

منتدى أمريكا والعالم الإسلامي

U.S.–ISLAMIC WORLD FORUM

DOHA, QATAR

*Common Challenges:
Addressing Together Emerging Global Issues*

Welcoming Remarks:

Amb. Carlos E. PASCUAL
Vice President and Director
Foreign Policy Studies
The Brookings Institution
United States

Keynote Address:

H.E. Abdullah bin Hamad AL-ATTIYAH
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Energy and Industry of Qatar

Speakers:

The Honorable Madeleine K. ALBRIGHT
Former United States Secretary of State

H.E. Anwar IBRAHIM
Leader of the Opposition in the Parliament of the Federation of Malaysia

GEN. David PETRAEUS
Commander of the United States Central Command

H.E. Barham SALIH
Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Iraq



PROCEEDINGS

CARLOS PASCUAL: Good evening. My name is Carlos Pascual. I'm the Vice President of the Brookings Institution, the Director of the Foreign Policy Studies Program there, and on behalf of the Brookings Institution, the Saban Center at Brookings, and the Foreign Ministry of Qatar, I would like to welcome you to the **2009 U.S.-Islamic World Forum**. Through the vision of His Royal Highness Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, Emir of the State of Qatar, American and Muslim-world leaders again unit in this form on the fields of policy, business, science, faith and the arts. We come to learn from each other. We come with a commitment to act, to break down barriers, and to build on the talent, vibrancy, faith and knowledge that rests in all of our societies.

We come together under the theme of common challenges, addressing together emerging global issues. In this global world, we are connected in ways which transcend borders. Money, ideas, technology, and people move on a global stage. Tom Friedman called it a flat world where traditional hierarchies among nations give way to interconnections among people, businesses and states. Others have used the worlds multipolar and interdependent. Tragically and dramatically, these were illustrated in a global economic crisis that started in the housing market in the United States and where the rescue capital is coming from China and the Persian Gulf. This is not a world of unipolar hegemony.

This we also know. In this global world there has also been great opportunity. Global markets have lifted 500 million people out of poverty especially in China and India. It has spawned the accumulation of unprecedented wealth. It has allowed for the transformation of states like China, India, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates into global



players. On this global stage the United States is still a critical actor. It is not a crippled state but it is a state that needs others.

There is also a great risk. When transnational forces become destructive, there are few barriers to stop their spread. When the United States fails to act responsibly to regulate its economy the threat is to the banking systems of the entire world. If religious schools in tribal areas of Pakistan teach hatred to young children, then children in Afghanistan and India and Iran and Iraq are threatened as well. If poor villagers in Turkey or Indonesia have flocks of chicken killed by avian flu, that is also a threat to every nation an airplane ride away. If in Detroit or Delhi or Beijing coal-fired plants spew carbon into the atmosphere, that is a threat in Mali or Darfur where pressures over land and water become more intense, or in Bangladesh or Sri Lanka where the threat of emersion underwater draws closer. And if there are regional wars as we just saw in Gaza, the tragedy is not just in the immediate deaths of those caught in the conflict, but it reverberates globally and thus the whole world would have a stake in peace.

In this global world, no nation acting alone can solve its problems. No nation can isolate itself from these global threats. And a retreat from action under the guise of ignorance can only be folly. It means that leadership must be built on international cooperation to solve problems together. It does not mean to dictate views or to act unilaterally, as that can only result in hurt and failure.

So we gather at this conference as individuals, Muslims, Christians, some of other faiths, some of no religious conviction, to find ways to meet these global challenges. I leave you with a few reminders of lessons from previous years. The first is respect. Tragically, many societies and in the United States and in the Muslim world have developed perceptions



of each other nurtured by stereotypes. We left last year's forum with a conviction to educate. Let us amplify that agenda. Second, I go back to statements a year ago from two of our speakers, Secretary Albright and His Excellency Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al-Thani. They reminded us that the rule of law is our strength at home and let us not forget to understand how we make it our guidepost internationally. Third, we agreed that conflicts among states can spin out of control and drown the prospects for peace. Tragically, we face that risk again between Israel and the Palestinians. But we also see other movements that are important. Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim is not with us at this opening session because he is chairing a conference on the Darfur peace process that is attempting to create the political foundations for a lasting peace. In Iraq, General Petraeus and Deputy Prime Minister Barham Salih, both of them with us today, have worked with Sunnis, Shia and Kurds to reduce the prospects for violence. On the broader Middle East, we have seen in the United States the immediate appointments of George Mitchell and Richard Holbrooke. Why? Because as we have been stressing in this conference, a new American administration has judged that even if peace takes time, the process of making peace must begin now.

In this form we will tackle these issues at three levels. The first is in plenary sessions such as this where we want to foster candid and constructive debate on the issues of the day; in our task forces where we will break into smaller groups and look at deep thematic issues on governance and energy, on human development and social change and on security; and finally in initiative workshops where the emphasis will be to spark partnerships on arts and culture, on science and technology and among faith leaders because from these partnerships we have seen that they can generate action, reconciliation and understanding.



Finally, let me comment on what we should expect of ourselves. Here I will draw on the words of President Barack Hussein Obama from his interview with Al Arabia just a short time ago when he was commenting on how we should judge him and what we should expect of him. He said, "I expect you to find someone who is listening, who is respectful, who is trying to promote not just the interests of the United States," and here we can substitute any of our countries, "but also of ordinary people who right now are suffering from poverty and lack of opportunity. Ultimately people will judge me not by my words, but by my actions."

We are thankful to the State of Qatar that has shown through its convening of this conference real action on building understanding. In that spirit it is my pleasure to introduce for the State of Qatar His Excellency Abdullah Bin Hamad Al Attiyah, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Energy and Industry, a man who has participated in the private sector as well through his membership on the boards of the Gulf Airways Corporation, the Gulf Helicopters Corporation, the Qatar Petrol Company, and through his support of many civic institutions. Your Excellency, we are very thankful to you and your state and we invite you to welcome us to this address.

ABDULLAH BIN HAMAD AL-ATTIYAH: (Arabic)

PASCUAL: Mister Minister, thank you so much for those welcoming words, for your encouragement on so many issues that have led us in the process of coming to this workshop and for the wisdom that you have injected into so many discussions that we've had, even the discussions we had just a few minutes ago on the great complexity of gas issues and gas markets around the world. So we thank you for that briefing even before we came here on stage.



