

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY / MIDDLE EAST UPDATE
June 7 - 14, 2012

1. [Maturing India-U.S. Relationship Sees More Converging Interests](#) (06-13-2012)
2. [State's Burns at U.S. Consulate Opening in Herat, Afghanistan](#) (06-13-2012)
3. [Ambassador Rice on Passage of U.N. Resolution on Yemen](#) (06-13-2012)
4. [Secretary Clinton, Israeli President Peres on Syria, Iran](#) (06-12-2012)
5. [State's Gottemoeller on Freeing World of Nuclear Weapons](#) (06-11-2012)
6. [Panetta Says Strategy Puts Dream of 21st Century in Reach](#) (06-08-2012)
7. [Clinton Praises Global Counterterrorism Efforts at Istanbul Forum](#) (06-07-2012)
8. ["Friends of the Syrian People" Call for More Pressure on Assad](#) (06-07-2012)

1. [Maturing India-U.S. Relationship Sees More Converging Interests](#) (06-13-2012)

By Stephen Kaufman
Staff Writer

Washington — At the conclusion of the third U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said both countries are united in seeking “an open, free, fair and transparent economic system,” and stability and security in South Asia and the Asia-Pacific region.

“India and the United States have a strong foundation of friendship and cooperation. But today we are seeing something new. The strategic fundamentals of our relationship are pushing our two countries’ interests into closer convergence,” Clinton said June 13 in Washington.

India and the United States share not only democratic values, but also diplomatic and security priorities, Clinton said. “We both see the importance of a coordinated international response to violent extremism and other shared global challenges,” she said.

The U.S.-India relationship has matured beyond the need for “dramatic breakthroughs” but needs “steady, focused cooperation aimed at working through our differences and advancing the interests and values we share,” Clinton said.

In a June 13 op-ed, Clinton wrote that the United States and India are both “big, diverse, noisy democracies, committed to pluralism, freedom, and opportunity,” and since India's rapid economic development and growing regional leadership that began in the 1990s, the trajectory of their bilateral relationship has begun to change.

“India's expanding gross domestic product, thriving private sector, emerging consumer class, and increasing diplomatic clout have all combined to make it a global power with a big stake in maintaining international security and prosperity. As a result, we find ourselves sharing more than just common values and political systems — we also increasingly share common interests in an open, free, fair, and transparent global economic system; peace and prosperity in South Asia and the Asia-Pacific; and a coordinated international response to violent extremism and other shared global challenges,” she wrote.

Clinton said the world's oldest democracy and the world's largest democracy “should have one of the world's most robust and consequential economic relationships,” and that more and more “we find that India's interests and America's interests are lining up.”

She emphasized the need to convert “common interests into common action,” with results that citizens in both countries can see and appreciate.

“We recognize that some Indians still fear that working closely with the United States will undermine their ‘strategic autonomy.’ But at the end of the day, a strategic partnership isn't about one country supporting the policies or priorities of the other. It's about working together on shared goals and preventing short-term disagreements from derailing long-term cooperation,” Clinton wrote.

In remarks June 13, Indian Foreign Minister S.M. Krishna said both countries have enjoyed “an unprecedented intensity of engagement over the past years,” with the beginning of the Strategic Dialogue in 2009.

“The Strategic Dialogue is a unique opportunity to bring together all the threads of our cooperation that constitute the extraordinarily rich tapestry of our relationship,” Krishna said, adding, “Our two sides have a shared vision that our global strategic partnership could be one of the most important defining relationships of the 21st century.”

In her remarks June 13, Clinton cited a new agreement between U.S.-based Westinghouse Electric and India's Nuclear Power Corporation to work on preliminary licensing and site development that will be needed to begin construction of new nuclear reactors in the Indian state of Gujarat. Clinton hailed the agreement as “a significant step toward the fulfillment of our landmark civil nuclear cooperation agreement.”

In addition, the State Department announced June 12 the first round of awards under the Obama-Singh 21st Century Knowledge Initiative to eight educational partnerships between the United States and India.

For the initiative, announced in November 2009 by President Obama and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, both governments pledged \$5 million each, and the eight projects will all be receiving \$250,000 over a three-year grant period to “encourage mutual understanding, educational reform, and economic growth, as well as the development of junior faculty.”

The initiative aims to “further strengthen, through faculty exchanges, joint research, and other collaboration, partnerships between American and Indian institutions of higher education in priority fields, including food security, climate change, sustainable energy, and public health,” according to the State Department.

[Clinton, Indian Foreign Minister at U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue](#)
[Panetta Praises U.S.-Turkish Alliance, Pledges More Support](#)
[Joint Statement on Third U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue](#)

2. State’s Burns at U.S. Consulate Opening in Herat, Afghanistan (06-13-2012)

Remarks by William J. Burns, Deputy Secretary, Herat, Afghanistan

Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. And thank you, Governor Saba, for your commitment to a strong partnership between the United States and Afghanistan.

I am truly honored to mark the opening of the U.S. Consulate in Herat, the first American consulate in Afghanistan. As a city with a rich cultural history and considerable economic potential, Herat is a vital place for the United States to have a diplomatic presence. The opening of this consulate reaffirms our long-term commitment to Afghanistan’s success and the enduring bonds of friendship between our peoples.

The opening of this consulate builds on a long history of American engagement in western Afghanistan. In the 1950s and 1960s, American educators assisted the new teacher training institute in Herat, which is now the Faculty of Education at Herat University. In the 1960s and early 70s, American Peace Corps volunteers served here. After the fall of the Taliban, the United States undertook a number of projects and programs in Herat, such as the construction of the Department of Women’s Affairs office and the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission building.

U.S. interest and involvement in this region flourishes today. The Ring Road that we drove in from the airport on was funded and constructed by USAID. The basic health services available to almost all citizens of Herat province are funded by on-budget support to your Ministry of Public Health. In the last ten years, more than 100 of your best and brightest professionals and students have traveled to the United States on education exchange programs. There are exciting partnerships between American universities and Herat University to advance education in agriculture, engineering, journalism, English, law and political science. And the single largest cultural preservation project the U.S. government has ever funded through the Ambassador’s Fund for Cultural Preservation is right here in Herat – the preservation of the citadel.

And so we are here to celebrate the opening of the consulate -- this remarkable refurbished facility, leased from the Municipality of Herat. This was truly a community effort – we purchased local products to use in the refurbishment, some of which you can see on display in the waiting room next door. World-class quality, Chesht-e-Sharif marble now graces some of the floors. Every week, on average, more than 70 Afghans contributed their time and skills to the consulate’s construction. One expert carpenter turned plain packing crates into beautifully carved room dividers. And artwork produced by students from Herat University is displayed on the walls of the consulate.

