# 21ST REGIONAL SECURITY SUMMIT

# THE IISS MANAMA DIALOGUE

## SPECIAL ADDRESS

## NATIONAL SECURITY AND ENERGY: THE US APPROACH

SATURDAY 1 NOVEMBER 2025

**SIR JOHN CHIPMAN**

EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, IISS

**THE HON. DOUG BURGUM**

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, UNITED STATES

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Mr Secretary, thank you very much. I think the Europeans in the room will have been very content with your linking your energy diplomacy in part to the policies the President is pursuing in the interest of getting a peace between Russia and Ukraine. The Bahrainis in the room will be very interested in your message of economic partnership because of the Comprehensive Security Integration Prosperity Agreement (C-SIPA) arrangement that was signed, and others may well soon join.

I have several questions piling up, but I thought I might just ask one to kick off with you. The IISS at the end of last year published a very thick dossier on energy security in the Eastern Mediterranean. I know that you are shortly off to Athens and that you are engaged in Eastern Mediterranean energy diplomacy.

It is a very complex region, the Eastern Mediterranean, and I wonder whether you could give us a sense first of how you approach that visit and your diplomacy with the states of the Eastern Mediterranean.

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Well, this will be Secretary of Energy Chris Wright, and I, and Deputy Secretary Danly, who is here today from Energy, will all be at the Partnership for Transatlantic Energy cooperation (P-TEC) in Athens, but this follows up that both Secretary Wright and I were both at Gastech earlier in Milan this year, where we had an opportunity, between the two of us, I think we met with over 20 different energy ministers during the time that we were there. This is, again, all about pursuing this idea of, if the United States produces enormous amounts of liquefied natural gas (LNG), and we are investing in all that export facility, we have to make sure that, commensurate on the other side, that there is the ability to receive it.

There have been discussions about NATO upping their defence spending for security to 5%. That has broken to 3.5% of that was going to be directed towards defence, 1.5% towards infrastructure. Think about that infrastructure as being part of the investment, because if energy security equals national security, making investments in pipelines to be in LNG import facilities would, again, help strengthen that.

In the Eastern Mediterranean, where there are enormous gas resources and some of that development has begun over there, there are discussions around the '3+1', but how do we develop those resources as another way to create alternatives? Because whenever we have got energy abundance, that is going to reduce chokeholds of aggressors that might feel like, hey, because everyone is buying from us, then we have the ability to exert more power. Energy abundance is great for prosperity, great for peace, so we would like to see how those resources develop.

And it is not, if you have an idea of energy abundance, then it is less about scarcity. It is not like, oh, we are worried about a customer being displaced by some capability in the Eastern Mediterranean, because there are so many opportunities for us to lift up the whole world, and particularly with LNG. It is such a versatile fuel. I mean, it can be used for heat, can be used for electricity, which we need for artificial intelligence (AI), as I talked about, but it also can be used to make fertiliser, which we need for food generation. So again, there is a tremendous future for LNG around the globe.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
And one quickie before I go to the eight or nine people who now want to ask you questions, and that is one initial I did not hear from you was SMRs. Where does small modular reactors fit in the national economic dominance agenda?

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Well, President Trump signed four executive orders around nuclear earlier this year. Since the time that he signed that, there has been a record amount of capital flowing back into this industry. This was an industry in America that was, at one time, the US was pre-eminent in those capabilities. But concerns, a lot of it, as we say, the word NIMBYism, not in my backyard. People had concerns about safety. Some of those, I think, unfounded. I mean, it became a bit of a hysteria around nuclear. As I have shared humorously, but true, a vending machine that you would put money into to get a can of pop or a candy bar come out of it, more people have died in America in the last 30 years from getting angry at vending machines and it tipping over on them than have died from nuclear. And that just happens to be an odd little quirky but true thing.

I mean, the safety record of nuclear is incredible. With small modular reactors, SMRs, one of the great benefits of SMRs, and there is a great future there, is being able to put the power generation close to where the load demand is. And it will not be just for specialised things like, hey, we have got a remote air base in the middle of Alaska, or remote parts of our country, to be able to do that. And then you cut out all the costs of building transmission lines because you can put the generation next to there. There are some real benefits, but there is real competition. There are over a dozen companies right now that are pursuing new designs, tremendous amount of innovation, and again, venture capital flowing back into that. We expect nuclear – this is all on the fission side. There are some people that still hold out that there is a possibility for fusion.

