



U.S. DEPARTMENT of STATE

SEARCH

[Subject Index](#)[Home](#)[Issues & Press](#)[Travel & Business](#)[Countries](#)[Youth & Education](#)[Careers](#)[About State](#)[Foreign Press Centers](#) > [Briefings](#) > [-- By Date](#) > [2008 Foreign Press Center Briefings](#) > [September](#)

International Partners and the War on Terrorism 2008

Ambassador at Large Dell L. Dailey, U.S. Department of State's Coordinator for Counterterrorism

Foreign Press Center Roundtable Briefing

Washington, DC

September 10, 2008

9:30 A.M. EDT

MODERATOR: We appreciate Ambassador Dailey making some time today. This is on the record. We will also have some comments and then we will ask you, when you ask a question, to say your name and media organization. Let's try to keep the questions brief, one question. Don't make them a four-part question, please, because we'd like to get to everyone. Everyone get a chance.

Ambassador Dailey, thank you.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay. Thanks for the opportunity to come here and speak to the Foreign Press Center and key correspondents on an international basis. I'm here with my deputy, Mr. Ron Schlicher, a recent graduate of Cyprus as the Chief Mission Ambassador, and also Rhonda Shore, our Public Affairs Officer inside my office, which is the Counterterrorism Office for Secretary Rice.



I have a short pitch here I'd like to give and to kind of set the tone of some – of things that are taking place recently. It's about three or four minutes. And then I'm prepared to field any questions that you have.

Seven years ago, on the 11th of September 2001, terrorists attacked the United States and the global community of nations. The victims of September 11 were citizens of more than 90 countries and adherents of many faiths, including Christianity, Judaism, and Islam.

Terrorism affects all of us. We have seen scores of civilians murdered on commuter trains in London and Madrid, on a ferry in the Philippines, and still more in Algiers, Casablanca, in Saudi apartment complexes, Sinai resorts, Uzbek cities,

Jordanian, and Indonesian hotels. We honor the victims of the families of 9/11 and of all the terrorist attacks around the world. They have shown the world their courage and dignity. Many turned grief into action and worked to establish scholarships and foundations in memory of their loved ones.

Since this tragic day, people worldwide have rallied around the fundamental principle that no cause can justify or excuse the murder of innocent people. The fight against terrorism is a fight against and for value -- and principles that are universal. Much more unites us as citizens around the world than divides us. Across all boundaries, we share a common humanity.

There have been positive developments in the counterterrorism world. In the last several years, we've been working with our partners on a regional strategy to disaggregate terrorist networks, eliminate terror safe havens, and disrupt terrorist links, including financial, travel, communications, and intelligence. And we're seeing results. For example, new legislation: in the last seven years, scores of countries around the world have introduced or upgraded counterterrorism legislation. Many countries have now passed anti-money laundering and counterterrorism finance legislation making it even more difficult for terrorists to operate.

For example, the 27 members of the EU all have financial intelligence units, acronym FIUs. All are members of the Financial Action Task Force, FATA, or the FATA-recognized regional affiliate, and all are members of the Egmont Group. Document security and securing borders has also been very progressive and successful; that's occurred in the borders and transportation, in document security, law enforcement capabilities, and restricting the international movement of terrorists.

In the area of capacity building, some of our partners have the political will but lack the capabilities to amount effective counterterrorism efforts. The State Department's Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program -- acronym ATA -- provides partner countries with training, equipment, and technology. Since the inception, we've trained over 6,000 individuals in 150 countries.

Foreign assistance is another vital component of our efforts. It addresses conditions that terrorists exploit for recruitment and ideological purposes. And there are the U.S. Government's assistance programs administered through the USAID Middle East Partnership Initiative -- acronym MEPI -- and the Millennium Challenge, MCC.

These programs increase across and increase access to education, improved health care, and focus on democratic and economic reform. For example, the United States is partnered with governments, NGOs, and local communities around the world to rebuild schools, and create education programs that reach marginalized children: girls, ethnic minorities, and children affected by HIV/AIDs, wars, and other catastrophes throughout the Middle East and South Asia. In Afghanistan, we built or repaired over 600 schools around the country since 2001. Enrollment has skyrocketed from 900,000 to 5 million.