President Obama and President Karzai signed the Strategic Partnership Agreement last month to signal that America will remain by your side for years to come. The SPA protects the gains of the

last decade. It is a positive vision for the future of the U.S.-Afghanistan relationship that contrasts starkly with the vision of violence and extremism offered by the Taliban and al-Qaida.

This agreement comes at a time when we have made significant progress toward defeating al-Qaida, transitioning security responsibility to Afghan forces, and denying extremists a safe-haven from which to threaten the United States. Let me discuss briefly our strategy moving forward.

First, we have begun a transition to Afghan responsibility for security. Already, nearly half the Afghan people live in areas where Afghan Security Forces are moving into the lead, and this number will rise to 75 percent by summer's end. Herat City has been under the security responsibility of Afghanistan for almost one year, and I am pleased to see first-hand the progress you all have made in that time.

Second, we are training Afghan Security Forces to get the job done. As our troops draw down, Afghan forces have surged and become more capable.

Third, we are building an enduring partnership with Afghanistan. The SPA sends a clear message to the Afghan people: as you stand up, you will not stand alone.

Fourth, we are supporting Afghan-led reconciliation. In coordination with the Afghan government, our redlines are clear — if the Taliban wants to be a part of Afghanistan's future, they will need to break with al-Qaida, renounce violence, and abide by the Afghan constitution. Many members of the Taliban — from foot soldiers to leaders — have indicated an interest in a settlement. A pathway to peace is now set before them. Those who refuse to walk that path will have to contend with strong Afghan Security Forces, backed by the United States and our allies.

And finally, we are building an international consensus to support peace, stability and a sense of economic hope for the people of South and Central Asia. Tomorrow, I will take part in the latest round of the Istanbul Process, where Afghanistan's neighbors and near neighbors will affirm their significant commitments to developing regional security and economic development. I commend the Government of Afghanistan for the strong leadership it has shown in this process.

This consulate, built with so many Afghan hands and so much Afghan talent, is a small reminder of what the people of Herat can accomplish. And it gives us hope for the greater effort facing Afghans—which is not merely the building of a single structure, but the building of an entire nation that deserves a future better than its recent past. Let this building stand as a sign of our commitment: As you build this future, one day at a time, you can count on the steadfast support and friendship of the United States of America.

Thank you.

[U.S. Forces Will Retain Self-defense Capability in Afghanistan](#) (06-12-2012)

[3. Ambassador Rice on Passage of U.N. Resolution on Yemen \(06-13-2012\)](#)

Statement by Ambassador Susan E. Rice, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, on the Adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 2051 on Yemen, June 12, 2012

The United States applauds today's unanimous adoption of UNSCR 2051 on Yemen. With this resolution, the international community has sent a clear, unified message that Yemen must move forward, unhindered by political discord or violence, with the next phase of its political transition as mandated by the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Initiative.

The Security Council made clear that implementing the GCC Initiative requires the resolve of Yemeni leadership and society, bolstered by the international community, to work together in a cooperative and productive manner. The Yemeni people must be able to pursue a more secure, democratic, and prosperous future without illegitimate interference or terrorism. Today, the Council made clear its strong condemnation of such conduct and willingness to consider further actions to deter those who threaten Yemen's political process.

In spite of those who seek to derail the transition, President Hadi has demonstrated strong leadership by steadfastly implementing much-needed reforms. We remain confident that President Hadi, the National Unity Government, and other stakeholders can continue to fulfill the GCC Initiative. The Yemeni government has made progress on several fronts, including important security sector reform, but additional reforms, as well as an inclusive and transparent National Dialogue process, are essential to pave the way for a constitutional referendum in 2013 and general elections in 2014.

Overcoming Yemen's challenges requires a comprehensive strategy that emphasizes governance and economic development as much as security issues. As the transition progresses, we will continue to help meet the needs of the Yemeni people by delivering humanitarian aid and economic assistance, supporting political and governance reform, and providing security assistance to combat the common threat of violent extremism.

[State Dept. Fact Sheet on U.N. Resolution 2051 on Yemen](#)

4. Secretary Clinton, Israeli President Peres on Syria, Iran (06-12-2012)

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton in a Joint Discussion with Israeli President Shimon Peres Hosted by the Brookings Institution, The Hay Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.

MODERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in a very special welcome to the president of the state of Israel Shimon Peres and the Secretary of State of the United States Hillary Rodham Clinton. (Applause.)

MR. INDYK: Please take your seats. Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much for joining us. It's a great pleasure to have you here on the occasion of this event to honor Haim and Cheryl Saban for their support, 10 years of support for the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings. I'm Martin Indyk, the director of the Foreign Policy Program at Brookings. One time I had something to do with the Saban Center. And we're especially appreciative that so many of you who have been involved in the work of the Saban Center over these 10 years are here to join us today.

I especially want to welcome Senator Inouye, Senator Feinstein, Justice Breyer, Chairman Genachowsky, and the ambassadors of Israel, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates for honoring us with their presence today.

When I asked Haim how he would like to be honored, he first, of course, refused. And then when I said that no was not an option, he said that we should do it in the Brookings Saban Center tradition of an exchange of ideas about the Middle East. "And who would he like us to invite to conduct that exchange," I asked him. And he answered in a flash, "Shimon and Hillary." It's a great testament to their friendship for Haim and Cheryl that they both agreed to join us today, and it's a great testament to their high reputation and fame that I can say the words "Shimon and Hillary" and

everyone will immediately know to whom I am referring, the president of Israel, of course, and the Secretary of State of the United States. Thank you both very much for doing us the honor of joining us today for this conversation.

I'm not going to spend time – our precious time – on introductions, since you know them both so well. But instead, I thought we should go straight to the conversation. I'm not sure what the protocol is. I suspect the president outranks the Secretary. (Laughter.) But since Shimon is such a chivalrous gentleman – he's known for that amongst his many other good characteristics – that I'm sure he would agree that it should be ladies first. (Laughter.)

So, Madam Secretary, I wanted to start by asking you about Syria, just to go to the heart of the matter. You've done an incredible job dealing with the world's problems, but I suspect the one that at least for the time being is the most vexing one for you is Syria. So tell us, please, what's your approach, what's the U.S. strategy for trying to deal with this tremendous brutality that we seem to be witnessing going on there from day to day?

SECRETARY CLINTON: Well, Martin, first let me thank you and Brookings, and particularly the Saban Center and especially Haim and Cheryl, for inviting us to be here. I am the one who is especially delighted and honored to be with a longtime friend and someone whom I don't think I'm alone in saying I admire so greatly. And I appreciate the chance to talk about some of the issues that we are addressing together. Certainly what happens to Syria matters greatly to the United States, but it matters drastically to Israel. And how we work through the many difficulties that are posed by this unrelenting, brutal crackdown carried out by the Assad regime and their military loyalists will have far-reaching consequences for the region and beyond.

