Introduction

GEN Hayden stated that he agreed with President Obama's recent response to a question about whether things in the world are really getting worse. The President said that one reason why people feel it is so is because we are now all so connected and we constantly hear details about what is happening in the world. However, General Hayden wanted to go beyond that and share his belief that there are a lot of bad things happening in the world.

- May not be as bad as during the Cold War when the threat was identifiable, singular, predictable, and existential
- For a security conscious audience such as the Rethinking Seminar participants, there is no need to detail today's threats

Tectonic Shift

There are 3 to 4 fundamental plate movements going on in global geopolitics

- May be hard to follow what is going on in day-to-day events
- But these Tectonic shifts are predictable
- To get a better context for today's threats look at these tectonic shifts individually

Tectonic #1: Power of States and the Nature of Power

Former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft (Ford and Bush 41 Administrations) wrote an article in 2012 for the Atlantic Council and subsequently discussed with Hayden

- Scowcroft noted that while on the NSC he worried about nation states and what they might do to harm US interests
  - Those were hard power issues involved moving masses of men and metal
  - If the US liked you, it promised men and metal; if not, it was the threat of the US moving around its men and metal
• The Ford Administration served at the height of the Industrial Age; Bush 41 near the end
  o Most of what was going on would primarily help nation-states
  o The Republican Party’s first president, Lincoln, was known for party platforms on slavery, but there were also planks on national infrastructure
    ▪ Republicans had power for the later part of the 19th century by supporting the building of important infrastructure
    ▪ During this period the government made *sweetheart* deals that allowed Rockefeller, Carnegie and Vanderbilt, and oil, steel and the railroads, etc. to prosper
    ▪ Building this infrastructure helped make the US the premier global industrial power by the beginning of the 1900s
• By comparison, Communism was a bad economic theory and an even worse governance theory
  o Was good for industrializing a large backward agricultural country quickly
  o Did it by consolidating all power in the nation-state
• It used to be so hard to make a phone call that we needed to have big government involved to ensure that the system worked
  o Today, we don’t want the government involved in getting us our email
• We are now in a post-industrial age, with a global interconnected web leading to a highly integrated world with supply chains that reach thousands of miles
  o Things that previously were done only by nation-states are now accomplishable by sub-state actors, gangs, groups and even individuals
  o Example: We once had to go to a bank building and talk to a person to get money and now we don’t
  o Power has been pushed down to the people and it has been wonderful
• Problem: the interconnected world has jammed together the weak and the strong in ways they never were before
  o Sub-state actors now can do bad things that only nation-states could accomplish before
  o There was a time when we didn’t lose sleep over a religious fanatic living in a cave in the Hindu Kush
• What we worry about today are mostly the by-products of state weakness or state failures
  o Terrorism, trans-national crime, cyber attacks all could be state-sponsored
  o What is new is that all can be done by non-state actors
• Islamic terrorist strongholds show up where governments are weak or don’t exist as is clear in this *Economist* map of Al-Qaeda & affiliates
Al-Qaeda, Affiliates and Fellow Travelers (Economist, Sept 2013)

- For transnational crime in North America, think Mexico, a weak state that can’t control much of its territory
  - There are threats to the US from the south but they do not involve any great desire to take back Arizona
- Cyber presents the largest ungoverned universe ever
  - No rules or accepted international practices there
  - Example: Estonia 2007 wanted to move a Soviet hero statue out of the center of Tallinn, the capital
    - Patriotic Russian hackers attacked and collapsed Estonia’s internet system
      - Was a big problem for Estonia, a highly wired state which even hosts NATO’s Cyber Center of Excellence
    - President of Estonia (raised in New Jersey) talks cyber issues
      - Noted that the world does not yet have cyber social contracts
      - Described the situation as “pure Hobbes,” referring to the philosopher who called life nasty, mean, brutish and short
  - Problem for the US: all the security establishments were set up around 1947 and are hard-wired to protect us from the behaviors of hostile state power
    - Today most security problems are not coming from states
    - Democratic states, especially the transparent US, struggle to make structures designed for fighting states ready to face non-state threats
    - Both Obama and Bush 43 have said the US is at war with al-Qaeda
• In a war the concept has been to close, engage and destroy, the enemy
• It was suggested that the US capture, not kill these enemies
  o Have captured enemies before: in WWII the US housed hundreds of thousands of prisoners
  o Problem today: small number of enemy combatants at Gitmo
• But, if we don’t want to capture or kill them, at least we must find out what they are doing by intercepting their communications
  o Has been done before (e.g., Enigma, Bletchley, etc.)
  o Problem: Snowden revealed what can and is being done
• Bottom line on Tectonic #1: There is an entirely new vector of threat and institutions are trying to play catch-up to deal with these threats

