



**Remarks as delivered by
Mr. James R. Clapper
Director of National Intelligence**

**GEOINT 2011 Symposium
Henry B. Gonzales Convention Center
San Antonio, TX**

October 17, 2011

MR. CLAPPER: Well, thanks, Joan [Dempsey], for a very gracious introduction. And thanks to the United States Geospatial Intelligence Foundation for its continued leadership. And I especially want to thank all the corporate participants who've made this whole operation flourish and grow every year.

It's really great to be back in San Antonio. This is sort of personal and professional roots in a way. Sue [Clapper] was recounting last night when they had the reception at the train station, and in the day, it actually was a train station – an operational train station – and she was recollecting when she met her mother here in May of 1966, who was going to join her for the birth of our daughter while I was in Vietnam – a long time ago.

On the way down, Tish [Long] and I flew together, and she was quick to point out when we flew over the New Campus East – which looks like two adjoining aircraft carriers, sort of bent at each end – it's huge. (Laughter.) This is, I think, as all of you appreciate, and I know many of you have seen it yourselves, just a magnificent edifice. I was there for Family Day – Sue and I went to Family Day there, and the coolest part was just wandering around the atrium, just kind of talking to people.

And it was very heartwarming for me because many thanked me for my small part in getting the campus going. I was kind of puffed up about it until somebody came up and said: "Are you somebody?" (Laughter.) It keeps you humble. (Laughter.) It's a place, though, that the magnificent geospatial intelligence workforce richly deserves. And it represents, I think, the institutional prominence of geospatial intelligence, which now really has a home.

Tish, of course, I can't say enough about how proud I am of her, and her stewardship of over a year; and a little later, you're going to see another example of that. Obviously, as is well-known, the first woman in charge of a major U.S. intelligence agency. She followed a trail blazed by our emcee this morning. And Joan, thanks to you for your contributions and the tremendous example that you've set in paving a way for women – power women – in intelligence.

Tish, for her part, is clearly a leader who gets integration, which is of course what I'm pushing right now in this job. By the way, I need to offer congratulations to her on her richly deserved receipt of the 2011 AFCEA Charlie Allen Award for Intelligence Service, which I think was awarded about five days ago. So, Tish, please a round of applause. (Applause.)

And as well, which I think says something about the continuity in the Intelligence Community, I think the man for whom that award was named, Charlie Allen, I think is here somewhere. So, Charlie, I don't know if you're out there, but a hand for you as well. Charlie, please stand up. (Applause.)

The geospatial intelligence field, as an endeavor, has really grown and matured and has a tremendous reputation in – I can now attest – in the White House as well. It is legendary for its standard of customer support. It is the base foundation for integration. As they used to say when I was director, "Everything and everybody's got to be someplace." And so geospatial intelligence provides that foundational base over which other forms of intelligence and information can be overlaid. And so it is the foundation for promoting integration.

And of course, Stu [Shea] already mentioned the huge role that geospatial intelligence played, not only in the Abbottabad raid, but a lot of other activities similar to that, where we've taken down people very important, but perhaps of less notoriety. And of course, one of the features of geospatial intelligence as an endeavor is the tremendous partnership it has had, which is one of the reasons it flourished, because of the partnership with industry, as manifested by this forum.

So one of my pushes, I said, is integration. I think this was actually the essence of what the 9/11 Commission came out with after the attacks of 9/11. That same theme found its way into the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. And I think the thought was that the sum is greater than the parts if we integrate intelligence. And it makes for a better product for policymakers, decision-makers – whether they're sitting in a fox hole or sitting in the White House.

So the bureaucratic manifestation of that, I suppose, at my place at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence – it was to bring together collection and analysis, heretofore separately managed endeavors, into one, and just focus on target outputs. And as many of you know, brought in Robert Cardillo, who I thought was uniquely qualified to make that work. We have now 17 National Intelligence Managers "for," who are organized around either regional or functional target problems.

Each one of them is charged with writing, documenting, what's called the Unifying Intelligence Strategy, which lays out requirements needs, gaps, capabilities. And then I hold each one of those NIMs – NIM-ships – responsible for the sort of "alpha to omega" of their particular domain, to include analysis, collection, and the enterprise: Who's doing what in the community? Where are our shortfalls? Where are our leads?

Integration has several dimensions. It is what I would call both horizontal and vertical. Obviously, horizontal – across the Intelligence Community, where, again as I said, GEOINT is crucial. It's also vertical, in the sense that integration also takes in engaging with state, local, tribal, private

sector – which happens to be a major theme of this trip. I’m doing a lot of domestic things, to include here in San Antonio, as well as St. Louis and Chicago.

