

# Naval War College Review

---

Volume 70  
Number 4 *Autumn*

Article 23

---

2017

## Autumn 2017 Full Issue

The U.S. Naval War College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Naval War College, The U.S. (2017) "Autumn 2017 Full Issue," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 70 : No. 4 , Article 23.  
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol70/iss4/23>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

# NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

**Autumn 2017**

Volume 70, Number 4



**Cover**

*Original caption: "Vice Admiral Friedrich Ruge, Inspector of the Federal German Navy (left) receives the Legion of Merit (Degree of Commander) from Chief of U.S. Naval Operations, Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, USN (right). The award was presented to Admiral Ruge on February 21, 1961." Burke and Ruge established a relationship of friendship and trust as they worked together to integrate the German navy rebuilt after World War II into the Western alliance system. In "German Navies from 1848 to 2016: Their Development and Courses from Confrontation to Cooperation," author Werner Rahn recounts the arc of the history of German navies.*

*Credit: Official U.S. Navy photo. The Citadel Archives and Museum, Charleston, South Carolina, Ruge Collection*

# NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW



Autumn 2017  
Volume 70, Number 4



NAVAL WAR COLLEGE PRESS  
686 Cushing Road  
Newport, RI 02841-1207

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE PRESS ADVISORY BOARD

Adam Bellow  
Seth Cropsey  
Jeffrey Kline  
Gale A. Mattox  
Capt. Robert C. Rubel, USN (Ret.)  
Robert A. Silano  
Marin Strmecki  
Dov S. Zakheim

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW EDITORIAL BOARD

Donald Chisholm  
Stephen Downes-Martin  
Andrew S. Erickson  
Col. Theodore L. Gatchel, USMC (Ret.)  
Cdr. Sean Henseler, USN (Ret.)  
Cdr. James Kraska, USN (Ret.)  
Capt. Thomas Mangold, USN (Ret.)  
John Maurer  
Col. Mackubin Owens, USMC (Ret.)  
Capt. Derek S. Reveron, USNR  
Capt. Peter M. Swartz, USN (Ret.)  
Capt. Sam Tangredi, USN (Ret.)  
Scott C. Truver  
James J. Wirtz

PRESIDENT, NAVAL WAR COLLEGE  
Rear Adm. Jeffrey A. Harley, USN

PROVOST  
Dr. Lewis M. Duncan

DEAN OF NAVAL WARFARE STUDIES  
Thomas J. Culora

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE PRESS  
Carnes Lord, *Editor*  
Robert Ayer, *Managing Editor*  
Kate Acosta, *Associate Editor*  
Timothy J. Demy and Brad Carter, *Book Review Editors*

Lori A. Almeida, *Administrative Assistant and Circulation Manager*  
Frank Uhlig Jr., *Editor Emeritus*

*Naval War College Review*  
Code 32, Naval War College  
686 Cushing Rd., Newport, RI 02841-1207

Fax: 401.841.1071  
DSN exchange, all lines: 841  
Website: [www.usnwc.edu/press](http://www.usnwc.edu/press)  
<http://twitter.com/NavalWarCollege>

*Editor, Circulation, or Business*  
401.841.2236  
[press@usnwc.edu](mailto:press@usnwc.edu)

*Managing Editor*  
401.841.4552  
[managingeditor@usnwc.edu](mailto:managingeditor@usnwc.edu)

*Book Reviews*  
[bookreviews@usnwc.edu](mailto:bookreviews@usnwc.edu)

*Other Naval War College Offices*  
401.841.3089



The *Naval War College Review* was established in 1948 as a forum for discussion of public policy matters of interest to the maritime services. The thoughts and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the U.S. government, the U.S. Navy Department, or the Naval War College.

The journal is published quarterly. Distribution is limited generally to commands and activities of the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; regular and reserve officers of U.S. services; foreign officers and civilians having a present or previous affiliation with the Naval War College; selected U.S. government officials and agencies; and selected U.S. and international libraries, research centers, publications, and educational institutions.

#### **Contributors**

Please request the standard contributors' guidance from the managing editor or access it online before submitting manuscripts. The *Naval War College Review* neither offers nor makes compensation for articles or book reviews, and it assumes no responsibility for the return of manuscripts, although every effort is made to return those not accepted. In submitting work, the sender warrants that it is original, that it is the sender's property, and that neither it nor a similar work by the sender has been accepted or is under consideration elsewhere.

#### **Permissions**

Reproduction and reprinting are subject to the Copyright Act of 1976 and applicable treaties of the United States. To obtain permission to reproduce material bearing a copyright notice, or to reproduce any material for commercial purposes, contact the editor for each use. Material not bearing a copyright notice may be freely reproduced for academic or other noncommercial use; however, it is requested that the author and *Naval War College Review* be credited and that the editor be informed.

Periodicals postage paid at Newport, RI. POSTMASTERS, send address changes to: *Naval War College Review*, Code 32S, Naval War College, 686 Cushing Rd., Newport, RI 02841-1207.

ISSN 0028-1484



# CONTENTS

---

<b>From the Editors</b> .....	5
<b>President's Forum</b> .....	9

---

## *Allied Navies*

### **German Navies from 1848 to 2016**

Their Development and Courses from Confrontation to Cooperation .....	13
---	----

*Werner Rahn*

Between the German navy's foundation in 1848 and the present day, it went from initial reliance on USN assistance, to twice attempting to cut Atlantic shipping routes between the United States and Europe, to a cooperative relationship between the two navies built on mutual trust.

---

## *Maritime Strategy*

### **The New Time and Space**

Dimensions of a Maritime Defense Strategy .....	48
---	----

*Tomohisa Takei*

China's aggressive land-reclamation projects in Asian waters represent a challenge to the status quo. The international system, the United States and Japan, and smaller countries seeking regional stability must reexamine their concepts of time and space if they are to better deter the designs of a revisionist power.

---

## *European Security*

<b>Rebuilding the Ukrainian Navy</b> .....	61
--	----

*Deborah Sanders*

Russia's seizure of many of Ukraine's naval assets dealt a serious blow to the already-small Ukrainian navy. The Ukrainian government's ambitions to rebuild a balanced fleet may be unrealizable. The progress already made in building a "mosquito fleet" suggests that redirecting development toward coastal defense would be a wiser course.

---

## *Maritime History*

### **Confronting Uncertainty with Decentralized Command**

British Naval Decision Making at the Outbreak of the War of 1812 .....	78
--	----

*Kevin D. McCranie*

During an era of slow, uncertain communications, Royal Navy operations during the opening months of the War of 1812 underscore the complexity of naval decision making at the campaign level. Studying this period aids in understanding the relationship among governmental leaders, their theater commanders, and operational elements at sea.



---

## *Strategy and Policy*

### **Money, Motivation, and Terrorism**

Rewards-for-Information Programs ..... 101

*Christopher M. Ford*

Governments rely on both hard and soft power to neutralize terrorists. The State and Defense Departments offer rewards running to millions of dollars for information to aid in the fight, but these programs receive a surprising lack of scrutiny. Both historical and psychological analysis can improve our framing and execution of such programs.

### **Research & Debate**

Strategic Culture Is Not a Silver Bullet ..... 121

*Antulio J. Echevarria II*

### **Review Essays**

The Case for Hard Power ..... 125

*The Big Stick: The Limits of Soft Power & the Necessity of Military Force*, by *Eliot A. Cohen*

reviewed by *Dov S. Zakheim*

Options for National Security Policy: Practitioners' Advice for the New Administration ..... 134

*Charting a Course: Strategic Choices for a New Administration*, edited by *Richard D. Hooker Jr.*

reviewed by *Sam J. Tangredi*

### **Book Reviews**

*Exporting Security: International Engagement, Security Cooperation, and the Changing Face of the US Military*, by *Derek S. Reveron*

reviewed by *Michael McCrabb* ..... 141

*How Everything Became War and the Military Became Everything: Tales from the Pentagon*, by *Rosa Brooks*

reviewed by *Thomas W. McShane* ..... 143

*Rough Waters: Sovereignty and the American Merchant Flag*, by *Rodney P. Carlisle*, with *Bradford Smith*

reviewed by *Scott Bergeron* ..... 144

*Practise to Deceive:*  
*Learning Curves of Military Deception Planners*, by Barton Whaley  
 reviewed by Richard J. Norton. . . . . 146

*Meeting China Halfway: How to Defuse the Emerging US-China Rivalry*, by Lyle J. Goldstein  
 reviewed by Mark R. Shulman. . . . . 148

*Sea Power: The History and Geopolitics of the World's Oceans*,  
 by James Stavridis  
 reviewed by Philip M. Bilden. . . . . 149

*Outsourcing War: The Just War Tradition in the Age of Military Privatization*, by Amy Eckert  
 reviewed by Edward Erwin . . . . . 150

*Napoleonic Warfare:*  
*The Operational Art of the Great Campaigns*, by John T. Kuehn  
 reviewed by Michael V. Leggiere. . . . . 152

*Hunters and Killers, vol. 2, Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943*,  
 by Norman Polmar and Edward Whitman  
 reviewed by Sean Sullivan. . . . . 154

*Honor before Glory: The Epic World War II Story of the Japanese-American GIs Who Rescued the Lost Battalion*, by Scott McGaugh  
 reviewed by Richard J. Norton. . . . . 156

*Routledge Handbook of Ethics and War: Just War Theory in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Fritz Allhoff, Nicholas G. Evans,  
 and Adam Henschke  
 reviewed by Edward Erwin . . . . . 159

**Reflections on Reading** . . . . . 162



## FROM THE EDITORS

---

For a nation to come to grips in a serious way with its own military history is never easy, particularly after a disastrous defeat (although victory is not without its own challenges). It is all the more impressive, then, that the modern German navy has institutionalized the study of its own history in a manner that bears testimony to the best traditions of German scholarship. In “German Navies from 1848 to 2016: Their Development and Courses from Confrontation to Cooperation,” Werner Rahn provides an authoritative overview of the German navy, from its rise in imperial times, through its role in the two world wars of the last century, to its reconstitution after the defeat of Hitler and the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany. In a period when major-power naval conflict once again has become thinkable, it is well to be reminded of the strategic importance of naval power—and of the gross blunders nations can make in wielding it. Perhaps the most telling insight he offers from the German experience is the navy’s failure to take sufficient account of the severe geographical limitations it faced. In this, as in other respects, there may be lessons here for a rising maritime China. Werner Rahn, a retired captain in the German navy and former director of the German Armed Forces Military History Research Office, was awarded the Hattendorf Prize for Distinguished Original Research in Maritime History by the Naval War College in 2016.

In the contemporary strategic environment, the most urgent challenge is not so much the threat of traditional major-power war as it is the aggressive use of nontraditional measures short of war by revisionist powers such as China and Russia. In “The New Time and Space: Dimensions of a Maritime Defense Strategy,” Tomohisa Takei argues that status quo powers such as Japan and the United States must be resolute in resisting these measures, stressing the importance of concerted multinational responses. Admiral Tomohisa Takei (Ret.), a former chief of staff of the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force, is currently a professor and distinguished international fellow at the Naval War College.

In “Rebuilding the Ukrainian Navy,” Deborah Sanders reviews the challenges facing Ukraine in reconstituting its naval forces following the devastating losses Russia inflicted on them in the course of its occupation of Crimea in 2014. She does so in the context of Russia’s ongoing proxy war in Ukraine’s eastern provinces, and notes in particular the threat this poses to the important port of

Mariupol. She argues that, given the desperate condition of the Ukrainian economy, for the foreseeable future the rebuilding effort should be limited to creating a “mosquito fleet” for coastal defense. Deborah Sanders is a reader in defense and security studies at King’s College London.

Perhaps in part because it had no very clear winner or loser, the War of 1812 has received relatively little attention in either British or American military historiography, particularly at the operational or campaign level. Kevin D. McCranie, in “Confronting Uncertainty with Decentralized Command: British Naval Decision Making at the Outbreak of the War of 1812,” makes the case that this neglect is unwarranted. At first sight, this history seems to lack contemporary relevance, given the poor communications available to maritime forces during that early period; but this assumes that today’s instantaneous electronic communications will not be subject to serious degradation at the outset of hostilities between major powers. Kevin McCranie is a professor in the Strategy and Policy Department at the Naval War College.

In “Money, Motivation, and Terrorism: Rewards-for-Information Programs,” Christopher M. Ford addresses the neglected subject of the efficacy of the long-standing U.S. government programs that generate information on terrorist activities by offering monetary rewards, using as a historical case study the very successful program the British instituted during the Malayan Emergency. He argues that much more attention needs to be given to the impact of such rewards on the particular situation and expectations of the recipients. Lieutenant Colonel Christopher Ford, USA, is currently a military professor at the Stockton Center for the Study of International Law at the Naval War College.

## IF YOU VISIT US

Our editorial offices are located in Sims Hall, in the Naval War College Coasters Harbor Island complex, on the third floor, west wing (rooms W334, 335, 309). For building-security reasons, it would be necessary to meet you at the main entrance and escort you to our suite—give us a call ahead of time (401-841-2236).





*Rear Admiral Jeff Harley is the fifty-sixth President of the U.S. Naval War College. The College is responsible for educating future leaders, developing their strategic perspective and critical thinking, and enhancing their capability to advise senior leaders and policy makers.*

*Admiral Harley is a career surface warfare officer whose sea-duty assignments have included command of USS Milius (DDG 69), Destroyer Squadron 9, and Amphibious Force Seventh Fleet / Expeditionary Strike Group 7 / Task Force 76. During his command of Milius, the ship participated in combat operations supporting Operation IRAQI FREEDOM and his crew won the Battle Efficiency Award and the Marjorie Sterrett Battleship Fund Award for overall combat readiness.*

*Admiral Harley attended the University of Minnesota, graduating with a bachelor of arts in political science, and received master of arts degrees from the Naval War College and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. Additionally, he served as a military fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City.*

## PRESIDENT'S FORUM

---



### *On Internationalization*

AFTER I ASSUMED MY POSITION as President of the Naval War College last year, I identified four broad elements of a vision for the institution. We will *operationalize*, *navalize*, *futurize*, and *internationalize* the College's education and research efforts, with an overall goal of contributing to the professionalism and capabilities of the nation's future leaders. Previously I laid out an overview in the *Naval War College Review's* Autumn 2016 edition and addressed aspects of the vision's *operationalization* component in the Winter 2017 issue, *navalization* in the Spring 2017 issue, and *futurization* in the Summer 2017 issue. I would like to round out the discussion of our vision by reviewing our ongoing efforts in the areas of international education and engagement.

Accelerating a process begun sixty-one years ago when the Naval Command College was established, and forty-eight years after the first International Seapower Symposium (ISS) was convened in Newport, the College will strive to *internationalize* itself further so that it becomes the veritable locus of international maritime cooperation. Over the past six decades, the participation of topflight international officers in the classroom greatly broadened and enhanced the educational experience of the College's U.S. alumni. But that was never the sole nor the overriding reason it first opened its doors to the international community; educating international officers always has been a goal in itself. On any given day, the College's international alumni command about 40 percent of the world's navies and coast guards. That these leaders possess a sophisticated understanding of international politics, a thorough familiarity with the United States and its military forces, and a shared appreciation for the profession's norms of behavior is of inestimable value to both the United States and the international community. The bonds of understanding, friendship, and trust forged in Newport have made



the College “neutral ground,” where the personnel of navies from around the world not only feel welcome but are inspired to work together.

Through a series of initiatives undertaken in the spirit of this *internationalization*, the College seeks to promote ever-greater levels of cooperation and interoperability among the world’s navies and coast guards. Key steps include the following:

- *Expand the Presidential Fellows Program to include four former heads of navy.* We are incredibly blessed to have Admiral Guillermo Barrera, former head of the Colombian navy; Admiral Nirmal Verma, former head of the Indian navy; and Admiral Tomohisa Takei, recently retired head of the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force, currently aboard. Rear Admiral Lars Saunes, former head of the Royal Norwegian Navy, will join us in the fall of 2017. In addition to writing, teaching, and mentoring students, they will advise the President of the College and, in coordination with the dean of International Programs, will develop and execute a plan that maintains policy momentum between the regularly scheduled International Seapower Symposia. Admiral Barrera notes: “When I give lectures for the College of Naval Warfare and the College of Naval Command and Staff, I stress the usefulness of the themes and tools that the NWC [Naval War College] uses and teaches, as well as the contributions of the theorists in helping to understand the finer points of maritime strategy and operations. I illustrate this by citing successes and failures that have occurred in real life. I also love supporting other areas of education at the College, such as the Combined Forces Maritime Component Commander course and the regional alumni symposia. These two initiatives are a significant part of the education of both the U.S. personnel and their global partners.”
- *Bring the International Maritime Staff Operators Course (I-MSOC) to full output by 2020.* This spring, fifteen officers from thirteen countries attended a “beta test” for the twelve-week course. Students were taught the fundamental concepts and processes necessary to support a coalition or combined maritime component commander, with emphasis on the U.S. Navy Planning Process and the organization and functions of a U.S. maritime operations center. Graduates of I-MSOC will serve as catalysts for greater interoperability of coalition forces brought together to meet the challenges of the next maritime crisis. The course will be held three times a year, for an annual throughput of seventy-five students.
- *Increase the frequency of the College’s regional alumni symposia (RASs) from one to two annually.* These symposia are international academic conferences premised on the belief that military education is not solely the product of a

schoolhouse, but rather a lifelong attempt to acquire knowledge about the profession of arms. RASs also foster professional interaction among up-and-coming military leaders within a region. This network promotes professional linkages among military officers at a crucial juncture in their careers when international contacts prove invaluable. Usually cohosted with a war college from another country, RASs offer an excellent opportunity to interact with and influence a wide range of naval professionals around the world—like a “mini-ISS.”

- *Institutionalize student military-to-military exchange efforts with China and other nations.* Building understanding, friendship, and trust is a slow, laborious process that begins with small steps—particularly with countries that harbor deep suspicions of the United States. Midlevel student exchanges are an ideal means to that end.
- *Increase the capacity of the College to conduct sustained, purposeful engagement with our international partners, particularly its war college counterparts.* The cost-effective means of influencing future generations of naval officers is through their professional military education. By adding a small cadre of active and retired foreign area officers, the College aims to expand its contacts abroad and facilitate faculty exchanges, curriculum development, and war gaming.

The return on investment of these small yet critical initiatives can be significant. The Naval War College will continue to seek ways to enhance its *internationalization* mission. It has been said that, while the sleek, gray hulls wrought by the skilled hands of patriotic shipwrights are important, we also must be vigilant in our efforts to build *friend-ships*, *relation-ships*, and *partner-ships*!

As noted in the opening paragraph of this President's Forum, the College is moving out smartly to execute a four-part vision for the institution to make it more supportive of the needs of the operating forces; more attentive to the unique challenges and opportunities represented by our naval heritage and focus; more cognizant of and attuned to the impact that technological change will have on our maritime and joint forces; and more assiduous in its efforts to enhance maritime cooperation and friendship around the globe. I can assure you that all hands are “turning to” to make this vision a reality.

JEFFREY A. HARLEY

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy  
President, U.S. Naval War College*

*Werner Rahn is a retired captain in the German navy, a leading German naval historian, and the former director of the German Armed Forces Military History Research Office. He received his PhD from the University of Hamburg in 1974. Among his critically acclaimed works is the sixty-eight-volume, annotated, facsimile edition of the War Diary of the German Naval Staff, 1939–45 (Mittler, 1988–97, in German), which has been called the single most important resource for understanding the decisions of the German naval high command during World War II. In addition, Rahn contributed the major naval sections to the monumental, multivolume series produced by the German Armed Forces Military History Research Office, Germany and the Second World War, published in English (Clarendon, 1990–) and German. In 2016, the Naval War College awarded Rahn the Hattendorf Prize for Distinguished Original Research in Maritime History. This article expands on his Hattendorf Prize lecture.*

© 2017 by Werner Rahn  
Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4

## GERMAN NAVIES FROM 1848 TO 2016

---

### Their Development and Courses from Confrontation to Cooperation

*Werner Rahn*

**M**ilitary history deals with the evolution and structure of armed forces and their position in state and society. In this sense, *naval history* is taken to mean that part of military history that concentrates its studies on the navy. However, when dealing with fields of research, one sphere provides the greatest challenge for military and naval historians: warfare in the widest sense.<sup>1</sup>

In his book *The Face of Battle*, British historian John Keegan points out that many historians are shy about exploring the profundities and realities of war.<sup>2</sup> Generally speaking, we can expect naval or other military historians to have a certain affinity for the subject of their research. They should have a basic knowledge about the military, in the same way that we expect an economic historian to have a sound basic knowledge of economic theory. But Keegan is justified in demanding that the military historian spend as much time as possible among military personnel, “because the quite chance observation of trivial incidents may illuminate his . . . understanding of all sorts of problems from the past which will otherwise almost certainly remain obscured.”<sup>3</sup> Like any historian, the naval historian bears a great responsibility in his striving after historical truth, if he wants to be taken seriously. The uncritical patriotic history that used to glorify naval actions should be a thing of the past.

Today, some historians tend to judge personalities, events, and structures according to today’s moral categories. They end up “putting the past on trial, and since the critical historian, armed with his generation’s self-confidence or with his progressive concept of the future, knows everything better, in this trial he will be prosecutor, judge, and legislator all in one.”<sup>4</sup>

In 1957, the German navy began to develop a new approach to studying its own history. That year, the first fleet commander in chief, Rear Admiral Rolf Johannesson (1900–89), organized the Historical-Tactical Conference. Since then it has been held every year, and is now a standard element of the naval officer's historical education. Johannesson's aim was to distance his service from subjective naval history about World War I.<sup>5</sup> He hoped that a critical discussion of the past would teach his officers truth, loyalty, and moral courage, and that they would determine their own position more solidly by recourse to history and the federal constitution. Through 2016, fifty-six conferences have been held, covering a wide variety of subjects.<sup>6</sup> Papers usually are presented by junior officers from the fleet, assisted by naval historians. The presentation of the papers and the candid discussion of subjects relevant to the business of the day usually provide testimony to the intellectual talents among the navy's officer corps. Many an admiral-to-be made a mark when as a lieutenant he presented some critical theory about history—provoking the older generation's opposition.

It is a perennial challenge to historians even to come close to historical truth. The commercial success of popular publications, as well as the large number of visitors attracted to museums, indicates how many people have historical interests. Such continuing interest is a stimulating challenge for professional historians. We should continue to try to present our findings about background information and structures from the past in such a way that the message gets across—meaning that historical knowledge and historical sensitivity become factors serving to help stabilize a liberal society.

### THE BIRTH OF A GERMAN NAVY

The first German *navy* worthy to bear such designation was established in 1848, when a conflict over the duchy of Schleswig resulted in a war with Denmark.<sup>7</sup> At that time, Germany could do nothing against the Danes' efficient blockade; ocean trade came to a standstill. This dilemma resulted in a rather emotional movement that advocated building up a fleet. The issue soon captivated the members of the national assembly that had convened at Frankfurt's Saint Paul's Cathedral only a short time before. On June 14, 1848, by an overwhelming majority, the first German parliament voted a large appropriation to build a fleet.<sup>8</sup>

Prince Adalbert of Prussia (1811–73), who had concerned himself with maritime problems rather early, played an important part in those first maritime plans. In May 1848, he published a memorandum on the buildup of a German fleet that became, so to speak, the Magna Carta of the German navy. By analyzing the maritime-strategic situation of Prussia and Germany and having taken into consideration already the imminent technical revolution, it formed the first theoretical basis for a German naval concept. The memorandum included three

models on which Germany might establish a navy: (1) providing mere coastal defense; (2) defending sea lines of communication (SLOCs); or (3) building up an independent sea power. Prince Adalbert, however, clearly emphasized that even steps leading toward the buildup of an independent sea power would involve many risks, and that once this option had been chosen there could be no stopping halfway.<sup>9</sup>

During the preparations for the buildup of a fleet, it soon became clear that almost all requirements—in personnel, matériel, and organization—could not be met. It was, therefore, only natural to ask for foreign assistance. Arnold Duckwitz (1802–81), the first German secretary of the navy, in October 1848 forwarded an official request to the American government for assistance in building up, with regard to personnel and matériel, a German fleet. In the United States, the German liberal revolution had been observed with interest and with an open mind. Thus, the German requests met with a positive response within both private and official circles. First contacts were established by the frigate USS *St. Lawrence*, commanded by Captain Hiram Paulding (1797–1878), which was visiting Bremerhaven in the fall of 1848. The ship and crew were received enthusiastically as envoys of a hoped-for ally. The U.S. Navy immediately began personnel-support activities by rendering assistance with training: the frigate took aboard four Prussian sea cadets for practical exposure. Captain Paulding, as an adviser, was for weeks the center of attention during all discussions on the fleet buildup, which were held in Berlin, Frankfurt, and Hannover. The matériel support concentrated on providing a modern frigate, which was equipped at the New York Naval Yard and transferred to Europe in the summer of 1849.<sup>10</sup>

Even though the duration and the scope of this first American military aid to Germany were limited, that assistance provided early evidence of an American policy of being ready and able to support, across the Atlantic, the principles of democracy and liberalism. On both sides of that ocean, common goals and mutual sympathy for the liberal-democratic forces resulted in the first steps toward cooperation. How close these idealistic ties actually were became evident after the Frankfurt National Assembly failed, when high emigration rates resulted from disappointed democrats finding their spiritual home in the United States. One example was Carl Schurz (1829–1906), who later became Secretary of the Interior. Such a “brain drain” strengthened the hand of conservative forces in Germany—the consequences of which are well known.

The German navy remained in existence even after the dream of a united *Reich* had long gone and the reality of particularism governed German politics. However, in 1853 the fleet was disbanded and its few ships were sold or scrapped.<sup>11</sup> Only Prussia, with its relatively longer coastline, still had available a limited number of naval forces, proudly named the Royal Prussian Navy.

Yet the idea of the navy as an instrument of national unification stayed alive even after 1848. After the foundation of the Reich in 1871, the navy's function as a symbol of German unity was stressed officially, in contrast to the army's organization by individual states. The very term *Imperial Navy* emphasized that this instrument of power was subject directly to the Reich. The personnel of the Imperial German Navy (IGN) came from all parts of Germany, and the fleet became, as Tirpitz (see below) once put it, a "melting pot of teutonicism."<sup>12</sup>

However, until 1897 the navy's development was overshadowed by that of the army. The navy's contributions to the wars against Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866, and France in 1870–71 seemingly were of no importance. Strategically, the IGN concentrated on providing a forward coastal defense.<sup>13</sup>

### STRATEGIC ROOTS OF BUILDING A GERMAN BATTLE FLEET

In 1894, spurred by the theories of Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840–1914), the German naval high command prepared a strategic concept for the buildup of a battle fleet.<sup>14</sup> Captain Alfred von Tirpitz (1849–1930), then chief of staff of the naval high command, seems to have taken the initiative to formulate the famous *Dienstschrift* (Service Memorandum) No. IX, under the misleading title "General Lessons Learned from the Fleet Autumn Exercise."<sup>15</sup>

In this memorandum, Tirpitz resolutely pleads that strategic offensive actions should be considered "normal tasks of a fleet."<sup>16</sup> Such actions should aim at bringing about "the earliest possible initiation of a battle," a battle that would reach the "main decision" of naval warfare. That decision could not be reached by a cruiser war, such as was prescribed under the tenets of the French *Jeune École* school of thought, but "only by permanent naval supremacy and lasting pressure on the enemy."<sup>17</sup>

Owing to Germany's position in the heart of Central Europe, its long coasts on the North and Baltic Seas, and its borders with eight neighboring nations, any strategy of the Reich that did not rely on strong alliance partners required it to decide whether a threat should be neutralized defensively or eliminated offensively. As long as Germany considered only France as a potential enemy (and later Russia as well), the offensive strategic concept for naval operations that Tirpitz laid down in Service Memorandum No. IX seemed appropriate.

In June 1897, Tirpitz was appointed state secretary in the *Reichsmarineamt* (Imperial Naval Office).<sup>18</sup> Not least because of his influence, the politics of the Reich gradually expanded to consider the risks involved in confronting Britain. For Tirpitz, England was, from the beginning, "the most dangerous naval enemy," against which Germany "most urgently required a certain measure of naval force as a political power factor." Since Tirpitz considered cruiser warfare a lost cause,

owing to Germany's lack of naval bases, he asked for the buildup of a fleet that "can unfold its greatest military potential between Heligoland and the Thames."<sup>19</sup>

Elsewhere within the IGN there were well-founded doubts regarding this conceptualization. Captain Curt Freiherr von Maltzahn (1849–1930), who at that time taught tactics and naval history at the German naval academy, warned as early as 1898 that reaching "Seeherrschaft" (sea control) by means of a battle would not suffice by itself to impose peace on the opponent, for such sea control would have to be maintained and exploited. This would require a surplus of strength. As long as neither party achieved sea control, the weaker party would be confined to fighting against the achievement of sea control by its enemy, forgoing victory as the goal of its own combat actions. It would be important to maintain a national seaborne trade "corresponding in strength to the means deployed for defense."<sup>20</sup> Maltzahn considered a combination of squadron operations and cruiser war to be the most suitable naval strategy. "Squadron operations are indispensable in this type of warfare, but they are only a means and not an end, and they become only really valuable if the freedom of action thus gained is exploited."<sup>21</sup>

However, such a foresighted and realistic alternative, one that combined a balanced defensive fleet with strong cruiser elements, stood no chance in the IGN. Tirpitz repressed any further strategic discussions so as not to jeopardize the buildup of the fleet, which had received legislative backing and thereafter was scheduled to be accomplished over an extended period.<sup>22</sup>

#### CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE: THE NAVAL ARMAMENT RACE

The objectives and planning principles of the German battle fleet construction can be summarized as follows: The basic prerequisite for gaining sea control was the destruction, or at least the decisive weakening, of the enemy battle fleet. Thus, planning focused on the fleet's capability to impose a decision in battle. The battle fleet also was considered a political means of power that could enable Germany to defend its overseas interests adequately. Britain, the most dangerous potential opponent, was to be deterred from a war with Germany by means of a strong fleet, or, should deterrence fail, was to be engaged successfully.

Among the liberal bourgeoisie, the naval policy met with strong support, which was increased even further by propaganda skillfully directed. However, while drawing up its ambitious armament program, Germany misjudged the dangers arising from its geographical situation in Central Europe. Any German approach that strove to establish an international maritime stature and adopt a counterpoint stance toward Britain was bound to be met with profound suspicion from Britain. After the German-British alliance talks in 1901 failed to produce any tangible results—the two sides were pursuing incompatible objectives—the



buildup of the German battle fleet became and remained a crucial disruptive factor, preventing any subsequent arrangement with Britain and resulting in an arms race.

From 1905 onward, that escalatory dynamic was characterized by an enormous increase in the combat power of battleships. With the construction of HMS *Dreadnought* in 1905–1906, the Royal Navy set a new standard. Tirpitz had to keep pace if the IGN was to remain equal, ship for ship, with its potential enemy. As a result, his long-term financial planning had been in vain, for the construction of capital ships involved ever-increasing costs.

Britain could cope with the cost increases involved in the construction of capital ships, or at least it had to do so since its security was exclusively dependent

---

*We should continue to try to present our findings about . . . the past in such a way that . . . historical knowledge and . . . sensitivity become factors serving to help stabilize a liberal society.*

---

on the superiority of the Royal Navy. In contrast, the defense of Germany was primarily an army responsibility, with the navy playing a secondary role. Britain's first lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill

(1874–1965) explained this in a public speech in February 1912. The strategic situations of both countries, Churchill pointed out, made his own fleet a vital necessity to the British Empire, whereas “from some points of view, the German Navy is to them more in the nature of a luxury.”<sup>23</sup>

Groaning under the burden of high naval expenditures, in 1912 both governments tried again to come to an agreement that they hoped would reduce the building rates of capital ships. In February 1912, the British cabinet sent Secretary of State for War Richard B. Haldane, 1st Viscount Haldane (1856–1928), to Berlin to try to reach a general settlement in these matters. However, Lord Haldane's talks with the German side never converted into real negotiations, and the effort failed after a few days. The British were unwilling “to commit themselves to neutrality,” and the German side—under pressure from Tirpitz—was unwilling to modify the country's planned building rate.<sup>24</sup> Tirpitz appreciated that for England “the Entente with France gives her the best security against a too powerful Germany,” he said. “I no longer believe that we can get out of this vicious circle.”<sup>25</sup> As Germany did not have enough resources to fulfill all the requirements of both the army and the navy, the IGN could not keep up in the unconstrained arms race that commenced thereafter, even though by 1914 it had become the world's second-strongest navy.

Before 1914, modern warships, such as capital ships, cruisers, and torpedo boats, were not only part of a nation's military potential but striking evidence

of its industrial and technological capability. Only highly industrialized nations could solve on their own the complex technological problems that the transition to modern capital ships involved. This was particularly true for the new technologies of engines and weapons, as well as for the improvement in ship survivability achieved through the use of high-quality steel armor.<sup>26</sup>

The period between 1905 and 1914 was characterized by a technological revolution that made naval weapons obsolete rapidly. This applied to cruisers, torpedo boats, and submarines as well as larger units. During the first major naval battles of World War I, the decisive effects of superior speed and more powerful guns became apparent.

### STRATEGY AND GEOGRAPHY

Tirpitz based his strategic concept on the assumption that the Royal Navy always would act offensively in a war against Germany; in particular, it would establish a close blockade of the German coast. Such a blockade near Heligoland “would provide abundant opportunities to equalize naval strength” or to “enter into a decisive battle.”<sup>27</sup> For the IGN, this hypothetical battle became an element of dogma—the focal point of its operational concept and fleet training. For this reason, knowledge of and experience with weapons technology, tactics, and shiphandling were more-decisive factors in the careers of naval officers than qualification in staff assignments—which had a long-term effect on the choice of personnel for command-and-control appointments. The work of the Admiralstab (naval staff), established in 1899, and the creation of a specialized corps of staff officers to man it, seemed secondary in importance. As a consequence, the naval officer corps remained unprepared for the complex strategic dimensions of a naval war against Britain.<sup>28</sup>

Although all the preparations focused on the “decisive battle,” a great deal of confusion existed regarding the true purpose of the battle.<sup>29</sup> While those staffing the German naval command had adopted Mahan’s theory of sea power willingly, they paid only lip service to a central element of that theory: the importance of geographical position and the resultant strategic options. By throttling Germany’s seaborne trade, an opponent could decide a “war by severing an artery essential to the existence of Germany.”<sup>30</sup>

An incorrect assessment of the effects of geography on British naval operations led the German naval leadership to a faulty assessment of British strategy. Britain had never attempted to eliminate an opponent’s navy at any price; it did so only when the British Isles and their SLOCs in the Atlantic were threatened. And these SLOCs remained outside the range of the German naval forces, except for a few cruisers and, later, submarines. To maintain a close blockade of the German

coast, the Royal Navy would have found it useful to eliminate the German fleet at an early date, but the Admiralty was well aware that such a strategic offensive would involve considerable losses. Especially cognizant of the threat that German torpedo boats, submarines, and mines represented, after 1911–12 the Royal Navy no longer considered deploying its Grand Fleet to the southern North Sea.<sup>31</sup> In November 1912, the Admiralty issued a set of “General Instructions” to its war plans against Germany, summarizing Britain’s strategic approach as follows:

The general idea is to use our geographical advantage of position to cut off all German shipping from oceanic trade and to secure the British coasts from any serious military enterprise and incidentally but effectually to cover the transport across the Channel of an Expeditionary Force to France. . . . It is believed that the prolongation of a distant blockade will inflict injury upon German interests. . . . To relieve such a situation, Germany would be tempted to send into the North Sea a force sufficient . . . to offer a general action. Such an action or actions would take place far from the German coast and close to our own.<sup>32</sup>

This plan implied a new wartime deployment for the Grand Fleet: basing it at Scapa Flow, in the Scottish Orkneys.