Tectonic #2: Don’t Get Used to Maps of the World
• In living memory, maps even in Europe have changed dramatically
• Warning: Don’t expect the current maps to remain the same
• Foundational internationally-agreed treaties that established the modern state system have been eroding at a rapid rate
  o Treaty of Westphalia, 1648, established: supremacy of the nation-state; i.e., where you lived determined your citizenship; that borders were inviolable
At the end of the Cold War

- These concepts have generally prevailed, but Putin is now opposing them
  - Claims mother language and culture/ideology is most important, not your residence
  - Nothing would be more destructive to the nation-state system if he gets away with this
- Treaty of Versailles-era decisions (post WWI) on borders have been eroding
  - Czechoslovakia is divided; Yugoslavia had a particularly ugly break-up
  - It appears as though many people just weren't in the right chairs when the music stopped for the former Soviet Union
  - Putin may be hostile, but may also have some valid points regarding Crimea
    - Historically it was a Russian area;
    - From it came the roots of the Orthodox church
    - Khrushchev gave it to Ukraine in the 1950s when the area really didn't matter – until the USSR broke up
Has a heavily Russian ethnic population – largely Russian military retirees (Think Tampa, FL as an equivalent)

- Syria, Iran, Iraq and Kuwait were created for the convenience of Europeans with indifference toward historic, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences
  - Bottom line: That these borders have lasted nearly 100 years does not mean that they are permanent

**Don’t count on this map remaining the same**

- Borders established in the Mid East and elsewhere were maintained first by European imperial power
  - Then the Cold War froze everything in place with all players being the clients of one side or the other, neither of which wanted changes
  - Most recently autocratic governments kept them in place for their own reasons
- Bottom line: Now many of the factors that have been holding these boarders in place are mostly gone and there has been 100 years of “bottle shaking”, i.e., the area is exploding or about to explode.
- In comparison to the Mid East, the US has fairly elastic governmental institutions that for the most part work
  - The US may have issues (all countries have some issues) but differences are worked out within US institutions
Nothing equivalent exists in the Mid East with conflicts such as Shia vs Sunni, religious extremists vs secularists, autocrats vs democrats, etc.

- Bottom line on Tectonic #2: Even if St. Francis replaced the 3 most worrisome leaders, there would still be trouble in the Mid East
  - Putin is definitely making things worse with his evil ways
  - Bashar al-Assad of Syria is probably more weak than evil
  - Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, leader of ISIL, is truly evil

- Predictions: The Mid East will remain an unsettled area
  - Iraq and Syria aren’t coming back as countries as they were
  - Policy-makers may need to come up with some form of soft-landing for the new geo-political structure that will replace Iraq and Syria as we knew them
  - Iraq may maintain a single seat in the UN General Assembly, but problems will remain based on historic precedence
    - What we call Iraq was divided into 3 administrative districts in the Ottoman Empire governed from Mosul, Baghdad, and Basra
    - Google *Iraq Ottoman Map*

**Tectonic #3: The Rise of China**

- Hayden noted that when talking to outside-the-beltway audiences he always first explains that China is not an enemy of the US
  - China has no good reason to be an enemy of the US
  - There are logical, non-heroic policy choices that will keep the US/China relationship competitive and occasionally hostile but not conflictual

- We should be worried about China’s weaknesses and problems as well as its strengths

- Problems and weaknesses include:
  - Demographic pyramid issues, i.e. few young people supporting many old people
  - Mal-distribution of wealth between coastal and inland areas
    - Along the coast China is modern; inland it is still China as it was 300 years ago
  - Environmental disasters
    - Example: In a recent estimate pollution costs China 11% of its GDP
  - Leadership questions
    - An irreverent question: China’s Xi Ping – Who died and made him emperor?
    - More substantive: What is the legitimacy of Chinese Communist Party rule?
      - Not the failed Marxist philosophy (or Engels or even Mao)
      - Not the (reported) 10% growth in GDP which is falling now

- It would be easier to predict the future if China were more ideological, but it, too, will have problems dealing with the growth of its middle class, the largest in history
  - Also, fastest growing in history but its growth is probably not sustainable
Could say that China’s Communist Party’s legitimacy was based on the deeply imbedded Confucian system of merit (moral superiority, intellectual superiority, etc.)
  - Problem: There are major corruption issues as all levels of government

