

Australia–Israel

Third Be'er Sheva Dialogue

Proceedings and Outcomes

Prepared by Dr Anthony Bergin

1 November 2017

Renaissance Tel Aviv Hotel, Tel Aviv, Israel







The Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, Prime Minister of Australia, addresses the dialogue



The Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, Prime Minister of Australia, and dialogue guests listen to introductory remarks from the President of Bar Illan University

On 31 October, the Australian and Israeli prime ministers, along with thousands of Australians and New Zealanders, gathered in Be'er Sheva to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Be'er Sheva.

The charge by the Australian 4th Light Horse Brigade on 31 October 1917 was part of the wider allied offensive known as the third battle of Gaza. The Battle of Be'er Sheva had qualities that make it truly heroic: the tactical use of surprise, the bond between a man and his horse, and a do-or-die charge across the desert that ended in victory.

Malcolm Turnbull's first official visit to Israel followed Benjamin Netanyahu's visit to Australia in February this year. Netanyahu is the first serving Israeli prime minister to have visited Australia. Increasingly, the two countries are recognising that their shared strategic interests go beyond resolving the complex and emotive Palestinian issue.

Against the backdrop of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Be'er Sheva and Prime Minister Turnbull's visit to Israel, the third Be'er Sheva Dialogue (named after the 1917

battle) was held at the Renaissance Tel Aviv Hotel on 1 November 2017.

The dialogue was co-hosted by the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies and the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (see Appendix 1 for the agenda).

The ASPI–BESA dialogue brings together experienced voices from Australia and Israel to share perspectives and analyses on common security challenges, while reflecting more broadly on the outlook for the relationship between the two countries.

Participants included representatives from government, the media, the military, industry, academia, parliament (from both sides of Australian politics), the intelligence community and think tanks (see Appendix 2 for a list of delegates). The dialogue was held under Chatham House rules, allowing delegates to engage in frank discussions about the future of Australia–Israel relations in the context of the future global strategic environment.

The agenda for discussions included diverse topics: southeast and north Asian security challenges, developments in the Middle East and East Mediterranean, terrorism trends and opportunities for counterterrorism cooperation, maritime security, cybersecurity,

defence industry cooperation, strategic policy under the Trump administration, and hybrid warfare strategies.

The third dialogue built on the first, which was held at Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel in 2015, as well as on the second round, held in Sydney, Australia in 2016. It also drew from a major report produced by ASPI and BESA in 2016: *The Wattle and the Olive: A New Chapter in Australia and Israel Working Together*.

Some of the recommendations emerging from the earlier dialogues and *The Wattle and the Olive* report have now been accepted by the two governments: for example, the signing of a memorandum of understanding on defence industry cooperation, an agreement that Australia and Israeli defence officials will hold annual discussions on strategic and security priorities, and the convening of a joint track 1.5 cyber dialogue in Australia in 2018.

The Be'er Sheva Dialogue has grown in stature. That was evidenced at the third dialogue by the number of high-level Australian and Israeli participants. Several Australian and Israeli delegates commented that the increasing maturity of the dialogue means there's now a greater candour and depth to the discussions.

Prime Minister Turnbull addressed the 2017 dialogue. His audience also included many supporters of the Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council, who made the journey to Be'er Sheva to attend the commemoration of the centenary of the famous charge of the 4th Light Horse Brigade. Turnbull saluted the achievements that the dialogue had accomplished in a short time.

Australia has always been seen as friendly by Israel, although it's rarely been a major policy focus in Jerusalem. While there's a mutual recognition of shared values, there hasn't been sufficient recognition given by either state to how each contributes to the other's national interests.

Through the Be'er Sheva Dialogue, it's become clear that there are also lots of good reasons why Australia and Israel should seek to strengthen their engagement and that there are numerous opportunities to enhance bilateral cooperation.



Participants at the 2017 Be'er Sheva Dialogue



Fiona Geminder, Vera Muravitz and Anne Rosshandler at the dialogue luncheon

Regional perspective

Several speakers pointed out that while the Middle East was very important to Australia, Canberra's main focus is on North and Southeast Asia and that Australia is valuable to allies such as the US because of expertise in this zone.

Both Australian and Israeli delegates agreed that the main security concern in Asia was North Korea, especially with the decision by the DPRK to continue with development of an ICBM capability. There was discussion of possible US mobilisation, including the possibility of decapitating the North Korean regime. Other issues running in the region, such as trade, were noted in discussions, but North Korea was viewed as the key strategic issue.

Several Israeli speakers said that while North Korea was a huge challenge their most pressing issue was Iran.

Another key issue raised was the rise of China and how its ascension would affect the Middle East and Israel in particular.

Topics canvassed were what kind of superpower China will be, how it will project power and how that will affect India.

There was also discussion about China's interest in Middle East energy and freedom of shipping and whether there will be Chinese involvement in post-ISIS talks involving Syria.

