

Annual Lecture 2011

The Battle for Hearts and Minds: Morality and Warfare Today

General Lord Dannatt

Theos 

Theos Friends' Programme

Theos is a religion and society think tank which seeks to inform and influence public opinion about the role of faith and belief in society.

We were launched in November 2006 with the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams and the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor.

We provide

- high-quality research, reports and publications;
- an events programme;
- news, information and analysis to media companies, parliamentarians and other opinion formers.

We can only do this with your help!

Theos Friends receive complimentary copies of all Theos publications, invitations to selected events and monthly email bulletins.

Theos Associates receive all the benefits of Friends and in addition are invited to attend an exclusive annual dinner with the Theos Director and team.

If you would like to become a Friend or an Associate, please visit www.theosthinktank.co.uk or detach or photocopy the form below, and send it with a cheque to Theos for the relevant amount. Thank you

Yes, I would like to help change public opinion!

I enclose a cheque payable to Theos for: £60 (Friend) £300 (Associate)

Please send me information on how to give by direct debit

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Postcode _____

Email _____

Tel _____

Data Protection Theos will use your personal data to inform you of its activities.

If you prefer not to receive this information please tick here.

*By completing you are consenting to receiving communications by telephone and email.
Theos will not pass on your details to any third party.*

Please return this form to:

Theos | 77 Great Peter Street | London | SW1P 2EZ

S: 97711 D: 36701

Theos 



Theos – clear thinking on religion and society

Theos is a think tank working in the area of religion, politics and society. We aim to inform debate around questions of faith and secularism and the related subjects of values and identity. We were launched in November 2006, and our first report '*Doing God: a Future for Faith in the Public Square*', written by Nick Spencer, examined the reasons why faith will play an increasingly significant role in public life.

what Theos stands for

In our post-secular age, interest in spirituality is increasing across Western culture. We believe that it is impossible to understand the modern world without an understanding of religion. We also believe that much of the debate about the role and place of religion has been unnecessarily emotive and ill-informed. We reject the notion of any possible 'neutral' perspective on these issues.

what Theos works on

Theos conducts research, publishes reports, and runs debates, seminars and lectures on the intersection of religion, politics and society in the contemporary world. We also provide regular comment for print and broadcast media. Recent areas of analysis include multiculturalism, Christian education, religious liberty and the future of religious representation in the House of Lords. Future areas of focus will include questions of values in economic policy and practice and the role of religion in international affairs.

what Theos provides

In addition to our independently driven work, Theos provides research, analysis and advice to individuals and organisations across the private, public and not-for-profit sectors. Our unique position within the think tank sector means that we have the capacity to develop proposals that carry values – with an eye to demonstrating what really works.

what Theos believes

Theos was launched with the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, but it is independent of any particular denomination. We are an ecumenical Christian organisation, committed to the belief that religion in general and Christianity in particular has much to offer for the common good of society as a whole. We are committed to the traditional creeds of the Christian faith and draw on social and political thought from a wide range of theological traditions. We also work with many non-Christian and non-religious individuals and organisations.

Published by Theos in 2013

© Theos

Some rights reserved – see copyright licence for details

For further information and subscription details please contact:

Theos

Licence Department

77 Great Peter Street

London

SW1P 2EZ

T 020 7828 7777

E hello@theosthinktank.co.uk

www.theosthinktank.co.uk

The Battle for Hearts and Minds: Morality and Warfare Today

General Lord Dannatt

The following is a transcript of the
Theos Annual Lecture 2011, given by General Lord Dannatt.

The lecture was delivered on
Tuesday 8th November 2011 at One Birdcage Walk, London.

fighting power

May I at the outset this evening thank Elizabeth Hunter, and all those involved in arranging tonight, for your very kind invitation to deliver the Theos Annual Lecture this evening. I consider it a great privilege to do so. And thank you, too, for your very warm introduction. Before I go any further this evening I would like to place tonight's topic: "The Battle for Hearts and Minds; Morality and Warfare Today", within its overall context.

