March 24, 2012

Brussels Forum

After the Revolutions: What Next for the Middle East and North Africa?

Mr. Craig Kennedy: Good morning. I think we're going to get underway. Grab a seat. I want to thank everybody for their great attendance last night at the Night Owl and then the after Night Owl. And when I came down at 7:00 a.m., I helped get rid of the last few people that were sitting in the bar. And a great turnout this morning; I think the discussions are just really terrific at the morning sessions. We always really appreciate the very dynamic and committed crowd that we attract for Brussels Forum.

So our first session this morning is After the Revolutions: What Next for the Middle East and North Africa? It's on the record and a very distinguished panel. And we've got a new moderator, first time with us, Amy Kellogg. Amy, please.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. (unintelligible) I

think, as a journalist, I would say that events in the region are happening faster than we can keep up with, really. It is dangerous to cover these stories now taking places in the Middle East and Northern Africa. Some of my colleagues have been killed. It's difficult to get access to some countries. So, at a time when the truth is more important than ever, it's more difficult to get to than ever.

As you all know, the complexities of the region are many, and I think it's fair to say that over the last decades many of us have glossed over them, whether we're journalists or in some cases even academics, political leaders. But there's new urgency to really understand those complexities, and that's why we have this distinguished panel today to help us gain some further understanding of what's happening and what the rest of the world can do to help these countries with their new governments, in some cases, in the process of trying to get rid of old governments. We have leaders who've had no political experience because they haven't

obviously been given the opportunity to do that or to get into the political game previously. Whether or not they will be successful in large part has to do with whether or not they can deliver jobs to their people.

So there are many questions that this panel will want to address, and I think also we will have to touch on the changes of (technical difficulty) community should be involved, how much the international community should stand back, what's the role of the United States, the EU, the Arab League, the GCC. And, frankly, I think a lot of people are curious about who has what agenda.

So I'm not the person you want to hear from; the panel is. And I'm going to introduce everyone briefly, then turn to each of our panelists with a question, a leading question, and then, as soon as possible, I want to get to the audience because I know all of you have questions as well.

I'm going to try to keep everyone quite brief, so if I have to interrupt anyone, whether it's a panelist

or someone in the audience, please don't think I'm being rude. I've been warned. It has to sort of flow very, very quickly and very nicely here this morning.

So first of all, we have Amine Gemayel, the former president of Lebanon, the founder of Beit al-Mustaqbal think tank and al Kataeb party in Lebanon, from a very, distinguished family, a well-known family, with a long, political career and a very, busy present.

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Then we have Lady Catherine Ashton, who is the--I want to make sure I get the title right. I always think that you're the Foreign Policy Chief for the EU but it's the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs with a very, impressive career in the United Kingdom prior to taking this job, including being Leader of the House of Lords but now in a position where, I think, there's probably more and varied responsibility than ever before.

Governor Tim Pawlenty, who was also a majority leader of the House of Representatives and running for

President for a period of time but with a real passion for world affairs in particularly the Middle East and Northern Africa and who actually lead a team of election monitors in Tunisia recently so definitely has a lot to offer to this debate.

And then Prime Minister Mahmoud Gebril, who got the National Transitional Council of Libya up and running when things were starting to kick off in that country, resigned when the Gaddafi regime fell but was such an important face and personality for all of us around the world as we followed the Libya story, which is far from over. And we'll talk about that shortly.

Now, I want to get to Lady Ashton and talk about the economic piece of this puzzle because, as I mentioned and as we all know, if people don't have jobs and economic security , it's not going to go well for these countries in this very, sensitive situation. So let's talk about what the EU is thinking about.

Baroness Catherine Ashton: Thank you, Amy. And can I say how nice it is to be back at the Brussels Forum?

It doesn’t seem ten minutes since I was sitting here a year ago. I call this economics-meets-politics, that the political changes that are taking place need to deliver for the people of this region the real things of their lives: jobs, education for their children, somewhere to live, a future. And what we have to engage in internationally is making sure that both sides of that are part of what we offer. In support, these are their countries. These people will decide their futures.

But those who want the support to move towards democracy also need to the support towards a strong economy. And so where I think the European Union has a, dare I say, unique role to play is in bringing economics-meets-politics to bear on the issues and problems of the region.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. (technical difficulty) I want you to add to that but also to talk about Lebanon a little bit right now because I think that, just before the Arab Spring kicked off, everyone was

concerned about what could happen in Lebanon with the tribunal indictments coming down and the fact that Lebanon is very much seen as a proxy place in the middle of a very volatile region.

Can you talk about--add on to Lady Ashton's comments about helping these economies, but also talk about what the impact on Lebanon has been of all of this?

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: You know, I'm coming from a region which suffered a lot for the (unintelligible) and centralists, as well as coming from a country--Lebanon has suffered the same. And my family, my party, we had suffered a lot of very difficult moments as a nation and so forth.

And in the meantime, maybe we are at the eve of a new era in this region, in the Middle East, and the main problem, how to build the better future for the area, the problem of culture, we need the culture. That is the main point for the time being, is the culture, culture of democracy, culture of freedom, culture of

togetherness, culture of respect of others. Those are the need for a better future for the Middle East, and we can't build families, we can't think about any kind of economic program or something else without focusing on this culture.

You know that in many, many countries in the Arab world for the case for centralists, they didn't implement any kind of experience, any kind of culture for democracy or freedom and respect of pluralism and so forth. So I have some suggestions, some thinking about why many--some keys how to focus on the culture and how to develop this culture of democracy and freedom.

Between those keys, the economic development in the area, because poverty leads to extremism, there is the--from the governance, a new governance, you can educate people about the governance, accountable governance. There is also the role of the media. We know that during this revolution (unintelligible) the use and the media's played a major role to ignite and to develop

such kind of revolution. So we have to focus also on the media and how to--also not to educate the media. It's not--they won't accept that kind of approach, but to find a way with the medias and the international media, that's the--they have to serve also this culture, culture of democracy.

And the role of Lebanon, too. Lebanon, which is to be the example of democracy and freedom in the area and, the most important, how to establish a harmonious coexistence among the various religions and ethnics and civilizations, so that's--so those are some ideas, some keys, how to approach the new era and to educate the people, to have a new reformed education. That's some keys.

