



World Rising Initiative 2015

Ve Assises Nationales de la Recherche Stratégique

Ecole Militaire, Décembre 2015

The World Rising Initiative 2015, organised by The House of the Rising Stars in collaboration with the Superior Council for Training and Research in Strategy (CSFRS) in the context of the Vth National Summit on Strategic Research, successfully took place on 1st December 2015 at the Ecole Militaire in Paris. The event gathered over 1,700 participants before France's leading experts on strategic issues: Régis Debray, Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, Tsvetan Todorov, Rony Brauman, Henry Laurens, Bertrand Badie, Gilles Kepel, Hubert Védrine... Six of our Rising Stars - Marcelle Balt, Ruth Bernabe-Palanca, Bertrand Epstein, Stephanie Kauv, Bertrand Oliva and Chad O'Carroll - has the unique privilege to sit down with a few of these high-profile personalities to debate the event's theme question, "Who is the enemy?"

Who is the enemy? Formulated so simply, the question reflects our perplexity faced with the tensions of a world that has become particularly complex. The terrorist attacks of 13th November 2015 in Paris seem to have wiped out any doubt: claimed by Daesh, the proto-State has become France's principal and explicit enemy. At least this is the shortcut made in the stunned and emotional aftermath of the bloodbath, even though the concept of enemy – as that of war - are no longer self-evident notions. The attacks may have expedited the problem of designating an enemy, yet they have confronted us with the difficulty of conceptualising what an enemy *is*.

Inaugurated by a cautious reminder by **Defence Minister Jean-Yves le Drian** that "the 'threats of force', namely the resurgence of state-type threats and the 'risks of weakness' are the zones of chaos upon which prosper radical movements", the daylong event sought to explore the return of a concept – that of enemy – hitherto negated in the name of globalisation and a new peaceful and democratic world order.

Below is a short overview of the events, taken from the article published in the February 2016 number of the *Revue de la Défense Nationale*.

The enemy: a structuring element of international relations.

The great philosopher and senior official **Régis Debray** opened the debate by reminding that the enemy has always been "an indispensable and salutary entity", "an evil so necessary, as is the 'barbarian' to any 'civilisation'". Hence the enemy is not a regressive notion but "a revitalising and structuring good" whose existence is a necessary condition to the forging of "a community of destiny".

In the words of political scientist **Bertrand Badie**, "the history of our States is the history of political orders constituted through confrontation; that is to say: enmity is structuring".

Quoting Carl Schmitt, philosopher **Ninon Grangé** recalled "the specific distinction of the political (...) is the discrimination of the friend and the foe. It supplies a principal of *identification* that serves as a criteria, not an exhaustive or comprehensive definition".

On this theme, **Tzvetan Todorov** adds that "Consubstantial to totalitarian conceptions of history, the notion of enemy does not play a primary role in the lives of democratic countries, but it is sporadically used in the same sense (...) The enemy is sometimes identified with a specific population: the immigrants of poor countries, Muslims... This effectively instils in the populations a feeling of fear, and hence of inciting a great number of electors to vote for the party formulating this accusation, and promising to eliminate that enemy. This touches upon the margins of the democratic framework".

Regarding the function of the enemy in international relations, **Hélène Carrère d'Encausse** notes "The cold war had the virtue of being reassuring. It took place in a familiar international order, predictable, perfectly organised. We knew where things were heading, we knew how to control them. Most importantly, the enemy was known. That world is over. It finished with the end of the Soviet Union. I would add that we entered a new world, ten years later, with the attacks on the twin towers (...). The United States, sole superpower that, for ten years, dominated and structured the international life, the major actor of international life can be reached at its core and is vulnerable. (...) And all of a sudden, we are faced with an indefinable enemy. Is it an enemy? It is near impossible to tell".

Designating the enemy, a political construction?

For international war reporter **Renaud Girard**, it is imperative to focus on the essential: "We are struggling to designate our principal enemy. And yet, like Nazism in the past, it does not advance behind a mask, neither in the written expression of its ideology, nor in his actions. It is international Islamism".

Military strategy expert and former senior official **Pierre Conesa** warned against the ambiguities of this "fabrication of the enemy": "When the USSR made the bad joke of disappearing in the 1991's (...), I watched the workings of the american strategic system that produces continuous flows of enemies: it was the "clash of civilisations" or "the end of history".