Bottom line: Playing the nationalism card may be the only way that the Communist Party can claim legitimacy and remain in power
  - May force them to do dangerous things including confronting US aircraft or other military forces
  - China now using the *Nine-Dash Line* map (possibly found in old trunk by Chinese officials) to say “That’s where we were and we want to be there now”
    - China wants to treat this salt water area the way the US treats its fresh water Great Lakes

*The Nine-Dash Line*

- Dr. Graham Allison researched how a status quo power (now the US) accommodated an emerging power (now China) throughout history
  - Went all the way back to relations between the Spartans and Athenians
  - Research showed that in 2 out of 3 of the dozen cases studied, a global (in their own terms) war brought the geo-political situation to its next steady state
    - This bears careful watching
Complication this time: China does not see itself as a rising power; rather it sees itself as being restored to its rightful place on the world stage

A promising point in the current situation: The economies of the two powers are more tightly integrated than in any previous example

US intelligence, defense, and diplomatic communities need to up their game
- Currently, the US business community has the best insights on and understanding of situations in China
- The US government should be taking advantage of these insights

**Tectonic #4: The United States**

- If this seminar were being done with former French officials speaking to a French audience, the first Tectonic discussed would be about what future moves the US might make
  - US may not want to be exceptional but most of the world thinks we are
  - US is so big and enriched with not only financial but also cultural and technical influence, that it has to be considered first
- Walter Russell Meade (Bard College Professor and Editor-at-Large of *The American Interest* magazine), puts US presidents in four baskets related to their foreign security policy approaches
  - *Hamiltonian* – America can't be free unless America is prosperous and America can't be prosperous unless it is strong
    - Therefore, America must go do things in the world
    - Romney would have fit here (made similar statement in his debate)
  - *Wilsonian* – basically idealistic with efforts for “making the world safe for democracy,” the League of Nations, etc.
    - Extrapolated 19th century *Manifest Destiny* to a global mission
  - *Jeffersonian* – did not want to play on the world stage and basically was turned inward
    - An undeclared naval war between France and Britain was being fought in US waters – both grabbed US sailors and ships for own use
    - In response Jefferson had a law passed allowing him to order US ships to remain in port (the unfortunately-named Non-Intercourse Act)
  - *Jacksonian* – national hero, the first democrat and Democrat president
    - Today it would be the people who watch Fox News
    - Showing the attitude of “You talkin' to me?"
- Hayden participated in and observed Oval Office meetings in the Bush 43 Administration
  - Noted then that Bush was the most Wilsonian president since Wilson
    - But Bush also had a touch of Jacksonian outlook saying “Bring it on!”
  - Obama is also Wilsonian as seen in his Prague no-nuclear-weapons speech
    - But also Jeffersonian – many people voted for him believing he was essentially a non interventionist
      - Believed it was time to do some nation-building at home
    - There have been a lot of political debates over the last six years
      - Obama's inner Wilson is fighting with his inner Jefferson
- People around the world interested in security carefully watch Obama’s UN speech to see where the US is going in the future
- Bottom line: Those concerned about national security do watch Obama for what he says, but where is US policy?

Conclusion

- Buckle Up – It’s going to be a rough century
- There are fundamental problems that need to be dealt with
- It will take a generation for these problems to be worked out

QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

Re: The Chinese Military Build-up
- This is the normal wave for a country that is getting stronger with global interests and long supply chains
- Professionals are not really worried about it, but are justly concerned
  - Don’t want to have to fight China
  - Best way not to is to be ready to do so
- China has no ideology anymore – just a raw mercantilism approach to world
  - Chinese leaders don’t care if people die in Darfur, they are there for energy
  - Throwing money around Africa adds to the corruption problem there
  - Would be better if they still had an ideology
  - China has been sending a lot of aid to small islands in the Pacific to convince them to back its claims about Taiwan in the UN
- China has specific objectives but it has been indifferent to the global system from which it profits in security terms
  - US must nudge them toward the concept that it is not all about them
  - China does need to take responsibility for helping maintain the system
  - They say, “We didn’t make this system” but must understand how much they have gained from that system

