

The Foreign Policy Centre



A Global Alliance for Global Values

By Tony Blair

Supported by



Preface by Stephen Twigg

A GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR GLOBAL VALUES

Tony Blair

Preface by
Stephen Twigg

September 2006

First published in 2006 by
The Foreign Policy Centre
23-28 Penn Street
London N1 5DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Email: info@fpc.org.uk

© Foreign Policy Centre 2006

All rights reserved
ISBN-13: 978-1-905833-06-1
ISBN-10: 1-905833-06-7

Preface

Tony Blair's 1999 Chicago speech set out the core for what has been termed a 'liberal interventionist' approach to foreign policy. Chicago came at the end of a decade which witnessed genocide in Rwanda and 'ethnic cleansing' in Bosnia. The abject failure of the international community to prevent these atrocities led many to question the prevailing 'realist' orthodoxy in foreign policy. Blair's first term in office saw the UK interventions in Kosovo and Sierra Leone. Both enjoyed widespread support; for many they were a positive example of what Robin Cook described as the 'ethical dimension' of foreign policy.

Then came 9/11. The subsequent intervention in Afghanistan had clear UN sanction and, in the UK, strong cross-party support. In contrast, the invasion of Iraq was the most controversial decision taken by Tony Blair's government. In this Foreign Policy Centre pamphlet the Prime Minister acknowledges that mistakes have been made, but makes a plea for supporters and opponents of the war to unite in support of democracy in Iraq today.

There is no doubt that Iraq divided the progressive coalition which welcomed Blair's Chicago speech and supported the interventions in Kosovo and Sierra Leone; the late Robin Cook was as eloquent in his defence of intervention in Kosovo as he was in his disagreement over Iraq. Is there an agenda around which that progressive coalition can be re-united?

It won't be easy but the challenge is an important one. Tony Blair lists some of the countries where there has been a failure to intervene effectively – Burma, Zimbabwe, North Korea and Sudan. Recent tragic events in Lebanon & northern Israel and the continuing horror of Darfur once again make the case for a more effective United Nations.

Blair sets out an attractive prospectus for UN reform – implementing Kofi Annan's proposals but going further; he also makes the crucial point that institutional change is necessary but by no means sufficient – the 'powerful' countries of the world have to show real political will. Securing a lasting regional settlement in the Middle East is an urgent task for the UN yet the stark reality is that it will only happen if the most powerful countries engage, not least the US.

The most damning criticism of western foreign policy is that we display ‘double standards’ – for example, intervention in Iraq but not in Darfur. Bill Clinton has described the Rwanda genocide as the greatest failure of his presidency. As the Prime Minister says here ‘the danger of leaving things as they are is ad-hoc coalitions that stir massive controversy about legitimacy; or paralysis in the face of crisis’.

An important focus for further progress lies in the decision of the 2005 UN Summit to adopt the principle of the Responsibility to Protect which was first promoted by Canada. This important doctrine has real potential to make a practical difference to the lives of some of the most vulnerable people in the world. The danger is that it might remain a paper commitment; real political will and leadership are needed here.

The United Nations emerged from the horrors of the Second World War. After the Holocaust, people said ‘never again’ - yet we have had Cambodia, the Balkans, Rwanda and now Darfur. For more than four decades the universal values to which the world signed up in the late 1940s were subordinated to the strategic and economic interests of the two power blocs fighting the ‘Cold War’.

Could this be the moment for a renaissance of those values? Or could history be repeating itself with a ‘new Cold War’ between the US and an increasingly confident China? Blair warns of the danger of the world again dividing into spheres of influence, or splitting as some nations focus on the “hard” issue of terrorism, others on “soft” issues like poverty.

This pamphlet is a powerful appeal for the international community to unite around a set of progressive values and to take up a shared agenda, taking climate change and trade justice just as seriously as the fight against extremist terror.

It is therefore a bold challenge both to those who have not given sufficient priority to peace between Israel and Palestine or global warming – and to those who believe we should walk away from Iraq or Afghanistan.

Tony Blair sets out the challenges we face – and an ambitious and progressive response to those challenges.

Stephen Twigg

Foreword by Tony Blair

I made the first of the speeches which inspired this pamphlet back in March this year. Since then events have moved on. In Iraq, terrorists undermine prospects for peace and prosperity. In Afghanistan, NATO troops engage in fighting of renewed intensity as the Taliban try to resist the democratic government. In the Middle East, a tragedy unfolded this summer, and now the region is trying to rebuild.

I do not pretend that no mistakes have been made, or that major problems do not confront us. But none of these events have changed my basic thesis. Instead they have brought it into sharper relief.

The conflicts I mention, and other issues like world trade and migration, are all part of the same thing. The great question of our age is, what are the values that govern the future of the world? Are they those of tolerance, freedom and respect for diversity - or those of reaction, division and hatred?

Our response to the September 11th attacks has proven even more momentous than it seemed at the time. That is because we could have chosen security as the battleground. But we didn't. We chose values. We said we didn't want another Taliban or a different Saddam. We knew that you can't defeat a fanatical ideology just by imprisoning or killing its leaders; you have to defeat its ideas.

In my view, the situation we face is indeed war, but of a completely unconventional kind. And it can't be won in a conventional way. We will not win the battle against global extremism unless we win it at the level of values as much as force. We can only win by showing that our values are stronger, better and more just than the alternative. That also means showing the world that we are even-handed, fair and just in our application of those values.

Evidently, we face huge challenges. Why are we not yet succeeding? Because we are not being bold enough, consistent enough, thorough enough, in fighting for the values we believe in.

I believe we will never get real support for the tough action that may well be essential to safeguard our way of life, unless we also attack global poverty and environmental degradation or injustice, with equal vigour.

Doing this requires us to change dramatically the focus of our policy. We must commit ourselves to a complete renaissance of our strategy to defeat those that threaten us.

We need to construct an alliance of moderation that paints a future in which Muslim, Jew and Christian, Arab and western, wealthy and developing nations can make progress in peace and harmony with each other.

To win the battle of values, we must prove beyond any question that our world-view is based not just on power but on justice; not just on what is necessary, but on what is right.

Unless we re-appraise our strategy, unless we revitalise the broader global agenda on poverty, climate change, trade, and in respect of the Middle East, bend every sinew of our will to returning to the Road Map and achieving a two state solution, we will not win. And this is a battle we must win.

That is why I say this struggle is one about values. Our values are our guide. Our values are worth struggling for. They represent humanity's progress throughout the ages. At each point we have had to fight for them and defend them. As a new age beckons, it is time to fight for them again.

Tony Blair

The age of interdependence

The defining characteristic of our modern world is interdependence. We live in the age of the inter-connected. We all recognise this when it comes to communication, culture and trade. But the same applies to politics too. And while the economics of globalisation are well matured, the politics of globalisation are not.

