

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

13th ANNUAL SABAN FORUM  
CHALLENGE FOR THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION  
IN THE MIDDLE EAST

KEYNOTE CONVERSATION

Washington, D.C.

Friday, December 2, 2016

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

PARTICIPANTS:

**Moderator:**

MARTIN INDYK  
Executive Vice President  
The Brookings Institution

**Featured Speaker:**

SAMEH SHOUKRY  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Arab Republic of Egypt

\* \* \* \* \*

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

MR. INDYK: (Applause) Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm delighted to have the opportunity to join Bruce Jones and Haim Saban and welcome you all to this 13th Saban Forum. It's also my special privilege and honor to introduce you to a very special guest, our keynote speaker this evening, His Excellency, the Foreign Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Sameh Shoukry. Foreign Minister Shoukry is very well known in Washington, as is his wife and we're very glad to have her join him this evening.

He is one of the architects of the current U.S. Egyptian relationship, having served as ambassador to the United States between 2008 and 2012. In those dramatic years, his steady hand, his wise judgment and his diplomatic skills help navigate the relationship through stormy seas, safeguarding and preserving the partnership between the United States and Egypt. He left Washington with the admiration and friendship of many people, including myself.

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

During his long and distinguished career, Sameh served as the permanent representative of Egypt to the United Nations in Geneva, as well as in London, Buenos Aires, New York, Vienna and in many central roles in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Cairo. He is the very model of an Egyptian diplomat. In 2014, President Sisi called Minister Shoukry out of retirement, back to serve his country as Foreign Minister. And in that role, as the largest -- as the representative of the largest, most powerful Arab country, he is one of the key players in shaping the Middle Today. A task we need not envy.

As part of this mission, he's been instrumental in the all-important relationship between Egypt and its neighbor, Israel, which he visited just this summer and again, represented Egypt at the funeral of the late Shimon Peres. This relationship between Egypt and Israel is critical for the peace and the welfare of the two countries, but it is also central to the prospects of broader peace and cooperation in the region. Cairo was and remains a

key to regional stability and peace. Anwar Sadat was the first Arab leader to make an official visit to Israel, as we all remember to address the Knesset in Jerusalem. Egypt was the first Arab country to make peace with Israel. It was the first Arab capital to host an Israeli embassy and with President Sisi's leadership and involvement, Israeli-Palestinian peace may again become possible.

In this regard, the relationships between Israel and Egypt naturally depend upon a third partner, the United States. It is no accident that Egyptian-Israeli peace was cemented in a trilateral handshake between President Sadat, Prime Minister Menachem Begin and President Jimmy Carter. Today, too, the strategic triangle between the United States, Egypt and Israel can serve as the cornerstone for a better, more stable and peaceful Middle East. Having had the opportunity to converse with President Sisi, together with the minister recently, I know that this is the Egyptian president's vision.

We're truly honored and delighted that

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

Foreign Minister Shoukry accepted our invitation to address the Saban Forum tonight. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming His Excellency, the Foreign Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Sameh Shoukry. (Applause)

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Thank you, Martin, for that introduction. I'm honor and delighted to be with you tonight at this important forum and I'm definitely glad to be back in Washington to see so many friendly faces. Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed my pleasure to be back in Washington today and to share with you Egypt's perspective on the key questions and the guiding principles that govern Egypt's foreign policy towards our troubled region. And to explore with you how Egypt and the United States can join forces to navigate such a turbulent regional environment in such troubled times.

Five years ago, the dynamics that govern the Middle East for at least six decades were profoundly changed, perhaps, even irreversibly altered. A wave of large scale societal change swept the region and

shook it to its very core launching a unique historic moment that is at once promising and alarming. How to navigate these turbulent waters is the core policy question of our time and is indeed, what will determine -- to quote Dickens, "...whether we are on the eve of a spring of hope, or a winter of despair." Such navigation is quite inconceivable without some form of a guiding principle, a framework for making sense of the epic we are in and a guide for policy therein.