I have been fortunate to have had 40 years as a soldier – those forty years covering four decades each with a different characteristic. For me the 1970's were all about Northern Ireland... The 1980's was the decade of the Falklands Conflict and the final years of The Cold War... While the 1990's – the age of the New World Order – started somewhat paradoxically in the deserts of Kuwait and Southern Iraq, before we discovered the Balkans and our commitments to Bosnia and Kosovo, not to mention East Timor and Sierra Leone, before 9/11 changed the dynamic and took the British Army back into Iraq and Afghanistan, places well known to our grandfathers and great uncles, and previous generations, and now we are looking once more at North Africa, the Middle East and the Gulf States.

What that forty years experience has taught me is that warfare, for all its violence, controversy and cost is essentially about people. It is people who do the fighting, on behalf of other people and amongst the people in whose country we are operating – so warfare today, and perhaps it was ever thus, is a human activity. So in addressing tonight's title, I do so in the broadest context of the hearts and minds of the people – their attitude to what they are doing, and their attitude to what is going on around them. So it is against the backdrop of people that we will consider morality and warfare this evening. If, as I speak, you feel that I have carved out too narrow a canvass, then please do broaden it to your own specifications in questions and discussion later.

Within the British Army we conduct military operations at the behest of the democratically elected Government and on behalf of, and in the name of, the people of this country. And we do so by the application of, what we call Fighting Power, which is at the heart of our military doctrine.

Actually, over its history, the British Army has had quite a patchy record in setting out its doctrine or its military philosophy. However in the latter years of the Cold War, an initiative taken by General Sir Nigel Bagnall – begun when he was Commander 1st British Corps, continued while he was Commander in Chief of NATO's Northern Army Group and culminating in his time as Chief of the General Staff, put in place a very practical military doctrine which remains the bedrock of the Army's overall thinking today. In the context of tonight's discussion, Bagnall said very clearly that Fighting Power – which is what an Army sets out to deliver in pursuit of the objectives of Grand Strategy as laid down by the Government – is made up of three components, or dimensions. These three are the Conceptual, the Physical and the Moral. Clearly tonight we are concerned with the third of those, but the moral component, or dimension, must be viewed alongside the other two.

The Conceptual Component, as the name implies, is that aspect of fighting power which determines the intellectual approach to the visualisation and planning of operations. The outcome of that thinking process does not result in the application of some rigid template, but in the application of well-understood principles that guide a commander into how to think about approaching the solving of tactical problems, great and small. The absence of such thought processes takes one back to improvisation and pragmatism, which might well have their place on occasions, but do not routinely constitute doctrine. I had a rude introduction to this absence of conceptual coherence as a very junior officer.

As a young platoon commander in Belfast in 1972, I was charged with responsibility for a very contentious part of the south west of the City. I won't dwell on the detail, but the issue was housing and who lived where, so I was hugely relieved when one day I was told the General Officer Commanding Northern Ireland was coming to visit. I explained my problem, walked him around the area and then asked, 2nd Lieutenant to Three Star General: "Well, General, what do you suggest I do?" He put his arm on my shoulder, and replied: "Well, Richard, we in the British Army have got pretty broad shoulders so just muddle through!" To this day I have been determined we could do better than just "muddling through"!

So, with that rather long preamble, what I would like to explore this evening is why the need for soldiers to understand and adopt high moral and ethical standards is more critical than ever in today's challenging and complex operating environment, and how it is a particular requirement of leaders, both to set an example and to ensure that these moral and ethical standards are rigorously adhered to.

Again, **the Physical Component**, as a term, speaks for itself. It is the ships, tanks, aircraft and other necessary materiel that the military possesses to carry out the tasks given to it by the Government of the day. Whether an Army has enough equipment of the right type at the right time can be something of a contentious issue – and sometimes difficult to anticipate correctly at the start of a campaign – but the old adage “give us the tools, and we will finish the job” has a certain resonance here.