The last thing, John, I would say, which I did not talk in my remarks, but the other thing that the National Energy Dominance Council (NEDC) is focusing on is critical minerals. And as we begin dialogues with other countries, and if you saw the activity of the last week, just a week ago, Monday, we signed the first of an agreement with Australia. Since that time, we have had Malaysia, Thailand, Japan, Korea and many others lined up to join part of this club of nations that could trade freely, both processing and critical minerals, amongst each other in part in a response to the export controls announced by China.

Also, that is another thing that we are deeply involved in from the NEDC, and happy to take questions on that as well.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Super, well, thank you very much. I will take five or six questions and clump them up together for you. But first, from Bahrain, Hasan Alhasan.

**Dr Hasan Alhasan, Senior Fellow for Middle East Policy, IISS**
Thank you, John. Thank you, Mr Secretary. I am right here in the back. From a market-share perspective, the United States' quote-unquote 'energy dominance' agenda seems to set it on a collision course with net oil and gas exporters here in the region. The energy-dominance agenda itself is framed in zero-sum terms, and perhaps that is no coincidence. But my question is not about oil and gas, it is about nuclear.

Saudi Arabia and the United States have been negotiating for quite some time the terms of a civil nuclear-energy cooperation agreement. But those negotiations have been somewhat slow to fully materialise. Could you provide us with a status update, Secretary, on those negotiations? And are you concerned that if those negotiations ultimately collapse or do not progress quickly enough for the Saudis, that the Saudis will instead opt for non-American civil nuclear technology, including perhaps Chinese? Thank you.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Thanks very much. We will collect those. Veerle Nouwens.

**Veerle Nouwens, Executive Director, IISS–Asia**
Thank you, John. Secretary, you, of course, already mentioned critical minerals, which are, of course, vital for modern energy technologies and an intensifying area of strategic competition. How is the US seeking to realign these supply chains? You have mentioned a couple of countries already, but will the Minerals Security Partnership still feature as part of your efforts? And secondly, could you offer a status update on the creation of a Critical Minerals Reserve, akin to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? Thank you.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
And from the US, Jonathan Bass.

**Jonathan Bass, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Argent LNG; Founder, SyriUS Energy Initiative**
Hi, Secretary Burgum. Thank you for coming. Jonathan Bass from Argent LNG. We are developing the 25 million-tonne facility in Port Fourchon, Louisiana. My question to you is, we signed a deal with Turkiye to supply gas into the Balkans, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and we are getting pressure from the Russians internally. How do you see that pressure being counteracted by those governments to be able to take on American gas as a separate supply in creating an energy hub in Turkiye?

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
I will take one more and then come back to the Secretary. James Hackett from the United Kingdom.

**James Hackett, Head of Defence and Military Analysis, IISS**
Thank you, John. Secretary, could you briefly explore back, on the subject of critical raw materials (CRM), what is the US onshoring strategy in this regard? What are the key priority areas for extraction, but also refining, which was the key pinch point, not just the minerals themselves? And what is your aspiration for this region and the place that this region can hold in US CRM policy moving forward? Thanks.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Perfect. So, nuclear cooperation with Saudi Arabia, Critical Minerals Reserve, the Turkiye–Balkans–Russia nexus, and onshoring critical minerals. Over to you.

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Okay, great. Let me jump in, in the same order here. But first, relative to Saudi Arabia, nuclear, and again, the energy dominance, I mean this partly with a smile and partly not, but the Energy Dominance Council came up with a name. Inside the White House is where the Energy Dominance Council is. There is also the National Economic Council, NEC. National Energy Council would have had the same initials, same acronym. This would have created a lot of confusion, just like the NSC (National Security Council), which is a different group. But the NEDC was, again, as you want to say interchangeably, energy abundance with energy dominance. It is not about dominating another nation or whatever. It is about having the energy to be able to not be dependent, be able to, again, sell energy to your friends and allies. But there is so much demand. It is not net-zero. There is so much demand coming in the world for energy, particularly around electricity. We are just short of electricity relative to what we need to power this whole AI generation.

