



**2014 Halifax International Security Forum
Plenary 3 Transcript
Who Controls the Map? Lost Innocents, Persistent Criminals, Depraved
Terrorists**

SPEAKERS

Shlomo Avineri, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

John Kelly, Commander, United States Southern Command;

Rob Nicholson, Minister of National Defence, Canada;

Alexander Vershbow, Deputy Secretary General, North Atlantic Treaty Organization

MODERATOR

Kathleen Koch, Author, Journalist, and Founder, Leaders Link

Kathleen Koch: Good Morning I would like to welcome you all to our panel on who controls the map. My name is Kathleen Koch, I am a former long-time CNN correspondent, author and founder now of the non-profit Leaders Link. We are the first organization to harness and share elected officials disaster lessons learned. Help other communities better prevent, prepare for and recover from disasters. Well let's get to the matter at hand now. Watching that video, you know, it's almost hard to remember that once upon a time a long time ago, the players on the world stage were largely Nation States and where there were non-state actors, they were largely operating in the wings on the periphery. And those on centre stage, the nation states, even if they disagree, they knew the rules, they knew their roles, they knew their lines and life seemed so much simpler then. Of course now we have no many violent non-stage actors who are elbowing their way now it seems to centre stage demanding attention and that's the phenomenon we are here to discuss and I really want to get right to it. We have a fabulous panel so let me get to our introductions briefly first; our wonderful host, Rob Nicholson, Canada's Minister of National Defense, Ambassador Sandy Vershbow, Deputy Secretary General of NATO, General John Kelly, Commander of U.S. Southern Command and Dr. Shlomo Avineri, Professor Emeritus at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, welcome gentlemen. Minister Nicholson, I would like to go to

you with the first question and really perhaps have you test the thesis; the question on the floor is: Are on stage actors truly increasingly controlling the map? Are they becoming more influential and important on the World Stage than nation state or are they simply commanding more attention than ever before, louder than ever before?

Rob Nicholson: Well they are certainly getting more attention than ever before and certainly their presence is increasing. Those of us who believe in nation states and the pluralism that can and should exist within nation states have a responsibility to ensure that these free actors, these ones who will challenge the nation state don't get their way and there are a number of ways we can do that. We can do it within our own borders and we can do it with international cooperation but it's something that we have to do.

Koch: Dr. Avineri, I know that you have some concerns about the decreasing situation, the decreasing strength in nations states in your corner of the world and how that is leading to the growth of the non-state violent actors. Talk to me about that.

Shlomo Avineri: Well the nations they exist as we know, it came out of Europe, mainly the Westphalian nations state after 1648, it took 300 years and 38 wars consolidated, but the nation state system in the Middle East was imposed after WW1, after the victory of the Allies over the Ottoman Empire by mainly British and French Imperialism who drew lines on the sand. The map that we know in the Middle East, straight lines between Syria and Iraq, between Syria and Saudi Arabia, etc. it has to do with what was decided about during WW1 by British and French Colonial Imperialist Officer Sykes-Picot the two most important people and it took some time to unravel and it is now unravelling because the system imposed on the Middle East, it created an impendent Syria, an impendent Iraq and an impendent Lebanon, was basically based on the interest of the British and the French, the local population was never asked. Syria and Iraq never existed in their present borders historically and this was done in total disregard for the wish of the local people. They were not asked whether they wanted to be Syrians or Iraqi, they were not asked where they want to be. And now that the system has been challenged and it has been challenged mainly by the American occupation of Iraq and later by their offspring, other identities are coming up. In cases like Syria and Iraq, people are mainly viewing themselves not only as Syrian and Iraqis, but as Shia and Sunni, Yazidis, Kurds, people who have very different histories and those take now dominance and are bringing about the disintegration of the national state as we know it. I think it is totally unrealistic to imagine that you can put Humpty Dumpty together again and have Syria and Iraq in their present borders as this has been since the British and French decided upon it during WW1. It's a new

game and it's a new state system. It's a state system that is becoming unravelling, not just the regime.

Koch: I would like to now go to, we have a couple of folks in the audience who are going to help us frame our discussion today because there are so very many violent non-state actors that we can touch on and discuss. So I have people who have pre-volunteered to share with me their thoughts on what you would like to see this panel cover today. So first if you would give me your name and tell me what you want to hear about today.

Audience: Thanks Kathleen. Peter Pham from the Atlantic Counsel in Washington and I work primarily on Africa and certainly the state system is under challenge as Professor Avineri said and one of the places it is under challenge is North Eastern Nigeria with the Boko Haram insurgency and I want to raise the question of how do we determine which of these conflicts where we have the state system under challenge, where we have non-state actors getting involved, we have numerous conflicts around the world, all demanding attention; what criteria are we going to use because if you look at the criteria to justify intervention against ISIS in Iraq and Syria, many of the same criteria are actually applicable in North Eastern Nigeria. Large swaths of territory under insurgent control, large urban centers in position of a radical ideology and even military capability. Boko Haram has done something that ISIS has not yet done; shoot down a fighter jet in combat operations and then beheaded the pilot. So and then we have exchanges between these groups. So what are the criteria to determine when the international community needs to step in?

Koch: Thank you Peter and now, Mouaz?

Mouaz Mustafa: Mouaz Mustafa with the Syria Emergency Task Force. You know, one of the biggest threats that we do have today is ISIS obviously and I think my question is why don't we look at the cues that they give us? We seem to...they telegraph regularly on social media in their conversations with each other and others about that they must fight, for example, what they call the Awakening Tribes in Iraq and they must fight the Syria Apostates first which are sort of essentially the Syrian opposition and they regularly tell that to their fighters before they even go after Assad or Iran or Israel or the U.S. or whatever else they have on their sort of list. At the same time in their videos that they bring out, there is a message to the United States and others; they are clearly saying they are cutting off people's heads and they are listening for reaction and in the latest video by Baghdadi, they are calling for American troops, they are saying stop fighting us with your proxies but come fight us face to face and these are very clear signals on what their fears are which is the moderate opposition in

Syria, the Sidney Tribes in Iran that have proved in the Anbar Awakening in the past what they can do, they have proved in Syria and Idlib province in six days, ISIS was destroyed in Aleppo in 27 days, they were completely decimated with negligible support from the West. And so why are we playing into their hands? I mean we seem to be even bombing some of the other Islamic extremist groups that were their enemies, thus uniting them and we are not empowering the guys that we were supposed...that have proven themselves against ISIS in the past. So I think that is my question in general.

