



# Assises nationales de la recherche stratégique

---

## Panel international :

### « La stratégie de la France et de l'Europe vue de ... »

#### Grande-Bretagne avec le professeur Jamie MacIntosh :

« Firstly I'll apologize for not even attempting a French flourish to begin with. So forgive me, I'll speak in English. It's more understandable to my English colleagues. I am very grateful to CSFRS for the invitation to be a troublemaker. It's good to know that troublemakers are in such a good business in this moment. I am glad to be here again in the military establishment, the *Ecole militaire* with such political direction to this new body. I'd say that for two reasons: what I found about the political class and the militaries, they share two things:

They have skin in the game. Bureaucrats don't. Bureaucrats only have their pensions and that's part of the reason why we have such a problem with making strategy. So I am delighted that this is the entirely the right venue to be, with the incentive begin to really hit the road. This cost blood, it cost treasure and it is worth getting right. Groupthink doesn't cut it. It really gets you into troubles. Good politicians know that. If they surrender themselves with people who are yes-man, their careers as politicians tend to be very short. So I am delighted that this institution is here.

I speak as an academic and in a personal capacity. I am going to touch on four points

- The reassessment of strategy.
- Resilience to crisis and particularly the economic dimension.
- What I would politically and correctly called AfPak as an operation theatre.
- And finally close on linking justice to cyber.

I much enjoy Alain Bauer's remarks this morning: he very much encapsulated why it is important to have the imagination in challenge in the defense and security community. Without that we are in real danger. And I think it's, you know, several decades on, it's still worth reminding ourselves just how dangerous the Cold War has been to our thinking. It froze our thinking and there is very little evidence that we've got use to a multi-polar world yet. So since that spirit that I am delighted to be able to talk here today and remind you from a British perspective: one of the things we have suffered from are raised to a power over the century from the Tudors because we understood that we were a pinprick of the end of the Peninsula. And we couldn't survive as a pinprick. We needed to be able to network across a large globe. We had to be an asymmetric power and as much as I know we have a fantastically special relationship with the United States. Part of that is being ? up mimicking asymmetrical power to our detriment and we have to re learn how to be an asymmetric power in the new networks that includes maritime, space, but also cyberspace.

I've emphasize the point that I see this is a multi-polar world. For those of you schooled and in international relations and politics balance of power, the rational calculus of interest is simply not going to cut it. The world is just not that strictly rational so what I have been advocating and many have been advocating is that strategy cannot be about drafting fine papers. That is not strategy that is what scribes and priest do. Strategy is about doing and learning. The watch world we have been sticking with is a dig delivery innovation and growth. Strategy in the core business of government -and I say core business is not a monopoly- has to be about our outcompeting the offering of others.

Just consider the criminal justice services in Pakistan. The Taliban gain a foothold in fatter in the Swat Valley because they provide a public service and less you can now compet that offering you will undermine public confidence. But we, equally in the west, the so called developed nations, have to understand that we are now competing to provide core services and that competition is a new thing we have become too much like in common firms; and it's very unhealthy. And that bring me on to the issue of resilience, resilience crisis. I start with the term crisis specifically. The short term for English dictionary is very succinct on it. A crisis is a decisive moment, a turning point for better or worse. I think it's not just an English language

but in several languages crisis has been conflated with catastrophe and again I blame the bureaucrats. Bureaucrats love to observe until things go wrong and they don't know what to do. What the military does and what the politicians need to grow much more firmly if they're going to exercise leadership and retain public confidence is to anticipate those decisive moments, be clear what drills they are going to execute at those decisive moments and make sure they have created other options. This is the spirit of delivery innovation and growth. I've defined crisis.

