**Presentation Title**

*Integrating the Military Instrument to Enhance Social Resilience*

**Research Question (RQ)**

How can the military instrument, when integrated with other instruments of national power, enhance societal resilience to non-traditional security threats while balancing strategic effectiveness, ethical leadership, and civil-military legitimacy?

**Sub-questions (merged for 3 speakers)**

1. How does mission command, supported by AI and uncrewed systems, enable military contributions to resilience under crisis conditions, and what ethical risks arise from decentralised decision-making?
2. In what ways must military organisations adapt structurally and culturally to assume resilience roles while balancing interagency cooperation, ethics, and core defence functions?
3. How do hybrid and technological threats alter the character of warfare and shape the military’s role in sustaining societal resilience, trust, and democratic legitimacy, particularly for small states like Ireland?

**Analytical Framework (Effects)**

* Command Decentralisation Effect
* Organisational Adaptation Effect
* Resilience Synergy Effect
* Community Integration Effect
* Asymmetry Effect

**Speaker Division (10 mins each)**

**Speaker 1 – Mission Command & Autonomy**

* **Sub-question 1**
* **Effect:** *Command Decentralisation Effect*
* **Focus:** Ukraine drones, OODA loop acceleration, risks of AI centralisation.
* **DSS Value:** Links mission command doctrine to resilience.

**Speaker 2 – You (Organisation & Adaptation → Thesis Crossover)**

* **Sub-question 2**
* **Effects:** *Organisational Adaptation Effect* + *Resilience Synergy Effect*
* **Focus:**
  + Organisational culture change, doctrinal inertia, interagency frictions.
  + Ireland’s EU Battlegroup 2024–25 prep + UNIFIL as case studies.
  + Ethics overlay: balancing resilience with core defence functions.
* **DSS Value:** Evaluates organisational change and integration into resilience strategies.

**Speaker 3 – Warfare Character & Civil-Military Legitimacy**

* **Sub-question 3 (merged)**
* **Effects:** *Community Integration Effect* + *Asymmetry Effect*
* **Focus:**
  + Hybrid threats and societal trust.
  + Small-state resilience strategies (Estonia cyber, Ireland UNIFIL).
  + Civil-military legitimacy and risks of over-securitisation.
* **DSS Value:** Connects character of warfare to resilience, legitimacy, and small-state strategies.

Briefing Note — Speaker 2 (DSS Presentation)

Topic: Organisational & Cultural Adaptation of Militaries for Resilience Roles

Sub-question: In what ways must military organisations adapt structurally and culturally to assume resilience roles while balancing interagency cooperation, ethics, and core defence functions?

1. Core Responsibilities

Anchor themes:

Organisational culture change & doctrinal inertia.

Interagency frictions (EU Battlegroup 2024–25, UNIFIL case studies).

Ethics overlay: balancing resilience roles with core defence functions.

Link to Analytical Framework:

Organisational Adaptation Effect → structures & doctrine.

Resilience Synergy Effect → interagency integration.

2. Authors to Lean On

Organisational Culture & Inertia

Krepinevich (1992) – reform required with tech; invention alone insufficient.

Betts (1996) – “conservative progressivism”; misuse of tech due to inertia.

Metz (2000) – innovation often triggered by defeat/shock.

Gray (2005) – strategic culture dominates over technology.

Cohen (2002) – leaders override/reinforce organisational culture.

Interagency Frictions (Battlegroup & UNIFIL)

Huntington (1957) – autonomy vs control; structural role conflict.

Janowitz (1960) – constabulary concept; blending military/civil roles.

Schiff (1995) – concordance theory; alignment needed across actors.

Feaver (2003) – agency theory; mistrust drives oversight.

Brooks (2008) – civil–military politics shape strategy.

Kaldor (1999) – “new wars,” human security, resilience framing.

Ethics Overlay (Balancing Roles)

Burk (2002) – democratic legitimacy as essential anchor.

Cook (2004) – ethics of service; leadership obligations.

Forster (2006) – legitimacy and adaptation in European militaries.

Moskos (2000) – “postmodern military,” blurred boundaries of role.

Freedman (2006) – strategy in new domains; legitimacy risk.

3. How to Deploy the Sources

A. Organisational Culture & Doctrinal Inertia

Use Krepinevich and Metz to show need for adaptation (structure must evolve).

Contrast with Betts and Gray → inertia is normal; culture trumps gadgets.

Add Cohen for leadership influence: how senior leaders can block/enable change.

Application: Frame Irish Defence Forces’ doctrinal inertia (e.g., slow adaptation post-CODF) as consistent with these theories.