In terms of Asian alliances, Australian speakers noted great interest in India and Japan, with growing border tensions between China and India and naval rivalry in the Indian Ocean. It was noted that Israel has growing ties with Japan, as well as developing positive changes in relations with Southeast Asian countries, like Vietnam.

Speakers noted China's increasing involvement in the internal affairs of other countries, including Australia, and agreed that China's assertiveness in the Indo-Pacific will continue, with potential to overreach.

One delegate's view was that China is going to find many complications that come with this extension of its reach. It's a country that hasn't fired a shot in anger since it fired on its own citizens in 1989. It has a strong military, but it's untested.

Some delegates suggested that we should watch how new networks respond, such as the India–Japan relationship. Modi and

Abe are taking a very hardheaded view of how their interests can mesh in the Trump era.

China, it was noted, is alienating many of those who want a respectful relationship, including Australia. India will always complicate China's position in the region. India will continue to have very significant problems both internally and in its neighbourhood. One Australian speaker said that Canberra should 'help India punch at its weight rather than below it' and that Australia is watching the India–Israel relationship with interest.

On North Korea, some Israeli delegates thought that failure to stop North Korea will almost certainly result in failure to stop Iran. There was discussion about the idea of offering Kim Jong-un in secret a Cuban missile crisis solution, but some argued that a Cuban solution won't work: Cuba didn't control the missiles, Russia did, and Kim is not Khrushchev.

There was also discussion of Trump's policies in Asia. One speaker noted that only 17% of Australians polled approved of Trump versus about 60% popular support for Obama. An Australian delegate noted that support for the US alliance is actually rising in Australia even as Trump himself is seen as unacceptable. Another speaker suggested that Russians love

watching the Chinese and the Americans fight, and there were lots of opportunities for that with respect to North Korea.

It was pointed out that Australia's economy is the same size as Russia's, but Australia's population is 24 million compared with Russia's 144 million. One Israeli speaker said that 'the bear is a bear, but it is a sick bear in a big cage'.

There was also discussion about the Eastern Mediterranean, with the idea advanced that it was a very broken up landscape after a strategic earthquake (the Arab Spring). The 'game of camps', as suggested by one speaker, is essentially ideological. The players include the Iranian branch, the ISIS (Daesh) branch, the Muslim Brotherhood, and the camp of stability. The only effective force given the weakness of Arab liberalism, one delegate argued, was the camp of stability. It's not that coherent or united, but it includes Israel as a member in good standing, as well as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, the UAE, much of the rest of Gulf except for Qatar, and North Africa except for Libya.

One delegate suggested that ISIS is increasingly out of the equation, even though it can still inspire through the internet. But the core IS proposition—the age of the new caliphate—is, one speaker suggested, pretty much dead. Hamas is much weakened

as a player in Gaza—so much so that it is courting Egyptian mediation with the Palestinian Authority. Qatar is under pressure from rest of Gulf. But one Israeli noted that the Muslim Brotherhood is still a challenge because Erdogan is playing a long game.

A number of speakers agreed that there should be a focus on Iran's points of influence regionally. There would, for example, be considerable implications of an Iranian nuclear umbrella offered to its allies in the region.

Syria, it was argued by one speaker, is divided into four areas of control: the Assad regime area, the remaining areas under Sunni rebels, an ISIS area and a Kurd area.

One delegate observed that there are two wars: a rebellion against Assad, and a Western-supported coalition against ISIS. Both appear to be entering their closing stages. ISIS is now defending its last territorial holdings (in the east). Assad cannot be destroyed now that the Russians are there.

One speaker suggested that the US will face an enormous decision once ISIS is completely knocked out. It could stick around

to look after its allies in Eastern Syria and be a player in division of Syria, or choose to summarily withdraw.

It was noted by one speaker that the Middle East sees the US as having failed to continue to support key allies, such as Iraqi Kurdistan and Egypt's Mubarak.

One delegate predicted that the US will probably withdraw from Syria. The Russians are the power there, even though it was argued by one delegate that the Russians are not that strong.

Another speaker noted that the Iranians have not built a successful alliance with non-Shia Islam. The Iranians are advancing but with a built-in limitation. Israel can defend its borders but it's still trying to work out how or if it should intervene in a conflict that will eventually reach its territory.

It was noted that there had been no discussion of the EU, but an Israeli delegate observed that while the EU is helpful in some respects, it is essentially meaningless when your frame of reference is dealing with an enemy.



The Hon Warren Snowdon MP and the Hon Kim Beazley AC at the dialogue luncheon



Dr Tobias Feakin, Australia's Ambassador for Cyber Affairs, and LTGEN (Ret'd) Kenneth Gillespie AC DSC CSM, Chairman of ASPI, at the dialogue luncheon

Terrorism threat

One speaker suggested that the terrorism problem is like a malarial strain. As it changes, we need to change our thought processes and evolve our capabilities. The metamorphosis that led to ISIS's creation, it was suggested, will lead to further evolutionary change. The advent of technology and its increasing pace is a double-edged sword that gives our enemies a raft of capabilities. They can operate with very small numbers and do a lot of harm with low tech.