Let me just make three quick points. First, we continue to support Kofi Annan's efforts, and we do so because he represents both the United Nations and the Arab League. It's quite unprecedented to have a joint special envoy who is speaking for two organizations that have seen their common interest in trying to bring an end to the violence and help to precipitate and then shepherd through a political transition.

And the six-point plan that former Secretary General Annan laid out is a good plan. Of course, it's not being implemented. And of course, the contempt and rejection of the first principle of that plan, namely the cessation of violence by the Assad regime, has certainly been a grave assault not only on the lives of the Syrian people but on the international effort intended to bring an end to this ongoing conflict.

Kofi Annan is now trying to put together a group of countries that would include Russia that we agree should be included to work on a roadmap for political transition. Russia has increasingly said that it was not defending Assad, but it worried about what came after Assad, and that it would work on political transition. But there are always a lot of caveats that they then interpose.

So I met with Kofi Annan on Friday. We talked through what his strategy would be and he is working very hard to try to implement it. The redline for us was the inclusion of Iran. We thought that would be a grave error since we know that Iran is not only supporting the Assad regime, but actively mentoring, leading, encouraging not merely the regular army, but the militias that are springing up, engaging in sectarian conflict.

So we have a timeline in mind to see whether or not this effort of Kofi's can be successful. The outer limit of that is mid-July when the Security Council has to decide whether or not to extend the

mission. And certainly, if there is no discernable movement by then, it will be very difficult to extend a mission that is increasingly dangerous for the observers on the ground.

Secondly, I think that the challenge faced by so many, from the near neighbors in the area to those further out, is what one can realistically do to try to bring an end to the violence without seeing an increase in the activities of certain elements of the opposition that could lead to even greater violence and the likelihood of the civil war that we're all trying to avoid.

So you hear from time to time that the Turks are meeting with certain elements. The Qataris, the Emiratis, the Saudis, others are trying to figure out how to support people who are under the assault of the Syrian regime. And it's quite challenging to actually deliver on that. Now there are lots of weapons on the black market, there's money that's available, there seems to be an increasing capacity in the opposition both to defend themselves and to take the fight to the Syrian military in an irregular way. But there's no doubt that the onslaught continues, the use of heavy artillery and the like.

We have confronted the Russians about stopping their continued arms shipments to Syria. They have, from time to time, said that we shouldn't worry; everything they're shipping is unrelated to their actions internally. That's patently untrue. And we are concerned about the latest information we have that there are attack helicopters on the way from Russia to Syria, which will escalate the conflict quite dramatically. There seems to be a massing of Syrian forces around Aleppo that we've gotten information about over the last 24, 48 hours. That could very well be a redline for the Turks in terms of their strategic and national interests, so we're watching this very carefully.

Finally, I would say that part of the reason why this is complicated in the face of a clear rejection of what the Assad regime is doing is because there is such a fear among many elements of the Syrian society and in the region about what would come next. You haven't had a wholesale departure, support, or even into exile of a lot of major players in the Syrian society. We are approached on a regular basis by representatives of different groups within Syria who are terrified of what comes next. I don't know how else to say it.

So how we manage a political transition, assuming we could manage a political transition; how we provide reassurance and some level of protection to Christians, Druze, Alawites, Kurds, Sunni business leaders and the like; how we prevent a massive inflow of refugees across the Jordanian and Turkish borders; how we protect Lebanon from getting caught up in the sectarian divides that afflict them as well as Syria – if these questions had self-apparent and actualizing answers, I would certainly share them with you. But as things stand, this is our constant, painful analysis as to how we can push the Assad regime out – there's no doubt it needs to go – but create a transition that gives at least some possible reassurance to those who fear what comes next.

So I think with that, I'll end.

MR. INDYK: Great, thank you.

Mr. President, Syria is, of course, your northern neighbor. The Israeli army is 40 kilometers from Damascus. Your chief of – deputy chief of staff is in the papers in the last two days warning about the danger that Syria's chemical weapons could get into the wrong hands. How do you see this, and what do you think can be done about it?

PRESIDENT PERES: Thank you very much, Martin. I want to thank very much Cheryl and Haim. With them, I feel at home on matters of peace and in (inaudible) of matters of social justice. I shall have a few words to say about the institute later.

I want to also to say a word or two about Hillary, not because my – only my personal admiration, which is really tremendous, but by the uniqueness of her role. Never before did anybody in history, men or women, traveled thousand of thousands of miles, from place to place, day and night, not because traveling is such a great pleasure but because she has an unprecedented responsibility.

All the previous Secretaries of States – not because of them – were dealing with international relations, which is one thing. Hillary is dealing with global responsibility, which is a totally different thing. When you have had international relations, it's enough that you go to a capital and that's it. No more. She has to face people all around the world with unbelievable differences.

Occasionally, the people are leading the government or the government is leading the people. And we live in a world where governments became weak because two of their main instruments were taken away from them: the control of economy and the control of security. Since economy became global, it affects every country, and look, no country can really affect it. So you have a global economy without the global government.

The same with terror. Because security, there is terror. It's global. It's wild. It doesn't have a law. It doesn't have an address. And again, there is no government that controls it.

So Hillary is trying, really, to fill the gap by creating alliances, by trying to have common basis, by being passionate. And the Administration wasn't built to handle it. So you have to penetrate an entirely new experience. Saying it, I believe in the Middle East we have to think about two tracks, not one: the present, which is transitional; and the future, which is permanent. I don't have the slightest doubt that finally the Arabs will (inaudible) the new age. They don't have a choice, as none of us has a choice.

But in between we have a transitional situation, which is not the same for all countries but different for every country. The Russians have had a Stakhanovich, a man that works a lot. So one of the doctors of (inaudible) came in the hospital and tell the nurses, "My girls, I'm so much in a hurry. Give me the average temperature of the sick people." (Laughter.) Well, there is no average temperature in the Middle East. (Laughter.)

So you have to have every situation to deal separately, now with Syria. I think in Syria two unprecedented things. First of all, the bravery of the Syrian people, which in my eyes is admirable and unbelievable. People are facing fire every day, a dictator that kills children. For me, the most shocking photo is to see a small coffin and a dead child in it. I can't stand it. People are reluctant to say, "Well, if Assad will go, we don't have an alternative." My answer: Assad stopped to be an alternative. Even if there is no alternative, he's neither an alternative.

So this is the first time that I really want to express my admiration for an Arab attempt to fight for their own freedom. It's admirable, and I wish them success.