Left and right still matter in politics, and the divergence can sometimes be sharp. But traditional political divides have been thrown into confusion in today's fast-changing world. The defining division these days is increasingly: open or closed? Are we open to the changing world? Or do we see its menace, but not its possibilities?

This divide can be found in many of today's great debates, whether on economics, trade, immigration or foreign policy. Underneath the daily stories of strife and sensation often lies this more profound struggle. It is not just a struggle about interests. It is a struggle about values, and especially a struggle about modernity: whether to be at ease with it, or in rage against it. The world is now in the course of choosing.

Without hesitation, I am on the open side of the argument. The way for us to handle the challenge of globalisation is to compete better, to embrace diversity, to be flexible to change. Political leaders have to give people confidence to do this. If we see competition or diversity as a threat, we are already on the way to losing.

Globalisation is a fact. But the values that govern it are a choice. And the great challenge today is to articulate a common global policy based on common global values. It is our task to fashion an international community that both embodies and acts in pursuit of the values we believe in: liberty, democracy, tolerance and justice.

These are the values our countries live by. They are values which can inspire and unify. People of all nations, faiths and races would live by them too, given the chance. The governments of the world do not all believe in freedom. But the people of the world do. The question is how, at this moment in time, in an international community that has been riven, do we achieve such unity around such values?

I believe that we only win people to these positions if our policy is not just about interests but about values, not just about what is necessary, but also about what is right.

And while this globalisation which is reshaping all our lives is a great opportunity, of course our heightened interdependence also carries risks. If we allow extremism, conflict, environmental degradation or injustice to go unchecked, we risk chaos threatening our stability.

A foreign policy of engagement

The consequence of this thesis is a foreign policy of engagement rather than isolation: active, not reactive. I set out the basis for this in my Chicago speech of 1999 where I called for a doctrine of international community, and again in my speech to the US Congress in July 2003. In several speeches I have made this year, I have set out in detail why after the events of recent years I am more convinced of this basic approach than ever.

This is why Britain has pursued a strongly activist foreign policy. We have based those actions at least as much on our values as on our interests. It is our values that link our military action in Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan and Iraq, with our diplomatic action on climate change, world trade, Africa and Palestine.

The traditional political divides are as confused in foreign policy as in other areas. The rule book of international politics has been torn up. In world trade, protectionist sentiment is rife on the Left, while on the Right there are calls for "economic patriotism". Some think it neoconservative to favour spreading democracy around the world. Others on the Right think that policy is dangerous and deluded. Some on the Left see intervention as humanitarian and necessary. Others believe that, if dictators don't threaten us directly, they should be left alone.

'Open or closed' is once more the choice. The divide is between those who believe that the long-term interests of a country lie in it being engaged and interactive, and those who think the short term pain of such a policy is too great. Confusingly, the proponents and opponents of each position come from all sides of the political spectrum.

Progressives may implement policy differently from conservatives, but the fault lines are the same. Where progressive and conservative policy can differ is that progressives are stronger on the challenges of poverty, climate change and trade justice.

I have no doubt at all that it is impossible to gain support for our values, unless the demand for justice is as strong as the demand for freedom; and the willingness to work in partnership with others is an avowed preference to going it alone, even if that may sometimes be necessary.

I believe we will never get real support for the tough action that may well be essential to safeguard our way of life, unless we also attack global poverty, injustice, and environmental degradation with equal vigour.

In defending this interventionist policy I do not pretend that mistakes have not been made or that major problems do not confront us. There are many areas in which we have not intervened as effectively as I would wish, even if only by political pressure. Sudan, for example; the appalling deterioration in the conditions of the people of Zimbabwe; human rights in Burma; the virtual enslavement of the people of North Korea.

I also acknowledge that the state of the Middle East Peace Process and the stand-off between Israel and Palestine remains a - perhaps the - genuine source of anger in the Arab and Muslim world, going far beyond usual anti-western feeling. The issue of "even handedness" rankles deeply.

So this is not an attempt to deflect criticism or ignore the huge challenges which remain; but to set out the thinking behind the foreign policy we have pursued.

Benign inactivity, or progressive pre-emption

Obviously, it is in confronting global terrorism that the sharpest disagreement is found. And nowhere is the supposed folly of the interventionist case so loudly trumpeted as over Iraq. Three years after the Iraq conflict began, it is said that here is the wreckage of such a

world view. The view is: under Saddam, Iraq was stable. Now its stability is in the balance. Therefore it should never have been done.

This is essentially the product of the conventional view of foreign policy since the fall of the Berlin Wall. This view holds that there is no longer a defining issue in foreign policy. Countries should therefore manage their affairs and relationships according to their narrow national interests.

The basic posture represented by this view is not to provoke, to keep all as settled as it can be, to cause no tectonic plates to move. It is a view which sees the world as not without challenge, but as basically calm. There may be a few nasty things lurking in deep waters, which it is best to avoid, but there are major currents that inevitably threaten the placid surface. It believes that the storms of recent years have been largely self-created.

I characterise this as a doctrine of benign inactivity. And it is the majority view of a large part of western opinion, certainly in Europe. It has imposed a paradigm on world events that is extraordinary in its attraction and in its scope.

According to this opinion, the policy of America since 9/11 has been a gross over-reaction. George Bush is as much, if not more, of a threat to world peace than Osama bin Laden, and what is happening in Iraq, Afghanistan or anywhere else in the Middle East is an entirely understandable consequence of US/UK imperialism - or worse, of plain stupidity.

The effect of this is to see each set back in Iraq or Afghanistan, each terrorist barbarity, each reversal for the forces of democracy, or advance for the forces of tyranny, as merely an illustration of the foolishness of our ever being there, as a reason why Saddam should have been left in place, or the Taliban free to continue their alliance with Al-Qaeda. Those who still justify the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq are treated with some scorn. The easiest line for any politician seeking office in the West today is to attack American policy.

Even when terrorists strike in nations like Britain or Spain, there is a groundswell of people ready to say that it is hardly surprising: if we do this to their countries, is it any wonder they do it to ours? They argue

that if we left it all alone, or at least treated it with sensitivity, everything would resolve itself in time.

There is an interesting debate going on inside government about how to counter extremism in British communities. Ministers have been advised never to use the term "Islamist extremist", because it will give offence. That is true - it will. There are those - perfectly decent-minded people - who say the extremists who commit these acts of terrorism are not true Muslims. And, of course, they are right. They are no more proper Muslims than the Protestant bigot who murders a Catholic in Northern Ireland is a proper Christian. But, unfortunately, he is still a "Protestant" bigot. To say his religion is irrelevant is both completely to misunderstand his motive and to refuse to face up to the strain of extremism within his religion that has given rise to it.

