

## 2011 NATIONAL FORUM ON STRATEGIC RESEARCH

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR PHILIPPE BAUMARD,  
CHAIRMAN OF THE CSFRS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

### Strategic orientations in defence and security research

Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to present the result of the collective thinking undertaken by the Scientific Council of the CSFRS, consisting of **108 members**.

Allow me to express my sincere thanks to them for accepting to take part in this experiment:

- The Vice-Presidents, Mrs Edwige Bonnevie, Mrs Nicole Chaix, Mrs Catherine de Wenden, Mrs Nicole El Karoui, Mrs Nicole Gnesotto; Mr Olivier Blin, Mr François Darrort, Mr Rémy Pautrat and Mr Jean-Marc Suchier;
- And all the members who wrote the report, who gave up their free time, holidays and weekends, to offer you the report today.

I will do my best to convey their **collective voice** and to sum up the key points.

... But before I start, I would like to say a few words about our Scientific Council and to tell you about the method used.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

As you will see from the very cautious introductory remarks to the report, the members of the Scientific Council are appointed *intuitu personae*. They were chosen for the exceptional nature of their expertise, but also for their personality. The intention of the Scientific Council is to be **independent, with freedom of speech. To guarantee this, all opinions, even the most divergent, were freely expressed.**

We are therefore by no means a "wise advisory council" and we did not particularly focus on wisdom in our work. (!)

We did not seek to please ourselves either: You will not find beautiful writing in this report. Please forgive us if the style sometimes strikes you as blunt. What we have produced are **questions that need answers**, and what we need to look at is the direction those questions are pointing in.

As Alain Bauer said, this Scientific Council is not a think-tank as understood in the Anglo-Saxon world. The Council includes members with opposing political beliefs and no-one has attempted to reach a pseudo consensus.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

**The concepts of defence and security are understood in their broadest sense in this report.**

Quite simply, the concept of defence and security has become must broader than during the first two cold wars.

**Yes, you are quite right to think** that sustainable development, biodiversity, energy and education are among the list of "topics" addressed by this Scientific Council.

Defence and security first and foremost, quite simply, mean ensuring our collective survival. I insist on the "we" that we too often tend to translate as "Others", those opposite, those next door, or those upstairs who clearly are not "like us".

For the first time in our Collective History, with a capital C and a capital H, we are faced with curves that have decided not to be cyclic any more, not to bend sweetly to return to what is "normal".

In this type of situation, there are two major attitudes:

- those who quote Kondratieff, who tell you that all this is cyclic, that we just need to learn to live with risks and that "water will flow under the bridge".
- and those who tell you that in fact there is no more water under the bridge, and that you can apply all the **precautionary principles** you like: **WE ARE NOW WAY BEYOND THE PRECAUTIONARY STAGE.**

----- \* \* \* \* -----

*That is probably the key message of the 2011 report.*

----- \* \* \* \* -----

Ten years ago, the world was concerned about the "big divide", the gulf between rich and poor. We were told that on the one hand, there was the world of the "interconnected", those who live near the coastline, with a constant eye on their I-phones, and on the other hand, there were the "**heartlands**", those who live in their regions, who are shut away in their dialects and who are afraid of the rest of the World.

**But ten years later**, the world does not consist of the interconnected from the jet-set opposite the outcasts of the digital world. There are heartlanders in the 8<sup>th</sup> arrondissement of Paris, and "interconnected" people north of Johannesburg. **The great divide is everywhere, and we just didn't see it coming.**

This is what Section II of the Scientific Council tells us: **We have not decentralised anything. We have not "empowered" anybody, whether in the French regions, in Detroit or in Tunis.** And we are continuing. We are continuing to the point of exhaustion, insurrection, disappointment. This disappointment is dangerous because it slowly but surely eats away at all the social pacts, those of our neighbourhood life, those of simple attachment to who and what we are.

Section 2 concludes that there can be no power if we can no longer be a society. The society model is not an ideological challenge, it does not place you to the right or left of an imaginary Maginot line. The society model is your collective resilience.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

Yes, says Section I: We need to ask ourselves serious defence and security questions. The logic of power based on the "demographic strength – economic power – military power" triptych is no longer to our advantage. It is no longer legitimate. The biggest, the strongest, is also the biggest spender, the greatest destroyer of the environment, the least resilient.

How can we claim to teach lessons, to impose a world order, when all our actions, our poor financial management, the downward spiral of our excessive sovereign debt, our models of society can no longer serve as standards?

The issue of "devaluation" of western values is central. The question needs to be asked. Europe and the United States have lost their aura in many parts of the world. We are facing a political weakening, which has military and strategic consequences. If this weakening continues, it could even challenge our nuclear equations. There are Fukushimas caused by nuclear disasters, but also domestic Fukushimas.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

When we suggest that human insecurity outclasses military insecurity at global level, is this not a totally new outlook? Let's stop playing dominos, doctrine tectonics: It is daily humiliation that moves lines and cracks. In Section III, we discover a world where it is no longer possible to organise one's own little local governance "on the quiet", where there are no islets of discretion, where governance mechanisms clash and fight for legitimacy. **The issue of "Others" becomes the strategic issue**, whether in the field of migrations, inequality in human development and resistance to environmental predation.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

**"Others" are no longer silent.** They know how to use coded networks, how to use the freedom to inform and be informed. Will the world become more serene because it is more open?

Does this tremendous knowledge lead to appeasement?

Section IV opts for a different conclusion. Although a digital world offers new opportunities, it also offers new vulnerabilities. And France is not ready. We urgently need to move away from silos, get rid of ideological shackles, build a solid and cross-functional frame of reference.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

Section V gives us the same warning. We are not an island. There is no archipelago economy. In terms of sustainable

development, we cannot separate our own sovereignty from that of others.

Insularity exists only in the accounting that we choose to apply to the issue of resilience; the economics of "just don't get caught" have no future.

On the contrary, that is where the **new stakes of power** lie. The first nation to reverse the logic, to make energy efficiency the new paradigm of power, is the nation that will prevail.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

**We must stop complaining about a "crisis-prone" world**, say the members of Section VI.

No, we do not lack knowledge.

The obstacles are behavioural, institutional, corporatist and industrial. That is what we need to change, by refusing tropisms, by refusing misuse of the precautionary principle, to serve industrial interests.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

But to achieve such objectives, we need to abandon another form of selfishness, the selfishness that triggers insecurity, that feeds ostracism, which falls within the economic scope.

**In the last decade, the economy suddenly arrived under the umbrella of strategic research.** International adjustment is

blocked. Selfishness is all the rage. Surplus countries create inflation in neighbouring countries, then speculate on it.

Section VII gives us a straightforward warning: It is dangerous to force financial globalisation in this context. Caught in socio-demography "in mid-stream", France is ageing, becoming more rigid and allergic to risks.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

I could not finish my overview of the Scientific Council report without mentioning the **strategic lever** which has become central in this landscape: Research and education.

Section 8 describes an **anxious research environment, whether in the public or in the private sector.**

There are many reforms, but reduced strategic visibility.

Greatest common denominators that have never really existed encourage fairy tales, facades, while all European countries are pursuing the same strategic objectives. Despite that, there is a France of technological entrepreneurship; it is envied; it achieves great success abroad.

----- \* \* \* \* -----

I will stop here. There is much more to read in the report itself.

Thank you for coming in great numbers today. I am leaving you in excellent company for a day organised with the IHEDN and INHESJ, where you will be able to hear directly from the writers of the report during the Workshops this afternoon.