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Dr. Gideon Rose, Editor, Foreign Affairs

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: Hello everybody and welcome. My name is Gideon Rose, I'm the editor of Foreign Affairs, and we have a great panel for you today. Before we get into that, I want to make three quick points.

First, as I said, I'm the editor of Foreign Affairs, and for many years, as many of you know, Foreign Affairs has been a proud media partner and sponsor of the Halifax International Security Forum. This year, I'm proud to say we are joined by a sister peer institution of foreign policy as another proud media sponsor and I'm delighted to say that because I can also delightedly say that Foreign Policy is now under the able management of somebody who's very familiar to the Halifax audience, Jonathan Tepperman, the new editor of Foreign Policy. And so we've done this as a tag team in many years past, and we're doing it again, but now we're doing it from different institutions. So welcome Foreign Policy to Halifax officially.

Second, it's worth pointing out that in these times where stories of piggishness and abuse and harassment are nearly not just daily, but hourly revelations, it is nice to know that it, we can demonstrate here in Halifax that it doesn't have to be that way. The fact that we can simply by picking the most qualified people, pull together a full lead panel of distinguished female experts and authorities
and figures and demonstrate in a practical sense that the commitment to building a society of equals is something that not just all Canadians share, but all of us at Halifax and in this world as well. And it's nice to do that.

Third, a little bit about Halifax. You know, last year, it was a very special meeting because it was occurring in the wake of the immediate election. This is also a special meeting because we're still trying to feel our way in this new world. The Halifax Citadel began as a fortress and is now an educational institution and celebration in some respects of the distinguished past.

In some ways, the Halifax International Security Forum has gone the other route. It began as a celebration and educational institution, talking about and pushing forward the final aspects of the Liberal International Order and it's now become an active military institution, a fortress intellectually to defend and think through the challenges facing the Liberal International Order that Halifax is one of the premier expressions of, institutionally.

So now, more than ever, the purposes, when we started meeting here, some people thought why do we really need this? Aren't these issues past? Do we really need yet one more coordinating mechanism? Aren't we always meeting with each other? Aren't we always talking about our purposes? Aren't we linked? Isn't this redundant and just a kind of vanity project? And now we know the answer. It is not. It is crucial to the defence of the free world that has been fought for by generations past and that we need to bequeath to generations in the future.

And with that, let's kick off this fascinating panel. We have a wonderful group of panelists. Ambassador Kay Bailey Hutch-, sorry Dr. Margaret MacMillan, distinguished historian, Ambassador Kay Bailey Hutchison, Jane Harman, former representative and head of the Wilson Centre, Constanze Stelzenmüller of Brookings and (inaudible) the German Marshall Fund. All distinguished experts.

Let me kick, ask you guys the question in effect posed by or thrown up by the introductory film. We fought for something and this is what we got. What, you know, there's a – I think the, the guru Baba Ram Dass once said, had a line, after the enlightenment, the laundry. You know, after the Liberal International Order, the Trump era. What is it that the west, the free world, the democratic community represented in Halifax, the, the outgrowth of all that history, what does it stand for now? What are the key purposes and principles that are, that we thought we knew we were moving forward five years ago, or six years ago or eight years ago when we now basically say what is that?

So can you give us a little bit of the history, Margaret, and then maybe we can go from there?
Dr. Margaret MacMillan: You should be careful cause I'll probably start with the Roman empire and keep going.

I think we always are, there's always a danger of thinking the present is dreadful and looking back and thinking the past was so much better and so much clearer. And I think we need to be very careful not to overestimate the degree of unity we had in the past. There were always tensions within the western alliance. In a way, after 1945, it was held together by the actions of the Soviet Union and its allies. And I'm not sure we, we may have agreed on basic principles. President Roosevelt talked about the four freedoms. I think we more or less agreed on those, although the Soviet Union didn't agree on many of those.

So I think we should recognize that it's natural to have disagreements about who we are, where we're going. This is not something that is new in human relations. And I think in a way, what the Cold War did was smooth over some of those differences. And we used words like democracy, like freedom without perhaps really stopping to analyse them.

And we didn't always act in ways to promote democracy and freedom in the west, and we weren't always sure that the west stood for, so perhaps I think with the ending of the Cold War, some of the uncertainties and tensions in the international system, and among those who felt that they knew what side they were on, have come out. What I think has also happened though with the passage of time, and this is something that does concern me, is that I think there was more agreement that we wanted to try and build a better world and we wanted to try and avoid what had happened between 1930 and 1945.

And with the passage of time, I think we forget why we wanted those institutions and why we thought it was a good idea to try and have a world in which nations worked together. And that concerns me because it seems to me it's affecting international institutions from the United Nations to the European Union. The steam that somehow got out of them, the reason why we wanted them is something we no longer feel as people did feel after 45.

Dr. Gideon Rose: Ambassador Hutchison, are we all still trying to build the better world together collectively or is every nation for itself?

Kay Bailey Hutchison: I think we are. And I, I know there is a lot of noise right now that would cause the writing of the paper, and it's certainly valid that we should look at our values and look at what we're fighting for. But I remember a time, oh probably in the 90s, that I even thought if we were attacked, it was after the greatest generation that we started thinking about how wonderful those
people were and I thought if we were attacked, would our people stand up and fight? Would we fight for our freedom and our way of life?

