

Promoting Religious Freedom During the Campaign Against Terrorism": Panel 1 Question and Answer

November 27, 2001

(left to right): The Hon. Morton Halperin, The Hon. Paula Dobriansky

CHAIRMAN

Dobriansky, I understand that you have to leave early, so we may start--MS. DOBRIANSKY: At 10 o'clock.CHAIRMAN YOUNG: 10 o'clock. By directing the first set of questions to you, if we may, and let me open it up to my fellow commissioners to questions and discussion they may have. Nina?COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yes. I want to thank you both very much, and I know both of you have been very dedicated to this issue of religious freedom in your capacities both in and out of going.I'd like to direct my question to Dr. Dobriansky. I was gratified, although some what perplexed, to hear you say that there has not been a tradeoff of human rights and religious freedom in this war against terror, because there's a perception that especially in the situation of Sudan that there has been precisely that. The President last week received a letter to this effect signed by 100 top religious leaders across the religious spectrum. And their concerns were that the administration had allowed the lifting of sanctions against Sudan at the UN and thus had elevated it from being an international pariah; that the administration had intervened directly in the House to block the Sudan Peace Act, to stall it; and that members of the administration had publicly gone about proclaiming the good cooperation of Sudan in sort of an unqualified way at the same time that Sudan was carrying out a very intensive bombing campaign in the southern christian parts of the country; and slave raids, according to the UN regional office, had taken place recently; and according to AID, food was still being blocked, humanitarian aid, from getting into the Nuba Mountain area, in certain areas, or at least there had been no permanent agreement to allow food delivery in the starving areas.So the concern is that there has been a policy tradeoff and that by rewarding Sudan without seeing concessions, without even making demands that there be improvements in religious tolerance to stop this war, which the Commission on Religious Freedom had called in its report genocidal, and in a large part religious, that it had given a green light that it could crack down on its religious minorities. And so can you be specific about Sudan, please?MS. DOBRIANSKY: Okay. First, I'd begin with the point that Sudan clearly has an egregious human rights record across the board. We have stated that very clearly. We have not compromised our position in this regard by clearly stating what is the situation on the ground.I'd also start with, I think, a very significant premise, and that is, in the process of reviewing those countries--and you know it's an ongoing review, it's not a one-time effort--to pick out countries of particular concern, Sudan remains on the list. I think that states it very unequivocally how we see Sudan's record in terms of certainly religious freedom or the lack of religious freedom, and no less in terms of statements that we have made throughout this process, how we see Sudan's overall human rights record.I was struck also by the fact--I know that Secretary Powell was asked in several press conferences, actually at the time when we had been in the process of assembling out coalition partners--he indicated that the coalition against terrorism was a diverse coalition. There are elements whose records on human rights broadly, no less religious freedom, are abysmal, but at the same time we left the door open to see what these countries would bring to the table. And in this regard Sudan has come forward to this process. Having said that, he stated quite unequivocally when asked, well, how do we want to view this in terms of Sudan's record, and he stated it, quite clearly, as we see it, that Sudan's overall human rights record is egregious.There's a third point I think that could be made here. It is true there were sanctions concerning travel that had been lifted, but the core sanctions, the economic sanctions remain in place. Those are the sanctions, to my knowledge, that were put in place as relevant to Sudan's overall record, deplorable record in the human rights area.Finally, I would just say, as you know, and I know you know very well, because there was an interest on the part of the Commission to engage an envoy, former Senator Danforth. He is on the ground. We do welcome--and he's returning--we do welcome very much your input as we go forward in this process. It is invaluable to us. But I don't see any kind of compromise in this case with regard to Sudan.A further point that I would make is that there are some who have argued that in an ironic way, that by the formation of the coalition against terrorism, that this affords us an opportunity, an opportunity to engage in some degree of dialogue that may not have been afforded before, and were we can put pressure on a number of countries. I'm making a statement more broadly on this score, not confined to this one country. And I think that is an opportunity that we do want to seize upon but not at the risk of compromising our principles in this area.COMMISSIONER SHEA: Can I just a follow up on that please? We had asked for a meeting, a private meeting with Envoy Danforth, and you know, and as you may or may not know, we did not succeed in getting it before he left for Sudan. We would be very interested in knowing what his trip was about and what he put on the table there. Will we be able to meet with him? Are you able to give us assurances that we will be able to meet with him?MS. DOBRIANSKY: My understanding is that Senator Danforth did in fact--he did not have contact with all of you collectively--but my understanding is, is that there was a discussion that did take place, I understand with some of you--I could stand to be corrected on that, but I thought that was the case beforehand.COMMISSIONER SHEA: I don't think he did. No, he did not.MS. DOBRIANSKY: Oh, I thought that there was an effort made beforehand.COMMISSIONER SHEA: No, there was no call from the envoy.MS. DOBRIANSKY: I will definitely take that back. I know that every effort was trying to be made. You contacted me directly on that.COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yes, you were cooperative, but we need to follow up.MS. DOBRIANSKY: And we will try to make every effort to put that together. I will certainly carry this back and convey that strong message on your part.CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Ambassador Stith?COMMISSIONER STITH: Yes. I'd like to pick up on the question that Dr. Halperin concluded with and ask it in a slightly different form. And that is: what ought we be doing in addition to what we are already doing to assist and promote the transition to democracy in countries where democracy presently does not exist?And, Madam Under Secretary, I'd also like to hear you respond to that as well, if you would.MR. HALPERIN: Well, I think it differs from