There was discussion of whether ISIS will go to ground. One view was that there will be some form of insurgency in Syria and Iraq. Some of the fighters will end up in neighbouring countries. Some will go to Europe. Some will come back to the Southeast Asian region, which concerns Australia.

One speaker noted that Australia has lost the most people to terrorism in the region. It was noted that there is still ungoverned space in the southern Philippines. One delegate noted that communities in Southeast Asia, while not entirely friendly to returning terrorists, are not entirely antithetical either. Several Australian speakers noted that the internal threat is something that Israel has faced since the date of its foundation.

In Australia, it was suggested by one delegate, the main concern was Sunni extremist terrorism, where they are drawing heavily on inspiration from external sources.

Australia, it was pointed out, has had five attacks in the past two years (successful in the sense of causing loss of life) and 13 attacks have been thwarted. (One was a well-documented case of a planned attack on the aviation sector in Sydney.)

It was pointed out that Australia has about 110 Australian ISIS fighters in the Middle East. About 200 in total have been there . Of the 110 fighting with ISIS, a total of 64 have been killed. Australian authorities have cancelled 230 passports to stop potential fighters from leaving Australia.

Both sides in the dialogue saw value in closer intelligence to counter terrorism, but one delegate noted that the battle is 'inside Islam', with the terrorists thinking of countries like Australia as part of the West. One speaker suggested that bilateral intelligence cooperation should be ongoing, transparent, and with full commitment from the parties.

One speaker said a key counterterrorism challenge was figuring out who learns better. Are we learning faster or more slowly than the violent extremists? It was suggested that 'they are better at

learning than we are. Whenever we close one avenue, they find another.

‘They are consumed by learning. And they learn together. They share ideas. It is hard for us to learn. If there is anything that makes Israel better at fighting terror, it's that we're a close community that conducts effective learning. So we are often a step ahead of our enemies’, one Israeli delegate observed.

A key message from the session was that we must outsmart the enemy. An Israeli delegate noted in this context that Israel has developed technology to detect underground tunnels.

On counterterrorism, there was some discussion about the balance between protecting human rights and protecting the right to live. One Israeli speaker said that Europe would prefer to protect human rights. Privacy trumps the right to live. But Israel understands that it must go a little in the other direction.

One Israeli delegate suggested that Australia as an island has protected itself from much terrorism. But it was suggested that, in the age of cyber terror, there are no islands, and so we all have to be better prepared. Both sides agreed on the need for counterterrorism authorities to mine social media in disrupting terrorism plots.



Dr Anthony Bergin moderates Q&A with the Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP



Distinguished Israeli guests listen to the Prime Minister's address

Maritime security

Both countries are close to major choke points along maritime oil and trade routes, making maritime security an important component of national strategic policy. Any country with a coast has an interest in maritime security.

Australia is a three-ocean country and also claims 42% of Antarctica. Its maritime domain is double the size of its continental land mass. Australia's oceans will contribute \$A100 billion to its economy by 2025 (currently \$A45 billion). Israel, it was pointed out, is an economic island, with most of its trade transported by sea.

One speaker noted that while Australia has a relatively small navy, it's now engaged in the biggest naval build-up since World War II. Its navy will be able to deploy in task groups, and few nations can really put together significant task forces. This will enable Australia to project power abroad and offer opportunities to interact more with Israel in naval affairs.

One delegate noted that Israel has significantly expanded its submarine fleet to give it a second-strike capability in the event of an Iranian strike. Generally it was suggested that Israel's navy has

taken on a larger strategic role: it's being invited, for example, to take part in NATO navy drills.

It was noted that like Israel, Australia has offshore resource developments. Israel's discoveries of natural gas deposits have dramatically changed the way it thinks about energy. Israel was once completely dependent on foreign imports. Now about 50% of Israel's electricity is generated from gas it takes from the sea. This should rise to 70%, and there is a debate about Israeli gas exports, which includes whom to export to (such as Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, Palestinian Authority, Jordan).

It was suggested by one speaker that Israel's offshore sector has led to a regional reorientation, with the country now enjoying warm relations with Greece and Cyprus.

Both sides noted that Australia and Israel are concerned about offshore asset protection. Around 70 Australian installations need protection. A big worry for Australia is the threat of sabotage from inside the workforce and there is a need to conduct regular counterterrorism exercises.

Several delegates pointed to the offshore sector as an area to exchange information, with one speaker suggesting that Israel

does not have a lot of offshore gas know-how and that the country was not used to foreign experts handling a major part of its economy. By contrast, an Australian delegate noted that Australia has world-class expertise in the offshore oil and gas sector.

An Australian speaker noted that his country depended on undersea cables, so any deliberate cutting of a submarine cable would be a very serious threat to the Australian economy.