For criminologist **Alain Bauer**, we have finally managed to grasp those against whom we had to fight: "The authorities, that for a long time hesitated to find the words to designate the adversary (when designating the enemy is the first step towards the capacity to fight it), have finally defined its contours ("terrorist jihadist army"), that correspond quite rightly to the organisation (a progress allowed by the inputs of military intelligence).

For **Bertrand Badie**, this poses the question whether a non-State can be an enemy: "The great Jean Bodin [...] had another word for distinguishing the non-State enemy. He called it the bandit. The bandit and the enemy, these are two different things [...] Can a entrepreneur of violence, and this is how I would name Daesh or Al-Qaeda, can acquire the status of enemy if it is not indeed institutionalised?"

To which **Régis Debray** would add "Giving a horde the dignity of an army, elevating a petty thug to the rank of soldier on the grounds that he himself takes you for an enemy and treats you as such, is this not doing him great honour and falling into the trap of establishing a link of equal-to-equal between a gang of nutcases or delinquents and a State of constituted law? Is it not elevating his rank, doing him a favour (is tribute not paid to one's fallen enemy)?"

The real nature of Daesh

The determination to combat this new "enemy" in no way dissolves the ambiguities it raises, reminds criminologist **Xavier Raufer**: "Is it really possible to wage war on anyone without having understood the nature and essence of the enemy? [...] In less than three years, the Islamic State appears. What's this story? Who produced, who realised, who authorised this "miracle"?"

To understand the nature of Daesh, political Islam specialist **Gilles Kepel** establishes the precise genesis of the organisation, recalling in particular how after the afghan djihad and the subsequent rise of Al-Qaeda, we are currently witnessing the third wave of contemporary djihadisme, of which Daesh is the product. "It begins in January 2005 with a Syrian engineer called Abou Moussab al-Souri, from Alep, who married a Spaniard from an old communist family that he duly veiled. They post online a 1,600 page publication titled "Call to the world Islamic resistance" (...) What can be said about this book? Roughly, that the 11th September is a mistake, the result of immoderation, of Ben Laden's hubris, and that it served no purpose but to give George Bush the legitimacy to strike and, in fine, destroy Al-Qaeda. He says that the Leninist and pyramidal model of the second phase should be opposed to the reticular, network-based model – hence "bottom-up" and not "top-down". He summarises his Arabic slogan in the following phrase: 'nizam, la tanzim', meaning 'a system and not an organisation'. (...) And it's Youtube – and later, of course, Facebook and Twitter – that ensure its durability.

(...) It isn't America, too far and too powerful, that should be hit but Europe, the soft belly of the close West, in which millions of youth from Muslim post-colonial immigration live, badly integrated and sure to be sensitive to the vocabulary of jihadist radicalisation. (...) Between 2005 and 2012 – the Merah affair will be

the first illustration – everything is put in place, in France, in the incubator of the Republic's prisons".

The continuum of violence

For **Jean-Yves Le Drian**, France's number one threat is, of course, that implemented by Daesh: "(...) Jihadism is a nebula of movements varying in size and efficiency, that operate beyond the borders, right to our land. The enemy's dangerousness, in this case, is linked to its plasticity"

Nevertheless, operational continuity should not be assimilated to political continuity of the threat:

"(...) There is a continuity of the threat, on the external and internal fronts, that calls in return for coherence in our military action. Intervening in Syria to strike Daesh in its hideouts means protecting in the same blow our territory and our population.

Let us take care, however, behind this proven operational continuity, to not play the enemy's game by envisioning a political continuum of the threat. For my part, I will never speak of an "interior enemy": if Daesh's fighter in Syria and Iraq is an enemy and is to be treated as such, the terrorist on national territory is a criminal and should be treated as such. For the rest, speaking of an "interior enemy" opens the door to an unfounded and dangerous stigmatisation, which is exactly what certain enemy theorists seek".

Bertrand Badie adds: "The enemy in our historical and political construction is without, he is opposite. (...) Does what we are living today truly refer to the idea of exteriority, when we know that the actors of violence live in our home and are amongst us, and reveal, fittingly, our failures in terms of integration and State-building? Is it not indeed the deconstruction of our States that generates this violence, when in the past the enemy was linked to the construction and the reinforcement of the State?"

