



2007 U.S.-Islamic World Forum

Doha, Qatar
February 17-19, 2007

The Brookings Project on
U.S. Relations With the Islamic World



at BROOKINGS



وزارة الخارجية





at BROOKINGS



MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

منتدى أمريكا والعالم الإسلامي U.S-ISLAMIC WORLD FORUM

17 - 19 FEB 2007 - فبراير ٢٠٠٧



2007 U.S.–Islamic World Forum

Doha, Qatar
February 17-19, 2007

The Brookings Project on
U.S. Relations With the Islamic World



at BROOKINGS



وزارة الخارجية



Table of Contents

| | | | |
|--|----|---|-----|
| Note from the Forum Organizers | 4 | Leaders Roundtable 5 | 65 |
| Program of Events | 7 | Injustice Within: Holding Up a Mirror to Our Own Societies | |
| Welcoming Remarks | 15 | TASK FORCE SUMMARIES | |
| by Martin Indyk <i>Director of the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution</i> | | Task Force A: Security | 68 |
| Opening Address | 19 | Task Force B: Governance, Religion | 75 |
| by H.E. Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al Thani <i>First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, State of Qatar</i> | | and Politics | |
| Opening Address | 23 | Task Force C: The Next Generation | 82 |
| by H.E. Syed Hamid Bin Syed Jaafar Albar <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia</i> | | LEADERS SEMINAR SUMMARIES | |
| Opening Address | 27 | Muslim Minority Leaders Seminar: | 86 |
| by Amre Moussa <i>Secretary General, League of Arab States</i> | | Bridging the Divide | |
| Opening Address | 33 | Science and Technology Leaders Seminar: | 90 |
| by Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi <i>Head, European Council for Fatwa and Research</i> | | Technology Partnerships | |
| Opening Address | 41 | Arts and Culture Leaders Seminar: | 94 |
| by Philip D. Zelikow <i>White Burkett Miller Professor of History, University of Virginia; Former Counsel, U.S. Department of State</i> | | Arts and the Public Sphere | |
| LEADERS ROUNDTABLE SUMMARIES | | Media Leaders Seminar: | 98 |
| Leaders Roundtable 1 | 47 | The Media Effect | |
| U.S. and Islamic World Opinion: How Do We See Each Other? What Are Our Different Narratives? | | CONCLUSION | |
| Leaders Roundtable 2 | 51 | Closing Leaders Roundtable, | 103 |
| The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict as a Microcosm of the Conflicts that Divide Us | | Where Do We Go from Here? | |
| Leaders Roundtable 3 | 55 | Outreach to Youth: Youth and the | 107 |
| Perspectives from Asia | | Future of U.S.-Islamic World Relations | |
| Leaders Roundtable 4 | 59 | Press Coverage of the U.S.-Islamic | 108 |
| How Do We Make Iraq Work? | | World Forum | |
| | | List of Participants | 111 |
| | | About the U.S.-Islamic World Forum | 117 |
| | | About the Brookings Project on | 119 |
| | | U.S. Relations with the Islamic World | |
| | | About the Saban Center for | 120 |
| | | Middle East Policy | |

Note from the Forum Organizers



THE BROOKINGS PROJECT ON U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE ISLAMIC World was launched in the wake of the attacks on September 11th, 2001. Its goal is to engage and inform policymakers, practitioners, and the broader public on developments in Muslim countries and communities and the nature of their relationship with the United States. At a time of great tension and mutual suspicion between the United States and the Muslim world, there is a critical need for dialogue between leaders from both sides.

With the generous support of the Government of the State of Qatar, the Project launched the **U.S.-Islamic World Forum** in 2004. The Forum's purpose is to provide a unique platform for frank dialogue, learning, and the development of positive partnerships between key leaders and opinion shapers from the United States and the Muslim world.

The theme of the 2007 Forum was "Confronting What Divides Us." Opened by H.E. Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al Thani, First Deputy Prime Minister (now Prime Minister) and Foreign Minister of the State of Qatar, the 2007 Forum brought together some 190 leaders from the United States and 30 Muslim countries, extending from Morocco to Indonesia. It was a diverse and distinguished group, with attendees ranging from ministers of government and CEOs of corporations to deans of universities and editors of newspapers. It was the type of meeting where U.S. officials mingled with Islamic scholars, and civil society leaders shared meals with government ministers. In addition to established leaders, participants were also enthusiastic about the chance to hear new voices and meet emerging leaders.

Luminaries from the fields of politics, arts, business, civil society, academia, science, and the news media participated in large, televised plenary sessions on core issues affecting U.S.-Muslim world relations like Iraq, Iran, and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The Forum also featured smaller task forces on key thematic issues like security, governance and religion, and the next generation. In addition, there were leadership seminars devoted to developing practical initiatives between the United States and the Muslim world in areas like arts and culture, science and technology, and among Muslim minority leaders in the West.

The Forum was significant on a number of other levels. Press coverage was extensive, with reporting about the event on an array of television, radio, and print outlets across the globe. In the weeks following, columns, articles, interviews and blogs by participants discussing their experiences and lessons learned proliferated, extending from Washington, D.C. to Beirut to Jakarta. In this way, the Forum is providing demonstrable evidence that dialogue between the United States and the Muslim world need not be one of pure negativity, and can be wrested away from demagogues on either side.

We would like to express our deep appreciation to His Highness Sheikh Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani, the Emir of the State of Qatar, for making it possible to convene this assemblage of leaders from across the Muslim world and the United States. We are also appreciative of the support and participation of Sheikh Hamad Bin Jasim Bin Jabr Al-Thani, the First Deputy Prime Minister (now Prime





Minister) and Foreign Minister, and the rest of the Foreign Ministry of Qatar. His Excellency Mohammed Abdullah Mutib Al Rumaihi, Foreign Minister's Assistant for Follow Up Affairs; Abdulla Rahman Fakroo, Executive Director of the Committee for Conferences; and His Excellency Ambassador Nasser Bin Hamad M. Al-Khalifa all merit special thanks for their roles in ensuring the successful planning and operation of the meeting.

We are also appreciative for the help and generosity of our planning partners: CNBC Arabiya; the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University; Lawrence Livermore National Labs; the Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia; the Arab Western Summit of Skills; American Muslim Group on Policy Planning; Doris Duke Charitable Foundation; America Abroad Media; Americans for Informed Democracy; and Soliya, in helping to facilitate the Forum. We would finally like to thank the hard work of the Brookings staff – Rabab Fayad, Aysha Chowdhry, Jacob Elghanayan, Arif Rafiq, Andrew Masloski, Reid Creedon, Ariel Kastner, Ross Johnson, Ralph Wipfli, Neeraj Malhotra, Brennan Berry, Casey Noga, Kais Sharif, Rim Hajji and Yinnie Tse.

The dialogue we all opened in Doha was critical, but clearly just a beginning. Future activities include building networks and conducting research on critical challenges in the U.S.-Muslim world relationship, and the convening of regional conferences that will take the Forum to other regions of the Muslim world. Our continuing goal is to expand upon and institutionalize this important effort to build understanding and promote positive relations between the United States and the Muslim world.

Kindest regards,

AMBASSADOR MARTIN INDYK
Project Co-Convener

DR. PETER W. SINGER
Project Co-Convener

PROFESSOR SHIBLEY TELHAMI
Project Co-Convener

BRUCE RIEDEL
Project Co-Convener

DR. STEPHEN R. GRAND
Project Director

HADY AMR
Director, Brookings Doha Center



Program of Events

** indicates open to media*

Friday, February 16, 2007

- 14:00 Registration and Task Force Sign Up**
- 15:00 Press Briefing***
Goals of the U.S.-Islamic World Forum
- SPEAKERS:** Mohammed Abdullah Mutib Al Rumaihi, *Assistant Foreign Minister for Follow Up Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Qatar*
- Martin Indyk, *Director, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*
- Stephen Grand, *Director, Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*
- Hady Amr, *Fellow and Director of the Brookings Doha Center, the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*
- 20:30 Arts and Culture Initiative Film Screening*** – “Booye kafoor, atre yas” (Smell of Camphor, Fragrance of Jasmine), including discussion with Director Bahman Farmanara

Saturday, February 17, 2007

- 9:00 Registration and Task Force Sign Up**
- 12:30 Welcome Luncheon and Roundtable***
U.S. and Islamic World Opinion: How Do We See Each Other? What Are Our Different Narratives?

CHAIR: Shibley Telhami, *Anwar Sadat Chair, University of Maryland; Nonresident Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

OPENING SPEAKERS: Steven Kull, *Director, Program on International Policy Attitudes, United States*

Dalia Mogahed, *Executive Director, Center for Muslim Studies, The Gallup Organization, United States*

Khalil Shikaki, *Director, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, Palestine*

17:30 Welcome Reception*

18:30 Opening Plenary*

WELCOMING REMARKS: Martin Indyk, *Director, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

OPENING ADDRESS: Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim bin Jabr Al Thani, *First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Qatar*

The Conflicts That Divide Us: Can We Find Productive Ways Forward?

SPEAKERS: Amre Moussa, *Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Egypt*

Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Head, European Council for Fatwa and Research; Host, Ash-Shariah Wal-Hayat Qatar*

Syed Hamid Bin Syed Jaafar Albar, *Minister of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia*

Philip D. Zelikow, *White Burkett Miller Professor of History, University of Virginia; Former Counsel, U.S. Department of State*

Program of Events (CONTINUED)

20:00 Dinner and Dialogue*

The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict as a Microcosm of the Conflicts that Divide Us

MODERATOR: Shibley Telhami, *Anwar Sadat Chair, University of Maryland; Nonresident Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

PANELISTS: Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim bin Jabr Al Thani, *First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Qatar*

Martin Indyk, *Director, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

Amre Moussa, *Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Egypt*

Asad-Abdul Rahman, *Member, Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Palestine*

Philip D. Zelikow, *White Burkett Miller Professor of History, University of Virginia; Former Counsel, Department of State, United States*

21:30 Arts and Culture Initiative Film Screening * – “Shame,” including a discussion with Mukhtar Bibi and Producer Mohammed Ali Naqvi

Sunday, February 18, 2007

9:00 Task Forces: Session One

A) Security Task Force - What are the changing security dynamics in the region?
Developed in partnership with the 21st Century Defense Initiative, the Brookings Institution

CONVENER: Peter W. Singer, *Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative, the Brookings Institution, United States*

- The Name Game: From “Long War” and “Islamofascism” to “Mujahideen” and “Takfiri,” do the descriptions and names we give conflict matter?

PRESENTERS: M. J. Akbar, *Editor-in-Chief, The Asian Age, India*

David Belt, *Assistant Professor, National Defense University, United States*

Marc Lynch, *Associate Professor, Williams College, United States*

B) Governance, Religion and Politics Task Force - Building effective states; fitting in faith

CONVENER: Shibley Telhami, *Anwar Sadat Chair, University of Maryland; Nonresident Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

- In an age of globalization, why are so many states having difficulty meeting the basic needs of their citizens? How do we make government work better for its citizens?

PRESENTERS: John J. DeGioia, *President, Georgetown University, United States*

Charles P. Henderson, *Executive Director, Association for Religion and Intellectual Life, United States*

Hadi Semati, *Professor, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Tehran, Iran*



COMMENTATOR: Khalil Shikaki, *Director, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, Palestine*

**C) The Next Generation Task Force:
New Media, the Economy and
Social Change**
*Developed in partnership with the
Wolfensohn Center, The Brookings
Institution*

CONVENER: Hady Amr, *Fellow and
Director of the Brookings Doha Center, the
Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the
Brookings Institution, United States*

- **What are the hopes and frustrations of the next generation? What is the role of the New Media in social change?**

PRESENTERS: Fowziyah Abdullah Abu-Khalid, *King Saud University, Department of Sociology, Saudi Arabia*

Ahmad Humeid, *Founder, www.itoot.net and www.ikbis.com, Jordan*

Nisreen Shocair, *President, Virgin Megastores Middle East, Jordan*

10:30 Coffee Break

11:30 Task Forces: Session Two

Security Task Force

- **Should the United States withdraw from Iraq? If so, what would happen next? Is civil war inevitable?**

PRESENTERS: Jalal al-Din al-Sagheer, *Imam, Al-Hadarah Al-Kazamiyah Mosque; Member of Parliament, Iraq*

Kenneth M. Pollack, *Senior Fellow and Director of Research, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

**Governance, Religion and
Politics Task Force**

- **What is the place of religion in the public square?**

PRESENTERS: Abdullah An-Naim, *Charles Howard Candler Professor of Law, Emory University, United States*

James Donahue, *President, The Graduate Theological Union, United States*

COMMENTATOR: Katharine Rhodes Henderson, *Executive Vice President, Auburn Theological Seminary, United States*

The Next Generation Task Force

- **What are the socio-economic, political and civic challenges facing the next generation?**

PRESENTERS: Abdelouahab Rezig, *Former Director, Office for North Africa, United Nations Economic Commission; Professor, University of Algiers, Algeria*

Mark Ward, *Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator for Asia and the Near East, United States Agency for International Development, United States*

Tarik M. Yousef, *Nonresident Senior Fellow, Wolfensohn Center for Development, Global Economy and Development, the Brookings Institution; Dean, Dubai School of Government, United Arab Emirates*

Program of Events (CONTINUED)

13:00 Luncheon and Plenary Session Three *
Perspectives from Asia
Developed in partnership with the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia

MODERATOR:

Mohammed Jawhar Hassan, *Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia*

SPEAKERS:

Komaruddin Hidayat, *President, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Indonesia*

Habib Rehman, *Executive Director, ITC India, Inc., India*

Bruce Riedel, *Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

15:15 Leaders Seminars

1) Muslim Minority Leaders Seminar: Bridging the Divide
Developed in partnership with the American Muslim Group on Policy Planning and the Arab Western Summit of Skills

How can American and European Muslim leaders work together to help bridge the divide within their own societies and with the Muslim world?

CONVENERS: Akram Baker, *Co-President, Arab Western Summit of Skills, Palestine*

Rokhsana Fiaz, *Founding Director, The Change Institute, United Kingdom*

PRESENTERS: Reza Aslan, *Author, No God But God, United States*

Hisham A. Hellyer, *Research Fellow, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, United Kingdom*

Shahid Malik, *Member of Parliament and Parliamentary Private Secretary to Minister of State, Department of Education and Skills, United Kingdom*

Maggie Mitchell Salem, *Regional Director, Middle East and North Africa, IFES, United States*

Ahmed Samir Younis, *Independent Consultant, United States*

2) Science and Technology Leaders Seminar: Technology Partnerships
Developed in partnership with Lawrence Livermore National Labs

How do we create international frameworks for spurring more robust science and technology partnerships between the United States and the Muslim world?

CONVENERS: Michael d'Arcy, *Researcher in Science and Security, King's College, London, United Kingdom*

Kristin Lord, *Associate Dean, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University, United States*

CHAIRS: Abdalla A. Alnajar, *Executive Director, Arab Science and Technology Foundation, United Arab Emirates*

Reno L. Harnish III, *Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, United States*

PRESENTERS: Kamel Ayadi, *President, World Federation of Engineering Organizations, Tunisia*



John Boright, *Executive Director, International Affairs, United States National Academy of Sciences, United States*

Cathleen A. Campbell, *President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Civilian Research and Development Foundation, United States*

Ali A. Mufuruki, *Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Infotech Investment Group, Ltd., Tanzania*

3) Arts and Culture Leaders Seminar: Arts and the Public Sphere

How can artistic and cultural communities contribute to improving understanding and relations between the United States and the Muslim world?

CHAIRS: Salman Ahmad, *Musician, Junoon; United Nations Goodwill Ambassador, Pakistan*

Benjamin Chavis, *President and Chief Executive Officer, Hip Hop Summit Action Network, United States*

CONVENERS: Shamil Idriss, *Acting Director, Alliance of Civilizations, United Nations, United States*

Cynthia P. Schneider, *Distinguished Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy, Georgetown University; Nonresident Senior Fellow, the Brookings Institution, United States*

PRESENTERS: Hany Abu Assad, *Film Director, Paradise Now, Palestine*

Robert Pinsky, *former Poet Laureate; Professor, Boston University United States*

4) Media Leaders Seminar: The Media Effect *Developed in partnership with the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University*

Can the media be “fair and balanced” in reporting on Mideast conflicts?

CONVENER: Marvin Kalb, *Senior Fellow, Shorenstein Center for the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University, United States*

PRESENTERS: Mohamed Elmenshawy, *Editor-in-Chief, Taqrir Washington, Egypt*

David Ignatius, *Associate Editor and Foreign Correspondent, The Washington Post, United States*

Carol R. Saivetz, *Research Associate, Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, Harvard University, United States*

Zafar Siddiqui, *Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, CNBC Arabiya, United Arab Emirates*

15:45

Coffee and Pastries Break

17:00

Leaders Seminars continued

18:30

Plenary Session Four*

How Do We Make Iraq Work?

MODERATOR: Michael O’Hanlon, *Senior Fellow, the Brookings Institution, United States*

PRESENTERS: Jalal al-Din al Sagheer, *Imam, Al-Hadarah Al-Kazamiyah Mosque; Member of Parliament, Iraq*

Rajiv Chandrasekaran, *Assistant Managing Editor, The Washington Post, United States*

Program of Events (CONTINUED)

Ashraf Jehangir Qazi, *United Nations Special Representative for Iraq, Pakistan*

Mark Kimmit, *Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of Defense, United States*

Chris Kojm, *Senior Advisor, Iraq Study Group; Senior Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, United States*

David M. Satterfield, *Senior Advisor to the Secretary and Coordinator for Iraq, Office of the Secretary of State, United States*

20:30 Social Dinner and Arts and Culture Initiative Performance*

Monday, February 19, 2007

9:00 Plenary Session Five*

Injustice Within: Holding Up a Mirror to Our Own Societies

MODERATOR: Jihad B. Khazen, *Director, Al-Hayat Newspaper Ltd., United Kingdom*

SPEAKERS: Ismael Ahmed, *Executive Director, Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services, United States*

Riad Al Assaad, *Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, South for Construction, Lebanon*

Mukhtar Bibi, *Community Activist, Pakistan*

Rola Dashti, *Chairwoman, Kuwait Economic Society, Kuwait*

10:30 Coffee and Pastries Break

11:00 Task Forces: Session Three

Security Task Force

- **The Aftermath of the Lebanon War: What are the lessons to be learned? Has Hezbollah become a new model in the Middle East? What happens next?**

PRESENTERS: Philip Gordon, *Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, the Brookings Institution, United States*

Rami Khouri, *Editor-at-Large, Daily Star; Director, Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs, American University in Beirut, Lebanon*

Governance, Religion and Politics Task Force

- **Where should the lines be drawn? What rights and responsibilities should be accorded to religious minorities? What happens when religious mores and public decision making collide on social issues? Is there room for compulsion in religion?**

PRESENTERS: Al Sadig Rahman al-Mahdi, *Former Prime Minister ; President, Umma Party,, Sudan*

Bob Roberts, Jr. *Founder and Senior Pastor, NorthWood Church, United States*

COMMENTATOR: Jillian Schwedler, *Assistant Professor, Government and Politics, University of Maryland; Chair, Board of Directors, Middle East Research and Information Project, United States*



The Next Generation Task Force

- What conceptual framework should local and international actors embrace to effect positive change for the next generation? What are the key factors for success?

PRESENTERS: J. Scott Carpenter, *Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, United States Department of State, United States*

Stephen Heintz, *President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, United States*

Randa Jamal, *Programme Analyst, Regional Bureau of Arab States, United Nations Development Programme, United States*

12:30 Concluding Luncheon and Plenary Session Six *

Where Do We Go from Here?

MODERATOR: Carlos Pascual, *Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies, the Brookings Institution, United States*

SPEAKERS: Abdullah Abdullah, *Former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Afghanistan*

David Ignatius, *Foreign Correspondent, The Washington Post, United States*

Rami Khouri, *Editor-at-Large, Daily Star; Director, Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs, American University in Beirut, Lebanon*

Al Sadig Rahman al-Mahdi, *Former Prime Minister; President, Umma Party, Sudan*

CONCLUDING STATEMENT:

Stephen R. Grand, *Director, Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States*

16:30 Outreach to Youth

Youth and the Future of U.S.-Islamic World Relations

Video Conference with Students at Yale University, American University, University of Jordan, and University of Qatar

MODERATOR:

Aaron Lobel, *Chairman and President, American Abroad Media, United States*

SPEAKERS:

Reza Aslan, *Author, No God But God, United States*

Bahman Farmanara, *Film Director, Iran*



In these times we have an obligation to find new ways to empower and spread the center of moderation and forgiveness that we are living here today.

Martin Indyk

Director of the Saban Center at the Brookings Institution



GOOD EVENING LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

On the behalf of the organizers, and on the behalf of our partners in the Foreign Ministry of Qatar under the leadership of the Assistant Foreign Minister Mr. Al Rumaihi, I would like to welcome you to the 2007 U.S.-Islamic World Forum. Through the vision of His Highness Sheikh Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Emir of the State of Qatar, and thanks to his generosity and his constant support, we were able to gather together a great group of leaders from around the Muslim world – from Africa, Asia, Europe and the Middle East – in order to meet and open a dialogue with leaders from the United States. This year we have made a special effort to diversify the participation by inviting leaders from the sciences, the arts, and the business world, among others. I would like to thank you all for making the effort of joining us tonight here in Doha.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are meeting in times of great danger and complexity, where the divide between the United States and the Muslim World seems to be deeper, and where sectarian violence is mounting. We have all witnessed the massacres in Iraq and Lebanon, the civilian suffering in Gaza, and the genocide in Darfur. Sometimes we feel that the doors of hell have opened in front of our eyes. And when we raise our eyes to the horizon, instead of seeing a future of peace and harmony, we see the possibility of civil wars and a nuclear arms race. For that reason, our discussion today can not be more pressing. I am not saying that the issues we will discuss in the upcoming days are going to impact the decision-making in Iran, the United States or elsewhere, but we seem to be in a time where everything seems to be deteriorating. In these times we have an obligation to find new ways to empower and spread the center of moderation and forgiveness that we, participants, are living here today. The only way to achieve this goal is to confront what separates and alienates us. The main theme of the 2007 U.S.-Islamic World Forum this year is “Confronting What Divides Us.” We believe that open discussions about our differences will lead us to focus more on our shared humanity, which will guide us to a vision of peace, serenity and mutual respect. This is the aim of the Doha Forum: building bridges between different communities, listening to each other, and respecting our differences.

Four years ago we battled against the current that threatened to become a tsunami, nurtured by anger and bloodshed. In such a hostile environment, keeping the doors of discussion open between the United States and the Muslim world has been extremely hard. But since the beginning of this Forum we have been able to strengthen scientific and youth programs. We also started an arts and culture initiative that we hope will lead to programs that will not only consist of the leaders present here today, but include thousands of Americans and Muslims across the world. In the next few months we will consolidate our efforts by opening a Brookings center in Doha with the collaboration of the Qatari Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His Highness the Emir was the first to raise this idea a few years ago. January 1st, 2007, was the date where an agreement was signed about this issue. We appointed Mr. Hady Amr as the Director of the Brookings Doha Center. This collaboration between one of the oldest and most influential think tanks in the



United States, and the Muslim State of Qatar, will undeniably lead to the consolidation of relations between the United States and the Muslim world through mutual visits of researchers and scientists. They will conduct studies about what is facing the Muslim world, and will contribute to the debate about public policy and all of the issues related to this country, and to the Gulf in general. By supporting the work of the Doha Forum we hope and expect that the Brookings Doha Center will play a leading role, and have a sustainable impact in the region.