It really was a call to America to say we have got to increase. It is not a transition. It is an energy addition. And of course, when we were trying to come up with names – some of you, I saw that

Metallica is playing here in January, even in Bahrain. There must be some interest in ageing rock bands still touring the world. But ACDC from Australia, they started touring 55 years ago. Some of the same people are still touring. Their T-shirts had ACDC with a lightning bolt. Then we were thinking if we had merchandise that it would be NEDC with a lightning bolt. Hopefully, that is all translating.

But with that, on the nuclear front, I had a great meeting electronically with [inaudible] just before I got on a plane to fly here on Thursday night. And so, the discussion with Saudi Arabia is ongoing. I expect there is going to be a lot of activity between now and when the Crown Prince is visiting the United States on 18 November. I am very hopeful that now that the conclusion with the discussions in Asia, that there will be significant announcements and hopefully even agreements signed when the Crown Prince and the President are together here, coming up in 18 days. But those negotiations, I would say, are ongoing.

Relative to critical minerals, there were two. Yes, we need a reserve for critical minerals and so do other countries as well. But the United States in particular, again, I would call it environmental extremism that has been applied for the last 20-plus years at home has helped kill the mining industry in America. We have got rare-earth minerals all over our own country. We have got critical minerals.

You take a look at the periodic table and say, what are the top 20 most valuable materials, I mean, China is doing 85–100% of the processing in the world. It is not just a US problem. It is a global problem. And it gives China, which imports one and a half million barrels of oil a day, they import more coal than anyone else in the world, they import more gas than anyone else in the world. They are also the world's largest – for those, if they might be here from the European Union or others that are still concerned about $CO_2$ – they are the world's largest emitter of all of these things. But they are a country that does not have food security and does not have energy security, but they made a decision 30 years ago: let us have a chokehold on the rest of the world relative to strategic minerals. And the United States in particular, we let that happen to ourselves, and we are determined to make sure that we do not have that dependency in the future.

That means that we have to onshore processing. We have to get back in the mining business. And many actions have been taken. One of the things that is probably the most remarkable in a country that has stayed away forever of having government ownership in the private sector is there have been three deals that have been announced where the Department of War using effectively congressional authority to be able to make investments in companies that are doing critical mineral processing. We do not want to own 51%, we do not want to have government-run businesses, but we needed to send a signal to the capital markets that we were interested in reviving those industries in America.

So for example, whether we own 10–20% of a company, in some cases, those companies' market values have tripled since the announcement of US participation, the Department of War, formerly Department of Defense, taking off-take agreements, and then also a commitment that we are going to be doing stockpiling or strategic reserves.

And so, and again, and as I tell the senators, yes, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we are working to begin to refill some of that, but if we have got extra dollars laying around, it is more important for us right now, with the shale revolution, between the Marcellus, the Bakken, and the Permian, if we need more oil, we know where to go get it. And we just go turn that switch on. We essentially have an underground reserve there that we can tap into, but we did not have the resources we needed into the critical minerals. There is a determined attempt to do that, to make sure we have that.

What was happening, as I am sure you all know, if a US company was got into mining, they started to develop a material, there would be a legal dumping by China that would collapse the price. The company would go from being profitable to not being profitable, then they not only could not, they could not do an initial public offering (IPO), they could not even get a loan in some cases. They were literally killing the mining industry strategically in our country, and the United States government is saying, and from a defence security, saying we cannot let that happen.

One of the questions was also about this region. This is another discussion that I had with [inaudible] when we were on the phone the other day is about critical minerals, and often critical minerals do not exist on their own. In the case of Saudi Arabia, there is some of the two heavy metals that are most important are also tied to the same mining operation with uranium, and so it is integral sometimes when we are having a discussion about uranium relative to nuclear discussion, relative to one, two, three, to also be having that intertwined with discussions about critical minerals.

