

GREAT DECISIONS

GDTV 2010: Power, Politics and the Persian Gulf

Show Transcript

>> WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ, UNREST IN IRAN, UNEASE IN THE GULF ARAB STATES- THE PERSIAN GULF HAS LONG CHALLENGED U.S. POLICY MAKERS, AND THAT'S MORE TRUE TODAY THAN AT ANY TIME IN HISTORY. HOW WILL PRESIDENT OBAMA'S DIRECT APPEAL TO ARABS AND MUSLIMS AFFECT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY GOALS? WHAT WILL THE WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ PORTEND?

>> WE HAVE TO HAVE A LONG VIEW, THINK OF THE REGION AS A WHOLE.

>> CAN THE U.S. AND ITS ALLIES PREVENT IRAN FROM OBTAINING A NUCLEAR WEAPON?

>> THEIR PRESIDENT MAKES STATEMENTS WHICH SOUND AS THOUGH HE IS A RELIGIOUS FANATIC, AND RELIGIOUS FANATICS ARE NOT DETERRABLE.

>> NEXT, ON GREAT DECISIONS.

>> IN A DEMOCRACY, AGREEMENT IS NOT ESSENTIAL, BUT PARTICIPATION IS. JOIN US AS WE DISCUSS TODAY'S MOST CRITICAL GLOBAL ISSUES. JOIN US FOR GREAT DECISIONS.

[INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC]

>> GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED BY THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, INSPIRING AMERICANS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE WORLD. FUNDING FOR GREAT DECISIONS IS PROVIDED BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, THE STARR FOUNDATION, SHELL INTERNATIONAL, AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE.

>> AND NOW FROM OUR STUDIOS, HERE IS RALPH BEGLEITER.

>> WELCOME TO GREAT DECISIONS, I'M RALPH BEGLEITER. JOINING US TO DISCUSS POWER AND POLITICS IN THE PERSIAN GULF ARE TRUDY RUBIN, AN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COLUMNIST FOR THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, AND ED TURZANSKI, SENIOR FELLOW AT THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AT THE LA SALLE UNIVERSITY. THANK YOU BOTH FOR BEING WITH US. WE CAN'T TALK ABOUT THE PERSIAN GULF WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE WAR IN IRAQ, OBVIOUSLY. LET'S START

THERE. TELL ME HOW YOU SEE THE WAR UNFOLDING OVER THE NEXT COUPLE OF YEARS, LET'S SAY. TRUDY?

>> UH, THERE ARE TWO POSSIBLE WAYS THINGS CAN GO. EITHER TOWARDS MORE FRAGMENTATION, OR, AND I THINK THIS IS A STRONG POSSIBILITY, TOWARDS ANOTHER DICTATORSHIP, A SOFT DICTATORSHIP. YOU SEE IT NOW WITH PRIME MINISTER MALIKI, UH, THE MAN IN CHARGE NOW WHO PEOPLE THOUGHT WAS A WIMP. HE HAS MANAGED TO PUT THE ARMY UNDER HIS CONTROL, HE HAS HIS OWN SECURITY SERVICE, HE HAS TAKEN CONTROL OF THE SPECIAL COMMANDO UNIT, WHICH IS ONE OF THE BEST UNITS THAT WE'VE TRAINED IN IRAQ, AND MANY OF THE OTHER PARTIES ARE AFRAID OF WHAT THEY SEE AS DICTATORIAL TENDENCIES. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF HE LOSES IN THE NEXT ELECTION, THERE'S A FRACTIOUS COALITION THAT WOULD HAVE TO PUT TOGETHER A GOVERNMENT, AND EVEN HE MAY HAVE TO PUT TOGETHER A FRACTIOUS COALITION, BECAUSE ALL THE PARTIES ARE SPLINTERING AND FORMING ALLIANCES, SOME ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES. BUT BOTTOM LINE, PEOPLE IN IRAQ YEARN FOR SECURITY, AND I THINK THEY WOULDN'T MIND HAVING A BETTER SADDAM.

>> ED, HOW ABOUT YOU?

>> I WOULD AGREE THAT THE FUTURE IS LIKELY GOING TO BE DETERMINED BY WHAT HAPPENS IN TERMS OF POLITICAL ACCOMMODATION. AND UH, THIS SOFT DICTATORSHIP TRUDY TALKS ABOUT MAY BE JARRING TO SOME PEOPLE, BUT IN INSTANCES WHERE PEOPLE HAVE NOT HAD A USEABLE DEMOCRATIC PAST, IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO GET TO THE POINT WHERE DIFFERENCES ARE SETTLED, PRINCIPALLY THROUGH POLITICAL DISCUSSION. IT MAY BE MESSY, JUST LIKE BISMARCK SAID. TWO THINGS YOU DON'T WANT TO SEE MADE, SAUSAGES AND LAWS. IT COULD BE VERY FRACTIOUS, BUT AS LONG AS WE CAN GET TO THAT TWO TURN OVER TEST, ONCE YOU'VE HAD TWO SUCCESSIVE TURN OVERS OF POWER THAT HAVE BEEN RELATIVELY CALM AND FREE, RELATIVELY FAIR, SCHEDULED ELECTIONS, YOUR CHANCES OF PROCEEDING DOWN THAT LINE ARE MUCH BETTER THAN THEY ARE GOING BACK TO WHAT YOU KNEW BEFORE. IRAN IS GOING TO HAVE A LOT TO DO WITH WHAT HAPPENS IN IRAQ, BECAUSE ITS CAPACITY FOR MISCHIEF IS STILL QUITE PRONOUNCED, ESPECIALLY AMONG THE SHIA.

>> IT STRIKES ME AS INTERESTING, ACTUALLY, THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS IN IRAQ. UH, SEVEN, EIGHT YEARS AGO, NOBODY WOULD HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT THAT, AND YET I THINK IT'S UH, AND ODD CONTRAST, TRUDY, FOR YOU TO BE TALKING ABOUT THE ELECTIONS LEADING TO A SOFT DICTATORSHIP. DOES THAT MEAN THAT YOU WOULD SEE THE ELECTIONS ENDING AT SOME POINT, THAT THEY WOULDN'T HAPPEN AGAIN, OR THEY WOULD BECOME ESSENTIALLY SHAM ELECTIONS, LIKE MOST OF THE REST OF THE ARAB WORLD?

