

**ENGAGING WITH MUSLIM
COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

February 26, 2009

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web:
<http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

51-302 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2009

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	Republican Leader designee
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, Delaware	
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York	

DAVID McKean, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Albright, Hon. Madeleine K., Former Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.	9
Fallon, Admiral William J., USN (Ret.), Former Commander of U.S. Central Command, Cambridge, MA	11
Prepared statement	13
Kerry, Hon. John F., U.S. Senator From Massachusetts	1
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator From Indiana	4
Mogahed, Dalia, executive director, Gallup Center for Muslim Studies, Wash- ington, DC	29
Prepared statement	32
Patel, Eboo, executive director, Interfaith Youth Core, Chicago, IL	36
Prepared statement	38
Zeyno Baran, senior fellow, Hudson Institute, Washington, DC	42
Prepared statement	44

**ENGAGING WITH MUSLIM
COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2009

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:45 p.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. John F. Kerry (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present. Senators Kerry, Cardin, Shaheen, Kaufman, Gillibrand, Lugar, Risch, and Wicker.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KERRY,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS**

The CHAIRMAN. Good afternoon. This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will come to order.

I apologize for the delay in starting. We've just had two votes, and we're still on the back end of one of those votes. So, I'm confident that colleagues will be on their way, and we look forward to their participation.

I'm excited about this hearing, and I'm glad that we're having it, and I'm excited about the witnesses that we are going to have here today as we really explore what, for too many people in too many parts of the world, is an unknown, or a "misunderstood." And I think it's important for all of us to do our utmost to try to understand each other better before we start making global decisions that implicate the actions of nations, and young men and women, and our treasury for years and years to come.

As the President made clear in his speech on Tuesday night, America has started a new chapter in our history. And part of this must be a new chapter in our relations with the Muslim world.

I've just returned from a trip to Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the West Bank, and Gaza. At every turn, I heard a newfound willingness. I actually heard a thirst, saw a thirst, felt a thirst, felt an incredible hunger throughout the world for a new dialog and for a new direction, and I found a willingness by people and governments alike to take a fresh look at America. Frankly, this moment won't last forever, if even for long. And so, we need to seize it.

Let me acknowledge, up front, that even speaking of a single Muslim world, as we often hear people do, is a misnomer. We must recognize the spectacular diversity of a religion that encompasses a fifth of humanity, many Sunni and Shia denominations, democracies and dictatorships, hundreds of languages, and uncountable thousands of tribes and ethnic groups. Most Muslims live far outside of the Middle East, from the fishing villages of Senegal and

the rice paddies of Java, from the suburbs of Paris to the streets of Dearborn, Michigan.

For all of these differences, today we must send the simple message to all Muslims: We share your aspirations for freedom, dignity, justice, and security. We're ready to listen, to learn, and to honor the President's commitment to approach the Muslim world with a spirit of mutual respect.

We have a great deal of work to do, my friends. An alarming number of Muslims today believe that our goal is not to end terrorism but to dominate or diminish Islam itself. And their mistrust is reciprocated by many westerners who now wonder whether the gaps between us are unbridgeable, whether higher walls or fewer visas can substitute for difficult tasks of coexistence.

These perceptions are harmful to America. Each undercuts our efforts in what I see as the larger struggle, not a cooked-up clash of civilizations between Islam and the West, but a struggle within Islam, between the overwhelming majority who share our basic values, and a small sliver who seek to pervert the Quran to justify bloodshed or move their societies backward.

Nobody thinks that national security policy should be a popularity contest. But, what should be equally clear is that our legitimacy matters. Not only do we need it to dissuade those vulnerable to an extremist message from taking up arms against us, we also need the active support and cooperation of their governments and communities. Part of restoring trust will be broadening relations with Muslim nations beyond the few lightning-rod topics that have defined them since 9/11, to include combating poverty, climate change, investing in human development, and creating knowledgeable societies. Breaking people out of poverty is perhaps one of the most singularly important of those challenges.

Among our most effective steps to counteract extremism, for instance, was providing the humanitarian aid to Pakistan and Indonesia in the wake of natural disasters. I was in Pakistan in the mountains at a time when we were delivering earthquake assistance, and I remember how perceptions of America changed in the whole country during that period of time, and people saw us differently. I also saw children who came out of the mountains and were attending schools in tented camps for the first time in their lives.

So, among our most effective steps to counteract extremism is that kind of intervention and engagement in the lives and cultures of countries. What mattered wasn't merely the assistance; it was the sight of American troops working actively to save Muslim lives.

At the same time, unless we take a different approach to addressing them, a handful of symbolically charged issues have the potential to poison the well and reduce all our efforts to non-starters or to afterthoughts in the minds of those that we seek to influence.

That's one reason why I'm so pleased that the President reiterated his commitment, on Tuesday night, that, "Without exception or equivocation, the United States does not torture." No public relations effort can erase the sting of Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib. And while strong words are helpful, the world will ultimately judge us by our actions.

Restoring our moral authority also inescapably demands that America return to our traditional role as an honest, fair, firm broker in the Middle East peace process. In Gaza, I visited a village called Izbet Abed Rabbo, and I saw little Palestinian girls playing in the rubble where, 3 months ago, buildings stood. It was searing. I said publicly in Gaza, as I'd said in the southern Israeli town of Sderot just earlier that day, standing with Tzipi Livni, that if Quincy, Massachusetts were lobbing rockets into Boston, I would have to put a stop to it. But, the reality is that people on both sides deserve better, and we know what it's going to take to get them there. Two states, side by side, in peace and security.

I'm not going to delve deeply into Israeli-Palestine issues in this forum, but suffice it to say that, without a demonstrated commitment to peacemaking as an honest broker, this will remain a millstone around any effort to reach out to Muslims anywhere in the world. And as we work to empower partners from Morocco to northwest Pakistan, we can't afford policies that make it unsustainable for locals to be seen as pro-American. We can't afford to be politically radioactive.

If we truly want to empower Muslim moderates, we must also stop tolerating the casual Islamophobia that has seeped into our political discourse since 9/11.

As we gather here today, a Senate colleague of mine is reportedly hosting a screening in the Capitol Building itself of a short film called "Fitna" that defames a faith practiced by 1.3 billion people. The movie's director has not only compared the Quran to Hitler's "Mein Kampf"; this director, a supposed champion of free speech, has suggested that his own Dutch Government ban the Quran outright. So, I'm glad you're here rather than there.

Let me also take a moment to recognize the important role of America's Muslim communities. Your patriotism is a source of security for all of us, and your freedom to worship is a powerful counterargument against those who say our values are incompatible with Islam.

In some ways, our tasks should be easy. Most Muslims are far closer to Americans, in their love of life, family, freedom, and prosperity than they are to the core values of al-Qaeda. The data shows that the more Muslims know about al-Qaeda, the less they like al-Qaeda. We should build on these trends, these beliefs, by seeking out and restoring the partnerships in education, science, technology, arts, and culture which for decades sustained good U.S.-Muslim relations. We should expand educational exchanges and seriously invest in foreign language capabilities. We also need smart public diplomacy that is embedded in our political and military decisionmaking. It is also encouraging that both sides increasingly see the need to deepen and improve our dialog.

From the "Common Word" letter from Islamic religious leaders, to King Abdullah's Interfaith Conference in Madrid, to President Obama's appearance on Al Arabiya, to the U.S.-Islamic World Forum in Doha, Qatar, which our first two panelists recently attended, we have these opportunities. And I might just comment, last summer I had the privilege of speaking again with former Prime Minister Tony Blair at a Yale Divinity School-sponsored conference at which there were about 70 mullahs, imams, clerics, aya-

tollahs from around the world, together with some 70 evangelicals from the United States, including some very well-known ones, like Dr. Robert Schuller. And there was really an unbelievable sense of common ground at that gathering, of the commonality of our Abrahamic roots, each of us, those who share those particular roots. But, there is no reason that Jews and Christians and Muslims shouldn't be finding much more to talk about that we agree on, rather than disagree about.

We're very honored to have with us today some really special voices, experienced voices in these arenas, respected voices, in order to speak to this issue.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has been a leader in these issues through the U.S. Muslim Engagement Project. Admiral William Fallon, former CENTCOM and PACOM chief, has unique insights into how our military actions and political goals can suffer without the active cooperation of local communities.

And then, on our second panel we are going to hear from three experts who will help us better understand, How do we move forward to effectively engage with the broader Muslim world?

Dalia Mogahed is the coauthor of "Who Speaks for Islam?" It leads Gallup's opinion survey of over 1 billion Muslims worldwide. Dr. Eboo Patel is the founder of the Interfaith Youth Core, now active on some 50 American campuses, and he focuses on cultivating religious pluralism amongst young people, and was recently appointed to the President's Advisory Council on Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. And Zeyno Baran is an expert on Eurasia and currently sits at the Hudson Institute, and she will offer her perspective on the spread of radical ideology in Europe.

I welcome all of you. Thank you for lending your expertise to this crucial topic, to what we will hope could be remembered as the beginning of our efforts here, as a pivotal moment in our relations with the Muslim world. This is not going to be a one-time, free-standing event. This committee is going to be committed to engaging actively in ways to try to bridge this gap as part of America's public diplomacy, and we look forward to an exciting and important dialog.

Senator Lugar.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator LUGAR. Well, I thank you, Senator Kerry, for holding this very important hearing on Muslim communities. And I join you in welcoming Secretary Albright, Admiral Fallon, and other distinguished witnesses.

In 2006, the committee held two hearings closely related to this topic. We heard from administration, counterterrorism, and intelligence officials, scholars and authors, on how we could improve engagement with the Muslim world. We also examined how we could best respond to radicalization that induces individuals to become terrorists and creates support for terrorist organizations among Muslim populations.

This hearing continues that oversight and provides a chance to explore new opportunities that have been created by the global interest in President Obama.

A poll released just yesterday by WorldPublicOpinion.org demonstrates the complexities of this issue. The report found that strong majorities in several Muslim countries disapproved of terrorist attacks on American civilians, but a majority of respondents, simultaneously, endorsed al-Qaeda's goal of forcing the United States out of the Middle East and its military bases. Furthermore, large majorities in several Muslim countries expressed approval of attacks on U.S. troops stationed on Muslim soil.

President Obama's actions in the first weeks of his Presidency indicate he is determined to provide leadership in reaching out to Muslims. Through his interview with an Arab television network, and his appointment of Senator George Mitchell as a special envoy to the Middle East, he has attempted to strike a more positive tone. And these steps have created some momentum toward productive engagement.

But, President Obama's popularity alone will not guarantee success in the absence of a consistent and compelling American narrative that is closely synchronized with our policies. This narrative must be embraced and implemented throughout our government, and it must be echoed by diplomats, development experts, contractors, military professionals, alike. We must continue to support exchanges that bring people from other nations into contact with talented Americans capable of explaining and representing our country. And we must also improve recruitment of Muslim Americans and those who have expertise in Muslim cultures into diplomatic and military service.

A lynchpin in the development and leadership change and the primary management of outreach programs to the Muslim world has been the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy. Since this post was created, in 1999, some very talented people have occupied it. Unfortunately, no one has occupied it very long. During the last 10 years, the post has been vacant more than a third of the time, and the longest tenure of any Under Secretary was a little more than 2 years. This circumstance has severely hampered attempts to implement a public diplomacy strategy, and it's contributed to others in our government inventing their own narratives. President Obama and Secretary Clinton must remedy this shortcoming by ensuring continuity in focus and message during their tenure.

This committee stands ready to support the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy. We want the Under Secretary to have the power, the funding, the political backing required to do the job. Funds for public diplomacy will have to be spent efficiently and creatively if we are to explain the views of the United States, display the humanity and generosity of our citizens, and expand opportunities for interaction between Americans and foreign peoples.

Our rivals in the marketplace of ideas are playing hardball. Al-Qaeda has an astonishing Web presence, including such features as multiple-angle videos of suicide bombings. The Iranian Government not only materially backs Hamas and Hezbollah, it maintains an outreach program in 47 predominantly Muslim, African, and Asian countries. And among other means, this program employs Iranian Cultural Centers that offer Persian language classes and extensive library resources.

This is one of the reasons why I recently introduced Senate Resolution 49, which calls for reassessment of whether we could safely reestablish American centers in major foreign cities. These centers offer libraries, outreach programs, unfiltered Internet access, film series, lectures, and English classes that enable foreigners to meet and interact with Americans of all walks of life. In past decades, American centers attracted young people, as well as community leaders, journalists, and policy experts. But, with the end of the cold war and the onset of more active terrorism concerns, most American centers were either phased out or downsized and moved behind protective embassy walls.

After taking into account security considerations, we should determine whether American centers can be re-established in some key locations.

Despite challenges, the United States has advantages that can be brought to bear on the problem. Our country is still admired for its democracy and freedom of political expression. Our disaster relief efforts in Pakistan and Indonesia in recent years produced measurable improvements in public attitudes toward the United States. And there is broad recognition in many Muslim countries of the importance of the United States in addressing global challenges like climate change, hunger, and technology development.

I look forward to hearing the perspectives of our witnesses on how the United States can construct a coherent program of engagement that builds on our Nation's strengths and takes advantage of the opening created by the new administration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask consent that a statement by Jim Sciutto, a reporter and author who has traveled and written extensively on this topic be submitted for the record. Mr. Sciutto was asked to testify, but could not get clearance from his supervisors at ABCNews.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the statement will be included in the record.

Senator LUGAR. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The information referred to by Senator Lugar follows:]

An excerpt from: *Against Us: The New Face of America's Enemies in the Muslim World*¹ by Jim E. Sciutto, Senior Foreign Correspondent, ABC News

For five years, I've lived in Notting Hill—home to fashion boutiques, gourmet delicatessens, Park Avenue rents and half a dozen guys planning for martyrdom. My neighbors are terrorists. I found out the first time in July 2005. After attempting and failing to blow themselves up on the London subway, three young British Muslims were captured in an apartment just down the street from me and right around the corner from "Travel Book Shop" where Hugh Grant's character worked in the movie "Notting Hill."

London's collective sense of security had already been shattered two weeks earlier, when four other British men detonated bombs on three subway trains and a bus across the capital. Those attackers had been successful, killing 52 people and themselves. As an American, I marveled at Britain's calm. London was shocked but not frozen. The buses and trains started running again almost immediately. Friends kept their dinner dates that night. Londoners proudly recalled the Second World War: We survived the blitz, we can survive this. But this time, the threat came from home. Britain's own people were killing their fellow citizens, and these were good British boys, with jobs, families, favorite soccer teams and unmistakably British accents.

There would be other chilling reminders of this threat every few months. In August 2006, a plot was uncovered in Waltham Forest, East London to blow up half

¹Harmony Books, September 2008.

a dozen airliners over the Atlantic using chemicals carried on board in soda bottles. If the alleged planners had been successful, they would have killed thousands: A 9/11 over the sea. In February 2007, Scotland Yard foiled a plan in Birmingham to kidnap and behead British soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Several newspapers shared a single headline for the story: “Baghdad comes to Birmingham.”

Each plot seemed more sinister than the next. In July 2007, two men tried to blow up car bombs outside two London nightclubs. When the bombs failed, they drove ten hours to Scotland to set themselves on fire outside the departure terminal at Glasgow airport. Like the Birmingham suspects, they had intended to bring Iraqi-like violence home to the British people. But this conspiracy had a new twist: The attackers were doctors. And they were my neighbors as well. Two of them had addresses just down the street from me, again, in idyllic Notting Hill.

What worried me was that the hate—against Britain, against America, against the West—had become a part of the fabric of everyday life. In early 2002, I had embarked on a traveling, educational tour of the Arab World as a foreign correspondent for ABC News. After 9/11, I knew we had dangerous enemies in the region. But they were, I thought, easily identifiable: Terrorists, radical imams, infiltrators from far away places. One hundred assignments later, from the Caucasus in the north, down through Afghanistan and Iran, the Persian Gulf, and into the Middle East, I was changed, even floored. In Afghanistan and Jordan, I’d met al-Qaeda fighters who told me it was their dream to kill me. That was no surprise. But for everyone from Egyptian democracy activists to Iraqis who had once supported the U.S. invasion to “pro-western” Lebanese lawmakers, America seemed to have perfected some sort of perverse art in alienating people.

The U.S. as foreign menace is a nice distraction from poverty, corruption and utter failure at home. Still, among Muslims, there is something distinct and demoralizing about their anti-American sentiment. Many Muslims I’ve met have long believed that the U.S. is trying to control their lives, nearly always with the worst intentions. They don’t blame me personally. They usually make the distinction between the American people and their politicians (though that distinction is fading). But they do treat me as America’s official spokesman, or as its defense attorney in an international court of public opinion where the facts as we see them don’t matter much. Here, the September 11th attacks were a joint plot of the CIA and Israeli intelligence. Mayhem in Iraq is not failed policy, but a deliberate American plan to occupy Muslim land and steal oil. The Israel-Lebanon War was a brazen attempt by the United States and Israel to send a violent message to Muslims by killing Lebanese civilians. Such assumptions extend even to native-born European Muslims. Among many British Muslims, the July 7th London subway bombers weren’t murderers, but innocent young men framed by the police (though they’ll often add that Britain deserved the attacks anyway).

After 7 years of reporting on this subject, I came to an unsettling truth: The al-Qaeda-inspired view of an evil America bent on destroying Islam has moved from the fringe to the mainstream. Today, America’s enemies are not the wild-eyed radicals I had imagined but often moderates—and many of those whom we thought were our friends are now some of our most virulent detractors.

Positive views of America—already anemic—have grown slimmer and slimmer. A 2007 poll by the U.S.-based Program on International Policy Attitudes in four Muslim countries (Egypt, Morocco, Pakistan, and Indonesia) found that 79 percent believe the United States seeks to “weaken and divide the Islamic world.” Strong majorities (64 percent on average) even believe it is a U.S. goal to “spread Christianity in the region.”

Between 2002 and 2007, the Pew Global Attitudes Project found that the number of people who rated the U.S. favorably declined in 26 of 33 countries. By 2007, there were 9 countries in which less than 30 percent of the population rated the U.S. positively. Eight of them were predominantly Muslim: Turkey, Pakistan, Palestine, Morocco, Jordan, Egypt, Malaysia, and Indonesia (Argentina was the odd man out).

In more than 30 years as a pollster, Andrew Kohut, the president and director of the Pew Research Center, said he has found no frame of reference for the current decline.

“We don’t have any experience with this. We never got the breadth of discontent with America as we have now,” he said. “In other countries, it’s disappointment, resentment, envy. Among Muslims, it ranges from strong dislike to hatred.”

