global health and trade, especially when major powers are stepping back from dialogue and cross-border cooperation ? And what work can France and countries like France and Korea play in rebuilding trust and improving cooperation ?

Emmanuel MACRON

Thank you for your question, which is in direct line with my introduction. You mentioned a lot of topics from biodiversity, health, climate change, but we can add AI, quantum, as I mentioned, and all the fields of innovations. None of these challenges, none of these fields of innovation, can be addressed by a single country. It doesn't make sense.

The only way to make progress is through cooperation. The first one, the basement is the cooperation among students, academics and researchers. It's extremely important. I mean, university, by definition, by DNA, is not a national exchange. This is by DNA *international*, and the objective of a university is to try to embrace the world, all the ideas.

The first way to address these key challenges you mentioned is not just to protect but give all the capacities of our universities and research centers to have a free and open research.

It's extremely important.

Our research, our discussion, obviously the teaching in our universities should not be directed or controlled by the government. It should be free and open, meaning it should be defined by those recognized by their peers and respected by the other academics and researchers as the ones being entitled to precisely teach you. They are the ones to define the way to teach you and the content of your studies.

Second, the fact that this research in your universities, in our universities, our research centers is free and open is extremely important. Meaning, the government is not the one to say : « this topic should not be a topic of research » or « this topic is forbidden ». It doesn't make sense. It's not consistent and compliant with our democratic values. So the first way to deliver this agenda and make progress on biodiversity, health, climate change, innovation in quantum, and so on is to protect the free and open science, is to protect our universities and research centers, and to encourage the cooperation between these universities and research centers.

This is a top priority of this very moment, of the global order. What we experienced during the past few years is a sort of fragmentation of this cooperation. Some countries started to block some cooperations, unhappily, some other countries started to literally kill the financing on some fields, some areas of research, which is clearly a betrayal of the spirit of coordination and cooperation that we need.

So, first one, what you do here and what we have to protect.

The second one is : we will make progress in these different fields by the innovations made in our labs, in our universities, in our startups and companies. This one is based as well by DNA on cooperation. This is why we have to encourage this cooperation by any means.

This is part of the bilateral agenda. In a much broader approach, this is what we want to encourage in the bilateral relation, but as well through different countries.

The last point is we have to create the right framework in order to encourage this cooperation between governments. 11 years ago, we made a great progress on climate with the Paris Agreement, because we were able to build an agreement between China and the U.S. first, and enlarge the agreement and bring everybody together around the table to say : « we will take commitments to reduce our CO2 emission » and in order to address what is by definition a global challenge.

Few months ago in Nice, we managed to do the same for the oceans with UNOC. We had this United Nations conference.

For the first time after a decade, we managed to have the relevant number of ratification to protect high seas with what we call the BBNJ for the high protection of our oceans. The only way to make progress on these topics and to build a relevant and efficient international framework is to manage, to bring together even those who have different interests, even those who are confronting on other fields. But to say : « ok, here, this is a global challenge » and when we speak about science, health, climate, by definition we speak about progress for the whole humanity. So we should stop competing for a while and we should say how to build the right compromise and work together. So university, cooperation among startups, companies and large corporates, and third : international framework to have this efficient multilateralism. This is a way to deal with these key challenges.

Student

Bonjour Monsieur le Président.

My name is Yeji Park and I'm currently working as a product researcher in a digital mobile platform. Working in this industry, I've engaged closely with users across different age groups and backgrounds and I've observed how technology shapes user behavior and online environments. Through this experience, I've come to see both opportunities these platforms create and the risks they can amplify.

As you know, there are growing concerns about how these platforms may deepen social divisions and tensions across different communities and cultures. In that context, I would like to ask for your thoughts on how we can prevent a worst case scenario where digital platforms accelerate radicalization and fragment social cohesion ?

Ultimately, how can we avoid these dynamics weakening our social and democratic systems ?

Emmanuel MACRON

Thank you.

I think this is a very relevant question. I'm never pessimistic, so I don't want to say it's already too late, but let's be honest.

Radicalization and fragmentation in our societies, it's no more [a] risk, this is a reality. Now the question is how to correct it and how to deal with the initially unexpected and negative effects of these social platforms.

Let me start by saying I'm a true believer in innovation and I think our two countries, by the way, have a lot of appetite for innovations. We innovate a lot, we do believe in that. I think it's very important that we have the relevant players in Korean and French societies to innovate, create, etc.. But having said that, when you look at the social platforms and the way it's used by our fellow citizens, I mean, we are creating an impossible world.

First, the impact on children and teenagers is super important and largely negative.