>> I DON'T THINK IT'S NECESSARILY THE CASE THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE A CONTINUOUS SERIES OF ELECTIONS EVERY FOUR YEARS, OR WHATEVER THE

PERIOD IS THAT THE IRAQIS CHOSE, BUT I THINK THERE'S SUCH A YEARNING FOR ORDER, THERE'S SUCH A YEARNING FOR STABILITY. IT'S SORT OF LIKE WHEN THE SOVIET UNION BROKE UP, AND WE TRIED TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA IN THE '90S, AND WE GOT CHAOS. AND PEOPLE THERE WERE YEARNING FOR ORDER. AND SO NOW THEY HAVE PUTIN, WHO IS ELECTED, BUT BASICALLY IS AN AUTOCRAT OF SORTS. I THINK YOU COULD SEE THE SAME THING IN IRAQ. PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO BE BLOWN UP, AND THERE THE SITUATION IS MORE DEATH-CAUSING THAN IN A POST-SOVIET RUSSIA. SO, IF YOU WOULD HAVE A PRIME MINISTER WHO UH, PLAYED THE POLICE AND THE MILITARY CARD MORE STRONGLY, ESPECIALLY AS U.S. TROOPS ARE LEAVING AND WE HAVE LESS INFLUENCE OVER WHAT IRAQI POLITICIANS DO, I THINK IT MIGHT BE ACCEPTED, ALTHOUGH A LOT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS MIGHT GRUMBLE, IF THAT PRIME MINISTER COULD DELIVER. COULD DELIVER SERVICES, COULD DELIVER SECURITY. PEOPLE ARE JUST TIRED. THEY STILL DON'T HAVE ENOUGH ELECTRICITY AND THEY DON'T HAVE JOBS.

>> YOU TAKE IT ALMOST AS GIVEN THAT U.S. TROOPS WILL BE LEAVING. DO YOU TAKE IT AS A GIVEN THAT U.S. TROOPS WILL BE LEAVING?

>> THEY'LL CERTAINLY BE RETREATING MORE AND MORE FROM EVERYDAY IRAQI LIFE, ON TO BASES. AND I THINK WHAT TRUDY'S TALKING ABOUT IN SUM, IS BEST DESCRIBED IN THE TERM, SECURITY. PHYSICAL SECURITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, AND THE QUESTION WILL BE, HOW BROADLY DO THE IRAQIS DEFINE THAT TERM? IS IT SECURITY JUST FOR MY CLAN, FOR VILLAGE, MY REGION, OR WILL WE GET TO A POINT WHERE IRAQIS STARTING THINKING MORE BROADLY? GOING BEYOND TRIBAL ALLEGIANCES THAT HAVE REALLY HELD THE COUNTRY TOGETHER FOR THE FIRST TIME, AND THIS IS SOMETHING TO LOOK FOR. WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO GET KURDS, SHIA, SUNNI, MARSH ARABS, TALKING IN NATIONAL TERMS, AS OPPOSED TO VERY SPECIFIC TRIBAL OR REGIONAL TERMS?

>> WHAT YOU SEE IS ALLIANCES BEING FORMED ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES. YOU'LL HAVE A SUNNI SHEIK MAKING AN ALLIANCE WITH A SHIITE PARTY, UH, AND YOU KNOW, TWO YEARS AGO, THEY MIGHT HAVE BEEN DRILLING HOLES IN EACH OTHER'S HEADS. AND SO, IN A SENSE, THAT'S PROGRESS, BUT A LOT OF THESE ALLIANCES COULD BE FLEETING. BUT AT LEAST THE PRINCIPAL OF DEALING ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES HAS NOW BEEN ESTABLISHED, SO ONE PROBABLY, AND I THINK MOST, PROBABLY, WILL NOT SEE CIVIL WAR AGAIN. THE QUESTIONS IS, WHAT KIND OF A GOVERNMENT CAN STOP BOMBS?

>> WE'VE BEEN TALKING SO FAR ABOUT THE IMPACT OF WHAT HAPPENS IN IRAQ ON THE GULF. LET'S HEAR WHAT SOME OF OUR OTHER EXPERTS THAT WE SPOKE WITH THINK ABOUT HOW IT'S GONNA PLAY OUT FOR THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.S. TROOPS IN THE REGION.

>> SO THE QUESTION THAT PRESIDENT OBAMA REALLY HAS TO ASK AND ANSWER IS NOT, ARE WE GOING TO END THIS WAR, WHEN ARE WE GOING TO END THIS WAR, BUT, WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO WITH THE PEACE? AND WHAT

ARE WE GOING TO DO TO BUILD ON THE SACRIFICES THAT WE'VE MADE, AND WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO TO BUILD ON THE SUCCESSES THAT WE'VE ACHIEVED, IN ORDER TO TRY TO DEVELOP AN ENDURING PARTNERSHIP WITH IRAQ, WHICH I THINK COULD BECOME A REAL KEY PILLAR OF AMERICAN POLICY IN THE REGION, AND A REAL FORCE FOR A LOT OF THINGS THAT WE CARE ABOUT IN THE REGION.

>> I THINK THE REAL PROBLEM IS THAT MANY IRAQIS DON'T WANT TO SEE THE U.S. GO. THAT HAVING ENTERED, UH, MANY OF THE GROUPS FEEL VERY VULNERABLE TO THE CURRENT GOVERNMENT, AND SEE THE U.S. AS GUARANTOR OF THEIR SECURITY. SO I THINK THE REAL CRISIS IS GOING TO OCCUR AS WE DRAW DOWN PAST THE 50,000 POINT, THAT GROUPS ARE GOING TO BE ASKING THE UNITED STATES TO STAY. UH, GROUPS ARE GOING TO FEEL VERY EXPOSED WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES. SO I'M NOT SURE THE UNITED STATES IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO TAKE THE BOOTS OFF THE GROUND COMPLETELY, THAT SOME RESIDUAL FORCE SERVING TO GUARANTEE THE INTEREST OF SOME OF THE AMERICAN CLIENTS IN THE COUNTRY AREN'T GOING TO HAVE TO BE REMAINING TO PROTECT THEM.