We have an opportunity to immediately jump into this world of global challenges and how we work on this together. We have an extraordinary group of individuals and leaders who are here to guide in this discussion. We will have four presentations from our four speakers and we will begin with Madeleine Albright. Madeleine Albright is someone who has become known to the world as Madam Secretary. She was the first female American Secretary of State, appointed in 1997. I think many of us understood that one of the things that she introduced into American foreign policy at that time was the principle that if America is going to be a global power, it also means that America must be a responsible power, and she has outlined those concepts in a tremendous book which she called "Memo to the President-Elect" and that book has had a tremendous impact in the transition process for President Barack Hussein Obama.

I would just also underscore that she continues her commitment in building leadership by continuing as a professor at Georgetown University even at a time when certainly there are many other global demands calling her in many other directions. Secretary Albright will be followed by Anwar Ibrahim. Anwar Ibrahim is currently the leader of Malaysia's parliamentary opposition. He served as Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia and also as Finance Minister in the periods of 1993 to 1998. One of the things that he certainly injected was a stance against corruption in the political process, a stance that at a time cost him personally but helped give integrity to the Malaysian political process, one that he continues to uphold, and as a result of that has injected real competition into Malaysian politics once again. Anwar Ibrahim will be followed by General David Petraeus. General Petraeus as you all know is the Command of U.S. Central Command. Before that he served for 19 months as the Commanding General of the Multinational Force in Iraq. In particular,



one of the things that General Petraeus introduced was the principle that we needed to take a new approach to counterinsurgency which is based on the principle of engaging and empowering local communities, and in doing so has been part of a process that has helped Iraqis radically transform their domestic security situation. For his work he has been named by many leading publications as one of the most influential leaders in the entire world. Finally we will be joined in a talk by Barham Salih. Barham Salih again needs no introduction in this region. He is the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq and Chairman of the Committees on Economic Affairs, Contracts and Energy among others. He has been a leading Kurdish politician for some time. He previously served as the Prime Minister of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan before being elected to the Iraqi National Assembly as part of the Democratic Patriotic Alliance of Kurdistan. Four outstanding speakers. Each of them will talk to us for about 10 minutes and then we will engage in a discussion among the panel. Secretary Albright?

MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT: Thank you very much, Carlos. It's a pleasure to be here, and I would like to thank the Minister for welcoming us on behalf of Qatar, and Brookings and all the organizers for inviting us. I have to say I'm deeply honored to be here on the stage with these three particular heroes, so thank you very much.

Excellencies and distinguished guests, I welcome the opportunity to return here to Doha and to participate in this forum. Much has happened since last year's gathering, but the value and need for dialogue has not diminished. We cannot make progress unless we have the patience and courage to learn from one another. It's true that efforts such as this area sometimes hampered by our inability to attract those for whom dialogue would do the most good. People who are willing to exchange views and reply to tough questions already have a



deeper grasp of the world than those ill prepared to do anything expect talk t themselves. But we live in an age where ideas are hard to contain and have faith that the insights we share here will find a broad audience and that the path of dialogue is the right one.

I hope I speak for everyone at this event when I say that the national, ethnic and religious identities we represent are compatible with our larger responsibilities. We believe we can defend the legitimate interests of the groups to which we belong without depriving others of their rights. This conviction may seem idealistic, but nothing could be more pragmatic. Consider that in the Balkans during the last decade, Slobodan Milosevic orchestrated a campaign of ethnic cleansing against Muslims. He died in jail. In Rwanda, Hutu militants sought to wipe out an entire population of Tutsis. They succeeded in destroying themselves. On 9/11, Osama bin Laden tried to ignite a war that would consume both the Muslim world and the West. He is failing because he has offered nothing to anyone except destruction and death. In Iraq, extremists attempted to tear the country apart along ethnic and religious lines. Iraqi voters responded by showing support for a more potent and representative central government.

In the Middle East, ideologues have conspired for decades to destroy the possibility of peace. They have not succeeded because a future without that possibility is no future at all. Some say that intercultural and interreligious cooperation is a dream beyond our reach. I say it is a fantasy to believe that any nation or group can long prosper by dominating or terrorizing others. The evidence is on my side, but as we are all aware, there are those who disagree. There are people of influence in every region who see themselves solely as a champion of a particular nation, people or creed and thereby exempt from any responsibility to the world. For them, the truth is not shaded by the complexity of competing historical



claims or present needs. They see no need to consult the judgment of others for they dwell in a universe not of doubt but of certainty where compromise is equated with betrayal and peacemaking with cowardice. They insist that virtue is theirs alone as if this quality were not diluted by selfishness of every people and the heart of every human being. This then is the division that matters most in the world, not the rivalry between Palestinian and Israeli, Hindu or Muslim, Sunni or Shiite, but the divide between people who are so blinded by anger that they have lost their moral bearings and those who understand that the right response to wrong is the pursuit of justice, not revenge, to strengthen the rule of law, not destroy it. This is the difference between Arab and Israeli leaders who speak of crushing one another and those searching for ways to live with one another. It is the difference between the factions in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan that strive to decimate old rivals and those willing to work cooperatively to build modern and prosperous states. Is the difference in Iran between leaders who incite conflict and those who want their country to take its rightful place as a regional and global partner. It is the difference between an American administration that rationalizes the use of torture and one that prohibits the use of torture. And it is the difference everywhere between those who define their own purpose by the destruction done to others and those who will not be satisfied until all countries and peoples move forward together.

In recent months we have witnessed breakthrough elections in the United States and Iraq. We have heard hints about the possibility of direct engagement between Washington and Tehran. And we know that the Obama Administration has dispatched energetic and able new envoys to the Middle East and Central Asia. All this is to the good, but the threat of violence in Gaza persists, Iran's nuclear program continues in violation of U.N. Security



Council resolutions, the war in Afghanistan drags on, the situation in Iraq remains fragile, and there is no regional consensus with respect to the meaning of such basic terms as justice, security, terrorism and human rights. Virtually everyone involved in every regional debate is accused of double standards and virtually all to one degree or another are guilty of precisely that. This argues for humility and for acknowledging that a productive dialogue requires all sides to think differently. It should not comfort but, rather, disturb us so that we feel compelled to make room in our minds for the ideas of others.