So that brings us to consider **the Moral Component – or the Moral Dimension** of fighting power and to do so in the contemporary context. So, with that rather long preamble, what I would like to explore this evening is why the need for soldiers to understand and adopt high moral and ethical standards is more critical than ever in today’s challenging and complex operating environment, and how it is a particular requirement of leaders, both to set an example and to ensure that these moral and ethical standards are rigorously adhered to. But, I would like to go on to argue, that although such standards are vital, I do not believe that they are enough. I am convinced that there is also a spiritual dimension that must not be overlooked. Furthermore, whether what I am saying applies just to the military, I leave for you to judge. But where to start?

need for values and standards

Some 200 years ago, Napoleon concluded that in battle – the Moral was to the Physical as three is to one – and I sense that he was probably right about that in his day, but today this ratio is coming more and more into focus in today's complex battlespace. When Napoleon made his comment, the 'moral' dimension was in the main understood – understood as 'the will to fight', or perhaps better described simply as morale. I think it is a truism of most walks of life – and certainly in the military sphere of business – that it is will and determination that count for so much more than mere material or technical acumen or ability. But I suggest today, that the moral dimension of conflict has itself, evolved.

As I have already hinted, soldiers would contend that war is a human activity, a contest of wills and a battle for hearts and minds – and in it people are ultimately the top and bottom line. More and more our Armed Forces now operate 'amongst the people' and not on vast tracts of open land, mostly devoid of people as was the case in North Africa in the Second World War, or in Kuwait and south eastern Iraq in 1991 in the First Gulf War. People are the environment today, in a way that towns, villages, hilltops and river lines were in the conventional – or as General Sir Rupert Smith calls it – the "Industrial Warfare" of yesterday.

Although he may be right, that the age of state on state 'Industrial Warfare' may largely be over – albeit one hesitates to be too definite – nevertheless operations 'amongst the people' are not necessarily new, but they are now commonplace. However what is pretty definitive is that in an age of global media, and global perspectives, no officer or soldier will be far away from the public gaze – and the people watching may be in any country in the world. So, sensitivity to culture, local beliefs and aspirations, and the soldier's personal demeanour and approach, are all vital parts of campaigning today.

And therefore, educating our people to understand their moral and social responsibilities – and not just to inculcate a will to win, as in Napoleon's day – is a key challenge for contemporary military leadership.

In past generations, certainly in this country, it was often assumed that young men and women coming into the Armed Forces would have absorbed an understanding of the core values and standards of behaviour required by the military from their family or from within their wider community. Indeed such standards would have typified our society more generally. I would suggest such a presumption cannot be made today.

The competing pressures of an evolving society – where individualism dominates and the utility of armed force is openly debated – and in an increasingly complex operating environment – all this combines to make the mental and moral preparation

The mental and moral preparation of our soldiers is as important as their physical training.

of our soldiers as important as their physical training. Our young soldiers must distinguish, in a split second, between a potential suicide bomber, dressed in civilian clothes, and an innocent bystander; they must be able to extract information from captured enemy forces in a timely manner to avoid future loss of life, but they must do so within the rule of law; they must be able

to kill and show compassion at the same time; they must be loyal to their country, their Regiment and their friends without compromising their own integrity.

Furthermore, it is not simply a matter of dealing adequately with these ultimate ethical challenges, but of doing so without compromise on our part, for if we compromise our moral values, then we will lose what is essentially a wider conflict of values and ideas. Today's conflicts are much less about territory and much more about people. Indeed as far as Afghanistan is concerned, I have frequently argued that this conflict is three things. It is War *Among* the People, as I have just described; it is War *About* the People – to win their hearts and minds, as this is now a classic counter-insurgency situation – and it is War *For* the People, not just of Afghanistan, Pakistan and the South Asia Region, but for

They must be able to kill and show compassion at the same time; they must be loyal to their country, their Regiment and their friends without compromising their own integrity.

the people of the West, and this country in particular. It is certainly in no one's interest to see Afghanistan as a failed or failing state exhibiting ungoverned space into which Islamist extremists can return to once again export terror to the West. I suspect that we might like to come back to that in discussion!