>> THE AMERICAN PRESENCE OVER THE NEXT YEAR WILL BE DIMINISHING, AND SO WILL U.S. INFLUENCE, BUT THAT'S A FACT OF LIFE.

>> LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT GEORGE FRIEDMAN'S COMMENT. HE SAYS, UH, IRAQIS MAY BE CLAMORING, IN EFFECT, TO HAVE THE U.S. TROOPS REMAIN IN IRAQ. ED, DO YOU THINK THAT'S THE CASE?

>> I THINK IT'S VERY MUCH THE CASE WITH THE KURDS. THE KURDS IN THE NORTH ARE VERY CONCERNED. AND KEEP IN MIND THAT WHEN SADDAM WAS STILL IN POWER, WE WERE THE GUARANTORS OF THEIR SECURITY, FOR THE MOST PART, AFTER THE '91 WAR. SO THEY'RE VERY MUCH INTERESTED IN SEEING SOME SORT OF AMERICAN PRESENCE. AND NOW THE QUESTION IS, HOW DOES MALIKI AND HIS GOVERNMENT RESPOND TO THAT?

>> TRUDY, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT U.S. FORCES THERE?

>> I THINK IT DEPENDS IN PART ON WHICH SHIITE LEADER IS PRIME MINISTER, AND THERE WILL BE A SHIITE PRIME MINISTER. UH, A SHIITE LEADER WHO WANTS TO PRESENT THEMSELVES AS A POWERFUL NATIONALIST MIGHT FEEL COMPELLED TO PUSH FOR A CONTINUED BUILD DOWN, EVEN THOUGH IN HIS HEART, HE WOULD KNOW IT WAS RISKY. BUT UH, THERE ARE SHIITE LEADERS WHO I THINK WOULD RECOGNIZE THAT THEY WANT SOME TROOPS, NOT JUST TO KEEP SECTARIAN CONFLICTS FROM BUBBLING, LIKE IN THE NORTH, BUT ALSO AS A SORT OF BUFFER AGAINST IRAN, BECAUSE IRAQ WILL BE CLOSE TO IRAN. BUT IN A WAY, IT CAN BE AN INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND IRAN BECAUSE IT WILL BE A SHIITE LEAD GOVERNMENT, AND HAVING A FEW U.S. TROOPS, NOT A HUGE NUMBER, BUT SOME THOUSANDS...

>> WHAT ARE YOU THINKING, ABOUT 50,000, 20,000, 100,000?

>> NO, I WOULD SAY 50 OR UNDER. THAT IN A SENSE, GIVES THEM A LITTLE

BUFFER AGAINST IRAN, WHILE LOWERING THE FEELING OF THREAT THAT IRAN PERCEIVES, AND ALLOWING THE IRAQIS TO PLAY THE ROLE THAT IRAQI SHIITE LEADERS AND KURDS HAVE TOLD ME WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THEM TO PLAY, WHICH IS AN INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN US AND IRAN, AND AN INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN SUNNI ARAB STATES AND IRAN, BECAUSE AFTER ALL, EVEN THOUGH THE MAJORITY IN IRAQ ARE SHIITES, THEY ARE ALSO ARABS.

>> LET'S TALK ABOUT IRAN FOR A COUPLE OF MINUTES. FIRST OF ALL, PAPER TIGER OR SERIOUS MILITARY CONTENDER IN THE PERSIAN GULF?

>> OH MY GOODNESS, A VERY SERIOUS CONTENDER, BECAUSE OF WHAT IT DOES THROUGH PROXIES THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE REGION. THE IRANIANS USE THE TERM, CAPACITY FOR MISCHIEF A LITTLE WHILE AGO IN REFERENCE TO THEM. YOU HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARY CAPACITY FOR MISCHIEF. AND ON A BREAKNECK PACE TO THE ACQUISITION OF A NUCLEAR WEAPON, WHICH IS LIKELY GOING TO SET OFF AN ARMS RACE IN THE REGION. THE SAUDIS AND THE EGYPTIANS HAVE ALREADY SIGNALLED THAT THEY'RE INTERESTED IN HAVING THEIR OWN NUCLEAR WEAPON, AND THE IRANIANS, THEY ARE A DILEMMA FOR US. AND I'VE HEARD THE EXPRESSION THAT PROBLEMS HAVE SOLUTIONS AND DILEMMAS HAVE HORNS. WELL, WE'RE ALL CAUGHT ON THE HORNS OF THE IRANIAN DILEMMA, BECAUSE THE IRANIAN PEOPLE WOULD VERY MUCH WELCOME WESTERN STYLE EXISTENCE MUCH CLOSER TO WHAT WE HAVE IN THE UNITED STATES, AND ACTUALLY, VERY GOOD RELATIONS WITH PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES. THE PEOPLE RUNNING THE COUNTRY, HOWEVER, HAVE A MUCH DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW, AND ARE VERY BUSY SUPPORTING HAMAS, HEZBOLLAH, EVEN AL-QAEDA, BOTH IN IRAQ AND THE TALABAN AND AFGHANISTAN, CAUSING THE DEATH OF AMERICANS AND ALLIED SOLDIERS. THEY ARE PLAYERS FOR THE LONG TERM.

>> COME BACK TO YOU IN A SECOND, TRUDY. LET'S HEAR WHAT SOME OF OUR OTHER EXPERTS HAVE TO SAY ABOUT THE IRANIAN-U.S. TENSIONS.