There is one man that we should thank for implementing the vision of His Highness the Emir, and he is the keynote speaker tonight: His Highness Sheik Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al-Thani, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar. He has served as Foreign Minister for his country since 1992, and for fifteen years now he has been taking the responsibility of strengthening, empowering and protecting not only the interests of his country, but also the interests of the Muslim and Arab worlds. At the same time, he served as a member of the Supreme Defense Council, the Constitution Committee, the Ruling Family Council, the Supreme Council for the Investment of the Reserves of the State as well as the Committee for the Support of Al Quds. And honestly I do not know how he can manage all of these responsibilities while keeping a smile on his face, as well as an acute vision and a sense of focus. And all the Americans that have had the chance of working with him – and I consider myself one of them – found him to be a real friend of the United States, and a sincere representative of the Arab and Muslim worlds.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome His Highness Sheik Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al-Thani.





If monopoly of power is unacceptable at the domestic level, it is even more important that policies based on power monopoly should come to an end in the international arena.

H.E. Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al Thani
*First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of
 Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar*



WELCOME TO DOHA ALL OF YOU. IT IS A PLEASURE TO OPEN the workings of this forum in our country for the fourth time. And it seems to me from the items on the agenda that there is a tendency to discuss the various issues that hamper efforts to build bridges between the United States and the Muslim world in various fields. In this context I would like to recall with you that last year when discussions generally focused on the varied visualizations of what would become of the Middle East in five years, I presented my vision on the persistence of the drawbacks and failures in the foreseeable future. I said then that these drawbacks and failures might become worse unless effective and sincere actions were taken in line with what we have been calling for to cure the ailments that the region has been suffering from. You all know that during the past year, we witnessed an escalation in the intensity of the crises that the region suffered from, along with the emergence of new conflicts that have aggravated an already explosive situation.

On our part, we have on several occasions referred to the wide scale criticism directed at the theory of the conflict between civilizations. We have rejected the theory, and presented our argument against its logic of considering the Islamic civilization the most dangerous threat to the heart of modern civilization, as represented by the West. Without going into the theoretical and academic details, I would like to say that this theory represents a specific political trend and that the choice of all of us should be a “dialogue between civilizations” so as to isolate every theoretical or material inclination to provoke a conflict between the peoples on this platform by separating them along illusory lines of civilization.

We think that the international community has finally reached an understanding on the basics of peaceful coexistence – a condition that gives answers to the problems facing the nations and societies of the world. Such understanding is based on dialogue and cooperation in service of the common best interests of all parties. Here, I would like to point out that I opted in my speech in front of you last year to pose the question of the actions required to consolidate relations between the United States and the Muslim world. I presented some of the policies that might help in bringing about an atmosphere of mutual understanding through open dialogue and continuous consultation. I don’t find any harm in referring to these points with other points that may come up as developments evolve. Despite the fact that we have different analyses and diagnoses of the ailments, it is of vital importance that we focus on some of the following relevant points:

1. To sincerely be committed to the provisions of the UN Charter, international law, the International Declaration of Human Rights and the other human rights conventions, foremost of which are the conventions catering to political, cultural, religious, social and economic rights. In other words, we should give due respect to the value of plurality and mutual respect in international relations. In this way the supremacy of law, rather than the supremacy of power, would prevail.
2. Regarding the relations between the United States and the Muslim world, we have to accept the realities that constitute the basis for public opinion



in the Muslim world. Thus we have to pay optimum attention to settling the Palestinian cause and other conflicts in the Middle East. Here is where the major challenge lies. The Palestinian cause has been, and remains, the main source of unrest and distrust between the concerned parties, and eventually between the two worlds to which they belong. In addition, there is the conflict in Iraq that threatens the Arab and Muslim worlds with the most dangerous consequences.

3. We have to pay more attention to awareness programs aiming to familiarize our societies with each other, promote mutual respect and appreciation of the peculiarities of each party, and disseminate a culture of positive coexistence. This is the special responsibility of political and public opinion leaders for enhancing understanding between cultures and the mutual respect of religious and culture beliefs.
4. It is essential to start implementing political reform and democracy-building policies with due consideration to the peculiarities of various societies. Individuals should be given the chance to participate in the management of their affairs, in accordance with the provisions of the law and through the constitutional and legal channels and establishments, in order to dispel the deep feelings of marginalization and injustice that prevail in various societies in the Muslim world.
5. Political development alone is not going to be useful unless it is accompanied by sincere economic development programs. Poverty and joblessness, which have worsened to a great extent, are a major source of feelings of frustration and injustice and, as such, they lead to violence. No doubt the realization of the desired objectives of development largely depends on the availability of material resources along with the intellectual capacity to guide these resources to achieve the best interests of all members of society without discrimination.
6. Giving considerable care to working out educational programs in the technical and general senses so that they target the desired diversity that is acceptable to society and promoting knowledge needed for advancement. Herein lies the importance of not neglecting world issues connected with humankind's common destiny.
7. Giving care to issues of youth, who really represent the future. Within this context, we should be concerned with implementing of policies that promote the creation of job opportunities and empower youth politically, economically and socially. Indeed, this would ensure the reduction of tensions that fuel conflict and violence.
8. Laying out practical and effective plans to propagate and promote an objective and accountable media. Within this context, media leaders may formulate a voluntary and binding code of conduct.
9. We should all be aware that in the contemporary world there is a complex set of phenomena which make it lack balance. The widening gap between the powerful and the weak, the rich and the poor, the educated and the

ignorant, needs to be bridged because otherwise it could lead to desperation and frustration as well as to mutual suspicions and incitement of conflict and violence.

10. Building bridges between societies and the promotion of dialogue and understanding help create the political will that ensures resolution of conflicts and disputes through negotiations.
11. Poverty eradication is critical, because if poverty persists it will cause desperation, a feeling of injustice and alienation, sentiments that will definitely lead to extremism and violence when they are associated with political grievances.
12. To redress terrorism with policies that the underlying causes behind their perpetration. The means of addressing terrorism are not necessarily military. In this respect, focus should be laid on “The World Strategy for Combating Terrorism” launched by the United Nations on September 19, 2006.

While speaking of the means that ensure averting conflict of civilizations, it is important to recall the report of the High-Level Committee on the Dialogue of Civilizations submitted on November 13, 2006 and unofficially discussed at the General Assembly Session on December 18, 2006. The above report contained a set of political analyses and significant diagnoses where numerous proposals were introduced that deserve study and consideration together with the policies needed to implement them.

In conclusion, I would like to highlight an extremely important point. We all call for reform, democratization and development at the domestic level in the Muslim world. We should also acknowledge the importance of this call at the international relations level, where special care should be given to international organizations and propagation of the democratic spirit within them through adherence, in good faith, to the commitments pledged by all. This is our only path for striking a balance between conflicting interests. If monopoly of power is unacceptable at the internal level, it is even more important that policies based on power monopoly should come to an end in the international arena and also the associated policies of double standards, lack of transparency, selfishness and use of force. We need to understand one another, respect our divergent viewpoints and actively work to settle our disputes through patience, tolerance and recourse to peaceful means on the basis of mutual convictions. Indeed, the destiny of humankind is the same on this planet and it is imperative that we coexist in the interests of all sides.

We also need to acknowledge that serious implementation of the above means and others in the same direction require solidarity among members of the international community in order to shoulder burdens. Countries and societies are not unilaterally capable of doing this.

Thank you.





Extremism and violence occupies front page news of the world. By doing so, the international media have fallen prey to the plotting of international terrorists... and thus widen the misrepresentation and misconception between the West and the Muslim world.

H.E. Syed Hamid Bin Syed Jaafar Albar

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia



EXCELLENCIES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, ASSALAMUALAIKUM warahmatullahi wabarakatuh and good evening.

At the outset, I wish to express my appreciation to the organizers of the U.S.-Islamic World Forum – the Saban Center for Middle East Policy and the Brookings Institution – for inviting me once again to participate in this forum, and to speak on the topic of “The Conflicts that Divide Us: Can We Find Productive Ways Forward?” My response to this question is simply, yes. However, we must address the causes of the divide, and not merely look at the symptom. We must also look critically at ourselves during the process.

Before I move on, let me talk about the conflicts that are well known to us. These include the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the Arab-Israeli conflict, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and many others. In all these conflicts, directly or indirectly, perceived or otherwise, we see the presence of the United States. We could say that that this is inevitable, as the United States is the sole superpower today. On the other hand, these conflicts mostly affect Muslims, and Muslim countries throughout the world. This situation has become more apparent since the end of the Cold War and after September 11. How do Muslims treat these issues? Secondly, there is a common feeling among Muslims that they have been unfairly and unjustly treated. It is for these reasons that I strongly believe that in dealing with these conflicts, the way forward understanding the root causes that have led to such schisms between the United States and the Muslim world. Let me be very clear however, that this is not intended to justify acts of terror or violence against fellow human beings. But it will, in my view, contribute a lot towards finding the best way to resolve these conflicts.

Some of the issues that I think need to be dealt with are as follows:

History. The holy wars of the past on the grounds of religion, ethnicity or territorial ambitions, has affected the way we look at each other. There is inherent resentment, suspicion and distrust that underscore our relationship. The task before us is to build bridges of trust, understanding, goodwill and respect toward one another, even to the extent of changing the mindset.

Culture. The cultural aspect in our interactions is equally important. Attitudes and feelings of cultural superiority have directly affected the way the United States deals with the Muslim world, especially during and after colonization. Relations were conducted on uneven grounds, with lack of respect toward, and understanding of, each other's cultures and values. Due to this, we are bound for a collision course. Again, understanding and appreciating the diverse cultures that make up the human race will enable us to live together with tolerance and in harmony.

Education. We have to admit that our educational system does not provide the opportunity to understand one another's cultures, traditions and values. We tend to arrive at conclusions based on superficial knowledge and ignorance. This breeds prejudice and bias, which can easily ignite xenophobia and violence. Conflicts and confrontations always begin because of this. In my view, the fault lies on the content of our curriculum, be it in the madrassah or secular school systems.



Environment. The environment we live in today is very chaotic and full of uncertainties. We must be able to manage it well in order to avoid facing open conflicts which cause sufferings and pains to the innocent. It is not difficult to begin a war, but it is definitely difficult to end one.

Politics and Economy. Behind all the issues I have just mentioned, it is politics that will dictate the move towards peace, security and prosperity. Whether we say it or not, there is always that political element that naturally divides us in the national and international spheres.

Media. The media, wittingly or unwittingly, bears a certain amount of responsibility for the current state of affairs between the United States and the Muslim world. With an eye for profits and ratings, the sensational becomes presented as the whole truth. Extremism and violence occupies front page news of the world. By doing so, the international media has fallen prey to the plotting of international terrorists who orchestrate their cruelty in order to capture the attention of the widest possible audience, and thus widen misrepresentation and misconception between the West and the Muslim world. This must be addressed through responsible reporting by the media.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen. While we speak clearly of our objective to overcome the conflicts that divide the United States and the Muslim world, our acts tends to demonstrate the contrary. We must be resolute in acknowledging that the conflicts between the two sides could easily be cast away through dialogue and interactions. We must learn to accept diversity and differences as a source of strength. We must not expect assimilation, but rather integration, in our society. We need to do all of this in order as to nurture respect and goodwill and allow for the triumph of tolerance and harmony. In this regard, we have to provide answers with openness and sincerity.

I wish to also highlight that we have done a lot of talking on how to bridge the divide between the United States and the Muslim world, as well as on the so-called “clash of civilizations.” But how much has it really narrowed the gap of understanding? As such, we must identify practical measures, and not continue to dwell on mere concepts, no matter how beautiful they may sound. We must take steps to translate those concepts into concrete and practical plans of action.

Thank you.





The Arab world is stirred up by movement, and looking for development and modernization, but to the same extent is also looking to obtain mutual respect, and this is what cannot be achieved by hegemony and pressure.

Amre Moussa

Secretary General of the League of Arab States

I AM DELIGHTED TO PARTICIPATE TODAY IN THE U.S.-ISLAMIC World Forum hosted by Doha, this Arab capital which has become a key regional and international center for dialogue between different cultures. I would also like to thank Deputy Prime Minister Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim bin Jabr Al Thani and our friends from the Brookings Institution for inviting me to this forum.

The subject of this forum, “Relations between the U.S. and the Islamic World,” is an issue that has become one of the main problems affecting international relations in the first decade of the 21st century. Moreover, the question of where this relationship is headed is likely to remain with us for years to come. Will it be towards further decline or can it still be saved? In any case, in an emergency situation, you need an S.O.S.

As for the forum and its title, they raise some questions. Why wasn't the title “The West and Islam” or “The U.S. and Other Civilizations”? The answer would generally be that the United States has been the hegemonic power in the international order since the end of the Cold War, and it alone earned resounding victory against the Soviet Union, and thus became obliged – some perhaps would say divinely – to form a new international order. Corroborating this, a number of this superpower's thinkers believe that the victory over communism and collapse of the Soviet regime represented the “end of history,” with the capitalist, democratic system thus proving its unequivocal superiority. Thus it is in the interest of other societies around the world to follow it as the best system, until the end of life on earth. They argue that U.S. foreign policy should work to protect, consolidate, and expand this order, and that the American system or the American creed – according to the definition of these scholars, led by the neo-conservatives – is the final order. Hence the evolution and change which is the norm of the universe had come to an end, based on the superiority of the best system, and the dominance of the society representing it, raising its banner over all other societies.

The components of this superiority are wealth, power, and thought, which would all be classified as positive, except that the means of carrying out this foreign policy has deviated towards the path of threats, intimidation, punishment, and the use of force, rather than towards the path of attraction and coexistence. Hence the great upheaval in American politics took place, and the well-known reaction in opposition to its foreign policy.

However, some American conservative thinkers still believe that the forces which can oppose this American plan come from other civilizations that keep rising and falling, and that the American civilization must avoid this fall. Or at the very least, the rise and fall which has happened to other empires should be averted as long as possible.

But what are these other forces which these thinkers view as hostile? Essentially, the way things have worked out so far at least, they are Islam and the Muslim world, according to what Huntington focused on before 9/11, in accordance with the policy which became clearer after 9/11. Thus we have reached a point where the Muslim world is the defendant, the target, and the enemy. Thus, this is the logic behind the title “The U.S. and the Islamic World”.



Since 2001 affairs have been managed by battles and wars and conflicts, at times called the “Clash of Civilizations,” at other times called the “War on Terror,” and on occasion labeled the “struggle between moderates and extremists.” It could be that some of this is present because of policies followed and their developments, but for these wars to be the slogan of an entire era and the basis of an international order, requires analysis.

In my view, the transition from the Cold War where the other party was the Soviet Union, to a “Clash of Civilizations,” where the other party is the Muslim world, is questionable, in that there are a great many conservative thinkers who hold the view that the American era and American superiority require continuous fights, and consequently need the Other as an enemy, so that the sequence will be obvious to those with a conservative disposition – the enemy, mobilization, battle, and victory. Here the dream is achieved – the dream of the “end of history.” A question arises, though: if there are those who imagine that Islam and the Muslim world can be defeated as was the Soviet Union which in any case is a grand illusion for a number of reasons is this possible? I say no. But let us imagine for the sake of argument that it happened. Would it stop here, or would the extremist conservatives’ gears set in motion to find the next enemy....whose turn would it be, taking into consideration that the disposition ruling the extremist conservative imagination is built on the necessity of finding an enemy? So who would this new enemy be? Is the conservative ideology’s mechanism like a leviathan or a raging elephant seeking a new war after the end of the war on Islam? When would the time come for the War on Buddhism or Judaism?

Also, do they think that it will work every time? I personally don’t think that it will, and we all see what has happened and is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan, the rising tension across the Middle East, and the total rejection of the policies of bias and double standards – these all become weapons you find in the arsenal of the ongoing war against Islam and Muslims.

I propose that we try to flip the title and say “Relations between the Islamic World and the U.S.,” and here I say that the Muslim world does not hate the United States, nor does it necessarily consider it an enemy that must be fought, except for perhaps a tiny extremist minority. The position of the vast majority in the Arab and Muslim worlds is to not hate, but rather to disagree with several aspects of U.S. foreign policy. They completely and fundamentally disagree in a way that cannot be addressed, or its consequences dealt with, except by the United States reexamining its foreign policy and reappraising its pros and cons, not only for security, but as a position that needs to be taken seriously.

So how can we, as citizens of Arab and I can also say Muslim countries, accept cooperation with policies biased towards Israel whether it does right or wrong concerning the Palestine question, the issue of the Israeli occupation of Arab lands, or the question of Israeli nuclear weapons? How can we coexist with these policies or help them succeed? We are not saying that amending or rectifying U.S. foreign policy would necessarily mean a stance against Israel and moving from one extreme to the other, but change is needed for America to be a fair broker with



reassuring policies that can be listened to. It is needed for the return of credibility to American policy in the region, to calm the tense atmosphere which prevails over relations between the United States and the Arab and Muslim worlds.

Then what is going on in Iraq? The gates of hell opened after the invasion of Iraq in 2003, and now Iraq is torn apart, living in a despair that is closer to hell than to anything else. It is important for everyone to find a way out to save Iraq and save all those involved and being harmed, and we Arabs are and will be at the top of the list of those being harmed, even if we are not involved.

Concerning Iraq, we see President Bush trying to find an honorable exit, and we are not against that but the problem in Iraq is not only with the presence of foreign troops, a foreign presence which will leave sooner or later. Rather, the real problem which the policies of the past years left behind is the genie which is out of the bottle and is driving wedges between Sunni and Shia, Arab and Kurd, and Muslim and Christian, whether in Iraq today or elsewhere tomorrow. Everyone must be aware of these wedges and the base desire behind them. Here we ask: will Iraq's troubles end if quiet is achieved in Baghdad? The issue is much deeper than that and requires a different look at Iraq and the future of Iraq, and needs a completely new policy addressing the real reasons lying behind what is happening, and which prevent the founding of a new, stable Iraq at peace with itself, before it is at peace with others.

Allow me now to move to the nuclear question in the region, since as Arab societies we do not understand that there is a military nuclear problem no one talks about and that even pushes for the acceptance of its existence. Meanwhile, there is another, smaller program, perhaps different, about which everyone is in an uproar. These double standards generate unrest when dealing with the nuclear issue in the region, and will lead to different types of arms races in the foreseeable future, and then to a widened dispute between the Arab world and the United States.

U.S. foreign policy, after it had been calling for democratic reforms in the Arab and Muslim worlds, quickly retreated for obvious reasons, which deprived its policy of further credibility and raised questions about the permanence of its policies, and the reality of its intentions.

These policies have clouded over the Arab-American relationship, and with it the Muslim-American relationship, which makes this forum's title an important one based on justifications and reasons that truly need goal-oriented discussions: specifically, how can U.S. policy convert the Arab and Muslim worlds into friends instead of pushing them into being enemies? They also need to be frank and honest in identifying those parties which seek, or have an interest in, consolidating hostility towards Arabs and Muslims and vice versa, and what the goal behind policies such as these are. Is it the protection of Israel? That which can protect Israel in the present and future is the creation of a just, balanced peace, not the politics of force or attempts at hegemony which will never bring the Arab world to its knees. The Arab world is stirred up by movement and looking for development and modernization, but to the same extent it is also looking to obtain mutual respect, and this is what cannot be achieved by hegemony and pressure to





force others to act against their beliefs and adopt that which is not in their strategic interest either in the short or long term.

Once again, I do not think that it is in the interest of the Arab world to be at odds with the United States, just as it is not in the United States' interests to be on hostile terms with the Arab and Muslim worlds, which comprise a huge portion of humanity and represent rich diversity in terms of ethnicities, religions, and sects, and are sources of energy and centers for profitable investment, bustling trade, and positive human interaction.

Ladies and gentlemen, this does not mean that we are blaming the Arab world's tardiness in achieving development, security, and stability on foreigners – we know how many mistakes we have made in setting our priorities, and how late we have been in catching up with the world, with science, and with the language of our age. We know that the time has come for us to join the 21st century as contributors, not as followers or executors of policies planned by others to achieve strategic interests without a regional consensus or understanding. And so, we end up with the imposition of stances that in and of themselves will create reactions of resistance that will remain with us throughout the entire Middle East for years, and maybe decades, to come.

Here I call for the United States to reassess its foreign policy from the starting point that the peoples of the region are looking for its friendship, as long as the United States also wants friendship, which once again requires a balanced foreign policy and being a fair broker. Also, it means that American policy grasps the reasons for the frustration and anger in the region and work to avoid them, and here it will find a different atmosphere and an outstretched hand, so that the title can become: "The U.S. and the Islamic World: Partners in Building a New World Where the Children of All Civilizations and Creeds are Partners in Constructing an Ideology of Peace, Justice, Coexistence, and Building Stability and Prosperity". This is if we are serious in our aspirations about "facing the conflicts that divide us," as the program of this plenary session says, and it is not just conference after conference in which we talk about relations between the United States and the Muslim world without taking a serious step towards this goal. Finally, I wish this forum the best of luck, and hope that it is not just a repetition of previous conferences, and does objectively address relations between the United States and the Muslim world such that the common interests of both sides are preserved, and their relationship can be a constructive one.





America cannot win over the world, especially the Muslim world, with its advanced weapons, smart bombs, enormous fleets, or aircraft carriers. But it can win over the world with the law of love, and the law of justice.

Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi
Head of the European Council for Fatwa and Research



IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE COMPASSIONATE, THE MERCIFUL, and praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds, and may peace and blessings be on Muhammad, Seal of the Prophets, and on the rest of his brother prophets and messengers, and those who follow them doing good deeds until the Day of Resurrection. I wish you well, brothers, may peace be upon you, the mercy of God, and His blessings.

I would like to start by thanking Brother Indyk for introducing me. Firstly, I almost excused myself from this meeting, and when the invitation came to me from Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim, God protect him, I at first declined. I had participated in the first two conferences, in which I attended the opening session with His Highness the Emir and gave the opening speech. I followed the third conference, but was not invited to it, and I noticed that – as my brother and friend Amre Moussa observed – these conferences repeat themselves without progressing forward. The relations between America and the Muslim world have not improved, but rather have worsened. So what is the point of meeting if we accomplish nothing except for passing the time?

But the brothers said “Come and say your speech...if you want to be critical, say so.” I said it is my duty.

So I decided to take part in this conference and wrote a speech – this is unusual for me, since I always give improvised speeches. But I have found trouble in conferences like these that are in English. We are in Qatar and our conference is in English, and the brothers are the ones running the conference and there is supposed to be genuine participation in choosing people and subjects and whatnot.

