

RELEASE IN PART B6

From: H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 6:58 AM
To: 'JilotyLC@state.gov'
Subject: Fw: thoughts on Egypt, middle east protests more generally, china and middle east peace (in under 2 pp)
Attachments: Egypt.docx

Pls print.

----- Original Message -----

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

B6

To: S

From: Anne-Marie

Date: Feb. 8, 2011

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

As I look at Egypt and related protests around the region, I think we are focusing on the wrong things and missing a big opportunity. We are focusing on "who" and "when" – Mubarak v. someone else, transition now v September. We should instead be focusing on the "what" – what any government must deliver to be acceptable. POTUS set the stage for this position in his emphasis on open government in his UNGA address: "As I said last year, each country will pursue a path rooted in the culture of its own people. Yet experience shows us that history is on the side of liberty; that the strongest foundation for human progress lies in open economies, open societies, and open governments." The WH is now pursuing an open government initiative (which Samantha would really like State to own, as we should, since the basic ideas came from Alec and me) that defines open government in terms of transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. That fits very well with what the Egyptian protesters are demanding. Our position should be that regardless who is in power, Mubarak, Suleiman, or anyone else, they have to deliver on these three principles. We will hold them to it, measure it, and respond accordingly. The protesters believe Mubarak won't do it, so they want him out. We (and the EU and any other governments we can get to support this position) should say that our support for any government is based on its actual record of delivering on these commitments. If Mubarak can deliver and then leave with dignity in September, so much the better. If he can't, then we are making it known that this is the yardstick by which he and anyone in his position must measure our support. That means we will review assistance, arms sales, political support, etc.

This position is completely consistent with your consistent focus both on the people and on their relationship with their governments. It's not about the government or the people, but rather about the relationship between them. That is exactly what you said in Doha: "I believe that the leaders of this region, in partnership with their people, have the capacity to build that stronger foundation. There are enough models and examples in the region to point to, to make the economic and social reforms that will create jobs, respect the right of diversity to exist, create more economic opportunity, encourage entrepreneurship, give citizens the skills they need to succeed, to make the political reforms that will create the space young people are demanding, to participate in public affairs and have a meaningful role in the decisions that shape their lives." Indeed, I think it's time to enunciate a "Clinton Doctrine," which brings together the