



JHU/APL Rethinking Seminar Series
*Rethinking Future Environments
and Strategic Challenges*



www.jhuapl.edu/rethinking

28 September 2017

General Michael Hayden (USAF, ret)

Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Former Director, National Security Agency

*Future Environments and Strategic Challenges to
the U.S., Her Partners and Allies*

Notes:

1. Below are informal notes of the speaker's remarks as taken by a JHU/APL staff member.
2. Links to the video, audio, presentation, and bulletized notes files for this and past seminars can be found on www.jhuapl.edu/rethinking and recent years' videos at the [JHU/APL YouTube Playlist](#).
3. General Hayden referred to the work of a number of international security experts who have previously spoken at Rethinking Seminars. Their names are linked to their most recent Rethinking appearances.

Introduction

General Hayden began by noting that he had given the same briefing the previous day to 1,600 insurance executives, but would be adjusting his remarks for the Rethinking Seminar audience who are more immersed in these topics than the average audience with whom he speaks. He explained he would go into more detail about why he chose what he did. He also noted that he hoped to spark some conversations, thereby gaining from the interaction.

As someone who is old enough to remember the Cuban Missile Crisis and went to DEFCON 3 in October, 1973 in reaction to Soviet moves, the General noted that he believed that he used to live in a more dangerous world in the past. However, now, he is not as sure about that as he used to be. He now sees the world as much more complicated than it had ever been in his lifetime.

Shifting Tectonics

There are substrata basal plates now moving and we must understand them to understand or predict what is going on in the world. It may not be possible to predict what will happen but we can identify major trends.

Tectonic One: Changing Nature of States

- Only 4-5 years ago this was considered the major tectonic shift
 - Now others trends are moving up the list
- Elements include:
 - Nation states and hard power play lesser roles
 - Sub-state actors and even individuals are empowered
 - Failed states create risks
 - The US is "threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones" (2002 National Security Strategy)
- Hayden worked for National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft in the Bush 41 administration

- In a 2012 article Scowcroft noted that when he was in that administration, all the pieces on the board he cared about were nation states, which were moved around with *hard power*
- Hayden discussed the article with Scowcroft who noted that in his era (ending with Bush 41) it was the end of the industrial era when things accumulated toward the center
 - One had to be at the hard core of centralized power to be a “somebody” because that was what the industrial era required
 - Look at late 19th century Republicans who had control of the government and built up the infrastructure the US required to burst on the world stage in the 20th
 - That was the way to propel a backward agrarian society into an industrial power but it was not good government
 - Accumulated power that was needed for linear industrial universe
 - Problem: We don’t live there anymore
 - Now our power-down/power-out, post-industrialized, inter-connected, globalized, etc., etc. world pushes power down and out to the edge
 - Hayden noted that he is old enough to remember:
 - Driving to a bank and talking to a teller to get money, whereas college kids today may not even bother with cash
 - Talking to licensed professionals to find new homes, something Zillow now does with a couple of clicks
 - When only 2 countries took pictures from space (only one did it really well); now Google lets anyone assess what Kim is doing with missiles
- Bottom line: The Power-down/Power-out world has enriched our existence but also empowered those who would do us harm
 - Hayden remembers a time when he didn’t have to lose sleep over religious fanatics living in caves in the Hindu Kush, but now he does
 - Now we live under threats whose severity used to only to be associated with malevolent state powers
 - Today threats come from sub-state actors, gangs, even individuals
- Can compare this age with the last great age of globalization 500 years ago during the great age of the sailing ship and can see the parallels
 - Sailing ships brought together societies that had been developing separately with no knowledge of each other
 - Sailing ships linked these societies together creating the greatest explosion in human learning, commerce, and exploration seen up to that point
 - But ships also brought on global slave trade, global piracy, and global epidemics – all with connectivity of 12 knots an hour
- Today’s empowerment and connectivity of non-state actors have brought
 - Terrorism
 - Transnational Crime
 - Cyber attacks
- Hayden reminded the audience that all the national security structures were hardwired in 1947 to respond to nation state threats
 - Arguments about the national security establishment that have gone on in the last 15 years are about taking a structure designed for one thing and making it do something else
 - Includes all the discussions about surveillance, targeted killings, renditions, detentions, etc.
 - There has been progress on how to respond to terror but not all is decided
 - Hayden noted the lashes he incurred as the director of NSA and CIA in the public debates about the 3-letter organizations and how they do things