Increasingly, negative views of America as a country are extending to the American people. Another Pew poll found that less than one-third of Egyptians, Moroccans, Palestinians, Pakistanis, and Turks have a favorable view of Americans, characterizing us as greedy, violent, and immoral.

Just after 9/11, President Bush declared nations around the world “with us or against us” in the war on terror. Now, those in the Muslim world are against us

in greater numbers than ever before—and they have a new face. A remarkable variety of people—normal people—believe the U.S. intentionally obstructs rather than promotes progress. Al-Qaeda may be losing the military campaign but, in considerable ways, it is winning the ideological war.

“Al-Qaeda’s ideological claims now have credibility, that the West is waging war against Islam,” said Fawaz Gerges, friend and long-time Middle East analyst. “There is a crusading spirit in the West. It helps shape the Muslim view that the U.S. is trying to control their lives. The U.S. is convinced Al-Qaeda is an evil-doer. Al-Qaeda has convinced Muslims that the U.S. is an evil-doer too.”

The hostility galvanized my own patriotism. I found myself eager to raise the alarm at how deeply our image has been damaged and search for ways to repair it. I found some of the answers by getting to know some of the people who see every event of their lives affected—stage-managed, even—by the U.S. For Iraqis, every car bombing has an American imprint. For Palestinians, it’s every foot of the wall Israel has built along the border of the West Bank. For Afghans, it’s the electricity that’s still off most of the day. We have no connection to them, but they feel every connection to us. Their anger is as real as their humanity. These people aren’t monsters. Through the profiles that follow, I hope to show how average people buy the conspiracy theories, answer “yes” when asked if America is seeking to weaken the Muslim world, and place more hope in holy war than in America.

In the eyes of many Muslims, America is the victim of its own mistakes. The United States has lost its moral compass across the region. For them, the gap between what we preach and what we do has always been wide, but today it is unbridgeable. The Iraq war was the worst advertisement for American intervention. Torture matters. Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib matter. Our relationships with dictatorships matter too. Muslim friends laugh when we call Saudi Arabia and Egypt “moderate” regimes. This is why dissidents in Egypt today see their cause as stronger without America than with it. “Without you getting involved,” a young Egyptian pro-democracy blogger told me, “We’d be fighting just (Egyptian President Hosni) Mubarak, not Mubarak and America.”

There is a strange contradiction at the root of much of the hate: while they resent us, many Muslims remain in awe of American power—so much so that they believe U.S. failures in Iraq, Afghanistan, or the occupied territories were America’s intention all along. Nothing else could explain the disparity between American promises and performance. As a result, the Iraqi trauma surgeon I’ve known since the invasion of Baghdad doesn’t credit America for the calm after the surge. After 5 years of piecing together the war’s victims, he is convinced America planned the mayhem from the start. He even believes the U.S. was behind many of the suicide bombings. To him, regardless of who’s responsible, the deaths of more than 150,000 Iraqis (as estimated by the World Health Organization through 2006) was too high a price for his country to pay. Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo are nothing compared to what al-Qaeda has done, but held up against America’s own standards, they are the crimes that have come to define us.

This feeling of being under attack has helped solidify a new Muslim identity—a new cause—of its own. Anti-Americanism is a form of Middle Eastern nationalism that transcends borders, even religion. That’s why I easily found Christians in Lebanon who revere Hezbollah as devoutly as Shiite Muslims; they see it as resistance against American imperialism. Across the region and even among Muslims in Europe, hating America has become a cause, a modern-day youth movement. Hippies didn’t trust anyone over 30. Muslims have learned not to trust anything American.

As Americans, we can react self-righteously. I’ve lost my cool in dozens of café debates with Muslim friends. But that will not bring us closer to winning them over. The truth is, they see a different set of facts and a different world. Looking far past 9/11 and into the next presidency, Americans can wish the hostility away or look for the elements of it we can address. We had opportunities to turn the tide of hate: After 9/11, when much of the region unanimously opposed al-Qaeda’s brand of violent nihilism, and again in 2005, when elections in Iraq, Palestine, Lebanon, Egypt, and the Gulf states gave some hope that the U.S. might be on to something.

Polling consistently shows Muslims’ priorities mirror ours: Family, economic opportunity, reform, and a political system they can participate in. It’s just that today they see America as standing in the way of these values, rather than promoting them. To us, freedom means elections. To many Arab Muslims, freedom means freedom from American influence.

There are ways we can save ourselves, I’ve been told, to turn the tide of hate. Sometimes, the solutions are straightforward, such as putting roofs over the heads of students in Afghanistan or getting pro-democracy campaigners released from Egyptian prison. More often, they are long-term and complicated.

“Many Muslims are still deeply enamored of America the idea,” said Gerges.

There's the hope. Today, America the reality, though, is a disappointment and a threat. This is the new philosophy—the new cause uniting disparate people in disparate places. America is the aggressor, the real impediment to peace, the enemy, and those standing up against us are not just masked gunmen in far-off desert hide-outs, they are graduate students in Lebanon, democracy campaigners in Egypt, doctors in Iraq, and even young men in by neighborhood of Notting Hill. Their attitude towards the U.S.—and Americans—comes from years of living as unwilling subjects of our foreign policy. Their insight into our country is at times grounded in profound wisdom and experience. At other times, it's based on pure bunk. But seeing through their eyes will help us understand their vision as well as America's position in the post-9/11, post-Iraq, post-George Bush world.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you, Senator Lugar. It's a pleasure to join with you in hosting this hearing, and I'm glad that we can do it.

Secretary Albright, thank you again for being here with us. We really appreciate it. Admiral Fallon. And if, Secretary, you'd lead off, we look forward to your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, FORMER
SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Chairman Lugar. It's a pleasure to be with you and members of the committee. I'm very pleased to be here with my colleague, Admiral Fallon, and to address the question of engaging the Muslim communities around the world.

I recently did participate in a study on this subject which recommended the following: Vigorous use of diplomacy to resolve conflicts, support for improved governance in Muslim-majority states, efforts to enlarge economic opportunity, and steps, based on dialog, to enhance mutual understanding.

Each of these approaches has value, and each should be explored during our session today, but I would like to use my time, at the outset, to make some additional observations.

First, as the subject of this hearing reflects, there are numerous Muslim communities around the world, including the United States. And these communities, as Chairman Kerry said, are diverse and cannot be portrayed accurately with a broad brush.

Second, successful engagement between any two groups involves certain rules. Each side has a duty to scrutinize its own actions, state clearly its expectations of the other, and listen with an open mind to opposing views. These principles are easier to recite than to fulfill, which is why disputes so often arise around the question of double standards. For example, the United States is frequently accused of applying one set of standards to its own actions and another to that of Arabs and Iran. For our part, we fault Arab States for rationalizing violence, suppressing political rights, perpetuating harmful myths, and refusing to accept responsibility for bad decisions. As a result, instead of dialog, we tend to have opposing monologs. This creates a climate in which advocates of compromise are routinely accused of betrayal. The way out is through leaders brave enough to admit that each side has faults and smart enough to translate shared frustration into a motive for common action. Such leaders do not arise often, but they are needed now.

Third, the West's interest in Muslim communities spiked after 9/11. That is understandable, but awkward. A dialog driven by such a traumatic event is sure to evoke accusations on one side and

defensiveness on the other. And this means that, if we're serious, we should separate our engagement as much as possible from the context of terrorism. The West has many more reasons than al-Qaeda to improve relations with the Muslim world.

My fourth point is related. Western media are full of references to "Islamic terrorism." But what does that mean? We do not portray the Oklahoma City bombing as Christian terrorism, even though Timothy McVeigh thought of himself as a Christian. McVeigh was guilty of mass murder, and there was nothing Christian about it. The same principle applies with Islam. When Muslims commit terrorist acts, they are not practicing their faith, they are betraying it.

Fifth, as any experienced diplomat can testify, engagement comes in many flavors, from tea to vitriol. Often, the stronger the brew, the more useful the encounter. Thus, American policy should be to talk to anyone, if, by so doing, we can advance our interests.

An example of the kind of hardheaded engagement I have in mind is that between the U.S. military and Iraq's Anbar Awakening, which turned former enemies into tactical allies. As this precedent suggests, conversation is not the same as negotiation, and smart engagement is not appeasement. Looking ahead, our Secretary of State and our special envoys should have all the flexibility they require.

Sixth, we need to repair our relationship with Pakistan. The world appears different from Islamabad than it does from Washington, and we cannot expect Pakistani leaders to place their interests beneath ours. At the same time, no country has suffered more from violent extremism.

Pakistan's primary challenge is governance. Nothing improves the climate for extremism more than the failure of official institutions to fill such basic needs as security, education, and health care.

In trying to help, we should bear in mind the distinction between the different and the dangerous. In Pakistan's northwest, people ordinarily worship, dress, and think in ways unfamiliar to us. This does not make them a threat, for their political horizons tend to be local. That changes, however, when we hurt the wrong people. A family whose loved ones are accidentally killed by an American bomb will no longer have a local mindset. So, we have a very difficult line to walk. Military operations against hardcore elements are still essential; but, we will never win if, through our actions, we inadvertently create more terrorists than we defeat.

Seventh, our engagement with Muslim communities should include explicit support for democracy. This preference need not be heavyhanded, but neither should it be so timid as to be inaudible. It is true that the democratic brand has been called into question, but for every question there is an answer. Armed groups, such as Hamas, have no place in an election. But democracy is why women have led governments in four of the five most populous Muslim-majority states. Recent provincial balloting in Iraq has helped to unify the country, while parliamentary debate has been useful in channeling anger. Upcoming votes in Iran and Afghanistan will no doubt influence the course of those nations. Democracy's advantage is that it contains the means for its own correction through public

accountability and discussion. It also offers a nonviolent alternative for the forces of change, whether those forces are progressive or conservative.

And finally, religion matters. I know there are some who would like to engage with Muslim communities without bringing religion into the conversation, but to them I say good luck. As Archbishop Tutu has pointed out, religion is like a knife; it may be used to slice bread or to stab your neighbor in the back, but it cannot be ignored.

Both the Bible and the Quran include enough rhetorical ammunition to start a war and enough moral uplift to engender permanent peace. The determining factor is less what the words say than the message we choose to hear.

Accordingly, I would like to close with a quotation, "If Muslims and Christians are not at peace, the world cannot be at peace. With the terrible weaponry of the modern world, with Christians and Muslims intertwined as never before, no side can unilaterally win a conflict. Thus, our common future is at stake. So, let our differences not cause hatred and strife. Let us vie with each other only in righteousness and good works."

This is a citation from a document entitled, "A Common Word Between Us and You," signed by a diverse group of more than 300 Muslim scholars. It is based on the shared commitment to monotheism and love of neighbor that is central to the Quran, Hebrew Bible, and the New Testament.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the bridges to be built through engagement with Muslim communities are not political, religious, intellectual, cultural, or economic. They are all of these at once. And this means that we each have a responsibility and a role.

Our purpose cannot be to erase differences, but to manage them so that they enrich, rather than endanger, our lives.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Admiral Fallon.

**STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL WILLIAM J. FALLON, USN (RET.),
FORMER COMMANDER OF U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND, CAM-
BRIDGE, MA**

Admiral FALLON. Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, distinguished members of the committee, it's a great pleasure and an honor to be here in your presence, and in the presence of my distinguished colleague, if I could be so bold as to, at least for today, try to rise to that occasion. Madam Secretary, a pleasure to see you again.

As you know, I've had some recent experience dealing in countries in much of the world that contain significant Muslim populations, and I think that this subject of the hearing today is really very appropriate; it's an area in which we've got to figure out how to move forward because the potential on the upside is terrific, and the other course of action, on the downside, is not where we need to be continuing.

I think that the business of engaging with the Muslim world is extremely important for our country, for a host of reasons certainly. First and foremost among them would be the large number of peo-

ple that are involved here. As Senator Kerry indicated in his opening statement, we are talking about almost a quarter of the population of the world, and there are a host of other economic, demographic, political, security, and other reasons why this subject is so important to us.

There are a lot of historical factors that I believe are at play in the current state of relations. I would point out that we can't do much about the past, but we can certainly do something about today and the future. And I think that's where we ought to really focus. And so, there are things that have gone on in history that have set the stage for the current state of affairs. Certainly, the aftermath of the events of 9/11 played a major role in the situation, and the ongoing conflicts in the Middle East adding more fuel. The result is a significant image issue, as you are well aware, and the purpose of this hearing.

Today we have some new opportunities, for a number of reasons. First and foremost, with the new administration, my sense, as I travel around the world, is a tremendous amount of enthusiasm and very high expectations for just something different and for goodness to occur. And I think it's a really great opportunity for us to try to leverage that goodwill.

Another fact of life is that the situation in Iraq has been dramatically improved over the last year and a half, and that this offers us some great opportunities.

And another one that might not, at first glance, appear to be positive, but in the aftermath of the financial and economic crises that's reverberating around the world, we've got a great opportunity here, because if we are going to solve these problems, we're going to have to work closely together. And I think, by now, people all over the world have a sense that this isn't going to be confined to a certain country or a certain part of the world, that everybody's going to feel it, they are feeling it right now. And this fact, alone, ought to motivate some behavioral change that would put us in good stead.

We have a problem that has been certainly uppermost in minds of people in this country and around the world since 9/11, and that's the terrorist threat. It existed before that, but it reached new heights. And it's been my experience that, if we're going to continue to work to try to resolve and minimize the impact of this challenge, it's going to require very, very close cooperation. And the more help that we can get from more people in different parts of the world, the better off we're going to be, and the more likely we're going to be to succeed in this challenge.

We can leverage goodwill. There have been events, in recent years, that have demonstrated that the U.S.—and really it's the people of this country—care about their fellow man. We have devoted enormous sums of money, a tremendous amount of effort, goodwill, to help people in hardship. There are a couple of events that occurred in parts of the world that were in my responsibility. The disastrous tsunami of late 2004, and the aftermath, changed, dramatically, opinion in the most populous Muslim country in the world, Indonesia.

I arrived just as the cleanup was really getting underway. And the difference in tone, the difference in a willingness to work with

us, was just remarkable over a relatively short period of time. And I know a similar set of events occurred in the wake of another disaster: The earthquake in Pakistan.

One of the reasons I highlighted the current fiscal and financial and economic crisis, was because from these challenges, typically, great opportunities arise. Our ability to react in a positive manner to these things is really important, and we have to do a lot of things, I believe, to set the stage. But, the opportunities are certainly there.

I've always found that actions speak louder than words. And we will need to demonstrate, as we are doing, by our actions, that we really care. And that's really the message, and that's what people look for. And so, as we contemplate, and as you've asked for input on ways and means and things that people might do, I think doing the right things to try to build confidence, to build trust between people, is the real deal here. And how do you do it? You've got to engage. You have got to interact with people. They have to see you, and they have to feel you, and they have to have a sense—my experience—that you really care and that you're interested.

So, treating people as we would like to be treated, and respecting them as individuals, is really the bottom line. And I think we are well within our capabilities to do that and to change the negative image that seems to persist in many parts of the world, to turn this around, and to make it mutually beneficial to these millions of folks around the world, as well as ourselves.

So, I'm delighted to be here and would be happy to answer your questions. I would ask that you take my few pages of written testimony and enter it into the record for your reference. And I'll be happy to take your questions, should you have any.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Fallon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL WILLIAM J. FALLON, USN (RET.)

Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, distinguished members of the committee. It is a pleasure to appear before you today to testify about "Engaging with the Muslim World."

It was my great honor to serve and often represent U.S. interests in the world during more than four decades of service in the U.S. Navy. During that time I had many opportunities to interact with people from Muslim majority countries and to understand the high value of frank and mutually respectful relations between people.

During the past 4 years in particular, while serving as Commander, U.S. Pacific Command and Commander, U.S. Central Command and most recently at the Center for International Studies at MIT, I have participated in many matters of high interest to the U.S. and other countries around the world. These interactions in Muslim countries have often been difficult due to a combination of negative perceptions, policies and bureaucratic issues.

I believe that engaging the Muslim world is of great importance to us for demographic, geostrategic, security, economic and military reasons. First, more than 1.5 billion people representing almost ¼ of the world population claim Islam as their faith. These people inhabit countries around the world but are concentrated in an area from North Africa through the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia. This area includes many of the most troubled and security challenged zones of conflict, as well as key sources of raw materials, especially oil and gas. These lands also front many of the critical maritime choke points, through which flows the majority of world commerce.

Many Muslim majority nations have historically shared good relations with the U.S. Others like Indonesia and Pakistan with checkered relations in the past are

currently high priorities for engagement. As you are well aware, since the attacks of September 11, 2001, negative perceptions based on insecurity have clouded relations between America and Muslim nations worldwide. The causes of these frictions are many, several predate 9/11, and include U.S. policies during the Cold War, recognition of and close relations with the State of Israel and the large U.S. military presence in the Middle East. The U.S. has oft stated and compelling rationale for its actions but the combinations of these and other factors have contributed to rising tensions. Recent large scale U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have intensified the situation and mutual distrust has become pervasive. Of course the catalyst for this bad feeling is the terror activities of a relatively small number but deadly cadre of Muslim violent extremists. And this intense security concern is a critical reason why engaging the Muslim world is so important.

With the start of a new administration in Washington, the substantial improvement in the situation in Iraq and the global reverberations of the financial and economic crises, I believe we have a grand opportunity to reengage the Muslim world to our mutual benefit. Although each of the three factors I have chosen to highlight are very difficult, they each offer the potential to help us reshape the recent situation.

There is great anticipation and expectation for change and positive developments with the advent of the Obama administration. Emotional expectations are high worldwide.

The improving security situation in Iraq, the drawdown of U.S. troops there, and increasing cooperation between countries in the region should improve the overall atmosphere in the Middle East. The reduced levels of violence, the return of displaced persons and increasing political competence of the Iraqi government are neutralizing what was only recently, a very negative factor in the region.

Although the current economic and financial crises are causing global impacts which are detrimental to many, the very scope and scale of the problems mandate intense international cooperation to resolve this gives us all an opportunity to work very closely together, to demonstrate concern, compassion and take positive steps to remediate the causes and address the effects of the crises.

I would suggest a number of steps to improve relations with Muslims.