Both states are vitally dependent on their ports (an Israeli speaker noted that Israel's harbours are threatened by Hezbollah and Hamas). Cybersecurity is also a great concern: the movement of containers is entirely dependent on advanced computing systems. It was pointed out that the Chinese are quietly buying and constructing Israeli ports and that Chinese military vessels have visited Israel (Haifa). Chinese naval deployments are an area of interest to both sides.

It was also noted that on the blue economy both sides could exchange information on the offshore gas sector, offshore wind and tidal generation, and sea aquaculture. Marine debris/litter on beaches is a concern to both countries, and one Australian speaker noted that Australia has developed a clever ocean-cleaning technology. One Israeli delegate noted that Israel has five

major desalination factories. If they are contaminated, or if there is an accident or spill, Israel's drinking water would be directly affected.

Maritime education was another area identified for cooperation, as was the development of an overall maritime security strategy.

Both sides thought there were opportunities to discuss the objective of eliminating oil dependency on what one delegate described as 'bad actors'. One Australian noted that Australia has a war stocks problem, especially with regard to fuel.

The agenda for cybersecurity

Both sides agreed that they faced the prospect of increased cyberattacks, and wished to discuss ways to promote national capabilities in cyberspace. It was noted that the Turnbull government recently released an international cyber engagement strategy. Israel, both sides noted, has become one of the world's top powers in cybersecurity. As we enter the age of the 'internet of things', the need for cybersecurity will grow.

It was pointed out that in increasing its efforts to defeat cybercriminals, the Australian government has directed the Australian Signals Directorate to use its offensive cyber

capabilities to disrupt, degrade, deny and deter organised offshore cybercriminals. Israel's intelligence agencies also play both defensive and offensive roles when it comes to threats from the online world.

Both Israel's and Australia's defence forces are focused on how to incorporate cyber capabilities into military operations.

On the cyber and innovation agenda, it was evident from discussions that Australia can learn a number of lessons from the Israeli cybersecurity success story, particularly in start-ups and skills development. But it was also clear that much of Israel's success stems from compulsory military service and the unique cybersecurity skills nursery that the Israeli Defence Force provides. One Israeli delegate noted that the IDF takes 'the brightest minds and has them work together for a few years. Some want to be doctors, some painters, but they learn to work in a team ... Also the Israeli character—directness is encouraged, which encourages kids to innovate.'

In an interesting aside, one delegate noted that Australia is benefiting from Israeli technology in the almond industry.

Significant investments in Australia are safeguarded by Israeli

sensors in orchards that tell what the trees need, such as water and fertiliser, making this an unusual cybersecurity issue.

One Israeli speaker argued that when it comes to cybersecurity every solution must be tailor-made. Perimeter security is not enough. Intelligence is everything: don't just read alerts but build a picture from the alerts.

One delegate noted that the cyber domain is constantly changing and that we need to use experience to build our methodology.

Both sides discussed cybercrime and the need to acquire admissible evidence, get laws in place, and help the judiciary prosecute the issue.

Election interference and other intrusions that have national security implications were also discussed, along with the difficult issue of attribution (geographically rather than to an IP address or an individual).

Australian delegates pointed out that Australia was keen to learn from both policy and technical responses of the Israeli government on cyber as well as understand how Israel views the international legal and normative picture.

Defence industry

One Australian speaker noted that while Israel is expected to 'punch well above its weight' to survive, which has driven it to become an innovator, Australia has depended on the US to supply the best military equipment money could buy. It was suggested that Australia had been innovative on the battlefield, but not so much when it comes to defence procurement.

One speaker suggested that there are wonderful examples of bilateral collaboration starting to happen with Israeli defence industries. Australia, it was suggested, can't ignore Israeli innovation in cyber if Australia wanted to stay at the leading edge.

One speaker noted that while Australia has become a user of Israeli products such as UAVs and missile systems, the Israeli defence industry is an Australian company's biggest customer for hardened steel.

An Israeli delegate said that he saw the potential for defence collaboration with Australia as both huge and unfulfilled. Israel's defence industry is a pillar of national defence and a major engine of economic growth, with 80% of defence production destined for export.

One delegate pointed out that Israel's poor security environment caused it to be creative, innovative, resourceful, audacious, and not afraid to fail.

Inventions were products of necessity. It was pointed out that there are 1,500 company start-ups in Israel per year, and that it has a top world ranking in R&D spending as a percentage of GDP. As a start-up ecosystem outside Silicon Valley, it ranked third in terms of the number of companies listed on the NASDAQ.

Several speakers noted that Israel can provide innovation know-how to bring the resources from Israel and build in-country solutions in Australia.

There was some discussion about Israel's policy on arms exports. One Israeli delegate pointed out that Israel is compliant with all the major international regimes on arms control and that there are countries to which Israel would never export.

Israel, one speaker noted, has a special export authority in the ministry of defence that is so powerful that it is one of the only agencies to be authorised by law to demand monetary compensation from companies that transgress without taking them to court.