country to country. And I think in many countries we had been doing that before September 11th. But I think the fact is that a number of administrations, going back, made a decision, which in retrospect I think was a profoundly wrong one, not to try actively to promote democracy, particularly in countries in the Middle East. And I think clearly that was a mistake. And I think this administration I think has begun to wrestle with the question of how do you do that and do that in a way that's responsible and doesn't lead to a worse situation, both from the point of view of human rights and freedom, and also from the point of view of creating states that promote terrorism. I think we have to begin with the support of civil society, of NGOs, of other groups struggling within the society. We need to make it clear to countries that we are no longer going to be silent in those countries as we have not been in the rest of the world, and begin to engage them in a dialogue. But I think we need to understand that it's very difficult, both because the leaders of many of these countries understand that a transition process means they are being removed from power, and there are not many people that are very enthusiastic about that, but also because there is a clear element of truth in the argument that if you open up too quickly, given what you've done for the last 50 years, that there's a risk that things get much worse and not much better, and therefore, given where we are, we need to move forward in a careful and deliberate way. But I think the first step I think has been taken in the administration and more generally in our society is to say we can no longer give a pass to the Middle East, as we have done for a very long time, in our efforts to promote democracy and respect for human rights including religious freedom. MS. DOBRIANSKY: I would add several things to--in response to your question. Mort had indicated the importance of civil society and NGOs. I just met, several weeks ago, with a group of academics and thinkers from the Muslim community, and I was really struck in fact, when posing a similar question to them, to hear what their response was. And the first thing that came up was in fact NGOs, how nongovernmental organizations inside can play one of the most significant roles in bringing about change, even if it's limited, even if it's very grass root or really a small-scale effort. You have to start somewhere, no less the broader effort of building a civil society and all that it stands for. But there's a second component to this, and the second component actually is something that maybe we forget far too often because it's basic, that's very basic in our own society, and that's education, being educated about what your own rights are. This was put on the table as well, that in those countries that are not democratic, either there are efforts to suppress information from getting out, be it in rural populations, no less urban populations, or particularly rural populations, and it certainly has a tremendous impact in terms of their overall societal attitude, and people's understanding of what their basic rights are.