Koch: Thank you Mouaz and finally Luis.

Luis Rubio: Thank you, good morning. LLuis Rubio from CIDAC in Mexico City. General Kelly I would like to ask you; how do you deal with the conundrum of violence in Central America and Mexico. I see two different problems to two different sides. On the one hand the weakness of the state institutions, the non-existent institutions in many cases, the problem of governments that lies on the problem of these societies. On the other, the enormous power of the criminal organizations which is largely based on the demand for drugs coming from the U.S. So prohibition for drugs and I am not advocating to eliminate it but the fact is that that creates an enormous part for our organizations with enormous wealth that undermines the capability of those states, even if they were willing to, to fight those organizations. So how do you deal with that conundrum with that class of combinational factors?

Koch: Thank you gentleman and why don't we just go right to General Kelly with that question sir.

John Kelly: Well, the way to fight, first and foremost is to reduce the drug demand in the United States, in Canada and the rest of the world. The amount of money that is generated by drug consumption primarily in the west fuels unbelievable levels of violence throughout the world. But certainly in your country, in Central America and other parts of the Americas and Caribbean, just cocaine alone, the profit that comes out of the United States, cocaine alone is about 80 billion dollars a year. The problems with the Cartels is not getting drugs into the United States, the problem is laundering the money. I mean when my organization seizes money, we don't count it, we weigh it and we turn it over to people. I mean think of a Tonne of money and no coins. It is a phenomenal amount of money. The way you do it sir is what we helped take place in Colombia. Colombia 15-20 years ago was nearly a fail state. Certainly as bad off as some of the nations that you have referenced. And mostly through their own efforts, almost entirely through their own funding, they had to make very, very hard decisions about their society, about their tax code, about including people into the fight, in

proving their military. Not only effectiveness on the battlefield but in the realm of human rights bringing government institutions out into the countryside where there never was any. The school solution if you will is what Colombia did. The United States assisted with a lot of advice, a lot of encouragement, very, very little money. Four cents on the dollar, all the rest of it was paid for by the Colombians but they had to make a commitment and today...

Koch: So that is the example of what works?

Kelly: Right, we have asked and they do it. The Colombians are now exporting their experiences. They are working with other countries of the Central American ISMIS and other part of the Caribbean. Working with them not only in reforming their military but also working with their governments telling them these are the things you have to do tax code wise. Again, get the elites involved, all of the things that we learned in Colombia. I can't say enough about what Colombia did for itself and is now doing for other parts of the region.

Koch: Mr. Nicholson, you have some thoughts in the area.

Nicholson: You have to go beyond that as well. I mean you need those nation states to cooperate with each other to resist, to tackle these things that happened to us and again with Operation Karib, Operation Marteel, is an example of nation states coming together working to stop these drug Cartels and Canada which is a creation of French and British imperialism has an important role to play in that in assisting and that's exactly what we do. We join in these operations because we know that these problems end up on our doorstep if we don't do it so yes we want to work with the countries to make sure that they have the institutions in place to resist, to fight this type of activity but it is vital for us as nation states to work together to assist.

Koch: And is that the drug Cartel, General Kelly that are your greatest concern when it comes to violent non-state actors in the 45 nations and territories in your area of operations.

Kelly: Yeah, I mean without doubt, I mean these Cartels, most people don't understand the size, the complexity and the reach. I mean they are joined by the way to the rest of the world. Transnational Organized Crime Network and this is a worldwide thing. There is terrorism being financed around the world to some degree by cocaine consumption in Canada, United State and Western Europe. It is kind of a really horrible irony. But yeah, these are...think multinational corporations. They grow it, they transport it and they market it in the United States. In Beijing and Auckland and in all over Western Europe. Anywhere they can sell it. It's an amazing organization.

The big ones are the Mexican ones but it's at the same time very large but very decentralized as well.

Koch: Ambassador Vershbow, I would like to get to you now. We will get to Boko Haram and we will talk about ISIS but I want to talk about Ukraine. I know Vice President Joe Biden just left there this week and he called these Russian Separatists Proxies of Russia. The Ukrainian Prime Minister this week called them Russian Mercenaries and refused to negotiate with them so where do they fall. Do we label them as separatists? I mean as non-violent...excuse me, as violent non-state actors?

Alexander Vershbow: Yeah.

Koch: Or are they an extension of the state?

Vershbow: Well it's a very ambiguous situation and deliberately so. This is sort of the underlying goal I think of President Putin and what he is doing in Eastern Ukraine. He is trying to have it both ways in some respects. And Russia still enjoys the status of a state, enjoys the benefits of the international system but at the same time it's using non-state actors to actively destabilize a neighbouring country. And we see that this is what we are calling a hybrid warfare and you can perhaps say these are hybrid non-state actors. There is an official dimension to it that some of them are Cossacks and volunteers or soldiers on vacation or people who kind of got lost and sort of decided to join the fight but nothing to do with Russia. And of course the aim is to have deniability although it is getting increasingly implausible. But this is kind of a new challenge and I think that this could be applied not just by Russia but by others in other parts of Europe and the rest of the world.

Koch: But are we adequately meeting the challenge? Dr. Avineri?

Avineri: If I may refer to the first question about criteria. I am going to say something that is not very politically correct. There is no one size fits all. We have to understand whether it is in Iraqi, Kurdistan or whether it is in Ukraine Russia, the history is what brought about the crashes. I mean the crashes in Eastern Europe, I don't want to go into it in great detail, has to do with the fact that the borders of Russia and Ukraine were an outcome of communist Soviet policy in the early to mid -19-20th century. And those became the order of the borders of independent states and this has left a lot of minorities. I am not justifying anything that is done by Putin in Russia but there is a backer onto it and it is the same in the Middle East. A few months ago everybody was talking about the terrible things that were happening to the Yazidis in Syria and also in Iraq. Who has ever heard outside the region about the Yazidis? Everybody didn't understand that there is a historical problem there that has to be looked at so I think

there is no one criteria. The only advice one can give, I think, to policymakers is before you make decisions, whether it is of intervention or not intervention. Where they are looking for your allies and trying to find your enemy, know a little but about the history of the region. Whether it is the history of the Kurdish National Movement that has been frustrated for decades. It has a history. Where there are relations between Sunni and Shias. Where there is a history of the Alawite minority in Syria. How come they became the dominant political force in Syria and we find sometimes a lot of ignorance about those back on there for some of the decisions that have been catastrophic.