In this conference I find that my speeches do not make sense for those who do not know Arabic, because I tend to speak quickly and cite texts, which are hard to translate, and so I have often noticed that non-Arabs do not understand me well, so I deemed it wise to write out the speech in order to force myself to read somewhat deliberately.

Firstly, I would like to say that we on this earth are the children of one planet under one God, and he does not differentiate between East and West or between America and the Muslim world. God Almighty said “Unto God belong the East and the West, and wherever you turn, there is God’s countenance” (2:115). We are all part of God’s kingdom, whether we are Easterners or Westerners, and we are all children of Adam. The Qur’an says “O children of Adam...” (7:26), and the Prophet (peace be upon him) says “O mankind, your Lord is one and your father is one, you are all from Adam, and Adam is from dust, there is no preference for Arab over non-Arab or white over black, except through piety.”

The theory of racial superiority which some Westerners believed in at some periods, that some peoples were created to lead and rule while other peoples were created to be led and ruled, this theory is null and void in Islam. People are all equal – “O mankind! We have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that you may know one another. The noblest of you, in the sight of God, is the best in conduct” (49:13). We are all from male and female, children of Adam and Eve in origin, and we are all from a man and a woman. And



“we have made you nations and tribes that you may know one another” as well, meaning to understand and know each other. This is what Islam brought, so why do we struggle and fight each other?

What are the factors which make us fight over what should bring us together more than it separates us? Is the difference in civilizations the cause? I do not think so. Civilizations can differ without it leading to conflict. Civilizations can have interaction instead of conflict, civilizations can interact and come together with each other, exchanging ideas and not fighting each other. Unless a particular civilization wants to impose itself on the world, ignoring the specific characteristics of the others...here conflict happens. But when there is not that, civilizations interact and coexist together.

There, brothers, are that which truly leads to conflict, five factors that we see clearly in front of us: ignorance, oppression, greed, hatred, and superiority. These are the five factors.

What does ignorance mean? That we are ignorant of one another, such as people demonizing Islam or imagining that Muslims are vicious beasts, and that the Qur'an calls for violence and hatred. As one of the Danes said a few days ago, “Muslims should tear out half the Qur'an,” because it is a book calling for violence and hatred. I swear, he did not read the Qur'an or understand a thing in it. The Qur'an does not call for violence but rather calls for peace. “Enter into peace one and all” (2:208).

When Muhammad (peace be upon him) reconciled with the Quraysh polytheists, known as the Treaty of Hudaibiyyah, a chapter of the Qur'an was revealed, called al-Fath, “Surely we have given to you a clear victory” (48:1) with this treaty. The Companions said, “O Prophet of God, is this a victory?” They could not imagine a victory without a war, a triumph without a war, and he said “Yes, it is a victory.” When some of the battles, the Battle of the Trench and the Battle of the Tribes, ended without bloodshed or fighting, the Qur'an commented on that, saying “And God turned back the unbelievers in their rage; they did not gain any advantage” (33:25). The armies of the Quraysh were over, and when they came with 10,000 men to wipe out the Muslims on their own ground, God turned them away in failure. They had not gained any advantage or achieved their goals, and “God sufficed for the believers in the fighting” (33:25). Look at this intricacy: “God sufficed for the believers in the fighting.” If Islam had been bloodthirsty it would not have said that. When it says “God sufficed for the believers in the fighting”, we finished with no bloodshed and no battle.

This ignorance is one of the reasons for the conflict, and so dialogue and negotiations are necessary for those in mutual disagreement to understand one another. For us Muslims, dialogue is obligatory it is not an option. We are ordered to have dialogue because it is part of our calling, “Call unto the way of thy Lord with wisdom and fair exhortation, and reason with them in the best way” (16:125). Call upon those within your religion with wisdom and fair exhortation, which is affecting their hearts. As for those outside your religion, reason with them in the



best way, have dialogue with them in the best way if there is more than one way. This is a command, it is obligatory. We Muslims are commanded. And so ignorance is the first of the conflict's factors.

The next thing is oppression, a human oppressing a fellow human, the strong oppressing the weak, the oppression of those who possess weapons against those who do not. The story of Cain and Abel says: "If you will stretch forth your hand towards me to slay me, I am not one to stretch forth my hand towards you to slay you, for I fear God, the Lord of the worlds" (5:28). This was the answer of the good brother to his evil, criminal brother, and this did not stop him, Cain had no qualms about killing Abel. This story is still played out today, but on a wider scale...bloodshed by the thousands, it could be by the millions. A human's oppression of his brother human is one of the causes of conflict, and this question will not be solved except by a single slogan, which is justice, justice for all people. We Muslims have justice for all of God's servants. Nine verses of Surat al-Nisa' defend a Jew whom some Muslims wrongfully accused of theft, while he was innocent. The Prophet went to the trouble of pleading on behalf of those people, and our Lord forbade him: "And do not plead on behalf of those who act unfaithfully to their souls; surely God does not love him who is treacherous, sinful" (4:107). Ignorance and oppression are among the conflict's causes.

Greed is when some people covet the wealth of others – what raw materials they have; oil, minerals, economic, agricultural, and industrial wealth, they want to seize it without anyone challenging them; this is greed. Oil is a blessing from God for this region, but it is also one of the reasons for the strong's greed towards it, and fighting over it.

There is also hatred or malice, by which I mean the dark emotion or dark idea dwelling in some hearts and minds against others. Sometimes people hate those who differ from them. Whites hate blacks, the poor hate the rich, and subjects hate the ruler. The idea of hating the Other is completely criticized by Islam, even a religious man hating the other religions or followers of the other religions, or those without any religion. Islam does not accept this, even those who differ from you in religion: "Unto you your religion, and unto me my religion" (109:6). The religions can coexist together, but sometimes some people store up historical animosities. Take what the Westerners called the Crusades and Muslim historians called the Wars of the Franks, who came from Europe to fight the Muslims in their own land. These wars left their marks on many people up to the present. Some people feed off of these hatreds. Some of them might say that we are stirring up a crusade, and it was said by President Bush at first, and they said it was a slip of the tongue...but I don't want to go on about this.

The other factor is superiority – that you look at yourself, your race, and your nation as being on top and the others as being inferior, the theory of racial superiority, the theory of the chosen people. This theory of superiority is rejected. Humanity is equal and nobody needs to be superior. This theory is rejected, this theory which allowed for the eradication of some peoples. They





were eradicated and wiped out of existence, or almost so, because one race was superior to another. These are the factors that lead to the conflict between humanity's children, one family's children against each other.

As for the relationship between America and the Muslim world, I know of course, as you do, that America is not monolithic; it would not be fair if we accused the American people of all standing against Islam. But when we talk about America, we are talking about the ruling administration in America. What Amre Moussa said, the neo-conservatives or the extremist Zionist Christian right which sometimes claims to be acting on orders from heaven – my Lord commanded me to fight Afghanistan, my Lord commanded me to invade Iraq. As if it is a message sent down to them from above. Those are the ones who stand with them.

Do we have a desire to antagonize America? No. We do not like to antagonize anyone. We want to reach out to all people. America is actually the one who started the feud when its theorists nominated Islam as an enemy instead of the Soviet Union, the “Evil Empire” as Reagan called it. Islam is the surrogate enemy, the “Green Menace” after the fall of the “Red Menace” and the détente with the “Yellow Menace,” the Chinese threat. The “Green Menace,” that of Islam, remained.

Islam is not a threat, Islam is the mercy of the worlds, and Muslims are the preachers of mercy and brotherhood to the world. Muslims look at all the world as their brethren, as the Muslim poet said: “If my origin is from dust, then it is all my country, and all the world are my relatives.” The Qur’an says “God does not forbid you for those who did not war against you on account of religion and did not drive you out from your homes, that you should show them kindness and deal justly with them” [60:8]. Dealing justly with them, giving them their rights. Kindness means giving them more than their rights. Justice and doing good deeds, that’s what this is. God did not forbid us to deal with those who did not fight us on account of religion and did not drive us out from our homes. This is the view of Islam. Islam calls for peace. “Enter into peace one and all” (2:208), even those who have fought Muslims. “And if they incline to peace, incline thou also to it, and trust in God. He is the Hearer, the Knower” (8:61).

For us, in Islamic law, Americans are classified as People of the Book. We call them People of the Book, meaning people of a divine religion. People of the Torah and the Gospel have special treatment and special provisions in Islam. We are permitted to eat animals they have slaughtered and marry their women, especially the Christians, since the Qur’an considers Christians to be closer to Muslims than anyone else: “The nearest of them in affection to those who believe are those who say ‘We are Christians’” (5:82).

This is America, then. In the days of the Cold War, the Muslim world was with America because it considered America to be the camp of People of the Book, while the Russians were the atheist camp, because it is well-known that communism does not believe in God, the prophets, the afterlife, or anything else. It is similar to the days of the dawn of Islam, with the conflict between the



Persians and the Romans: “The Romans have been defeated, and they after their defeat will be victorious within several years” (30:2-4). Islam was for the victory of Rome because they were People of the Book.

So what I want to say is that it is America who is antagonizing us, it took Islam as a surrogate enemy, and accuses Islam of being the source of violence and terrorism, while it forbids our occupied peoples from resisting the occupiers. It does not want the Iraqi people to resist the American occupation, nor does it want the Palestinian people to resist the Israeli occupation. Whoever does this is accused of terrorism. Hamas and the Palestinian resistance factions are all accused of resisting the occupiers. Because I oppose the Palestinian occupation, I am categorized by our American brothers as a terrorist, as calling for terrorism. Does this make people love America? They are double standards. America, which forbids the resistance from defending its country, does not say a single word condemning Israel’s daily acts of slaughter, torture, displacement, starvation, destruction, and siege. It does not say a single honorable word. On the contrary, Israel runs amok in the region with all this violence, supported by American money, American weapons, and the American veto.

This is why people are against America. Amre Moussa said that Arab and the Muslim worlds do not hate America. I disagree. People hate wrongdoers. A wrongdoer is hated. If you do me wrong, I will hate you. People do not love the wrongdoers, and “God does not love the wrongdoers” (3:140). He who does me wrong and denies me my right to exist and takes a completely prejudiced stand with my enemy, so of course people hate him, and, unfortunately, America is winning more enemies than friends. We think that America supports democracy in the whole world, but if a democratic government elected by its people in free, fair elections comes along, like the Palestinian government, America stands against this government. It is America that supports most of the dictatorial regimes that oppress their people and survive through despotism. Even if they allege to be democratic, it is fraudulent, a democracy of 99.99%, this is what America does.

I swear, if America changed its stance, we would change our stance. We are not at odds with anyone forever. The Noble Qur’an says “It may be that God will bring about friendship between you and those whom you hold to be your enemies” (60:7). God gives amnesty, meaning the hostilities are not permanent. An enemy could become a friend of yours, changing his stance. We have only one enemy towards whom our stance never changes – Satan. “Satan is your enemy, so take him for an enemy” (35:6). Still, our stance can change. America cannot win over the world, especially the Muslim world, with its advanced weapons, smart bombs, enormous fleets, or aircraft carriers. It cannot win over the world with all this, but it can win over the world, especially the Arab and Muslim worlds, either with the law of love, loving people, or the law of justice. It can make justice for all, not justice for some and not others. It would not be biased towards one faction against another, nor one state against another. This is my opinion.

I conclude my speech with some advice that I hope Brother Indyk passes on to the decision makers in America. My advice is that America should give up the



idea of controlling the world by force. America tried to use force, and it has more power than the entire world. It tried using force, and it was unable to control the world. It has been unable so far to decide a battle in its favor, neither in Afghanistan nor in Iraq. So far America has been unable to control the world by force, and has lost billions, tens of billions, hundreds of billions, and with them has lost people's trust and goodwill. So my suggestion is that America spend these billions, or half or a quarter as much on the world's needs, the world's problems, especially those of the South, the poor, the Third World. America can stretch its hand out to them. If it had stretched its hand out to Iraq, it would have won Iraq over without a war. We have an Arab poet who says "Do good works for people to capture their hearts, for what captured the people was doing good works." With good works, with human interaction, you win over people's hearts.

This is what I advise America to do. Some realists or neo-realists might think this suggestion of mine is strange, but I am saying that there may come a day when America will wish it had taken this position. America will not stay on top of the world, God's laws reject that. A new power must emerge, in China, India, or elsewhere, to challenge America, and then America will wish it could go back to its old isolation, to the era of its great founders, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and others. America will wish it could go back to this era, the era of isolationism, not that of globalization and controlling the world. I think that if America thinks hard about this and interacts with the world on this basis, it can win over the world and have the world with it and cheering it on. But as for controlling the world with steel and fire, with overwhelming might, it is absolutely out of the question that people will respond favorably to it. This is my advice, and I hope that Brother Indyk will relay this to the decision makers.

I apologize, brothers, for having gone on for so long, but it was my duty to pass on my message as long as I have this platform, and I seek God's forgiveness. May peace be upon you, God's mercy, and His blessings.





A sensitive and sensible balance of freedom and public order, along with respect for human dignity and the rule of law, seem to help societies manage change, and change is one of the few constants in the modern world.

Philip D. Zelikow

Former Counsel, United States Department of State



I WAS ASKED TO ADDRESS THE OVERALL THEME OF “THE CONFLICTS that Divide Us,” and whether we can find a productive way forward. My answer is yes, we can find a productive way forward.

Because America is so singular and visible, the world focuses on American choices. As an American, this can be flattering. Americans like to think their country is very important, and so it is. So Americans half-expect this attention. They even half-welcome it, even though the commentary is usually critical and negative! But all this attention on American choices is misleading. The main story now is not about us. It is about you.

The main issue facing leaders of the Arab and Muslim worlds is to decide how their societies should adapt to the modern, globalized planet in which they live. In other words, what kind of country do you want your children to inherit?

The United States indeed played a central, leading role in shaping the modern, globalized world we all live in today. As that great twentieth-century struggle came to an end in 1990 and 1991, global forces accelerated to create the era of world politics we live in today, an era in which problems and conflicts tend to be transnational in character, defined less by borders and alliances and more by the fault lines running across societies.

Compared to what had gone before, the security challenges of this new era did not seem to be so serious, at least at first. Even though these challenges were smaller, the international system was too weak to handle them. So the United States had to step in, again and again. These are usually painful stories when one looks back on them, not because America did too much, but because American intervention came too late, or was ineffective. And it was always reluctant.

After 9/11, the United States changed. The country mobilized for a new kind of war. It began changing or rebuilding every major national security institution in the government – a process that is still underway. America led an international campaign to liberate and stabilize Afghanistan. That campaign continues today in partnership with the Afghan government. Around the world, the fight continues against an ultra-violent cult of Islamist extremists. And the United States led an invasion and occupation of Iraq.

Iraq. Looking back on it now, with the advantage of the information now available about the former Iraqi regime, it certainly seems that Saddam Hussein was on a path that was bound to come to a bad end. The questions were how, and when, and how high a price Iraqis, Americans, and other would have to pay when that end came.

For a generation to come, historians will debate the motives and causes for the decisions surrounding that invasion. I was not part of that administration. But I expect the historians will not end up finding much evidence of a deliberate strategic campaign to remake the Middle East. They are likely to find an exceptional confluence of historical circumstances that came together in a unique way, not the unfolding of a grand design or master plan for the Middle East.

Today, America and other leading countries do not have a blueprint for the international system that can manage the problems of this new era. They do not



even have the architectural drawings of such a system. Some think this is bad and that we should do more; others believe the role of governments and international institutions should remain limited. I believe we should build the capabilities needed to solve practical problems, and then see how these specific solutions accumulate and interact to produce a system that no one country will have designed.

In this stage of historical development, a few ideas should stand out.

1. Nations and peoples must decide whether they will finally reject the belief, rooted in a kind of social Darwinism, that international life is a struggle of all, a zero-sum game in which one's gain is always another's loss. Most of the twentieth century was a struggle to build, with some success, a globalized system in which most nations attained unprecedented prosperity and freedom.
2. A sensitive and sensible balance of freedom and public order, along with respect for human dignity and the rule of law, seem to help societies manage change, and change is one of the few constants in the modern world.
3. Globalization has not overwhelmed the nation state. States remain essential in at least two ways:
 - First, they provide most of the infrastructure and law enforcement that allows a globalized system to function; and
 - Second, they shape – and should be held accountable – for the way their own societies adapt to the global system.

You may know Tolstoy's famous line, in *Anna Karenina*, that "all happy families resemble one another, each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." For nations, I think the description can be reversed. In international life it seems more that each successful adaptation to the global system is successful in its own way; all failed states resemble one another.

So I say again that the key issue of conflict for the Arab and Muslim worlds does come back to how they will answer the questions of: What do you want for your people? How do you want your societies to adapt to the modern, globalized planet you inhabit today? Only Arabs and Muslims can finally answer these questions.

Many of you are very accustomed to an interdependent world and ready to accept interdependence. Your countries must then find your own workable, cooperative ways to adapt. You face choices about this every day. Yet some reject this reliance on the outside world. They reject the materialism that globalization seems to represent and beckon to older ideals of religion, sect, or nation. They insist on the self-sufficiency and independence so that the nation, however they define it, can fulfill its destiny without outside restraint.

It is not hard for calls like these to find an audience, especially if people feel that they are not likely to be able to find a sense of identity, or participation, or profit, in this modern, interdependent world. It is hard to predict the future. That is why I am so glad to be back at the university, teaching history. In my history classes, I know what will happen next.



But let me ask each of you to try a little experiment with me. Imagine that you are an investor with ten million dollars to invest. You have opportunities in four countries: Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan. You must pick one of them. You can buy an option that will tie up your money for ten years. Each of the options are connected to construction, so you will make a lot of money if the country is experiencing strong, wide economic growth ten years from now, in 2017.

That is the bet: Knowing what you know today, which of these countries – Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan – would you bet on for strong, general economic growth ten years from now? Think about the factors you would want to look at and think about in each of these countries.

You can see again why I'm glad to be a historian. But it is an interesting experiment. Reflect on the questions you would ask yourself in deciding about this investment. It may illustrate some choices leaders must face very soon.

Now let me apply some of these very broad ideas to some specific policy problems today. Let's start with Iraq. The leaders of Iraq now face decisions about how the Iraqi people will live and work together. The initiative for making those decisions now rests with them, not with the United States. I am not smart enough to predict with confidence what the Iraqi leaders will choose. What I can do is keep an eye on American interests. We have some vital interests in Iraq, interests that can command wide support:

1. Iraq should not become a base for global terror. It should not become another Afghanistan.
2. Iraq should remain independent. It should not collapse into being a proxy battlefield for regional rivalries.
3. The UN-mandated coalition should try to keep Iraq from sliding back into tyranny. The last one caused a generation of war. We should try to prevent another.

In this vital place, with so much uncertainty, America needs to step back, but not step out. We should act like a foreign government. We should not be a central player in their domestic politics.

But America needs a flexible, diversified, and decentralized presence. I think most Iraqi leaders will want our help for a long time to come. We should be willing to provide help, understanding that this is a country going through revolutionary change. Lasting improvements will take some time. We might be able to sustain a long-term commitment in Iraq if we are prepared to back, decisively back, people and policies that show promise. And our government should be prepared to step away from people and policies that are not likely to advance American interests or Iraqi renewal.

In the American political debate, the polemics on each side tend to leave the Iraqis out of the equation. Some argue we should escalate regardless of what the Iraqis do. Some argue that we should withdraw regardless of what the Iraqis do. Both positions seem to be more about people looking inward, than looking at how to protect enduring American interests in the future of Iraq.



I will comment only briefly on the Israeli-Palestinian question, since we will be having a full panel discussion just on that in a few minutes.

I have said before, and repeat now, that I think an active policy to address the Israeli-Palestinian dispute is an essential part of any American foreign policy for this region. Secretary Rice is working very hard on this problem. She is traveling to the region again right now. Her commitment to the peace process, and President Bush's commitment, is strong and it is sincere.

I was disappointed that, in the Mecca agreement, Palestinians found it so hard to recognize Israel's right to exist. Return to my point earlier about the fundamental choice: Do you adapt to interdependence, or reject it? Here there is truly interdependence. No Palestinian state can be viable unless it has some basic economic understanding with Israel. And you can't get much of an economic understanding with a state you are trying to destroy.

Finally, I want to speak briefly about Iran's choices. The recent discussion about Iran's support for people killing Americans in Iraq is a good illustration. Start with what we know. The latest official intelligence community view is as follows:

"The Qods Force – a special element of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard – is involved in providing lethal support to select groups of Shi'a militants in Iraq. Based on our understanding of the Iranian system and the history of IRGC operations, the IC [intelligence community] assesses that activity this extensive on the part of the Qods Force would not be conducted without approval from top leaders in Iran."

This is a rather restrained summary of the available evidence. The alternative hypothesis, of course, is that Iran's top leaders did not approve of such a large-scale Quds Force effort. Some of you know more about Iran than I do. You can judge which hypothesis you consider most likely.

But we have some other important evidence. The United States and Britain privately and publicly asked the Iranian government to explain this behavior in 2005. The communications were significant, and included a public statement from Prime Minister Blair himself. The diplomatic replies were dismissive. And the Iranian-supported violence actually escalated in 2006.

There are some ironies here:

1. Many in Iraq and in the region actually think the Iranians are doing much more than this. As some of you may have experienced personally, the American government has actually, and rightly, spent quite a bit of time trying to convince Arab leaders that their fears of Iranian mischief were exaggerated.
2. A further irony lies in the long delay before America began talking about this problem and acting on it. For many months American officials were torn between a desire to do something, and a wish to avoid confrontation. When a government is conflicted about what to do, the usual result is inaction. So the delay was precisely because Americans did not want a confrontation. But, over time, it became more and more obvious that Iran mistook American forbearance for American weakness.



3. The world, as usual, focuses on American debates and American choices. But by far the more interesting question is why the Iranian government and its various agents decided to engage in such risky actions in the first place, and stand by the actions – even escalate them – after hearing America's and Britain's concerns for more than a year.

One hypothesis is that at least part of the Iranian government actively seeks conflict, perhaps believing this will help their revolutionary agenda both at home and in the region.

If so, the United States will not be drawn so easily. U.S. forces will defend themselves in Iraq. There are, and should be, severe costs paid by those who come to kill our soldiers. But, from everything I know, the United States does not want a war with Iran.

Again the world is not trying to tell Iran what to do. It is really asking a question, a question that only Iranians can answer. What kind of nation are you trying to build? One that works with the modern, globalized world? Or a nation devoted to attacking it? President Ahmadijani proudly defies the world and says Iran does not need any help.

Iran's leaders can, of course, cite the examples of countries like North Korea. No country in the world has worked harder to be self-sufficient. But do the proud inheritors of a magnificent Persian civilization really want to have all the stature, all the prosperity, all the influence, and all the security that North Korea now enjoys today? If Iran will comply with the UN Security Council resolutions, all of its concerns can be discussed with every country of interest, including the United States. The cooperative path is there, if Iran wants it.