We asked for a scientific report two years ago in France. A lot of countries did the same in the region, Australia did the same. It's quite clear that when you look at the situation of mental health for teenagers, when you look at all the negative consequences and the correlation, you can establish with precisely mental health, loneliness, stress, etc., for children and teenagers, we have a big issue with social networks.

This is why in France we are passing a law in order to ban under 15 years old social networks. We will have at the European scale a verification age process and we will define at a national scale a digital majority. We will say, for France, under 15, no access to the social network. Why ? Because you are not ready emotionally. I think it would be crazy to say we will delegate the brain and the emotions of our children and teenagers to these social networks.

So we protect them, exactly as we decided decades ago not to give alcohol, or not to leave our children and teenagers to go alone everywhere in this world. Because some places are more exposed than some others. You have to be ready. In parallel, we want to increase the place of reading, fundamental education, but as well, to make sure that our teenagers are fully equipped to be exposed to the social networks.

This is the first point, but this is for me, the basis.

The second point is exactly what you described. As I mentioned, this is not a risk of fragmentation. By structure, by DNA, the social networks, the social platforms, create polarization and fragmentation. Why ? Because when you look at the way it's structured, you follow some people and you are followed by people. The community you create through this approach is a community of like minded people.

Progressively, if you inform yourself through these social networks and through the accounts you follow, and through the guys reacting as followers to your accounts, you have, by design, a bias, because you are exposed to people who decided to follow you because they believe in the same thing, because they have some affinity with you and same on the other side.

This phenomenon creates a cognitive bubble. You are trapped in this bubble because I follow you and probably you follow me. Because we have the same education, we believe in the same ideas, we are obsessed by the same things and so on, but it's not the right representation of what a nation is, what a community is. So this is the first bias.

The second one is that because everybody is hidden behind an account and you are not forced to have your identity. You are not like we are in this room.

You see my face, I see your face. If there is a bad behavior, I can say this is a bad behavior and everybody will recognize your face.

Don't worry, I don't speak about you.

But if everybody is hidden, we will start behaving badly because there is no more incentives to just what is the basis of the civilization. This is the second problem we have with the social networks. The fact that you are not sure it's not a fake account. Clearly there is a predominance of hate speech and excessive speech. When you see you are trapped amongst yourselves in this cognitive bubble and there is a premium for those who go to the extreme by design these social networks push you at the maximum of what your community is ready to listen to.

The third point is about algorithms. When we speak about social networks, we speak about business models. A lot of you probably inform yourself on these social networks. You exchange the social networks, but are you paying something to do so ? No. Why ? Because there is a business model, but this business model is not obvious to you. This business model is based on data. Through these exchanges, because you go to certain accounts to inform yourself, because you exchange information, you interact with your friends and families ; you exchange data. This data is the one to be used by this social platform because they sell this data to make individual advertising business much more efficient than the classical one.

They have a business, which is not the purpose of your interaction with this social platform. This is the big misunderstanding of everything.

We are delegating our social relations, sometimes the way we inform yourself, the relation with the rest of the community to these platforms, whose business model is not to create that, but to sell our data, to make money with big brands, products and so on.

The day you start realizing that, you consider that the algorithm, which is the one who will push some content to you, favor some accounts to you, will push some videos when you scroll.

They do it for what ? It creates a maximum level of excitement. This business is based on the fact that you will exchange a maximum number of data, and you have to be excited. They want to create this excitement because they want you to spend the maximum number of hours and to get the maximum numbers of data in order to maximize our capacity to sell ads.

Ok, so this is a big issue, because what they do is creating more separation between people, more fragmentation, and they create a lot of biases.

This is why, if we decide *de facto*, which is the case, to delegate our democracy to these social networks, we delegate our democracy and the interactions to this algorithm, whose objective is precisely to create excitement on your side and sell data on the other side.

This is unfair. There is no other choice than regulating these social networks. This is why, on top of the ban under 15 years old, what we are working on at the European scale is to say : interdiction of fake accounts, trolls and so on, regulation and transparency of algorithms. We need the transparency of algorithm. I want to have a clear view on the rule of the game. [*what we are working on at the European scale is to say :*] interdiction of the ad business in electoral period. Because everybody can buy and create some bias during your elections and regulation of the contents. There is no way that a speech which is forbidden in this area should be allowed on social networks. Hate speech, racism, homophobia, etc., has to be forbidden and controlled and regulated with the responsibility of the social platform when we speak about this field.

Here are some convictions but this is one of the key challenges for democracy.