The second point, which is unprecedented, is that the Arab League took on responsibility against an Arab country. And as Hillary has mentioned already, it's a joint venture between the United Nations and the Arab League. I would say, gentlemen, you send observers. Now you know the situation. What is your proposal? You don't want anybody else to intervene because this will be foreign intervention. Okay, do it yourself and the United Nations will support you. Better that the Arabs will do it, particularly when Syria is a very complex case.

You have the (inaudible) and the Shiites and the Kurds. It's either a dictator that will force them to be together or a confederation that will make them agree. Let the Arabs do it. They are ready. Let them take responsibility. Let's not accuse anybody that we are intervening. Let's us support them in any way we can, clearly humanitarian. I don't speak about Israel. I'm not sure that they would like that very well. We would like to help – not by arms, but by foot, by support, by voting, and by morale. And I think right now this should be the decision.

The leaders of the world, and what can Russians do? The Russians will be finally accused of intervening. They may be admired in Syria, but they are creating a great deal of opposition in the rest of the Arab world. So no single country can do it without being accused. The Arab League should and can do it. And if you ask for my advice, this should be the right policy.

MR. INDYK: Thank you. Shimon, just following on from that, I wonder if we can shift to the Palestinian issue for a moment? Here, we say that the status quo between Israel and the Palestinians is unsustainable. But out there, where you live, it looks from day to day like Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority, even Hamas and Gaza, all of them seem to be satisfied with the status quo, at least for the time being. So in your view, is the status quo sustainable?

PRESIDENT PERES: I don't think there is a status quo. I think there are two. They're the same movement. Once I think Henry Kissinger said that in Israel the foreign affairs is an extension of the domestic situation. Now I can say about the rest of the world that the domestic situation is the result of the outside world. We cannot separate ourselves on the global world from the changes in Egypt, the changes around the world. It's moving. It's moving.

And I think even – between us and the Palestinians now, some positive moves. For example, I would outline two. One is that the economic development – because in order to make peace, you have to build a nation, and the Palestinians started to build a nation with the American help, with the Israeli support and agreement. Secondly, the Palestinians have never had a force of their own. And I wouldn't like to generalize, but in the Middle Eastern terms, you don't have real parties – you have real forces.

Abu Mazen Abbas didn't have a force. Now, for the first time, he has a force, fifteen thousand youngsters that were trained by you, that are loyal to him. They clearly wouldn't like that Hamas will command them. And I think that Abbas is a serious man. I know him for a long time. Actually, he and myself signed agreement here on the White lawn –

MR. INDYK: Just over there. (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT PERES: Yes. And clearly we miss (inaudible). And it was presided by Bill Clinton. I shall not forget it. At 19 years past since then, I wished it would be faster. But you know, you cannot make a baby become a boy in a short while, and a boy become a grownup personage. There is age. It takes time. But it's growing.

I think now it is the time to make peace with the Palestinians. The Israeli Government has a wider base. The Palestinians understand that not everything which was happening in the Arab Spring is necessarily bringing them time, because one of the important thing about the Arab Spring is the Arab youngsters understand that their situation is not a result of the conflict between us and the Palestinians. They know that reform begins at home. What's happening in Syria has nothing to do with Israel. What happened in Tunisia has nothing to do with Israel, or Libya. And I think we should let the Arabs reform their lives and stop using the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as an excuse.

Now, elections are important, and I think – I believe the youngsters in the Middle East achieved doing things, important things. They brought an end to dictatorship after the uprising of the youngsters. I don't recommend anybody who seeks a guaranteed job to be a dictator in the Middle East. It's over. (Laughter.) It became totally uncomfortable.

Then there was a (inaudible) people to go to the elections, but they made one mistake. They didn't prepare themselves for the elections. Now, whoever will be elected, even if he'll have a majority, if he doesn't have a solution for the economic problems of Egypt, the elections don't mean much. If they don't have a solution for the security of Egypt, elections doesn't mean much. And I would just say to people that I know in Egypt don't forget for a moment that 60 percent of the population are young people. The future is theirs, and they are sick and tired. They don't want to remain poor. They are not ready to accept corruption. They want freedom. Many of them opened their eyes in Tunisia. I watched that many of the demonstrators were young ladies who are sick and tired of being discriminated.

And by the way, if you discriminate women, you discriminate your people, because you allow only half of the people to participate in building the nation. But if the women doesn't have a chance to be educated, the children are uneducated; they don't give a future to the children. Forty-one percent of the Egyptians are illiterate. And for that you don't need money. You really have to reform at home. And believe me, I wish and I pray that the young people will succeed, not because of us, because of them. They better they will have it, the better we shall have it.

MR. INDYK: It sounded for a moment like Shimon was channeling Hillary. (Laughter.) So do you want to pick up on the women's issue in the Arab Spring and your view of how things are going for the women in this process?

SECRETARY CLINTON: Well, I think it's too soon to tell. I think Shimon is right that we have a transition that we're going through to get to whatever future there will be. And it's not going to happen quickly and it's going to have, I would expect, some bumps in the road and difficulties along the way. But I believe that one of the important indicators as to how the whole process of democratization, political reform, economic reform is going is the way that the newly formed governments and their allies in the various countries treat women.

And to that end, there is both – there is mixed news. There is some positive news in that there are certain guarantees being put forth about women's rights and opportunities, but there are some worrying actions that certainly don't match those guarantees. And I think that raises the larger issue, because Shimon is right that democracy has to deliver. I mean, a lot of what was behind the revolutions of the Middle East and North Africa was economic aspirations that were not being met, outrage at corruption, the difficulty of doing business, the doors that would slam in one's face, the absence of jobs even if you were an educated young person.

So there has to be a level of economic returns for people's leap of faith and investment in a democratic future, and that is going to be extremely hard. Every one of the countries that is making these changes has a lot of work to do to open up their economy, to go after corruption and the like. At the same time, the political reforms that are occurring and the commitment to democracy, albeit unformed and quite not – I guess quite not yet clear in the minds of leaders or citizens – is raising a lot of issues. Because for us, democracy is not one election, one time. We're not sure exactly how others see this democratic enterprise that they have signed onto, because democracy is about building institutions. It's about extending rights to everyone, protecting rights of minorities, ensuring that people are equal under the law, requiring independent judiciary, free press, and all the rest.

So it's not just what happens to women, although we will keep a very close watch on what is happening to women. It is what is happening to the democratic experiment. And what we're trying to do is encourage the countries that are pursuing this to keep reaching out, learning from the experiences of others, most recently the post-Soviet nations but also Latin America. We come with a long 236-year experiment. And people in the region may or may not think that we're a relevant example, but we've encouraged a lot of outreach to countries that threw off military dictatorships, totalitarian regimes, and to find common cause with their experience.