I think, again, those complex negotiations will continue, but we are interested in keeping those going, and the same thing in the US, where there has been an ideological battle waged against coal in our own country. We are absolutely under this administration trying to reverse that, in part because many of the richest deposits of critical minerals in America for some of the key minerals like gallium, germanium exist inside US coal, and if you are processing the coal for thermal uses and doing that in a clean way – if there is a coal plant running in America, it is extremely clean because it has been under regulatory attack for 20 years. I mean, if they have survived this long, they are among the cleanest facilities in the world. But we would have an opportunity jointly to attach on critical minerals processing to some of those existing operations.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Wonderful. Can you offer any comfort to Jonathan Bass on Turkiye, Balkans and Russia oil?

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Oh, thank you. Yes, that was my last one here, but yeah, we do have, the US ambassador from Turkiye is here with us today. I know he is going to be in some dialogues with us this afternoon. If you have not had an opportunity to meet him, please do. We see this as part of this idea of getting LNG to Eastern Europe, and Turkiye could play a key role there.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Super. We will take four more, and then come back to you, Mr Secretary. From the United Kingdom, Tom Beckett.

**Lieutenant-General (Retd) Sir Thomas Beckett, Senior Adviser and Corresponding Director, IISS–Americas**
Thank you. Secretary Burgum, President Trump in his first term berated Europe for its energy reliance on Russia, and he was quite right to do so. If countries opt, and building probably on Jonathan's question, if countries opt to buy from the US, will the US be a reliable supplier, or will it turn tax off and tariffs on at a whim?

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Mona Al Resais from Bahrain.

**Mona Al Resais, Analyst, Strategic and International Studies, Derasat**
Yes, thank you. The US has declared a national energy emergency, and Mr Secretary, you also mentioned the Energy Dominance Council, and it is going to accelerate oil business and greenhouse

gas and geothermal development. So how does the US plan to lead on global energy security without undermining climate goals?

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Thank you very much. And from one of our Young Leaders, from Morocco, Hatim Aznague.

**Hatim Aznague, Project Analyst, Energy and Climate Action, Union for the Mediterranean**
Thank you so much. Hello, Honourable Secretary. Thank you.

Much of the United States' approach to the regional energy security still relies on the legacy frameworks built for hydrocarbon flows and crisis response. As the Gulf acquires greater geopolitical momentum, and the Mediterranean becomes increasingly relevant to supply diversification, what specific mechanisms is the United States prepared to modernise or rethink to ensure this cooperation does not remain reactive, but anticipatory and institutionalised building? Thank you.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Thank you. And from Bahrain, Faisal Syed.

**Faisal Syed**
Good afternoon, Secretary. Touching on rare-earth minerals again, amid recent Chinese stances and comments and threats with respect to shutting off rare-earth minerals, could you please explain how realistic and feasible is it to challenge Chinese dominance to prevent these bottlenecks, and what timeline is this execution realistic?

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Thank you. And two more. One from Sascha Bruchmann of Germany.

**Sascha Bruchmann, Research Fellow, Defence and Military Analysis, IISS–Middle East**
Thank you, John, Mr Secretary. With your US hyperscalers, basically hyperscaling AI, there seems to be an exponential increase in demand for electricity, much of it produced from natural gas. Given that natural gas is also now really important as an export commodity to Europe and has that security dimension, I am curious about, is the exponentially growing demand by AI at some point going to eat into your export capacity? Where do you see both grow? Because both seem to be growing, which is, how do these trend lines collide?

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
And finally, Brynja Huld Oskarsdottir, the Director of Science and Technology Committee of Parliament.

**Brynja Huld Oskarsdottir, Director, Science and Technology Committee; Director, Mediterranean and Middle East Special Group, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, NATO**
Hi, good afternoon. Hi, I am here at the back. Thank you, Honourable Secretary, for your interesting remarks.

I, in my role at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I work with 280 legislators from across the 32 NATO countries, and obviously defence spending is very high on our agenda, especially the new 1.5%, which you mentioned earlier on. I wonder if you could elaborate a little bit on the 1.5% investment in terms of the energy pipelines. It is my understanding that the framework for the 1.5% is still being negotiated and agreed upon at NATO HQ. And famously, obviously the Italians have been said no, a bridge from Sicily to mainland Italy does not count. And I would be interested in hearing

more if the US will push for energy security equals national security in terms of the 1.5% investment. Thank you.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Thank you very much. I think that presents quite a package of questions for you. So over to you, sir.