I emphasize this point because issues of war and peace can only be resolved by people who speak effectively across the borders of nationality, ethnicity and creed. True reconciliation will only come by confront tests that transcend such categories yet which still speak to our civic and moral obligations. And we can only meet these tests when we are both true to ourselves and able to imagine ourselves free of any identifying label except that of human being.

This past month in Washington, Americans inaugurated a new President after holding peaceful and fair elections for the fifth-sixth time. President Obama's rise to power was greeted by a widely shared exclamation. People from all walks of life, white and black in the United States and overseas said they had never thought they would see the day when an African American would become President. Given that my nation was born in slavery, sundered by Civil War and challenged by decades of discrimination and racism, there is little to wonder at the shock and every reason to take heart. For there is a message in the Obama presidency that applies far beyond the borders of the United States, and President Obama started the conversation on Inauguration Day with these words, "To the Muslim world we seek a new way forward based on mutual interest and mutual respect." The gaps that exist



between peoples can be bridged, wounds can be healed, hatreds can be dissolved and the once unthinkable can become reality. With courage and persistence, even the most elusive dreams can come true and all it takes is a willingness to bear foremost in mind our common humanity and to embrace with honesty and introspection the challenge of dialogue. Thank you very much.

PASCUAL: Secretary Albright, that was excellent. Thank you very much, and thank you for continuing to reinforce as you have so often the importance of reaching out, of openness and the strength and the importance of the rule of law as the foundation for that. Anwar Ibrahim, please.

ANWAR IBRAHIM: Thank you, Carlos -- very good evening. A tough act to follow this remarkable lady with such impressive credentials. On a personal note, I have known her and her support in the struggle for my freedom, and her passion for justice is indeed legendary. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Much has already been said about the past, the missed opportunities and broken promises of a country which many in the Muslim world hold in high esteem. Our deepest fears were bated with hope that the Obama Administration would honor the promises of a new agenda to reengage with America's friends and with its foes around the world in the interests of greater peace and in the pursuit of justice and liberty. We see a President committed to the values of freedom and democracy who believes that the critical issues dividing the United States and the Muslim world can be resolved not through fiery rhetoric and bellicose language, but by positive engagement in a language of mutual respect.

The new administration in its infancy has made some significant moves already to answer those calls for change. While we have yet to see a tangible end to the Arab-Israeli



conflict, the appointment of George Mitchell as Middle East Envoy is a welcome step. The withdrawal from Iraq and the rethinking of the -- to resolving the conflict in Afghanistan are clear indications that Guantanamo Bay was a gross error in judgment and a betrayal of America's principles, clear statements against the use of. And even the mention of a hadith that as humans, not many Muslim leaders quote the hadith, but we have Obama quoting one, "we ought to be guided by universal truth that no harm would be enacted upon a person that one would not one foisted upon oneself."

We hope that in the new administration we find a more credible partner both in resolving the most vexing political and security issues of our time, but also in pursuing an agenda for sustainable economic development. Poverty remains a key issue across Asia, the Middle East and much of Africa and provides a meaningful context in which to pursue a common agenda which would bring great benefit to millions subsisting on just a few dollars a day. In the context of the global recession, there are clear avenues for cooperation to stimulate growth could which could revive ailing economies including those in the developing world and ameliorate its global negative impact.

Muslim countries cannot be bystanders in this area, nor can they place all their hopes on the possibility of a sea change in American foreign policy. No edict from the United States will change the state of affairs unless we the Muslims witness real progress in ensuring that governments in the Muslim world are more responsive to the aspirations of their own people and fulfill their legitimate aspirations. We need look no further than Indonesia which in 1998 met the unprecedented peaceful transition from military authoritarianism to democracy virtually overnight and without the intervention of a single foreign soldier. No less significant is Turkey which now stands as perhaps the most mature Muslim democracy



in the world. But these two examples is too few and in between is a sea of unfreedom which has bred among other things poverty and radicalism. If we can a certain rapprochement from the United States, the question remains will the United States find credible partners in the Muslim world? Do they have a credible partner in us? The fact remains that issues of governance and accountability still loom large and continue to cast doubts upon the legitimacy of ruling elites. In this regard, reform is no longer an option. There must be firm resolve borne of the efforts of leaders and with the support of institutions of civil society to bring about the right changes.

The clamor for change among Muslims has not abated. Nevertheless, in the Muslim world the past notion of the United States promoting democracy has been a tale of selective ambivalence if not outright hypocrisy. This is in the past. We saw that in Algeria in 1991 and more recently in Palestine. In other countries, democracy -- as elections may take place irrespective of the conduct of those elections. These are in fact sham democracies. They underlie undemocratic characteristics -- tightly controlled media with an unmistakable bias, rigged elections, oppressive -- of opposition parties and a judiciary under siege. This is not an academic issue. Where I come from this is stark reality. Muslims just be committed to change.

The question that remains is how can we proceed. First, real engagement must be inclusive. We should not start by building a wall around ourselves setting preconditions and prejudging groups and parties. These impediments only serve to strengthen old prejudices and further sew suspicion and doubt. For full engagement must proceed from the premise that no nation, not even the United States of America, region, the Arab world, culture or



religion including Islam or Christianity, has a monopoly on the values of freedom, justice and human dignity. These are indeed universal principles that we all share. Thank you.

PASCUAL: Thank you, Anwar, and thank you for your very eloquent statement and one which you have in many ways taken very great personal sacrifice to continue to advance out of your own convictions. We thank you for that very much. General Petraeus?