When in 1912 the German naval staff discovered the new orientation of its potential enemy, the chief of naval staff, Vice Admiral August von Heeringen (1855–1927), examined in a war game whether and how Germany’s High Seas Fleet could counter a distant blockade. The result was sobering. The Blue (i.e., German) war-gaming party had advanced its squadrons as far as the Firth of Forth, but there they encountered difficulties and suffered considerable losses while withdrawing. The admiral concluded: “If the British really restrict their activities to the remote blockade and consistently hold back their battle fleet, then the role of our beautiful High Seas Fleet could be a very sad one in wartime. The submarines will have to do the job.”<sup>33</sup>

It must be left open what type of submarine employment Heeringen had in mind, but his estimate hit the central strategic problem for German naval warfare during World War I. Over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the role of the submarine as a naval weapon “had grown from base to coast defence and from this to an offensive task in enemy waters.”<sup>34</sup> Basically, the submarine was a mobile torpedo boat with long endurance. Submerged, a submarine made only slow progress—but it had the ability to vanish below the surface of the sea for several hours.

In comparison with other naval powers, the IGN came late to building submarines. The first one, *U-1* (282 tons), was commissioned in December 1906. Obviously, Tirpitz had waited until he was sure that submarines were an effective offensive weapon. After 1908, he ordered more than forty oceangoing submarines, of which twenty-eight had been completed before war broke out.<sup>35</sup>

## WORLD WAR I

When Britain joined the war on the side of France and Russia in August 1914, it became clear that the German High Seas Fleet could not perform its political function of deterrence. Britain, relying on its superior fleet and the strategic positions the country and its empire held worldwide to protect its vital SLOCs, considered the German fleet, which could operate only from the North Sea, to be an acceptable risk.<sup>36</sup>

In August 1914, the IGN lay under the spell of great enemy superiority. The naval command placed all its hopes on reducing enemy forces through offensive submarine and minelaying operations. The assumption was that the opponent would seek battle, but Germany's fleet was to be employed in such a battle only "under favorable conditions."<sup>37</sup>

Although the few German cruisers stationed overseas at the outbreak of war were quite successful in *guerre de course* (warfare against merchant vessels), the Royal Navy soon neutralized them. Germany's East Asiatic Squadron, under Vice Admiral Maximilian von Spee (1861–1914) moved across the Pacific Ocean and destroyed a British squadron off Chile, but its advance to the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic on December 8, 1914, proved fatal.<sup>38</sup> The example demonstrates that the IGN neither recognized nor made use of the strategic advantages it might have derived from coordinating the operations of its naval forces overseas with those at home.

However, one small but powerful German squadron did influence the balance of forces and the overall course of World War I: the Mediterranean Division, comprising the battle cruiser *Goeben* and the light cruiser *Breslau*, under Rear Admiral Wilhelm A. Souchon (1864–1946). The breakthrough of the two units to Constantinople and their formal handover to Turkey in August 1914 influenced Turkey to join the war on the side of the Central powers in October 1914. The Turkish straits (the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus) became impassable for the Allies; all their attempts to penetrate them failed, with heavy losses.<sup>39</sup> Thus, the second important route to Russia, other than the Baltic Sea, remained blocked, contributing to Russia's loss as an ally of the Entente in 1917. After the war, Sir Julian S. Corbett commented as follows on this German strategic success:

When we consider that the Dardanelles was mined, that no permission to enter it had been ratified, and that everything depended on the German powers of cajolery at Constantinople, when we also recall the world wide results that ensued, it is not too much to say that few naval decisions more bold and well-judged were ever taken. So completely, indeed, did the risky venture turn a desperate situation into one of high moral and material advantage, that for the credit of German statesmanship it goes far to balance the cardinal blunder of attacking France through Belgium.<sup>40</sup>

The various operations the High Seas Fleet conducted in the North and Baltic Seas, which culminated in the battle of Jutland in May 1916, cannot conceal the fact that primarily it performed the functions of a “fleet in being”: securing the German coast, blocking the Baltic approaches, and keeping clear the submarines’ sailing routes.<sup>41</sup>

In the first few months of the war, the submarine gave a striking demonstration of its power. On September 22, 1914, *U-9* (Lieutenant Otto Weddigen [1880–1915], commanding) sank three aged armored cruisers in an hour. At first, the Royal Navy could not believe the cruisers “had been attacked by a single submarine and attributed the disaster to a whole flotilla.”<sup>42</sup> Over the next couple of weeks, the U-boats extended their patrols; by October 1914, *U-20* had penetrated the Channel to attack transports on their way to France, circumnavigated the British Isles, and returned to Germany, having cruised 2,200 miles in eighteen days.<sup>43</sup>

#### *Commerce Raiding by U-boats, 1915–18*

The varied arguments concerning the degree of success German submarines achieved in their raiding against Britain’s maritime commerce are a classic example of the civil-military struggle of a nation at war. At the time, this struggle was influenced greatly by public opinion, for submarine warfare became a popular myth to which a large number of Germans subscribed; they believed the U-boat was some sort of infallible, magic weapon that would bring victory. Because of some successful surprise raids, not only the public but the naval command overestimated the efficiency of submarines.

Initial considerations within the IGN regarding the employment of submarines against British shipping had not yielded a clear picture by the time Tirpitz spoke publicly on the issue—which he did without consulting Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg (1856–1921) or chief of naval staff Admiral Hugo von Pohl (1855–1916). In response to the British threat to “strangulate the [German] economy with the help of a blockade,” as Churchill had put it in a speech on November 9, Tirpitz responded in an interview that Germany could “play the same game”—by torpedoing all British shipping.<sup>44</sup>

This triggered a passionate public debate that had repercussions for the naval command. The young historian Gerhard Ritter (1888–1967) knew from his own experience during the war that

[i]t was Tirpitz’s interview that poured more oil on the fire when it was published in late December. Thenceforth the question of submarine warfare was no longer a naval problem for the experts to judge, but a political issue of the first order, with everyone having his say. A “U-boat movement” quickly came into being. . . . Again the academic superpatriots were in the forefront with plans and petitions to the Chancellor

and the navy on how to starve Britain into submission. Some of the most renowned names at the University of Berlin were among them.<sup>45</sup>

The naval staff encouraged support for commerce warfare from the government; however, the method's prospects for success could not be assessed, because so few submarines were available. Of the twenty-two submarines in the North Sea in early 1915, only fourteen (those with diesel engines) could operate west of the British Isles. The chancellor came under both public and naval pressure while making his decision, and he relied too much on the navy staff's optimistic forecast. Early in February 1915, Bethmann-Hollweg gave his consent to submarine warfare—without either the government or the naval command having analyzed thoroughly the methodology of commerce raiding itself or the associated political risks and international complications.

The German proclamation of February 4, 1915, declared “the waters around Great Britain and Ireland, including the whole of the English Channel, to be a war zone in which every merchant ship encountered would be destroyed, without it always being possible to assure the safety of passengers and crew. Because of the British misuse of neutral flags, it might not always be possible to prevent attacks meant for hostile ships from falling on neutrals.”<sup>46</sup> By conducting commerce warfare in this way, Germany opened new issues in international law, because submarines could not adhere adequately to the classic prize rules. This was particularly so after the British began arming merchant vessels, and later created disguised British auxiliary cruisers (Q-ships), which were a great threat to U-boats.

Despite these challenges, the commanding officers of German submarines, displaying a combination of caution and skill, achieved remarkable results with their deck guns while managing to comply with the prize regulations. Owing to a lack of space, submarines could not embark survivors, but in many cases they towed lifeboats to nearby coasts. However, the German naval staff criticized this practice: “The deterring effect of the submarine war will be lost if it is felt that passing the blockade zone is no longer a serious risk to the lives of the crews.”<sup>47</sup> Without providing its submarine commanding officers with clear instructions, the naval command obviously assumed that most ships would be sunk by torpedoes without warning, further deterring neutral shipping.

When the U.S. government raised concerns about the way the war was being waged and referred to the international principles of naval warfare, the chief of the general staff, General Erich von Falkenhayn (1861–1922), feared the United States might enter the war. He wanted a guarantee that submarine warfare would force England “to give in” within six weeks. When the kaiser inquired about the matter, Tirpitz and the new chief of naval staff, Vice Admiral Gustav Bachmann (1860–1943), confirmed this amazing forecast—without explaining what they

meant by England's "giving in." On February 12, Bachmann wrote to Admiral Pohl, then commander in chief of the High Seas Fleet: "It is in the military interest to make submarine warfare as effective as possible. Do not shy away from sinking enemy passenger liners. Their loss will cause the greatest impact."<sup>48</sup>

The first serious instances of confrontation with the United States arose from German naval activities. On May 7, 1915, the submarine *U-20* sank the British passenger liner *Lusitania* (31,550 gross registered tons [GRT]), using only one torpedo. This attack was conducted without warning and claimed the lives of 1,198 civilians, including 126 Americans; however, it was established later that *Lusitania* had been carrying some war matériel in its forecandle.

This incident caused a severe diplomatic rift with the United States. President Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924) called on Germany to adhere to the accepted principles of naval warfare and to respect the safety of American citizens traveling in the war zone. Following a similar incident in August 1915, the German government yielded. In September, over the objection of the naval command, commerce raiding was ordered stopped west of the British Isles; only in the North and Mediterranean Seas was commerce raiding continued, and then in accordance with the prize regulations.

By early 1916, the number of operational U-boats had risen to fifty-one. Intensified submarine warfare, as demanded by the chief of general staff, resumed in February 1916. It aimed at sinking armed British merchant vessels, without warning, while sparing passenger liners. But the French Channel steamer *Sussex* was torpedoed on March 24, 1916, and another severe crisis between Germany and the United States ensued. On April 18, 1916, Washington threatened to sever diplomatic relations.<sup>49</sup>

Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg now saw his earlier pessimistic assessment of the situation confirmed. From the onset of the new stage of submarine warfare, he had doubted the need for such a hazardous venture, "which would claim as a stake our existence as a great power and the future of our nation in its entirety, while the chance of winning, that is, the prospect of bringing England down by fall, is a rather uncertain one."<sup>50</sup>

So the chancellor provided assurance to Washington that merchant vessels "would not be sunk without warning or without saving people's lives."<sup>51</sup> As a result, the frontline commanders of the IGN (i.e., of the High Seas Fleet and the German marine corps in Flanders), acting on their own initiative—later backed up by the naval command—moved their submarines out of the western operating areas because they felt that operating under prize regulations exposed their vessels to great danger. Commerce raiding under the prize regulations was continued only in the Mediterranean. In the North Sea, the submarines operated against military targets until September 1916, without achieving any significant results.

This extreme reaction—transferring submarines out of the operating areas entirely—was inconsistent with the actual situation. Of the thirty-five submarines that had been lost by June 1916, only four had been destroyed by Q-ships, and none had been destroyed by armed merchant vessels.

Submarines' promising capabilities for commerce raiding, even under the prize regulations, became more discernible in summer 1916.<sup>52</sup> The resumption of submarine warfare under the prize regulations provoked no political risks while achieving considerable results: the monthly average of sinkings between October 1916 and January 1917 was 189 merchant vessels, of 324,742 GRT. This was not

---

*[T]he first German secretary of the navy in October 1848 forwarded an official request to the American government for assistance in building up . . . a German fleet. . . . [T]he German requests met with a positive response within both private and official circles.*

---

enough to force a decision in the war against Britain, but the war economy of the Allies was damaged heavily enough to produce a chance for a negotiated peace. Still, the naval command, in a rigid and dogmatic manner, repeat-

edly demanded “unrestricted submarine warfare.” The IGN was convinced that this would result in decisive victory, even presuming the expected break with the United States.

The naval staff decided to test the U.S. government by sending a submarine to the U.S. East Coast. On October 7, 1916, thirty-one-year-old Lieutenant Hans Rose (1885–1969), endowed with powers equivalent to those of an ancient Roman proconsul (his wording), headed his submarine, *U-53*, for Newport, Rhode Island, as a demonstration of the efficiency of German submarines—and as a warning to the U.S. Navy. After a three-hour visit to the Naval War College, Rose departed Newport—and sank five enemy merchant ships off the American coast, under prize rules. Sixteen U.S. destroyers observed this action at close range.<sup>53</sup>

The atmosphere and attitude among German naval officers at that time were portrayed in a diary entry by Lieutenant Ernst von Weizsäcker (1882–1951) of September 27, 1916. “The naval officers are sitting around, drinking, talking politics, hatching plots, and into the bargain feel patriotic, trying, in a dishonest way, to force submarine warfare. Submarine warfare is designed to conceal the foolish things done in developing the fleet and employing the fleet in war. This inadmissible propaganda evidences their bad consciences.”<sup>54</sup>

However, the propaganda Weizsäcker mentioned was effective. This was especially significant since the new general headquarters of all army forces, under Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg (1847–1934) and General Erich Ludendorff (1865–1937), realized that the attrition campaign had failed and that, as things stood, victory in France was becoming less and less likely.



Unlike the military, Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg intended to avoid U.S. entry into the war on the Allied side. He hoped that President Wilson would arrange a negotiated peace. However, when the British government in December 1916 harshly rejected a German peace offer, German leaders changed their opinion. Now the military leaders, especially Hindenburg and Ludendorff, categorically demanded “unrestricted submarine warfare,” claiming it was the last means of gaining victory. At a conference on January 9, 1917, after heated discussion, the chancellor supported their demand, and the German high command recommended unrestricted submarine warfare on February 1, 1917.<sup>55</sup> A few weeks later, at a meeting of the Main Parliament Committee, Admiral Eduard von Capelle (1855–1931), Tirpitz’s successor, “went so far as to insist that the effect of American entry into war would be ‘zero!’ American troops would not even be able to cross the ocean for lack of transport.”<sup>56</sup>

In response to unrestricted warfare, the United States broke relations with Germany, announcing “armed neutrality.” However, the Entente wanted the United States to enter the war, so the alliance could take utmost advantage of a fully mobilized American war economy. Thanks to maladroit German diplomacy, this goal soon was accomplished.

Seeking to keep the Americans militarily engaged on their continent and in the Pacific Ocean, Germany proposed an alliance with Japan and Mexico. The proposal was sent by cable to Mexico in the so-called Zimmermann telegram on January 16, 1917. With the aid of captured German codebooks, British naval intelligence managed to decrypt all the German diplomatic cables transmitted among Berlin, Washington, and Mexico City. To expedite the U.S. decision-making process, the British government transmitted the pertinent cables to Washington, and President Wilson had them released to the press on February 28.<sup>57</sup>

Germany’s offer to Mexico of an alliance inflamed American public opinion against Germany. Early in April, the United States entered the war on the side of the Allies. Thus, unrestricted submarine warfare alone did not trigger the American declaration of war, but Germany’s naval stance contributed to it in a substantial way.

On February 1, 1917, Germany had 105 operational submarines available to conduct unrestricted submarine warfare. By June 1917, their number had been increased to only 129. Because of the increase in operations between February and July 1917, repair periods gradually were prolonged, leading to a decrease in the number of operationally ready submarines.<sup>58</sup>

On the other hand, in April 1917 alone, 458 Allied ships totaling 840,000 GRT were sunk. This led to a severe crisis for the Allies, who momentarily doubted their ability to continue the war. However, Germany did not achieve its strategic objective—effective disruption of British shipping. The Allies introduced

**GERMAN SUBMARINE LOSSES 1914–18**

Cause	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	Total
Ramming						
• By warships	2	1	—	8	3	14
• By merchant vessels			—	2	2	4
Artillery						
• By warships	—	2	3	—	3	8
• By merchant vessels	—	—	—	—	1	1
• By Q-ships	—	3	2	6	—	11
Searching gear with petard	—	1	1	—	1	3
Explosion of ammunition aboard a merchant vessel	—	—	—	1	—	1
Attack by aircraft	—	—	—	1	—	1
Depth charges	—	—	2	7	21	30
Torpedoing	—	4	1	7	6	18
Mines	2	2	6	21	23	54
Accidents						
• By German mines	—	2	1	6	1	10
• By German torpedoes	—	1	—	—	1	2
• By beaching	—	1	2	2	—	5
• During diving	—	—	—	1	—	1
• Collision with German submarine	—	—	—	1	—	1
Unknown	1	2	4	—	7	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>178</b>

Note: excludes accidents in home waters.

Sources: Robert M. Grant, *U-boats Destroyed: The Effect of Anti-submarine Warfare 1914–1918* (London: Putnam, 1964); Robert M. Grant, *U-boat Intelligence* (London: Putnam, 1969). Cf. Joachim Schröder, *Die U-Boote des Kaisers: Die Geschichte des deutschen U-Boot-Krieges gegen Großbritannien im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 2003), and Rahn, "Die Kaiserliche Marine und der Erste Weltkrieg," p. 72.

convoying in the summer of 1917, and thereafter far fewer ships were sunk. Between February and June 1917, an average of 363 ships of 629,863 GRT were sunk per month, whereas during the last quarter of 1917 sinkings averaged 159 per month, totaling 365,489 GRT. In 1918, the numbers of ships sunk decreased even further. Because of this, the German naval staff was not able to keep the promise it had made: by the autumn of 1918, about 1.4 million American soldiers had made it to France. U.S. entry into the war proved to be the decisive factor in the defeat of Germany.<sup>59</sup>

After the Allies introduced the convoy system, German submarines faced serious operational and tactical problems. The concentration of merchant ships in a convoy had to be countered with a concentration of submarines. Even before

that, reconnaissance was required—the convoys had to be detected. The few boats available west of the British Isles could not cover the entire operating area, allowing many convoys to reach Britain undetected. When a submarine sighted a convoy, it could conduct a submerged attack, with torpedoes. The gun armament, which until the institution of convoying had achieved most results, fell into disuse.

Along with introducing the convoy system, the Allies enhanced antisubmarine defense by developing more efficient depth charges and the first underwater locating devices. But above all, it was the intensive mining of the shipping lanes in the North Sea and the English Channel that caused most U-boat casualties. Of the 132 German submarines lost in 1917–18, at least fifty sank after hitting mines.<sup>60</sup>

At the end of September 1918, the army's supreme command admitted military defeat and demanded an immediate armistice. The United States made termination of unrestricted submarine warfare a precondition for reestablishing diplomatic contact. Yet the German naval command—to justify its existence—prepared to send the fleet out for one final battle. The ships' companies discerned that the naval command was acting arbitrarily and refused to obey. Within a few days, this mutiny developed into a revolt that led to the collapse and end of the IGK, which accelerated a general uprising in Germany.<sup>61</sup>

### *The Lessons of the Great War*

In spite of outstanding achievements and successes against a superior opponent in various war theaters, the outcome of German naval operations was negative at the end of World War I. Not only did the IGK's strategic concepts for fleet employment and for commerce warfare using submarines fail, but those failures were the starting point for a revolt that triggered the political overthrow of the government. Nevertheless, the High Seas Fleet effectively operated as a fleet in being. Its presence pinned down the British Grand Fleet in the North Sea, including lighter naval forces, which consequently were not available for convoy-escort duty in the Atlantic. The fleet protected the German coast, blocked the Baltic against Allied resupply shipments to Russia, and, to a certain extent, backed up submarine warfare by keeping the departure and return routes clear. Contrary to the current view of historians who entirely deny the fleet's strategic importance, the fleet was an asset for the German war effort; but a realistic cost-benefit analysis shows that, in the end, the fleet did not achieve what it was expected to.

One of the fundamental lessons learned during World War I was that, over the long run, an effective blockade could so weaken the German war potential and economy, which were greatly dependent on the importation of raw materials, that not even defensive operations could be conducted. The German naval command

had not realized that sea power, i.e., the ability to control and successfully use the sea, essentially is the product of both fleet strength and geographical position. If either factor were deficient, the entire result suffered. This was one of the essential reasons the High Seas Fleet did not bring about a decision in the overall conduct of the war. It failed to develop a concept in which the two components of naval warfare—surface forces and submarines—were integrated to enable timely and effective deployment against the two key strategic weak points in the enemy alliance: Allied merchant shipping in the Atlantic and the Russian coastline in the Baltic.

During the submarine war against Allied merchant shipping, the naval command rigidly relied on a one-sided and, in the end, inadequate naval concept that ignored the possibility and reality of U.S. entry into the war, thereby contributing to Germany's defeat. During the operations against Russia, Germany hardly ever exploited its naval superiority. However, Germany's blocking of access to the Baltic, in parallel with its ally's control of the Turkish straits, diminished Russia's war potential considerably. This success in the economic war, which Germany had not foreseen, relieved the country of the necessity to prosecute the war on two fronts by the spring of 1918; but that was too late to bring about success for the overall war effort.

The result Germany experienced in World War I was due not only to insufficient concepts and means but to the naval command's strategic incompetence. The leadership seemed to be incapable of recognizing the natural limits that existed—limits that would have to be imposed on any German naval strategy within the overall strategic concept.

#### THE INTERWAR PERIOD, 1919–39

The Treaty of Versailles reduced Germany to the status of a third-rate naval power.<sup>62</sup> Submarines and military aircraft were forbidden to it altogether. As a result, the navy lacked the weapons that modern naval warfare required. However, French opposition thwarted the British attempt to abolish the submarine entirely; Paris became the champion of minor naval powers by emphasizing the importance of the submarine as a naval weapon for weaker nations.<sup>63</sup> During the preparation of the peace treaty, Admiral William S. Benson (1855–1932), the American Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), advocated only moderate cuts in the strength of the future German navy so as to maintain a counterbalance to the British fleet in the North Sea.<sup>64</sup> The British never considered taking over the German ships for their own fleet—too costly; they simply wanted to sink them. However, France and Italy dismissed this idea. The problem was solved when the Germans themselves sank the major part of their fleet at Scapa Flow on June 21, 1919.<sup>65</sup> The German naval command regarded this accomplishment primarily

as a moral success. The consequences of the scuttling were severe: the Allies demanded full compensation, and claimed 80 percent of all German port equipment; and the navy had to surrender its last five modern light cruisers.

German naval forces came to seem superfluous, given the total military defeat of 1918, the domestic unrest of 1919, and the ongoing border conflicts with Poland. However, for the navy to continue in existence and preserve its independence from the army, the service required a plausible long-run mission. When, during the peace negotiations in the spring of 1919, the German government offered to renounce its force of six old battleships so as to achieve concessions in other areas, the victorious powers refused, pointing out that Germany should retain some limited naval forces for its own protection. They projected a small German fleet as a stabilizing factor in the Baltic area. Thus, Germany's former enemies contributed considerably to the continued existence—modest as it was—of the German navy.<sup>66</sup>

The naval command argued that a navy was necessary because of the territorial changes in eastern Europe, referring primarily to the alterations to Poland's borders and the resultant isolation of East Prussia. In 1919–21, a Polish-Russian border dispute led to war, and future border conflicts could not be ruled out.<sup>67</sup> If Germany had no naval forces at all, it would be impossible to defend East Prussia; the Poles would be able to cut the sea route across the Baltic—the only reliable line of supply for the German enclave.

The navy's deliberations, unlike those of the army, soon expanded to consider other possible conflicts. As early as 1922 they took into account Poland's ties with France. Once again, German naval strategy focused its attention on the North Sea. Given the German economy's great dependence on seaborne supplies, the prerequisites for conducting defensive operations could be achieved only if German shipping in the North and Baltic Seas continued unhindered.

The navy considered itself to be an instrument of territorial defense against France and Poland, while hoping, in better times to come, for an end to armament restrictions. When it became apparent that the limitations on their own arms that the victorious powers had announced at Versailles were not going to materialize, the German government consistently aspired to equal rights and national sovereignty in the military sphere, such that it could develop the country's armed forces into an effective instrument of national defense.

In terms of matériel, a new start gradually was made, by constructing some torpedo boats and light cruisers. However, the challenge of developing a ten-thousand-ton armored vessel (permitted by the peace treaty) that had sufficient combat power to survive an engagement with French capital ships was a tough nut to crack. Given the displacement limitation, it was not possible to meet normal requirements for armament and armor plating. When the changes in the

armament limitations for which the naval command had hoped failed to materialize, the navy was forced to concentrate on designing a ship that was more like a cruiser than a battleship.

The decisive elements that influenced this change in planning lay on two levels, the tactical-operational and the political-military. In the tactical-operational sphere, exercises showed that heavy naval forces needed more speed. In the political-military sphere, the naval command thought it imperative

---

*Over the course of the twentieth century, Germany twice tried to force a strategic decision, in direct confrontation with the Anglo-Saxon naval powers, by cutting the Atlantic shipping routes. Both attempts ended in failure.*

---

that every German ship constructed be superior in at least one respect to the warship categories defined in the Washington Naval Agreement (encompassing multiple treaties) of 1922. For battleships,

it sought speed; for cruisers, heavy guns. To replace the old battleships while remaining under the terms of the peace treaty, the naval command planned a ship carrying six twenty-eight-centimeter (cm) guns and capable of twenty-eight knots.

To understand the German line of reasoning, it is necessary to look at the status of international naval armaments at the end of the 1920s. The countries that had signed the Washington Naval Treaty (Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States) had navies dominated by capital ships having eight to twelve heavy guns (with calibers between 30.5 and 40.6 cm) and speeds of twenty to twenty-three knots. Only Britain and Japan had battle cruisers equipped with six to eight heavy guns. These had a top speed between twenty-seven and thirty-one knots. Until 1930, the Washington Naval Treaty limited the total tonnage and construction of battleships and aircraft carriers. For cruisers, the treaty established ceilings only for the displacement and armament of individual vessels. Thus, cruisers with a standard displacement of ten thousand tons and light armor were built. Their main armament comprised six to ten 20.3 cm guns; they had a top speed of thirty-three knots. Although they could evade the slower capital ships, they had to avoid contact with battle cruisers, which were capable of similar speed yet far superior in armament.

Since the core of the French fleet consisted of nine slow capital ships and five fast heavy cruisers, the German naval command deliberately endowed its ten-thousand-ton vessel with the characteristics of a “small battle-cruiser”: it was superior to cruisers in armament and to capital ships in speed. With six 28 cm guns in two triple turrets and a speed of twenty-six to twenty-eight knots, the *Panzerschiff* (armored ship, also known as a “pocket battleship”) came very close to the concept of the battle cruiser. Moreover, diesel engines would give the ship a

maximum range of twenty thousand miles, vastly exceeding that of any cruiser or capital ship. Owing to its combat effectiveness and endurance, the pocket battleship was suitable for both warfare in the North Sea and offensive operations in the Atlantic.

The construction of the ship immediately attracted the attention of foreign naval experts. In April 1929, the British ambassador in Berlin, Sir Horace Rumbold (1869–1941), reported to his government as follows:

From a naval technical point of view, the building of this vessel is to be welcomed, as its design promises to include a number of new features in warship construction. The principal of these are reported to be a comparatively heavy armament of six 11-inch guns, eight 5.8-inch and twenty antiaircraft guns, six torpedo tubes, adequate armour protection, special Diesel engines giving a cruising speed of 26 knots, the extensive employment of light metals and electric welding in place of riveting, and the highest degree of unsinkability.<sup>68</sup>

However, Germany's naval command regarded the construction of pocket battleships not just as a military necessity but as a political-military lever with which to upset the entire system of international naval armament controls that had been established—without German participation—at Washington in 1922. The naval command hoped this step would give Germany the chance to be readmitted to the community of major naval powers.<sup>69</sup> Of course, if Germany had been included in the Washington Naval Agreement, this would have been tantamount to a wholesale abrogation of the naval arms limitations laid down in the Treaty of Versailles.

### *Change of Strategy and Operational Planning*

The naval command was cognizant that Germany was highly dependent on seaborne imports. It tried to impress this overall strategic reality on the army so the latter would take that factor into account when drawing up its operational plans. From 1928 onward, the new minister of the Reichswehr (German Imperial Defense), Lieutenant General Wilhelm Groener (Ret.) (1867–1939), set new standards for all operational planning by the army and navy. He stressed that the idea of a large-scale war had to be ruled out from the start. Military operations against foreign powers should be limited to two possible types of conflict: (1) repelling raids from neighboring states onto German territory; (2) maintaining armed neutrality during a conflict between foreign powers.

Groener demanded that the Reichswehr be combat ready to oppose immediately any sudden Polish invasion. For the navy, this new concept meant it had to be able, on seventy-two hours' notice, to begin operations to destroy the Polish navy and neutralize the port of Gdynia as a naval base.<sup>70</sup> Such a demonstrative strike clearly was intended to be part of a strategy of deterrence. Under this

concept of calculated escalation, the German government could react quickly to a possible invasion, then refer the conflict to the League of Nations without delay. Thus, the government gave the navy, for the first time, a role as an effective instrument of crisis management.

In the spring of 1929, Groener requested that the naval command review whether Germany, to conduct its maritime defense, would need any surface units that went beyond the ceiling of the peace treaty. By so inquiring, Groener got at the heart of the self-perception of the navy's leadership, which saw its service not merely as an instrument of national defense but, in the long run, as an indispensable prerequisite for a future German maritime position of power. Under no circumstances would a return to brown-water-navy status be acceptable; the German navy instead intended to build oceangoing units, in accordance with the traditional concept of naval prestige, and thereby to express hope for a better future. Naturally, it was not possible, nor was it intended, to explain this to a minister who, although he had pushed the Panzerschiff through the Reichstag (national legislature), otherwise had expressed often his critical attitude toward the buildup of the German High Seas Fleet before 1914.

In his reply to Groener's question, "Does Germany need large warships?," the chief of naval command, Admiral Erich Raeder (1876–1960), championed the earlier naval concept, which focused on a potential conflict with France and Poland.<sup>71</sup> He argued that the attitude of the navy must not be determined by wishful thinking to reestablish itself as a major naval power. Its most important task in war was to prevent—at all costs—enemy forces from interdicting German SLOCs. World War I had proved the connection between German resistance at the home front and naval blockade: "Cutting off our sea lanes is the simplest and safest way, without any bloodshed, of defeating us. Our enemies know this as well. England has the most powerful fleet world-wide and its geographical position is disastrous for Germany. Therefore, any armed conflict has to be avoided that would turn England into one of our enemies. We would be doomed to failure right from the start."<sup>72</sup>

Raeder's memorandum concluded that the navy—without even considering the limits the peace treaty set—could fight the fleet only of a second-class sea power, such as France.

### *Naval Rearmament under Hitler, 1933–37*

A few days after seizing power in January 1933, Adolf Hitler (1889–1945) made it clear to naval and other military commanders that he intended to develop the armed forces into an instrument of his power politics. As far as the translation of this objective into armament was concerned, Hitler was initially cautious. As he explained in a speech on February 3, 1933: "The most dangerous period is that



of rearmament. Then we shall see whether France has statesmen. If she does, she will not grant us time but will jump on us (presumably with eastern satellites).”<sup>73</sup>

The Reichsmarine (German Navy) had to make do with compromises regarding the displacement and armament of its future capital ships. However, in view of the anticipated long-term buildup of the fleet, these compromises seemed acceptable. The last of three Panzerschiffe was launched in June 1934. The next two units were upgraded to battle cruisers (31,000 tons, thirty-one knots, nine 28 cm guns) in answer to the French battle cruisers *Dunkerque* and *Strasbourg*.<sup>74</sup>

The Anglo-German Naval Agreement of June 18, 1935, allowed Germany to have a surface fleet with a tonnage up to 35 percent of that of the British Empire. German naval leaders now believed they had attained their goal of “equal” rights. The 35 percent ceiling applied not just to total tonnage but to individual categories of warships. In the case of U-boats, Germany was allowed to achieve 45 percent at first, later 100 percent, of British submarine strength. In this context, Germany gave assurances that its navy would adhere to what were known as the “cruiser rules” regarding submarine warfare conducted against merchant shipping.<sup>75</sup>

The navy’s planning thus was based wholly on the structure of that of the other naval powers. Its motto was: What the other navies, with their rich traditions, consider proper, and what Germany now is permitted within the 35 percent ceiling, is what Germany will build. The navy started to build a so-called normal fleet: fast capital ships, heavy and light cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and—for the first time after seventeen years—submarines. One week after the Anglo-German Naval Agreement was announced, the navy commissioned its first, small (250-ton) U-boat—thereby revealing its long-term secret preparatory activity in this area.<sup>76</sup>

Even if the U-boat had not been improved in basic ways since 1918, it had developed considerably in every direction (e.g., in its improved torpedoes, its minelaying ability, and its capacity to transmit and receive signals both while surfaced and while submerged). Nevertheless, opinion was widespread in all navies that the U-boat had lost the eminence it had achieved in World War I as one of the most effective naval weapons. The British Admiralty was convinced that asdic (a submarine location device named after its progenitor, the Anti-Submarine Detection Investigation Committee) had reduced the submarine threat almost to extinction. In contrast to this opinion, the small German U-boat staff, centered on Captain Karl Dönitz (1891–1980), was convinced that antisubmarine warfare (ASW) weapons were greatly overrated and had not made decisive progress since 1918.<sup>77</sup>

From 1928 onward, Admiral Raeder determined the navy’s thinking. In studying Germany’s World War I cruiser campaign, he had come to the conclusion

that during the autumn of 1914 there had been a strategic correlation between the North Sea campaign and the operations of the cruiser squadrons in the Pacific and South Atlantic. Raeder realized that all naval theaters of war formed an interconnected whole, so any operation had to be viewed in relation to those in other areas. Accordingly, he made overseas cruiser warfare and battle-fleet operations in home waters integral components of a single naval strategy that sought to exploit diversionary effects, thereby exhausting the enemy's forces and disrupting his supplies.<sup>78</sup>

Raeder formulated his strategic thinking most clearly in a briefing to Hitler on February 3, 1937. Analyzing Germany's Great War experiences, he pointed out the correlation between strategy and a country's military-geographical situation. Raeder was aware of the likely "totality" of a future war—that it would be a struggle not just between forces but of "nation versus nation." He emphasized the negative consequences for Germany if it were unable to procure continually the raw materials it lacked. In so doing, Raeder pointed out the glaring weaknesses in Germany's war potential—but was unable to influence Hitler's policy of confrontation.<sup>79</sup>

#### *Buildup of the Navy against Britain, 1938–39*

A fundamental change in strategic planning by the Kriegsmarine (as the German navy was known after 1935) commenced in spring 1938. As it became apparent that the Western powers opposed German expansion, Hitler issued a directive that all German war preparations should consider not only France and Russia but also Britain as potential enemies. A second confrontation with Britain now influenced all further planning for the next naval war. Raeder followed Hitler's hazardous course of confrontation willingly, or at least without protest, in contravention of his strong statement on this matter to Groener in 1929. Raeder assumed—erroneously—that the navy would have several years of peace to continue its buildup.