And allow me, because we are here in the GMF, the George Marshall and the German Fund, allow me to propose, why don't we imagine a new adventure for the George Marshall ideas, which is to implement a new Marshall plan for the Middle East. Maybe it's essential to find an institution like the George Marshall

Institution, the Marshall plan, to not only to focus on economic reforms and economic development, but also, in the meantime, to focus on the culture, how to spread a new culture, how the Marshall plan could also apply for the new education, the new governance, accountable governance and its ideas are essential for the time being. And maybe the GMF could play a major role. And we are here to help on this, and it would be a kind of modus operandi, how to achieve this new culture, how to improve this new culture that I'm talking about. And GMF could play a major role in that way. Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Excellent. Okay. I was going to go to Governor Pawlenty next, but I think I need to jump to Prime Minister Gebril because yesterday, here at the Forum, people were saying--or one of the questioners suggested that Libya had been abandoned after the fall of Muammar Gaddafi. And I think, coming from what President Gemayel was saying about needing to develop a political culture, needing to develop economic culture in some of these countries, do you feel that Libya has

been abandoned since the fall of Gaddafi? What do you think right now the international community can do to help develop the economy and the political culture of Libya?

The Hon. Mahmoud Gebril: I'm afraid that statement is not far from truth, you know. Libya was at the center of attention probably of everybody on the 17th of February simply because of its strategic position, of its position of strategic commodities, such as oil, natural gas, renewable energies, et cetera, et cetera.

It seems that our partners forgot that in Libya, when the regime fell down, the state fell down also, you know, which is totally the opposite of what took place in Egypt and Tunisia. And it's a tragic mistake. It's a fatal mistake to abandon Libya now because now Libya is in a political vacuum and security vacuum. And vacuums don't remain vacuums. Extremism might spread at any moment, and I'm afraid its (unintelligible) indicators are there right now, you know.

It's really shocking for me. You know, Libya was at

the center of attention. Everybody was concerned about Libya. But the moment the regime was down, everybody disappeared from the scene, you know, except from those intelligence elements on the ground, of course, you know. But other than that, I mean, as President Gemayel said, you know, Libya is a unique case. And as Libya, as in the Arab Spring, what we need now is a different understanding.

I'm afraid there is a widening gap now between this and (unintelligible) Two years ago at Genoa, at the GMF, I was arguing the case that the future of the Middle East will be shaped by the dot-com generation. This dot-com generation is totally connected to this global culture, you know. They are not basically connected to the old roots of the Middle East and the Arab culture. You can note the slogans of old demonstrations in Cairo and Tunisia and Libya. Nobody was signaling the United States or Israel or anything. Nobody's talking about Arab unity. All of them were talking about dignified life. So this is a new

phenomenon. Unfortunately, we approach this phenomena with our old wisdom, with our old tools of analysis. I'm afraid those tools are totally irrelevant, you know. So a new understanding. We have to re-establish new tools of understanding, so we can cooperate and cope with this phenomena.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay, thank you very much. Governor Pawlenty, what--are people in Washington concerned about extremism filling the void of this power vacuum that Mr. Gebril was talking about? And if so, what are they saying about it? And then maybe you could talk about your experience in Tunisia a little bit.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Sure, thank you. Good morning, Amy. And you said something in your opening remarks that I thought was very interesting. And that is, from a journalist's perspective, you find it hard to keep up with these unfolding events because they're unfolding so rapidly that it's difficult, from a journalistic standpoint, to cover them. Well, if you

move that one increment further to, from a policymaker's standpoint, these events are viewed as happening so rapidly, in some cases, so precipitously, as to catch many people by surprise. But I think, with the benefit of hindsight in the future, we'll look back and see that many of these events, perhaps, were inevitable or certainly more predictable than many currently think.

Regimes that are authoritarian, dictatorial, oppressive, against freedom, in my view, are inherently unstable. And so in Egypt, for example, you had a situation where people were debating the post-Mubarak future. Well, President Mubarak was 82 years old and in ill health. The referendum shouldn't have been between whether he was going to successfully pass power to his son or whether the military was going to attempt to migrate the future authority to someone else to their liking. That set of choices, that range of choices, in my view, was inherently too limited, inherently too naïve with respect to the future.

And so you have regimes, as was, I think, aptly described, living in the shadow of the future, and they were unsustainable. Each one of these is different. And so, in the case of Tunisia--and I did lead an election-monitoring delegation there during the recent elections--in their particular case, a smaller country, a more homogeneous country relative to sectarian issues in conflict, more capacity, the elections were managed procedurally, I think, in a credible way, but, of course, you had an Islamic result. Not a party won with a pretty healthy margin. So there's some in Washington and elsewhere who were somewhat surprised by that result, either by the nature of the result or the magnitude of the result. And I would suggest, well, when you have a democracy, an election in a Muslim country that has an overwhelmingly Islamic perspective, you're going to have an organization or leaders, in all likelihood, emerge with that background.

And the question isn't that. The question is, in terms of their commitment to the rule of law, to human

rights, to freedom, to democracy, to being able to provide economic opportunity to their people, are they committed to that or to some other agenda?

Their rhetoric, in the case of the Ennahda Party in Tunisia is, in relative terms, somewhat more hopeful than some were concerned initially. But the proof will be in the pudding, and the answer is we really won't know for a long time. And we'll judge them not by their speeches they gave in the recent elections but in their behavior and their success of meeting the needs of their people over a longer period of time.

And then, lastly, I would just say we need to have capacity if we're going to have democracy, and the hard work of capacity-building through various organizations and groups and countries who have that resource and that interest is a really important part of the future. And it's hard work, and it's important work. But we need to roll up our sleeves and do it.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: I think with all of these new parties, particularly the religious ones, it will be

interesting to see how they change as they become leaders and in government and with power, and whether they're up to the task and, if so, how they change. I think people will be curious to see because, obviously groups in opposition, be they religious or not, have slogans and have a certain popularity, especially if they've been oppressed. But when they get into power, are they ready? Are they up for the challenge? And they may well be. We'll have to see.

I think, actually, I should turn it over to the audience now, don't you? Because we've got a lot of people. We've got a lot of countries in our panel that we could talk about and certainly a lot of political angles. So I think that we'll turn it to the audience. And I think what I'll do is take three at a time, like people were doing yesterday, and then we'll divvy them up among the panel members. So--

Mr. Roland Freudenstein: Thanks very much. I'm Roland Freudenstein from the Center for European Studies, which is the foundation of the European

People's Party, which is not quite as North Korean as it sounds.

I would like--you know, we had several references to culture and to support for democracy. It's just a couple of weeks ago that representatives of 17 NGOs, not only American but also one European that I used to work for, were flown out of Egypt because they had been tried for illegal activity, tax evasion and so on. Their job was nothing else than to support democracy and bring people together and try to offer recipes for good governance. It's exactly what we need, I think.