DAVID PETRAEUS: Good evening to you all, and thanks Carlos, thanks to the Brookings Institution for pulling this great event together. Thanks to our hosts here in Qatar, Deputy Prime Minister -- and to you and to my special sadiki and friend, the Chief of Defense Staff General Alatia, it's great to see you tonight. I must say it is a true honor to be on a panel with these other heroes of mine, a former Secretary of State whose extraordinary personal story and exceptional professional achievements have inspired generations of Americans and who truly embodied the American dream. It's not lost on some men in Washington, however, Madam Secretary that you did so well walking point for women as the first female Secretary of State that two of your successors have been women. Men are wondering if they can't get a break in Washington anymore; to the Malaysian political leader Anwar Ibrahim, a man who has played such a significant role and been so courageous in his pursuit of democracy in his country's dynamic political arena for nearly 40 years, and to another great sadiki and partner, Iraq's Deputy Prime Minister Barham Salih, a wonderful partner of mine in Iraq from April 2003 until the present, a brilliant, thoughtful, courageous and Iraqi statesman who in many respects is the personification of the Iraqi dream. And I want to take this moment to congratulate Iraq's leaders, its people and you, Dr. Barham, on the impressive conduct of the provincial elections that were held on January 31 --



Again it's an honor to be on this panel and it's great to see such an impressive audience in this superb facility, though I must point out to the conference organizers that requiring a U.S. Army General to speak without PowerPoint slides and a laser pointer is a bit like sending an infantryman out on operation without his weapon. But I'll try to do my best without our usual communication aids.

In fact, tonight I actually want to talk about something other than Iraq and other than counterinsurgency, although it is certainly a security topic, a topic of the pursuit of common security objectives through a security architecture that is emerging as countries in this region, the United States and other nations from outside the region seek to foster security and stability in this vitally important area of the world. To describe the emerging architecture I'd use the word network, though the phrase network of networks would be even more descriptive as the various components of the networks are very extensive indeed. In fact, discussing all of the relationships and programs that comprise the emerging regional security architecture would require more time than we have tonight. But I would like to highlight a number of the programs and initiatives that make up this architecture for there is an impressive amount of cooperative activity underway in this critical region.

Indeed, this region's security architecture is becoming increasingly more robust. Inside the collective network that comprises it are a number of layered security networks each of which I'll discuss briefly tonight, a training network, an equipping network, an information sharing network, a leader engagement network of enormous importance, and of course, an operational network. And after briefly describing the value of the overarching security network, to the shared interests of the participating states I'll touch quickly on each of the networks laying out some of the ways we're working together with our regional



partners to strengthen them, noting that all of this has as its foundation cooperative action in furtherance of shared national interests.

The relationships that make up the security networks are centered on and made possible by the significant consensus in the region in pursuit of shared common interests. States find and implement cooperate multilateral solutions for the security challenges we face. Indeed, many of the countries hold a number of common security interests, for example in preventing terrorism, in combating violent extremism, in deterring potential aggressors and halting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related technology, in reducing the trade in illegal narcotics, in countering piracy and in ensuring the free flow of commerce and the security of strategic infrastructure. And in all of the networks I'll describe the objective is to strengthen relationships and increase defensive and deterrent capabilities in pursuing of common interests thereby enhancing security in the region and producing three additional effects.

First, efforts to strengthen the network foster the development of strong relationships between countries. A growing network of cooperation builds trust and confidence among neighbors. Strong partnerships are stabilizing, and we're helping to build such partnerships through the many programs and initiatives that comprise the security network. Second, the network enhances the collective deterrent and defense posture and capabilities of the nations in it. And again, this has a stabilizing influence as well. Strong capable, interoperable forces comprise a powerful disincentive to potential aggression. Third and finally, the network often helps countries strengthen their capabilities and capacities to improve and maintain security inside their borders as well. This is important given the common interest we have in countries being able to address internal as well as transnational



extremists and insurgent threats as well as the other regional challenges such as smuggling and narcotics trafficking.

Having described the objectives of the regional security architecture, I'd now like to briefly describe the networks that comprise it. Essentially, the overall regional security network is comprised of a number of layered interconnected subordinate networks each centered on an area of cooperation between countries. Participating nations work together to expand each of these individual networks and to link them with each other to enhance the collective potential of the overall regional network. In some cases this involves pursuing bilateral initiatives, in others turning bilateral initiatives into multilateral efforts, and in still others it involves leveraging a multilateral initiative from one network by activities related to another. And let me quickly touch on five of these layered networks or areas of cooperation.

First we've seen the emergence of a growing training network in the region. Numerous countries participate in mutually beneficial multilateral training opportunities such as joint exercises, regional training center activities and formal training programs to enhance security force capabilities including the ability to counter terrorism, enhance border security and protect critical infrastructure. The training network also involves individual level training such as international exchange programs for professional military education that are of particular importance, the establishment of world-class special operations training centers, air warfare training centers and ground force training complexes among others, as well as the conduct of numerous air, land and sea exercises have added to this network enormously in recent years.

A second growing network involves the equipping of security forces and development of their infrastructure. In many cases, countries in the region purchase foreign



military equipment from small arms to aircraft. In other cases, countries cooperate as opportunities arise to pass to others still serviceable and modern military equipment through various mechanisms. In other cases, countries work together to develop security force infrastructure by, for example, building checkpoints along borders, establishing bases to protect infrastructure and modernizing existing air bases and port facilities. In all cases, this network results in more capable and more interoperable forces.

A network of information sharing is a third growing area of cooperation. This includes countries working toward a so-called operating picture and shared early warning systems both essential elements of ballistic missile defense, an area that has seen significant progress in the past year alone. The information sharing network also includes efforts to share via intelligence agencies cooperation and bilateral agreements intelligence for the conduct of operations to counter extremism. All of this helps to develop the common situational awareness of and reduce seams between and decrease the possibility of miscalculation by networked countries.

Another important network is that of leader engagement. Conferences like this weekend's factor as an element of that network. Those that focus more centrally on security issues are of course more of what I have in mind. But regional security conferences, chiefs of defense gatherings, ambassadorial meetings, defense and interior ministerials and so forth provide important opportunities to develop the personal relationships that are so important in this region and to working through key issues. In addition, bilateral engagements by military, security and diplomatic leaders traveling to countries inside and outside the region to discuss areas of cooperation and mutual interest are also important elements of this network. Naturally, the relationships that are established benefit the other networks and



foster transparency, mutual understanding and professional development, all of which have benefits for the region.

The fifth and final network I'd like to point out tonight is the important operational network in which so many countries play a part. This network consists of real world operations from counter-piracy effort to ballistic missile defense preparation, from joint intelligence operations to the conduct of joint maritime activities; from joint efforts to ensure infrastructure security to cooperation to interdict drug smugglers. The operational network not only performs vitally important missions to us all, it also enhances interoperability and working relationships. And of course it also leverages the other components of the network I've described this evening to ensure maximum collective capability.