In the summer of 1938, the naval staff produced a strategic study that concluded that, given a geographical starting position similar to that of 1914, only oceanic cruiser warfare, employing improved Panzerschiffe and U-boats, held any prospect of success.<sup>80</sup> Despite this realization, a planning committee of senior officers busied itself with the question of what tasks battleships could perform in a cruiser war in the Atlantic. The result was paradoxical and revealing: "The chief of staff of the naval staff concluded at the end of the discussion that all participants agreed that battleships were necessary, but that no consensus regarding their use could be achieved for the time being."<sup>81</sup>

Traditionalists considered the most important arm of naval power to be capital ships. Focusing on them meant that the concept of sea control pushed

the concept of sea denial into the background. Unlike the big-ship traditionalist Tirpitz, the naval staff during the 1930s had proposed a sea-denial strategy repeatedly. In contrast, the suggestion to develop a German strategy of sea control constituted a new, alternative approach to sea and world power in the twentieth century. In September 1938, the commander in chief of the fleet, Admiral Rolf Carls (1885–1945), noted as follows: “If, in accordance with the will of the Führer, Germany is to achieve a firm world-power position, it will need, in addition to

---

*The allied forces—especially . . . Admiral Arleigh Burke . . . —supported . . . creation [of the Federal German Navy]. . . . [A] close cooperation and friendship developed between Admiral Burke and Vice Admiral Friedrich Ruge . . . , the first head of the [FGN]. Burke created a basis of confidence with his firm conviction that allied forces could fulfill their common tasks only if their cooperation were based on openness and mutual trust. Vice Admiral Ruge succeeded in establishing this basis of confidence, which today is accepted as a matter of course.*

---

sufficient colonies, secure sea routes and access to the high seas. . . . A war against Britain means a war against the Empire, against France, probably also against Russia and a number of countries overseas, in other words against one-half or two-thirds of the whole world.”<sup>82</sup>

Nevertheless, Raeder was more inclined toward a sea-denial strategy via an oceanic cruiser campaign with Panzerschiffe, and he intended to

give this strategy priority in the future armament program. However, by November 1938 he had been unable to gain Hitler’s support for his program. Hitler did not accept the cruiser warfare strategy, insisting instead that the navy step up the pace of its battleship construction so that as soon as possible he would have at his disposal an instrument of power he could employ globally.

The navy had to accept this decisive change. It formulated a new concept, the so-called Z-Plan, which centered on the construction of six capital ships by 1944. Additionally, battle cruisers, Panzerschiffe, aircraft carriers, fast light cruisers, and 247 U-boats were to form the backbone of German naval forces for the future Battle of the Atlantic. On January 27, 1939, when Hitler ordered that the buildup of the navy was to take precedence over all other tasks, including the rearmament of the army and the Luftwaffe (air force), he heralded a gigantic buildup of naval forces. Within a few months, the planning of a series of six new-design, diesel-driven battleships was complete; the construction of two units began in the summer of 1939. In the meantime, on April 27, 1939, Hitler denounced the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935.<sup>83</sup>

The experiences of World War I acted as the starting point for developing the so-called pack tactics that German U-boats employed against enemy sea routes

during World War II.<sup>84</sup> Dönitz recognized that the concentration of merchant shipping in convoys would require a similar concentration of U-boats to counter. And before the U-boats could attack a convoy, they needed to locate it—in other words, the problem of reconnaissance would have to be solved. In 1917–18, a number of U-boats had attacked successfully on the surface, under cover of darkness. During the evaluation of wartime experiences, former U-boat commanders recommended adoption and further development of this method of attack. Dönitz also had drawn attention to the advantages of night attacks in his book *Die U-Bootswaffe*, published in 1939. Nonetheless, later in World War II, this type of attack took British ASW defenses by surprise—they had relied too much on the supposed superiority of asdic. The escort forces were unable to cope with the German tactic, particularly as asdic had an effective range of no more than about 1,400 meters, which left it ineffective against U-boats operating on the surface.<sup>85</sup>

## WORLD WAR II

Disillusionment came on September 3, 1939. Totally unexpectedly, Hitler ordered the navy to launch a naval war against Britain.<sup>86</sup> The German navy was in no way prepared. Raeder's initial estimate of the situation was very pessimistic, and he resigned himself to the realization that neither the few U-boats nor the surface forces would have any decisive effect on the outcome of the war: "They can do no more than show that they know how to die gallantly and thus are willing to create the foundations for later reconstruction."<sup>87</sup>

However, the progress of the war soon demanded a new estimate of the situation. Nine months on, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands had been occupied; by June 22, 1940, France had suffered a total defeat. German naval control extended from Norway to the Pyrenees. Therefore, the German naval staff switched to an offensive concept of naval warfare, aimed solely at destroying Britain's maritime transport capacity. The Kriegsmarine's surface forces were insufficient for such a task; to supplement them, the navy concentrated on constructing and employing the means of naval warfare that had proved its worth during World War I—the U-boat.

The naval staff knew from its experience during the previous war that employment of the U-boat against the enemy's merchant marine could be successful only if U-boats were deployed continuously along the enemy's SLOCs, employing as many vessels as possible. The navy calculated that the number of U-boats permanently at sea should range from 100 to 150 boats. Taking into consideration time for maintenance and resupply, this meant the navy needed approximately three hundred operational boats at its disposal.<sup>88</sup> In the quest to achieve this, time was an important factor:

1. In an economic war waged against a country that depended on supplies by sea, success could only be achieved in the long run. It was therefore a question of continuously weakening the enemy's maritime transport capacity to an extent that exceeded the rate at which the enemy could construct new merchantmen.
2. From the summer of 1940 onward, it became apparent that the British war effort increasingly was being supported by the resources of the United States. This made the naval staff intent on "putting Britain out of action soon, before the effects of even greater American aid made themselves felt."<sup>89</sup>
3. Since it took around two years to construct a U-boat and bring it to operational status, amassing the numbers the navy envisaged so as to achieve the necessary concentration of forces required plans to be made at a very early stage.<sup>90</sup>

While a numerically increasing U-boat fleet held out the prospect of German success, the naval staff had to take into account that the enemy, in view of the looming threat, would do everything he could to strengthen his ASW effort.

In October 1939, the naval command presented a U-boat buildup plan that set a monthly rate of twenty-nine boats. Hitler approved the plan; however, he refused to sanction priority, since he was at that time more concerned with the demands of the imminent land campaign against France.<sup>91</sup> One year later, in November 1940, the navy had to realize that U-boat construction was being held up by shortages, and that the current building rate barely covered the current loss rate. The naval staff foresaw that there would be limits to the Reich's material resources and production capacities. In December 1940, it viewed America's growing support of Britain as a dangerous development "towards a marked prolongation of the war." To the naval staff, this portended a "very negative effect on the overall German war strategy."<sup>92</sup> This statement expressed the simple, obvious fact that Germany could not win a prolonged war of attrition against the two Atlantic naval powers.

For this reason, in December 1940, Grand Admiral Raeder requested that Hitler "recognize that the greatest task of the hour is concentration of all our power against Britain." To Raeder, this meant focusing air and naval forces against British supplies. The admiral was firmly convinced that U-boats were the decisive weapon to be used against Britain. Although Hitler did not reject Raeder's view, he referred to the allegedly new political situation: the necessity "to eliminate at all cost the last enemy remaining [i.e., Soviet Russia] on the continent, before he can collaborate with Britain. . . . After that, everything can be concentrated on the

needs of the Air Force and the Navy.”<sup>93</sup> In Hitler’s eyes, Britain was not the enemy on which all weapons had to be concentrated, but a potential partner who might be made to “see reason” if an appropriate amount of military pressure were applied. Hitler also knew that a forced economic war could not lead to any marked success in one year. Furthermore, this kind of effort could increase the danger of the United States entering the war, something he sought to avoid at that point.<sup>94</sup>

In July 1941, after the first successes in the war against Russia, the naval staff tried to convince both the Wehrmacht (Armed Forces) Command and Hitler of the immediate strategic necessity to concentrate on fighting the Anglo-Saxon naval powers. Analyzing the threat to which Germany was exposed, the naval staff portrayed the dilemma of a European continental state that lacked the vital elements of a naval power but was forced to fight against the greatest naval powers: “While in World War I we had the second strongest battle fleet in the world but no appropriate operational base, we now dispose of a strategically favorable operational base, however, we do not have the required battle fleet to operate within the Atlantic.”<sup>95</sup>

The naval staff predicted that the two Allied naval powers would continue to fight, even if the Soviet Union collapsed, so they could reach their “final goal”: destroying Germany on the continent. The naval staff came to the conclusion that “the enemies’ prospect for the battle in the Atlantic for the year 1942 must be assessed as favorable.” For this reason, the naval staff advocated that Germany bring about a decision in the Atlantic by taking advantage of both political assets (the cooperation of Vichy-France and Japan) and military assets (the concentrated employment of all available forces, in particular the U-boats and air forces).<sup>96</sup>

From 1940 onward, Germany possessed a good geographical position for naval warfare in the Atlantic, but this basis could not be exploited fully, owing to insufficient weaponry. The U-boat provided an effective weapon in the fight against enemy shipping up to 1942, but thereafter wider war demands, especially the critical situations in the Mediterranean and on the eastern front, forced the naval command to employ its last remaining offensive capability like an “operational fire brigade.”<sup>97</sup> This led to enormous attrition, which was counterproductive to the strategic concept of mass concentration in the Atlantic. As the Allies developed better ASW weapons, the concept of a “U-boat war” failed in 1943 because the submarine had lost its ability to escape from enemy surveillance.

In fact, the concept of attrition warfare began to fail by the fall of 1942 in the face of the mobilization of Allied resources and industrial capacities, especially those of the United States. The German naval staff analysis at that time of the accelerating buildup of Allied maritime transport capacity already revealed that the U-boats could not increase the monthly rate of sinkings to a level necessary

to win the “tonnage race.” The naval staff delivered a pessimistic prognosis: “If, . . . considering the enemy’s rising production output, Germany wishes to diminish the enemy’s tonnage from the end of 1942 onwards to the same extent as is currently being achieved, ship sinkings per month will have to be increased to approximately 1,300,000 GRT. Given the current situation, it is doubtful whether such a high rate of ship sinkings will be feasible for a sustained period of time.”<sup>98</sup> Recalling the historical argument that “no war in history . . . has yet been won by the use of one method of warfare,” the naval staff came around to an understanding that reflected actual conditions.<sup>99</sup> By the end of 1942, German U-boats, as a realistic threat, had succumbed to the immense industrial capacity of the United States.

From 1943 onward, the navy had an officer at the helm, Grand Admiral Dönitz, who both was a charismatic leader and had close links to Hitler and Nazi ideology. Not until after Hitler’s death did he change “from the almost-blind tool of a criminal to the responsible soldier of the traditional Prussian school.”<sup>100</sup> At that point he did everything in his power to end the already-lost war in a proper fashion and, at the same time, to evacuate as many people as possible across the Baltic to the West. The latter effort—the navy’s last wartime act—brought the service much positive postwar public recognition.<sup>101</sup>

Over the course of the twentieth century, Germany twice tried to force a strategic decision, in direct confrontation with the Anglo-Saxon naval powers, by cutting the Atlantic shipping routes. Both attempts ended in failure. The second defeat brought with it the end of the German Reich and the dissolution of all German armed forces.

### **BUILDING A NEW NAVY AFTER 1955**

The Western orientation of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) led to close integration of the new German armed forces into the Atlantic Alliance.<sup>102</sup> Ten years after the surrender of Germany’s World War II forces, a new German naval force came into existence. The allied forces—especially the U.S. Navy, including its CNO, Admiral Arleigh Burke (1901–96)—supported its creation. During the first years of the buildup, a close cooperation and friendship developed between Admiral Burke and Vice Admiral Friedrich Ruge (1894–1985), the first head of the Federal German Navy (FGN).<sup>103</sup>

Burke created a basis of confidence with his firm conviction that allied forces could fulfill their common tasks only if their cooperation were based on openness and mutual trust. Vice Admiral Ruge succeeded in establishing this basis of confidence, which today is accepted as a matter of course.

This meant for the FGN, the smallest of the armed services within the FRG armed forces, that, for the first time in its history, the naval service was obliged

merely to perform that function “which a German Navy can actually perform,” in close cooperation with the great maritime powers.<sup>104</sup>

At the same time the FRG joined NATO in May 1955, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was integrated into the Warsaw Pact. The formation of light naval forces ensued, out of the Volkspolizei See (i.e., the national sea police force of the GDR) that had been in existence since 1950. In 1960, the GDR’s newly established forces were termed Volksmarine (People’s Navy), in commemoration of the 1918 revolutionary tradition. This navy, which was strictly integrated within the ideological leadership claimed by the Communist Party, demonstrated little continuity with former German naval forces, whether in formation, structure, or mandate. Within the Warsaw Pact it evolved into an *offensive* naval force for use in confined and littoral waters.

The two German naval forces exhibited great disparity until 1990. Each navy regarded the other as a potential military adversary in the context of the system of alliances. However, both were spared the necessity to prove their combat strength. With the reunification of the German republics in the fall of 1990, parts of each were incorporated into the German navy.<sup>105</sup>

Today, the German navy has not only a lively interest in its history but a special relationship to it. A clear link can be seen between the historical self-understanding of its officers and the history of their service. In the past, this link often served only as an attempt to legitimize and secure the service’s position. The navy, which came into being in the mid-nineteenth century, often had to fight for recognition and even for its existence during a relatively short history. However, when historical interest is limited only to the navy and naval warfare, there is a danger that too little attention will be paid to the overlapping political correlations.

Nowadays the situation is different. Germany is one of the leading export nations in the world, and therefore extremely dependent on trade and the unhampered use of the high seas. This situation requires an understanding and an acceptance of the maritime domain as a vital Achilles’ heel for the prosperity of the German economy and society. This situation underlines the necessity for a well-balanced navy that is able to conduct demonstrations and to protect German maritime interests, in cooperation with alliances and partners. The situation for the German navy is much more comfortable at present than in previous eras, reinforcing its self-confidence; but a wider understanding of its roles is needed, now more than ever.



## NOTES

1. The first part of this article is based on my essay "Germany," in *Ubi Sumus? The State of Naval and Maritime History*, Historical Monograph 11, ed. John B. Hattendorf (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1994), pp. 137–57.
2. John Keegan, *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo, and the Somme* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1976), p. 29.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
4. Thomas Nipperdey, "Wozu Geschichte gut Ist," *Militär-geschichtliche Mitteilungen* 41, no. 1 (1987), p. 9.
5. Statement of Rolf Johannesson [Rear Adm., FGN (Ret.)] to the audience, in *Der Marineoffizier als Führer im Gefecht*, ed. Deutsches Marine Institut (Herford, F.R.G.: E. S. Mittler, 1984), p. 242.
6. See Jens Graul and Dieter Hartwig, eds., *Von den Historikern für die Flotte* (Bochum, Ger.: Winkler, 2011), esp. annex, pp. 141–200.
7. The following material is based on my article "140 Years of German Navies: Their Defeat and Rebirth—from Confrontation to Cooperation," in *The Influence of History on Mahan*, Historical Monograph 9, ed. John B. Hattendorf (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1991), pp. 81–84, and my entry "Navies, Great Powers: Germany, 1848–1945," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Maritime History*, ed. John B. Hattendorf (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), vol. 2, pp. 705–11. See also Werner Rahn, ed., *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel: Vom Symbol nationaler Einheit zum Instrument internationaler Sicherheit* (Munich, Ger.: Oldenbourg, 2005).
8. For details, see Günter Moltmann, "Die deutsche Flotte von 1848/49 im historisch-politischen Kontext," in Rahn, *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel*, pp. 64–80.
9. Adalbert [Prinz von Preußen], *Denkschrift über die Bildung einer deutschen Kriegsflotte* (Potsdam, Ger.: 1848); reproduced in Jörg Duppler, *Prinz Adalbert von Preußen: Gründer der deutschen Marine* (Herford, F.R.G.: E. S. Mittler, 1986), pp. 79–115.
10. For details, see Günter Moltmann, *Atlantische Blockpolitik im 19. Jahrhundert: Die Vereinigten Staaten und der deutsche Liberalismus von 1848/49* (Düsseldorf, F.R.G.: Droste, 1973), pp. 150–56.
11. See Duppler, *Prinz Adalbert von Preußen*, p. 50.
12. Alfred von Tirpitz, *Erinnerungen* (Leipzig, Ger.: Koehler, 1920), p. 127.
13. Tirpitz was ennobled in January 1900. Latest biographies of him include Patrick J. Kelly, *Tirpitz and the Imperial German Navy* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2011), and Michael Epkenhans, *Tirpitz: Architect of the German High Seas Fleet* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2008).
14. Cf. Holger H. Herwig, "The Influence of A. T. Mahan upon German Sea Power," in Hattendorf, *The Influence of History on Mahan*, pp. 67–80.
15. Alfred von Tirpitz, "Taktische und strategische Dienstschriften des Oberkommandos der Marine, Nr. IX: Allgemeine Erfahrungen aus den Manövern der Herbstübungs-Flotte," June 16, 1894 [hereafter Dienstschrift No. IX], app. doc. no. 2, RM 4/176, Bundesarchiv-Militärarchiv, Freiburg, Ger. Cf. in this context Volker R. Berghahn, *Der Tirpitz-Plan: Genesis und Verfall einer innenpolitischen Krisenstrategie unter Wilhelm II* (Düsseldorf, F.R.G.: Droste, 1971), pp. 45–89; Ivo Nikolai Lambi, *The Navy and German Power Politics 1862–1914* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984), pp. 68–86; and Rolf Hobson, *Imperialism at Sea: Naval Strategic Thought, the Ideology of Sea Power, and the Tirpitz Plan, 1875–1914* (Boston: Brill, 2002).
16. Dienstschrift No. IX, pp. 2, 5.
17. The Jeune École dominated French naval thought in the 1880s. It made commerce raiding a strategic priority and placed great reliance on new technologies, primarily the torpedo. Rahn, "Navies, Great Powers: Germany, 1848–1945," p. 703.
18. For further details on his appointment, see Berghahn, *Der Tirpitz-Plan*, passim.
19. "Allgemeine Gesichtspunkte bei der Feststellung unserer Flotte nach Schiffsklassen und Schiffstypen" ["General Considerations on the Constitution of Our Fleet according to Ship Classes and Designs"], June 1897. The German version of the complete document

- and a translation appear in Jonathan Steinberg, *Yesterday's Deterrent: Tirpitz and the Birth of the German Battle Fleet* (London: Macdonald, 1965), p. 209.
20. Curt Freiherr von Maltzahn, *Der Kampf gegen die Seeherrschaft* (Kiel, Ger.: C. Schaidt, 1898). Ca. 1971–72 I drew on a private copy of the original while consulting the papers of Admiral Behncke in the German Military Archive; some years later the original seems to be missing. Cf. John B. Hattendorf, "The Caird Lecture, 2000: The Anglo-French Naval Wars (1689–1815) in Twentieth-Century Naval Thought," in *Talking about Naval History: A Collection of Essays*, Historical Monograph 19 (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 2011), pp. 83–103.
  21. Maltzahn, *Der Kampf gegen die Seeherrschaft*, p. 15.
  22. Cf. Wilhelm Deist, *Flottenpolitik und Flottenpropaganda: Das Nachrichtenbureau des Reichsmarineamtes 1897–1914* (Stuttgart, F.R.G.: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1976).
  23. Quoted in Arthur J. Marder, *From the Dreadnought to Scapa Flow: The Royal Navy in the Fisher Era, 1904–1919*, vol. 1, *The Road to War 1904–1914* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961), p. 277. Cf. in this context Holger H. Herwig, "Luxury" Fleet: *The Imperial German Navy 1888–1918* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980), pp. 76–77.
  24. Marder, *The Road to War 1904–1914*, p. 286.
  25. Admiral Tirpitz to Admiral Müller [Chief of the Naval Cabinet], February 26, 1912, in *ibid.* For Müller, see also *ibid.*, p. 78 note 11 and pp. 223–24. In 1904, the United Kingdom and France formed the Entente Cordiale; in 1907 the United Kingdom and Russia formed their own entente; collectively this resulted in the so-called Triple Entente.
  26. Cf. in this context Michael Epkenhans, "Technology, Shipbuilding and Future Combat in Germany, 1880–1914," in *Technology and Naval Combat in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, ed. Phillips Payson O'Brien (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 53–68.
  27. Marder, *The Road to War 1904–1914*, p. 373.
  28. Cf. Wulf Diercks, "Der Einfluss der Personalsteuerung auf die deutsche Seekriegführung 1914–1918," in Rahn, *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel*, pp. 235–67. Cf. also Kurt Assmann, *Deutsche Seestrategie in zwei Weltkriegen* (Heidelberg, F.R.G.: Vowinkel, 1957), pp. 32–35, and Marder, *The Road to War 1904–1914*, pp. 412–13. Vice Admiral Assmann was head of the German naval archives, 1933–43.
  29. Cf. Paul Kennedy, "Maritime Strategieprobleme der deutsch-englischen Flottenrivalität," in *Marine und Marinepolitik im kaiserlichen Deutschland 1871–1914*, ed. Herbert Schottelius and Wilhelm Deist, 2nd ed. (Düsseldorf, F.R.G.: Droste, 1981), pp. 178–210. See also Edward Wegener, "Die tirpitzsche Seestrategie," in *ibid.*, pp. 236–62.
  30. Marder, *The Road to War 1904–1914*, p. 379.
  31. Cf. Kennedy, "Maritime Strategieprobleme," pp. 197–98.
  32. Quoted in Marder, *The Road to War 1904–1914*, p. 382.
  33. Quoted in German by William Michaelis, "Tirpitz' strategisches Wirken vor und während des Weltkrieges," in Rahn, *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel*, pp. 397–425; also quoted (with a slightly different text) by Assmann, *Deutsche Seestrategie*, p. 30.
  34. Arthur Hezlet, *The Submarine & Sea Power* (London: Peter Davies, 1967), p. 23.
  35. For details, see Arno Spindler, *Der Handelskrieg mit U-Booten*, vol. 1, *Vorgeschichte* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1932), pp. 148–76.
  36. This section is based on my article "German Naval Power in the First and Second World Wars," in *Naval Power in the Twentieth Century*, ed. N. A. M. Rodger (Basingstoke, U.K.: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 88–100.
  37. "Operations Order for North Sea Theatre, 30 July 1914," quoted by Otto Groos, *Der Krieg in der Nordsee*, vol. 1, *Kriegsbeginn bis Anfang September 1914*, 2nd ed., *Krieg zur See, 1914–1918* (Berlin: Marine-Archiv, 1922), p. 54. Cf. Paul G. Halpern, *A Naval History of World War I* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1994), p. 23.
  38. Cf. Erich Raeder [Vizeadmiral], *Der Kreuzerkrieg in den ausländischen Gewässern*, vol. 1, *Das Kreuzergeschwader* (Berlin: Zweite, 1927), pp. 244–54.
  39. Cf. Halpern, *A Naval History*, pp. 109–24.

40. Julian S. Corbett, *History of the Great War: Naval Operations*, vol. 1, *To the Battle of the Falklands, December 1914* (London: Longman, 1920), p. 70ff.
41. James M. Morris and Patricia M. Kearns, eds., *Historical Dictionary of the U.S. Navy* (London: Scarecrow, 1998), s.v. "fleet in being": "a naval force that acts as a deterrent to hostile action in an area because of its ability to inflict appropriate damage on an enemy." Cf. Raeder, *Das Kreuzergeschwader*, p. 81.
42. Hezlet, *The Submarine & Seapower*, p. 28. Cf. Halpern, *A Naval History*, p. 33.
43. Cf. Groos, *Der Krieg in der Nordsee*, vol. 2, *Von Anfang September bis November 1914, Krieg zur See, 1914–1918* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1925), pp. 184–85.
44. Cf. Gerhard Ritter, *The Sword and the Scepter: The Problem of Militarism in Germany*, vol. 3, *The Tragedy of Statesmanship: Bethmann Hollweg as War Chancellor (1914–1917)* (Coral Gables, FL: Univ. of Miami Press, 1971), pp. 288–318.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 124–25.
46. Spindler, *Vorgeschichte*, p. 87. For translation, see Halpern, *A Naval History*, p. 293.
47. Naval Staff to High Seas Fleet, March 28, 1915, quoted in Hans J. Koerver, *War of Numbers 1914–1916: The Kaiser's Navy Gone Rogue* (Steinbach, Aus.: LIS Rheinisch, 2016), p. 84 note 171.
48. Quoted in Koerver, *War of Numbers*, p. 78.
49. Cf. Spindler, *Der Handelskrieg mit U-Booten*, vol. 3, *Oktober 1915–Januar 1916* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1934), esp. pp. 85–153.
50. See "Denkschrift des Reichskanzlers von Bethmann-Hollweg," February 29, 1916, quoted in Spindler, *Oktober 1915–Januar 1916*, p. 98. See also Ritter, *The Tragedy of Statesmanship*, p. 164ff.
51. German note to U.S. government, May 5, 1916, in Spindler, *Oktober 1915–Januar 1916*, pp. 145–49, quotation at p. 148.
52. For details, see Spindler, *Oktober 1915–Januar 1916*, pp. 154–245.
53. Three of the ships were from Britain, one from Norway, and one from the Netherlands. For details of this visit, including pictures, see Wellington Long, "The Cruise of the U-53," U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings* 92/10/764 (October 1966), pp. 86–95; Jan Heitmann, *Unter Wasser in die Neue Welt: Handelsunterseeboote und kaiserliche Unterseekreuzer im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Kriegführung* (Berlin: Berlin-Verl. Spitz, 1999), pp. 227–250; Hans Rose, "U 53 fährt nach Amerika," in Werner von Langsdorff, *U-Boote am Feind: 45 deutsche U-Boot-Fahrer erzählen* (Gütersloh, Ger.: Bertelsmann, 1937), pp. 158–85; and David Kohnen, with Nicholas Jellicoe and Nathaniel Sims, "The U.S. Navy Won the Battle of Jutland," *Naval War College Review* 69, no. 4 (Autumn 2016), pp. 136–37.
54. Ernst von Weizsäcker, diary entry, September 27, 1916, quoted in *Die Weizsäcker-Papiere 1900–1932*, ed. Leonidas E. Hill (Berlin, F.R.G.: Propyläen-Verlag, 1982), p. 215. Cf. Holger H. Herwig, *The German Naval Officer Corps: A Social and Political History, 1890–1918* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973), p. 188.
55. Cf. Ritter, *The Tragedy of Statesmanship*, pp. 288–318.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
57. Cf. Barbara Tuchman, *The Zimmermann Telegram* (Edinburgh, Scot.: Constable, 1959), and Patrick Beesly, *Room 40: British Naval Intelligence 1914–18* (London: Hamilton, 1982), pp. 204–24.
58. For details, see Spindler, *Der Handelskrieg mit U-Booten*, vol. 4, *February until December 1917* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler, 1941; repr. London: Putnam, 1964).
59. Cf. Spindler, *Der Handelskrieg mit U-Booten*, vol. 5, *Januar bis November 1918* (Frankfurt, F.R.G.: E. S. Mittler, 1966), esp. attachments at pp. 343–98.
60. Cf. Werner Rahn, "Die Kaiserliche Marine und der Erste Weltkrieg," in *Ringelnatz als Mariner im Krieg 1914–1918*, ed. Stephan Huck (Bochum, Ger.: Taschenbuch, 2003), pp. 39–89, esp. table p. 72.
61. For details, see Gerhard P. Groß, ed., with the assistance of Werner Rahn, *Der Krieg zur See 1914–1918: Der Krieg in der Nordsee*, vol. 7, *Vom Sommer 1917 bis zum Kriegsende* (Hamburg, Ger.: 2006), see esp. documents as attachments, pp. 423–64.
62. This section is based mainly on Jost Dülffer, *Weimar, Hitler und die Marine: Reichspolitik*

- und *Flottenbau 1920–1939* (Düsseldorf, F.R.G.: Droste, 1973); Werner Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928: Konzeption und Führung der Marine in der Weimarer Republik* (Munich, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1976); and “German Naval Strategy and Armament, 1919–39,” in O’Brien, *Technology and Naval Combat*. Cf. Wilhelm Deist et al., eds., “The Rearmament of the Wehrmacht,” pt. 3 in *Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 1, *The Build-Up of German Aggression* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990), pp. 372–540.
63. Cf. Marder, *From the Dreadnought to Scapa Flow*, vol. 5, *Victory and Aftermath* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970), p. 258, and Stephen W. Roskill, *Naval Policy between the Wars*, vol. 1, *The Period of Anglo-American Antagonism 1919–1929* (London: Collins, 1968), p. 92.
64. Cf. Roskill, *The Period of Anglo-American Antagonism 1919–1929*, p. 100.
65. Cf. Andreas Krause, *Scapa Flow: Die Selbstversenkung der wilhelminischen Flotte* (Berlin: Ullstein, 1999).
66. For details, see Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928*, pp. 13–50.
67. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 35–42.
68. “Annual Report on Germany for the Year 1928,” March 25, 1929, p. 33, FO 311/1364, National Archives, Kew, U.K.
69. Cf. Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928*, p. 245ff.
70. See *ibid.*, pp. 144–46.
71. The May 1929 document “Does Germany Need Large Warships?” is included in Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928*, pp. 281–86.
72. Translation is from Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928*, p. 283ff.
73. Quoted by Andreas Hillgruber, *Germany and the Two World Wars*, trans. William C. Kirby (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1982), p. 57.
74. For details, see Siegfried Breyer, *Schlachtschiffe und Schlachtkreuzer 1905–1970: Eine geschichtliche Entwicklung des Großkampfschiffes* (Erlangen, Ger.: Karl Müller, 1993).
75. See Dülffer, *Weimar, Hitler und die Marine*, pp. 204–334.
76. Cf. Allison W. Saville, “The Development of the German U-boat Arm, 1919–1935” (PhD dissertation, Univ. of Washington, 1963).
77. Dönitz joined the IGN in 1910. During World War I he commanded *UB-68*, which was sunk in 1918; he became a prisoner of war. From 1934 to 1935 he commanded the cruiser *Emden*. He served as Chief, U-boat Command from 1935 until January 1943. Dönitz was promoted to captain in 1935, rear admiral in October 1939, and grand admiral in February 1943. From 1943 to 1945 he was commander in chief of the navy. In October 1946 he was sentenced at Nuremberg to imprisonment for ten years, and in October 1956 was released from prison. Dönitz died on December 24, 1980. Cf. Clay Blair, *Hitler’s U-boat War: The Hunters, 1939–1942* (New York: Random House, 1996), pp. 35–49; Peter Padfield, *Dönitz: The Last Führer; Portrait of a Nazi War Leader* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984); and Dieter Hartwig, *Großadmiral Karl Dönitz: Legende und Wirklichkeit* (Munich, Ger.: Schöningh, 2010).
78. For details, see Rahn, *Reichsmarine und Landesverteidigung 1919–1928*, p. 127.
79. Cf. in this context Michael Salewski, *Die deutsche Seekriegsleitung 1935–1945*, vol. 1, *1935–1941* (Frankfurt, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1970), pp. 32–33; Dülffer, *Weimar, Hitler und die Marine*, pp. 435–36; and Carl-Axel Gemzell, *Raeder, Hitler und Skandinavien: Der Kampf für einen maritimen Operationsplan* (Lund, Swed.: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1965), pp. 49–51.
80. Cf. Salewski, *Die deutsche Seekriegsleitung 1935–1945*, vol. 3, *Denkschriften und Lagebetrachtungen* (Frankfurt, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1973), esp. pp. 27–63. Note document no. 1, “Seekriegführung gegen England.”
81. Deist et al., “The Rearmament of the Wehrmacht,” p. 474.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 475.
83. For details, see Dülffer, *Weimar, Hitler und die Marine*, and Salewski, *1935–1941*.
84. Cf. Hubert Jeschke, *U-Boottaktik: Zur deutschen U-Boottaktik 1900–1945* (Freiburg, F.R.G.: Rombach, 1972), pp. 63–65.

85. Stephen W. Roskill, *The War at Sea 1939–1945*, vol. 1, *The Defensive* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954), pp. 35–36; Karl Dönitz, *Zehn Jahre und zwanzig Tage: Erinnerungen 1935–1945* (Koblenz, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1985), p. 26; cf. the translation, Karl Dönitz, *Memoirs: Ten Years and Twenty Days*, trans. R. H. Stevens (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1990).
86. This section is based mainly on my contribution, "The War at Sea in the Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean," in *Germany and the Second World War* ed. Horst Boog et al., vol. 6, *The Global War* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 2001), pp. 301–466. Cf. my articles "The Atlantic in the Strategic Perspective of Hitler and Roosevelt, 1940–1941," in *To Die Gallantly: The Battle of the Atlantic*, ed. Timothy J. Runyan and Jan M. Copes (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994), pp. 3–21; "The German U-boat Campaign in World War II," in *Commerce Raiding: Historical Case Studies, 1755–2009*, Newport Paper 40, ed. Bruce A. Elleman and S. C. M. Paine (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 2013), pp. 187–207; and "The Atlantic in the Strategic Perspective of Hitler and His Admirals, 1939–1944," in *Strategy and the Sea: Essays in Honour of John B. Hattendorf*, ed. N. A. M. Rodger et al. (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell, 2016), pp. 159–68.
87. "Reflections of the C.-in-C. Navy, on the Outbreak of War, September 3, 1939," *Brassey's Naval Annual 1948*, reproduced in *Fuehrer Conferences on Naval Affairs 1939–1945* (London: Greenhill, 2006), pp. 37–38. For another translation, see the U.S. Navy's seven-volume typewritten edition: *Fuehrer Conferences in Matters Dealing with the German Navy* (Washington, DC: Secretary of the Navy, 1947). Cf. also Werner Rahn and Gerhard Schreiber, eds., *Kriegstagebuch der Seekriegsleitung 1939–1945, Teil A* [War Diary of the Naval Staff, 1939–1945, pt. A], vol. 1, *August/September 1939* (Herford, Ger.: E. S. Mittler, 1990), pp. 7-E–17-E. For details on this edition, see the review: John B. Hattendorf, "The War Diary of the German Naval Staff, 1939–1945," *Documentary Editing* 18, no. 3 (September 1996), pp. 58–62.
88. Cf. Salewski, *Denkschriften und Lagebetrachtungen*, pp. 64–69. Note document no. 2, "Gedanken über den Aufbau der U-Bootschwaffe."
89. Rahn and Schreiber, eds., *Kriegstagebuch der Seekriegsleitung 1939–1945, Teil A*, vol. 16, *Dezember 1940* (Herford, Ger.: E. S. Mittler, 1990), p. 238.
90. See Kurt Assmann [Vice Adm.], "Why U-boat Warfare Failed," *Foreign Affairs* 28, no. 4 (July 1950), pp. 659–70, esp. pp. 665–66.
91. Cf. Salewski, *1935–1941*, pp. 131–32.
92. Rahn and Schreiber, *Dezember 1940*, pp. 233, 238.
93. Cf. *Fuehrer Conferences*, pp. 160–63. See also Andreas Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie: Politik und Kriegführung 1940–1941* (Frankfurt, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1965), pp. 352–77, and Bernd Wegner, "The Road to Defeat: The German Campaigns in Russia 1941–43," in *Decisive Campaigns of the Second World War*, ed. John Gooch (London: Frank Cass, 1990), pp. 105–27, esp. pp. 106–107.
94. See Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie*, pp. 144–78; and Michael Salewski, "The Submarine War: A Historical Essay," in *The U-boat War*, ed. Lothar-Günther Buchheim (New York: Knopf, 1978), n.p.
95. "Denkschrift zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Seekriegführung gegen England Juli 1941," July 21, 1941, quoted in Salewski, *1935–1941*, pp. 195–96.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 196.
97. Rahn, "The War at Sea in the Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean," p. 405.
98. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 331.
99. "Stand und Aussichten des U-Bootkrieges," Naval War Staff memorandum, October 20, 1942, annex 1, quoted in Salewski, *Denkschriften und Lagebetrachtungen*, p. 303. Cf. Rahn, "The War at Sea in the Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean," p. 337.
100. Salewski, *Die deutsche Seekriegsleitung 1935–1945*, vol. 2, *1942–1945* (Frankfurt, F.R.G.: Bernard & Graefe, 1975), p. 552.
101. Cf. Rahn, "140 Years of German Navies," p. 83.
102. Cf. Johannes Bertold Sander-Nagashima et al., *Die Bundesmarine 1950 bis 1972: Konzeption und Aufbau* (Munich, Ger.: Oldenbourg, 2006).
103. For details, see Arleigh Burke, "Fred Ruge, My Friend," in *Seemacht und Geschichte*:

*Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Friedrich Ruge*, ed. Deutsches Marine Institut (Bonn, F.R.G.: MOV, 1975), pp. 29–38.