>> I THINK THAT WE SHOULD TALK TO PEOPLE WHO WE UH, HAVE VERY FUNDAMENTAL DISAGREEMENTS WITH, AS WE DO WITH IRAN. WE OUGHT TO TELL THEM WHY, TO THEIR FACE, WE CONSIDER THEM TO BE A THREAT, AND WHY THE WORLD COMMUNITY THINKS THEY'RE SUCH A THREAT. BUT I'M UH, HOPING WHAT WE'RE ABLE TO DO IS TO UH, KNIT TOGETHER THE WORLD COMMUNITY IN A VERY, VERY TIGHT WAY, WHICH SENDS A MESSAGE TO IRAN. AND THIS WOULD INCLUDE THE RUSSIANS, THE CHINESE AND OTHERS, THAT HAVING MOVING TOWARDS A NUCLEAR WEAPON IS UNACCEPTABLE TO THE WORLD COMMUNITY. AND I THINK IT'S VERY DOABLE NOW.

>> WE WERE SERIOUS ABOUT NEGOTIATING. WE SHOULD NOT START THEM BY TALKING ABOUT MORE SANCTIONS, OPTIONS NOT BEING LEFT OFF THE TABLE, WHICH IS, OF COURSE, AN INDIRECT WAY OF THREATENING USE OF FORCE, ABUSING THE IRANIAN STATE AS A TERRORIST STATES, AND SO FORTH. SOME PEOPLE, EVEN IN THE ADMINISTRATION, HAVE BEEN DOING THAT. AND I THINK IT'S A MISTAKE, BECAUSE IT ACTUALLY PLAYS INTO THE HANDS OF THE HARD

LINERS.

>> WE GOT TO MAINTAIN WHAT WE CALL THE DOUBLE TRACK APPROACH, WHICH IS AN APPROACH OF HAVING A CORPORATION DIALOGUE NEGOTIATION IN ORDER TO FIND A POLITICAL SOLUTION TO A PROGRAM THAT FOR US WOULD BE FUNDAMENTAL, AND THIS IS STRICTLY CIVILIAN. ALL THE COUNTRIES WOULD HAVE SIGNED A NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY, HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THAT TYPE OF PROGRAM. THAT RIGHT COMES ACCOMPANIED BY SOME RESPONSIBILITIES. AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES TO GIVE TO THE REST OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY, AND THE OBJECTIVE GUARANTEES THAT THESE PROGRAMS ARE STRICTLY CIVILIAN.

>> IF THE OBJECTIVE IS TO MAKE SURE THAT WE PREVENT IRAN FROM HAVING AN ACTUAL NUCLEAR BOMB, RATHER THAN PREVENT IRAN FROM BEING ABLE TO BUILT ONE. AND I THINK THAT IS FULLY DOABLE. AND THERE ARE PLENTY OF INSTRUMENTS AT OUR DISPOSAL THAT CAN BE USED, INCLUDING VERIFICATION AND INSPECTIONS BY THE IAEA, THAT HAVE NOT BEEN FULLY UTILIZED.

>> BUT THE MOST IMPORTANT THING TO REMEMBER IS, IF IRAN IS ATTACKED, IT WILL RESPOND. AND IT'S MOST IMPORTANT RESPONSE WILL BE MINING THE STRAITS OF HORMU ZAND REST OF THE PERSIAN GULF. AND IF THAT HAPPENS, THEN THE CONSEQUENCES TO THE WORLD ECONOMY WILL BE ENORMOUS.

>> ALRIGHT, SO WE'VE SEEN ALL THE THREATS LAID OUT THERE. TRUDY, WHAT'S YOUR VIEW OF IRAN'S ROLE IN THE REGION?

>> IRAN WOULD BE A MAJOR PLAYER IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NO MATTER WHO WAS THE RULER OR THE GOVERNMENT, BECAUSE IT'S A HEAVY-WEIGHT. IT HAS IMMENSE OIL AND GAS RESOURCES, AND A LARGE, TALENTED POPULATION. BUT I THINK WE HAVE TO LOOK AT THIS RISK CAREFULLY AND ANALYZE IT. IS IT TO THE REGION OR IS IT TO THE WORLD? IF IT WASN'T THAT IRAN HAD A PRESIDENT, AHMADINEJAD, WHO TALKS IN APOCALYPTIC TERMS. I THINK IT WOULD BE EASIER TO LOOK AT THAT THREAT. BUT MOST EXPERTS BELIEVE THAT IRAN IS REALLY INTERESTED MAINLY IN BEING ABLE TO PRODUCE A WEAPON, BUT NOT ACTUALLY TO PRODUCE IT, BECAUSE THAT WOULD CAUSE CONSEQUENCES FOR IRAN THAT COULD BE VERY DANGEROUS, THAT IT WANTS TO HAVE THAT CAPACITY SO THAT NOBODY WILL ATTACK IT. AND THAT IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, AS TRITA PARSI BROUGHT UP. CAN YOU PREVENT IT FROM BREAKOUT? AND THE SECOND ISSUE IS UH, WOULD THEY EVER REALLY USE HAVING A WEAPON IF THEY BROKE OUT? THE IRANIANS, I DO NOT BELIEVE ARE CRAZY. THIS IS A COUNTRY WITH A LONG HISTORY. THEY WOULD BE ANNIHILATED IF THEY USED A WEAPON. THEY CERTAINLY WOULD NEVER USE ONE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES. SO MISCHIEF MAKING, YES, THEY MEDDLE IN THE REGION. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, IRAN IS A SHIITE COUNTRY. THE MIDDLE EAST IS MAINLY SUNNI. IRAN CANNOT DOMINATE THE REGION. IT CAN MAKE TROUBLE. AND I THINK WE HAVE TO LOOK AT THAT IN THAT CONTEXT AND DECIDE HOW TO DEAL WITH IRAN, AND NOT OVERBLOW THE THREAT INTO SOMETHING THAT BECOMES HYSTERICAL.

>> LET ME ASK YOU A QUESTION THAT IS, UH, KIND OF FOCUSED IN ANOTHER DIRECTION, BUT ABOUT IRAN STILL. UH, SAUDI ARABIA HAS BEEN SOMETIMES A PLAYER IN THE ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE PROCESS. THEY'VE GOT SEVERAL PROPOSALS MADE AND SO ON. DOES IRAN'S THREAT TO SAUDI ARABIA, IN A STRANGE WAY, CREATE A STRANGE BEDFELLOW IN PUTTING A COMMON INTEREST BETWEEN ISRAEL AND SAUDI ARABIA?