Now, the question is, how should the United States, but also other countries--the European Union was also affected--how should we react to cases like that? Should we threaten to withdraw funds? And it would be very easy for the U.S. government to do so with all the aide that's given to precisely the Egyptian military. Or should we take the soft approach and say, well, we understand. You know, we've been colonizing these countries for so long, we've been such bad

imperialists, we've been chummy with the dictators in the past, so, you know, let's creep back, sign--pay the fines, sign all the agreements that will probably make it very difficult to actually fulfill our goals.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Gloss over, really.

Mr. Roland Freudenstein: Right. Okay. So--and that leads me to, and this is my last point, to a wider question of conditionality. How conditional can the European Union and the United States and other democracies be with the new governments when we've been so lenient with their predecessors? Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Good question. Thank you. Your neighbor.

Mr. Harlan Ullman: Thank you. I'm Harlan Ullman. My question is in the form of two brief observations. First, I would assert that the Arab Spring has become the winner of our discontent and is growing even worse. And, second, I would say in Egypt all that's happened is that an army general has been replaced by an air force field marshal or vice versa. Tell me why I'm

wrong, or tell me why I'm right.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Excellent. Pink.

Ms. Mia Doornaert: Thank you. Mia Doornaert, a newspaper columnist in Brussels. Talking about how Libya has so-called been abandoned, I think it's very dangerous to give the countries who intervene, to try to give them a guilt feeling because the result is not perfect because, as we are now debating what to do in Syria, you get a feeling of damned if you do and damned if you don't. We are being blamed for not intervening in Syria. We are being blamed because the result in Libya is not perfect. Of course, it's not, and it's not our fault, as Mr. Gemayel very rightly said. The basic problem is not poverty. It's culture from where the poverty is a result.

And if a dictator like Mr. Gaddafi creates a scorched Earth, which is there, nobody can make 1,000 flowers of democracy grow. So I do not think we should blame ourselves. And if we (unintelligible) with dictators in the past, you have to take regimes as they

come. If you go and oppose Saddam Hussein, you're wrong. If you treaty with them you're wrong, you should forget--I think it's the wrong approach.

So--and I have a question to Mr. Gemayel. Culture is very important. There's also culture of respect of other countries. Do you expect that with a regime change in Syria there will be more respect for the independence of Lebanon and less interference in the way different communities manage to live together peacefully in Lebanon?

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. So let's start with President Gemayel since that question was for you, and then we'll move on.

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Yes. Lebanon remained during all this period, this crisis, as an example of harmonious coexistence, it didn't affect, really, the coexistence--the harmonious coexistence, and in the meantime, we maintained our culture of democracy and freedom during all those decades.

For sure, that change in Syria could help

tremendously the situation in Lebanon, but, in the meantime, we--I think that we were able to resist very strongly. And we are still--the democracy in Lebanon is still alive and very modest. We can export. We can help other regimes all over to follow the Lebanese democracy.

Lebanese democracy is in our culture. That's why I was insisting on the word culture. We have the culture of democracy in Lebanon, the culture of freedom, the culture for harmonious coexistence. That is very important.

And I want to focus on another point, which is for--there is a new improvement in the position of some in the Islam--the Arab Islam. And what is interesting to know, that, for instance, very prestigious leaders, a Muslim leader, like, for instance, Sheikh Azhar--Azhar is the main important Sindhi institution in the world established in Cairo. So the Sheikh Azhar issued a very important charter recently, and in this charter, he is saying exactly--talking about the Islam--Islam being

able to really promote democracy and this new culture. And he said, and I quote, he said, "Al-Azhar embraces democracy based on free and direct voting. (unintelligible) precepts include pluralism, rotation of power and combating corruption and ensuring it's accountability." So it's a important step toward the future, how to combine the Islam and democracy and how such kind of leaders, important leaders, are ready to contribute to this culture of democracy and freedom.

In the meantime, another statement given by Issam el-Erian, who is one of the most important leader of the Muslim Brotherhood also in Cairo. Also, he's saying, "We envision the establishment of a democratic, civil state that grows on universal measures of freedom and justice, which are central Islamic values." So we have to build on those statements, on those new Islamic approach in the Arab world because we need to cooperate with those Islamic leader if you want to really to succeed because the influence of Islam in the Arab world. And if you want to succeed, we need to really

give that a chance and help those leaders.

In the meantime, in Lebanon also, the main Islamic group, (unintelligible) Party, also issued a statement very close to this one. And myself during a conference in January with the--it was an international conference also. I drafted a kind of charter, a charter which could help the emerging regimes in the Arab world to adopt this culture, to follow the culture of freedom and democracy. So there is a chance now, beginning with those initiatives, to build a new Arab world and to help those revolutions to lead to a new era, an era of democracy, tolerance, soft power and so forth.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you, President Gemayel. Thank you for sharing those comments with us because I don't know if everyone was aware of them from the religious leaders. Conditionality, I think that's a good question for both Lady Ashton and for Governor Pawlenty. How much should aide be conditional on events, facts on the ground?

Baroness Catherine Ashton: We had a recent informal

Foreign Ministers' Meeting of the European Union called the Gymnich, and I put on the agenda the spectrum of engagement to isolation, partly because sometimes the news part of what we do is about the tough sanctions that we might take, the hard end of conditionality. And much less is actually said about the whole political process and the way in which you're trying to engage in different ways.

My general view is that engagement is pretty much always better than isolation. There are exceptions where you have to say we will have nothing more to do with this country, this regime, while these things happen. And in that framework of engagement to isolation, you also have to work out what it is you're trying to do and what conditions you place upon it.

When we saw the situation of last year and the massive changes that were going on in our neighborhood, I was reminded that when I took office, I said we should be judged as Europe by the effectiveness we have in our own neighborhood. It's also, by the way, what I

think our friends across in the Atlantic--across the Atlantic feel that Europe should do. We should take responsibility for our neighborhood. And that meant rethinking and rewriting the policy and the ideas that we had. And we came up with the idea of more for more. And what, really, that says is we will move faster with you. We will support you more, with more resources, with more capacity building, with more money, with market access, with the mobility that you need. And we will go as fast as you go.

But on the way to that, this is about the values that we hold in the European Union. And there are many countries of the 27, and soon-to-be 28 European Union members when Croatia finishes the process--there are many people within those countries who themselves have been down the very bumpy, difficult road to democracy, who will be more than happy to share their experiences and their knowledge, but also to recognize that each country is different. And there's no difference in looking at the countries in our neighborhood.

