RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: H

NEAR DUPLICATE

Sent: 2/8/2011 11:40:02 PM +00:00

To: Huma Abedin <Huma@clintonemail.com>

Subject: Fw: thoughts on Egypt, middle east protests more generally, china and middle east peace (in under 2 pp)

Attachments: Egypt.docx

Pls print.

----- Original Message -----
From: Anne-Marie Slaughter <[redacted] B6
To: H
Cc: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>; Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>; Abedin, Huma <AbedinH@state.gov>
Sent: Tue Feb 08 17:18:11 2011
Subject: thoughts on Egypt, middle east protests more generally, china and middle east peace (in under 2 pp)

To: S

From: Anne-Marie

Date: Feb. 8, 2011

Re: Egypt, State-Society Relations, China, and Middle East Peace

As I look at Egypt and related protests around the region, I think we are focusing on the wrong things and missing a big opportunity. We are focusing on "who" and "when" – Mubarak v. someone else, transition now v September. We should instead be focusing on the "what" – what any government must deliver to be acceptable. POTUS set the stage for this position in his emphasis on open government in his UNGA address: "As I said last year, each country will pursue a path rooted in the culture

of its own people. Yet experience shows us that history is on the side of liberty; that the strongest foundation for human progress lies in open economies, open societies, and open governments." The WH is now pursuing an open government initiative (which Samantha would really like State to own, as we should, since the basic ideas came from Alec and me) that defines open government in terms of transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. That fits very well with what the Egyptian protesters are demanding. Our position should be that regardless who is in power, Mubarak, Suleiman, or anyone else, they have to deliver on these three principles. We will hold them to it, measure it, and respond accordingly. The protesters believe Mubarak won't do it, so they want him out. We (and the EU and any other governments we can get to support this position) should say that our support for any government is based on its actual record of delivering on these commitments. If Mubarak can deliver and then leave with dignity in September, so much the better. If he can't, then we are making it known that this is the yardstick by which he and anyone in his position must measure our support. That means we will review assistance, arms sales, political support, etc.

This position is completely consistent with your consistent focus both on the people and on their relationship with their governments. It's not about the government or the people, but rather about the relationship between them. That is exactly what you said in Doha: "I believe that the leaders of this region, in partnership with their people, have the capacity to build that stronger foundation. There are enough models and examples in the region to point to, to make the economic and social reforms that will create jobs, respect the right of diversity to exist, create more economic opportunity, encourage entrepreneurship, give citizens the skills they need to succeed, to make the political reforms that will create the space young people are demanding, to participate in public affairs and have a meaningful role in the decisions that shape their lives." Indeed, I think it's time to enunciate a "Clinton Doctrine," which brings together the world of states and the world of societies that I was talking about in my farewell remarks – your emphasis on development, women, Internet freedom, 21st century statecraft, and public-private partnerships are all about a relationships between governments and their citizens that deliver for their people (I'd be happy to write that up in a separate memo .....:-)). If this is the tide of history, then you are perfectly positioned to ride the wave.

This position has a number of advantages. First, it can remain constant across all the countries of the region, whereas the "who" and the "when" will vary country by country. Second, we can start getting very concrete, looking at things that governments have done successfully in the region to empower their people, fight corruption, expand opportunity, etc and emphasizing those as evidence that governments can deliver. Third, we can emphasize that a transparent, accountable, and participatory government is the best bulwark against extremism, thereby putting the onus of blocking violent extremism on what governments actually deliver. Fourth, taking this position puts us in the best strategic position vis-à-vis China, which will become increasingly relevant as these protests spread to African countries (already happening in Sudan). We want to frame the debate as "who stands with the people in terms of their right to connect, right to basic services from their government, transparency, and accountability versus the Chinese position of "assistance with no strings attached." What they portray as a violation of sovereignty or interference in domestic affairs" is in fact insisting on a relationship between a government and its people based on universal rules and rights.

Now is also the time to play up the many things we are doing to fight corruption. Your OECD speech in May was already going to focus on anti-corruption and domestic finance for development, but it's time to start owning this agenda more now, talking about the percentage of taxes the Egyptian elite pay, for instance, just as you did in Pakistan, and celebrating specific anti-corruption measures (like putting civic licensing-obtaining records and permissions of various kinds—on line) that governments in various Indian provinces have taken. Peter Harrell has been pushing an anti-corruption fund with Tom Nides and doing a lot of work on this issue with Jeremy Weinstein at the White House. Great opportunity to put a major collaborative network together with both NGOs and American corporations who chafe at the restrictions they are under versus the much looser restrictions on their foreign competitors.

Finally, and I know that I am ever the optimist, I think this is the time to change the game on Middle East Peace. We should come out and say that Israel and Palestine now have the opportunity to be an island of prosperity and stability in a turbulent sea, and an example of open societies, open economies, and open governments for others in the region. Now is the time to go for broke – we are not going to be able to hold back these massive floods of political, economic, and social aspirations which have been dammed up for decades. We need to get ahead of them, creating channels for to guide their path. If we stick to endless incrementalism, we're done. It's ironic that you should be the one pushing POTUS on this, but it's the right thing to do (and not a bad story). That's what leadership means – shaping, influencing, making our own luck. Making that push will also help us with protesters/societies around the region as we would be removing one of the standard ways their governments deflect attention from their own bad performance. Given how turbulent everything is, everyone's instincts are to hunker down rather than introducing yet another variable into the equation. But we can turn all this turbulence to our advantage, particularly with both Israeli and Palestinian leaders who think their days in office are numbered. Netanyahu may be riding high, but the pictures of young secular Arabs demanding basic rights and freedoms is going to undermine the Likud narrative of fear pretty quickly.

AM

Message Headers:

B6

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: Huma Abedin <Huma@clintonemail.com>

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2011 18:40:02 -0500
Subject: Fw: thoughts on Egypt, middle east protests more generally, china and middle east peace (in under 2 pp)

B6

PR_RIM_PAGER_TX_FLAG:	true
PR_RIM_MSG_REF_ID:	399560679
PR_RIM_MSG_FOLDER_ID:	-3
PR_RIM_DELETED_BY_DEVICE:	true
PR_RIM_MSG_ON_DEVICE_3_6:	true
PR_RIM_MSG_STATUS:	1