Vershbow: In the case of Europe, we have developed not just since the end of the cold war but since the end of WW2, a rule based international system has very much...and the Soviet Union before it has been a key stakeholder, in fact, the whole Helsinki final act was the result of a Russian push for an international treaty that would codify existing borders and codify the principle that borders should not be changed by force and at the end of the Soviet Union, Russia signed the treaty at Belavezha that basically said that they would accept the internal border of the U.S. Star as international borders. So Russia has now systematically destroyed its own legal framework that it, itself helped to create and let's not forget the Budapest memorandum in which they got this great deal.

Koch: So what do we do about that? Avineri, my other panelists, what do we do?

Avineri: I don't disagree but the point is that in the disintegration of the Soviet Union into fifty nations, they did something that was not part of an international agreement but part of an internal development in Russia. We know that the United States was very much at one time against the disintegration of the Soviet Union and then you accept it as a fait accompli, there are developments here that you have to take into account that doesn't justify violent actions coming from Moscow.

Koch: Does NATO need to be doing more in Ukraine?

Vershbow: Well, we are already doing a lot in terms to trying to help strengthen Ukraine and NATO is only one actor in this regard. The European Union is deeply involved, the U.S. is deeply involved, trying to help them strengthen their state so that they are less vulnerable to this sort of interference by Russia. We are assisting them in re-building their security forces, NATO doesn't get into the issue of lethal versus non-lethal. That's decided by nations but nevertheless we are trying to help them be able to defend their sovereignty because that's what's at stake here and if Ukraine can't preserve it sovereignty, other states are even more vulnerable than ever. But let's also not forget that this isn't about ethnic compatriots even though that has been used as the justification by President Putin and his quite remarkable and hair-raising speech of

March the 18th about the Russian world. It's all about preventing democratization and a pro-European orientation from taking root in a neighbouring state of U.S.S.R. ... of Russia. Freudian slip but it actually Apropos.

Koch: Die Hard.

Kelly: The good old days.

Vershbow: And it is driven in point and term by Russian domestic politics. Putin doesn't want a Maidan in Russia and so he is going to eliminate any chance of a successful popular rebellion against corrupt kleptocracy in Ukraine.

Koch: Minister Nicholson, General Kelly, anyone want to weigh in on this?

Nicholson: Well again as one of the nation states that are part of NATO, we're firmly committed to the operation reassurance to do what we can to send out the message that this is completely unacceptable. And going back to the first...

Koch: Doesn't sound like Putin is getting the message.

Nicholson: Well you know, with the sanctions in place and the economic sanctions that are taking place and the international outrage of them, it is certainly my hope and the hope of everyone that he does get the message because we are not going to let up on this. This is a continuous effort on behalf of Canada and likeminded countries to insist whether it takes 5 years or 50, the people of Ukraine deserve the freedom that they deserve, that they fought for and that they achieved and that has to be one of our goals.

Kelly: Well done.

Koch: Dr. Avineri, I'd like to go back to Boko Haram because you brought that up and commenting on the issue Peter raised, you say all this criteria can't apply in the same way in every country. It is interesting that your Prime Minister Benjamin has described Boko Haram in the same breath as ISIS and Hamas and has called them branches of the same poisonous tree and Israel has actually been instrumental in training the most effective military unit in Cameroon that is really basically the only unit in the region that has been taking on and defeating Boko Haram so what are your thoughts on that? Do we need more aid in that respect to help in these regions?

Avineri: Well you have put me in a little bit of an uncomfortable position because I am not only a political scientist but also I am a citizen and I occasionally vote in Israeli elections. And I am not going to tell you for whom I voted because it's none of your business. But let me tell you I did not vote for Netanyahu ok. So having said that,

having said that, I think what you point out suggests something which maybe also of interest in fighting ISIS. That perhaps the only way of winning the war against non-conventional asymmetrical players is by asymmetrical action on the part of the nation state of the West. I am not only... and we have good examples and bad examples. There is the Soviet Union with all its might wasn't able to overcome the Afghanistan situation and United States has problems, had problems, has problems, in Afghanistan and Iraq even now. And the answer is perhaps to adopt some of the tactics which are being used by the non-conventional and non-asymmetrical forces and perhaps in this respect the Peshmerga which are on the borderline of a non-conventional form of guerilla group and an infantry group can perhaps have a better chance of doing it than even a constituent Iraqi army which is then doing it a very bureaucratic and state organized army. So one has to look very carefully at what are the counter insurgency or counter measures and to look at non-conventional and asymmetrical ways and whether what you have said is the answer to Boko Haram or not, I do not know because I am not aware too much of the genuine situation but one has to look seriously at non-conventional answers. Bombing from above and a conventional warfare is not going to be the answer.

Koch: I think that takes us to ISIS and General Kelly, before we start discussing the best way to address ISIS and how things are going up to this point, I would like to look backwards a little bit and you spent a good bit of time in Iraq and from the research that journalists and others have done, they believed that ISIL had its inception in Camp Bucca, a prison camp where eight of the leaders of ISIL were incarcerated together there for numerous years. I am wondering for the time that you spend in the region, did you see this coming? The disenfranchisement of the Sunni's and again, this kind of...this metastasizing of these groups in prisons.

Kelly: Not in prisons, I mean these movements began, you know years ago. We all know the history. And it will continue to expand and morph and for probably I think decades and decades to come I mean this is a very, very long war and I mean no one in this room, in my opinion, will be alive at the end of this war and we will win it so long as we stay true to our values and our likeminded decent people gather together and do what needs to be done so I don't think it necessarily, I mean the fact that they happened to be in the same place at the same time...to the point that was made here a few minutes ago. We are most successful I think, and again the Colombian example or the Sunni Awakening example in our Province, when you work by, with and through the local people and trust them and get to know them and you know put your arms around them, it takes time. You know when I was first sent to Anbar Province the advice Paul Bremmer and Rick Sanchez gave me was, you are going to worst part of Iraq, we will never win down there, just don't get too many people killed. I would tell you within five

years the forces that were there, all of the forces that were there handed a win. And we handed the political leadership a win by, as I say, engaging with the religious people, with the women's groups, literally, with many, many, many women's groups, with the Tribal leaders, the Clan leaders...

Koch: So you handed them the win and they lost the win?