Although I haven't touched on every aspect of the regional security architecture, I'll leave it there in order to say a bit more about why I've referred to all these areas as a network. Indeed, I've done so for an important reason. Understanding our cooperation in the region as a network of relationships and programs between countries allows us to see that cooperation in context. First, the network concept reflects the fact that seemingly unrelated programs and cooperative engagements between countries actually are related in important ways. Each cooperative endeavor is another link that connects countries of the region in pursuit of common interests and adds to the strength of the collective network. Each enhances stability in the region not just by including security capabilities, but by building relationships. And each has the potential to intersect with another, creating synergies as the overall network becomes more robust.



Second, the network concept allows us to see the regional security architecture as part of an even larger network of cooperation. The regional security network is not of course a stand-alone network. Rather, it is surrounded by and supportive of development in aid networks, diplomatic and governance networks and economic networks among others. Indeed, the more connected all these networks are the more our goals and methods are aligned and the more effective we are in pursuing our common interests. As always, a comprehensive approach is essential.

Third, the network concept is both more accurate and more beneficial than traditional views of poles of power or blocs of nations. In a world of transnational challenges, cooperative solutions are essential. And in a network, a nation can be as cooperatively linked as it is able to or wants to be. Although we obviously and understandably have areas of divergence with certain countries, we all benefit from the way some of those same countries now have some links into the regional security network by for example their contributions to counter-piracy operations, and that is just one example of such situations in which common interests prevail. I'd suggest then that the network concept provides room for cooperation with other countries on common interests as well, though I'm happy to leave the policy aspects of that to those in the new administration who are examining such possibilities, some of which were introduced by Vice President Biden in his speech in Munich a week ago.

I realize I've pushed the time limit a bit this evening, so let me conclude by briefly reiterating that the volume and quality of cooperation underway as part of this region's security network are impressive and continue to grow. And through the strengthening of this network based on common interests and cooperative efforts, countries in this region and



those engaged in it are indeed doing what the title of this panel suggests, addressing together emerging global issues, in this case, regional security issues that very much have global implications. Thank you very much.

PASCUAL: General, thank you. I can only imagine what the PowerPoint presentation might have been like with all of those networks being interconnected and spinning one another. I'm sure you would have dazzled with us with the PowerPoint graphics that you could have done up here. But your discussion of networks obviously provokes a question of what's missing in the networks, and we'll come back to that in the question and answers. Mister Deputy Prime Minister?

BARHAM SALIH: Thank you, Carlos. Having sat through some of the PowerPoint presentations by General Petraeus, I can assure you they are very impressive indeed.

I'm very pleased to be here and I'm honored to be sharing this panel with these very distinguished leaders. Thank you for inviting me and thank you for the organizers of this event, the State of Qatar and the Saban Center.

I will focus on Iraq because I do believe that Iraq has vigorously confronted many of the issues that this forum seeks to address. I hope you will not accuse me of being a self-centered Iraqi, but I do believe that Iraq has important implications to the broader relationship between the Muslim world and the United States. Moreover, Iraq sits at the intersection of so many divides within the Muslim world. I do want to say also that the implications of Iraq's transition is also very profound and very consequential to the Muslim world, or, rather, worlds.

Undeniably it has been a tough transition. We have had to fight every inch of the way with the help of my good friend John Petraeus and his men and women in uniform. The



transition in Iraq has been difficult, a source of deep frustration to Iraqis and the friends of Iraq. However, while acknowledging the challenges and the setbacks, we must also recognize the remarkable progress that has been achieved against the odds and despite the sneering cynicism especially and ironically from the Muslim world or at least part of the Muslim world that Iraq is emerging from the difficulties of transition and has embarked on an unprecedented mode of democratic policies in the heart of the Muslim world. The recent local elections was an affirmation that this transformation and progress albeit still fragile and precarious.

What has occurred in Iraq is remarkably important by any standards. The United States helped to save Muslims in Iraq from a genocidal criminal tyranny, like your intervention in Bosnia to help save the Muslims of Bosnia from genocide. The transformation has been tough and painful, fraught with mistakes and missteps along the way by Americans and Iraqis alike, many of those mistakes perhaps avoidable, but we must always remember that the pains of these past 6 years pale in comparison to the horrors we had to endure under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

Looking back, it was a painful irony to witness so many in the Muslim world opposing the liberation of their fellow Muslims in Iraq. Regrettably, some also chose to justify and support the terrorist onslaught against our nascent democratic process. The result is that we endured bleak years in which Iraqis with the support of our friends and allies in the United States persisted with the political process while some of those around us fervently prayed and plotted for our demise.

Fortunately, ladies and gentlemen, those days are largely behind us. Those negative attitudes are being consigned to the past. A number of facts have emerged that have caused



this new phrase. First, the significant minority of Iraqis who had initially rejected liberation and the change of regime have now largely accepted that the status quo ante was not viable and that they must participate peacefully in the new Iraq. They now work within the political process. It is now incumbent upon us in the Iraqi leadership to make sure that the political process is reformed to ensure that it is genuinely inclusive and allows for a sustainable power sharing arrangement among the main communities of the country. The second factor, I would say that the broader Middle East region increasingly understands that supporting Iraq is also in its interests and that a victory for al-Qaeda and its brand of terrorism would have been a calamity for all. In recent years Iraq was struck by a tsunami of terrorism. Al-Qaeda and its allies threw all that they had against Iraq's young political process. Al-Qaeda targeted women, children, mosques, schools, even funerals. The terrorist attack in -- 2 days ago is a reminder that you cannot be complacent about al-Qaeda, that the reality remains that al-Qaeda has largely failed in Iraq. Iraqis scorned and rejected them and I dare say that it could well be recorded that the battle in Anbar Province was the genesis of the defeat of al-Qaeda in Iraq but perhaps across the Muslim world too.