Arie Zaban, President of Bar-Illan University; Vera Muravitz; and Sam Lipski, CEO of the Pratt Foundation, attend the Australian Prime Minister's address



Dr Colin Rubenstein AM, Dr Anthony Bergin, Mark Leibler AC, Professor Efraim Karsh, the Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, Lucy Turnbull and Arie Zaban at the dialogue

Strategic policy under the Trump administration

One Australian speaker suggested that the most unselfish gesture in human history by any nation was when the US after World War II, which had an absolute capability to provide total security for itself, decided instead to make its people hostage as it extended its deterrence around the world in defence of freedom. No other nation would do it then or now.

One speaker noted that Trump had been elected with a very high power index, the most powerful in living memory: Trump was not, it was argued, beholden to his own party. He had control over the White House, the Senate, the House, 34 of 50 governorships, 36 state congresses, and the Supreme Court. It was suggested by one delegate that Trump was beholden to no ideology and no policies.

One delegate noted that Trump then 'took on' the intelligence agencies. The loyalty of the intelligence agencies is a president's most powerful tool, and Trump decided to take them on. One speaker said Trump confused people. It was noted by one delegate that the worst thing you can do is promise and not deliver.

One speaker suggested that lowest point concerned US military strategy in South Asia when Trump announced to a room full of marines, 'We're going back to Afghanistan'. That moment was Trump saying in effect that he'd been defeated by Washington.

Some delegates argued that Trump has learned that the more unpredictable he is, the more powerful he becomes. It was pointed out by one participant that the Trump administration has a power cell of significant generals who all happen to be marines. They are the crucial players. One delegate noted that under Trump, Japan and South Korea are taking more responsibility for dealing with North Korea.

One Israeli participant said that he doubted if there was any grand strategy or policy in Washington on the Middle East. The main challenges here, it was suggested by one delegate, are generated from three radical Islamic elements: Iran's desire for hegemony (and exploiting the nuclear deal), the jihadists (whoever they are at the moment), and Erdogan in Turkey (a NATO member).

One delegate argued that Obama had decided to use the Iranian regime as part of the solution to the ISIS problem, ignoring all other facts about Iranian support for terror. The delegate said that

while he had reservations about reopening the nuclear deal, much can be done in terms of imposing sanctions without reopening the deal itself.

One participant said that Israel was encouraged that the first decision by Trump was to launch Tomahawks in response to Assad's use of chemical weapons. Israel was also encouraged by his support for non-jihadist Sunnis in Syria and for the Kurds. But, it was suggested by some delegates, both those parties now feel abandoned by the US. The only players in Syria are Russia, Iran and Hezbollah.

One Israeli delegate argued that if the US was not going to support the Kurds, then it shouldn't have allowed the referendum to go forward. They allowed it, didn't support them and, sure enough, 'the Iranian-backed Iraqis stomped them'.

Another delegate said that the Sunni world was encouraged by Trump's visit to Riyadh. But recent events in Syria and Iraq make the Sunni world doubt the US leader's intentions.

Regarding Israel–Palestine, one Israeli thought the current Trump administration was more realistic and not delusional about time frames.

An Australian delegate noted that Israel has formed stronger relationships with Saudi Arabia and the UAE, with the Middle East looking less balkanized.

There was some discussion on Trump and the South China Sea and one delegate observed that US rhetoric has not been backed up by action yet.

On Syria, it was suggested by one delegate that the US will have to make a decision after ISIS is wiped out in Syria. A question was raised about the implications for Israel if the US were to leave eastern Syria to Iran and its allies. One delegate thought there had been a US decision to leave Syria to Russia, Iran and Assad. The Kurds in Syria had no longer believed they would be backed by the US (and they were through Raqqa).

One Israeli speaker said that Israel's policy should be to stay out of Syria unless it was directly threatened, which includes by weapons shipments. If Israel's interests are threatened by Iranian deployments along the Syrian border/the Golan, probably a 'big stick' would be used to clarify that that would be a red line for Israel.

One delegate noted Israel's concerns about an Iranian corridor from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. Iran, it was suggested, now dominates Iraq and it's in Syria and Lebanon. This is not only bad for Israel but, as several speakers suggested, it's bad for the Arabs.

One delegate noted that Israel was in the same boat as the Sunnis for the time being: Israel fights jihadists, it does not like the Muslim Brotherhood and it does not like Iran. It was suggested that Israel must find a way to protect its interests in the absence of a US strategy.



Senator Linda Reynolds CSC addresses the dialogue luncheon



MAJGEN Kathryn Toohey AM CSC with BESA's Professor Eytan Gilboa

Countering hybrid warfare

There was some discussion on definitions, with one speaker suggesting that 'hybrid' is a combination of conventional and unconventional military and nonmilitary actions to achieve a strategic goal.

Hybrid warfare, it was also suggested, is in the grey zone. It attacks and targets populations through proxies and information operations. That's what makes it unique. One example given was China putting lots of civilian fishing boats in the South China Sea as a form of hybrid warfare.