According to the PEW polls, support for al-Qaida has been dropping throughout the Muslim world in recent years. The numbers of people who support suicide bombing in countries, ranging from Indonesia, Lebanon, and Bangladesh, for example, have dropped by half or more in the past five years.

In Saudi Arabia, only 10 percent now have a favorable view of al-Qaida. This was taken during the December poll by Terror Free Tomorrow. Following a wave of suicide attacks in Pakistan last year, support for suicide operations among Pakistanis has dropped to 9 percent. It was 35 percent five years ago, while favorable views of bin Laden in the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan, around where he's believed to be hiding, have plummeted to 4 percent since it was 70 percent in August of 2007.

In places where al-Qaida has gained control over a threatened civilian population, it has quickly worn out its welcome. We have seen this in al-Anbar, across Iraq, in Algeria where tens of thousands have protested al-Qaida's violence, most recently in Pakistan where polls increasingly show the Pakistanis are losing patience with al-Qaida.

We cannot be complacent, though. Core elements of al-Qaida are adaptable and resilient. By making use of local cells, terrorists have sidestepped many of our border and transportation security measures. Last year, we saw terrorist attacks in Algeria, India, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Yemen.

We are engaged with a decentralized enemy that has a highly professional and sophisticated propaganda machine able to exploit electronic data through the internet. The international community, the governments and international organizations, politicians, academics, religious and community leaders, in general, need to do better in disrupting terrorist propaganda and its misinformation. We can destroy terrorist leadership, disrupt terrorist networks, and eliminate terrorist safe havens, but unless we prevent terrorists from recruiting new members, locally and expanding its reach globally, we will not be truly successful.

Counter-radicalization is a key policy for the United States. I'd like to say not just counter-radicalization, but also anti-radicalization, which is a precursor. Evidence shows that terrorists manipulate grievances, whether real or perceived, to subvert legitimate authority and create unrest. This process is similar to a conveyor belt in which terrorist groups convert alienated or aggrieved populations to extremist viewpoints and turn them by stages into sympathizers, supporters, and ultimately, full-fledged members.

In conclusion, I'm prepared to take questions, but I'd like to summarize. We can marginalize violent extremists by addressing people's needs and grievances, by giving people a stake in their own future, and providing alternatives, both physical and ideological, to what the terrorists offer. Over time, our global and regional cooperative efforts will reduce the terrorists' capacity to harm us and our partners, while local security and development assistance will build our partners' capability.

If we're going to be successful, we must work together toward a common goal in a strategic, coordinated and international manner. Our vision will win in the long run because time is on our side.

Thanks for this opportunity to give this portion, and I'm more than prepared to field your questions. Please. Who's the first one? Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Andrei Sitov, *ITAR-TASS* from Russia. How important is cooperation with Russia for you? What are your priorities? That's the overall question. What are your priorities? The working group that (inaudible) is the business of government (inaudible) and counterterrorism together (inaudible)?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: We had a counterterrorism working group session with the Russian Federation, Russian Government, I'd say about two months ago. It was very successful. We talked about bioterrorism; radicalization; movement of foreign fighters into Iraq, into other troubled areas; information and intelligence sharing. And it was productive.

And in our eyes, counterterrorism is a common problem for a lot of nations, and as a result, we stay in our focused counterterrorism environment and work towards those goals. And we think we've been pretty successful, not just with Russia, but we've had a recent one, a bilateral meeting in India, in Pakistan, in China, and we have these with a total of ten important countries that deal with us in counterterrorism.

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: [Bhagyashr Garekar, *The Straits Times*] What are your current concerns about terrorism in Southeast Asia? Could you give us a snapshot?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Our biggest concern is JI, affiliated with al-Qaida. It's got a trans-regional perspective. Several folks are incarcerated that have shown in that organization terrorist tendencies. It has been part of the fuel in the Philippines. There have been some success -- early success, with the detainment of Hambali.