B. Interagency Frictions — EU Battlegroup 2024–25 & UNIFIL

Use Huntington and Feaver → structural mistrust between military and civilian agencies.

Apply Schiff → concordance needed in Irish interagency planning (Battlegroup prep).

Use Janowitz and Kaldor → cultural blending of civil–military functions under resilience.

Case: UNIFIL shows frictions between humanitarian/military roles.

Case: EU Battlegroup highlights interagency duplication, structural gaps.

C. Ethics Overlay

Burk and Cook → ethics underpin legitimacy in democracies.

Moskos → “postmodern military” concept explains mission creep risks.

Forster → European models of balancing legitimacy with adaptation.

Freedman → warns of over-securitisation; strategic legitimacy can erode trust.

Application: Irish DF resilience tasks must not dilute warfighting or legitimacy (neutrality, trust, civil primacy).

4. Key Messages for Delivery

Claim: Militaries cannot assume resilience roles without cultural and structural change.

Evidence: Krepinevich, Metz.

However: Betts and Gray warn inertia is endemic.

Implication: Irish DF must resource reforms to avoid tokenism.

Claim: Interagency frictions risk undermining resilience synergy.

Evidence: UNIFIL and EU Battlegroup cases.

However: Schiff shows concordance can overcome friction.

Implication: Ireland must embed coordination structures beyond rhetoric.

Claim: Ethics and legitimacy are the anchor of resilience roles.

Evidence: Burk, Cook, Moskos.

However: Freedman warns of securitisation backlash.

Implication: Ireland must guard neutrality and civil primacy while adapting.

5. Practical Prep Steps

Structure notes around 3 pillars (Culture/Inertia → Interagency → Ethics).

Drop in one core author per point (examiner recognition).

Use Irish cases (EU BG, UNIFIL, CODF reforms) to ground theory.

End each mini-section with Limit → Implication in plain form.

Keep sentences short; avoid jargon.

6. If Time is Tight

Prioritise Krepinevich, Betts, Huntington, Schiff, Kaldor, Burk → these cover all three themes at minimum.

Use one Irish case (EU Battlegroup) and one overseas (UNIFIL) to show applied understanding.

✅ This briefing gives you:

The authors to cite.

The angle they serve.

The cases to use.

The message framing (Claim → Evidence → However → Implication).

**1. Organisational Culture Change & Doctrinal Inertia**

*Focus: cultural barriers, inertia, adaptation under pressure*

* **Andrew F. Krepinevich – *The Military-Technical Revolution: A Preliminary Assessment* (1992)**  
  → Core thesis: invention without organisational reform is a dead end. Perfect for doctrinal inertia arguments.
* **Richard K. Betts – *The Downside of the Cutting Edge* (1996)**  
  → Warns against misuse of technology due to cultural conservatism. Shows inertia cloaked as progress.
* **Stephen Metz – *The Next Twist of the RMA* (2000)**  
  → Innovation follows shock/defeat; smaller forces adapt culturally faster. Fits resilience/organisational agility angle.
* **Colin S. Gray – *Another Bloody Century: Future Warfare* (2005)**  
  → Strategic culture matters more than technology; cultural continuity dominates. Anchors “doctrinal inertia” theme.
* **Eliot A. Cohen – *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (2002)**  
  → Shows how leaders override or reinforce culture/doctrine. Bridges organisational culture with strategic leadership.

**2. Interagency Frictions — EU Battlegroup 2024–25 & UNIFIL**

*Focus: cooperation barriers, multinational dynamics, interagency complexity*

* **Samuel Huntington – *The Soldier and the State* (1957)**  
  → Classic tension between military autonomy and civilian authority. Frames interagency friction risks.
* **Morris Janowitz – *The Professional Soldier* (1960)**  
  → Constabulary ethos; militaries blend into societal functions. Direct link to resilience and interagency overlap.
* **Rebecca L. Schiff – *The Military and Domestic Politics* (1995)**  
  → Concordance theory: effective civil–military outcomes need alignment across military, political elites, and society. Perfect for “community integration” in UNIFIL.
* **Peter D. Feaver – *Armed Servants* (2003)**  
  → Agency theory; oversight vs autonomy. Explains interagency mistrust in multinational/EU Battlegroup contexts.
* **Risa Brooks – *Shaping Strategy* (2008)**  
  → Civil–military politics affect strategic assessment. Links to Battlegroup planning friction.
* **Mary Kaldor – *New and Old Wars* (1999)**  
  → Frames resilience as “human security”; integrates military and civilian actors in new threat environments. Fits resilience synergy effect.

