

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

REDEFINING U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY:
THE INTERLINKAGES WITH
AMERICAN SOCIETY AND FOREIGN POLICY

Washington, D.C.
Friday, April 5, 2019

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

BONNIE JENKINS
Founder and President, Women of Color Advancing
Peace, Security and Conflict Transformation
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

Discussion:

BONNIE JENKINS
Founder and President, Women of Color Advancing
Peace, Security and Conflict Transformation
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

ARSALAN SULEMAN
Chair, America Indivisible
Nonresident Fellow, Georgetown Institute for
the Study of Diplomacy

Panel I: U.S. Voting and U.S. Foreign Policy: Regional Focus:

MICHAEL O'HANLON, Moderator
Senior Fellow and Director of Research, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

ASHA CASTLEBERRY
Adjunct Professor
George Washington University

LAURA KUPE
Counsel, Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives

EMILY MENDRALA
Executive Director
Center for Democracy in the Americas

SYLVIA MISHRA
India-U.S. Fellow in Public Interest Technology
New America

JUNG PAK
SK-Korea Foundation Chair in Korea Studies, and
Senior Fellow, Center for East Asia Policy Studies
The Brookings Institution

JEANNINE SCOTT
Board President
Constituency for Africa

Panel II: U.S. Voting and New National Security Issues:

LIZA ARIAS, Moderator
Herbert Scoville Jr. Peace Fellow
Center for Strategic and International Studies

AMBASSADOR GINA ABERCROMBIE-WINSTANLEY
Member
Third Way Cyber Enforcement Initiative Advisory Board

MUHAMMAD FRASER-RAHIM
Executive Director
North America for Quilliam International

DANIEL LUCEY
Senior Scholar, O'Neill Institute
Georgetown University

UZRA ZEYA
President and Chief Executive Officer
Alliance for Peacebuilding

Closing:

MICHAEL O'HANLON
Senior Fellow and Director of Research, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. JENKINS: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MS. JENKINS: It's great to see all of you here this morning despite the weather outside. We had such a beautiful day yesterday, and unfortunately we are not having such a great day today. And hopefully the weekend will be a little better. But for today, it's great to see all of you here this morning.

My name is Bonnie Jenkins. I am a Senior Nonresident Fellow here at the Brookings Institution in the Foreign Policy Program. I am also the Founder and Executive Director of an organization called Women of Color Advancing Peace, Security and Conflict Transformation.

I want to thank Brookings for co-hosting this event with WCAPS. This is actually the second event on *Redefining National Security* that WCAPS is doing with Brookings Institution.

WCAPS' vision is to advance the leadership and professional development of women of color in the fields of international peace, security and conflict transformation.

At WCAPS we believe global issues demand a variety of perspectives, a space is needed that is devoted to women of color that cultivates a strong voice and network for its members, while promoting dialogue and strategies for engaging in policy discussions on an international scale.

Redefining national security is a theme within the WCAPS' mission that helps to promote the underlying approach of our work. The reason why this theme has been chosen is that we all face global threats that seem to be increasing in reach, and we find that these threats are challenging to our national security, and are not in the category of traditional military or hard security issues.

It is difficult to argue that global concerns such as climate change, infectious

disease, challenges to our oceans, and to food and water security are not impacting the lives and well-being of U.S. citizens, and will do so increasingly in the future.

This leads one to the recognition that as a country we need to be in a better process -- have a better process of making connections between domestic and international concerns, since these global challenges affect everyone around the world, including Americans. And as in areas of peace and security the ramifications of these threats will be more harmful to women, and predominately to women of color here and around the world.

So, we at WCAPS want to continue to provide a space for dialogue on global challenges that affect the U.S. and our national security particularly. And how we address such issues raise the question also of how these concerns are reflected in our decision-making on who will be our leaders to decide how the U.S. will combat these threats.

In the lead up to this event, I did a small survey to find out how people define national security in 2019. Most responses did center on the need to focus on both traditional and non-traditional approaches.

For example, one person said, "National security is the protection of the nation from both domestic and foreign threats; while it includes having an adequate armed force it should also hold a strong focus on protection of the nation's citizens. For example, working against having a Police State, making sure all citizens have adequate food and water, protecting our environment and working against domestic terrorism."

Another person stated, "At its broadest level, national security is the ability to secure life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all members of our country regardless of their station in our society."

And finally, one other person said that there are three main components to national security: one, is internal integrity such as free and fair elections, free media, civilian control, have a stable military, plus private engagement by citizens that confirm the nation's social contract survives and thrives.

Secondly, relationship integrity such as collaborative involvement in social, economic and other agreements with other state actors. And third, it includes issue involvement, such as focusing on the key global regional and local issues from human-caused climate change, trade, immigration and a healthy environment.

This morning's discussions will touch on these themes. It will focus on -- the discussions will focus on how we define national security, how that definition does or does not recognize the interrelationship between international and domestic threats, and what connections we should draw that educate us on how we vote in leaders who will help define national security and, therefore, our policies on how we address U.S. and global challenges.

I invite all of you to learn more about WCAPS and visit our website at WCAPS.org, and help us as we promote a vision for a more equitable, diverse and inclusive peace, security and foreign policy process.

And with that, I'd like to welcome our first speaker today to the stage. Mr. Arsalan Suleman.

Good morning, Arsalan. How are you?

MR. SULEMAN: Good morning. Thank you, Ambassador.

MS. JENKINS: I think what we'd like to do first is allow you to introduce yourself, and say a little bit about what you do, and what you've been working on in the past couple years.

MR. SULEMAN: Great. Well, thank you so much. Thanks to you, and WCAPS, and the Brookings Institution for organizing this really great discussion. I'm very happy and proud to be a part of.

Well, I used to be part of the Obama administration, in the State Department where I was working in a couple of capacities. I was working as the -- first the Deputy Special Envoy to the OIC, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Then in the last two years, the Acting U.S. Special Envoy to the OIC, and I also spent some time in the Bureau of

Democracy Human Rights and Labor, where I was a Counselor for Multilateral Affairs there, advising on U.S. human rights policy in the U.N. system.

But since the end of the administration, I've gone back to practicing law, so I'm at the law firm Foley Hoag, LLP. I'm also a Nonresident Fellow at the Georgetown Institute for the Study of Diplomacy. I was a graduate of the school, so I'm really happy to be back there with the Institute.

And I've also co-founded an organization called America Indivisible. America Indivisible is a non-profit, non-partisan, coalition organization focused on combating anti-Muslim bigotry by emphasizing the American values of unity, inclusion and pluralism.

And we have a coalition of about 20 organizations including American-Muslim organizations, Sikh-American organizations, we have veterans' groups like Veterans for American Ideals, we have interfaith groups like the Shoulder-to-Shoulder Coalition.

So it's a broad diversity of organizations, all of which are organized around one particular goal that we are trying to focus on, which is increasing the number of Americans who know their fellow Muslim-Americans, their neighbors, colleagues, and the goal behind increasing that knowledge, that awareness, is that many studies have indicated that when people know people from different groups they are much more likely to associate other people from that group with positive values than with negative values.

And unfortunately a lot of the polling data indicates that upwards of half of Americans have claimed not to know Muslims, and that lack of personal knowledge we believe, our Coalition believes, is a really key element of anti-Muslim bigotry that we've been seeing in the country.

And so as a Coalition, we are working to, again, increase that number and percentage of Americans who know their fellow Muslim-Americans, and we are doing that in various ways.

One way that we're doing it, is by focusing on local elected officials, so we

are working closely with mayors, and governors, City Council members across the country to try to help them and their local Muslim communities establish sustained dialogues.

And when I say local Muslim communities, I'm also actually talking a little bit broader, because as you heard our Coalition includes other groups, Sikhs, South-Asian-Americans, and Arab-Americans, so that our Coalition is broader in the sense that it's including people who are often perceived to be Muslim, because unfortunately we've seen many hate crimes that are targeting Sikh-Americans, or Indian-Americans.

The motivation behind those attacks are often related to anti-Muslim bigotry, but they end up affecting people who aren't actually Muslim, and just are perceived to be Muslim.

So, our work focuses on having, or fostering sustained dialogues between local communities and their elected officials, and one of the initiatives that we are launching this year is called the Public Leaders for Inclusion Council, which will bring a cohort of about 25 local government officials from around the country working in local and municipal government, to have a sustained leadership training program where they receive a six-week-long course in leadership training. And it concludes with the Summit here in D.C.

So we are really excited about that type of work, but another area of our work also is to develop toolkits to give local communities and government officials the tools that they need to do this work on their own. So a big part of our, you know, operating principle, we are a very lean organization, is to really leverage our Coalition partners and to try to leverage grassroots communities who are really interested in doing this work.

MS. JENKINS: That's great. I'm actually very familiar with your organization, and we're going to be partnering with you on some activities. So I look forward to that.

MR. SULEMAN: We are very excited about that. Thank you.

MS. JENKINS: So, I wonder if you could say a little bit about some of the

things that you did at your time while you were at the State Department, because I want to connect it to some of these issues of domestic and international concerns. So, why don't say a little bit about what you did there? And then we could talk about some of these international, domestic, global threats.

MR. SULEMAN: Sure, absolutely. So, the role that I had in the State Department that related to the Special Envoy's Office, the U.S. Special Envoy to the OIC, that role for the Obama administration was particularly defined by pursuing the policies that the President had set out in his 2009 Cairo Speech.

Not to be confused with Secretary Pompeo's Cairo Speech which apparently was groundbreaking, but President Obama's 2009 Cairo Speech which really set forward a new vision for the United States' engagement with Muslim communities around the world, as well as Muslim majority countries, because unfortunately in the past, and I think it's very clear that in the present as well, our relationship with many Muslim-majority countries and communities globally is securitized.

It's seen through the lens of counterterrorism and counter-extremism, or whatever terminology is being used, and that lens distorts our policy, it distorts, frankly, the pursuit of our national interests. And one of the goals that we were pursuing in the OIC Envoy's Office was to expand the scope of our cooperation and collaboration with the OIC, OIC member countries, and also Muslim communities more broadly within OIC member countries.

And that entailed a broadening of the conversation. So, sure we were addressing issues related to counterterrorism, and cooperation, and counter-extremism, that is absolutely an important element of foreign policy, but that's not the only element.

We also tried to directly address head-on political concerns that these communities had about U.S. foreign policy, so that related to issues about the U.S. invasion of Iraq, the war in Afghanistan, the use of drone strikes in various parts of the world,

including in areas where we don't have active military operations, and included discussing policies related to the Middle East, and U.S. support for certain regimes in the Middle East, as well as U.S. policy on Israel and Palestine.

So, there was a broadening of that conversation, both with officials, but in particular with the publics. And there was a broadening of the scope of our focus on engagement. So, we tried to foster partnerships in areas where there was mutual interest and mutual trust, and so we were able to help expand collaboration on health issues, like polio eradication efforts, and maternal and child health programs.

We also made an effort to increase the number of OIC countries in the Global Health Security Initiative, we were expanding humanitarian cooperation because the OIC has a network of NGOs that is active in areas where, frankly, American NGOs don't have great reach. So that will include countries like Somalia and Yemen, and because of that collaboration we were able to expand the reach of some of U.S. humanitarian efforts, but also in collaboration, broader, U.N. coordinated relief efforts.

We also worked on human rights issues so that was very much on the agenda as well, so that included issues of women's rights and women's empowerment, and within that sub-basket of groups we worked with the OIC and member countries on initiatives like providing support for women in STEM fields. We had a program where we had dozens of women's scientists from OIC member countries who received funding to come to the United States for leadership development training programs.

We also worked with the OIC on combating female genital mutilation, and in 2016, in fact, the OIC, as an organization, took a position that called on all of its member states to ban the practice throughout all of its member states. And we confronted head-on issues related to religious freedom and the treatment of religious minorities.

So, for a long time the OIC had been sponsoring, within the United Nations, efforts to ban speech related to what was defined as speech that's blasphemous, or insulting

to religion or religious figures.

And that type of framework; or view of speech, unfortunately, is present in many countries where there are blasphemy laws, and there are speech restrictions that target, you know, treatment or language directed at religions or religious figures. And unfortunately those laws are often used to target religious minorities and political dissidents.

And we worked with the OIC on getting that issue out of the U.N. So, with that work as of 2011, that resolution that they had been sponsoring, the Defamation of Religions Resolution is no longer in the U.N. Instead, there was a replacement resolution that focused on specific concrete steps that governments and society can take to combat discrimination on the basis of religion.

And that included steps like having leaders speak out and condemn instances of hate crimes, or anti-religious speech. It talked about education programs, it talked about engaging with communities. A lot of the initiatives and policies that traditionally we've seen in the United States, I say traditionally purposefully, because a lot of those actions aren't present or salient today, but a lot of the steps that are traditionally associated with the U.S. response to hate speech and hate crimes were memorialized in that resolution, and are encouraged globally.

So that's a little bit of an example of sort of the scope of issues that we were dealing with in that office, you know, specifically.

MS. JENKINS: Great. And I was not aware of all those things that you -- I knew some of it, but I wasn't aware of that much. That's really great to hear about what you are doing. And you know you've already touched on it a bit, about some of the things that you did. And you talk about what you're doing here now in the U.S. with your organization, and I think that you were doing and you were at State Department on the international scale.

So, what are some of the things that you would -- that you would say about the way in which international issues are connected to domestic issues? Some of these

issues you're talking about in terms of, you know, religious freedom, or women empowerment, or some human rights issues you were addressing overall. What are the connections that you see? And what do we lose when we don't make those connections?

MR. SULEMAN: Yeah, absolutely. Well, there was an old saying in the U.S. that politics stop at the water's edge, but tweets certainly don't, nor does Facebook Live. And, you know, if that old saying ever had an ounce of truth I think we've definitely seen that basically obliterated recently and in recent years.

And I think in part that's because of the reality of global integration, you know, first of all things that are said here are instantaneously broadcast globally, and people can see discussions that are happening. They can see this discussion right now, you know, if they so choose.

So, the politics that we are engaging in here affect the politics and dialogue and discourse and discussions that other societies are having globally. But in addition to that the reality of integration has also played a role in shaping our discourse on what were traditionally seen as domestic issues.

So, you know, the old saying from the Clinton years of: is the economy stupid, if you think about it now the discourse about the economy here, in particular since the 2016 Election, is focused on trade and how other countries are apparently taking advantage of us in trade agreements. And about immigration, how the OPIC, you know, "open borders" that we've had has contributed to the loss of jobs in certain parts of the country.