Kelly: Yes. We won and we handed that win off and that obviously one of the great regrets of my career is the very people that I told when I left, the shakes and the local...and the Mayor of Fallujah and the Mayor of Ramadi and the Mayor of Kyme and the Umams, when I left I said stay focused on being citizens on Iraq. Over time an Iraqi good enough democracy will develop. That democracy in my view had to include the Umams and the tribal leaders in some way and stay true to them and we won't walk away from you. It broke my heart about a week ago to see about 300 Tribesman from out in the heat area just machine gunned and these were people I knew and trusted and it breaks my heart that we walked away. Now, we are back in with a little bit of hope we will make this thing work.

Koch: Minister Nicholson, I wanted to give you the opportunity to respond. ISIL yesterday came out and said that they believe that they were the inspiration for the attacks on two members of your Canadian Military, the murders of them last month. They said that they...they made the pronouncement worldwide that anyone who is joining in this coalition with the United States to fight ISIL, go after them and kill them.

Nicholson: Again, I don't know if that has been officially confirmed but nonetheless this was a couple of terrible tragedies that took place here in Canada and I have been saying how grateful we are for the support and the condolences that we have received throughout the world but it reinforces our resolve to tackle ISIL at home and abroad and again it goes back to what this conference here is all about or this panel is, and that nation states have to bind together to challenge these and going back to that first question, where do we strike? Where do we come together? I think there has to be a recognition that not one country can do it all on their own. It is not enough for the United States to do this, to tackle all these problems. We need all likeminded nation states to realize that we all have a stake in fighting whether it's ISIL or drug cartels. These individuals are the same. They are immoral, they respect no laws and they are dangerous and so we all have that responsibility and let me just finish that by saying you can ask me who I voted for anytime Kathleen. I just want that to be part of the record here.

Avineri: May I just make two points; first of all, I think that one of the most successful Western strategies has been using drone strikes. We are shying away on the border of

asymmetric law because you are not fighting an enemy in the tradition and the confrontational way and this has been successful with a lot of problems. Most in Pakistan but also in Yemen which shouldn't really minimize the way that sometimes the west and (29:00) is adopting those strategies and I would like to see more of it. Secondly, because the guys I was mentioned in the earlier session, I just want to make a footnote as an Israeli. Israel is a nation state that was fighting an organization whether you call it terrorist or not, it doesn't matter. With fighting an organization that was not fighting or playing by the rule of international law so therefore those of us who are concerned about what is happening in Canada or what is happening in Britain or 9-11, United States, you have to understand that Hamas and Gaza is not exactly the same but they are first cousins of the same phenomenon. It is a non-state organization that shields itself behind women and children, occasionally behind international law which it of itself is not committed to so this is one of the problems Israel is suffering from. I am not saying that everything that Israel is doing is right, a lot of it is not. But we are witnessing the same problem in our case. The fact that behind it there is a Palestinian national movement and the Palestinians have the right to serve determination, I have no problem about that but Hamas is a non-state actor and it should be viewed in the world just as a non-state actor. It is not identical with Boko Haram, it is not identical with ISIS but those are cousins of the same family and we have to understand that.

Koch: Professor Vershbow?

Vershbow: I would like to come back to the issue of how do we fight ISIS or ISIL as we call it and I think that the essential part of the strategy that is being pursued now against ISIL and I think it is applicable in other case including Vis a Vie Boko Haram is the importance of the local forces. We tried the outside intervention imposing a solution from outside, we can't salvage the situation in Iraq but it didn't work out so well. And basically we don't have the resources to intervene in large scale in any case. But I think also the viability of a solution is build up local forces who can fight for their own countries, fight for their own more moderate ideologies to counter the toxic ideologies of groups like ISIL and also building up institutions of local governments inclusiveness was the failure of the Maliki government. It wasn't that the tribe lost their way, it was that the government in Baghdad excluded the Sunnis progressively from participating in the Iraqi state and it made the parts of Iraq fertile ground for ISILs message. And so we have to work with the local forces and this is where the international community can help and NATO is looking to expand its role in defence capacity building and helping counties build stronger defence institutions and military capabilities, counter terrorist capabilities so they can do the leading part of the fighting themselves. We can support them. In the case of ISIL is it so serious that we have to

use kinetic action from the air to beat them back but the longer term solution is building up the local institutions that can defeat them on the ground. And also getting states of the region to be the key part of any external military intervention so it doesn't have this same image of western crusade against Islam that we suffered in Iraq.

Koch: Actually I would like to throw out one question before we do go to the audience in just a minute. I thought it was very interesting what former Israeli Prime Minister and Defence Minister Ehud Barak said yesterday. If we eradicate ISIL, who wins? He said who wins is Assad, Iran and Hezbollah. Thoughts?

Avineri: It is really one of the problems because they have view that there is really wars against...between the good guys and the bad guys, what do you do if the war is between the bad guys and the bad guys? Who are the bad guys you would like...

Koch: Who do you help?

Avineri: To support and I think as Barak put yesterday it is a dilemma very clear here and one should be. Well I am not sure there is an easy answer to it but there is something out there which we should bear in mind and it is what I want to agree with the Ambassador. I am not a Huntingtonian and I think to understand what is happening now in Huntingtonian terms are wrong. This is not a clash of civilization, it is not a clash between the West and Islam. This is an internal civil war within Islam between moderate, accommodating Muslims who are very deeply religious, very devout, read from the same text and a very extreme interpretation of Islam. I am not the one to say which is the right interpretation, I will leave it to them but the war will be won, if it is going to be won with Western help but it will be won by moderate Muslims against extremist Muslims and this is why Saudi Arabia which is not exactly a moderate Islamic country but it is a nation state with responsibility, with deep links to the west who is also sometimes links with Israel. The key is in the hand of the Muslim nation. The Uma, whether it wants to fight the extremists within their own camp or just give up and I am very much encouraged by the fact that the coalition today is not just a coalition of westerners against Muslim extremists but the major issue and a major allies are the most moderate Muslim countries. Some of them are problematic, I mean the regime in Egypt is problematic but considering the alternative, it is the sort of thing which has a chance of bringing a legitimate Islamic government which is not exactly democratic, not exactly liberal but it is fighting its own civil war against Islamic radicals and I think this... one should bear in mind it is not a unconventional war.

Koch: Thank you Dr. Avineri. And now myself.