And 9/11 happened and yes, the answer was yes. We did stand up and fight and time after time after time, we read about people who were signing up, leaving a very big football career and going and just signing up to fight for America, fight for our country because we’d been attacked. And then, you saw the first time, the only time that NATO has invoked Article 5 was after 9/11. It was on 9/12. And Nick Burns, the Ambassador to NATO at the time told me that America didn’t ask for that. They hadn’t even thought about it yet. It was 9/12 after we were still horrified. But the NATO allies came together and said we need to declare Article 5 and did it on 9/12.

So yes, we are fighting and, and I want to say, as the Ambassador to NATO, although we have our differences in certain things that one country might do or one country in our alliance might say or do about another, that it is a unified alliance and it is unified to make sure that we have a security umbrella for our freedom and our way of life. So yes, I think the spirit is still there and I think the, the importance of that spirit must be passed from generation to generation.

And I don't want to take too much longer cause I know we have other wonderful panelists, but there was an incredible article by David Brooks in the New York Times this morning who really pinpointed that it, we maybe be getting out of balance with the zeal for individual freedoms which we all want to have, but maybe we’re getting out of balance with also the community spirit, the giving back spirit, the standing up for our countries and our patriotism for our countries spirit.

And maybe that's what we ought to be examining, how we make sure that we're bringing the next generation in to love our countries, to care about security our countries and be willing to fight for the freedoms that we have stood on the shoulders of giants who got for us and it is our responsibility to continue.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: I think that's, that's wonderful.

Before I move on to Jane, let me just take a two finger. Everything you said about the post 9/11 reaction was absolutely accurate. I mean, many of us remember that and were deeply moved by it. Now, many of the NATO allies feel themselves under pressure and threat from the east. Can we say confidently that the United States will have their back when they’re under threat they way they had ours when we were under threat?

**Kay Bailey Hutchison**: Yes. Yes, they can because we have a European deterrence initiative right now. We are putting very mixed NATO troops into the three Baltic countries. I'm looking straight ahead at the Chairman of the Military
Committee of NATO and he’s nodding his head, because he knows you just saw our leader, Secretary General Stoltenberg because he is a wonderful leader, bringing our alliance together and we are now in the three Baltic countries that are under the most pressure, plus Poland.

We’re helping Romania, which is across the sea from the Crimea, which Russia illegally took over in 2014, and we did stand up as NATO and we started adjusting and we started adjusting to terrorism too. And as many of you know, because many of you are from the countries where we are also helping people fight for their way of life. Afghanistan, we’re going to be doing more to help stabilize. Iraq, when that dread of ISIS is defeated from that country so they would have a chance. So, yes.

Dr. Gideon Rose: Thank you very much. Congressman Harman.

Jane Harman: So two introductory thoughts. First of all, to congratulate Peter and his team on the wisdom of selecting this gender balanced panel. (laughter) I think we should make Gideon an honorary woman. (laughter) (applause)

Dr. Gideon Rose: I think we're now the replacement team for foxes outnumbered. (laughter)

Jane Harman: And the other is no matter what anyone will, is going to say about the Trump administration, it surely was wise to nominate Kay to be our Ambassador to NATO. She’s a shining light and I’m very pleased to see what she's doing there. I've already been there to check her out.

So on this topic, where do we start. Woodrow Wilson was president 100 years ago, and I had, and he’s our only PhD president. I head the Wilson Centre now, I spent a long time in Congress, and many of his ideas 100 years ago never came to pass. Back in the day, he was considered – I'm sure Margaret would agree – a bit of a, you know, of a dreamer for imagining a world order, which sort of, mostly came to pass after World War II, but has, I think, been challenged by all kinds of forces that aren't going away. Let’s understand it. They aren't going away.

Social media isn’t going away, globalization isn’t going away and probably terrorism isn’t going away and this is the point I want to start with. Terrorism is a tactic, but it is fuelled by radical ideas. Beating radical ideas with military alone won’t work. You have to beat bad ideas with better ideas. How do we get to better ideas? We really do have to have a common narrative and we don’t have it right now, and that’s something that I think has to be resuscitated. That’s one.
Number two, I’m not sure if the people in this room are the right people to come up with that narrative. It won’t be top-down anymore in this world. It has to be bottom-up. The fuel for populism and tribalism is not in this room. It’s elsewhere and it is pushing the rest of us around. And so figuring out how to get people to think civilly and engage with each other and come up with a common set of facts and maybe a common conclusion I think is a huge challenge.

Final point, US leadership is really missed. I agree with what Kay said. I think there is a commitment to Article 5, but what is the United States strategy in the world? What are, what do we, what are our interests and values and how do we plan to achieve them? It wasn’t clear in the last administration, and it isn’t clear in this administration. And one of the huge missing ingredients is a relationship between Congress and the President. That is just absent. It’s not just that Congress is so toxic politically, but it is that the relationship between Congress and the President is so toxic, and was toxic in the Obama administration.

So I think if we had more conversation around that at this meeting, we might be able to start thinking more constructively about that new narrative that will make a big difference in fighting the threat of terrorism.

Dr. Gideon Rose: Dr. Stelzenmüller.

Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller: Well, I guess I’m the European joker on this panel. And I did consider —

Dr. Gideon Rose: We prefer to think of it as the European wild card. (laughter)

Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller: — making a lot of jokes about an all women panel, but I will desist for now, unless provoked.