For magistrate and IHEJ Secretary General **Antoine Garapon**, we should even go beyond the notion of exterior/interior to integrate into our approach the phenomenon of deterritorialisation of violence, which leads to three effects: "(1) The enemy is everywhere and nowhere. The front no longer exists. We could speak of asymmetric war, but asymmetry supposes a disequilibrium of forces in one same space. (...) (2) Globalisation changes the nature of the event. (...) We have spoken at length of geopolitics, but there is an anthropological cause. (...) there is a generational rupture, absolutely manifest, that generates terrorism and in fact concerns young girls as much as it does young boys in different paths. There is also the anthropological trauma of emigration. All of these different causes coagulate, because what characterises globalisation is the intensification of the world, where everyone simultaneously reaches a given point (...) (3) A confusion, and integration of all registers. In the old world, in the territorialised world, in fact because of territory, one can distinguish diplomacy, economics, the military, the ideological, the religious, which of course make up a system but in a slow and structured manner. Today, we are in a hyper-integrated world, densified, where all of these causes arrive at the same time. So there is this

paradox that terrorism constitutes a profound, complex system with globalisation."

How to act against Daesh?

Faced with Daesh, **Jean-Yves Le Drian** reminds that we must follow "a global strategy that can associate all those – and there are many – that find themselves designated by Daesh as its enemies." And we must in particular respond on four levels: military, police and judiciary, political and ideological, and finally economic.

Nevertheless, for Former Foreign Minister **Hubert Védrine**, we must already pre-empt the limits and consequences of our intervention: "If containing is not sufficient because we fail to neutralise, if neutralisation is beyond reach, we must eradicate. But we eradicate well what we replace. Here lies the connexion between the military dimension and the political dimension. (...) It is very important to find the solution of political substitution."

Military strategist and foreign affairs senior officer **Pierre Conesa** enquires on the feasibility of such an approach in Syria that "contains five wars in one. That of the Turks against the Kurds, that goes back a few decades; that of the Sunnis against the Shiites that tears apart 'only' seven countries of the region including Syria and Iraq; that of Daesh against Al-Qaeda, with a competition for leadership that increasingly marginalises Al Nostra perhaps to the point of one day sitting at the negotiation table; the Salafists against all the minorities and who (...) today massacre first the Shiites (whom they call hypocrites, meaning bad Muslims), the Sufis, etc. The ultimate layer of this construction is that of Assad against everybody. And we arrive like white knights thinking we are finally going to resolve the Syrian crisis..."

Hubert Védrine also recalls the French difficulty to include the religious factor in the process of conflict resolution. "Destructing the causes, drying out the hotbed, is a long-term endeavour. To eradicate the current Islamist threat, we should – after the sadly inevitable military dimension and the political dimension involving thousands of diplomatic negotiations – think about the strictly religious dimension. Yet the West, notably France, has taken a long time to admit this because it contradicts a sort of dominant belief according to which we have gone beyond religious questions."

On this same theme, Collège de France historian **Henry Laurens** also recalls that "in this region of the world, the national sacred and the religious sacred and entirely conflated. It is not like in our villages where we have the war memorial and the church. In this region of the world, all the religious monuments are national monuments – in other words, everything biblical is political, everything religious is political. Of course, this can seem general. But we must remember that during the Camp David 2 accords, part of the negotiation was shattered on Temple Mount, plaza of the Mosques."

We must, **Antoine Garapon** concludes, "react in an adapted, resilient (...) manner, with the idea that one of the strategic objectives of jihadist terrorism is to disqualify the rule of law and show that it is all a hypocrisy and that the true nature of western European States, is that they are anti-Muslim and give rights only to those who are not Muslim".

(...) The French solution, since 1986, is to adapt at each terrorist threat, by creating, each time, laws that ply but do not break. And with a certain efficiency in fact, under the condition – and this is, of course, another characteristic of law – that it brings guaranties to this anti-terrorist apparatus. (...) Processing, adapting ourselves, not plying, never abandoning the idea that law is both a weapon and a system of guarantee."

Conclusion

The Assises also recalled that alongside entities like Daesh, we are witnessing, everywhere in the world and to different degrees, the emergence of a new criminal 'melting pot' integrating religious fanaticism, massacred, piracy, trafficking of humans, drugs, toxic substances and raw materials. The second round table, which is not reviewed here, was dedicated to some of these contemporary criminal threats: visibility and invisibility of mafias (economist **Clotilde Champeyrache**), the hijacking of technological revolutions to criminal ends (President of the CSFRS Scientific Council **Philippe Baumard**), criminal finance (financial crime specialist **Marie-Christine Dupuis**) and environmental crime (lawyer and former minister of environment **Corinne Lepage**).