The final point I'd make is this, that, on the basis that engagement is usually better, it's about engagement with people. And it is about saying our willingness to support is based on ensuring that all people are included. Not surprisingly for me, it's a big focus on women. When I was last in Libya, I was at a conference of 200 Libyan women. I know that colleagues from the European Parliament have met with them again recently. It's really important that that engagement is more for more and absolutely about inclusivity, and where it's not, then on the spectrum of engagement to isolation, we have to move in a different direction.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: A few observations--and I agree with the comments that Lady Ashton just made--that the prime minister talked about a culture of democracy. Cultures take time to develop. And if that culture has been missing or absent, diminished or oppressed, it's going to take some time to build

towards that.

So I liken it to the analogy of a compass setting. We want our compass setting, say, to true north, which over time is directionally towards freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, markets and the like. The winds and the waves and choppy seas may blow us to the side for a little bit, but we must steer back to that compass setting, those compass settings.

So in terms of conditionality, whether it be on military aide, economic aide, there are certain levers that the EU, the United States and many others have, one of which is to make sure our leaders speak consistently and clearly and unequivocally about those values. So when President Reagan, for example, spoke to the dissidents in the former Soviet Union, those words by themselves in that moment didn't instantly change things, but they were consistent with the compass settings, the values, the direction that we took. And those words were heard, and they were meaningful and impactful. So one is our communications is a lever, two

is the conditionality of the aide that I just mentioned.

I agree with Lady Ashton's comments on that, which was they--between full engagement and isolationism, you have to be nuanced and thoughtful about how and when to exercise or retract those levers. And each case is different. And then, finally, we need to be judging or (technical difficulty) does not result in the kinds of outcomes that we want, absent the right kinds of behavior.

So in Syria, for example, we had many American officials trooping to see President Assad and his British wife, and they came back with the conclusion that, certainly, this individual is a next generation reformer. It turned out to be deadly wrong. He's a killer. He was hosting and transiting people who went into Iran and killed American soldiers. He is a conduit and an enabler (technical difficulty) Hezbollah. So to look back now with the benefit of hindsight, to say impressionistically we were going to embrace him based

on imagery and rhetoric when, in fact, his behavior even then, and certainly more recently and certainly now, reveals a very different and more deadly story. We need to be clear-eyed, not based on the flourishing rhetoric but based on the behavior and the results and the outcomes.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Yeah, my hindsight is 20/20 vision.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Yes.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: And sometimes I wonder about those who've been beaten up for engaging Gaddafi and whether, in fact, they were doing the right thing trying to build a relationship with the Gaddafi family or whether they should've seen the signs that it would never work. But, anyway, we'll never know exactly the answer to that one. Let's get some more questions from this side. One, two, three, oh, and you'll be the next, I promise. Four, we'll do four in this case.

Mr. Mohammed Al Abdallah: Thank you. My name is Mohammed Al Abdallah. I'm a Syrian Human Rights

Activist. I want to get back to President Gemayel as we are neighbors. I want to (unintelligible) more with him. Regarding Lebanon and the democracy in Lebanon, the incidents in Syria is dividing Lebanon, and it already has started.

Pro-Hezbollah and the Pro--the Syrian-Iranian regime supporting of the Syrian regime and they've been abusing, the refugees, they've been trying to, trying to support the--excuse me--to support the revolution. Furthermore, the position of the Lebanese government has been very shameful in the Security Council. They had very bad position, even worse than the seating government. The Lebanese president of the Security Council was even worse than the Syrian. Furthermore, it's not dividing Lebanon only by Sunni and Shia, which is expected thing and understood. It's dividing the Christian community. And the very irritating thing to see, the head of the (unintelligible) to shift to a megaphone for the propaganda machine of the Syrian government, accusing the revolution of being

(unintelligible), accusing the protestors of being targeting the Christian.

And, furthermore, that's why we think of the policymakers in the U.S., if you don't act now immediately, this conflict in Syria or the revolution could shift a civil war that's going to drag the neighbors because we have very vulnerable neighbors, Iraq and Lebanon. Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: David.

Mr. David Ignatius: David Ignatius from the *Washington Post*. I think it's fair to say that President Obama has tried to take the United States to the extent he, out of the first paragraph, you might say, of the story of change in the Middle East and let Arab people feel that they're writing their own history at last. This is sometimes called strategic reticence generously, other times called leading from behind.

Does this panel, which is vitally interested in the U.S. role, would you like see more assertive American

action in the Middle East now? And, briefly, Lady Ashton, I want to take advantage of your presence here to ask you if you'd give this group a brief progress report on your negotiations, contacts with the Iranians and where they may be leading. Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay.

Mr. Andrew Cahn: Andrew Cahn, Nomura. I suppose one thing we could offer the--our neighbors in North Africa or in the Middle East is membership of the European Union, but we're not going to do that, as Morocco discovered 30 years ago when they applied. So the question I'd like to ask the panel is, what sort of regional integration mechanism do you think might work in the Arab world? Because without that, we will continue to have regional instability. If one could build up some form of political and economic (unintelligible) trade integration in the region, you can contemplate a reduction in tension. In 1945, it was impossible to consider that Europe would be a peaceful

region as it is now. Can we contemplate such a future in the Arab world?

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. And we're going to get Laura down here. Thank you.

Ms. Laura Blumenfeld: Thank you. Laura Blumenfeld, the German Marshall Fund. I'm just picking up from Dave Ignatius's question. I'd be interested to hear from each of you, just a brief critique of the Obama administration's response to the Arab Spring, and then possibly two specific concrete suggestions of how we might approve the situation. It could be humanitarian, military, whatever you think might improve the situation.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. I think that we'll start with defense of Lebanon vis-à-vis Syria.

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Yes. In fact, let us be very clear the Lebanese people are divided between pro- and anti-Syria, pro- and anti-Assad. It's very clear. But, in the meantime, let us consider the battle

half-full instead of half-empty. We're able to preserve a kind of (technical difficulty) of the political violence from Syria into Lebanon. And we were able, during the Syrian fightings, were able to keep the political process going on in Lebanon to preserve a take--taking care of government. And I think that it's not very--it wasn't at all, and it's not very easy for Lebanon to be and to keep stability because what is essential in Lebanon, for the time being, regardless what's going on all around, is to keep stability. Stability is essential for many, many reasons. That's why, regardless, the divisions along the various political parties in Lebanon, we were able to keep a kind of dialogue between inside Lebanon concerning the Syrian crisis.