- While not all is decided on the terror response, it is way ahead of decisions about how to handle threats from the web – the largest ungoverned space in history

Tectonic Two: Things That Seemed Permanent Are Proving Not to Be

- A more recent concern and more slowly developing
- Many people in the Rethinking audience work at trying to solve polynomial international security questions and should be working with constants and variables as one would in algebra
 - Problem: What was thought to be a constant now turns out to be a variable
- Example: Feb 2016 Republican members of the House and Senate held their annual retreat to hammer out “common Republican positions”
 - Hayden was on a panel with other distinguished experts in international security but things got rather rowdy with so many differing opinions
 - Bob Kagan (Brookings) stated that what is happening is the melting down of the post WWII / American liberal / Bretton Woods / IMF / World Bank world order
 - The world it was established for is fundamentally changing
 - Must remember that the US deserves credit for creating and maintaining this world for the last 75 years
 - Although there were problems, it was the healthiest, most long-lived, best educated, most peaceful 75 years in history
 - On reflection, Hayden realized that we are now seeing the melting down of the post-WWI world order, too
 - What was taught for decades as *The Map* can now be seen as only *a map*
 - Many countries no longer exist (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, USSR, etc.)
 - Bottom line: Used to see countries as constants, but in this world countries are variables
 - Iraq no longer exists and isn’t coming back
 - Only effective force fighting for a unified Iraq now is the US military
 - Similar situations in Syria and Libya and perhaps Lebanon
 - Even 18 months ago could see that a unified Syria was long gone
 - Getting rid of Assad would be a good thing but it won’t solve the problem because Syria isn’t there
 - See what happened to Bosnia and Herzegovina – now only entities, not countries
 - Seeing fog surround the Treaty of Westphalia’s “settled” concepts for the West
 - Ended the last great war of religion (1648) by dividing the secular from the sacred, coercive power of the state from concepts of theology
 - Agreed such concepts as the meanings of citizenship / state / government
 - While not perfect, concept last 350 years and exported to rest of world
 - When possible, its proponents divided the world up into secular nation states
- Although the concepts of Westphalia were taken as a given, they may not have been fully accepted by everyone everywhere
 - ISIS offers an alternative theory – not secular, but an Islamic state or caliphate
 - Can find very close parallels between the struggles that Christians had internally in the 17th century and those now going on in Islam
 - Same questions of secular / sacred / state / private conscience / coercive power
 - Can’t be so arrogant to assume that this great monotheism will end up with the same resolution as our great monotheism
 - Must recognize that the civil wars over these questions (when approximately 25% of Europe’s population died) were about as bad as what is going on in Islam today

- Bottom line: Today's problems are far less about a war *between* civilizations as they are about a war *within* a great civilization – Islam