Third and most importantly perhaps, the nature of the Iraqi-American relationship has changed. Iraq's sovereignty has been restored and our international legal standing has been normalized to its status before Saddam's invasion of Kuwait. We have become a partner with the United States with the increasingly functioning institutions and capability security forces. Today Iraqi soldiers and police are initiating and leading operations across Iraq and are gaining the trust and support of the population. While Iraqis have no desire to see foreign troops in their country indefinitely, they also understand that a long-term partnership with the United States will shield Iraq from regional predators and the possibility



of renewed domestic conflict. Hence, the Iraqi Parliament has ratified a security pact and a strategic framework agreement of friendship and cooperation with the United States. The security pact defines clear timelines for the redeployment of American troops from Iraq. American military will be leaving the urban centers by the end of June 2009, of this year, and all of Iraq's provinces will be turned over to Iraqi security control. We are working on developing our security capabilities with the help of the United States and NATO so that by the end of 2011 when U.S. troops are scheduled to redeploy away from Iraq, our troops will be able to discharge their security responsibilities.

It also stipulates that Iraq will not be used as a staging post for any aggressive acts against our neighbors whom we hope will understand that the objectives of the agreement is to bring about an enduring security and prosperity for Iraq, and that should also be seen as a major achievement for their interests too.

While the security agreement has received much attention, the Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation Between Iraq and the United States is most important I believe in the long term. This agreement defines the long-term cooperation between two sovereign nations in areas of economy, education, health, and other areas related to improving the quality of life for Iraqis. Iraqis and their political leaders debated the agreements intensely and openly and it was remarkable that an overwhelming parliamentary majority transcending sectarian and ethnic affiliations voted to ratify these agreements.

Ladies and gentlemen, I understand that America's intervention in Iraq has led to much polarization in the Muslim world and even within the United States. Much is to be learned from this episode and perhaps all has not been positive, but to many of us in Iraq, the fundamental issue remains that the United States has helped to overthrow the tyranny of



Saddam Hussein and gave the people of Iraq the opportunity to build a free democracy and we are charting a new course of normal cooperative relations between our two nations. As Anwar Ibrahim has said, investment in corrupt dictatorial elites will not deliver stability. Investment should be made in the free will of people.

Iraq was an extreme case, an international pariah run by gangsters who were guilty of multiple attacks and aggression and genocide. What matters then for the Muslim world and the United States are not the specifics of Iraq, but lessons learned from this transition in Iraq. After some mistakes, some avoidable and some not, we are working on establishing a partnership which is crucial to sustaining and consolidating the gains achieved thus far. Iraq and the rest of the Arab and Muslim world are also normalizing their relations and we are hopeful that a new era of cooperation has begun with our neighbors. If the United States and the Muslim world want to genuinely cooperate, then I suggest looking at the achievements and also the missteps of Iraq's transition will be important. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

PASCUAL: Thank you very much. We now have approximately 15 minutes for discussion among the panelists. None of you who are sitting up here is shy, so one of the things I would also like to invite is that I will ask some questions, but if you have questions for one another or if you would like to comment on one another's statements, feel free to do so because the more that I think that we can conduct this as a conversation the more interesting it will be for all of you and for the audience as well.

I'm going to start, Secretary Albright, with you. During your tenure as Secretary of State you made a statement once that the United States is an exceptional nation and some interpreted that as saying that the United States in fact could set its own rules, and of course



we have 8 years of an administration that did seem to set its own rules, but I don't think that that's what you meant. Maybe it might be useful just contrasting the past with the present what you meant by exceptional and what it means for American leadership today and how that plays into this challenge of building partnerships.

ALBRIGHT: Thank you, Carlos. I actually said both exceptional and indispensable. Let me say President Clinton first used the term indispensable, but I said it so often that it became identified with me. In my definition and wherever I've looked it up anywhere, there is nothing about the word indispensable that means alone; there is no part of that definition. And I know that some people thought it was arrogant and hubristic, but I didn't mean it that way. I think it was a point in time after the end of the Cold War when I was concerned that Americans were looking inward. There was discussion of a peace dividend and that we would be able to worry about ourselves, and as somebody who has appreciated America's international role I thought it was very important to keep Americans engaged abroad, and I to this day believe that unless the United States is somehow involved in a project, things don't happen. I was in enough meetings to see that. So indispensable for me did not mean alone, it meant engaged.

Exceptional; I do believe America is an exceptional nation. I do think a country that welcomes as many diverse people as the United States does, that has a sense of the importance of a multinational, multiethnic state that makes it possible for somebody like me who was not born in the United States to not only become a citizen and grow up a free American, but to become secretary of state, is pretty exceptional. But I have never believed, that we should make exceptions for ourselves in the rule of law. If we expect other people to abide by certain principles and law, that we should not ask that exceptions be made for us.



And what troubled me most, and Mr. Deputy Prime Minister I'm so fascinated by your remarks on Iraq and with apologies to General Petraeus, I actually think that the war in Iraq has been a great disaster for American foreign policy, and let me just say I speak only for myself. I don't represent anyone: I speak for myself. I have the greatest pride in American troops. I have never seen forces that are so remarkable and so honorable and so dedicated to a mission. But I am concerned about what Iraq has done to America's reputation. I am very glad that President Obama has decided to close Guantanamo. I think it is very important and I have been very worried about what the war in Iraq did in order to enhance the power of Iran and generally concerned about the regional problems.

I do believe in democracy so I've been very interested in what you both and my good friend Ibrahim have said. I believe in democracy, but the United States cannot impose democracy. That is an oxymoron. So I do think we're indispensable and I do believe we're exceptional, but we can't ask that rules be changed for us.

PASCUAL: Anwar, do you want to pick up on some of those themes, and in particular some of the things that you were saying, that Muslim states have a responsibility themselves to take actions where they feel like they have the capacity? And you in particular have been an example of that personally how you've been trying to move that sense of responsibility in an Asian context. Secretary Albright commenting on the issue of democracy reinforced that as a principle democracy is the right direction to go. We need to understand better how to do that in a way that's respectful of national rights, and getting your guidance on that would be particularly helpful. Maybe you can pick up on those points.