And the government is trying also to keep a kind of neutral position because any involvement could be a disaster for the Lebanese unity, Lebanese coexistence and so forth. And we are trying to do our best to also have the Syrian people to achieve liberty, to achieve

democracy, but by political means and not being involved directly in the Syrian crisis.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: What about refugees? What--where do you stand on refugees?

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: It's a--we are--we have, for the time being, about 10,000 refugees in Lebanon, roughly 10,000. And the Lebanese government is trying to handle this issue, and we don't have a major problem. But the problem could become more serious, whether have an additional number, and at that time will have to face maybe security problems and economic problems as long as you have to feed all those people.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. Prime Minister Gebril, I want to bring you in on two points that sort of--from two different questions. But one about Arabs writing their own history, or rewriting their own history I should say, and the other that, I think, is relevant to Libya is about regional integration and how you see new

patterns of integration in this post-Arab Spring environment.

The Hon. Mahmoud Gebril: Okay. As I said before, you know, this phenomenon is unprecedented in the history of the Middle East, you know. And when a regime changes, concern, I think--we've never been through this process before. We've been through too many coup d'état in the region since World War II, but a real revolution, like the French one, we've never been through one like that, you know. So, for our friend who asked about the Arab Spring turning into winter, it's just a (technical difficulty), you know. So, this is a (technical difficulty) phase (technical difficulty) that's not only structure. The easiest thing is to have a parliament and parties. But to have a cultural democracy, a cultural demographic--sorry, a democratic behavior, this is the real instance of democracy. And this is a question of a changing and deconstructing--the reconstructing the socialization process in the region, a new educational system, a new wave of

bringing our kids, a new religious interpretation of our religion, a new media system. Those--the four appearances of creating new values through which we can have a new value system. What's compatible with this process is that we have a new generation, which is connected to the rest of the world, which is completely different from my generation or from the present generation. This is a new phenomenon. So we have a new opportunity for us to write our own history and to connect to the rest of the world.

The first point is that, for the West and for the Arab Spring countries, we have to read from the same page. They are approaching this with their own perspective. We have our own priorities. It's legitimate, and we appreciate that, for instance, for the wisdom of the United States, that they are concerned about chemical weapons in Libya. That's a legitimate concern. We are concerned, too, but they should not forget that we are concerned also about developmental issues. We are concerned about how to

collect arms from the streets. We are concerned how to have a new educational system. We are concerned in how to have a new health system. We've never been through a real developmental process for 42 years. This is our main concern. But to approach us with only one point and one mind, that's not helpful. You have to read from the same page and to rebuild and re-assist a new relationship that looks after a mutual interest and mutual respect for both parties.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. Thank you. Lady Ashton, David wanted a little preview of your (technical difficulty).

Baroness Catherine Ashton: Just a couple of brief things about two of the points that were raised that, I think, are really just worth saying something brief about. Andrew's point about trade is really critical because actually having strong regional trade relationships are going to be essential for the development of the economies of the countries of our neighborhood. They were for us as we became the

European Union. They will be in our relationships with Tunisia, with Libya, with Egypt, with Syria, with Lebanon, with all of the countries going through change. And it's something that I push very hard with our member states because they need to also see that as a critical part of the offer, if you like.

The second thing I wanted to say was one of the big challenges for engagement, when you have the end of a regime and the beginning of something new, something that looks like it could be what I call deep democracy in the future, is that the big tanker-like institutions of which the European Commission--as I'm vice president to that, is why--have to find ways to engage with a different order. There aren't civil servants. There aren't bureaucracies to engage with. They're just groups of people. And groups of people themselves are often in a transitional phase unwilling to make long-term decisions with good reason because they're not the elected governments. So one of the real challenges for

us--and we've certainly seen that in Libya--has been to find ways to do that.

On Iran, as you know, I announced that we had received a letter from Dr. Jalili, which, together with the six political directors from the countries mandated by the Security Council, United States, China, Russia, United Kingdom, Germany and France, we have decided that there was enough within that letter to propose that talks should resume or begin, depending on how you want to look at them. And we met this week, the political directors with me, to discuss how to take that forward. And we're now in contact with Iran to set the date and the place. I can't give you that now, but in the next very short time, I expect to be able to do that.

Just two further comments: one, if this is successful, it will be a sustained process. So we should be thinking of this as the beginning of a process. And, therefore, everyone should be aware that it will take time. There's a lot to do. And, secondly,

that when we meet, we'll be looking to ensure that what is being put before us, if you like, is a real willingness to have a sustained process, too.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. Governor Pawlenty, critique of Obama's--President Obama's handling of the Arab Spring.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Well, Amy, I wanted to respond to this gentleman's question about Egypt and the swapping out of military authorities. The Arab (technical difficulty) opportunity, said another way, a vacuum, it will be filled in some manner. So there will be a competition for how it is filled. And in order to buy space and time for, hopefully, a development of a culture of democracy, there's things we can do by way of capacity building and help that have been referenced here. So I would suggest, sir, that it's not a guarantee. It's an opportunity. It is an opportunity to compete for a better future, a compass setting towards freedom and democracy and related opportunities. But the hard work and the competition for that space and

for that future is now on, and it is incumbent upon primarily the people of those individual countries to vie for a better future and to fill it, hopefully enabled by well-intentioned people who are committed to freedom and democracy around the world.

And the alternative, an 82-year-old dictator who was not long for the world either way, I mean, it wasn't the choice between what was and what is. Mubarak was gone either way pretty soon. And this relates to David's question. You know, as we think about the opportunity to lead and starting with the principle of when you see wrong, call it out, perhaps one of the last straws that broke the camel's back was Mubarak stealing the 2010 parliamentary elections in Egypt. And not a word was uttered, or not much of a word was uttered in terms of those committed to freedom and democracy. The world was largely silent on the phenomena of Mubarak stealing the 2010 parliamentary elections.

Now, would it have made an ultimate difference in

terms of how the events unfolded subsequent had leaders stepped forward and called that out? Maybe. But it's certainly from within Egypt. The one more increment of tolerating corruption, the stealing of elections was at least an accelerant to what happened, a partial accelerant, a variable. And then, beyond that, this isn't the forum for direct criticism of particular leaders, but I do think it's important for those in positions of leadership to minimally call these things out as appropriate in a timely and clear manner with those compass settings that I talked about earlier. And I also think, with respect to how we go forward, there isn't a cookie cutter, you know, there isn't a recipe for each of these countries.