Look, I'm going to be maybe a little starker in my take on what's happening now. And I, I say this also as a German whose living in America for the third time in her life, and who's the children of young people in World War II. My father was drafted as a young soldier into the Wehrmacht in 1944 and my mother was, was bummed out of Berlin. And if my parents taught me one thing, it was this must never ever happen again, it must never ever go out from German soil. And after which atonement and reconciliation, we have to be a part of a new good peaceful liberal world order.

And I think if we’re all honest with each other, and the problem is, of course, that we’re likely to agree with each other on this panel and in this room more than with our relatives at the Thanksgiving table or with the people in the towns that we come from. Then that world order is currently under threat as it has never
been in our lifetime. And the new, the new dividing line is not between the right and the left or the extremists and the moderates, but between those who want open, liberal societies in an integrated globalized world want to protect that, want to see American leadership for that and those who want none of that, who want America first or Germany first, who want to pull up the drawbridges and who want to go back to a tribal society, which I think would be a tragedy for all of us.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Three quick points. First, I couldn't agree more about what you said about Germans, the German experience, and it's a good way we can do a preview now. The next issue of Foreign Affairs, the one succeeding the one you have in your gift bags, which will come out in December, actually has Stolpersteine on the cover and is all about how nations have processed their past and you know, the Germans may get very bad ranks for their crimes, but they at least the (inaudible) door for having the post-criminal recovery and commemoration.

And so everything you said is true and we actually all should look to the Germans as a model for how they process their history.

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller:** We did also, 12, 12.6% of us elected the AFD into Parliament this year and they do actually contain some very genuine neo-Nazis. So, you know – (laughter)

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** You know, well we can each talk about our own neo-Nazis but that will be a different discussion.

The, a question I'd like you guys to grapple with. Two questions. One is Constanze's gauntlet thrown down that this is, we're in a, really, a sort of battle between the forces of the enlightenment and open societies on the one hand and those of the closed societies and tyranny on the other, at home and abroad. Is that really the frame that is dividing the world these days and the best framework for that.

And the second one would be a point that Jane made that I'm not entirely sure I agree with, which is that the people in this room don't necessarily have the ability to sort of, you know, do much about the problem or concede that they aren't the right people, because the interesting, one of the interesting questions that had, the populous surge has thrown up is? Are the problems really external problems that, are bad things happening in many countries in the advanced industrial world and so forth inside the order because people outside are doing bad things to us or them?

Or is it because there are predatory elites that have essentially rigged the system and gamed it such that it's not serving the ends of the masses of the
societies in which they live? And in that case, if there are indeed predatory elites, then, maybe not predatory but certainly a better elite representation wouldn’t be possible than this kind of place. And so if the problem is actually not outside the gates but in the behaviour of the Prospero and his friends inside the gates, the people running the fancy costume party, then that’s something that, that people here should talk about.

So I guess the questions I would have, want a freeform discussion on are we really in a global fight of the open society against its enemies, the way Constanze was talking about? And are the problems sort of external to our countries or internal and is it the elites that have screwed things up at the expense of the masses?

**Dr. Margaret MacMillan:** I don’t think there’s a simple answer to that, because I think it’s probably a combination of – as others have pointed out – it’s a combination of a number of factors. I think too often liberalism has tended to be confused with economic liberalism and we’ve forgotten about the other sides of liberalism, we’ve forgotten about the respect for values, the respect for the individual or respect for human dignity. We’ve forgotten about why, when we talk about freedom, we’ve tended to talk about freedom from government interference and, or freedom to do what we want, and I think we’ve forgotten that freedom is also responsibility and it’s participating, it’s, you can’t keep drawing on a bank and not expecting it to go bankrupt.

And we're not, I feel collectively we’ve perhaps not been paying enough back in. So I think there are definitely problems within our societies but I think there’s also a tendency in the world for nations to go their own ways. Not perhaps pulling up the drawbridges so much, although I think that’s certainly there, but simply arguing that the world, what’s better in the way which the realists would like it to work when you simply have an anarchy and competing nations.

And again, I think we’re forgetting that there is something beyond individual, individual, in my case, or any of our cases or separate nations. There is something beyond that. There is something which we can all buy into, which in fact we do better out of, but again we tend to forget where we need it. And so we're not, I think, putting in enough energy into our own societies, but perhaps also not putting enough into maintaining the international institutes and the whole web of internat- -- it’s not just the big ones, it’s that whole web of international institutions which we’ve constructed somehow since 45.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Ambassador?

**Kay Bailey Hutchison:** Well, I think the frustrations that have caused a lot of the harshness of the rhetoric and the populism that we have seen in elections is mostly the technology revolution that has happened so fast and has left some behind, some people behind, some number of people behind.
If you look at the statistics, really what has happened in the last 20 years has been an improvement in the lives of most people in the world. The global domestic product in 1990 was about $24 trillion. In 2014, it was $81 trillion. The number, percentage in poverty during those 20 years dropped from 35% of the world’s population to about 10% living in poverty.

I think we have made some very strong good strides for more people, but I think some have been left behind because the technology revolution has been so fast. I would couple that with – and I’m going to speak now for my own country – and there may be others that would disagree from their own standpoint, but I do think that back to David Brooks’ point, I think we are missing in basic education the need to make sure that our young people are taught about responsibility and civics, the importance of our form of government and the importance of keeping it. I mean, some of the polls show young people in America polled are about 50% saying that democracy’s the best form of government. I mean, those are things that, you know, I don’t know if that’s accurate, I don’t know if it’s young people just, you know, trying to say something provocative, but I do think we are missing civics and basic responsibility, love of country, patriotism, understanding the relevance of the sacrifices made in the films that we just saw, the sacrifices of people who have been willing to fight and die for freedom, and that we’re living on that and that we have a responsibility to assure it for our children.