And I think we also have to have a certain level of both humility and patience. We have to call out, at any turn, developments that we think endanger the democratic enterprise: the consolidation of power, authoritarian tendencies, and the like. But we also have to recognize that we didn't have a straight line. There were a lot of changes that we had to do as we moved toward a more perfect union. We didn't include everybody in the first run. We excluded women, among others. We had to fight a civil war to extend citizenship to former slaves.

I mean, we have to be honest enough to recognize that time has sped up. And to some extent, the work that has to be done in building these new democracies is much harder today than it was even after the Berlin Wall fell. I mean, every single move is now scrutinized, spread around the world through social media. It's really hard. So even if the people involved are coming at it with the best of intentions, good faith, they're going to face a lot of setbacks and challenges to their decision making and other problems that will make what they're attempting to do in the economic and political realms very difficult.

So women are the canaries in the mine, as many have said before, in these societies – in many societies. How they're treated, whether they're included, will tell us a lot about what we can expect from the democratic movements that are ongoing. But I think we have to do all we can to support the right tendencies and decisions in order to get the right outcome.

MR. INDYK: Thank you. Mr. President, if we can shift to Iran.

PRESIDENT PERES: I want to say well, about the women, I won't give up easily. See, I'm a gentleman, so I'm more optimistic than Hillary about women. President Obama asked me, "Who is against democracy in the Middle East?" I told him, "The husbands." (Laughter.) They don't want to share with the women equal rights. So why I'm becoming optimistic? Doesn't (inaudible). My optimism stems from a different point.

Today, the children are on the side of their fathers, not on the side of their mothers. And that is my hope. They understand that if they want reform, really, their country, and many of them went to the universities, and are equipped with modern communication, they won't give up.

The world democracy is a little bit complicated because some people think democracy is another religion. So you have to convert from being a Muslim to be a democrat. Well, it's not the case because Islam is a spiritual position, not a economic doctrine. And for that reason, I am a little bit even more optimistic than you are. And I think one should watch the combination of the women and the youngsters. And the fathers may find themselves all of a sudden in troubles. They won't take it, they will boss the future. So that is my note of optimism. (Laughter.)

MR. INDYK: Thank you, fabulous. You do the question about Iran then.

SECRETARY CLINTON: Oh, no, that – (laughter) – no use in (inaudible). (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT PERES: No, here I am not just a gentleman. (Laughter.)

MR. INDYK: All right. Shimon --

PRESIDENT PERES: Iran?

MR. INDYK: In – Iran. In 1981, you recall that you were opposed to the use of – in 1981, you were opposed to the use of preventive force against Iraq’s nuclear program. And I wonder, when you look back on that, what were you thinking about that at the time? What was your reason for opposition?

PRESIDENT PERES: Let’s not talk about Iran without patience, ability, strength, and cool, and say Iran, the Iranians are not our enemies. In history, we have many very friendly relations, and now very dangerous. So I’m asking myself, why are we really against Iran? Is it just because of nuclear bomb? Not only.

What revolts the world against Iran is that in the 21st century, the Iranian leaders, not the Iranian people, are the only one that wants to renew imperialism – we can’t accept it – in the name of religion. From that, it started. That’s the reason why many Arabs are against not Iran, but the Iranian hegemony. The Iranians don’t say the hegemony should be Arabic, because they’re not Arabs. So they want to say it Muslim, because they’re Muslims.

And we see the way they want to construct an empire – by terror, by sending money, sending arms, hanging, bluffing. We cannot support it. The world cannot support it, whether you are a Russian – I am speaking in – with Putin and Medvedev to say we cannot support a nuclear Iran. Now, if Iran will win, the whole Middle East will become the victim. Actually, the world economy will become the victim, because the way they rule is without any regard to anybody else. And this is the first problem. We cannot allow it to happen – all of us.

The second thing is the ways they do. It’s against a return to the Machiavellian formula that the goals justify the means. So you can kill, you can lie, you can murder, you can collect arms. My God, we are over it. We cannot return to it. It’s a human problem. The globe is already so complicated. It doesn’t govern without the government in economic terms. And this is a terrible alternative. And I’m afraid that some countries may take advantage if the Iranians will ruin the situation in Iraq, in Syria, in Lebanon, and they won’t stop. They will go further, wherever there is a drop of oil, wherever there is a chance of gaining anything.

We can’t agree with it. And that is why the nuclear weapons became so dangerous, because they serve a purpose and nobody can guarantee that they will restrain. And it’s governed by a single man who nominated himself as a deputy of Mohammed, my God. And where such a complete holiness arrives, reason stops, prediction stops.

And it’s a situation that I am not aware of anybody that threatens Iran, that wants to oppress Iran or govern Iran or reduce Iran, nothing whatsoever. Iran could have flourished without it. They have oil. They have a large country. They have an old culture. Who is against Iran? We’re against a policy that endangers our age. And unfortunately, they use the time – I can understand exactly the United States of America. It can say well, the United States, why did you do this, why did you do that, (inaudible), but Iran cannot take away from United States one thing: the character of their history. There is no trace of imperialism in American character.

Yesterday, I've been at the headquarters of your army. I told them you're the only army that doesn't fight to conquer or to occupy but fights for freedom and peace, not only for America, for the rest of the world. Historically speaking, the Americans are fighting for values, no matter if you do this or you do that. So you cannot be caring of the rest of the world and indifferent to Iran. And the Iranians are speeding up. They are taking the American process of democracy and making the wrong use of it.

So I believe that President Obama represents the deepest assumptions and concepts of the American history. It's above politics. It's above everything else. I think the reasons are profound and serious and urgent because they may reach a point of no return. Then it is too late. So the President said rightly I want to try with nonmilitary means, which is typically American, rightly so. But America understands if this will be the only option, the Iranians will laugh at them, say okay, the sanctions won't act, and then she'll be free. Then they said – the Americans are saying there are other options on the table, please don't forget it. And we are aware of the time element as well.

So this is the way really I look at it. I don't take it as a personal whim or as a personal ambition. Clearly we are more sensitive than others because when nobody threatens Iran, Iran threatens us. What did we do to them? We are the only country which is being threatened to be destroyed by them. But I don't suggest that this is the only reason that makes us more sensitive. But it doesn't reduce the great and major danger that we are facing.

MR. INDYK: Madam Secretary, maybe you can tell us how it's going with the negotiations after an initial sense of optimism with the IAEA as well. Both tracks, both the IAEA and the negotiations have taken place in Baghdad. There's a sense that not much progress is being made. Is that an accurate perception?