And then I would also just add the importance of access, I mean in terms of being able to have access, whether it's through NGOs, through other means. And this comes to a last point. You're going to have later a panel, which I think is quite critical, looking at tools and what kinds of tools exist in order to affect change. Public diplomacy I think is critical in getting and conveying messages and ideas, ideas that can resonate with people that are conveyed through a variety of means, be it exchanges, be it through NGOs, be it through radio, be it through television, newspapers, what-have-you. CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Dr. Land. COMMISSIONER LAND: I just wanted to make a clarifying point. I did meet with former Senator Danforth, along with several other religious leaders, but I made it very clear at the time that I was not there as a commissioner, but with my other hat on, as a person who deals with religious liberty concerns for Southern Baptists. And so that might be where the confusion came, but I did make it very clear, and introduced myself in my Southern Baptist capacity, not in my commissioner capacity. MS. DOBRIANSKY: That was a group meeting, right? COMMISSIONER LAND: And it was a group meeting with several other religious leaders, some Sudanese and some American. MS. DOBRIANSKY: I, at the time when Nina had contacted me on this, I was going overseas. And I know that there was a strong effort to do this, and I thought that it had happened. But what I will go away--and thank you for that clarification--what I will go away with definitively is though the message registered here today. CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you. What we did, as Nina mentioned, we did have conversations with his staff. I know Nina had conversations with you. I had a conversation with Loren Craner. We do appreciate very much the State Department's cooperation and the message they sent to him, that we very much would like to meet with him, and so we appreciate that. Thank you. Commissioner Tahir-Kheli, you had? COMMISSIONER TAHIR-KHELI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to second what other commissioners have said in thanking you both for coming to address us. And it sort of sets a good overview of the issues that are before us as we worry about some of the spill over from the war on terrorism. I just wanted to make a comment on what Dr. Halperin said, and ask sort of a question of the Under Secretary Dobriansky. It is indeed true that constitutional democracies have the best way of dealing with all manners of freedom, including of course religious freedom, but we find in our work that that's actually not such a clear-cut situation. Even large constitutional democracies with a very healthy tradition of protecting individuals, tend to have issues and instances where religious freedom is one of those that gets trampled. We find instances of force conversions, attack on individuals--I mean attack to the point of killing of members of other religions, destruction of religious sites, sometimes with security forces watching. I mean without naming names of countries, I mean this goes on. So clearly just the conversion into the constitutional form, although it is a goal I think we must have because it's good across the board, but does not necessarily lower though sort of watchfulness I think of the specificity of religious issues. But, Under Secretary, given that the war on terrorism is coming at exactly--at first time that the United States is not a member of the Human Rights Commission, how do you see the spill over? Because some of these issues, some of which I think were mentioned to you in the context of Sudan, we have traditionally looked at, scrutinized and taken leadership in the annual meetings of the Commission on Human Rights, painful though sometimes it has been, where is the review process? Where is the United States in its sort of decision to focus on rejoining and the negotiations with the Europeans, et cetera, and in the absence of membership, how could we then move forward? You mentioned the very critical role of the nongovernmental organizations, and I've seen that firsthand in Geneva, but without American membership, I'm just a little curious how that role plays out. MS. DOBRIANSKY: Okay. With regard to the state of play on the UN Human Rights Commission, in the aftermath of what took place earlier this year with our being voted off the Commission, we have had a review process.

And as part of that review process it was determined that we would go forward and would share with the Europeans and with, if you will, the western and other group, the WEOG Group, our desire to see as to the possibility for a slate, a slate, an uncontested slate. As you very well know from your days at the United Nations, the fact that none of the countries who come into place in the UN Human Rights Commission, they do so not because they're elected, per se, but because as a group of countries, there's a slate that is advanced and which is not contested. In fact, Sudan fits in that case. Some thought they were elected and they were not. They were chosen by the African countries and then came in to membership of the UN Human Rights Commission. We have advanced our thinking on this with the Europeans. In fact, I believe when the Secretary was up at the UNGA he had further opportunity to discuss this issue directly with a number of countries, and then also during the course of the week, this was--meeting of the UNGA--this was discussed. At this time there isn't a resolution on this. There isn't an agreement to come forward with a clean slate. So it still remains as to what position we will take. That is still under review and that is still being discussed. But having said that, let me make two other quick points. Your views, of course, would be very welcome in that process because if it is not agreed to having such a slate, as I said, the review will continue. The decision on this actually ultimately does rest with the President as to what we will do. Let me add one other point, and that is on what we've been doing meanwhile. There are number of fora within which one can advance human rights or human rights issues. I've mentioned bilateral meetings in terms of opportunities afforded for direct engagement, be it both publicly--excuse me--be it both privately as well as publicly. I mean I think about the President's statements. I was with him when he was in Shanghai, and what he had said there privately as well as publicly, particularly with regard to religious freedom. Secondly is, of course, there are other regional fora within which to advance human rights issues, NGOs, other fora within the UN itself like in the UNGA. And finally I would also mention the Community of Democracies, which we just completed our review on, the Community of Democracies, and we are, as part of the convening group, we are going forward. We are discussing ways and means of using the Community of Democracies as an effective vehicle in the myriad of challenges that we have before us, particularly post-September 11. But that is not a substitute for. These are just avenues that we are using at this time.