And so I do think if I were going to say there’s one thing that we can do going forward, it’s start at the basic education level. Not only give equal access to all children for education in all, in every country. You know, girls have to be educated and every child has to be educated, regardless of their circumstances. They need that equal opportunity, which is what, I think, we have tried to do in America and which has given us a great lead in innovativeness in bringing, bringing an equal educational opportunity has given us the innovative edge.

But I think we must make sure that that is happening throughout the world, if we can so that every child will have the chance to make their country better through an educated system and then make sure we are teaching that basic love of who we are and what we represent.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** So Jane, who are we and what do we represent?

**Jane Harman:** Well, first of all, I wasn’t saying that the views of people in this room don’t matter. I think they do matter. The question is who will listen? And in this environment where people pick their own echo chamber on social media and pick their own facts, it’s pretty hard even if we came up with some brilliant
ideas by Sunday, which of course Peter will do, to know that anyone will, anyone beyond the elites around the world will pay attention.

I love Kay’s optimism, but I’m not as optimistic. There are 65 million displaced people around the world. There are a growing number of failing states. There has been an endless war in the Middle East for 16 years and the number of war theatres is increasing. And the way out of that is hard. I mean, I applaud the notion of educating every kid and making sure that civic values are taught. I think getting from here to there, even just in America, is going to be a real reach.

So what are some shortcuts that could make this better? That’s why I came back, I come back to this idea if we could try to forge a common narrative in the space where this bottom-up group of alienated people are spending their time, if we could somehow get a narrative out that is inclusive, is pluralistic. You’re right when you talk about the clash of civilizations because so many countries are becoming more autocratic. Think Saudi Arabia. Think China. And maybe other places. Well, I can – think Egypt. If we – and think Turkey – I hate to say it and they’re an ally, but if we, if we could come up with a common narrative that would get people to be open to this idea of inclusiveness and more respectful of pluralism, then maybe we could rebuild and restore.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: Constanze.

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller**: I don’t think we’re going to find a common narrative if we don’t keep the promises we make to ourselves in our foundational narratives. And I think that’s where it starts. And I think we – again, I’m going to be the grenade lobber here, but I do think that America and Europe are currently experiencing the biggest democratic stress test that we have ever seen in our lifetimes. And we have to ask ourselves is this just nasty enemies prodding and poking at our vulnerabilities, which is certainly happening, or is it really us not having paid attention to the existence of these vulnerabilities and the fact that these vulnerabilities of our open representative democracies are magnified and increased by the hurricane that is globalization.

Are our levies capable of withstanding these fragmenting forces? And I think the resounding answer is no. We have seen neo-Nazis marching within the last months, within the last half year in Charlottesville, in Warsaw and in Eastern Germany. I mean, if that’s not a wake-up call, I do not know what is. And those people are not going to be convinced by narratives of our civics classes.

I think we have to, the way I try to map this out, is I think we have to make a distinction between real and imaginary grievances and illegitimate and legitimate grievances. Neo-Nazis, to my mind, don’t have legitimate grievances. I don’t, my empathy with them is pretty limited. Forgive me, but that’s just the way it is. On the other hand, there might be confused kids who attach themselves to that
kind of movement because they have nothing, nowhere else to go, because this is what gets them attention. Those are the ones we need to talk to.

So, and then there's the very real grievance, I think, of those who suffer from economic inequalities, from bad health care, from terrible schools. Are we doing enough to address that? I don't think so. And it seems to me most of us here are foreign and security people. That's our tribe. But we should know by now that if we don't fix the ills of our own representative democracies, our social contracts and our markets, then we have what, the bandwidth that we have for effective and legitimate foreign and security policy, you know, shrinks to almost nothing.

So we're, we should discuss these things, we should fix these things in our own enlightened self-interest.

Dr. Gideon Rose: That's an absolutely brilliant point and very well put. You know, I was listening to John Brennan the other day talk about the Uzbek immigrant, the Uzbek immigrant who had ran his car or truck down and killed several people in Lower Manhattan a couple of weeks ago, actually ending up right outside my son's school. But – and he pointed out that this was not a, this was somebody who had come as a regular immigrant who had tried to make a life, who had had difficulties and who had lost his way and then looking for some kind of meaning in a failed life and ended up finding it in ISIS and then had gotten sort of self-radicalized with the general propaganda and then committed this.

But the exact same story, whether it's neo-Nazis, whether it's crazy, well, not the crazy gun people, that's a separate story – but the neo-Nazis and the ISIS, it's not a right, it's a good point that you made because we often have a tendency to focus on the specifics of the manifestation of the violent ideology rather than the grievances of the people that lead them to ultimately go in search of some source of meaning, often a negative one as well.

As a middle aged white American male these days, you are very aware of pondering your unearned privilege and one of the unearned privileges is commanding the stage with these women. So at this point, I will stop and shut up and turn it over for discussions with the audience. So let's go back over here. Yes, Josh Rogin. Let me get a microphone. The gentleman from the Washington Post.