But to be more specific on the moral issues – when a political decision is reached to send a military force on a discretionary intervention, I maintain that there is a conscious or sub-conscious acceptance that in deploying to a less fortunate part of the World, we do so having publicly adopted a position on, or very close to, the moral high ground. We are going somewhere to help people less fortunate than ourselves. But

when officers or soldiers act in a way contrary to our traditional values and standards and fail to respect the human rights of those they have gone to help, then we risk falling from the high ground to the valley, often in a very public way. So, a part of the challenge now for the military leadership is to educate and train our young people – each one a potential individual decision-maker – so that all concerned understand their moral responsibilities, as well as how to operate their weapons and equipment. This is the rationale behind why in the British Army we place great emphasis in educating our soldiers about our core values, core values of Selfless Commitment, Courage, Discipline, Integrity, Loyalty, and, perhaps most critically, Respect for Others. Furthermore we require our soldiers to understand and apply these values to their general conduct, both in training or on operations; off-duty and on-duty. And, like any ethical creed, these values must be learned and followed for their own good, and not just as a means to another end.

Indeed, I would contend that without an individual moral understanding from all concerned within a military endeavour, from policy-maker to private soldier; then the outcome will be in doubt in both war and peace. But where we get it wrong, when there are lapses in behaviour and conduct then they must be confronted. And whilst in our case, I believe the British Army is an extremely professional military force, committed in the last decade to difficult campaigns in both Iraq and Afghanistan, it is a sad fact that a small number of individuals have let us down and we need to understand how and why this came about. It is for that reason, the decision that a previous Secretary of State for Defence took in 2009, which I fully supported, to have a Public Inquiry into the Baha Mousa case, was the right thing to do. If you are not familiar with that sad case, Mr Baha Mousa died of over 90 blows to his body while in our custody in Iraq in 2004, and that is unforgivable. All our soldiers must know that collectively and individually, we can, and should, and will be called to account when things go wrong. Our perseverance in the Baha Mousa case should therefore have come as no surprise.

And, of course, everything we do today is under the scrutiny of the media and in the shadow of international lawyers.

behaviour not qualities

But as respected and useful as possession of a large number of key qualities is, our discussions at Sandhurst also turned to functional models of leadership behaviour.

At that time, the Action Centred leadership model put forward by Professor John Adair, then of The Industrial Society was very influential. His Three Balls Venn Diagram approach to leadership of three individual, but over-lapping, elements had much resonance. His model required three things – the identification of the need to blend:

- ✦ On the one hand, identifying and achieving the Task , while,
- ✦ On the other hand, maximising the efforts of the Team , while most critically,
- ✦ Looking after the interests of all the Individual members of that team – and all this seemed like a winning formula to us.

And that single construct of Task, Team and Individual still, I believe, retains great merit – but, one wonders, is that enough?

what are you trying to do?

Now while a dry debate about the merits of a qualities approach to leadership or a functional approach is very interesting, it remains just that – essentially theoretical and, by definition, not that interesting or useful.

However, I think a key question that roots this part of our discussion rather more, is to analyse, as I have already suggested, what it is, that the leader is actually trying to do?

And to answer that, I suggest there is the need to have an understanding of what level of activity the leader is trying to lead within and at what level he is trying to lead at.

And this brings me back to one of the fresh strands of thought that Sir Nigel Bagnall introduced in the 1980's. As a result, we separate out activity into three levels – the Strategic, the Operational and the Tactical.

In any field of work, the first and last of those are well known. The Strategic level is where the big thoughts are thought, and every business endeavour or large organisation seems to be well supplied with Strategic thought – strategies for this, strategies for that – probably too many things called strategies, if we are honest.

And then down below, where it all happens, is Tactics – where the rubber actually hits the road – and in this sense the tactical level is about Delivery.

I have heard it said that 20% of a business is about Strategy, the other 80% is Delivery, but critically, the glue that holds it all together is Communication – successfully communicating the Big Idea to those who have to make it happen. But if Communication is delivered by leaders, or managers, who really know their stuff, who can inspire their staff and who can drive through to their objectives, then this is probably another commendable formula.

But in my construct, this overlooks the key level of activity, and this is the Operational level, the level which sits between the Strategic and the Tactical. It is the level that sits between the ideas and the action – it is the level which turns the ideas into action, and in my book that is the level which lifts the mediocre to the exceptional, it is the level that

lifted Napoleon, Wellington and Montgomery into the history books, and the likes of Bill Gates and Richard Branson into the Worlds Rich Lists.