104. Dieter Hartwig, comment in Günter Fromm et al., *Die deutsche Flotte im Spannungsfeld der Politik 1848–1985*, ed. Deutsches Marine Institut and Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt (Herford, F.R.G.: E. S. Mittler, 1985), p. 197.

105. Cf. three essays published in Rahn, *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel*: Knut Eckstein, “Die Volksmarine im Kalten Krieg,” pp. 615–31; Hans Ehlert, “Vom Matrosen zum Admiral: Theodor Hoffmann und die Volksmarine der DDR,” pp. 633–56; and Dirk Horten, “Erfahrungen im deutschen Einigungsprozeß: Die Auflösung der Volksmarine 1990/91,” pp. 657–72.



## THE NEW TIME AND SPACE

### Dimensions of a Maritime Defense Strategy

*Tomohisa Takei*

*Your Majesty, King of Zhao, if you serve the King of Qin, he will ask to be given the castles of Yiyand and Cheng Gao. If you provide the castles this year, the King of Qin will then tell you to give him some land the next year. If you give away parcels of land, eventually the amount of land suitable for release will be reduced, and, if you do not provide land, then everything that you have done up until now will become useless, and eventually you will run into big trouble. . . . [W]ithout doing any battle, your land will be sliced away, continuously.*

蘇秦列傳 [BIOGRAPHY OF SU QIN]

Compared with previous years, the Japanese defense white paper for fiscal year 2016 devoted more pages to discussing territorial disputes in the South China Sea—where China has been behaving with disrespect to international norms. The Chinese are overriding international law with Chinese civil law. China’s activities, such as reclamation activities on submerged features, reefs, and rocks, have exacerbated longstanding territorial disputes among Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) members. International and regional attention has been drawn to the decision in favor of the Philippines versus China

by a tribunal constituted under Annex VII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and held in the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) at The Hague.

In the Spratly Islands, China purports to build seven “islands” from reclaimed coral and sand.<sup>1</sup> It takes significant effort, time, and expense to build dry land from scratch by “reclaiming” it onto a reef. Even Subi Reef, the closest of these features to China, is located 510 nautical miles (approximately 950 kilometers) from Hainan Island. In disregard

*Admiral Tomohisa Takei currently serves as professor and distinguished international fellow at the Naval War College. Admiral Takei joined the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) in 1979 after graduating from the Japan National Defense Academy. He received a master’s degree in regional study from the University of Tsukuba in 1993. Admiral Takei was a surface warfare officer and specialized in weapon systems. He assumed duties as the thirty-second chief of maritime staff of the JMSDF in October 2014 and retired in December 2016.*

Japanese version © JMSDF Command and Staff College (MSCS)  
Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4

of generally accepted land-reclamation practices, the Chinese allow no time for the foundation to stabilize; instead they build multiple facilities right away and militarize the area. Just two years after starting reclamation activities at Fiery Cross Reef, for example, China announced the completion of a three-thousand-meter runway and peripheral facilities. China also conducted a test flight of a civilian airplane on January 2, 2016. By early 2017, facilities had been completed for twenty-four military aircraft on three reclaimed “islands”: Fiery Cross Reef, Mischief Reef, and Subi Reef. The Vietnamese government condemned this act as an infringement of sovereignty.<sup>2</sup> According to estimates based on similar projects in Japan, the costs to build an artificial island as big as the one on Fiery Cross Reef (2.74 square kilometers in area, five meters in height), pave a three-thousand-meter runway, and build an airport with all the necessary ancillary facilities (e.g., aircraft warning lights and guide lights) could be as high as U.S.\$2.4 billion (¥240 billion).<sup>3</sup>

China is executing six construction projects similar to the Fiery Cross Reef reclamation simultaneously, bringing several dredging boats and pump dredgers to expedite the effort. Many view this activity as an effort to gain territorial control of the South China Sea. Neighboring countries and the international community at large, including Japan and the United States, have pursued peaceful, legal resolutions of this issue, so far to no avail.<sup>4</sup>

From August 5 through August 9, 2016, while two to three hundred Chinese fishing boats were operating around the Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea, up to fifteen China Coast Guard (CCG) vessels entered and exited the contiguous zone repeatedly, and fifteen CCG vessels entered Japanese territorial waters (i.e., within twelve nautical miles of shore) during this short period.<sup>5</sup> Considering the abnormal number of CCG vessels (three to four have been more common for such incursions) and their intrusion into territorial waters, the Japanese government made a diplomatic protest to the Chinese government. Suspicions arose that the activities of the many fishing boats and CCG vessels operating in the area surrounding the Senkaku Islands actually constituted an invasion being directed by the Chinese government, especially because after the most intrusive entry to date occurred on August 9 the invasion of territorial waters suddenly paused—abnormal behavior for ordinary fishermen.

Two issues emerged from these events in the South and East China Seas.

The first is that China has demonstrated that it has the resources to carry out multiple massive, expensive marine-construction projects simultaneously and quickly, and it seemingly disregards limitations imposed by UNCLOS and complaints from the international community. China’s one-party-rule political system makes it easy for the Chinese Communist Party to control and direct numerous fishing boats and deploy a large force of CCG vessels.



The second issue is that the land-reclamation activities in the Spratly Islands and the dispute over the Senkaku Islands both can be considered part of China's strategy to expand its maritime claims in the region. The nature of the country's political system, combined with the massive economic resources available to it, provides China with the flexibility needed to adjust the speed and scale with regard to time and space considerations for its territorial-expansionist maritime strategy. No other country in the Asia-Pacific region can match China in this regard. Consequently, every effort must be made to avoid "mirror imaging" China when analyzing the current security environment.

This article examines the concepts of time and space from the perspective of a status quo nation that seeks to deter the designs of a revisionist power, and helps formulate a new maritime self-defense strategy for Japan that serves as a useful reference for small and medium-sized countries that seek to preserve stability in their regions.

#### THE NEW SECURITY ENVIRONMENT: THE TIME DIMENSION

During the height of America's military intervention in Vietnam, from 1965 to 1968, the quantity and quality of the American military was so overpowering vis-à-vis the Vietcong, along with their North Vietnamese allies, that it seemed the United States could not lose the war. But, as Yōnosuke Nagai observed in his *Jikan no Seijigaku (Politics and Time)*, one must understand America's loss in terms of who lost to whom.

Conclusively speaking, it is a cruel historical fact that the metropolitan power, empowered through an urban industrial/technological society, lost to [the Vietcong], empowered through a primitive, agricultural society. This battle was not a *simplicistic battle of military "ability" but a battle of "will."* While the battle of "ability" is basically a spatial and quantitative battle, the battle of "will" is *determined by the system's stamina size, or the size of the sacrifice (cost) measured by time.*<sup>6</sup>

In other words, as the struggle became protracted, an increasingly war-weary American citizenry lost its will to fight. In contrast, the North Vietnamese, despite dramatic battlefield losses and the defeat of the Vietcong following the Tet Offensive, eventually prevailed because they never lost their will to fight, despite the passage of time.

Nagai also notes two asymmetries that generally (including in the Vietnam War) work to the advantage of a liberation army fighting against a government army: (1) The existence of sanctuaries helps the liberation army avoid defeat. (2) The liberation army—the revisionist force—takes the initiative against the government army—the status quo defenders.<sup>7</sup> The Vietnam War was an asymmetrical battle between a metropolitan power, the United States, and a liberation army. The liberation army based itself in its sanctuary of North Vietnam,

supported by China and the Soviet Union, and used this advantage to carry out guerrilla war freely against South Vietnam. Over time, the liberation army took advantage of the two asymmetries, patiently continuing to fight in such a way as to avoid defeat. The war eventually exhausted the will of the metropolitan power to continue to fight. The liberation army skillfully used a “ripening-time” strategy—it waited until the time was ripe, then took decisive action.<sup>8</sup>

National liberation wars that follow such a ripening-time strategy, such as the Vietnam War and the Algerian War, continue to be fought today, such as in Afghanistan, Syria, and North Africa. However, in these modern conflicts we see a variation in the strategy in the form of indiscriminate terror attacks, such as those carried out by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). Not only does ISIL send terrorists disguised as Middle Eastern refugees into Europe; it uses social media to promote its version of violent extremism, sending out propaganda and encouraging terrorism. Hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing the Syrian civil war and Libya’s domestic disorder have flooded Europe. This phenomenon, accompanied by continuing terrorist acts, has made the member states of the European Union (EU) suspicious about refugees, which led to a fundamental shift in EU refugee policy. ISIL’s indiscriminate terror attacks are intended to demonstrate the organization’s power and to exhaust the national will of those opposed to it. In this context, ISIL’s indiscriminate terror attacks can be categorized as part of a ripening-time strategy.

Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea using “hybrid warfare” and its promotion of conflict in eastern Ukraine, like China’s one-sided land-reclamation activities in the South China Sea, exhibit characteristics of the ripening-time strategy.<sup>9</sup> Russia’s military is overwhelmingly more powerful than Ukraine’s, and Russia has placed about forty thousand soldiers in the vicinity of the shared border. Ukraine cannot recapture Crimea, and because Russian public opinion strongly supports President Vladimir Putin’s foreign policy, Russia can maintain its efforts—fighting to avoid defeat—and wait until Ukraine loses its will to fight and concedes.<sup>10</sup>

With regard to the South China Sea, China has pursued a strategy similar to Russia’s in Crimea and eastern Ukraine. China’s land-reclamation activities, its construction of harbor and airport facilities, and its militarization of the entire body of water have ensured China’s actual control over the features under dispute. Now China waits for the international community to lose its will to contest Chinese actions.

On July 12, 2016, an Annex VII arbitration tribunal denied China’s claim to historic title within the area of the “nine-dash line” as being incompatible with UNCLOS. It further determined that the Spratly Islands consist only of mere rocks and low-tide elevations, rather than islands that can sustain human habitation; only the latter would have been entitled to an exclusive economic zone

(EEZ). Consequently, regardless of which state has lawful title to the features in the Spratly Islands, those features are entitled, at most, to a territorial sea; no feature generates an EEZ. Specifically, the court's ruling noted that four of the seven China-controlled "lands" were constructed on rocks; they accrue twelve nautical miles of territorial waters, but not an EEZ or an extended continental shelf. The other three features, Subi, Hugh (or Hughes), and Mischief Reefs, are low-tide elevations in that they are above water at low tide but submerged at high tide. These features are considered to be part of the seabed; no state may claim title over them. If they lie in the EEZ of a coastal state, that state does enjoy exclusive sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the living and nonliving resources of the features. However, almost half of the seven features in question are located within two hundred nautical miles of the Philippines, Brunei, and Malaysia, which dispute ownership with China, while the remaining features are located on the high seas, belonging to no country and falling within no country's EEZ.<sup>11</sup> Because EEZ borders in the South China Sea are not finalized, the several countries involved are left fighting over the "territory" of the Spratlys and many other small features, sometimes trying to seize control by force (even if on a small scale), through land reclamation, or both.

The seven features where China is reinforcing its control have been transformed from their original state, and CCG patrol vessels now block foreign vessels from the area. The number of ships in the People's Liberation Army Navy and the CCG continues to expand, now exceeding the totals of their counterparts in Vietnam, Malaysia, and the Philippines combined.<sup>12</sup> Numerous fishing boats assigned to the People's Armed Forces Maritime Militia further skew the odds against China's regional neighbors in any maritime dispute.

China prefers to conduct only bilateral negotiations with its regional neighbors. To be most effective, interested nations should resist such lopsided negotiations and act only multilaterally. However, some countries with strong economic ties to China oppose adoption of a legally binding code of conduct, and as a result have prevented ASEAN member states from acting together.<sup>13</sup>

Confusion and uncertainty in the South China Sea work to China's advantage. The government of the Philippines appears to be losing its will to fight in its territorial dispute with China. President Rodrigo Duterte announced on September 13, 2016, that the Philippines would end joint maritime patrols with the United States—to which both parties had agreed previously—in April 2017; thereafter it will allow only aerial patrols, and only within territorial waters.<sup>14</sup> On September 28, 2016, while visiting Vietnam, Duterte stated that the Philippines would hold the U.S.-Philippine bilateral war games—military exercises that China opposes. However, Duterte stated that following the PHIBLEX 33 amphibious exercise,

his government also would reinforce its economic relationships with China and Russia.<sup>15</sup>

On the basis of the foregoing, it appears that China has undertaken a cunning strategy designed to wear down its regional neighbors: ignore the PCA ruling (calling it “a political farce staged under legal pretext”—Wang Yi, China’s minister of foreign affairs); reinforce control of the artificial islands and surrounding waters via CCG patrols; use economic leverage (involving, e.g., economic aid and export/import restrictions) over neighboring countries to demand compromise; and squat in the area until disputant nations eventually give up.<sup>16</sup>

Compared with Russia, China has executed its ripening-time strategy more slowly and flexibly, taking advantage of having the world’s second-biggest economy and a single-party political system that offers its leadership almost complete autonomy from domestic interference in its foreign and defense policy making. If China had taken actions in the South China Sea as clear and aggressive as those of Russia in Crimea, nearby nations would have reacted strongly. Instead, to avoid fueling its neighbors’ suspicions, China took its time testing the waters to see how the international community would react to its slow but continual transgressions. Indeed, China has taken further advantage of the power vacuum in the region caused by America’s continued preoccupation in the Middle East. Applying its vast resources to marine construction projects, China made such significant territorial changes over such a short period that it is now impossible to revert to the status quo ante. At this point, China need only wait patiently until the nations involved give in and compromise.

#### THE NEW SECURITY ENVIRONMENT: THE SPACE DIMENSION

While it waits for a situation to ripen, it is important for a revisionist power to restrict the other parties’ ability to seek restitution, and instead to extract concessions.

Modern history offers Nazi Germany’s accession of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia as an example of effectively drawing out concessions from an opposing party. As part of its “salami slicing” of eastern Europe, Nazi Germany at the 1938 Munich Conference demanded that other countries, principally the United Kingdom and France, allow the cession of the Sudetenland, justified by the presence of the many ethnic Germans living in that area. The appeasers acceded to this demand in exchange for a guarantee that Germany would settle for these new boundaries and not go to war. The people of western Europe, still weary from World War I and remembering how difficult it had been to de-escalate tensions once mobilization plans were initiated in August of 1914, sought to avoid war at all costs.

In other words, there was no temporal or spatial redundancy in either political or military affairs. Public opinion influenced and pressured politicians' decision-making processes, to the detriment of more-sound military advice.

These days, the development of truly global information-communications technologies means the mass media report incidents that happen on the other side of the world as if they occurred next door. Economically, the world is much more mutually interdependent than during Hitler's day; in this way, political as well as economic relationships among nations are intimate. As a result, should war break out, there is much less spatial redundancy than in the past. If an unforeseen armed conflict occurs between China and Japan (the countries with the world's second- and third-largest economies, respectively) the effect on the world economy and international affairs would be devastating—even if the war zone were limited geographically.

In a strategic environment such as this, revisionist powers have taken the initiative—China and Russia already have crossed the line. By contrast, status quo powers tend to be psychologically suppressed, desiring to avoid retaliating with military force or even exercising a police function. Revisionists, by their willingness to take the initiative at any time, can manipulate the rate by which they increase their governmental presence, encouraging status quo states to conclude that a forceful response is not necessary. Then revisionists can expand their military operations in the area slowly, increasing the tempo gradually, such as by adding air operations to sea operations, or vice versa.

Human senses have thresholds. For example, when exposed to loud noise, your hearing gradually becomes immune; and if continuously pricked with a needle, eventually you feel no pain. The threshold for enduring pain rises as time goes by. Similarly, if revisionist actions are repeated and expanded with some subtlety, the mass media and the international community will accept such actions as the new norm, unless the status quo powers take some kind of sudden, unexpectedly aggressive action.

When revisionist powers practice salami tactics skillfully in peacetime, it imperceptibly raises the pain threshold. If defenders of the status quo take no action in the face of graduated, repetitive aggression, it suggests acceptance of a new stasis. One act of appeasement will lead to another. For defenders of the status quo, how to put a stop to the cycle of appeasement is a crucial challenge.

## SOLUTIONS TO THE NEW SPACE AND TIME

As a useful example for understanding space and time in the new security environment, consider NATO's response to Russia.

### *Altering the Space Dimension*

To increase their security in the face of salami tactics, small and medium-sized powers have only two choices: appeasement or collective security through bilateral or multilateral alliances. Alliances bolster deterrence by creating closer relationships among the threatened states, thereby making the space “denser.” During the Cold War, NATO and the neutral states of northern Europe recognized this reality and reacted effectively to Russian aggression in the region.

In 1994, the United Kingdom, the United States, Russia, and Ukraine signed the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, under which Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons. In exchange, the signatories promised that they would not use force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine.<sup>17</sup> However, twenty years later, Russia invaded Ukraine and annexed the Crimean Peninsula, then muscled in on the Donets region of eastern Ukraine, both enclaves of Russian speakers with historic and cultural links to Moscow. Fighting continues today between the forces of the Ukrainian government and the rebel armed forces—another revisionist effort initiated by a power out to challenge the status quo in defiance of international law.<sup>18</sup>

NATO condemned Russia’s activities as an attempt to destabilize eastern Ukraine and a violation of international law. NATO and its member states repeatedly called on Russia to withdraw from Crimea and fulfill its obligations under international law.<sup>19</sup> NATO held a summit in Warsaw in July 2016 and issued a communiqué that branded a wide variety of Russian activities destabilizing to the European security environment. The cited actions included the ongoing illegal and illegitimate annexation of Crimea; the violation of sovereign borders by force; the deliberate destabilization of eastern Ukraine; and large-scale exercises and other provocative military activities near NATO borders, including in the Baltic and Black Sea regions and the eastern Mediterranean.<sup>20</sup>

Although historically Sweden’s foreign policy has opposed participation in military alliances in general, the Swedish government made clear in 2009 that it supported multinational security and cooperation. It enthusiastically promoted security cooperation and interactions with other countries through international institutions, including the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. After Russia’s annexation of Crimea, Sweden, although not a member of NATO, reinforced its relations with the organization by signing the memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding host-nation support. Sweden also is building bilateral, multilayered, cooperative security relationships with other countries.<sup>21</sup> On June 8, 2016, Sweden’s minister of defense, Peter Hultqvist, signed a letter of intent with his American counterpart, Ashton Carter, to enhance defense cooperation. This followed an earlier defense-cooperation understanding with the

United Kingdom in 2014. While there is no mutual defense obligation between Sweden and the United States, their MOU laid out five key aims: enhancing interoperability, strengthening capabilities and posture through training and exercises, deepening armament cooperation, advancing cooperation in research and development, and meeting common challenges in multinational operations.<sup>22</sup>

Finland's foreign and defense policies are similar to Sweden's in many ways, but there are some differences. After Finland became independent from Russia in 1917, it attempted to maintain a good relationship with the Soviet Union, a country with which it shares a long, troubled border. Finland remained more neutral militarily than Sweden (i.e., less Westward tilting). For example, the Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance, signed in 1948, was canceled in 1992 after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, but Finland replaced it with a basic treaty with Russia. Then, after Finland joined the EU in 1995, it changed its policy to "military non-alignment, backed up by a credible national defense." After Russia annexed Crimea, Finland, also a nonmember of NATO, enhanced its relationship with the organization by signing the MOU regarding host-nation support in 2014.<sup>23</sup> On July 9, 2016, in connection with NATO's Warsaw summit, Finnish defense minister Jussi Niinistö and his British counterpart, Michael Fallon, signed a declaratory expression of intent between their countries.<sup>24</sup> The document does not obligate Finland or Britain to provide mutual assistance in the event of a crisis, but rather sets a framework for cooperation.<sup>25</sup> A short time later, on August 22, Niinistö told Reuters that Finland also was negotiating a defense-collaboration agreement with the United States.<sup>26</sup>

Motivating these changes in the foreign policies of Sweden and Finland, including the rapid enhancement of their relationships with NATO, the United States, and the United Kingdom, are Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea, the continuing "hybrid warfare" being practiced in eastern Ukraine, and the growing military competition between NATO and Russia in and around the Baltic Sea.

### *Altering the Time Dimension*

Deterrence also can be reinforced by improving military readiness with regard to time. The following discussion continues to consider the example of northern Europe, where NATO has placed combat troops in the Baltic countries and Poland, each of which shares a border with Russia.

The histories of all four of these countries provided grounds for profound suspicion of Russia; in particular, Poland has been partitioned many times over the centuries. After the Cold War, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania did try to maintain good relationships with their large eastern neighbor, but for reasons of national security they also took steps to enhance their relationships with NATO and the EU. They joined NATO to avail themselves of the principle of collective

self-defense.<sup>27</sup> After the Russian annexation of Crimea in the name of protecting Russians, it is not surprising that these countries requested that NATO station troops on their territories. Latvia is particularly vulnerable, as 40 percent of its population is Russian speaking; Estonia's equivalent proportion is 30 percent. Poland shares a border with Ukraine. It is easy to understand why these countries are particularly fearful of what Russia might do.

At the same July 2016 Warsaw summit, NATO welcomed the offers of Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States to serve as framework nations for a robust, multinational forward presence. Beginning in early 2017, that enhanced forward presence was to rest on four battalion-sized battle groups introduced into Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, provided by framework nations and other contributing allies.<sup>28</sup> To enhance its presence in its southern area, such as Romania, NATO further decided to improve integrated training.<sup>29</sup> However, establishing a forward allied military presence is not a sufficient deterrent.

In a discussion focused on China's antiaccess/area-denial strategy, Aaron L. Friedberg invokes a more general principle: that the most difficult question confronting U.S. military planners is not what kind of military power they should use, but how aggressively American military power should be used *in an opponent's land*. At a critical moment, if the opponent discerns that the United States has neither the intention nor the ability to employ its military power on the opponent's territory, the leader of that opposing country will not fear retaliation and will underestimate the risk of war that an attack will cause; he will devote more resources toward mounting an offense than to maintaining a defense.<sup>30</sup>

Applying Friedberg's logic to the future of eastern Europe, if Russia believes NATO has no specific response plan and is not ready to retaliate out of concern for Russian escalation, there is little to deter Russia from continuing its salami tactics. The main purpose of positioning NATO troops in the Baltic countries is to deter Russia's next action.<sup>31</sup> Will NATO's forces counterattack against Russia, despite the risk of escalation? The answer to this question is at the core of NATO's existence.

### *Space and Time*

These two responses to the new security environment—making space more dense and speeding up the readiness timetable—are intended to prevent additional applications of salami tactics by China and Russia. Where a situation seems to have reached the last stage of a ripening-time strategy (i.e., the revision is almost completed), is there any way to recover?

Russia's action in Crimea is clearly illegal, but as a permanent member of the UN Security Council (UNSC) Russia can veto any UNSC resolution. Russia also has more military power than Ukraine, including nuclear weapons. It would



be difficult for Ukraine to recover its illegally occupied territory anytime soon. Ukraine's only viable strategy is to maintain its citizens' will, thereby preventing the situation from "ripening" any further. It must continue patiently to negotiate within a multinational environment, understanding that any favorable resolution will take significant time.

The best global strategy to prevent larger powers from intimidating weaker ones into making concessions is to never accept any change to the status quo and never confer legitimacy on the illegal use of force. The status quo ante must be maintained. To avoid giving revisionist powers even the smallest opportunity to undermine stability, small and medium-sized nations also should take proactive measures, such as reinforcing alliances and creating favorable international public opinion. Deterrence also can be improved by enhancing collaborative relationships with other nations in areas for which no collective-defense system like NATO exists.

Whether applied reactively or proactively, the basic concepts discussed in this article should be understood and employed dynamically. Static military measures meant to maintain a status quo are meaningless. States need the capability to respond to peacetime salami tactics by revisionist powers to a degree calibrated not to cross the threshold of excessive force. To do so, it is important to have available and to deploy, at the right time and in the right way, both a dynamic police force and such military power as will enable a country to deter or respond to the situation.

Globally, military conflict is expanding. Small and medium-sized states facing intimidation from revisionist powers naturally hesitate to employ military force, even in their own defense. But in the new security environment, in which revisionist powers ingeniously adjust and rebalance the status quo, states must plan for an opponent's initiatives, maintain the ability to act, and be sure of the political will to use force in a crisis, despite the risks of escalation. Above all, the key to calming a crisis before it escalates is to return to the original state of affairs before the revisionist power enters the waiting-game phase of a ripening-time strategy.

The Japan Coast Guard (JCG) has dispatched its patrol ships and aircraft into the sea and air areas around the Senkaku Islands. This helps to maintain security and reinforces the effectiveness of JMSDF surveillance activities in the sea and air domains. Even now, four years after property rights to the Senkaku Islands were transferred from private parties to the Japanese government, the mass media's interest in East China Sea affairs remains high, and they continue to broadcast JCG reports on the activities of Chinese vessels in the waters near the Senkakus. Japanese citizens maintain high awareness of the current situation, and their interest in the Senkaku Islands ensures the government will protect the islands and

Japanese citizens. Japan's response stance is at the threshold level. Mass-media contributions such as these undoubtedly play a significant role in shaping public attitudes, which helps prevent China from unilaterally altering current conditions as part of a ripening-time strategy.

This article has analyzed the security-environment dimensions of time and space, from the perspective of status quo-maintaining nations. The discussion should provide readers with some ideas bearing on Japan's maritime self-defense strategy and its future national security with regard to China. More generally, the article illustrates that the current security challenges vis-à-vis revisionist states such as Russia and China are complex; any attempt to address changes in the status quo is complicated by the many actions and calculations of different parties. Such a situation cannot be explained using military rationales alone, and must be addressed using a multilateral approach that employs all the instruments of power.

---

#### NOTES

- The original Japanese version of this article appeared in *Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force Command and Staff College Review* 12, special issue (November 2016). The epigraph comes from 司馬遷 [Sima Qian], trans. Tamaki Ogawa, Makoto Imataka, and Yoshihiko Fukushima, 蘇秦列伝 『史記列伝(一)』 [Records of the Grand Historian, *Biography of Su Qin*] (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1993), p. 12. Su Qin was an influential strategist during the Warring States period of ancient Chinese history. He advocated a “vertical alliance” to deter the strong 秦 (Qin) kingdom's expansion toward and invasion of the Six Kingdoms on its eastern border. To weaken the Vertical Alliance, the Qin created some bilateral alliances, constituting the so-called Horizontal Alliance.
1. They are Johnson South Reef, Cuarteron Reef, Gaven Reefs, Hugh/Hughes Reef, Fiery Cross Reef, Subi Reef, and Mischief Reef. Airports have been constructed or are under construction on Fiery Cross Reef, Subi Reef, and Mischief Reef. Japan Ministry of Defense, *Defense of Japan 2016* (Tokyo: 2016), p. 57.
  2. 中国, 「人工島」の滑走路で試験飛行ベトナムが抗議 [“China Conducted Test Flight at ‘Artificial Island,’ Vietnam Protested”], *Asahi Shimbun*, January 4, 2016.
  3. Offshore civil engineering work (e.g., dredging, bank protection): about ¥99.2 billion; onshore construction (e.g., site preparation, building power plants): about ¥5.3 billion; airport-related construction (e.g., concrete pavement, lights installation, power plant installation): about ¥3.8 billion; total: about ¥108.3 billion. ¥108.3 billion × 220 percent (applying a remote island-construction index to the 1,200 km from Hainan Island) = about ¥238.3 billion. The calculation excludes onshore facilities (e.g., office buildings, barracks, tower, hangars, fuel tanks).
  4. For an example, see Group of Seven Foreign Ministers' Meeting, “G7 Foreign Ministers' Statement on Maritime Security, April 11, 2016, Hiroshima, Japan,” available at [www.mofa.go.jp/](http://www.mofa.go.jp/).
  5. Japan Coast Guard, 平成 28 年 8 月上旬の中国公船及び中国漁船の活動状況について [“Activity of Chinese Fishing Boat and Chinese Government Ships in the Early Part of August 2016”], *Japan Coast Guard*, [www.kaiho.mlit.go.jp/](http://www.kaiho.mlit.go.jp/).
  6. Yōnosuke Nagai, *Jikan no Seijigaku [Politics and Time]* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1979), p. 60 [emphasis added].
  7. *Ibid.*, pp. 62–65.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 80.
9. Japan Ministry of Defense, *Defense of Japan 2016*, p. 71.
10. According to the Pew Research Center, roughly eight in ten Russians (83 percent) say they have confidence in President Putin to do the right thing in world affairs, and roughly nine in ten (89 percent) think the Ukrainian government in Kiev should recognize the results and allow Crimea to join Russia. "Chapter 3. Russia: Public Backs Putin, Crimea's Secession," *Pew Research Center*, May 8, 2014, [www.pewglobal.org/](http://www.pewglobal.org/).
11. The three biggest reefs are Mischief, Hugh/Hughes, and Johnson Reefs.
12. "China's Activities in the South China Sea," [Japan] *Ministry of Defense*, December 22, 2015, [www.mod.go.jp/](http://www.mod.go.jp/). Also see Lyle J. Morris, "Blunt Defenders of Sovereignty: The Rise of Coast Guards in East and Southeast Asia," *Naval War College Review* 70, no. 2 (Spring 2017), pp. 75–112.
13. Thailand, Laos, and Myanmar have sought to avoid expressing a position regarding the South China Sea; Cambodia repeatedly has expressed its active support for China's position. The National Institute for Defense Studies Japan, *East Asian Strategic Review 2016* (Tokyo: May 2016), pp. 152–53.
14. "Do Not Co-patrol with the US Military—Consideration to China in the South China Sea—President of Philippines," *Jijitsushin Sha*, September 13, 2016, [www.jiji.com/](http://www.jiji.com/).
15. "Duterte: 2016 PH-US Military Exercises Will Be the Last," *ABS-CBN News*, September 28, 2016, [news.abs-cbn.com/](http://news.abs-cbn.com/).
16. "Remarks by Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi on the Award of the So-Called Arbitral Tribunal in the South China Sea Arbitration," *Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of China*, July 12, 2016, [www.fmprc.gov.cn/](http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/).
17. Permanent Reps. of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America to the UN, Letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Permanent Representatives of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the Secretary-General, UN Doc. A/49/765, S/1994/1399, Annex I (Dec. 19, 1994).
18. "Basic Data of Ukraine," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, [www.mofa.go.jp/](http://www.mofa.go.jp/).
19. For example, the United Kingdom, along with NATO, the EU, and the UN, requested an explanation from Russia and stated that it will maintain the pressure of sanctions on Russia, working with EU partners. "National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015," [gov.uk](http://gov.uk), November 23, 2015, pp. 53–54.
20. "Warsaw Summit Communique," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, July 9, 2016, art. 10, [www.nato.int/](http://www.nato.int/).
21. "Basic Data of Sweden," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, [www.mofa.go.jp/](http://www.mofa.go.jp/).
22. "Minister of Defense Peter Hultqvist Signed US-Swedish Statement of Intent," *Government Offices of Sweden*, June 8, 2016, [www.government.se/](http://www.government.se/).
23. "Basic Data of Finland," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, [www.mofa.go.jp/](http://www.mofa.go.jp/).
24. "Finland, Britain Sign Defense Protocol," *Finland Times*, July 10, 2016, [www.finlandtimes.fi/](http://www.finlandtimes.fi/).
25. *Ibid.*
26. "Militarily Neutral Finland in Talks with U.S. on Closer Defense Collaboration; Minister," *Reuters*, August 22, 2016, [www.reuters.com/](http://www.reuters.com/).
27. "Basic Data of Estonia," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, [www.mofa.go.jp/](http://www.mofa.go.jp/).
28. "Warsaw Summit Communique," art. 40.
29. *Ibid.*, art. 41.
30. Aaron L. Friedberg, *Beyond Air-Sea Battle: The Debate over US Military Strategy in Asia*, Japanese ed., trans. Shigetoshi Hirayama (Tokyo: Fuyoshobo, 2016), pp. 182–83.
31. "Warsaw Summit Communique," arts. 10–11, 40.

## REBUILDING THE UKRAINIAN NAVY

---

*Deborah Sanders*

**T**he Russian Federation's rapid and illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014 has had a profoundly negative effect on the Ukrainian navy. The service lost access to a third of its Black Sea coastline, control of the Kerch Strait, and access to the defense industries located in Crimea.<sup>1</sup> It lost the majority of its service personnel and access to its military and maritime infrastructure and ports in Crimea. The Ukrainian navy also lost two-thirds of its warships, including its most modern platforms. Despite Russia's slow return of some of Ukraine's maritime platforms, the Russian seizure of many of Ukraine's major warships and naval aviation and air assets has dealt a serious blow to the already small Ukrainian navy. Andri Ryzenko, a former deputy head of the Ukrainian navy, has described the fleet as an "operational shadow of its former self" in urgent need of modernization and rebuilding.<sup>2</sup>

*Deborah Sanders is a reader in defense and security studies in the Defence Studies Department of King's College London at the Joint Services Command and Staff College, where she specializes in maritime issues and military transformation in the Black Sea. She is a founding member of the U.K. Consortium on Small Navies and the Corbett Centre at the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom. She was awarded her doctorate in 1997 from Aberystwyth University. She has published extensively on the Black Sea; her most recent publications include a monograph, Maritime Power in the Black Sea (Ashgate, 2014), and an article on the Bulgarian navy after the Cold War published in the Spring 2015 issue of the Naval War College Review.*

*Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4*

In light of these severe losses and the realization of the important role maritime forces can play in the war in the east and in protecting Ukraine's interests in its exclusive economic zone (EEZ), there is a growing recognition within the Ukrainian government of the need to rebuild the Ukrainian navy. Ukraine's president, Petro Poroshenko, has announced ambitious plans to "revive" the Ukrainian navy, stating that in the future it would be equipped with state-of-the-art precision weapons.

This article examines the Ukrainian government's attempts to rebuild the Ukrainian navy and argues that, while Ukraine faces political,

conceptual, and financial challenges in reviving its maritime power, it has made some modest progress toward building a “mosquito fleet.” This fleet has been bolstered by the addition of some small, new ships and the increasing professionalization of Ukraine’s naval personnel, in particular its marines. This progress suggests that Ukraine can go in a radically different direction as it redevelops its navy: toward coastal defense.

To make this argument, this article proceeds in three sections. The first examines why maritime power is important to Ukraine. It argues that Ukraine’s commercial and economic interests already have been affected adversely by the lack of a navy. The war in the east has revealed the vulnerability of Ukraine’s coastline, and Russia’s seizure of maritime infrastructure and its attempts to exploit energy reserves in Ukraine’s territorial waters have reinforced the urgent requirement to rebuild the fleet. The second section explores the range of difficulties Ukraine faces in rebuilding its navy. These factors include the impact of the Russian annexation of Crimea, the lack of a coherent and realistic concept for the navy, and domestic challenges. The final section evaluates the progress made so far in building a small, coastal-defense navy.

The rebuilding of the Ukrainian navy merits further analysis for several reasons. First, it illustrates the often intrinsic link between land and maritime power: for Ukraine’s navy, the loss of Crimea has been equivalent to, or even worse than, a defeat in a fleet action. It demonstrates the problems of “rebuilding in contact,” in which medium- to long-term maritime interests may have to be mortgaged to address short-term military needs in the east. Finally, it demonstrates the problems of generating maritime capabilities in a weak-state context in which economic challenges and political instability interfere with the ability to establish and implement effective maritime policy and strategy.