>> YES, UP TO A POINT. WITH THE SAUDIS ARE AFRAID OF, AGAIN, IT'S NOT NUCLEAR IRAN, IT'S IRAN INTERFERING IN THEIR ETHNIC DISPUTES. THE SAUDIS HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL SHIITE MINORITY THAT LIVES IN THE OIL REGION. THEY DON'T WANT IRAN STIRRING THAT UP. SIMILARLY, IN OTHER GULF STATES, LIKE BAHRAIN. AGAIN, BAHRAIN HAS A SHIITE MAJORITY, THERE ARE SHIITE MINORITIES, THAT'S WHAT THE REGION IS AFRAID OF, AND ALSO OF IRAN'S MEDDLING IN THE GULF AND BEING TOO MUCH OF A HEAVY-WEIGHT THERE. SO, ON THE ONE HAND, SAUDI ARABIA FEELS A COMMON INTEREST, BUT I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT EXTENDS TO WANTING ISRAEL TO BOMB IRAN, BECAUSE ATTACKING IRAN JUST OPENS UP ALL KINDS OF UNSEEN NEGATIVE POSSIBILITIES. NOT JUST THAT THEY WOULD MINE THE STRAITS, WHICH WOULD SEND OIL PRICES UP. MAYBE THE SAUDIS WOULDN'T MIND THAT. BUT AGAIN, IT RAISES THE QUESTION OF IRAN GOING TO MEDDLING MODE FULL-BLOWN, AND CAUSING UNREST THROUGHOUT THE GULF STATES AND IN THE REST OF THE REGION. I THINK THEY'RE MORE AFRAID OF THAT THAN THEY ARE OF NOT HAVING AN ATTACK ON IRAN.

>> ED?

>> I AGREE WITH MUCH OF WHAT TRUDY HAS SAID. FIRST OF ALL, THE IRANIANS ARE A PEOPLE OF A CERTAIN SELF-IMAGE, THAT REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT IS AHMADINEJAD OR IF THE SHAH HAD STILL BEEN THERE, THEY'D WANT A NUCLEAR WEAPON. IF THE PAKISTANIS CAN HAVE ONE, IF INDIA CAN HAVE ONE, IRAN SHOULD. AS FOR THE SAUDIS, THEY'VE NEVER FOUGHT THEIR WAY OUT OF A PROBLEM...

>> YOU'RE SAYING IRAN THINKS IT SHOULD. YOU'RE NOT SAYING YOU THINK IRAN SHOULD.

>> OH, NO, NO, NO. IRAN THINKS IT SHOULD. UH, THE SAUDIS HAVE NEVER FOUGHT THEIR WAY OUT OF PROBLEMS, THEY'VE ALWAYS BOUGHT THEIR WAY OUT OF PROBLEMS. AND IT'S NOT JUST THAT THE SHIA MAJORITY LIVES IN THE OIL PRODUCING REGIONS OF SAUDI ARABIA. THEY'RE ACTUALLY A MAJORITY WITHIN THOSE OIL PRODUCING REGIONS. SO THEY'RE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT IRANIAN INFLUENCE. AND I THINK EVERYONE AGREES THAT--AND I WOULD IMAGINE THE ISRAELIS ALSO WOULD AGREE, THAT IF THEY HAD BEEN PUSHED TO THE POINT WHERE THEY BELIEVE THEY HAD TO STRIKE AT THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR FACILITIES, IT WOULD BE TERRIBLY COSTLY FOR THEIR INVASION FORCE. A LOT OF THOSE PLANES WOULDN'T MAKE IT BACK. AND THE CONSEQUENCES COMING OUT OF THAT WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY HORRIBLE. SO HERE'S THE QUESTION: CONSIDERING HOW MUCH THE IRANIANS HAVE

INVESTED, TENS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS, AND THE PROBLEMS THAT WENT WITH IT, IN TRYING TO GET THE CAPACITY TO ACQUIRE A NUCLEAR WEAPON, ARE THEY NOT GOING TO ACQUIRE THE WEAPON? I WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT MAY BE A BIT OFF-POINT TO SUGGEST THAT, NO, THEY JUST WANT THE ABILITY TO BUILD ONE, BUT NOT TO HAVE IT. I THINK THEY WANT TO HAVE IT, AND THEN TO USE IT POLITICALLY, BECAUSE NUCLEAR POWER'S JUST UNUSABLE. THE MINUTE YOU PRESS THE BUTTON, IT'S PRETTY MUCH-- YOU'VE THROWN OUT ALL THE REASONS WHY YOU GOT IT IN THE FIRST PLACE.

>> CAN THE U.S., ISRAEL, AND SAUDI ARABIA LIVE WITH IRAN WITH A NUCLEAR WEAPON?

>> WE MAY HAVE TO, BECAUSE I CANNOT IMAGINE WHAT IT IS THAT THE UNITED STATES, OR ANY COMBINATION OF THE STATES, WOULD OFFER TO IRAN TODAY THAT WOULD MAKE THEM SAY, YOU KNOW WHAT, YOU'RE RIGHT. FORGET THE TENS OF BILLIONS WE'VE SPENT AND ALL THE TROUBLE, WE'RE GOING TO MOVE IN A DIFFERENT DIRECTION. I CAN'T IMAGINE WHAT IT IS WE'D OFFER THAT THEY WOULD ACCEPT AND WE WOULD NOT FIND ABSOLUTELY UNPARDONABLE AND UNTENABLE.

>> TRUDY, YOU DISAGREE WITH THAT, OR?