Because, it is at the Operational level where the General or the Captain of Industry does his real work, and where an End to End plan is formulated to transform the original idea – the Big Idea – into success on the battlefield, or to serious profit on the balance sheet.

And this requires serious intellectual rigour and professional understanding to do this critical operational level activity properly – to devise a plan – a campaign plan – to take one in a series of steps, which we, in the Army, would call battles or engagements, to the pre-identified End-State – and on to success in the Campaign – clearly the antithesis of muddling through. But the compilation of the Plan is nothing without the application of energy, drive and inspiration to take the team on the journey, and this aspect of leadership is key – and it begs the question: will those who are integral to your plan actually come on the journey with you? Because the plan, however clever, unless there is a really strong capacity to lead, then successfully promoting followship is quite another thing. And to arrive with no-one behind you is a very lonely experience! And many a young officer has been followed, only out of curiosity.

mission command

But then the question is: how to do all this?

In my organisation – and this is where I admit, but without apology, that I am a victim of my own experience – we exercise leadership through a process known as Mission Command – and we aim to do this both in barracks and in the field – but I would apply the principle more widely still, and it is a plea for decentralisation – a plea to let decisions be taken at their most appropriate level.

Now, that said, and in a general sense, I think I have already touched on the key elements of this. Essentially, there are three components to what we call Mission Command, all of which hinge around the leader:

- ✦ First, the Commander, the Senior Manager, the Leader needs to think through his problem and convert his strategic goals into the front end of his Operational or Campaign Plan, and this results in him clearly setting out his Intent, in a short statement. He needs to have applied sufficient analysis and intellectual rigour so that he can set out to his subordinates or his employees his statement of what needs to be done and his statement of his overall intentions as to how it is to be done. This, I suggest, is more than just a rather wishy-washy Vision Statement. This is personal, leadership business and not a corporate staff activity.
- ✦ The second stage, in a non-prescriptive way, is to separate out the tasks that need to be done and then to delegate them to subordinates, along with the necessary manpower, equipment and financial resources to carry out those tasks. But the boss doesn't tell them what to do – he tells them what they are to achieve; this is very much output or outcome focussed, not input focussed.
- ✦ And finally – and this is where the process can go wrong – having delegated the tasks in a reasonable fashion, he, or she – needs to supervise the execution of those tasks appropriately – not in a way that stifles the initiative of the subordinates to whom the tasks have been delegated, but in a subtle and

nuanced way, remembering that while tasks can be delegated, responsibility can never be delegated – the buck always stops with the boss; and this is a really important point for tonight's discussion.

Without going down a rabbit hole unduly, I think that the significance of the degree of ownership of a plan and the absolute responsibility for it came home to me most starkly in July 2000 when I gave evidence for the Prosecution at the trial of one Radislav Krstic before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the Hague. General Krstic had commanded the Drina Corps of the Bosnian Serb Army at the time of the capture of Srebrenica and the subsequent massacre in Eastern Bosnia in July 1995. He was about the same age as me, had a professional military background in the Yugoslav National Army that had begun at the same age as mine had in the British Army, and in 1995 was commanding a formation very similar in size and organisation to 3rd (United Kingdom) Division which I was then commanding. His mistake – on 13th July 1995 – was to accept a mission from his superior and develop a plan that led directly to the massacre of 7000 to 8000 Muslim men and boys. He had accepted ownership of the operation, thereby became responsible for the plan, but mistakenly tried to base his defence in Court on having *delegated* his responsibility, and – he was quite properly convicted and sentenced to 42 years imprisonment for a variety of war crimes.

When we say glibly, “the buck stops here”, for Radislav Krstic it stopped for him in spades on the day he was convicted! That said – and as an aside – I know, he knows, and the Court also knows that his real failure was a complete collapse of personal moral courage.