A crux of the debate over the significance of the historic moment we are witnessing as well as how to navigate it revolves around two contradictory positions. The first focus is exclusively on the opportunities for long awaited change. Its proponents argue that it is time for change; the structures of power and governance in the Arab world. This is what the people want and this is what they should get at any cost. This is probably the thinking that has informed and continues to guide strategies of several regional and international actors that sought to

support change without necessarily being too fussy about their allies. And this is how several extremists and a handful of U.N. designated terrorist organizations, including ISIS and Al-Qaeda found financial and military support in Syria, Iraq and Libya, to mention but a few examples.

On the other end of the political spectrum is another diametrically opposed position that sought in the face of a wave of messy social change to reverse the clock. Dysfunctional governments that failed to address their peoples' aspirations were on balance preferable to sectarian warlords and militia leaders or the terrorist threat. All that was needed, therefore, was to restore the old regimes and do business as usual, however decadent and dysfunctional that may be. If the price of the restoration of the old ways of governing is to quash every legitimate demand for change and crush popular hopes thereof, then, so be it.

We are also quite familiar with the diabolical consequences of this strategy, as well as

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



its inherent futility. In vain in any attempt to stop the legitimate calls for change and the march of progress, the question remains, however, how to reap the benefits of this tidal wave of change whilst minimizing the price thereof. This is the core dilemma of foreign policy planning and the execution in the region. Ladies and gentlemen, our approach in Egypt is -- to this dilemma is pretty straightforward. And our opening hypothesis is two-fold. First, that orderly change is the much needed prerequisite to breaking through the historical impasse that the region has reached and to fulfilling the aspirations of millions of young people in the Middle East. A region in which more than 60 percent of the population are under the age of 30.

Second, that the compromise -- that compromising the integrity and the stability of the institutions of nation states in the Middle East is not the way to achieve the much needed and much desired change. Indeed, the experience of the last five years has demonstrated beyond any doubt that

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

undermining the institutions of the nation states creates a political and social vacuum that is quickly filled by primordial institutions, sectarian militias, and outright terrorists, whose ideologies are hostile to the hopes for democracy, modernization, and the revival of civic order, from Syria to Libya, to Iraq and Yemen, examples about.

The challenge, therefore, is to achieve change within the nation states, not on the ruins thereof. The nation state remains the most viable vehicle for modernization and social change and its more progressive versions is the embodiment of civic order and democratic principles and policies. That is the hopes that inspired the calls for change since 2011. Egypt, traditionally, the intellectual and political powerhouse of the region demonstrated through the two waves of its revolution in 2011 and 2013 that an orderly and progressive change which responds to the aspirations of the vast majority of the population while maintaining the integrity of the nation states institutions is a viable choice.

Egyptians demanded change, but they rejected the ruin of their state institutions in the process. They believed that they can have a democratic government that is at once representative and responsive to their needs and desires, forward-looking and boldly committed to ambitious reform. The foreign policy of this rejuvenated reform and revived Egyptian state is guided by principles that are deeply embedded in our millennial history and values. Distrustful of conspiracy theories and conflictual world views and strictly committed to the cosmopolitan principles of peace, development, respect for the independence of nations, and non-intervention in their affairs, while believing that regional and international interests are essentially reconcilable and that there are always opportunities for regional and international cooperation to face the challenges of our times.

If Egypt could change and democratize its government, revive its regional role, and embark on the most ambitious program of political and economic reform in its modern history without undermining the

integrity of the state, then so can our brethren, the Arab world and the region. This tested principle continues to guide our approach to our region.

Revived democratic and reformed nation states are the answer to the aspirations of the civic uprisings that swept the regions some five years ago. Sectarian militias, blood-thirsty warlords, and identity-based cleansing are, by contrast, the product of the civil wars that the democratic aspirations of several countries of our regions have regressed to.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you would disagree that orderly change based on rejuvenation, reform and democratization of nation states would probably be the best way out of today's turbulence in the Middle East and indeed, this continues to be the guiding principle that governs Egypt's policies towards the region. Take Syria, for example, with half a million Syrians killed, millions of refugees and displaced persons and unprecedented rise of sectarian warlords and terroristic groups, it's difficult to remember that this tragedy started with peaceful and legitimate

demands that the Syrian people are perfectly entitled to.