Resilience we are now redefining. Not in terms of bounds back to the state of guarantee, we can reverse time and we don't go back to things as they were. Time is only go one direction and things inevitably change even when there is continuity in change. So a definition of resilience is now the power, the injuring power of all bodies for transformation, renew and recovery with the flux of interactions and flow of events. What we are trying to emphasize there in much in keeping with the scholars of ecology and catching up with defense and security is that this is about diversity and change more than staying the same. The military understand that and that's an important part we have to stick with. So it's about doing and learning and bouncing forward to thrive and not bouncing back to a state of guarantee. And now a touch on the economics, and this very much comes to the presentation I heard this morning. I had difficulties although we ended up at the great convergence. I wasn't too sure why we were in this ding dong between keynesianism and neo classicism. I don't think either that economic ideology is going to wait forward for us. Reuniting mass consumption, mass production all being with mass customization isn't really going to save the planet. What I advocate is more Schumpeterian Economy. It is about the capacity to innovate. That's where we need to move. Innovation freezes mass innovation, frugal innovation and upon innovation, is the one thing humanity shares that is not scarce. It's almost infinite in its abundance So that have both an important contribution to military and defense security in the bad days but in the good days it's about economic growth. What I'd emphasize here then is that the defense and security have to change the business models. If we think in Europe nearly going for larger economy of scales for more comprehensities to try and continue to survive on the dying business models: we have missed the trick. There are major productivity gains that need to be achieved and that is just on the basis of fiscal policy will not sustain more profligacy: a point for the US to know maybe more than us.

If I go to Afghanistan, I somehow startled that at the end of the session this morning Pakistan was the revelation. This to me is very troubling if we can even get our operation a large right and our operation design right we have got real concerns. The time space of the operational theatre has to include both Afghanistan and Pakistan. The news gets worse. Our window of opportunity in the AfPaK theatre has shot. The

best we can do is follow the Soviets in finding as good a political smocked screen as possible to get out. And once we have got out, after the Soviets and NATO I think it is China's turn to see to see how much it can do in this fantastic testing ground.

I pay tribute to our military as a former infantry man, my heart goes out to the soldiers who continue to go out and fight in the circumstances that they do but we have enough combat hurting now. And I also want to make it absolutely clear, the military search and blaming the military at this point will be a Pyrrhus defeat because the military were the only people on parade. The bet that was missing was the political settlement and more importantly the civilian search never happened. There are practical details why the civilian search didn't happen. They didn't share in the kind of insurance indemnities that would allow anybody but bright young cavaliers to go into theatre and enjoy themselves. People with wisdom had mortgages that they couldn't lose and we couldn't get out over simple administrative points like indemnifying them. The Civilian search didn't happen, strategy didn't deliver. The operation campaign is flood. Perhaps the Chinese will do it better

As we live however the things we have to be mindful of this is not an excuse for nuclear proliferation and nor it is an excuse to cover deal with the Saudis, that is the real strategic question. If I move quickly then to the issue of the law, frankly I was baffled why the Anglo Saxon were being blamed for Strasbourg, left me completely flood, we thought it was you. So I am kind of glad because Strasbourg must be something right because we both hate them. Let's just remind ourselves, European convention about human rights was written by a guy in a British army uniform but he was Austrian and he wrote it as Roman law. So let's address the issue. The issue is the convention need rewriting but nobody got the political balls to do it and the issue that keep falling from it particularly if -as has been said by our home Secretary previously- the ECHR was design to stop the fascist state oppressing the individual. When it was written nobody considered fascist individuals on networks of individuals oppressing communities or threatening the state. There is a rebalancing to be had and it seems impossible for us to do it through the Council of Europe. And that again lead us then into the idea of a cyber treaty. I can well understand why the Russians want an arms treaty inside cyber space because they will be the only one to hear to it. Nobody else will. But I don't think we are going to be that stupid! Five forms of jurisdictions, five types of law, 198 sovereign jurisdictions we are not going to have a cyber treaty. We need a doctrine instead.

The path into cyber space of evolving capacities again brings me back to the military. They have shown themselves capable of integrating capabilities particularly under the pressure of war. What our former Chief of the General Staff called transformation in contact. That has to achieve great to death. The cosy relationship with the military industrial complex has got to change. We need massive productivity gains. And that

Mercredi 8 juin 2011

is both under the issue of leadership ad fundamentally of ethics. I leave you with one question. I know the formal infantryman who I would trust on pulling the trigger and it's not a civilian. The question of who is responsible for cyber attacks has to be more carefully addressed. Thank you."