There was some discussion on whether hybrid warfare is a new concept, and some suggested that it is as old as warfare itself. A hundred years ago the British had conventional mounted desert forces in the Middle East. They also had unconventional forces and Lawrence of Arabia. One speaker suggested that this was an example of hybrid warfare.

Another speaker said that perhaps what's changing is the level of effort being put in and the level of technology. Australia needs to develop a counter hybrid strategy, but it was noted that it already has significant building blocks in place. These include partnerships

with coalition partners and across government, investment in intelligence, strong governance to mitigate the risk of undue influence, and acquiring new agile technologies to be able to operate across the whole spectrum of warfare (such as cyber, AI, drones and fifth-generation air force development).

One speaker argued that there should be a focus on the land domain, because 'that is where wars are ultimately won', even though it was suggested that most Western militaries neglect the land forces.

An Israeli delegate stated that the IDF loves special forces, air forces and operating in the oceans. But 'we don't like the bloody issue of land fighting' even though it is 'the most crucial issue for the future of warfare.'

On intelligence capabilities, one delegate argued that most militaries have great theatre capabilities. But when it comes to the tactical level, there's almost nothing and that is a problem: 'We cannot build a system that depends entirely on theatre capabilities. It won't work. It never has in the past and it won't in the future', the speaker argued.

It was suggested that there must be capabilities at the tactical level, zone of operation level and theatre level.

The issue of firepower was raised, specifically the need to be accurate. It was suggested that modest investments were needed in that area.

One delegate raised the issue of the need for a revolution in the air, and the need for 'thousands of UAVs for every platoon leader', especially as enemies are likely to have such fleets. It will also require the tactical capability to counter this threat. An Australian delegate noted that the Australian army is giving off-the-shelf UAVs to units.

An Israeli delegate raised the issue of the need to adjust the IDF's command and control system, which can be too complicated. The suggestion was to take the money out of HQ and improve the tactical levels.

Another matter discussed was the need to adjust training systems. One Israeli speaker said that the connection today between land training and the future battlefield wasn't strong enough. An Israeli delegate noted that in infantry officer courses, every cadet finishes the course with five or six practical experiences but that they need

60. It was pointed out that this was possible, as one unit the speaker had visited had started training using virtual reality goggles and that they 'can become experts that way'.

One speaker suggested that all Western militaries need to undertake a quiet revolution to be prepared for the new battlefield, especially in urban terrain where sometimes every building, even every room, poses a different threat.

One delegate argued that the laws of conflict are not designed for hybrid battlefields and that both states will be required to 'future-proof' the law. Foresight regarding legal obligations is required along with foresight regarding the battlefield. One Israeli delegate noted the importance of accuracy and the need to use as little power as possible in civilian environments and keep ethical standards no matter the circumstances. More sophistication was required in working with the media and influencing in a positive way a free media in a democratic state.

An Israeli speaker noted that, looking back at the three last operations in the Gaza Strip, Israel learned a lot of lessons about maintaining legitimacy both inside and outside Israel. One delegate suggested that Israel 'knows today how to handle

massive uses of power inside urban terrain, not just in the most legal way but in the most ethical way'.

One speaker said that while it's not up to militaries to change the law, in areas such as cyberwar the rules are not clear.

An Israeli speaker argued that while the reality is in war you need to kill your enemy, over the past 30 years the IDF has become much better about working with civilians and the media while fighting a war and taking into account legal matters. There is a legal adviser, for example, advising on selection of targets for aerial bombardment. The IDF, it was pointed out, keep the files so that if someone takes the military to court, the IDF has all the documentation about these incidents.

One Israeli speaker suggested that while Israel may be fighting for the next 300 years, the main issue is to reach a point where somehow both sides decide not to be friends, but to establish a new kind of relationship, like Israel has with Egypt and Jordan. That's a formidable achievement for Israel and so Israel needs to be optimistic.

Areas for future collaboration

The following recommendations don't represent a consensus view among all the participants, but instead identify a range of ideas that emerged during discussions for further consideration by the governments of Israel and Australia.

Areas noted for possible future joint exploration were how both sides can counter the soft-power threats to liberal democracies and how to leverage social media monitoring for indicators of radicalisation or intended terrorist acts.

It was also clear from our discussions that there are prospects for further joint exchanges on how we can share experiences of hybrid threats and what they mean for the battlespace, as well as trends in military innovation, specifically UAVs, force protection and missile defence.

There was a strong interest in sharing lessons on how to protect the gas industry at sea.

There was also clear recognition that Australia and Israel should identify the conditions for closer practical collaboration in cyber industries with security applications.

Israeli government agencies work closely with their cyber industry. Australia can learn a lot from the Israelis about how to build trust and achieve a common purpose between government and the private sector.

The discussions about China, particularly on critical infrastructure investment in Israel (with China building key Israeli ports), suggest there's an opportunity for greater dialogue between the two nations on the role of China and foreign investment.