And crucial here, of course, is the interaction between the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. The FBI has truly undergone an amazing transformation over the last 10 years, and has become an intelligence-driven organization. Bob Mueller and I recently agreed now to expand a pilot program for the creation of DNI reps domestically, so we’ll have 12 DNI reps in the United States, regionally focused, in which Special Agents in Charge would be the DNI rep. This also applies, of course, to our friends and allies – integration – notably our Commonwealth compatriots.

Another challenge that I feel compelled to talk to you about, of course, is the confluence of three different forces. And I refer to the responsibility to share, and of course the need to protect. And then overlaying that balance is adherence to and protection of civil liberties and privacy. I have found that to be a major responsibility, particularly in this position.

Of course, the WikiLeaks episode certainly complicates the issue of responsibility to share. And of course we are doing, even in this constrained budget environment, that which we can do to improve auditing and monitoring, so we’ll have a better sense of what people are doing contemporaneously, media-wise. So we’ll build in whatever additional mousetraps we can, but in the end, this was a case – you know, our whole system is based on personal trust, and this was an egregious violation of that personal trust. We’ve had bad eggs in our system before, and we will have them in the future.

The second bin of issues I thought I would mention to you is, of course, our budget challenges. We’re all going to have to give at the office. And we, too, in the IC are going to contribute to reducing the deficit – which itself poses a profound threat to national security. In fact coincidentally, today we handed in our homework assignment, if you will, to OMB, and it calls for cuts in the double-digit range with a “B” over 10 years.

We’ve experienced 10 years of growth – actually a fairly easy proposition, when you think about it, for the Intelligence Community, because every year all they had to do was hand out more money and more people. And that’s certainly been the case in the entire six-year existence of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Well, now we’re going to be in a much different mode. I was around in the early ’90s, as many of you were. I was serving as Director of DIA at the time, when we were enjoined to reap the peace dividend occasioned by the fall of the Wall, the end of the Soviet Union – the enemy we had grown to know and love and lost. And so I hope we have profited from that experience.

We didn’t manage the workforce drawdown very well. We went through about a seven- or eight-year period of drawdowns in the community; probably cut our all-source analysis capability by as much as a third; reduced human coverage around the world profoundly; we let our overhead constellation, both SIGINT and imagery, atrophy; and we kind of forgot about the basics of power, space, and cooling; and that came back to haunt us later.

Not to drop a name, but I did mention to the President once, and he agreed that this oncoming challenge of reducing our budget rationally is kind of a litmus test for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. What we've tried to do is, of course, engage the agency directors – notably the Big Five – and the program managers. Why focus on them first? Well, it's kind of like Willie Sutton: "Why do you rob banks?" "That's where the money is." And so we've tried to actively engage program managers – among whom prominently of course has been Tish – in this process.

We've tried to abide by some organizing principles, starting with no salami slicing. That didn't work well before, and salami slicing is a way of avoiding hard decisions. That assumes that everything we do in intelligence is of equal value. And we all know that's not the case. We try very hard to protect our people, which in the end is our most valuable asset. And to try to do it more rationally than we did the last time, by ensuring that no matter how austere this gets, that we continue to hire, no matter how few it may be, so we bring in new blood, new ideas, new energy into the Intelligence Community every year – unlike what we did in the '90s.

We must sustain and protect research and development. That's a hard thing to do because invariably, the future important gets overtaken by the now and urgent. And of course the old saw about sunk costs are lost costs. We're trying to protect – in fact, invest in – capabilities that serve the most intelligence masters, or most demands. And as much as I hate to say it to this group, we are going to have to reduce our contractor profile.

Now, I say that as someone who was a contractor for six years. And I am the first to acknowledge the hugely important role that contractors play in the Intelligence Community. If all the contractors failed to come to work tomorrow, the Intelligence Community would stop. And so no one places a higher premium on the contributions that contractors make and the huge role that you play, but we're all going to have to share in the pain.

Another note on process: Dr. Mike Vickers, who succeeded me as Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence – we have worked hand-in-glove with the USD/I staff, and we've kept both programs, the NIP [National Intelligence Program] and the MIP [Military Intelligence Program], as we go through this exercise, completely transparent to one another. So anything – any decisions we make in the NIP, any decisions that DOD makes in the MIP, are completely transparent to each other, and there's good reason for that. It's to ensure – to try to prevent unintended consequences, and make sure the left hand and the right hand are in sync, particularly when it comes to shared funding. And there are a lot of things where we share funding.