- First would be to listen to their side of the issues and be willing to visit with them and discuss the challenges. Messages are important and President Obama sent a good signal with his recent interview on the Al Arabiya television network.
- Demonstrating our interest in peace and stability with the majority of like minded Muslims by engaging in the Middle East peace process and outreach initiatives across the world, puts action to words. The early designation of Senator Mitchell as Special Envoy is commendable.
- Lending a helping hand, as we are doing in many countries to assist the less fortunate with economic, health, education and security issues.
- Demonstrate, by simple acts of respect and kindness at our U.S. points of entry in treating people the way we want to be, and they should expect to be, treated.
- Fix the bureaucratic process and embarrassing delays in the visitors VISA program for people coming into this country for meetings, conferences and other exchanges.
- Most of the things that make a difference in relations between people come down to issues of trust. We build trust by personal engagement and treating people with respect. In my experience this entails little risk and works well with a majority of people.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views. I stand ready to address any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Admiral.

Thank you both for your testimonies. It's almost hard to know where to start, because it is such a vast and complicated topic, but let me just ask, at the outset, if I could—you just said, Admiral, that, you know, how to do it is sort of the critical question here for all of us, and that we have to engage. I assume you would both agree that the policies we choose to pursue are going to be critical in shaping how people see us. I mean if we, for instance—pretty much everywhere I've gone in the region, whether I'm in Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Middle East, elsewhere, we—or elsewhere in

the world—we hear tremendous kickback on America's involvement in Iraq and the policy choices we made there. We started out, in Afghanistan, with 100 percent support for what we were doing. Just 100 percent. A 100-percent support for the Karzai government, a 100-percent support for us. Now we've seen a rapid turnaround, with increased support for the Taliban, which al-Qaeda and other entities take advantage of, but which has come about because of the absence of what Secretary Albright talked about, which is good governance and the delivery to the people.

So, the question is, sort of—I mean, is there sort of an order of priority of the things that we can pay attention to that will make a difference—i.e., getting our policy right in Afghanistan, Pakistan—getting our policy right in these areas—or is it, notwithstanding the policy, that if we did more on the humanitarian front, more on the education front, and so forth, that it will negate that, or it won't matter?

Secretary Albright.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. It's very important to get the policy right. I think that not everything that has gone wrong is due to American actions. But, I do think that the direction of our policy clearly has an effect. And it's kind of like an umbrella under which some of the other points that you raise have to take place. And one does not exclude the other, frankly. But, I do think that we have to figure out what our objectives are—wherever we are. I think the problem with the war in Iraq is that it was unclear what exactly it was about. And in Afghanistan, we lost our way. So, I do think there needs to be a sense about the direction that we want to go in.

It's a combination. You have to have security in order to move forward on some of the governance issues. And then, the governance is also important, in order to make sure that the people can get benefits out of everything that's put in. If you have corrupt leaders in any country, the benefits never get there.

So, what I would like to see is a concerted effort, obviously in redefining policy, but also having a vibrant program on governance issues—not the imposition of American institutions, but the assistance and support for those who want to develop their own institutions. But, I find it very hard to decide we would only do policy and not do the education and various issues that you and Senator Lugar were talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, take—how—where would you say that the Taliban fit into the description that you've given us of, sort of, this challenge? I mean, they're reacting to the lack of security; they are reacting, obviously, to their interpretation of their faith and their desire for Shari'ah, in its fullest interpretation, which many people within Islam would disagree with, as to whether or not it is a legitimate full interpretation.

I was just in Syria. One high-level official told me how he has a photograph of his mother, 20 years ago or so, visiting the Omayan Mosque, wearing a long skirt, not below the knee, and no cover, because she wasn't going there to pray. She was going there to visit with somebody, to show it to them. And, under the requirements, as interpreted, if you're not there to pray, you don't have to cover. Today people are covered, everywhere, in increasing numbers.

So, these interpretations tend to become, to some degree, part of an entire, sort of, cultural and quasi-political movement, if you will, to challenge the orthodoxy of other entities or people, or even religions, in some cases. You see that with the extremes of the Taliban and in other parts of the world.

Whose responsibility is it to try to draw those distinctions, or to try to create the tolerance that might exist? Because our legitimacy in trying to do that, it seems to me, is almost nil. And there's no central authority, otherwise within the religion, that does that. So, it's subject to that kind of exploitation. Now I wonder, How do we address that? And particularly with respect to something like what's happening now in Afghanistan with the Taliban.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Well, I mean, you ask a very difficult question, and a very basic one. Clearly, when I was in office, we had very serious problems with Taliban, because they were making women be voiceless and disappear, and generally made life impossible. I went to visit refugee camps where the women told horrendous stories. And I won't go through that. The Taliban have done dreadful things to the population of Afghanistan.

But, a point that came out in our last Doha summit, that I think is worth mentioning here because it fits, Anwar Ibrahim, who was the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, now is a leading opposition leader, said something that is vital, and that is that many of the changes and the weeding out of extremists has to be done by the Muslim communities themselves; that when we tell people who's good and bad, it can backfire—either we like somebody, and that's kind of a kiss of death; or we make somebody evil, and that gives them greater stature. And so, I do think we need to look for members of the Muslim community that can help.

We've had problems even with the vocabulary. We talk about "moderate Muslims." The bottom line is that moderate Muslims do not believe moderately. They believe passionately about moderation. And so, we need to somehow engage them to help us—

The CHAIRMAN. Well said.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. [continuing]. In that particular problem.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. That's very well said. I'm almost—my time is up, so Senator Lugar, and then we'll do another round.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Albright, I mentioned, in my opening comments, the American centers that used to be around the globe. It is obviously easy for an outsider to advise the Secretary of State and our State Department to open such centers. But, let me just ask, from your experience, what is the practical effect of this? We've taken extensive security measures to move our embassies, in some cases, far out of the capitals, out of touch with the coffee houses and the ambience that used to be a part of our engagement and diplomacy because we felt that our employees and others might be bombed and lose their lives. But even where security challenges are not critical, these centers were shuttered. Nevertheless, now there is a thought that perhaps these centers might be opened in some localities where the security situation allows; that this is an opportunity for our message to reach people who earnestly would like to read, study, be a part of that. Do you have any overall comment and first reflections?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Senator, I have your resolution here, and I was looking at it with great interest, and I must say, I feel this one very personally. I am the Secretary of State who brought public diplomacy into the State Department. I think it was the right thing to do. It was very important to get public diplomacy and policy together. I also was the Secretary of State, on August 7, 1998, which was when our Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were blown up. And I went to get the bodies and brought people home and dealt with the families. And the issue was about security.

Senator LUGAR. I see.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. And it was the hardest thing to think about—what to do. Our embassies are supposed to be the eyes and ears of our country, in foreign countries, to be open and welcoming, and yet we have had to move them out, put them behind walls; and obviously the information systems were also a part of that.

I love your resolution. I love all the “whereases.” I have a problem, because—you raise it at the end—the security. That’s a very big issue. And so, I hope that we can do what you are talking about. The best of America is in our openness and our capability to explain our story. And during, for instance, the period of communism, it was always amazing to go to one of the American centers. When I was in Prague, I went to something called the jazz section, where their proudest document was an album from the “Rolling Stones.”

We have so much to offer, but the security part of this—I hope that, as you propose, the “whereases” really are used, and that the security people look at this. But it’s great to think about this. Absolutely.

Senator LUGAR. Well, thank you for that very important encouragement.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Senator LUGAR. Let me ask—during your tenure—and you described this in your book, “A Memo to the President”—you twice offered to sit down with Iranians, without conditions, to discuss all issues. And, as you described it, both times, various ways, you were rebuked. Now, this hearing is about engagement, and once again that word is being used with regard to Iran. And suggestions are being made, perhaps, that Dennis Ross or others may think through formulas as to how we approach this indirectly, or maybe more directly. But, what counsel would you give, at this time, to our Secretary of State, or to our President, with regard to engagement with Iran?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. I do believe that it is very important to have engagement with Iran. And this fall, five former Secretaries of State—three Republican—Kissinger, Baker, Powell—and Warren Christopher and I—all agreed that we should have dialog with Iran, without preconditions. We can’t learn about what it is they are thinking, nor can they learn about what we are thinking, without that engagement.

That doesn’t mean it’s easy, because, as you point out, we tried; they missed the signals. In many ways, Khatami did not know exactly how to respond, and there were questions about who was really in charge. Iran is an incredibly complex society, but we will know nothing if we do not have engagement at a variety of levels.

And so, I hope very much that the administration is able to go forward on this, with your support.

Senator LUGAR. Admiral Fallon, currently, maybe even as we meet here, there are important officials, including the Foreign Ministers, the Defense Ministers, those involved—pardon me—in intelligence operations, in Pakistan and Afghanistan, meeting with our Secretary of State and our Secretary of Defense and others. It's remarkable, coming together of three countries in Washington at this time. I salute Dick Holbrooke, as well as Secretary Clinton and Secretary Gates, for the contacts at Veirkundea and various other places that made this possible. And Senator Kerry and I were privileged to visit, last night, with the participants, many of them. And they did seem to have, as you've pressed, a sense that security is an existential problem in Pakistan and Afghanistan. And it is not doing us a favor by trying to clear up a few people who might once again attack New York and Washington.

But, from your experience, how deeply is this felt, and how likely is it that there can be a confluence of interest in which we all feel a problem of security and therefore—as opposed to doing favors to one another—are able to work on the same wavelength?

Admiral FALLON. We all need things—pardon me—we all need things, and everybody in the world would like to have some things. And so, there are always opportunities to get together and make trades. But, I think I'd like to answer this by circling back to a couple of questions that the chairman asked, and we vetted, to your question, as well.

The business of engagement—and we talk about it all the time—and who understands what it is. To me, it's a long-term commitment to actually working with people. And, it seems to me that we get worked up about the engagement. We get pretty exercised about trying to solve problems in the wake of untoward events. Pretty easy to see how that happens. But, related to policies, and related to long-term behaviors, which I think are—again, it's what people see and observe that really makes a difference—we could be helping ourselves, I believe, by relatively modest investments in time, treasure, and people, for the long haul, that would preclude us getting into a lot of these deep holes that we now find ourselves trying to dig out from. And so, engagement, to me, is actually being in the world, as our forward-deployed forces are—certainly our diplomatic people in the various embassies, but, increasingly today, the many thousands of military people that represent us around the world who are actually out there on the oceans, in the skies, and on land in various countries.

And I think equipping these people with the tools that would make them effective in engagement, convincing to people, that we really care, is critically important. And frankly, from the policy standpoint, the resources that I've found available to do these things were pretty minimal. And I think it's pretty obvious now that people see this, across the board. We've got a Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, who's publicly stated, a couple of times, the benefit of having more of an investment and working closer with our Department of State, USAID, and other people. So, I think this is really important.

Regarding the downside of policies and the effects of near-term swings—I'd like to highlight two examples.

Indonesia and Pakistan, two countries that are in the forefront of interests today, for different reasons. Certainly Pakistan, with the conflicts and the origins of the terrorist activities, and the difficulty in fixing things in Afghanistan without addressing the complications, and so forth. We went for about 10 years with no relationship, military to military, with leaders in that country, because of our policies. I understand the motivations and a lot of the history, but the downside was that we lost the confidence of many people in that country, and more importantly, we lost an ability to influence behaviors. And so, it's difficult to recover from that.

Indonesia, again, different circumstances, but similar kinds of challenges. And were it not for the very, very tragic tsunami, I'm not sure that we'd be much further along today than we were back in 2004. And these are things I have found, as I came and appeared before you and your colleagues in other hearings, to be difficult sells, frankly. To look at these policies in a different light than the viewpoint that originated them, and for example to get buy-in to long-term investment up front in those things that would be so helpful—as the Secretary has enumerated here.

How does all this come together? And what goes first? And what really makes a difference? Without stability and security, all of the other desired engagements with education and politics and commercial things and so forth, are very, very difficult to do. In an atmosphere where people are just concerned about surviving, day to day with security dangers, as we've just seen, certainly in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places—it's very difficult to get effective engagement programs going. So, the element of security, stability—uniquely enabled by our military people—again, working these things in advance pays huge dividends. And so, again, we're not going to undo what's been done in the past, except by our actions now and in the future. And I think focusing on those for the long term would be very, very helpful.

Thank you.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Thank you, Secretary Albright and Admiral Fallon, for being with us this afternoon.

I want to pick up, a little bit, Admiral Fallon, on what you were just saying about better equipping the military to be the face of the United States. What kinds of resources, what kinds of assistance, could we provide to our service men and women in Muslim countries so that they could better represent the United States?

Admiral FALLON. Thank you. The list of unique things is probably pretty short. The best thing we can do is to train and equip, in a general way, our people to go about their business in the world professionally. Their example, in the way they carry out their normal military duties, is hugely important. The image that they carry with them, based on their day-to-day performance, is really very critical.

But, we have all kinds of capabilities that can be brought to bear, as we do from time to time, in addition to the standard professional military expectations. Certainly, hospital ships—we were able to very effectively employ those in Southeast Asia, and recently in other theaters, in Europe and in Latin America.

We can actually put military people in areas that would be considered high risk by other civilian organizations; and, by our military presence in some of these places, doing humanitarian things, we can supplement our presence with civilians who would not likely go unless they had that security and stability blanket that comes with our forces.

And I think there are other things that are really helpful. It's been my experience that the thing that really makes a difference is people being confident that their own governments can take care of them. And the issue of governance, and how problematic that is in so many areas, is important.

What we've tried to do in the military is to train the local security forces to be able to take care of business on their own. They're the faces that really ought to be on the streets. It's great for us to come in from time to time and help out and do humanitarian things, as well as our regular security business, but a major effort is training and equipping those local forces.

Some of this is policy, and the resources and clearances are necessary for our people to engage in different countries, and then having our people available to go out and actually do the engagement, but—so, there's a list of things, but there are not many that are specifically unique to Muslim countries. These are just things that would be helpful, in general.

Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Secretary Albright, you talked about women in the Muslim world and some of the women that you encountered. Should the U.S. do more to promote women's rights in Muslim countries? And, if so, what kinds of activities, efforts, should we undertake to do that?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. We do need to be true to ourselves and be able to explain why we believe that having women politically and economically empowered helps to strengthen societies. But, we also need to work with the women in a particular country and get a better understanding of it. I have found that—as I travel, that, for instance, Saudi women want to be heard. Not all of them want to drive, but they do want to be heard. We need to work with them, take some guidance from them, in terms of the things that they would like us to help on.

We should do everything we can to encourage women to be involved in political activities. I have read, with great pleasure, that King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia has, in fact, now named a woman to be a Deputy Minister. That is a step forward. And in other Muslim countries, there are women that are active. We should do what we can to help, but we should not do it in a way that is counterproductive to the women in the country themselves. So, we have to work with them. And I think we make a better society if we help women to be politically and economically empowered.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Wicker.

Senator WICKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you both.

This question is for both of you, but I will begin by quoting from Secretary Albright's testimony. Thank you for emphatically stating that our engagement in Muslim communities should include explicit support for democracy.

I recently returned, with a Cardin delegation, from Ramalla, Jerusalem, Damascus, and other locations. We had an opportunity in our delegation to meet with one of the chief negotiators for the Palestinian Authority. And I don't know that I'm quoting him precisely, but the essence of one of the statements that he made was, "Anyone who says democracy is not appropriate in the Middle East is a racist." I'd like to ask both of you to respond to that statement.

And also, Secretary Albright, you mentioned that armed groups, such as Hamas, have no place in an election. And yet, they won the parliamentary election, regrettably. That allows someone like President Assad in Damascus to respond to us that he's comfortable hosting a leading Hamas faction in Damascus, because they are part of a popularly elected political party.

So, the second part of the question is, Was there some failure in American foreign policy that allowed this Hamas success to occur in the parliamentary election, which has resulted in a divided government for the Palestinian Authority?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much, Senator. I am chairman of the board of the National Democratic Institute, and have been spending a lot of time on democracy issues. And I do believe in democracy, and I do think that there is no part of the world that isn't ready for democracy. So, I think we can't just decide that some group of people are not ready to make decisions about their own lives. It doesn't necessarily have to be an American-style democracy, but I have thought that everyone is ready for some form of it.

NDI now has 30 programs in various countries—including Muslim countries, and Gaza and the West Bank. So, this is something that I feel very strongly about. And what has been unfortunate is that the war in Iraq has given democracy a bad name. You can't impose democracy; you have to support it. And I've worked very hard on that.

On the issue of Hamas, it is a very complicated aspect of this, because what happened—and I speak only for myself—is that the U.S. pushed for those elections at a time when it was unclear as to whether Hamas was going to give up its violent approach, in terms of participating in a democratic process. I'm very glad that Senator Mitchell is the negotiator, because he understood what happened in Ireland, where the IRA split in a way that there was a political arm, Sinn Fein, that could be dealt with, that allowed it to be part of the political process. And that hasn't happened with Hamas.

So, I think there should be an entry fee for entering into a democratic election, and Hamas did not—was not asked to pay that entry fee.

Senator WICKER. May I interject? Should they have been prevented from offering candidates in the election?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Well, I think there was a real question about the timing of the election, frankly.

Senator WICKER. I understand.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. They could have, maybe, offered candidates but the goal should have been to divide some of Hamas, those who are willing to recognize Israel, give up violence, and then live up to former agreements from those who are not.

The reason why Hamas actually did as well as it did, is that people need to vote but also to eat. Democracy has to deliver. And so, Hamas and Hezbollah, and other organizations sometimes, are providing important services to the people. And therefore, part of what has to happen—and it goes to your point earlier, Senator Lugar—is, there has to be economic work and education and a way that people see some benefit to democracy. Hamas did not win by that much in each of the districts, but it was primarily, I think, because they were delivering, and Fatah wasn't.

Senator WICKER. Admiral.

Admiral FALLON. Certainly, the Secretary is the expert in the political dimensions here, but I'll tell you that, from my experience, people around the world like choices. They don't like to be told they have to do things. And getting back to an earlier comment about the Taliban in Afghanistan, the people don't like the Taliban. They've had a good taste of this. And I recall, back in Iraq, a year or so ago, Governor of Anbar telling me, you know, "We've had al-Qaeda; we don't like them." But, people have to have some confidence that there's an alternative. And I think trying to set the conditions that allow opportunities so the people do have choices is really important.

Senator WICKER. Thank you. And having been to the Middle East, I can tell you that Secretary Mitchell is universally well-received as an envoy from the United States.