Had he refused to accept the Mission from General Ratko Mladic, or talked his superior out of the idea, then he would not be in prison now, and upwards of 8000 people would still be alive. The risks of the morally correct line were obviously high, but on the day he failed the test.

spiritual dimension

But to return to my main theme, my own feeling is that high standards of leadership and an embedded understanding of core values provide a very sound moral baseline from which the military can move forward in the conduct of its business. But, and this is a critical question, one wonders whether a sound moral baseline is enough? Should there not also be a spiritual dimension – or even a spiritual foundation to this moral dimension? Not surprisingly, I believe there should. A moral baseline is very much a thing of the head, whereas a spiritual dimension is very much a thing of the *heart*.

And, fundamentally, it is that word “believe” or “belief” that is at the heart of any spiritual dimension.

For some, belief in the Cause, belief in the Leader or even given the tribal nature of the British Army, belief in the Regiment – will be enough. But I disagree.

What really sustains, in my view, is something more than this – something far bigger than ourselves, something bigger and deeper than we can imagine or rationalize for ourselves.

This first came home to me as a young platoon commander in Belfast in the early 1970's. My platoon got involved in a fierce gunfight – two terrorists were killed, two of my soldiers were shot and one died – everyone that day was really frightened, despite our denials!

That experience told me that even the toughest of men, when the chips are down and the reality of life and death confronts, then even the toughest of men are reaching out into the spiritual dimension, beyond the rational and beyond the moral!

But don't just take that assertion from me – let me read you part of an account by a British Private soldier, who had just shot his first enemy fighter in Afghanistan in 2006. He wrote this:

"Afterwards I sat there and I thought. "Hang on. I just shot someone." I had a brew and that. I didn't get to sleep that night. I just lay there all night thinking, "I shot someone." It's something strange.

A really strange feeling' 'You feel like, you know, a bit happy with yourself – I've done me job, it's what I've come her for, know what I mean? He's Taliban and I've got one of them. You feel quite chuffed about it.

Then you're feeling, like, you know... well you know, sad. You're thinking..... well, you know..... you know..... the, the geezer's another human being at the end of the day, like. Then you get the feeling, well, you know, it's either him or me. And then you're thinking... I think people get, like, you know, religious then as well. You're thinking, well in the bigger picture, if there is like a Geezer up there and a Geezer downstairs, what does that mean to me now I've just shot someone? Is that me done for? Am I going to hell or what? And all of that went through me mind that night, for hour after hour after hour."

There are young people out there tonight asking those questions, and that spiritual challenge must be responded to.

I sense, therefore, that much as our leaders in the Army must instil in their soldiers the core Values and Standards of behaviour that are so vital today and police them rigorously, so too our leaders need an understanding of this spiritual dimension, and so have an idea how to provide a response for their soldiers, because they are asking for it – and that is a real responsibility. And is this just confined to the military? I am not sure.

the ultimate role model

Now, one aspect of leadership development, to which I have already referred, is the identification and deliberate modelling on someone that is really respected as a leader.

In my experience a number of people have left a lasting impression on me, but if we are lifting the discussion in the context of this Theos Lecture to a spiritual dimension then there is one obvious role model to look to as far as I am concerned, and, in my experience, that is to look at the person and example of Christ himself – because in my opinion he, and only he, has the answers to the key questions in today's and tomorrow's complex environment.

Christians quite rightly put huge emphasis on the death and resurrection of Christ, but His life also provides the model that we will do well to try to emulate.

The motto of the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst is “Serve to Lead”. Christ, in his lifetime, is a very clear example of that maxim. He was a true Servant Leader. When Christ washed His disciples' feet, He was doing the most menial and humble task – and by serving His disciples He was earning the right to lead them. He would ask of others nothing that He would not do himself.

And His style of leadership? It was to say quite simply “Follow Me”. It was not said in a macho way, but it was said in a way that gave people the opportunity to look at Him, to look at what He stood for, to look at what He promised and to decide for themselves to follow Him – and this is key, since the flipside of Leadership is Followership, and the real trick of being a successful leader is to make people, out of their own free choice, follow – not out of curiosity – but out of a belief and confidence that the direction of travel is right, and that the objective is worth the cost along the way, and that the leader is a person of both character and integrity.