Right now Iran stands for, and with those, who want to reject and attack the globalized system of cooperation. Perhaps this will change. I hope so. For now, though, the best response is patient, unified determination. It is good to keep the Iranian challenge in perspective. This is, after all, a country that is deeply divided at home between different visions of the future. Its economy is struggling and is quite dependent on the outside world and outside investment just to retain its current performance. Iranian policies have won few, if any, real friends in the world, aside from Venezuela, Cuba and North Korea. This does not look like the wave of the future. My hope is that, if Iran can see and must face the real costs of its own policies, then, over time, the Iranian people will make good decisions about the future they want for their children.

You have been very patient with an ex-government official. I have discovered an amazing thing, though. With every week that I am out of the government, the problems get easier to solve.

Thank you.





The United States views improving relations with the Muslim world as a public relations issue. Muslims view it as a policy issue.

U.S. and Islamic World Opinion: How Do We See Each Other? What are Our Different Narratives?



THE FORUM OPENED WITH A SERIES OF PRESENTATIONS ON public opinion in the United States and Muslim World in order to get an assessment of U.S.-Muslim World relations and serve as a starting point for the rest of the Forum. Shibley Telhami related the findings of his work with Zogby International in polling six Arab countries: Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. His polls were intended to look at the changing dynamics of politics in the region, particularly as a result of the change in the media. One overwhelming trend Telhami noted was a widening gap between governments and their public on most of the core issues that they are facing today, including their attitudes toward Iran and the United States, and their attitudes toward what the priority threats are in the Arab world. By far the most important issue to the public was brokering Arab-Israeli peace based on the 1967 borders.

The results of the latest polls indicate an extremely negative view on the United States by much of the Arab world, yet also recorded a major drop-off in confidence in Bin Laden. In 2003, at least 60% of the polled population in each country reported confidence, whereas in the recent polls there was not a majority in any country polled. The polls also indicate a drop-off in public support for the United States. Of the people polled, 77% believe that the United States has ploys for bases in Iraq and that the United States would not leave if asked, along with a staggering 65% that said they do not believe democracy was a U.S. objective in the Middle East. The vast majority of those polled believed oil was the primary objective of the United States in the region. The greater part of the population polled believed the Iraq war created more terrorists, along with a sweeping majority who said there was less peace in the region compared to under the reign of Saddam Hussein. A majority in each of the countries surveyed believed that the United States posed the second biggest threat to them, with Israel in first place. George W. Bush was listed as the most disliked politician, ahead of Tony Blair and former Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon. Only 1% of those polled said they admired Bush. The most admired politician, at 18%, was former French President Jacques Chirac. 39% of the people polled said that they sympathized with al-Qaeda because it opposed the United States.

Dalia Mogahed presented polls conducted by The Gallup Organization in both the United States and a variety of Muslim and Arab countries, carried out from the fall of 2005 to the end of 2006. When asked what Western societies can do to improve relations with the Muslim world, a significantly larger number of those polled in the United States responded “I don’t know,” than those in the Muslim world. Of those polled in the Muslim world, 27% replied that Western societies need to demonstrate more respect for Islam and stop degrading Muslims in order to improve relations, while 18% said that Western societies need to focus on economic development and reform in Muslim nations. In contrast, 11% said that Western societies need to stop interfering in the internal affairs of Muslim states.

CHAIR

SHIBLEY TELHAMI

Anwar Sadat Chair, University of Maryland; Nonresident Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States

OPENING SPEAKERS

STEVEN KULL

Director, Program on International Policy Attitudes, United States

DALIA MOGAHED

Executive Director, Center for Muslim Studies, The Gallup Organization, United States

KHALIL SHIKAKI

Director, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, Palestine



A small percentage of Muslims and Americans polled both agreed with the statement that Muslim societies need to reduce extremism. A minority of Americans polled said that the solution is for Muslim societies to accept the United States' way of doing things. A considerable percentage of Americans thought improved communications are necessary, and another 12% said that Muslim societies and Western societies need to better understand each others' beliefs. By contrast, only 15% of the Muslim world polled said that Muslim societies need to demonstrate more flexible attitudes toward the West and respect the other's positive thinking, while only 12% said Muslim societies need to establish and promote relations based on mutual respect with the West. Mogahed noted that these polls indicate the fundamental differences in the way the conflict is viewed. Whereas Americans see the problem as one of public relations, Muslims see the divide as an issue of policy and respect.

Steven Kull reported his findings from a recent joint survey of American and Iranian public opinion. His report revealed a surprising amount of common ground between the polled populations, despite the negative perception of the United States by many Iranians. In all Muslim countries polled, a majority said that the U.S. military presence in the Middle East is doing more damage than repair, and viewed the United States as having a primarily negative influence in the world. A major focus of the polls was Iran's nuclear program. Nine out of ten Iranians polled said that it is important for Iran to have a full-fuel-cycle nuclear program, and dismissed the possibility of incentives provided by the United States to forego the program. A majority of Americans said that Iran is trying to develop nuclear weapons. However, an overwhelming majority of Americans said that the United States should deal with Iran diplomatically and attempt to build better relations, rather than through military force. In response to Iranian claims that the program is intended purely for nuclear energy, 55% of Americans polled said that they are open to the idea of accepting Iran enriching uranium, so long as it stays below the amounts needed for arming a nuclear weapon, and that UN inspectors be allowed to examine the nuclear facilities.

There is some common ground in the situation in Iraq, as significant percentages of Americans and Iraqis polled agreed that U.S. military presence in Iraq is creating more conflict than it prevents, and a majority of both Americans and Iraqis want the United States to commit to a withdrawal timeline. A variety of questions reveal that Americans support local hegemony in the region. 75% of Americans polled said that the United States should commit to withdrawing within a year if the Iraqi government or Iraqi people want them to do so, as well as 59% of Americans who said that the United States should remove its military presence from the Middle East if a majority of people in Middle East support it, according to a Chicago Council poll.

Khalil Shikaki's presentation focused on public opinion in Israel and the Palestinian territories. His findings challenged some of the common conceptions of each side's views on peace. Shikaki's polls focused on the opinions of the Palestinian refugees living in three areas: Jordan, Lebanon, and the West Bank and Gaza.



The questions were focused on the future of the refugees, in terms of representation, living situations, and other key issues. Shikaki's polling focused on three issues: the right to return itself, where people would go once they had the right, and how they would behave under different conditions and circumstances of return and residency. A significant majority of the refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, almost two-thirds, said they want to remain where they are, though almost one quarter said they would come to a Palestinian state, even without a solution. One question that was posed exclusively to the refugees living in camps in the West Bank and Gaza had to do with their condition of living. A solution was proposed that the camps would be significantly renovated, but without removing the refugees from the camps. This was met with approval; a significant percentage was in support of this, indicating that the refugees are considerably unhappy with their situation even beyond the refugee issue.





We Muslims find a total, 100% divorce between American values and American policies, when it comes to the Palestinian issue.

The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict as a Microcosm of the Conflicts that Divide Us



SHIBLEY TELHAMI, ANWAR SADAT CHAIR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF Maryland and Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, moderated this discussion and opened by providing a context by citing the desire of majorities on all sides of the conflict for a peaceful solution. Philip Zelikow followed Telhami's introduction with an examination of U.S. efforts to bring about such a solution. He emphasized the importance that is placed on the Israeli-Palestinian issue—both by the Bush administration and worldwide. He countered the common belief that the issue gets short-changed by citing the efforts of this and previous administrations, instead suggesting that the failure has really been the inability to effect substantive policy changes. Zelikow observed that one reason so much time is devoted to the Israeli-Palestinian question is that the United States recognizes that numerous other issues in the region are strongly affected by the Palestinian-Israeli question, from the situation in Lebanon to U.S. policy in Iraq. Zelikow also stated that it is impossible to look at the Middle East generally without devoting a significant amount of time to the Palestinian-Israeli question.

Next, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States Amre Moussa offered a critique of U.S. policy on the Palestinian conflict. Moving forward, Moussa suggested the Arab states must be more closely involved in the peace process to achieve a lasting solution. As the next important step, Moussa called for an international conference under the supervision of the United Nations, and with the participation of all member states, headed by the United States. He also pointed to the importance of an impartial interlocutor that will mediate and have similar demands from both Israelis and Palestinians. The Secretary-General then criticized the inefficiency of past summits, and asked for a real commitment from all involved parties to revive the peace process by including a timeline, as well as specific and realistic demands from each party. He added that the Quartet, Jordan, and Egypt will have to help build the capacity of those who support peace in Palestine. He gave the example of President Abu Mazen, whom he described as a responsible partner who lacked the capacity and support to translate his thoughts and vision into action. He also added that the United States should work hand-in-hand with Israel, since the political will of Ehud Olmert must be supported by a strong ally who can help make tough decisions.

Martin Indyk briefly assessed the United States' recent and historic involvement in this issue. Though he applauded the Secretary of State's recent diplomatic effort, he characterized the Bush administration's larger role as episodic. Indyk noted further that U.S. diplomacy is most effective when working with a strategic context. Though the context that democracy would bring peace has largely failed, a new possibility is emerging in the threat, shared by Israel and the Sunni Arab states, of increasing regional instability and growing Iranian influence. Indyk stated that he did not believe that the United States could effectively impose a solution on the Israeli and Palestinian people. Despite the desire for this in much of the Arab world, he said such a stance would only provoke distrust where the opposite is needed. Instead, he suggested that the United States can be most ef-

MODERATOR

SHIBLEY TELHAMI

Professor, University of Maryland; Nonresident Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States

PANELISTS

MARTIN INDYK

Director, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States

AMRE MOUSSA

Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Egypt

ASAD-ABDUL RAHMAN

Member, Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Palestine

PHILIP D. ZELIKOW

White Burkett Miller Professor of History, University of Virginia; Former Counsel, Department of State, United States



fective when working with Israel to make her feel confident about an agreement, as it had in the Israel-Jordan Treaty of Peace and the Oslo Accords. Moving forward, Indyk affirmed the need for the United States, Israel, and Arab states to help bolster Abu Mazen as a capable partner. He concluded by supporting Moussa's call for an international conference, at the right time.

His Excellency Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim bin Jabr Al Thani followed by discussing some of the changes in international relations of the past six years, noting that the Arab states must shoulder some of the blame for the intransigency of the region's problems. He highlighted the need for the Arab states to better recognize where their interests meet and be more effective in those areas. However, he cautioned that Arabs should avoid using the Palestinian issue as a panacea to erase any differences among these states. His Excellency stated that while he understands America's strategic partnership with Israel, he feels the United States should use this relationship to encourage Israel to be more accepting of a peaceful solution. The need for such a solution, he said, should be felt not only by the Palestinians, but the Israelis as well because they currently rely heavily on U.S. support, which could one day erode. Finally, he reiterated support for an international conference, which in his vision seemed an ideal for the United Nations.

Asad-Abdul Rahman, a member of the Executive Committee of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, spoke at length about the experiences of the Palestinian people as a result of the Palestinian-Israeli situation. He applauded the reestablishment of a consensus government in the recent Mecca Agreement and urged the United States and Israel to show patience with Hamas. He made the point that Hamas's views appear quite moderate if compared to some of the Israeli parties that constitute its coalition government. He tried to explain the militancy of segments of the Palestinian community as a result of the humiliation they've suffered over the past half-century. Rahman went on to address the nature of the relationship between Palestinians and the United States. He observed that while Palestinians admire American values, they find a fundamental disconnect between these values and American policies toward the Palestinian issue. Rahman concluded by returning to the theme of what America's role should be in assisting a final solution. He restated that the people on both sides of the conflict want peace, but the Americans need to put pressure on both parties for a solution.

In the following discussion with the audience, the focus was primarily on the dissatisfaction that the Bush administration policies have caused. In particular, concerns were raised that the United States has been allied with Israel at the expense of the Palestinians in the peace talks in the last few decades. The question was asked whether U.S. isolation of Hamas after its electoral victory undermines the sincerity of its democracy promotion program. Philip Zelikow countered by claiming that the United States can reasonably support the democratic process that brought Hamas to power, and still hold that government accountable for its stances.





It is the belief of the Muslim leadership in India that never has it become more important to seek the middle path than now...to become more, not less plural; more, not less tolerant.



Perspectives from Asia



MUSLIMS FROM ISLAM'S HISTORIC CORE, THE MIDDLE EAST, constitute just one-fifth of all Muslims worldwide, while Muslims from Asia make up more than half. Yet discussions concerning "the Islamic world" all too often focus exclusively on the Middle East. This session brought to the fore the different experiences and perspectives of Muslims from South and Southeast Asia on such issues as combating radicalism, reconciling Islam and modernity, and political and economic reform. Chaired by Mohamad Jawhar Hassan, a panel composed of Komaruddin Hidayat, Habib Rehman and Bruce Riedel assembled to offer their insights on these subjects. The panel also served as a prelude to a Brookings-planned regional forum in Kuala Lumpur, slated for October 2008.

Komaruddin Hidayat began the plenary with a discussion about Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim nation and a pluralistic democracy comprised of a diverse array of religious and ethnic groups. He emphasized dialogue as the most effective way to solve the current societal problems facing Indonesia, and described the many fora for interfaith dialogue present in Indonesia, undertaken by political parties, universities, NGOs, as well as a variety of interfaith fora. Citing several verses from the Qur'an and explaining that Islam means submitting to God voluntarily, he suggested that a pluralistic society is in fact ordained by God in order to encourage understanding and cooperation between communities. As such, Islam is inherently predisposed to democracy and pluralism, and to force one's religion upon another is contradictory to Islamic principles.

He stressed that the problems facing Indonesia are not problems related to Islam, but rather economic and political injustices stemming from the dictatorial rule of President Suharto. While some may address such injustices through religious radicalism during Indonesia's continuing transition into a fully-fledged democracy, Hidayat emphasized political and economic marginalization as the root causes of such grievances. He also touched on the misunderstandings and misperceptions of many Indonesians concerning the United States. Alluding to the current crises in the Middle East, he explained that many Indonesians do not see an America that supports freedom and democracy, but instead see an America that is waging war against Muslim nations. It is this misunderstanding that must be addressed by both sides.

Habib Rehman sought to highlight the experience of Muslims in India in order to draw any lessons they may hold for Muslims elsewhere in the world. He began with a sobering view of the economic status of Muslims today, who together make up 22% of the world's population but less than 5% of the world's GDP. He stressed that economic deprivation and poverty is the root cause of all violence and discord, but warned that the entire world is currently not in a condition to sustain the levels of consumption seen in the developed nations. As such, global economic reform is necessary to prevent further conflict between the rich and poor nations.

Rehman discussed how Islam spread throughout India through a process of assimilation and adaptation, resulting in a flowering of culture and civilization. It is through this tradition of religious accommodation and assimilation that India's

MODERATOR

MOHAMMED JAWHAR HASSAN
Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer, Institute of Strategic and
International Studies, Malaysia

SPEAKERS

KOMARUDDIN HIDAYAT
President, Syarif Hidayatullah
State Islamic University,
Indonesia

HABIB REHMAN
Executive Director, ITC
India, Inc., India

BRUCE RIEDEL
Senior Fellow, Saban Center
for Middle East Policy at the
Brookings Institution, United
States



constitution provides equal rights to all citizens regardless of religion, and grants Muslims special consideration in areas including family law, divorce, waqf and inheritance. India was highlighted as a wonderful example of the way in which Islam and modernization are capable of co-existing in a secular and pluralistic society.

Bruce Riedel offered an American perspective on the United States' relationship with South Asia over the last 25 years. After reviewing the fitful attempts by the United States as to where to include South Asia in its institutional structures, Riedel suggested that this organizational ambivalence is symptomatic of a more general inability to craft a coherent policy toward the region. Focusing on Afghanistan and Pakistan, he lamented that Afghanistan has once again become the "forgotten war" and compared today's situation with America's involvement in Afghanistan during the Cold War in the 1980s. As a result, Afghanistan is more dangerous than ever – the Taliban is again on the rise, attacks have tripled between 2005 and 2006, and the tactical use of suicide bombing has been imported from Iraq. Riedel declared that the United States must make a long-term commitment to the revival of Afghanistan. The United States is finally beginning to realize the cost of inattention, with President Bush recently pledging over \$11 billion to assist the Karzai government, though it may be too little, too late.

Riedel also warned that Pakistan is the central battlefield in the struggle against al-Qaeda, and that the "Pakistanization" of al-Qaeda has disastrous consequences for the entire world. Although Musharaff has become a staunch ally of the United States in the War on Terror, Riedel explained that Pakistan still practices "selective counter-terrorism," pursuing al-Qaeda while tolerating the Taliban and actively supporting other militant groups. This is a result of the Kashmir conflict, which is intimately tied to the fate of Musharraf and the Pakistani Army. Riedel stressed that now is the time for the United States to concentrate on resolving the Kashmir issue through quiet, preventive diplomacy.

The plenary concluded with a question-and-answer session. The issue of Pakistan's military rule was discussed, and participants agreed that the United States must do more to support democracy in Pakistan, and encourage the Pakistani military to cease supporting terrorist groups in Kashmir and the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. It was noted, however, that both India and Pakistan have made significant progress with regards to resolving the Kashmir crisis, and that the time is ripe to capitalize on this period of mutual goodwill. The experience of Indian Muslims was also discussed further, and it was suggested that there must be reform within the Muslim educational system and madrassas, so as to better synthesize with the modern world. The plenary ended with Mohamed Jawhar Hassan announcing that the Brookings Institution's Saban Center hopes to continue this fruitful dialogue with the Asian Muslim world through a regional forum in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.





Time is running out for the U.S. and for Iraqis. The President is going in one direction; Congress in another. The consequences for this lack of consensus are dire.

How Do We Make Iraq Work?



SIX YEARS AFTER THE UNITED STATES-LED INVASION OF IRAQ, the war continues. Iraq has long been the most visible and pressing point of contention in the relationship between the United States and the Muslim world, with many of the actions and policies of the U.S. government remaining hugely unpopular amongst Muslims across the globe. The Bush administration's policies in Iraq, the idea of a "Sunni-Shi'a divide," security, and the issue of multilateral engagement were all major topics of discussion in debating how to make Iraq work.

Ambassador Satterfield began his remarks by defending the administration's new policies in Iraq. He admitted that earlier policies and actions proved unsuccessful, and that the administration was working to correct earlier mistakes and prevent new ones. However he placed most of the blame for the violence in Iraq on al-Qaeda, Iran and Syria for fomenting insurgency and sectarianism, saying "the issue is not between Shi'a and Sunni, but between those who want to advance their agenda by peaceful means, and those who want to do it by violence." He warned of both al-Qaeda's desire to seize Iraq and establish a radical Islamic caliphate, and the increasing involvement of Iran in Iraq's affairs.

Satterfield also placed some of the blame on the Iraqis themselves, and expressed frustration at the Iraqi government's inability or unwillingness to bring an end to sectarian violence and commit to peaceful reconciliation. "Ultimately Iraqis are responsible for their own country," he said, and "no security measures by the U.S. or Iraqis will succeed until a national government pursues a national reconciliation agenda." Satterfield also touched on the issue of American public opinion, and warned that public support for the war in Iraq will continue to erode if more American troops continue to die, and if Iraqis prove themselves unwilling and unable to stem the violence and begin rebuilding their country.

Sheikh Jalal al-Din al-Sagheer followed Satterfield. Al-Sagheer rejected claims that the widespread violence in Iraq is caused by a widening divide between Shi'a and Sunni Muslims, instead putting the blame on self-interested Iraqi politicians. "There are many areas where Sunni and Shi'a live together with no problems," he said, "but there is a problem between the leaders in the region who create violence." He also placed some of the blame on neighboring Arab states, who he said inflamed the situation by providing weapons, and the Arab news network *Al Jazeera*, claiming that the network uses sensationalism to promote their agenda.

Al-Sagheer criticized the American position in Iraq, saying that the United States needs to shoulder its responsibility. Sagheer then discussed the need for a unified Iraqi nationalism from both Sunni and Shia politicians in order to combat sectarianism. He also noted that Iraqi security affairs need to be more fundamentally Iraqi, observing that Iraqi citizens would be more attuned to the security situations.

General Kimmitt also emphasized the role of Iraqis in the security plan, and went on to defend the Iraqi army. Kimmitt also stressed the transient nature of the security plan, saying that the most useful measure of progress would be political growth, rather than decreased terrorist acts or diminished levels of violence.

MODERATOR

MICHAEL O'HANLON
Senior Fellow, The Brookings
Institution, United States

PRESENTERS

JALAL AL-DIN AL-SAGHEER
Imam, Al Hadarah Al Kazamiyah
Mosque; Member of Parliament,
Iraq

DAVID SATTERFIELD

Senior Advisor to the Secretary
and Coordinator for Iraq, Office
of the Secretary of State,
United States

RESPONDENTS

RAJIV CHANDRASEKARAN
Assistant Managing Editor, The
Washington Post, United States

MARK KIMMITT

Deputy Assistant Secretary of
Defense for Near Eastern and
South Asian Affairs, Department
of Defense, United States

CHRIS KOJM

Senior Advisor, Iraq Study
Group, United States

ASHRAF JEHANGIR QAZI

United Nations Special
Representative for Iraq, Pakistan



In the same vein, Kimmitt observed that attempts to regulate security would be wasted if they failed to aid the government's actions in matters such as national reconciliation.

Rajiv Chandrasekaran of *The Washington Post*, opened with a brief discussion of the disconnect between American intentions in Iraq and the realities on the ground. He criticized the new Baghdad security plan, declaring that the Iraqi government needed to seriously consider the growing impact of sectarian identities. He went on to speculate about the implementation of the new Baghdad plan, and questioned whether it was actually being enforced on Moqtada al-Sadr's organization, or merely mopping up the fringes. Beyond his suspicions about the plan's application, Chandrasekaran remained skeptical about the plan itself, worrying that the situation was too far advanced for the plan to have any real effect. Similarly, he was concerned that domestic politics could soon constrain President Bush's actions, sacrificing more meaningful long term progress for immediate, but superficial, improvements.

Finally, Chris Kojm presented a review of the major recommendations laid out in the Iraq Study Group report released on December 6, 2006. He focused on the need for a large-scale, multilateral diplomatic offensive led by the United States, and including all of Iraq's neighbors. He emphasized that the United States should engage constructively with states like Iran and Syria, both of whom have an interest in avoiding chaos in Iraq, and also have the influence to contain or prevent such violence. He recommended that Iran stem the flow of arms and training to Iraq, respect Iraq's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and use its influence over Iraqi Shia groups to encourage national reconciliation. He also said that Syria should control its border with Iraq to stem the flow of funding, insurgents, and terrorists in and out of Iraq. In addition, Kojm asserted that there should be a renewed commitment and push to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that involves constructive dialogue not only with the Israelis and Palestinians, but with neighboring states like Lebanon and Syria.

Ambassador Qazi followed Mr. Kojm and stated that the Government of Iraq could not bring about progress without the active cooperation of the regional and international community. Yet he also emphasized that fostering national reconciliation and building effective national institutions must be an Iraqi-led and Iraqi-owned process. He warned that reliance on the use of force alone could not bring about stability. Qazi noted that re-establishing security requires political progress, and called for the Government to accord the highest priority to bringing about genuine political reconciliation among Iraqis. He emphasized that strengthening human rights and the rule of law is necessary to create solid foundations for development and reconstruction efforts, and gave a brief presentation of UN initiatives to that end.