The Southeast Asian countries really look at terrorism far more aggressively than I understood it before I moved in this position, and far more favorably as I have studied more about it. They look not just at the building capacity to go after terrorists, but they also do good, excellent work in intelligence sharing and information sharing, not just bilaterally between them and maybe the United States, but also inside their own government amongst stove-piped agencies.

But most importantly, they share across the border regionally. Because I think we all understand terrorists may be active in Malaysia and just scoot right across the border into another country. Of course, Malaysia's authority stops, sovereignty stops, but it starts with Indonesia. And so there needs to be a cross-border, trans-regional relationship, and Southeast Asia is successful at that.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: [Julio Marenco, *La Prensa Grafica*] Yes, (Inaudible) of Latin America. I have two questions, one regarding to FARC. How do you assess the threat of FARC, if it's still a threat for the hemisphere? And the second is related to Mexico and the link between narcotics commerce and terrorism.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Let me take the FARC. You know, we kind of view the FARC now as pretty disrupted, very damaged, not totally destroyed. I mean, its leaders are dying or getting captured with some regularity. I'll give you an example. The very, very successful activities of President Uribe with his democratic security program has been a model program for other countries to use because he goes across support from the United States, internal action on his part by his military and law enforcement, judicial activity, hearts and minds through health, education and welfare. So President Uribe has done a magnificent job in the counterterrorism world.

The best example of his success is that the FARC was about 18,000 people, I believe, in 2002, and now, it's somewhere between 7,000 and 8,000 with the returnees being -- going through a rehabilitation program -- there's a different word for it, I'm not sure what it is -- used in Colombia.

QUESTION: Reinsertion?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Pardon me?

QUESTION: Reinsertion, I believe.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: It could be reinsertion, yeah, where they embrace the folks, help them psychologically, financially, education-wise, and then reinsert them back into the society. This is a model program. He has external support, internal support, support of the people, and has been pretty darn successful.

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: [Salmy Hashim-Gheblawi, *Bernama*] What is the future of Guantanamo Bay as you – as the Bush Administration winds down, you know, (inaudible) Administration at the end of the year? And what's the state of the two Malaysian terrorists?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: The U.S. Government's official position is to eventually move away from the Guantanamo Bay detention facility by not having any more detainees in it through sending them back to their host nation with assurances that the host nation will do appropriate diligence in protecting them and integrating them. If we are uncomfortable with that, or if the host nation is a country that we don't deal with for whatever reason, then we look at a third-party nation to take them. We are interested in moving Guantanamo Bay out of the U.S. history books as a place that has probably not served us as well as we want.

I cannot answer specifically on the two Malaysian individuals, other than inside that parameter.

QUESTION: How many are left now in Guantanamo?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: I think between 350 and 400, something like that.

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: [Joyce Karam, *Al Hayaf*] Thanks, Ambassador Dailey, for doing this. I wanted to ask you about the Hezbollah threat. How do you assess it today? And there was a story on the wires yesterday that Israeli forces are warning members of the army that are traveling outside (inaudible) from Hezbollah improvising (inaudible) information and other information on the internet. If you can talk just a little bit on how do you pursue these threats or how the Hezbollah threat may be in the U.S.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: I think there's still a threat that exists around the world as a result of Hezbollah, a foreign terrorist organization. The death of Mughniyeh has still been unavenged, so it's prudent for all nations that -- to take the appropriate steps to be aware, to be alert, to avoid activities with Hezbollah or potential Hezbollah organizations. You can see how that has over -- in the past, caused death and destruction. I'm not completely sure what the Israelis are issuing. I suspect it's prudent -- notices to travelers to be careful where they go and whatnot. Is that basically it?

QUESTION: The members of the army that are out of Israel and --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Ah, okay.

