

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION  
Center on the United States and Europe

THE EVOLVING TRANSATLANTIC AGENDA

Washington, D.C.

Friday, July 11, 2008

**Introduction and Moderator:**

DANIEL BENJAMIN, Senior Fellow and Director  
The Center on the United States and Europe  
The Brookings Institution

**Featured Speaker:**

JIM MURPHY, Minister for Europe  
United Kingdom

\* \* \* \* \*

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. BENJAMIN: (In progress) -- Jim Murphy discussing Public Diplomacy in a Globalized World. We've had a very busy week here at Brookings despite what should be the summer slowdown. We've had people who are here to talk about extremely difficult problems. For example, yesterday we had the Secretary of Defense from the United Kingdom, Des Browne, who spoke about Afghanistan and Iraq. We had the general yesterday who will be taking over the Southern Command in Afghanistan. This morning we had Kai Eide, the U.N. Special Representative of the Secretary General in Afghanistan. But I don't think we've had anyone who had as tough a job as the British Minister of State for Europe.

It is a great pleasure to welcome Jim Murphy. Des Browne said yesterday that he was really here, that is, Des Browne was really here to get people accustomed to listening to Scottish, and he did a very good job. We're hoping that you will keep this up and we can stay on the same wavelength.

It is a truism but nonetheless an important truth of the 21st century that there are a number of very difficult problems that we face that know no single national answer, that no country alone can change. Over the last few years we have certainly had a lot of strains in relations

between the United States and some of its long-time allies, although I would not include Britain in that group. But it is clear that we start from somewhere behind the starting line in terms of finding common cause and finding solutions to these very difficult challenges which include such issues as nonproliferation, trade, counterterrorism, and climate change, perhaps the biggest of all. I think that it's safe to say that in January 2009 no matter who the president is, we will have a fresh start and a renewed effort to find common international solutions to these problems. But this will by no means be easy and there are lots of important gaps that need to be addressed in public opinion on the different sides of the Atlantic and also within different countries within Europe on how to address many of these issues.

It's with that background that I think Jim Murphy has come to Washington to discuss a new book, *Engagement in Public Diplomacy in a Globalized World*, and to begin a very important transatlantic dialogue on what we do to address these critical issues. So without further ado I'm delighted to welcome Minister Murphy here to Brookings, and I turn the podium over to you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you very much, Daniel, and thank you for your kind introduction. I think Des and I spoke before, Des Browne, the Defense and Secretary, coming to Washington basically as

part of a wider Scottish strategy to have you all not just understanding our accents, but speaking with it, and not just being able to understand it. And Daniel's point about being the Minister for Europe in the U.K. government is not a job in the U.K. government without its controversies, and I think that's what Daniel was alluding to. Many of you who are U.S.-based and perhaps are not aware of all the nuances of British public relationship with European politics, maybe this anecdote will illustrate just what Daniel was alluding to. When I became the Minister for Europe just over a year ago when I went to see Gordon Brown at the change of government, I had been the Minister for Employment and I became the Minister for European Affairs and Public Diplomacy. Apart from friends, the note of congratulations I received was an anonymous one by email and quite short and it kind of illustrates I think the nature of the job of European Minister in the U.K. Four short messages. Firstly it was congratulations on your new job which I thought was surprising, a nice and fresh start. The second thing was I've watched the careers of all of your predecessors. I thought good, someone who's interested in public life and politics. That's another good sign [but it] turned for the worse. The third message which was you will die a traitor and be buried in a traitor's grave. And that kind of gave me a sense of the year that I had ahead, and it's not all been as enjoyable as that. It's had even more difficult moments, but

that remains one of the kinds of jobs in U.K. politics with a lot of the cut and thrust of domestic politics and often there's a conversation about Britain's past rather than Europe's future.