Now, an area where I think there is huge potential for achieving savings and building integration is in IT. In our FY '12 request, somewhere between 20 and 25 percent of that request is for things labeled or coded in our Congressional justification book as information technology. So if there is an area where we can bring about efficiency and savings, I think that's it. Specifically, I think, the technological advances in Cloud computing, which can be used – and I have to hasten to emphasize this – this is an enabler, not a panacea. But I think there's great potential there for us in the Intelligence Community.

So we put together a team of IC leaders, which has met for a pretty intense 30-day efficiency study to try to determine our own destiny here. All five of the National Intelligence Program entities, to

include specifically and especially the Central Intelligence Agency, are engaged in this. So those of you who know about “The Quad,” it’s become “The Quint.” And the new director of the CIA, Director Dave Petraeus, is a supporter of that.

We’re trying to keep our CIOs connected with our CFOs – the financial officers. This effort is led by the IC CIO Al Tarasiuk, the former CIO of CIA, and then Dawn Meyerriecks, who is the Assistant Director of National Intelligence for Acquisition, Technology and Facilities. The NGA CIO, Keith Littlefield, who did his penance on ODNI staff and is now back at NGA, has been a major player in this effort. And this group has found substantial opportunities to accelerate integration across the IC, concentrating on integrating a common IT architecture, but allowing for unique mission or agency-specific capabilities.

And if we execute this right, this will allow us to operate more effectively and efficiently; improve IC integration and information-sharing, security and privacy; preserve our mission capabilities; have common access and common improved user experience; increase confidence and trust in the IC’s handling of personal information; and most especially, save money. I’ve established a stretch goal that over the 10-year period, we can hopefully accomplish one-half of the needed savings through IT efficiencies.

The focus right now is on eliminating unnecessary and redundant IT systems across the IC, providing a more defensible system, with greater mission capacity than any individual IC agency can do on its own. I’ve asked the agency CIOs, under the direction of Al, to create and deliver an implementation plan this December. And that will lay out the specifics for the way ahead. And this will call for some investment in the near years, and hopefully we’ll reap the benefits in the later years.

Al, Keith and the other CIOs will have a panel session here on Wednesday, and they’ll have more to say about where we’re headed. So for now, suffice it to say, enhancing collaboration and enabling integration – both mission necessities – are only possible through a transformational shift in the way we’ve done IT business.

I’ve always liked the quote attributed to a New Zealand physicist, Ernest Rutherford, who said, “We’re running out of money, so we must begin to think.” (Laughter.) And I think that kind of applies here.

Another quote I saw recently – one of the early Assistant Secretaries of Defense for Systems Analyses under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson was Alain Enthoven. These words were spoken some 50 years ago, but I think they’re kind of timeless. They speak to our current situation, and for that matter, by extrapolation to the role of ODNI. It’s a little long, but bear with me, and I quote:

“No large organization is likely to pursue automatically the broader national interest, as distinct from its own institutional and parochial interests, without external forces and leadership in that direction. The main job of the Secretary [of Defense] is to lead the Department in the pursuit of the national interest. He cannot do this job by passively administering a predetermined budget ceiling, rubber stamping his approval on agreed JCS recommendations and adjudicating Service disagreements. He has to take the initiative, raise

issues, provoke debate, demand studies, stimulate the development of alternatives and then decide on the basis of fact and merit.”

Again, said half a century ago, but I think it applies today exactly to the situation we face in the Intelligence Community. We’ve made tremendous progress in the Intelligence Community since 9/11. And of course – and many of you’ve heard me use the G-word before – but having achieved intelligence geezerdom, I go to back to that first tour, when my daughter was born here, and I was in Vietnam. I went in 1965, and automation was acetate, grease pencil, and two corporals. (Laughter.) And we have come a long way in almost a half a century. And yes, we have a challenge, but we’ll get through this one too, and we need your help.

In all of this, of course, I’d be fibbing if I didn’t say how proud I am of what geospatial intelligence has done, and is doing. I’m very proud of that.

So I think the format is, I’ll conclude here, and then we’ll open it up for questions, and maybe some answers. I don’t know – we’ll see. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. DEMPSEY: So a moderator only has two jobs: One is to keep the schedule going, and the other is to make sure that you all are providing questions. I failed at the second one this morning; I forgot to tell you to please provide your questions to the folks who are walking around the room with cards. We do happen to, fortunately, have a few questions already though.