QUESTION: -- are basically using the internet, maybe Facebook in terms of that (inaudible) what information --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yeah. I can't comment on their skill of using the internet to communicate with their folks that are traveling around the world or whatnot. But it is prudent indication not just to Israelis, but I think whoever killed Mughniyeh is still to be determined. It could be Syrians. It could be factions inside Lebanon. So, you know, I guess in the scheme of things, all folks are vulnerable to a possible collateral damage if someone goes after Mughniyeh -- yes, ma'am -- Mughniyeh's killers.

QUESTION: You want to say something?

QUESTION: Deniz Arslan, Turkey, *Anatolia News Agency*. Ambassador, could you update us on Turkish-American cooperation against PKK? Also, secondly, Turkey's counterterrorism involves – includes only Turkey citizens. So does it make difficult to cooperate – cooperate against international terrorism?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: It doesn't make it difficult to cooperate with Turkey on international terrorism, because we cooperate in so many other areas and it's a good relationship. There are stalwarts there in that portion of the world and so there's absolutely no difficulty in cooperation, good intelligence sharing back and forth. So let's not be confused with the potential for difficulty. There's not. We would like to see their counterterrorism laws be more robust. Yeah, and we've expressed that in a couple forums.

I think, if I have my facts correct, their counterterrorism laws are primarily focused against the country of Turkey. And if you do a counterterrorism event in another location that is currently identified by EU or UN as a counterterrorism violation or whatnot, they're not as interested in those folks as the terrorism against the country of Turkey. That's probably a layman's interpretation of the quandary we've got. We'd like the Turkish laws to be able to go after terrorism in a global perspective, those people coming through their country or whatnot, that the Turks can detain them and pick them up. That's a world for lawyers and whatnot to try and hammer out and solicit Turkish support in robust counterterrorism laws.

Here's a challenge in the counterterrorism business. This does not pertain to Turkey, but it is – does pertain to other countries. If you look at terrorism just as criminality, then you inadvertently underscore – or in a U.S. expression, lowball what's really taking place, because a terrorist is driven ideologically: a suicide bombing and murdering innocent people. But in criminality, it's just to get money. There's no ideological connection. So if your laws just go after criminality, and not at the higher level of ideologically driven terrorists, when you do have a capture of an individual, you don't have the tools to put him or them into jail. So that's why we stress in the United States the importance of – in implementing counterterrorism legislation to allow you to go to that unique driven ideological murderer that doesn't exist inside criminal laws.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Yes. Samir --

QUESTION: I didn't get an answer for my second --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yeah, and let's go back and get that later on, because when you ask me more than one question, I get so hyped up in that one question, I forget the second one. (Laughter.)

So go ahead.

QUESTION: Samir Nader from *Radio Sawa*. I'm sure now that as coordinator for fighting terrorism and after almost eight months of -- on the killing of Mughniyeh, you should have an idea about who was behind killing him. I mean, you may not wish to tell us, but can you give us a hint or something?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yes, I have an idea. (Laughter.) But I can't give a hint. I'm sorry.

QUESTION: All right.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay.

QUESTION: Well, can I have one more question?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: No, no, no. Everybody gets a chance.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Mr. Ambassador, my -- Talha Gibriel from *Asharq Al-Awsat*. You mentioned that Osama bin Laden is hiding in northwest Pakistan. There is a report today on the media that he has been -- died or dead already. So could you please update us about exactly -- Osama bin Laden, what is the situation now?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: I suspect he is still alive. I think he is being driven into almost total isolation by the Pakistan Government, its activities, both militarily and non-militarily, by the U.S. Government, by its activation of the international community to freeze assets and to prevent travel done with the international community. I don't know what newspaper you're looking at. I did a real quick --

QUESTION: Something on the -- in *the Washington Post*.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yeah, I did a real quick look at *The Washington Post* as I raced over here this morning. I didn't notice that bin Laden had been killed. I have not received it in official channels yet. I don't want to be sarcastic with you, but I suspect that might be faulty.