Tectonic Three: States That Are Brittle, Ambitious...and Nuclear

Russia: Trending Nuclear (again) – Not a resurgent but revanchist power

- As seen with:
 - Exercises blending nuclear and conventional weapons use
 - Military doctrine documents consider nuclear first use
 - Investment in nuclear modernization in a way that will force the US to also spend a lot of money on its nuclear forces
 - Other things that Russia is doing: hackers, the Crimea incursion, threats to the Baltic states, flaunting what military power they have in air/sea/space, interfering with elections
- Why the Russians are doing what they are doing relates to the growing limitations on Russia power, including:
 - Running out of entrepreneurship, and already out of democracy
 - They still have oil and gas but at \$47/bbl they might as well be out of it and can't expect the situation to improve much in the future
 - If prices rise too much, the US can simply open valves and world prices will drop
 - It is "A gift from God" that the US is now a net exporter of gas/oil
 - They are also running out of Russians because of their dramatically declining population
 - Mostly because of the high death rate which highlights societal problems
 - Primary causes of death for Russian males: violence, traffic accidents and substance abuse
 - Putin's first social contract told the Russian people that he would be autocratic, but they would be rich
 - When Putin returned after the Medvedev interim he faced <\$50/bbl oil and sanctions, so told the people that he will still be autocratic, but they will be proud
 - Plans to redress historic Russian grievances
 - Putin is basically a Soviet nationalist; wants to be accepted as the Soviets were
- Putin's actions can be explained with a Russian-flavored story
 - Putin is sitting in a kiddy chair at the kiddy table but longs to be over with the big people and he has no way to make his chair any bigger
 - At night, he repeatedly sneaks into the dining room and cuts off a half inch of the big peoples' chair legs
 - He believes that by doing this a little bit at a time, he will eventually be able to slide his chair over where it will look like it fits nicely with all the others
- Bottom line: Putin uses this method in his assaults on the EU, NATO, as well as his support of BREXIT, and his interference in the US elections
 - Putin is trying to drag others down to a level where he looks more relevant

Nuclear State Concerns

- **Iran:** Permanent nuclear threshold state
 - General Hayden noted that he *probably* would have voted no on the Iran Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action deal but he is also *not* in favor of ripping it up
 - *If it works*, in 10-12 years Iran will be an industrial strength nuclear nation never more than 3 weeks away from enough fissile material to build a nuclear weapon
- **Pakistan:** Route to the Jihadist bomb?
 - The Fund for Peace rates all 171 countries on their fragility each year by studying the news, and using other in depth research methods

- The US is in category 2 (stable), not 1, because it has low scores in 2 of the 12 categories used to rank countries' stability: wealth distribution and political processes
 - In cat 1: Finns, Swedes, Norwegians, Canadians – but US is the first continental power to show up on the cat 2 list
 - Pakistan is at the other end of the list (unstable) ranking 17th out of 171 countries
- Pakistan also has 120 nuclear weapons and is making them faster than any other country
- **North Korea: Bombs, Missiles, and Pathologies**
 - The US intelligence community for over a decade has believed that NK would never give up its nuclear weapons
 - Everyone can do their own calculations about what the US may or may not demand to get to a new stage with Kim Jong-un

Tectonic Four: The Rise of China

- One of the more traditional tectonic shifts
- China is not an enemy of the US and has no reason to be
 - Always competitive and occasionally confrontational
 - Never any need to get to the level of conflict
- Hayden and his colleagues spend more time worrying about Chinese failure than about Chinese success or Chinese weaknesses rather than Chinese strengths
- China has a lot of cracks in the Chinese economic miracle
 - Will be the first industrialized nation to get old before it gets rich
 - US is artificially young because of immigration and other factors
 - Environmental catastrophes are possibilities
 - Extremely unequal distribution of wealth
- Both Trump and Kim are probably driving Beijing crazy
 - China primarily wants an expanded area of influence
 - Kim's actions are just pulling US power back into the region with the enthusiastic support of the entire neighborhood – totally contrary to Chinese interests
- The legitimacy of the Communist Party is also a weakness for China
 - Consider Xi Jinping – Who made him emperor?
 - Xi is head of the Party but he has nothing to do with Marx, Engels, or even Mao
 - Power is totally related to the climbing Chinese GDP over the last 30 years, but the figures probably aren't as high as the officials proclaim
 - Everyone agrees that GDP will be falling due to the middle-income trap when China will not be able to sustain the growth seen in the recent past
 - China's social contract looks much like that of Russia: We'll be autocratic, but you'll be rich
 - When can't deliver on rich, then almost automatically have to deliver on pride
- Bottom line: Can see these efforts towards bolstering national pride in China's aggressive acts in international waters, in anti-Western protests, etc.
- Recommendation: [Graham Allison](#)'s recent book, *Destined for War*, based on his *Atlantic* article, "The Thucydides Trap"
 - A historic examination of a status quo power (the US) and an emerging power (China)
 - Looks all the way back to the Peloponnesian War when the Spartans had to put up with uppity new people from Athens
 - Brings the history forward to look at 17 examples in the modern era of status quo vs emerging power conflicts
 - From Prince Henry versus Ferdinand and Isabella in the 15th century
 - To how Britain and France handled a unified Germany in the late 20th century
 - In 13 of the 17 examples the methodology to rebalance the equilibrium is global war