Audience: Hi Peter McKay, Canada. Just to come back to I think an important question asked by our moderator and that is NATO's ability to take preventative, protective action here. The membership action program planned some years ago could have included Ukraine, it could have included Georgia, it could have included and should include Montenegro. This protective shield provided by article five has been effective when one considers the Baltic states, when one considers the role that NATO has played and continues to play in terms of training and helping countries to prepare and defend themselves. There is a very impressive deterrent message that comes from membership in this exclusive alliance. The only time it has really been penetrated was 9-11. And that wasn't from a state actor. And so I guess the question in retrospect but more importantly looking forward is, shouldn't we look to expand NATO? It has been some years, shouldn't we take a more open view? We talk about open door, there seem to be an invisible shield over that door right now and I am interested in your thoughts on that Mr. Vershbow.

Vershbow: I am a strong partisan for NATO enlargement and I still believe that we have to uphold that vision and not be intimidated by Russian efforts to draw red lines and to re-establish the sphere of influence in their neighbourhood. The membership action plan of course isn't the same as article five. It would have put Ukraine and Georgia on a more clear path and it is not necessarily the case that it would have made a fundamental difference in what we have seen in the last 9-10 months. Sadly what this crisis has underscored is the sharp difference between being a member of NATO when you get article 5 and you get the protection which is now being strengthened by the way with another action plan, the Readiness Action Plan. The RAP so that we can be more agile and more able to respond very quickly to both conventional and hybrid threats that might come particularly in the Eastern part of the Atlantic and particularly up in the Baltics. But no one was prepared to go to war for Ukraine in this spring when the little green men began to occupy Crimea. But I think that we have to both stay true to our vision for the countries that still pursue membership and that includes Georgia, it includes three other western Balkan countries and ultimately the way to show that the door is really open is by letting somebody in. I think the next opportunity to take such a decision is at the end of next year when we are going to have an intensive review of Montenegro's case. They kind of came close but not quite close enough for this last summit in Wales. But we also have a substantial package to help the Georgians to get further down the road towards membership. That is going to be a very divisive issue when the debate comes whether it's at the next NATO summit in 2016 or the one after. But we cannot be true to our principles if we allow the Russians to bully us into abandoning the open door.

Koch: Dr. Avineri, briefly.

Avineri: Yeah, I don't want to sound critical of NATO because some of my best friends are in NATO so I should be very careful but I have been trying to administer the case question. To my mind, the future of the relationship with Ukraine has to do with whether Ukraine is capable to create a coherent political structure. Ukraine has not exactly been a failed state but in the last 25 years it was not really very successful in creating a coherent non-corrupt and integrated state system and to my mind what NATO can do and it has been very successful within the case of Georgia is to help Ukraine create a coherent state system with a bureaucracy, with an army. One of the reasons that corruption is so rampant in Ukraine is because the state structure has been politicized, has been not very effective and this is a great challenge, it has to be done with Ukrainians, it cannot be done from the outside but you have to...one has to find the kind of people in Ukraine who can do it. Until now, most of the leaders of Ukraine have not been very helpful, perhaps Tymoshenko will be more successful than others.

Vershbow: I totally agree and the issue of NATO membership is being debated now in Ukraine. At the moment they still have a non-align policy. If they change that we will defend their right to pursue NATO membership but the issue isn't really ripe for any decision making. They first have to get their act together in terms of building a viable state based on the rule of law and that is where the European Union has a big role to play and that is precisely what Putin is trying to prevent. He doesn't want them to succeed and he will actively try to subvert their efforts and the west has to be extremely determined and committed and ready to commit serious resources to help Ukraine succeed but they have to make the fundamental decisions themselves.

Koch: We have a question right here. And if you would introduce yourself please.

Audience: John Vinocur, Wall Street Journal. I would like to ask Sandy Vershbow and John Kelly a question concerning a statement by Vice President Biden last night. He said he used the word unacceptable to describe Russian military activity in the Ukraine currently. I once asked Richard Holbrook what unacceptable meant in our time and he said there is only one meaning for it diplomatic history and it means this shall not stand. I would like to ask NATO and General Kelly what does unacceptable mean today when at the same time the United States announced its contribution to Ukraine this week is ready to eat meals?

Vershbow: Ok. Certainly what Russia has been doing I think meets the test of unacceptable in the sense of violating the sovereignty of Ukraine, using the cover of these so-called separatists to de facto create another frozen conflict in a portion of Ukraine and all these things are flagrant violations of UN resolutions, defining

aggression and umpteen agreements that Russia itself has over the years stood by. Now our response doesn't have to be instantaneous but we have to continue to impose higher and higher costs on Russia for its aggression. The key instrument the international community has come up with and they are working, the sanctions. We have to do what we can to strengthen Ukraine and help make it more resistant to this kind of interference. We have to abide by long-term non-recognition policy towards Crimea, we can't forget Crimea just because Eastern Ukraine is the part that is now in flames because if they get away annexing part of a sovereign state and post-cold war Europe, the whole basis for stability and security is at risk. I think we'll have to see what more we can do to strengthen Ukraine. It is not just NATO's responsibility because the key challenges they face are political, economic, institutional, rooting out corruption, carrying out the fundamental reforms, coming up with a more rational energy policy so they are less dependent on the Russians for gas. There is a huge list of things that they need to do and we have to help them as much as possible. So this shall not stand doesn't mean it is going to be dealt with tomorrow but we have to be in this for the long haul, stay committed to our principles, put some real resources behind our policy and I think ultimately Russia's hand will get weaker over time and we will be able to roll back some of what we have seen.

Kelly: And my comment would be simply and I certainly agree with everything the Ambassador said, we have to take a long view of this and you know, as a military man I will do exactly what I am told to do. Right now I don't think we should do anything but take a long view at sanctions and just wait this thing out. I mean obviously there would be a point I guess if the leadership in Russia were to really push this thing to a really irrational level that would be a different story altogether but at the end of the day I think that probably right now it is best to watch and wait, but again as a military man I don't make policy, I just execute it and will do what we are told to do.

Koch: Thank you sir. Question here.

Audience: Pipla Malmgren. Former advisor to George W. Bush and now advisor to global investors. As an economist, I wanted to ask you about the alignment between states and their sovereign commercial entities, organized crime and the intelligence services where we see government seeking to arm people with a hundred bucks, have them cross a border and buy a lot of assets and a lot of loyalty. This is a particular issue in a world economy that is weak and to General Kelly's point that money laundering and the revenue generation is not just from drug trafficking but also from trafficking and counterfeit luxury goods where the rates of return on capital are much higher these days. So they are behaving in a very rational manner and turning to things that actually pay faster. So this is an important question because the border

can move without any military event with what I have described. So I am interested in your views on this.