A number of issues were raised in the question and answer session that followed the discussion. The topics ranged from the findings of the Iraq Study Group to the security plan and its realization, as well as questions about Moqtada al-Sadr. Hassan Ibrahim, of *al-Jazeera*, asked if it would be possible to achieve politi-

cal reconciliation with the varied factions while ignoring significant parts of the Sunni community in Iraq. Satterfield suggested in response that it would be more useful for the station to focus less on provocations and more on a democratic Iraq in the future.

Marvin Kalb concluded the session by articulating one of the main themes to run through the questions and comments: recent American elections and public opinion polls have made it clear that the American people want a withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq in the coming year. Kalb asked, what can be done in the face of this popular impatience? Satterfield responded by saying that Americans want to see a promising plan for withdrawal more than a speedy withdrawal.









Democracy in the Middle East depends immensely on the participation of women in the political sphere.



Injustice Within: Holding Up a Mirror to Our Own Societies



IN RECENT YEARS, THE MOUNTING CONFLICTS WITHIN THE Muslim worlds have turned the spotlight on the crucial issue of injustice within Muslim societies. In communities that are often multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic, and multi-sectarian, there exist distressingly large examples of inequality between community groups. This plenary session gave participants the opportunity to debate such challenging and uncomfortable domestic issues. A debate over the role of the Arab-American community after the 9/11th attacks was the first topic to be addressed by the participants. Women's right in the Muslim world was another central theme in the discussion, and many participants gave recommendations on ways to empower women within their societies, such as creating a strong network of women activists, and redefining women's rights through a modern reinterpretation of Quran. Another important issue was political reform, and the question of minority representation in heterogeneous communities.

Ismael Ahmed began the session by exploring the status of Arab-Americans in the United States after September 11, 2001. Human rights have been a growing concern in the United States amongst the Arab and Muslim communities, given the record numbers of discrimination cases reported against these target communities. He reminded the audience that the origins of the Arab-American community date back to 1511, with the first wave of slaves coming from North Africa. Members of this community suffered severe discrimination since, as slaves, they did not have the right to become regular citizens or possess any property. During the Nixon Administration, Arab-Americans were subject to scrutiny stemming from, in part, a highly negative representation in the media, and were believed by many to be the "evil within". After the events of September 11th and the adoption of the Patriot Act, the situation became more complicated since all Arabs – Muslims and non-Muslims alike – were now considered potential threats to America and its interests. However, the Arab-American community in the United States remains vibrant and active in the local and national levels of American society. Ahmed noted that the 9/11 attacks made the community more aware of the role it should be playing as an element of reconciliation and understanding between East and West.

Next, Rola Dashti discussed the issue of minority rights, but from another perspective. She noted that religion has been used as an excuse by extremists and fundamentalists to limit women activists in the Muslim world. The struggle for gender equality and women's rights has been perceived as a threat to Muslim customs and traditions. Women activists are also often accused of being unpatriotic and anti-family, since they are trying to establish what are perceived to be non-Muslim, Western traditions. She stressed that political rights for women are not only part and parcel of basic human rights, but also the most effective way to spread democracy. Muslim governments' positions about this ideological difference tend to be more favorable to the arguments of religious extremists. By winning the right to vote in 2005, women in Kuwait won a large victory against radicals who cannot see women in the role of a development partner, but only in the more traditional role of a housewife and a child bearer. Dashti stated that

MODERATOR

JIHAD B. KHAZEN

Director, *Al-Hayat* Newspaper Ltd., United Kingdom

SPEAKERS

ISMAEL AHMED

Executive Director, Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services, Detroit, United States

RIAD AL ASSAAD

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, South for Construction, Lebanon

MUKHTAR BIBI

Community Activist, Pakistan

ROLA DASHTI

Chairwoman, Kuwait Economic Society, Kuwait



religion is used by radicals to control women who are treated merely as sex objects. The battle between women activists and religious fanatics is a daily struggle to change erroneous conceptions about women and their role in society. Her final remark was that religion has been wrongfully forced into politics, and warned that in the case of an Islamist rise to power, women will have no hope in playing any political role whatsoever in the near future.

Riad Al Assaad addressed the issue of equal political participation and representation in multi-ethnic, multi-sectarian states. He gave an overview of the history of Lebanon, as well as the history of its myriad constitutions (Lebanon has known three constitutions, the first being drafted in 1926). After independence in 1943, Muslims and Christians understood the importance of coexistence, but unfortunately Muslims were still looking for protection from Arab countries and Christians were still looking for protection from France. Al Assaad stressed that Lebanon should be built to embrace *all* communities and sects, based on the principles of freedom, welfare, prosperity, and more importantly, a common national identity. Following the devastating and decade-long civil war, the Taif Accord of 1989 came as an agreement between the three main religious sects in Lebanon – the Sunni, the Shi'a and the Maronites. The accord regulated the relationship with Syria, and gave each community a role in the building of the new society. He regretted that the accord was not implemented due to internal conflicts within each community, and added that after the year 2000, constitutional structures were not reformed. The leadership in Lebanon failed to restructure itself on three major occasions – first, when Israel withdrew from southern Lebanon in 2000; second, after the Paris Accord in 2001; and lastly, after the assassination in 2005 of former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri.

The audience was asked to mull over two important questions: 1.) Where to begin reform, knowing that both the regime and the politicians are resistant to change? And 2.) Can the Lebanese people agree on the creation of a liberal state without interference from external actors? The participant declared that Lebanon will face great challenges in the upcoming three months, when presidential and parliamentary elections are scheduled to take place. The panel concluded by recommending the reorganization of the educational system, and the creation of an electoral system that guarantees equal representation to all communities and religious groups.

Lastly, Mukhtar Bibi shared a success story of how she decided in 2002 to open a school for girls in Pakistan. In the beginning, it was very difficult to convince people to send their daughters to school. Starting with only two students, Bibi had great difficulties financing the school and was obliged to sell her private property to ensure continued operations. Eventually her efforts paid off, and the school received funding from different sources which allowed it to remain open and fully operational. Today, the school teaches 350 female students, and another school was recently opened to receive 250 male students. Due to the vast success of these schools, she is working to open a third educational facility.

Task Force A - Security

CONVENER

PETER W. SINGER
Senior Fellow and
Director, 21st Century
Defense Initiative, the
Brookings Institution,
United States

PRESENTERS

MOBASHAR JAWED (MJ)
AKBAR
Editor in Chief, The Asian
Age, Pakistan

JALAL AL-DIN AL-
SAGHEER
Imam, Al-Hadarah Al-
Kazamiyah Mosque;
Member of Parliament,
Iraq

DAVID BELT
Assistant Professor,
National Security
Strategy, National
Defense University,
United States

PHILIP GORDON
Senior Fellow for U.S.
Foreign Policy, the
Brookings Institution,
United States

RAMI KHOURI
Editor-at-Large, Daily
Star; Director, Issam Fares
Institute for Public Policy
and International Affairs,
American University in
Beirut, Lebanon

MARK LYNCH
Associate Professor,
Williams College,
United States

KENNETH POLLACK
Senior Fellow and Director
of Research, the Saban
Center for Middle East
Policy at the Brookings
Institution, United States

PARTICIPANTS

RIAD AL ASSAAD
Lebanon

MUEAN AL JABIRY
Iraq

SYED HAMID BIN SYED
JAAFAR ALBAR
Malaysia

SAMAR AL-GAMAL
Egypt

HAMID ANSARI
India

ROBERT AYAN
United States

YOUSEF BIN ALAWI BIN
ABDULLA
Oman

RASHID BIN MUBARAK AL
GHILANI
Oman

MARSHALL M. BOUTON
United States

RONALD BRUDER
United States

CATHLEEN A. CAMPBELL
United States

CENGIZ CANDAR
Turkey

RAJIV CHANDRASEKARAN
United States

ABDELKRIM DAHMEN
Algeria

JERRILYNN DODDS
United States

MOHAMED ELMENSHAWY
Egypt

ROKHSANA FIAZ
United Kingdom

VARTAN GREGORIAN
United States

FADI HADDADIN
Jordan

REHANA HAKIM
Pakistan

ALI HAMADE
Lebanon

RENO L. HARNISH III
United States

HAMEED HAROON
Pakistan

MOHAMED JAWHAR
HASSAN
Malaysia

HISHAM A. HELLYER
United Kingdom

SAMIR HOSNY
Sudan

DAVID IGNATIUS
United States

MARTIN INDYK
United States

DAVID KEENE
United States

LEYLA KHAIAT
Tunisia

LYDIA KHALIL
United States

JIHAD B. KHAZEN
United Kingdom

SAMER KHOURY
Greece

MARK T. KIMMITT
United States

CHRIS KOJM
United States

ALEX KRONEMER
United States

STEVEN KULL
United States

F. STEPHEN LARRABEE
United States

AARON LOBEL
United States

KRISTIN LORD
United States

MONA MAKRAM-EBEID
Egypt

SHAHID MALIK
United Kingdom

IKHWANUL KIRAM
MASHURI
Indonesia

DALIA MOGAHED
United States

AMRE MOUSSA
Egypt

MEHBOOBA MUFTI
India

ALI A. MUFURUKI
Tanzania

Task Force A (continued)

ABDUL KARIM AL-MUHAMMADAWI
Iraq

BRUCE RIEDEL
United States

ELINA NOOR
Malaysia

EDWARD M. ROGERS, JR.
United States

GROVER NORQUIST
United States

CAROL R. SAIVETZ
United States

SAMAH NORQUIST
United States

DAVID M. SATTERFIELD
United States

MICHAEL NOZIK
United States

KUANSHBEK SAZANOV
Kazakhstan

MICHAEL O'HANLON
United States

GAMAL SHAHIN
Egypt

CORY ONDREJKA
United States

ZAFAR SIDDIQI
United Arab Emirates

CARLOS PASCUAL
United States

MICHAEL YAFFE
United States

TODD G. PATKIN
United States

MOHAMMED YAHYA
United States

ASHRAF JEHANGIR QAZI
Pakistan

AHMED SAMIR YOUNIS
United States

HEATHER RAFFO
United States

ARFA SYEDA ZEHRA
Pakistan

HABIB REHMAN
India

PHILIP D. ZELIKOW
United States



IN RECENT YEARS, THE SPREAD OF GLOBALIZATION HAS HAD A profound impact on traditional notions of the concept of security. As the War on Terror increasingly cuts across cultural, linguistic and religious boundaries, and as technology has vastly democratized the way people worldwide produce and consume the news, how we label and describe present-day conflicts has become just as critical as the conflicts themselves. Similarly, the crises in Iraq, Lebanon, and Israel-Palestine are dictated in part by sectarian and cultural divides, as well as the involvement of external states like the United States and Iran. Yet the rise of powerful non-state actors such as al-Qaeda and Hezbollah, funded and strengthened at the grassroots level, have infused a new and unprecedented dynamic into traditional security concerns.

Session 1

The first session focused on the narratives and terminologies that we use to understand and describe today's conflicts. The ensuing discussion highlighted the challenges in describing conflict and conflict actors. Participants from the Muslim world agreed that many American expressions don't resonate well in the Muslim world and even lend legitimacy to those who use terrorism and kill innocent people. *Jihadist*, for example, is one commonly used by American leaders, yet is a designation that terrorists take pride in. One participant said, "A terrorist would never say that he is engaged in *haraba*, or just waging war." The existing vocabulary often links religion with extremism and terrorism, implicitly giving religion a negative connotation.

It became clear that Muslim sentiments run high on this association, because Muslims see terrorism or fundamentalism as phenomena independent of Islam, or any other religion. Yet, one expert pointed out that the language we use is rooted in realities on the ground, and that even if we talked about it the right way and used exactly the right terms, the substantive issues still remain to be resolved. Policy and actions matter more than words, even more so, as one participant pointed out, when there is a gap between the language used and policy outcomes. This theme ran through all three of the task force sessions. At the very least, "terminology exposes hidden agendas," one participant stated.

Session 2

The second session focused on the current situation in Iraq, the future of an American presence in the country, and the consequences of a U.S. withdrawal. A consensus emerged from the discussion and debate that the United States is both part of the problem and yet must also be part of the solution. One leader stated, "The realities on the ground demand that the U.S. must stay in the short term," expressing a consensus and fear among those present that an immediate withdrawal would cause civil war. At the same time, however, no one wants to be occupied indefinitely. It was asserted that the United



States should start to hand over more responsibilities to the Iraqi government and trust it to do its job. There was widespread agreement that the United States must overcome a palpable legitimacy deficit that undermined any of its efforts, vis-à-vis the Iraqi people, the Middle East, the Muslim world, and even some of its traditional allies, particularly in Europe.

There was also an intense concern about the ongoing violence in Iraq, much of it sectarian in nature. Participants discussed what the impact of a civil war would be on Iraq and on Iraq's neighbors. One expert pointed out that "we can see all dimensions of civil war in their initial stages in Iraq," and noted that it would be very hard to contain such a conflict. Indeed, many feared that a civil war would likely spread to Iraq's neighbors and emphasized both the need to take measures to limit its spread and to begin to pay attention to building refugee flows.

Session 3

The final session of the Security Task Force focused on the Lebanon conflict and its implications for the broader Middle East. The session also addressed to what extent Hezbollah is starting to serve as a role model for other non-state actors in the region. In the ensuing debate, three broad themes emerged.

Many experts agreed that the rise of non-state actors such as Hezbollah is linked to the capacity of governments in the region to provide services for the people. It was argued that Hezbollah has simply stepped in where the government has failed. There is a strong domestic component to the popularity and legitimacy of organizations such as Hezbollah, which as a result have been





able to transform into political movements. While Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood are adopting similar strategies in Palestine and Egypt, the full application of Hezbollah as a complete model is limited to certain circumstances unique to Lebanon's history.

The second theme that appeared highlighted the international dimension of Hezbollah's popularity and success, in particular its resistance to United States and Israeli influence in the Middle East. There was broad agreement that anger over U.S. and Israeli policies in the region provide a common cause for opposition groups. We are able to witness the parallel emergence of pan-Arabism to counter the American presence, based on an alliance, albeit temporary, between Iran, Syria and Hezbollah that asserts a Muslim identity and transcends traditional schisms between Sunnis and Shiites, Arabs and Persians, and secularism versus sectarianism.

Finally, the discussion exposed the fragile, but central position of Israel in the Middle East. It was found that Israel's reaction to the kidnapping of two soldiers and the subsequent fighting paradoxically strengthened Hezbollah while reducing Israel's deterrence capacity. The continued unresolved conflict between Israelis and Palestinians unites Hezbollah and others, and gives them a public rationale and support for armed opposition.

The Security Task Force highlighted the need for a strategy that empowers those who oppose violence and terrorism, that matches words with deeds to achieve legitimacy, and focuses on preventing terrorist groups and insurgents from filling the vacuums left by weak governments.



Abdul Karim Al-Muhammadi

Robert W. Stanger







Task Force B - Governance, Religion and Politics

CONVENER

PETER W. SINGER
Anwar Sadat Chair,
University of Maryland;
Nonresident Senior Fellow,
the Brookings Institution,
United States

PRESENTERS

AL SADIG RAHMAN AL
MAHDI
Former Prime Minister;
President, Umma Party,
Sudan

ABDULLAH AHMED
AN-NAIM
Charles Howard Candler
Professor of Law, Emory
University, United States

JOHN J. DEGIOIA
President, Georgetown
University, United States

JAMES A. DONAHUE
President, The Graduate
Theological Union,
United States

CHARLES P. HENDERSON
Executive Director,
Association for Religion
and Intellectual Life,
United States

BOB ROBERTS, JR.
Founder and Senior Pastor,
NorthWoods Church,
United States

HADI SEMATI
Professor, Faculty of Law
and Political Science,
University of Tehran, Iran

KHALIL SHIKAKI
Director, Palestinian
Center for Policy and
Survey Research,
Palestine

THOMAS G. WENSKI
Bishop and Chairman,
International Policy
Committee, U.S.
Conference of Catholic
Bishops, United States

COMMENTATORS

KATHARINE RHODES
HENDERSON
Executive Vice President,
Auburn Theological
Seminary, United States

JILLIAN SCHWEDLER
Assistant Professor,
Government and Politics,
University of Maryland;
Chair, Board of Directors,
Middle East Research
and Information Project,
United States

PARTICIPANTS

RANA ABBAS
United States

ABDULLAH ABDULLAH
Afghanistan

VAHID ALAGHBAND
United Kingdom

HANY ABU ASSAD
Palestine

RAJA EASA AL GUR
United Arab Emirates

ABDUL AZIZ ABDUL LATIF
AL SHARIKH
Kuwait

SAMAR AL-GAMAL
Egypt

NAIF A. AL-MUTAWA
Kuwait

ABDALLA A. ALNAJJAR
United Arab Emirates

YUSUF AL-QARADAWI
Egypt

NORA AMIN
Egypt

ABDELMADJID AMRANI
Algeria

HAMID ANSARI
India

NABIH AYAD
United States

HOSSAM BADRAWI
Egypt

KAMEL AYADI
Tunisia

ROBERT AYAN
United States

THOMAS BECKER
United States

MOHAMMAD REZA
BEHZADIAN
Iran

MALIKA BENAOUA-
ZOUAOU
Algeria

MARYAM BIBI
Pakistan

JOHN BORIGHT
United States

MARSHALL M. BOUTON
United States

RONALD BRUDER
United States

MICHAEL D'ARCY
United Kingdom

ABDELKRIM DAHMEN
Algeria

RICHARD E. DARILEK
United States

ROLA DASHTI
Kuwait

GAMAL EID
Egypt

MOHAMED ELMENSHAWY
Egypt

BETSY FADER
United States

MARK GALLI
United States

AMR GOHAR
Egypt

STEPHEN R. GRAND
United States

VARTAN GREGORIAN
United States

L. MICHAEL HAGER
United States

TAJ HAMAD
United States

HUSAIN HAQQANI
United States

HAMEED HAROON
Pakistan

MOHAMED JAWHAR
HASSAN
Malaysia

Task Force B (continued)

HISHAM A. HELLYER
United Kingdom

KOMARUDDIN HIDAYAT
Indonesia

TORLA BIN HJ HASSAN
Malaysia

SAMIR HOSNY
Sudan

JOEL C. HUNTER
United States

SYEDA ABIDA HUSSAIN
Pakistan

SHAMIL IDRIS
United States

DAVID IGNATIUS
United States

TERESA ANN ISAAC
United States

NAJAT M. JUMAAN
Yemen

SAMER KHOURY
Greece

ALEX KRONEMER
United States

STEVEN KULL
United States

F. STEPHEN LARRABEE
United States

MARK LYNCH
United States

MONA MAKRAM-EBEID
Egypt

MAGGIE MITCHELL SALEM
United States

DALIA MOGAHED
United States

MONA MOHIB
United States

MEHBOOBA MUFTI
India

ALI A. MUFURUKI
Tanzania

HIAM NAWAS
United States

GROVER NORQUIST
United States

SAMAH NORQUIST
United States

MICHAEL O'HANLON
United States

ATHAR OSAMA
United States

ABDELL NASSER OULD
ETHMANE
Mauritania

SOLI OZEL
Turkey

CARLOS PASCUAL
United States

TODD G. PATKIN
United States

RICHARD PEÑA
United States

ASAD-ABDUL RAHMAN
Palestine

RICHARD W. RAHN
United States

DOUGLAS E. RAMAGE
United States

JAMES REARDON-
ANDERSON
United States

BRUCE RIEDEL
United States

IMRAN RIFFAT
United States

KHALED SAFFURI
United States

CAROL R. SAIVETZ
United States

JOSEPH SAMAAN
United Arab Emirates

CYNTHIA P. SCHNEIDER
United States

CHRIS SEIPLE
United States

GAMAL SHAHIN
Egypt

RONALD SIDER
United States

FAOUZI SKALI
Morocco

ANARA TABYSHALIEVA
Kyrgyzstan

TAMARA COFMAN WITTES
United States

SAKENA YACOOBI
Afghanistan

MICHAEL YAFFE
United States

MOHAMMED YAHYA
United States

ARFA SYEDA ZEHRA
Pakistan



IN THE MODERN POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT, NON-STATE ACTORS have acquired an increasingly prominent role. This has drastically changed not only the way states interact with one another, but also the interaction of the state with its people. As states fail to meet the needs of their citizenry, social groups – often affiliated with a particular religion, political party, or ideology – step up to shoulder the responsibility. These developments have added new challenges to the already complex process of governance in today’s world.

Session 1

The first session of the task force dealt with the phenomenon of globalization and its effects on the ability of the state to meet the needs of its citizens.

Several participants in the first session noted that religion plays an increasingly prominent role in the public sphere, both within and outside of the Muslim world. In the United States, the so-called “religious right” was seen as having undue influence over the American political arena in the last decade, while in the Middle East parties like Hezbollah and Hamas have won significant electoral victories in their home states, and widespread popular support across the Muslim world.

It was also noted that globalization has led to problems in state care and welfare for needy citizens. States are often unable to meet basic human needs the people because the state is not responsible for producing food, for example. States are better equipped for preventing harm, while religious institutions could be used to fill the gap left by state care. Religious organizations have a long history of providing social services when the state is unable to do so, from Hamas in Palestine to the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt.

The economic, political, and social effects of globalization are the likely source of religion’s rising prominence. One participant explained the attraction of religion by saying that states and governments cannot provide people with a sense of worth and meaning. Religion satisfies the human need for a sense of meaning in an era of globalization. It was suggested that making states and governments more accountable to their citizens would be the best way for them to narrow the gap between what they can provide and what their citizens need. In this regard, the participant added that Western democracy promotion efforts should come from a “process-driven” rather than an “outcome driven” policy, such that long-term projects aimed at increasing government accountability might have the opportunity to succeed.

Session 2

The second session of the task force examined the question of religion’s position in the public sphere – what it should be and what it could be.

One participant declared that the separation of church and state – even in Western liberal democratic societies – is essentially an illusion. Politics inherently provides an opening for religious belief and doctrine to enter the sphere of governance. There was widespread disagreement over the notion that Islam



has historically sanctioned the mixing of governance and religious belief, and it was argued that the state in fact needs to be neutral with regard to religion in order for a Muslim to be a Muslim. Some cautioned that one should never be overconfident in the ability of secular politics to overcome the world's problems, stressing that religion has a legitimate role to play in human life.

Several participants noted that religion is extremely powerful as a social force. It is important for the public to hear a broader range of religious voices to keep religious leaders from remaining invisible. The success of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s preaching was mentioned, and it was noted that Martin Luther King, Jr. in actuality led a successful *religious* movement in the public square, but did not impose his views on anyone. Rather, he laid a plan for radical social change that dramatically affected politics and culture in the United States.

It was widely observed that religious leaders need to do more to support religious understanding and provide greater levels of structure in society. It was noted that religious leaders should work to support global institutions, and that the Alliance of Civilizations at the United Nations encourages the role of religion globally. Both Christianity and Islam are widely dispersed networks throughout the globe, and have considerable portions of those networks in poor global regions. Through established institutions, religious groups can play a vital role in supplying goods to the needy worldwide.