Re: Force Structure
- As an intelligence officer can only offer a generalities view
- US is now an information-based society as is the Air Force
  - Must protect that above all else
- In Hayden’s time DoD went for precision over mass
  - But, precision-guided munitions only work if you have exquisite information including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) and targeting
  - But, if we lose ISR or communications assets and don’t have exquisite information, then you have given up today’s precision weapons capabilities
- Even as an Airman, Hayden is uncomfortable with stripping away so much of the Army’s capabilities
  - We can’t say that we will never fight on land again – it is not in our control
Re: Handling the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and Related Threats

- Need to divide this problem into a close fight and a deep fight
  - US is awesome in a close-in battle – killing machines against those already committed to kill us
- DoD must fight to give others space and time to handle the deep fights
  - It will take a whole of government approach to handle the problems
  - It is one thing to take out the guy with an IED today, and another to stop the production rate of such people over the next year or 5 years
    - So far these longer term issues have not been handled all that well
- A long term issue
  - The Bush 43 Administration was appropriately attuned to the near danger but perhaps didn’t shift gears enough for the deep battle
  - The Obama Administration was intent on pulling back and did not look that closely at how to handle the deep fight
- The US should handle the deep fight much like it did the deep fight in the Cold War
  - Stood firm in the Fulda Gap, Korea, etc.
  - Let the Communist system collapse under its own weight
    - It helped that collapse along by pointing out incredible flaws in the Communist system
- The US had the credentials to point out these flaw because Communism was a western philosophy written by Marx, a German in a London library
  - In that war, all came from a Judeo-Christian set of philosophies
  - Problem: In the current war we lack those credentials
    - Can’t tell those on the other side that they are wrong, i.e., we cannot say “That’s not what the Prophet meant,” etc.
    - Saying such things makes it worse
- Bottom line: US ability to influence the deep fight is a real challenge
- Small glimmer of hope: The Arab Spring did move the Arab region’s discussions beyond the Koran
  - Started mentioning responsive government, free press, transparency, etc.
  - Unfortunately, the Arab Spring never really got traction
  - Likely to be a multi-generational struggle
- Good news: Recently Arab monarchies are going public with their objections to ISIL
- The Treaty of Westphalia stated that countries would not use religion as an excuse for killing each other any more so Europe became secular
  - Only a simplistic version of modern European history
  - Brings up questions about the current situation:
    - While the two biggest monotheist religions (Christianity and Judaism) moved along the arc, is the third bound to follow that arc?
    - Will Islamists reach a point as they intersect with modernity when they can separate the sacred from the secular?
- Pope Emeritus Benedict noted that Islam was more of a transcendental religion than Christianity even though it came out of the same desert with some basic similarities
  - However, Christianity developed through the Greek philosophies with strong doses of Aristotle, Plato, etc.
Islam has not done that and remains more about “the will of God” rather than man’s approach of “Well, how about this?”

Question: What compromise between sacred and secular has Western thought made that Islam could make?
  - Answer: We don’t know

Note: The separation of church and state is less in the US than in any European country, but the Islamist extremists are most angry with the US

**Re: President Obama’s Policies**

- See: *Confront and Conceal: Obama’s Secret Wars and Surprising Use of American Power* by David E. Sanger
  - Discusses the broad stroke efforts in the first term of the Obama Administration to align perceptions of US policy with the realities of US power – a good idea
  - But the military would consider this withdrawal – the most difficult maneuver

- Hayden is critical of the “no boots on the ground” policy
  - Might always need some small set of boots on the ground

**Re: Failed States**

- China is accelerating the failure of some failing states
- US must be careful – otherwise its efforts could look like imperialism
- For the deep fight (to prevent the production of threats in years to come), the US usually has the wrong people in the room, i.e., only military
  - Problem: other parts of the government don’t plan or deploy the way DoD does – different cultures
  - Result: Army battalion commanders wind up doing aid projects or Marines end up making decisions about cotton crops vs light manufacturing

- US is not organized to do what needs to be done – a big problem
  - SecDef Gates even tried to push Congress to send more money to the State Department, but failed

**Re: Rewiring the US Government Structure to Do Better**

- On 9/11 the US had foreign intelligence and domestic law enforcement efforts and associated agencies
  - But the bombers were foreigners already inside the US and slipped between the various jurisdictions and agencies

- After 9/11 there were efforts such as the Terrorist Surveillance program that was based on raw Executive authority under Article Two
  - The President used executive authority rather than getting Congress involved in designing a new program
  - Best to let the Executive take it as far as possible before Congress starts ripping things out, which might result in something like the Director of National Intelligence (DNI)
The restructuring associated with creating the DNI was an attempt to deal with the too many jurisdictions and agencies problem.