But back to his effectiveness: He has -- his effectiveness has dramatically reduced. He just can't command or control couriers, messages, third parties. All that really affects what he can get done, as evidenced by nothing being done significantly for years. Now are we slow in killing him, detaining him, or capturing him? We're not as fast as we'd like to be. But we got Manuel Noriega. We got Abu Abbas, who led the PLO in the 1980s. We'll get bin Laden.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Jose Katigbak, the *Philippine Star*. In terms of cooperation, ability, willingness, how would you rate the Filipino army's fight against terrorism in the -- now? And how would you grade the U.S. efforts to supply, train the Filipinos?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay. Is General Bias (ph) still in the Philippine military?

MR. SCHLICHER: As far as I understand.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay. Now he and I happen to be West Point classmates. We're both class of '71. So you probably will not get a completely balanced picture because we're friends.

QUESTION: Try.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yeah, okay, I'll try. I think that the Philippine Government and its relation with the United States Government's bilateral efforts in Mindanao along with Jolo and the islands that are out there -- been very, very successful. They have asked, by virtue of this constitution and its history, not to have a lot of Americans in the area in a very aggressive, overbearing presence. And we have complied with that. We have been able to provide unique capacity-building skills, information exchange in providing of equipment like offshore, small patrol boats and whatnot.

They also have a success story. With the MILF, they have dismantled the -- I think the ASG and they have been in a reconciliation -- political reconciliation, which is the right way to reintegrate a political party or a terrorist organization that is prepared to move to the center. So the Philippines has kind of led the way with its efforts with MILF. Now I know it's been up and down. There's some recent --

QUESTION: Yeah.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: -- problems. But in the scheme of things, the strategy has been a sound strategy. We can't applaud the military -- government -- the military in the Philippines and the political government in the Philippines any more than we -- than possible. We also applaud Ambassador Kristie Kenney's efforts too on interaction. It's a special spot for the United States because we had a -- we have a historical relationship. So I think it's going very good. But in counterterrorism, it takes time, doesn't happen overnight.

QUESTION: So are the planes being used for missile strikes against, say, Abu Sayyaf hideouts?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Say that again. I didn't want to do a follow-on question. He tricked me, but I'll answer that.

QUESTION: But, you know, the U.S. role in -- are U.S. (inaudible) planes being used for missile strikes against suspected --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: I know of none.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: [Guido Olimpio, *Corriere Della Sera*] Predator -- Predator -- are they good tools to catch Osama bin Laden, to kill Osama bin Laden?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: The NATO what?

QUESTION: Predator, Predator.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Oh, Predator. Okay. Now I'm going to use my -- I'm an Army helicopter pilot and I'm going to use some of my technical aspects, if I may. The Predator, with its optical capability and its other signal collection capability and the fact that it has weapons on board has turned out to be an excellent weapon, not necessarily in counterterrorism, but in, I

think -- called asymmetric warfare. And let me talk about that just a little bit.

People come against the United States and they come against Pakistan and they come against Saudi Arabia because they know those are formidable militaries. So they come at little small ways, usually using terrorism. A good counter – and that's asymmetric warfare – a good counter to asymmetric warfare is something like the Predator that could go down and do a distinct, minimum collateral damage, minimum coordination, meaning flying from a host nation, minimum offensive activity to a host nation. So the Predator or aircraft like that are good asymmetric warfare tools, and they're getting refined in the technique every day.

And, oh, by the way, it's not just the United States that's got Predator or Predator-like tools. A lot of the Western nations have them and other nations are getting them, because it is a excellent tool.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: I'm Henry Reins from the *London Times*. How high would you assess the concern over – there's a great concern in the UK of homegrown – home born and raised, homegrown terrorists. How – what is the level of concern here on a British (inaudible) not necessarily affiliated with a higher chain of command coming here to attacking the United States?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Well, now, this is also going to be a biased answer, but I'll try and give a balanced one. The United Kingdom are our partners side by side in the global war on terror and have realized that the immigrant population may end up having a very, very, very tiny sliver in it of violent extremists. I think the UK folks – because it's an international perspective, much greater than the United – international history much greater than the United States has realized that and done – and established many and numerous programs to outreach to that population, to encourage moderation, to integrate into the economic program of UK, the political program of UK, and the cultural programs in United Kingdom.