The treat now originates from hybrid groups, opportunistic and unstable, capable of unexpected metamorphoses: a criminal-terrorist continuum has appeared over a few years, which no longer corresponds to our old categories.

By acting in a gradual and asymmetric fashion against States, this polymorphous "enemy" each day confronts democratic societies to the flaws of their modernity. It pushes democratic governments into their entrenchments, forcing them to continuous arbitrations between, on the one hand, the operational efficiency of justice, police and intelligence services, and on the other hand, their will to respect the rights of their citizens.

At least it obliges us, in a salutary manner, to question the meaning of our own commitments and the values on which they rest, without losing sight of the requirement of true universality that continues to animate us.

Over lunch, the Rising Stars had the unique opportunity to sit down with Grand Report Renaud Girard and Board Members Pierre Dassas, Nicole Guedj and Mona Makram-Ebeid to confront their visions of the world. Of the many topics discussed, the Rising Stars raised the issues of the legitimacy of military intervention abroad, the role of Western powers in peace-building in post-

conflict States and the importance of education and sanitation the eradication of extremist groups.

Following the summit, the Rising Stars and Mentors were asked for their impressions on the summit:

"It was interesting to hear French perspectives on global terrorist threats such as Daesh so soon after the recent attacks in Paris. As someone who focuses primarily on North Korea, the presentations were useful in highlighting the evolving and asymmetric nature of threats facing many Western European and American countries. I especially enjoyed the presentation by the *Figaro* journalist Renaud Girard."

Chad O'Carroll

"I particularly enjoyed the introductory speech given by Eric Danon qui presented with a brilliant simplicity the context, stakes and speakers of the conference on "Who is the Enemy?" He explained the strongly political character of a question that in its attempt to define "against who?" describes he who asks the question.

Given so shortly after the attacks in Paris, the introduction took on a particular consonance. For their part, the French President and political figures in general affirm in pleasant unanimity that "the enemy is Daesh" and that "France is at war".

The presence of foreigners at the table (notably USA and Egypt) revealed the differences in national appreciation of the issue, their conceptions of society and politics and their understandings of the enemy and war.

From the lunch-debate organised with two experts, I would remember in particular Mona's contribution. She invited listeners to apprehend the wider threat posed by Daesh, and the role of States like Egypt in the fight against radicalism, notably on the Sinai front where over 2000 have died already. She underlined the lack of support lent to President Sisi in this fight despite his real commitment. An welcome intervention that reminds us that ISIS does not only manifest itself through terrorist actions or foreign combats in Syria or Irak; confrontations take place three hours plane away from Paris, close to a major tourist destination. Mona also reminded us that after being designated, an enemy must be confronted, either through a system of diplomatic alliances which may be refused. "

Bertrand Oliva

"The topic of the Assises 2015 could (sadly) not be more timely. I was afraid that the debates would be too centred on terrorism in the wake of the Paris attacks, but on the contrary I was pleasantly surprised by the various round tables that adopted a general approach to the

definition of the enemy. The discussions covered the theoretical dimension of the enemy - Ninon Grangé brilliantly explained the need for an enemy - as well as its practical implications, notably the representation of the enemy in different forms of criminality.

Yet the topic of terrorism was unavoidable. Indeed President Hollande had declared a few days earlier that "the enemy is Daesh", an enemy that Gilles Kepel gave a magnificent speech about. I personally felt that each intervention gave a historical background of its subject and made an assessment of who the enemy is today. I would have like to see a little more propection and proposals of concrete solutions. But the presentations were all pertinent and interesting. Mme. Carrère d'Encausse deserves a special mention for her wonderful speech."

Ruth Bernabe-Palanca

The proceedings were entirely filmed by the CSFRS and two articles drafted for the RDN and the IHEDN and are available in French at the following address <http://www.csfrs.fr/assise>

The footage of the lunch-debate and the interviews of the Rising Stars and Mentors on the topic "Who is the enemy?" is available on the Foundation's website and on its Youtube channel. www.thehouseoftherisingstars.com and <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCoVk-WJaMCM1fBUxTIvrNXw>