You know, I'm not trying to imply that those arguments or topics have, you know, no factual basis to them, but my point is simply that these issues that have traditionally been seen as foreign-policy-related issues, you know, trade, immigration, are very central now to the conversation of issues, like the economy.

And the conversations that have been shaped by the -- in particular by the 2016 Elections, but I think more broadly, we've seen how that affects global dialogue on

those issues.

So, you mentioned religious tolerance, you know, the rise in hate crimes in the United States that have targeted minority groups, including religious minority groups such as Jews and Muslims, is a topic and an issue that is very well read, and covered and discussed internationally. And unfortunately, we've seen the interplay between the rise of right-wing, and White nationalists, or White supremacist groups in the United States having an impact on the rise of such groups abroad, in Europe and elsewhere.

And there's a symbiotic relationship to them because of the shared ideology, but what has traditionally been seen as sort of a domestic -- well, people are more and more calling it domestic terrorism now, but it was seen as sort of a small domestic threat, and the President has continued to describe it as such.

I think the reality of that now, and more and more people are realizing it, is that these groups represent a real transnational terrorist threat, and the ideology is shared, and unfortunately the ideology, in particular in the past few years, has been getting more oxygen. It's been getting more sustenance and support from people in elected office, including arguably this administration, but in particular as well in Europe.

If you look there are a number of right-wing political parties that have campaigned on platforms that are, in particular, focus on anti-immigration issues, but those parties have a very clear and disturbing links with anti-Semitism, and anti-Muslim sentiment, Islamophobia.

So, the issues that we have domestically related to racism and White supremacist and nationalist groups, we've always had that, it's never gone away, and there's always been a relationship between those groups and things happening abroad, but I think we are more aware of it now. And I think the ties and connectivity between them are being more widely covered and discussed.

So, I definitely think that, you know, these issues are -- certainly while they

are important key domestic issues but they're also very much tied in, into foreign policy issues.

And you mentioned issues related to human rights, this gets into that as well, and it gets into the point that I was sort of getting at before, which is in the past the United States was seen globally as a moral voice for human rights, and our progress on civil rights was a point of pride.

That we could look to other countries internationally and say, we have problems, we continue to work on those problems, but we've come a long way. And I think the narrative on those issues and our human rights issues now is very different. You don't see this administration talking about human rights. You don't see in any readout you get from a meeting with a foreign official any line at all that mentions human rights being discussed or raised at all.

In fact, instead the position of the government has been if human rights are raised it's a private matter, and it's not linked directly to our national interest, according to Secretary Tillerson, and I don't think that policy has changed at all.

And the rhetoric of targeting minority groups of divisiveness in our politics has really tarnished our image abroad as a leader on human rights issues, and that has given license to other countries to take actions that you wouldn't have predicted that they would have taken had America been more assertive in making human rights issues more central to our foreign policy, and raising those issues directly.

So, you can look at the panoply of issues, but I'm talking in particular about the treatment of the Uyghur minority in China, the issue of the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar, the rise in violence against religious minority groups in India, the treatment of various religious minorities in Europe.

Instead of raising concerns about these developments and these trends internationally, unfortunately this administration has, instead, continued to politicize

minorities and immigration, and continue to target groups for rhetoric that has helped lead to a rise in hate crimes. And we've seen that documented.

If you look at the FBI statistics for hate crimes they've been going up over the past three to four years. Last year there was a jump I believe about of about 35 percent in terms of anti-Semitic hate crimes. If you look at the trend over the past two or three years anti-Muslim hate crimes have been on the rise.

The Southern Poverty Law Center has documented over the past three years that there have been more than doubling of anti-Muslim hate groups in the United States. So this is a real trend, there are real facts behind it, the government is not doing enough rhetorically and in terms of leadership on it. And there is a direct relationship between these developments and developments internationally that that are being either ignored or not directly handled in an effective way.

MS. JENKINS: Great. Thank you. So, what we are going to do now is -- I think Arsalan has been able to provide us a background for our two panels that we're going to be having. And so we are going to save -- I guess we have time maybe for one question, if anyone has any. But we wanted this to be kind of the background for starting our conversation in the next two panels.

So unless -- if we can hold off any questions and, maybe, you know, start addressing them as we go through the next panels, that would be great.

But before we do, I want to thank Arsalan Suleman for taking time to be with us, and your organization is doing great work here in the U.S., and looking forward to working with you.

And with that, I want to welcome our first panel to the stage that's going to be moderated by my colleague, Mike O'Hanlon at Brookings, the Foreign Policy Program.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you so much, Bonnie. (Applause) That was awesome. Thank you very much for a great start. It's good to see everybody here this

morning. I'm Mike O'Hanlon with the Foreign Policy Program at Brookings.

I have an amazingly privileged position to be able to coach this dream team, so to speak. (Laughter) And the way we're going to proceed, sort of like the original dream team from the 1980s, is we are going to let everybody be a superstar initially on their own terms, and give you their one big idea about the part of the world they most study. And that's going to be round one.

And then we're going to -- and by the way, I'm also going to let everybody introduce themselves very briefly, even before round one, so that everyone's in the conversation quickly, right off from the starting gun.

And we're going to move fast because we've only got one hour and ten minutes for this entire panel. And then we're going to look, you know, in our second round of discussion, about the overarching theme of today, as Bonnie explained so eloquently, the linkages between foreign and domestic policy.

We are not going to try to force every conversation into that framework initially but we will look to see to what extent we can extract out some themes and threads after having heard the big idea that everyone is going to advance about their own part of the world that they study or most understand. And then we'll look to you to join the conversation for roughly the second half of the show.

So, again, we'll quickly move down the aisle with introductions. And then I'll come back and pose a brief question which is going to be similar in character to each panelist about their one big idea, then we'll have some discussion, and then bring you in.

So I'm Mike O'Hanlon; and I work on National Security here at Brookings.

MS. SCOTT: My name is Jeannine Scott. I am the Founder and the Principal of America to Africa Consulting.

MS. MENDRALA: Hi. Emily Mendrala. I'm the Executive Director at the Center for Democracy in the Americas, where we promote dialogue between the U.S. and

Latin America on issues where U.S. policy is at odds with the region.

MS. KUPE: Hi. I'm Laura Kupe, and I'm Council on the House Committee on Homeland Security. I'm here speaking on behalf in my own capacity.

MS. CASTLEBERRY: Hi. I'm Asha Castleberry, Adjunct Professor at George Washington University, teaching U.S. Foreign Policy in Congress, and also Board Member WCAPS. And I'm also putting my disclaimer out there that my voice only represents me and not the U.S. Government.

MS. PAK: I'm Jung Pak. I work on Korea issues at the Brookings Institution.

MS. MENDRALA: hi everyone I'm Silvia Mishra. I'm India-U.S. Fellow at New America. And also I lead the CBRN Working Group at WCAPS.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you all. And so Jeannine, if I could start with you, and I really just want to ask, you know, a big idea that you would like to advance, either a concern you have about U.S. policy towards Africa. Or some positive trends you see in Africa you think people should be aware of, or some problems that we should all be aware of, irrespective of where U.S. politics are. In other words, the floor is yours to just sort of start us off with a big idea, or proposal, or a big concern. As you wish.

MS. SCOTT: Well, I think if we look at U.S. policy towards Africa, in a sense, particularly now, I would say that it's a bit minimalist. We have had the administration put out in Africa Strategy in December of last year, with about three principal things around trade and commercial ties, terrorism and aid efficiency.

At the same time, I think we've also not really focused on some of the trends that we see on the African Continent that could lead us to engage a bit differently. I look at some of the demographic trends on what that means for us in terms of long-term engagement with the Continent both for trade and investment, as well as for issues with the youth bulge which also have issues that could be raised around terrorism, and other threats

that could arise.

And I look at the fact that while we are looking at -- pushing against China, and some of the others, that I don't think our particular engagement is as effective as it could be in terms of really engaging with -- really engaging countries in terms of some of the things that they're looking at doing.

So when I look at the levels of U.S. engagement in terms of trade declining, and the rest of the world rising. Why is that so? And why are we having problems, or why are we not stepping up to the plate in terms of continuing the types of engagement that we may have had in the past?

MR. O'HANLON: Thanks. On just one quick follow-up, because you were so succinct, we have time for that. Africa of course is a fascinating and huge Continent, 54 countries, more than a billion people. I think most population increase this century is expected to be in Africa, and some people think it could get as high as 3 to 4 billion by century's end.

So there's both the challenge and the opportunity of doing so many things with those people. By the way Laura and I both hail indirectly from the same small city in DRC. I was a Peace Corps Volunteer there, her parents are from there, Kikwit, and so we are certainly interested as well.

But when you look at Africa, and you take all of it together, you take these demographic trends, you know, that there are more democracies than ever in Africa, but there are also plenty of strongmen leaders still left. There are hopeful signs of greater stability and rapprochement, let's say, with Ethiopia and Eritrea, but there are also still plenty of conflicts in Sudan and CAR, and elsewhere, much of the Maghreb.

I realize this is an impossible question, but what's your gut tell you about, is this more a moment of peril or more a moment of promise for Africa?

MS. SCOTT: I think for Africa that there is more of an element of promise. I

think there is more light at the end of the tunnel than people may be willing to give credit for, or that they're able to see. If you've engaged with the Continent as I have for over 30 years now, I think we see maturation of governments, as you say, in the democratic process, I think you see maturation of markets, I think you see the rise of a middle class.

There are still elements that need to change in terms of strongmen that still are there, in terms of certain other types of DNG issues that we can point to. But I would say that the glass is much more half-full than it is half-empty at this point in time.

The one element of concern that I probably would say, it's not getting as much attention as it could or should, has a little bit, is the rise of -- the terrorism rise, particularly across the Sahel, with some bands in Eastern West Africa. And I think that, especially as we see changes with our Middle East policy, I think there's a linkage there in terms of the rise that we are seeing of some of those elements on the Continent.

They've been fairly well contained to date, but that's an element of a challenge or a problem that I see where we may need to pay a little bit more attention.

MR. O'HANLON: That's great. Thank you. And Emily, now the same sort of question to you, you know what's a big idea that you would like to put on the table. And also, we know that Latin America writ large is a very complex region and it has a lot of hopeful trends, well established democracies in most cases, but also some pretty acute problems, from Venezuela to elsewhere.

Concerns about crime levels, income disparity, so again a very complex story as you would expect from such a large group, a large group of nations. How do you sum up the opportunities at this juncture, and what's a big proposal or idea that you would want to advance to the crowd?

MS. MENDRALA: Great. Thanks. I'll set up a bit of a competition. I would argue that Latin America is the U.S. foreign policy area that is most intertwined with U.S. domestic political considerations. In Latin America circles we call it "intermestic" the mix

between international and domestic, the linkages between and sometimes the conflation of international and domestic politics in Latin America.

And the reasons are obvious, our geographical proximity, family ties, cultural ties, historical ties, the sheer volume of commerce that flows through the region, and Florida. And I say Florida because U.S. policy toward Latin America matters immensely to Florida. There's a large Hispanic population, a growing immigrant population in Florida from countries in Latin America.

Two-thirds of the recent arrivals from Venezuela to the United States have resettled in Florida, and just as U.S. foreign policy matters immensely to Florida, Florida matters immensely to presidential candidates. Its swing state status can't be overstated.

And so this results in, oftentimes, an outsized role for Florida in the consideration of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, and oftentimes a decision-making role for Florida politicians. And, you know, it's an oversimplification to say that Florida is dominating all of U.S. policy toward Latin America, that's not quite as much the case with respect to Mexico, Central America, migration policy writ large.

Just this week when President Trump announced his intent to cut off aid to the Central America and the Northern Triangle, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, Senator Rubio tweeted his disapproval, calling it counterproductive.

But when it comes to Cuba and Venezuela, two foreign policy priorities for this administration, Florida is definitely in the driver's seat and has served as the backdrop for U.S. policy toward Latin America, big speeches, big decisions, Secretary -- I'm sorry -- National Security Advisor Bolton was in Miami in November delivering a major foreign policy speech on Latin America, and it was billed as a foreign policy speech on Latin America writ large, but the three countries that were the focus of his speech were Cuba, Venezuela and Nicaragua, which he dubbed the Troika of Terror at that speech.

And earlier this year President Trump also traveled to Miami to deliver

another major foreign policy speech on Venezuela, and Florida is serving as the backdrop for U.S. policy toward Latin America. And it's easy to see why Diaspora communities would and should have a major role at the table when determining some of these decisions in U.S. policy toward the region, but there's a danger that comes when personalization drives policy, rather than national security interests.

And there are risks that come when emotions, strong emotions, and many of them incredibly justified, are dictating U.S. policy, and in some respects, military training, military planning toward the region.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. Thank you very much. Laura, if I could now moved to you. My fellow have Kikwit friend.

MS. KUPE: (Speaking in Kikongo)

MR. O'HANLON: (Speaking in Kikongo). I never thought we'd get to use Kikongo on the stage.

MS. KUPE: That's right. I know. (Laughter)

MR. O'HANLON: But I wondered -- I realize you're not studying Africa or Latin America, per se, but you're studying homeland security in the United States, and so in a way you can maybe speak to this theme of inter-linkages as well as anybody. So, please, the floor is yours.

MS. KUPE: Certainly. So, in addition to the homeland angle also for Europe and migration angle as well, because like Mike mentioned my parents are originally from the Democratic Republic of Congo, and I was born in Germany, and raised in Luxembourg during part of my childhood before we moved to Michigan.

So, I grew up in Europe and Luxembourg, and particularly when the EU was being celebrated, and really getting its foundation for what it is today, and even the Schengen Zone, it's named after the City of Schengen which is in Luxembourg.

So, it is that background that I have -- it is that background that has really

helped me look at Europe in a very unique lens especially as it has been developing now, and one big thing as relates to homeland security issues, as well as you know issues related to Europe right now in terms of migration there's a lot of discussion around how that migration is impacting national identities as well as security issues.

But one thing that I realized, and Arsalan provided a great foundation when it came to the discourse on migration or integration, one big issue in Europe is that they don't have the vocabulary to deal with this topic now. Especially now, as Arsalan had also mentioned, there has been a rise in far-right and populist parties. And one big example of the impact of those parties was the discussion around the U.N. Global Migration Compact, which was a non-binding agreement, but over time became very politicized.