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Well, let me start off with Thomas's question off the bat from the UK on tariffs and would the US turn the taps off. One of the things that, I think, is important, well, I have not seen a headline, but if you take a look at the tariff strategy of the United States, energy has never been a part of it. Even with Canada, you might say, oh, there is a battle going on between the US and Canada over tariffs. That is about automobiles. That is between Ontario and the state of Michigan, which side of the border the auto factory to be on. I mean, the US is a huge partner with the western provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan, in terms of millions of barrels of oil a day flowing back and forth across those borders. My own state was a border state with Canada. We had pipelines flowing both directions. Zero tariffs on energy.

The intention, at least right now, there has been no indication that we are going to have any plan other than to continue that way. And with this club-of-nations approach on critical minerals, same thing, tariff-free exchange. I think it is important that as part of this energy diplomacy that we have got the free movement of energy.

Energy is global markets. We expect that. And again, the commercial interests are so aligned. Forget the politics or policy, but the US energy, it is not a government – it is not a government oil or gas company. These are private companies. They have got strong, powerful interests. When they develop customer bases around the world, they do not want to have policy shut them off. They are still confused about why the prior administration even said you cannot even build an LNG export facility.

But maybe that, again, I will jump to that other question that the individual asked from the US about hyperscalers and demand. The US has the remarkable ability to continue to increase our gas production. In many of these shale fields, which are still growing, as the field develops, the gas-to-oil ratio keeps increasing.

In my own state, during the time that I was governor, the gas-to-oil ratio doubled. And so, people say, oh, your oil production is relatively flat. And I am like, yes, it is flat, but our gas production has doubled. Well, how is that with no more wells? It is just the ratio, it keeps increasing. We have got the ability.

And the thing which I would also tap into, this thing from a global pricing standpoint, is Alaska has so much gas. Well, the Alaska pipeline was created 50 years ago. This was a technological marvel. It starts on the North Slope. It goes 800 miles. It crosses three mountain ranges. The highest one is 4,100 feet above sea level, up and down. It was built on the North Slope in an area where there is frozen tundra. It is on stilts. It has got the ability to withstand the seismic activity. Fifty years without a spill. And this pipeline was built in 28 months, and they had to build a road next to it. It was in a place that was a roadless wilderness. This is back when America could build great things quickly.

And part of the Trump administration is, we have got to be able to build like incredibly great technological marvels and do that at a speed that we were able to do in our own lifetimes. How do we get back to that? But for every barrel of oil that came off the North Slope, and it has been billions of barrels of oil have come south of that pipeline, there was no ability to export gas.

The gas that came up with every barrel of oil was re-injected in the ground. There are known trillions of BCF (billion cubic feet) that have gone back into that North Slope. And when we look at the demand for LNG from our Pacific allies, Japan, Korea, Philippines, others that have virtually no oil and gas resources, it is eight days from Anchorage in Alaska to Tokyo. It is a secure supply route that we can provide.

There is, again, there is an opportunity as we look at markets around the world where there is going to be increasing demand. Africa, India, China continues to have consumption going up.
There are markets everywhere, but we need more supply. Otherwise, we are going to have, again, the inflationary impacts that would affect global prosperity. So that is another aspect.

And in the hyperscalers, which again, when I said earlier that a kilowatt of electricity is worth more than it ever has been in human history, that flows back into the business models of the tech company. I spent 30 years in tech before I became a governor. I was a corporate officer for one of the largest tech companies in the world. During the time that I was there, the company grew from $9 billion in net income to $18bn in net income. We grew from 40,000 employees to 90,000 employees, and we had almost no CapEx expenditures, no CapEx expenditures. We were a software company. We hired salespeople and software developers. If we needed an office in Munich or Singapore or someplace, you leased it. So there literally, even as a corporate officer, there was not a CapEx meeting to go to.