We have to have some sophistication and some thoughtfulness around how each one is handled with an understanding of the context, history, previous relations, opportunity, capacity, relations going forward, but, in all of that, set the compass to true north towards freedom. If we have to circumnavigate

around an iceberg or an island here or there, that's perhaps predictable. But we need to steer back towards those values and reward, encourage all of that to the fullest extent possible.

In my own view, at least as it relates to Egypt as an example and now Syria, the West's understanding of that and reaction to it was at least initially quite confused and, in my view, not as clear-eyed as it should have been.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Well, I think, sometimes--

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Well, that's why we are suggesting a Marshall Plan, a new Marshall Plan. (Unintelligible) Marshall Plan toward the region because it's very complex and you have a genuine approach to the fund distribution. We need the mechanism and the Marshall Plan--a new Marshall Plan, something similar (technical difficulty) because it's not a push button solution.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Do you ever think, President Gemayel, that there could be a regional block that

involved Iran and Israel, a trading block or a--not tomorrow, obviously, but do you think that that could be a real pooling of power, talents, natural resources?

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: So it's early to answer the question because we know very well that the Iranian issue is actually very, very critical. And we know that there is a real problem, a real dilemma concerning the situation in Iran. But, in fact, what we are working for in the near future to find the comprehensive approach, comprehensive program, to--how to reconcile this region and to imagine a new era of cooperation and mainly--the most important word is partnership, a partnership between the East and the West, between the West and the whole Middle East, that we need a partnership to build the best future for the area, for the region, and it's an objective.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Should we get some more questions? Okay. Let's go to the center here. Let me get them. Thank you.

Mr. Iain Conn: Iain Conn, BP. I've heard a lot of

talk of levers and conditionality, but we're starting to get into conversations about partnership and engagement. And I just--my question relates to that. Clearly, we're aiming to build and rebuild trust between Europe, the U.S. and the countries of the Middle East and North Africa. That requires understanding and cooperation, which requires engagement. And my question really is about style of engagement. Does the panel think that we have on each side appropriate style of engagement in order to start to rebuild trust? And if not, what's the one single thing that you would change in order to improve our chances of a better engagement?

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. Let's go.

Ms. Anne-Marie Slaughter: Thank you. Anne-Marie Slaughter from Princeton University. I just can't resist pointing out, given the panel yesterday on Global Europe, where is it going, that today we're asking Lady Ashton to brief us on her lead in the Iranian negotiations. And I want to ask her both to

respond to former Minister Gebril's comment about abandoning Libya and also perhaps to give us a quick summary of where you are on Syria because last night Romanian Foreign Minister Mladenov said the EU should really be in the lead.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you.

Unidentified Audience Member: My name is (unintelligible) from Morocco. I want to make the following statement. The Maghrib region is the least integrated region in the world. Less than one percent of this trade between the countries is so low, could we think about new terms of engagement from the European Union in conditionality of integration of the Maghrib? Second, Morocco signed with an F.T.A. with the United States. Could it be enlarged to the rest of the Maghrib countries that did their homework in terms of democracy and open up trade as a base for better integration and democracy in the Maghrib? Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: I think I want to stop at three 'cause I think it will be easier for us to get through

these. Lady Ashton, the comments about Libya may be being abandoned and Europe taking the lead on Syria, what are your thoughts?

Baroness Catherine Ashton: It's great to see you, by the way, as always. Not surprisingly, I disagree that we've abandoned Libya. In terms of, I think, the media and the imagery, not surprisingly, too, Syria has become the picture that we're all looking at and where we're all putting as much effort as possible. And I'll come onto that. But in terms of what we're trying to do in Libya, from a European perspective, we've worked out very clearly with the interim government, with our colleagues and partners from the United Nations where we think we can add value to what's happening. So people looking at security sector reform, border management, how to support the growth and development of this infrastructure of capacity to be able to ensure that delivery can take place by government that didn't have an infrastructure before.

I think what I was alluding earlier about the

challenges of trying to engage with those who themselves are interim is difficult on both sides because you're trying to set down a long-term strategic plan as much as short-term help. And what Europe does extremely well is be there for the long term. And equally these are leaders who don't feel that they can always answer for the long term because they're not going to be necessarily the elected leaders of the future. And so trying to work out how to do that is quite difficult.

Having said that, we've been clear that we need to engage with Libya on the issues I've mentioned. On support for women, we took a group of women from Libya to observe the elections in Tunisia, of engaging on education, on health, on all of the different areas where we can support the people and to begin to think about, too, how we can support them to make sure assets get back to Libya and how the economy can grow later. The obvious example of that being that so many Egyptians gained their income from working in Libya

that, when they all left, that created an additional set of issues for Egypt that could be resolved by people coming back to Libya. It's never fast enough. And there's no doubt that we can do more, and we can do it better. But the commitment is absolutely there.

On terms of Syria, it's Bulgarian Minister Nikolay who I know feels extremely passionately about this. He has a long, personal knowledge and history in Syria. For my part, I think it's really important that we are working closely with the Arab League, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and, most importantly of all, with the UN. And we've set up that group with the EU, again, to work together a kind of--we called it during the--what we did on Libya and still do, the Cairo Group. We call it now just a contact group. But those organizations coming together to work out, not just what we do now but actually what we're going to do when we hope we see the end of violence, the end of Assad and the move forward.

My view is that we have in the shape of Kofi Annan

somebody of enormous experience who has taken on an incredibly difficult challenge. And he has asked--I spoke to him the day before yesterday. We keep in touch. And he has asked that we support him, that we give him the chance to try and make the difference and we allow him to find a way through on behalf of the United Nations under the Arab League. I think that's what the European Union should now do. And so we are clear from the Foreign Affairs Council. We are continuing our sanctions on Syria. We have continued to increase some on individuals, on entities. We continue to have a delegation on the ground who are in touch with people. We continue to meet the opposition groups and to urge and encourage them to engage with each other and to be inclusive. And I believe we should continue to support Kofi Annan in his mission, support the friends of Syria and drive collectively as the international community.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you, Lady Ashton. You want to add something to that, don't you, Mr. Gebril? I

also--go ahead, but I would like you to address the rebuilding of trust issue that Mr. Conn had between Arab world and West. And I know, as an American, we're always faced when we go to the Arab world with a--and even before the Arab Spring, with a lot of anger about policies, American policies that have gone wrong. So take it.

The Hon. Mahmoud Gebril: Well, I just want to go back to what Lady Ashton just said about that the European Union has not abandoned Libya. First of all, at least during the month is where I was presiding over the Cabinet, you know. I really appreciate what the European Union did, you know. They've been there, you know, for us, and Lady Ashton personally, you know, she pledged all sorts of support. But what I'm talking about is reconciling priorities, you know.