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Commissioner Gaer? COMMISSIONER GAER: Thank you. I too wanted to thank both of you for joining us and for your remarks. Given that Under Secretary Dobriansky is leaving early, I'll direct my first question there. And it's precisely on this question of how does one continue to maintain American values, American principles and the dialogue that you speak about in your testimony? You state that you see this coalition, and I quote, "as a tremendous opportunity to engage these countries on their human rights records," unquote. Yet, what we have understood has been that although, and as you also say, the OSCE has been a forum where the United States made religious freedom a priority, it's our understanding that no names of countries were actually mentioned in that forum, suggesting that U.S. policy that dates back to Arthur Goldberg in OSCE, is somewhat being changed, that is, the policy of naming names. I'm wondering first of all if you can tell us how the dialogue will move beyond bilateral conversations in forums like the OSCE and the UN as well as the Commission on Human Rights, whether or not the U.S. is a member? Will the U.S. continue in the area of religious freedom and in the area of human rights in general to name names of countries, to sponsor resolutions that address particular countries, even if it's not the main sponsor, and to act in that fashion? And secondly, if you could possibly just shift a little bit to the question of the situation in Indonesia. We have had a visit from the head of state of Indonesia, and the President and she made statements afterwards about the coalition, and yet within Indonesia we not only have egregious and extensive allegations of human rights violations in general, but religious intolerance and killings and other things in particular. One of the agents alleged to have played a major role in kicking this whole issue off in Indonesia, particularly in the Moluccas, has been the group called Laskar Jihad, which I believe is on the State Department's list of countries that promote international terrorism, and is led--and is alleged to be linked to the bin Laden organization. How does the United States intend to, and has it, in its interaction with Indonesia, how has it addressed the continuing presence of this organization, which it has been alleged to me is in fact winked at by elements of the security and military, and indeed if not actively supported in its efforts, in efforts that have led to the killings of thousands, thousands of people in intercommunal conflict and as part of an effort to cleanse the area of--on the part of Laskar Jihad, to cleanse it of christians, and has been responded to, of course, by christian militias as well.

MS. DOBRIANSKY: On the first, I'm actually glad that you did ask the question you did, because I realized after I completed my answer that I didn't get to address, you know, what we would do as nonmembers. And this affords me the opportunity, that clearly one of the other opportunities is that as a nonmember of the UN Human Rights Commission, that does not prohibit us from still playing an active role on the sidelines, if you will, and for that matter, sponsoring resolutions, as long as we get other countries to join in with us. As you know, you can't do it individually. Toward that end I would see us as being as active as we have been in the past. In fact, it's interesting to me, some in the private sector have said when they look back at what happened and doing a post mortem in the last round of the UN Human Rights Commission, some had argued that because we were so direct and we were so forceful in naming names and in being specific, that there were other countries that were shying away from that. I think that one has to look at each setting and what is the circumstance and what other circumstances are afforded. Having said this, the UN Human Rights Commission has certainly been a vehicle and an opportunity to spotlight international attention clearly on human rights abuses across the board. So in short, I would see us being active if it came to it that we are, you know, in this whole process being active on the sidelines and hoping to get other countries to join in on resolutions that are specific and are targeted and naming violators. As for the second, I hesitate, actually, on responding actually to your question, because I really want to--it's a very detailed question. I know that human rights issues have been raised broadly, but yours was very specifically targeting a specific group that, as you said, is on the list of the State Department's terrorist list. If you don't mind, I would rather come back to you on that one.