Today, right now, as we sit here, the five big tech companies in America have a combined CapEx budget for next year, the next 12 months, of $384bn globally – $384bn. Almost all of that is going into chips, AI factories – I call them an AI factory, not a data centre, because the data centre is a closed-loop thing between a company and their customer and transaction. I mean, an AI factory is producing a GPT, general purpose technology, it can be used by anybody, it can be used to cure cancer, it can be used for defence, it can be used for anything.

The demand for that capability, that productivity-enhancing capability, is going to be enormous. And so these guys are trying to build out power generation because the regulated power producers in America have been lulled to sleep for the last 30 years in a regulated environment where they are managing an asset base towards a return that was determined by often state regulators as opposed to being real entrepreneurs that say, if I produce more electricity, someone will pay more for it. And if it is off the grid, it will not affect the consumer pricing.

There is going to be a whole revolution in how power is generated, but that is creating demand in global supply chains for turbines, for transformers, for everything else that we need to produce that electricity. But again, there is capital that is flowing around the world, but that is just for five companies. And again, just to put it in perspective, if any of you are a financial analyst or follow markets, $384bn from five companies is bigger in the US than the next five industries. I mean, you throw automotive, plus manufacturing, plus whatever, you cannot get the $384bn from five industries, much less five companies.

And so, this is a complete sea change that anybody that is in the energy business needs to understand. There is a whole new set of customers that did not even come knocking at your door other than to sell you software. Now they are going to be some of the biggest consumers of this. And their focus in the short term is on natural gas because the nuclear stuff is a few years away. Someone did mention geothermal in here as well.

But we are committed – it is not, in the US, that we are committed to, people have misused this word, renewables. It is about baseload. It is about persistent affordable baseload. It is about energy sources

that are not highly subsidised. The Trump administration is not ideologically against wind and solar. We are against spending taxpayer money through the roof to subsidise forms of electricity that do not work when the sun is not shining, the wind is not blowing. And then if they say, oh, but we will solve it with batteries, but all the batteries come from critical minerals that are controlled by China; that is not a good national-security policy. So geothermal we can do at home, nuclear we can do at home, gas we can do at home, hydro we can do at home. All of these things which might also fall into the category of renewables are something we are interested in. We are just not interested in doing the massive subsidies on the back of taxpayers.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
And then perhaps you could just end exactly on that note and explain how you would respond to that specific question of whether it is feasible to challenge China's dominance in rare-earth minerals to prevent bottlenecks. What is the poker play that is going on there?

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
Well, this is a great question. Part of it I addressed earlier, which is again, it is a huge, big step forward. The US government through the Department of War is investing in companies that do critical-mineral mining and refining. I mean, this has like not happened before, where we are making direct equity investments in those companies. And then we are also opening up public lands. President Trump signed with a stroke of a pen, there is a 211-mile industrial toll road that is going to be built in northern Alaska that goes to the Ambler mining region. There are over 1,700 mining claims there. It is one of the richest mining areas in the world. It has never been able to be accessed before. That is going to happen.

We are doing the things to increase supply. We are making investments to restructure how capital can flow to the refining industry. And we are partnering with all of our other allies, the framework that I described that has been signed by six countries in the last two weeks. Any country that wants to have that discussion with us should, because I think very quickly, we can say, here is the framework, join the club, and let us all work together to solve the critical-minerals supply issue together.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**
Mr Secretary, we might have to close with that, but could I, myself, close by saying as a chair, it is really a joy to see someone not only so passionate about their subject matter, but in such command of their subject matter. And thank you for addressing this audience on energy security and for your participation in this 21st Manama Dialogue. It has been a delight. Thank you very much.

You are a cabinet secretary, have a last quick word.

**The Hon. Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, United States**
I do not want to kill your applause, John, sorry, but I was going to say to everybody here, again, thank you for being here. Thank you for being part of the dialogue.

And for those of you that are in dialogue with the United States, again, we are grateful for all of our partnerships across this region. And we are grateful for the opportunity to continue to use energy diplomacy to bring peace not only to this region, to the whole world, but also to make sure that we have got prosperity for every citizen on the globe. It begins with energy security, or national security begins and ends with energy security, but so does prosperity.

Thank you all for being here.

**Sir John Chipman, Executive Chairman, IISS**

Thank you, sir.