MR. CLAPPER: You made them up.

MS. DEMPSEY: No, I didn’t make them up; I would never do that. (Laughter.)

Since many of the people in this room are part of either the commercial imagery organizations or they rely on commercial imagery to test and develop products and capabilities for both the industry and the government, I think there’s a great deal of interest in what you see in terms of the government’s continued support for commercial imagery during a period of reductions.

MR. CLAPPER: Well, as we like to say on the Hill, thanks for the question. (Laughter.)

Well, I think we are committed – in fact there’s a national security presidential directive to that effect to sustain – from the standpoint of a healthy industrial base – to support commercial imagery. Commercial imagery – and I’m a big believer in it; I certainly was when I was director of NGA – has a very important complementary role to play. And of course, it has great utility because it’s a fact it’s unclassified. So it’s invaluable in sharing in overseas coalition endeavors, which we do constantly, and it’s certainly huge in disaster recovery and those sorts of things. So we will continue to support commercial imagery. The issue, of course, will be to what extent and will we be able to support it as robustly as we have in the past? And that remains to be seen.

MS. DEMPSEY: Thank you.

You mentioned, Director Clapper, that there will be cuts in industry and in contractors. At the same time, you mentioned that you intend to try to protect the government workforce. Do you have the ability to look at the contribution that contractors make in terms of services contracts, as well as what the government staff does, and make those cuts, and protect resources, based on mission, rather than where someone sits?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, I think I got the question there. (Chuckles.)

I think, you know, there are sort of countervailing forces here. Because, on the one hand, we have been enjoined and have been pursuing this for the last, I guess, four or five years, is, on a selective basis, converting contractor spaces to government positions. There is confusion – and you know, we sometimes have difficulty communicating this to our overseers, which is the fact that, you know, the government buys a service, and we don't really dwell too much on how many faces to fill spaces it takes to render that service. So I think the question really boils down to the latitude and flexibility to decide what positions really do need to be government, and then have a clearly defined concept in mind for what it is we need the contractors to do. And again, I emphasize that contractors have played a hugely important role in the Intelligence Community, and will continue to do so.

But at the same time, I think we all know that we've been rather luxuriously funded the last 10 years, particularly with what we call supplemental or overseas contingency operations funding, and we accelerated rapidly. That was the way. And I recall when I was at NGA, in the early dark days after 9/11, and that was how we rapidly expanded the workforce, is by bringing on contractors. And you know, I think, in retrospect, maybe we weren't as disciplined as we might have been, and so now I think we're going to have to be.

MS. DEMPSEY: Do you see the idea of putting the power of GEOINT in the hands of the user expanded across the Intelligence Community; and how do you see the vision of putting intelligence with easier access in the hands of all users?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, this is a case where GEOINT is taking the lead; and I know Tish will speak more to this later. She's a brave lady; she's even going to do an onstage demo, I understand. So I think this is the way to go; and that this is one way, by the way, to promote efficiency. If you can put it in the hands of the users, and don't have to be there to do it for them, and present GEOINT or any other form of intelligence to a user, so the user can manipulate it and tailor it to his or her heart's content, is the way to go.

So I'm looking at GEOINT as kind of the bellwether for the rest of the community. I'd also acknowledge it's probably the most convertible or transformational discipline for this purpose of any of them, but I think GEOINT's going to show the way.

MS. DEMPSEY: Can you speak to the DNI joint collaboration nodes, like the one at ADF East in Colorado? Are they your model for DNI integration?

MR. CLAPPER: Yeah, absolutely. That is a question I'd like to get.

There is fantastic capability, I think, you know, that's kind of the epitome of the amalgam of the technical collection, and technical intelligence disciplines is represented at ADF Colorado. And we are engaged in a pilot program there. And the reason, of course, is that the multiplicity of agencies and disciplines represented there, all five of the services are there, the Commonwealth is there. So it is the ideal operational laboratory for promoting integration. And we have embarked on a pilot program which I hope will work and will be extendable, which will have the effect of making even more information readily available, transparently on a single workstation, to our Commonwealth when they are embedded in our footprints.

MS. DEMPSEY: I have a question here, actually for Director Long, but I think it's applicable to a number of the agencies. Does NGA do all-source intelligence? For that matter, does NSA do all-source intelligence? And what do you see as the difference between all-source intelligence and integrated intelligence?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, I never got too hung up on this business of who does what, you know, in these very surgically drawn boundaries between so-called single-discipline analysis and multidiscipline analysis. I think that, you know, geospatial intelligence analysts should be permitted to torture the electromagnetic spectrum any way they can to glean intelligence. (Laughter.) And I think SIGINT analysts should be able to freely torture the electromagnetic spectrum that they deal with to extract intelligence. (Applause.)