That's really not the main purpose of why I'm here this morning, but I'm delighted to have been invited. I'm in Washington as Daniel said to launch this book, copies of which I'm sure are available at the back. I'm just come from a breakfast with Marshall Scholars, fascinating, some of whom may of course be with us in the audience at this fascinating discussion. And it's also an honor this morning to the think tank that contributed a major part toward the birth of that Marshall Plan. The scholarships were I think as you all know were set up as a thank you for the generosity of spirit shown by the United States in the dark days following the Second World War when Europe's destiny was at another crossroads, when this institution was working with some of the world's most innovative thinkers to find a new international order in those dreadful days and perhaps from a more optimistic perspective, perhaps with a similar juncture today.

This session as Daniel said is on the evolving transatlantic agenda with a particular reference to public diplomacy, and while I'm the U.K. Minister, I wanted to concentrate most of my remarks on some of the challenges in respect of the United States and the European Union.

So when the great and the good gathered at Brookings in the immediate postwar period and when they came up with the Marshall Plan, the transatlantic relationship was as we all know dominated by the Soviet threat and that Cold War understandably deepened our already remarkably strong relationship. But in the years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, one of the transatlantic essay question has always been, Now that my enemy is dead, is his enemy still my friend? The answer is a very loud, resounding, values-based yes, because Europe's relationship with the U.S. has never been based simply upon a common threat, it's never been about the politics of expediency, it's been forged through a long-term common endeavor in business, in culture, in politics, defense, and in diplomacy. And these common values have not changed since the end of that Cold War, but some things have changed irreversibly.

The European Union and the European continent are one. During the Cold War the U.S. administration rightly asked itself, What do we need to do in Europe? The contemporary question of course is different. It's what do we need to achieve with Europe together? There is this new space for E.U.-U.S. cooperation as European instruments such as foreign and security policy and European defense policy becomes more effective. Right now the drive in Europe is about trying to make sure that the European Union becomes a more effective global actor that drives

an enduring legitimacy for its purpose and that bipolar politics that I've already spoken about of the Cold War meant that the transatlantic relationship could to a large degree be defined through the prism of democratic principles.

Twenty years ago, 40 percent of the world's states were democracies. Now it's over 60 percent. And in addition to that, China, India, and others are no longer emerging but have emerged as major players on the international scene economically and politically. So this transatlantic relationship will be defined by how it operates within the context of these contemporary challenges whether it can work cooperatively to find a strong international response to these global challenges. This issue has dominated my past year as the Minister for Europe and the Minister for Public Diplomacy. The key issue for both of those portfolios has been how we should respond to the case of globalization.

There are two specific U.K. initiatives that I want to draw your attention to. On the European Union we are working on a policy called Global Europe which encourages Europe to spend less time on its own structures, its own institutions, its own rules, its own laws, and start to look more at the role that it can play globally, more time on issues such as

international trade, counterterrorism, and climate change. In short, more time on substance, less time on structures.

On public diplomacy we've been rightly through a period of questioning pretty rigorously whether we've been doing the right kinds of activity. Now we're starting to come up with of the conclusions and some of the tentative answers which I'll refer to in a moment. But one way that we'll able to do a lot of this better than the U.S. is through our new foundation, the Wilton Park-USA Foundation which will have its very first meeting today. Wilton Park has sometimes been described as public diplomacy in action. Set up by Winston Churchill after the Second World War, it is a much-valued U.K. asset and a world leader for hosting top-level foreign-policy debates, and we are keen to see more U.S. participation, so have established this U.S.-based foundation.

The British government has identified in this context five key global challenges that I wish to say a word or two about. They are not unique to the U.K., they are not unique to the European Union, challenges faced by all of us and it gives us an unprecedented scope of cooperation. The first one as Daniel has already referred to is climate change. Twenty years ago this issue of climate change was hardly on the radar. Now it's a major threat to our future security and at the top of our list of priorities. By 2025, the world will be more polluted, more exploited, more arid, and the



competition for scarce resources more acute. The global demand for energy will grow by over 50 percent. By 2020, half of the world's oil production will occur in countries already considered high risk of internal instability. It's easy to see the effect of this on our own security. Unchecked climate change will undermine the conditions for jobs and growth across the world. It will exacerbate new stresses, water security and food security, which in turn could lead to conflict between and within states. For us the message is absolutely clear, the world needs to find new partnerships to tackle this climate insecurity. So part of our vision for the European Union is to pursue a global role in search of climate security. An evolving transatlantic relationship and evolving transatlantic partnership should have climate change at its heart. Our immediate challenge is to reach a new global deal in the city of Copenhagen in 2009. An intense multilateral effort is needed to get the right kind of deal and the U.S. and Europe and the more developed economies not only have a role, we not only have a role, we have a responsibility in this regard.