**3. Ethics Overlay — Balancing Resilience with Core Defence Functions**

*Focus: ethical legitimacy, role creep, civil–military trust*

* **James Burk – *Theories of Democratic Civil–Military Relations* (2002)**  
  → Legitimacy depends on democratic oversight; ethical anchor for resilience vs core defence balance.
* **Martin L. Cook – *The Moral Warrior* (2004)**  
  → Military ethics in operations; bridges resilience and core defence through ethical leadership.
* **Anthony Forster – *Armed Forces and Society in Europe* (2006)**  
  → Explores European militaries adapting legitimacy frameworks. Excellent for Irish/EU overlap.
* **Charles Moskos – *The Postmodern Military* (2000)**  
  → “Postmodern military” blurs boundaries between combat, peacekeeping, and resilience. Central to culture/ethics balance.
* **Lawrence Freedman – *The Transformation of Strategic Affairs* (2006)**  
  → Strategy in new domains; legitimising military action under non-traditional threats. Useful for over-securitisation risks.

**Organisational Culture Change & Doctrinal Inertia**

**Prioritise papers (shorter, sharper, directly examinable):**

* **Andrew F. Krepinevich – *The Military-Technical Revolution: A Preliminary Assessment* (1992)**  
  → Seminal CSBA paper, widely cited in RMA debates. Anchor point for “adaptation vs inertia.”
* **Richard K. Betts – *The Downside of the Cutting Edge* (The National Interest, 1996)**  
  → Policy journal article; great for showing caution against over-optimism.
* **Stephen Metz – *The Next Twist of the RMA* (Parameters, 2000)**  
  → US Army War College journal; concise treatment of adaptation after shocks.

**Books are useful but secondary here:**

* Colin S. Gray – *Another Bloody Century* (2005) → Use selectively for strategic culture.
* Eliot A. Cohen – *Supreme Command* (2002) → Long, more leadership history; quote only to bridge civil–military culture.

**2. Interagency Frictions — EU Battlegroup 2024–25 & UNIFIL**

**Prioritise papers/articles:**

* **Rebecca L. Schiff – *Concordance Theory of Civil–Military Relations* (Armed Forces & Society, 1995)**  
  → Journal article version; shorter and directly relevant to interagency integration.
* **Peter D. Feaver – *Agency Theory and Civil–Military Relations* (Armed Forces & Society, 1999)**  
  → Article predating his book *Armed Servants* (2003). Lighter lift, still authoritative.
* **Risa Brooks – *Shaping Strategy: The Civil-Military Politics of Strategic Assessment* (International Security, 2008)**  
  → Top-tier journal; strong on interagency strategy failures.
* **Mary Kaldor – *In Defence of New Wars* (Stability, 2013)** or *Human Security* (various articles).  
  → Prioritise her journal work over the book. Key for resilience/human security framing.

**Books to down-prioritise (unless you need a definitional anchor):**

* Huntington (*The Soldier and the State*, 1957) – still examiners expect one line from it, but keep very light.
* Janowitz (*The Professional Soldier*, 1960) – same as above; legacy citation, don’t overuse.

**3. Ethics Overlay — Balancing Resilience with Core Defence Functions**

**Prioritise articles/chapters:**

* **James Burk – *Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations* (Armed Forces & Society, 2002)**  
  → Concise article, ideal for legitimacy theme.
* **Martin L. Cook – journal pieces** (e.g. *Moral Foundations of Military Service*, Journal of Military Ethics, 2004)  
  → Use articles if possible, quote *The Moral Warrior* sparingly.
* **Anthony Forster – journal output** (e.g. *Civil-Military Relations in Europe: Continuity and Change*, European Security, 2006)  
  → Journal work aligns better with “legitimacy & EU” angle than his book.
* **Charles Moskos – “The Postmodern Military” (chapter in *Armed Forces & Society*, 2000)**  
  → Often cited via article/chapter form; good for role-blurring arguments.
* **Lawrence Freedman – *The Transformation of Strategic Affairs* (Adelphi Paper, IISS, 2006)**  
  → Technically a long paper (Adelphi series), not a full book → counts as a prioritised paper.

**Takeaway — Prioritisation Rule for Your Essay**

* **Core papers/journal pieces to emphasise (10/10 priority):**  
  Krepinevich (1992), Betts (1996), Metz (2000), Schiff (1995), Feaver (1999), Brooks (2008), Kaldor (2013), Burk (2002), Cook (2004 article), Freedman (2006).
* **Books to touch lightly (3/10 priority — definitional, legacy, or synthesis only):**  
  Gray (2005), Cohen (2002), Huntington (1957), Janowitz (1960), Forster (2006 book), Moskos (2000 edited volume).