Yet, in respect of radical Islam, the paradigm insists that to say what is true is to provoke, to show insensitivity, to demonstrate the same qualities of purblind ignorance that leads us to suppose that Muslims view democracy or liberty in the same way we do.

Just as it lets go unchallenged the frequent refrain that it is to be expected that Muslim opinion will react violently to the invasion of Iraq: after all it is a Muslim country. Thus, the attitude is: we understand your sense of grievance; we acknowledge your anger at the invasion of a Muslim country; but to strike back through terrorism is wrong.

I believe that this is a posture of weakness, defeatism, and most of all deeply insulting to every Muslim who believes in freedom. Instead of challenging extremism, this attitude panders to it. Instead of choking it, it feeds its growth.

None of this proves, incidentally, that the invasion of Iraq or Afghanistan was right; merely that it is nonsense to suggest our actions were taken because those countries are Muslim.

I recall the video footage of Mohammad Sidique Khan, the ringleader of the bombers of 7th July 2005 in London. There he was, complaining about the wickedness of America and Britain, calling on fellow Muslims to fight us. I thought: here is someone brought up in this country, free to practise his religion, free to speak out, free to vote, with a good standard of living and every chance to raise a family in a decent way of

life. He was talking about us – the British – when his whole experience of us has been the very opposite of the message he is preaching. And insofar as he is angry about Muslims in Iraq or Afghanistan, let Iraqi or Afghan Muslims decide whether to be angry or not, by ballot. There was something tragic, terrible, but also ridiculous about such a diatribe.

This ideology has to be taken on – and taken on everywhere. This terrorism, in my view, will not be defeated until we confront not just the methods of the extremists but also their ideas. I don't mean just telling them that terrorist activity is wrong. I mean telling them that their attitude to America is absurd, that their concept of governance is pre-feudal, that their positions on women and other faiths are reactionary. We must reject not just their barbaric acts, but their presumed and false sense of grievance against the West, their attempt to persuade us that it is we and not they who are responsible for their violence.

In addition, since only by Muslims can this be done, we must stand up for those within Islam who will tell them that the extremist view of Islam is not just theologically backward, but completely contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Koran.

We must reject the notion that somehow we are the authors of our own distress, that if only we altered this decision or that, this extremism would fade away. The only way to win is to recognise that this phenomenon is a global ideology, and to defeat it by values and ideas set in opposition to those of the terrorists.

The roots of extremism

The roots of global terrorism and extremism are indeed deep. They reach right down through decades of alienation, victimhood and political oppression in the Arab and Muslim world. Yet this is not and never has been inevitable.

To me, the most remarkable thing about reading the Koran is to understand how progressive it is. I speak with great diffidence and humility as a member of another faith. I am not qualified to make any judgements. But as an outsider, the Koran strikes me as a reforming book, trying to return Judaism and Christianity to their origins, rather as reformers attempted with the Christian Church centuries later. It is inclusive. It extols science and knowledge and abhors superstition.

It is practical and way ahead of its time in attitudes to marriage, women and governance.

Under its guidance, the spread of Islam and its dominance over previously Christian or Pagan lands was breathtaking. Over centuries it founded an Empire, leading the world in discovery, art and culture. The standard bearers of tolerance in the early Middle Ages were far more likely to be found in Muslim lands than in Christian.

This is not the place to digress into a history of what subsequently happened. But by the early 20th century, after renaissance, reformation and enlightenment had swept over the Western world, the Muslim and Arab world was uncertain, insecure and on the defensive. Some countries like Turkey went for a muscular move to secularism. Others found themselves caught between colonisation, nascent nationalism, political oppression and religious radicalism. Muslims began to see the sorry state of Muslim countries as symptomatic of the sorry state of Islam. Political radicals became religious radicals and vice versa.

Those in power tried to accommodate the resurgent Islamic radicalism by incorporating some of its leaders and some of its ideology. The result was nearly always disastrous. The religious radicalism was made respectable; the political radicalism suppressed and so in the minds of many, the cause of the two came together to symbolise the need for change. So many came to believe that the way of restoring the confidence and stability of Islam was the combination of religious extremism and populist politics. The true enemies became "the West" and those Islamic leaders who co-operated with them.

The extremism may have started through religious doctrine and thought. But soon, in offshoots of the Muslim Brotherhood, supported by Wahhabi extremists and taught in some of the Madrassas of the Middle East and Asia, an ideology was born and exported around the world.

On 9/11 2001, 3,000 people were murdered. But this terrorism did not begin on the streets of New York. Many more had already died, not just in acts of terrorism against western interests, but in political insurrection and turmoil round the world.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

Its victims are to be found in the recent history of many lands: Russia, India, Pakistan, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Indonesia, Kenya and countless more. Over 100,000 died in Algeria. In Chechnya and Kashmir, political causes that could have been resolved became brutally incapable of resolution under the pressure of terrorism. Today in 30 or 40 countries, terrorists are plotting action, loosely linked with this ideology. Though the active cadres of terrorists are relatively small, it exploits a far wider sense of alienation in the Arab and Muslim world.

These acts of terrorism were not isolated incidents. They were part of a growing movement. A movement that believed Muslims had departed from their proper faith, were being taken over by Western culture, were being governed treacherously by Muslims complicit in this take-over, whereas the true way to recover not just the true faith, but Muslim confidence and self esteem, was to take on the West and all its works.

The struggle against terrorism in Madrid, or London, or Paris, is the same as the struggle against the terrorist acts of Hezbollah in Lebanon, or the PIJ in Palestine, or rejectionist groups in Iraq. The murder of the innocent in Beslan is part of the same ideology that takes innocent lives in Saudi Arabia, the Yemen or Libya. And when Iran gives support to such terrorism, it becomes part of the same battle, with the same ideology at its heart.

Sometimes political strategy comes deliberatively, sometimes by instinct. For this movement, it was probably by instinct. It has an ideology, a world-view, it has deep convictions and the determination of the fanatic. It resembles in many ways early revolutionary Communism. It doesn't always need structures and command centres or even explicit communication. It knows what it thinks.

Its strategy in the late 1990s became clear. If they were merely fighting with Islam, they ran the risk that fellow Muslims - being as decent and fair-minded as anyone else - would choose to reject their fanaticism. A battle about Islam was just Muslim versus Muslim. They realised they had to create a completely different battle in Muslim minds: Muslim versus Western.

That is what September 11th did. Still now, I am amazed at how many people will say, in effect, there is increased terrorism today because we invaded Afghanistan and Iraq. They seem to forget entirely that

September 11th predated either. The West didn't attack this movement. We were attacked.

The nature of the struggle

This brings me to a fundamental point. For this ideology, we are the enemy. But "we" is not the West. We are as much Muslim, as Christian, or Jew or Hindu. We are all those who believe in religious tolerance, in openness to others, in democracy, liberty and human rights administered by secular courts.