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you very much. I realize it's 10 o'clock, and have to leave. But thank you very much, and the record of this hearing will remain open for another 7 days, so if you'd like to submit additional materials, that would be fine, and we may have additional questions that we might submit as well to you in writing if that's

all right, and ask for an answer. MS. DOBRIANSKY: Absolutely. And again, really, thank you, and I look forward to the occasion of meeting with all of you again, and no less meeting with you individually, and just really thank you. CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you. Dr. Halperin, I wonder if I could direct a question to you. You mentioned the notion of nation building as a critical variable in trying to advance religious freedom as well as all of the human rights, which sounds to me enormously sensible. We have often thought of human rights in the context of sort of negative sanctions. We impose trade embargoes. We withdraw ambassadors. We do other sorts of negative things in the event that we don't like the human rights record. And yet we think of democracy building, we think more positive incentive. I'd be interested in your views in terms of how we might think about advancement of human rights in a positive sense as well. I mean, the legislation under which we operate actually lists 15 or 20 possible steps the President may take. Some substantial number of those are actually positive steps: use of AID funding for advancement, educational programs, Voice of America, and so forth. If you could just offer some thoughts on sort of more positive policy steps, particularly in the context of Middle Eastern countries, which as you say there has been a sense have not had as much attention focused on these issues, I'd be very interested. MR. HALPERIN: Okay. My short answer to that question is by promoting democracy. That is, I think that because of the history of how the human rights issue and the democracy issues came up within American politics, there continues to be a dichotomy between the two in the State Department, in the NGO community, in the way we think about these issues. In my view it is long overdue to bury the hatchet between these two groups, to recognize that they're really the same struggle. And so my first answer is that if you care about human rights, including religious freedom, you have to work to establish constitutional democracies. And let me say I understand very well they're not the entire answer. I spent a great many years working for the American Civil Liberties Union and spent a good deal of that time working on religious freedom issues including trying to counteract some decisions from Justices on the Supreme Court who ought to know better. So the struggle for religious freedom in a constitutional democracy, just as the struggle for all rights in a constitutional democracy never ends, nevertheless I would argue that you are much better off with a constitutional democracy. It provides the framework both in and outside the country to struggle on those issues, recognizing that, in my view, we can't trust any government to respect our rights including our rights of religious freedom. But I think there are some specific positive things we can do, and one of them that Paula mentioned is education. I mean I think we have left the financing of elementary education in many Muslim countries to private religious groups who have used this to preach hatred and intolerance. We need to actively engage ourselves in the process of supporting public secular education, particularly in the Middle East, in Central Asia and in South Asia, and I think that's an important step. Second is the promotion of NGOs, and that's partly a question of funding and partly a question of coming to their defense and support. Paula mentioned the Community of Democracies. We invited a number of Arab countries to that meeting, whose commitment to democracy was, let's say, less vigorous than some of the other countries that were invited. Right after the conference the Egyptians arrested an Egyptian because he was engaged in NGO activities with outside support. We protested, more strongly than we had before, but not strongly enough. So I think part of our effort has to be to insist that tolerance for NGOs, whether they're religious or secular, be part of our affirmative effort in particular countries. I do have, Mr. Chairman, some comments on some of the issues that were raised which I held off, so before I conclude, I'd like to have a couple minutes maybe to comment on a couple of other issues. CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Please. MR. HALPERIN: One is this question of what we do in the UN. And while the administration has gone forward with the Community of Democracies, one part of it that it has not gone forward with, which I think is a mistake, is the effort to establish a democracy caucus within the UN. I do not think we should accept as inevitable and permanent the notion that regional groupings get to nominate countries and the rest of the UN has to go along and vote for those countries, so that if the Asian group puts up Syria for Security Council membership two weeks after September 11th, we all meekly vote for Syria because we don't have a choice, we say, or we allow countries like Sudan to be elected to the Human Rights Commission. The UN, by its form and structure, is a democratic organization in which majority votes elect people. There is nothing in the charter that prevents us from saying that we are not going to vote for countries that we think fall short of certain basic standards for positions which make a mockery of those standards. And I would say the Human Rights Commission and the Security Council are two central elements in which we ought to apply those rules. Now, it's a very long process. And you talk to anybody in New York and they tell you that tampering with the prerogatives of the regional caucuses is equivalent to the Russian and the French Revolution put together, and will create more harm in Manhattan than was caused on September 11th. My view is that you don't get anywhere unless you start. This will be a long process, but I think we ought to use the Community of Democracies and the Democracy Caucus to begin to lay down some markers that--now we did that on the Security Council when Sudan was nominated. We persuaded the African Caucus to split on that issue. We had two candidates from Africa put forward, and we worked very hard and elected Mauritius on the grounds in part that it was a democratic country, and that therefore when we had a choice we were going to choose the democratic country. I think we ought to move to the point where we have a choice and where we insist upon standards of countries' behavior before they get to be at least on the Security Council and the Human Rights Commission. Maybe there are other bodies in which you would have lesser standards. So I think that's an area in which we need to push forward. Let me say on Sudan, I think the issue there is very complicated. It is clear that this is a country where repression of human rights and particularly religious freedom is as bad as probably anywhere on the earth. On the other hand, I think there are two other issues. One is, there is a debate, among people who know Sudan, of the best way to alleviate that, and whether the continued efforts to isolate Sudan are the way to go or whether an engagement with that country trying to move toward some kind of peaceful settlement is the right solution. I spent a lot of time, when I was in the government, hearing the arguments on both sides. I think there is much to the argument on both sides. It is very hard to decide, but there are a lot of people who care deeply about human rights in Sudan, who believe that a policy of isolation and confrontation with the regime is not the right way to go, simply on humanitarian and human rights grounds. Second, I