So there couldn't be more diligent friends monitoring what's taking place for their own national reasons. So we are comfortable that everything that's possible is being done and being done in a thorough manner.

QUESTION: I just – on the terror – on the airlines bomb trial, which finished –

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Oh my goodness, yeah.

QUESTION: -- with a very mixed result, there's a lot of anger among the intelligence community in the UK that the arrest of Rashid Rauf in Pakistan (inaudible), stayed there for – did not get the (inaudible).

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: All they wanted, yeah.

QUESTION: What is your view on that? Why was he arrested so early against the specific wishes of the Brits?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Let me put two things – answer that in two ways. First of all, yes, the results of the Rashid Rauf criminal case was mixed. But three of the eight convicted for murder, that's pretty powerful. And the predicament that I told you before about criminality and anti-terrorism laws, in the British case here, this group actually got apprehended while there

was an awful lot of intelligence information on them, but not usable evidence in court. And this is a frustration that is taking place now.

There has been some concerns that picking up Rashid Rauf, I believe in Pakistan, prematurely triggered picking up the others and therefore, limited the collection of usable evidence in court. That could be.

There's always a balance between stopping a terrorist activity moving to the operational level and collecting as much on you as you can to make it a successful court case. Because we really do want to try them in court cases and get out of the Guantanamo Bay business, so we really do want to get that – enough evidence to get them into jail and keep them in jail a long time.

You never know how close they are to an operational mission until you scoop them up. So if you're a little bit late, they've done some damage. If you're a little bit early, you may not have your case.

Okay. Yes, ma'am. Question number two.

QUESTION: [Deniz Arslan, *Anatolia News Agency*] On PKK, can you update us on progress with the PKK, (inaudible)?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: We have with the Turkish Government a level of unprecedented intelligence sharing that, based on my experience, is on a tactical vein unshared with the sovereign – unmet in sovereign nation situations. So – and that's directed towards information collection in the PKK. So, dramatic sharing – it's a different type of sharing with our other partners because this is viewed kind of, right or wrong, as a battlefield, the northwest – the southwest – southeast area of Turkey and the northern area of Iraq.

My second point is that we have, through diplomatic efforts, obtained a very conscious political statement, a diplomatic statement from Iraq that the PKK is a terrorist organization. So – and that hadn't happened up until, I think, about four or five months ago. So in both of those areas, sharing of intelligence and getting diplomatic recognition as a terrorist organization, we think are dramatic steps forward to show our understanding of the challenges that Turkey's got with the PKK.

Who hasn't answered – asked one yet?

QUESTION: Right here.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay. Go ahead, please.

QUESTION: [Ali Imram, *Associated Press of Pakistan*] Two questions. First, you said that Osama bin Laden is hiding somewhere on the (inaudible) border in Pakistani – do you have anything (inaudible) specific (inaudible) on that?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Yeah, let me go back and just clarify. It's reported that's where he's hiding. If we had any hard, fast data, we'd be working with the Pakistanis on scooping him up. You know, I think the Pakistanis – in fact, I'm confident the Pakistanis are as interested in getting him as the United States because al-Qaida, led by bin Laden, are instigators in FATA. They're providing money, they're providing insight, they're providing opportunity to the Pakistan militants.

Now, here's – who's here from Pakistan? You're from Pakistan, right? The militants now aren't just doing things in Pakistan. They're reaching into Pakistan proper. I happen to have been there about two weeks ago. The first day I was there, 20 dead, a suicide bombing at Diakan (ph) hospital. Two days later, 70 or 80 dead at the ammunition plant, with I think over a hundred wounded.

The Pakistan people now realize that the militants in FATA and the foreign fighters in FATA are a threat nationally. And the military, I think, feels the same way, and they're doing operations up in the northern area up in Bajaur to go after them. So -- you know, but in the scheme of things, bin Laden's presence triggers a lot of that. So I think the Pakistanis agree with us that getting bin Laden is the right thing.