It was suggested that religion could also play an important role in the public sphere by encouraging accommodation of alternative and sometimes conflicting viewpoints. The true test of a religion's adequacy lay in its ability to acknowledge and respect other traditions in the service of justice and freedom for all.

Session 3

The third session of the task force focused on how best to accommodate religious minorities in a given society. The session also dealt with how to resolve the inevitable conflicts that occur between religious mores and public decision making on sensitive social issues.

It was noted that both faith and reason are essential to the satisfaction of human needs. Because of this, any step toward reconciling the two must take a middle path, as any step too conservative or too progressive could provoke a counterproductive reaction from people.

The audience was warned that while faith and belief can be positive forces, people of every religion must enjoy respect from everyone else. Faith and belief, when forced into the mold of an ideology, has the potential to become closed and exclusive, claiming sole moral authority and precluding the possibility of multiple interpretations of the faith. Similarly, religious institutions need to be chiefly concerned with protecting the needs of the vulnerable above anything else.



Several participants spoke about the practical difficulty of uniting different religions. Actions that are too progressive or too conservative will alienate both sides, with the result that drastic overhauls of existing systems are not practical. The most important step is to have on-going dialogues and a sense of reciprocity.

Others noted that the question of accommodating pluralism – both within a single religious tradition and among different faith traditions – is at the heart of reconciling religion and governance. A participant complained that religion, by definition, retains a sense of superiority that challenges the beliefs and views of other faiths. In this respect, the participant wondered what the meaning of respecting other faiths might look like in practice. Another participant suggested that the solution to this perceived religious chauvinism could come from encouraging the view that those who share a different faith from one's own are not necessarily enemies or in any way inferior. Most participants agreed with this statement, while recognizing the challenges inherent in successfully encouraging this interpretation everywhere.





Task Force C - The Next Generation

CONVENER

HADY AMR
Fellow and Director,
Brookings Doha Center,
the Saban Center for
Middle East Policy at the
Brookings Institution,
United States

PRESENTERS

FOWZIYAH ABU-KHALID
Assistant Professor,
Department of Sociology,
King Saud University,
Saudi Arabia

J. SCOTT CARPENTER
Deputy Assistant
Secretary for Near Eastern
Affairs, Department of
State,
United States

STEPHEN HEINTZ
President, Rockefeller
Brothers Fund, United
States

AHMAD HUMEID
Blogger, 360East.com,
Jordan

RANDA JAMAL
Programme Analyst,
Regional Bureau of Arab
States, United Nations
Development Programme,
United States

ABDELOUAHAB REZIG
Former Director, Office
for North Africa, United
Nations Economic
Commission; Professor,
University of Algiers,
Algeria

NISREEN SHOCAIR
President, Virgin
Megastores, Middle East
Region, Jordan

MARK WARD
Administrator for Asia and
Near East, United States
Agency for International
Development, United
States

TARIK M. YOUSEF
Nonresident Senior Fel-
low, Wolfensohn Center
for Development, Global
Economy and Develop-
ment, the Brookings
Institution; Dean, Dubai
School of Government,
United Arab Emirates

PARTICIPANTS

RANA ABBAS
United States

REZA ABEDINI
Iran

HANY ABU ASSAD
Palestine

ALICIA ADAMS
United States

SALMAN AHMAD
Pakistan

ISMAEL AHMED
United States

RIAD AL ASSAAD
Lebanon

LATIFA A. AL BUSSEIR
Saudi Arabia

RAJA EASA AL GURG
United Arab Emirates

NAIF A. AL-MUTAWA
Kuwait

NORA AMIN
Egypt

HADY AMR
United States

REZA ASLAN
United States

KAMEL AYADI
Tunisia

AKRAM BAKER
Palestine

THOMAS BECKER
United States

MALIKA BENAOUA-
ZOUAQUI
Algeria

MARYAM BIBI
Pakistan

MUKHTAR BIBI
Pakistan

JOHN BORIGHT
United States

CATHLEEN A. CAMPBELL
United States

CENGIZ CANDAR
Turkey

BENJAMIN CHAVIS
United States

FERI DAFTARI
United States

JERRILYNN DODDS
United States

RAJAE EL MOUHANDIZ
Morocco

BETSY FADER
United States

DAVID FISHER
United States

MARK GALLI
United States

AMR GOHAR
Egypt

FADI HADDADIN
Jordan

L. MICHAEL HAGER
United States

KOMARUDDIN HIDAYAT
Indonesia

JOEL C. HUNTER
United States

TERESA ANN ISAAC
United States

NAJAT M. JUMAAN
Yemen

MARVIN KALB
United States

DAVID KEENE
United States

LEYLA KHAIAT
Tunisia

CHRIS KOJM
United States

LAUREN LEVY
United States

KRISTIN LORD
United States

SHAHID MALIK
United Kingdom

MONA MOHIB
United States

Task Force C (continued)

MOHAMMED ALI NAQVI
United States

HABIB REHMAN
India

HIAM NAWAS
United States

ALI REZA SAMI-AZAR
Iran

MICHAEL NOZIK
United States

KUANSHBEK SAZANOV
Kazakhstan

CORY ONDREJKA
United States

CYNTHIA P. SCHNEIDER
United States

ATHAR OSAMA
United States

CHRIS SEIPLE
United States

ABDELL NASSER OULD
ETHMANE
Mauritania

CHRISTOPHER SHIELDS
United States

RICHARD PEÑA
United States

ANARA TABYSHALIEVA
Kyrgyzstan

JANE PERLEZ
United States

LUCAS WELCH
United States

ROBERT PINSKY
United States

THOMAS G. WENSKI
United States

HEATHER RAFFO
United States

SAKENA YACOOBI
Afghanistan

ASAD-ABDUL RAHMAN
Palestine

GIDEON YAGO
United States

RICHARD W. RAHN
United States

AHMAD SAMIR YOUNIS
United States

DOUGLAS E. RAMAGE
United States

IAN ZAIDER
United States

The Next Generation



MEMBERS OF THE NEXT GENERATION TASK FORCE DISCUSSED the challenges facing youth in the Muslim world, a topic of critical importance given the fact that the median age of the Muslim world is 23 years old. Acknowledging the diversity of this age group, Task Force members discussed the overall feelings of youth towards Western culture and the role of new media in expressing youth opinion. A key component of the discussion was the notion that while education is a key element in addressing challenges facing this generation; the challenges extend beyond educational needs. One participant summarized the situation by saying that while this generation of youth is increasingly educated and has a high level of human capital – conditions that are usually promising from an economic standpoint – in the Middle East, many youth may feel or actually are excluded from economic and political opportunities. There was widespread agreement that the private sector must be better incorporated into strategies geared towards addressing unemployment and under-employment.

Session 1

The first session of the task force focused on the hopes and frustrations of youth and the role of the new media in regards to social change. In general, there seemed to be a common understanding around the following ideas:

1. Youth in the Muslim World may be frustrated because they do not know their own culture's achievements; what contributes to this lack of understanding is censorship, cultural leanings and a lack of access to media.
2. In response to the lack of cultural understanding, the media can be used to “preserve” culture. Conversely, new media can also be used selectively, meaning that youth will seek out opinions that match their own.
3. New media can change mass media's paradigm of “Islam vs. the West,” which emphasizes a separation of cultures.
4. The challenge with new media is that while it can be used to spread new ideas, it can also be used to spread hatred.
5. Youth have supported Middle Eastern products like music, movies and books rather than Western bestsellers. Through their purchasing power, youth have supported local franchises and products. On the other hand, some polling has indicated different opinions, finding that youth are interested in learning English to access American media and internet sites.
6. Youth want change but do not want to be told how to change by the West. In their opinion, change must occur on their own terms.

Session 2

The second session of the task force focused on the socio-economic, political and civic challenges facing the next generation. The main issues raised at this session were the following:

1. Current socio-economic, political and civic issues present both opportunities and challenges. The challenges are already understood: primarily,



youth come out of educational programs but there are no jobs waiting to match their skills.

2. The solutions are hard to pinpoint because there are no case studies to explore; we simply need more analysis on the subject.
3. We currently do not know how to talk to youth about issues such as health, family concerns and asset management.
4. From the United States perspective, the majority of funding targets programs that are only for the youngest segment of the population, and should instead target a wider range of ages.
5. We must be adaptive, creative and humble as there is no one solution to the challenges facing the youth of the Muslim world.
6. Solutions must be “inclusive”—meaning they cannot be imposed top down or from the outside world. Rather, solutions must be constructed with youth input.

In response to the challenges established by presenters during the second session on socio-economic, political and social issues, a number of actionable ideas were raised which included the following.

1. Solutions should target youth outlets, like MTV, YouTube and mobile phones.
2. There needs to be as great a focus on job creation as there is emphasis on expanding educational programs.
3. Youth must be given funding and support to push technological boundaries.
4. We must match educational programs to employer needs by building communication between employers and educational programs.
5. Introduce economic, educational, and structural reforms. These reforms should be home grown and not imposed.

Session 3

The third session focused on the contextual framework that local and international actors should embrace to effect positive change for the next generation.

1. Agencies that are involved in this field should be willing to experiment on developing programs to meet the needs of youth.
2. Youths should be asked to articulate their concerns. In order to understand the youths’ perspectives, we must meet them where they are in their lives and work with them on their terms.
3. The key goal should be to empower youth. Lessons from successful youth organized-projects in the United States should be analyzed for their potential to help and stimulate projects in the Muslim world.
4. People are frustrated with the status quo, especially young people.



5. Technology, especially blogs and email, have allowed us to see the growing frustration of the youth, as well as their hopes.
6. Youth want freedom but the definition of freedom is broad and diverse; some want religious freedom and freedom from the influence of the West and therefore we cannot expect all youth to build bridges with the West.
7. The priority should be on structural reforms within society; specifically, if we target political repression, youth will ultimately benefit.
8. Conversely, priority should be given to shifting the attention of youth from participating in organizations outside the political system to being brought into the policymaking process.
9. Youth are not in the policymaking process because they are too cynical about the policymaking sector to effect change.
10. Youth are not in the policymaking process because of cultural barriers, specifically older people who will not cede control to younger people.

To address the issues discussed during the third session on the contextual framework that local and international actors should embrace, the participants agreed upon the following actionable ideas:

1. Build bridges using new media; however, old media should also be used because it typically reaches more youth than new media does. Old media can employ new concepts like reality shows to which youth can relate. Bridges can also be built with educational reform and political empowerment.
2. Construct programs that incorporate the private sector, as this is where new opportunities and jobs lie.
3. Support both new and old technologies, especially because traditional media continues to play an important role reaching a large audience. Additionally, some youth perceive new technology as a Western conspiracy. New media and the web should be used, however, to help connect young people to each other to promote civic discourse.
4. Focus on greater regional integration and partnerships as many initiatives in one country do not know about similar initiatives in other countries.
5. Ease visa restrictions so that young workers can live in the West to take advantage of job opportunities. Exchange programs should also be promoted to give youth an opportunity to work together on issues of shared concern.
6. Push for youth to be a real presence at conferences and involved in policymaking settings.



Muslim Minority Leaders Seminar

CONVENERS

AKRAM BAKER
Co-President, Arab Western
Summit of Skills, Palestine

ROKHSANA FIAZ
Director, The Change Institute,
United Kingdom

PRESENTERS

REZA ASLAN
Author, *No God but God*,
United States

HISHAM A. HELLYER
Research Fellow, Centre for
Research in Ethnic Relations,
University of Warwick,
United Kingdom

SHAHID MALIK
Member of Parliament;
Parliamentary Private
Secretary to Minister of State,
Department of Education and
Skills, United Kingdom

MAGGIE MITCHELL SALEM
Regional Director for the
Middle East and North Africa,
IFES, United States

AHMED SAMIR YOUNIS
Independent Consultant,
United States

PARTICIPANTS

HADY AMR
United States

MARSHALL M. BOUTON
United States

DALIA MOGAHED
United States

MONA MOHIB
United States

HIAM NAWAS
United States

GROVER NORQUIST
United States

SAMAH NORQUIST
United States

CARLOS PASCUAL
United States



THE THEMES THAT EMERGED FROM THIS SEMINAR'S PRESENTATIONS and discussions included the differences among Muslim communities in the West, the importance of Muslim engagement with non-Muslims, the impact Muslims could have in their own countries were they to engage actively in discussing both foreign and domestic political issues, and the unique status of the American Muslim community vis-à-vis other Western Muslim communities.

It was noted that, though Muslims recognize the idea of belonging to a transnational *umma*, or community, Muslims throughout the world also identify with the countries in which they live. At a time when national identity is often difficult to define, it is additionally difficult for Muslims to integrate into that image. American policy makers and politicians should recognize and understand the diversity of Muslim identity when formulating policies related to the Muslim world. The fact that Muslims live in countries all over the world has meant that non-Muslim communities have had to grapple with the difficulties of living in a multi-cultural society. It was noted that non-Muslim Europeans have had particular difficulties with this. Both Muslims and non-Muslims need to reach out to one another more consistently in order to overcome these difficulties.

Building on this suggestion, it was recommended that more foreign Muslim students be allowed back into Western countries, and the United States in particular, for study. The drop in student visas issued to Arabs and Muslims after September 11, 2001, was lamented. The cultural education achieved by such exchanges was recognized as one of the best ways to encourage mutual understanding and respect.

In contrast to the popular belief that the majority of Americans support U.S. policy towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, a survey that was conducted in 2002 by the University of Maryland revealed that 60% of Americans supported the creation of a Palestinian state — a percentage that went up to 80% when the Palestinians renounced violence. On a similar note, it was stressed that Arabs and Muslims dislike American policies, rather than Americans or America. The importance of getting to know Middle America, not just the populations of large cities, was also emphasized.

Western calls for Muslims to repeatedly and consistently condemn terrorism often cause Muslims to feel that they are viewed suspiciously. It is unfair to assume that because some terrorists carry out their crimes in the name of Islam, that all or even most Muslims agree with the motivations for or the carrying out of such crimes. The barrage of negative presentations of Muslims in the media, it was noted, creates a siege mentality among Muslims.

A great source of conflict for American Muslims is the fact that the average Muslim is being asked by his non-Muslim peers to explain and define the American Muslim community, despite its rich variety of ethnic and sectarian backgrounds. This attitude only serves to divide Muslim and non-Muslim communities.

It was observed that it takes immigrants three generations to integrate into American society, a span of time that Muslim immigrants don't have the



luxury of because of external pressures. The only comparable situation was that of Japanese American immigrants, but even in 1941 many second and third generation immigrants were put in internment camps.

It was noted that the form of radical Islam espoused by terrorists is heresy, and the most effective weapon against heresy is orthodoxy. It is therefore important to enfranchise those at the lower levels with better access to religious schools and scholars, in order to prevent the further spread of radical misinterpretations. While the concept of reforming Islam is poorly received by the Muslim world, it is more a conflict of terminology. The Muslim world does not want a reform, but rather a renewal of Islam, which would include raising the standards of women and the poor in countries worldwide. Many Western Muslim communities, it was observed, fail to engage actively with domestic politics in their own countries. While foreign policy decisions will naturally be of concern to Muslims around the world, domestic policy remains equally important. Muslim opposition to certain foreign policies should not automatically be considered extremism or radicalism. More involvement in domestic politics by Western Muslims would facilitate mutual understanding and help to dispel negative stereotypes. At the same time, Western Muslims should pay more attention to specific domestic concerns such as improving education, fighting crime, providing healthcare, and alleviating unemployment, as these issues are just as important to the interests and well-being of Muslim Westerners as they are to other Westerners.





American Muslim identities, it was argued, are strikingly different from European Muslim identities. Western Muslims could use their experiences of living in multicultural and tolerant environments to lead the global movement for a discourse of reform within Islam. The uniquely integrated nature of the American Muslim community, it was asserted, could be helpful in catalyzing other Western Muslim communities to engage actively with their own local circumstances.

At the close of the seminar, the participants devised the following actionable initiatives to improve relations and interactions between Muslims and non-Muslims on a global scale:

- Produce a media watch-list of words and phrases generally agreed to be counterproductive to mutual understanding and communication;
- Use the model of American Muslim involvement in American society and politics to catalyze Muslim engagement with society and politics in general;
- Increase debate and discussion between Muslims in American and in Europe in order to share best practices and learn from one another's experiences;
- Begin to create a discourse of Muslim reform based on the principles of *ijtihad* in order to produce a modern Islamic discourse;
- As a result of this discourse, Muslims should put forth an ideology of Islamic tolerance and peace to oppose the ideology of hate and violence.



Science and Technology Leaders Seminar

CONVENERS

MICHAEL D'ARCY
Researcher in Science and
Security, Kings College
London, United Kingdom

KRISTIN LORD
Associate Dean, Elliot
School of International
Relations, George
Washington University,
United States

CHAIRS

ABDALLA A. ALNAJJAR
Executive Director, Arab
Science and Technology
Foundation, United Arab
Emirates

RENO L. HARNISH III
Principal Deputy
Assistant Secretary of
State, Bureau of Oceans
and International
Environmental and
Scientific Affairs,
Department of State,
United States

PRESENTERS

KAMEL AYADI
President, World
Federation of Engineering
Organizations, Tunisia

JOHN BORIGHT
Executive Director,
International Affairs, U.S.
National Academy of
Sciences, United States

CATHLEEN A. CAMPBELL
President and Chief
Executive Officer, U.S.
Civilian Research and
Development Foundation,
United States

ALI A. MUFURUKI
Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer, Infotech
Investment Group, LTD.,
Tanzania

PARTICIPANTS

RAJA EASA AL GURG
United Arab Emirates

ABDELMADJID AMRANI
Algeria

ROBERT AYAN
United States

HOSSAM BADRAWI
Egypt

MALIKA BENAOUA-
ZOUAOU
Algeria

RONALD BRUDER
United States

GAMAL EID
Egypt

VARTAN GREGORIAN
United States

AMR GOHAR
Egypt

L. MICHAEL HAGER
United States

TORLA BIN HJ HASSAN
Malaysia

JAMES HOLSTE
United States

NAJAT M. JUMAAN
Yemen

LEYLA KHAIAT
Tunisia

ATHAR OSAMA
United States

RICHARD W. RAHN
United States

IMRAN RIFFAT
United States

KHALED SAFFURI
United States

KUANSHBEK SAZANOV
Kazakhstan

Technology Partnerships



THE SEMINAR'S PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS PRIMARILY revolved around assessing opportunities for partnership between the United States and predominantly Muslim states to promote science and technology. The promotion of science and technology was deemed significant due to its important role in facilitating economic growth, employment opportunities, and the skills necessary to succeed in the global knowledge economy.

Building on the progress from the previous two years' seminars, there was a strong desire to identify an actionable agenda from the meeting. However, one of the challenges was the recognition that the Muslim world is hardly a homogenous entity, with widely differing challenges and opportunities in the field of science and technology. This issue surfaced in discussions contrasting the economic situations of the North African states versus those of the Gulf States. In a later discussion on the challenge of "brain drain," it became clear that while "brain drain" is of primary concern to many Arab countries, in Malaysia "brain gain" is now an objective. Algeria was also mentioned as a country that has had success encouraging its students to study in the United States and Europe, and then return to Algeria. Recognizing that all Muslim states do not face the same challenges is important to understanding how each can improve. As a corollary to the famous quotation that all happy families are the same but each unhappy family is so in its own way, the point was made that science and technology success stories have tended to be highly individualized – as in the cases of Finland, Ireland, and Malaysia. However, science and technology still represents a logical place for partnership because the United States is a leader in the field and widely acknowledged and admired as such in the Muslim world.

The benefits of science and technology partnership were primarily discussed in the context of higher education, economic growth, and job promotion in the Muslim world. With a surging demographic challenge as outlined in a prior task force on the Next Generation, the question remained how best to use science and technology to increase employment opportunities. Participants discussed needed reforms to governments, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations that could facilitate sustainable benefits to local and regional economies. With almost half of the states with majority Muslim populations ranked in the bottom 20% of the world in indices of development and economic freedom, much attention was focused on creating better business environments to encourage innovation. A common feature of each technology success story has been government commitment – whether national or local – to economic growth. One avenue to improve government's embrace of science and technology is to institutionalize non-governmental advisors much as in the United States. However, the case of Kazakhstan was mentioned, where, despite technically having a non-governmental development apparatus, the state remains omnipresent and impedes true innovation. The conclusion drawn was that governments are important players, but the private sector must be the engine for change. A similar view was that efforts should be made to focus the science and technology sector in the Arab world – beginning with academic research – on practical applications of science



and technology and commercialization. As opposed to gearing their studies solely toward publication in academic journals, students of botany in Pakistan, for example, should also be researching ways to improve the horticulture of local flower growers, so that they may go beyond domestic production and begin to export.

The discussion of the role of government and the private sector in stimulating innovation fed a related exchange over whether to guide science and technology policy toward immediately actionable programs to prevent a deepening employment crisis or to adopt a more long term approach to science's role in the Muslim world. A project conducted by Education for Employment, an NGO, served as an example of the possibilities of vocational training. EFE was able to use unemployed college graduates in Gaza to fill accounting vacancies by tailoring a training course for them. Similar possibilities exist in many other fields including engineering and nursing. Those who favored this streamlined approach emphasized the severity of the employment situation in most Muslim states and were willing to make certain compromises – e.g. the introduction of foreign interests and capital – in order to spur science and technology growth in the near term. The approach of those who favored a more cautious, broad engagement in the field of science and technology emphasized the need for more universities and other institutional improvements to encourage long term growth. Of course, these two positions are not exclusive and the group agreed that both goals must be pursued simultaneously.

Perhaps the issue of greatest consensus was on the need for more institutional capacity in the Muslim world. Whether the question was how to spur greater commercialization and entrepreneurship or to reduce uncertainty in the business environment, a common answer was through institutions that while potentially funded by government or the private sector, could operate as a facilitating third party. A number of initiatives, including the U.S. government-sponsored Jordanian Science and Technology Initiative and Sun's Centers for Excellence, were praised for their work, but there must be significantly more growth in this area for deeper science and technology partnerships to form between the United States and the Muslim world. In addition, those present who work at NGOs in the region added that they could use advice and support from their American counterparts.

In addition to a general call for more robust science and technology institutions in the Muslim world, there was support for existing NGOs in America to initiate branches in the Muslim world, with a number of the officers of these institutions who were present at the meeting eager to do so. The other actionable proposal that came out of the seminar was to reproduce the model provided by the Iraqi Virtual Science Library for more states and regions. The Virtual Library allows scientists in Iraq to have access to many of the same research articles as their colleagues in the United States. This type of network is positive both as a bridge for understanding and scientific partnership, but also as a potential attractive source for innovation for private sector investment and commercialization.