Question: Good afternoon. Josh Rogin, Washington Post. My question is for Ambassador Hutchison. Thank you so much first of all for joining us at this conference and thank you for your service.
As you know, our NATO partner, Turkey, is purchasing or has purchased a very large Russian anti-aircraft missile system called the S-400. Under the law passed by Congress and signed by the President, the Trump administration is required to sanction Turkey and cut off US defence sales to that country for doing business with a banned Russian firm. My question is have you, has the Trump administration explained this to our Turkish friends? Are you going to implement those sanctions? In other words, tell us everything that’s going on behind the scenes please? (laughter)

And my broader question is how can Turkey be a credible NATO ally as it grows closer to the Russian military and acquires systems that directly threaten NATO capabilities? Thank you.

Kay Bailey Hutchison: Well, Russian knows and has most certainly been told all of the ramifications of that purchase. And they also are, know that it is inter, not interoperable with any NATO system. And their answer is that they needed something fast and that this would not be in any way a part of the NATO overall umbrella. Obviously, it’s a great concern, there’s no doubt about it. But on the other hand, Turkey is a very valuable ally in NATO. They have done their part, they are one of the four framework nations in Afghanistan right now and doing a very credible job. And they have answered the call every time NATO has made a call.

So they are an ally and we are going to deal with kind of a tough issue. Bilaterally, I don’t know that a decision has been made on that particular question, which is a valid question. It’s just that I don’t know what the answer will be on it, but Turkey is a member of NATO, they are a valuable ally and we will continue to work through the issues that I have to say we have with all nations in our alliance have some issues that are not exactly right the way you would like for it to be.

We have bilateral disagreements all across, but in the big picture, we are together and on the big things. Turkey is right there with us and a helpful ally and we need all of us to contribute to the extent that we can to make the overall umbrella of security for the alliance, and for the people that we’re trying to help.

Question: Thank you.

Dr. Gideon Rose: Yes, over here. If you could please stand up when asking the questions and identify yourself.

Question: My name is Jackson Janes, I’m from Johns Hopkins in Washington. Dr. MacMillan, you just watched this film. There is a harking memory of 20-, of 1917 when Woodrow Wilson was trying to create a world safe for democracy. That failed miserably and it led to the second world war. Do you see echoes of
that today and particularly with regard to the trend toward people, all of them wanting to make their great again without necessarily a great leadership coming from the United States, if I can add? If a man, if a President is in Vietnam and says there's no place like home, it strikes as a very strange message for a global power to be saying. What is at stake for securing what purpose if the purpose is only to make one nation great again? Do you see the danger that I'm pointing at that led to the second world war reoccurring now?

Unidentified Male: Or the first.

Dr. Margaret MacMillan: There's always a danger, I think, of things going badly wrong. I never think history repeats itself, and I would disagree with you that Woodrow Wilson's idea of making the world safe for democracy was a complete failure. I think what he did was introduce and publicize – and these were some of the ideas that had been around for some time, but Woodrow Wilson took them and worked them into a vision. And I think we need vision sometimes, as long as we recognize that visions should not be constraining. They should be goals to be aimed for, they shouldn't be a blueprint.

And I think what he did was introduce the idea that we have collective responsibility for each other among nations and that we should try and work together not just to maintain peace and provide security for each other, but to actually make the world a better place. I mean, he had very clear goals and these were supported by a lot of people. What went wrong, I think, were the conditions for making peace in 1919 were not all that good and what happened in the intervening 20 years, because I think to say 1918, 1919 led directly to 1939 is just wrong.

It's 20 years, what was everyone doing in those 20 years and what went wrong? And there were failures of leadership, there was also the tremendous strain put on the system – and I hope Constanze is wrong that we aren't feeling a similar strain – but the tremendous strain put on by the Great Depression, which made people all over the world doubt in the efficacy of their own types of government and in the, and in, in their own elites.

And so I think what we need to take from that period is that we do need people who will look ahead and say look, we can build a better world. You know, if you just do business as usual, you're going to find that the institutions that make business as usual possible are going to crumble, and that's, that I think what worries me. I think at the moment, there is not a willingness. – that's unfair because there's always a willingness to try and make the world a better place. But I think there's too much of a cynicism, a feeling we can't do anything about it. And we're not looking at some of the major problems and we, well we are, but we're not looking at them seriously.
I mean, climate change, we've looked at and then we forget about. Demographics, I mean, there's a huge problem with demographics for the developed world where the population is declining which in some ways you could argue is a good thing, but the balance is wrong. And tremendous pressure on developed countries from parts of the world where people want to get out of. So I mean, I think there are lots of things that we're not at the moment really grappling with.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Yes?

**Kay Bailey Hutchison:** I just want to have a two finger to say that I don't think it's an accurate position to say that America is not doing more in deterrence of Russia. In addition to what NATO is doing in, in the Baltics, in the Balkans and the surrounding areas is – and President Trump increased an initiative that is $5 billion now of American forces on top of the NATO forces in those countries. It's the European Deterrence Initiative that's American, besides the NATO one. And we are carrying the heavy load in Afghanistan, in addition to help from NATO and it's a tough, a tough thing.

We've been there 16 years and we are now saying we aren't putting a timeline on it because we're going to stay to finish helping the Afghan people help themselves to a better life. And we're getting ready to make a major initiative on stabilizing Iraq and this is American taxpayers paying the extra to take a leading place in the world for these people.