This is not a clash between civilisations: it is a clash about civilisation. It is the age-old battle between progress and reaction, between those who embrace in the modern world, and those who reject its existence; between optimism and hope on the one hand, and pessimism and fear on the other.

In any struggle, the first challenge is accurately to perceive the nature of what we are fighting. We have a long way to go.

It is almost incredible to me that so much of western opinion appears to buy the idea that the emergence of this global terrorism is somehow our fault.

For a start, the terror is truly global. It is not just directed at the United States and its allies, but also at nations who could not conceivably be said to be allies of the West.

Second, what it is doing in Iraq and Afghanistan is plainly not about those countries' liberation from US occupation. Its purpose is to prevent those countries becoming democracies - not "western style" democracies, any sort of democracy.

It is also rubbish to suggest that it is the product of poverty. Of course, it uses the cause of poverty as justification. But its fanatics are hardly the champions of economic development.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

It is they, not us, who are slaughtering the innocent, and doing it deliberately. In truth, it is they who are the only reason for the continuing presence of our troops.

Their aim is not to encourage, but to prevent Palestine living side by side with Israel. Their priority not to fight for the coming-into-being of a Palestinian State, but for the going-out-of-being of an Israeli State.

The fact is the terror is based on religious extremism. And not any religious extremism; but a specifically Muslim version. The terrorists do not want Muslim countries to modernise.

They hope that the arc of extremism that now stretches across the region, will sweep away the fledgling but faltering steps Modern Islam wants to take into the future. They want the Muslim world to retreat into governance by a semi-feudal religious oligarchy.

Yet despite all of this, which I consider virtually obvious, many in our countries listen to the propaganda of the extremists, and accept it. And to give credit where it's due, the extremists play our own media with a shrewdness that would be the envy of many a political party.

They look at the bloodshed in Iraq and say that's a reason for leaving. Every act of carnage somehow serves to indicate our responsibility for disorder, rather than the wickedness of those that caused it. Much of our opinion believes that what was done in Iraq in 2003 was so wrong that it is reluctant to accept what is plainly right now.

People believe that terrorist attacks are all because of our suppression of Muslims. People seriously believe that if we only got out of Iraq and Afghanistan, it would all stop. And, in some ways most perniciously, a large part of our opinion looks at Israel, and thinks we pay too great a price for supporting it and sympathises with Muslim opinion that condemns it. Absent from so much of the coverage is any understanding of the Israeli predicament.

If we recognised this struggle for what it truly is, we would be at least along the first steps of the path to winning it. But a vast part of western opinion is not remotely near this yet.

In the era of globalisation, the outcome of this clash between extremism and progress is utterly determinative of our future. We can no more opt out of this struggle than we can opt out of the climate changing around us.

Inaction, therefore, pushing the responsibility on to America, deluding ourselves that this terrorism is a series of individual isolated incidents rather than a global movement, is profoundly and fundamentally wrong.

That is why it is mistaken to ignore the significance of the elections in Iraq and Afghanistan. The fact is that, given the chance, the people want democracy. From the moment the Afghans came out and voted in their first ever election, the myth that democracy was a Western concept, was exploded. In Iraq too, despite violence and intimidation, people voted. Not a few, but in numbers large enough to shame many western democracies.

What these votes show is that people do not want dictatorship, neither theocratic nor secular. When the supporters of Saddam Hussein or Mullah Omar dare to stand in elections, they don't win many votes. Iraqi and Afghan Muslims have said clearly: democracy is as much our right as yours. In embracing it, they are showing that they too want a society in which people of different cultures and faith can live together in peace. This struggle is our struggle.

Who is trying to stop them? In Iraq, a mixture of foreign Jihadists, former Saddamists and rejectionist insurgents; in Afghanistan, a combination of drug barons, the Taliban and al Qaeda. Their case is that democracy is a western concept which we are forcing on an unwilling Islamic culture. Every conspiracy theory, from seizing Iraqi oil to imperial domination, is repeated. The problem we have is that a part of opinion in our own countries agrees with them.

Why are these reactionary elements fighting so hard? The answer is that they know the importance of victory or defeat in Iraq. Right from the beginning it was obvious to them. Of course, there have been mistakes made and unacceptable abuses of human rights. But here in its most pure form is a struggle between democracy and violence.

For sure, errors have been made on our side. It is arguable that de-Baathification went too quickly and was spread too indiscriminately, especially amongst the armed forces. It's easy to forget, however, that

A Global Alliance for Global Values

the real worry back in 2003 was a humanitarian crisis, which we avoided, and that the pressure being put on the coalition was all to de-Baathify faster.

But the basic problem from the murder of the United Nations staff in August 2003 onwards was simple: security. The reactionary elements were trying to de-rail both reconstruction and democracy by violence. Power and electricity became problems, not through indolence either on the part of the Iraqis or of the coalition forces, but through sabotage. People became frightened through terrorism and through criminal gangs, some deliberately released by Saddam.

These were not random acts. They were and are a strategy. When that strategy failed to push the coalition out of Iraq prematurely, when it failed to stop the voting, they turned to sectarian killing and outrage - most notably February's savage and blasphemous destruction of the Shia shrine at Samarra.

The extremists know that if they can succeed, either in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon or anywhere else wanting to go the democratic route, then the choice of a democratic future for the Arab and Muslim world is dealt a potentially mortal blow. Likewise, if these countries become democracies and make progress (and certainly in Iraq's case, prosper rapidly) then it is the most effective blow, against both their propaganda about the West and against their whole values system.

In each case, the forces of the US, the UK and many other nations are there to help the indigenous security forces grow, to support the democratic process and to provide a bulwark against the terrorism that threatens that process. In each case full UN authority is in place.

The debate over the wisdom of the original decisions, especially about Iraq, will continue. Opponents will say Iraq was never a threat; there were no weapons of mass destruction; the drug trade in Afghanistan continues. I will point out that Iraq was indeed a threat, as two regional wars, fourteen UN resolutions and the final report of the Iraq Survey Group show. I will remind people that in the aftermath of the Iraq War we secured major advances in tackling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction - not least a new relationship with Libya and the shutting down of the AQ Khan network. I will recall that it was the

Taliban who manipulated the drug trade and housed Al Qaeda and its training camps.

But whatever the conclusion to this debate, if there ever is one, the fact is that now, whatever the rights and wrongs of how and why Saddam and the Taliban were removed, there is an obvious, clear and overwhelming reason for supporting the people of those countries in their desire for democracy. Since June 2003, the multinational force has been in Iraq under a UN resolution and with the authority of Iraq's first ever elected government. In Afghanistan, the United Nations authority has been in place throughout.

The crucial point about these interventions is that they were not just about changing regimes but changing the value systems governing the nations concerned. The banner was not actually "regime change" it was "values change". That is why I have said that we have done, by intervening in this way, is more momentous than possibly we appreciated at the time.