Madam Secretary, I'm glad that former Secretary Kissinger is part of a group that spoke with a unified voice on this issue. You say "religion matters," and you ask the question, "What is Islamic terrorism?" I think we'll agree, there is such a thing as Islamic terrorism. Secretary Kissinger said publicly, with respect, that, "One of the things that is needed is for an Islamic reformation." Would you respond to Secretary Kissinger's statement? Do you agree with that?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. I think that—and it's something that I answered, partially, to Chairman Kerry—is that some of the changes have to come from within Islam, that they—they have a process whereby there is discussion and debate within the Muslim community, but it's nothing that we can tell them to do. I don't think it's possible for us to tell them, "Have a reformation." But there are those—and I have met many Muslims—who see that there needs to be some approach that allows them to have greater debate. But, it is not up to us to tell them to do that.

Senator WICKER. Thank you, ma'am.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, we're going to our next panel. I think we're going to have a couple of experts who can sort of help address some of the specifics of that. And it really is an interesting question.

I might just comment also, quickly, that when Secretary Albright says that there wasn't a, sort of, entry fee, if you will, to be paid, and the opponents were unable to deliver services, and Hamas could—I think it really underscores one of the great missed opportunities, frankly, for the West with respect to this entire process. I know that, at the time, the Palestinians did not want to have the elections; they wanted them delayed, because they foresaw the difficulties. The Israelis, likewise, foresaw the difficulties. And frankly, we are the ones who insisted on the election taking place, and then we're surprised with the results of the democracy that we had insisted on. So, it's really part of the convoluted history of, you know, bad vision and policy. It's the question I asked about the policies and what their out—you know, implications are.

I would also add that I remember visiting with President Abbas the day he got elected in 2005, and he explained to me that he knew very well what the challenge was that he faced, but he didn't know how he was supposed to meet it, because he didn't have the resources. And frankly, for about 4 successive years, we, the West, as a whole, and some neighbors in the vicinity, ignored his needs. And they never had the ability to deliver and develop the governance that we've always demanded of them.

So, in many ways, you know, we all, sort of, share some of the responsibility for where we find ourselves now, and it's an interesting part of the history of this.

But, I do think the next panel can get more specific on some of this, which we look forward to.

Senator Kaufman.

Senator KAUFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding this hearing. And I'm pleased, also, to hear—which I totally agree with—this is just the first step. This is clearly one of the most important questions we are going to be dealing with in this Congress and, I think, Congresses to come, unfortunately.

Secretary Albright, what of the tools of public diplomacy—I mean, a lot of this is about public diplomacy—as you said, you brought public diplomacy to the State Department—what tools of public diplomacy do you think are most useful in engaging with the Muslim world?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Senator, I think that there are a number of them. First of all, you know, when we think of public diplomacy, most people think it's us talking at them. For me, I think one of the most important parts of it is listening and getting a dialog going. Exchanges, whether they are of students or intellectuals or opinion leaders or legislative leaders, are a very important part.

We also need to be more attuned to modern technology. Our competitors know how to use a lot of new technology, so we must be able, as innovators, to use every aspect. And I hope that, as the new people get into place, then the Board of International Broadcasting basically can look at a variety of those tools.

And then, we also ought to use their tools. I don't think it hurts if we go on al Jazeera in order to explain ourselves. And so, President Obama did al Arabiya. It is very important for us to tell our message, but also to listen. So, the tools, I think, should be those that allow exchanges, visas, all those various aspects that bring us into contact on a number of different levels.

Senator KAUFMAN. You know, I'd really like you to think about this—American centers, you know, and how we deal with this. I—it isn't just the cold war. I was in Johannesburg, where Libra Yosi had the—used to have the library there, and Mandela and Umbeki, and all the leaders of the ANC came into that library in order to learn about democracy. And when we talk about democracy, and wanting to force a democracy, I think giving people an opportunity to kind of read history and see history is really an extraordinary thing. And I also understand the incredible security problems we have. But—

Dr. ALBRIGHT. I think it would be wonderful to do them. And I think it is the security issue—I just know how awful we felt when we had to close down a lot of it. And—it's very difficult—and I remember, as a professor, traveling around and visiting the places, and having opportunities to give lectures and various things. So I agree, and I hope we can figure it out.

Senator KAUFMAN. Admiral, I can't think of better words than "actions speak louder than words," and I think you are absolutely right. What are some of the actions that you think we should take that would send a message to the Muslim world?

Admiral FALLON. If I could follow up on the questions you asked—

Senator KAUFMAN. Sure, absolutely. Yes, thank you.

Admiral FALLON [continuing]. The Secretary, to answer this question, because I think there are things that would be impactful immediately. In central Asia, which is a majority Muslim population, in just about every country, there is virtually no impact—zero—from U.S. media. People hear what they've traditionally heard in that area, and that's Russian language T.V. broadcast, because it used to be part of the former U.S.S.R. And if you would ask any of our ambassadors, they would, I expect, concur, U.S. television would be extremely useful. Not easy, but certainly not grossly expensive. And it's something that I think would have an impact, because it would give people an opportunity to hear something else. We don't have to aim it to them, we can just let them have access into things like the way we run our business and so forth. I think it would be immensely useful.

Al Jazeera: The President did Al Arabiya. I did an Al Jazeera interview last year, actually the year before last now, that hadn't been done before. I did it on the Arabic channel. And I thought it was a tremendous opportunity to answer some tough questions, but to let people see that we weren't intimidated, We need to go out and do them. I think things like that are really important. For a lot of reasons, we shy away from those things.

I share your conviction that the small outreach centers—the libraries and information stations in other countries—are of immense value. Plainly speaking, this comes down to a willingness to take risk and making judgments about risk, every day. It's relatively—however difficult in implementing, relatively easy to give blanket guidance regarding risk. So, "We've got a terrorist threat here; can't do this, can't do that." So people immediately go to ground, and we put policies in place that prevent us from acting. Walls go up and you can't get there.

I think that we need to consider local situations, empower our leaders on the scene to be able to make choices and make decisions, and to flex, as they see things. But, until and unless we can actually get these places open so people can come to them, we will not progress. The tremendous impact of our troops in Iraq, for example, getting out from behind the walls and among the population—that is phenomenal in helping us to recover that security situation. In a more peaceful environment, in these other less violent countries, even more leverage, because there's less intimidation on the front end.

So, you can't easily edict these kinds of things, from a policy standpoint, but I think we can try to build in the flexibility and encourage our people on scene to make decisions. Certainly, there's risk entailed every day, but, then again, crossing the street around here is a challenge sometimes.

Senator KAUFMAN. Great.

Admiral FALLON. Thank you.

Senator KAUFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I've got to make one comment, and that is, with the discussion of Al Jazeera and Al Arabiya, we have a station, called Al Hura, that 27 million Arabs listen to every week, and a radio station called Sawa, which 20—17 million listen to. So, we have good communications. And I think the more we develop this—Al Jazeera has a budget of 300—over \$300 million, Al Hura has \$100 million. The most powerful economic-political machine in the history of the world—the United States—is spending one-third on satellite television than Al Jazeera is spending on theirs. So, I think, you know, an opportunity—we have an opportunity to do these things, and I think you are absolutely right, in terms of what we should be doing and how broad our public-diplomacy reach should be.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Kaufman.

We have a vote on. We're on the back end of the vote. Senator Gillibrand, you should have time to be able to get through your round, and then there's a grace period, and I'll tell them that you're on your way, to cover you.

Meanwhile, Senator Feingold is on his way back here to continue the round of questioning, and I'm going to go and come back immediately. So, Senator Feingold did want to ask this panel, if he has a chance—and I know he's on his way; and then we'll keep rolling through. Thanks.

Senator Gillibrand.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for holding this hearing.

Thank you, to our esteemed guests.

Secretary Albright, I'd like to ask you a little about Pakistan. In your testimony, you said that we need to repair our relationship with Pakistan, and the primary challenge is governance. I want to talk a little bit about, and ask your opinion on: What types of investments and what type of work can we do with the Pakistani leadership that will be helpful? And, in particular, I want to ask about—certainly, there's very large refugee populations in the FATA region. And should we or should we not be investing in education, health care, economic development, types of microlending

that could create futures for families and people that live there, so that we don't have the ease with which the Taliban or al-Qaeda can recruit now in areas where there is extreme poverty and a lot of hopelessness? I'd like your views on which kind of investments America should look at, and what kind of strategy, in particular, should we be engaged with in Pakistan to help with the issue that you bring our attention to, which is governance?

Dr. ALBRIGHT. It's so nice to see you, Senator.

I think that Pakistan provides more problems, I think, than any other country. I've often said it has everything that gives you an international migraine.

It has nuclear weapons, poverty, extremism, corruption, and is in a very difficult location—and it has a weak government. I think that we could do better by providing assistance that would help on economic issues, such as education and health. This has been suggested previously by Senator Biden and Senator Lugar. The question is how to decide what the amount is, and then to whom to give it, and whether it should be distributed to nongovernmental organizations, or in some other ways that doesn't get caught up in the troublesome parts of the system.

The problem with it is that it will be hard to show immediate results to the taxpayers of the United States, who are being asked to do many things at the moment. They will want to know, what are we getting for that dollar? But, I think our assistance can be invested well—in education, for instance, because part of the problem is that the madrassas are educating some of the young people in ways that are not helpful. So, putting money into those particular programs through nongovernmental organizations, and then adding some to help governance and institution-building is very important.

Senator GILLIBRAND. And do you have any thoughts about processes to put in place for oversight and accountability? When I visited Pakistan, one of the generals that I spoke to—his largest concern was that there is no way, with billions of dollars that are given to the government, that we've ever had, to establish some level of accountability so that investments are going in the places where they're intended. Do you have any thoughts about—and maybe, Admiral Fallon, this is an area where you have expertise on—if we do continue investment, and we want to do investments in certain areas to have a long-term intended result of combating terrorism, what would your recommendations be for how we, not only deliver the funds, but how do we keep accountability so that the American taxpayer knows that these investments are to keep their children safe?

Admiral FALLON. This is a complex issue, for a lot of reasons. We provide assistance to foreign countries, and many are very grateful for that assistance, but they are sensitive to the fact that the package comes with lots of strings. And it's something we have to really be careful of. There are some things that we can do on our own, where we can maintain the accountability for such things. And in the business of security assistance, we have a number of these procedures that are pretty well inscribed in policy. And I think—taking the appropriate steps to ensure that we abide by the regulations and that we don't create more problems for ourselves—but,

is important I think we have to be sensitive to the fact that people are proud, particularly in Pakistan.

There are a lot of things that the Pakistanis are accused of; but, my experience is, they are proud of their achievements, and there's a significant well-educated, hardworking middle class in this country, and they would like to be recognized as such. So, I think we need to be sensitive to that.

But if I could piggyback on something the Secretary said, there's some expectation that we're going to have instant results, you know, we're going to make an appropriation, and next year the seeds will sprout and everything will be wonderful. Just doesn't work that way. It requires long-term investment.

And again, we have, for a lot of reasons that this committee or the graybeards here on the committee would certainly know a lot about, we enacted policies, in past decades, that have now come home to roost—in many respects, because we just had no way to leverage, no way to get inside and actually have influence on either the way money was spent or in the priority of things.

So, as you consider the policy implications of various laws, just a recommendation to try to take the long view, whenever possible, because the issues in Pakistan are not going to be solved overnight; it's going to take a long time.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you both. I would love to have this conversation last for many, many more minutes, but I do have to go vote. So I'll come back, if you're still—I'll ask more questions.

Thank you.

Senator GILLIBRAND [presiding]. We will put this hearing into recess until the chairman returns so we can continue the panel.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Folks, thank you for coming back to order. I apologize, but, as is often the case, the floor schedule is clashing with the hearing schedule, and that happens around here a lot. The result is, we actually have a couple of votes coming, so it's just going to truncate the process. So, we're going to have to wrap up this panel and try and get started with the next panel, and just be a little flexible.

If I could just ask you both sort of a quick question, as we—it struck me, in the last trip that I took, that, more than ever, there has been a transformation, to some degree, in the entire arena of South Asia, Middle East. And what we viewed previously, almost exclusively, as sort of Arab-Israeli and the Palestinian issue, is transforming, now, into moderates versus extremists. And that secular governments, secular moderate governments, Arab governments, are increasingly concerned about this radicalization that is taking place.

Sort of a last question on the table—and we've talked about the public diplomacy, we've talked about the policies themselves, we've talked things—but, is there any major step or initiative that, in your judgments, could have the greatest impact? Or is there some outreach to a particular entity, or group of people, whose engagement might make the greatest difference in pulling us back from this precipice?

Secretary Albright.

Dr. ALBRIGHT. Well, I believe—and I think it's the new modus operandi of the Obama administration, as well as for you, Mr. Chairman. The trip that you just took was exceptionally important, in terms of the countries and the timing—looking for partners among the Arab or Muslim governments, to see if they can help us.

I also believe that there is no incompatibility between democracy and Islam, and that it is therefore vital to work on governance issues.

And then, if I might—and it's the basis of my book about the role of God and religion—I think that religious leaders can play a very important role, in terms of bringing various groups together in conflict prevention, and get ahead of the issue. I wouldn't have religious leaders negotiating, but I would have them there. And also young people. I really think—and you're going to hear from Eboo Patel, in terms of—I think the next generation is the one that really has to be worked on. But—

The CHAIRMAN. But, if I—

Ambassador ALBRIGHT [continuing]. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an extremely important set of hearings. And to the extent that I can be helpful in a continual way on this, I would be very pleased to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you've been enormously helpful to be here today, and I really want to look to you for advice and counsel and help as we go forward. And we will go forward, and I just commend everybody, though we're not in the job of selling books on the committee, but "The Mighty and the Almighty"—I feel like a talk-show host or something, but—

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. The introduction by President Clinton—but it's a terrific piece, and it does confront a lot of these issues. And in the next panel, we have the "Who Speaks for Islam?" These are important books, and it's important for all of us to try to understand this better.

So, Admiral, do you want to add a last word?

Admiral FALLON. Just a couple. There's no magic, here. It requires a long-term commitment to try to let people have choices in this struggle between extremists and so-called moderates or—I think that giving encouragement to the majority, who want stability, want security, and they want to be able to live their lives in some semblance of normalcy, removing some of the obvious distractors—things that are pointed to constantly as, "Well, if only that were solved." We're not going to solve the Palestinian-Israeli problem. They're going to have to solve it, the people there on the scene. But, we can help. We can provide encouragement. We can try to remove, to the best of our ability, these—I call them distractors—that are often put up as excuses.

And people are people. Human nature being what it is, always looking for ways to either have somebody else take the hit or to avoid, often, responsibility for our own actions. So—

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Admiral FALLON [continuing]. Encouraging responsible leaders to actually take charge, to step up and take the initiative, with some sense that they're not just going to walk the plank, that if they're going to operate in an arena of some risk and some insecurity, that

we'll be there to help them, as best we can. And I think that pursuing those kinds of policies, long term, gives us the best chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we thank you.

Admiral FALLON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We all have to remember that the concept of diversity, pluralism, and tolerance didn't even come easily here. And the history of my State is written partially by people who escaped from a place called Salem, wandered through the woods for a winter, and found a place that they named Providence, which is now the capital of Rhode Island, as well as people who fled to what is now Connecticut, because they were seeking refuge from religious extremism. And that was, indeed, the original purpose of a whole bunch of folks coming to Massachusetts and to this country. So, we've been through this.

You can go to Europe in the 1600s, 30 years of a war between Catholics and Protestants, and opportunists who took advantage of their struggle. And an awful lot of people have died in the name of someone's sense of their rectitude about the good scriptures of any religion.

So, as Madeleine Albright said today, the Bible and the Quran are filled with a choice of which rhetoric you want to choose to employ, and you can make war or you can make peace. That's our struggle. And we are going to continue to explore it in greater detail, and uninterruptedly, I hope, on occasion.

But, I thank you so much for being here today. Thank you very much. Thank you, Secretary. Thank you, Admiral.

[Pause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to bring our second panel to the table, if we could, as fast as possible. Thank you very much for joining us.

Dalia, would you begin? Thank you.

If we could try to keep opening statements to 5 minutes. I'm going to have to disappear again, because there's a vote on. I'll try to wait as long as I can, in hopes that someone appears to continue. If they don't, we'll have to recess.

Thanks, Dalia.

**STATEMENT OF DALIA MOGAHED, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
GALLUP CENTER FOR MUSLIM STUDIES, WASHINGTON, DC**

Ms. MOGAHED. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for inviting me to share the findings of our massive poll on Muslim opinion around the world. It's a complicated issue, and so, for the sake of time, I will get just—get right to the highlights.

Though many have weighed in on the question of whether there is an inevitable clash between Muslims and the United States, and the West as a whole, the group that we seldom hear from are ordinary people. And that's why I felt that it was very important for our research to be heard by this panel.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you just tell us quickly—

Ms. MOGAHED. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. How you—who you are and how you do that?

Ms. MOGAHED. OK, absolutely.

Ongoing since 2001, Gallup has conducted tens of thousands of hour-long, face-to-face interviews with Muslims in more than 40

nations, including Europe and the United States. We spoke to men and women, young and old, educated and illiterate, from urban and rural settings. In totality, we surveyed a sample representing 90 percent of the global Muslim population, making this the largest, most comprehensive study of contemporary Muslims ever done.

Our research uncovered a number of surprising insights, but the most important was this. A massive conflict between the U.S. and the Muslim world is not inevitable. Our differences are driven by politics, not a clash of principles. Our findings suggest that Americans and Muslims, who are Asians, Arabs, and Africans, share a great deal in common, but that three primary filters shape the views of those who disapprove of the U.S. They are perceptions of being disrespected, politically dominated, and anger at acute conflicts.

To improve relations and further decrease the appeal of violent extremism, we must turn to what I will call the three R's: Resolution of conflict, political and economic reform, and mutual respect.

So, contrary to popular media images, residents of Muslim-majority countries share a great deal in common with many Americans. This includes a shared admiration for democratic values and good governance, valuing faith and family, and a good job, as well as an overwhelming public rejection of violent extremism against civilians.

Most agree that interaction between Muslims and Western communities is more a benefit than a threat. And majorities worldwide, from Boston to Baghdad, also say better relations between the two communities is of personal importance.

In general, Muslims around the world are slightly more likely than the American public to unequivocally reject targeting civilians by individuals or the military. Our study found that those who sympathize with attacks on American civilians support that position by using political ideology, not religious fervor. In contrast, those who say that terrorism is wrong explain that position using religious prohibitions on murder. This means that what is at the heart of support—public support for terrorism, is not religious extremism, but an extremist political ideology.