So, when the Compact was basically brought to the table, to the U.N. in 2016, under the Obama administration, the world was right -- was all behind it because, again, we were in the aftermath of the migration crisis from the Middle East and Africa.

But then with the election of the Trump administration, it was evident that that opened the door for more far-right narratives to basically change the narrative on the importance of the Compact. Because again, the Compact was just really supposed to be a mechanism through which countries would talk about a strategy on how to deal with the forces of migration.

And because of that -- because of the discourse around the Compact in Belgium, for example, it led to the collapse of the Belgian Government because the Prime Minister at the time decided to join the Compact. But then it was in a coalition with a far-right party that decided to pull out of the coalition because Belgium had to -- had at that time, decided to sign on to the Compact.

So, really it shows that when there's that -- when there isn't that vocabulary, and when there isn't engagement, especially from immigrant and migrant communities on the European side, that the leadership right now doesn't really have the tools or the

messaging to talk to the populations that they serve.

And I think the interesting thing around migration is that most migrants are housed in the developing world. So, 85 percent of the world's refugees are in the developing world, and yet in Europe and in the U.S. it's created a great deal of political turmoil.

And so one thing that I would like to raise as a topic that I think we both -- on both sides the Atlantic have to figure out, is how do we talk about migration knowing that far-right and nationalist narratives are impacting the health of our democracies.

And I think a big part of that is organizations like Arsalan's, or Muhammad's organization that really are bringing new voices to the table, because clearly these narratives are not only impacting our democracies, but also our national security.

And I know a lot of folks, this week, were talking about NATO, but I wanted to talk about Europe and homeland issues in this context.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. And one quick follow-up to, given that you work on Capitol Hill, recognized, you know, that you're speaking on behalf of yourself.

MS. KUPE: Right.

MR. O'HANLON: But nonetheless I'm assuming that -- I think I know the answer to this question -- that the prospects for immigration reform this year or next are relatively low, but is there any potential movement or hopefulness? Any way in which this incredibly hyper-charged, politicized issue could see some degree of common ground, or is that just beyond the pale for the next two years in all likelihood?

MS. KUPE: All right. I mean, speaking in my own capacity, right now I don't see any legislative solution, but I think I always have hope in our youth, our millennials, because I think -- I have an immigrant background, and I think the Dreamers have created a great movement. So I think in some of those ways, those are ways that we can talk about immigration in a more humane and comprehensive way.

So, even if there's no legislative solution, I think there are other means through which we can push the narrative forward.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you for sustaining the theme of hope that everybody has managed to --

And Asha, maybe it's going to be a challenge for you since you're from -- sort of, your experiences are in the Middle East where the amount of hope is maybe dwindling by the decade. But there are still some signs of positive movement in some places.

And also you're an expert and you teach on U.S. Congress and foreign policy, and that's often where domestic and foreign policy considerations sort of meet head to head. So, the floor over to you for however you'd like to address these topics?

MS. CASTLEBERRY: Yes. So, thank you so much. You know, and I spent time as a Military Officer, worked on security cooperation in the counter-DAESH Campaign, so definitely my perspective built up as a result of being there for a couple years.

Yes. Looking at the current strategy right now, as mentioned before by our Keynote, that security still dominates the discussion when it comes to our MENA strategy. And how it relates to our foreign -- our domestic policy, we clearly saw that play out yesterday where we voted to end the conflict in Yemen.

And I still feel that as we continue our wars in -- our global wars in the Middle East, the American people are constantly feeling war fatigue. Right? So, Yemen, I think the Yemen conflict in terms of the vote yesterday is going to continue that momentum of, let's try to end the other additional wars.

But my idea is, if we want to end these wars we should do it with a comprehensive exit strategy developed by the AUMF, that's where I think we should come to the table. We can't just end it, and then just pull out, we have to come with some sort of comprehensive exit strategy, which is underscored by Colin Powell's doctrine. We must

need an exit strategy when it comes to these global wars.

Now, in terms of how the current strategy looks right now, I think it's a mixed approach. If you look at the continuity aspect of it, there is some continuity occurring, started from Obama into the Trump administration.

As far as countering DAESH, the strategy is pretty similar. You know, when Trump came in, he continued on, you know, liberating Mosul, going, you know, into Raqqa. Also both administrations have invested a lot in terms of rebuilding these military armed forces in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

And also both administrations have condemned Bashar al-Assad for using chemical weapons, but there's also a division on whether, you know, President Obama, he was more of, okay Bashar al-Assad has to go, versus President Trump is more of -- and I don't really know what his stance is. Right? But overall in terms of the security infrastructure, that both administrations used a very similar strategy.

Also if you look at populism, or how the liberal world is always being challenged in this strategy, it's very interesting with this administration. If you look at the issue with human rights, this has been dismissed just like with our keynote speaker has mentioned before, and we saw that play out with the Khashoggi situation.

As well as looking at the Yemen conflict where we saw the Executive Branch pretty much supporting the funding of arms sales to Saudi Arabia that was contributing to the Yemen conflict.

We also see where the Liberal War was being challenged in terms of regional unity, when the Qatari Crisis broke out we did see our Former Secretary of State tried to become a mediator, but we also saw where the Commander-in-Chief side with Riyadh over Doha. So that also was an indication where we are not really that serious about regional unity, and right now it's still at a stalemate between (Inaudible).

We've also seen where our nuclear nonproliferation efforts have been

challenged, so throwing away the Iran deal, as well as supposedly there's some speculation out there of supporting Riyadh to have its own nuclear weapons programs. So our nuclear nonproliferation effort in the region has been diminished.

And then we also see these new initiatives that are pretty interesting, where, in Afghanistan we are constantly -- we are in, right now, negotiations with the Taliban, which makes sense to a certain degree due to the fact that they have gained a lot of ground, and the Afghan Government has lost ground. And you have millions of people that are living under Taliban rule, so it makes sense to come to the table and speak with them.

But I think another idea I would like to point out in terms of looking in Afghanistan, especially with Pakistan, is that we do have a new leader there who is quite interesting, and I think that the United States could come to the table and talk to about bringing peace in that region itself.

And also, the last one I want to mention in terms of MENA, is that we are seeing more competition from Russia, especially when it comes to their foreign military sales program, they have been very successful as far as selling their -- some of their weapons systems, especially when you saw this play out with the S-400 where Turkey was pretty much interesting -- interested in purchasing the S-400 Missile Defense Program.

So, the Russian Foreign Military Sales Program is definitely giving them a little more political influence to the point where you're seeing that some States in the Middle East are becoming more comfortable with Bashar al-Assad actually staying in Syria. So, we will see more to follow.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. Thank you. Jung, the previous four speakers, each one has taken a whole Continent, or a whole region, and given us a nice way to think about trends. You, by contrast, are more of a specialist in one country and one person.

You are the CIA's top watchers of Kim Jong-un for many years. You wrote the number one most popular Brookings essay of 2018 called *The Education of Kim Jong-*

un, which is now being turned into a book, maybe someday a movie. (Laughter)

And so I wonder what you would want to say about how we have opportunities, or peril, or promise on the Korean Peninsula today, please.

MS. PAK: Thanks, Mike. And thanks to all of you for joining us at Brookings and WCAPS. I'm thrilled to be a part of this conversation. So, I'm going to continue on with the pessimistic side of the panel.

So, you know, just to recap what North Korea -- what has happened with North Korea. In 2017 Kim Jong-un set about -- the Leader of North Korea set about setting facts on the ground with President Trump. He tested intercontinental ballistic missiles that have the potential to hit the United States, and he had his sixth largest -- sixth and most -- largest nuclear test.

So given that, and in thinking about this panel about redefining national security, it occurred to me that when it comes to North Korea, it's good, old-fashioned, traditional ideas of national security, ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, and the fact that we could potentially be under attack from a nuclear armed ballistic missile from North Korea.

As an anecdote I'll point back to -- this is not so long ago -- but in North Korea years, you know, when you're covering the North Korea account, you think in -- the years and the weeks seem to be much longer as if they're dog years. (Laughter)

Not long ago in January of 2018, there was a false ballistic missile alert that went out in Hawaii. Ballistic missile incoming, take shelter, you don't have very much time. Go. And it was a false alarm but the person who set the alarm, or pushed out this text message, didn't know it was a false alarm. He thought it was real. And it made sense why he would think it was real.

At the time, this was when Kim Jong-un was calling the U.S. President an old deranged man, and President Trump was calling Kim Jong-un and rocket man, and calling him all sorts of nasty names, and really threatening a military conflict that a lot of

people thought -- and I think it's true -- that we were headed towards -- toward a military possibly nuclear conflict with North Korea.

And so people in Hawaii had reasons to believe that there might -- that there was a ballistic missile attack coming in. And North Korea was at the forefront of people's minds given the context in which the alarm was set.

People rushed over to find their children, they tried to -- they hid under bathtubs, they tried to find shelter, people cried not knowing what to do, people got out of their cars and started running around on the roads looking up at the sky waiting for a ballistic missile to fall.

So this is a very real -- this is a very real, almost old-school kind of national security coming to the fore and as a top story in 2018.

But you know one of the things that -- you know, and that was one take away from my experience looking at the WMD issue from the Asia perspective. So, there was that conflict and how, you know, how North Korea seems to matter more, and Asia seems to matter more.

During the Fire in Fury days I got lots of phone calls from friends from New York, to the Midwest, to L.A. wondering about whether they should go on their business trip to South Korea, or to China, or to Taiwan, or to Japan, and it really highlighted how much our economies and our -- and how the international had fused with the domestic.

Third, what happened in Hawaii, and these phone conversations that I've had with friends and colleagues who are asking me whether it was safe to go to the region really reminded -- reminded me that America is a Pacific Nation.

I think when we're based in New York or Washington it's -- you know, and that we forget that the United States is such a large piece of land, you know, geographic land, and that Hawaii and the West Coast has been under a much bigger threat from North Koreans and ballistic missile type activities than New York and Washington has.

So, I point out those three key points that the old traditional forms of national security threats still exist. Second, that we are intertwined internationally and domestically, given Asia has the second, third, and eleventh largest economies in the world. And third, that the geographic boundaries of the United States are large, and that we are a Pacific country.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you, Jung. Fantastic. And Sylvia, I'm now moving to you to wrap up the first round of opening interventions. And you've got a big country and a big region, you study India and the Indian Subcontinent, but you also have specific interest in drone technology. So, take it as you wish. Over to you.

MS. MISHRA: Thank you, Mike, and Bonnie. I'm very excited to join this panel. I study South Asia as a region and I would cast my remarks on the Subcontinent.

So, South Asia has been marginal to the U.S. global interest during the Cold War but, however, after the '90s, as in how South Asia's economic health did grow, the U.S. increasingly started paying more attention to the region. Also the war in Afghanistan, and as Asha mentioned, the exit strategy from Afghanistan has become an important, also a sticking point in terms of how the Trump administration really shapes out its policy.

But the 2016 Elections was viewed very closely in the region where almost 1.8 billion people reside, and then there are several transnational issues, and terrorism issues, and also it holds two nuclear-armed adversaries, India and Pakistan.

So what really happened in the United States had important policy ramifications and bearings for South Asia as a region, whilst the world was entirely surprised by the sense of unilateralism that the Trump administration injected in its foreign policy, and also domestic policies, the record of the Trump administration on South Asia has been quite -- has semblances of continuity with the Bush and the Obama administration.

One of the Trump -- the United States' largest partner in the region, India, has been able to make gains with the United States on various policies that continued from

the Bush and the Obama administrations. But essentially, also South Asia is the only region where the Trump administration had come out with two important policy pronouncements.

One, which is the South Asia strategy in 2017 September, and a free and open Indo-Pacific, which essentially also looks at managing the rise of China, and in both the two strategies India plays an important role, and is pretty much at the heart of United States strategic calculus for the region.

But I would like to spend some time reflecting also on the Afghanistan strategy, as Asha rightly pointed out. Yes, it is important to talk to the Taliban, but however the Trump administration has vacillated from 2017 till today in 2019, initially it did say that it would maintain a modest troop in Afghanistan. And then by the end of 2018 it essentially is trying to look at an exit strategy.

However, it is important to keep in mind that these strategies do not involve the Afghan Government, that is one, and which is extremely concerning. And second, the NATO countries have a commitment to be in Afghanistan till 2024.

The United States negotiation led by the U.S. Special Envoy in Afghanistan is a being headed unilaterally and without taking into concerns of the NATO allies, which I find extremely concerning, and probably would be destabilizing in the long term in the region.

In terms of Pakistan, the United States has been trying to follow a more transactional policy, especially under the Trump administration where the administration has been nudging for all the right reasons, you know, for Pakistan to take more stringent and decisive actions on clamping down on terror networks.

However, it is important to bear in mind that Pakistan plays an important role, and also enables the United States Government to formulate an exit strategy. So there would be still continuities in terms of how the U.S. deals with Pakistan on that front.

The positive picture that emerges from the entire South Asia strategy is the

United States partnership with India, and both the countries have been bolstering bilateral ties in terms of maritime security defense readiness, and also interoperability issues.

However, there are still some sticking points, and as they say, India has also not escaped the Trump's treatment on trade issues, as the Trump administration tries to inject new uncertainties, shaping new global trade, rules, there are a lot of ambiguities on how the bilateral our trade ties pan out, and also -- and we can get into the weeds of it.

The immigration policy are trying to clamp down on the H-1B visas, and has been a significant challenge in our bilateral relations, which probably create more stresses in bilateral relationship, but it is expected that the positive aspects would -- and especially bolstering partnership in the strategic realm would take more precedence, and managing these differences would be possible.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. So, we've got a lot on the table. We've heard about Sylvia's 1.8 billion people in South Asia; Jung Pak's 70-plus million on the Korean Peninsula between the two Koreas; we've heard Asha talk about 500 million people in the broader Middle East, we've heard Laura talk about a half billion in Europe, we've heard also another half billion in Latin America from Emily, and then the 1.1 billion in Africa from Jeannine.

And we've heard some elements of continuity between Obama and Trump in certain policies. For example against DAESH, or in engaging with India, a trend that had begun really, as you said, with Bill Clinton and George Bush.