The painful irony is that the extremists have a clearer sense of what is at stake than many people in our societies.

The choice for Iraq

Iraq is facing a crucial moment in its history: to unify and progress under its first unity government, a government fully elected by its people for the first time, or to descend into sectarian strife bringing a return to certain misery for millions. In Afghanistan the same life choice for a nation is being played out. In many other Arab and Muslim states, struggles for democracy dominate their politics.

I don't want to reopen past arguments. I want to advocate a new concord to displace the old contention. You may not agree with original decision. You may believe mistakes have been made. You may even think, how can it be worth the sacrifice? But surely we must all accept that this is a child of democracy struggling to be born – and that we, the international community, are the midwives. The war split the world. The struggle of Iraqis for democracy should unite it.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

It should be our task to empower and support those in favour of uniting Islam and democracy everywhere. We must stand up for, and not walk away from, those engaged in a life or death battle for freedom.

Shortly after Saddam fell, I met in London a woman who after years of exile - and there were 4 million such exiles - had returned to Iraq to participate in modern politics there. A couple of months later, she was assassinated, one of the first to be so. I cannot tell what she would say now. But I know it would not be: give up. She would not want her sacrifice for her beliefs to be in vain.

Two years later, the same ideology killed people on the streets of London, and for the same reason. To stop cultures, faiths and races living in harmony. To deter those who see greater openness to others as a mark of humanity's progress. To disrupt the very thing that makes London special. To undermine the progress that would in time, if allowed, set Iraq on a course of progress too.

When I last visited Iraq, to meet its newly-formed government, I came back no less daunted by the responsibility on our shoulders to help them succeed. But I did come back inspired by their determination that they do indeed succeed.

There was a moving moment when I was talking to the new Prime Minister in his office in Baghdad that he told me, with a smile, used to be the dining room of one of Saddam's sons. We were on our own with the interpreter. He leant across to me and said: "if we can change Iraq we can change this region and the world".

In every country of the region there are people, probably the majority, who are desperate for change. In Kuwait, I heard how they were planning elections for the first time with women voting. Across the Gulf states, in the steps, however difficult, Egypt is taking, in signs of change in nations as different as Jordan or Algeria, there are possibilities for progress. These are the true voices of Muslim and Arab people, more true than the voices of hate, with their poisonous propaganda that seeks to divide.

For me, a victory for the moderates means an Islam that is open: open to globalisation, open to working with others of different faiths, open to alliances with other nations.

This is ultimately a battle about modernity. Some of it can only be conducted and won within Islam itself. But let us remember that extremism is not the true voice of Islam. Millions of Muslims the world over want what we all want: to be free ourselves and for others to be free. They, like we, regard tolerance as a virtue and respect for the faith of others as a part of their own faith.

That for me is what this battle is about. It is a battle of values and of progress, and therefore it is one we must win. If we want to secure our way of life, there is no alternative but to fight for it. That means standing up for our values, not just in our own countries, but the world over. We need to construct a global alliance for these global values; and act through it. Inactivity is just as much a policy, with its own results. It's just the wrong one.

The battle for hearts and minds

Islamist extremism's whole strategy is based on a presumed sense of grievance that can motivate people to divide against each other. Our answer has to be a set of values strong enough to unite people with each other.

This is not just about security or military tactics. It is about hearts and minds, about inspiring people, persuading them, showing them what our values at their best stand for.

Just to state it in these terms, is to underline how much we have to do. Convincing our own opinion of the nature of the battle is hard enough. But we then have to empower modern, moderate, mainstream Islam to defeat reactionary Islam.

Why are we not yet succeeding? Because we are not being bold enough, consistent enough, thorough enough, in fighting for the values we believe in.

Though it is where military action has been taken that the battle is most fierce, this struggle will not be won by military victory alone. To succeed, we have to win the battle of values, as much as the battle of arms. We have to show that these are not western, still less American or Anglo-Saxon values, but values in the common ownership of humanity, universal values that should be the right of the global citizen.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

Ranged against us, there are people who truly hate us. But beyond them are many more who don't hate us, but who question our motives, our good faith, our even-handedness. These are people who could support our values, but who believe we support them selectively.

These are the people we must persuade. They have to know this is about justice and fairness as well as security and prosperity.

That is why on a whole range of critical issues, we face not just powerful questions about our national interests, but also vital tests of our commitment to global values. If we believe in justice, how can we let 30,000 children a day die preventably? If we believe in our responsibility to the generations that come after us, how can we be indifferent to the degradation of the planet? How can we have a global trading system based on unfair trade? How can we bring peace to the Middle East unless we resolve the question of Israel and Palestine?

Wherever people live in fear, with no prospect of advance, we should be on their side; in solidarity with them, whether in Sudan, Zimbabwe, Burma, North Korea; and where countries, and there are many in the Middle East today, are in the process of democratic development, we should extend a helping hand.

This requires, across the board, an active foreign policy of engagement not isolation. It cannot be achieved without a strong alliance. This alliance does not end with America, but it does begin with America. For us in Europe and for others around the world, this alliance is central.

Let me be quite plain here. I do not always agree with the US. Sometimes they can be difficult friends to have. But the strain of, frankly, anti-American feeling in parts of European politics is madness when set against the long-term interests of the world we believe in.

The danger with America today is not that they are too much involved. The danger is if they decide to pull up the drawbridge and disengage. We need them involved. We want them engaged. The reality is that none of the problems that press in on us can be resolved or even contemplated without them.

An agenda which goes beyond security

Our task is to ensure, with America, that we do not limit the agenda to security. A great danger is that global politics divides into "hard" and "soft": the "hard" get after the terrorists; the "soft" campaign against poverty. That divide is dangerous because interdependence makes all these issues just that: interdependent. The answer to terrorism is the universal application of global values. The answer to poverty is the same. That is why the struggle for global values has to be applied not selectively, but to the whole global agenda.

Another danger is that after the Cold War, we go back to a world based on spheres of influence. Think ahead. Think China, within 20 or 30 years surely the world's other superpower. Think Russia and its precious energy reserves. Think India. I believe all of these great emerging powers want a benign relationship with the West. But I also believe that the stronger and more appealing our world-view is, the more it is recognised to be based not just on power but on justice, the easier it will be for us to shape the future in which Europe and the US will no longer, economically or politically, be transcendent.

As for isolationism, a perennial risk in US and EU policy, my point is very simple: global terrorism means we can't opt out even if we wanted to. The world is interdependent. To be engaged is only modern realpolitik.

So my point is this: we must be bold enough, consistent enough and thorough enough, in fighting for the values we believe in. If our security lies in our values, and our values are about justice and fairness as well as freedom from fear, then our agenda must be more than security.