The second global challenge I wish to address is counterterrorism. We all know that this debate about counterterrorism is often associated with policies on Iraq and Afghanistan. My very strong view is that that's a revisionist mistake. As we all know, of course 9/11 predated those campaigns. So did the 1998 bombings of the U.S.

embassies in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi, and over 15,000 people have died in what's termed high-casualty terrorist bombings since 1996. But this phenomenon has put a strategic premium on cooperation between our security services as well as demands for dedicating resources to our security and forces as never before to fight terrorism. So our own security services is now twice the size it was on 9/11, and Europe and the U.S. have and will continue to rightly intensify our cooperation to make the transatlantic space safer for all of our citizens. This radicalization is a key priority for our public diplomacy. How can we work together in addition to the security services and all the work that rightly takes place? How can we work together to counter the poisonous propaganda of al-Qaeda throughout the world, but in particular in the Arab street. We need to ask ourselves how can we communicate much more effectively with those who are susceptible to that propaganda, and I'm happy to listen to your views as to how you think we should be doing that.

The third area is on international trade. As we all know, the pace of economic, political, and cultural globalization is unprecedented and will of anything quicken further still. Over the past 50 years the U.S. and Europe have been the great winners of this postwar trade liberalization but that success has to be maintained. Our economies have grown and generated new jobs and globalization has helped to stimulate

productivity and a remarkable degree of innovation. Economies in Europe and North America have become much more interdependent as we all know. Even with the emergence of India and China we remain the biggest investors in each others' economies. So looking ahead, a successful conclusion to the Doha Round is the next big challenge. If the U.S. and the E.U. continue to work together, the round can be concluded and should be concluded this year helping to further break down barriers between our markets and promoting global liberalization. Progress in this ground will be the clearest sign of our intention to resist economic nationalism or protectionism which now in the current crunch is more and not less important. But I know as a politician, and I'm acutely sensitive to this, that we cannot ignore the strains that globalization places on our citizens, whether it's perceived risk of offshoring or rising inequality.

The fourth issue I wish to refer to in the context of this emerging transatlantic relationship is on conflict. As Daniel said, and many of you may have heard my colleague Des Browne speak yesterday and I have no intention of repeating his comments, he focused on Iraq and Afghanistan, Des said, and in particular this is the only area I wish to focus on, he made his own case very well, that in relations to Afghanistan, "If the structures of governments that we develop are to be sustainable for the long-term and robust, then they must be delivered through the Afghan

structures and in line with Afghan culture." I think that's the important message from Des's speech yesterday and it's one that I wish to repeat today. In that context, I believe that the international community despite the pressures that we have does have a relatively good story to tell on conflict. In the postwar period, conflict peaked in the mid-1980s and is now at its lowest level since 1964 and there is absolutely no room for celebration about that. As of 2007, 19 countries were involved in major armed conflicts, instability spreads, and as has always been the case, a conflict on one side of the world can affect the interests of people on the other. So conflict as well know inhibits development and robs us of potential partners in science and culture and business as well as politics. So it is a priority of us to pay more attention not just to how we resolve conflict, but how we actually prevent it. Considering the facts that lead people to accept or initiate violence and warfare is an important context of this conflict prevention. So this progressive self-interest not just to save lives but is also cost-effective when we consider that some sources suggest that the typical civil war in a low-income country has been estimated to cost \$54 billion, and when consider size, the more developed economies that pay the majority, rightly pay the majority of that peacekeeping or reconstruction is a progress, sensible, and right thing to do. It's also the smart thing to do. So we're determined to see how the

E.U. can on a stronger international role particularly on our own doorstep and to Europe's East and to Europe's South in Africa and the Middle East using all of its tools, peacekeeping, development, and trade, and we have seen a start here. There are 11 separate European security and defense missions now operational including and importantly in the Balkans. A major virtue of the European Union Treaty of Lisbon is that it will make the E.U. more effective and efficient at foreign policy.