SECRETARY CLINTON: Well, I think the point of the negotiations is to do exactly what Shimon said, which we have been consistent in pursuing since the beginning of the Obama Administration, to have a credible pressure track that united the entire world. That was not the case when President Obama took office, and it now is. It's quite remarkable that not only the international community in general but the P-5+1 and, most particularly, China and Russia have remained as committed and forceful in the diplomatic negotiations with Iran over the nuclear program.

There will be, as you know, meetings in Moscow starting next week, over the weekend. And there is a unified position being presented by the P-5+1 that gives Iran, if it is interested in taking a diplomatic way out, a very clear path that would be verifiable and would be linked to action for action, which has been the approach that we've advocated and that has been agreed upon.

I can't, sitting here today, tell you what the Iranians will or won't do, but I am quite certain that they are under tremendous pressure from the Russians and the Chinese to come to Moscow prepared to respond. Now, whether that response is adequate or not, we will have to judge. They, for about the last 10 days, have been pushing to get a so-called experts meeting, pushing to try to even postpone Moscow in the absence of such meeting. And there was not a single blink by any of the negotiators. And then, as you saw in the news, there was a statement that yes, the Iranians would show up. My counterpart from Russia, Sergey Lavrov, is either there or on his way there.

And the Russians have made it very clear that they expect the Iranians to advance the discussion in Moscow, not to just come, listen, and leave. We'll know once it happens. But I think that the unity and the resolve that has been shown thus far is of real significance, because clearly the threats that Shimon outlined are very real. The continuing effort by the Iranians to extend their influence and to use terror as a tool to do so extends to our hemisphere and all the way to East Asia. So the threat is

real. We're dealing with a regime that has hegemonic ambitions. Those who live in the near neighborhood are well aware of that, trying to manage it, and avoid the Iranians' ability to score points and create more islands of influence is one of the great challenges that we are coping with.

But I just want to end with a story that I brought back from Georgia last week. I was in Batumi, which my friend, Strobe Talbott knows well, which is being turned into a kind of mini Las Vegas on the Black Sea – lots of casinos, big hotels, all kinds of public art. And I was talking to one of the municipal officials, and I said, "Well, what kind of tourist season are you expecting?" He said, "We think we're going to have a huge tourist influx." I said, "So who are most of your tourists? Where do they come from?" He said, "Well, we have a lot of Turks and we have a lot of Russians and we have a lot of Iranians and we have a lot of Israelis." I said, "Oh, how's that all work?" (Laughter.) And he says, "Well, I'll tell you," he said, "if you go to the discos late at night, the two kinds of people that are left are the Iranians and the Israelis." (Laughter and applause.)

And shortly after hearing that story, I walked into a public building in Batumi, which is one of President Saakashvili's very creative and impressive advancements, where truly it's one-stop shopping. You go into one public building; you can get a marriage license, a work license, a passport. It's quite remarkable. So I was wandering around, being shown this modern technological wonder. And I walked into the visa section, and these three men came running up to me and they said, "We love you, we love you. We're from Iran." And I said, "Oh well, we're trying to get along with you." "Oh, we like you. The people like you."

Now, who knows? (Laughter.) But I think that – I think that the larger point in Shimon's very eloquent and, as usual, compelling description is that there continues to be this disconnect between the people of Iran, which is a much more diverse society than most of us understand or know how to deal with, and this leadership, which is becoming more and more rigid, more of a military dictatorship, if you will. And so there is a lot happening inside Iran, and keeping this pressure on, keeping the sanctions on, keeping the world united against this nuclear threat and what it represents to this regime, remains our highest priority. So we're pushing forward on it, and we'll see what comes out of Moscow.

MR. INDYK: Unfortunately, the time has come when we have to conclude. And you've been both very generous with your ideas and analysis and time.

5. State's Gottemoeller on Freeing World of Nuclear Weapons (06-11-2012)

U.S. Department of State
Remarks by Rose Gottemoeller,
Acting Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security
Joseph Rotblat Memorial Lecture, Hay Festival
Hay-on-Wye, Wales, United Kingdom
June 10, 2012

New Partnerships for Combating the Threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction

"Above all, remember your humanity." Sir Joseph Rotblat recalled these words from the 1955 Manifesto of Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein when he accepted the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995, on behalf of the International Pugwash Movement. For Jo, they reflected very well the frame of mind we must have when we confront the problem of nuclear weapons.

I was honored to know Joseph Rotblat, and these words have stuck with me. When we talk about creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons, we are not talking about some remote utopia, we are talking about preventing the use of the most powerful weapon ever conceived by man. We are talking about protecting humanity.

The idea of a world free of nuclear weapons is nothing new. It was upon us almost as soon as scientists realized the feasibility of nuclear weapons. Sir Joseph was one of this community. As a leader of the Pugwash Movement, he was instrumental in making nuclear elimination a legitimate topic for policymakers around the world. When he was pushing for reductions at the height on the Cold War, Jo saw an opening for conversation – not one in English and Russian across the negotiating table, but one in the universal languages of math and science, a conversation among scientists. This open forum for scientific dialogue, which became the Pugwash Movement, led to some of the first arms control and nonproliferation treaties.

Through his work, Sir Joseph played a big role in making the goal of “zero” an acceptable goal of security policy. Two years after his death, four venerable Cold Warriors – former Secretaries of State George Shultz and Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of Defense William Perry and former Senator Sam Nunn – published an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal calling for a world without nuclear weapons. The group, often called “the Four Horsemen” saw it as “a bold initiative consistent with America’s moral heritage.” Two years later, President Obama spoke to thousands of people in Prague, stating that the United States would seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. That speech was the foundation for what we in Washington call the Prague Agenda.

Even with the massive shift in accepting nuclear elimination as a policy worth pursuing, Sir Joseph warned us, “the Cold War is over, but Cold War thinking survives.” When it comes to the next steps in nuclear reductions, this is undoubtedly true. In order to dismantle this dangerous legacy, we have to change the way we think about these weapons. And we have to be ready to challenge our notions of how they might be eliminated.

We are entering unknown terrain. As we steadily reduce nuclear weapons toward zero, the more cheating matters. Consider, if you will: if a country can stash away just a few nuclear weapons while others continue to eliminate them, that country can spring a significant and dangerous surprise on the world community. To counter this possibility, we will need innovative approaches. Finally to achieve zero, we will need a truly global effort involving thousands and thousands of people. I am guessing you are asking yourself, “How on Earth can an ordinary person such as I help with a problem like this?”

Joseph Rotblat considered this challenge decades ago. He developed the concept called “societal verification,” which he defined as the involvement of whole communities in monitoring compliance with treaties, in contrast to using the highly specialized teams of experts such as we use to verify the New START Treaty. Sir Joseph argued that technological verification of the New START kind was sufficient for reducing arsenals to lower numbers. However, the prospect of a state clandestinely acquiring only a few nuclear weapons in a disarmed world requires greater confidence and verification. Sir Joseph believed societal verification would bring us this increased confidence. Such a societal regime, he said, would be essential in achieving the goal of zero.