Arts and Culture Leaders Seminar

CONVENERS

SHAMIL IDRIS
Acting Director, Alliance
of Civilizations, United
Nations, United States

CYNTHIA P. SCHNEIDER
Professor in the Practice
of Diplomacy, Georgetown
University; Nonresident
Senior Fellow, the
Brookings Institution,
United States

CHAIRS

SALMAN AHMAD
Musician, Junoon;
United Nations Goodwill
Ambassador, Pakistan

BENJAMIN CHAVIS
President and Chief
Executive Officer, Hip Hop
Summit Action Network,
United States

PRESENTERS

HANY ABU ASSAD
Film Director, *Paradise Now*
Palestine

ROBERT PINSKY
Former Poet Laureate of the
United States; Professor,
Boston University,
United States

PARTICIPANTS

REZA ABEDINI
Iran

ALICIA ADAMS
United States

NAIF A. AL-MUTAWA
Kuwait

NORA AMIN
Egypt

THOMAS BECKER
United States

FERI DAFTARI
United States

JERRILYNN DODDS
United States

RAJAE EL MOUHANDIZ
Morocco

BETSY FADER
United States

BAHMAN FARMANARA
Film Director, Iran

ALEX KRONEMER
United States

LAUREN LEVY
United States

MOHAMMED ALI NAQVI
United States

MICHAEL NOZIK
United States

CORY ONDREJKA
United States

RICHARD PEÑA
United States

HEATHER RAFFO
United States

ALI REZA SAMI-AZAR
Iran

AZHAR USMAN
United States

LUCAS WELCH
United States

GIDEON YAGO
United States

Arts and the Public Sphere



“IT IS NOT SO MUCH A CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS WE ARE DEALING with as a clash of ignorance.” With this comment, a participant from the 2007 U.S.-Islamic World Forum succinctly captured the challenge before the Arts and Culture Leaders Seminar. Filmmakers, musicians, authors, historians, and artists gathered to discuss how artistic and cultural communities could contribute to improving understanding and relations between the United States and the Muslim world. Through the universality of the arts and its capacity to impact basic human emotions, participants agreed that they have the potential to change perceptions and help shape how people view themselves, and others.

The group analyzed the following questions:

1. How can artistic and cultural communities contribute to improving understanding and relations between the United States and the Muslim world?
2. How can arts and culture be harnessed to broaden and deepen the perception and understanding of Islam and the Muslim world in America?
3. How can the challenges of broadening and deepening perceptions of America in the Muslim world be addressed through arts and culture?
4. What are some recommendations for establishing sustainable, reciprocal arts and cultural exchanges and partnerships that help to accomplish these attitudinal shifts?
5. What are “best practices” and what are pitfalls?

The participants agreed on several key points:

- Positive role models are critical, and there is a dearth of role models from the global Muslim community. One participant had tackled the problem of the absence of role models through his comic books which feature heroes based on Allah’s ninety-nine positive traits.
- More representations of diverse examples of stories and culture from the global Muslim community, as well as a greater presence of ordinary Muslims in everyday roles in TV and films, would increase understanding across cultures. A strong belief was expressed that arts and culture, particularly film and television, could make a difference in the face of the ignorance of and antipathy towards Muslims revealed in a recent Gallup poll.
- New technologies have the potential for viral distribution; for new, cheaper modes of production of music and film; and through these two capacities to create new markets.
- Distribution of artistic products from the Muslim world rarely penetrates beyond the coasts in the United States and these products have limited reach beyond their country of origin. One participant invited suggestions of Muslim artists to tour at music festivals.
- Universities offer an excellent network for distribution as venues of artists. It was noted that universities play an important role in creating, studying, and disseminating culture. Universities can provide attractive and practical alternatives when commercial venues are not an option.



“The market is defined by consumers; consumers change when you create new markets,” commented one contributor, who also noted that the independent film market in the United States was shaped significantly by the annual Sundance Film Festival. New technologies facilitate new methods of distribution, notably through the internet, which, in turn, open up new possibilities for cheaper, smaller scale productions in music and film. A young musician explained that she did not sign with a music label, but instead produces her own music. There was widespread agreement that disseminating music, films, and dialogues “virally” offered tremendous possibilities for linking people virtually across the globe, and for increasing access to artistic products.

“Most young people in the U.S. and the Middle East want to know about each other,” stated a participant, because young people want to “tell their own stories and hear about others who are like them.” New means of communication (cell phones, internet) make this possible, and could be used more creatively to link people across cultures.

Hip-hop music and culture was recognized as a highly influential “global language” that transcends differences in nationalities, race, religion and culture. The audience was reminded of hip-hop’s Muslim roots when it began 35 years ago in the United States, and its popularity and impact remains today, as many young people express both their dissatisfaction with their lives, and their hopes for the future, through the diverse medium of hip-hop. A hip-hop video by artist DMX showed participants how music and lyrics can incorporate different religions and nationalities.

Participants also discussed upcoming film and television projects. One production company is currently shooting a movie based on the acclaimed novel *Reading Lolita in Tehran*. A comedy show that has toured world-wide is also being turned into a movie. The comedian promoting the film emphasized the fact that 5 to 8 million Muslims live in America, and yet no one tells their story – “No one has done a film about Muslims *for* Muslims.” Recently, a new Canadian sitcom, *Little Mosque on the Prairie*, has been well received by Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

The seminar ended with participants agreeing on the following conclusions:

1. Working groups should be formed to develop projects and initiatives with three key topics and areas of expertise: Harnessing new peer-to-peer technologies, utilizing the power of cross-cultural icons, and encouraging a more nuanced representation of Islam and Muslims.
2. An institutional home for the Arts and Culture Initiative should be established;
3. Institutional homes for individual working groups should be identified;
4. Finally, existing programs or models should be expanded or applied to the challenges of the U.S. relationship with the Muslim world. Examples of such projects could include Robert Pinsky’s *My Favorite Poem* project to include an Arabic component, with dual translations. Another idea was to adopt the Tournées Film Festival model in France, for showing films about the Muslim world on college campuses around the country.

The Arts and Cultural Leaders Seminar concluded by discussing additional steps to be taken in the future, beginning with a working group meeting in Los Angeles in June 2007. In addition, the Initiative hopes to develop sustainable projects out of these working groups, and to raise funds to support them. Lastly, a White Paper analyzing past and present cultural links and programs between the United States and the Muslim World, and accompanying strategies for the future, will be presented at the 2008 U.S.-Islamic World Forum.



Media Leaders Seminar

CONVENERS

MARVIN KALB
Senior Fellow, Shorenstein
Center for the Press,
Politics and Public Policy,
Harvard University,
United States

PRESENTERS

MOHAMED ELMENSHAWY
Editor-in-Chief, *Taqdir*
Washington, Egypt

DAVID IGNATIUS
Associate Editor and
Foreign Correspondent, *The*
Washington Post,
United States

CAROL R. SAIVETZ
Research Associate, Davis
Center for Russian and
Eurasian Studies, Harvard
University, United States

ZAFAR SIDDIQI
Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer, CNBC
Arabiya,
United Arab Emirates

PARTICIPANTS

MOBASHAR JAWED (M)
AKBAR
India

SAMAR AL-GAMAL
Egypt

CENGIZ CANDAR
Turkey

RAJIV CHANDRASEKARAN
United States

FADI HADDADIN
Jordan

ALI HAMADE
Lebanon

HAMEED HAROON
Pakistan

JIHAD B. KHAZEN
United Kingdom

RAMI KHOURI
Lebanon

AARON LOBEL
United States

IKHWANUL KIRAM
MASHURI
Indonesia

DALIA MOGAHED
United States

JANE PERLEZ
Correspondent, *The New*
York Times, United States

GAMAL SHAHIN
Egypt

The Media Effect



THE MEDIA LEADERS SEMINAR GAVE PARTICIPANTS THE opportunity to examine issues surrounding media coverage of conflicts and wars. Participants discussed whether the media can be fair and balanced in reporting on Middle East conflicts, whether media have a special responsibility when covering instances of asymmetrical warfare, and whether reporting can or should be improved. A key proposal made in the seminar was for reporters to establish lines of communication with each other and use these lines of communication to critique each other when they feel strong journalistic standards are not being met.

The seminar began with a presentation of a paper that examines media reporting during the 2006 war between Israel and Hezbollah. One participant argued that the war could be used to illustrate the challenges of reporting on asymmetrical conflicts (those between state and non-state actors). It was mentioned that this was the first war in which television networks were themselves part of the battle. Television and internet reports often included real-time images of the war, including reports of Israeli troop movements, and therefore, unintentionally, enabled Hezbollah to gain useful intelligence.

Another participant raised the point that in conflicts between open societies and non-state actors, open societies face the challenge of controlling information. In the 2006 war, Hezbollah was able to devise and control a precise narrative. It achieved this by restricting journalist access and restricting subjects who could be interviewed. In contrast, journalists were able to get a more nuanced, and accurate picture of feelings within Israel during the war. This was largely due to the fact that the Israeli government was unable to restrict the flow of information or control who was being interviewed. A key concern raised was whether journalists moved from being objective reporters of events to pawns of organizations seeking to advance a message. The issue is of critical importance, because Hezbollah provided misleading and factually incorrect information to journalists. The question was asked how journalists should handle a situation in which information is available from only one side. During the 2006 war, the Lebanese government did not release information. Therefore, journalists were faced with information only coming from Hezbollah. One journalist said that reporters need to be responsible and aware that sources often try to manipulate their opinion. As such, when reporting from Lebanon, journalists should have given a disclaimer that those people they interviewed were supplied to them by Hezbollah. An American made the point that American media is guilty at times of being a conduit for misinformation. For instance, American media did not question the false assertions made by the Bush Administration that there was a link between Iraq and al-Qaeda.

There was debate over whether journalists are too easily influenced by actors in a conflict. It was argued that many reporters in the Arab world adopted Hezbollah's narrative of Israel being an aggressor and acting disproportionately. There was much debate against this point, and it was asserted that Israel's response to the Hezbollah attacks was disproportionate. This was not a sign of



having adopted Hezbollah's opinion because disproportionality is in fact part of Israel's national security strategy. Israel seeks to project a strong military image and regularly takes action to create a strategy of deterrence. It was also noted that in the war, Lebanon suffered far more civilian casualties. Because of this fact, news organizations focused on reporting on the civilian casualties in Lebanon, not because they were biased.

There was debate about what it means to be fair in one's reporting. The point was made that being fair and impartial may mean talking to both sides to garner facts and opinions, but may not require a journalist to always give equal space in presenting opposing views. One participant said that in practice, journalists do not always garner information from both sides, often preferring to interview sources from their own country. In addition, it is often difficult for a reader to determine whether a story is balanced. For instance, when the Israeli media showed images of settlers crying as they withdrew from Gaza, many may have felt that this was propaganda to make the public resist any future withdrawals. However, these were images of what was actually occurring, and were probably not intended to carry biased commentary. Another participant presented a working paper that analyzed media coverage of Israel's withdrawal from the Gaza Strip in 2005. The paper looked at Israeli and international coverage, and noted differences in how various outlets reported on the events. The authors used the study to raise the issue that there will always be different ways to report on a single event and it may be impossible to have a single "truth."

Culture was another point of contention, arguing that the line between opinion and reporting in the Arab world is not as rigid as it is in the United States. However, another participant disagreed, arguing that truth-seeking is not culture-specific. Truth is a universally-held value and there are many instances of Arab reporters who do not insert commentary into their reporting. The debate led to an argument that the Palestinian press censors itself because rarely does one see reporting of violence between Palestinian factions, when such violence often occurs. Instead, the Palestinian press seems to prefer reporting on violence between Israelis and Palestinians. One participant countered that it is imperative to understand the context of forty years of occupation. Another said that self-censorship is not unique to the Gaza Strip. It is impossible for journalists to operate outside of the context in which they find themselves, and many must take in to account the danger of reporting on certain issues. The point was raised that journalists often have to comply with libel laws in host countries, affecting the way in which they can report on events or individuals. In addition, while in the United States journalists may not self-censor for political reasons, they do for commercial reasons. Whether a paper restricts its reporting because of a stringent government, or whether a paper restricts its reporting because of the sensibilities of its advertiser, the net result is the same.



A number of suggestions were put forth about how to strengthen the media. One was to devote resources to establishing educational programs in the Middle East that focus on teaching strong reporting and communication skills. Some participants suggested establishing a Universal Code of Conduct for journalists, but many dismissed this as impractical. Because it would be difficult to settle on standards. In addition, it is inappropriate to impose rigid, universal standards on journalists. The point is not to settle on a rigid set of standards, but to at least have an open debate about improving journalistic standards.

One idea embraced by many was to have exchange programs where journalists spend time working in other media organizations and other countries. This would enable journalists to gain a rounded perspective of a region and establish relationships with journalists in other countries. These relationships are critical for strengthening the media. The best way to strengthen reporting is to have reporters critique their colleagues works when they feel it has not lived up to journalistic standards. Most participants agreed that the best way to improve journalism is to have this ongoing, fluid relationship among reporters in which they monitor and give feedback on each other's works.





There has to be a timetable to end the occupation in Iraq, and shift the focus to the crisis that has developed because of the invasion.



Where Do We Go From Here?



THE FUTURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES and the Muslim world is extremely dynamic. The constant fluctuation of events limits our ability to predict how relations may change even in the short term. Repairing relations that are under fire requires effort and compromise from both sides. The speakers discussed various facets of the changing face of U.S. –Islamic world relations, and called for a diverse array of actions from both sides.

Carlos Pascual, Vice-President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, said the United States and Muslim world need to work together to build mutual political understanding and respect through dialogue and business, as well as educational and cultural alliances. Pascual observed that the dominant theme from the conference was the Middle East conflict, the solution of which could bridge the gap between the United States and Muslim world.

Al-Sadig Rahman Al-Mahdi began by saying that American foreign policy has been characterized by missed opportunities, and needs to have a change of heart. “Outside the [George W. Bush] administration there are hopeful signs. Now there are no doubts several voices are talking of radical change,” he said. Al Mahdi noted that while there is mutual demonization between the United States and the Muslim world, “Yankeeophobia” is limited whereas “Islamophobia” has become widespread. In the same vein, he noted that any dialogue would be impossible without a change in U.S. policy accompanied by serious reform by the Muslim world. Al Mahdi also stated that Iran has as much a right to develop nuclear technology as thirty-six other countries, and added that it should be policed, not held to a double standard.

He declared that the Sudan’s future was to be decided by coup-makers and warlords, and that Islam requires a reformation of sorts. The major issues Islam needs to address are how to deal with the past, sectarianism, despotism, underdevelopment, fanaticism, modernism and violence. Al Mahdi felt that the United States squandered the chance to intervene in Darfur until it became a full-blown humanitarian crisis. “This conference must call for a radical change in U.S. policy,” he declared.

Dr. Abdullah Abdullah followed Al Mahdi. He said that from his viewpoint, the main issues were the United States vis-à-vis the Muslim world, and the United States vis-à-vis Afghanistan. He recalled that the United States had stood by Afghanistan’s side during the Soviet occupation of his country and became partners after the Russians pulled out. After the Cold War, the United States and Afghanistan had a short-term relationship before backing off. “To say the least, this was a short-sighted view into an issue which later had global consequences,” said Abdullah.

Now the two have entered into marriage for the second time. “I hope this is also not in the short-term. There is little understanding between the two sides (Islam and the United States). We do not know each other.” There is a serious need to identify and solve the differences between the Muslim world and the United States, he said.

MODERATOR

CARLOS PASCUAL

Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies, the Brookings Institution, United States

PANELISTS

ABDULLAH ABDULLAH

Former Foreign Minister, Afghanistan

AL SADIG RAHMAN AL-MAHDI

Former Prime Minister; President, Umma Party, Sudan

DAVID IGNATIUS

Associate Editor and Foreign Correspondent, *The Washington Post*, United States

RAMI KHOURI

Editor-at-Large, *Daily Star*; Director, Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs, American University in Beirut, Lebanon

David Ignatius was of the view that the United States has to take a serious approach to solving the Palestinian problem and shift its focus in Iraq. “There has to be a timetable to end the occupation in Iraq, and shift the focus to the crisis that has developed because of the invasion,” he said. Ignatius also observed the necessity of preventing the spread of the civil war throughout the region. Ignatius called for the United States to consider the demands and opinions of Iraq’s neighbors, and the wider Muslim World. In addition to Iraq, the United States needs to seriously consider the Palestinian problem, and abandon double standards. He said that America should return to its role as a mediator in this conflict. Its positions should be independent of either side, and it must be willing to talk to all parties to achieve peace.

Rami Khouri, editor-in-chief of Lebanon’s *Daily Star*, warned that a broad popular front is emerging to challenge American hegemony. Iraq “discredits what America tries to do in the Mideast,” he said. Khouri discussed the evolution of the relationship between the United States and the Arab and Muslim worlds, saying that one of the most striking changes is a growing appreciation for the idea that the standards of internal democracy should apply to relations among countries. He noted the frequent mentions of this topic during several earlier plenaries, as numerous Arabs and Muslims called on the United States to abide by a universal set of rules. Khouri raised the specific example of the United States and Israel appearing to set themselves apart from international rulings on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, while attempting to regulate proliferation of the rest of the international community.

Khouri went on to discuss the role of Islamist parties, noting that as Arab and Muslim societies become more democratic, the most legitimate parties are likely to be parties like Hezbollah and Hamas. If those parties are prevented from participation, or denied incumbency, the democratic process will fall apart. Thus, the core debate should not be about the participation of these parties, but rather how the manner in which they do so can be admissible to all concerned.







Outreach to Youth: Youth and the Future of U.S.-Islamic World Relations

A HIGHLIGHT OF THE 2007 U.S.-ISLAMIC WORLD FORUM WAS ITS multimedia youth outreach program.

The outreach element was developed in partnership with Soliya Interactive, a non-profit organization that uses media technology to connect university students in the United States, Europe, and predominantly Muslim countries for cross-cultural dialogue and learning. A local film crew of students from Qatar University assisted with the on-site operation and taping.

The initiative provided a multi-media interface through which students in the Muslim world and the West were able to ask questions to a number of leaders that attended the Forum. Videos of these questions and answers were then made available on-line to the students, university classes, and the wider public. This enabled a unique discussion between leaders and students across the United States and the Muslim world.

The participants consisted of a diverse set of Soliya students from the American University of Beirut in Lebanon; South Valley University in Egypt; Al Akhawayn University of Irfane in Morocco; Centre College, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Brown University in the United States. Their questions were posed to seventeen Forum attendees. These participants included such notables as Abdullah Abdullah, former Foreign Minister of Afghanistan; Syed Hamid Albar, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Malaysia; Naif Al-Mutawa, founder and CEO of Teshkeel Media Group in Kuwait; Hamid Ansari, Chairperson of the 5th Statutory National Commission for Minorities in India; Rola Dashti, Chairperson of the Kuwait Economic Society in Kuwait; Bahman Farmanara, a film director from Iran; David Ignatius, foreign correspondent for *The Washington Post*; Martin Indyk, Director of the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, United States; Marvin Kalb, Faculty Chair at the Kennedy School of Government, United States; David Keene, Chairman of the American Conservative Union, United States; Rami Khouri, Editor-at-Large and former Executive Editor of the Beirut-based Daily Star newspaper, Lebanon; Shahid Malik, Member of the House of Commons, U.K.; Dalia Mogahed, Executive Director of Muslim Studies at the Gallup Organization, United States; Grover Norquist, President of Americans for Tax Reform, United States; Khalil Shikaki, Director of Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, Palestine; Peter Singer, Director of 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution, United States; and Shibley Telhami, Anwar Sadat Chair at the University of Maryland, United States.

Via live, streaming video, the attendees were questioned by the students on a series of issues that the students were most concerned about. Their questions ranged from whether the United States considers Islam as a threat, and vice versa, to the nature of media coverage in the United States and the Muslim world. Interestingly, the multimedia set-up allowed the same set of student questions to be asked to each individual participant. The result enabled a unique compilation of viewpoints, allowing those on-line to compare and contrast the views of the leaders and discover both common themes and key areas of discord.

The proceedings enabled the leaders who help shape relations between the United States and the Muslim world to interact with a group of concerned students, who will help shape these relations in the future. It expanded the dialogue to include the younger generation. Video archives will soon be available on the Forum's website: www.us-islamicworldforum.org.

MODERATOR

AARON LOBEL

President and Chairman,
American Abroad Media,
United States

SPEAKERS

REZA ASLAN

Author, *No God but God*,
United States

BAHMAN FARMANARA

Film Director, Iran



Press Coverage of the 2007 U.S.–Islamic World Forum

| | |
|---|--|
| Agence France Presse (France) | Malaysian News Agency (Malaysia) |
| Al Ahram (Egypt) | Middle East Company Newswire (United States) |
| Al Rayah (Qatar) | Middle East Online (United States) |
| Al Sharq (Qatar) | Mideast Media Analysis (United States) |
| Al Watan (Saudi Arabia) | New Haven Register (United States) |
| Al-Hayat (United Kingdom) | PakTribune.com (Pakistan) |
| Aljazeera.net (Qatar) | People's Daily Online (China) |
| Arab Monitor (Italy) | Public Broadcasting Station (United States) |
| Bahrain News Agency (Bahrain) | Qatar Tribune (Qatar) |
| BBC Radio (United Kingdom) | Sudan Tribune (Sudan) |
| Christian Science Monitor (United States) | Taqrir Washington (United States/Egypt) |
| CNSNews.com (United States) | The Brunei Times (Brunei) |
| Emirates News Agency (United Arab Emirates) | The Daily Star (Lebanon) |
| Global Insight (Global) | The Korea Herald (Korea) |
| GreaterKashmir.com (Kashmir) | The Media Line (United States) |
| Gulf Times (United Arab Emirates) | The New York Sun (United States) |
| Huliq.com (United States) | The Peninsula (Qatar) |
| Indian Muslims (India) | The Statesman (India) |
| International News Network (Pakistan) | The Washington Post (United States) |
| Islamic Republic News Agency (Iran) | The Washington Times (United States) |
| Islamonline.net (Global) | Turkish Press (Turkey) |
| Kuwait News Agency (Kuwait) | United Press International (Global) |
| Malaysia General News (Malaysia) | Zawya (Global) |





List of Participants

Afghanistan

ABDULLAH ABDULLAH

Former Foreign Minister

SAKENA YACOobi

Founder and President,
Afghan Institute of Learning

Algeria

ABDELMADJID AMRANI

Dean of the Faculty of
Arts and Humanities,
University of Batna Algeria

MALIKA BENAOUA-ZOUAOUI

Doctoral Program Coordinator,
Universite de Blida,
Algeria Law Department

ABDELKRIM DAHMEN

Member of Parliament,
Parliament of Algeria

ABDELOUAHAB REZIG

Former Director, Office for North
Africa, United Nations Economic
Commission for Africa; Professor,
University of Algiers

Egypt

SAMAR AL-GAMAL

Journalist, *Al-Ahram Hebdo*

YUSUF AL-QARADAWI

Head, European Council for Fatwa and
Research; Host,
Ash-Shariah Wal-Hayat

NORA AMIN

Actress, Director, Writer

GAMAL EID

Executive Director, Arabic Network for
Human Rights Information

MOHAMED ELMENSHAWY

Editor-in-Chief, *Taqrir Washington*

AMR GOHAR

CEO and Managing Director, National
Telecom Card Company (NTCC);
Chairman, CELLTEK

MONA MAKRAM-EBEID

Professor, American University in
Cairo; President, Association for
Advancement of Education

AMRE MOUSSA

Secretary General,
League of Arab States

GAMAL SHAHIN

Correspondent, *El-Akhbar*

Greece

SAMER KHOURY

Executive Vice-President of Operations,
Consolidated Contractors Company

India

MOBASHAR JAWED (MJ) AKBAR

Editor-in-Chief, *The Asian Age*

HAMID ANSARI

Chairman, National Commission
for Minorities

MEHBOOBA MUFTI

Member of Parliament,
Parliament of India

HABIB REHMAN

Executive Director, ITC India, Inc.