## UKRAINE AS A MARITIME STATE

Long land borders and proximity to Russia have given the Ukrainian state a continental focus, but Ukraine also has important maritime interests. President Poroshenko has stated unequivocally that Ukraine, was, is, and will remain a maritime state. Some of its maritime interests are economic in nature, but others are military strategic. In June 2015, the then deputy head of the Ukrainian navy, Andri Ryzenko, pointed out that Ukraine’s prosperity, its economy, and the potential growth of tax revenues depend on realization of the country’s maritime potential. A quarter of Ukraine’s gross domestic product (GDP) is generated by the five regions with access to the sea.<sup>3</sup> Ukraine’s maritime ports and maritime infrastructure in the Black Sea are important national strategic facilities. Before the annexation, Ukraine had twenty commercial seaports; eighteen of these were state owned, and together they contributed more than 1.55 billion Ukrainian

hryvnia (UAH) (approximately U.S.\$55 million) to the Ukrainian state budget.<sup>4</sup> While Ukraine has lost access to five of its ports located in Crimea, it retains four important commercial ports in Odessa, Chornomorsk, and Yuzhny, located on the northwestern coast of the Black Sea, and Mariupol' in the Sea of Azov.<sup>5</sup> Taken together, these ports account for almost 70 percent of the total commercial cargo into Ukraine. In a sign of their significance to the Ukrainian economy, Ukraine increased its container turnover by almost 6 percent in the first quarter of 2016.<sup>6</sup> Further demonstrating the economic importance of these ports, Cargill, an American global corporation, announced in early 2016 that one hundred million dollars had been invested to build a grain terminal in Yuzhny.<sup>7</sup>

Ukraine's ports also matter because Ukraine has an export-oriented economy; it is a major exporter of machinery, grain, coal, steel, and fertilizers, which are shipped out through its ports. Indeed, these are of growing importance, and from 2015 to 2016 Ukraine increased its export volume by 12 percent.<sup>8</sup> Mariupol', for example, is the busiest commercial maritime hub on the Sea of Azov, and before the Russian annexation of Crimea it produced almost a third of the Donets region's total industrial output, including over 70 percent of the region's steel production.<sup>9</sup> Considering these important maritime economic and commercial interests, rebuilding the Ukrainian navy clearly is necessary to protect Ukraine's national interests.

Ukraine's maritime interests are also military in nature, and the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine against separatist and Russian forces has only sharpened them. This protracted conflict and the vulnerability of the strategically important city of Mariupol' also have created incentives to rebuild the Ukrainian navy. Mariupol' constitutes a key battleground—the front line and a decisive point in the ongoing conflict. For the separatists, Mariupol' represents an important strategic prize: taking it would give them control of the two hundred miles of coastline running from Donetsk to Crimea, effectively halving Ukraine's Sea of Azov and Black Sea coastlines. The seizure of Mariupol' also would represent a symbolic coup for the separatists, as President Poroshenko named the city Ukraine's provisional capital of the Donets region in 2014. Importantly, the capture of Mariupol' also could provide a land corridor from Russia to the Crimean Peninsula.

Although Ukrainian forces have secured control of the city, Mariupol' remains contested, and Ukrainian positions in the surrounding area are under almost-constant attack. After separatists seized its administrative buildings in the spring of 2014, the city was brought back under Ukrainian control in June 2014.<sup>10</sup> In August 2014, the rebels launched another offensive to take Mariupol'; it was halted by the signing of the Minsk Agreement. However, in a sign of the importance of this port to the separatists, Mariupol' was shelled again in January 2015, killing

thirty people and injuring eighty-three others.<sup>11</sup> This protracted battle for Mariupol' is far from over. In August 2016, one Ukrainian soldier was killed and five were wounded after the separatists launched an intense artillery barrage near Mariupol'. Shyrokyne, a seaside village just east of Mariupol', was attacked sixteen times by Russian-backed separatists, nine of those times with heavy weaponry.<sup>12</sup> A month later there were reports from Ukraine's Anti-Terrorist Operations Headquarters that rebels again had fired on Ukrainian positions near Mariupol'.<sup>13</sup> The constant attacks around Mariupol' clearly demonstrate a very real and ongoing threat from the separatists to Ukraine's maritime interests and security.

More widely, Ukraine faces a growing threat from Russia's maritime capabilities. Ukraine's military doctrine identifies the Russian Federation as a direct threat to Ukraine.<sup>14</sup> This threat encompasses not just support to Ukrainian separatists but a more general military buildup. For example, since the annexation, estimates suggest that Moscow has spent almost \$750 million upgrading its forces in Crimea, and essentially has "turned the peninsula into an iron fortress capable not just of defending itself, but also of delivering missile strikes on ground targets in central and southern Ukraine."<sup>15</sup> In the early months after the annexation, Russia moved quickly to develop a fully capable air-defense system and deployed mobile, long-range, antiship systems. These, together with similar systems installed on the coast of Krasnodar, give Russia the ability to strike surface targets from its ground-based locations across about a third of the Black Sea.<sup>16</sup> As part of the more recent military buildup, the Russian navy will deploy batteries of Buk missiles in Crimea, which, along with the S-300 and S-400 missile systems already stationed in Crimea, effectively will secure (Russian) airspace over the peninsula and the Black Sea.<sup>17</sup>

Russia almost has doubled the number of service personnel in Crimea, creating seven new military formations and eight military units in addition to those available to the Black Sea Fleet.<sup>18</sup> Russia also has increased the number of tanks and combat armored vehicles in Crimea by a factor of almost seven, artillery systems are 7.2 times more numerous than before the annexation, and the numbers of helicopters and submarines also have doubled.<sup>19</sup> Russia has replaced the aviation component of the Black Sea Fleet, landing its first fourteen multirole Sukhoi Su-27SM and Su-30 fighters at Belbek Airport in Crimea.<sup>20</sup> Advanced Russian missile systems deployed to Crimea include batteries of Pantsir-S1 combined surface-to-air (SAM) antiartillery systems, capable of engaging both airborne and land-based lightly armored targets, as well as conducting fire on military and industrial targets. Russian Bastion antiship missile systems also have been deployed along the Crimean coast; these can engage both surface ships of different classes and land-based targets. Lastly, Russia has deployed the Bal coastal missile system from the Caspian to control its territorial waters, and the air-defense

troops stationed in Crimea also received S-300PMU SAM systems.<sup>21</sup> Commenting on the upgrading and renewal of Russian capabilities in Crimea, NATO's then supreme allied commander Europe General Philip M. Breedlove, USAF, stated in early 2015 that the new weapons systems have made Crimea "a great platform for power projection in this area."<sup>22</sup>

Russia has ambitious plans to strengthen the Russian armed forces in Crimea further over the period 2020–25, to include increasing service personnel, armaments, air assets, and missile systems, as well as the size, power-projection capabilities, and antiaccess/area-denial ability of the Black Sea Fleet.<sup>23</sup> The Black Sea Fleet will be augmented with up to six new frigates, two new missile corvettes, and six Kilo-class diesel-powered submarines.<sup>24</sup>

The emergence of a separatist micronavy complicates further the traditional Russian naval threat. There is increasing evidence to suggest that the separatists are building their own maritime capabilities, including cutters armed with large-caliber weapons.<sup>25</sup> A report by a pro-Russian newspaper in May 2015 claimed that the rebels had set up an Azov Flotilla, with a maritime Spetsnaz element, in the Donetsk People's Republic.<sup>26</sup> This development by the separatists—of a small, highly mobile fleet equipped with antitank guided missiles, automatic grenade launchers, and machine guns, able to carry out attacks on Ukrainian shipping and ports or to land forces and conduct raids or sabotage missions—is clearly a serious threat to Ukraine's coastline and the country's ability to protect its maritime domain.<sup>27</sup> In August 2016, there also were reports that the separatists had practiced carrying out and defending against an amphibious landing.<sup>28</sup> A video of the landing posted online shows soldiers coming ashore in several dozen small speedboats and BTR-80 amphibious armored personnel carriers.<sup>29</sup> Although the reach of this potential amphibious force currently is limited by a lack of landing ships, local media reports claimed that the separatists had demonstrated a high level of combat readiness in both defensive and offensive coastal operations.<sup>30</sup> In a sign of the seriousness of this threat, the Ukrainian Defense Ministry announced that Ukrainian marines, coastal artillery, and other naval detachments were taking part in antiterrorist operations to prepare to "deter an armed aggression from the sea."<sup>31</sup>

Ukraine clearly faces many challenges to its maritime interests. In meeting these threats, Ukraine's government has attached significant importance—at least in theory—to the rebuilding of the Ukrainian navy. In rebuilding its navy, Ukraine could be assessed as having a number of advantages over other states attempting to develop their maritime capabilities. For example, Ukraine has a clear threat against which to frame its maritime policies and capabilities; the war in the east has removed some of the domestic barriers to increased defense spending; and the loss of so much naval equipment might reduce the physical



and intellectual constraints that legacy systems impose. In practice, however, Ukrainian naval regeneration has been impeded by a number of key difficulties.

### THE CHALLENGES TO UKRAINIAN MARITIME REGENERATION

One clear challenge facing those rebuilding Ukraine's navy is the losses suffered at the hands of Russia. The key losses that impinge on the future development of the Ukrainian navy were of the maritime infrastructure and ports in Crimea. The loss of these facilities has had a devastating effect on the Ukrainian navy—as noted, equivalent to a major defeat at sea. The Ukrainian navy lost its headquarters in the Black Sea and much of the service's signals-intelligence, training, administration, maintenance, and logistics infrastructure, including its ammunition storage facility in Inkerman Valley.<sup>32</sup>

As a result, the truncated Ukrainian navy has been relocated to Odessa, which, as a commercial rather than a military port, lacks the maritime infrastructure necessary to support and maintain the fleet effectively. Compared with Sevastopol's waters, the sea near Odessa is shallow, which creates practical challenges if Ukraine is to realize its plans to build an underwater capability to deter a potential enemy. Considerable investment will be required to turn Odessa into an effective maritime base for the fleet, and the Ukrainian government has been slow to develop maritime infrastructure there. In April 2016, more than two years after the loss of Crimea, the Ukrainian Defense Ministry finally announced plans to begin construction of a modern maritime base in Odessa for the Ukrainian navy.<sup>33</sup> Three months later, the defense minister confirmed that UAH 100 million (almost four million dollars) had been allocated to construct the navy headquarters in Odessa.<sup>34</sup>

Given the challenging security environment in the east, the eventual construction of a safe and effective naval base in Odessa is likely to remain problematic, however. Not only has there been a spate of terrorist attacks, but the situation on the ground in Odessa remains difficult. In January 2016, a Ukrainian sailor prevented an attack on a naval facility in Odessa, and Ukrainian military patrols also recently foiled an attempt to plant a mine near a military checkpoint in the city.<sup>35</sup> There has been a series of terrorist attacks in Odessa that call into question the safety of the fleet and its service personnel.<sup>36</sup> A recent Jane's Sentinel Security Country Risk Assessment on threats to Ukraine states that government assets, transport infrastructure, and assets associated with progovernment troops and businessmen in Odessa are currently at risk of attack.<sup>37</sup>

The loss of Ukrainian naval platforms also created a serious challenge in terms of rebuilding the fleet, because those lost included a majority of the navy's most modern ships.<sup>38</sup> In total, the service lost eleven ships and boats, eight auxiliary vessels, and its only submarine. These vessels included three of the navy's most

modern: two corvettes, *Ternopil* and *Lutsk*, and the command ship *Slavutich*.<sup>39</sup> Other key losses included the landing vessel *Olshansk*; two of Ukraine's mine-sweepers, *Cherkasy* and *Chernihiv*; the antitorpedo boat *Kherson*; and the anti-sabotage boat *Feodosiya*.<sup>40</sup> As a result, the fleet currently operates only ten ships, with thirty-three support vessels. Reports suggest that half of these platforms need to be repaired and all are outdated, due to end their operational lives in 2018.<sup>41</sup> Highlighting the poor state of the current fleet, Vice Admiral Serhiy Hayduk, a former commander of the Ukrainian navy, stated in January 2016 that the fleet had "lost its fighting capacity."<sup>42</sup>

Personnel losses also posed a significant problem. When Russia annexed Crimea, about twelve thousand of the Ukrainian navy's almost sixteen thousand service personnel were based in the region, and almost 75 percent of Ukraine's maritime personnel remained in Crimea.<sup>43</sup> The loss of so many of the navy's experienced personnel had a damaging effect on its operational effectiveness, at least in the short term.

Another set of difficulties in regenerating the Ukrainian navy is conceptual and policy related: it has proved easier to define the threats to Ukraine's maritime interests than to determine clearly what sort of navy is needed to meet those threats. While there has been some discussion of what a revived navy actually would or should look like, many of the suggestions have been conservative in outlook, focusing on a balanced fleet and traditional roles—ignoring the high cost of and other challenges to building such capabilities. Admiral Ihor Kabanenko, a former Ukrainian deputy defense minister, has suggested that the Ukrainian navy should be a small, modern, and balanced fleet that consists of surface ships and submarines, naval aviation, naval infantry, special operations forces, and other components that can react adequately to threats from the sea. Vice Admiral Serhiy Hayduk has stated that Ukraine should revive its submarine force, purchasing between two and four subs, probably secondhand from Turkey. The naval staff also recognizes the need to purchase new minesweepers.<sup>44</sup>

A paper written by former deputy navy chief Ryzenko provides the most comprehensive outline of the naval staff's vision of what a future Ukrainian navy should look like. In this paper, Ryzenko examines what assets and capabilities, investment, and organizational changes the Ukrainian navy will need in the future to perform its core mission of protecting Ukraine's maritime sovereignty and national interests at sea. According to Ryzenko, the fleet's core mission will be divided into three tasks. The first of these is defending Ukraine's coastal area, including its harbors and ports; securing critical infrastructure; and countering landing operations. The second task is performing general maritime operations and wider sovereignty protection; this includes securing sea lines of communication, performing antisurface and antisubmarine warfare, and carrying out

defense diplomacy missions. The third task is conducting what Ryzenko terms offensive maritime operations; these would include destroying enemy ships at sea, controlling the air where needed, and conducting amphibious landings.<sup>45</sup>

Some have argued that Ukraine should implement a much more modest “mosquito fleet,” or coastal-defense, navy concept. A mosquito fleet–type force aims to deny command of the sea to adversaries with larger and more powerful navies.<sup>46</sup> Such a fleet consists of small, fast, and relatively cheap platforms, backed up by gunboats, mines, and coastal-defense ships. The goal is to make it impossible for an enemy to approach the country’s coastline.<sup>47</sup> Under such a plan, the Ukrainian navy would have a much smaller force, with no submarines, more-limited coastal-defense and combat-support units, and very limited air-control ability over the fleet. In effect, it would focus on performing just one of the three tasks Ryzenko laid out: the defense of Ukraine’s coastal area, including its harbors and ports, securing critical infrastructure and countering landing operations. As will be discussed later, Ukraine has made some modest progress toward building both the quantitative and qualitative elements of a coastal-defense force.

A third key challenge in rebuilding the Ukrainian navy is the gap between the Ukrainian government’s rhetorical commitment to such a reconstitution and its actual funding priorities. In light of the ongoing conflict in the east, the government made the decision in its defense spending to prioritize increasing the combat effectiveness of its land and air, rather than its naval, forces.<sup>48</sup> As a result, while Ukraine’s defense budget has increased significantly, the navy’s share of the overall budget has remained small.<sup>49</sup> Ukraine’s 2016 defense budget is four times higher than 2014’s, and 2017’s will increase further.<sup>50</sup> The Ukrainian navy’s budget, however, amounts to just 2 percent of the defense ministry’s total budget, and only 0.5 percent of the total budget is spent on procuring weapons and military equipment for the fleet.<sup>51</sup> The lack of investment in the fleet, in comparison with the other two services, can be seen clearly in the so-called *White Book*, the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense’s annual publication on the current state of the armed forces. For example, in 2015 the army acquired nine new weapon systems; the air force had twelve new acquisitions, including four helicopters and ten unmanned aerial vehicles; but the navy added no new weapon system or capabilities to its arsenal.<sup>52</sup>

At the root of all these difficulties is the parlous state of the economy, which has necessitated hard choices. The Ukrainian government still is fighting a costly war in the east, and the Ukrainian economy has been slow to recover from the crisis. In a speech at the UN summit in New York in September 2015, President Poroshenko spelled out the high economic costs of the conflict in the east: he claimed it was costing Ukraine five million dollars a day. He went on to point out that Ukraine had lost about a fifth of its economic potential with its eastern

territories.<sup>53</sup> Production within the Donets region has plummeted 70 percent, and estimates suggest this has cost Ukraine 7 percent of its GDP. Russia's annexation of Crimea has contributed to the loss of another 4 percent of Ukraine's GDP.<sup>54</sup> In addition, the flow of refugees from the region either to Russia or to other parts of Ukraine not only represents an important loss of manpower but puts additional strain on the Ukrainian economy.<sup>55</sup> Although there have been some positive signs that Ukraine's economy will begin to recover in 2017, structural shortcomings and domestic impediments to economic growth—such as unsustainable fiscal policies and the difficulty of attracting foreign capital—suggest that this recovery will be slow at best.<sup>56</sup>

Thus, even if the Ukrainian government were able to allocate a larger share of the defense budget to the navy, the capital-intensive nature of naval investment and the poor state of the Ukrainian shipbuilding industry would make it difficult to effect any quick transformation in naval capabilities. Estimates suggest that rebuilding a navy capable of performing all three of the core tasks discussed earlier—defending Ukraine's coastal and maritime area, conducting wider maritime operations, and carrying out offensive maritime operations—would require the navy's budget to increase by a factor of about twenty. To procure the necessary platforms (artillery boats, landing craft, corvettes, submarines, and auxiliary support vessels) and coastal-defense and combat-support units, as well as to invest in maritime aviation and personnel, Ukraine would need to spend about \$3.6 billion over the next five years, according to Ryzenko.<sup>57</sup> Indicating the scale of the challenge facing the Ukrainian government, this amount constitutes significantly more than Ukraine's whole defense budget for 2016. In contrast, development of a mosquito fleet that would enable the navy to perform one core task effectively would require a more modest fourfold increase in the current naval budget.<sup>58</sup>

The long-term decline of the Ukrainian shipbuilding industry also has had an impact on the rebuilding of the Ukrainian navy. After the collapse of the USSR, Ukraine inherited a significant shipbuilding capacity, with plants in Kiev, Mykolayiv, Kherson, Sevastopol, Kerch, and Feodosiya. They were capable of building missile and aircraft carriers, large antisubmarine ships, heavy transport ships, boats, lighter carriers, and multipurpose icebreaking supply vessels.<sup>59</sup> During the last three decades, however, Ukraine's shipbuilding industry has become increasingly unprofitable and has lost much of its competitive edge in both international and domestic markets.<sup>60</sup> Several large enterprises are close to bankruptcy, and many of the shipyards have been operating at 15–30 percent of their production capacity.<sup>61</sup> As a result of these challenges, the shipbuilding industry's contribution to Ukraine's overall industrial output has dropped from 5 percent to less than 1 percent.<sup>62</sup> This decline in the shipbuilding industry has been caused by a number of factors, including increasing steel prices, limited credit resources, a lack of

government support, and the investor-deterrent effect of the conflict in Ukraine's east.<sup>63</sup> As a result of these challenges, many of Ukraine's shipbuilding enterprises have had no new orders over the last few years, have large wage arrears, and suffer an acute shortage of experts.<sup>64</sup>

Because of weak domestic demand for shipbuilding and a lack of government investment in the country's shipbuilding industry, Ukraine is unlikely to receive any new major warships in the imminent future.<sup>65</sup> Ukraine's Project 58350 corvette program not only has failed to produce a single ship but appears to have been shelved. Under plans announced in 2011, ten corvettes were to be built for the Ukrainian navy by 2026. However, construction of the Project 58350 flagship, *Volodymyr Velykyy*, had been progressing extremely slowly, and a decision was made in October 2015 to allocate funds toward upgrading the existing fleet rather than developing new platforms.<sup>66</sup> While the manufacturers claim that 80 percent of the hull is ready, the ship's technical readiness stands at closer to 17 percent, suggesting that even if the platform secures sufficient funding it is unlikely to be brought on line until at least 2018.<sup>67</sup>

Ukraine's tumultuous domestic politics further complicates all the previously discussed difficulties in building an effective navy. Despite the president's commitment to implementing wide-ranging economic reforms, they will be difficult to achieve, given the fragility of the new government coalition and endemic corruption.

In April 2016, the former prime minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk was replaced by the former speaker of the Verkhovna Rada (the Ukrainian parliament) Volodymyr Groysman. The new coalition, made up of the political parties of the president and the former prime minister, has only a very small parliamentary majority, so it relies on support from other parliamentary factions and groups. This weakening of the government majority will complicate all policy making further.<sup>68</sup>

Endemic corruption in Ukraine compounds all these problems. Highlighting the extent of the problem, Transparency International ranked Ukraine 143rd out of the 173 countries on its Corruption Perceptions Index, and estimates have suggested that over twelve billion dollars per year disappear from the Ukrainian budget.<sup>69</sup> Thomas de Waal, a senior fellow at Carnegie Europe, has argued that *corruption* is an inadequate word to describe the conditions in Ukraine; the problem is not that a well-functioning state has been corrupted, but that the "corrupt" practices themselves now constitute the "rules" by which the state is run.<sup>70</sup> Calling into question the ability of the government to engage in reform in the future, the worst corruption "occurs at the nexus between business oligarchs and governmental officials," where a few oligarchs control over 70 percent of

Ukraine's economy and have captured and corrupted Ukraine's political and judicial systems.<sup>71</sup>

### BUILDING A MOSQUITO FORCE

Faced with problems in funding and procuring maritime capabilities, Ukraine has prioritized, at least in the short term, the acquisition of smaller, faster platforms, in effect building the elements of a small coastal-defense force. In November 2015, the Ukrainian navy began acquiring the fast-attack elements of a mosquito fleet when it received two Gurza-M (Project 51855)-class small armored artillery boats designed for patrolling coastal areas. Currently undergoing sea trials, each boat carries a combat module fitted with automatic cannon, a grenade launcher, a machine gun, and two antitank missile systems with laser guidance.<sup>72</sup> In March 2016, the Ukrainian Defense Ministry signed a contract with the state-owned Ukroboronprom Company in Kiev to provide four more of these small armored gunboats for the Ukrainian navy.<sup>73</sup> Two of these gunboats are likely to be Centaur armored amphibious assault ships based on the Gurza-M, but with extended functionality. They would be designed to deliver marines or special forces, and to deliver fire support to land forces under engagement in littoral and inland waters (estuaries, rivers, and water-storage basins) at distances up to one hundred miles.<sup>74</sup> In addition, these boats will be highly deployable and could be sent by land to Mariupol' to operate in the Sea of Azov. Each boat can fit into two trailer trucks: one truck for the hull with the weapons removed; the other for the tower, plus a container with the dismantled weapons.<sup>75</sup> Further augmenting Ukraine's mosquito fleet, a U.S. contractor, Willard Marine, also will supply four high-speed patrol boats to the Ukrainian navy, accompanied by on-site crew training in the design, operation, maintenance, and repair of the boats.<sup>76</sup>

It is interesting that the combination of a lack of government funds, consequent equipment shortages, popular engagement in the war, and the leveraging of the opportunities that new technology affords actually has facilitated the development of the fleet, in particular via some very innovative forms of equipment procurement. For example, in December 2015 the navy's flagship, the frigate *Hetman Sagaidachny*, was fitted with a modern navigation radar system financed by a charitable organization, a part of the Come Back Alive volunteer movement. The movement raised the funds through Internet crowdfunding.<sup>77</sup> This organization has funded similar systems for other maritime platforms.<sup>78</sup>

Beyond the headway it has managed in developing the physical capabilities of a mosquito fleet, Ukraine has made much more progress in developing the qualitative aspects of its maritime power.<sup>79</sup> In this regard, the conflict in the east has had a paradoxically positive spillover effect on the building of a coastal-defense

navy. Training to fight and actually fighting the separatists have enhanced the professionalism of Ukraine's naval personnel, particularly its marines; this has served as a force multiplier, by improving the ability of the fleet and its personnel to operate. In a visit to Odessa in September 2015, Vice Admiral James G. Foggo III, then commander of the U.S. Sixth Fleet, commented positively on what he saw of the professionalism of the officer corps and sailors of the Ukrainian navy. In September 2014, the fleet demonstrated its commitment to developing the ability to conduct joint operations. Special units of the Ukrainian navy and Interior Ministry as well as naval aviation units practiced a joint search-and-attack training operation involving the detection and destruction of illegal armed groups in the Odessa region. In July 2015, another joint tactical training exercise took place in the Southern Bug estuary in the Mykolayiv region of Ukraine, in which the Ukrainian navy, air force, and ground forces practiced conducting an amphibious assault and an airborne landing, further enhancing their joint skills.<sup>80</sup>

Indeed, Ukraine's marines in essence have been rebuilt from scratch into one of the most combat-ready elements of Ukraine's naval forces. When Russia annexed Crimea, only one-third of the six-hundred-strong Feodosiya-based marine battalion opted to return to Ukraine, depriving the fleet of its most combat-ready element.<sup>81</sup> The marines subsequently have been reconstituted and have gained valuable combat experience fighting in eastern Ukraine. In recognition of their enhanced combat abilities, units of the marine corps were deployed to the outskirts of Mariupol' in July 2015 to bolster the city's defenses. Commenting on this deployment, Ukraine's president stated that the marines "will enhance the protection of Mariupol significantly."<sup>82</sup> The marines also have benefited from an increase in the number and scope of their training exercises. In 2015, the numbers of marine corps battalion and company tactical exercises increased seven- and 5.5-fold, respectively, and platoon field-firing exercises also went up fivefold over the previous year.<sup>83</sup> In July 2015, they also held their first brigade-level tactical training exercise, and they developed their joint skills further by practicing their ability to coordinate with air and maritime platforms to capture a shoreline and destroy enemy forces.<sup>84</sup> Ukrainian navy commander Hayduk claimed that by these exercises the "marine corps have [*sic*] completely renewed its battle readiness."<sup>85</sup> More recently, in August 2016, in response to the Russian Federation's announcement of a large naval exercise in the Black Sea, Ukraine's president announced that the country's marines and coastal artillery units also would hold a large military exercise, which would seek to heighten further the combat readiness of all naval forces, especially the marines.<sup>86</sup>

The fleet's active participation in multinational maritime operations also has played an important role in enhancing the combat effectiveness of its service personnel. In September 2014, just months after the annexation of Crimea, Ukraine

held its annual SEA BREEZE exercise, demonstrating its commitment to developing the professionalism of its maritime forces. As part of this cohosted multinational exercise, Ukrainian naval personnel practiced setting up and securing a maritime safety zone in a crisis area. In October 2015, Ukraine's frigate *Hetman Sagaidachny* also took part in a joint PASSEX drill with Bulgarian, Romanian, U.S., and Turkish ships in the western part of the Black Sea. Vice Admiral Hayduk claimed that this operation was a testament to the high level of cooperation between the Ukrainian and NATO navies and that multinational operations such as this allow fleet personnel to master NATO standards and enhance their interoperability.<sup>87</sup>

Ukraine's marines also have benefited from taking part in multinational maritime exercises. These exercises have allowed the marines to develop a number of important skills, ranging from conducting amphibious landings or tracking down an enemy submarine to protecting critical maritime infrastructure. In July 2016, over 220 U.S. and Ukrainian marines, along with other naval forces, conducted an amphibious landing during another annual SEA BREEZE exercise in Odessa. During this exercise the marines practiced establishing a safe beachhead ashore and protecting critical infrastructure. Commenting on the progress Ukrainian naval forces had made, Captain Richard Dromerhauser, USN, stated that he had witnessed the flawless execution of a very difficult and complex operation.<sup>88</sup> In August 2016, Ukraine's marines also practiced tracking down an enemy submarine as part of the SEA SHIELD multinational military exercise, which took place in the western part of the Black Sea off Odessa. A month later, Ukrainian marines participated in the PLATINUM LYNX 2016 exercise held in Romania. Working alongside NATO allies, they enhanced their interoperability in a combined training environment.<sup>89</sup> The United States also recently announced the funding of a two-week training course in Mykolayiv for noncommissioned marine corps officers to enhance further their operational and combat effectiveness.<sup>90</sup>

Despite the many challenges Ukraine faces in rebuilding its fleet, the government has made some modest progress in developing a mosquito force. Recent additions to the fleet include two small armored artillery boats designed for patrolling coastal areas. In 2017 the navy will be augmented further by additional small attack craft.

Ukrainian naval forces, in particular the marines, have enhanced their combat effectiveness significantly, including their ability to operate in a joint environment. By increasing their training and their participation in multinational exercises, Ukraine's marines have enhanced significantly their ability to protect Ukraine's maritime interests.



However, while increasing the operational effectiveness of its naval personnel is an important enabler in allowing the Ukrainian navy to protect the country's immediate maritime interests, it cannot substitute for, and could be compromised by, the current lack of maritime platforms. Owing to the low number of serviceable maritime platforms, the Ukrainian navy has struggled to increase the time spent training its naval personnel at sea.

Nonetheless, it is clear that, while Ukraine will continue to face some tough challenges in building a small mosquito force, Kiev is moving, albeit slowly, in the right direction. Faced with building a "navy in contact," Ukraine should be encouraged to adopt a more pragmatic—but ultimately a more radical—model for its navy of the future. Ukraine can neither afford nor sustain a balanced, blue-water maritime force. In contrast, developing an effective and efficient mosquito fleet would give Ukraine the capability to protect its EEZ and deter threats to its maritime infrastructure and coastline. The Ukrainian naval staff's ambitious plans to build a balanced force able to perform all three roles discussed in this article (protecting the EEZ, engaging in wider operations, and conducting offensive maritime operations) need to be discouraged actively. Such plans are unrealistic and unrealizable, and pursuing them will delay the construction of a more modest and achievable mosquito fleet. By continuing to invest in the development of small, highly mobile attack craft and in the enhancement of the professionalism of its naval forces, Ukraine can continue to be a maritime state, at least in the short to medium term.

---

#### NOTES

1. "Crimean Losses and Their Consequences" [in Russian], *Defense Express*, April 24, 2016, [defence-ua.com/](http://defence-ua.com/).
2. Andri Ryzenko, "Model and Reformation of the Ukrainian Navy 2015–2020" (Odessa, May 25, 2015). Captain Ryzenko gave a copy of this conceptual paper to the author at the USN Conference on Maritime Security, Naples, Italy, June 2016.
3. "Model and Reform of the Ukrainian Navy (2015–20)" [in Russian], *Defense Express*, June 30, 2015, [defence-ua.com/](http://defence-ua.com/).
4. "In 2012 Ukrainian Seaports Handled 160.6 Mln Tonnes of Freight," *Black Sea News*, February 1, 2013, [www.blackseanews.net/](http://www.blackseanews.net/).
5. The ports lost were Sevastopol, Feodosiya, Yalta, Yevpatoriya, and Kerch.
6. Eugene Gerden, "Change Coming to Ukrainian Ports," *Pacific Maritime* 33, no. 3 (March 1, 2015), [www.pacmar.com/](http://www.pacmar.com/); also see "Black Sea Container Market Amounted to 587,168 TEUs in the First Quarter," *Port News*, June 2, 2016, [www.hellenicshippingnews.com/](http://www.hellenicshippingnews.com/).
7. Mike Hughlett, "Cargill, Ukraine Finalize Plans for \$100 Million Port on Black Sea," *Star Tribune*, February 24, 2016, [www.startribune.com/](http://www.startribune.com/).
8. "Ukraine's Mariupol Port at Heightened Risk of Collateral Damage as Further Ceasefire Talks Unlikely in the Short Term," *Jane's Intelligence Weekly*, January 26, 2016; also see "Black Sea Container Market."
9. Pierre Vaux, "Putin's Next Prize in Eastern Ukraine," *Foreign Policy*, March 2, 2015, [foreignpolicy.com/](http://foreignpolicy.com/).

10. A. O., "Chaos in Mariupol: Temperature Rising," *The Economist*, May 10, 2014, [www.economist.com/](http://www.economist.com/).
11. Alessandra Prentice and Pavel Polityuk, "Russian-Backed Rebels Are Attacking a Strategically Vital Ukrainian City," *Business Insider*, January 25, 2015, [www.businessinsider.com/](http://www.businessinsider.com/).
12. Pierre Vaux, "One Ukrainian Soldier Killed, Five Wounded after Intense Artillery Barrage near Mariupol," *The Interpreter*, August 9, 2016, [www.interpretermag.com/](http://www.interpretermag.com/).
13. "ATO Report: 30 Enemy Attacks, Snipers Active outside Donetsk, Mariupol," *UNIAN*, September 17, 2016, [www.unian.info/](http://www.unian.info/).
14. National Security Council (NSDC), *Military Doctrine of Ukraine* [in Ukrainian], sec. 9, available at [www.president.gov.ua/](http://www.president.gov.ua/); "Ukraine's New Military Doctrine Names Russia as Main Adversary," *UNIAN*, September 2, 2015, [www.unian.info/](http://www.unian.info/).
15. Sergey Ishchenko, "Fortress Crimea: How Russia's Defensive Arrangements on the Peninsula Look" [in Russian], *Svpressa.ru*, March 18, 2015; also see "Militarization of Occupied Crimea as a Threat to International Security" [in Ukrainian], *Defense Express*, March 14, 2016, [defence-ua.com/](http://defence-ua.com/).
16. Yuri Barash, "Armed and Dangerous: Prospects for the Development of Groups of the Russian Armed Forces in Crimea" [in Russian], *Defense Express*, May 29, 2014, [defence-ua.com/](http://defence-ua.com/).
17. "On Alert, Crimea to Get BUK Missile Systems," *Sputnik International*, February 27, 2017, [sputniknews.com/](http://sputniknews.com/).
18. Ishchenko, "Fortress Crimea."
19. "Militarization of Occupied Crimea."
20. "Russian Agency Details New Weapons Deployed in Annexed Crimea" [in Russian], *RIA Novosti*, December 3, 2014, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
21. Dmitry Gorenburg, "Black Sea Fleet Projects Power Westwards," *Oxford Analytica Daily Brief*, April 15, 2016, [dailybrief.oxan.com/](http://dailybrief.oxan.com/).
22. For details, see Sam LaGrone, "NATO Commander Breedlove: Imported Russian Missiles Have Turned Crimea into a Black Sea 'Power Projection' Platform," *USNI News*, February 25, 2015, [news.usni.org/](http://news.usni.org/).
23. "Militarization of Occupied Crimea."
24. Gorenburg, "Black Sea Fleet Projects Power Westwards."
25. Andriy Muravskyy, "Ukrainian Navy: Restart" [in Russian], *Den*, May 13, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
26. "Russian Tabloid Says Ukraine Rebels Set Up 'Top Secret' Flotilla" [in Russian], *Komsomolskaya Pravda* (Moscow), May 7, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
27. *Ibid.*
28. "Givi Leads DPR Forces in Practice Assault on Mariupol," *Fort Russ News*, trans. J. Arnoldski, August 27, 2016, [www.fort-russ.com/](http://www.fort-russ.com/).
29. *Ibid.*
30. Alex Kokcharov, "Ukrainian Separatists Demonstrate Amphibious Assault Capability," *IHS Jane's Defence Weekly*, August 24, 2016, [www.janes.com/](http://www.janes.com/); "Donetsk Separatist Marine Capability More Likely to Be Used for Raids on Mariupol Ports Than Seizing Territory," *IHS Jane's Country Risk Daily Report*, August 24, 2016.
31. Ihor Vetrov, "Ukraine Creating Mosquito Fleet" [in Russian], *Segodnya*, May 31, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
32. "Ukrainian Navy Decimated by Russian Move into Crimea," *IHS Jane's Defence Weekly*, March 24, 2014, [www.janes.com/](http://www.janes.com/).
33. "Ukraine to Build Modern Naval Base in Odessa, Defence Minister Says" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, April 6, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
34. "Ukrainian President Praises Domestically Produced Armoured Boats on Navy Day" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, July 3, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
35. "Ukrainian Navy Says Sailor Prevents Attack on Odesa Facility" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, January 9, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
36. "Recent Blast in Downtown Odessa Qualified as Terrorist Attack—Interior Ministry," *TASS Russian News Agency*, March 29, 2015, [tass.com/](http://tass.com/).

