

## LETTERS

### **Masters of Strategy**

I enjoyed David Leece's excellent summary of history's great strategists [*United Service* **68** (2), 21 – 26 (June 2017)].

In his definition of strategy, he applied a modification of the traditional United States construct for the 'elements' of national power. The United States has traditionally used DIME – that is, Diplomatic, Informational, Military and Economic. David used Political, Economic, Psychological and Military.

Another United States construct used is PMESII – that is, Political, Military, Economic, Social, Infrastructure and Information. Other constructs also use Legal and Finance.

Ontologies are important as they frame the way we think about subjects and situations. Similarly, strategic planners need to align actions with responsibility. Who in a government, for example, would be responsible for the information line of effort?

I'm not advocating the use of one construct over another, but it is important to recognise that human society is a complex adaptive system with an almost infinite number of different ways of being arranged. So, understanding the 'problem' is the first challenge and then, once you think you have that figured out, the second stage is determining how to encourage bits of that system to move in the direction that you want.

**Marcus Fielding**  
Melbourne, 27 July 2017