Today, we have the information revolution to lend to this task, and Sir Joseph’s concept is closer to reality. Our environment today is a smaller, increasingly-networked world where the average citizen connects to others in cyberspace hundreds of times each day. We exchange and share ideas on a

wide variety of topics. Citizens are armed with more information tools than ever before. Why should we not put this vast problem solving entity to good use?

Think about this: Any event, anywhere on the planet, has the potential now to be broadcast globally in mere seconds. The implications for arms control monitoring and verification are compelling. It is harder to hide things nowadays. When it is harder to hide things, it is easier to be caught. The neighborhood gaze is a powerful tool.

The Possibilities

Open source information technologies can improve arms control verification in at least two ways: either as a way of generating new information, or as analysis of information that already is out there.

Let me give you some examples, to give you an idea what I'm talking about.

In 2009, in recognition of the 40th anniversary of the Internet, the U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) held a competition where 10 red weather balloons were moored at visible fixed locations around the continental United States. The first team to identify the location of all 10 balloons won a sizable cash prize - \$40,000. Over 4,300 teams composed of an estimated 2 million people from 25 countries took part in the challenge. A team from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology won the challenge, identifying all of the balloon locations in an astonishing time of 8 hours and 52 minutes. Of course, to win in such a short time or complete the challenge at all, the MIT team did not "find" the balloons themselves. They tapped into social networks using a unique incentive structure that not only incentivized people to identify a balloon location, but also incentivized people to recruit others to the team. Their win showed the enormous potential of social networking, and also demonstrated how incentives can motivate large populations to work toward a common goal.

Social networking is already being incorporated into local safety systems. RAVEN911 — the Regional Asset Verification & Emergency Network — is a multilayer mapping tool that supports emergency first response in Cincinnati, Ohio. RAVEN911 uses live data feeds and intelligence gathered through Twitter to provide details that cannot be given on an everyday geographic map, such as the location of downed electric power lines and flooded roads. Authorities are cooperating with communities in Southwestern Ohio, Southeastern Indiana and Northern Kentucky to develop and implement this emergency management system, in order to help fire departments assess the risks and potential dangers before arriving on the scene of an accident. This open source system gives emergency responders a common operating picture, to better execute time critical activities, such as choosing evacuation routes out of flooded areas.

In addition to collecting useful data, the ability to identify patterns and trends in social networks could aid the arms control verification process. In the most basic sense, social media can draw attention to both routine and abnormal events. We may be able to mine Twitter data to understand where strange effluents are flowing, to recognize if a country has an illegal chemical weapons program; or to recognize unexpected patterns of industrial activity at a missile production plant. In this way, we may be able to ensure better compliance with existing arms control treaties and regimes such as the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The synergy is stunning: private citizens may contribute to monitoring for illicit weapons of mass destruction wherever they are found.

Now, how could approaches such as this work specifically in the arms control context? I've been thinking about the notion of verification challenges.

Let's just imagine that a country, to establish its bona fides in a deep nuclear reduction environment, may wish to open itself to a verification challenge, recruiting its citizens and their i-Phones to help prove that it is not stashing extra missiles in the woods, for example, or a fissile material production reactor in the desert. Of course, some form of international supervision would likely be required, to ensure the legitimacy of the challenge and its procedures. And we would have to consider whether such a challenge could cope with especially covert environments, such as caves or deep underground facilities.

6. Panetta Says Strategy Puts Dream of 21st Century in Reach (06-08-2012)

By Jim Garamone
American Forces Press Service

This article was originally posted on June 6 to the Department of Defense website.

New Delhi — The dream of the 21st century is a world that shares in prosperity and security and peace, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said here June 6.

The United States reaching out to countries is the best way to make this dream real, he told reporters traveling with him in Asia.

“The United States has to look at the world realistically and not be naïve about the challenges that are out there,” he said. “But at the same time we cannot be afraid to engage.”

Panetta's trip to Asia is all about reaching out and engaging with partners. The secretary began his trip with a stop at U.S. Pacific Command in Hawaii and then moved to Singapore to the Shangri-La Dialogue. Next stop was Vietnam, and on June 5 he came here.

At each stop, Panetta spoke of the U.S. turn toward the Asia-Pacific and, specifically, what this turn means to the countries of the region. The U.S. Navy, for example, will have 60 percent of the fleet in Pacific and Indian Ocean waters. U.S. Marines will rotate in and out of Australia. American officials are speaking with Philippine officials for another possible rotational location. Littoral combat ships will rotate in and out of Singapore.

But this is just a beginning, Panetta said. Asian officials understand the change in strategy, but “we now have to put meat on the bone, which means we have to follow through with actions,” he said.

Now, U.S. military officials will work with partners to improve military capabilities. “We've got to show that we can deliver,” the secretary said.

Some countries in the region are worried that the policy is aimed at isolating China, Panetta said, but the United States wants to build better relations with China on all levels, including security.

“The important element of all this is that this is not about retrenchment, this is about outreach,” Panetta said. “The outreach is not just to our traditional allies, it's to China, it's to Russia and it's going to be to others to try to ensure that we build better military-to-military relationships with those countries, build better diplomatic ties and trade ties to the countries for the future.”

The secretary believes nations in the region have been receptive. “In the discussions I’ve had in both Vietnam and here in India it is very much a broad-based relationship with the United States that they are interested in,” he said.

Vietnamese leaders are interested in acquiring some U.S. technologies and to have U.S. ships use their ports, Panetta said. “They are also interested in exchanges in regards to the ability to work together, to provide advice and assistance and to help them improve their capabilities,” he said.

In India, Panetta said the ties are much stronger. The U.S. military has been operating with Indian forces for a decade and each year the number of exercises grows and the contacts between the two militaries expand. India has bought more than \$8 billion in U.S. systems in the past decade. “So it is a pretty broad-based relationship as well,” Panetta said.

“What I sensed from both countries ... is if they believe the United States is truly interested in developing their capabilities and not simply just going in and telling them what to do, or trying to overwhelm them with power, I think they are willing to listen,” the secretary said.

“The real challenge is to convince them that that is what our intentions are all about,” he added. “And I think we are making good progress on getting that point across.”

[Special Report: Travels With Panetta](#)
[U.S. State Department Background Note: India](#)

7. Clinton Praises Global Counterterrorism Efforts at Istanbul Forum (06-07-2012)

By MacKenzie C. Babb
Staff Writer

Washington — Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says global counterterrorism efforts are making a significant difference in keeping citizens safe, and she is calling on countries around the world to continue to stand together in the fight against violent extremism.