Furthermore, Muslims are more likely than the American public to say that they themselves are afraid of being victim to a terrorist attack, and feel—even more often mention this than the American public—that they must work to stop violent extremism in their own communities. So, though violent extremism may seem to be at the heart of what divides the U.S. and Muslims around the world, it is actually our common enemy.

With so much shared, why do so many in Muslim-majority countries have unfavorable views of the U.S.? Rather than a hatred of our principles, three policy-driven perceptions drive the views of those who disapprove of the United States. They are anger at acute conflicts, perceived political domination, and disrespect.

Acute conflicts begin this list. Most believe the invasion of Iraq did more harm than good, and very few believe that we take an evenhanded approach to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In addition to these conflicts, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, other events, such as abuses in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, contribute to perceptions of being under attack.

Political domination is the second, and it's very important to understand that many Muslims around the world admire what they say are universal values that are practiced so well in the West, including good governance and self-determination, as well as human rights. However, they doubt that the United States—they are skeptical as to the United States true intentions in promoting these values in their region, and point to our support, or our perceived support, for dictatorships.

Finally, disrespect. And I will spend a few minutes on this, because it's so important. When asked what the West can do to improve relations with the Muslim world, whether we were talking to someone in Casablanca or Kuala Lumpur, the most frequent response was for the West to demonstrate more respect for Islam, and to regard Muslims as equals, not inferior.

Where does this perception of disrespect come from? Ironically, it stems from the perception that we don't live the values that they so admire about us in our treatment of them—rule of law, self-determination, and human rights. Many believe that the U.S. is denying Muslims these rights by supporting dictatorships, direct occupation of Muslim lands, and what is seen as passive support for Israeli violence.

To explain the perceived gap between America's espoused values and its treatment of Muslims, or perceived treatment of Muslims, they turn to this idea that we must be singling them out and looking at them as less than we are.

What is the way forward? And I will refer to the same report that Secretary Albright mentioned, the "Changing Course" report put out by a high-level commission. I'm going to focus on one specific aspect of that report, in addition to what I just said, which is this idea of mutual respect. How do we show mutual respect?

First, we move, think and speak and act to the reality that Muslims are allies, not suspects, in the fight against violent extremism. We must talk about this issue by recognizing that they are the primary targets of terrorism.

This will mean deemphasizing the unquenchable demand for mainstream Muslims to condemn terrorism, again and again, as if this assumes their co-membership in one group with the terrorists, instead of with us, as fellow victims of terrorism.

Terms like "Islamic terrorism" or "jihadists" glorify the terrorists by giving them religious veneration. Instead of using terms like this, or using terms even like "radical Islam," which is a little like saying "totalitarian democracy"—that's simply a contradiction in terms—we should use a term simply like "bin-Ladenism." And—

The CHAIRMAN. Could I stop you there?

Ms. MOGAHED. Un-huh.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me, because I have some questions, but I need about 2 minutes to go vote.

Ms. MOGAHED. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. So, we need to recess until we get back, and—so, we'll stand in recess for a few minutes.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

Senator KAUFMAN [presiding]. We'll call the committee back to order, and we'll continue with the testimony by Dalia Mogahed.

Ms. MOGAHED. Thank you.

Second, we will have to condemn Islamophobia as un-American. This is where the U.S. must stand head and shoulders above what sometimes seems as Europe's less-developed comprehension of free speech. We don't use racial slurs in public, not because they are prohibited in the legal realm, but because our society has evolved beyond that in the moral realm. European societies, for whom living in a multicultural society is still relatively new, must grow in the same way. This also includes constructive exchange in accurate depictions of media.

Three is listening. While many Muslims are critical of actions carried out by both our government, as well as their own, from the wars in Iraq and Gaza to economic corruption and lack of freedom, the majority reject terrorism as a legitimate response. To further weaken the extremists, we must listen to, not necessarily agree with, mainstream Muslim's concerns over injustices, and engage those peacefully working to address these concerns.

And finally, I'll end with the vital role for Muslim Americans to play. Not only are Muslim Americans ambassadors of America's inclusiveness in engaging Muslims around the world, but represent a valuable brain trust for crafting smart, equitable policies for an interdependent world. Groups like the Muslim congressional staffers and many other groups are vital resources for thinking about these issues. In addition, Muslim Americans' legal and social welfare in their own country is viewed as a litmus test for America's position toward Muslims, in general. We must therefore continue to promote our core American values of due process, justice, and equality in our treatment of all people.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Mogahed follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DALIA E. MOGAHED

Mr. Chairman, ranking member Lugar: Thank you for inviting me to share findings from Gallup's ongoing research on Muslims around the world, and what our analysis suggests is the best way forward in reversing the apparent downward spiral in the relationship between the United States and these diverse communities. This is a complicated issue, and given the time constraints of this hearing, my remarks will necessarily sound general. I apologize for this, but I would like to just outline the framework for tackling this challenge. These ideas are more fully developed in my book,¹ along with a new report on Muslim Americans to be released Monday, which we'll make sure all of you receive.²

Many claim to speak for Muslims, and therefore an accurate representative understanding of this silenced majority from their own perspective is a critical first step to building effective strategies to improve relations. My remarks this afternoon reflect extensive Gallup research on global Muslim attitudes. Ongoing since 2001, Gallup has conducted tens of thousands of hour-long, face-to-face interviews with residents of more than 40 nations with majority or substantial minority Muslim populations. The sample represents residents young and old, educated and illiterate, female and male, and from urban and rural settings. In totality, we surveyed a sample representing more than 90% of the world's 1.3 billion Muslims, making this the largest, most comprehensive study of contemporary Muslims ever done.

Our research uncovered a number of surprising insights, but the most important was this: A massive conflict between the U.S. and Muslims around the world is not inevitable. Our differences are driven by politics—not a clash of principles. Our research suggests three primary filters shape Muslims' negative views of the U.S.:

¹*Who Speaks for Islam? What a Billion Muslims Really Think*, John L. Esposito and Dalia Mogahed (Gallup Press, 2008)

²"Muslim Americans: A National Portrait," Gallup Center for Muslim Studies, March 2009

Perceptions of 1. disrespect; 2. political domination; 3. acute conflicts. To improve relations and further decrease the appeal of violent extremism, we must turn to what I will call the 3 R's: Resolution of conflicts, and Reform and Respect, rather than looking to religious explanations for Muslim behavior.

Common Ground

Contrary to popular media images, residents of Muslim majority countries around the world share a great deal in common with most Americans. This common ground includes an admiration of democratic values and good governance, valuing faith and family, and an overwhelming public rejection of violent extremism. Ordinary people around the world also agree that greater interaction between Muslim and Western communities is more a benefit than a threat, including more than 70% of Americans. Majorities worldwide, from Boston to Baghdad, also say better relations between these communities is of personal importance.

Our findings suggest anti-American sentiment is not borne out of a religiously inspired hatred of Western culture. For example, though anti-American sentiment is rampant in many Muslim majority countries, especially in the Middle East, it is not shared by Muslims in sub-Saharan Africa. At the same time, it is not exclusive to Muslims. Less than 10% of the general public in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Germany, and Spain approved of U.S. leadership in 2008, whereas strong majorities—more than 70% of Muslims in Mali and Sierra Leone expressed approval. Moreover, even those Muslims who view the U.S. and the U.K. negatively have a neutral to positive view of France and Germany—in fact, as positively as they view other Muslim majority countries. These results suggest Muslims' views of countries fall along policy and not cultural or religious lines.

Despite widespread disapproval of U.S. leadership, Muslims worldwide said they in fact admired much of what the West holds dear. When asked to describe what they admired most about the West in an open-ended question, the most frequent response was technology, expertise, and knowledge; the second most frequent response was freedom and democracy. Moreover, when Americans were asked the same question, the top two responses were identical. Majorities, including more than 80% of Egyptians, say that moving toward greater democracy will help Muslims progress. Contrary to what might be assumed in light of the Danish cartoon crisis, Muslims around the world, in majorities greater than 90% in Egypt, Indonesia, and Iran said they would include free speech as a fundamental guarantee if they were to draft a new constitution for a new country.

However, while acknowledging and admiring political freedom in the West, Muslim communities did not favor a wholesale adoption of European models. Very few associated “adopting western values” with Muslim political and economic progress. Our data suggest that while admiring fair elections in the West, many Muslims envision a democratic model of their own. We found the majority in virtually every country surveyed believed Sharia should be at least a source of legislation.

At the same time, a vast majority of those surveyed, in addition to their admiration for political freedom in the West, also said they support freedoms of speech, religion, and assembly—as well as a woman's right to vote, drive, work outside the home, and lead. In addition, a mean of 60% say they would want religious leaders to play no direct role in drafting a country's constitution (and even among those who take the contrary view, most would want clerics limited to an advisory function). So while Muslim support for Sharia is high, so is their support for democratic and egalitarian values, including women's rights and freedom of speech. At the same time, majorities do not want a “theocracy” or a government run by presumably infallible theocrats.

Counter intuitively, our analysis suggests Sharia is viewed as representing “rule of law”—a set of rules and rights that no dictator is above because they are God given—unalienable rights endowed by the Creator. For example, a near unanimous 96% of Egyptian women associate Sharia compliance with protecting human rights. Government's role, therefore, should be to protect those rights. Thus, complete secularism can mean for many the lifting of all constraints in preventing government-sponsored tyranny—in fact taking away people's God-given rights.

Aspirations were also common. When respondents in Muslim communities around the world were asked to describe their dreams for the future, we didn't hear about waging war against the West, but instead we heard getting better work and offering a better future to their children. This response was heard among 70% of Indonesians and 54% of Iranians. A recent Gallup survey found that Americans wanted President Obama to talk about ‘jobs’ in his speech to Congress this past Tuesday, followed by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The poll could have been from any number of Muslim communities.

Like Americans, the overwhelming majority of residents of Muslim communities around the world reject attacks on civilians and consider them morally wrong. Those that sympathize with attacks on American civilians are no more religious than the mainstream and defend their position with political ideology, not religious theology, while those who oppose terrorism explain their position in moral or religious terms. The most frequent response to what Muslims should do to improve relations with the West was to modernize, project a more positive image of Islam, and to help stop extremism. It is also interesting to note that among the most frequent responses to the question about their greatest fear was being a victim of terrorism. Violent extremism is a common threat to everyone.

With so much in common, what is standing in the way of greater engagement? Three primary mutually reinforcing perceptions shape America's negative image. They are perceptions stemming from acute conflicts, the perception of political domination, and disrespect.

Acute conflicts: It would be difficult to overstate the sense of moral outrage many Muslim communities feel, especially in the Middle East, about the acute conflicts currently involving the U.S. as a direct or indirect actor. Iraq tops of this list, but also includes Afghanistan and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Majorities around the world, including 90% of Egyptians and 57% of Iranians, believe the invasion of Iraq did more harm than good. Only percentages in the single digits believe the West takes an even-handed approach to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. When asked what the U.S. can do to improve relations with the Muslim world, people in the Middle East cite the U.S. pursuing a more balanced approach to this conflict near the top of the list. However, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is less central to Muslims in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa except during raging conflict like the past war in Gaza. In addition to these conflicts, other events such as abuses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay prison contribute greatly to the filter of being under attack.

Political domination: Many Muslims around the world, while admiring of Western values, believe the U.S. does not live these values in their treatment of Muslims. For example, significant percentages of Muslims do not believe the U.S. is serious about democracy in their regions. This is the view especially in countries where democratic promotion has been the loudest, such as Egypt, where 72% doubt American promises of democratic support, and Pakistan, where 55% have this view. Doubting American intentions with regard to democracy are closely tied with the perception that America is a hegemonic, neo-colonial power that controls the region. More than 65% of Egyptians, Jordanians, and Iranians believe the U.S. will not allow people in their region to fashion their own political future the way they see fit without direct U.S. influence.

Disrespect: When asked what the West can do to improve relations with the Muslim world, Muslims around the world, whether in Casablanca or Kuala Lumpur talk about respect. They speak about respect as reciprocal and say that Muslims must also show respect for the West to improve relations. However, while the majority of Muslims say they respect the West, most do not believe the West respects them. In some cases, they are right. The majority of Americans also say they do not believe the West respects the Muslim world, and when asked what they admire most about the Muslim world, the most frequent responses were "nothing," followed by "I don't know."

What Muslims say they admire most about the West is what they associate most strongly with the U.S. citizens' liberties. At the same time, many believe the U.S. is denying Muslims these same rights of self-determination and human rights through support for dictatorships, direct occupation including human rights violations, and what is seen as tacit support for Israeli violence.

To explain the perceived gap between America's espoused values of democracy, human rights, and self-determination on one hand, and its treatment of Muslims on the other—Muslims turn to the belief that America and its allies must be hostile toward Islam and regard Muslims as inferior. Meaning, since the perceived way Muslims are treated is antithetical to cherished Western values, these same Western powers must be hostile to Islam and Muslims. This perception is compounded by anti-Islamic rhetoric, or the desecration of Islamic symbols, especially by those in positions of authority.

So, not surprisingly, when we asked Muslims worldwide what the West can do to improve relations with the Muslim world, the most frequent responses were for the West to demonstrate more respect for Islam and to regard Muslims as equals, not as inferior. For example, when we asked this question of Lebanese respondents just days after the end of the conflict between Hezbollah and Israel—a conflict re-

spondents blamed on America almost as much as it is blamed on Israel—people had this to say:

“They (the West) should consider us humans and should end war and be at peace with Muslim World.”

“West should treat Muslims equally to improve their relations because they look down upon us.”

Other respondents from around the globe echoed this sentiment. For example, a respondent from Morocco said, “The West has to change and moderate their attitudes towards Muslims. They have to not look down on our people.”

The New Way Forward

This analysis was the basis of a new bipartisan consensus report on U.S.-Muslim engagement, which I took part in drafting, titled “Changing Course.”³ The report’s recommendations fall under the three R’s: resolution of violent conflicts, reform (political and economic), and respect (mutual).

Resolution of conflict

Muslims, like all people, want to live safe, prosperous, and free lives. Resolution of violent conflict and responsible withdrawal from occupied land is the most important step we can take to squelch public anger at the U.S. This includes the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as continuing to de-escalate tensions with Iran and Syria. These also include helping to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For these reasons, President Obama’s immediate selection of envoys to these trouble spots was crucial. However, since many of these conflicts are likely to rage on for several more years despite our best intentions, we will need to manage the interim by setting realistic expectations and by speaking and behaving like fair brokers of peace. For example, though we seldom talk in these terms, Palestinians need security as badly as Israelis and bear the brunt of civilian casualties in the conflict. We must therefore talk about and work for security for Israelis and Palestinians.

Reform (political and economic)

Reeling from what appeared to many as disastrous policies promoting democracy in the past several years, many are leery of promoting political reform. However, “Changing Course”⁴ concluded it is in our best interests to strengthen institutions of good governance in Muslim communities, support democratic processes—not specific personalities—and widen our definition of acceptable election outcomes. In addition, business partnerships that promote economic growth and job creation are important foundations of a thriving middle class and civil society, which are the bedrocks of democracy.

Respect

Since this is both a priority of President Obama and a critical issue from the perspective of Muslims, I will go into the most detail. According to our research, “respect” is reflected in words and actions. The two most significant statements associated with respect were refraining from desecrating Muslim symbols and treating Muslims fairly in the policies that affect them. Four specific recommendations emerge from our research:

1. *Muslims and Americans vs. violent extremism:* Our language must reflect the reality that the primary victims of violent extremism are Muslims abroad, and that they fear falling victim to political violence more than Americans do. We are, therefore, natural allies against this common threat. This will mean de-emphasizing the unquenchable demand for mainstream Muslims to condemn terrorism again and again as this assumes their co-membership in one group with the terrorists, instead of with us as fellow victims of the same crime. Use of terms like “Islamic terrorism” or “Jihadists” glorifies the terrorists with religious veneration, while fueling the very perceptions they work to exploit - that America is at war with Islam.
2. *Condemn Islamophobia as un-American.* This is where the U.S. must stand head and shoulders above Europe’s underdeveloped comprehension of free speech. We don’t use public racial slurs, not because they are prohibited in the legal realm, but because our society has evolved beyond them in the moral realm. European societies, for whom living in a multicultural society is still relatively new, must grow in the same way. With all our faults and ongoing struggles, America has something to teach the world about multicultural relations.

³ “Changing Course: A New Strategy for U.S. Engagement With the Muslim World”

⁴ Ibid.

We have learned through our civil rights struggle, at least in principle, that our democracy is stronger when it no longer excludes entire segments of its citizens, and that our freedom is protected, not compromised, when our definition of civility includes them.

3. *Listening.* While many Muslims are critical of actions carried out by both our government and their own, from the wars in Iraq and Gaza to economic corruption and lack of freedom, the majority reject terrorism as a legitimate response. To further weaken the extremists, instead of defending our way of life, we must listen to—not necessarily agree with—mainstream Muslim concerns over injustice, and engage those peacefully working to address them.
4. *Muslim Americans' vital role.* Not only are they ambassadors of American inclusiveness, but as one of the most educated and diverse faith communities in the nation,⁵ they represent a valuable brain trust for crafting smart, equitable policies for an interdependent world. Groups like the Muslim congressional staff's association can be a vital resource for thinking about these issues. In addition, Muslim Americans' legal and social welfare in their own country is viewed as a litmus test for America's position toward Muslims in general. We must therefore continue to promote our core American values of due process, justice, and equality in our treatment of all.

Senator KAUFMAN. Thank you very much.
Mr. Patel.

**STATEMENT OF EBOO PATEL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
INTERFAITH YOUTH CORE, CHICAGO, IL**

Mr. PATEL. Mr. Chairman, my name is Eboo Patel. I am the founder and director—executive director, of an organization called the Interfaith Youth Core. Our mission is to spread the message of religious pluralism to tens of millions of people worldwide, and to train and mobilize tens of thousands of young people to be its architects.

I would like to say that I am the son of Muslim immigrants from India. They came to America, not just for the opportunities of personal and professional advancement, but also for the opportunity to contribute to a nation that was built on the contributions of many from all over the world. They view my testimony here as a partial fulfillment of their American dream.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the question of the 21st century will be the question of the faith line. That is, how diverse religious communities choose to interact, whether that interaction moves with conflict or toward cooperation. The biggest mistake we can make on the question of the faith line is to define it wrong. The wrong definition of the faith line pits Muslims against Christians, or believers against nonbelievers. If we define the faith line as Muslims against Christians, we are left with a world of 2 billion people at war with a world of 1.3 billion people. That is an eternal war.