Look at the situation. In the U.S. they decided to delegate all these questions to the social platform themselves because a large majority of them are Americans. I don't have the feeling that the society is super happy with that. They decided *de facto* to delegate the functioning of the democracy to private interests. In Europe, we are fighting hard to regulate. This is for me one of the hottest topics we have.

In China, they provide some of these big social platforms and the most successful one. But what they decided, they totally banned the social platform for themselves. They have another one for their children and teenagers [but] for the rest : total ban. This is a good signal.

The way is how democracies can cooperate to have sustainable social networks and social platforms, meaning respecting our children and respecting the normal functioning of democracy and fixing this issue of fragmentation and polarization. This is one of the key challenges for this coalition of the independents I mentioned. This is a key challenge for the Europeans, the Canadians, the Brazilians, the Koreans, and so on.

Thank you.

Student

Bonjour, Mr. President. My name is Seungmin and I'm a graduate student majoring in on-device AI. It's a great honor to have this conversation with you.

First thing first, let's start with meaning something very obvious. As someone working in science and engineering, I've been fascinated by how France is pursuing such an ambitious vision under your leadership, especially in areas like AI, quantum technology and healthcare. So these days, with rising tensions between countries, there's a growing need for sovereignty and resilience.

Yet in my own field of on-device AI, I see every day how technology developed in one country quickly becomes an essential infrastructure elsewhere. So given that, I believe that science is one of the few areas that is available to pursue one nation's strength and, on the other hand, also build deep and lasting connections between countries.

In that context, I wanted to ask you : in which scientific fields do you see the greatest promise that can help cooperation between France and Korea ?

Furthermore, how can these collaborations help collaborations to address the challenges that my generation will have to face ?

Emmanuel MACRON

Thank you for your question and thank you for being involved in this extremely important field of research. I already addressed the importance of cooperation, the importance of open science and cooperation between universities, but as well the importance of this cross-border cooperation. So I don't want to come back to that. Let me be more specific about what we can do between Korea and France.

Thank you for your nice word about France. I could have the same for Korea because the journey you just delivered is super impressive.

I mean, your country at the middle of the 50s was one of the poorest nations of the world and today should be the 12th or the 13th bigger economy of the world.

I think there is very few countries having delivered such a journey. It's a growth and innovation story. I think when we speak about the cooperation between our two countries in terms of innovation, I would definitely say semiconductor and quantum.

I'm a little bit under stress because I speak under the supervision in my delegation of the president of our science academy, our Nobel Prize [who] is [a] specialist in quantum. I did my best to make him believe that I was starting to understand a few things. I will not expose too much myself. But definitely quantum is a field where you are very good, we are very good.

By the way, a lot of our labs are building new cooperations with yours, and our companies are precisely sealing new partnerships together. So quantum is a field where if we work together, increase our capacity, we can deliver and achieve some concrete results. Delivering the exascale computer and some of these key achievements of quantum is key.

Second, on AI. On AI, for the same reasons we have good data scientists, we have good mathematicians, good physicians on both sides, and we have good fundamental science and relevant ecosystem. We have as well a lot of synergies and I would say AI and semiconductors, I would put myself at the crossing of these two fields.

This is an area where we can do together. France is one of the key places of innovation in France and semiconductor. We had the CEA, Soitec, STMicroelectronics and obviously with Samsung and other leaders, you are key players in these categories.

Everybody is running in order to deliver more semiconductors but as well to innovate, to decrease the size. It's one of the key elements of the AI infrastructure. So on this field, plus all the innovation, we have a space of cooperation which is extremely important.

Third, healthcare and health innovation. Our two countries have a great tradition but we are accelerating on some field of research and this is a place where we have both labs and startups. We have a lot of existing fields of cooperation, and we want to accelerate. I would say innovation in nuclear energy. Laser, fusion, obviously improvement of fission and optimization of the cycle. We are competitors, but we have good research centers.

This is exactly what we have to elaborate, because we are competitors, but the question is : we have so many common challenges... How, remaining competitors, we define some space of cooperation where we put our assets in common, our financing in common, our labs in common, to say : « okay, we want to deliver that together ».

It's super important.

I'm not comprehensive, but I speak about some fields of very important cooperation, where if we work together, we can achieve very concrete results. But what's very important is what we will build together will allow us to be more independent vis-à-vis some others.

I don't believe in *otarsia* [autarky]. My obsession is not to say : « your country, my country, has to be 100% independent. » It doesn't make sense.

But I want to be in a situation to diversify and always to choose where I decide to be dependent and is it sustainable, which is the difference between independence and *otarsia* on one side, but the difference between being free and being the vassal of everybody else. Neither Korea or France want to become the vassal of a big power. The main risk in this different field of innovation is because the U.S, on one side, China on the other one, have very powerful approach and very powerful strategy on AI, on quantum, on energy. I don't put an equal between China and U.S. They are totally different. One in democracy, the other one is not a democracy.