We've also heard about some sharp differences not only in our panel, but in the previous discussion led by Bonnie, in which we've talked about immigration policy and the signature Trump administration focus on toughening treatment of the border, of allies, of certain groups, and certain potential concerns that he's got in regard to immigration.

So, what I'd like to do now is invite a bit of a conversation, a little more free-ranging, I'm not going to work down the row, I just want to invite people to speak in the vein

of what Laura started to do when I asked her about the prospects for immigration reform.

And she said, I'm not going to spend a lot of time handicapping what's going to happen on Capitol Hill this week or next week, but there's an underlying trend here in our country which has to do with the next generation of leaders, which has to do with the demographics of our country.

And that gets at this question that Bonnie and I wanted to build today's event around, of the longer-term interlinkages between domestic and foreign policy. Not just what's happening in this Trump era but more generally and more broadly looking long term.

So, the question I want to pose to the panel -- and just please feel free to start as you wish -- is to, how do you -- how do you understand the dynamics in American society shaping our future foreign policy? Looking not just over this next one to two years, but to the 2020 Election and beyond, and I'm really trying to get away from specific individuals, not just Donald Trump, but Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, you name it.

You can invoke any people you wish of course in your in your thoughts, but I'm really trying to think about forces in our country, you know, trends in our demographics, in our domestic cohesion or lack thereof in our domestic policy, and how those affect our foreign policy, opportunities, choices, what kind of constraints they impose on our foreign policy, and so on.

And that's a pretty big question that can be taken in a lot of different directions, so I'm hoping that somebody is motivated to start the discussion. Again, building on the theme and the spirit of what Laura said, where she talked about long-term opportunities perhaps in how we think about immigration. But anybody else on their topic, or on any other topic, would someone like to begin that part of the conversation? Laura, back to you.

MS. KUPE: Definitely. I mean, as someone who has been an immigrant on both sides of the Atlantic, you know, outside of my day job, I'm interested in the trans-

Atlantic space. And so it's interesting, as a millennial and as a person of color, when I go to think tank events around D.C. and folks talk about, well, you know, the older folks in the room talk about 1989, in not a bad way.

MR. O'HANLON: It wasn't so long ago. (Laughter)

MS. KUPE: -- long ago, it's like it -- I was born slightly before the Wall fell, but it is interesting that they talk about, you know, in German the *Mauerfall*, the Fall of the Berlin Wall, and the Cold War, and also when -- I've watched a lot of the events around NATO, everyone talks about 1949.

And as someone who works in the trans-Atlantic space, and would be like, you know, more young folks and different constituency groups to be engaged in trans-Atlantic discussions, it's interesting that, you know, as our country becomes more diverse, talking about, you know, 1949 or the Berlin Wall, may not resonate with certain populations.

And so I think it is important for especially folks who are going to be leading our nation in government, or in think tanks, to be more creative about how that's going to impact how we look at regions like Europe that have been traditional allies.

And so in one way, I think America's demographics are an advantage because Europe is also changing, and Germany now one in four Germans has a migrant background, and I think that's a very powerful statement because Germany initially was not considered or seen as a country of immigration, and the United States, in my opinion, has had a more successful record of integrating immigrants and that's something that I feel like we could lead on.

And then another thing, too, that I would say to the trans-Atlantics in the room is that since America's demographics are changing, and we are seeing, like, we have populations that have ties to Asia to Latin America and Africa, that we are not, maybe, going to be interested in Europe as much.

Maybe like you Jung mentioned, America is also a Pacific nation, and we

have a large African-American population, and also large African immigrant population, so the focus may be going elsewhere. So I think those demographic changes may lead to the United States looking elsewhere because America itself is changing.

MR. O'HANLON: I'm very proud we haven't had to mention the word Brexit yet in our conversation, for example. (Laughter)

MS. KUPE: Right. You know, I'm trying to see -- I'm trying to bring a different angle because Brexit and NATO tend to dominate -- the discourse around the trans-Atlantic relationship. But I think, especially for moving forward, I think it's important to highlight these elements as well.

MR. O'HANLON: So others, please, get ready to jump in too. But Emily, I wanted to actually ask you a question, and please say whatever you were going to say as well. But you did a great job of making the argument that our ties with our hemisphere are as important as any other relationship we have with overseas nations, which is a pretty compelling argument.

And you talked about Florida; you talked about Secretary Pompeo, and the Trump administration's views. I also wanted to invite you to look out at the trends and see where the demographics are going in terms of this country, and Hispanic and Latino populations, and how that's going to affect domestic and foreign policy. But whatever else you wanted to say, please go for it.

MS. MENDRALA: I think -- I'm going to respond to that question precisely, I think -- I made the argument that U.S. policy towards Latin America is driven by a narrow subset of people in the United States. And I think going forward that will necessarily change.

Take Cuba, for example, there are very clear drivers of U.S. policy toward Cuba, but you'll see increasingly American farmers, for example, clamoring for access to a \$2-billion market 90 miles off our Shore.

You see libertarians questioning why U.S. policy toward Cuba prohibits

travel for tourism -- for tourism purposes in Cuba, and a kind of, get-your-hands-off-my-travel kind of way. And I think the broader subset of the American populace, and broader national security considerations will drive those policies going forward.

Also in the realm of national security, the U.S. and Cuba have established strong law-enforcement ties via dialogues, agreements, information sharing, accords, and have seen success.

In October of last year U.S. law enforcement officials alerted Cubans to a U.S. fugitive from justice who would traverse Cuba in route to Russia. He had been on the run for 12 years and Cuban authorities were able to arrest him in cooperation with U.S. authorities, and return him to the United States.

Also in Central America I think the conversation will increasingly be driven less by a conversation around fear of migration and immigrants arriving at our border, and more about investing in strong, stable partners in Central America creating markets for U.S. goods, for example.

That will, in effect, create the environment where individuals decide to stay in their country. They'll be more stable, they'll be more prosperous, more secure, better governed. And these are some of the areas where I think a broader conversation on the issue of national security involving businesses and various stakeholders will drive a more successful U.S. policy -- foreign policy toward the region.

MR. O'HANLON: That's great. Is it also fair to say, just in very broad terms, that Latino voters are a little bit more of a swing vote than certain other groups? And therefore both parties can be expected to compete for their votes, and to recognize that this is going to be one of the determinants of future electoral victory or failure, and, therefore, the issues will naturally elevate and broaden?

MS. MENDRALA: Certainly, and I think Latino voters are becoming more organized as well, but it's also important to state that, you know, many of them are not

single-issue voters, they don't vote primarily on U.S. policy toward the region. They also care deeply about health care, for example, and so I think politicians will have to grapple with the challenge of determining what, you know, these large subsets of swing voters care most about when it comes to an election year.

MR. O'HANLON: Asha?

MS. CASTLEBERRY: Yes. As far as looking at the changes, as being a professor at a university I get to really learn about how the younger folks feel about foreign policy, and I find it really amazing as an Army Veteran that when I talk about counterterrorism or 9/11, they're like, I don't remember any of that. Especially 9/11, right, oh, I was like two or three years old, or I was even born yet. Right?

So, when they view these wars in Iraq, Afghanistan or Syria they're very confused, and/or they feel more of, I don't even understand why we are there, we should just possibly leave. So, I think that you're going to see where they're going to become more of just becoming like more detached from those types of issues and more of, in favor of ending these wars.

Also while they are, you know, looking at these words and really focusing on the funding aspect, economic security at home is becoming more of a reality. So they're saying themselves, hey, why are we funding these wars? I don't really understand why we're in there. Meanwhile, I'm going through a lot in terms of economic challenges at home.

So, you know, there's going to be this debate between, okay, where our -- where our American dollars should go to that is more useful, and evidently helping us in terms of economic challenges, or addressing our economic challenges 21st Century is going to be more of a priority. And that's why this socialist rhetoric is somewhat more -- sexier to the younger folks, because they feel that it addresses a lot of their economic concerns.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you. That's great.

MS. SCOTT: With regard the Africa region, as you rightly said, we are

looking at a population of just over one billion right now, but the trends would indicate that by the end of the century Africa will be home to the largest population of some close to 4 billion people. And I think that that carries both opportunities as well as challenges.

I think you're looking at a very large labor force, that if well-educated can be deployed both on the Continent as well as around the world. You're looking at market opportunities with the rise of the middle class that would be emerging at the same time.

And I think that that provides certain types of opportunities for everyone but again, if the challenges on the Continent in terms of addressing education, and skills development, and others, if that's not addressed then we will have the other side of the coin which is, as I said earlier, will lead to unemployment issues which will -- could lead to terrorism issues and other types of instability.

And so I think that we need to look at, what are the types of peace dividends that we are in a position to sow, in terms of working with leaders on the Continent and particularly youth in the next generations on the Continent to ensure that we are able to pull out the best scenarios for the Continent and the implications that that has for U.S. in terms of investment opportunities, in terms of other types of engagements as well, and in ensuring that we have peace and stability.

MR. O'HANLON: Do you think there's a way -- if I could just stay with Africa for a minute -- one thing that was striking, I think President Obama made probably a fairly astute political assessment that he didn't want to be seen as doing more on Africa simply because he was the first African-American President.

And that was, perhaps, the correct decision for him but it also perpetuated this fact that we tend to spend less time and attention on Africa than I think we should in general. And you mentioned that U.S. trade with Africa has been declining, and I think China's trade with Africa is now four or five times ours.

And Senator Coons and some others have been working hard on legislation

to try to change that, but obviously you don't legislate trade, per se, and it's going to have to come, to some extent, out of the energy and, you know, opportunities of the private sector and American citizens. I'm not sure we should expect the African American Diaspora to be the major way in which that happens, because of course African-Americans have often been here decades and centuries, and the links to the Continent or perhaps not as strong as for some Latinos in the United States with their own countries of origin.

I'm offering very broad generalizations that are not completely correct, I realize. But what's it going to take for the United States to really pay attention to Africa? Is there -- is there a key opportunity or key new message that we need to find to try to incentivize, you know, not just policy discussions at Brookings, but business leaders, investors, et cetera, to pay more attention to the huge Continent with all the huge opportunities and big demographic trends?

MS. SCOTT: Well, I think just what you said at the end there, that there are so many opportunities that the U.S. is probably not really leveraging as well as it could at this point of time. We do still represent the largest amount of foreign direct investment in the Continent, but that's dwindling on a daily basis, practically, with the rise of others. Not just China, but Russia, Turkey and some others as well.

So, I think we really need to put a lot more emphasis on some of the commercial and economic development issues that we can -- that we can work on. And that will provide us with many of the other opportunities and that, in turn, leads to the jobs, and to the stability, and so forth, that we are looking to achieve on the Continent perhaps.

But I think we're not putting nearly as much emphasis on some of the private sector and commercial opportunities that we should have. And therein, there's a question of education I think, the American business community and America writ large with regard to the Continent, and what it represents today as opposed to what people think it represents today, or what it represented yesterday.

MR. O'HANLON: Jung, I'm tempted to -- before going to Sylvia -- I'm tempted to ask you a Tiger Mom question, because we are both friends with Amy Chua who was here last year, and talked about political tribes in her new book. But the question I'm interested in getting at, you talked about the United States being a Pacific nation, and there are obviously important communities of Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, Indians -- going towards Sylvia next -- who are very important parts of our country, and who whose energy, whose ideas we benefit from greatly.

Do you see, and I realize you're a Korea specialist, not U.S. politics or, you know, U.S. demographic specialist, but do you see new opportunities from that community in terms of what they can interject into our conversation, into our thinking?

We've had a big Asia-Pacific rebalance since President Obama's time, and we are trying to recognize we're more of a Pacific nation. Laura has said that maybe we're going to be a little less Eurocentric in the future because of all these trends.

Do you sense that the broader Asian-American Diaspora or community is going to inject some new ideas into our foreign policy as well, and in some ways affect our Asia policy? Or is it more focused on, you know, being just part of this country, and we shouldn't look to Asian American communities for specific foreign policy interventions or ideas? Do you see what I'm driving at?

MS. PAK: Yeah. You know I'm not -- I think that, you know, Asia, Asian-Americans are a huge group that varies socioeconomically, educationally, as well as culturally. And I think the issue with Asian-American is that they're the model minority without taking into account all of the -- all of the various different experiences.

And I think that the Asian-American communities are getting much more from just -- from an outside -- as an observer, that more involved and getting into civic organizations, and forming their organizations, business organizations, or neighborhood associations to try to inject a voice into U.S. politics.

But, you know, my perspective is also, you know, I found this conversation about, you know, Dr. Castleberry's, Asha's comment about her students not having a memory. The African Continent's youth, the burgeoning youth, and I also think about when we're talking, you know, redefining national security that we have to redefine national security because of these demographic changes.

That we, you know, we probably need to focus more on the African Continent now then when it's too late, and I speak in terms of -- with the perspective of what's happening in Northeast Asia.

I remember in 2014 or 2015 the sale of adult diapers in Japan surpassed that of baby diapers. In South Korea we -- in South Korea the replacement birth rate is below one, so there's a huge demographic time bomb about to go off in Japan in South Korea, one of the biggest industrialized economies, reliable democratic partners and allies in the region, China has excess men.

And so while, you know, Asia is a strategic focus for the United States now, you know, things are going to change -- the respective countries' national security priorities are going to change. There are going to be demographic and other constraints on those governments' reliable allies and partners.

And so I think we have to -- I think what this panel is doing is really showing how we need to redirect and refocus, and also anticipate some of those challenges and redefining national security. Not just for what it means to us specifically, but also what's happening over there is going to affect our priorities in the decades forward.

MR. O'HANLON: By just building on that point, by the way, just a couple of quick additional observations. One is that China may experience the same kind of downward demographics that we've seen already in Japan and Korea. And China has lifted the one-child policy, but guess what, a lot of Chinese don't care, and they're not necessarily responding the way the government anticipated.

I've seen some projections that China's population could dip below a billion by the end of the century, depending on trends and how they might be affected. And also we know that one of the strengths of the United States, we're lucky that we are a melting pot society and we've got a nice gently growing population, which is probably pretty good from the point of view of national power.

So I think some of the debates about American decline and China's rise, don't adequately incorporate some of these demographic trends, which may be more favorable to us than people often recognize.

But Sylvia I wanted to give you the last word in this round. And then we'll go to the audience. And, you know, you made a very important point I thought earlier, that we've seen a lot of continuity in U.S.-India policy and U.S. relations with the Subcontinent now for a number of administrations and that's continuing.