MOHAMMAD SALIM

Member of Parliament,
Parliament of India

Indonesia

KOMARUDDIN HIDAYAT

President, Syarif Hidayatullah State
Islamic University, Jakarta

IKHWANUL KIRAM MASHURI

Chief Editor, *Republika*

Iran

REZA ABEDINI

Artist

BAHMAN FARMANARA

Film Director

ALI REZA SAMI-AZAR

Former Director, Tehran Museum
of Contemporary Art; Head, Iranian
Visual Arts Center

HADI SEMATI

Professor, Faculty of Law and Political
Science, University of Tehran

Iraq

MUEAN AL JABIRY

President, Jefferson Group
of Companies

JALAL AL-DIN AL-SAGHEER

Imam, Al-Hadarah Al-Kazimiyah
Mosque; Member of Parliament,
Parliament of Iraq

ABDUL KARIM AL-MUHAMMADAWI

Leader, Marsh Arab Party; Member of
Parliament, Parliament of Iraq

Jordan

FADI HADDADIN

Editor, *misbahalhurriya.org*

AHMAD HUMEID

Blogger, *360East.com*

NISREEN SHOCAIR

President, Virgin Megastores,
Middle East Region

Kazakhstan

KUANSHBEEK SAZANOV

President, Economic
Financial Consulting

Kuwait

NAIF A. AL-MUTAWA

Founder and Chief Executive Officer,
Teshkeel Media Group

ROLA DASHTI

Chairperson, Kuwait Economic Society

ABDUL AZIZ ABDUL

LATIF AL SHARIKH

Director, Kuwaiti Diplomat Institute



Kyrgyzstan

ANARA TABYSHALIEVA

Director of Research Programs
Institute for Regional Studies

Lebanon

IBRAHIM AL-AMIN

Columnist, *As-Safir*

RIAD AL ASSAAD

Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer, South for Construction

ALI HAMADE

Editorialist, *An-Nahar*

RAMI KHOURI

Editor-at-Large, *Daily Star*; Director,
Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy
and International Affairs, American
University in Beirut

ROULA M. TALJ

Political Analyst

Malaysia

SYED HAMID BIN SYED

JAAFAR ALBAR

Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MOHAMED JAWHAR HASSAN

Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer, Institute of Strategic and
International Studies Malaysia

TORLA BIN HJ HASSAN

Dean, International Institute of
Islamic Thought and Civilization

ELINA NOOR

Analyst, Institute of Strategic and
International Studies Malaysia

Mauritania

ABDELL NASSER OULD

ETHMANE

Foreign Secretary, SOS Slaves

Morocco

FAOUZI SKALI

Director-General, Spirit of
Fes Foundation

RAJAE EL MOUHANDIZ

Artist

Oman

YOUSSEF BIN ALAWI

BIN ABDULLA

Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

RASHID BIN MUBARAK

AL GHILANI

Ambassador to Qatar,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Pakistan

SALMAN AHMAD

Musician, Junoon; United Nations
Goodwill Ambassador

MUKHTAR BIBI

Community Activist

MARYAM BIBI

Founder, Khwendo Kor

REHANA HAKIM

Editor-in-Chief, *Newsline*

HAMEED HAROON

Chief Executive Officer, *Dawn*
Group of Newspapers

ASHRAF JEHANGIR QAZI

UN Special Representative for Iraq,
United Nations

ARFA SYEDA ZEHRA

Chairperson, National Committee on
the Status of Women in Pakistan

Palestine

HANY ABU ASSAD

Film Director, *Paradise Now*

AKRAM BAKER

Co-President, Arab Western
Summit of Skills

ASAD-ABDUL RAHMAN

Member, Executive Committee of the
Palestine Liberation Organization

KHALIL SHIKAKI

Director, Palestinian Center
for Policy and Survey Research

Qatar

MOHAMMED ABDULLAH

MUTIB AL RUMAIHI

Assistant Foreign Minister of
Follow-Up Affairs, Ministry of
Foreign Affairs

SHEIKHA ABDULLA

AL-MISNAD

President, Qatar University

SHEIKH HAMAD BIN JASSIM BIN

JABR AL-THANI

First Deputy Prime Minister and
Minister of Foreign Affairs,
State of Qatar

Saudi Arabia

FOWZIYAH ABU-KHALID

Assistant Professor, Department of
Sociology, King Saud University

LATIFA A. AL BUSSEIR

Assistant Executive Manager,
Strategic Studies, Kingdom
Foundation

Sudan

AL SADIG RAHMAN AL MAHDI

Former Prime Minister;
President, Umma Party

SAMIR HOSNY

Director, Department of African
Affairs and Afro-Arab Cooperation,
League of Arab States

Tanzania

ALI A. MUFURUKI

Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer, Infotech Investment
Group LTD

Tunisia

KAMEL AYADI

President, World Federation of Engineering Organizations

LEYLA KHAIAI

Honorary World President, World Association of Women Entrepreneurs

Turkey

CENGİZ CANDAR

Journalist, *The New Anatolian*

SOLİ OZEL

Professor, Istanbul Bilgi University

United Arab Emirates

RAJA EASA AL GURG

Managing Director, Easa Saleh Al Gurg Group

ABDALLA A. ALNAJJAR

Executive Director, Arab Science and Technology Foundation

JOSEPH SAMAAAN

Managing Director, Tanweer Enlightenment Ltd. Corp.

ZAFAR SIDDIQI

Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, CNBC Arabiya

TARIK M. YOUSEF

Nonresident Senior Fellow, Wolfensohn Center for Development, Global Economy and Development, the Brookings Institution; Dean, Dubai School of Government

United Kingdom

VAHID ALAGHBAND

Chairman, Balli Group

MICHAEL D'ARCY

Researcher in Science and Security, King's College London

ROKHSANA FIAZ

Director, The Change Institute

HISHAM A. HELLYER

Research Fellow, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick

JIHAD B. KHAZEN

Director, *Al Hayat* Newspaper Ltd.

SHAHID MALIK

Member of Parliament, Parliamentary Private Secretary to Minister of State, Department of Education and Skills

United States

RANA ABBAS

Deputy Director of the Michigan Office, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; President, AWARE

ALICIA ADAMS

Vice President of International Programming and Dance, Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

ISMAEL AHMED

Executive Director, Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services

HADY AMR

Fellow and Director, Brookings Doha Center, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution

ABDULLAH AHMED AN-NAIM

Charles Howard Candler Professor of Law, Emory University

REZA ASLAN

Author, *No God but God*

NABIH AYAD

Advisory Board Chairman, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC)

ROBERT AYAN

Partner, Minah Ventures

THOMAS BECKER

President, Chautauqua Institution

DAVID BELT

Assistant Professor, National Security Strategy, National Defense University

JOHN BORIGHT

Executive Director, International Affairs, U.S. National Academy of Sciences

MARSHALL M. BOUTON

President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs

RONALD BRUDER

Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Education for Employment Foundation

CATHLEEN A. CAMPBELL

President and Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Civilian Research and Development Foundation

J. SCOTT CARPENTER

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State

RAJIV CHANDRASEKARAN

Assistant Managing Editor, *The Washington Post*

BENJAMIN CHAVIS

President and Chief Executive Officer, Hip Hop Summit Action Network

RICHARD E. DARILEK

Director, RAND-Qatar Policy Institute

FERI DAFTARI

Curator of Islamic Contemporary Art Exhibition, Museum of Modern Art

JOHN J. DEGIOIA

President, Georgetown University

JERRILYNN DODDS

Professor and Art Historian, School of Architecture, City University of New York

JAMES A. DONAHUE

President, The Graduate Theological Union

BETSY FADER

Director of Strategy and Planning/Program Director for Child Abuse Prevention, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation



DAVID FISHER

Chairman, Capital Guardian

MARK GALLI

Managing Editor, *Christianity Today*

PHILIP GORDON

Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, the Brookings Institution

STEPHEN R. GRAND

Fellow and Director, Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World, Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution

VARTAN GREGORIAN

President, Carnegie Corporation

L. MICHAEL HAGER

President, Education for Employment Foundation

TAJ HAMAD

Secretary General, World Association of NGOs

IMAD HAMAD

Regional Director, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC)

RENO L. HARNISH III

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State

STEPHEN HEINTZ

President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund

CHARLES P. HENDERSON

Executive Director, Association for Religion and Intellectual Life

KATHARINE RHODES HENDERSON

Executive Vice President, Auburn Theological Seminary

JAMES HOLSTE

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Texas A&M University at Qatar

JOEL C. HUNTER

Senior Pastor, Northland Church

SHAMIL IDRIS

Acting Director, Alliance of Civilizations, United Nations

DAVID IGNATIUS

Associate Editor and Foreign Correspondent, *The Washington Post*

MARTIN INDYK

Director, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Brookings Institution

TERESA ANN ISAAC

Former Mayor, City of Lexington, Kentucky

RANDA JAMAL

Programme Analyst, United Nations Development Programme

MARVIN KALB

Senior Fellow, Shorenstein Center for the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University

DAVID KEENE

Chairman, American Conservative Union; Managing Associate, Carmen Group, Inc.

LYDIA KHALIL

Counter Terrorism Analyst, New York Police Department

MARK T. KIMMITT

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, United States Department of Defense

CHRIS KOJM

Senior Advisor, Iraq Study Group; Senior Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

ALEX KRONEMER

Co-Founder and Executive Producer, Unity Productions Foundation

STEVEN KULL

Director, Program on International Policy Attitudes

F. STEPHEN LARRABEE

Corporate Chair in European Security, The RAND Corporation

LAUREN LEVY

Creative Executive, Miramax Films

AARON LOBEL

President and Chairman, America Abroad Media

KRISTIN LORD

Associate Dean, Elliott School of International Relations, George Washington University

MARK LYNCH

Associate Professor, Williams College

MAGGIE MITCHELL SALEM

Regional Director for the Middle East and North Africa, IFES

DALIA MOGAHED

Executive Director, Center for Muslim Studies, The Gallup Organization

MONA MOHIB

Vice Chair, Asian-Pacific Islander Caucus, Democratic National Committee

MOHAMMED ALI NAQVI

Director and Producer, Munan Pictures

HIAM NAWAS

Analyst, Rothkopf Group

GROVER NORQUIST

President, Americans for Tax Reform

SAMAH NORQUIST

Founder and President, Global Partners, LLC

MICHAEL NOZIK

Producer, *Syriana*

MICHAEL O'HANLON

Senior Fellow, the Brookings Institution

CORY ONDREJKA

Chief Technology Officer, Linden Lab

ATHAR OSAMA

Senior Executive, ANGLE Technology Group

CARLOS PASCUAL

Vice President and Director
of Foreign Policy Studies,
the Brookings Institution

TODD G. PATKIN

Founder, Todd G. Patkin Companies

RICHARD PEÑA

Program Director,
New York Film Festival

JANE PERLEZ

Correspondent,
The New York Times

ROBERT PINSKY

Former Poet Laureate of the United
States; Professor, Boston University

KENNETH POLLACK

Senior Fellow and Director of
Research, Saban Center for Middle
East Policy at the Brookings
Institution

HEATHER RAFFO

Artist

RICHARD W. RAHN

Director, European Center for
Economic Growth

DOUGLAS E. RAMAGE

Indonesia Country Representative,
The Asia Foundation

JAMES REARDON-ANDERSON

Dean, Georgetown University School
of Foreign Service in Qatar

BRUCE RIEDEL

Senior Fellow, Saban Center for
Middle East Policy at the Brookings
Institution

IMRAN RIFFAT

Finance Director,
The Synergos Institute

BOB ROBERTS, JR.

Founder and Senior Pastor,
Northwood Church, Texas

EDWARD M. ROGERS, JR.

Chairman, Barbour Griffith &
Rogers, LLC

KHALED SAFFURI

Founder and President, Islamic
Free Market Institute

CAROL R. SAIVETZ

Research Associate, Davis Center
for Russian and Eurasian Studies,
Harvard University

DAVID M. SATTERFIELD

Senior Advisor to the Secretary and
Coordinator for Iraq, Office of the
Secretary, Department of State

CYNTHIA P. SCHNEIDER

Professor in the Practice of
Diplomacy, Georgetown University;
Nonresident Senior Fellow, the
Brookings Institution

JILLIAN SCHWEDLER

Assistant Professor, Government and
Politics, University of Maryland;
Chair, Board of Directors, Middle
East Research and Information
Project

CHRIS SEIPLE

President, Institute for Global
Engagement

CHRISTOPHER SHIELDS

Chief Executive Officer,
The Festival Network, LLC

RONALD SIDER

Founder and President,
Evangelicals for Social Action

PETER W. SINGER

Senior Fellow and Director, 21st
Century Defense Initiative,
the Brookings Institution

SHIBLEY TELHAMI

Anwar Sadat Chair,
University of Maryland; Nonresident
Senior Fellow, the Brookings
Institution

JAMES A. THOMSON

President and Chief Executive
Officer, The RAND Corporation

AZHAR USMAN

Comedian, 9 Saints Entertainment

MARK WARD

Senior Deputy Assistant
Administrator for Asia and the Near
East, U.S. Agency for International
Development (USAID)

LUCAS WELCH

President and Founder, Soliya

THOMAS G. WENSKI

Bishop and Chairman, International
Policy Committee, U.S. Conference
of Catholic Bishops

TAMARA COFMAN WITTES

Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East
Policy at the Brookings Institution

MICHAEL YAFFE

Academic Dean and Professor, Near
East South Asia Center for Strategic
Studies, National Defense University

GIDEON YAGO

Screenwriter

MOHAMMED YAHYA

Founder and Executive Director,
Damanga Coalition for Freedom and
Democracy

AHMED SAMIR YOUNIS

Independent Consultant

PHILIP D. ZELIKOW

White Burkett Miller Professor
of History, University of Virginia;
Former Counsel, Department
of State

IAN ZAIDER

President, Media and Management
Division, The Festival Network, LLC

Yemen**NAJAT M. JUMAAN**

Assistant Professor of Business
Administration, Sana'a University;
Deputy General Manager for
Financial Affairs, MAJ Corp



About The U.S.–Islamic World Forum

ONE OF THE GREATEST CHALLENGES IN GLOBAL POLITICS TODAY IS THE dangerous tension growing between the United States and the world's Muslim states and communities. Relations between the world's community of 1.4 billion Muslims and the world's leading state power are at a historic low point, to the benefit of neither. This deepening divide is not just tragic, but is also a critical impediment to cooperation on a breadth of vital issues, ranging from dealing with terrorism and radicalism, to supporting human development and freedom.

Each year the activities of the *Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World* culminate with the annual U.S.-Islamic World Forum (the “Doha Forum”) in Doha, Qatar. The Doha Forum is designed to bring together key leaders in the worlds of politics, business, media, academia, and civil society from across the Muslim world – including Muslim communities in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East – and the United States. Such institutionalized dialogue between leaders and opinion-shapers is an urgent necessity, in order to help prevent a fault line from forming between the West and the Muslim world.

The Doha Forum is designed to serve as both a convening body and catalyst for positive action. Therefore, its focus is on a dialogue that leads to the development of actionable programs for government, civil society, and the private sector. The Forum's annual conferences have become the foremost meeting for positive cross-cultural engagement among leaders from the United States and the Muslim world. It also provides the foundation for a range of complementary activities designed to enhance the effectiveness of the dialogue. These include the assembling of task forces of policymakers and experts, and associated outreach, research, and publications. We also plan to conduct follow-up regional forums in other parts of the Muslim world, beginning with the inaugural U.S.-Islamic World Forum: The Kuala Lumpur Round 2008. Collaborative media, education, and youth-centered programs help expand its impact.

The first meeting of the Forum was in January 2004. Over 165 leaders from the United States and 37 states in the Muslim world met over the course of 3 days, to discuss a wide variety of topics including: the peace process, Iraq, human development, education, the role of the private sector, the new media, etc. The leaders in attendance ranged from government ministers and CEOs, to deans of Universities and editors-in-chief of internationally-acclaimed newspapers. Former U.S. President Bill Clinton and Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani, the Emir of Qatar, delivered the keynote addresses. Following Forums have sought to build upon these foundations by addressing the sense of an upswell for change in the region, and in the relationship between the United States and the Muslim world.

The theme of the 2007 U.S.-Islamic World Forum, “Confronting What Divides Us,” seeks to build on past sessions. Since our last Forum, the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, last summer's conflict in Lebanon, the stalled prospects for peace between Israel and the Palestinians, and the specter of an increasingly bold Iran have come to dominate international headlines and fuel more resentment and anger on both sides. Such infamous incidents as last year's Danish cartoon controversy, and Pope Benedict XVI's contentious remarks concerning Islam, further underscore the level of mutual suspicion and distrust. In light of such deteriorating conditions, it has become ever more apparent for the need to have frank and direct dialogue on the most pressing issues dividing the United States and the Muslim world.

A comprehensive summary of the Forum can be found at www.us-islamicworldforum.org.



The Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World

The *Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World* is a major research program housed within the Saban Center for Middle East Policy. The project conducts high-quality public policy research, and convenes policy makers and opinion leaders on the major issues surrounding the relationship between the United States and the Muslim world.

The Project seeks to engage and inform policymakers, practitioners, and the broader public on developments in Muslim countries and communities, and the nature of their relationship with the United States. Together with the affiliated Brookings Doha Center in Qatar, it sponsors a range of events, initiatives, research projects, and publications designed to educate, encourage frank dialogue, and build positive partnerships between the United States and the Muslim world.

The Project has several interlocking components:

- The U.S.-Islamic World Forum, which brings together key leaders in the fields of politics, business, media, academia, and civil society from across the Muslim world and the United States, for much-needed discussion and dialogue;
- A Visiting Fellows program, for scholars and journalists from the Muslim world to spend time researching and writing at Brookings in order to inform U.S. policy makers on key issues facing Muslim states and communities;
- A series of Brookings Analysis Papers and Monographs that provide needed analysis of the vital issues of joint concern between the U.S. and the Muslim world;
- An Arts and Culture Initiative, which seeks to develop a better understanding of how arts and cultural leaders and organizations can increase understanding between the United States and the global Muslim community;
- A Science and Technology Policy Initiative, which looks at the role that cooperative science and technology programs involving the U.S. and Muslim world can play in responding to regional development and education needs, and in fostering positive relations;
- A “Bridging the Divide” initiative which explores the role of Muslim communities in the West; and
- A Brookings Institution Press Book Series, which aims to synthesize the project’s findings for public dissemination.

The underlying goal of the Project is to continue the Brookings Institution’s original mandate to serve as a bridge between scholarship and public policy. It seeks to bring new knowledge to the attention of decision-makers and opinion-leaders, as well as afford scholars, analysts, and the public a better insight into policy issues. The project is supported through the generosity of a range of sponsors including the Government of the State of Qatar, The Ford Foundation, The Carnegie Corporation, The Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, and the Institute for Social Policy Understanding. Partners include the U.S. Institute of Peace, The MacArthur Foundation, the Joan Shorenstein Center, American University, RAND Corporation, the Education for Employment Foundation, the USC Center for Public Diplomacy, and Unity Productions Foundation.

The Project Conveners are Ambassador Martin Indyk, Dr. Peter W. Singer, Professor Shibley Telhami, and Mr. Bruce Riedel. Dr. Stephen R. Grand serves as Project Director, and Mr. Hady Amr is the Director of the Brookings Doha Center.

For more information, please visit: <http://www.brookings.edu/fp/research/projects/islam/islam.htm>.

The Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution

THE SABAN CENTER FOR MIDDLE EAST POLICY WAS ESTABLISHED on May 13, 2002 with an inaugural address by His Majesty King Abdullah II of Jordan. The creation of the Saban Center reflects the Brookings Institution's commitment to expand dramatically its research and analysis of Middle East policy issues at a time when the region has come to dominate the U.S. foreign policy agenda.

The Saban Center provides Washington policymakers with balanced, objective, in-depth and timely research and policy analysis from experienced and knowledgeable scholars who can bring fresh perspectives to bear on the critical problems of the Middle East. The center upholds the Brookings tradition of being open to a broad range of views. The Saban Center's central objective is to advance understanding of developments in the Middle East through policy-relevant scholarship and debate.

The center's foundation was made possible by a generous grant from Haim and Cheryl Saban of Los Angeles. Ambassador Martin S. Indyk, Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, is the Director of the Saban Center. Kenneth M. Pollack is the center's Director of Research. Joining them is a core group of Middle East experts who conduct original research and develop innovative programs to promote a better understanding of the policy choices facing American decision makers in the Middle East. They include Tamara Cofman Wittes, a specialist on political reform in the Arab world who directs the Middle East Democracy and Development Project; Bruce Riedel, who served as a senior advisor to three Presidents on the Middle East and South Asia at the National Security Council during a 29 year career in the CIA, a specialist on counterterrorism; Suzanne Maloney, a former senior State Department official who focuses on Iran and economic development; Shibley Telhami, who holds the Sadat Chair at the University of Maryland; Daniel Byman, a Middle East terrorism expert from Georgetown University; Steven Heydemann, a specialist on Middle East democratization issues from Georgetown University; and Ammar Abdulhamid, a Syrian dissident and specialist on Syrian politics. The center is located in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at Brookings, led by Carlos Pascual, its Director and a Brookings vice president.

The Saban Center is undertaking path breaking research in five areas: the implications of regime change in Iraq, including post-war nation-building and Persian Gulf security; the dynamics of Iranian domestic politics and the threat of nuclear proliferation; mechanisms and requirements for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; policy for the war against terrorism, including the continuing challenge of state-sponsorship of terrorism; and political and economic change in the Arab world, in particular in Syria and Lebanon, and the methods required to promote democratization.

The center also houses the ongoing Brookings Project on U.S. Relations with the Islamic World, which is directed by Stephen Grand. The project focuses on analyzing the problems in the relationship between the United States and Muslim states and communities around the globe, with the objective of developing effective policy responses. The project's activities includes a task force of experts, a global conference series bringing together American and Muslim world leaders, a visiting fellows program for specialists from the Muslim world, initiatives in science and the arts, and a monograph and book series. Under the directorship of Hady Amr, a new Brookings Doha Center is being opened in Qatar that seeks to extend the Brookings tradition of independent, in-depth research and quality public policy programs to Doha, and the broader Muslim world.





The Brookings Project on U.S. Relations With the Islamic World



THE SABAN CENTER
for MIDDLE EAST POLICY
at THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-797-6462, Fax: 202-797-2481
www.brookings.edu/sabancenter



وزارة الخارجية