So all of these issues lead to a final challenge that our Primer Minister Gordon Brown is particularly driven by which is the effectiveness of international institutions. We can't simply tackle conflict or international trading rules or climate security or terrorism without an effective international framework. And let's clear, the reason for pushing for more effective representative international institutions is not only altruistic to have a better world and to help others, but also is in the U.K. self-interest. So I'm interested in your views on how we can make the United Nations in particular, but other international institutions, more effective and responsive today's unprecedented challenges.

I know that diplomacy like the military is often seen as a form of national prestige, or more simply as a vehicle to advance national interests. But I would argue that increasingly there is a convergence of what a national and international interest. Modern public diplomacy is I

believe an essential means of achieving all of these objectives. So this is the final area I wish to comment on today. What do I mean when I talk about modern public diplomacy? First that we must engage with foreign public throughout the policy cycle. We must take account of people's views when we formulate policy and not just when we implement it. The anecdote about Ed Morrow is told in our book. Whilst he was director of the U.S. Information Agency he told President Kennedy that if he was expected to be there at the crash landings of policy, he also wanted to be there at the takeoffs. In modern public policy, substitute Ed's U.S. information Service of the 1960s with the foreign public of today. If we them for example to change their behavior on their carbon footprint, we need to listen to their views as we formulate international agreements on climate security, and part of this approach is about the need for better communication. A fundamental conclusion about public diplomacy, lesson one of public diplomacy according to one of our contributors, is that communication starts with listening. We have to stop equating public diplomacy with public relations, shouting our core messages and (inaudible) lines louder and louder in the false belief that people are not hearing us. They are, but they want genuine engagement rather than clumsy propaganda. And my contention is that we can't make

international policy unless we can understand how the world looks and fields standing in someone else's shoes.

I'll put it more directly. What is an individual's motivation to act responsibly on climate security or on radicalization if they don't even have shoes on their feet? As a former British Ambassador to Moscow said when writing his memoirs way back in 1952, he described, "The notion that an ambassador should cruise around trying to get contact with the man in the street," he described that as a "pathetic fallacy." I would argue that that pathetic fallacy has now become a strategic necessity because in many countries power has shifted from the elites to the public. In the past we could find easily the people of influence in a foreign country in smart clubs and large houses in capital cities. Now it's much harder, and we should celebrate that fact that it is much harder to do so. It is a very good and important change in the nature of power. But we need to seek out our stakeholders not just from the corridors of power but also in the slums and the business districts and in the comfortable suburbs of our towns and in our cities. So this engagement leads us to find solutions that benefit everyone, and in this modern public diplomacy that's evolving, the transatlantic relationship is the logical and I would argue the essential start to this engagement. Thank you very much.

MR. BENJAMIN: I'm afraid that Mr. Murphy doesn't have a tremendous amount of time, so we'll get to the questions very quickly. Let me just say that the great American scholar Gary Wills in his writings on the American Revolution attributed some of the key intellectual influences to the Scottish Enlightenment of David Hume, Ferguson and others, and I'm delighted to see that the enlightenment is still coming over from Scotland. You set out an enormous agenda for us and some of your scenes dovetail quite neatly with a lot of things that in the debate here in Washington right now. For example, former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has also spoken about the democratization of foreign policy in an era of the communications revolution. So let me start this off quickly by giving you an analogy. Twenty years ago central bankers could save a currency by intervening. Today it's been very for governments to ever save a policy by intervening with public statements. How can governments keep up with this enormous amount of electronic media especially when it seems like in an era when newspapers are closing all the time, Gresham's law of change, I think he was a Scot too wasn't he, and the bad drives out the good?