If our priority in Libya now is building a national army and collecting arms from the streets so we can have order back and have elections carried out on time in June, these are the most important priorities for us

right now.

When you provide us with a different assistance, such as empowering women, we appreciate that, but it will not be felt because it would not touch the real nerve. So people feel that we've been abandoned now. We are in desperate need to have order back. We are in desperate need to have our sovereignty protected because we've been violated by almost everybody, you know.

So these are the utmost of priorities for us right now. To rebuild the trust, the first thing as I said before is to read it from the first page. We come to the table with no pre-imposed or pre-designed agenda, that this is my agenda and I want you to fit in. Now, we develop the agenda together.

As I said, this is a new generation. This is a new era. It won't fit at all, and it won't be productive at all to approach it with old agendas or with old policies. Simply what took place is we have 67 percent population young people less than 40 years old, and

those are the ones who carried out the revolutions in the five countries. But when the West and the rest of the world started dealing with those countries, they started dealing with the elites like myself, you know, which means that the real people are still out of the picture. And they're going to be back to the squares, Tahrir Square and (unintelligible) square because they have not been included. Their dreams, their agendas, the ideas about a new world, about a dignified life, it's not being included, not on our agendas as old elites in the Middle East and definitely not the new agendas because you have preset agendas. So you can expect more instability in the region to take place as long as those people are still out of the picture.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Governor Pawlenty, rebuilding trust, I wonder if you think that the United States has learned lessons from policies in the past that have not gone over well or been perceived to be helpful in the Middle East. And also, do you think that the Americans are coping with the fact that there has really been a

deficit of Arabists and people who understand the region? I think it's fair to say, historically--and if the United States is going to continue to be able to affect events in the region and work with the region, it seems to me something that needs to be addressed.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Well, I will address that, but I think it’s related also to this gentleman’s question about styles of engagement.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Yes.

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: And like leadership, there’s different styles of leadership that can be effective. There’s different styles of engagement that can be effective, but, in the end, they have to be effective. So as you’ve seen an attempt at a different style of engagement in recent years with Russia, one might ask, how did that work in terms of effectiveness? You saw a different style of engagement with Syria, reestablishing the ambassador there (technical difficulty) withdrew it and other (technical difficulty) how did that work? You saw an effort to

reach out and engage Iran several years ago, at least aspirationally. How did that work?

So these are interesting questions about styles and aspirations. But over a reasonable period of time, the measure has to be, did they work? And there's a very big difference between being popular and being effective. And, in the end, we need to be effective. And so as it relates to Russia, as it relates to Syria, as it relates to Iran, if you are an academic grader as to the effectiveness, not just the style, at least in recent years, you might suggest not so well on the effectiveness meter.

In terms of the lessons more broadly for the region, from a United States perspective, we have, I think, some unique capabilities, relationships, capacities that remain vitally important for the region and for the world.

It was Prime Minister Netanyahu himself who said on a television interview not too long ago, you know, there really is only one country in the world who can

address, on a sustainable basis, the potential military nuclear threat that is emerging in Iran. There's only one country who can ultimate address that, in his opinion.

Can we all be mindful of the lessons of the past? Of course. Can we learn from that and strive to do better? Of course. But there are certain capabilities and certain--a capacity, whether it be in democracy building, economies and the like, that, I think, the United States is well-positioned, in some cases, uniquely positioned, to continue to play a very vitally important role on these agendas.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. I don't think anyone has addressed the issue of integration in the Maghreb. I don't know who wants to take that one, and then we'll move on to more questions. Mr. Gebril, you're the neighbor.

The Hon. Mahmoud Gebril: Well, I think I agree with him because the relationship, either inter-Maghreb relationship, or inter-Arab relationship, it's not

that--I mean, the trade relationship in the Arab world--inter-Arab trade relationship is always around nine percent of the total. It's been like that for--since my birth, I think, you know. So I think rebuilding trust is very important.

To--I think there is an opportunity with those in new generations assuming power in the countries of the Maghreb that a common language might emerge, you know. I think the Maghreb has a better chance dealing with European Union when they deal as a block. I think they have a lot to bring to the table is a plus because he's been a nag within this context of relationship.

I am optimistic about inter-Maghreb relationship with the countries of the Maghreb, especially with those new signs of projected growth, either in Morocco and Tunisia. I think they did a splendid job in the past ten years (technical difficulty) of the future. I am very much optimistic about the Maghreb block in the next 10, 15 years.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay, more questions.

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Concerning--excuse me.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Yeah.

The Hon. Amine Pierre Gemayel: Concerning the Maghreb, I think that there is a problem there. They should follow a little bit the example of the CCG, the Conserve Corporation of the Gulf Countries. They were able to create a kind of confederation among those countries. And then they became more efficient, effective on the international scene as a group of countries being able to work altogether. And maybe the first time in the Maghreb will be to join their efforts and to establish their own program because, until now, there is a conflict, whether they are in Africa or in the Arab world. There is such kind of misunderstanding. That's why they have first to rebuild such kind of council and then to establish a blueprint that they can really be more efficient in the Arab context or on the international scene.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. I think we're running short

on time, so let's--okay.

Mr. Konstantin Von Eggert: Good morning, Konstantin Eggert from Moscow. I'd like to ask Amine Gemayel and Mr. Gebril--there's a lot of conversations now going on in different capitals about the role Russia plays in the current Middle East affairs. And there's this general view that Russia's losing out because of its support for Assad and its dithering attitude with regard to Libya and that its prestige in the Arab world is hugely undermined. I wonder whether you think it's true or whether it's just, you know, current politics and everything would be back to business as usual after these events settle down in this way or another. Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thanks, sir. Someone? Yes. Here, please.

Mr. Michael Ignatieff: Michael Ignatieff from Canada. I think everybody in the room is aware that by sundown today, Assad will have killed another 20 people. Men will get up tomorrow, and he will have

killed another 20 more. And, I guess, the question is --and Baroness Ashton referred to the Kofi Annan mission and everybody's placing their hopes in Kofi Annan--but how much time in realistic terms do we actually have in Assad, in Syria? And where is Governor Pawlenty's compass pointing him in relation to what's going to have to be done here? Or is it--are we essentially saying, this is over because this guy is going to keep going 'til he puts this place back in order, and is that result a consequence, that this room is prepared to accept?

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Okay. I think, to be fair, we should get someone over here. I'll give you your microphone.