However, the regional international powers that supported various militias to achieve regime change in Syria and those who sought to reverse the clock at any cost, the Syrian people had to endure one of the bloodiest civil wars of modern times. How do we break the vicious cycle of destruction in Syria? To start with, we need to accept that the attempts to reverse the clock and resort and restore the status quo ante in Syria are as delusional as the reliance on sectarian militia-led transformation in Syria.

By contrast, our vision for the way forward in Syria is based on two pillars. The first is to preserve the national unity and territorial integrity of the Syrian state and to prevent the collapse of its institutions. The second is to support the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people in rebuilding their own state through an acceptable political solution that represents them all and furnishes an enabling environment for reconstruction efforts. This is why

we continue to support the efforts of the United Nations Special Envoy Staffan de Mistura, and we call on him to resume political negotiations immediately and without delay.

It's also why we hosted two all inclusive conferences for the various moderate Syrian opposition groups in Cairo in 2012 and in 2015, which brought together Syrians from across the political spectrum and demonstrated that they can agree on a comprehensive document that included a doable roadmap for the transition from the current plight in Syria. You must have all noticed that these documents were the foundations upon which every subsequent effort, Syrian or international to put forward a practical political sediment were premised. Ladies and gentlemen, the revival of a reformed national state means that external political engineering is neither desirable, nor possible. The international community is not in a position to pass judgment on the suitability of national stakeholders, let alone to decide to exclude any of them on grounds of

convenience.

The experience in Iraq and the debacle in Syria should have taught us at least that much. The same applies to Libya. Underlying the Skhirat Agreement was the acknowledgement that any viable sediment should revolve around the three legitimate state institutions: the presidency council, the House of Representatives, and the national army. Naturally, achieving consensus among the three institutions in the wake of violent upheaval is not easy. Problems and contradictions about and deadlocks emerged profusely. However, this does not mean that we can opt to take sides between the three legitimate institutions in moments of disagreement. Or even alienate one of them if the hope that this might speedup the process of reconciliation.

In all frankness, several international and regional players have opted at one point or another to undermine one of these institutions or to replace the national army with allegedly benign militias, but not Egypt though. We remain convinced of the futility of

political engineering and we do not think any non-Libyan party is in a position to aware or exclude Libyan stakeholders, thus, our vision for Libya is based on an unwavering commitment to the full implementation of the Surat Agreement and follows a clear sequential approach. Our duty now is the encourage the presidency council to fulfill its duty to present a new, more inclusive and representative government of national accord. Subsequently, we should all shift our attention to insuring that the House of Representative meets to endorse the government and undertake its constitutional work in preparation for Libyan elections that would bring about elected Libyan governing bodies that exercise their full authority over a united and territorially intact Libyan national state.

Meanwhile, we should devote our efforts to supporting the Libyan national army's efforts in the fight against the growing terrorist organizations in Libya. I could go on and explore other cases of trouble nation statehood in the region, say, in Yemen

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



or in Iraq, but they all follow the same pattern. Troubled nation states faltering and creating a vacuum that is subsequently primordial organizations and sectarian militias and they can all benefit from the same answer, revive, reform an all inclusive modern nation states based on civic ethics and full citizenship.

The quest for reformed and modernized nation statehood is not only the answer to the emerging threats in the Middle East, it is also the answer to the oldest of the conflicts in our region -- the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Egypt, as you all know, was the pioneer of peace in the Middle East. Our vision was and still is based on full nation statehood for everyone in the region. We are committed to bringing to a successful end, more than six decades of this conflict, without which we cannot shift the resources of our region to more productive channels. To do so, the Palestinians cannot and should not be denied the right to an independent nation state.

The alternative to a two state solution is

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

open-ended turmoil even if, in the short term, things look deceptively quiet and manageable. Desperation and lack of any light at the end of what is indeed a very long tunnel could only be detrimental to any hopes of stability and prosperity in the region. The parameters of a two state solution and the structure thereof are quite self evident. What remains is a return to the negotiations in good faith. I would like here to remind you that President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi has offered publicly to support any forthcoming negotiations and to provide, if needed, post-agreement security guarantees.