>> NO, I BASICALLY AGREE. I THINK THE ONE THING WE COULD OFFER, AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THIS WILL BE OFFERED AND I HAVE DOUBTS WHETHER IT WOULD SUCCEED, IS AN IDEA THAT'S BEEN THROWN AROUND FOR YEARS, WHICH IS THAT YOU WOULD HAVE AN INTERNATIONAL CONSORTIUM THAT WOULD PRODUCE ENRICHED URANIUM. AND I'M NOT SURE THAT THIS IRANIAN GOVERNMENT WOULD ACCEPT EVEN A COMPROMISE LIKE THAT. HOWEVER, WE CANNOT FORGET THAT THERE IS STILL A LOT OF TURMOIL INSIDE IRAN. THE OPPOSITION IS NOT OVER, THE LEADERSHIP IS DIVIDED, AND THE OPPOSITION LEADERSHIP, EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE SONS OF THE REVOLUTION AND SAY THEY WANT NUCLEAR CAPACITY, UH, CLEARLY ARE INTERESTED IN A MORE HEALTHY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE REST OF THE WORLD. AND WE DON'T KNOW HOW THAT STRUGGLE THAT'S GOING TO PLAY OUT IN THE END.

>> GOTTA SPEND A COUPLE OF MINUTES THINKING OF BIGGER PICTURE IN THE REGION. LET'S HEAR WHAT OUR EXPERTS SAY ABOUT THE OVERALL PERSIAN GULF REGION.

>> ACTUALLY HAVING IRAQ EMERGE AS A REASONABLE STABLE POLITY THAT IS NOT PREDATORY, AND THAT IS NOT ITSELF UNSTABLE IN ATTEMPTING TO DESTABILIZE ITS NEIGHBORS, WILL BE, IN ITSELF, AN EXTREMELY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE REGION. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT DOES DISTORT AN EQUILIBRIUM THAT HAD GROWN UP WHERE THE SAUDIS WERE ONE POLE OF THE EQUATION, THE IRANIANS WERE ANOTHER POLE OF THE EQUATION. NOW YOU HAVE A THIRD POLE.

>> WE HAVE TO HAVE A LONG VIEW, THINK OF THE REGION AS A WHOLE, AND ASK OURSELVES, WHAT REDUCES OUR PRESENCE? WHAT INCREASES THE

PROBABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES BEING BOGGED DOWN FOR MANY YEARS TO COME IN A LARGE, SEETHING, REGIONAL CONFLICT? WHAT IS THE LONG-RANGE DANGER TO ISRAEL? AND THEN ACT INTELLIGENTLY ON THAT BASIS AND NOT BE MANIPULATED INTO OVERREACTIONS OR MOVES EITHER CALCULATED TO OWN ANY CASE CONTRIBUTING TO THE COLLAPSE OF A SERIOUS NEGOTIATING EFFORT.

>> IRAN ALREADY IS THE MAJOR POWER WITHIN THE PERSIAN GULF. ABSENT THE UNITED STATES, THE IRANIANS ARE IN A POSITION WITH THEIR CURRENT MILITARY FORCES TO IMPOSE A PAX ON THE REGION, TO DOMINATE THE REGION.

>> WHENEVER THE UNITED STATES IS UNWILLING TO DEAL WITH IRAN, RECOGNIZE IRAN'S ROLE, NEGOTIATE WITH IRAN, THEIR RESPONSE HAS BEEN TO MAKE IT AS COSTLY AS POSSIBLE FOR THE UNITED STATES TO PURSUE THAT POLICY OF NON-RECOGNITION. THAT MEANS PLAYING ITS CARDS AGAINST U.S. INTEREST IN LEBANON, IN ISRAEL - PALESTINE, IN IRAQ, IN AFGHANISTAN, IN THE PERSIAN GULF, AREAS THAT ARE A VITAL SECURITY INTEREST FOR THE UNITED STATES, AND IN WHICH THE U.S. IS QUITE INVOLVED IN.

>> SO REAL QUICKLY, JUST BRIEF ANSWER IF I COULD, UH, RUSSIA AND CHINA, WILL THE COUNTRIES OF THE PERSIAN GULF BASICALLY PREFER TO TURN TO THE U.S. FOR CONNECTIONS AND MILITARY HARDWARE, OR WOULD THEY LIKELY SIDE WITH EITHER RUSSIA OR CHINA, BUILDING UP THOSE TWO COUNTRY'S INFLUENCES IN THE REGION?

>> IT'S NOT A ZERO-SUM GAME. THEY'LL PLAY EVERYTHING BASED ON WHAT THE SITUATION DEMANDS AT THE TIME AND THERE'S A RISK IN GOING ALL IN FOR ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER. THEY DON'T SEE THEMSELVES ALLOWING TO BE - I DON'T SEE THEM ALLOWING TO BE A PART OF THAT...

>> I THINK THE GULF STATES ARE MORE COMFORTABLE WITH THE UNITED STATES, EVEN THOUGH THEY CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE DOING.

>> TRUDY RUBIN, COLUMNIST FOR THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, THANKS VERY MUCH FOR BEING WITH US. AND ED TURZANSKI, SENIOR FELLOW AT THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE IN PHILADELPHIA, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AT LA SALLE UNIVERSITY. THANKS, BOTH OF YOU, FOR BEING WITH US ON GREAT DECISIONS. AND THANK YOU AS WELL FOR WATCHING GREAT DECISIONS. I'M RALPH BEGLEITER, WE'LL SEE YOU NEXT WEEK.

>> TO LEARN MORE ABOUT TOPICS DISCUSSED ON GREAT DECISIONS, VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT GREATDECISIONS.ORG. GREAT DECISIONS IS AVAILABLE ON DVD. TO ORDER, VISIT SHOPPBS.ORG OR CALL 1-800-PLAYPBS. FUNDING FOR GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY IS PROVIDED BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, THE STARR FOUNDATION, SHELL INTERNATIONAL AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE. NEXT TIME ON GREAT

DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICIES...