MR. MURPHY: Thank you for your comments on the Scottish Enlightenment. I'd just say that my family was in Ireland at the time of the Scottish Enlightenment so I wasn't captured by it.



MR. BENJAMIN: Perhaps you were drawn to it.

MR. MURPHY: Tried and catch up with it rather than be captured by it. I don't think there's a government in the world which effectively manages to change its behavior in light of technological advancement. We're continually playing catch-up in the provision of services and in our communications. In the world of public diplomacy I think that's particularly true. Ambassadors who are diplomats have to be ambassadors of the World Wide Web and an international policy -- internet presence is a static information point and that's a problem for international politics. But I just wanted to offer this cautionary note, that as soon as I talk about modern public diplomacy, a couple of minutes before we start talking about the internet and modern public diplomacy, and it's important that we do, but the internet is a means of communication -- the content of the package, not the wrapping of it, and engagement through the internet is necessary but it's not in itself sufficient. So modern public diplomacy is executed increasingly through the internet, but it isn't in itself modern public diplomacy. Modern public diplomacy, there's an irony here and I make a long speech and I can't stay for long when I say that modern public diplomacy starts with listening, and it's listening to the policy and not just in the execution of the policy and not just in the communication of the policy. But all governments are playing catch-up. I think that's where

some of the people are best it are from the new emerging economies of Central and Eastern Europe -- start from scratch and learn from our mistakes.

MR. BENJAMIN: Secretary of State George Shultz used to say that listening is one of the most underrated ways to discover the truth, and sounds like it's a good lesson. Peter, can you introduce yourself? I know Peter won't have this problem, but could all future questioners make sure there's a question mark at the end of your question?

MR. SCHOETTLE: I'm Pete Schoettle from Brookings, and thank you very much for coming. My question relates to public diplomacy, specifically to the Middle East. The U.S. has put a major effort into Al-Hurra, our television program for that part of the world. My question to you is during the Cold War the BBC was phenomenally effective, and what are you doing now toward the Middle East? How does what you're doing compared to the American Al-Hurra program?

MR. MURPHY: We'll do a couple of questions just in the interests of time?

MR. BENJAMIN: Sure.

MR. KOBER: Stanley Kober with the Cato Institute. You mentioned Des Browne's speech yesterday. I noticed the *Financial Times* focused on that same part of the speech in its report today. I wonder if

you could flesh that out because it begs the question what are American-British allied soldiers supposed to risk their lives for when you say we want them develop their own way with their own culture and so on? Where specifically do you draw the line between fighting for democracy but not imposing the native culture?

MR. BENJAMIN: Why don't we just take one more here?

QUESTIONER: Minister Murphy (inaudible) university -- national relations -- I'm just wondering, you mentioned that Western society should outreach to other countries and engage -- but some countries, specifically Russia and China, they try to kind of bring up this notion of sovereign democracies and they try -- and we obviously know that closure of some British consul outlets in Russia. Could you please comment on how to do that? How do you break the doors that are being shut down?

MR. MURPHY: Peter's point about the BBC, I think somewhere in -- is that Winston Churchill with all the other great things he was -- him and his team were remarkable modern public diplomats of their time in the way in which messages were carried by the BBC at the time of the war in particular how we communicated and who communicated to the American public in the early-1940s, some things that we now take for granted about the message and the messenger were kind of very

innovative at that time. In fact, for example it wasn't a Briton, it wasn't a hometown English person who was speaking more like an East Coast American who was reporting for the BBC on conflict and the war and everything else -- in the book the way in which probably the greatest empire in the world and the most powerful empire the world had ever known was portrayed as a plucky underdog was an important part of framing of the debate at that time, and there were reasons why some of that was true and there were reasons why it was important for that to be said.

We've got a Public Diplomacy Board. It's a relatively new innovation. I chair it in (inaudible) office. The BBC World Service sits on that board. The British Council, another remarkable organization that's referred to in -- Russia is also on that board. So there's a great deal of coherence. I should add to that a very strong caveat, at no point did we ever seek to influence the editorial position of the BBC. That's just the wrong way to behave in this context.