Koch: Was it directed to General Kelly? Ok, thank you.

Kelly: Well the transnational organized criminal organizations of the world are, you know, massive global businesses and they will make money any way they can but I will tell you the big, big money is in drugs. But just as we saw last summer with the unaccompanied alien children \$68,000 that came out mostly from Central America. I mean the network that I deal with and that we have really good clarity on in terms of how it operates. The networks are an opportunity and they jumped on it. In fact, there were discussions within the network as to whether they were moving too many children because that is not where the real money was and it was getting in the way of moving cocaine and heroin and methamphetamines so they started to adjust the flow internally so that they wouldn't lose out on the big money and that was the flow of drugs. But you are right, I mean luxury goods and all sorts of exotic animals and all that, all of this moves on this international network. All you have to do is... and people and sex slaves and all you have to do is pay the fair and you have got a free ride and the network I deal with, a free ride into the United States for kind of a minimal amount of money.

Koch: Minister Nicholson.

Nicholson: Yes, we have to come to grips with the reality of what we are dealing with. The globalization of all these different types of crime is a factor that we have to deal with and those of us in the nation states have to ensure that number one, we have that global cooperation with those who are likeminded individuals and countries and the ensure that our laws keep pace with what is actually happening in this world. I mean 30 years ago if you looked at the laws in Canada there are quite a few descriptions of using the Postal Service for crime. Well, you know, we have moved beyond that and the criminals in this country no longer send telegrams to each other. They have gone beyond that and our laws have to reflect that kind of reality and the reality that crime respects no borders and we have to deal with that and I believe that we are dealing with that. There is greater international cooperation. I was recently using the example of a child porn bust and people were arrested in about five different countries. Well that wasn't just a coincidence. I mean that was the kind of cooperation that is now taking place between nation states that has to happen because these crimes aren't just localized and committed in one country or they do go across borders and so I am encouraged by the greater cooperation that now exists between nation like mind and nation states and again we all have this challenge to make sure our laws reflect as to what's happening out there and that we are properly responding to them.

Koch: Ok, we have a question here.

Audience: Tolu Ogunlesi from Nigeria. West Africa editor for the Africa Report. For many years until this year Boko Haram was a shadowing insurgent group you know, coming out of hide outs for bombing attacks and shooting attacks. This year is started to transform into an invading army similar to what you are seeing with ISIL. Is the future perhaps non-state actors attempting to become state actors, setting up governments as we have seen with Boko Haram for example and knowing how adaptive they are...

Koch: Offering services, offering...

Tolu Ogunlesi: Offering services and welfare schemes and all that and knowing how adaptive they are, is there a possibility that they might become a bit more benign and attempt to invent themselves as government? Is that and how much of a possibility is that?

Koch: And how could we make that happen, interesting question, who wants to take that? Ok.

Avineri: The question was raised and here I want to convince where I was wrong. At one time there were people there that thought that once Hamas becomes part of the government or controls Gaza it will be responsible, it will behave like a nation state. In some cases, it may happen. But again, it is not a deterministic system. It is not literal, it can happen in some cases, it can't happen in some other cases and I am not sure about Boko Haram specifically but I don't want to rule this out but the fact is that until now the experience we have had especially in the Middle East of organization which were a non-state organization beginning to control territory, it doesn't make them immediately responsible. One more point about ISIS. Barak mentioned it yesterday very dramatically, how the beheadings have shocked the west but the beheadings have also motivated a lot of young people in the Middle East to join ISIS and we should be aware of that because people who have lost their identity, Syrians or Iraqis or Lebanese or whatever, see it as an expression of power and I am against censorship but I would suggest that we very seriously think those of us who are responsible for mass communication, every time you show again and again the beheadings, it may shock people in the west to action but I may also motivate people in the Middle East to join ISIS. One should be at least aware of this. No censorship but...

Koch: You are giving them what they want. You are giving them publicity.

Avineri: Yeah, you should be aware and the same about Boko Haram. What to us is shocking, to a lot of people on the other side of the hill is an issue of pride, of power

and the fact that the west doesn't always succeed in countering those atrocities just underlines and strengthens the motivation among some young people who are alienated, poor, feeling outside of society to join something which is so very dramatic. At least we should be aware of that.

Kelly: And I would offer their real advantage is to stay symmetric. Once they start to conventionalize if you will, then they set themselves up for targeting. So I think that as long as they stay shadowy and do what they are doing, they are a lot harder to get to particularly if there is not a commitment to put boots on the ground as the expression goes but if they start to conventionalize and I agree that just because they take over a bit of territory doesn't mean they are going to turn into good guys and gals. But once they start to come together whole terrain you know, we can find them and we can fix them and we can take care of business. So if I was their military advisor, I would tell them stay asymmetric.

Avineri: That is why some of them don't do it. Precisely because of this reason.

Kelly: That's right. I mean even with ISIS now we knew we would have some initial successes because we were watching how they operated and then as we started to apply force against them...you know this whole thing, warfare is first and foremost an intellectual activity and you learn from the people you are fighting and it's chess, it's whatever and we had some initial successes because we knew how they were operating and once we started to apply force they then understood how we could...what our capabilities were to get to them and they started to disperse and get shadowy and ...

Koch: They adapt.

Kelly: They adapt and I think that is what Dave was saying a little earlier. It's all about adapting to each other over time. First and foremost it is intellectual, it is not force.

Koch: And we have a question right here.

Audience: Eka Tkeshelashvili Georgian Institute for Strategic status. If we look what Russia has been for decades in our part of the world, it's a pattern that Russia uses very systemically using non-state actors as the proxies and actions of those being clearly attributable to Russia as a state. So why ambiguity is still part of an equation? Are the actions ambiguous enough to be really clearly defined or is it just convenient to keep them ambiguous enough because there is not strategy on what to do about it? And is it high time with this big war in Ukraine to bring clarity to this situation? NATO is stepping up and then we see much more clarity from the side of the NATO in terms of intelligence information and Russia's actions on the ground and that's a progress if we

compare it to what has been happening in 2008 and afterwards. So part of the strategy, should the clarity be part of it in a way that deniability is not the tool that Russia could use anymore and why are we still shying away from helping state actors to step up and be defensible with their own efforts more so that they build up their defense capabilities when Russia is doing everything to make sure that no state actors have all the tools they need destabilize the state actors in the asymmetrical hybrid warfare that we are in in Eastern Europe right now.