I prefer to divide the faith line—to define the faith line as a line that divides people I call “religious pluralists” from “religious totalitarians.” I have a very simple definition for “religious pluralist.” It’s somebody who believes in a society where people from diverse backgrounds live in equal dignity and mutual loyalty. I have a very simple definition of a “religious totalitarian.” It’s somebody who wants their community to dominate, and everyone else to suffocate.

⁵“Muslim Americans: A National Portrait,” released by Gallup March 2, 2009
www.MuslimWestFacts.com and www.Gallup.com

I believe that young people will make the difference between whether we live in a century defined by religious pluralism or a century defined by religious totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, I believe we are losing this battle. And the answer to that is very simple. It is because religious extremist movements target, in particular, young people. Al-Qaeda can very easily be understood as a movement of young people taking action. Osama bin Laden himself was recruited, when he was a teenager, by a man barely a decade older than him. When he became a 20-something, he in turn started recruiting teenagers for a new global force that he called al-Qaeda.

The youth bulge, particularly in the most religiously volatile parts of the world, is remarkable. The median age in Iraq is 19.5. There are more children in India than are citizens in the United States. We cannot forfeit this powerful terrain, this major opportunity, to religious extremists simply because they are the ones targeting, training, and mobilizing these young people.

The other truth is that young people have played an absolutely key role in building religious pluralism throughout the ages. Martin Luther King, Jr., was only 26 years old when he led the Montgomery bus boycott. He worked, through the inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi, arm in arm with the Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, and through an inspirational correspondence with the Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh, a Buddhist monk.

Mahatma Gandhi, the great Indian Hindu leader, was 24 when he started his movement against the racist laws in South Africa. And a too-little-known Muslim leader, named Abdul Badshah Khan, was a young man when he mobilized thousands of Muslims to be part of the movement to free the subcontinent.

These are the youth leaders of interfaith cooperation. They exist amidst us today. We need to be inspiring them, training them, and mobilizing them. America and Islam have an enormous shared value when it comes to pluralism. As the American philosopher Michael Walzer once said, the challenge of America is to embrace its differences and maintain a common life. That strikes me as deeply resonant with a line from the holy Quran. In Sura 49, we are told that god made us different nations and tribes that we may come to know one another.

I think it is—the time is now to declare the 21st century the “Century of Religious Pluralism,” and to declare this generation the architects of that value.

I have a couple of specific recommendations for the United States Government to make. My organization has had a presence on six continents. Many of our programs have been facilitated by wonderful institutions, like the State Department. Unfortunately, too many of those initiatives have been ad hoc. I believe it is time to move from scattered initiatives to strategic approaches. I believe it is time to go from seeding programs to scaling programs.

Two of my colleagues recently did a tour of European countries, where they engaged several hundred mostly young Muslim leaders in Europe, and trained several hundred others, to be the architects of religious pluralism. Why shouldn't this be tens of thousands? It is simply a matter of concentrated resources and coherent mechanisms at institutions like the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, imagine if the 2 billion Christians on the planet and the 1.3 billion Muslims, the several hundred million Hindus, the 50 million Jews, viewed themselves as partners in fighting malaria, or AIDS, or the various ills that afflict humankind. That is the century we could live in. The United States can play a major role in that.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Patel follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. EBOO PATEL

Introduction

Chairman Kerry, Senator Lugar, and esteemed members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the very important topic of engaging Muslim communities around the world. As your invitation to testify indicated, before we can engage Muslim communities, we must first attempt to understand these communities. My testimony will highlight some of the characteristics of Muslim majority countries and the Muslim community in Europe. My recommendations for engagement, in turn, are premised on the belief that we must involve young people in our strategies and use interfaith action to build a better relationship with the Muslim world.

Trends Among Muslim Youth

There are several factors that underscore the importance of engaging with young people.

Globalization has given rise to unprecedented interaction among diverse religious communities around the world. Ultimately, it is young people, as they in particular have embraced new forms of global communication, who will decide how these interactions tend. This increased communication has led to new forms of identity engagement amongst youth, which are less reliant on traditional nation-state boundaries and more likely to be influenced by transnational factors. This interaction can lead in one of two directions: conflict or cooperation. The dominant theory that outlines this interaction is the “clash of civilizations” as outlined by Samuel Huntington. Alternately, many see the world through a different paradigm, separating not civilizations but, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., those who choose to live together as brothers or perish as fools.

In Muslim majority countries, three additional trends are at work. First, there is a youth bulge. In Afghanistan and the Gaza Strip, the median age is about 17 years; in Iraq and Pakistan it is barely 20, and in Syria and Saudi Arabia the median is about 21.5 years. This trend extends all over the Middle East and North Africa—the median age is under 27 in Algeria, Morocco, Egypt and Jordan.¹ How these youth express and engage their religious identities has influence far beyond their individual reach. Will we have a generation of young people who believe that their way of being, believing, and belonging is a barrier against diversity, or worse, a bomb to destroy it? Or will young people understand their faith as a bridge to promote equal dignity and mutual loyalty amongst diverse religious communities? I believe that with the appropriate attention and investment, there is an effective way to do the latter.

Second, these youth are faced with changing socio-economic factors that create insecurity. There is a clear lack of job opportunities and services to meet the needs of these youth. The unemployment rates in Afghanistan and the Gaza Strip have been estimated at close to 40%, and in Jordan and Iraq this number is around 30%.² Without gainful employment and the potential for traditional social roles or upward social mobility, these young people are becoming frustrated and lost.

Third, at this moment, as youth seek identity and purpose in their lives, they are confronted with a global religious revival. Scholar Thomas Farr writes “Faith, far from exiting the world’s stage, has played a growing role in human affairs, even as modernization has proceeded apace. Iran’s Shiite revolution in 1979, the Catholic Church’s role in the ‘third wave’ of democratization, the 9/11 attacks—all illustrated just how important a global force religion has become.”³ According to Todd Johnson and David Barrett, “Demographic trends coupled with conservative estimates of con-

¹ CIA World Factbook

² CIA World Factbook

³ Farr, Thomas. “Diplomacy in an Age of Faith: Religious Freedom and National Security,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 2. Pg 110.

versions and defections envision over 80% of the world's population will continue to be affiliated to religions 200 years into the future."⁴ Sociologist Peter Berger states that "the assumption that we live in a secularized world is false [. . .] The world today [. . .] is as furiously religious as it ever was, and in some places more so than ever."⁵

Religion remains a primary source of identification for many and is a robust transnational identifier. Groups who promote intolerance, violence, and segregation have used religious identification in young people to actively promote division and mistrust. The power of religion, however, can be used by youth to build peace and productive engagement.

Youth identity is not an issue that is relevant only in the Middle East. Muslim communities in Western Europe are a key demographic that cannot be ignored. As of 2003, there were 15 million Muslims in the European Union (three times more than in the United States at the time). Moreover, in 2003 the Muslim birth rate in Europe was triple that of the non-Muslim birth rate. By 2015, the Muslim population in Europe will have doubled, while the non-Muslim population will have declined by 3.5%.⁶ Many of these European young Muslims face issues such as discrimination, economic deprivation, underemployment, and residence in ghettoized communities. Among native-born Muslims in Europe, there is often a feeling that they do not have a stake in larger society, and must choose between their religion and citizenship.

Two trainers from Interfaith Youth Core recently traveled to Italy, Spain, France, UK, Netherlands, and Belgium to deliver a series of "Religious Pluralism" trainings to audiences of religious youth, many of whom were Muslim. We observed a widespread sense of frustration amongst Muslim youth at their inability to freely express their religious identity, a feeling of isolation, and a willingness to identify oneself in opposition to the larger society. It is imperative to engage these groups, increase youth capacity as bridge builders between communities, and help them form social networks and partnerships beyond their faith communities.

Religious Extremism is a Youth Movement

The United States can be a better partner in engaging Muslim communities around the world by realizing the power of investing in young people. If we are not engaging and educating young people in interfaith cooperation, there are others who are pushing them towards extremism.

Osama bin Laden, for example, is a brilliant youth organizer. At fourteen, he was recruited to an after-school Islamic study group where the organizer, a young adult, introduced to him the idea of violence as a means towards fulfilling religious obligations. At university, Osama fell under the spell of a radical, charismatic teacher, Abdullah Azzam, a Palestinian who had joined the Muslim Brotherhood as a young man and later helped found Hamas, Azzam wanted to find a way to make Sayyid Qutb's vision of the violent overthrow of corrupt regimes a reality. Azzam traveled around the world to spread his message, raising money and recruiting young people to join the armed effort. He opened dozens of recruitment centers, known as services offices. Osama bin Laden was the first to answer Azzam's call. At the age of twenty-three, he financed Azzam's Peshawar Services Office. It was here that bin Laden met a young doctor from a prominent Cairo family, Ayman al-Zawahiri. The two were struck by the range, quantity, and commitment of Muslim youths pouring into Peshawar, eager to wage jihad. Like entrepreneurs, they realized the potential of this massive market of young Muslims for the "product" of totalitarian Islam. The result of this recruitment was an international network of Muslim youths schooled in the ideology of totalitarian Islam, taught to hate the "imperialist infidel," and trained to kill—and that is who became Al Qaeda.

Just as a skilled totalitarian youth organizer convinced a young Osama to answer the call of jihad through stories of the power of youth to return the ummah (collective Muslim community) to glory, so bin Laden is doing the same for this generation.

Bruce Riedel describes al-Qaeda as a set of highly effective leaders who have created a compelling narrative, based partly on American missteps in the Muslim world, and a remarkably resilient organizational structure that seduces a small group of young Muslims to destroy in a highly strategic manner.⁷ This combination

⁴Farr 112.

⁵Berger, Peter. *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999. Pg 2.

⁶Taspinar, Omer. "Europe's Main Street," *Foreign Policy*, March/April 2003.

⁷Riedel, Bruce. *The Search for Al Qaeda*, Brookings Institution Press, 2008.

of effective leaders, compelling narrative, resilient structure, willing youth and strategic destruction is one that can be defeated with the right vision, message and strategy. To counteract those like bin Laden who see an inevitable conflict between the Muslim world and the West, we must invest in young people to build religious pluralism and cooperation and take interfaith action.

Opportunities for Engaging Youth Towards Interfaith Cooperation

Interfaith action counters the clash of civilizations and is an alternative way to engage young people of faith. It focuses not on our differences, but on our shared potential. Instead of pitting people of different religions against one another in an endless war, interfaith action builds mutual respect and understanding through cooperative service and constructive dialogue.

Looking back we see alternative models for how young people of faith can positively engage a religiously diverse world. Consider the young Martin Luther King Jr., a devout Christian who worked with Jewish leaders and used the methods of a Mahatma Gandhi, an Indian Hindu, to build a more just and equitable America. Learning from King, we must empower young people of faith to work with those of different religions to foster peace and cooperation.

This is not just a Christian or Hindu philosophy, it is also found in Islam. The tradition of Islam teaches the importance of interfaith cooperation and a central tenet of the tradition is one which embraces diversity and promotes pluralism. The Quran states "O Mankind, We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know each other. Verily the most honored of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you." (Quran 49:13). There are many examples of Muslims who have promoted pluralism, from the Muslims in South Africa who joined the struggle against apartheid to Badshah Khan, a Pashtun who was inspired by Gandhi's non-violent approach, and recruited thousands of young Muslims to rally for a free Subcontinent.

The organization I founded and lead, Interfaith Youth Core, brings young people of different faiths together to serve others by building houses, serving the poor or restoring the environment. From this shared service experience, Interfaith Youth Core helps young people realize the shared values of all religions, such as compassion, mercy and peace. Service to others and a shared values dialogue help young people understand how they can maintain their own faith identity while working together with those from different faiths to create not a clash of civilizations, but a more peaceful and just world.

When I attended interfaith conferences as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, I saw that they were filled with senior religious leaders. I also recognized that those who were on the front lines of religious violence were not senior theologians, but young people. If movements of violent extremism were mobilizing thousands of young people to action everyday, and the interfaith movement only involved theologians and academics gathering at conferences, we would forfeit the ground to terrorists. It was upon this realization that I founded the Interfaith Youth Core to build a global movement of young leaders taking action to advance religious pluralism.

Interfaith Youth Core affirms and strengthens the religious identity of young people while helping them embrace the vision of religious pluralism. We nurture their leadership skills and invest in them with resources and opportunities worthy of their boundless potential for good. We connect them with one another to form networks so they will understand the world's diversity on a personal level and be empowered by other interfaith leaders.

As indicated above, last month two Interfaith Youth Core staff members, both Muslim women, embarked on a three week training tour across Western Europe supported by the State Department. They conducted trainings for about 400 young European interfaith leaders in Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain and France, with the goal of sparking an interfaith youth movement across Europe. Many of the communities they visited included recent Muslim immigrants to Western Europe, as well as established Muslim minority communities. The goal of this training trip was to build bridges between communities in Western Europe and illustrate a new way of engaging people of different faiths including the Muslim community.

This grant gave Interfaith Youth Core the opportunity to spread the message of religious pluralism, expand our network of interfaith bridge builders, and gain valuable experience of the context of the countries we visited. It gave Interfaith Youth Core the opportunity to begin to plant the seed for interfaith cooperation; however a greater investment needs to be made to take this to scale.

We have been on the ground in over a dozen countries, and we currently have several more pending requests for our services by the State Department. Though this approach is fruitful, it has been too ad hoc and scattered; it needs to be more

strategic. There needs to be a structure in place in government institutions that enable a more coherent and full scale approach.

Recommendations:

The U.S. needs to involve young people in our engagement strategies and use interfaith action to build a better relationship with the Muslim world. Interfaith cooperation is one most critical issues of the 21st century and it is imperative to equip young leaders to take action. The following are a set of recommendations towards realizing this goal.

1. Promote religious pluralism as a core commitment globally. Religious pluralism in the United States can serve as a model for engaging religious diversity around the world.
 - Change the framework of U.S. Engagement with Muslim communities from the “clash of civilizations” to the framework of “pluralism vs. extremism.”
 - Rather than the current characterization of counterterrorism efforts as “freedom and democracy versus terrorist ideology,” policymakers should frame the battle of ideas as a conflict between terrorist elements in the Muslim world and Islam.
2. Empower young leaders to advance interfaith cooperation in their communities.
 - Government should identify and amplify civil society forces that have innovative and effective models that promote youth-led interfaith cooperation.
 - Equip young leaders with the knowledge base and skill set for interfaith action.
 - Invest in institutions that focus on increasing the training and capacity building of interfaith leaders.
3. Continue to prioritize citizen diplomacy efforts for engagement with Muslim communities around the world.
 - Facilitate interfaith exchanges, cross-cultural education, and religious literacy programs in a public diplomacy initiative that is coherent, strategic and comprehensive in nature.
 - Enable partnerships between U.S. institutions and partners in Muslim communities around the world.
 - Highlight the Muslim American community as a key example of America’s vibrant pluralism, and use them as citizen diplomats to engage other communities around the world.

ADDENDUM TO THE TESTIMONY OF DR. EBOO PATEL

[At the conclusion of testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 26, 2009, Senator Ted Kaufman asked the panel to forward practical suggestions on how to engage youth in the Muslim world in positive relationships. Over the last 10 years of working with young people, I have learned that we need to empower young people to become leaders and equip them with the knowledge base, skill set, and networks to effectively build pluralism and organize interfaith action in order to create conditions for peace and stability. The key question is how can we accomplish this?]

The first step to building pluralism is providing the framework. Pluralism has three parts: respect for identity, mutually enriching relationships between people of different backgrounds, and concrete action for the common good. Correctly identifying “us” and “them” is critical to shifting how young people think about the world and their place in it. We want them to know that the line is not drawn between Muslims and Jews, or Americans and Middle Easterners. Very simply, “us” includes all people who believe that we can live together in peace, and “them” includes those who seek to destroy diversity. At this time also let me clarify that when I say “interfaith” in the context of the Muslim world, I mean not only engaging with other religions, but confronting internal tensions between different sects within Islam.

In part, this means providing young Muslims both physical and intellectual space to discuss issues openly and without fear. We need to support organizations that provide such space where diverse young people can interact, work, learn and teach. A State Department Official estimated that radical groups have spent 70 billion dollars proselytizing over the past 30 years. We need to commit to a substantial investment to counter the impact of this sustained targeting of young people.

The second step is to provide the skill set needed for organizing. We must teach these young leaders how to bring people from different perspectives together, facili-

tate an effective dialogue, and assess their communities to identify needs and how they can rally young people to address their concerns. As interfaith organizers, these youth will be able to take action to build cross-cultural relationships and mutual understanding, serve their communities and strengthen the fabric of their civil societies.

The third step is providing the networks of support. Young people building pluralism in the Muslim world should be connected to one another, but also to Americans building pluralism in the U.S. and Germans building pluralism in Germany. International exchanges serve this function of networking and connecting young people, as well as provide a space for discussing issues and building skills. Rather than funding the international exchanges on an ad-hoc basis, we must organize a federally funded, cross-departmental investment in a strategic international exchange program.

Above and beyond these physical exchanges, social networks are effective points of connection in our globalized era. I would point to IFYC's network, "Bridge-builders," where in just five months over 1000 young people from all over the world have congregated to collaborate on events and programs, share ideas, projects and resources, and post testimony, photos and videos of their interfaith activities. This network opens up a virtual discussion forum to discuss the challenges they face in their work and how to overcome them.

By empowering young people as leaders in their communities we will answer their questions of "Who am I? How do I relate to you? What can we do together?" Just as the youth recruiters of Al Qaeda reach young people at an early age with answers to these questions of identity, we can equip young people as leaders to build more pluralistic societies throughout the Muslim world, and connect them to other young leaders to bridge the gap between the West and the Muslim world.

Senator KAUFMAN. Thank you.
Ms. Baran.

**STATEMENT OF ZEYNO BARAN, SENIOR FELLOW,
HUDSON INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Ms. BARAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

I believe the biggest challenge in outreach programs is the inability to identify what it is that America wants from Muslims. In other words, what is the purpose of engagement? Is it merely to stop terror attacks against Americans and its allies? Is it to learn about a religion and its many cultural, political, and historic aspects? Is it to genuinely try to improve the lives of Muslims, whether they live in Pakistan, Somalia, or in America?

I would argue that we will see an end to terror, radicalism, and extremism when our intention becomes the empowerment of Muslims so they can achieve their full human potential.

However, for a long time we've been trapped in a war-on-terror mindset, and thereby forgetting that terror is a tool used as part of a bigger strategy. This strategy encourages division, separating the West from the rest, so that those in the latter category will be left with no choice but to support Islamist political ideology.