Leadership – the spiritual dimension

Now, stepping back from the potentially provocative to the practical, another significant contributor to the leadership and moral debate is the late Viscount Hambleden, the founder of the WH Smith Empire. He said: “Character and integrity are as important in a manager or leader as capability”. I sense that, once again, I have already touched on both aspects of character and integrity in what I have said so far. A leader does indeed need certain qualities, of which integrity is key, and at the same time there are certain capabilities that a leader needs as well – to understand the objectives, to map out the route from strategic end state to tactical decisions, and above all to communicate his intent clearly while delegating responsibly, but knowing that he never delegates responsibility.

But what really gives the leader his or her moral authority – his or her right to lead – does at the end of the day come down to him, or her, as a person – the nature of their character and the degree of their integrity – and this is very different from media enhanced image.

In my book, Character, or personality, defines the person – and answers the question as to whether this is someone to emulate or to follow, and with what enthusiasm.

Moreover, integrity establishes the moral baseline to lead. Is this someone who can be trusted? Is this someone whose instructions are honourable? Is this someone to commit too? Do they really have legitimate interests at heart, or is this person simply a self-seeker, or purely interested in the bottom line? These are all judgements for the subordinates, the employees, the followers, the voters to make. Their judgements, I submit, will ultimately define success or failure in the enterprise – perhaps not in the short term, but certainly in the medium to long term.

conclusion

With one eye on the clock, let me try to wrap up what I have been trying to say. Within warfare today, the battle for hearts and minds of people will only be won if there is the correct emphasis on the moral dimension of soldiering.

The Moral Dimension is but one of the three Dimensions of Fighting Power, and perhaps of even more significance today than in the past.

The moral courage to do the right thing – to use force when it is justified, to respect the human rights of all those around us is absolutely critical to today's operations – fought amongst the people, about the people, and for the people. Our capacity to do that comes not only from within individuals, but from within an Army that is underpinned by the Core Values and Standards of Behaviour that not only define it, but which realises that it is incumbent upon us to inculcate them formally into our people.

In a secular sense I draw huge encouragement from the examples of British Soldiers like Private Johnson Beharry in Iraq and the late Corporal Brian Budd in Afghanistan, both awarded the Victoria Cross in recent years, who both showed bags of physical and moral courage, but I suggest, beyond the human response to extreme situations there is a compelling need for a spiritual response too. The ratio of the moral to the physical in conflict may have been Three to One 200 years ago; but today, the ethical and the moral issues have extended that ratio considerably; and I sense that when one adds into the mix the spiritual dimension, then the ratio is exponential. It is my experience that a life centred on the promises of God set out in the Bible and shaped by the example of Jesus Christ's life and a personal understanding of what his death and resurrection actually means provides the most solid explanation to the complex and turbulent times within which we live. But that view is a private view, and one that I held as an individual member of the British Army. Of course while I was Chief of the General Staff, it would have been improper to try to impose that view on others, but I could set an example – if others chose to follow, it was up to them – but my duty was to lead, hence the emphasis I have placed on leadership this evening.

But I wonder, in closing, given that much of our society is pretty unstructured these days, and given that the military has the unique opportunity to educate its own into the importance of a proper moral understanding, then perhaps the military community may have a wider contribution that it can make to the Nation? After all, our soldiers, sailors and airmen are recruited from the civilian population, and after their time in our Ranks, it is to the civilian population we all ultimately return, but perhaps with a greater moral and ethical understanding, albeit borne out of necessity, opportunity and experience.

So by aiming to set high moral and ethical standards as an Army, a Navy and an Air Force, should we not consciously be trying to set an example to our society at large? Is there not a moral and ethical example that the military can set and perhaps even give a lead? I may be being presumptive, but I think it is something to consider, and was a question I sometimes discussed with my people. After all, our Armed Forces exist to serve the Nation; and maybe there could perhaps be no better way to do this; but perhaps I am guilty of wishful thinking.

So, I think I will leave it there, and I look forward to your questions, and our discussion.