Ladies and gentlemen, the rapid and large-scale developments that I have talked about in more than one area of our region obviously do not occur in a bubble. Given the strategic importance of the Middle East, it is only natural that several regional and international powers may want to be involved in seeking to influence the course of developments in our region. Benignly and otherwise, Egypt appreciates the stakes of the Middle East are of interest to several

international players and whilst we insist on national ownership of all solutions to the Arab world's problems and on reformed nation statehood as the key response to the challenges of our time, Egypt remains, as always, ready to cooperate with all our partners to bring satisfactory conclusions to the crisis that's spread in our region. In so doing, we cannot accept any attempt by any regional or international actor to use sub-state entities and sectarian militias to further their interest. Acceptance of the necessity of change from within, one that preserves the territorial and institutional integrity and social cohesion of nation states is a core criterion of deciding whether or not we can cooperate with any regional or international stakeholders in this regard.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am back today in Washington at the moment full of promises and challenges. I came -- I come from a country that is moving quickly to restore its leading role in a rapidly changing region. The Egyptian people have demonstrated their ability to take charge of their

future through two revolutions in the span of three years. The first, to initiate change and the second, to preserve the nature of Egypt's unique morale and social foundation. We recognize that we face monumental changes and inherent problems, but the current determination to deal with these challenges is unshakable. Egypt has changed in many ways, most important of which is the confidence of Egyptians and their leadership. And the faith of the leadership and the resilience and fortitude of the people.

This confidence and this faith allows us to embark on a new chapter in our history to deal with our problems head on, and to make difficult decisions and rise to the occasion to create a better future for our children and grandchildren.

We recognize our shortcomings, and the necessity to achieve greater progress in the areas of political, economic, and social reform, while dealing with the internal challenges associated with societal evolution, educational and economic deficiencies, as well as regional and global turbulences and threats.

Egypt has always been and will continue to be the beacon of modality of the Middle East. This will be reinforced now by implementing policies based on a moral code of conduct and values derived from our history and heritage.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the eve of a new U.S. Administration that has stated its commitment to working with its regional partners to fight terrorism and restore stability to the Middle East.

The question of how our two great countries can cooperate to address the regional challenges that I have outlined is therefore in order.

I believe that we share with the United States and with the new Administration a firm belief in the importance of restoring stability and the territorial integrity of the region's nation states through supporting nationally owned processes of reconciliation and revival of these states.

How else can we face the growing threat of terrorism, and how can we bring about the peaceful conclusion to the multitude of crises in our region?

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

The interests of our two countries are in clear convergence. In Syria, we can work together for a peaceful settlement according to the Vienna process, and based on the Geneva declarations. In Libya, we can both work to support the full implementation of the Skhirat agreement, and an all inclusive government of national accord.

We both share the same unrelenting commitment to the eradication of sectarianism and terrorism. We both agree on the unsustainability of the current stagnation between Israel and the Palestinians, and the need to relaunch their efforts to achieve the two-state solution.

I could go on, but I trust that you get the idea. The Middle East is in turmoil. Egypt is keen on cooperating with the new U.S. Administration to address the challenges thereof.

I have sought to outline our vision on how to address these challenges, and I trust you will agree with me that this vision converges with the stated goals of the new U.S. Administration and the

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

Middle East, thereby furnishing all the necessary conditions for a revival of our much needed strategic partnership.

I thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. INDYK: Thank you very much, Minister Shoukry, for honoring us with a very serious speech, keynote speech, for which we're very grateful. The Minister has kindly agreed to a conversation, in which I will have a chance to follow up with some of the points that he made.

I was quite struck by what you appear to be saying about a common agenda with the United States. The implication was with the Trump Administration. You spoke about restoring stability, and interestingly, President-Elect Trump yesterday spoke about his focus being on promoting stability in terms of his foreign policy.

Do you feel that the kinds of principles you laid out about eradicating sectarianism, restoring stability, and promoting peace are in fact the common

purposes between the Trump Administration and the Government of Egypt?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: It strikes me that there is a great deal of convergence by the statements that have been made by President-Elect Trump and some of his advisors in terms of the meetings we have had with President-Elect Trump during the campaign.

There is a clear vision in this regard, a vision that corresponds to our objectives. Our objective is to regain the stability of the region and to create from Egypt a point of expanse of what we have achieved in other parts of the region.