You know, you wouldn't think that there's a lot of similarity between Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump except maybe on India policy. And is this a trend that you think we can now really assume is going to continue? Or are there potential, you know, landmines out there, issues that could arise, that could interrupt this otherwise fairly happy narrative that we're starting to see emerge?

MS. MISHRA: Well, thank you. And before I answer that question, I wanted to underscore one point, and listening to all the panelists over here. One of the key ingredients for maintaining the United States global primacy has been its soft power value. And the fact that due to all these talks about, like, which are essentially inward-looking by this administration, what this is doing is essentially clamping down on the number of students that come to the United States to study, which is also an important factor of continuing America's soft power value.

I recently read reports about how there has been a significant drop in the number of Chinese and Indian students in the United States, and these students also

contribute to the American economy. Indian students make up almost 18 percent of the total number of students that are -- that comes to the United States every year or to study. And Indian students contribute 7.5 billion annually.

So, that is one thing possibly going ahead one would need to grapple with, this is for the U.S. policymakers to think through how to -- how to sustain America's soft power. And in terms of discussing India-U.S. relations and the future of a bilateral or partnership, whilst we often say in the strategic community of both the countries, that we have agreed to disagree on several issues, there are several outstanding differences.

And to a great extent, the Indians policymakers also feel that the United States have been very transactional. And which is a fair, especially on economic policy issues there. There, a gamut of issues on which both the countries are not looking eye-to-eye. And that's fine, but both the countries should see to it that there is no spillover in terms of the broader strategic continuities, and essentially the commonalities of security interest in the broader Indo-Pacific.

Now, the rise of China and essentially managing its rise is going to be a problem and a challenge, not only for the United States but also for Japan, Australia, Vietnam, Indonesia, India, and several of the Indo Pacific countries. And investing in robust partnership, especially the likes of Australia, Japan, India and essentially the Quad, and how the United States is able to coordinate its resources, and essentially inject a rules-based order in the region, is going to be a key area of both a concern and also opportunity.

One area where -- which has come -- and one issue that has come into sharper focus in the Trump administration, is essentially nudging its allies and strategic partner to take more, or share the burden, so o the United States is trying to get its strategic partners and allies to do greater burden-sharing in the Indo-Pacific and also in Europe, which necessarily is not a bad thing. But how all these countries should closely coordinate, should be an area of concern, and also a study for strategic analysts.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. So, now we'll go to you. I think I'm going to do one mega round of questions. We've got about 18 minutes, and we want to then go right into our second panel. So, we'll take five or six questions, or whatever number you have, and I'm going to ask the panelists to each be taking notes on the one or two questions you want to respond to. And that's all we are going to really have time for.

So, once we hear some questions we'll have about one or two minutes per panelist for each person to address one, or at most two questions. And we'll start here with the gentlemen and the fifth row, and then we'll come over here to the woman across the way.

MR. SIEBENS: Hi. Good morning everybody. James Siebens from the Stimson Center. This question is about Africa and development. I have some ground truth in the region, Sub-Saharan Africa, and there is a good deal of resentment building up actually about the amount of Chinese investment in infrastructure projects there's a sense that the populations are not necessarily seeing employment benefits or financial benefits from that, as directly.

And so this goes to foreign direct investment. How can the U.S. continue to invest in the region without generating the kind of sense that there's a sort of neocolonial purpose behind it, and there's benefits accruing to the investors and not the host countries?

MR. O'HANLON: Great. Thank you. And then we'll come over here, please.

MS. ORLOSKY: Thank you. Sofya Orlosky, with Freedom House. I think this conversation is very important, and as someone who works on human rights and democracy issues around the world, I think that there is a fundamental vulnerability right now that the United States faces as we lost our leadership role in the international arena, on democracy, being a democracy champion, and promoting the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

As democracy declines around the world and in the United States, how prepared are the decision-makers here, both at the federal level, but also around the states and local jurisdictions, to identify the red flags that we are seeing all around the world, and all the regions that you cover, that democracy is under attack.

The attack on press freedom, judicial independence, the independence of prosecutorial inquiry, immigration issues, minority rights, all of these things have happened before and we see them elsewhere, but how are we prepared to identify them here and sound the alarm early enough before it's too late?

MR. O'HANLON: And we'll come over here to these two questions. And I've been asked to ask you to stand when you pose your question, please. So, we make sure we get your beautiful face on C-Span.

MR. WEBB: Thank you. David Webb, Defense Department. This is particularly for Asha and Sylvia. There is a handful of startling analogies in Afghanistan to Vietnam 1873, with our negotiations with the Taliban kind of excluding the Afghan National Government, and the Taliban operating in very similar ways to the Vietcong.

The primary difference is there, being that through supporting al-Qaeda, the Taliban has a history of attacking the U.S. homeland or supporting attacks on the U.S. homeland where the Vietcong very specifically tried to avoid doing so, with domestic appetite for supporting these wars in the Middle East and South Asia dwindling over time, how do we avoid returning Afghanistan to 1996?

MR. O'HANLON: Great. And then woman right in front, please?

MS. SPECK: Mary Speck, I'm a Senior Associate with CSIS. I have a question for Emily about a generational change within the Latino community, particularly in Florida. And I was wondering whether the crisis in Venezuela, and the consensus that there is within Latin America for a peaceful transition in Venezuela, has any reflection within the Latino community, in terms of supporting a peaceful transition and more consensus around

the issue of Cuba, particularly around the issue of human rights and the need for a change in Cuba, but a peaceful change in Cuba.

MR. O'HANLON: And we'll take a couple more, if there are questions and then -- additional questions right here please. And then pretty soon we'll come back to the panel to wrap up.

QUESTIONER: Mathura Dannaker, I'm a local high school student.

MR. O'HANLON: Great.

QUESTIONER: So, we've touched on immigration and anti-Semitism. So specifically how can we foster cultural acceptance and empathy from Americans to people of foreign nations, and from those of foreign nations to Americans?

MR. O'HANLON: Super. Thank you. And is there a final question, or should that be it? One more, right here, please; here comes the mic.

MS. REDDICK: Thank you. Eunice Reddick, Former of State Department. And this is back to Jeannine, but perhaps other members of the panel, regarding opportunities in Africa, or missed opportunities, on the trade side. There's been a lot of praise for the new BUILD Act that will create the new International Development Finance Corporation, and bring in collaboration of more coordination between U.S. Government agencies, but also the opportunity to bring in equity financing that should help give us a seat at the table that's now occupied by China on infrastructure, and even the EU.

But we haven't seen the implementing legislation yet, so we don't know what this is going to look like. And perhaps we are putting those supporters in this bipartisan support for the BUILD Act. But are we putting all of our eggs in one basket that may not necessarily give us the opportunity for U.S. business, but also to increase economic prosperity in Africa.

So, I'm thinking about what worked 30 years ago, for example, in U.S. cooperation partnership with Southeast Asian countries, for example. What else are we

missing in terms of tools for that partnership with the African countries on economic growth?

MR. O'HANLON: Super. Thank you. And so now we are going to go to the panel, starting with Jeannine, and just working down. You've been all very kind, to not only ask great questions but to divvy them up geographically. So, we've got a couple on Africa, one on Latin America, one on South Asia and Afghanistan.

And because I never want to see my good buddy, Jung Pak, left out I'm also going to add a question for her which is to talk -- which is one last element of these interlinkages that we haven't yet discussed too much today, which is Americans living abroad, and specifically Americans living in Korea, and how that may shape how we think about crises on the Korean Peninsula, because I've learned from Jung on this issue in the past.

So, without further ado, if we could just work down the panel, a couple of minutes each, and then we'll finish Panel I, and move to Panel II. My friend.

MS. SCOTT: Thank you. I think with regard to Chinese investment in Africa, yes, on the one hand there is the element of resentment, or people feeling that the Chinese don't come with an even-keeled approach. At the same time I think many officials or private sector people, if you ask them, will say, but the U.S. is generally felt to be missing. And so I think there is a great deal of interest, a great deal of thirst, if you will, for Americans to come in and to invest in the Continent.

People feel as though the American companies that come in are much more balanced in their approach. They provide training, they work much more readily with local counterparts, and I think that just -- we have to have ways and means to encourage American businesses to actually come in.

And I think that goes to the second question that was directed towards me, which is: What are some of the tools? What are some of the things that we need to have at our disposal? We have not seen what the BUILD Act will actually look like, but I think that it

is a step in the right direction, because it will allow us to take equity, it will allow us to maybe look at some of the other areas, where we have been missing, maybe an infrastructure and other.

And to leverage some of those opportunities where we have not been as strong in terms of engaging the U.S. private sector operators on the Continent, and kind of leveling that playing field where others tend to have a lot more state support or other types of advantages.

So, I think we're looking in the right direction, we've yet to see what it will really look like in terms of having new tools that at our disposal to do that. But I do know that there's an amazing thirst for American companies, of all sizes, not just large corporations, but the SMEs who can really engage particularly with younger people, and with women entrepreneurs and others, and those are really some of the back-backbone companies that you have out there.

There's a great deal of thirst for Americans to come out and to provide those linkages, and it leads to the prosperity, the stability, the peace dividends that I've spoken about earlier, so, yeah.

MR. O'HANLON: That's great. Thank you. Emily, over to you.

MS. MENDRALA: Thank you, Mary, for your question. I think you're right, in Venezuela there has been a regional consensus, and not just a regional consensus, in many respects a global consensus, and in some aspects the U.S. rhetoric, at least, has gotten out ahead of that consensus arguing for at times, apparently, a military intervention where -- whereas the region and the world has been much more reserved.

In Florida specifically, and you asked about a generational divide, and I'll speak about Cuba. The Florida International University does a poll regularly to assess the views of Cuban-Americans in Florida vis-à-vis U.S. policy toward Cuba, and it shows a very clear generational divide.

That the younger Cuban-Americans in Florida believe that engagement is the best answer for U.S. policy toward Cuba. And the reasons why they're multifaceted, it's because U.S. policy toward Cuba, as stated, the embargo has not worked, has not achieved its intended purposes, but also because they see engagement as in the best interest of U.S. national interests, but also the Cuban people.

There's a burgeoning private sector in Cuba that flourished when engagement reached its peak under the -- at the end of the Obama administration, and in many respects the private sector invested a tremendous amount of capital and took huge risks to set up small businesses in the hospitality sector.

And in second tier, second order private sector businesses that would benefit from an influx of cash for the -- for the hospitality sector, and a lot of them have lost a lot with the downturn of U.S. travel to the region. And there's a tremendous organization in Florida, based out of Miami called CubaOne that takes second-generation Cuban-Americans, the younger folks, on trips to the island.

Families with a lot of history, a lot of emotions, and tackles those, and show, and in some instances introduces young Cuban-Americans to family members from -- with whom they've been separated for decades. It's very powerful, but it's powerful not just at the personal level, but also in showing the next generation of Cuban-Americans the impact that engagement can have at the personal and broader policy level.

MR. O'HANLON: Excellent. Thank you. Laura, over to you.

MS. KUPE: Okay. Well, I'd like to address the Africa question as well particularly as it relates to Europe. So Europe colonized Africa, and as the child of Former Belgian Colonial subjects, and as Mike knows, Belgian Colonial rule was amongst the most brutal.

I think for the United States there's an opportunity to come in as an alternative to China and Europe, and Europe has also invested in Africa, addressing the

things that Jeannine mentioned, like the youth bulge, because the migration crisis is also, not just come from the Middle East, but also coming from Africa.

So, Germany, for example, is proposing a Marshall Plan in Africa. So, knowing that -- and also France with Emmanuel Macron there, he's made multiple trips to Africa again to address the migration issue and encouraging folks to stay there, and hopefully by staying there -- he mentioned that it's important for them to stay there, because there are these business opportunities especially if folks really harness them.

And so with that, I feel like the United States could be a credible partner. And then I think it's also important who the United States can send. So, like it was mentioned that we don't want to highlight that we are a neocolonial power, I think that's a great opportunity where Diaspora communities could play an important role, me being part of one.

And then I think another thing that Diaspora communities, especially the more recent African immigrant communities in America could provide is, again, trying to harness the power of remittances. So, in many cases remittances are keeping a lot of African countries alive including my parents as natives of the Democratic Republic of Congo. So if there's a way to better harness remittances, I think that's also a big opportunity there.

And then I wanted to talk about, the question about empathy, so a big thing that I'm realizing having, again, I call myself Afropean-American, being a total third-culture kid, I think a big thing of highlighting interconnectedness, I'm American, my parents are from the Congo, I have cousins in Canada, in the UK, South Africa, probably somewhere -- someone is in China at this point.

But I think it's highlighting the interconnectedness, and it's not just the -- and I would also say, it's not always the onus on the people of color to do the teaching, but also the other communities to be receptive.

And I think also just to finish up the question about the red flags. I think a

big thing is having folks from those communities in positions of power, because they usually notice those red flags head-on. And I think with the New Congress, with new members like Rashida Tlaib, and Ilhan Omar, and Joe Neguse, who are from Diaspora communities that have experienced war or turmoil, that they could be the ones to start pushing that conversation.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. You wove a lot into that, very good, and cogent and succinct answer. Asha, over to you.

MS. CASTLEBERRY: Yes. With regards to Afghanistan the way I approach in terms of achieving stability, there's two ways I see that should be a priority, and one of them is -- we are definitely working on -- is to continuously invest in the women in terms of SSR, Security Sector Reform, getting them involved more in the security sector.

I think that is invaluable moving forward, in achieving stability and empowering them too, as elected officials. That would be definitely key move forward for the future Afghanistan.

The other piece to it, what I see is that we need a comprehensive regional approach or strategy for Afghanistan. General Mattis had mentioned this during the beginning of his term that this was necessary, but unfortunately not all the key players were involved in that regional strategy.

You definitely do need Pakistan, Iran, India, China, and possibly Russia to be part of that and to build a consensus on how we can build -- achieve stability in Afghanistan. If you do not include those key players you're going to pretty much have a setback, in terms of achieving stability there.

And going back to the point with human rights, I think the one thing that's very important is to groom leaders of tomorrow to get involved in these human rights issues, and be able to articulate how whatever's going on overseas in terms of, you know, human rights violation how that connects at home.

And there's a lot of examples of that, especially for those that have experienced, you know, human rights issues. So, I think we just make -- we need to have leaders that know how to articulate it well as far as connecting what goes on at home versus globally. And I think once we have that we'll be better off.