The BBC has a remarkable amount of investment into a new Arabic Service. When I visited I went along and thought there will be a couple of people in a room perhaps this size or half this size. It's an enormous venture. A huge amount of investment aimed at 24-hour broadcasting all the time. That's an important way in which the BBC is

playing its role as global communicators and I think it does it with great sensitivity. An important point here is aside from the BBC, the other danger about public diplomacy is that it becomes trapped in a vocabulary of nation branding. That's been -- in the past and we were guilty of it. What we've got to do to be more effective in the world is to (inaudible) like the United Kingdom and that's good.

But sometimes it was about our public diplomacy strategy was difficult on occasion in the past to differentiate between that and our tourist strategy. Her Majesty the Queen, red pillow boxes, Tower of London, Big Ben, and the idea that people liked Britain or liked the British policy, there's no evidence of that being the case. So this modern public diplomacy is distinct from nation branding. It's important for people to think well of your nation, of course it is, particularly with investment and tourism, and in particular, positive nation branding is important in the context when you're up against belligerent nation branding from the other side. This isn't an exercise in simply nation branding and better communication.

On this point of Des's comment, I'll briefly respond because Des spoke about it more yesterday and I don't want to go over Des's comment and reinterpret Des's comment. Perhaps a kind of foreign policy aspect of this is that what's the lesson we've learned on development

policy? Is that aid is remarkably important, but it isn't a long-term solution. Continually to provide U.K. taxpayers' or international community taxpayers' support to an impoverished country is a fundamental strategic political moral imperative unquestionably. That's one of the reasons why I'm in the Labour Party on the basis that type of philosophical moral view of the world. But again it's a long-term solution. It's about those countries developing the capacity to trade freely with other nations and within their own regions so that there's self-sustainability of economic competence. A direct parallel is a similar train of thought which is that for all the reasons here, it's strategic, politically, morally and all of those things essential that U.K. troops, U.S. troops, it's not for me to decide U.S. troops, I'm only talking about the U.K. None of this is about the U.S. incidentally. It's all about the U.K. and the E.U. And it's right that we do that, it's essential that we do it, but it isn't the long-term solution. That's what Des was saying and that's what I believe. There's a long-term solution for those countries to have ownership of their own trade policy, their own economic policy, their own military capacity, and a strong and independent foreign policy. The types of things that we all rightly take for granted those countries should also enjoy, and there's no timeline on that. We're not interested in setting a timeline, but it's about a process and a transition and it's important that that happens.

The final point from the gentleman at the front was about Russia. Our relationship with Russia, the European Union's and the U.K.'s, is of course of strategic importance and interest, its size, its proximity, its economy, its diplomatic power of influence, but it's not without bumps in the road. We know that. We all know that. The action against the British Consul which is a fantastic example of soft power and soft influence and an enormous benefit for the U.K. on so many different levels. Russia's action on closing down two of our offices is illegal. It's unwarranted and it's illegal. Who suffers? It's difficult for us, it's difficult for our staff, a very essential staff, so it's half a million Russians who use the services of the British Consul. Half a million Russians are the losers as the British Consul is thwarted in this illegal move. So we'll continue to make that case in Russia. Incidentally, Russia is a good example of this modern public diplomacy where we -- modern public diplomacy I said is bilateral engagement with foreign governments but international relationships with foreign publics. So British investment in Russian NGOs is important (inaudible) reform, journalistic freedom, and the funding of those NGOs are an important example of this kind of multidimensional public diplomacy. I hope that responds to your point about the British Consul in Russia.

MR. BENJAMIN: I guess we have to go to the back of the audience and see whether you're allowed to answer another question or not.

MR. MURPHY: It's up to you. No one is saying leave, so I'm happy to keep talking if you're happy.

MR. BENJAMIN: Let's go right here then.

MR. MURPHY: Is there someone at the back of the audience who's got a question?

MR. BENJAMIN: I didn't see any hands go up back there so that's why I favor the front of the audience, the ones I can see right here.