think there is the question of our other interests. We now know that Sudan, even before September 11th, went out of its way to try to indicate that it had stopped its policy of providing safe haven for terrorists, and that it expected something in return and did not get it. That is a message that we sent to several countries. We sent it to Libya. We sent it to Sudan. We sent it to North Korea. We sent it to Cuba. That is to say, "Stopping your support of terrorism does not get you off the terrorism list, does not get you the kind of openness to the United States that those countries were seeking by doing that." And I think given the importance of that issue to us, that that has to be weighed in the balance as well as how we deal with the issue of religious freedom. Finally, let me say that I think we need to be concerned about the lessons we send to the rest of the world about tolerance, about support for freedom, including religious freedom, and how we deal at home with the issues raised by the events of September 11th. Obviously, the particular ways that we treat Muslims and seem to single them out in various ways is a matter of concern, but I would say more generally, when we seem to sanction--because we think we need it--secret courts in which testimony is not shown to the witnesses, in which people can be convicted and even put to death in a secret trial, we need to understand that we send a signal to people in other countries that it's okay to do that when they think they have a problem and it may be that they think their problem is to suppress a religious group that they feel is a threat to their security. And so when we preach to the Chinese, to the countries of Central Asia about the importance of due process of public trials, I think we need to understand that they look not to what we say but to what we do, and I think actions like the creation of the military commission are sending a signal to the rest of the world which will profoundly undercut our efforts to promote tolerance for religious, political and other forms of behavior, and entitling people to fair trials and due process in dealing with those issues.

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you very much. We are out of time for this panel, but we very much appreciate your attendance. I make the same offer to you that I made to Dr. Dobriansky, is that if you have any supplemental materials you would like to submit, we would be delighted to receive those, and we may pester you with a few additional questions. Bishop Murphy?

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question of the Chair? I had the impression, when the Under Secretary spoke, that she was going to provide perhaps more information to us specifically regarding Commissioner Gaer's--

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: That was my understanding.

COMMISSIONER MURPHY: I wondered if it might not be possible at the same time to ask her--I would do a follow up to Commissioner Gaer specifically about Saudi Arabia. And if Dr. Halperin had a minute, I'd be very interested in anything he might want to say, if that's possible, sir?

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Yes. Yes to both. Dr. Halperin?

MR. HALPERIN: I was talking about Saudi Arabia in the comments I made earlier in which I didn't mention countries. It is one of the places we have given a free pass to. We have allowed them to not only in their own country, but throughout the region, support education and other groups that preach intolerance and even support for terrorism, and we have not had conversations with them about human rights and about religious freedom as we do with many countries in the world. And I think there are signs which I would support and urge you to support, to say that it's time to stop that, that we cannot give any country, no matter how important we think it is to our commercial policy or even our antiterrorism policy to have a free ride on these questions, and Saudi Arabia I would put first on the list.

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you again very much for your time. We appreciate it very much.

MR. HALPERIN: Thank you. I very much appreciate the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Thank you. We will take a five-minute break as our next panel assembles.