QUESTION: And the second part of this --

QUESTION: [Andrei Sitov, *ITAR-TASS News Agency*] Yeah, (inaudible). I'm interested in your assessment of what -- terrorist threats in the Caucasus, which has been more vulnerable, I guess, (inaudible) for the Russians. And also a general (inaudible) question: Have you learned anywhere in the world (inaudible) because of different -- and the definition of terrorism?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Let me take that second one, okay? And we'll -- we can go around a third time for the first question.

QUESTION: All right.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: There is a lot of concern that there's not an international definition of terrorism. And I think it was the perm rep from UAE just two days ago, as a result of the general assembly reconfirming its strategy, the representative from UAE said we like the strategy being reconfirmed, it's the correct thing, but oh, by the way, you still don't have a definition of terrorism -- international definition. And I kind of see the logic that we need that. In fact, when I moved in, I said, "Where are we on that?"

It's too hard to get to. But what the world has done is said, okay, we can't get a world, agreed-upon international definition, but we're still going to do certain things that thwart terrorism: 1267 committee; the implementation of the 1267, which is designations; and the other 13 protocols that approach terrorism in different forms, maritime, whatnot.

The AU has its own definition of terrorism and they use that as they apply it to their region. So although I would like to see terrorism perfectly defined and everybody piling on in a perfect, thorough and understanding way, there are enough tools to allow us to still go after terrorism without that specific definition.

Yes, sir.

QUESTION: [Julio Marenco, *La Prensa Grafica*] Yes, going back to FARC in Colombia, even though their activities have been disrupted, there is -- they seem to have a pretty good network of contacts in the hemisphere. For example, three of the former FARC members have been granted asylum in Nicaragua and President Ortega is an outspoken supporter of the FARC. What do you -- come up with that?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Well, it's a shame that other countries are giving haven. We need to try and, you know, through diplomatic means, you know, stop doing that way out for FARC members.

There is an advantage, though. They're not in Colombia, they're not doing FARC activities, and they've become someone else's problem. So I think President Uribe probably says, if I can't get my hands on them, I'd rather have them out away from things so they can't stir the pot up; still a success story, even though some FARC members are getting around and whatnot. And I think we're seeing some complicity with President Chavez, with the FARC. That's negative. That's negative for him in the eyes of folks in South America. So yeah, it's not all perfect with finishing off the FARC, but it's absolutely going in the right direction. And unfortunately, some folks are being housed and that – we have to handle that diplomatically.

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: [Salmy Hashim-Gheblawi, *Bernama*] Yes, sir. I'm just wondering, how do you rate the effectiveness of this regional counterterrorism center in Southeast Asia?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: How do I --

QUESTION: How do you rank it – rate it? You know, is it effective?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Absolutely.

QUESTION: I mean, in what way?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Let's look at Indonesia, the largest Muslim nation in the world; a lot of challenges – economic, poverty, whatnot. There is not a strong terrorist threat there. What's going on in Thailand, that southern peninsula of Thailand? That's not a regional terrorist threat. That's a localized ethnic challenge.

We have the – what's that – the Sulawesi Sea and the Sulu Archipelago, kind of ungoverned area – Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, whatnot. Through mutual relationships, that area is being patrolled and monitored. So that area is a pretty successful counterterrorism area, like I said before, bilaterally and then cooperation – or cooperation regionally.

QUESTION: Does it work closely with the (inaudible)?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: (Inaudible.)

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: [Joyce Karam, *Al Hayaq*] (Inaudible) Syria (inaudible), there has been a deterioration in the U.S.-Syrian relations, and many people in the intelligence -- they, you know, they (inaudible) fear that intelligence cooperation with the Syrians is not as good anymore and that might cause (inaudible) terrorism (inaudible).