But their natural trend today is to have a fight between number one and number two.

You are number 13. I don't know where we should be : number 6, something like that.

So the big risk we have is, okay you are in the club of the 20, fine, but you will be the vassal of one of the two ones. No. So the question is how to reduce our dependency to these big powers and how to create cooperation, which is different from dependencies on this field.

This is the power of the cooperation between Korea and France.

Because the way we decide to cooperate in this different field, there are no chance that you will be in the situation of hegemony with me or the opposite. We will have to cooperate given the relative size we have and the fact that we need each other.

Here are the key elements of our cooperation. I could complete, but this is the first answer.

Student

Bon après-midi.

Je suis très contente de te voir.

I'm Eun-bin, and I'm currently a master student who is studying political science and sustainable development. As we are seen today, we are confronted with rising geopolitical tensions and economic instability. That leads to democratic backsliding, which is the key issue that both France and Korea are focusing on because we are the democratic countries.

I really wanted to ask at this point. These challenges are showing us that the progress that we've made is not sustainable and it's not guaranteed and it can be reversed at any time.

I would like to ask what kinds of efforts are needed at the individual, the governmental, national, or international level so that we can ensure the sustainable development ?

Emmanuel MACRON

Thank you.

I think it's an important question.

First, it's part of our DNA, being a democracy.

Your President mentioned earlier the importance of enlightenment in France and our philosophers, about democracy, rule of law and so on. Your country experienced during the past few years a democratic crisis.

We add our own crisis and nobody is immune. You're right, we have to be very humble.

But I see the current mood is to say : « okay, democracies are weak » in a certain sense, « it's slow », « people don't manage to find consensus », « it's more and more divided ».

There is this narrative in our democracies to say : « if you want to be more efficient, just let's adopt a system which is more efficient », led by business leaders or more authoritarian, etc.

It was a narrative existing in your country, and I want to commend your people, your current President, by standing very clearly and defending democracy and protecting democracy.

This is existing everywhere.

I really believe that the best way to address our current challenges and design long-term development for our societies is through democracies.

Why ?

Because this is the only place where you can share an open information.

You can have debates, you can disagree. But through these disagreements and the time the debates take, the time of democracy, it's not a slowdown. It's just a time you need to correct imperfections to work together to build the relevant level of consensus to bring the whole society but as well to improve the solution. I think the best evidence of that, and probably we didn't sufficiently make the open feedback of this period of time. But it's the COVID time.

Just remember, beginning of 2020, let's say mid-2020. Confronted to the pandemic everywhere we had the debate in our societies, what's the best model ? I have a clear memory of that.

A lot of people were saying : « China is super efficient », « super efficient lockdown everywhere ».

On the other side, others were saying : « okay, here, total openness ». And so on.

Our countries were trapped in democratic debates. We did the best we could do in democracy. We say : « okay, we will base our decision on science ». So a lot of our countries established independent scientific committee. We did so.

We had a lot of debates to criticize the government. You are doing too much, you are too strict the week after, now, you are too flexible.

But we stick to the science. We took the right measure ; we accompany our people.

Look at all the scientific reports of this period of time issued in science and so on.

The best in class by far were democracies. In authoritarian regime, the short-term answer seems to be the same. I remember as well the Russian vaccine : super efficient and used by some other authoritarian regime. Even somewhere, some place close to this one. It appeared it didn't work. But there was no open science, no assessment, no shared information.

Those who delivered the best results in front of COVID were democracies. The retext is super clear because it was based on open science, open debates, attempt to build the consensus with dissenting opinions, which doesn't exist in democracy. Consensus is not unanimity. It was based on this permanent debate.

I really believe that democracy today, in an open world of online and permanent information, is much more challenging. It remains the best system by far. Now the point is, it's never achieved. So we are at the moment where we have to reinvent it. For me, one of the main issues is the one we discussed with your fellow colleague : social networks. Because as they are creating fragmentation, as they are clearly encouraging plotism, and threatening a lot of these bases of our democracy, it's put at risk. But this is our role collectively, to be lucid about that and to correct these negative impacts by some regulations, by a better education and so on.

Let me finish on one point.

The challenge of our democracies today is to invest on the next generation and to improve education system and never stop better educating our people. This is the only way.