MR. O'HANLON: Super. Thank you. Jung?

MS. PAK: Hi. So, Mike, I think your question about Americans living abroad and the empathy question can be put together. You know, Senator Graham at the height of this Fire and Fury, and locked and loaded, when North Korea said, in talking about preemptive strikes against North Korea that it's better if people die over there, than if people die over here. So, before war gets over to our shores.

And I thought it was a really tone-deaf way of putting things, just to put it mildly. But, you know, it neglected the fact that they're -- you know they're -- millions of people, Americans who are constantly traveling through Asia, through Africa, through Latin America, and were constantly on the move. And I think that part of the empathy issue is that, you know, that travel abroad is a key part of developing empathy and inspiring the next generation of national security professionals.

Our friend and colleague, Amanda Sloat here, who was a State Department -- who was a Diplomat, said she wasn't really interested in being a diplomat over Europe -- until she traveled overseas and studied in Europe. And now she's the leading voice on Europe, in addition to representing U.S. interests with Europe.

So I think -- but you know studying abroad and being -- and feeling safe abroad is highly dependent on how protected you feel by the U.S. Government. And one of the -- one of the greatest things I think about the U.S. passport is that you can take it, and that you're an American citizen, and that there'll be somebody backstopping you. The Consulate, the Embassy at these various locations.

And I think when we look at Otto Warmbier who was detained by North

Korea and came back in a coma; Jamarcus Choge, U.S. resident, and there was not a -- not very much of a, you know -- what is it -- opposition criticism of what happened to them.

MR. O'HANLON: Right.

MS. PAK: It sends a really stark message to people who are -- to Americans who are going to travel overseas, and to those regimes that are not amenable, or who don't want American speaking abroad, or criticizing their government, et cetera. And so I think, you know, empathy, travel abroad and U.S. government protection are all really intertwined.

MR. O'HANLON: Fantastic. Thank you. And Sylvia, to you for the last word.

MS. MISHRA: Thank you for a great question on Afghanistan. It is a very difficult question as we try to grapple with the way ahead in Afghanistan. I do agree with Asha, what you said about the importance of having a comprehensive regional strategy and approach towards Afghanistan.

However, one of the key ingredients right now I think is having transparency in talks, what we do not know, are what are the red lines that in the negotiations that the United States is having with the Taliban. And in that case transparency with the NATO allies would be essential.

I would ideally like a return back to the Afghan-led, Afghan-owned process. We have to understand it was just yesterday the New York Times reported that Taliban which now are like controls majority of Afghanistan. There was an attack on Afghan National Security Forces, and 30 police personnel were killed.

Now, what we know, till 2019 April, is that the United States and Taliban have come to an understanding that the Taliban would not host terror networks in Afghanistan territory. We really are supposed to take those words on face value, so essentially looking at transparency measures.

And I would also like to tease out a bit from Asha's point and talk more about regional partnership in 2017 South Asia strategy, there was important emphasis and mention of what India can do in Afghanistan, and the Trump administration welcome a greater role of India in the region.

India is the fifth largest donor in Afghanistan, and just in dollar terms, and it has also built a lot of goodwill in terms of its development assistance to the region. Therefore, thinking about ways and coordinating how we could probably accommodate the Taliban, but also within the broader framework of an Afghan-led, Afghan-owned process, because we really do not want to relinquish of all the grounds that we have achieved in the last 18 years in terms of advancing on human rights issues. And just creating a more stable and secure Afghanistan.

MR. O'HANLON: Thank you very much. So, with that, we are going to a seamless transition. I will hand off to Liza. But please join me in thanking Panel I.

(Applause)

(Recess)

MS. ARIAS: Good morning, everyone. It's so great to see all of you here today. My name is Liza Arias. I'm a Scoville Fellow at CSIS and I will be moderating this wonderful panel this morning.

Before we get started I do want to take a moment to thank Ambassador Bonnie Jenkins, Brookings Institution, and WCAPS for putting together this phenomenal event.

The last panel we heard from had a wonderful discussion and we've had wonderful insights all morning, and we're going to continue that trend here today. We're going to take a much more broad focus than the previous panel did. The previous panel focused on regional issues, we're going to be focused specifically on issues within the national security spectrum, and we have a wonderful panel to do that.

So I'm going to have the panelists introduce themselves and then we'll jump right in and leave enough time for audience questions.

MS. WINSTANLEY: I am Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley. I am a retired U.S. diplomat, former Ambassador to Malta, former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism. And I am here with my Third Way Cyber Enforcement Initiative hat.

MR. RAHIM: I am Muhammed Fraser Rahim, the Executive Director for Quilliam International. I run our efforts in North America. We are the world's oldest counterterrorism organization. We work on rehabilitation more broadly, former extremist. I'm also an assistant professor at the Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina.

MS. ZEYA: Hi, everyone. My name is Uzra Zeya and I am the President and CEO of the Alliance for Peacebuilding. We are the largest global network of peacebuilding organizations worldwide, 100+ members working in 153 countries to sustain peace and end conflict. I'm also a recovering former diplomat. (Laughter)

DR. LUCEY: Good morning, my name is Daniel Lucey. And I would like to thank Ambassador Jenkins and the Brookings Institution for allowing me to participate in the panel today.

I am an infectious disease and public health physician. I teach at Georgetown Medical Center and also at the new institute, the law center. In addition I am a research association in anthropology at the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History where we help to create a three year exhibit on epidemics, which is largely what my career has focused on. It is open from 2018 until 2021.

Thank you.

MS. ARIAS: Great. Well, as you can see, we have ample expertise to draw from.

The first question I would like to pose to the panel has two parts. Each of you work on a wide-ranging number of issues, from cybersecurity to counterterrorism,

peacebuilding, and global health. I would be curious to hear whether you believe that your issue area has been impacted by the policies, or perhaps I should said the absence of policies, enacted since 2016, and what you believe the long-term implications of those policies are for the field.

The second part is given that we live in a society where the electoral environment creates shifts from one side to the other every four to eight years, what do you think the long-term effects of that are for long-term American national security?

So, why don't we start with you, Ambassador Winstanley?

MS. WINSTANLEY: Certainly. There has been a marked difference with how this Administration deals with cybersecurity and the role of the United States in international fora. The cyber czar from the Department of State position has not been filled again. It was a very important coordinating position for U.S. government agencies and how we interacted with other governments overseas. By the U.S. retrenching in our position of leadership on this very important issue, it means that we are not having the influence, we are not gathering our allies in international fora, particularly in the United Nations, with ensuring that our priorities and views are supported and take precedence over some very different views, competing views, from Russia and China and other countries throughout the world.

So our lack of leadership is in fact going to harm us, in my opinion, in the longer-term.

The second part of your question is? Repeat it please. I'm sorry.

MS. ARIAS: Sure. So given that we live in an electoral system where you often see a shift from one party to another every four to eight years, and as result we often see very different policies put forth, what you think the long-term implications of that are for American national security.

MS. WINSTANLEY: Right. Okay. Thank you. Then I would argue that

those shifts, such as they are, and certainly as a diplomat, we always argue that the shifts overseas were not as large as people expected them to be from one administration to the other, a lot of wasted time, a lot of missed opportunities for what we as the United States can accomplish internationally. And we need to show leadership on a number of issues; and when we step back, it falters.

So I would say we're missing opportunities and we've wasted time.

MR. RAHIM: So I didn't mention this, but I worked in the intelligence community and I was a counterterrorism analyst and Gina and I worked together on -- I was thinking about the Cairo speech too as well --

MS. WINSTANLEY: Yeah.

DR. RAHIM: And I worked at our National Counterterrorism Center. And so I'm thinking about how things have shifted, I mean just in terms of terminology. For the work that I do I'm dealing with violent extremism more broadly, counterterrorism, the distinction that CVE is not necessarily within the same counterterrorism rubric. As a government analyst, I have probably thought they were one in the same.

And so I think for me it's been an interesting shift from seeing a very government centric sort of understanding of the problem set and then being on the outside working in the nonprofit space where we are working in real time on issues of deradicalization, demobilization, and rehabilitation, both domestically in the United States and certainly abroad.

And so we're now getting into the nuance nature. And what do we mean when we talk about extremism, what do we mean when we talk about terrorism, what do we mean when -- are we making the distinction between academics when I'm teaching my students and cadets who will be going into the military, are we talking about political violence. And all the definitional sort of nuanced nature is so important to where we are going.

I know that there was certainly conversations, particularly early on, whether the Trump Administration language of the use are -- is this countering Islamists or countering Islamic extremism? What do we mean by that? Is it terrorism prevention? One positive thing I can say within the Trump Administration is they haven't used that language, at least per se in outward fashion. There might be certainly come other criticism on their nuanced nature of it.

But I think for me it has been a -- for our work this is important. The language, the labeling. We know -- and this probably will get some of the points we'll get into later -- but we know that there's just a rise of just extremism more broadly, particularly in the domestic terrorism space.

As relates to the second question, yes, I think that there are shifts. In a perfect world there is a continuity of information and briefing from one previous administration to the next. We certainly saw some of the breakdown of that between the Obama Administration and also the Trump Administration. Doing a content analysis of the national security strategy that was put out, or counterterrorism strategy was put out back in November, I would have liked to see a little bit more meat to the table as it relates to prevention. The jury is still out where we're actually going on this issue, and so I think we have wasted time in light of the problem set and the issues that are increasing. And that is a concern, at least from someone who is working on counter extremism on a daily basis.

MS. ARIAS: So, Dr. Rahim, you talked about prevention, and I know that Uzra works on peacebuilding, which to my understanding seeks to address the root causes of conflict. So I'm wondering what your thoughts are on this.

MS. ZEYA: Absolutely. I'm an optimist by nature, so I'm going to take a bit more hopeful look forward in terms of what the changes since 2017 have wrought in our field. I would say that the indicators are all quite negative globally. You know, we are seeing unprecedented numbers in terms of global displacement, over 70 million civilians

worldwide being pushed out of their homes, of their residences, driven by conflict, driven by violence.

We have also seen a shift in humanitarian assistance worldwide where 20 years ago it was the more traditional frame, 80 percent of humanitarian assistance went toward national disaster recovery and relief. Now that paradigm has shifted. Eighty percent of humanitarian relief goes toward conflict driven violence and outcomes.

Now, the answer, as you mentioned, Liza, is prevention. And what's interesting to me is we are seeing emerging I think a bipartisan consensus towards a paradigm shift of smart power, of a full spectrum effort of peacebuilding, what I would call bringing in development, bringing in humanitarian relief, bringing in human rights advocacy, civil society support, capacity building, all toward smart preventive action that heads off conflict and resolves conflict. Conflict cannot be ended per se; it's healthy in any society to have divergences and differences that can hopefully lead to a better outcome. But we I think are facing a moment where maybe some of the complacency that experts like me and many of mine fine colleagues who are still in government had, that simply the facts would bring us to a better solution. I think we really now need to involve more actors. It isn't just government who can solve these problems. Civil society, many of the wonderful panelists who have presented today, I think are part of that effort, but also looking for likeminded partners, fellow government, fellow actors in academia, in advocacy organizations, who can work towards this preventive root causes approach.

One final point I would make is despite the very disturbing or sobering message sent by consecutive administrative budgets since 2017, again we've seen a bipartisan consensus in congress that has preserved State Department and USAID operations and assistance in these areas. So, again, I think there is more there in terms of a constituency, irrespective of party, who believes in these smart investments toward our security and toward a more peaceful world.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you.

DR. LUCEY: Thank you, Liza. I'd like to focus on one specific pivotal point where we are now, in my opinion, between the previous administration, this administration, and then whatever the next administration is with regard to international epidemics, which could originate in the United States or could come to the United States.

So the point I'd like to focus on is called the Global Health Security Agenda, or GHSA. And it was begun in 2014, in February of 2014, and funding expires September of this year. Hopefully the funding will be -- adequate funding will be renewed for the following five years, until 2024. And, in my view, for five or ten or fifty years, long after I'm gone, after that.

So the central focus of the Global Health Security Agenda begun in 2014 was on making the world safe against infectious diseases. So very ambitious vision I would say. Nevertheless, I think it's very important and it has had clear progress over the past five years, but it's really much longer than a five-year plan to really come to fruition, for maturation, to prevent epidemics, to respond better to them, so they aren't as severe when they do occur.

And I would say that also one thing that hasn't been emphasized enough is to help with the recovery of the countries or the regions where the epidemics occurred.

So the Global Health Security Agenda focuses on three things, prevent, detect, and respond. And there's 11 action packages which are divided 3 or 5 each to the prevent, detect, and respond part. So prevent is, for example, to prevent antimicrobial resistance, which really is a worldwide pandemic. It's worldwide epidemic, much like HIV is truly a pandemic, and tuberculosis, which is linked with HIV.

The second big point in the Global Health Security Agenda that I think is very important, looking back at all the epidemics for the last 50 years and going forward for the next 10, 20, 50 years, are infectious diseases, viruses or bacteria or fungi that come

from animals into our species. And most of the big outbreaks that have reached the news in the past 15-20 years are from animals, so we call them zoonotic. So Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, which was not just in the Middle East, but was in South Korea in the summer, May-June of 2015, certainly Ebola, West Africa, now in the DRC, and North Kivu and Ituri Province, the SARS pneumonia in Asia and Toronto in 2003. All examples of these zoonotic diseases.

So the Global Health Security Agenda now has expanded from 28 countries in 2014 to 64 countries, but also it's closely linked to building the capacity to prevent and detect and respond to epidemics in not only these countries, but then through using a tool called the Joint External Evaluation, or JEE, working directly with the World Health Organization, therefore not just 64 countries, but all countries in the world, to prevent, detect, and respond effectively. And I would say maybe some more emphasis needs to be added on the recovery part.

MS. ARIAS: So I'd like to follow up with you on that. It seems that prevention is a big part of the work you do, but it's often hard for us as a society to focus on prevention because we don't sense the urgency. And so I'm wondering if you see that there is adequate concern with a potential infectious disease epidemic in the near future, do you think we're adequately preparing for that, and, if not, how do we create a sense of urgency for something that hasn't happened yet?

DR. LUCEY: So I should have said in the beginning that anything I have to say is simply my own opinion. And I have some unorthodox opinions, but I'll try to keep them non-controversial and brief.