MR. MURPHY: The one person in the audience I know --

MR. BENJAMIN: Then we'll come back over here.

QUESTIONER: This is a special favor. Tom -- from the "Times of London." Jim, I'm interested in the public diplomacy you're engaged with in America with respect to climate change, the extraordinary effort that Britain has gone through to change the climate on this issue not just at a governmental level but at the state level and also at the level of public opinion. Could you just elaborate on that a little bit?

MR. BENJAMIN: Can we go over here now?

MR. MITCHELL: Minister Murphy, Gary Mitchell from the "Mitchell Report." You spoke about Prime Minister Browne's interest in



the effectiveness of international institutions, improving it. I'm interested to know what your view of your government's view and the E.U.'s view is of an idea that continues to sort of make its way around this country a little bit which is the notion of a concert or a league of democracies. I guess to sort of put a slightly sharper point on the question, whether it is the view of your government and/or the European Union that that's a step forward in enhancing international institutions in global governance. I'll leave it at that.

MR. BENJAMIN: Do we have one more here?

MR. STEVEN: I'm David Steven (ph). I run the -- Program on Public Diplomacy and contributed a chapter to the book. Mr. Murphy, we described the IPCC as one of the most important pieces of public diplomacy, a way of bringing the world to consensus on the problem.

MR. BENJAMIN: The IPCC is?

MR. STEVEN: I'm sorry. The International Panel on Climate Change, the body that has brought the climate science together and has helped us reach a global consensus about the problem of climate change. Do you think we've done enough work to reach a consensus on how to get to solutions? And what role do you think public diplomacy can do in addressing (inaudible) political, economic, and cultural factors?

MR. MURPHY: Two on a similar subject and then one -- Gary's point about coalition of the willing democracies or however you wish to say it. It's not as a strong debate in the U.K. as I think it is in the U.S. In an ideal world, the U.N. would be that -- coalition of democracies. The European Union certainly is, 27 independent brilliant democracies who voluntarily share sovereignty with one another, they share some of their own sovereignty in return for their share of 26 other nations' sovereignty. I think if you're looking for a model, I think -- one of my friends, Dennis McShane, is a Member of Parliament and formerly in my job described the European Union as the patient miracle. I think that's a lovely way of describing it. I hope that that (inaudible) can be given that way after our history. So the answer to the question is, I refer to some figures -- democratic trend is on our side and will continue to be so not just because of globalization of the media but it's a human instinct that's becoming ever more powerful including in those countries that aren't yet democracies, and that's clear.

However, I don't think whether international institutions (inaudible) starting again with the Security Council of the United Nations today we wouldn't design the system that we have today. And that's not me saying that the U.K. shouldn't be a Permanent Member. That's not me. No matter how much -- we do, that's not one of the things we're going

to do. We might -- but we're not going to do -- so let's not get involved in that. The United Nations I think is ripe for reform. The European Union has gone through a period of painful reform, difficult reform, and it's now had -- the European Union actually -- come to the end of its reform process. That's the point I made. And the European Union now has the tools to do its job. No more institutional change after this treaty. I don't think the U.N. has been through that process. So what we say in the European Union is institutional changes must finish and then we have to get to work on the U.N.'s international framework.

On climate change, these points. One was about international -- with the U.S.-- they're connected. One example of this -- the U.K.'s efforts on climate change in the U.S. and the fact is an awful lot of this work is at state level. This week I've been in California, Utah, New York, and here, and the climate change debate is still a debate and it's kind of really very energetic as you all know. So what I've taken from the U.S. experience, first of all, that the U.K. and probably -- the U.K. is very involved in the debate. I was out and I was talking to the governor out in Utah -- he's not from my political family. And I met the mayor of Salt Lake City who's a Democrat. And both of them shared a kind of real passion for this -- a very bipartisan -- at that level, that leadership a kind of bipartisan determination to get on top of this. But the U.K. is involved in supporting