I've written extensively about the difference between Islam, the religion, and Islam, the political ideology, and how we need to expose the extremists' cynical exploitation of their religion as a means of convincing the moderate majority of their fellow Muslims that the current conflict is religious in nature.

Today, the Islamist movement is, unfortunately, much stronger, compared to 2001. And it will continue to get stronger over the next decade unless we realize we are faced with a long-term, social transformation project. It is transforming Muslims into angry and fearful people who can then be easily controlled.

So what should the U.S. do? Don't reduce Muslims to people whose main identity is their religious affiliation. They have hopes,

frustrations, and aspirations, just like everyone else. Don't expect the silent majority to speak up until and unless they see a clear sign that the U.S. has decided to win, which means empowering the true democrats and ending existing unholy alliances.

In choosing partners to engage, listen to what they say, and look at what they do when they are with their own people, not what they say to you in private meetings behind closed doors. Don't assume an individual group that sounds moderate, in fact is moderate.

It is, therefore, critically important to shine a light on what is truly going on under the so-called Islamic regimes, so Muslims can see for themselves and no longer be manipulated into believing, for example, "Life under a Shari'ah-based legal system will be much better than life under liberal democracy."

Most people believe it is possible to take only good aspects and leave bad aspects of Shari'ah. Maybe one day this will be possible, but today the implementers of Shari'ah do not allow such choices, because according to Islamic ideology, Shari'ah, Islamic law, regulates every aspect of an individual's life. And since it is considered to be God's law, no compromise is possible.

You don't need to believe me, but please don't also believe men whose lives are not as affected as women. And please don't, also, believe women who have never lived under the Shari'ah system. Just ask women who have lived, and continue to live, under a Shari'ah system. Ask them if their lives have improved. Or, ask them if they want their daughters to live under this system.

Unfortunately, media, especially those sources that cater to Muslim audiences, hardly ever show—things such images of Muslims killed—being killed by other Muslims, imams preaching hatred, mothers celebrating their son's suicide-bombing success, or teachers indoctrinating young brains with hatred toward Jews and Christians and anyone they consider to be "the other." These are not seen or heard by the mainstream, the silent majority. They are kept ignorant and in denial. The only time they see heartbreaking images of women and children dying is when it is non-Muslims, especially Americans, killing them.

Most people have no idea what is going on in places like Darfur or even in the middle of a European capital. Unless people have the information and can analyze it for themselves, they will never say, "Enough," to the abuse of their state, or stop hating America.

One of the most important areas the U.S. can help is by increasing funding and coverage of information sources like Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and others. They can find other ways, maybe like the American centers, to enlighten people so that they can see and hear the truth for themselves.

This is especially important when it comes to the most critical Muslim partners, women. Of all the various segments of the Muslim communities, women, I believe, have to be the primary focus of engagement in addition to the youth, of course. This is not just feminist jargon. Women are the focus of the Islamists, who have correctly identified them as the most important starting point. Women are the nucleus of the family and society. Mothers raise the next generation. A woman kept ignorant, illiterate, and living in fear can easily be controlled. If we neglect the women, we neglect

the next generation. So, if the U.S. wants to see a different kind of social transformation, then women have to be at the center of all programs and not filed away under “women’s issues.”

To start, there is absolutely no excuse or justification for beating or otherwise violating a woman. The offenders, whether they are husbands, fathers, brothers, or cousins, need to receive the appropriate punishment. At the same time, women need to know where and how to get help. And places such as shelters need to be available.

In addition to the basic safety and security, women need to be empowered, and their imagination needs to be kept alive. And here, culture, arts, and literature are essential tools, and it is also why these are the first areas targeted by the Islamists. Anything that will keep the imagination alive so they can dream of a different life is banned by the Taliban and the like.

It is also limited and controlled by secular authoritarian leaders. After all, the Islamists and the secular authoritarians are the two sides of the same coin. Both want to control the hearts and minds. Instead, we need to free minds and fill hearts with love. Only then will anti-Americanism subside.

Like everyone else, Muslim women need to read, or be told, about uplifting and empowering stories from their own cultures. For example, the tale of Scheherazade, and her stories that span 1,001 nights, is one of the most beautiful ones. Unfortunately, it is still not available in most parts of the world where the Muslims live. It is often banned, while books that preach hatred are distributed freely.

Scheherazade’s tale has many different lessons for many of us. It is a story about a king who would marry and then kill his wife after their first night because he would fear they would betray him. Scheherazade, however, survived, thanks to her wit and imagination. She began telling a tale that continued 1,001 nights, and in this process, she gradually opened the king’s heart and soul to love. In the end, he spared her. In many ways, she spared him, too, by awakening his humanity.

This is the kind of story we need to be told—that mothers need to be telling their daughters. This is the kind of a story men need to hear as boys so they don’t become hardened radicals. They don’t need to fear women or keep them oppressed. If Scheherazade did not have the right tools to capture the king’s imagination, she would have been killed like many others before her, and the king and the kingdom would have continued to suffer.

By spreading stories like hers, we can help save other women and men, the rulers and the ruled, and ultimately ourselves.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Baran follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ZEYNO BARAN

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lugar, Members of the Committee: Thank you very much for the opportunity to share with you my ideas about how to engage more effectively with the many and varied Muslim communities around the world. There are huge expectations that the Obama administration will undo some of the damage to the perception—and influence—of the United States within Muslim societies that has accrued during the past decade. I hope my brief presentation will contribute to this effort.

I will begin by describing the biggest challenge facing the U.S. today: the problem of “us” and “them.” While it is clear to us, in Washington at least, that our foreign and security policies are not directed against Islam or any other religious community, it is not so readily understandable to many Muslims who see themselves as being part of “them.” In order to engage more effectively, our first step is to develop an accurate understanding of just who “we” and “them” are—otherwise the U.S. may continue to alienate Muslims and strengthen the Islamists. I will then suggest some “do’s and don’ts” that should guide U.S. policy going forward, before in closing emphasizing two priorities that the President and his administration should adopt: liberal democracy and the empowerment of women.

Engagement: With Whom and for What Purpose?

I believe the biggest challenge in outreach programs has been the inability to identify what it is that America wants from Muslims; in other words, what is the purpose of engagement? Is it merely to stop terror attacks against Americans and allies? Is it to learn about a religion and its many cultural, political and historical aspects? Is it to genuinely try to improve the lives of Muslims, whether they live in Pakistan, Malaysia, Somalia or North America? I would argue that we will see an end to terror, radicalism and extremism when our intention becomes the empowerment of Muslims so they can achieve their full human potential. However, for a long time we have been trapped in a “war on terror” mindset, thereby neglecting the fact that terror is merely a tool used as part of a bigger strategy. This strategy encourages division, separating the “West” from “the rest,” so that those in the latter category will be left with no choice but to support Islamist political ideology. I have written extensively about the difference between Islam (the religion) and Islamism (the political ideology) and how we need to expose the extremists’ cynical exploitation of the religion as a means of convincing the moderate majority of their fellow Muslims that the current conflict is religious in nature—and that the only solution is for Muslims to come together as part of a single nation (umma) following its own legal system (sharia) in pursuit of a new and anti-democratic world order.

Why is Islamism a threat to democracy? Because according to its interpretations, sharia regulates every aspect of an individual’s life; moreover, since it is considered to be God’s law, no compromises are possible. The holistic nature of Islamist ideology makes it fundamentally incompatible with the self-criticism and exercise of free will necessary for human beings to form truly liberal and democratic societies.

The Islamist movement is much stronger today than it was in 2001. And it will continue to get stronger over the next decade unless we realize we are faced with a long-term social transformation project designed to make Muslims angry and fearful people who can then be easily controlled.

Despite our denials, this destructive ideology is increasingly taking hold in America as well. Consider Islamization like smoking: one cigarette may not cause that much harm, but continued smoking will do terrible damage to one’s health. Some people die from it.

Just recently we were shocked about a beheading of a woman by her husband who, reportedly, cited sharia as grounds for denying her a divorce. FBI Director Robert Mueller recently talked about the first known U.S. citizen to participate in a suicide bombing in Somalia; he said, “The prospect of young men, indoctrinated and radicalized within their own communities and induced to travel to Somalia to take up arms—and to kill themselves and perhaps many others—is a perversion of the immigrant story,” he said. “For these parents to leave a war-torn country only to find their children have been convinced to return to that way of life is heart-breaking.” He is right.

A Different Transformation

Death and destruction leads to further death and destruction; we need to rebuild—above all people’s imagination, and thereby freeing their creative powers to live with joy and passion.

So what should the U.S. do?

Let’s start with what not to do:

- Don’t reduce Muslims to people whose main identity is their religious affiliation; they have hopes, frustrations, aspirations just like anyone else.
- Don’t expect the silent majority to speak up until and unless they see a clear sign that the U.S. has decided to win, which means empowering the true democrats and ending existing unholy alliances.
- In choosing partners to engage, listen to what they say and look at what do when they are with their own people, not what they say to you in private meetings, behind closed doors.

- Don't assume an individual or group that sounds moderate in fact is moderate.
- Don't look for "spokesmen" or "representatives" for Muslims as the solution. Most of these people just speak for themselves or their organizations. Moreover, Islam teaches Muslims that we are our own masters; we submit only to God, and no religious authority on earth can control our hearts and minds—unless we let them.

It is therefore critically important to shine a light on what is truly going on under the so-called Islamic regimes—so Muslims can see for themselves that life under a sharia-based legal system is not, in fact, better than under liberal democracy. When asked why they want sharia, most people explain that they want an end to crime and corruption and want to live with safety, security and dignity; most believe it is possible to take only "good aspects" of sharia, and leave out "bad aspects." Maybe one day this will be possible, but today, the implementers of sharia do not allow such choices. Because, as I mentioned earlier, since it is considered to be God's law, no compromises are possible.

You don't need to believe me, but please also don't believe the men whose lives are not as affected as women, and please don't also believe the women who have never lived under the sharia system. Just ask the women who have lived or still do live under a sharia system—ask them if their lives have improved. And ask them if they want their daughters to live under this system as well.

Unfortunately, media, especially those sources that cater to Muslim audiences, hardly ever show things such as images of Muslims being killed by other Muslims, imams preaching hatred or mothers celebrating their son's suicide bombing success, or teachers indoctrinating young brains with hatred towards the Jews and Christians and anyone they consider "the other." These are not seen or heard by the members of the silent majority, which is kept ignorant and in denial—the only time they see heartbreaking images of women and children dying is when it is non-Muslims, especially Americans, killing them. Most people have no idea what is going on in places like Darfur or even in the middle of a European capital. Unless people have the information and analyze it for themselves, they will never say "enough" to the abuse of their faith—or stop hating America.

For this purpose providing alternative media sources is critically important. The U.S. can best help by increasing funding and coverage of both the Voice of America as well as Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and find other ways to help enlighten people so they can see and hear the truth for themselves.

In this context, I believe there are two fundamental priorities the Obama administration ought to adopt, if this time things are to be different: a commitment to liberal democracy and to the empowerment of women.

Commitment to Liberal Democracy

Throughout the world, liberal democracy is once again being challenged both as a political system and, more fundamentally, as an ideology and as a set of beliefs. Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in an ideological struggle—and the U.S. is losing ground. Further spread of Islamism will leave America isolated and powerless to achieve its goals in security and foreign policy.

Faced with authoritarian threats in both religious and secular forms, the U.S. should not be questioning whether to promote democracy; but should be deciding how. A democracy promotion effort needs to be not piecemeal, but comprehensive; a holistic challenge requires a holistic response. The whole concept needs to be redesigned with an eye towards constructing a longer-term timeframe that lasts beyond any one presidential administration. If not, the U.S. and its allies will continue to grow weaker as its opponents strengthen.

In general, the U.S. looks for short-term successes when instead a generational commitment is needed—as the Bush administration originally stated. But again, the U.S. had to demonstrate success quickly, and thus went for the "low-hanging fruit"—at points even sounding as doctrinaire about democracy promotion as those who oppose democracy. Now, as a result, we are back at the same point in the cycle—if not lower.

Despite over 60 years of on-again, off-again efforts at democracy promotion in the Middle East and places like Afghanistan and Pakistan, the binary model that forces a choice between autocrats in power and populist extremists out of power has never really disappeared. It is a mystery to me why the U.S. does not remain true to its own values and support the third option—the liberal democrats. Yes, liberal democrats in most parts of the so-called Muslim world are but a small minority today—but they will never grow in support unless backed by the U.S.; the other two sides already get all the financial and organizational help they could want.

The prevailing view—that Islamists should be co-opted into existing political systems—simply will not work. Often, Islamists are willing to make superficial concessions while continuing to hold an uncompromising worldview. The U.S. simply does not understand Islamism, even though it has been an active and increasingly powerful counter-ideology over at least three decades. Islamism is not compatible with democracy; Muslims can be democrats. There is a huge difference.

The academics, analysts and policy makers who argue that a movement like the Muslim Brotherhood today is “moderate” seem to disregard its ideology, history, and long-term strategy. They even seem to disregard the Brotherhood’s own statements. It is true that most affiliates of this movement do not directly call for terrorist acts, are open to dialogue with the West, and participate in democratic elections. Yet this is not sufficient for them to qualify as “moderate,” especially when their ideology is so extreme. Turning a blind eye to ideological extremism—even if done for the sake of combating violent extremism and terrorism—is a direct threat to the democratic order.

Unfortunately, since 9/11, the U.S. has alienated many of its allies and strengthened enemies in the Muslim world. This is one of the reasons why the U.S. lost the support of the secular movement within Turkey, which is traditionally the domestic constituency most closely allied to the West. Turkey is the only NATO member with a majority Muslim population. Today, a large majority of Turks have negative views of the U.S., and these include people who are American educated. Why is that? Because they (correctly) perceive U.S. policy as promoting a “moderate Islamist” government in their country—one that can serve as a model for the Muslim world. Yet even the current political leadership coming from an Islamist past opposes to be called “moderate Islamist” and instead prefers “Muslim democrat” as a description.

Turkey is truly unique for a country with nearly all Muslim citizens; the U.S. needs to first understand what makes it unique before trying to change it so it fits a particular democratization theory. The end of the caliphate and the Islamic sharia legal system were revolutionary moves. Most Muslim countries still have sharia law enshrined in their constitutions, something which has impeded their democratic evolution. For its part, Turkey has evolved as a democratic country because it was founded as a secular republic. It is in this context the country has served as a beacon of hope for liberal democrats across the Muslim world.

Going Forward

It is critically important to recognize that since 9/11, anti-American movements, groups and leaders (from Russia to Venezuela) have come closer together in a shared hostility to the Western liberal system. The worldwide U.S. commitment to, and promotion of, liberal democracy must therefore not be tacked on as an afterthought, but must be at the core of the U.S. foreign and national security strategy. This means returning to the fundamentals of what America is about: defending and guaranteeing freedom and dignity.

Yet, it is important to keep in mind that anti-American groups will continue to try to take advantage of open societies. Some intentionally provoke incidents intended to promote an “us versus them” mentality. They also feed conspiracy theories. The Islamist narrative is about victimization and humiliation; it is part of a deadly mixture of the feeling of political and economic inferiority with moral and ethical superiority.

I believe having President Obama in office will grant the U.S. only short-term relief; Islamists are working on new narratives and searching for new grievances, since their need to undermine the U.S. and its democratic vision is so incredibly strong. Hopefully, the Obama administration will not be so eager to reverse the unpopularity of the Bush years that it will limit the emphasis on democracy that is so essential for advancing American interests.

America needs to be true to its values and principles. The U.S. should not be promoting “moderate Islam,” but liberal democracy. There is no Arab or Muslim exceptionalism; leaders make these arguments in order to retain their hold on power over their people. Even though people in different parts of the world may use different terms, the yearning for what we call freedom and liberal democracy is indeed universal.

There are no easy solutions, but if the U.S. does not show leadership, no one else will. We need to be patient and focus on institution-building to enable democratic cultures to take hold. Each country has its own path that is based on its own history, culture and traditions, and it takes time; there simply is no shortcut. The U.S. seems to have a lot of patience with the “democratization” process in Saudi Arabia—so why is there a different approach to Egypt?

We need to make a long-term commitment and not look for short-term successes that jeopardize longer-term gains. It should be clear by now that democracy is not

merely about the electoral process. Holding elections, however free and fair in a technical sense, without first undertaking the difficult process of building institutions will get us only one thing: Hamas. Simply put, hungry, fearful, and uneducated people cannot be democrats. They need to be safe from being killed purely because they are from the wrong ethnic, religious or sectarian background. People also need to be educated—illiteracy is a problem in itself, but what is taught is as important. If all they are taught is how to memorize the Koran or why to hate the West, how can they transcend this teaching? And without building critical-thinking skills as well as teaching civics and democratic values, we will continue to see highly intelligent Western-educated doctors and engineers committing suicide attacks. People also need to be able to feed and clothe their families; but material successes are not enough to imbue one with a love for the liberal democratic system that makes them possible.

Clearly, the U.S. cannot do this cheaply—especially given how much everyone else is spending on anti-democratic agendas. In many of these programs, there can be partnerships with the Europeans and others who are similarly committed to democratic development. Moreover, compared to how much U.S. is spending on wars and military budget, the amount will be minimal with huge returns. And, with the economic crisis hitting parts of the world that are so critical, such as Pakistan, there is even greater need for the U.S. to allocate larger sums of money for education and institution building by supporting organizations that would eventually lead to democratic civil society—particularly secular organizations (press, judiciary, women’s organizations, small and medium business associations, etc).

In many parts of the world, following the shock of globalization and the resulting questioning of identities, countries are reconstructing their own national identities. The U.S. has to be influencing this process so destructive ideas do not take root.

Empowerment of Women

This is especially important when it comes to the most critical Muslim partners, the women. It is also why of all the various segments of Muslim communities, women have to be the primary focus of engagement. This is not just feminist theory; women are already the focus of Islamists who have correctly identified them as their most important starting point of their social engineering project: Women are the nucleus of family and society; mothers raise the next generation—a woman kept ignorant and living in fear can easily be controlled. If we neglect the women, we neglect the next generation. So if the U.S. wants to see a different kind of social transformation, then women have to be at the center of all programs and not filed away under “women’s issues.”

To start with, there is no excuse or justification for beating or otherwise violating a woman—and when it happens, the appropriate punishment must follow. At the same time, women need to be given help; and the existence of places that help them, including shelters, needs to be widely publicized. Rape needs to be punished severely since it is a form of murder—one which kills the spirit—and which is used systematically as a weapon of war against civilian populations.