For a forthcoming book Hayden looked into the establishment of the DNI and why SecDef Rumsfeld was so opposed to it.

- Question one should ask: What could the new DNI do that the Director of Central Intelligence could not do if the President wanted it done?

**Re: Using Intelligence to Predict Problems Related to Climate Change**

- It would be possible to use intel resources to examine climate change consequences, assuming climate change is occurring.
  - CIA climate office was set up just after Hayden left CIA
  - There was a certain element of “flavor of the month” involved
- To predict what could happen we need to look at a specific climate scenario.
  - Then intel can provide a list of things to watch out for.
- An unclassified report on global water is available listing the 10 most endangered rivers – none in North America – and makes predictions.
  - Elsewhere there are reports that Yemen will be without water soon.
  - Intelligence could help here.
- The process would be like looking at branches and sequels for a plan.
  - Take three different scenarios of climate change and their logical outcomes.
  - Then identify where the common outcomes across the three appear.

Then you can start formulating policy.

**Re: Intelligence in the Private Sector**

- There is genuine intelligence available in the private sector now.
  - Wrong to think genuine intelligence is a government monopoly.
  - Exclusivity of the government’s intelligence is gone.
    - Can now watch missiles in N. Korea being stacked on a home computer.
    - Used to get pictures of such activity dropped from satellites only a couple of times a year.
- The peculiar advantage of Western hi-tech societies is eroding.
  - Within US society, the peculiar advantage of government to be omniscient over the private sector is also eroding.
  - In Gulf War I (1991) it was possible to hide a massive movement of tanks, etc.
    - Won’t be able to do that again.
    - Could keep that secret from the Iraqis then but not now.
- Technological advances have been a great leveler between and among nations.
  - Also between the capabilities of the government and the private sector.

**Re: Cyber Domain**

- Cyber has been considered a domain in US military doctrine for years.
  - US forces will need to operate there along with land, sea, and air.
  - US wants to be able to use cyber when it wants to and deny it to others when it chooses to.
• Cyber is a domain but...
  o Millennials may think it is a digital Eden
  o More like a digital Mogadishu
• When the internet was invented, no one talked about security – they just wanted to move data
• US is a cyber-faring nation with awesome cyber power
  o US invented it
  o Greatest concentration of cyber power in the world is just outside the Beltway in Maryland (at NSA)
• Americans have to live in the least well-defended cyber domain in the world
  o US political culture won’t allow the government to go into that domain to do what we are generally accustomed to doing in other domains
  o When checking email, we don’t ask “Where is my government to stop all these threats?”
• Bottom line: The US government will always be late to meet needs in the cyber domain, but the private sector has stepped in at an awesome level
  o Cyber threat intelligence now at an amazing level with capabilities such as web crawling, foreign national employees assuming persona in chat rooms
  o These are definitely intelligence operations
• Must remember that the government is not coming to save you in the cyber domain
  o You are responsible for your own safety there
  o Good news: many private sector organizations will be stepping in to help

Re: Foreign Development of GPS Alternatives
• US will no longer have a monopoly on GPS capabilities and controls
  o This may not matter, not sure
• It is going to happen but is neither good nor bad
• May mean that the US needs to make some adjustments to accommodate the situation

Re: Other Possible Tectonic Shifts
• Tectonic shifts are not about raw good vs evil nor about personalities
  o They are more about fundamental shifts
• The US mal-distribution of wealth is more structural than from evil intent
  o Moving away from an industrial society where labor was well rewarded
  o Now in an information society where there is sharp distinction between those who can play and those who cannot
• This does reflect a need for action

Re: Developing Cultural Understanding
• US interests and those of others are never exactly the same, but negotiators try to work in the overlap
• An interesting phenomenon when talking to foreign counter-parts:
  o At some point the other side will launch into his country's creation mythology
- Can only sit and wait it out – avoid agreeing too much
  - Question: At what point does the US side launch into its creation mythology?
- To deal with other cultures must start with humility and deep respect
  - We learn the most about cultures by understanding their languages especially their nouns that never translate exactly correctly
- Must develop intelligence personnel with deep cultural understanding through immersion, language training, long time in a country, etc.
  - Must ensure those who do develop that understanding in the military are promoted enough to keep them
- US can go into a situation with arrogance, thinking they are better at doing something
  - They often are but it may be more important to be sensitive to others than to be right
  - Must remember that the US is the only Superpower in the running
    - The other guy in the room knows that the US is and he is trying to put a check on that power