Koch: Thank you.

Vershbow: Well I think that on the latter part of your question we are trying to do that and to help build up the legitimate authorities and not be intimidated by the latest Russian threats. They have drawn a red line on the NATO decision at the Summit to build a joint training centre and in Georgia and the Sector General the other day said we are doing that because Georgia is a sovereign country and we have agreed to do it and we will do it. But the first part is harder. The Russians are very clever and we haven't talked about it so much today but the disinformation is truly extraordinary, the way they are able to sow doubts even in our countries as well as convince their own people that everything is squeaky clean but in our own countries they have made a lot of in roads and convincing people that the truth is somewhere in between as to what is really going on in Ukraine when in fact it's, for me it is quite clear what is going on. It is a quite black and white situation but they are very clever in covering their tracks. They take down social media posts that say go against their narrative but they still have doubts about who shot down Malaysian Airline 17 even though it was pretty clear that the separatists had control of the Russian air defence missiles shot down the plane and then they drove it out of the country. It was all photographed and posted on social media but they somehow still maintain doubt about that. SO we have to do better and we have to think harder about controversial subjects like releasing more intelligence. We always have to weigh the balance between protecting sources and methods and using intelligence as part of our public diplomacy. I think we have been too hesitant sometimes to expose that is really happening on the ground because of the well-founded concerns of our intelligence community but it sometimes comes in conflict with good policy. But I think fortunately there is enough indiscipline in the Russian side that they begin to reveal the truth. Just yesterday this famous guy Strellkoff, Egor Gerkin who was the Minister of Defence of the Donetetsk People's Republic for some period as a Russian citizen, he published an article saying the whole thing in the East was my doing. It would never have succeeded if we didn't bring in Russian forces and the locals were incapable of doing this. So there are blowing their own cover story and we have to exploit these and broadcast these things a bit more effectively.

Koch: Dr. Avineri.

Avineri: I hate to add again, I agree with what has been said but there is a...I would like to add a sceptical issue here and this just has to do with creating, making Ukraine a coherent body politic and it should be done and I hope it is going to be done and NATO's support is very important. But one should also be a little bit sceptical about some of the things which are done by the Ukrainian government. When in order to maintain control over an Eastern city, I am not going to mention the city, the name starts with a D. You appoint then a local oligarch as a governor and he is dispensing his money in order to get support for a good cause but it is done in a way which is delegitimizing the government itself or maybe delegitimize the government and I hope that NATO will also use its democratic voice for transparency and for liberalism to give the sort of advice to the Ukrainian authorities, the legitimate Ukrainian authorities that does certain things which are perhaps a little bit problematic. Just a foot note.

Vershbow: In Ukraine they do...the President does appoint the governors in Ukraine so...

Avineri: OK.

Vershbow: So the process was legitimate but I can agree with you on the particular choice.

Avineri: It has to do the division of the body politics.

Koch: Ok, we have a question here.

Audience: Roland Paris from the University of Ottawa. I have two questions for General Kelly about Iraq. I was very taken about what you were saying about your own experience with the Sunni Tribes and we know that immobilizing those Tribes is central to the coalition strategy now to eject ISIS from Iraq. I was wondering what you think the prospects are at being able to win their support once again to take up arms to fight against ISIS given that they might perceive as an abandonment by the United States and also skepticism about the Bagdad government and my second question has to do with the debate taking place about whether U.S. or western military forces will need to be deployed in front line rolls as advisors when this offensive begins so I am wondering if you can comment on that please?

Kelly: I had a unique experience on my last tour in Iraq. It was my third tour but I think I have got 37 or 8 months in the country all totalled and when I went back in 2008-2009 the awakening had certainly taken hold, things were good, violence was down in Unbar Province. The Sunni province never ever, ever was supposed to be so, you know,

improved. The rest of the fact Bremer or whoever said to me, you know the rest of Iraq will be a shining democracy eventually and the Sunni region will always be a hot bed of murder and all this. The unique experience when I went back for my last tour was I was now making common cause with men and we would talk about this in the various meetings. We used to have shake get-togethers. We would call them shakedowns, large groups of the shakes would come together but more of the men in the room I had been trying to track down in need to capture a kill in my previous two tours and they had spent most of their time in my previous two tours trying to capture or kill me so to sit there and talk to them about why they decided to come over, if you will and it had to do with Al-Qaeda and it had to do with, interestingly enough, they said we understood that we just couldn't beat you militarily. You just kept coming back. Day after day after day. Very interestingly. The women in the province...the mothers were getting tired of going to their sons burials the young women were tired because their fathers were not allowing them to marry. We took advantage of that actually, the discontent among the female population and made appeals in terms of information operations to the women to go past the men. But a long story short when we put together, we formed two divisions in Unbar province and intentionally made those divisions of both Sunni and Shia and they work together and they are the best two divisions in the army and they never broke. It all about that kind of experience with the tribes. These tribes have stayed true to Bagdad more or less even though Bagdad, frankly Malaki, didn't deserve that, they more or less stayed. For a couple years after I came back I still get emails from the Tribal leaders. Very, very, you know, kind of what do we do about this guy Malaki but interestingly enough in the Anbar province region, they stayed more or less true to the Bagdad government for whatever reason I don't know but we encouraged them to do that. I think the second part of your question had to do with abandonment. They don't have a choice right now. They have got to...the people that are being abused, murdered, tortured by ISIS whether they are courage, whether they are...I mean its... they don't have much choice so our coming back in there to assist them with, you know, air power right now is having some toll on ISIS but they are adjusting to that. At the end of the day, you in fact need boots on the ground. I don't know what colour they need to be, they don't need to American or Canadian or NATO boots necessarily but they have to have boots on the ground. But there is nothing more important to these partner nations that we work with around the globe, there is nothing more important that there is a commitment and I will say from my country, there is a commitment from the united states that we will stand with you and just a sprinkling of U.S, uniforms amongst them to... that is the sense of commitment they get and again the divisions we form. The 40,000 Iraqi police units that we put together, we had American advisors throughout all of the units and that level of commitment, just a sense that we are there with them worked enormously in Iraq to a very large degree

in Afghanistan. Do we need to have boots on the ground? Yes. Someone's boots have to be on the ground. But at the end of the day if it is important enough to say my country, if it is in my country's national interest, if it is in ...but there has got to be boots on the ground.