Thanks.

That actually ratchets up the standard for all-source. So all-source analysts just simply can't cut and paste what they get from NGA or NSA; they have to give it some more thought and insight and prediction.

So there is plenty of work to go around, and so I don't worry about it too much. I think all-source is just what the name implies: When you can put the two disciplines together first, and of course there are many great examples of joint reporting between those two agencies particularly, NGA and NSA, with the kissing logos.

And then, of course, when you add the HUMINT, and now a big deal for me is Open Source and its importance, and the developing partnerships that are existing between Open Source and its other disciplines. So, we're in a target rich environment here. And so, as I say, I don't get too hung up on that.

MS. DEMPSEY: You mentioned that the community needs to continue to invest. What areas do you anticipate making investments in beyond Cloud, and the couple of things that you mentioned?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, some of them I can't stipulate too much, but I would just say obviously, Cyber is an area we're going to invest in. I'm very, very committed to – I think Bruce Carlson will be speaking later – even with our budget challenges, we must sustain a robust overhead architecture. And the reason for that is that this is that capability that represents satisfaction of many, many different target demands. We must sustain cryptanalysis and the computational capability that goes

with that. We must sustain – which is always going to be a challenge for us – foreign language capability. Just to name a few.

MS. DEMPSEY: Quite a few questions this morning on Cloud, and several of them talk about the fact that there are a number of efforts underway to develop Cloud capabilities. The NRO has a DNI initiative, NSA's cyber pilot, as well as issues around Cloud security. Can you speak to these? If the intent is to achieve efficiencies, how do you intend to invest in Cloud and get the community in the right Cloud direction?

MR. CLAPPER: I'll give a cloudy answer.

(Laughter.) Obviously this is, you know, we planted many seeds here, and that's what I'm looking to this group and this effort headed by Al Tarasiuk to bring these together to the extent that we have to. And obviously, use of the Cloud engenders some security challenges. So that's why we have kind of put the hammer particularly on the CIA and NSA to work together to work through many of these solutions. But I think what we need to do is kind of bring all the horses together, so we're kind of headed in the right direction. And I think this would be a good question to ask at the session Wednesday with the CIOs.

MS. DEMPSEY: You mentioned the need to continue to hire, but with all of the pressures on pay, promotions, and awards being held back, how do you intend to maintain that focus on hiring?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, we're going to have to be very selective, I think, because we're not going to be hiring nearly the number of people that we have been able to over the last 10 years. So we're going to have to be very careful.

I'll tell you frankly, one of the things I'm very concerned about – and I've spoken with IC leadership about this – is the impact on diversity. As we bring on people, albeit the number may be limited, that's a consideration that we must not forget. So I think we're going to have to be selective, bring in people who have operational skills to bring to bear, and this is something we're going to have to work as a community and not separately.

MS. DEMPSEY: Can you talk a little bit – we saw the opening video about how GEOINT is coming together, and changing the way the user experience is for intelligence. What do you see as the future of ISR in war zones?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, ISR has become the coin of the realm. There just is an unlimited appetite for it. It's voracious, and I think that's not going to stop, even as we phase down, as we are in Iraq, and as we will in Afghanistan. The other commands have been in a kind of a dry spell, and they have huge pent-up, frustrated demands for ISR. And I think this is something that the Secretary of Defense and certainly Dr. Vickers, I know will speak to that, about the importance that the department attaches – and will continue to attach – to ISR.

MS. DEMPSEY: You talked about efficiencies coming from the IT efficiencies effort, and as much as half of the savings could come from there. Where do you see the remainder of the savings come from?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, I tried to outline what I thought were the main areas. We are going to have to – again, I think the greatest single potential is in IT. I think another thing we’re going to have to look at – and this will take some time – is overseas facilities and do we really need all of them or not, as we are looking at, of course, facilities domestically. That’s one of the reasons why I’ve changed the mission function of our AT, Acquisitions and Technology, to add Facilities – to look at exactly that from an IC-wide perspective. And so that’s one area that – we don’t have to do it right away, but we’re certainly going to be looking at.

MS. DEMPSEY: For the record, I did not make this question up.

Last year at GEOINT, you spoke about the importance of changing the budget structure and potentially putting the NIP in a separate category under the DNI. Can you give us a status update on that effort?