Development and Africa

In forging a global alliance around a shared agenda, the first task is to focus the world's attention. Before Britain's G8 Presidency in 2005, the issues of Africa and climate change were not high up the political agenda in the UK, let alone internationally. Now they are. This is in no small part down to the efforts of millions of people mobilised by the Make Poverty History campaign and Live 8, which played an extraordinary part in mobilising civic society. But just because the

A Global Alliance for Global Values

issues are at the top of the agenda now, doesn't mean that they can't easily slip down again.

We must ensure that they don't. We must continue to mobilise the resources and will to turn the commitments of 2005 into action to combat the ravages of conflict, famine and disease, particularly in Africa.

We achieved at the Gleneagles G8 Summit last year more than most people thought possible. Kofi Annan called it the greatest summit for Africa ever. We agreed to double aid for Africa and increase total aid for all developing countries by \$50 billion a year, up from \$80 billion in 2004 to \$130 billion by 2010. In 2005 aid was increased to over \$105 billion, over halfway to the 2010 target. In Britain we have increased aid by 140% in real terms since 1997.

The G8 agreed to cancel 100% of the multilateral debts of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC). This could amount to a total of \$50 billion of relief. 14 African countries have already benefited from cancellation of their debts to the IMF. A further 18 African countries could benefit once they qualify under the HIPC initiative, which is to ensure that the resources released by debt relief go to the benefit of the poor. Zambia for example has already used the resources released from this debt relief to make healthcare free for all people in rural areas. On Africa I have learnt two key lessons in the last ten years - in Sierra Leone, in Rwanda, in Ethiopia, and now in Sudan. Firstly, that everything is connected so there is no single solution. There is no point in providing healthcare if there is no clean water. People with an education also want skilled jobs. There is no point in having resources like oil if it only fuels corruption, so we need a comprehensive approach.

Secondly, if people are given the chance of improving their future, in no matter how small a way, they take it every time. So the process of change in Africa has to be a partnership, a deal between developed countries and African governments, not simply something handed down from the wealthy world to the poorer world.

I have seen that if there is real commitment by African governments to progress, then their people are well capable of doing the rest. Which is why, no matter how desperate the situation looks, or how insurmountable the obstacles appear, we have to maintain the

optimistic belief that hope is indeed possible. That is why we established the Commission for Africa, which published its report, 'Our Common Interest', in March 2005. At Gleneagles three months later, the G8 agreed with African leaders to implement over 50 of the detailed recommendations of the Commission. As well as agreeing to cancel debts and double aid for Africa, there were commitments on peacekeeping, on AIDS treatment, on free healthcare and primary education, on improving infrastructure and encouraging investment.

The increased resources agreed at the G8 should help us invest, above all, in better healthcare and education for poor people in developing countries and to achieve the Millennium Development Goals to get all kids into primary school, to cut infant and maternal mortality rates and to tackle infectious diseases. Again there has been progress, but we need to go further. The polio eradication initiative is on track to end polio transmission in all countries, except Nigeria, by the end of 2006, though extra international funding is still needed to eradicate polio fully.

Innovative financing mechanisms can ensure that aid is increased as quickly as possible. For example, the International Finance Facility for immunisation is going to frontload some \$4billion of aid to help save somewhere in the region of 5 million children's lives before 2015. The first bonds are on sale this year. Solidarity contributions on airline tickets are another innovative way to help deliver more aid. The UK already has an air passenger duty, and with France in particular we are developing an international drug purchase facility designed to lower the costs and improve the availability of drugs for HIV and AIDS and malaria.

It is 25 years since AIDS was discovered. For the first time we have in place the means to begin to reverse the AIDS epidemic. Eight times as many Africans are on treatment now as three years ago, but still only one in five who need it get it. The G8 agreed that we should aim to provide universal treatment for all AIDS sufferers by 2010. The UN has now agreed that every developing country should produce a plan for delivering on this promise, and that no plan that meets the criteria of the UN should go unfunded.

Corruption sometimes sounds peripheral to the central task facing us in Africa. But I have met people from African countries who tell me that action on corruption is the single most important thing that we can do for them.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

Another particular priority is peace and security. Over 20,000 peace keeping troops have been trained since the 2004 G8 pledge to train 75,000 by 2010. We have been training, for example, Rwandan troops in Kenya who are now protecting refugees in Darfur. I learnt about this from the time in the year 2000 in Sierra Leone where we sent - the UK - a relatively small force to Sierra Leone to help end the civil war. I have always, since that time, been sure that if Africa had its own ability to respond rapidly to the conflicts as they broke out, then many of the long protracted conflicts we have seen on the continent could be avoided.

Poverty is a killer, and famine is a killer, but so is conflict. And conflict is what often contributes to the famine and to the spread of disease. It prevents countries settling down, it prevents them having any prospect of getting inward investment, it prevents the people of enterprise in the country having the possibility of moving forward.

The African Union has established the doctrine of what they call “non-indifference”, which I think is a very good way of putting it. They have now established a standby force to do this, and we will help it achieve full capability by 2010. To emphasise why this is so important, in the Sudan at the present time we have an African Union force. But let us be very clear, if we had had a really good standby force capability when things first began to go wrong in Sudan, the situation would be very different today. If we want any reason why an African Union standby force is critical, not peripheral, in dealing with the issues of Africa, we need to look no further than the Sudan.

Climate change

The next issue on which the whole world needs to focus is the threat of climate change, now made all the more acute by anxiety over energy supply.

Firstly, we need to build a global consensus about the scale of the action we need to take. In the end, there will be no forgiving of any of us if we do not pay attention to the degrading and polluting of our planet.

Secondly, there will be no agreement worth having that does not involve the US, China and India as well as the rest of us. I have always

tried to ensure that Britain gives leadership on climate change, but I know that Britain will account for only 2% of the emissions that harm our world. Unless we are able to gain a partnership that involves China, and India and America and the major developing countries, then we are never going to be able to deal with this problem.

We need a framework that the major players buy into, and has at the heart of that framework a goal to stabilise temperature and greenhouse gas concentrations. There will be no resolution without a clear, disciplined framework for action, with measurable outcomes.

I happen to believe in clear targets because I have seen them work. The best example is the EU Emissions Trading Scheme that has already been shown to be an incredibly powerful incentive for private sector action, involving around 12,000 installations across 25 countries, and a market that is estimated to be now worth 5.4 billion euros.

I also believe a clear goal and a strong framework would help spur the technology revolution we need. It is vital to give business the certainty it needs to invest in cleaner technology and reduce emissions so that they can produce the clean products consumers want to buy.

The investment decisions that are being made now, both within Europe and across the world, will determine what happens to global emissions in the next 15 - 20 years. But we need to go further.

That is why, within the European Union I believe we need to give a clear strong signal to business that this emissions trading scheme should be extended and strengthened after 2012 and made the heart of a global carbon market.