- *Destined for War* hones in on this concept
 - Hayden calls this the pass-fail geo-strategic task of the 21st century
 - If we get this right, we should be OK
 - If we get this wrong, nothing else will probably matter
- Must remember: China is not an enemy

Tectonic Five (Sort of): The United States – the Most Disruptive Force on the Planet

- If the Seminar had been given outside of Paris and Hayden had been the former head of the French equivalent of the CIA, the US as a *tectonique* would have been at the top of the list
- What is going on in the US is more disrupting than any other single cause in today's geopolitics
- As an intel guy Hayden said he usually plays Red, but when he has to play Blue he turns to [Walter Russel Mead](#)'s description of the US presidents, who fall into one of four boxes
 - Hamiltonian – America's first Treasury Secretary, Washington aide de camp
 - America can't be free unless America is prosperous
 - America can't be prosperous unless America is strong
 - Mitt Romney would have been a Hamiltonian since he used the same words in the second debate
 - Wilsonian – American idealism (the war to end all wars, the war to make the world safe for democracy)
 - Repackaged the 19th century concept of manifest destiny with export version
 - US has at least some responsibility to share (occasionally impose) these values
 - Jeffersonian – inward turning despite fighting a war in N. Africa and buying Louisiana
 - Wanted to build shining city on the hill by putting all energies into building a thriving society here
 - In response to an undeclared naval war, he had Congress pass laws that allowed him to order US merchantmen not to sail, thereby "fixing" the problem
 - Jacksonian – First democrat in the White House spelled either with a little or big D
 - "Man of the people," war hero, Indian fighter
 - Mead describes Jacksonian foreign policy views as "sort of like the people who watch Fox News"
 - Hayden's even more succinct description uses the Robert De Niro line from *Taxi Driver*: "You talkin' to Me?"
- Recent Presidential Types
 - Hayden worked mostly for George W. Bush, a Wilsonian with an overlay of Jackson ("Bring it on" in response to questions about problems in Afghanistan – pure Jackson)
 - Obama was equally Wilsonian (Cairo speech, call for world without nuclear weapons) but with a big dose of Jefferson (tide of war turning so time for nation building at home)
 - The longer he was in office, the more the inner Jefferson came out
 - Many saw Obama as indecisive – probably caused by the inner Jefferson struggling with the inner Wilson
 - Their problem: Should go do something, but don't really want to do *that*
- Where does President Trump fit?
 - Mead calls him a Jacksonian in foreign policy: "nationalist, populist, suspicious of the outside world and willing to use force to beat it back"
 - Concept is: "I won't go there but don't make me mad, because you aren't going to like it"
 - Also a little unconstrained – not Trumpism, really Jacksonian
 - Jackson even did ethnic cleansing in Florida
 - Deep strain of Jackson in the person of Donald Trump – "Now you've made me mad; now watch"

- In the Jacksonian view America is identified by blood, soil, and shared history
 - More blood and soil than Madison’s “We, the people”
 - Americanness as shared identity rather than Americanness defined by a concept
- However, Trump created his Administration without any Jacksonians
 - Mostly a bunch of American internationalists – a mixture of Hamiltonians and Wilsonians
 - Kagan’s 75 years of peace was dominated by American internationalists
 - Only struggle was between the Wilsonian internationalists and the Hamiltonian internationalists (ideals vs. self interest)
 - During confirmation hearings nominees all said things contrary to the Jacksonian approach and contrary to what President Trump had said
 - Example: Secretary Mattis said “If we didn’t have a NATO, we would have to build one”
 - Result: Jacksonian president with American internationalists in all the power seats
 - Those who didn’t need confirmation were primarily the family and friends and they generally tend toward Jacksonian views of the world
 - People like Bannon, Gurka, and maybe Steve Miller lean toward the clash of civilizations view of the world
- Problem for the permanent government (or in Hayden’s words the expertise governed by the rule of law): To what degree can these institutions influence family/friends decisions?
- Bottom line: The US is considered disruptive because the rest of world knows little of these views/concepts and understands them less so they say:
 - We understand that the American liberal world order 1.0 is gone
 - But where are you going with the 2.0 version?
 - What will be your role?
 - How much of a role will you take in creating and sustaining 2.0?
 - This is a global question for which the US is having trouble finding an answer