In addition to the basic safety and security, women need to be empowered to know their own value while being provided with the tools to defend and protect themselves. Most importantly, their imagination needs to be kept alive, and here culture, arts, and literature are essential tools—and that is also why these are the first areas targeted by the Islamists. Anything that will keep the imagination alive so they can dream of a different life is banned by the Taliban and the like.

It is also often limited and controlled by the secular authoritarian leaders—after all, the Islamists and the secular authoritarians are the two sides of the same coin: both want to control the hearts and minds. We need to free the minds and fill the hearts with love, not hatred; only then will the anti-Americanism subside.

Like everyone else, Muslim women need to read or be told about uplifting and truly empowering stories—from their own cultures. I mean truly empowering because I have in mind the story of an Iraqi woman who was part of a plot in which young women were raped and then sent to her for matronly advice, only to be told that becoming suicide bombers was their only escape from the shame and to reclaim their honor. This shows how far the destructive powers will go. Instead, we need role models like Scheherazade, and learn from her stories that span a thousand and one nights. Her tale is one of the most beautiful ones with many different lessons for many of us—yet is unavailable in most parts of the world where Muslims live; it is often banned, when books that preach hatred are distributed freely. It is a story about a king who would marry and then kill his wives after their first night because he would fear they would betray him. Scheherazade, however, survived thanks to her wit and imagination: she began telling a tale that continued for 1001 nights, and in this process she gradually opened the king’s heart and soul to love—in the

end he spared her. In many ways she spared him too by awakening humanity that allowed him to love again.

This is the kind of story we need be told by mothers to their daughters. This is the kind of story men need to hear as boys so they do not become hardened radicals. They need not fear women or keep them oppressed and ignorant: if Scheherazade did not have the right tools to capture his imagination, she would have been killed like many others before her, and the king and the kingdom would have continued to suffer. She saved them all; by spreading stories like hers, we can help save other women and men, the rulers and the rules, and ultimately ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Zeyno, thank you. Very important testimony.

I apologize, Eboo, for missing your opening comments, but I have your submitted statement here. And I apologize, to all of you, that this has been a little bit disjointed. I hate that, and this—the schedule seemed to be getting jammed.

Regrettably, also, the White House has asked me to come down, now, in about 15 minutes, for a meeting on the President’s announcements on Iraq tomorrow. So I’m going to have to leave here momentarily. But, as I said, this is a beginning and not an ending. And what I think I may do is, really, perhaps even set up a roundtable, maybe, the next time we do this, and invite some of you back to be part of that, so we can have a little more give-and-take and back-and-forth on some of this, which I think would be helpful.

As I listened to your testimony, Zeyno, and I listened to yours, Dalia, it strikes me that there is actually a little bit of a contradiction in what you’re saying to what the first panel said, in the sense that, while—and even in some of my comments, because when I draw this line of what is the real teaching of the Quran, or the real teaching of Islam, you’re obviously painting a picture of how that’s being abused. But, we are obviously not the right people, for all the obvious reasons, to point that out to anybody.

So, when the question was asked earlier by Senator Wicker about sort of a reformation, or whatever you want to call it—and it’s obviously inappropriate for us to call for it—the question looms large, Who will stand up? Who will define the realities, here?

I mean, when you have people who clearly are told, “If you wrap a bunch of plastic, you know, satchels around you, and you walk into a nightclub and blow yourself up, you’re going to go to paradise, and there are 72 virgins waiting there, and you’re going to have breakfast with the prophet,” and so forth, what do you do? Who does what?

Ms. MOGAHED. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I think you are asking a very important question. What I would like to propose, though, is that this radical ideology is a byproduct of a deeper issue, which is a radical political ideology. And that’s where we can have a much greater effect. So—

The CHAIRMAN. So who’s the “we”?

Ms. MOGAHED. The United States of America. The religious extremism is really just a veneer around a very deep political extremism, political ideology around widely held grievances. And so, what people are hearing is that—the terrorists are telling them, “We can solve your problems if you will use violence. Violence is the way to solve your problems.” And they are using religious terminology to give that approach—

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. We all understand that.

Ms. MOGAHED. I understand, but let me explain—the second piece is that if we can deal with the grievances, then—and show people that you can change things through peaceful means, the religious extremism will no longer appeal to people. I—the appeal of the religious extremism is a byproduct of—

The CHAIRMAN. Of the failure of governance, to some degree.

Ms. MOGAHED. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. But, isn't that also a failure of opportunity, to some degree? I mean, there are countries—I'm not going to go through them all here now—where there are some very unwritten—and I will use the term “unholy alliances”—between the existing regime and an extreme practice of religion. And one sort of says, “Well, we'll leave you here to rule, but we're going to be—rule the minds and the hearts and souls.” And so, whether it's Wahhibism or some other extreme, a lot of money is being invested in that—

Ms. MOGAHED. Right.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Today in the world. And so, who and how—I mean, it—will stand up to say, “This is, in fact, a distortion. This is a hijacking of the legitimacy?” Because countless numbers of Muslims have come to me and said, “Senator, you should know, killing innocent people is outlawed in the Quran.”

Ms. MOGAHED. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And any—you can go run down the list of things that are outlawed. And, in fact, then, on the positive side—there isn't any religion that doesn't live by the Golden Rule, supposedly; and yet, obviously these folks aren't.

But, you know, what we're searching for is the most effective mechanism—I mean, there are long-term ones; we can certainly keep reaching out and keep talking. But, if these governments are going to ignore some of the fundamental complaints of their own citizens, and some of the fundamental empowerment of their own citizens, it's going to be hard, it seems to me, for us to break through that.

Ms. MOGAHED. If I may, I—

The CHAIRMAN. OK, both of you respond.

Ms. MOGAHED. I will say, very quickly, our data shows that what drives public sympathy for terrorism is not religious fervor, and it's not even religious extremism. It is political views. The people who sympathize with terrorism look different than the mainstream, in their perception of politics, not in their perception of religion.

And so, to get at that sympathy for terrorism, it's not by reforming Islam, it's by offering people a different way to make change than the violence that the extremists say is the only way.

The CHAIRMAN. Zeyno.

Ms. BARAN. Well, I would say the problem we have is that Wahhibism has “reformed” Islam and it has not reformed it in a positive way. Rather, it has actually silenced pluralistic voices within Islam.

We can't say there is a single Christian voice. There are many, many different Christian voices. Through, unfortunately, very bloody periods, different groups were established, and now we now who are the radicals and who are the not-radical voices.

Unfortunately, in Islam, after decades and decades of billions of dollars spent, Wahhabism has made serious inroads, and is now clouding over all other interpretations, all other understandings.

There are thousands of Muslims who disagree with that. But, usually they are silent. They don't have money, they don't have resources, and they don't have safety. Often, anybody who disagrees with certain views is silenced or even killed. So, it becomes a very dangerous enterprise. And I think, if anything, the U.S. can at least support those people.

You're right, the U.S. does not have legitimacy to speak about the Quran or the different understandings of Islam. There is not a single correct interpretation. But, there are people who are trying to bring out the different understandings and the plurality of Islam.

Now, on the grievance issue—I've studied Islamist groups working all over the place, including in America. The grievance will never end, because the ideology is based on sometimes provoking confrontation and in other times overemphasizing the grievances. We all have problems in our lives. The question is, how do we deal with it? And if you are told that, "The answer to your problems is to change the world order so that we all will live under an Islamic caliphate, and then everything will be great, and there will be justice and peace" the sense of being a victim will never come to an end. So we need to do both, making sure that ideology is no longer taking hold, especially among youth, and also while addressing some of the legitimate grievances, that there's always something to be upset about.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me leave Senator Kaufman in charge, here, and I thank you very much. I promise you, we will get back and set this up in a structure where we continue this discussion with other experts. And I promise you, it will be interesting.

Thank you very, very much.

Senator KAUFMAN [presiding]. Thank you.

Mr. Patel talked a lot about youth, and I think that anyone who looks at the demographics of many of the—especially in the Middle East, the demographics are overwhelmingly—it's youth-based culture.

Can the three of you kind of give me some practical suggestions on how we should engage the youth in the Islam world? I know you can—

Mr. PATEL. So, Mr. Chair, let me begin with some of those, and then turn it over to my esteemed colleagues here.

Let me first, though, address some of the lingering dimensions of the past question. And let me begin by asking a question, which is, What is going to lead, tomorrow, in the Arab press, about the conversations about Islam on Capitol Hill? Is it going to be this hearing, or is it going to be the fact that an unbelievably offensive film was shown in a—amongst the most ornate rooms of Capitol Hill?

Senator KAUFMAN. Mr. Patel—

Mr. PATEL. Yes.

Senator KAUFMAN. Let me just cut—that's true about everything. That—I mean that's not—don't take this as personal, but every day the media is led by the outrageous, the scandal, the—where there's

division, where there's arguments—on Capitol Hill, the unusual is always driving out the kind of normal dialog. So, this is not special to just this question.

Mr. PATEL. While I—I think I agree with that. I think that part of what is happening is a mirror reflection of itself, which is to say, we, here, are asking the question about, Where are the peaceful voices in the Muslim world? My sense is, the vast majority of the peaceful world are speaking and singing in peaceful voices. What they hear of—what we see of them are only the most violent voices. What they see of us are our version of violent voices.

Senator KAUFMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. PATEL. The Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu once said—if we do not—if you do not understand yourself, and you do not understand the enemy, you will lose every battle.

My big fear is that we are getting the “us” and the “them” wrong. And instead of focusing, as Dalia said, on bin Ladenism, and seeking to destroy that and uplift the rest of humanity, there are too many people sending messages about the “them” being 1.3 billion people. How we get clarity around that, get our own—communicate our own values, our own sense of “us” as including Muslims and Christians, seculars and Buddhists, Arabs and Americans, and a sense of “them” which is about groups of people, of whatever religion, who want to dominate others.

My favorite line on this is simple. The terrorists of all traditions belong to one tradition, the tradition of terrorism. How we communicate that, I think, is going to be the difference between conflict and peace in the 21st century.

Senator KAUFMAN. But—

Mr. PATEL. How we communicate that to young people is going to be especially important.

Senator KAUFMAN. But, could I just say that the—you know, this is always a problem, and we're going to have to do it in a world where we have a free press. I mean, I think—Ms. Baran was talking about Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, al Hura television, Sawa—all these people have—I mean, the basic message there is freedom of the press and free exchange of ideas. So, whatever we do, we have to do it with the understanding that there is going to be people saying all kinds of crazy things about—you know, about us and about people that encourage a free press.

So, the real question here is, realizing that that's the start—and it's compounded by the fact that many of the countries that we're broadcasting into does not have a free press. As you said—I think it was Ms. Baran—talked about al Jazeera showing just one side of the story, showing just the fact that it does not show Muslims killing Muslims, does not show many of the things that are going on. So, it makes it even more complicated.

So, that's just a reality. As long as we're pushing—as long as we're saying we should have a free press, as long as we're calling for the free exchange of ideas, which I think is one of the basic beliefs that we have, as a way to deal with this—it has the unintended, kind of, ugly side effect of allowing people, that have rather radical ideas in our society, to get a platform for doing it. But, taking that into account, as a given—unless you don't agree that's the

given—kind of, what do we do in order to engage with the youth, understanding that reality?

Mr. PATEL. I think that that is a given. I think that there is an additional given. I'll close with this comment, which is that how we frame the question matters a great deal. There is no good answer to the question, "When did you stop kicking your dog?"

Senator KAUFMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. PATEL. And there is no good answer to the question, "Why are you people so violent?" As Dalia suggested in her testimony, when we approach 1.3 billion people as suspect and not allies, when we—when we say, "Where are your peaceful voices?" when, in fact, the truth is, the United States has the most prominent and important scholars of Islam in all of the Western world, scholars who are deeply regarded, even in the great learned cities of the Muslim world, and we don't know them, we don't know their names in a common way, the way we know, for example, Christian names, we reveal our ignorance in a way that makes a fifth of humanity feel like suspects.

Senator KAUFMAN. I agree.

Mr. PATEL. I think the fact that the majority of that fifth of humanity are young people, and we are nurturing this poisoned relationship—in part, by the framing of the question—instead of saying, "What can we—Who are you, how do we relate to each other, and what can we do together?" we are saying, "Why are you people a problem?" That is going to lead us downhill in this century.

Senator KAUFMAN. Good.

Ms. Baran.

Ms. BARAN. Well, I will say, on this issue, since this film-showing has been raised, this actually goes to some of the basic lack of understanding of—I agree, of the—sort of, the "us" and "them," but also, in general, what America is about.

In America, there are all kinds of opinions that we hear, we may detest them but we learn how to deal with it. If we don't agree with a particular opinion, we try to get together, and then we try to explain to others why that opinion may be hurtful, why it may do damage, but we don't try to silence it. Because when we silence, then we are no different than some of the oppressive regimes of the Middle East.

Now, as a Muslim, I, of course, disagree with Geert Wilders' understanding of what Quran is. But, I would like to be discussing with him, in the way that we talk about engaging with Muslims. Muslims need to also engage with voices that say, "Well, here is some of your leadership saying these things. Do you agree or do you not agree?" And by just saying that, "These things are horrible views," it seems almost that we are in denial that, in the leadership positions, people are actually doing very damaging things, in terms of poisoning minds of people. And the difficulty, though, is, when there is not a culture and practice of challenging or free thinking or free press, then people assume these are intentional, these are intended to hurt Muslims, these sort of acts are intended by the U.S. Congress, for example, to insult Islam. I think there is a lot of engagement that is needed on that level to explain why some event like this might take place. We may not agree with it, but we might be able to explain it.

And another thing is that education, then, becomes even more important, because people need to be able to understand for themselves, when certain things happen, that it's not the U.S. Government, or it's not Christians, that it's individual people. And then, we also need to learn how to deal with it. When he says, "Islam is a violent religion," if our response is having violent demonstrations, then we only make his case.

Senator KAUFMAN. Great.

Ms. Mogahed.

Ms. MOGAHED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My biggest recommendation to engage youth is allowing job creation. The largest unemployment rate among youth in the world is in the Middle East. It's higher than 25 percent. In the Palestinian territories, it's 50 percent. The biggest issue on the minds of young people in the Middle East, and in the greater Muslim world, where there is a youth bulge, is employment and job opportunities. And so, anything we can do to stimulate economic growth to create jobs is the most—is going to be the most important and most valuable thing that we can do to engage young people in this part of the world.

Senator KAUFMAN. Great.

Listen, I want to thank you for being here. And I'm really, really pleased the chairman says we're going to continue this, because obviously we could go on for another 2 or 3 hours, and not even begin to touch the surface. But, I think it's really been an education.

And I think that, you know, to answer your question about the message we send, the fact that we're having this hearing today, I think, sends a message. The fact that there's two things going on in the Capitol at the same time, why, it just sends a message on what we're all about.

I think that one of my main concerns—I'm kind of prejudiced, because I was on the Broadcasting Board of Governors—but, I think broadcasting not just to the Muslim world, but the entire world, so that people can better understand what our system is, and see firsthand what our system is, and understand what a free press is, and what the examples of free press, is one of the big things we can do in order to fix the problems.

I also think the economic issue is probably, you know, the single most important thing to youth. But, I think, looking at the survey data—and you know better than I do—a lot of the youth in the Muslim world are very taken with American culture. I'm not talking about the "bad" part of our American culture—"bad," in quotes—but the "good" part of American culture. So, I think, in many countries, as I see, you know, the extent that our culture is out front is a good thing to kind of help people at least begin to engage.

And again—and finally, I think you were all right, in terms of, clearly, some of the grievances. Part of this is about grievances, and how we deal with grievances, the—what our policies are and the rest of it.

So, I thank you all for coming here. It's been a great hearing, and I'm looking forward to the next one already.

So, the committee's adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN
KEITH ELLISON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA

Let me start by thanking Chairman John Kerry and ranking member Richard Lugar for holding this important hearing today. I would also like to thank the distinguished members of the panels for their participation and for their important work on this issue.

This hearing is a commendable effort toward repairing and fostering better relations between the United States and the Muslim world. The timing of this hearing could not have been better. President Obama's commitment to initiate a new partnership based on mutual respect and mutual interest is a groundbreaking olive branch to the 1.5 billion Muslims in the world. Similarly, the President's recent appointment of Senator George Mitchell as Special Envoy to the Middle East is indicative of the vital re-engagement of the United States in the region's peace negotiations.

Let me also express my appreciation to you, Senator Kerry, for traveling to Gaza last week to see first-hand the situation on the ground. As the Chairman knows, I also made the trip to Israel and Gaza together with Congressman Brian Baird of Washington State, coinciding with Chairman Kerry's visit to the area.

Since coming to Congress, I have had the opportunity to visit several countries throughout the Muslim world. I have found a consistent interest for more dialogue and better relationships with the U.S. among Muslim leaders. These leaders hope for the U.S. to have a better understanding of the Muslim world, and they wish to move beyond the negative characterizations that have colored our relationships in the years following 9/11.

In my view, there exists a delicate, yet robust interconnection between the United States and the Muslim world that provides both challenges and opportunities. Muslim countries share a religious faith, but they are also distinct countries with diverse cultures, traditions, and ideologies. They should not be viewed monolithic or homogeneous.

The national security and economic interests of the U.S. are better served if we preserve and build our relationships with the leaders and people of the Muslim world. In fact, the U.S. has had, and consistently maintains, several important allies among Muslim countries. To cite one example, Morocco, a Muslim country, was the first country to publicly recognize the United States in 1777, and remains our oldest and closest ally in North Africa.

The American Muslim community also reflects the diversity of the larger Muslim world. American Muslims live in every state and community in America. They are proud and patriotic Americans, yet they maintain ties with their extended families in their countries of origin. We can develop better relationships with the Muslim world through increased dialogue with American Muslim leaders and organizations.

There is a need, however, to broaden the scope of our engagement beyond counterterrorism and security. We must take a more comprehensive view of other areas of mutual benefit such as economic development, trade, cultural understanding, and educational exchange.

Our national security interests will be best advanced by initiatives being undertaken by President Obama, including outreach to the Muslim world, a responsible ending to the war in Iraq, the closing of Guantanamo Bay, and renewed leadership in the Israel-Palestine conflict.

This hearing represents a significant step toward increased dialogue on these critical issues. Most importantly, we need to send a clear message that we are determined to interact in peace with the Muslim world based on respect and understanding. I believe that, with this paradigm shift in our thinking, we will meet with greater success in our relationships with the Muslim world, including a more profound security for America and the world.