That also is how we get a sensible, balanced but effective framework to tackle climate change after the Kyoto Protocol expires in 2012 must be an American priority too. America wants a low-carbon economy; it is investing heavily in clean technology; it needs China and India to grow substantially. The world is ready for a new start. America can help lead it.

We all need more investment in research into cleaner technology to bring that technology from design to manufacture, and to enable it to be used by households in both developed and developing countries.

A Global Alliance for Global Values

We are taking real action to reduce UK domestic emissions. The UK has already reached its target under the Kyoto Protocol, 7 years ahead of schedule. We will be actually doubling our Kyoto targets by 2012 - a track record very few can better. But there is also a more ambitious 20% target on CO₂ emissions. We are getting closer, but we are not there yet. Our Energy Review has set out a path for us to get within reach.

We need also to recognise, however, that taking action on climate change is not just a matter for governments. Yes, government needs to give a lead, but ultimately one of the things government must do is to make it easier for each one of us to act in our daily lives, in the choices we make, whether it is in the energy we use at home or how we move around, we can each also make a contribution towards tackling this global challenge.

Finally, we need to accelerate discussions. We can't take the five years it took to negotiate Kyoto.

Trade and migration

In the immediate term, we are confronted with the World Trade Round. Whatever its difficulties, we must not give up on it. Again, the issue is: open or closed. People in our countries look at the rise of China, the emergence of India; they see the competition; fear the loss of jobs and push back.

Everywhere you look today, the tide of protectionist sentiment is flowing. In this WTO trade round, we still have the opportunity to make it ebb.

At stake, obviously, is our commitment on world poverty and development. But also in the balance, is the very idea of multilateral action to achieve common goals. If we can't put a decent trade round in place, when it is so plain that our long-term national interests and the wider interests of the world demand it, this will be a failure with multiple consequences, all of them adverse.

Europe's agricultural protection is a policy born of another age and it is time to end it. But change in Europe alone is not the answer. America must open up. Japan, too. In non-agricultural market access we look to

leadership from Brazil and India. And we must agree a development package for the poorest that includes 100% market access and aid for trade.

This is a cause of prosperity - because we all benefit from open markets; of justice, because the poorest nations need to be able to stand on their own two feet and trade in our markets; and of self-interest, because if we want to build the right relationship with China, the sensible thing is to bind them into the world economy, not put them in opposition to it.

Finally, today's world is a world on the move. Immigration is the toughest political issue in Europe and the USA right now. People get scared of it for understandable reasons. It needs to be controlled. There have to be rules. But, properly managed, immigrants give a country dynamism, drive, new ideas as well as new blood.

We need rules to ensure migration is fair. But mature nations are those which have overcome the fear that different ethnic groups damage our identity or put our cohesion at risk. Today we take pride in our diversity. We know tolerance, respect for others, and a basic way of life founded on democratic freedoms are held in common by the vast majority of our people, whatever their race or creed.

Ambitious goals

I am under no illusions at all that we set very, very ambitious goals at Gleneagles. We have made good progress but it is going to take an enormous amount of work in the years to come to eliminate poverty in Africa and tackle climate change. However, the fact is we have a framework in which these things can now be done. The truth is that the Commission for Africa and the Gleneagles Summit gave us the commitments that are necessary for the years to come. We have to deliver on those commitments, but no-one seriously disputes the analysis, no-one seriously disputes the scale of the challenge, and actually no-one really disputed the scale of the commitments at the time they were given. But we have to make sure that they are now implemented and carried through.

On both Africa and climate change, our generation has the possibility of making a real difference. Whether we do so or not depends of course on the programmes we put in place, but it also depends on something else. That is our acceptance that a different type of foreign policy is needed today. Engagement and preparedness to intervene is the only sensible approach. The reasons are everywhere the same. If one part of the world has a problem, the rest of the world has too. These problems can only be tackled collectively, they cannot be tackled individually. So the best form of foreign policy is a strong, multilateral intervention.

Relentless efforts for Middle East peace

Most of all, we need to re-energise the Middle East Peace Process between Israel and Palestine – and we need to do it in a dramatic and profound manner.

Its significance for the broader issue of the Middle East and for the battle within Islam, goes beyond correcting the plight of the Palestinians. A settlement would be the living, visible proof that the region and the world can accommodate different faiths and cultures. It would be a total and complete rejection of the case of Reactionary Islam. It would destroy not just their most effective rallying call, but fatally undermine their basic ideology.

We must therefore redouble our efforts to find a way to the only solution that works: a secure state of Israel and a viable, independent Palestinian state.

Moreover, we need a concerted strategy across the whole Middle East. For example, I don't believe we will be secure unless Iran changes. I emphasise I am not saying we should impose change. I am saying that the freedom and democracy which I have no doubt most Iranians want, is something we need. There is a choice being played out in the region: to be partners with the wider world; or to be defined in opposition to it. If Iran leads the latter camp, the results will be felt by us all.

But - and it is a big 'but' - this progress will not happen unless we change radically our degree of focus, effort and engagement, especially with the Palestinian side. In this the active leadership of the US is

essential but so also is the participation of Europe, of Russia and of the UN.

We need relentlessly, vigorously, to put a viable Palestinian Government on its feet, to offer a vision of how the Roadmap to final status negotiation can happen and then pursue it, week in, week out, until it is done. Nothing else will do. Nothing else is more important to the success of our foreign policy. But it will not happen unless in each individual part the necessary energy and commitment is displayed not fitfully, but continuously. For my part, I have committed to making this an absolute priority for the rest of my time in office.

International institutions fit for this task

This is a big agenda. The challenges affect us all. They can only be effectively tackled together. It means action on all fronts. And they require a pre-emptive and not simply a reactive response.

Here is where it becomes very difficult. A few decades ago, we could act when we knew. Now, we have to act on the basis of precaution. We have to act, not react. We have to do so on the basis of prediction, not certainty. Circumstances will often require intervention, usually far beyond our own borders. To address such an agenda effectively, we must do so collectively, on the basis of shared values.

Increasingly, there is a mismatch between the global challenges we face and the global institutions we have to confront them. After the Second World War, people realised we needed a new international institutional architecture. Today I look at our international institutions and think: these are the structures of 1946 trying to meet the challenges of 2006. In this new era, in the early 21st century, we need to renew them. I have therefore made some tentative suggestions for change.

First, the United Nations. Kofi Annan has done an extraordinary job as Secretary General. He has proposed reforms that should certainly be done. But we should go further. A Security Council which has France as a permanent member but not Germany, Britain but not Japan or Brazil, China but not India, to say nothing of the absence of proper representation from Latin America or Africa, cannot be legitimate in the

A Global Alliance for Global Values

modern world. I used to think this problem was intractable. The competing interests are so strong. But I am now sure we need reform. If necessary let us agree an interim change that can be a bridge to a future settlement. But we need to get it done.