Conclusion

General Hayden summarized his talk with

- A quote from David Rothkopf’s *National Insecurity*: We have gone “in twenty years from a bipolar world to a bipolar superpower.”
- An “optimistic” summary slide stating: “Buckle up. It’s going to be a tough century” with pictures of jihadists, drones, overloaded refugee boats, aggressive Russians, North Korean missiles, and cyber hackers

QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

Re: Proliferation of Remotely Piloted Vehicles (RPVs) and Other Technological Advances

- Proliferation of technologies even to non-state actors has a certain inevitability
- As with the discussions about unbreakable encryption, someone will call for Congress to pass a law against the spread of our advancing technology, but that won’t stop it
 - RPVs are basically simple technology, not rocket science
 - US may have slightly accelerated the development of globally available weapons platforms because of the way they were used
 - Not necessarily a decisive thing
 - The US knew that its monopoly would be transient
- The US understood that it was breaking new trail and that others would follow fairly rapidly

- If the US does something, everyone else will say it is legitimate, so must be careful how it is used – not just for intrinsically moral, ethical, or legal aspects of the moment
- By way it used RPVs the US legitimated the use of targeted killings outside a conflict zone
 - The US knew there would be 2nd/3rd order effects and would at times accept them because the demands of the first order effects (i.e., these people want to kill us)
- Can only hope that the way RPVs will be used won't make things any worse than they would otherwise be

Re: The US Capability to Think and Act Strategically

- Hayden is a bit worried about US intelligence but not blaming anyone for this
 - Being at war with troops in harms' way for 16 years, focuses the mind: Do what is needed for this so don't go out and do other things
- The US has never been more intense and focused on the present, more operational, more tactical than it is today
 - While being awesome at this, it may be at the expense of broader things
- Examples of the problem:
 - Arab Awakening: Although hard to predict, President Obama was legitimately and understandably disappointed in what intelligence could tell him about what was going on
 - Must be aware that the CIA has never looked more like the OSS than it does today
 - But CIA is really the nation's espionage service and it should be handling those broader things that need doing
- One more example of limitations of the intense present focus: When Hayden was CIA Director he received an urgent call in 2008 about the Russian invasion of Georgia
 - The president of Georgia called the White House desperately wanting to know if the Russian tanks were on the way to Tbilisi endangering him and his government
 - CIA wanted to track the direction and progress of the tanks, but it couldn't be done using national technical means
 - Systems had been tuned so much toward capturing data from low-powered cell phones in terrorist havens, that the capability to track Russian tanks had been lost
 - Instead CIA contacted all case officers in the region to take cell phones and cars to go out looking for the tanks phoning in with the details of any they saw
- Bottom line: These problems were nobody's fault – it was just a matter of the pace of current operational necessities causing the community to lose focus on broader issues

Re: North Korea

- At least two years ago Hayden was telling civilian audiences that N. Korea could be expected to have nuclear-tipped ICBMs shortly and that was considered an acceptable risk
 - The Trump Administration understands this and is expanding the US definition of acceptable risk
 - It is the US that is stirring the pot
- Today, must understand that China doesn't want to change anything and N. Korea is on its development arc and knows where it is going
 - The only thing that is different is the US, which is trying to ramp up the pressure by:
 - Deploying THAAD in Korea (under an Obama decision)
 - Occasionally sending a carrier battle group up and down N. Korea's eastern coast
 - Doing some chest thumping
 - Developing a few meaningful sanctions
 - Trying to increase N. Korea's diplomatic isolation
 - The audience is China, not N. Korea – N. Korea is already committed to its path
 - Is it possible to get China more involved by making the situation less stable?