I think this is a mutual interest that we share with the Administration, and it shouldn't be in any way conceived that the call for stability is a call for the maintenance of the status quo, that it is a call for an organized change and progression of societal demands of the population of the region, which have clearly indicated the desire to forge ahead in a new fashion of inclusivity of democratization, respect of human rights, and a more inclusive society,



free from the scourge of terrorists and sectarian pressures.

MR. INDYK: When you talked about that, and you spoke, I think quite eloquently, in the beginning about the need for orderly change, and the difference between the kind of radical change that the region has experienced through evolutions particularly in Egypt, versus the status quo and no change at all.

You have taken both those models and spoke about this model of orderly change. Again, I assume the implication of that is that Egypt is going to be this model of orderly change.

What does that mean actually in terms of reform, political reform, economic reform, within Egypt?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Well, certainly I think open to the necessary involvement of all segments of society to phrase and to achieve those common values of democratization, economic reform, and social reform that are necessary for any society to develop adequately.

These are values of humanity, values that I think are well embedded in our common heritage, and I don't think they are any longer matters of contention or debate, but they are to be implemented within the ability of societies to absorb and taking into account the various characteristics.

Certainly, what has happened in the United States, and having had the benefit of living in this country for a variety of years over the last 40 to 50 years, the United States today is much different than what it was 50 years ago in terms of its development, in terms of the degree of the maturity of its systems, and even social and moral fabrics.

So, I think this is a necessary evolutionary process, one that corresponds to the aspirations of the people of the Middle East that were demonstrated in 2011, and that continue to be the motivator of reform.

It is a response from governments who are keenly aware of the ability of the people to take matters into their own hands, institute change, and

also it is important that necessarily always the demands for change can be vibrant and can be overreaching, but the threat has been what has resulted in places like Syria and Libya, and a dysfunctionality in creating vacuums and anarchy, and the potential of civil conflict that can be very detrimental.

When we see that more than half the Syrian population, a population that has been renowned for its entrepreneurial abilities, for its educational standards, now a status of destruction and what the people have had to endure is, I think, an example of what we should avoid.

MR. INDYK: When it comes to Syria, you outlined an approach which I think, if I'm interpreting it correctly, really leaves the issue of political transition to later, that from your point of view, the first thing is to preserve the institutions, and try to resolve the conflict, and then deal with the political transition. Is that fair?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Not really. It's not a sequential issue. It's an issue, I think, that has to be addressed all at once, but from the perspective of a political process, because we cannot continue advocating the same process that we have witnessed over the last five years and expect different results.

If this status of conflict and destruction continues, none of the proponents are able or capable of achieving any definite success, and thereby, we should change course, and to change course in the international community, the United Nations Security Council and the U.N. Envoy must initiate a political process, must include all of the participants, and must reach an agreement that is inclusive of all of the political entities in Syria.

We take it for granted that such a process will necessarily change the nature of the dynamics of Syrian governance, and this can only be expected in terms of the consequences that have occurred out of these last five years.

It would be ludicrous to think those who have suffered will opt for the status quo in any fashion.

MR. INDYK: I think that's absolutely right. It's hard for me to imagine, I don't know whether you will agree with this, that the Syrian people could accept President Assad as their leader given the incredible death and destruction that he has reigned on his own people.

MINISTER SHOUKRY: I would think this process should be all inclusive and should take into account the interests of all participants, all segments of Syrian society, but it's up to the Syrians to decide their future and the manner in which they are governed.

MR. INDYK: That's why I called you in my introduction "the model diplomat." (Laughter) You talked about the unacceptability of countries that are supporting -- I think you used the term "sub-state entities," "use of sub- state entities" to advance their interests.

Again, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but Iran uses sub-state entities to advance its ambitions in the region. You know that is a concern of many of your fellow Arab leaders in this regard.

But my sense is that Egypt has a bit of a more nuanced approach to Iran. Could you just elaborate a little bit on how you see Iran's role in the region?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Well, as I indicated, I think the Arab world and Egypt as a contributor and custodian of Arab national security is always advocating that this is a responsibility of the Arab countries, and that we do not accept interference or intervention without the regional context from any state.

This is a matter of sovereignty, a matter of the cohesion of the Arab entity, and although we base our policy on principles of non-intervention, of respect, and sovereignty, we recognize that there are interests, and we must all accommodate national

interests, but not at the expense of what might be deemed as influence or interference.