So I don't see that, that historic perspective that we are leading up to a leaderless world that is sitting by and letting bad things happen. We are acting. We're NATO, we're America and our allies that are helping us bilaterally as well. And I think we are taking the steps. NATO was formed not to have another World War I and World War II and I think we're being true to that purpose.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Thank you. Over here, ma'am.

**Question:** Miriam (unidentified), I'm running the (inaudible) Journalist from (inaudible). It's been very fruitful because we need democracy and freedom, but we also not have our duty to our country, not only to ask and try to get it, but what we are going to do afterwards. And also what you have said about getting to people's (inaudible) instruction, not only education, it's instruction and education and well, many of other things.

Our government, our regime is one of a kind, I would say, at this time and it's in a moment of not changes but new generations that the government is trying to put in place. So it's a very difficult moment and also interesting and I think that we could not lose it. I would like the United States to be more and not to have withdrawn, as it has right now because it's been very fruitful, Americans going
and other people from everywhere, for instance, from Canada, the main tourists in Canada and Cuba are Canadians.

So it's very important for us. Like, I think that I would like your opinion what would you think that we could do? Address more and more people's interests, necessities or something different from the opposition or Cubans in general? Cuban civil society, independent civil society in general. Thank you very much.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Thank you. Does anybody have a Cuba comment?

**Kay Bailey Hutchison:** Well, I think what we have tried so long to do is to encourage freedom and Cuba, but of course, that hasn't worked. Isolating Cuba has not worked. I thought opening trade and trying to help build their economy would make things better. And I, I still think that’s the, still what we haven’t given a chance yet to succeed, but we’re having setbacks. There’s no, there’s no doubt about that because of the situation with the, the embassy people and the sicknesses.

So I think we have to do everything we can to help the Cuban people find a better way of life. I think helping their economy and trying to have more communications there is very important. I will say that I have known companies who want to go in and invest. I've known airlines that want to go in and try to serve. But they are being hampered at every turn by the Cuban government. And you are not going to be able to get investment if you don't have a rule of law and contract rights and there has to be some ability to, to have a fairness if you're going to make an investment.

And so I understand your frustration, I absolutely do. We want to help the Cuban people and I think we will continue to make the efforts, as we can.

**Jane Harman:** If I could just add one thing. It's a brave comment for Ambassador Hutchison to make that our, the US policy of 50 years of isolating Cuba didn't work. And I agree that it didn't work. What comes next, I hope, will be notwithstanding maybe a temporary blip, a more open US policy because we're hurting ourselves. The rest of the world is in Cuba. Cuba is transitioning and I think Cuba will be capable of building the civil society it doesn't have now.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Over here. Sir.

**Question:** (inaudible), professor of international relations at Japan's National Defence Academy. I am very glad to hear very fruitful comments from the excellent panelists about necessity for us to unite together to protect the liberal international order, which we have enjoyed for more than 70 years, after the end of World War II. Having said that, I have one complaint. That is so far, the element of Asia is missing from the argument.
Yes, I mean, in Europe, the liberal international order has been increasing strain because of the rule breakings by Russia and in western (inaudible) problems exist. But in East Asia too. I mean, liberal international order is under increasing strain because of increasingly assertiveness, increasing (inaudible) assertive China. And last year, as was in plenary session which I was, for which I was a panelist, we discussed about that. But since then, the situation seems to be even worse. How do you think about the way we should unit together to that problem in East Asia? Thank you very much.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Anybody want to take an Asia comment?

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller:** I can do it.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Okay. Constanze.

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller:** Maybe it's not intuitive since I'm the European on the panel, but I think that Asia is one of the arenas next to the Middle East, and indeed next to Europe where we are seeing the grievous consequences of what I think of as a decline in American leadership. And I think we saw that on the presidential visit to Asia now. Forgive me. I'm going to be blunt and I do this because I love America and because I want American leadership.

Now, also lest I be misunderstood, I, I am tired of the alliance burden sharing which consists in American sins of commission and European sins of omission. That's not to say I would like us to undertake sins of commission as well, but I would like to see a more forward leaning European role in the Pacific, particularly given the enormous trade interest that we have there, and that ought to give us a first order strategic interest in the stability and the safety and the prosperity of the region. That really is a huge argument for Europe paying more attention there.

So I (inaudible) them first. But the, I think we have to understand that although there are many, many people in the White House, in the Defence, in DOD and in the State Department working to keep things normal and to reassure allies everywhere, including the Pacific, that they will not be left alone. Presidential words and tweets carry their own throw weight. And while they may not change the policy, what they do do is increase the risk of strategic miscalculation and they presumably add momentum to the shifts in tectonic plates of the international order that we're already hearing creaking all around us.

Turkey is a case in point. Turkey and Russia and Iran are working together to reorder the Middle East. We have very little to oppose to that. I think very similar things are happening in your region. And I think if we need to have any conversation this weekend, it is how we as a western alliance put together with
our allies from other parts of the world can stop these incredibly damaging developments which can very well lead to an actual war in one of these (inaudible).

**Jane Harman**: Let me play optimist for a minute.

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller**: Sorry about that.

**Jane Harman**: Try. (laughter) Even about President Trump's recent trip. First of all, he made the trip and he spent a week and a half (laughter) focused on, but seriously on a, on a long agenda —

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: What's your point?

**Jane Harman**: — visited five countries, went to two international summits, and made a contribution. We don’t have to like every minute of it. Certainly we don’t have to like the tweets, but I think the message delivered in many countries and the friendship with Japan for example, was positive. So there’s that point.