the Western Climate Initiative, facilitating discussions in the Western governors' gatherings. There are 33 states I think in the U.S. who are now operating toward the Kyoto ambition. The U.K. has actually exceeded its Kyoto commitments -- a very small number of states who have done so. And incidentally, our economy continues to grow and we continue to have more jobs while doing so with the growth of green-collar jobs, blue-collar jobs merging over to green-collar jobs and hundreds of thousands of people in green-collar jobs in the U.K. which is one of the lessons I think for other countries, particularly from Germany -- green-collar jobs. But our involvement is with technical support and facilitation of the Western Climate Initiative and supporting the impetus that's generated in those individual states themselves. I think the U.K. is the only government from another country who is involved in that process. We do it -- on behalf of the European Union, but we're facilitating the debate and providing technical support and assistance, and it's right that we do so because those challenges are global.

One of the points that I picked up in Utah, I spoke about the remarkable passion of the governor and the Mayor of Salt Lake City, but I also had -- as some of you may know this is in advance of coming here today, I've -- my way from Utah is there's also a train of thought which says, and it's your view and forgive me for implicitly criticizing your view,

but I don't agree with it, which is that -- two points, firstly, climate change isn't man made, it's just part of the natural rhythm of the Earth and what we have to do is just sit this out and it'll come right. I'm not a scientist, but that's kind of -- from the U.K. and the European perspective, that's just not the established orthodoxy of the scientific community. The second part of this conclusion is a more political one, and again the public diplomacy lesson in this is in the second part of this, is that not only is the science unsure, but it's actually part of a liberal conspiracy to undermine a conservative way of life and there's this grand international conspiracy on climate change, and I don't believe in any conspiracy theories -- largely internet-based kind of conversations. We have to understand it -- what we think in London is this. We know others in Utah think something diametrically different. And in other states -- the conversation in Poland for example is different. Poland has a similar kind of energy profile to Utah, 80 percent relying on dirty coal. You can't just lecture the Poles. You've got to understand and support. So part of the solution is that for example listening and then saying that part of the solution on climate change of course it includes fossil fuel. There isn't a coherent package of climate change and energy mix that doesn't include fossil fuel, but it has to be clean -- carbon capture and storage, green-collar jobs and everything else that goes with it. So the public diplomacy lesson -- one of the public

diplomacy lessons I've taken after a week in the States is listening to the state politicians in Utah. They feel it, they believe it passionately, and as passionately as I believe the diametrically opposite. But if their concerns can be met on the context of the impact on their local economies, then we have to try and meet them and reduce some of the negative stuff, fear there's a consequence of this climate change transformation. The final thing is that -- the additional message is that whoever is the earliest adopter -- the lesson from Germany is that whoever is the earliest adopter on this climate change technology is the big winner and it's undoubted. Germany still has some concerns about niche aspects of their car production and that's fine, but the way in which the German economy is transforming toward green-collar jobs I think is a lesson for the entire international community and we want to follow that. We're beginning to do it, but we say it's a kind of -- a transformation within structured economies -- strategic and long-term nature and the early adopters and we're determined to be one of the early adopters. The good people of Utah, it would be great if they were as well, but we would like to be earlier adopters because the earlier you adopt the bigger the win.

MR. BENJAMIN: I fear we're going to wrap it up now. I see that there is someone pointing toward the door in the back rather insistently. I want to thank you, Mr. Murphy for a terrific presentation. I

only wish you had more time in Washington and could take a little of your public diplomacy toward some of the other Western and Southwestern senators who've described global warming as the biggest hoax ever perpetrated on mankind since you've been very soft-spoken and persuasive in speaking with us, but I think that there's a lot of agreement here as to the reality of the science. In any case, we're delighted that you came today. We hope you'll be back. This is a discussion about moving opinions and formulating good policies and getting them across to the public that I think we'll be having for a number of years to come as democratic governments try to get into the job of shaping opinion as opposed to chasing it in a way that I think is absolutely vital for the success of these governments in the years to come. So thank you very, very much. We're pleased you chose Brookings to come and speak to us.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you very much.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC**

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

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public # 351998

in and for the  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
My Commission Expires:  
November 30, 2008