IBRAHIM: Carlos, there have been numerous surveys to prove one point -- who speaks for Islam to prove that generally Muslims have no aversion or hatred to the United



States of America. In fact, I grew up with the ideals of the American dream. The difference is therefore the foreign policy conduct and we see or saw the worst during the Bush Administration. The point emphasized by Secretary Albright is clear. I share the ideals, the clamor for reform is clearly obvious and Muslims do understand what freedom is all about. And when we find President Obama articulating that issue in a strong language not bellicose, not out of hatred but mutual respect, we share his sentiments and ideals. Where we differ is again to dictate. For example, you can't dream or expect democracy to flourish through the presence of a few hundred-thousand troops. There is a contradiction here. There is a contradiction. One of the reasons I was detained was because I was too friendly with the United States. That's a contradiction because I opposed strongly the war in Iraq. But that is past. I appreciate the attempt by Deputy Prime Minister Barham, a close colleague of ours, but I think I share the sentiment that let's look beyond. What is done is done. It cannot be undone. But let us now look beyond this. How do we then pursue this agenda forward getting the troops out and rebuild. That's part of our responsibility because Iraq is a great and important Muslim nation and no one can just dismiss it because of the failures of Saddam or the opposition to the war or the American occupation in Iraq.

But my earlier point is this. There are so many expectations and euphoria about the new administration and people are looking for Obama to solve the problems of the world and the Muslim world and I think this is a bit not only presumptuous but it's ridiculous. How do we expect the President of the United States when we say don't dictate to us, don't tell us what to do, don't try to attempt and dictate and solve all of our problems, and then we just wait, do nothing, no reform, no respect for all people's rights, no question of our own legitimacy, allow for rampant corruption and moral decadence to be in place, no free



elections, no respect for the rule of law, no free media, and just wait for Barack Obama? So to my mind is we need to respond. Here is once probably in our lifetime a President of the United States coming with such a vision and so much hope and we welcome that. I want Muslims to respond and to give some trust in him for his genuine efforts and sincerity. I do believe that we are going to agree with him. He works under this system. Mind you, Barack Obama won and obtained the mandate of the American people. No, he is not there for the mandate of the Muslim world. He does not represent the Muslim world. He represents the United States of America. We have to accept this reality and then work with him and respond by firstly changing and undertaking reform in the Muslim world. Stop the civil strife. Stop this injustice and oppression. Fight against terrorist cells within our midst. And show that there is real meaningful change. And I think if this the spirit then we can work together as equals as the great United States of America and countries in the Muslim world for that matter. Well, I come from Asia. We were quite keen not to confine necessarily the Muslim world. It can be China, India or Singapore, my colleagues here, and we should have that spirit to work together. I am optimistic because here is a chance. But have Muslims actually responded to the call by Obama? That is the question. And the response is not by just shaking his hand or pleasing him. The response is by undertaking the reform and changes within our own societies. Thank you.

PASCUAL: General Petraeus, I was going to come back to you going back to the issue of networks. You stressed the importance of having complete networks and to put them in a regional context. Obviously this is a region where there has been instabilities beginning with Pakistan and Afghanistan, Iraq, into the Middle East, and of course one major country that's in the midst of that is Iran. You indicated in your comments that there are political issues



that are beyond your perspective and we'll respect that. But I'd just be curious, if you could say to Iran here are some things that you could be doing now, practical things where you can make a real contribution and actually make things better, what would those practical things be? So let's put politics aside. Let's talk about the realities of cooperation.

PETRAEUS: Let me thank you so much for that question, Carlos. As a soldier I've spent most of my life trying to go around minefields rather than blundering through them. Actually, if I could, and I'll get to the specific question if I could, but I think it is probably worth recalling already the new administration's statements on this subject. Vice President Biden made a very important speech that's really the first policy address of the new administration. It was last Saturday in Munich. Interestingly, the Speaker of the Iranian Parliament also spoke, Ali Larijani. But I think it would be worthy to recall his words there and that will give us some hints I think also about what are practical steps that could be taken.

"Our administration," he said, and I'm quoting, "is reviewing our policy toward Iran, but this much is clear. We will be willing to talk to Iran and to offer a very clear voice, continue down the current course and there will be continued pressure and isolation, abandon the illicit nuclear program and your support for terrorism and there will be meaningful incentives." The Vice President also highlighted what he termed the centrality of diplomacy in our national security. He noted as others here have the appointment of Senator Mitchell and Ambassador Holbrooke to advance respectively the Mideast peace process and the ongoing efforts in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region. And he explained that, and again I quote, "We'll engage. We'll listen. We'll consult. America needs the world just as I believe the world needs America." And it was I think also instructive for those who were at the



conference, and I was, to hear the words of the Speaker of Iran's Parliament, and rather than characterize those I would offer that you each read them for yourself.

What practical things could be done? I think that Deputy Prime Minister Barham Salih would probably suggest that there could be a cessation of the training, equipping and funding of extremist elements known as the special groups. They have different names now, Katab Hizballah, Sabahok, some others, and the residual militia ties that have caused so much damage to the Iraqi people. It was not just Sunni extremists that were tearing apart the country. This is a cycle of Sunni on Shiia and Shiia on Sunni. And one of the elements fueling that violence was indeed the assistance provided Iran. There is absolutely no question about this and there is also no question that some of this does continue to this day as I'm sure that the Deputy Prime Minister would affirm.

What about the smuggling of weapons? What about as the Vice President noted the illicit nuclear program? What about the assistance albeit at a small level to the Taliban in Iran which is a particularly interesting issue because of course they cooperated in the early days. It's not in their interests to see the Taliban, again a Sunni ultra conservative extremist element, return to take control of Afghanistan, and yet there's a willingness to provide some degree of assistance indeed to make the lives of those who are trying to help the Afghan people difficult. Those are just a couple of the practical things I think.

I can tell you that as the commander of the region that encompasses the 20 countries in which Iran is at the heart that we watch it very, very closely with an enormous amount of information with our partners together with one of those networks that I talked about, the information sharing network, and we watch very closely for signs that perhaps this is an indicator of the desire to cooperate. There have been some small gestures here and there



that again I think the Deputy Prime Minister might discuss. It might be interesting to hear his views because as he will point out and I was keenly aware of as the commander in Iraq and having served there for nearly 4 years, Iran and Iraq are always going to be neighbors. They have to contend and live with each other. They have to figure out a modus operandi and it would certainly be wonderful to see constructive relations rather than some of these elements of what have been termed malign influence by other observers at various times. Maybe the Deputy Prime Minister would want to take that up.