37. "Ukraine—Security," *Jane's Sentinel Security Assessment—Russia and the CIS*, September 9, 2016, [www.janes360.com/](http://www.janes360.com/).
38. Ihor Vetrov, "Gyurza, Kentavr and Lan: What Boats the Ukrainian Navy Expects to Receive" [in Russian], *Segodnya*, November 17, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/); "Ukrainian President Praises."
39. Ihor Servov and Khrystyna Konoalova, "Plans for Defence Sector: Robotic Tanks and Submarines" [in Russian], *Segodnya*, January 29, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
40. RIA Novosti, "Inspection of Ukrainian Ships Entering Russia's Black Sea Fleet to Be Done by Year's End," *Kyiv Post*, March 27, 2014, [www.kyivpost.com/](http://www.kyivpost.com/); also see "Ukrainian Weekly Says New Russian Submarine Heading for Sevastopol" [in Russian], *Flot-2017*, August 31, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
41. Vetrov, "Gyurza, Kentavr and Lan"; also see Tatiana Urbanskaya, "Deputy Chief of Ukraine's Navy: Terms of Operation of All Ukrainian Military Vessels Will Have Run Out by 2018," *UNIAN*, July 6, 2015, [www.unian.info/](http://www.unian.info/).
42. "Ukrainian Navy Chief Urges Funding to Build Warships, Formation of a 'Sea Lobby'" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, January 2, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
43. Urbanskaya, "Deputy Chief of Ukraine's Navy."
44. *Ibid.*
45. Ryzenko, "Model and Reformation of the Ukrainian Navy 2015–2020."
46. Ian Speller, *Understanding Naval Warfare* (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2014).
47. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
48. For details, see Ukraine Ministry of Defense, *The White Book 2015: The Armed Forces of Ukraine* (Kiev: 2016), available at [www.mil.gov.ua/](http://www.mil.gov.ua/).
49. Ukraine Minister of Defense, "Military Budget for Year 2016 Is Four Times Greater Than in 2014," *Ministry of Defence of Ukraine*, February 27, 2016, [www.mil.gov.ua/](http://www.mil.gov.ua/).
50. The Ukrainian defense budget has increased year on year from UAH 50 billion in 2015 to 56.6 billion in 2016 to 65.4 billion in 2017. However, given the decline in the value of the Ukrainian currency, these figures show a decrease in defense spending between 2015 and 2016 in U.S. dollars. For details, see "Russia and Eurasia," chap. 5 in *The Military Balance 2017* (London: IISS, 2017), p. 227.
51. Ryzenko, "Model and Reformation of the Ukrainian Navy 2015–2020."
52. Ukraine Ministry of Defense, *The White Book 2015*, p. 96.
53. "Poroshenko Says Conflict Costing Ukraine \$5 Million a Day," *Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty*, September 28, 2015, [www.rferl.org/](http://www.rferl.org/).
54. Anders Åslund, "Russia's War on Ukraine's Economy," *Project Syndicate*, July 9, 2015, [www.project-syndicate.org/](http://www.project-syndicate.org/).
55. Pierre Vimont, "Ukraine's Indispensable Economic Reforms," *Carnegie Europe*, April 29, 2016, [carnegieeurope.eu/](http://carnegieeurope.eu/).
56. "Ukraine—Economy," *Jane's Sentinel Security Assessment—Russia and the CIS*, September 9, 2016, [www.janes360.com/](http://www.janes360.com/).
57. "Model and Reform of the Ukrainian Navy (2015–20)," annex A.
58. *Ibid.*
59. Andrey Pospelov, "Ukrainian Defense Industry in the 'Hybrid War' with Russia. Part 5," *Borysfen Intel: Independent Analytical Center for Geopolitical Studies*, February 5, 2015, [bintel.com.ua/](http://bintel.com.ua/).
60. "Ukrainian Shipbuilding: Awaiting a Renaissance," *Turkey Sea News*, July 15, 2013, [www.seanews.com.tr/](http://www.seanews.com.tr/).
61. "Ukrainian President Seeks Shipbuilding Revival," *Marine Log*, May 18, 2011, [www.marinelog.com/](http://www.marinelog.com/).
62. "Ukrainian Shipbuilding."
63. Anna Mikhailyuk and Vladislav Shvets, "The Shipbuilding Industry of Ukraine: Factories Looted, No Specialists" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, August 13, 2015, [economics.unian.net/](http://economics.unian.net/).
64. *Ibid.*

65. Tomas Malmlöf, "A Case Study of Russo-Ukrainian Defense Industrial Cooperation: Russian Dilemmas," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 29, no. 1 (February 2016), pp. 1–22.
66. Maksym Hardus, "Harsh Reality: Is Ukraine Ready to Fight at Sea," *Apostrof*, January 29, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
67. Vetrov, "Ukraine Creating Mosquito Fleet."
68. Andrew E. Kramer, "Volodymyr Groysman Approved as New Prime Minister by Ukraine's Parliament," *NYTimes.com*, April 14, 2016.
69. James A. Lyons [Adm., USN (Ret.)], "A 'Culture of Impunity,'" *Washington Times*, July 10, 2016, available at [www.washingtontimes.com/](http://www.washingtontimes.com/).
70. Thomas de Waal, "Fighting a Culture of Corruption in Ukraine," *Carnegie Europe*, April 18, 2016, [carnegieeurope.eu/](http://carnegieeurope.eu/).
71. Lyons, "A 'Culture of Impunity.'"
72. "Four Armoured Gunboats Laid Down at Ukrainian Shipyard" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, April 7, 2016, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
73. *Ibid.*
74. "Ukrainian Navy Will Be Reinforced with Three New 'Kentavr' Fast Assault Crafts," *Defence Blog*, April 22, 2016, [defence-blog.com/](http://defence-blog.com/).
75. Serhiy Zghurets, "Mount 'Centaur,'" *Ukrainian Defence Review*, no. 3 (July–September 2015), pp. 30–34.
76. "Willard Marine to Supply Aluminum Patrol Boats for Ukrainian Navy under Foreign Military Sales Program," *Willard Marine*, February 3, 2014, [www.willardmarine.com/](http://www.willardmarine.com/).
77. Vitaly Shevchenko, "Crowdfunding in Ukraine's DIY War," *BBC News Europe*, July 29, 2014, [www.bbc.com/](http://www.bbc.com/).
78. Interfax, "Ukrainian Navy's Flagship Equipped with New Radar System" [in Russian], *Interfax-Ukraine*, December 4, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
79. For a discussion of qualitative and quantitative factors and how they shape maritime power, see Deborah Sanders, *Maritime Power in the Black Sea* (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate, 2014).
80. "Naval Drill Held in South Ukraine" [in Ukrainian], KANAL TV (Kiev), July 21, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
81. Colby Howard and Ruslan Pukhov, *Brothers Armed: Military Aspects of the Crisis in Ukraine* (Minneapolis, MN: East View, 2014).
82. "President's Statement Following the Tactical Exercises in Mykolaiv: Ukraine Will Do Everything to Protect Its Maritime Border and Mariupol," *President of Ukraine / Petro Poroshenko*, July 21, 2015, [www.president.gov.ua/](http://www.president.gov.ua/).
83. Ukraine Ministry of Defense, *The White Book 2015*, p. 40.
84. "Full Scale Ukrainian Marine Drills Held Year after Russian Takeover of Crimea," *Ukraine Today*, July 21, 2015, [en.ua.today.com/](http://en.ua.today.com/).
85. "Ukrainian Marines, Coastal Defence Batteries Hold Drills" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, May 16, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
86. Daniel McLaughlin, "Russia and Ukraine Boost Security as Crimea Tension Soars," *Irish Times*, August 11, 2016, available at [www.irishtimes.com/](http://www.irishtimes.com/).
87. "Ukrainian Flagship Takes Part in Black Sea Drills" [in Ukrainian], *UNIAN*, October 15, 2015, as reported on *BBC Monitoring*, [monitoring.bbc.co.uk/](http://monitoring.bbc.co.uk/).
88. Justin Stumberg [Mass Communications Specialist 1st Class, USN], "Amphibious Landing Operation Conducted at Sea Breeze 2016," *America's Navy*, July 29, 2016, [www.navy.mil/](http://www.navy.mil/).
89. "Ukrainian Marines Participate in Platinum Lynx 2016 Exercise in Romania," *Ministry of Defence of Ukraine*, September 22, 2016, [www.mil.gov.ua/](http://www.mil.gov.ua/).
90. Interfax-Ukraine, "U.S. and European Instructors Start Training Ukrainian Marines in Mykolaiv," *Kyiv Post*, September 21, 2016.

## CONFRONTING UNCERTAINTY WITH DECENTRALIZED COMMAND

---

### British Naval Decision Making at the Outbreak of the War of 1812

*Kevin D. McCranie*

On June 18, 1812, the United States declared war on Britain. Although the declaration hardly could be described as unexpected, given years of strained relations, the United States did obtain a degree of surprise.<sup>1</sup> This was inevitable given the distance between the two countries and the nature of period communications—it took weeks to transmit information between the United States and Britain. The slowness of communications created a window of vulnerability for British naval forces in North American waters.

Events in Britain only exacerbated the exposure of its naval forces. On June 8, ten days before the American declaration of war, a new government formed in London. One of its first acts constituted an attempt to ameliorate a major point of conflict with the United States: it suspended the restrictions on American commerce delineated in previous orders in council. Through late June and most of July, British leaders in London hoped their conciliatory gesture would lead to a favorable response. Little did they know that the Americans had declared war five days prior to Britain's repeal of the orders.<sup>2</sup>

Only in late July did news of the American war reach London. British decision makers then had to consider whether the Americans, given the suspension of

the orders in council, would back away from hostilities. The uncertainty contributed to additional delays, and it was not until September 26 that new instructions and leadership reached Halifax, Nova Scotia.<sup>3</sup>

Between the June 18 declaration of war and the arrival of new instructions and leadership on

*Kevin D. McCranie is a professor of strategy and policy at the Naval War College. He is the author of Admiral Lord Keith and the Naval War against Napoleon (University Press of Florida, 2006) and Utmost Gallantry: The U.S. and Royal Navies at Sea in the War of 1812 (Naval Institute Press, 2011).*

© 2017 by Kevin D. McCranie  
*Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4*

September 26, British naval leaders in North American waters faced tremendous uncertainty. Vice Admiral Herbert Sawyer, commander of the North American station and the senior officer at Halifax, served as the theater commander for an area of operations that spanned southward from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence in the north, past Halifax and the Eastern Seaboard of the United States, to the northern edge of the Bahamas; Sawyer's command stretched eastward to include Bermuda as well.<sup>4</sup>

Sawyer had to go to war with the force he had, not necessarily the warships he needed. He had to execute operations relying on old instructions and his understanding of British strategic priorities and intent. In an uncertain environment, he had to lead British naval operations in theater while providing his political leaders with assessments of American intentions. Captain Philip Broke, commanding the thirty-eight-gun frigate *Shannon*, was the second key British naval decision maker in North American waters.<sup>5</sup> He oversaw Sawyer's principal strike force. Broke's primary mission involved mitigating the threat the U.S. Navy posed. This article assesses how Sawyer and Broke made decisions, executed operations, managed risk, and dealt with uncertainty at the outbreak of the War of 1812.<sup>6</sup>

Royal Navy (RN) operations during the opening months of the War of 1812 underscore the complexity of naval decision making at the campaign level. This is a subject that all too often is lost between descriptions of naval battles and general narratives of naval war. Yet a study in naval decision making aids in understanding the relationship among governmental leaders, their theater commanders, and operational elements at sea.

## THE WORLD SITUATION

Much of what Sawyer and Broke encountered at the outbreak of the War of 1812 was expected. Naval leaders in the age of sail operated in an environment in which communications were slow, so officers had to be agile enough to deal with evolving circumstances, from minor incidents to acts of war. Naval officers had to be aware of government intent so their actions could fulfill broader objectives.

Yet the specific circumstances that Sawyer and Broke encountered were unique. Britain already was engaged in a protracted, multitheater war against Napoleonic France, with the Royal Navy operating in the role of the dominant naval power. The War of 1812 originated on the periphery of the larger conflict, meaning the isolation Sawyer and Broke faced was more extreme than their peers faced in European waters. This was not a new theater in an existing war against a familiar naval foe, but a new opponent in a geographically distant region fought in parallel with the ongoing Napoleonic struggle. For Britain, the existential threat was France, not the United States.

## THE SITUATION IN AMERICA

Even so, leaders in London recognized that something needed to be done. “As soon as the discussions in America began to take a serious turn,” the secretary of the British Admiralty explained, “the British government sent orders to their naval officers, not couched in doubtful terms, but in the plain good old English style.”<sup>7</sup> Leaders in London understood that if the United States initiated hostilities, their theater commander in American waters required guidance.

Sawyer received the following three directives, dated May 1812:

1. To repel any hostile aggression, but also take care not to commit one.
2. In the event of a declaration of war by America, or the issue of letters of marque, or any invasion of the provinces and islands [of Canada], to commence and direct hostilities, and to sink, burn, or destroy American ships, and to pursue all other measures, offensive and defensive, for the annoyance of the enemy and the protection of his Majesty’s subjects.
3. To exercise, except in the specified cases, all possible forbearance towards citizens of the United States.<sup>8</sup>

These three instructions sought to meet wider policy aims. Governmental leaders in London attempted to minimize tensions by directing the Royal Navy to employ “all possible forbearance towards citizens of the United States.”<sup>9</sup> They wanted to avoid a war that necessarily would drain assets from the primary war against France. If hostilities did occur, destroying American ships would deprive America of commerce while driving commerce into British protection. Moreover, the elimination of American warships and privateers that could threaten British merchant shipping forwarded “the protection of his Majesty’s subjects.”<sup>10</sup> Avoiding war was the best-case scenario, but if war did occur the initial naval object sought to limit America’s ability to use and disrupt the maritime commons.

Sawyer’s order “to sink, burn, or destroy American ships” highlighted the way to protect a critical vulnerability—Britain’s sea lines of communication (SLOCs). The commerce that passed along these maritime arteries ensured Britain’s global economic position.<sup>11</sup> In 1812, every major RN deployment had for its fundamental object the protection of British commercial interests, with naval stations arranged at terminal, choke, and transit points along the SLOCs.<sup>12</sup> Major trade routes included the link between the British Isles and their possessions in the West Indies. These trade routes were largely dependent on prevailing currents and winds. The latter circled the Atlantic in a clockwise pattern. Shipping outward bound from Britain plunged south until it reached the latitude of Barbados, where it caught trade winds that propelled it westward across the Atlantic. The return voyage to Britain followed the predictable current of the Gulf Stream. This brought such shipping close to the Eastern Seaboard of the United

States. Sawyer's North American command mitigated threats to commerce on this part of the return voyage. At approximately the latitude of Boston, shipping pressed eastward into the Atlantic, using the Azores as a waypoint on its voyage to the British Isles.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, Sawyer's command was positioned to protect the terminal point of the sea-lanes between the British Isles and its possessions in Canada. The U.S. declaration of war put these sea-lanes at immediate risk. The instructions to Sawyer attempted to mitigate this vulnerability by directing him to destroy American warships, privateers, and merchant commerce. The object of ensuring the security of the SLOCs dominated the design and execution of British naval operations during the opening months of the War of 1812.

### OPENING ENGAGEMENTS—AND CONFUSION

On June 23, 1812, about a hundred miles east of New York, lookouts aboard the thirty-six-gun British frigate *Belvidera* sighted a small squadron. Captain Richard Byron identified the strangers as American warships. Given his orders and the tension between the United States and Britain, he beat a hasty retreat, but the squadron gave chase. During the afternoon, the lead ship, the American frigate *President* under Commodore John Rodgers, opened fire. Only then did Byron allow his crew to engage. Three hours into the chase, Byron had his crew start the water over the side and cast nonessential items into the sea. Now lighter, *Belvidera* drew away from its pursuers. It had been a close-run affair.<sup>14</sup> These were the opening shots of the War of 1812 at sea.

Four days later, Byron brought *Belvidera* into the harbor at Halifax, where he found Admiral Sawyer.<sup>15</sup> Sawyer must have been unsure how to proceed. His most recent instructions directed him “[t]o repel any hostile aggression, but also take care not to commit one.”<sup>16</sup> With regard to the latter, he had only to remember several previous shooting incidents between British and American warships. In 1807, HMS *Leopard* had fired on the American frigate *Chesapeake* owing to a suspicion of British deserters aboard the American warship. Outrage in the United States nearly resulted in war. Four years later, in 1811, Rodgers, commanding *President*, almost destroyed the British warship *Little Belt*. This shooting incident occurred in the dark; both the British and the Americans thought the other at fault.<sup>17</sup> Indicative of the early confusion over *Belvidera*'s encounter, one British periodical posited, “Our Government has expressed an opinion, that the attack made upon the *Belvidera* had neither resulted from any new orders of the American Government, nor was any proof that war had been decided on.”<sup>18</sup>

Was *Belvidera*'s engagement merely another incident, or was it war? Sawyer needed confirmation. If it had been a mere incident, an overzealous and aggressive reaction could precipitate actual war; whereas if hostilities already existed, hesitation could result in the loss of British warships, commerce, or worse.



Sawyer's instructions were clear: if he could confirm that a state of war existed, he was "to commence and direct hostilities."<sup>19</sup>

Given the high level of uncertainty about American intentions, Sawyer's first move involved the collection, assessment, and dissemination of intelligence. Less than a day after the battle-scarred *Belvidera* made Halifax, Sawyer dispatched the naval sloop *Colibri* to New York under a flag of truce to determine whether a state of war existed. He also sent vessels to London and Jamaica with details of the attack. Just in case it had not been an accident, he dispatched another warship to warn the commanding officer at Newfoundland and ask for reinforcements.<sup>20</sup>

All these reports were incomplete. Sawyer could only speculate about why the Americans had attacked *Belvidera*. Doing the best he could, Sawyer pieced together the disparate accounts he could glean from American newspapers and the dated reports of British diplomats.<sup>21</sup> It took over a week after *Belvidera* reached Halifax to confirm the declaration of war. When Sawyer did receive indisputable proof of hostilities on July 5, it cost him another warship to carry this news to England.<sup>22</sup>

#### THE SITUATION IN HALIFAX

Sawyer's response also had to take into account the means at his disposal. He had but twenty-three operational warships.<sup>23</sup> On paper, this might appear impressive, but his area of operations required extensive deployments. Moreover, he had to provide escorts to convoys. Few warships were then at Halifax, or at least nothing approaching the combat power of the American squadron that nearly had overwhelmed *Belvidera*. That the Admiralty in London had provided Sawyer with less than an optimal force might lead to accusations of mismanagement, considering that Britain was the dominant naval power, possessing approximately half the world's warship tonnage.<sup>24</sup> However, the navy as a whole was stretched thin, given global naval commitments and ongoing operations against Napoleonic France.<sup>25</sup>

On June 30, three days after the battle-damaged *Belvidera* had anchored at Halifax, the thirty-eight-gun frigate *Shannon* and the thirty-two-gun frigate *Aeolus* arrived. Captain Broke of *Shannon* related, "We came in five days from Bermuda—thinking all tranquil & pacific with America—& counting only on a dull tiresome refit at this port, before we could resume our cruize, . . . but on arriving here . . . we met rumours of war" (emphasis original).<sup>26</sup> Chance favored the British. Not only had *Belvidera* escaped, but a planned refit had brought two additional frigates to Halifax. Sawyer saw an opportunity. *Belvidera* completed hasty repairs and Sawyer's flagship, the sixty-four-gun *Africa*, stood ready. With *Shannon* and *Aeolus*, the British had three frigates and a sixty-four-gun ship concentrated for operations. Sawyer thought this force sufficient to deal with the American squadron. *Shannon*, *Africa*, *Belvidera*, and *Aeolus* sailed from Halifax

on July 5 under the overall command of Captain Broke, just hours after receiving indisputable proof that the United States in fact had declared war.<sup>27</sup>

Rather than assigning Broke command of his most powerful naval detachment, Sawyer surely wished to raise his flag in *Africa* and personally proceed in quest of the American squadron, but he remained at Halifax. The uncertain political and naval situation meant that Sawyer needed to stay in communication. At Halifax, Sawyer could coordinate better among the various elements of his command. He had no idea when reinforcements would arrive, he had yet to receive instructions from London detailing specific objectives or rules of engagement, and he was unclear regarding what kind of war the Americans intended to wage. In addition, the location of the American squadron that had attacked *Belvidera* was unknown. Tracking down leads would require significant adaptation, and this could draw the British squadron far from Halifax.

Moreover, Sawyer expected developments in the Gulf of Maine and its offshoot, the Bay of Fundy. This constricted area of water contained several important British Canadian ports, including Saint John, New Brunswick. To complicate matters, the bordering New England states were the center of American maritime activity. Sawyer expected cities such as Boston, Salem, Gloucester, and Marblehead, Massachusetts, to fit out numerous privateers.<sup>28</sup> Such commerce raiders possessed government-issued licenses to prey on British shipping but were owned, fitted out, and manned by private individuals, resulting in a state-sanctioned business venture that sought profit from the capture of commerce belonging to hostile states.

The threat of American privateers materialized more slowly than expected, however. It took eight days after the declaration of war for the U.S. government to legalize their use.<sup>29</sup> An additional factor delayed the sailing of privateers: in April 1812, Congress had placed a ninety-day embargo on all American shipping. This prevented the sailing of American merchant ships, with the object of keeping the Royal Navy from sweeping them from the seas in the first weeks of a war. The embargo did not expire until July 4, 1812—and the government made no exception for privateers.<sup>30</sup> As one U.S. newspaper aptly printed, “Is it not very odd that privateers would be prevented from sailing sixteen days after war is declared?”<sup>31</sup>

A narrow window of opportunity existed during which the Americans might have benefited from the Royal Navy’s ignorance of hostilities. That window had closed by the time American privateers entered the fray because HMS *Indian*, an eighteen-gun sloop, and *Plumper*, a ten-gun brig, already had reached the Bay of Fundy.<sup>32</sup> Although this did not prevent American privateers from taking several quick prizes and even blockading the British Canadian port of Saint Andrews, British actions mitigated the damage. Sawyer assessed the threat as severe. When *Spartan*, a thirty-eight-gun frigate, returned to Halifax on July

9, Sawyer dispatched it to the Bay of Fundy. The thirty-six-gun *Maidstone*, the first wartime reinforcement to reach Sawyer's command, joined *Spartan*. British warships alternated among escorting convoys, including a hastily organized one of a hundred vessels; patrolling to sweep up privateers; and conducting small raids up rivers to neutralize privateers in their nests.<sup>33</sup> The British had significant success, taking more than twenty privateers between mid-July and mid-August, with nearly all the captures occurring in the waters between the Bay of Fundy and Halifax.<sup>34</sup>

Sawyer's decision to remain at Halifax instead of sailing in quest of Rodgers's squadron also allowed for the more effective employment of eleven reinforcing warships. Quietly dispatched between mid-May and July, they trickled into North American waters during the early months of the war. The Admiralty had intended these warships to take the place of those cycling home with convoys and to provide limited reinforcements to buttress Sawyer's command in the midst of worsening tensions with the United States. But they served a different purpose, giving Sawyer additional options and helping to soften the initial blows to British commerce.<sup>35</sup>

## TWO SQUADRONS

With Admiral Sawyer remaining at Halifax to manage naval deployments across the theater of operations, Captain Broke had a more specific objective: dealing with Commodore Rodgers and his squadron of American warships. The British decision to seek out the American squadron rested on the assessment that Rodgers posed the most dangerous threat to British maritime interests. He had the strength to eliminate British warships, put SLOCs at risk, and savage a valuable convoy. Whereas American privateers aimed at inflicting cumulative losses on British maritime commerce over a protracted period, Rodgers's squadron in a single blow could inflict significant damage, not just to commercial shipping, but even to British warships.

Sawyer had two choices when developing instructions for Broke. He could provide restrictive orders, in an effort to maintain tighter control, or he could provide his intent, trusting his subordinate to execute operations effectively. During the period of uncertainty at the outbreak of the conflict, it was unclear whether the Americans expected direct aid from France. Sawyer worried that such aid would manifest as a combined expedition aimed at Halifax. In hindsight, an attack on Halifax was beyond the means of the United States; however, the possibility caused Sawyer concern during July 1812, and he had no way to recall Broke in the event such an attack transpired.<sup>36</sup> Given this factor alone, there certainly was much to be said for keeping tight control over Broke's detachment.

However, the nature of communications, coupled with the scarcity of warships, led Sawyer to choose a decentralized command model. The speed of communications limited any attempt at control because it would stifle Broke's initiative. This was particularly true given the uncertainty about the Rodgers squadron. Restrictive orders would make an encounter with the American squadron less likely. Sawyer explained to Broke that his actions "must depend on information you may from time to time obtain either of the situation or movements of the American Squadron or other circumstances, and it is left to your judgement and discretion to act as shall appear to you best for His Majesty's Service." Sawyer prioritized forward deployments, but this caused Sawyer to explain to Broke, "I have no means of keeping up a communication with you, till the arrival of reinforcements from England."<sup>37</sup> Without reserves, Sawyer became isolated from the operational elements of his command. Sawyer decided to trust Broke to make informed decisions.

Four days out, Broke's squadron linked up with the thirty-eight-gun British frigate *Guerriere*.<sup>38</sup> Broke now controlled four frigates and a ship of the line. This was a powerful squadron, especially when viewed as a percentage of Sawyer's overall command. At the outbreak of hostilities, Sawyer controlled five true frigates; Broke now had four of them in his squadron, leaving only *Spartan* for other assignments. Also attached to Broke's squadron was the sixty-four-gun *Africa*. Launched in 1781 and hardly considered a frontline warship by 1812, Admiralty documents still described *Africa* as a third-rate ship of the line—the sole warship larger than a frigate in Sawyer's entire command.<sup>39</sup>

Thus, Sawyer had depleted the combat power of his entire command to provide Broke with an effective force. It now fell on Broke to determine the location of Rodgers's squadron. The last positive intelligence was over two weeks old, dating from *Belvidera*'s running fight. Broke had to make an educated guess regarding what Rodgers had done in the meantime. He concluded that the Americans most likely had returned to either Boston or New York, the principal ports with the maritime infrastructure to sustain a powerful American naval squadron. Therefore Broke took his squadron toward Nantucket, to place his ships between those two cities. He hoped to lure Rodgers out for a fight by attacking trade in the area.<sup>40</sup> Broke maintained that he would "continue to destroy all such as are not worth our sending in . . . and hope thus to make the Enemy feel the Evils of the War they have so wantonly began."<sup>41</sup>

Then, on July 12, Broke fell in with *Colibri*, the flag-of-truce vessel Sawyer had sent to New York. Several British diplomats had taken passage aboard *Colibri* there, and they provided Broke with intelligence on the strength of Rodgers's squadron. It contained the forty-four-gun *President*, the forty-four-gun *United States*, the thirty-six-gun *Congress*, the eighteen-gun *Hornet*, and the sixteen-gun *Argus*.<sup>42</sup>

Sawyer had dispatched Broke's command with an object of defeating the American squadron. How well would the sixty-four-gun *Africa*, the thirty-eight-gun *Shannon*, the thirty-eight-gun *Guerriere*, the thirty-six-gun *Belvidera*, and the thirty-two-gun *Aeolus* have done in an engagement with Rodgers's command? First, it should be noted that the rated number of guns provides only an approximation of combat power; most of the warships mentioned above mounted more than their rated number of guns. The rating system itself was a legacy system that did not take into account developments such as the introduction of the short-range carronade. Moreover, the Americans had a tendency to rate warships smaller than they actually were—this served a propaganda purpose.<sup>43</sup> In this case, it meant that the thirty-six-gun *Congress* displaced roughly two hundred tons more, and had a slightly heavier broadside, than either the thirty-eight-gun *Shannon* or the thirty-eight-gun *Guerriere*.<sup>44</sup>

How the British warships compared with forty-four-gun American warships such as *President* and *United States* is a particularly thorny question. William James, a contemporary observer and the first British historian of the war, argued that warships such as *President* were built of heavier timbers than seventy-four-gun British ships of the line.<sup>45</sup> In a later study, Theodore Roosevelt countered, "The American 44-gun frigate was a true frigate."<sup>46</sup> In reality, *President* and *United States* displaced about 40 percent more than thirty-eight-gun frigates such as *Shannon* and *Guerriere* and 50 percent more than thirty-six-gun frigates such as *Belvidera*. In terms of armament, the principal battery of the American warships consisted of twenty-four-pound guns, while British frigates such as *Shannon*, *Guerriere*, and *Belvidera* mounted eighteen-pound guns. In comparison with a sixty-four-gun ship such as *Africa*, *President* and *United States* displaced approximately 150 tons more, had a similar complement, and threw a broadside that was one hundred pounds heavier, albeit with a larger percentage of short-range carronades.<sup>47</sup>

Considering the above information, the two squadrons were fairly equal in aggregate combat power, but several factors gave the British a slight advantage. Although each squadron contained five warships, the small sizes of the Americans' *Hornet* and *Argus* would make them very fragile instruments of war in any engagement. Moreover, two-thirds of Rodgers's total broadside weight consisted of carronades, including almost the entire armament of *Hornet* and *Argus*; carronades comprised only 40 percent of the British broadside weight.<sup>48</sup> In a long-range engagement, the Americans would have to rely on two oversized frigates and one just a bit more powerful than *Shannon* to fight a sixty-four-gun ship and four smaller frigates.

Although the odds were in Broke's favor, he worried that Rodgers had linked up with other U.S. frigates. Information gleaned from American newspapers

indicated that the thirty-two-gun *Essex* likely had joined the American squadron. And Broke believed that *Constitution*, the third forty-four-gun American frigate, also might have joined Rodgers.<sup>49</sup> The addition of either of these warships would tilt the odds in Rodgers's favor.

In the worst case, Broke's command had the combat power to inflict enough damage to make the American squadron a nonfactor in the coming months. By the time the Americans had repaired any battle damage, British naval reinforcements would have shifted the naval balance in American waters permanently.

## OFF NEW YORK

The diplomats aboard *Colibri* also informed Broke that Rodgers had not returned to port after his action with *Belvidera*. "It was generally believed they were gone in search of the homeward bound West Indies Fleet under convoy of the *Thalia*."<sup>50</sup> Although this was accurate information, Broke needed confirmation, so he proceeded toward the entrance to Long Island Sound.<sup>51</sup> On July 14, he left his squadron over the horizon and brought *Shannon* inshore to gather intelligence about the American squadron. Specifically, Broke sought local fishermen or those involved in the coasting trade; such individuals stayed connected with events ashore and had access to local newspapers.<sup>52</sup>

Since it was unlikely that an American would speak with a British naval captain knowingly, Broke perpetrated a ruse. He hoisted American colors over *Shannon* and pretended to be the U.S. frigate *Congress*. It would take an extremely educated eye to tell *Congress* and *Shannon* apart: their dimensions were nearly identical and each mounted eighteen-pounders on its main gun deck.<sup>53</sup> (Flying false colors was a perfectly legitimate deception that all navies of this period used; the deception became dishonorable only if one fired on an opponent while still under a false flag.)<sup>54</sup>

In two separate incidents, Broke lured fishermen aboard *Shannon*. He even told them that he had parted company with Commodore Rodgers after running low on water. Broke described the fishermen as "thoroughly deceived," for they provided him with significant information, including accurate details about the engagement with *Belvidera*.<sup>55</sup> Since Broke knew the correctness of this news, he viewed the remaining information as more reliable, including reports that Rodgers had pursued a homeward-bound British West India convoy.<sup>56</sup> The information gleaned from the fishermen, in combination with the reports received from the diplomats aboard *Colibri*, indicated that Rodgers had pursued a West India convoy. But Broke remained skeptical; although the diplomats and fishermen had provided similar information, Broke worried that the newspapers on which the intelligence was based were inaccurate. Broke announced, "I shall anxiously seek for some further accounts of the American Squadron."<sup>57</sup>

Broke was not the only one attempting to locate Rodgers; U.S. Secretary of the Navy Paul Hamilton also wanted to find him. At the outbreak of hostilities, Hamilton had given Rodgers permission to surprise British warships in the offing before “returning immediately after into port.”<sup>58</sup> However, after attacking *Belvidera* Rodgers did not follow Hamilton’s instructions. It took several weeks for Hamilton to realize that Rodgers was seeking bigger objectives than isolated British warships. The arrival of British warships on the U.S. coast caused Hamilton’s apprehension to grow, so he dispatched the fourteen-gun *Nautilus* to locate Rodgers’s squadron. *Nautilus* proceeded to sea on July 15 with a difficult task. There were two squadrons at sea—one under Rodgers, the other under Broke. They were similar in size, and from a distance would look very much alike. *Nautilus*’s challenge was to find the right squadron; at this it failed. *Nautilus* fell in with Broke’s command on July 16, and after a short chase became Broke’s prize.<sup>59</sup>

No sooner had Broke gobbled up *Nautilus* than his frigates chanced on *Constitution*. The outbreak of hostilities had found the latter in Annapolis, Maryland, and in need of additional men. Hamilton ordered *Constitution* to join Rodgers at New York. The ship was off New Jersey when Broke’s squadron found it. After an epic chase, *Constitution* finally outran the British squadron on the morning of July 19.<sup>60</sup>

During the pursuit of *Constitution*, Broke’s squadron became badly strung out, with the frigates drawing well ahead of *Africa* and *Nautilus*; *Africa*, an old sixty-four-gun ship, could hardly keep up with the more nimble frigates, and *Nautilus* was manned with only a prize crew. *Africa*’s captain, not waiting for instructions, sent *Nautilus* to Halifax with the information that Broke had obtained. Sawyer had not provided Broke the means to stay in contact, but the fortuitous capture of *Nautilus* alleviated this issue. Later, Broke described the captain of *Africa* as acting with “great judgement”: with only a prize crew, *Nautilus* added little to the British squadron but could provide Sawyer with valuable intelligence, and *Africa*’s captain seized the opportunity.<sup>61</sup>

The news *Nautilus* carried informed Sawyer of Broke’s movements over the previous two weeks. Broke consistently had positioned his squadron where Rodgers was most likely to come to him. Initially, Broke had expected Rodgers’s squadron to be anchored at either Boston or New York. He tried to draw Rodgers out for a fight by putting American commerce at risk. Simultaneously, he sought intelligence. What he obtained indicated that Rodgers was still at sea, likely in search of a convoy. If true, such intelligence changed Broke’s mission. While continuing to seek confirmation, Broke placed his command between Rodgers’s squadron at sea and his most likely base of operations at New York. In this location, Broke’s squadron was positioned to snap up *Nautilus* and *Constitution*. The

latter escaped only by superior sailing. Broke accurately concluded that both *Nautilus* and *Constitution* also were on the lookout for Rodgers's squadron.<sup>62</sup>

## OF CONVOYS

After chasing *Constitution*, Broke pondered his next move. He needed to shift his squadron from its position off New York. The longer it remained, the more likely it became that Rodgers would divine Broke's position and avoid him by seeking another port. Rather than gamble on the port to which Rodgers would return or search for the American squadron directly, and "[h]aving received undoubted information [that] Commodore Rogers [*sic*] was gone upon the Grand Bank of Newfoundland to lie [in] wait for our West India Convoys and considering the vast injury his squadron might do in that point," Broke later would explain that "it appeared to me the more important duty to abandon the plan we had entered upon for distressing the Enemy trade, for the protection of our own."<sup>63</sup>

Broke understood the centrality of Britain's maritime trade. No matter how much he wanted to engage the American squadron or gain prize money by capturing American merchant commerce, the ulterior objective of protecting British commerce remained paramount. So Broke sailed eastward across the Atlantic in quest of the West India convoy. Oddly enough, finding the convoy increased the likelihood of encountering Rodgers: since convoys sailed along predictable routes, this one would act as a magnet for the American commodore. By seeking out the convoy, Broke again was attempting to force Rodgers to come to him.