Furthermore, we should give the Secretary General new powers: over appointments in the Secretariat; over how the resources of the UN are spent; the right to propose action to the Security Council for the resolution of long-standing disputes. We should streamline humanitarian and development operations. There is a case for establishing one humanitarian agency to ensure better prediction of an impending crisis, swifter action to remedy it, and better co-ordination of short-term relief with longer-term development.

Second, the World Bank and IMF. These institutions together play an important role in global stability and prosperity. There is a case, as has been argued before, for merger. But in any event, there is certainly a powerful case for reform.

Third, there is a strong argument for establishing a multilateral system for "safe enrichment" for nuclear energy. The IAEA would oversee an international bank of uranium to ensure a reliable fuel supply for countries utilising nuclear power without the need for everyone to own their own fuel cycle.

Fourth, the G8 now regularly meets as the G8+5. That should be the norm.

Finally, we need a UN Environment Organisation, commensurate with the importance the issue now has on the international agenda.

I do not, for a second, under-estimate the task of achieving these changes. But I am sure it is time to make them.

What is the obstacle? It is that in creating more effective multilateral institutions, individual nations yield up some of their own independence. This is a hard thing to swallow. Let me be blunt. Powerful nations want more effective multilateral institutions - when they think those institutions will do their will. What they fear is effective multilateral institutions that do their own will.

But the danger of leaving things as they are, is ad hoc coalitions for action that stir massive controversy about legitimacy; or paralysis in the face of crisis.

No amount of institutional change will ever work unless the most powerful make it work. The EU doesn't move forward unless its leading countries agree. That is the reality of power: size; economic, military, political weight.

But if there is a common basis for working - agreed aims and purposes - then no matter how powerful, countries gain from being able to subcontract problems that on their own they cannot solve. Their national self-interest becomes delivered through effective communal action.

Conclusion

In my nine years as Prime Minister I have not become more cynical about idealism. I have simply become more persuaded that the distinction between a foreign policy driven by values and one driven by interests, is wrong. Globalisation begets interdependence. Interdependence begets the necessity of a common value system to make it work. Idealism becomes realpolitik.

None of that will eliminate the setbacks, short fallings, inconsistencies and hypocrisies that come with practical decision-making in a harsh world. But it does mean that the best of the human spirit which, throughout the ages, has pushed the progress of humanity along, is also the best hope for the world's future.

That is why I say this struggle is one about values. Our values are our guide. Our values are worth struggling for. They represent humanity's progress throughout the ages. At each point we have had to fight for them and defend them. As a new age beckons, it is time to fight for them again.

Today, after all the turmoil and disagreement of the past few years, there is a real opportunity to bring us together. We must be prepared to think sooner and act quicker in defence of our values - what I call progressive pre-emption. There is an agenda for it, waiting to be gathered and capable of uniting a world once divided.

This is the moment for reconciliation in the international community around this agenda. It needs passion as well as policy. We are engaged in a struggle which will determine our collective future. **It is one which, together, we can and must win.**

About the Foreign Policy Centre

The Foreign Policy Centre is a leading European think tank launched under the patronage of the British Prime Minister Tony Blair to develop a vision of a fair and rule-based world order. We develop and disseminate innovative policy ideas which promote:

- Effective multilateral solutions to global problems
- Democratic and well-governed states as the foundation of order and development
- Partnerships with the private sector to deliver public goods
- Support for progressive policy through effective public diplomacy
- Inclusive definitions of citizenship to underpin internationalist policies.

The Foreign Policy Centre has produced a range of seminal publications by key thinkers on subjects ranging from the future of Europe and international security to identity and the role of non-state actors in policymaking. They include *After Multiculturalism* by Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, *The Post-Modern State and the World Order* by Robert Cooper, *Network Europe* and *Public Diplomacy* by Mark Leonard, *The Beijing Consensus* by Joshua Cooper Ramo, *Trading Identities* by Wally Olins and *Pre-empting Nuclear Terrorism* by Amitai Etzioni.

The Centre runs a rich and varied events programme which allows people from business, government, NGOs, think-tanks, lobby groups and academia to interact with speakers who include Prime Ministers, Presidents, Nobel Prize laureates, global corporate leaders, activists, media executives and cultural entrepreneurs from around the world. For more information, please visit www.fpc.org.uk

Our best minds in your best interest.

As a leading global communication consultancy, APCO helps clients define success, as well as develop and implement a strategy to achieve that success. Our clients' goals become ours – allowing them to succeed in ways they didn't think possible.

Contact us to put our best minds to work for you.

Margery Kraus, President and CEO
APCO Worldwide
tel: +1 202 778 1010
fax: +1 202 466 6002
mkraus@apcoworldwide.com

Brad Staples, CEO
Europe, Middle East and Africa
tel: +32 2 645 9811
fax: +32 2 645 9812
bstaples@apco-europe.com

PR Week 2006
PR Agency
of the
Year

Antitrust & Competition
Coalition Building
Corporate Social Responsibility
Crisis Management
Government Relations
Internal Communication
Investor Relations
Issue Management
Litigation Communication
Market Entry
Media Relations
Mergers & Acquisitions
Online Communication
Opinion Research
Positioning

APCO
worldwide®



The appalling conflict in the Middle East this summer has served to remind the world of the great challenges that remain to deliver peace and security. To succeed, Tony Blair argues that a complete renaissance of our strategy is needed. While military force must inevitably be part of the war on terror, the struggle is fundamentally a battle of ideas. The challenge for all moderate leaders and communities, not just those in the West, is to tackle the forces of extremism head on.

The publication of this pamphlet comes just after the 5th anniversary of 9/11, which changed the global landscape in ways we are still trying to comprehend. As Tony Blair says in his introduction, this is a conflict of a “completely unconventional kind”, and it can’t be won in a conventional way.

With powerful insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq, and home-grown suicide bombers in Britain, many say we are not succeeding. This pamphlet argues that we need to be bolder, and also more consistent in the values we fight for. As Stephen Twigg says in his preface, we need an agenda that can reunite the progressive coalition that supported intervention in Kosovo and Sierra Leone, but was in disagreement over Iraq.

A crucial part of that agenda will be a renewed focus on bringing peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. Everything possible must be done to reenergise the Middle East Peace Process, to deliver a lasting settlement of a conflict that casts a shadow over the region and of the whole world.

Tony Blair tackles the critics of his foreign policy of engagement, arguing that the ‘doctrine of benign inactivity’ is a folly. The forces of extremism will not simply fade away. Instead we must fight for the values which can unite the whole world: liberty, democracy, justice and tolerance.

In the era of globalisation, the outcome of this clash between extremism and progress will determine our collective future.

£12.95

ISBN-13: 978-1-905833-06-1
ISBN-10: 1-905833-06-7