>> EVEN THE FAMED MILITARY STRATEGIST, TSUNG-TSU ACKNOWLEDGED THAT TO SUBDUE THE ENEMY WITHOUT FIGHTING IS THE HEIGHT OF SKILL. YET MORE RESOURCES THROUGHOUT HISTORY HAVE BEEN DEVOTED TO MILITARY ENDEAVORS THAN TO PEACE EFFORTS. DOES THE U.S. INTEGRATE THE TOOLS OF PEACE BUILDING INTO ITS STATE CRAFT? WHEN DO CHALLENGES LIKE POVERTY, DISEASE AND CLIMATE CHANGE BECOME ISSUES OF NATIONAL SECURITY? AND WHAT ROLE CAN GLOBAL INSTITUTIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS PLAY IN SUPPORTING GOVERNMENT LEAD EFFORTS?

>> NEXT TIME, ON GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY.

[INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC] CLOSED CAPTIONS BY CAPTIONLINK
WWW.CAPTIONLINK.COM

>> WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ, UNREST IN IRAN, UNEASE IN THE GULF ARAB STATES- THE PERSIAN GULF HAS LONG CHALLENGED U.S. POLICY MAKERS, AND THAT'S MORE TRUE TODAY THAN AT ANY TIME IN HISTORY. HOW WILL PRESIDENT OBAMA'S DIRECT APPEAL TO ARABS AND MUSLIMS AFFECT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY GOALS? WHAT WILL THE WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ PORTEND?

>> WE HAVE TO HAVE A LONG VIEW, THINK OF THE REGION AS A WHOLE.

>> CAN THE U.S. AND ITS ALLIES PREVENT IRAN FROM OBTAINING A NUCLEAR WEAPON?

>> THEIR PRESIDENT MAKES STATEMENTS WHICH SOUND AS THOUGH HE IS A RELIGIOUS FANATIC, AND RELIGIOUS FANATICS ARE NOT DETERRABLE.

>> NEXT, ON GREAT DECISIONS.

>> IN A DEMOCRACY, AGREEMENT IS NOT ESSENTIAL, BUT PARTICIPATION IS. JOIN US AS WE DISCUSS TODAY'S MOST CRITICAL GLOBAL ISSUES. JOIN US FOR GREAT DECISIONS.

[INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC]

>> GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED BY THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, INSPIRING AMERICANS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE WORLD. FUNDING FOR GREAT DECISIONS IS PROVIDED BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, THE STARR FOUNDATION, SHELL INTERNATIONAL, AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE.

>> AND NOW FROM OUR STUDIOS, HERE IS RALPH BEGLEITER.

>> WELCOME TO GREAT DECISIONS, I'M RALPH BEGLEITER. JOINING US TO DISCUSS POWER AND POLITICS IN THE PERSIAN GULF ARE TRUDY RUBIN, AN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COLUMNIST FOR THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, AND ED TURZANSKI, SENIOR FELLOW AT THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

AND PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AT THE LA SALLE UNIVERSITY. THANK YOU BOTH FOR BEING WITH US. WE CAN'T TALK ABOUT THE PERSIAN GULF WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE WAR IN IRAQ, OBVIOUSLY. LET'S START THERE. TELL ME HOW YOU SEE THE WAR UNFOLDING OVER THE NEXT COUPLE OF YEARS, LET'S SAY. TRUDY?

>> UH, THERE ARE TWO POSSIBLE WAYS THINGS CAN GO. EITHER TOWARDS MORE FRAGMENTATION, OR, AND I THINK THIS IS A STRONG POSSIBILITY, TOWARDS ANOTHER DICTATORSHIP, A SOFT DICTATORSHIP. YOU SEE IT NOW WITH PRIME MINISTER MALIKI, UH, THE MAN IN CHARGE NOW WHO PEOPLE THOUGHT WAS A WIMP. HE HAS MANAGED TO PUT THE ARMY UNDER HIS CONTROL, HE HAS HIS OWN SECURITY SERVICE, HE HAS TAKEN CONTROL OF THE SPECIAL COMMANDO UNIT, WHICH IS ONE OF THE BEST UNITS THAT WE'VE TRAINED IN IRAQ, AND MANY OF THE OTHER PARTIES ARE AFRAID OF WHAT THEY SEE AS DICTATORIAL TENDENCIES. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF HE LOSES IN THE NEXT ELECTION, THERE'S A FRACTIOUS COALITION THAT WOULD HAVE TO PUT TOGETHER A GOVERNMENT, AND EVEN HE MAY HAVE TO PUT TOGETHER A FRACTIOUS COALITION, BECAUSE ALL THE PARTIES ARE SPLINTERING AND FORMING ALLIANCES, SOME ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES. BUT BOTTOM LINE, PEOPLE IN IRAQ YEARN FOR SECURITY, AND I THINK THEY WOULDN'T MIND HAVING A BETTER SADDAM.

>> ED, HOW ABOUT YOU?

>> I WOULD AGREE THAT THE FUTURE IS LIKELY GOING TO BE DETERMINED BY WHAT HAPPENS IN TERMS OF POLITICAL ACCOMMODATION. AND UH, THIS SOFT DICTATORSHIP TRUDY TALKS ABOUT MAY BE JARRING TO SOME PEOPLE, BUT IN INSTANCES WHERE PEOPLE HAVE NOT HAD A USEABLE DEMOCRATIC PAST, IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO GET TO THE POINT WHERE DIFFERENCES ARE SETTLED, PRINCIPALLY THROUGH POLITICAL DISCUSSION. IT MAY BE MESSY, JUST LIKE BISMARCK SAID. TWO THINGS YOU DON'T WANT TO SEE MADE, SAUSAGES AND LAWS. IT COULD BE VERY FRACTIOUS, BUT AS LONG AS WE CAN GET TO THAT TWO TURN OVER TEST, ONCE YOU'VE HAD TWO SUCCESSIVE TURN OVERS OF POWER THAT HAVE BEEN RELATIVELY CALM AND FREE, RELATIVELY FAIR, SCHEDULED ELECTIONS, YOUR CHANCES OF PROCEEDING DOWN THAT LINE ARE MUCH BETTER THAN THEY ARE GOING BACK TO WHAT YOU KNEW BEFORE. IRAN IS GOING TO HAVE A LOT TO DO WITH WHAT HAPPENS IN IRAQ, BECAUSE ITS CAPACITY FOR MISCHIEF IS STILL QUITE PRONOUNCED, ESPECIALLY AMONG THE SHIA.