So every day I wake up and I try to answer the question that you ask. And for me it's not just about one threat epidemic, there are multiple ones. Nature doesn't require that it behaves the way that we want it to or that there's one epidemic at a time. There are epidemics going on all the time around the world, they're just not in the news

anymore. There's Dengue, there's Malaria, there's HIV, there's tuberculosis, there's so many epidemics going on all the time.

But I certainly agree with you about if you really are successful in public health in preventing outbreaks, it's crickets, you hear nothing, and you get no benefit or not added funding, et cetera. So prevention to prevent something occurring or coming back that we should have been able to prevent, we fail at that badly. And I'm speaking only for myself. But, for example, the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, pneumonia, that occurred in 2003, November 2002, coming out of Guangdong Province in Southeast China, and then from Hong Kong going to many places, including Toronto, not just in Asia. It was a new class of a virus that never caused a severe human disease before, but now it turns out to be the same one as the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, which appeared, everyone says, first in Saudi Arabia, but really it was in Northern Jordan, in Zarqa, Jordan in April of 2012, and now it has spread at least once far away to South Korea, far from the Middle East, as did the SARS virus.

But we have no anti-viral drugs and no vaccines for either of these two types of viruses, which are called coronaviruses. I'm just saying that as one example.

And one other brief example -- I'm breaking my promise to be brief -- but Ebola. So, for me, I was very, very fortunate and honored, one of the most meaningful opportunities of my life as a physician is to be able to work in South Africa providing care as best we could in 2014 in Sierra Leon and then in Liberia with Doctors Without Borders. And how there's the tenth outbreak in the DRC for the first time ever, in an extremely dangerous and lethal conflict zone, chronically lethal conflict zone. And after 2001 Ebola was included in the list of the six highest biothreats of the U.S. government, they said category A threats. Ebola was one of them. But where was the antiviral drug or drugs? Where was the antibodies for treatment against Ebola? Where was the vaccine or vaccines against Ebola? Because we actually need more than one for different species of Ebola. Where was the

effective risk communication? All of which were glaringly absent in the epidemic in 2014. It was glaringly absent, with terrible consequences in terms of suffering and death of the people, including healthcare workers who suffered through the epidemic and now in DRC.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you for that. So, as you all know, we're talking about interlinkages between domestic society and foreign policy. And I want to touch on that in my next question.

We often think that when voters go into the voting booth they are primarily concerned with domestic policy and not so much foreign policy. But it is clear that there are linkages that exist between the two. And I'm wondering if any of you see direct links between the work you do and domestic society, and if you could talk a little bit about that.

Uzra, I'm hoping you would want to jump in here talking about migration a little bit, especially when we saw the cutting off of aid for the northern triangle, which was mentioned earlier. What that might mean for domestic migration policy?

MS. ZEYA: You know, absolutely. I maybe would like to share an anecdote actually from my past life as a diplomat where I was the number two at the U.S. Embassy in Paris during a three-year period that was marked by a wave of terrorist attacks, three major terrorist attacks.

I'm sure all of you recall probably the most notorious was the November 13, 2013 attack that took 130 lives in multiple attacks all over the City. So as an American diplomat I was charged with first mission assuring the safety and security of Americans. We had a major undertaking to assist the victims, the many American victims of this attack, but also engaging the host government, the French government to offer Americans support in solidarity in addressing what was a largely domestic origin extremist, violent extremist problem with an intersection from the exploding conflict in Syria.

Now, it seems like an entirely foreign policy issue, but what was interesting was at the same time we had the U.S. primaries in the United States. So one connection I

would make is after the November 13 attacks of 2015, a few weeks later then-candidate Trump proposed the Muslim ban. And I myself, I have to say, having been overseas, I did see a direct connection between those two events and I did see an instrumentalization, I would say of foreign policy issues and crises for a domestic purpose.

On a more positive side, I think that the polarization that I witnessed in Europe, you know, driven by issues like the migrant crisis there, driven by issues of inequality still lingering from the 2008 financial crisis, we now I think acknowledge that this polarization is occurring in our own country, and I think that creates an impetus towards action, positive action, to try to bridge these gaps. And that's where I feel strongly that the field of peacebuilding is not only a tool to use in managing conflict abroad, but it has an immediate relevance to the situation in our own country.

So what we're talking about is applying principles of dialogue, of mediation, of getting over this human instinct to put people in two categories, the us and the them, to really find a common thread that works towards solving problems together.

So, for me, you know, maybe more than ever, peacebuilding has an immediate relevance at home and abroad.

And one more point I would make, just in answering your question on prevention and this nexus with public health. I mean I do believe we have a strong evidence case for peacebuilding in the national security space, saving lives and money. And I think all you have to do is look at the stats for the toll of American led military interventions since 9/11. Where there was a recent study by Brown University that put a price tag at \$5.9 trillion in the cost of those wars if you factor in as well the care of the many American veterans who will need lifelong care as a result of their very courageous service. The civilian toll, all totaled, the estimates are anywhere between \$370-500 million. So I mean this is an absolute crisis.

Now, if you look at peaceful means, peacebuilding methods, as an

alternative to this \$5.9 trillion cost, you see that only less than 1 percent of U.S. foreign assistance goes towards peacebuilding. Now, studies have shown if you were to double that amount in the 31 most conflicted afflicted and fragile countries, you would have a cost savings over 10 years of nearly \$3 trillion.

So, for me, this is a case where it's not only nice to do, but it is the smart and really a must do. And I feel there's a moment of opportunity in reorienting, in redefining our national security policy at this moment towards prevention.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you. Does anybody else want to jump in here?

DR. RAHIM: Well, I'll say this. You know, we make this statement often times -- you know, you don't have to be black to challenge racism, you don't have to be gay to challenge LGBTQ bias abuse, or you don't have to be Muslim to speak up against anti Muslim bigotry.

But all of those issues are shared issues that, particularly in a domestic context, communities must find a way to balance out in a cohesive manner to not just look at their singular issue, but work in a partnership fashion to realize this is a coalition effort, this must be done across our, in this case, western liberal democracy.

So for us, this is important because we've been working tirelessly. Our organization was established by former extremists who were on the other side of the sort of pendulum swing, involved in being former members of Al Qaeda, former members of ISIS, former members of Hizb ut-Tahrir, and they made this slow journey in and out of extremism. And what they will tell you, including individuals working with right here in the United States, is that that journey takes time. But that journey that takes time also requires them to know the other. And knowing the other allows for a two-way conversation that at times might challenge some of their really deep-seated biases and prejudices, et cetera.

And so, for us, I think that that's important, particularly as we find ways to address some of these domestic issues that certainly have a foreign policy agenda or

foreign policy implications as well. Certainly, the Muslim ban has been a concern as well. And I think for us it's a constant -- it's a challenge, to be quite honest with you. This isn't solved overnight.

I was a former peacebuilder after I left government, working from the war room to the peace room and now I guess I'm in the outside world. But those practices in peacebuilding, in reconciliation, conflict resolution are so vital and important in that sort of whole of society approach. If I say nothing else throughout this sort of dialogue with the panel, is that that communication, that sharing of knowledge, is so important, and it's a whole of society approach. And so that's a positive aspect.

I think we certainly can see that that's something that we are engaging on, but I think there's more work that has to be done.

MS. WINSTANLEY: What's the term -- intersectionality?

DR. RAHIM: Yes, absolutely.

QUESTIONER: Yes.

QUESTIONER: Mm-hmm.

MS. WINSTANLEY: Yeah? Okay. Certainly, with cyber -- and frankly, the frame of this entire discussion, redefining national security, all of these issues are national security issues. I mean international issues with domestic implications. And cyber, like all the rest of them, we have our domestic views on it, but none of them are addressed or resolved domestically. So our privacy, surveillance, cyber surveillance, how we spend our time on the internet, who has access to our information, how it might affect our democracy or democratic processes, outside interference in that, and domestic interference in that. They are all connected. The means of doing it are the same regardless of whether they're criminals or foreign governments, or terrorist organizations. The means are the same. So the cyber policy I think is very much falling into that.

How we deal with enforcement is a huge issue. To stop people from taking

advantage of us or committing crimes against us, it takes enforcement, the fact that something bad is going to happen to them. And the latest cyber strategy for the United States talks about our outreach and our ability to overmatch other countries, other organizations, but we also have to be able to bring people to justice. And that's something that we currently lack, and this is something that the current congress could be working on, the Administration should be thinking about, and it will be before us for the foreseeable future.

So that's something that we need to think about because it has a domestic implication as well as with international cooperation, because we can't solve it by ourselves.

And I'll leave it with that.

MS. ARIAS: Great. Does anybody else have anything?

MS. ZEYA: Oh, I just have to correct the statement I made before, the toll from the U.S. led wards since 9/11 is 376,000 -- between that and 500,000. Still quite high.

MS. ARIAS: Yes. (Laughter)

So, as you can see, there are clearly interlinkages between the two and it seems that from what all of you have mentioned, there is a net positive to prevention, to addressing these issues before they become crises.

How do we as members of the national security community better communicate that to the American public? Because it seems to me that if all of what you have mentioned seems like it's something that we should all be engaging in and be advocating for, communication seems to be missing. How do we fix that?

MS. WINSTANLEY: Certainly for the cyber I think we are all beginning to better understand the implications, our vulnerabilities as a nation and as individuals within the nation. You know, they always joke about when they ask who's had their identity compromised, that it's not if it's going to happen, but when it's going to happen to you. And I dare say some people in this room already have had the experience, myself included.

So that's one part of it. We're beginning to understand it, we're beginning to understand how different organizations and companies use our information, access our information. I had the extraordinary experience of trying to buy something from Costco -- I'll call them out -- on line and before I could use it I got the message that my cookies had been disabled and unless I allowed them to track me I could not spend my money with them. So the reminder of, if you're not paying for it, you are the product. That's one part of it.

So I think people are increasingly beginning to understand that and we're moving in a way as a nation to demand that it be addressed. So we need to keep talking about it, keep calling out these things as they happen to make sure we all understand we are the product and we are vulnerable, internationally and domestically.

DR. RAHIM: You know, I think for the issue of terrorism that this is, as we've been saying, a societal issue and challenge.

I grew up in Charleston, South Carolina and the attacks in 2015, Dylann Roof and the perpetrator that killed nine innocent lives at Emanuel AME Church, was carried out by a white supremacist. Anders Breivik in 2011 carried out this attack and started this sort of mass wave. And Frazier Glenn Miller, a very well-known white supremacist mentioned that Anders Breivik's manifesto was sort of part of this global movement to do something for, in this case, white men and preserving of Aryan identity.

So, you know, for us -- I mean for me and the work that we're doing, I think seeing that the challenges, the issues, are cutting across communities. This isn't just a threat of individuals who seek to abuse the name of Islam and carry out attacks in the name of Al Qaeda or Daesh. The full gamut is really where we're all in a situation where we have to respond to. It's the same issue within gang communities where individuals engage with gang activity. We just saw the hip-hop American rapper, Nipsey Hustle, who was victim of -- again, the information is still out there, but potentially a gang attack. That response is a community response, but these are multiples issues.

So, you know, how do you get communities involved, how do you get the American public involved? You recognize that there is not a singular issue, that we all collectively must stand up and work in partnership to know the other. You might have suspicions, you might have concerns. How can we engage to break down those barriers? And so because there's a diversity of issues at play, that requires all of us to be information.

And I think that that sort of simple message is so important. I mean the Amtrak statement of see something, say something, it's a bit corny and cliché-ish, but it certainly resonates with us. So we have to find and come up with maybe some interesting newer mantras or mnemonic devices that might be attractive, at least in sort of the terrorism space or counterterrorism space to respond adequately for the broader laymen, the public at large, to understand.

MS. ARIAS: So I'm curious, because right now what we're seeing is that there is some reticence within certain government circles to acknowledge domestic terrorism. And I'm wondering who is going to lead that charge then, is it up to civil society, is it up to NGOs to engage with that? Who is at the forefront? (Laughter)

MS. WINSTANLEY: Well, I think it behooves all of us. So civil society certainly is going to have to speak up, individuals are certainly going to have to speak up, but I think it remains a government responsibility because the government can marshal the resources of multiple agencies to address this. So we're not in the right space right now as a government, but we've got to get back there. We have to get back there.

And, again, you know, internationally the fellow in Australia -- from Australia, in New Zealand, who references Anders Breivik. I mean it is connected, we're using cyber to get that information out there. So all of these issues are absolutely interconnected. But I think it's going to take government.

MS. ZEYA: Just to add a few points on the great insights already shared, I would fully agree. I think it starts at the individual and community level. A friend of mine

reminded me the other day that democracy is not a spectator sport.

So to Arsalan's points made at the opening, I think so much of mistrust or fear in society results from another that you don't know or you think you don't know. So maybe all of us getting beyond our comfort circle, our likeminded dialogue partners, to really take in those who seem so diametrically opposed and try to find common ground.

You mentioned communication, which I believe is a major deficit on conveying this great evidence case. We've got to be -- we, as peacebuilding organizations, have to do a better job communicating the human element of all of this. Toward that end, we recently launched with 17 other major peacebuilding organizations something called the Coalition Campaign, which is not branded Plus Peace. You can look it up on line and join us. And what it is is, it's an effort to drive from the grass roots public embrace of all of the things we're discussing, peaceful, nonviolent means to address and bridge these differences. But, again, I'm a firm believer that it begins at the human level. I think we also have to look at the institutional level. As Dr. Rahim mentioned, there is a lot of institutional damage that has been done to some of our major national security organizations, namely the State Department where vacancies -- you've had a major exodus of senior leadership. We also have a less diverse and inclusive State Department. I would say the numbers show that.

And just a little data point to share, the situation was not great at the end of the previous administration, but for African Americans in the Senior Foreign Service, I believe we're at a crisis point. The numbers have gone down since late 2016 from 4.6 percent to 3.0 percent. That is a major drop that I think needs to be addressed. And, again, the evidence case is proven that more diverse institutions and organizations produce better results.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you.

Dr. Lucey, how do we make the case to the American public that global

health matters?

DR. LUCEY: Through a collaborative, comprehensive, and persistent effort. And I think the most important point is to know your audience and how best to communicate with your particular audience at a particular time.