Koch: We have a question up here and I think we have someone back here

Audience: Antonio Rodiles I am from Cuba, political dissent and my question is for General Kelly. How do you deal with a QWA Government that does...has been a government that violates the human rights for 55 years and right now, for example, he is taking a huge advantage of the traffic on QWAN through Mexico but at the same time they sell themselves as a unique possibility to keep the stability in the region for Cubans? How do you deal with that?

Kelly: Well let me start by saying this. A lot of people talk about human rights at least in my country's experience, the U.S. Military does human rights. Everything I have done in my career, on the battlefield or right now, what I do now in Southern Command, everything I have done has begun and ended with human rights. The human rights records in Latin America in general to use my current billet, with the United States Military is able to work with militaries and I am restricted in some cases for a lot of different reasons but the militaries that I have worked...the U.S. Military has worked with, in Latin America, the Caribbean, those militaries have improved enormously. In fact, if you do the independent polling of the Central American countries, Honduras, you know Guatemala, Belize, all of these countries, Colombia, Peru, with the exception of the Catholic Church, the number one most admired and respected institution in the government, our institution is the military. They want to see the military on the streets. They want to see their military doing things in the countryside. Cuba, I am restricted, I do not deal with Cuba. I wish I could but I do not deal with Cuba. I also don't deal with anyone, any country that will violate human rights. I have, I chastise various countries, I won't tell you which ones that I catch in a way not working the human rights angle the way that they should. There are countries in Latin America I am allowed to work with, there are countries... but I won't work with them until they start taking Human Rights seriously and I go back to this almost miracle that is Colombia. Colombia exports security to various countries. Working side by side with those countries but they also export the lesson of human rights that they learned with their fight against the FARC which is the single biggest human rights violator I think probably in the world. Certainly in Latin America. It has been for 50 years so I can't work with the Cuban Military, I wish I could because the track record of people like me working with human rights, questionable human rights militaries is that they get

better at what they do but I take your point and I wouldn't mind working with them though. I think we could have a positive influence in the human rights if no other topic.

Koch: Ambassador Vershbow, briefly.

Vershbow: I have absolutely no rule with effect to Cuba but I just wanted to make a point about NATO's role in training militaries particularly as we try to expand that in the Middle East and North Africa in the coming years. One of the key goals is to instill institute western standards and that includes western standards of human rights and this is an area where we very much need to partner with the good non-state actors which we haven't paid any attention to which were highlighted in the essay, the NGOs. Who are...I don't think they have lost innocence, I think they are very courageous realists who put themselves in harm's way and they are indispensable partners for NATO when we are in operation and when we also carry out some of these capacity building programs. We need to work together with NGOs to help us institute human rights practices, UN Resolution 1325, Women, Peace and Security, this is something where we have adapted it as a policy but we need to work with NGOs, the good ones, the good non-state actors to help us achieve our mission.

Koch: Thank you and we have a question back here.

Audience: Nadia Schadow, Smith Richardson Foundation. I have a question to any of the panelists but there seemed to have been two themes from this morning's event and then the current panel. The first, the ideological interconnectedness of these extremist groups where they are not bound by borders and then the second being the importance of working with local forces to fight and help be at the forefront of fighting their own internal battles, given that, what is the prognosis for Afghanistan given the U.S. position to withdraw. Thank you.

Koch: No, thought the United States was reported as going to be extending with the troops in Afghanistan will be doing, they will be freer to actually take on the Taliban and not be in a training role.

Vershbow: I take that on to be a NATO mission. First of all we are not withdrawing now, we are drawing down to the end of the current ISAF mission but we are going to be there for at least another two years with a train, advise and assist mission so we will continue to support mentor, train, finance the Afghan Security Forces. I think that the prospects are pretty good that they will be successful; they are already in the lead for all combat operations. They have had allied support, including air support and other enablers but there are increasingly able to fly solo with only minimal support. I don't know the details of this latest U.S. decision. I only read the New York Times but I think

there is recognition that the Taliban is still out there. They are degraded. They are not capable of holding territory but they can still stage spectacular terrorist attacks from time to time. So that is why are we not going to be turning an on/off switch, we are going to stay engaged, continue to be with the Afghans and even after the two years we will have some kind of long term enduring partnership with them that will continue to include, I am sure a strong defence capacity building program so that the NSF can stay as effective as they are now.

Koch: Dr. Avineri.

Avineri: Perhaps a footnote into this, it seems to me that there is one problem that sometimes is being overlooked in the West. And this is the issue of secularization or secularism in the Middle East. In the West, secularism or secularization is considered a spot of the enlightenment legacy. It is connected with liberalism, democracy, individual rights. Not so unfortunately in the Middle East. The history of the Middle East in the last 80-100 years has been that secularization was introduced by reformers in a coercive way from above. The Shah on Iran, Attaturk in Turkey in a less dramatic way Ben Ali in Indonesia and Mubarak in Egypt and even the Assad family in Syria, I mean where the fact of the matter is that most of the Christians in Syria today support Assad, not because they like him or his dynasty or because they believe in the future of Syria as a democratic country but because they believe that under an Assad regime, their religious pluralism or their religious community will be somehow protect which is not the case under ISIS. So we have to understand that some of the animals against us as we try our regimes in the Middle East comes not only from the fact that they are retaliant but they also are connected through secularism and what we see in Iran, the Islamic revolution, the AK party in Turkey an similar different kinds in Egypt the Muslim Brotherhood are a response to a coerced secularization which is sometimes to western ears not acceptable because we think that secularization is connect through democracy, not so in the Middle East. It just adds to the complexity and to my belief that when you look at the contending parties in the area, one has to understand that some of the political configurations are very different from the ones that we are used to in the West.

Koch: Thank you so much and I know that we could go on for probably another good hour but we have run out of time and so I think we agreed this morning that this is not going to be an easy fight and it is not going to be over any time soon. It is a generational battle and the blood tens of thousands of innocent and service man and women have been spilled and I want to take this opportunity to thank in particular General Kelly for his service and his sacrifice. His son died in Afghanistan in the fight in

2010. So thank you General Kelly. Thank you to my wonderful panel, thank you to my audience.

--

End.