Secondly, the imminent threat in the Middle East, in the, in Asia, is nuclear, you know, the nuclear menace of North Korea and all of Asia feels that, including China. And I do think there is the possibility that the countries of Asia and China and the US will be able to come up with some way to walk North Korea back, whether it's a freeze for a freeze, which some now say they don't want, or it is some other strategy. I think US attention is being paid there and I think if that can happen, that could open opportunities for stronger cooperation.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: And it's actually a great little debate there because, you know, we were talking before about narratives, like what, what great historians like Margaret do is find narrative threads throughout history so that the blooming, buzzing confusion tells a story when you read it and it's logically connected. And we know that story to a certain extent of the last century, right. We could all tell different versions of it, but the parts of the graph going forward, the lines, the out years are dotted lines that we're doing.

And so in some ways, what we’re talking about and thinking about in the ways that, you know, Peter thought about this panel kind of thing is okay, if you put a pin in 20, you know, 2117, a century from now and you look at from there back to here, what would that, we know what the first century of that trajectory looks like. What does the second century look like? Is this turbulence a blip in the ongoing thing like every little market reaction, which basically is a (inaudible) dip when you look at the long stock market chart just goes gradually up and up? Or is it some kind of (inaudible) point in the other direction cause history doesn’t necessarily be progressive?
We don't have time to discuss that right now, but it's a, that's the way you should be thinking about these larger questions. How permanent is this? Is it a blip? Do you buy the dip and effect or is it, you know, the precursor to some larger crash?

We have a bunch of questions, I'm going to group a couple of them now. Right here, you've been waiting for a while. And right there in the back with the beard.

**Question:** Thank you. Jakkie Cilliers from the Institute for Security Studies. Apologies for taking the floor again.

I wonder we say peace, prosperity and principle, and the big divide seems to be between the upper in-, the high income countries and the rest. And I've not heard the issue of income disparity in an era of globalization. And I wonder if that isn't the big divide that is driving all the other issues and that is what the west stands for today is protection of its prosperity in the face of, in a global era, in an era of globalization that is in actual fact, driving all, driving the inequalities and driving the, all the other threats that we confront today.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** And over here. Bundle up together.

**Question:** Hi, I'm Kevin Baron from Defence One. I heard a lot about the strain on international order and Dr. MacMillan, you talked earlier about the need to maintain multinational institutions. Can you drive that a little bit forward? What do you want to see happen – and I'd ask the academics and the former members of Congress, I've heard for several years a need for a new international order, but all I can tell are that we have a lot of conferences like Halifax or Aspen or Brussels, but – and Munich, thank you – but what needs to happen more? Does it have to come from the president? Does it have to come from, you know, what, what leadership?

And for the members of Congress, how does that bring in the electorates, the people? Do they have a role in this? Should they have a role in this or is it rooms like this that's going to make that new future happen, if it needs to?

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Open season on both.

**Dr. Margaret MacMillan:** I don't think there's a simple answer to either one of those questions because I don't think it is just about economics. I think it's about values, I think it's about certain societies that people want to live in. And so if we see it just in terms of economic competition and economic dissatisfaction, then I think we're missing something very important.
And on how do we build a better world order, again, I don’t think there’s one answer. I think leadership is clearly needed but unless you carry people with you, you can be the most brilliant leader in the world, but you have to be able to bring people with you. I mean, I think FDR, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was capable of doing that. He never went too far ahead of the American population, which sometimes infuriated American allies and those who wanted the United States to get involved. But he knew that any sustained commitment, I think has to be made with the support of the people and I think that is in the and why democracies, imperfect and messy as they are, tend to muddle through a bit better than autocracies because they have to have more sources of support and they have to listen to more voices.

Jane Harman: I think the issue of income inequality is not just an issue between rich nations and poor nations, it’s within nations. I think there's income inequality, certainly in the United States, packets of that equality and, you know, the so-called hillbilly country elected Donald Trump as president because these people are anxious about the future of work and he spoke to them in a way that the Democratic candidate, Hillary Clinton, didn't.

And there is a question about the future of work in all of our societies. What will it look like in a, in a time of automation and AI? What will it look like and how can we assure people, young people, especially in countries with a youth bulge, that they will have anything productive to do and instead, they might just sit on a sidewalk or not even a sidewalk, a dirt, a dirt road looking at their devices, become radicalized, blow themselves up and continue this horror of terror. So I think it's a major challenge and, and one we don't have good answers for.

On the other point, I think that's the point I made in the first place, that who do you listen to? Who has an authoritative voice? Does anyone here remember Walter Cronkite who would conclude his, his newscast every night with and that's the way it is. I mean, who is it out there who can say that's the way it is?

Dr. Gideon Rose: Usually it's the conference moderator type, but –

Jane Harman: Oh. (laughter) It's Gideon, well.

Dr. Gideon Rose: Here in front. Right up here.

Jane Harman: Okay.

Question: I’m Mark Hetfield, I’m the President of HIAS, which is the American-Jewish communities refugee organization. It’s true that Trump has paid attention to Asia by spending so much time there, but he certainly spent no, paid no attention to human rights issues in Asia, with the biggest ethnic cleansing going on since Rwanda in, in Myanmar right now. But in my field, in
the refugee field, it’s another place where we have seen a total collapse in collective responsibility for human rights. There is no sense of responsibility sharing anymore, there is, for refugees at this time. And we have the largest displacement in human history.