Effective communication, I prefer to say, is the central goal of the Smithsonian Exhibit at the Museum of Natural History about epidemics. And in addition there is an international and national traveling version that can be downloaded, and has been, and displayed in more than 30 countries in the past 11 months since the exhibit opened, and in more than 30 places in the United States. And it continues to spread. It's been translated into 6 languages and it's available to be -- I call it customized. So you -- any individual or organization, whether in this country or any country around the world, can create their own panels or posters to the international exhibit. And I think that is the most important part in terms of effective communication.

And, again, beyond -- for any given epidemic or virus or bacteria, you have to calibrate -- or to effectively communicate you have to make the message clear and understandable and embraceable for the community that you're trying to convey the message with. And so, for example, in our good epidemics, I always try to go to more than one country or more than one place where the epidemics are. So for SARS, in 2003 I went to Guangzhou, Hong Kong, and Toronto. And Ebola, as I mentioned, to Sierra Leone, Liberia, and then briefly to Guinea. MERS throughout the Middle East and then to South Korea. Because the message is different in terms of who you're trying to effectively communicate with.

So for me, the small step for the exhibit, which I originally proposed just before going to Sierra Leone in August of 2014, but which is really a synergy of strength that made it come true, so it's curators and anthropologists, visual designers, educational experts, writers, many people from WHO, CDC, NIH, et cetera. But I would say, my own

opinion, is the major goal that I had in mind is to try to reduce the level of fear, especially excessive and irrational fear about epidemics that I think most of the general public in our country have, and to increase the level of hope. In other words, what can I do personally, living in this city or another city, in this country or another country in the world, what can I do to help protect myself and help to educate other people about what they can do to prevent and respond to epidemics.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you. So I'm going to try and sneak in one last question that everybody needs to feel compelled to answer, and then we'll turn to audience questions.

When we talk about national security, I think often, especially in today's environment, it's very easy to get caught up in partisanship. But at the end of the day, when we talk about national security we are talking about our collective security as a country.

WCAPS has done a lot of work on this theme of redefining national security, and I'm curious whether each of you feel that there is a need to redefine national security to better reflect our current needs and priorities, and if so, in what way?

Who would like to start us off?

MS. WINSTANLEY: I'll do a quick yes, absolutely. And this ability to have these conversations on an ongoing basis I think are really important for all of us in the country, so I'm hoping we have discussions like this around the country to talk about these issues. And the fact that when we're talking about national security, it is not a partisan issue. It's not a partisan issue.

And over the years -- we started doing nation security strategies in 1988 and there have been consistencies through those strategies every year since then. I would argue they don't have the right things in them at this point in our history and that we need a wider diversity of people at the table to ensure that these sorts of issues are included in it as priorities and that the more diverse people you have bringing issues to the table the better we're going to do at addressing them.

So nonpartisan, yes, redefine it.

DR. RAHIM: Ditto, ditto, ditto. (Laughter) What I would just amplify is that, you know, the diversity of thinking, diversity of perspectives, is so important. I'm just thinking about my time being in government and being at the table and offering insights. Something in my projects we worked on together, just being able to provide really practical -- hey, we're going to go this direction but maybe you need to not work on this because it's going to have tone deaf response.

So I think that having that diversity of viewpoints is enriching diversity of experiences. Our unity is our diversity. We say that, but I think really our diaspora communities, individuals coming from elsewhere really help shape how we can respond to global issues and respond in an adequate and timely way.

MS. ZEYA: Again, ditto, ditto. (Laughter)

Two quick points I would make. Again, I believe that we should redefine national security towards embracing prevention as a frame. But, two, I absolutely second the emphasis on inclusion. But I think you can take it at so many different levels. And one, I would say, having been at the table in American led deliberations, is we need local voices at the table. You know, you take a case in point, Afghanistan, where you have both the democratically elected government, but more importantly, Afghan women absent from a process for which, again, the evidence is established that when women and civil society participate in negotiations, peace agreements are 64 percent more likely to last.

So, again, it's a must do in addition to being a nice to do. But I think we can take that inclusion question, you know, self critically in terms of our own country and getting out of the DC bubble, to really make these issues relevant and make the connection to Americans of all backgrounds, irrespective of rural, urban, party affiliation, or religion. And I'm a big believer in that.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you. Any final thoughts.

DR. LUCEY: I won't say ditto, I'd say yes, yes, and yes.

MS. ARIAS: Diversity of lexicon. (Laughter)

DR. LUCEY: I think with the infectious disease, from my point of view, I'm obviously biased. I think there's not a very difficult case to make. We always say -- I should use a different lexicon, but, you know, viruses don't respect borders. Well, neither do bacteria, fungi, parasites, or anything else.

But, again, if I can just say this, I think that once again we're at a pivotal time, much like I said before, with Global Health Security Agenda, whether it's going to be re-funded for the next five years or not, that's going to be decided in a couple of months.

The pivotal time that I call attention to now, and again, it's strictly my opinion, is that the new, as of September 18, 2018, so I call it new U.S. national biodefense strategy, was first announced and out of the Oval Office. And the Secretary of HHS was named as the cabinet level -- so it's a cabinet level authority organization and the Secretary of HHS was designated as the head for organizing the U.S. biodefense national strategy. And the Undersecretary is a medical doctor who is the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, or ASPR, A-S-P-R, and it's Dr. Robert Kadlec. And he is quite familiar with epidemics around the world with his zoonosis, so called one health, which integrates human health and animal health and environmental health. And they're having a meeting two weeks from now here in DC to try to get national input, and I hope international input, but certainly national input to our new biodefense strategy. And he spoke last night, Dr. Kadlec did, at a meeting at EcoHealth Alliance, which is a big champion of international work to prevent, detect, and respond to zoonotic epidemics, and also they emphasized recover as well in their new document from this past month, building resilience against bio threats.

And so I'd just like to say that I think Dr. Kadlec is a good person to be in charge, if you will, of HHS ASPR office because while the primary focus is understandably on the U.S., he's quite aware of viruses coming from elsewhere, bacteria, biological threats.

MS. ARIAS: Great. Thank you so much.

We have about 15 minutes left for questions. So I will take about four to five and then I will turn to the panelists to respond to the question or questions that they would like.

So why don't we go right over here to the gentleman in the back. Please state your name and affiliation.

Thank you.

MR. CRUZ: Good morning. Leo Cruz with National Security Action. Thank you for the discussion this morning.

To talk about the diversity of issues that you all represent, what is the bold vision for looking ahead and what are the tools that you need to reimagine what we have in our national security toolbox? Thinking about that, how do we communicate that value to the American people, particularly when there is an information campaign, even talking about disinformation when it comes to vaccines, when it comes into democracy, when it comes into diplomacy? All these issues are intersectional, even the truth about climate change, this distraction that we're fighting, how can we combat it and live up to our values and change the way we interact with the world? But also then how do we sell that at home, that this is a valuable thing that we need to engage in?

Thank you.

MS. ARIAS: Great. Thank you.

We'll go to the lady right here in the back.

MS. GUNER: Hi, Abby Guner, student at SAIS and also program assistant with Women in International Security.

So we're talking a lot about the Green New Deal domestically, but in terms of climate change and its relation to conflict and crisis and also global health, nationally and also globally, I'm wondering how we connect that issue to national security issues.

MS. ARIAS: Great. Thank you.

Right here. The gentleman right -- yes.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. This question is for Dr. Muhammad. You previously mentioned in your remarks about the rising white supremacist violence internationally, but also right here in the United States.

I'd be curious, since you have a background in CVE, how would you apply that kind of CVE mindset to trying to resolve that rising extremism here in the United States?

MS. ARIAS: Thank you. Do we have anyone else? Yes, right here.

QUESTIONER: Good morning. (Inaudible) current high school student.

So this question is for the Ambassador. It appears clear that cyber law has fallen behind cyber technology. How do we really go about enforcement or preventative action, as the other panelists mentioned, regarding cyber threats?

MS. ARIAS: Great. Thank you. One more, or can we turn to the panelists?

Great. So thank you for those wide ranging and insightful questions.

Who would like to take the first one? I know, Ambassador Winstanley, we had one just addressed to you just now.

MS. WINSTANLEY: Okay, so I'll start. Great question. Thank you. I did not pay her. (Laughter)

Yes, we have fallen behind and the thoughts on what we need to do are in three categories that we as citizens need to be thinking about and demanding accountability for.

One is our government, what we're doing. And the recent strategy that was put out, as I said, it talked about overmatch and possibly retaliation or response through cyber activities, cyber incidents. We have a number of ways of describing them. That certainly is a part of it, but, again, the enforcement is also important. The ability to hold people to account, not just to attack them, but to bring them to justice. And so that is law

enforcement, providing new tools, and ensuring cooperation among different aspects of U.S. agencies that deal with this issue.

So holding our government to a higher standard, holding the private sector to a higher standard, whether it is social media platforms and what they allow to happen to us via their platform at our expense, or companies, organizations that allow our privacy to be compromised. And the reality is we're the victims, they aren't the victims. And the cost of doing something, they've made a calculation it's easier to tell us a few months later, oh, your information is out there and good luck with that. They also need to be held to account and to raise those standards. They can do a better job. And we as individuals also have to be held to account because we can do a better job. We have to demand and look at what the reality is and not decide that the convenience is more important than what is actually happening to us, and I think a long-term impact into influence and our democracy and how we conduct ourselves as a nation.

So all three categories have things to do in this pace and I think we can.

Thank you.

MS. ZEYA: I'd like to just take a stab at the first question, which was a tough one. But what I understood is you asked is how do you, given all the negative factors we described, articulate a new vision that is truly a way forward. I absolutely believe we can't, you know, hope for the best or hope to go back to a status quo ante of 2016. The world is moving and the retreat in American Executive Branch leadership that we're seeing, let's say in multilateral fora, or we talked about Africa policy and China's very -- you know, firing on all cylinders, one belt, one road, approach.

So I really believe that the answer is through greater power sharing and inclusion. You know, I firmly believe the United States remains the preeminent power, but it is not the sole superpower. And with that means some of the traditional elements of shoring up alliances, which are greatly frayed at this very moment, but also looking at big emerging

powers, like India, like Brazil -- despite the electoral results there -- South Africa -- we don't hear much, but we should be talking about, and getting beyond governments and really bringing in non-government stakeholders not only as partners, but on more as equal partners. I mean with mutual respect and involving the private sector in that area as well.

I mean, if anything is true, you know, in my own observations, you know, having come back to the U.S. after three years living in Europe during a very difficult phase, this disaffection that we see with institutions is global. But with that, I think there comes an exciting opportunity of how do we reconstruct those institutions to address monumental challenges like climate change, which I firmly believe is our greatest long-term national security threat, as well as the opportunity of technology transforming the entire mode by which we receive information, communicate, and think.

So I think the onus on all of us to articulate that new vision, but in a way that maybe we don't have to be constrained by a post-1945 P5 U.S. sole superpower, USG, I would say, approach.

DR. RAHIM: I would add just to -- I agree. I think that this -- we have to be creative, particularly in our U.S. government space. I think the public-private partnership probably can -- we can open up so many more doors in that domain. You know, the incubator space, get as creative as possible. We didn't even add into -- the AI dynamic to this, which is a whole other sort of element to this as well in all of our spaces. And so I think there are ways to be creative.

There is a fascinating piece that came out I think yesterday in Quartz Africa about what's taking place in Rwanda. I have my issues and concerns with Kagame, but that's a whole other conversation. (Laughter) But what I will say to you is the Germans, particularly Volkswagen, is there doing some creative work, particularly with ride sharing, really interesting entrepreneurial activity with innovation and creativity that I think we can learn from as well. Some practices of just recycling, good government practices. Again, not

perfect, but elements in which we could extract to apply for our context as well.

As it relates to your question -- just for brevity and make sure everyone else is able to respond -- we're already doing this, we're working, we're rehabilitating individuals as we speak right now in the United States. So I'll give you that short version, which is positive. We're working with other partners. We play nice in the sandbox. So in the nonprofit space, we believe if other people are doing good work, use those good practices as well.

There's an organization called Free Radicals that's done some really creative work -- Christine Picciolini, you might be familiar with him, a former neo-Nazi himself. And so there are efforts already in way, both in the United States, in Europe, where our headquarters is based, where we're doing work as we speak, and expanding too as well.

MS. ARIAS: Thank you.

DR. LUCEY: If I could just speak briefly to the two questions on this side. Adding onto what Muhammed said, I just want to say just now earlier, the American gentleman -- person that you mentioned had read the manifest of the Norwegian gentleman, and there was a very small part that caught my attention, and that was that both the American and the Norwegian mentioned three specific infectious diseases that they wished they could get their hands on to infect people. One was the pandemic influenza virus of 1918, which is the worst one that we've ever known of, and the second one was small pox, which has been eradicated from the world since 1980, but still exists in laboratories in Atlanta CDC and a place called Novosibirsk in Russia, and anthrax. God forbid if that ever happens, any of those three.

With regard to climate change, from my narrow lens of infectious disease, for me it's really -- well, I'll just say it, it's 100 percent sure. I always hate to say that, but it's 100 sure that due to climate change the geographical range of where we would call vectors - - so mosquitoes and ticks and fleas -- is going to expand and be able to transmit their

viruses and bacteria, you know, whether it's malaria or dengue or chikungunya or yellow fever or zika or Lyme disease to many, many more parts of the world and many more human beings in our species that have not been exposed before and therefore don't have any population immunity. And also most of those diseases, with a few exceptions, like yellow fever, we don't have vaccines for or effective treatments for. That's happening and will continue to happen. That's 100 percent.

MS. ARIAS: Well, thank you all. Thank you, everyone, for coming today and joining in on this wonderful discussion.

Please join me in thanking our panelists.

MR. O'HANLON: If I could just have 30 seconds. Bonnie asked me to just say a farewell and a thank you. I'm not going to make any new additional intervention or speech, but I will simply observe that going back to the title of our event, redefining national security, even if you take a traditional definition and you want to stick with that -- and Jung Pak was talking about traditional threats earlier -- even if it's about threats to Americans and to the homeland, it's clear that the nature of the threats, the types of threats are changing and evolving and multiplying, but also maybe the opportunities, the groups that can work together globally and at home, to confront those threats present us with ways in which we can be more effective.

So, again, you don't have to necessarily walk away wanting to redefine the meaning of the words national security, but I hope that these panels have helped convey the range of new dangers and perils, but also some of the positive opportunities that we have working together. So thank you all for being here, and happy weekend. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020