“We’ve worked together to disrupt terrorist financing; pass new and more effective counterterrorism laws; tighten border, aviation and maritime security; and improve international coordination,” Clinton said at the Global Counterterrorism Forum ministerial meeting in Istanbul June 7.

During the past decade, more than 120,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested around the world and more than 35,000 have been convicted, Clinton said. Terrorist group al-Qaida is “on the path to defeat” following the 2011 death of leader Osama bin Laden.

“Our citizens are safer because of the work we have done together,” Clinton said. “But despite this progress, the danger from terrorism remains urgent and undeniable.”

The secretary said the threat of terror has spread to become more geographically diverse, and extremist groups are now “actively encouraging lone-wolf terrorists” to carry out attacks and killing sprees.

“Just as the threat we face crosses borders and oceans, so must our response,” she said. “We need a strategic, comprehensive approach to counterterrorism that integrates both military and civilian power, that uses intelligence, law enforcement, diplomacy, development, humanitarian assistance and every possible partner and asset.”

Clinton said defeating terrorist networks requires more than simply removing insurgents from the battlefield. The global community needs to attack finances, recruitment and safe havens; take on extremist ideology and diminish its appeal to young people; improve conditions for women’s security; and continue to help build the capacities of nations working to take on the fight.

She said the Global Counterterrorism Forum emphasizes strengthening civilian institutions as a critical part of its strategy, and that the group will continue to work together to defeat ideologies of hatred and violence.

Clinton applauded the United Arab Emirates for announcing the creation of the first international center to combat extremism and develop best practices to blunt the spread of radicalization. She said the United States will support the center, scheduled to open in Abu Dhabi later in 2012, with both funding and expertise.

The secretary said strengthening the rule of law is another critical way to stem the spread of extremism, and she commended the pledge of more than \$90 million to provide rule-of-law training for police, prosecutors, judges and prison officials in countries working to step up their counterterrorism efforts. She said the United States is contributing \$15 million to the effort, which will also include a focus on rehabilitating and reintegrating violent extremist offenders in prison.

She added that political revolutions across the Middle East and North Africa have “struck a devastating blow to the extremists’ ideology.” As citizens claim their universal rights, demand more accountable governments and seek broader economic opportunities, Clinton said, they gain the potential to transform and improve counterterrorism efforts across the region.

Clinton, who co-chaired the counterterrorism forum along with Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu, said the group’s work remains essential for keeping up with the ever-changing threat of extremism.

“We’re here because we face implacable foes who are determined to kill civilians, disrupt societies and spread their ideology of hate,” she said. “All of us share a commitment to take on this challenge, and the United States is very proud to continue working with you to further our common efforts.”

The secretary’s visit to Turkey came as the last stop on a seven-nation tour that began May 31. Before her arrival in Istanbul, Clinton visited Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. She is scheduled to depart for Washington following the forum June 7

[Clinton at Opening of Global Counterterrorism Forum](#)
[Briefing on Global Counterterrorism Forum in Istanbul](#)
[Briefing on Clinton's Meeting about Syria](#)

8. "Friends of the Syrian People" Call for More Pressure on Assad (06-07-2012)

Washington — Representatives from some 60 countries, meeting in Washington June 6, reaffirmed their support for an immediate end to violence in Syria and called for increased international pressure on Bashar al-Assad's regime.

The Friends of the Syrian People International Working Group on Sanctions released the results of its second meeting in a statement issued the same day through the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Qatar, Turkey and the United States co-chaired the meeting, which was hosted by the Treasury Department. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner delivered opening remarks.

"The Group reaffirmed its support for an immediate end to the violence against the Syrian people," the statement said, "and called on all members of the international community to demonstrate solidarity with the Syrian people by implementing and enforcing measures to increase pressure on the Assad regime to fully comply with its obligations in accordance with UN and Arab League Joint Special Envoy Kofi Annan's Six Point plan and UNSCRs 2042 and 2043."

The group also reaffirmed its support for sanctions outlined in the statements from its April 17 meeting in Paris and the Friends of the Syrian People's February 24 meeting in Tunis, Tunisia.

The group said the Assad regime's ongoing brutality is the greatest threat to the well-being of the Syrian people and emphasized that sanctions do not target Syria's civilian population. Instead, it said, sanctions aim to increase pressure on the people and institutions responsible for the Syrian regime's brutal repression, as well as deprive the regime of the resources it uses for this repression.

The group expressed "deep dissatisfaction" with the Assad regime's failure to abide by its Annan Plan commitments and "grave concern" over the growing threat to regional stability. There was substantial agreement that further measures will be necessary in light of continued violence and denial of the Syrian people's democratic aspirations.

In this regard, the group said it supports a U.N. Security Council Chapter VII resolution called for June 2 by the Arab League that would include sanctions on the Assad regime by member states, including asset freezes, travel bans, an arms embargo and other measures.

The group recognized steps taken by participating states and called on them to fully implement and enforce existing sanctions to exert maximum pressure on the Assad regime. It recognized that while these measures are imposing significant strain on the regime, "a continued concerted multinational approach" is needed to further deprive the regime of the financial resources necessary to sustain its campaign of violent repression.

The group called on all states to harmonize national and regional sanctions by imposing, at a minimum, an asset freeze on senior Syrian regime officials, as well as an asset freeze on and restriction of transactions with Syria's Central Bank and its Commercial Bank to ensure their isolation from the international financial system.

It also called on all states to embargo Syrian petroleum products and ban insurance and reinsurance for shipments of Syrian petroleum products. In addition, it called on states to ban arms shipments to the Syrian regime and insurance and reinsurance for third-country arms shipments to the regime.

The group called on all states to issue guidance to their domestic financial institutions on the risks associated with doing business with Syria and to require those institutions to exercise enhanced due

June 14, 2012

diligence on all transactions involving Syria, to keep the Assad regime from using deceptive financial practices to evade international sanctions.

The group called on Syrian business leaders and others who continue to support the Assad regime to withdraw their support or face further international isolation.

Deploring those states that are undermining the Annan Plan's chances for success by providing financial, diplomatic or material support to the Assad regime, the group called on them to cease immediately providing any support that aids in "the violent repression of the legitimate democratic aspirations of the Syrian people," the statement said.

Once the democratic transition is started, the group said, it is committed to bringing about a swift review of sanctions in order to support the reconstruction of the future Syria in coordination with the Friends of the Syrian People Working Group on Economic Reconstruction and Development.

The group reaffirmed its resolve to act collectively to restrict and sanction the Assad regime and its supporters and to share information on measures taken to increase pressure on the regime.

The International Working Group on Sanctions will meet next in Doha, Qatar, in July. [Its statement](#) is available on the Treasury Department's website.