MR. CLAPPER: Ain’t gonna happen. (Laughter.)

MS. DEMPSEY: Can you tell us what the top three metrics would be that you know that you have succeeded in better integrating intelligence across the IC?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, I’m seeing it already, and one thing I’m looking at, to the subject of some interest on the part of our Congressional overseers, is the effect of setting up this NIM structure and UISs, and how that impacts on resources, and we are already seeing payoff there. So I think – can’t go into the specifics, but where the involvement of the National Intelligence Managers “for” is having a direct impact on how we make resource determinations – which, when you think about it, kind of makes sense – both on a short-term and a longer-term basis.

MS. DEMPSEY: There’s a question about whether MASINT should be subsumed as part of GEOINT?

MR. CLAPPER: (Chuckles.) There are some perpetuals, and they’ll always come up. (Laughter.)

Well, you know, the way I came to think about Measurement and Signature Intelligence or MASINT is that it is a trailblazer – an R&D trailblazer for others. And so what I would hope – and I think I see signs of this, with MASINT doing this – is once a technology, a technique, a process that they develop and build, would hand it off to a more established discipline. And that was certainly the case that I tried to promote when I was NGA Director, are those imagery and imagery-related aspects of MASINT, that that would morph or move to GEOINT, if that’s where it naturally belonged. And I think frankly that works. It’s very hard, as despite its struggles over the years for MASINT to exist as a separate, self-standing discipline in the classical sense, since it doesn’t have the institutional basis that the other classical disciplines do. So I would look at more of a trailblazer, you know, plowing ahead in new arenas, and then, once something becomes reasonably mature, handing it off.

MS. DEMPSEY: Over the last decade, from Iraq to the Arab Spring, policymakers and commanders have required intelligence to address matters well beyond order of battle and kinetic

action. This intelligence has required many population-centric capabilities. What is your strategy for institutionalizing these capabilities, particularly given the fact that they've largely been funded through supplementals?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, the last part of the question is another one of the subset challenges we're going to have deal with, which is, morphing things that have been funded essentially in supplemental or OCO funding into the base. And there are some capabilities and techniques that we've developed over the course of the last 10 years in the CT battle that we need to sustain. So that in itself is a big issue.

The whole issue of – and, again, I think this is where there's great potential that Tish and NGA already see, with the relationship between social media, human dynamics, human terrain, whatever you want to call it, and geospatial intelligence. What better way to portray things than that?

I've really gotten religion personally about Open Source, and as I learned very graphically during Arab Spring, the importance of social media, and understanding what it shows and what it doesn't show. Again, there's no silver bullet in social media. It is yet another tool that can be helpful in understanding the dynamics – political, social, economic – in a country. But it isn't going to predict for you when the tipping point is reached, and some autocrat decides his time's up. Until we develop more of a mind-reading capability, I don't think that's in the cards.

This brings to mind, I guess, something that – you know, kind of an old saw in intelligence, but I think it particularly applied during Arab Spring and some of the criticism we came in for, and that's – you know, understanding the important distinction between mysteries and secrets. Secrets are knowable; mysteries are not. And I think too often the Intelligence Community is held to the same standard for divining both, and we don't.

MS. DEMPSEY: You mentioned investing in cyber capabilities, and of course we have General Alexander up next, so we can address this to him as well. But given that the government doesn't have sufficient cyber professionals, how do you think the government is going to be able to pipeline people into the cyber area?

MR. CLAPPER: Well, there – again, this kind of gets to the issue we talked about before, you know – bringing new blood, new energy, new creativity, new innovation into the community. And obviously one of the areas that we must stay on top of is in the cyber arena.

I think, from what I see, there's a developing groundswell in academic circles, in colleges and universities around the country, to teach courses, have in fact even degrees. This is particularly true in the Washington area, and I suspect is or will be here in San Antonio. I am meeting later with the mayor and the Chamber of Commerce to talk about that. And I think to the extent that we in the Intelligence Community can promote academic institutions offering courses and degrees in this will be for the best. And this is a case where the government is not and cannot do it all. And so there needs to be a healthy infusion of cyber-competent people in the government and outside the government. Because the only way we're going to bring about this protective shield, if you will, in the cyber domain is through a partnership.

MS. DEMPSEY: We're out of time.

MR CLAPPER: Oh.

MS. DEMPSEY: (Chuckles.) We're out of time this morning. Director Clapper, thank you so much for spending time with us. Best of luck. Thank you.

(Applause.)

###