- The plan is coherent but perhaps not one that Hayden would choose
 - Has to be done very carefully
 - Sometimes the US rhetoric isn't careful
- Using this plan, the US must employ all the non-kinetic options and consider which kinetic options it could use and recognize N. Korea's development arc as unacceptable
- Need something that is so dangerous that it pushes China into action, but not so bad that it provokes a N. Korean action including kinetic options as ranked below
 - Lowest possible action: boarding and searching at sea since it is only done against one or two at any given time
 - Next is general blockade of shipping
 - Shooting down a missile in flight would be next but hard to do and could make things worse if you miss
 - Next is destroying a missile on the launch pad
 - Problem: Although this list contains about all the possible options, no one of them would probably work to push China, but any of them could provoke N. Korea
- Realistic military planning is now in this kinetic layer of options, all of which will require presidential decisions
- The off-ramp for any of these options requires sitting down with the N. Koreans
 - There is no resolution without negotiations
 - But the N. Koreans aren't about to give up their nuclear weapons
- The best outcome the US could hope for involves:
 - Capping the nuclear missile program where it is now, maybe with a slight roll back, maybe more monitoring, maybe a more transparent program, etc.
 - Looking back at Tectonic #5: Is the US government willing to accept something like this?
 - Answer: Unknown

Re: Future of Iraq, Syria, Kurds, etc.

- There is historic momentum toward:
 - Not states, only entities and *de facto* not *de jure* borders
 - A rump Syria formed around a Homs, Aleppo, Damascus axis
 - Beginning to look a little bigger than a few months ago because recent Russian interventions have allowed some pushing of borders
 - Includes the formation of an Alawi-stan
 - Already essentially have a Shia-stan
 - Not a satellite of the Iranians but must take them into account as it often the case with small states that have big neighbors
 - It is Arab, not Persian
 - Already have Kurdistan – but how many?
 - Autonomous Kurdish Region (outcome of its referendum TBD) in Iraq, plus Syrian Kurds, etc.
- Missing piece is a Sunni-stan we can live with
 - US military action in the region over the last 3 years was designed to build a Sunni-stan that both the US and the Sunnis could live with
- Kurdistan referendum is important but not likely to be decisive
 - Must remember to not overreact and not to believe selves to be over-empowered
 - Will be irritating but need to let it ride for a little bit

Re: China's Role with N. Korea

- Fundamentally, China can do more, but what they can do would not be definitive
 - China can't just flip a switch and Kim gives up his missiles and nuclear ambitions

- Situation is bad for China, too
 - The US is there and everyone else likes it
 - The region is being re-nuclearized (e.g., talking of putting nuclear weapons back in Kunshan but that probably won't happen)
 - China most upset with THAAD deployment in Korea and will be more upset when Japan gets it
- The longer the current tense situation continues, the worse it is for China
- China's problem: How to put pressure on N. Korea without cracking the egg
 - If it cracks, there will be yolk all over Manchuria
- All major powers have a nuclear client to whom they give a hall pass
 - The Russians gave a hall pass to the Iranian nuclear program
 - The Chinese gave a hall pass to the N. Korean nuclear program
 - The US gave a hall pass to the Pakistanis
 - In these relationships, each major power has some other concerns that were important
- Bottom line: The nuclear logic train may not be as compelling as it appears to be from the outside