Can you tell us (inaudible) Syrian cooperation, and given that the government in Damascus has been (inaudible) sometimes

and they're ready to cooperate more (inaudible) other terrorist groups. Would we see this cooperation resuming anytime soon?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Syria is still a state sponsor of terrorism. It's on our list. It fills into that category unequivocally. The interaction of their intelligence services and ours, I'm not completely attuned to. I'm kind of more of a policy guy than a operational guy.

I think we're finding Syria realizes it can do more inside the system, inside the political world, inside the diplomatic world than it can outside. The best example is through the good offices of Turkey, there's Israeli-Syrian discussions going, I know at a lower level, but it's taken place.

With regards to how well they try and reintegrate into the system, they still are not as cooperative as we want them to be, and an example – and the best example is the movement of foreign fighters. Foreign fighters from other countries around the world, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe – 90 percent of those folks go through Damascus and end up in Iraq. Syria could stop that fast. They haven't. We've asked them in many different forums and many different manners to tighten up the movement of foreign fighters, stop the facilitation. They've done some, but it's only been to the survival of the Syrian Government. It hasn't been because the international world wants them to stop suicide bombers.

So to make a – kind of a closing statement on this is that Syria needs to do more. It needs to be more aggressive in stopping foreign fighters. And it does need to reintegrate more so into the diplomatic world. And it needs to stop tampering with activities in Lebanon. It needs to stop being a throughput of equipment from Iran to Syria and from Iran through Syria to Lebanon.

Are you – where are you representing? What newspaper are you representing?

QUESTION: *Al Hayat*, an Arab --

QUESTION: Saudi paper.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Oh, from Saudi?

QUESTION: No, no, an Arab – it's an Arab paper – international Arab newspaper (inaudible).

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay, good. Please print what I said. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: Can I follow up? Can I follow up on --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Well, who hasn't gotten a --

QUESTION: I have a second one.

MODERATOR: We're going to take one more, sir. We got to – you've been --

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay.

MODERATOR: -- very generous with your time.

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Okay. Yes, sir.

QUESTION: [Ali Imram, *Associated Press of Pakistan*] Daily report for (inaudible) story in *Washington Post*, they say that the – counterterrorism on hearts and minds that has convinced (inaudible) no country figures for investment and education, hospitals, interest section in (inaudible) Pakistan. And in light of the recent upsurge in (inaudible) strikes in the Pakistani territories, doesn't that undercut the hope that – U.S. had hoped for, in democracy in Pakistan without delegitimizing them?

AMBASSADOR DAILEY: Here's the challenge we got in Pakistan. We've gotten, you know, through our Congress, hundreds of millions of dollars allocated for year – for five years, one year for five years for a total of 750 million. Pakistan's got some money, also. This goes into the FATA area, into northwest province. It is social programs, good governance programs, and economic programs. What's taken place, though, is that the militants in the FATA have kind of hijacked the initiative. And they've gone into a very, very aggressive militant action that now prevents some of those programs from being implemented, because there's – it requires dedicated security, there's not safe areas and whatnot.

So what's happened is that the Pakistan Government now realizes that, have seen it – I think they've seen it on the horizon the whole time. They have to go in and do some type of activity to regain stability and establish security to let these social programs, hearts and minds, like you said, schools and hospitals go along, because if that doesn't happen, then the effectiveness of that program doesn't take place.

And so we stand by counterterrorism's essence, which is, don't let recruits come up from the bottom, don't let people be dissatisfied, don't let terrorism exploit those conditions – economic, social, religious, political or ideological. Don't let the terrorists use those. In Pakistan, they'll be in a race against time. Everything's in place for that stuff to work. It's just that the militants have reached out and basically started a low-level insurgency.

To everybody, thanks a lot. It's a real pleasure. Thank you.



[Updates](#) | [Frequent Questions](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Email this Page](#) | [Subject Index](#) | [Search](#)

The Office of Electronic Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, manages this site as a portal for information from the U.S. State Department. External links to other Internet sites should not be construed as an endorsement of the views or privacy policies contained therein.

[FOIA](#) | [Privacy Notice](#) | [Copyright Information](#) | [Other U.S. Government Information](#)