Mr. Radwan Ziadeh: Radwan Ziadeh, Syrian National Council. Actually, I need to endorse a question that David asked but also for Lady Ashton. We really appreciate, of course, the response of the EU on the crisis in Syria. But, yesterday the EU actually issued next to Iran, now they included 126 individuals. But

the sanctions will not work. The same day the news that Iran and Russia (unintelligible) and, yesterday, we're getting the news from Latakia for actually new shipments coming yesterday from Russia to Syria with no weapons and no equipment.

This is why I think now is the time for the EU to change the course on Syria, to be more serious as they did in Libya and more cause, actually, from Syrians who are calling, actually, for intervention. And this is why I think it's time to discuss how to implement the safe zone. It's as a priority now to protect the civilians in Syria. Thank you.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. Okay. And maybe, as we're wrapping up--'cause these are probably the last questions--Prime Minister Gebril, you could talk about similarities and differences between the Libyan and Syrian situation since a lot of people are saying why was there a NATO operation in Libya and not in Syria.

The Hon. Mahmoud Gebril: Well, I think what I would strongly recommend for our Syrian brothers, you know,

unity first, unity second and unity third, you know. Syrian National Council, divided as it is, would not be effective, and you will not be heard in any circles outside Syria, you know. But the more united you are, in our case, though we had too many differences, you know, but we stuck to one agenda, you know, of course, those differences emerged after the liberation, you know, as you can see right now, you know.

But in your case, the differences came first. This is going to affect the sustainability of struggle against the regime, you know. So being united is a must, whatever the cost is because, without that unity, you will not be heard anywhere, you know.

The question of having international intervention, I doubt that this would happen in the Syrian case, simply because of the sensitivity of the region. Israel, Iran, Hezbollah, you know, those powers have their own calculations, you know. They don't intervene just for the sake of intervention. They intervene when it's safe and there is no repercussions--wider

repercussions for that intervention.

I think that Syrian (unintelligible) the Syrian Free Army can do a lot if there is a united command and control, and if there is a real popular support inside. To my knowledge, there was never a case in the history of humankind where a regular army managed to defeat a guerrilla. Never happened, you know, because it's completely a different strategy and a different style, you know. You're going to win, you're going to be victorious, no doubt about it because the Syria revolution, in my opinion, is irreversible, but the agony is going to be there. You're going to be--it's going to be more pain for them, the Libyan case.

For them, because the Libyan intervention has been criticized and used as a model of deterrence in too many countries--and this is wanted, by the way, for too many countries in the region. They wanted to use the Libyan case as a deterrence not to have revolution in their own countries. But in the long run, revolution is going to be victorious, believe me.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Governor Pawlenty and Lady Ashton, what should we be doing?

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Well, Assad is trying to kill his way to victory. And we have a situation again where he enabled and allowed, through his capabilities, the killing of American soldiers in Iraq and other forces in Iraq. He is a leader of a state sponsor of terror, including Hezbollah and others. And, day by day, as this gentleman's question suggests, is attempting to kill his way to victory. In my view--and I'm speaking now on only my personal view on these set of comments--the time has come for more direct assistance to the rebels and the opposition in Syria, short of boots on the ground.

And so there are historic models that have been quite successful in what the United States might do, what the EU and others interested in a freedom agenda would do, that includes Poland and a number of other historic examples. But I think the establishment of a safe zone and some more direct assistance to the--

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Like arming them, or do you mean financial assistance?

The Hon. Tim Pawlenty: Well, I think potentially both. Again, I'm not calling for boots on the ground, but I think the presumption that Assad will inevitably fall, I think, is debatable given his willingness to kill his way to victory. And I think he would fall if the rebels had some more concerted and direct assistance, economically and perhaps otherwise, again, short of boots on the ground. But to stand by and watch this day by day now and over time potentially allow himself to reassert control over the country or most of it, I think, would be a very disappointing result, to say the least.

Baroness Catherine Ashton: We've talked about the differences between Libya and Syria, and I don't want to dwell on that because I think it's always a mistake to try and make comparisons. But one thing I would say is to turn our attention to the United Nations and the Security Council because what--when we talk about

unity, and I agree with what Dr. Gebril was saying about, for the Syrian National Council, for the groups in Syria, the more that they can come together and demonstrate two things: one is unity of purpose, the other is, for the population in Syria, an inclusiveness, that everybody is included in the future. That is so important.

And when I went in the middle of the fighting in Libya, I went to visit people in Benghazi. I visited the transitional national council, a group of about, I think, 31 people who represented all the different strands of the country and who came together with an agenda that it was about the future. I remember talking about education, health in the middle of a time when people were worried about the relatives down the road who were literally fighting. But it was an extraordinary experience to see that this was a united effort and people felt that what was happening was for all of them. And I think I think that's so important

that the people in Syria should feel what is going on is for all of them.

The second thing is I referred to the United Nations, and I mean about unity there as well--with the Security Council, the lack of unity, how it's created a real challenge for the rest of us trying to work and support the people in Syria. And I have urged the Russians and the Chinese, and I'd so again, to really get behind what needs to happen, which is, first and foremost, to stop the fighting, to stop the killing, and, as far as we can, to back the initiative that we've all put as the United Nations on the ground, which is Kofi Annan, in his efforts to try and achieve that.

Now, there's lots of talk about whether we can set up safe zones and so on. And the governor will know as well as I do that that sounds very easy, and it's incredibly difficult to do. It's why we're talking with our colleagues in the countries that border onto Syria to see what can be done, particularly for refugees.

Coming over yesterday, we had Ahmet Davutoglu joining us for an adverse council to talk about what Turkey is doing and how they're receiving a thousand refugees a day and what support we can give to them. But unity of purpose is extremely important on the ground and it's extremely important in the international community. And

I think that's what my dear colleague, Nikolay Mladenov--and I think he's here. I think I can spot him--was talking about yesterday with a passion that I--I didn't know you were here when I described you as a passionate that I've seen here--but you are. And your long experience of this is how do we create that sense of unity of purpose and direction and does the EU play its full and proper role? I think sanctions do matter, I think, because they say politically we find this unacceptable. But they're also not going to be removed. You know, the long-term as well is about trying to find a way in which Assad gets the message that he has to stop now, that he has to go.

Ms. Amy Kellogg: Thank you. And, unfortunately, we're very much out of time. I'd love to give you one more word, president, but I think you've addressed Syria in some detail. So, I think on this note, we just need to thank everyone, particularly our panelists, who've helped us shed light on so many issues.

Mr. Craig Kennedy: Thank you so much. It was really an excellent start to the day. We're going to take a coffee break, be back at 11:30, and we'll talk about jobs.