We have a very clear vision, and there must be consequences to any infringement on Arab national security, and that is something that the Arab world and its solidarity will always rise to the occasion to defend.

MR. INDYK: One of the things that has always struck me about Egypt because Egypt, you know, is the largest, most consequential Arab state, and it has a long, long history of civilization, ancient civilization, and cohesion as a state, you look at the region and you look at the other regional players there, so Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, when you look at the broader strategic picture within the region, how do you see those other players? How do they fit into your broad strategy?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Well, as I said, I think there is a great deal of cohesion within the regional Arab states and their commonality of purpose, but then we recognize, of course, the presence of states

outside of the Arab domain, and it has always been our position that relations should be based on principles of mutual interests and benefits, and that should not overreach into positions of influence or intervention to manipulate the proceedings or manipulate conditions within a state.

There are well-founded principles in the U.N. Charter and in international law, and ones that I think we should continue to advocate and build the international world order upon. These are core principles, and I think the more we are clear on the definition and the limitations that are created, the better benefits, I think, all will extract.

MR. INDYK: Finally, I wanted to ask you about what you said about the peace process. There is clearly a strengthening of the relationship between Egypt and Israel that's been quite noticeable under President Sisi, and a greater Egyptian leadership role of late than we've seen over the last five or six years.



But what I heard you say this evening sounded more like you would be supporting perhaps an American led process rather than taking your own initiative to try to resolve this.

On the other hand, Egypt has been quite active on the Palestinian front in terms of seeking a succession there.

Can you just give us a little more granularity in terms of how you see Egypt's role, and what you think can actually be done in these circumstances?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Well, Egypt is committed and it's part of its foreign policy objectives to consolidate the peace treaty with Israel, and to continue to regard the peace treaty as a fundamental component of stabilizing the region.

And it has, I think, served for that purpose, and continues to be the guiding example for wider peace in the region and the end of conflict, but it's not only that we have supported the initiatives of Israel.

I think most recently President Sisi indicated very directly his vision for the end of the conflict and his readiness to be an active participant in bringing together the two main proponents, the Israeli government and the Palestinian authority, in whatever form of renewed negotiations that they would deem appropriate, and they would be willing to engage in.

It remains stated publicly that this is how we view the way forward to the end of the conflict, but there are many other initiatives.

There is the U.S. Administration, the current Administration's efforts led by Secretary Kerry, who has been valiant in his determination. There is a French initiative. There is the constant referral of this issue to the United Nations Security Council, to which we are currently a member.

So, we will continue to promote and advocate on the basis of renegotiations between the two sides. This has to be on the basis of conviction of the two sides to end the conflict, to achieve the two-state

solution as the viable way forward that can be embraced by not only the two peoples but can be embraced by the region, by the international community.

And we will continue to provide whatever we can to support that process within the ability of both sides to recognize that this is a historic moment, and that it is in their best interests and the interest of the region and the interest of international peace and security that we finally end the conflict.

MR. INDYK: As you know, I had a little bit of involvement in the last go around of direct negotiations. One of the things that was highly problematic there was the fact that we had no agreed terms of reference, Resolution 242 and 338 don't really apply to the Israeli-Palestinian dimensions of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

MINISTER SHOUKRY: But we have Oslo.

MR. INDYK: We have, indeed, Oslo, but it doesn't have terms of reference for a final status

negotiation. As you know, that was an interim process.

So, I'm wondering, you know, there has been a lot of talk of late that it would be useful to introduce via the Security Council a kind of updated Resolution 242, which would have parameters or principles that would lay out the terms of reference for renewed negotiations.

Is that something that Egypt would find useful?

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Well, I think the degree of its usefulness is the degree that the main two sides would embrace and implement such a proposal.

Again, I think we have a multitude of resolutions that have set the tone and addressed many of the dimensions of the conflict, but have not had the necessary impact to forge ahead in resolving the conflict, but any proposal, initiative, or direction, whether in the Security Council or elsewhere, I think it is necessary that both sides are fully committed

and recognize the value of such a process to their interests.

MR. INDYK: Minister Shoukry, you have been very generous with your time and with your insights, and we are all very grateful to you. Thank you very much.

MINISTER SHOUKRY: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of  
Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016

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