There has certainly been an American abdication of leadership on this front. We have just filed suit for the second time against Donald Trump for his Muslim ban as my agency has. And so my question is what is the link today between collective security for human rights and collective responsibility for human rights and collective responsibility for security? Is, is there a link and what can be done in this absence of American leadership?

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** It's interesting.

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller:** May I?

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** Constanze?

**Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller:** That’s a question that’s close to my heart, as you know because I started life as an international lawyer, and as a journalist, wrote about war crimes, tribunals and in fact, the regions where war crimes were committed in Rwanda and the Balkans. And while I think that we may have seen in the 1990s, in the west, something like normative overreach. I think what we’re now seeing is normative disarmament. Normative disarmament, a stepping back from our own universalist commitments in response to a feeling of being overwhelmed by the promises and an inability to keep the promises that we made.

And again, I think this is something that needs to be calibrated. We may have promised more than we could keep. There are places where we have done; Afghanistan is one of them. But I think if we march back on the principle, if we march back on our commitment as such to the universalism, you know, of the freedom from fear and the freedom from want and other universal values, then we, then I think we undermine ourselves, we undermine our own legitimacy and our belief in our ourselves.

And I think that then, that is the most damaging thing I see happening now, really, this sort of creeping delegitimization of values that were at the core of the western narrative and that define who we are and what we stand for.

**Dr. Gideon Rose:** And it comes (inaudible) that the refugee crisis follows, is a separate and different, and migration issues have an additional dimension to them, I think, in, to human rights abuses. It's part of the broader humanitarian operation, but there really is an interesting question of we have a world in which increasingly goods and services are globalized and move freely but people don’t
and we’re seeing the contradictions and, and what the national boundaries of community are.

It’s not, it’s not surprising that Canada, with a more clearly thought through, democratically accountable and seemingly efficient immigration system has had far less of the populist backlash that, let’s say, the US has had. And you know, there are people who have said that, you know, many people I know who are not particularly huge fans of the Trump administration have felt that on certain kinds of immigration issues in terms of how to rethink some of the US system and, it has some good ideas, including aping Canada.

And so I think that the broader question of how should one respond to human rights abuses in situ, as it were and the separate question of international migration are two different aspects of the sort of humanitarian kind of issue. And one that even, even if we’re doing normative, even if we can agree that we should be more involved humanitarianly in various kinds of interventions, the question of the migration and refugee systems are —

**Jane Harman**: To be fair though, the immigration issue is a huge driver of election results in Europe too and the Brexit result. A lot of it has to do with immigration. And there is a gigantic migration of people from the Middle East coming west and societies either can reject them or absorb them, but it’s, it’s not going to – rejecting them all and having them all die at sea is not, is not, it seems to me, a moral outcome. So how does —

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: Is accepting them all?

**Jane Harman**: Well, Angela Merkel tried that and got punished politically. I think there, you know, America was built on immigrants. I don’t know who in America wasn’t an immigration except for native American Indians. So I think part of our innovation and, and creativity, much of it comes from immigrants. Even now, they head some of our most innovative tech firms. So I, I think we have to find a way to absorb immigrants, not push them out. And I think it’s a very good question about how we could do that.

And last comment, ethnic cleansing in Myanmar is reprehensible. It’s just reprehensible and so disappointing that a leader like Aung San Suu Kyi would be in the position she is and not speak out.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: There’s so many things we could discuss. We literally are over time and one of the things we do in Halifax is we try to stick to schedule cause there’s so many good things going on. We don’t want to get early on off of schedule.
Any final comments from our panelists? Any final thoughts you want to utter? Okay, let me say first of all, thank you to all of you guys. And let me also just – sorry --

**Kay Bailey Hutchison**: There was a final comment.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: Ambassador.

**Kay Bailey Hutchison**: No, I was just going to say that I, I think that immigration and migration are different from refugees. And I think refugees, that is a humanitarian issue, it’s something that we should address, we should address more, every country should address more. Immigration, I think, is separate and Jane is on, she’s right on that. I think there, the, the turmoil and the mixing of that has made it a problem.

But just to end, I’ll say I am the optimist, and I do think that, I think your points are, are well taken. Most certainly you are the academically strong crowd here talking on these issues, but I think the basic spirit of freedom, the NATO alliance, I think, is an umbrella for good, for security, for countries that will stand up for themselves. We will be there for them, in general. I think America is showing leadership.

I’m not saying particular, I know there are controversies about the way things are said and I understand that, but in the main, we have a leadership that, I know America first probably rankles people, but I think that what, what we’re saying is we want to have partnerships, we want to have a, a global participation, but it doesn’t mean we’re not going to lead, it doesn’t mean we’re not going to continue to innovate. It doesn’t mean that we’re not going to continue to bear the financial burden of the efforts that are being made.

And so I’m optimistic that that zeal for freedom is still among people, all people really and we’re going to help people who, who are in a situation in which they can’t fight for themselves or we’re going to help them fight for themselves in a good way so that they can sustain a better way of life.

**Dr. Gideon Rose**: Thank you Ambassador. Let me just say this. I think a wonderful final comment. Now, we can move on to the next Halifax tradition, which is of course celebrating our common values and interests by going and doing unspeakable things to a number of crustaceans. (laughter)

Thank all of you and we look forward to seeing you, going forward.

(applause)
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