In defence, one idea that came out of the discussions was that consideration might be given to undertaking a small-scale joint Australia–Israel military exercise in the near term in an area of mutual interest. Consideration should also be given to holding a regular ministerial-level defence dialogue.

On international policy, the dialogue discussions showed that there's potential for looking beyond bilateralism and mapping possible structures for discreet multi-party consultations (for example, with India, which Israel is forging closer relations with).

The third Be'er Sheva Dialogue again underlined how each state can contribute to the other's security interests. It demonstrated interest in more substantive engagement between Australia and

Israel in defence and security affairs. It provided once again a vehicle to promote, explain and discuss areas of mutual interest and identify opportunities to strengthen engagement between the two countries.

The dialogue raised awareness of the security issues affecting both states with key national elites and strengthened relationships among influential stakeholders, enabling an exchange of ideas across a range of different sectors.

The Be'er Sheva Dialogue continues to provide the means to fill some of the voids in security cooperation between the two nations and identify areas where it can be enhanced.

ASPI-BESA 2017 Be'er Sheva Dialogue

Tel Aviv, Israel

1 November 2017



APPENDIX 1: DIALOGUE AGENDA

DIALOGUE, Wednesday 1 November 2017 Oceanus Hall, Renaissance Tel Aviv Hotel, 121 Hayarkon Street, Tel Aviv 63453 Israel	
0900–0930	Registration and Morning Tea
Welcome remarks	
0930–0945	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lt Gen. (Ret'd) Ken Gillespie AC DSC CSM, Chairman, Australian Strategic Policy Institute• Prof Efraim Karsh, Director, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
Session 1: Regional perspective	
0945–1045	<p>Chair: Prof Efraim Karsh, Director, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies</p> <p><i>South East and North East Asian Challenges:</i> Prof Rory Medcalf, Head of National Security College, Australian National University Mr David Akov (respondent)</p> <p><i>Middle East/East Mediterranean:</i> Dr Eran Lerman, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies</p>

Session 2: The terrorism threat in 2018 and beyond: opportunities for closer counter terrorism cooperation

1045–1130	<p>Chair: Dr Colin Rubenstein AM, Executive Director, AIJAC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maj. Gen. (Ret'd) Duncan Lewis, Director-General of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation • Brig. Gen. (res.) Yossi Kuperwasser, Former Director General of the Israel Ministry of Strategic Affairs
-----------	---

Session 3: Opportunities and challenges in Maritime Security

1130–1230	<p>Chair: Prof Eytan Gilboa, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Anthony Bergin, Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Senior Research Fellow, National Security College, Australian National University • Dr Ehud Eiran, University of Haifa
1230–1330	<p>Luncheon with the Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, Prime Minister of Australia</p>

Session 4: The agenda for cyber security

1330–1430	<p>Chair: Ms Gai Brodtmann MP, Shadow Assistant Minister for Defence and Cyber Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE Dr Tobias Feakin, Australia's Ambassador for Cyber Affairs • Mr Michael Levinrad, Head of International Cooperation, Israel National Cyber Bureau, Prime Minister's Office (TBC) • Brig. Gen. (res.) Ariel Karo, Director of ISTAR, Systems Directorate Air & C4ISRR Systems Division, Rafael
-----------	--

Session 5: Defence industry: opportunities for collaboration

1430–1530	<p>Chair: Mr Uzi Rubin, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lt Gen. (Ret'd) Ken Gillespie, Chairman, Australian Strategic Policy Institute • Former IAF Commander Maj. Gen. Ido Nehushtan, President of the Israel-Australia Chamber of Commerce
1530-1600	<p>Afternoon tea</p>

Session 6: Strategic policy under Trump administration

1600–1700	<p>Chair: The Hon Dr Mike Kelly AM, MP, Shadow Assistant Minister for Defence Industry, Parliament of Australia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Hon Kim Beazley AC, Distinguished Fellow, Australian Strategic Policy Institute• HE the Hon Joe Hockey, Australian Ambassador to the United States• Former Chief of Staff of the Israel Defense Forces, Moshe Ya'alon
-----------	---

Session 7: Countering hybrid warfare strategies

1700–1800	<p>Chair: Maj. Gen (res.) Gershon ha-Cohen, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maj. Gen. Kathryn Toohey, Head Land Capability, Australian Army• Maj. Gen. Yair Golan, former DCOS
1930-2100	<p>Cocktail reception in The America Hall with Australian National University's National Security College <i>Australian Cyber Delegation to Israel</i>.</p> <p>Featuring remarks from the Hon Dan Tehan MP, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister for Defence Personnel, Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Cyber Security</p>