Because they are confronted to new democratic risks. You are never immune, but they have to be ready. In a certain way, they have to have the intellectual antibodies in order to protect themselves from that. But the democracy is, in a certain way, a fragile system, because it's always exposed to a risk coming from inside or outside. But the lucidity on our fragility and the fact that this is a common work to be permanently adjusted makes us much more solid than any authoritarian regime. Because authoritarian regimes are based on very few people, most of the time are accompanied by corruption in order to preserve the dominance of very few people on the others.

It is a sub-optimum because it does not use the brain and the talents of a large majority of the population. This is why democracy is a much more efficient system.

I think we are permanently improving it.

Emmanuel MACRON

I can take one last question.

Student

Hello, Mr. President.

My name is Yun Soo Cho. I am a business-majoring student in third grade.

I want to ask you briefly about the international relations that are going on right now.

So two days ago, you sat down with the Japanese Prime Minister, Sanae Takaichi.

You claimed that although Europe might not be the fastest and swiftest continent, it still is the most predictable and most stable continent. In contrast, President Trump's rhetoric, or his style of speech, is rather strong and stubborn or rather inconsistent as well.

I can see all the conflicts going on between the US and Iran because Mr. Trump said that he will destroy Iran's infrastructure. Earlier today, Iran shot down an American fighter jet. Inside this conflict, oil prices are surging. I believe that it's common for all over the world.

But the people's cost of living is surging way too high.

As a member of the G7 and as a President, what is your administration's policy to alleviate the cost of living ? Since you talked with President Lee Jae-Myung today, what kind of cooperation did you promise with him ?

Thank you.

Last but not least, can I take a selfie with you ?

Emmanuel MACRON

Okay for the second one.

I will elaborate a little bit more for the first one.

I think the situation where we are is quite challenging, to be honest.

Because the US. is a great country. They paid a very high tribute for your country and peace in your country. They pay a very high tribute for peace in Europe. The D-Day in France is not to be forgotten. They played a very important role to build this international order I mentioned after the Second World War.

They are the *guarantee in last resort* of this international order in a certain way.

The problem we have is that they, the main countries with the highest responsibility start to jeopardize themselves the international order. I think our responsibility, it's true for the G7 and even more broadly. Some big countries are not part of the G7 which is based on democratic values. China is not part of the G7 but they have a very high responsibility in the international order.

What we have to do is to stick to the principles. We signed a Charter, building the United Nations. The day you start creating yourself double standard, what is your credibility to avoid war ? The day you say, « I don't like your regime, I don't like your organization, I consider you are threatening your neighbor, so I will intervene and bomb you », you open a Pandora box. Why shouldn't the other do the same ? This is why I really think that being compliant with international order does not make sense for everybody.

This is why if we go to Iran, we say, « We do believe in international order and with the importance of negotiation ». Iran is a very bad regime. No discussion about that.

I disagree with them on a lot of topics, but I don't believe that we will fix the situation just by bombings or by military operations.

Look at what happened with this type of operation in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Libya.

We never delivered, never, even after 20 years. You have to respect the sovereignty of people. If people want to change a regime, they want to react, step up, they can do so.

What are our objective ?

Number one, as soon as we can : cease fire.

Comprehensive negotiations in order to make sure that the international community have a full view and a relevant monitoring on nuclear activities, ballistic activities, and on the regional proxies used by Iran to create destabilization. This comprehensive framework is the one to be built through negotiation to empower United Nations agencies to monitor a sustainable peace and with some retaliations if this is not respected by Iran.

But we have to build this framework. So what we want to do is to be part of that.

We have a specific topic which is clearly impacting your country and, more broadly, a lot of countries on the origin and, *de facto*, given our interdependencies, of the whole world is the Hormuz Strait. Because a large majority of the oil and gas used in this region and in your country comes from that through the Hormuz Strait.

We want to reopen the Hormuz Strait. We believe, and this is where we established a clear cooperation with your president, working together with some of our nations to planify a peaceful operation to escort some tankers and carriers through Hormuz Strait based on a deconfliction mechanism with Iran.

Negotiation.

The day we have a more peaceful situation or a ceasefire. This is a very concrete action.

We are ready to deliver a bunch of countries together through cooperation and discussion. This is exactly what we decided together.

But more than that, I really believe that predictability, compliance with international law is the only way to build trust and to preserve peace. This is what we want to do. This is why I speak about the bilateral relation, the way you should look at France and Europe today... We are innovative like you are attractive. We do believe in the next generation. We want to make much more things with you in innovation industry. We are creative as well, like you in music, in cinema, etc. We want to do much more with you because we have this DNA in common between Korea and France.

Together, we do believe in the strength of negotiation, stability, and trust.

It makes a lot of things.

So let's do it.

Thank you for your attention.

Thank you.