If I could ask a question to the Deputy Prime Minister after, I'm keenly interested in the disputed boundaries issue in Iraq because I personally think many people have seized on the upcoming elections, the budget issues because of the price of oil, new governments, national elections and so forth, I personally think that the issue that will require the most statesmanlike activity will be the disputed boundaries issue, so I'd be interested in how one of Iraq's greatest statesmen will address it.

SALIH: On the issue of Iran, the General is absolutely right. This is one of the most crucial issues for Iraq and how we manage our relations with Iran will determine so many issues, even domestic dynamics of the countries. Iraq and Iran share a border 1,400 kilometers or so. We have had a very troubled past, an 8-year war that neither Iran nor Iraq should be interested in going back to that mode. It is in our national interest and I believe in Iran's national interest to have cooperative relations between two sovereign nations. We tell your Iranian neighbors as we tell other neighbors of Iraq that they should invest in the free will of the Iraqi people. Interference in the domestic affairs of Iraq will only mean destabilization of this country and will mean ammunition to those who want to go back to the status quo ante that meant war and conflict with Iran.



We do not want our country to be the domain of conflict between regional actors and international actors. We want instead of Iraq being the zone of conflict and rivalry, we want it to be a zone of consensus in terms of defeating al-Qaeda and extremism and making sure that the stability of Iraq is a common interest of the various neighbors. The Iranian Foreign Minister was in Baghdad 2 days, 3 days ago, and we talked about some of these issues that need to be addressed. And we have in addition to what you have discussed, General, issues of borders that need to be addressed, issues of war reparations and a variety of others. We have a legacy of difficulties, but again it is in our national interest as a new Iraq to really seek constructive relations with all our neighbors, Iran included, but that has to be based on respect for Iraqi sovereignty and the free will of the Iraqi people.

Talking about the domestic issues, while I want to emphasize and affirm the important security gains that have been achieved over the last 2 to 3 years especially with the surge led by General Petraeus, and this has been very important to providing an enabling environment for the political process to move on including the latest elections, but we have many, many political issues that remain unresolved. Issues of power sharing, issues of disputed territories, Kirkuk and those other areas like Hanikin, Makmur and so on. And also issues of revenue sharing, oil and so on.

On the issue of disputed territories, it's important to note that many of these areas were subjected to a deliberate campaign of ethnic cleansing not different from what happened in Bosnia. Saddam Hussein has left us a legacy of problems. Now it is incumbent upon us to really seek solutions that will be zero sum gains. President Talibani recently visited Kirkuk and engaged in discussions with all the community leaders, but in that context let me also offer a note of hopefulness about Iraq. Many people on the eve of the war



predicted civil war in Kirkuk, that the civil war in Iraq will be sparked out of Kirkuk. You've been there in Mosul and have witnessed the situation in Kirkuk. The community leaders always walked back from the brink and did not allow the extremists to do this. Remember this about Iraq, ladies and gentlemen. Our country hit by this terrorist onslaught day in, day out. Remember Zarqawi letter, this terrible plan, even plan, to instigate the civil war between the Shiia and the Sunni? Despite that, Iraq did not end in a civil war situation. That is not to say we don't have problems. We have many, many political issues that are yet unresolved.

I think as we focus on the security search we need to focus on a political search, and here Madam Secretary the indispensable nation, the United States, who have invested to much regardless of the debate over the war, and I respect your judgment and the judgment of many friends in the United States who felt bad about this war, we are where we are. Iraq is an important country. It is a pivotal country. We need to ensure that those gains are sustained. This is not the time to walk away. I'm not saying that the issues are easy to solve. This is the heart of the Muslim Middle East. Issues of Islam and democracy. Issues of Iran and the Arabs and the Turks. Issues of Kurds and Arabs, Shiia and Sunni are all at play in Iraq. I believe the world has an interest in making sure that Iraqis overcome their difficulties, and we have difficulties. So far I believe the omens are positive as Iraqis have shown in the recent elections. They have surprised many of the observers. They did not go with the conventional wisdom that they will vote for this party or that. They delivered their judgments. This is something genuine emerging from the ashes from the difficulties of the last 20 to 30 years of tyranny and the difficulties of transition. I know Madam Secretary and I would share an abiding interest in supporting human rights and making sure that Iraqi Muslims and Christians and others really have a chance at living peacefully at long last. Much



of this is up to us in Iraq. It is up to Iraqi leadership from all the communities, but the support of the international community is important. And in that context let me say I became politically active in the 1970s when I saw the United States was supporting Saddam Hussein, the Russians were supporting Saddam Hussein, and were indifferent to the genocide and the ethnic cleansing that was taking place in Iraq. That was surely not the right to do I thought. I hope there will be lessons to be learned from Iraq, not all positive, certainly there are missteps that need to be avoided and need to be learned from for the Muslim world, the Iraqis, and no doubt for the United States, but I hope that we will all be united in the commitment to making sure that Iraq will develop toward a stable democracy that we all want it to be.

PASCUAL: Mister Deputy Prime Minister, a most eloquent statement. It would be fascinating to continue this discussion. We've already taken 10 minutes longer than we were supposed to, but I hope you will indulge us given the quality of our speakers. I think some of the things that you've seen stressed here is the importance of taking responsibility, of doing it on the basis of rules, on the importance of nations cooperating, and that if you can do that it can become a foundation for freedom and justice. Let's give this extraordinary panel a hand for their presentations. Before many of you start to leave, if I could ask all of you to stay in your seats and allow our panel to walk out. Where we will go from here is immediately behind to the -- terrace. You will go out the side door and people will direct you to the room which is directly behind us. Dinner will proceed for about an hour or an hour and 15 minutes. For those of you who have the stamina, I hope we can welcome you back here for a special session on Palestine, Syria, and the Arab-Israeli conflict which will continue immediately after dinner. Thank you.



CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public

351998

in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

My Commission Expires: November 30, 2012



THE BROOKINGS PROJECT ON U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE ISLAMIC WORLD
THE SABAN CENTER FOR MIDDLE EAST POLICY AT BROOKINGS
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW • Washington, DC 20036 • Phone: 202-797-6462, Fax: 202-797-2481
www.brookings.edu/sabancenter