On the morning of July 29, the squadron exchanged signals with the convoy's sole escort, the thirty-eight-gun frigate *Thetis*, about six hundred miles east of New York City.<sup>64</sup> Broke explained, "This fleet was talked of confidentially in America as the chief object of Commodore Rogers' [*sic*] hazardous enterprise;— we shall at least ensure their safety, and I hope our escorting them may lead to a meeting of the Squadron."<sup>65</sup>

But Broke's assessment was flawed: although he had found a West India convoy, he had not found the one Rodgers had pursued. The convoy Broke located comprised approximately seventy ships and had sailed in early July; Rodgers instead had pursued the May convoy, comprising 120 merchant vessels escorted by the thirty-six-gun frigate *Thalia* and the eighteen-gun sloop *Reindeer*.<sup>66</sup> After the running fight with *Belvidera*, Rodgers had approached the May convoy. Rodgers nipped at its heels between June 29 and mid-July; he received reports from several merchant vessels that the convoy was nearby; his squadron even sailed through garbage the convoy had left floating in its wake. But the pursuit was to no avail, and on July 13, when Rodgers was nearly into the approaches to the English Channel, he called it off. All this occurred before Broke even had captured



*Nautilus*. After Rodgers gave up his quest for the convoy, he made a large circuit of the Atlantic before heading home.<sup>67</sup>

The convoy Broke found was never in danger—but this assessment is available only from the perspective of hindsight. Both the Admiralty in London and Sawyer at Halifax approved of Broke's actions.<sup>68</sup> Given the convoy's value, the weakness of its escort, and the uncertainty of the American threat, the risk had been too high to act otherwise. The convoyed merchant vessels had arrived safely; the prime difficulty in assessing successful commerce defense involves understanding why it worked. Rather than seeking the enemy and defeating it through a sequential series of actions, commerce protection involved the complex interplay of convoys, escorts, and patrols—and a high degree of chance. Only by knowing Rodgers's position in relation to that of the convoy can one conclude that Broke did nothing either to deter the American squadron or to protect the convoy most at risk. Although Broke failed to bring Rodgers to battle, he had assessed the available intelligence, understood the centrality of commerce in Britain's grand strategy, and concentrated his squadron at a decisive point—in this case, in relation to a convoy. Instead of directly seeking battle with Rodgers, Broke prioritized Britain's trading empire, understanding that this course of action was the most likely way to bring Rodgers to him.

So Broke's squadron stayed with the convoy as it lumbered toward England. *Africa* and *Thetis* provided direct protection, while the frigates chased down sightings. One of these turned out to be an American merchant vessel that had encountered Rodgers's squadron on July 10. Broke learned that Rodgers had not pursued *Thetis*'s convoy but instead was ahead of it. Prevailing currents and winds would make it difficult for Rodgers to double back and attack the convoy that Broke now protected. Thus, it was reasonably safe. Even so, Broke split his squadron, leaving *Africa* and *Guerriere* to assist *Thetis* in shepherding the flock of merchantmen.<sup>69</sup>

At longitude 45 degrees W, these two warships followed Broke's orders and parted with the convoy. Over the next week, they slowly clawed their way back toward Halifax. On the afternoon of August 14, *Guerriere* and *Africa* intentionally went separate ways: *Africa* steered for Halifax, carrying Broke's official reports, while *Guerriere* continued on patrol. Only five days after parting with *Africa*, *Guerriere* encountered *Constitution*. The ensuing battle resulted in the first significant British naval loss of the war.<sup>70</sup>

#### GROPING IN THE DARK—TO LITTLE EFFECT

Meanwhile, Broke took *Shannon*, *Belvidera*, and *Aeolus* toward the American coast, where he hoped to intercept Rodgers. Broke was now attempting to confront the American squadron with only three frigates, since he had gleaned from

various sources of intelligence that Rodgers also had three frigates, not four or even five as Broke once had believed.<sup>71</sup> Another factor in Broke's decision to confront Rodgers with a reduced force stemmed from his assessment of the U.S. Navy. When Broke learned of *Constitution's* victory over *Guerriere*, he concluded, "We are all eager for an opportunity of *convincing the Yankees* how much they are indebted to chance for their success in this contest. Their force is superior in ship & metal & number of men—but not in *skill or courage equal*" (emphasis original).<sup>72</sup> Broke did not respect his opponent, and it can be assumed that he thought the crews of his three smaller frigates equal to the task of defeating Rodgers's more powerful frigates.

However, by reducing his squadron to three frigates Broke had accepted additional risk; there was no margin for any circumstance that would further reduce his command. This is exactly what occurred on the night of August 10, when *Belvidera* became separated from *Shannon* and *Aeolus* during a chase. *Belvidera's* Captain Byron then captured *Hare*, an American merchant brig with a treasure trove of intelligence. Some weeks earlier, *Hare* had encountered Rodgers's squadron. Thinking the merchantman would beat the American squadron home, a number of letters were sent across. These now fell into British hands. Understanding their significance, Byron immediately pressed for Halifax.<sup>73</sup>

When *Belvidera* arrived on August 24, Byron not only brought Sawyer the captured letters; he provided the first reports of Broke's movements over the previous month. Problematically, Byron did not have Broke's actual reports—these were aboard *Africa*, which still was making its way slowly toward Halifax. Without a clear description of Broke's intentions, Sawyer faced considerable uncertainty, but he needed to act quickly. The captured letters indicated that the Americans would return to the United States at the end of August. Sawyer directed the thirty-eight-gun *Spartan* and thirty-six-gun *Maidstone* to reinforce Broke.<sup>74</sup> These reinforcements became even more important when *Aeolus* had to go in for water—Broke was now alone as Rodgers approached.<sup>75</sup>

At Halifax, Sawyer obtained additional intelligence about Rodgers from *Statira*, a thirty-eight-gun frigate that Sawyer had taken under his command after the start of hostilities. The ship encountered Rodgers's squadron on August 26 while patrolling along Saint Georges Bank. The distance between the American warships and *Statira* was enough to leave both sides in doubt about the exact nature of the encounter, but two days later *Statira* again fell in with the squadron, and this time the Americans spied the British frigate and gave chase. The pursuit lasted sixteen grueling hours before the weather came on thick, swallowing up the British ship.<sup>76</sup> Rodgers again had failed to capture an isolated British warship; and, just as *Belvidera* had done two months earlier, *Statira* carried news of the encounter to Halifax. Sawyer quickly assembled another squadron comprising

*Statira*; the forty-gun *Acasta* and the thirty-eight-gun *Nymphe*, two other war-time frigate reinforcements; and the former U.S. sloop *Nautilus*, now recommissioned as *Emulous*. This squadron sailed on September 2 with orders to find Broke and defeat the American squadron.<sup>77</sup>

This was all for naught, however. The same day that *Statira* made Halifax, the American squadron anchored at Boston. Sawyer characterized the American venture as “a very unsuccessful cruize—having taken and destroyed seven vessels of little value.”<sup>78</sup> Rodgers certainly achieved less than he had desired. He failed to capture a single British warship or locate even a small British convoy. Yet the British could consider themselves extremely fortunate. The American squadron had chased *Statira* and had come within the narrowest margin of capturing *Belvidera*. And only a few miles had separated Rodgers from an extremely valuable but weakly escorted West India convoy of approximately 120 merchant vessels.

#### A RETURN TO THE LARGER PICTURE

Sawyer had devoted the best of his command to seeking out Rodgers’s squadron, at the expense of other responsibilities. Even as late as September 9, Sawyer wrote of “the inferior force I had to meet the various exigencies” on the station.<sup>79</sup> Broke added, “I am bitterly disappointed at not meeting the squadron we are looking for—& who have diverted our attention from every other pursuit.”<sup>80</sup> Privateers had damaged British commerce, and many American merchant vessels had escaped the tentacles of the Royal Navy while Broke sought Rodgers.

Worse still, British deployments had broken down. British actions hinged on Broke maintaining concentration at the critical point, but the nature of period communications and the lack of smaller vessels to carry reports between Broke and Sawyer curtailed effective interaction. Without efficient communications, the instructions Sawyer provided Broke in early July became critical. High levels of uncertainty caused Sawyer to allow Broke significant discretion in developing a course of action. By all evidence, Broke ably assessed available information and acted in accordance with the intent of his instructions and Britain’s strategic priorities. The result, however, drew Broke deep into the Atlantic to protect a vulnerable convoy. There was no way to keep Sawyer informed. After seeing the convoy to safety, Broke allowed his command to fragment. This was in part a response to intelligence about the strength of Rodgers’s squadron, but other factors contributed to the five-ship squadron becoming five widely separated individual warships.

In the aftermath, *Guerriere* was lost in combat. *Africa* slowly lumbered back to Halifax with Broke’s reports. The delay in getting these to Sawyer further contributed to the uncertainty gripping British operations in late August and early September. *Belvidera* separated from Broke in a chase, then captured vital

intelligence about Rodgers's movements. Captain Byron took the information to Halifax, since this was a fixed point, whereas seeking Broke was akin to finding a needle in a haystack. After apprising Sawyer at Halifax, *Belvidera* failed to rejoin Broke before Rodgers reached Boston.<sup>81</sup> *Aeolus* parted with *Shannon* on August 28 because of a lack of water. As luck would have it, *Aeolus* encountered *Spartan* and *Maidstone* the next day. They provided *Aeolus* with enough water to remain on station, but they failed to locate *Shannon*.<sup>82</sup> Broke found himself alone on the American coast—and Rodgers slipped by everyone.

Then, adding insult to injury, Broke encountered the U.S. frigate *Essex* late in the afternoon of September 4. Although *Shannon* overhauled the American frigate, darkness fell before Broke could bring the American to action. It was a close-run affair, with the captain of *Essex* describing his escape as “extraordinary.” The result likely would have been quite different if Broke had had another frigate or two in company, allowing him to use multiple warships to cut off *Essex*.<sup>83</sup> The lack of water, chance, and other priorities had left Broke alone, however.

#### BRITISH NAVAL LEADERSHIP

Captain Broke's performance exemplifies naval leadership at the operational level of war. His assessment of intelligence, acceptance of risk, and decision making despite limited information provide instructive examples. Six weeks into the operation, Broke's squadron fragmented. This was, at least in part, the result of the choices he made; but how long can an isolated squadron commander maintain the mental acuity to make the best choices before uncertainty leads to negative results?

While Broke dealt with the single problem of Rodgers's squadron, Sawyer had to master theater command. He had twenty-three warships at the outbreak of hostilities, and this number grew with the arrival of the thirty-six-gun *Maidstone*, thirty-eight-gun *Nymphe*, forty-gun *Acasta*, and thirty-eight-gun *Statira*. In addition, seven smaller warships arrived with convoys.<sup>84</sup> These reinforcements were offset during the first three months of the war by the combat losses of the thirty-eight-gun *Guerriere* and the schooner *Laura*, while the British lost the eighteen-gun *Emulous* to the wiles of the ocean.<sup>85</sup> Normal operations also diminished the command. Sawyer dispatched several warships with convoys, while others carried news of hostilities to distant locations. By September, Sawyer's command was only slightly larger than it had been at the outbreak of hostilities; however, it did contain a larger percentage of frigates.

Sawyer juggled forces and prioritized commitments, acting most decisively when he received news of Rodgers's squadron, first by dispatching Broke, then by sending *Spartan* and *Maidstone*, and finally by dispatching *Statira*, *Nymphe*, and *Acasta*. Convoys sailed at regular intervals—Sawyer did not interrupt their

sailings because of the war; in fact, he provided escorts for the unexpected convoy that departed British Canadian ports in the Bay of Fundy in July. Sawyer also provided warships to maintain a presence around Halifax and Bermuda, the two bases that were essential to sustaining his command.

Finally, Sawyer sought out American privateers. This proved easier than it should have been, owing to U.S. government delay in passing enabling legislation for commissioning private armed vessels, as well as the decision not to amend the 1812 Embargo Act to allow privateers to sail before it expired. For privateers, surprise came not from where but when they would strike. Commerce warfare could inflict more significant damage if conducted before widespread knowledge of the commencement of hostilities. Once Sawyer had learned of the declaration of war, he understood that the Gulf of Maine and the Bay of Fundy would be prime operating grounds. It would take longer for the Americans to commission a meaningful number of large, oceangoing privateers; until then, hastily commissioned, smaller private armed vessels could seek easy prizes in nearby waters. Overall, however, the British were less vulnerable than they should have been, owing to American delays and Sawyer's foresight.

Sawyer managed naval deployments during the opening months of the war effectively, but the Admiralty decided he was unfit for independent command. He had been appointed to his position in October 1810, when North America was a backwater: tensions had calmed after the *Leopard-Chesapeake* incident, and the shooting incident between *President* and *Little Belt* was months in the future. But once the Admiralty became aware of hostilities in late July 1812, it sought a more experienced commander.

Although Sawyer managed naval operations effectively, he lacked an appreciation of broader political considerations. In early July, Sawyer had dispatched *Julia* to England with "certain intelligence of the act of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Declaring War against Great Britain having been approved by the President." When *Julia's* commander, Valentine Gardner, brought Sawyer's dispatches to the lords commissioners of the Admiralty, they censored Sawyer, noting "their regret that on a subject of such extreme importance as that of a declaration of war by America you should not have given their Lordships the particulars of the information which you state yourself to have received, and that you did not send the American official documents upon this subject which Captain Gardner of the *Julia* reports to have seen at Halifax."<sup>86</sup>

Sawyer's haste in dispatching this information to London likely led to the omissions. Certainly, he had operated in a vague sense of suspended animation for the week between *Belvidera's* arrival at Halifax following the ship's escape from Rodgers's squadron and the official confirmation of the war. These were tense and uncertain days, and it is understandable that Sawyer failed to

provide the Admiralty all the details. Although the omission might have been understandable, the Admiralty did not view it as excusable. For one thing, the First Lord of the Admiralty had to address other government leaders about the declaration of war without critical documentation, which was embarrassing. Moreover, Sawyer did not direct Captain Gardner to detain the mail and passengers aboard *Julia* until the Admiralty had been informed about the declaration of war. This failure led the Admiralty to complain that the resultant “spillage” (to use a modern term) provided that “the Public was in possession of as early and *more ample* information than His Majesty’s Government” (emphasis original).<sup>87</sup> This was not just embarrassing; it caused Britain’s political leaders to work at a disadvantage as they tried to address the outbreak of hostilities. So, while Sawyer may have managed naval operations on a distant station adequately, he lacked the political acumen to interface with the British government. There was more to command on a distant station than merely being proficient at the operational level of war. The Admiralty understood that Sawyer was operationally competent, but not politically savvy.

Rather than remove Sawyer, the Admiralty decided to amalgamate the North America, Leeward Islands, and Jamaica stations under a senior admiral who could provide the oversight necessary to link the political, strategic, and operational aspects of Britain’s naval response to the War of 1812. Sawyer would remain the senior officer at Halifax, where he could focus on operational issues, while the new commander would manage operations from Halifax to Barbados.<sup>88</sup> The presumed ability of one officer to command such an extensive area of operations led to the following quip: “Why they have excluded the East Indies and the Mediterranean, I know not, for surely they might as rationally have been included in this most unprecedented command.”<sup>89</sup> Certainly, it was unparalleled—and in fact proved unwieldy.

The Admiralty’s choice to fill the new position was Admiral Sir John Borlase Warren. He had commanded in North America in the aftermath of the *Leopard-Chesapeake* affair and had extensive experience both operationally and as a diplomat.<sup>90</sup> Although Warren’s command included the North America, Leeward Islands, and Jamaica stations, it is telling that he sailed directly for Halifax. This was the decisive point for controlling British naval operations in its war against America, and Warren needed to establish communications with Sawyer to obtain firsthand information about the progress of the naval war.

When Captain Broke learned of the change, he wrote, “Sir John Warren’s arrival makes a grand revolution in our government, poor Adml Sawyer is much hurt at the rude manner in which the Admtly have deprived him of his chief command.—perhaps he will go home.”<sup>91</sup> This was prophetic. Warren reached Halifax on September 26, and just days later Warren wrote privately to a member

of the Admiralty that Sawyer was “unwell & I believe it is so & he is very Grumpy also at what he calls being superseded in his command.” Rather than having a disgruntled subordinate, Warren gave Sawyer permission to return to England.<sup>92</sup>

With Warren’s arrival, the first chapter of Britain’s naval War of 1812 came to a close. Operationally, British naval leaders had demonstrated considerable skill at managing fog and friction while accounting for uncertainty. The British lacked a complete picture of American political intentions and an exact understanding of how the Americans planned to wage war at sea. This required leaders such as Admiral Sawyer and Captain Broke to work with available information and make assumptions about the rest.

At the same time, they had to prioritize. Prioritization does not come easily to a dominant naval power; after all, its navy should be able to master all threats. But in this case the available warships were insufficient, and it took time for reinforcements to arrive. Sawyer and Broke sacrificed everything else to protect British commercial shipping. Warships protected convoys and the SLOCs rather than directly engaging American warships and privateers or sweeping up American commerce. Sawyer and Broke understood the difference between seeking battle and ensuring maritime security. In uncertain conditions and with a less-than-adequate force, security took priority. British naval officers in North American waters showed a keen regard for Britain’s commercial position and understood the role of warships in supporting Britain’s global maritime trading empire.

Yet Sawyer’s reward was to be superseded as theater commander. The Admiralty did not plan to remove Sawyer—he was an effective operator. Instead, Sawyer asked to be removed, since he felt aggrieved when the Admiralty placed Warren in a position to be his immediate superior. To demonstrate that the Admiralty held little ill will, the same First Lord of the Admiralty by 1814 had appointed Sawyer to command the Irish station. This was a command in close communication with London that oversaw convoys and patrols on the approaches to the English Channel—a command that demanded Sawyer’s expertise.<sup>93</sup>

However, the outbreak of war with the United States required a different type of know-how; it demanded an admiral who simultaneously could manage deployments and communicate broader strategic and even policy-level considerations. Sawyer did not communicate well enough with his political superiors. Distance and the speed of communications certainly made exchanges with London more difficult, but these factors were known, and Sawyer could have accounted for them by lavishing more care on his reports, to include all available documentation. That he did not do so proved embarrassing, which led to friction between the civilian leaders and their senior officer at Halifax.

Understanding intent, identifying objects, and managing risk are not the only hallmarks of success in decentralized command; clarity and precision in communications prove just as important, for without these attributes, the tenuous links among decentralized nodes of authority become strained. The Americans contributed enough to the uncertain environment; ambiguity need not have been exacerbated by the failure of naval leaders to provide adequate communications with their civilian masters.

---

#### NOTES

1. Statements by Earl Bathurst (February 18, 1813) and Viscount Castlereagh (February 18, 1813), 24 Parl. Deb. (1st ser.) (1813), p. 609; Rory Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807–1815* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1996), pp. 234–35.
2. William Hamilton to Foster, May 11, 1812, and Castlereagh to Foster, June 17 and 23, 1812 (and Attached Memorandum), in *Instructions to the British Ministers of the United States, 1791–1812*, ed. Bernard Mayo (New York: Da Capo, 1971), pp. 379, 381–83; *London Gazette*, June 23–27, 1812; Jon Latimer, *1812: War with America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2007), pp. 33–34. It should be noted that the suspension of the orders in council would become permanent only if the U.S. government responded by ending its restrictions on British shipping.
3. Croker to Sawyer, July 29, 1812, pp. 28–29, Admiralty Papers [hereafter ADM] 2/1375, The National Archives, Kew, U.K. [hereafter TNA]; Warren to Croker, October 5, 1812, p. 98, ADM 1/502, TNA; Robert Stewart, “Statement of British Naval Forces on the North American Stations, 1810–1813,” in *Correspondence, Despatches, and Other Papers of Viscount Castlereagh, Second Marquess of Londonderry*, ed. Charles W. Vane, Marquess of Londonderry (London: William Shoberl, 1851) [hereafter *Castlereagh*], vol. 8, p. 289.
4. Instructions to Sawyer, October 7, 1810, pp. 175–99, ADM 1/159, TNA.
5. Regarding ships and the number of their guns, throughout this article: For British warships, the number of guns is drawn from “Ships in Sea Service,” July 1, 1812, ADM 8/100, TNA. For American warships, the number comes from Paul Hamilton [Secretary of the Navy] to William Giles [Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate], December 14, 1811, in *American State Papers: Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States; Naval Affairs*, ed. Walter Lowrie and Walter S. Franklin (Washington, DC: Gales and Seaton, 1834), vol. 1, pp. 265–66.
6. The bicentennial of the War of 1812 has stimulated significant scholarship on the naval war. A survey of the most important new studies includes Stephen Budiansky, *Perilous Fight: America’s Intrepid War with Britain on the High Seas, 1812–1815* (New York: Knopf, 2010); George C. Daughan, *1812: The Navy’s War* (New York: Basic Books, 2011); Brian Arthur, *How Britain Won the War of 1812: The Royal Navy’s Blockades of the United States, 1812–1815* (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell, 2011); and Andrew Lambert, *The Challenge: Britain against America in the Naval War of 1812* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012). However, none of these works have addressed British naval decision making at the outbreak of the war specifically. Studies that do address the opening of the naval war are more dated. Jeff Seiken provides the American perspective in “‘To Strike a Blow in the World That Shall Resound through the Universe’: American Naval Operations and Options at the Start of the War of 1812,” in *New Interpretations in Naval History: Selected Papers from the Fourteenth Naval History Symposium*, ed. Randy C. Balano and Craig L. Symonds (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2001), pp. 131–46. Barry J. Lohnes penned an article in 1973 addressing the British navy at Halifax. While superb at identifying the constraints



- the British faced, Lohnes fails to explain what reasonably could be expected from the British naval force at the outbreak of hostilities. See "British Naval Problems at Halifax during the War of 1812," *Mariner's Mirror* 59, no. 3 (1973), pp. 317–33. There is no biography of Sawyer. Broke received an edited volume in 2013, but it focused on his critical victory over the U.S. frigate *Chesapeake* rather than his decision making in the early months of the war. See Tim Voelcker, ed., *Broke of the Shannon and the War of 1812* (Barnsley, U.K.: Seaforth, 2013).
7. Statement by Croker, February 18, 1813, 24 Parl. Deb. (1st ser.) (1813), p. 645.
  8. *Castlereagh*, vol. 8, pp. 287–88. Note: these points are direct quotes from the British document.
  9. *Ibid.*
  10. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
  11. Julian S. Corbett, "Napoleon and the British Navy after Trafalgar," *Quarterly Review*, no. 471 (April 1922), pp. 238–39; Arthur, *How Britain Won the War of 1812*, p. 57; Lambert, *The Challenge*, p. 17; James Davey, *In Nelson's Wake: The Navy and the Napoleonic Wars* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2015), pp. 313–14; Kevin D. McCranie, "The War of 1812 in the Ongoing Napoleonic Wars: The Response of Britain's Royal Navy," *Journal of Military History* 76, no. 4 (October 2012), pp. 1067–94; Kevin D. McCranie, "Britain's Royal Navy and the Defeat of Napoleon," in *Napoleon and the Operational Art of War: Essays in Honor of Donald D. Horward*, ed. Michael V. Leggiere (Leiden, Neth.: Brill, 2016), pp. 476–99.
  12. "Ships in Sea Service," July 1, 1812.
  13. Patrick Crowhurst, *The Defence of British Trade, 1689–1815* (Folkestone, U.K.: Dawson, 1977), p. 171; N. A. M. Rodger, "Weather, Geography and Naval Power in the Age of Sail," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 22, nos. 2–3 (1999), p. 191.
  14. Byron to Sawyer, June 27, 1812, ADM 1/502, TNA; Log of *Belvidera*, June 23, 1812, ADM 51/2018, TNA.
  15. Log of *Belvidera*, June 27, 1812, ADM 51/2018, TNA; Sawyer to Croker, July 5, 1812, p. 45, ADM 1/502, TNA.
  16. *Castlereagh*, vol. 8, p. 287.
  17. Spencer C. Tucker and Frank T. Reuter, *Injured Honor: The Chesapeake-Leopard Affair, June 22, 1807* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1996); Jonathon Woodard Hooks, "A Friendly Salute: The President–Little Belt Affair and the Coming of the War of 1812" (PhD dissertation, Univ. of Alabama, 2009).
  18. "Naval History of the Present Year, 1812 (June–July)," *Naval Chronicle* 28, pp. 73–74.
  19. *Castlereagh*, vol. 8, p. 288.
  20. Sawyer to Croker, July 5, 1812.
  21. Foster to Sawyer, Washington, June 15, 1812, p. 44, ADM 1/502, TNA; Bradford Perkins, *Prologue to War, 1805–1812* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968), p. 406; Donald R. Hickey, *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1989), p. 41.
  22. Sawyer to Croker, July 21, 1812, p. 68, ADM 1/502, TNA.
  23. "Ships in Sea Service," July 1, 1812. Twenty-three is the number of operational warships, which omits noncombat vessels such as receiving ships.
  24. Jan Glete, *Navies and Nations: Warships, Navies and State Building in Europe and America, 1500–1860*, *Stockholm Studies in History* 48 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1993), vol. 2, p. 376.
  25. McCranie, "The War of 1812 in the Ongoing Napoleonic Wars."
  26. Broke to his wife, July 2, 1812, Broke Papers, HA 93/9/105, Suffolk Record Office, Ipswich, U.K. [hereafter SRO].
  27. Sawyer to Croker, July 5, 1812.
  28. Sawyer to Croker, July 21, 1812, p. 68.
  29. An Act Concerning Letters of Marque, Prizes, and Prize Goods, June 26, 1812, in *The Naval War of 1812: A Documentary History*, ed. William S. Dudley et al. (Washington, DC: Naval Historical Center, 1985), vol. 1, pp. 167–69.
  30. Latimer, *1812: War with America*, p. 33.
  31. *The Columbian* (New York), July 2, 1812.
  32. Sawyer to Croker, July 5, 1812.
  33. Sawyer to Croker, July 21, 1812; Log of *Spartan*, August 1–3, 1812, ADM 51/2812, TNA; *Commercial Advertiser* (New York), August 15, 1812.

34. H[erbert] Sawyer, "List of American Privateers Taken . . . between the 1st July and 25th August 1812," in *The Naval War of 1812: A Documentary History*, ed. Dudley et al., vol. 1, pp. 225–26. The first capture occurred on July 16, the final one on August 21.
35. *Castlereagh*, vol. 8, p. 288.
36. Sawyer to Broke, July 4, 1812, p. 351, ADM 1/1553, TNA.
37. *Ibid.*
38. The name of this ship appears throughout without a diacritical accent. When it was in French service, an accent was used; once it entered British service, the accent was dispensed with.
39. "Ships in Sea Service," July 1, 1812; Sawyer to Croker, July 5, 1812; Rif Winfield, *British Warships in the Age of Sail, 1793–1817: Design, Construction, Careers and Fates* (London: Chatham, 2005), p. 100; Brian Lavery, *Nelson's Navy: The Ships, Men and Organisation 1793–1815* (London: Conway Maritime, 1994; repr. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2003), p. 48; Brian Lavery, *The Ship of the Line, vol. 1, The Development of the Battlefleet 1650–1850* (London: Conway Maritime, 1983), p. 126.
40. Broke to Sawyer, July 12, 1812, no. 2, HA 93/6/2/8, SRO.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Sawyer to Croker, July 21, 1812. The intelligence indicated that the squadron under Rodgers consisted of *President*, *United States*, *Congress*, *Hornet*, and *Wasp*. The only difference was that Rodgers's actual squadron included the sixteen-gun *Argus* instead of the eighteen-gun *Wasp*.
43. Kevin D. McCranie, *Utmost Gallantry: The U.S. and Royal Navies at Sea in the War of 1812* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2011), p. xiii.
44. Paul H. Silverstone, *The Sailing Navy 1775–1854* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2001), pp. 28, 30; Winfield, *British Warships*, pp. 165, 176.
45. William James, *Naval History of Great Britain* (London: Harding, Leopard, 1826; repr. London: Macmillan, 1902), vol. 5, p. 381; William James, *Naval Occurrences of the War of 1812: A Full and Correct Account of the Naval War between Great Britain and the United States of America, 1812–1815* (repr. London: Conway Maritime, 2004), p. 8.
46. Theodore Roosevelt, *The Naval War of 1812; or, The History of the United States Navy during the Last War with Great Britain*, 3rd ed. (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1883), p. 60.
47. "Ship Manning and Guns," ADM 7/556, TNA; Winfield, *British Warships*, pp. 100, 124; Silverstone, *The Sailing Navy, 1775–1854*, pp. 26–27.
48. "Ship Manning and Guns"; Silverstone, *The Sailing Navy, 1775–1854*, pp. 26, 28, 46–47; Winfield, *British Warships*, pp. 100, 154, 165, 168, 176.
49. Broke to Croker, July 30, 1812, p. 351, ADM 1/1553, TNA.
50. Sawyer to Croker, July 21, 1812. *Thalia* was a thirty-six-gun frigate.
51. Rodgers to Hamilton, June 21, 1812 (two letters of this date), pp. 47–48, Letters from Captains, M125, reel 24, record group 45, National Archives and Records Administration, United States [hereafter RG 45, NARA].
52. Broke to Sawyer, July 14, 1812, no. 4, HA 93/6/2/8, SRO.
53. *Ibid.*; Silverstone, *The Sailing Navy, 1775–1854*, p. 28; Winfield, *British Warships*, p. 165.
54. Faye M. Kert, *Privateering: Patriots & Profits in the War of 1812* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2015), pp. 21–22.
55. Broke to Sawyer, July 14, 1812.
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Ibid.*
58. Hamilton to Rodgers, June 18, 1812, p. 61, Letters to Officers, M149, reel 10, RG 45, NARA.
59. Hamilton to Crane, July 10, 11, 1812, pp. 92–93, M149, reel 10, RG 45, NARA; Crane to Hamilton, July 29, 1812, p. 114, Letters from Officers below the Rank of Commander, M148, reel 10, RG 45, NARA.
60. Hull to Hamilton, July 7, 1812, p. 94, M125, reel 24, RG 45, NARA; Hamilton to Hull, June 1, July 3, 1812, pp. 61, 86, M149, reel 10, RG 45, NARA; Broke to Croker, July 30, 1812.
61. Broke to Sawyer, July 14, 1812, entry for July 21, no. 4, HA 93/6/2/8, SRO.

62. Ibid.
63. Broke to Croker, July 30, 1812.
64. Pocket journal of *Shannon*, July 24–29, 1812, HA 93/10/24, SRO; Journal of *Shannon*, July 24–29, 1812, HA 93/6/2/112, SRO; Log of *Thetis*, July 29, 1812, ADM 51/2874, TNA. This convoy originally had a second escort, the twenty-two-gun *Garland*, but that ship parted with the convoy in the Straits of Florida.
65. Broke to Croker, July 30, 1812.
66. Vashon to Stirling, June 8, 1812, Stirling to Croker, July 13, 1812, p. 138, ADM 1/263/124, TNA; Byam to Croker, August 24, 1812, ADM 1/1553/359, TNA; Log of *Garland*, July 1–2, 11–12, 1812, ADM 53/572, TNA.
67. Rodgers to Hamilton, September 1, 1812, p. 2, M125, reel 25, RG 45, NARA.
68. Admiralty response attached to Broke to Croker, July 30, 1812, ADM 1/1553/351, TNA.
69. Broke to Sawyer, August 7, 1812, no. 11, HA 93/6/2/8, SRO; Log of *Shannon*, August 5–9, 1812, ADM 51/2861, TNA.
70. Broke to Sawyer, August 7, 1812; Log of *Africa*, August 8–14, 1812, ADM 51/2092, TNA. For information on *Constitution* and *Guerriere*, see James, *Naval History of Great Britain*, vol. 5, pp. 371–83; Robert Gardiner, *The Naval War of 1812* (London: Chatham, 1998), pp. 40–43; Lambert, *The Challenge*, pp. 75–78; Daughan, *1812: The Navy's War*, pp. 73–85; Budiansky, *Perilous Fight*, pp. 141–47; and McCranie, *Utmost Gallantry*, pp. 48–52.
71. Broke to Sawyer, August 7, 1812.
72. Broke to his wife, September 22, 1812, HA 93/9/113, SRO.
73. Sawyer to Croker, August 25, 1812, p. 83, ADM 1/502, TNA; Log of *Belvidera*, August 21, 1812, ADM 51/2018, TNA.
74. Sawyer to Croker, August 25, 1812, p. 83.
75. Broke to his wife, August 23, 1812, entry for August 28, HA 93/9/110, SRO.
76. Rodgers to Hamilton, September 1, 1812; Sawyer to Croker, September 9, 1812, ADM 1/502/92, TNA; Logs of *Hornet*, *United States*, and *Congress*, August 26–28, 1812, record group 24, NARA; Log of *Statira*, August 26, 28, 1812, ADM 51/2814, TNA.
77. Sawyer to Croker, September 9, 1812.
78. Sawyer to Croker, September 17, 1812, ADM 1/502, TNA.
79. Sawyer to Croker, September 9, 1812.
80. Broke to his wife, August 9, 1812, HA 93/9/109, SRO.
81. Log of *Belvidera*, August 15–September 5, 1812, ADM 51/2018, TNA.
82. Log of *Aeolus*, August 28–31, 1812, ADM 51/2106, TNA.
83. Porter to Hamilton, September 2, 1812, p. 18, M125, reel 25, RG 45, NARA; Log of *Shannon*, September 4, 1812, ADM 51/2861, TNA.
84. *Castlereagh*, vol. 8, p. 288.
85. Warren to Croker, October 5, 1812, p. 98; Winfield, *British Warships*, pp. 176, 295, 360. When this existing *Emulous* was lost in 1812, the Royal Navy applied the name to the former USS *Nautilus*, as noted earlier. The latter ship was sold out of the service in 1817.
86. Croker to Sawyer, July 29, 1812.
87. Ibid.
88. Croker to William Hamilton, August 3, 1812, pp. 33–34, ADM 2/1375, TNA.
89. Lord Radstock to Son, August 4, 1812, Waldegrave Family Papers, WDG/11/13/27, National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, U.K. [hereafter NMM].
90. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Sir John Borlase Warren”; Peter LeFevre, “Sir John Borlase Warren, 1753–1822,” in *British Admirals of the Napoleonic Wars: The Contemporaries of Nelson*, ed. Peter LeFevre and Richard Harding (London: Chatham, 2005), pp. 229–44.
91. Broke to his wife, September 22, 1812, entry for September 27, HA 93/9/114, SRO.
92. Warren to Johnstone Hope, October 7, 1812, Correspondence with Lord Melville, MEL/101, NMM; Warren to Croker, October 18, 1812, p. 111, ADM 1/502, TNA.
93. Various letters, 1814, Cork, Irish station, ADM 1/626, TNA.

# MONEY, MOTIVATION, AND TERRORISM

## Rewards-for-Information Programs

*Christopher M. Ford*

**A**ttempting to neutralize terrorists is a vexing problem. Terrorists are elusive: they emerge to commit acts of terror, then blend back into their environment. Frequently they are lone individuals who travel freely, do not wear uniforms, and assiduously seek to avoid detection. Governments historically have employed a hard/soft-power approach to the problem: targeting terrorists through direct action (counterterrorism units, drone strikes, etc.), while employing soft-power mechanisms either to gain information or to create an environment that is less conducive to facilitating, supporting, and encouraging acts of terror.