Re: Response to the Arab Awakening and the Tyranny of Expertise

- The US could not have done a whole lot even if it had had a better understanding of the situation
- Might have been useful to prepare policy-makers on the scenario branches and sequels that might follow
- Although not in government at the time, Hayden had heard that after the self-immolation in Tunisia, things would be bad for a while, but its government would survive
 - President Ali had handled such events in the past and knew how to handle them
- If that was a true view in the community, could call it the *tyranny of expertise*
 - Experts had been looking at something for such a long time that they may have been trapped into an argument of continuity
 - Instead, they should have been exploring for signs of discontinuity
 - Obviously, intel community's ability to appreciate what was happening was weak, given that 5 weeks after the "don't worry" recommendation, a million people were at a protest
- Besides the problems of tactical over-focus, the intel community might tend to think of itself as the teller of secrets as opposed to being the teller of the story whose plot we have to steal
 - Hayden began to see this in his last 2 years at CIA and has developed more of an appreciation of the concept since then
 - Problem: There was nothing in a North African desk drawer that an agent could have stolen that would have helped predict one million protesters in the aftermath of the self-immolation in Tunisia
 - Solution: Only way to predict such things would be not stealing something but having the ability to stand back from the situation and understand the broad sweep of the story
- Hayden noted he as seen more evidence of this ability to stand back and look at the broad historic sweep outside the American intel community than inside it
- If he returned to government (which he will not), Hayden would try to bring together essential espionage and analysis with a more comprehensive appreciation of global events from the broader society's view point
 - A provocative view which may or may not be true: American business knows more about China than does American intelligence

Re: Climate Change and the Tectonic Shifts

- Generally, could take it into account but doesn't largely because it wasn't something normally addressed in the intel community
 - At CIA worked for a president (Bush 43) who didn't ask questions about climate change

- When Leon Panetta took over, his president (Obama) did ask such questions and so CIA opened a small, short-lived center to look at it
- Intel usually handles such situations by saying: Tell us what scientific theory interests you and we'll tell you what the geo-strategic implications may be
 - Intel doesn't get into predicting specifics like rainfall in the Sahel in 10 years
 - Intel takes whichever scientific theory a policy-maker believes is most accurate and will play it out with regard to the geo-strategic threat scenarios
- Intel doesn't get into the debate of whether or not climate change is man-made and it doesn't care, but it sees climate changes and does care about their geo-strategic implications
- **Additional recommendation:** See the 2012 unclassified National Intelligence Estimate on global water and rivers, [Global Water Security](#)
 - Pure intel document based on observations in 10 major watersheds of the world
 - Discussed what the shortage of water would mean for stability in these regions (none in Western Hemisphere)
 - Addressed not climate change per se but the man-made effects on water availability, which had strategic implications

Re: Unprecedented Migration and the Weakening of Westphalian-Style States

- Intel community is very concerned about mass migration, no matter whether it caused by climate change, political developments, or violence from a conflict
- In talking to Obama Administration officials, Hayden understood the logic of their views but didn't necessarily agree with them, such as
 - Syria was a big deal, but not a huge deal, certainly had humanitarian issues, but it was not a threat to the vital interests of the US
- However, the destabilization of Europe does threaten the vital interests of the US
 - Connecting the dots: Syria's problems can cause destabilization of Europe and that does involve a major US interest
- Bottom line: The intelligence community needs to help policy-makers "look around corners," which is something that policy-makers often don't want to do
 - Using Jeffersonian thinking, policy-makers wouldn't want to get involved in Syria's civil war
 - Intel has a role to play here by identifying the 2nd- and 3rd-order effects that may be around the corner
- Must recognize that things have changed from the days when we only cared about nation states and hard power
 - Now have questions that ignore state boundaries
 - For today's problems, heat, blast, and fragmentation are often not useful responses

Re: Definitions of Terrorism

- Definition used by CIA: Violence against the innocent for political effect
 - It doesn't matter what the cause the person is fighting for, any violence against the innocent should be equally condemned
- The US definitely needs lots of friends to fight terrorism
- Scary: the downplaying of alliances in Trump's current Jacksonian approach
- Alliances are not a burden for the US, but rather a strategic advantage
 - For comparison, list all the friends of China or Russia who are important in the world
 - It is a wonderful strategic advantage that the US has so many like-minded allies with whom it can cooperate
- In his inaugural address, President Trump complained about the poor state of the military because of all the money spent on the militaries of other countries, but:

- The *poor state* of the military is probably badly overstated
- Not even worth going into the statement about how much is spent on other militaries
- In a room of largely internationalists, Hayden expected he would find strong support for the alliance structure
- During his 31 months as Director, CIA, Hayden visited 50 countries and each one was doing something important for themselves and for the US
 - All had much smaller intelligence services; CIA had more lawyers than some had in their intelligence services
 - More than 50 came to see him at CIA
 - All had something to contribute and he always had time for them because the exchanges were mutually beneficial
 - While CIA was global, technologically powerful, and well-resourced, the others were local, focused, and culturally and linguistically agile
 - The others might learn things without getting much meaning until they plugged into CIA's global view
 - CIA could not tell the relevance of its global view in their specific circumstances without their partnership
- May have done too good a job of building partnerships in at least one situation
 - Possibility: Egypt's intel chief was such an excellent asset that the CIA did not want to disrupt things by developing too many sources about the Muslim Brotherhood
 - Feared upsetting and losing him and also upsetting his boss, Hosni Mubarak

Re: Intelligence and the Maritime Global Commons

- Territorial waters and lines around territorial waters involve legal and international policy issues rather than intel
 - Intel can provide talking points and background for conversations and negotiations
- Looking at the big picture, the US is a maritime power and its policies are absolutely driven by freedom of navigation concerns
- South China Sea is very important
 - China sees it as a vital interest because they see the SCS as theirs for various reasons
 - The US sees its vital interest as the concept of freedom of navigation
 - The intel contribution may be identifying that neither side will be able to back down, and that could cause flash points

Re: The Accelerating Rate of Change in the World

- In a parallel phenomenon, policy-makers don't have time to digest and reflect
 - The phone is ringing, CNN is on, Congress is threatening investigations, etc.
 - Must step back to see what is going on even though there is an inclination toward action
- By nature, President Obama wanted to push back and that was probably a plus but was inclined to reflection almost to a fault
- By nature, President Trump is just the opposite and is inclined to action, not reflection, almost to a fault
- Can be interesting for intel briefers who must understand their clients
 - Would probably brief an event differently to President Obama than to President Trump
 - Would be best to do it by cutting across the grain if possible
 - With a little more urgency to President Obama to try and get him to act
 - With a historical narrative to President Trump to try and get him to understand the background of a situation and force reflection prior to action
- Trump's response to the Syrian use of chemical weapons
 - President Trump asked Director, CIA if Syria had really done it

- Director, CIA investigated and assured Trump that they had
- Trump ordered the cruise missile strikes on a Syrian airbase— a correct application of American power
- However, the move was absolutely anti-Jacksonian – used US military power for the good of an international norm whose violation had no effect on the US
- Trump didn't ask: Why do you think he did it? What does this mean? What are the third and fourth moves coming up?
- Recommendations for briefers
 - Try to pull a President Trump more into the broader narrative of the situation so that he understands the complexity of what he is facing
 - Try to impress on a President Obama with clarity why what you are telling him is close to actionable information
 - Note: This is not politicizing intel, nor is it cooking the books, nor is it driving a policy-maker to a preferred conclusion
 - It is understanding how the First Client learns and then organizing the presentation of the available information

Re: Quantum Computing

- As former Director, NSA, General Hayden noted that he was not a technician but has been observing the drive toward quantum computing since taking that job in 1999
 - Quantum computing has always been only 2 or 3 miracles away ever since
 - However, there has been progress
- When it arrives, it will change equations and be a disruptive element
- As with climate change, intel would look to see what the implications would be of a change
- With quantum computing, intel should be looking to see what the implications will be for both the offense and the defense side
 - In which ways? At what times?
 - In global competitions, developments may improve things for one side and then the other
- Hayden felt more confident discussing what the strategic implications of a successful quantum computer would be
 - Doesn't have an answer yet
 - Expect multiple effects but can't yet tell which will be decisive
 - Went through the same sort of considerations with air power
 - Some experts very early on said it would be decisive and eventually it was
 - However, miscalculating its impact early was very expensive