ASPI–BESA 2017 Be'er Sheva Dialogue

Tel Aviv, Israel

1 November 2017

APPENDIX 2: PARTICIPANT LIST

Israeli delegation

- **Maj. Gen. (res.) Gershon Hacoen**, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
- **Dr Ehud Eiran**, University of Haifa
- **Maj. Gen. Yair Golan**, former DCOS (
- **Professor Efraim Karsh**, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
- **Brig. Gen. (res.) Yossi Kuperwasser**, Former Director General of the Israel Ministry of Strategic Affairs
- **Brig. Gen. (res.) Ariel Karo**, Director of ISTAR, Systems Directorate Air & C4ISR Systems Division, Rafael
- **Mr David Akov**, MFA
- **Mr Uzi Rubin**, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
- **Moshe Ya'alon**, Former Chief of Staff of the Israel Defense Forces
- **Dr Eran Lerman**, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
- **Professor Eytan Gilboa**, The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies
- **Mrs Vera Muravitz**, Chairman, International Friends of Bar-Ilan University
- **Mr Ido Spitzer**, General Manager, Rafael Australia Pty Ltd
- **Maj. Gen. Ido Nehushtan**, President of the Israel-Australia Chamber of Commerce

Australian delegation

- **The Hon Kim Beazley AC**, Distinguished Fellow, Australian Strategic Policy Institute
- **Dr Anthony Bergin**, Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Senior Research Fellow, National Security College, Australian National University
- **Ms Gai Brodtmann MP**, Shadow Assistant Minister for Cyber Security and Defence, Parliament of Australia
- **The Hon Michael Danby MP**, Member for Melbourne Ports, Parliament of Australia
- **The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP**, Shadow Attorney-General, Shadow Minister for National Security, Parliament of Australia
- **Dr Tobias Feakin**, Australian Ambassador for Cyber Affairs
- **Ms Fiona Geminder**, Co-owner of Visy
- **LTGEN (Ret'd) Ken Gillespie AC DSC CSM**, Chairman, Australian Strategic Policy Institute
- **HE the Hon Joe Hockey**, Australian Ambassador to the United States
- **Mr Jeremy Jones AM**, Director of International & Community Affairs, Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council
- **The Hon Dr Mike Kelly AM MP**, Shadow Assistant Minister for Defence Industry, Parliament of Australia
- **Dr Isaac Kfir**, Director of National Security Program, Head of Counter Terrorism Policy Centre, Australian Strategic Policy Institute
- **Mr Julian Leeser MP**, Member for Berowra, Parliament of Australia
- **MAJGEN (Ret'd) Duncan Lewis AO DSC CSC**, Director-General, Australian Security Intelligence Organisation
- **Mr Sam Lipski AM**, Chief Executive Officer, The Pratt Foundation
- **Professor Rory Medcalf**, Head of National Security College, Australian National University
- **MAJGEN (Ret'd) Jim Molan AO DSC**, former senior officer in the Australian Army
- **Senator Linda Reynolds CSC**, Senator for Western Australia
- **Professor Gregory Rose**, School of Law, University of Wollongong
- **Dr Colin Rubenstein AM**, Executive Director, Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council
- **Mr Ahron Shapiro**, Senior Policy Analyst, Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council
- **The Hon Warren Snowdon MP**, Shadow Assistant Minister for the Centenary of ANZAC, Parliament of Australia
- **Mr Cameron Stewart**, Washington Correspondent, *The Australian*
- **MAJGEN Kathryn Toohey AM, CSC**, Head of Land Capability, Australian Army
- **Mr Patrick Walters**, Executive Editor, *The Strategist*, Australian Strategic Policy Institute



Wyatt Roy, Maj. Gen. Gershon Hacohen, Fiona Geminder and Roslyn Glickfeld at the dialogue luncheon



Dr Anthony Bergin, LTGEN (Ret'd) Kenneth Gillespie, the Hon Mike Kelly MP, the Hon Gai Brodtmann MP, and Senator Linda Reynolds lay a wreath at the Battle of Beersheba centenary commemorations

Acknowledgements

The 2017 Be'er Sheva Dialogue would not have been possible without the continued kind and generous support of The Pratt Foundation. ASPI especially thanks the CEO, Sam Lipski, for his continued engagement with the dialogue.

A very special thank you to the Pratt Family, Mrs Jeanne Pratt AC and Ms Fiona Geminder, for their commitment to fostering Australia–Israel relations and their continuous support of the Be'er Sheva Dialogue.

ASPI acknowledges the support of Rafael for the 2017 dialogue and for the excellent briefing Australian delegates received at the company's facility in Haifa.

The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies was ASPI's generous host during our stay in Israel. The dialogue would not

have occurred without the hard work of Professor Efraim Karsh, Dr Eran Lerman, Ms Hava Waxman and Ms Judith Levy.

ASPI acknowledges the wonderful support provided to all Australian delegates by ASPI's events and media manager, Ms Renee Jones.

Both ASPI and BESA also acknowledges the role of Bar-Illan University at the dialogue and especially thanks President Arie Zaban for introducing Australian Prime Minister Turnbull.

Dr Colin Rubenstein AM and the team at the Australia/Israel & Jewish Affairs Council were essential to the success of the 2017 dialogue and their great efforts are warmly appreciated.

All photos taken by photographer Yoni Rafe.