Open access. Some rights reserved

Policy Statement

This work is licenced under the Creative Commons

Attribution – noncommercial – No Derivative Works 2.5 Licence (the 'Licence').

To view a copy of this licence:

- visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>
- or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.



creativecommons.org

As a publisher of this work, Theos has an open access policy that enables anyone to access our content electronically without charge.

Please read and consider the terms and conditions set out in the licence, details of which can be obtained via the Internet or post at the relevant addresses set out above.

Users are welcome to download, save, perform or distribute this work electronically or in any other format, including in foreign language translation, without written permission subject to the conditions set out in the Licence. The following are some of the conditions imposed by the Licence:

- Theos and the author(s) are credited;
- Theos' website address (www.theosthinktank.co.uk) is published together with a copy of this Policy Statement in a prominent position;
- the text is not altered and is used in full (the use of extracts under existing fair usage rights is not affected by this condition);
- the work is not resold;
- a copy of the work or link to use online is sent to the address below for our archive.

Theos, Licence Department, 77 Great Peter Street, London SW1P 2EZ
hello@theosthinktank.co.uk

Please contact us if you would like permission to use this work for purposes outside of the scope of the Licence.



Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:



Attribution. You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.



Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



No Derivative Works. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Previous Theos reports:

"Doing God"

A Future For Faith in the Public Square
Nick Spencer | 978-0-9554453-0-9

Coming off the Bench

The past, present and future of
religious representation in the House
of Lords
Andrew Partington and Paul Bickley
978-0-9554453-1-6

Religion and Law

Nick Spencer | 978-0-9562182-8-5

Neither Private nor Privileged

The Role of Christianity in Britain today
Nick Spencer | 978-0-9554453-3-0

Talking God

The Legitimacy of Religious Public
Reasoning
Jonathan Chaplin | 978-0-9554453-4-7

Rescuing Darwin

God and evolution in Britain today
Nick Spencer and Denis Alexander
978-0-9554453-5-4

Faith and Darwin

Harmony, conflict or confusion?
Caroline Lawes | 978-0-9554453-6-1

The National Lottery

Is it Progressive?
Paul Bickley

Religion and Identity

Divided loyalties?
Sean Oliver-Dee | 978-0-9554453-7-8

From Goodness to God

Why Religion Makes Sense of our Moral
Commitments
Angus Ritchie | 978-0-9562182-9-2

Discussing Darwin

An extended interview with Mary
Midgley
978-0-9554453-9-2

Doubting Darwin

Creationism and evolution scepticism
in Britain today
978-0-9554453-8-5

Mapping the Field:

A review of the current research
evidence on the impact of schools with
a Christian ethos
Researcher: Dr Elizabeth Green
Research Supervisor: Dr Trevor Cooling
978-0-9562182-0-9

Free to Believe?

Religious Freedom in a Liberal Society
Roger Trigg | 978-0-9562182-1-6

Wholly Living:

A new perspective on international
development
Cafod, Tearfund and Theos
978-0-9562182-2-3

Doing God in Education

Trevor Cooling | 978-0-9562182-3-0

Give us our Ball Back

Reclaiming Sport for the Common
Good
Paul Bickley and Sam Tomlin

Turbulent Priests?

The Archbishop of Canterbury in
contemporary English politics
Daniel Gover | 978-0-9562182-5-4

Multiculturalism:

a Christian Retrieval
Jonathan Chaplin | 978-0-9562182-6-1

the battle for hearts and minds

"I have been fortunate to have had 40 years as a soldier – those forty years covering four decades each with a different characteristic...What that forty years experience has taught me is that warfare, for all its violence, controversy and cost is essentially about people. It is people who do the fighting, on behalf of other people and amongst the people in whose country we are operating – so warfare today, and perhaps it was ever thus, is a human activity. So in addressing tonight's title, I do so in the broadest context of the hearts and minds of the people – their attitude to what they are doing, and their attitude to what is going on around them."

The 2011 Theos Annual Lecture was delivered by General Lord Richard Dannatt and chaired by BBC Defense Correspondent Caroline Wyatt on Tuesday 8th November 2011, at One Birdcage Walk, London.