>> IT STRIKES ME AS INTERESTING, ACTUALLY, THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS IN IRAQ. UH, SEVEN, EIGHT YEARS AGO, NOBODY WOULD HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT THAT, AND YET I THINK IT'S UH, AND ODD CONTRAST, TRUDY, FOR YOU TO BE TALKING ABOUT THE ELECTIONS LEADING TO A SOFT DICTATORSHIP. DOES THAT MEAN THAT YOU WOULD SEE THE ELECTIONS ENDING AT SOME POINT, THAT THEY WOULDN'T HAPPEN AGAIN, OR THEY WOULD BECOME ESSENTIALLY SHAM ELECTIONS, LIKE MOST OF THE REST OF THE ARAB WORLD?

>> I DON'T THINK IT'S NECESSARILY THE CASE THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE A CONTINUOUS SERIES OF ELECTIONS EVERY FOUR YEARS, OR WHATEVER THE PERIOD IS THAT THE IRAQIS CHOSE, BUT I THINK THERE'S SUCH A YEARNING FOR ORDER, THERE'S SUCH A YEARNING FOR STABILITY. IT'S SORT OF LIKE WHEN THE SOVIET UNION BROKE UP, AND WE TRIED TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA IN THE '90S, AND WE GOT CHAOS. AND PEOPLE THERE WERE YEARNING FOR ORDER. AND SO NOW THEY HAVE PUTIN, WHO IS ELECTED, BUT BASICALLY IS AN AUTOCRAT OF SORTS. I THINK YOU COULD SEE THE SAME THING IN IRAQ. PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO BE BLOWN UP, AND THERE THE SITUATION IS MORE DEATH-CAUSING THAN IN A POST-SOVIET RUSSIA. SO, IF YOU WOULD HAVE A PRIME MINISTER WHO UH, PLAYED THE POLICE AND THE MILITARY CARD MORE STRONGLY, ESPECIALLY AS U.S. TROOPS ARE LEAVING AND WE HAVE LESS INFLUENCE OVER WHAT IRAQI POLITICIANS DO, I THINK IT MIGHT BE ACCEPTED, ALTHOUGH A LOT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS MIGHT GRUMBLE, IF THAT PRIME MINISTER COULD DELIVER. COULD DELIVER SERVICES, COULD DELIVER SECURITY. PEOPLE ARE JUST TIRED. THEY STILL DON'T HAVE ENOUGH ELECTRICITY AND THEY DON'T HAVE JOBS.

>> YOU TAKE IT ALMOST AS GIVEN THAT U.S. TROOPS WILL BE LEAVING. DO YOU TAKE IT AS A GIVEN THAT U.S. TROOPS WILL BE LEAVING?

>> THEY'LL CERTAINLY BE RETREATING MORE AND MORE FROM EVERYDAY IRAQI LIFE, ON TO BASES. AND I THINK WHAT TRUDY'S TALKING ABOUT IN SUM, IS BEST DESCRIBED IN THE TERM, SECURITY. PHYSICAL SECURITY, ECONOMIC SECURITY, AND THE QUESTION WILL BE, HOW BROADLY DO THE IRAQIS DEFINE THAT TERM? IS IT SECURITY JUST FOR MY CLAN, FOR VILLAGE, MY REGION, OR WILL WE GET TO A POINT WHERE IRAQIS STARTING THINKING MORE BROADLY? GOING BEYOND TRIBAL ALLEGIANCES THAT HAVE REALLY HELD THE COUNTRY TOGETHER FOR THE FIRST TIME, AND THIS IS SOMETHING TO LOOK FOR. WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO GET KURDS, SHIA, SUNNI, MARSH ARABS, TALKING IN NATIONAL TERMS, AS OPPOSED TO VERY SPECIFIC TRIBAL OR REGIONAL TERMS?

>> WHAT YOU SEE IS ALLIANCES BEING FORMED ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES. YOU'LL HAVE A SUNNI SHEIK MAKING AN ALLIANCE WITH A SHIITE PARTY, UH, AND YOU KNOW, TWO YEARS AGO, THEY MIGHT HAVE BEEN DRILLING HOLES IN EACH OTHER'S HEADS. AND SO, IN A SENSE, THAT'S PROGRESS, BUT A LOT OF THESE ALLIANCES COULD BE FLEETING. BUT AT LEAST THE PRINCIPAL OF DEALING ACROSS SECTARIAN LINES HAS NOW BEEN ESTABLISHED, SO ONE PROBABLY, AND I THINK MOST, PROBABLY, WILL NOT SEE CIVIL WAR AGAIN. THE QUESTIONS IS, WHAT KIND OF A GOVERNMENT CAN STOP BOMBS?

>> WE'VE BEEN TALKING SO FAR ABOUT THE IMPACT OF WHAT HAPPENS IN IRAQ ON THE GULF. LET'S HEAR WHAT SOME OF OUR OTHER EXPERTS THAT WE SPOKE WITH THINK ABOUT HOW IT'S GONNA PLAY OUT FOR THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.S. TROOPS IN THE REGION.

>> SO THE QUESTION THAT PRESIDENT OBAMA REALLY HAS TO ASK AND

ANSWER IS NOT, ARE WE GOING TO END THIS WAR, WHEN ARE WE GOING TO END THIS WAR, BUT, WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO WITH THE PEACE? AND WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO TO BUILD ON THE SACRIFICES THAT WE'VE MADE, AND WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO TO BUILD ON THE SUCCESSES THAT WE'VE ACHIEVED, IN ORDER TO TRY TO DEVELOP AN ENDURING PARTNERSHIP WITH IRAQ, WHICH I THINK COULD BECOME A REAL KEY PILLAR OF AMERICAN POLICY IN THE REGION, AND A REAL FORCE FOR A LOT OF THINGS THAT WE CARE ABOUT IN THE REGION.