The most recent significant terrorist attack against the United States—the attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi, Libya—provides a useful illustration of

the classic hard/soft approach. In the immediate wake of the attack, the United States deployed to the region agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the U.S. European Command Fleet Antiterrorism Security Team Platoon, two Navy warships, drones, and other military capabilities. Shortly after that, the United States offered a ten-million-dollar reward for information leading to the capture of those responsible for the attack on the mission.<sup>1</sup>

The U.S. Department of State (DOS) offered the reward under the Rewards for Justice (RFJ) program, which it has called “one of the most valuable assets the U.S. government has in the fight against international terrorism.”<sup>2</sup> Together, RFJ and the

*Lieutenant Colonel Christopher M. Ford, USA, is a judge advocate currently assigned as a military professor at the Stockton Center for the Study of International Law at the Naval War College. He previously served in legal assignments with the 7th Infantry Division; the Joint Special Operations Task Force (Philippines); the 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne); the U.S. Army Trial Defense Service; the 5th Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division; and the 1st Cavalry Division. He also served as an assistant professor of law and a department executive officer at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York. He holds a master of laws degree from the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School, a juris doctor from the University of South Carolina School of Law, and a bachelor's degree from Furman University.*

*Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4*

U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) rewards program have paid more than two hundred million dollars to informants since 1984.

Despite these programs' size and scope and our reliance on them, they receive a surprising lack of scrutiny or attention from the media, academia, and the government.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, no government or research entity ever has evaluated or even questioned the efficacy of these programs. While this fact is surprising on its own, it is downright astonishing given that a significant body of psychology research demonstrates that extrinsic rewards structures—such as those that underlie these rewards programs—can *undermine* motivation and thus prove counterproductive. To structure rewards programs better, the rewarder must appreciate the relationship between the award and information: why and when people are motivated to provide useful information. With this in mind, rewards programs can be restructured to motivate potential informants more effectively, achieving far better results at a much reduced cost.

This article then has three goals. The first is to highlight both the importance of rewards programs and the lack of critical attention they have received. The second is to review the implementation of current rewards programs through two heretofore unused lenses: research into the psychology of motivation, and the historical case study provided by what the British experienced during what they called the “Malayan Emergency.” Finally, this article introduces two suggestions for structuring rewards programs better. These approaches, termed here *maximizing* and *minimizing*, seek to provide readily implementable improvements that apply historical lessons, together with guidance taken from years of academic research on motivation.

## THE EXISTING REWARDS PROGRAM

### *Background*

The 1984 Act to Combat International Terrorism established the RFJ program.<sup>4</sup> The DOS Bureau of Diplomatic Security manages the program, which permits the Secretary of State to authorize “rewards for information that leads to the arrest or conviction of anyone who plans, commits, aids, or attempts international terrorist acts against U.S. persons or property, that prevents such acts from occurring in the first place, that leads to the location of a key terrorist leader, or that disrupts terrorism financing.”<sup>5</sup>

Rewards can be up to U.S.\$25 million, or more if the Secretary of State “determines that a greater amount is necessary to combat terrorism or to defend the United States against terrorist acts.”<sup>6</sup> Since 1984, the program has put up more than two hundred million dollars in rewards and has paid out more than \$125 million.

The DoD rewards program allows the Secretary of Defense to pay rewards for nonlethal assistance that benefits the U.S. armed forces.<sup>7</sup> The standard operating

procedure referred to as Money as a Weapons System implements the DoD program, which provides smaller rewards in greater numbers than RFJ.<sup>8</sup> Many other countries, including Afghanistan, Argentina, China, Greece, Guinea, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen, offer similar rewards programs for assistance against those designated as terrorists.

### *Judging Program Effectiveness*

There has never been an evaluation of the effectiveness of either U.S. program. DOS long has maintained that RFJ is both successful and effective. On the program's web page, administrators state that the program has "provided information that has helped prevent or favorably resolve acts of international terrorism against U.S. interests and bring to justice some of the world's most notorious terrorists."<sup>9</sup> This statement is true; then again, twenty-five-million-dollar rewards have failed, and in some cases continue to fail, to lead to the capture of Saddam Hussein, Osama Bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.<sup>10</sup> Further, multimillion-dollar rewards have failed to produce information on virtually any major terrorist attack on the United States, stretching from the Benghazi attack (2012) back through the attack on USS *Cole* (2000), the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya (1998), the bombing of the Khobar Towers (1996), the hijacking of Pan Am Flight 73 (1986), the hijacking of TWA Flight 847 (1985), and the bombing of Pan Am Flight 830 (1982).<sup>11</sup>

So, determining whether RFJ is a "successful" program depends on the metric of success used. Perhaps generating a single piece of information would be deemed successful; researchers at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (known as CERN) spent an estimated \$13.25 billion to discover a single Higgs boson elementary particle—by all accounts, a successful effort.<sup>12</sup>

In the context of rewards programs, however, a far more important metric is the efficiency of the program. Consider the following example: a terrorist bomb injures two U.S. citizens. If the U.S. government offered a ten-million-dollar reward and received information leading to capture of the terrorists, the rewards would be successful—but not necessarily effective. If a one-million-dollar reward generated the same information, it would be both successful and more effective. Or consider a rewards program that produces one hundred pieces of information, but could produce five hundred pieces of information if its administration were changed slightly.

The goal of any rewards program should be increased efficiency: more information at a lower cost. Increasing efficiency requires first understanding a program's costs.

### *Valuing Rewards Programs: The Cost of Information*

Conducting an objective, academically rigorous evaluation would be the best method for understanding the costs and benefits of the programs. Interestingly, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has conducted evaluations of rewards and incentives for federal employees, tax whistle-blowers, and those who report Medicare and Medicaid fraud.<sup>13</sup> The GAO report on incentivizing federal employees provides useful guidance for evaluating the combined DOS/DoD rewards program. The report notes that “[a]gencies that fail to evaluate their incentive programs have no basis for determining whether their programs actually motivate and reward employee high performance.”<sup>14</sup>

In any rewards program, the actual reward paid is the largest and most obvious cost of the program. RFJ has paid out more than \$125 million in rewards. In exchange, the U.S. government has received information. Was the information worth more than \$125 million? Would it have been worth a billion dollars? Or perhaps “only” one million? Might the information have been provided for free?

When information is received through a rewards program, the government often presumes that the program motivated the informant. However, informants may act out of a sense of patriotism, personal animus, or some other motivation that we falsely attribute to the reward. In such cases, a reward would be “wasted,” as the individuals would have come forward for a much smaller reward, or perhaps none at all. Without understanding what motivates an individual to come forward with information, it is impossible to fix an efficient price (the amount of the reward) for what the government is purchasing (information).

Absent objective valuations, officials must resort to subjective valuations; what makes Ayman al-Zawahiri “worth” twenty-five million dollars and Mullah Omar “worth” ten million dollars remains unclear. Government officials have indicated that there is an internal process that establishes these numbers; but given the suspiciously round reward figures, the valuation is at least somewhat subjective.

Beyond the actual cost of the reward, ancillary costs must be considered. The majority of RFJ targets are thought to be located in predominantly war-torn, rural, impoverished areas.<sup>15</sup> Injecting large sums of cash into such regions has the potential to cause any number of unintended consequences. Most obviously, rewardees or others could use the money to perpetuate violence by purchasing weapons or funding violent operations that will destabilize the region further. Conversely, the rewardee may become a target for revenge or robbery. The DoD program guidance expressly discusses this possibility.<sup>16</sup> A broader negative implication of a large reward is its destabilizing impact on the local economy. In theory, these unintended outcomes are more likely in some regions than others. Accordingly, rewards programs should take into account the recipient’s location.

There also exists the possibility that the offer of a reward could bolster the reputations of wanted individuals, inflating their standing among associates and possibly in the broader community, and bringing them greater support (money, personnel, and equipment). Thus, the reward may exacerbate the problem it is seeking to resolve. Some, for example, believe that offering a reward for the capture of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi increased his reputation.<sup>17</sup> DoD has recognized this possibility, noting in its reward program guidance that “lower rewards limit notoriety for insurgents (Jesse James effect).”<sup>18</sup>

A rewards program also may embolden or anger the target of the reward. For instance, in 1975 members of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) assassinated Ross McWhirter (a cofounder of the *Guinness Book of World Records*) three weeks after he offered a reward for information leading to the arrest of members of the IRA. One of the killers, after his release in 1999, noted that McWhirter “put a bounty on our heads. He asked for it.”<sup>19</sup> Poor rewards program execution can lead to such blowback.

Finally, it is instructive to look at the GAO report on incentivizing federal employees, which identifies several problems with rewards programs, including concerns regarding the possibility of fostering negative internal competition.<sup>20</sup> A poorly structured or advertised program can even result in program failure. The FBI, for instance, pulled an advertising campaign for RFJ in the Seattle area following widespread complaints that the campaign promoted stereotypes.<sup>21</sup>

The true cost of a rewards program, then, is the cost of the reward plus the cost of any follow-on effects of the program such as increasing violence; bolstering enemy reputations; angering enemies, thereby incentivizing their actions; and fostering negative competition for information. The very idea that a rewards program could have negative implications is anathema to the DOS view of its program, which is that as long as information is coming in, the program is working. Yet such costs are very real and should be considered when structuring rewards programs. This was one of the lessons the British learned in their Malayan rewards program.<sup>22</sup>

## THE MALAYAN EMERGENCY:

### A REWARDS-FOR-INFORMATION CASE STUDY

Governments long have offered monetary rewards in exchange for beneficial information or action. Letters of marque—essentially licenses for private individuals to capture enemy ships, rewarded from the sale of booty—date from as early as 1295.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, in the sixteenth century countries began formalizing the concept of prize money—at first, money paid to crews for capturing a wanted pirate.<sup>24</sup> Rewards for information on terrorists are a more recent development.



One of the earliest references relating to rewards for information for capturing what the British termed terrorists comes from the Malayan Emergency.

The Malayan Emergency traces its origins to the establishment of the South Seas (Nanyang) Communist Party in 1925; the organization was renamed the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) in 1930.<sup>25</sup> The party, comprising primarily ethnic Chinese, garnered widespread popular support after Japan's invasion of Malaya in 1942. The MCP established the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army (MPAJA), which the United Kingdom and the United States officially recognized as the "foremost resistance organization behind the Japanese lines."<sup>26</sup> At the end of the war, the MPAJA "had established *de facto* control of many areas."<sup>27</sup> The British sought to control MPAJA forces by placing them under British military command—paying, clothing, and otherwise providing for all MPAJA forces. By 1946, however, relations between the British and the MCP were collapsing rapidly.<sup>28</sup> In February 1948, the communists—now styling themselves the Malayan Races Liberation Army—launched a series of major labor strikes, followed by a terror campaign, and eventually an insurgency that became protracted.<sup>29</sup>

The British initially responded with military force, but shifted to a whole-of-government approach with the implementation of what was called the Briggs Plan, named after British lieutenant general Sir Harold Briggs, the commander of British forces. The overall intent of the plan was to cut off the insurgents from their support base.<sup>30</sup> While the plan was, at its essence, a population-control program, a major component of the program was a psychological warfare campaign, with an associated rewards program.<sup>31</sup> Briggs enlisted the assistance of Hugh Carleton Greene, whose mission was "to persuade the terrorists to surrender, disrupting their organization and spreading disaffection in the process, and to encourage the civilian population to oppose them."<sup>32</sup>

Before Greene arrived, the British had attempted—disastrously—an amnesty plan and were contemplating a rewards program.<sup>33</sup> Greene conducted a cultural assessment of the communist fighters and their sympathizers and found that—ironically—they were motivated by "greed."<sup>34</sup> Greene recognized that properly targeting the motivation could incentivize peasants to provide information, and those recruits tired of the jungle lifestyle to quit. In December 1950, Greene secured funding for large increases in the size of rewards. In March 1952, Briggs's successor, Sir Gerald Templer—who is thought to have coined the phrase "hearts and minds"—further increased the size of the rewards.<sup>35</sup>

Large reward size was one factor that made the Malaya rewards program successful. Rewards ranged from three times the average Malayan worker's annual income to as much as eighty-five times the annual figure. In one example from 1956, an informant who supplied information that led to the ambush of three terrorists received an award equivalent to seventeen years of pay.<sup>36</sup> By contrast, in

2010 the gross domestic product per capita in Iraq was \$6,594, yet the vast majority of rewards under the DoD program are below ten thousand dollars. Granted, there are complications with advertising very large rewards (discussed later in the article), but both the British in Malaya and the Americans in Iraq recognized the problem.

While the size of the reward the British paid was important, so too was the structure of the program: it provided rewards for nearly everything and everybody. The program paid rewards both for surrenders and for information leading to captures.<sup>37</sup> Personnel who surrendered were rewarded at a rate commensurate with their importance; for instance, a surrendering platoon leader might receive double the reward provided to a surrendering platoon sergeant. Informants who provided information leading to the capture of a wanted person were given a reward equal to 75 percent of the “surrender value” of the person. Further, voluntarily surrendered insurgents who provided information still were provided rewards, but at a 50 percent discount on their “surrender value.”<sup>38</sup>

The program proved extraordinarily successful. In 1953, for instance, 372 insurgents surrendered, compared with only seventy-three captured.<sup>39</sup> During the entirety of the program, 2,702 insurgents surrendered, compared with only 1,287 captured.<sup>40</sup> Seventy percent of defectors cited the program as having influenced their decisions to defect. This number, a RAND study notes, “leaves out of account those who were captured, wounded, or killed on the basis of defector intelligence. It also ignores the profound effect which surrenders had on morale in the insurgents’ camps.”<sup>41</sup>

What can the Malayan Emergency tell us with regard to modern rewards programs? Among other lessons, three are particularly instructive. First is the program’s recognition that “large public bounties on the heads of terrorist leaders, coupled with their continued immunity from the government, were inadvertently turning them into objects of hero worship among the rank and file.” So British authorities stopped advertising maximum rewards; instead they announced base reward amounts, with the provision that the reward could be much higher.<sup>42</sup>

The second lesson learned is that rewards can generate or encourage vigilante justice—a rewards program is a modern-day “Wanted Dead or Alive” campaign.<sup>43</sup> While this would be a valid critique of the Malayan rewards program, both the DoD and DOS rewards programs are limited by statute to “nonlethal” assistance.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, the British program highlighted the “blood on the hands” issue. Should a reward be paid to an individual who has participated in acts of terrorism or violence? If so, is there a limit to the acceptable level of violence? For instance, what if, in 2002, Ayman al-Zawahiri had offered to give up Osama Bin Laden? The answers to such questions likely are situation dependent. The British in Malaya struggled with this question, modifying their position several times over

the course of the program. One commentator summarized the moral quandary as follows:

[T]o the soldiers on the ground it seemed almost surreal that “terrorists who were caught were treated like murderers, while those who surrendered were ‘treated like kings.’” That this dilemma was keenly felt by the men on the spot cannot be over-emphasized. Many argued that it was morally indefensible that a man caught with a truckload of supplies intended for the terrorists could be prosecuted and sentenced to death, whereas a terrorist with “several brutal murders to his discredit” could decide to surrender, “walk out of the jungle and get a job.”<sup>45</sup>

Reasoning that anything that brought the war to a faster conclusion was morally justified, the British in August 1950 stopped prosecuting those with “blood on their hands.”<sup>46</sup>

## MOTIVATION

### *Motivating People*

A rewards program constitutes a government attempting to entice a person to do something (provide information assistance) in exchange for an incentive (money). Understanding a person’s motivation allows the rewarding government to aim its rewards programs better, such that they produce the maximum amount of information for the minimal cost. Hugh Greene, for example, understood that the Malayan insurgents were motivated by money, and he structured the British program accordingly.

Psychologists generally categorize motivation as either internal or external.<sup>47</sup> Intrinsic motivation is internal—it arises from within the individual.<sup>48</sup> External motivation is the result of outside pressures on the individual, such as rewards and punishments.<sup>49</sup> An intrinsically motivated person receives satisfaction from the activity itself, whereas the externally motivated person receives satisfaction from the result.<sup>50</sup>

Rewards programs are external motivations designed to encourage action (providing information) toward the desired outcome. While the desired outcome is easy to understand, it is devilishly difficult to predict the behaviors that will lead to that outcome—and, by extension, the incentives that will encourage these behaviors. Many rewards programs target complex environments in which myriad internal and external motivations may be in play. Misidentifying motivations for providing information can render a rewards program ineffective quickly.

Studies by psychologists in the early 1970s were “the first of many to illustrate the paradox that extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation.”<sup>51</sup> The relationship between reward and motivation, however, is exceedingly complex. When the reward is external to the activity, for instance, numerous studies have

found that “using an extrinsic reward to motivate someone to do something that the person would have done anyway could have detrimental effects on the quality and creativity of the person’s performance and on the person’s subsequent motivation to perform the activity once the extrinsic reward was received.”<sup>52</sup> External rewards can cause people to “lose touch with their natural interests, psychological needs, and intrinsic satisfactions.”<sup>53</sup>

Edward Deci and Richard Ryan published a seminal paper on the subject in 1985. In it they argue that, in instances where “the primary significance of [the] event for [the rewardee] is that it conveys [the rewardee is] being controlled,” it will “decrease [the rewardee’s] subsequent motivation.”<sup>54</sup> This paper generated a flood of studies and papers reaching varying conclusions. A comprehensive review of the research in 1996 concluded that “(1) the detrimental effects of rewards occur under highly restricted, easily avoidable conditions; (2) mechanisms of instrumental and classical conditioning are basic for understanding incremental and detrimental effects of reward on task motivation; and (3) positive effects of rewards on performance are easily attainable using procedures derived from behavioral theory.”<sup>55</sup>

Deci and Ryan formulated their work into a theory they dubbed *cognitive evaluation theory*, which holds that “events that negatively affect a person’s autonomy or competence diminish intrinsic motivation, whereas events that support perceived autonomy and competence enhance intrinsic motivation.”<sup>56</sup> Again conducting a meta-analysis of their theory and its scholastic progeny, Deci and Ryan concluded that “tangible rewards made contingent on task behavior tend to be experienced as controlling and to undermine intrinsic motivation.”<sup>57</sup> The solution is to structure rewards that “minimize the control in the situation by making the rewards nonsalient, by using an autonomy-supportive interpersonal style, and by highlighting competence clues.”<sup>58</sup>

Surprisingly, the research that Deci and his colleagues conducted came up with findings that were even more unexpected with regard to the person providing the reward. In a study of teachers and students and the effects of rewards on performance, the researchers found that teachers who endorsed the concept of rewards for performance had a *negative* effect on their students’ performance. The researchers found that other measures of external control (e.g., grades) were “highly detrimental to . . . self-motivation.” A further conclusion was that where external mechanisms (e.g., grades) were motivating, they often motivated the wrong behavior (e.g., a desire to get a good grade as opposed to a desire to master the material).<sup>59</sup>

Deci, Ryan, and others also have conducted a great deal of research on the separate but related issue of intrinsic versus extrinsic aspirations. RFJ and all

similar rewards programs presume that the rewards offered (money) will motivate persons to provide information. These programs offer, in effect, a promise to fulfill what Deci refers to as the “American Dream”—where “wealth and fame are believed to produce happiness and well-being.”<sup>60</sup> Unsurprisingly, this may not be the desired end state for everyone. The research suggests that “overinvestment in the extrinsic ‘having’ goals may be harmful to, rather than the foundation for, well-being and life satisfaction.”<sup>61</sup> This phenomenon appears to have cross-cultural application. Deci, Ryan, and others argue that “intrinsic pursuits such as relatedness, growth, and community are likely to directly satisfy basic psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence[,] . . . [while] placing heavy emphasis on pursuit of extrinsic goals and rewards such as money . . . can provide only indirect satisfaction of these basic needs and may actually distract from or interfere with their fulfillment.”<sup>62</sup>

Identifying the importance of intrinsic motivation is only half the equation; it is equally important to understand how to structure a rewards program to target intrinsic motivation. With regard to the latter, there are, of course, various schools of thought. Adherents of cognitive evaluation theory hold that “intrinsic motivation springs from two innate sources (the need for competence and the need for self-determination).”<sup>63</sup>

The psychologist Abraham H. Maslow provides another perspective. Maslow theorized that humans are driven by wants and needs—specifically, unsatisfied needs.<sup>64</sup> Satisfied needs, Maslow argued, do not motivate behavior. Maslow organized all needs in a hierarchy and theorized that the needs at each level must be satisfied in full before the individual will be motivated by higher-order needs. At the base level are physiological needs (breathing, food, water, etc.), followed by safety (of self, family, food, property, etc.), love (friendship, family), esteem (confidence, achievement, respect, etc.), and finally self-actualization.<sup>65</sup> In other words, if a person is starving, his or her entire motivation for action will be to satisfy that unsatisfied need.

Interestingly, a study of the U.S.–South Vietnamese rewards program Chieu Hoi found that the program attracted defectors, “since it provided for all their needs such as shelter, food, medical care, clothing, and also saved them from the threat of the US army.”<sup>66</sup> Soldiers, Vietcong or otherwise, are not motivated by other needs until these fundamental needs are met. Once that level of need is satisfied, the individual is motivated by subsequent unfulfilled needs at higher levels of the hierarchy. Unsurprisingly, a RAND study of the British rewards-for-information program in the Malayan Emergency found that “[u]ntil the government could provide a defector or informer the protection he needed, the program got nowhere.”<sup>67</sup>

### *Motivating Informants*

Applying Maslow's model to a rewards paradigm produces some interesting insights. Take, for example, a farmer living in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas who knows the location of Sirajuddin Haqqani and the existence of a reward for him. The farmer realizes that his life will be upended if he provides the information about Haqqani—doing so has the potential to disrupt his hierarchy of needs. Being a rational person, the farmer will weigh that potential cost (disruption) against the benefits of providing the information (cash). A cash reward can provide for the basic needs (e.g., food, water, shelter, clothing). Then the farmer will consider his other needs, specifically his personal and financial security.

Here is where the current rewards systems break down. The farmer recognizes that his personal security will be threatened once he provides information against the Taliban—a concern that will be heightened if he is paid an in-kind reward (e.g., a new goat suddenly shows up on his doorstep). He quickly realizes that a reward cannot guarantee physical security, so his only realistic option would be to move away. The DoD rewards program acknowledges this problem, noting in the case of Iraq that “[l]arge reward amounts for the Iraqi people primarily provide an expeditious means to leave the country, and an average citizen and their family are at risk if they come into a sizeable amount of U.S. dollars.”<sup>68</sup> Moving away, however, would disrupt the farmer's familial relationships and his sense of belonging in the community. His attention then will shift to whether and how a reward can fill these unsatisfied hierarchical needs. Current rewards programs provide nothing in this regard; not only do they fail to fulfill an informant's unsatisfied needs, but they have the potential to disrupt needs that currently are fulfilled.

Another interesting case study is the Taliban foot soldier living day to day in the same camp as Sirajuddin Haqqani. How can a rewards program incentivize him? Or, viewed another way, what is motivating the soldier *not* to provide information? To answer this question, it can be instructive to look at what put the foot soldier in the camp in the first place. To recruit a member successfully, the Taliban must be able at a minimum to convince him that it can satisfy his basic needs (e.g., food, water, and shelter). If the recruit is truly destitute and starving, this may be the only motivation he needs. The Taliban offers further incentives to motivate behavior, such as a sense of belonging, friendship, recognition, self-esteem, and even the prospect of self-actualization.

To motivate the foot soldier to give up his comrade, friend, or leader or to quit the Taliban, the rewarding agent must be able to satisfy these needs of the reward recipient that suddenly no longer will be fulfilled once he takes action against the Taliban. In a study of the Chieu Hoi program, researchers found that the reasons cited most frequently for defecting were “the physical hardships, the economic

needs of the family back home, the desire to evade criticism or punishment, fear of death, and homesickness.”<sup>69</sup> The British in Malaya distributed “thousands of leaflets carrying photographs showing healthy-looking [former insurgents], apparently happy and reunited with their families.”<sup>70</sup>

In contrast, the U.S. programs, as currently structured, fail to satisfy even the most basic need of personal safety. Proponents of the program would argue that the cash payment allows the recipient to move to ensure his and his family’s security. This argument assumes they have the ability and desire to travel. There also may be physical, bureaucratic, and political impediments (e.g., health, passports, visas, finding a new home country that will take them) that would prevent such individuals from traveling. But even assuming a rewardee and his family can and will travel, when they move away from their community the hierarchical needs that community formerly supplied (love, esteem, achievement, etc.) no longer will be fulfilled.

Like the hypothetical farmer, the foot soldier is a rational actor who will weigh the benefits and costs of providing the information. Unless the reward can mitigate the disruption to his hierarchy of needs, the reward will do little to motivate him. With regard to awards, Professor John Esposito has noted that “[y]ou have to be sure that people are protected . . . , because in order for the system to work well, there should be complete anonymity.”<sup>71</sup>

It is worth noting that Maslow’s theory does not apply perfectly to this subject. Organizations rooted in religious doctrine have the capacity to attract adherents who are willing to forgo basic needs in exchange for self-actualization. A monk, for example, may be willing to forgo physical comfort and secular community acceptance in a quest for spiritual fulfillment. Al Qaeda may attract individuals willing to forgo the fulfillment of basic needs such as physical safety in exchange for self-actualization (i.e., martyrdom). Maslow’s hierarchy provides little guidance about how to motivate such individuals.

Yet despite the gaps in Maslow’s theory, it provides a relevant and useful illustration of a fundamental point: in most instances, money alone will not motivate people to provide information if their personal safety cannot be guaranteed.

On the broader point of applying psychological models to the structuring of rewards programs: no model can provide the details. Even if one accepts that rewards must address hierarchies of needs, those needs are very situation dependent. Consider two hypotheticals. In the first, the informant is a U.S./Afghan citizen whose family lives in the United States; in the second, the informant is an Afghan citizen whose family lives in Afghanistan. The needs of these two individuals are different. Similarly, programs have to be adapted to the cultural environment in which they are implemented. Wisely, the DoD rewards program in Afghanistan is based on Afghan culture.<sup>72</sup>

### *Program Models*

*Minimizing the Reward Profile.* Given the issues addressed above, consideration should be given to approaches that address these issues. The first approach would seek to provide rewards in a way that minimizes the conspicuousness of the reward. A minimized-profile rewards approach provides the dual benefits of reducing threats to an informant's safety and reducing the appearance of control, to avoid undermining intrinsic motivation. Various methods are available to minimize a reward's profile. For instance, rather than soliciting information from individuals, information can be solicited from and rewards paid through organizations (neighborhoods, companies, government agencies), with the organization reaping the benefits collectively in the form of in-kind rewards.

Providing rewards across a large organization significantly reduces the threat of retribution, thereby reducing individual members' concerns for their safety. Naturally, under this reward paradigm, the organization as an entity will reap a greater short-term reward than the individual members of the organization; the owners of a factory, for instance, benefit from a new piece of equipment. The long-term benefit, however, accrues to everyone: a more productive business leads to economic stability and long-term security.

Another method would be to provide rewards in the form of annuitized payments. Rather than being paid in a lump sum that would increase scrutiny on the informant, the reward would come in small payments over a long span of time (e.g., a few dollars a week for many years). A related tool could be the use of "micro" rewards. A micro rewards program would seek small bits of seemingly inconsequential information. The idea is that the information requested would be so innocuous that it would not cause the informant any of the concern about potential disruption to his life that might result from giving up more-significant information. For instance, how many cars pass a given intersection in a given day? When was the last time you saw somebody in the village you did not know? The key to this program is the relative anonymity of the rewarding party's involvement in the program and restricting the requests to very low-level, seemingly innocuous information. The downside to this model is the possible flood of information, much of which will be useless.

On this point, a relevant case study concerns a competition that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) sponsored in 2009. DARPA was interested in exploring how social networking can be applied to solving problems. For the competition, it required participating teams/individuals to find "10 8-foot balloons moored at ten fixed locations in the continental United States."<sup>73</sup> Just before the competition began, the balloons were floated surreptitiously at random locations in nine states. The winning team found all ten balloons in less



than nine hours. Its performance beat that of the other four thousand participating teams so roundly that it shocked DARPA, which had scheduled the competition to last two weeks.<sup>74</sup>

This case study is interesting and relevant for two reasons. Critical to the winning team's success was its ability to work through thousands of tips in an extremely short period. Over the course of the competition, the four thousand teams' social networks were churning out significant amounts of information; indeed, many of the teams engaged in disinformation campaigns intended to mislead other teams. Despite this, the winning team was able to parse all the information coming in and separate the quality information from the useless or misleading.<sup>75</sup> This demonstrates that there is a mechanism that can be applied to a problem set such as this, allowing the user to evaluate lots of small bits of information and identify the valuable ones.

Furthermore, the DARPA competition itself could provide a model for rewards programs. The key to the winning team's success was its incentive structure. DARPA offered a total of forty thousand dollars in prize money. The winning team allocated this evenly among the ten balloons, giving each a "value" of four thousand dollars. Two thousand dollars went to the person who found each balloon. This was hardly unique; most other participating teams offered some reward for finding balloons. What set the winning team apart is that it then gave one thousand dollars to the person who had referred the balloon finder to the team's website (if there was no referral, the finder received two thousand dollars and the other two thousand dollars went to charity). Then the team gave five hundred dollars to the person who referred the referrer, \$250 to the person who referred that person, and so on.<sup>76</sup>

This diffuse incentive structure essentially propagated itself over existing social networks: people were incentivized to get as many friends working for the winning team as possible. The speed with which this propagated itself is remarkable. Each of the five members of the team sent out an e-mail explaining the competition and the incentive structure. Within forty-eight hours, team members had five thousand people signed up to assist them.<sup>77</sup> This likely could be replicated to address any discrete problem or pursue any piece of information. While networked computers, e-mail, and websites make this incentive structure easier to manage and propagate, it could be done in the absence of computers through phone networks or even word of mouth. The British rewards-for-information program employed a similar model, paying members of the public a cash reward for assisting terrorists in surrendering.

The minimized-profile rewards model is not without its downsides. Substantially increasing the number of rewards paid greatly complicates management of the program. Rewards must be tracked and paid. Regardless of the sophistication

of the algorithm used to sort the data, each piece of the data would have to be entered into the system. Further, providing small payments over a long period creates an ongoing concern for the safety of the informant.

*Maximizing the Reward Package.* A program that minimizes the reward profile seeks to satisfy an informant's need for security by keeping the reward clandestine. An alternative model would address this need by maximizing the reward. *Maximizing* does not refer to the dollar value of the reward; as noted above, money alone rarely satisfies a person's psychological needs, and may have the opposite effect. Rather, *maximizing* refers to a program that creates award packages that, along with providing monetary rewards, also ensure the informant's safety.

In a rare congressional hearing on RFJ, Representative Brad Sherman noted that after giving the United States information, some informants "might find their country of origin to be a dangerous place."<sup>78</sup> He asked DOS's Robert A. Hartung whether the department has the authority to provide visas as part of the reward. After some back-and-forth, Sherman summed up the issue: "But if we really provided the fine print on the Web site the way you would in a securities offering, we would have to asterisk and say whether or not we help you avoid death is subject to our sole determination as to whether you are in danger[;] and whether or not we can let you live in the United States, even if we think that is necessary for your protection, is subject to the determination of other agencies."<sup>79</sup>

The most obvious maximized rewards package would combine a cash award with the guarantee of a new identity and permanent residency in another location. The RAND report on the Chieu Hoi program found that one of the major deficiencies of the program was a failure to "aid [defectors'] reintegration into South Vietnam."<sup>80</sup> While informants today are relocated in some instances, a potential informant may not know this, or may not want to entrust his safety to the bureaucratic vagaries of the rewards system. Thus, the State Department should advertise the possibility of visa packages, citizenship, and similar benefits.

Further, the broader the incentive package, the more psychological needs it will fulfill. For instance, money and moving expenses may satisfy an informant's physiological and safety needs, but accepting them obliterates the fulfilling of needs that his family and community currently perform. Moving the family with the informant satisfies a portion of the informant's needs, but fails to address needs that the community satisfies (a sense of belonging, self-esteem, respect, etc.). A maximized reward would protect the informant and his immediate family, plus his extended family, his close friends, or both. For example, rather than paying a ten-million-dollar reward and moving five people, the rewards package might pay five million dollars and move a dozen people. The greater the chance that an informant can live safely with his family and friends, the greater the chance the informant will consider coming forward.

### *Implications for the Commander*

While commanders on the ground have no control over the structure or administration of DOS's RFJ program, they should be aware of the program's existence—and its limitations. Commanders may well find themselves in circumstances in which they are recommending a reward from RFJ. Further, DoD regulations require coordination between DOS and the combatant commanders on rewards programs.<sup>81</sup>

Combatant command staffs should structure their rewards programs to allow for minimized-profile rewards. Commanders on the ground should think of ways to minimize rewards' profiles while considering the various negative aspects of the rewards-for-information programs. Finally, all users of the DoD rewards program should track rewards given and information provided rigorously so the effectiveness of a program can be measured objectively.

Rewards programs plainly have a role in a counterterrorism fight. The British program in Malaya provides a powerful example of a dynamic rewards program, one carefully constructed to target the motivation of the targeted individuals. Several factors contributed to the success of the British program, foremost a keen understanding of the motivational and cultural components of the program and a willingness to adapt the program continually to changing circumstances.

The U.S. rewards programs have tremendous potential. They are firmly established, well organized, and well funded. It is also clear that rewards can yield information leading to the capture of terrorists. Where programs focus on "success" rather than effectiveness, however, their full potential is left unrealized. All rewards programs would benefit from objective evaluations and functional definitions of success that take into account the benefits and costs of a given program. The work that psychologists have produced since the 1970s provides a useful model from which to construct a better rewards program—or, at a minimum, a good place to begin the conversation on how best to employ rewards to catch more terrorists.

---

#### NOTES

1. The program most recently has offered rewards for five senior leaders of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, sometimes known as ISIS.
2. U.S. State Dept., "Rewards for Justice Program," *U.S. Department of State: Diplomacy in Action*, [www.state.gov/](http://www.state.gov/).
3. A search on EBSCOhost returned two articles in peer-reviewed journals that mention "Rewards for Justice," and then only in passing. A search on JSTOR returned a single article, again mentioning the program in passing. A search on Google Scholar returned several articles referencing "Rewards for Justice," but no piece critically examining the program. A search on Westlaw found five court cases and forty-two law review articles that mention

- the phrase. Of these forty-seven instances, all except a handful mention the program in passing.
4. Rewards for Information Concerning Terrorist Acts, Pub. L. No. 98-533, 98 Stat. 2706 (1984).
  5. U.S. State Dept., “About RFJ—Program Overview,” *Rewards for Justice*, www.rewardsforjustice.net/.
  6. Ibid.
  7. U.S. Defense Dept., *Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation*, DoD 7000.14-R (Washington, DC: Under Secretary of Defense [Comptroller], 2012), vol. 12, chap. 17.
  8. Secretary of the Army, *Commander’s Guide to Money as a Weapons System: Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures*, No. 09-27 (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Center for Army Lessons Learned, April 2009).
  9. U.S. State Dept., “About RFJ—Frequently Asked Questions—How Effective Is RFJ?,” *Rewards for Justice*, www.rewardsforjustice.net/.
  10. There are contradicting reports on whether a reward was paid for the information that led to the capture of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. The RFJ website does not indicate a reward was paid.
  11. U.S. State Dept., “Acts of Terror,” *Rewards for Justice*, www.rewardsforjustice.net/.
  12. Alex Knapp, “How Much Does It Cost to Find a Higgs Boson?,” *Forbes/Tech*, July 5, 2012, www.forbes.com/.
  13. *The Effectiveness of Federal Employee Incentive Programs: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring, and the District of Columbia of the S. Comm. on Government Affairs*, 106th Cong. (May 2, 2000) (statement of Michael Brostek, Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, General Government Division, U.S. General Accounting Office), available at www.gpo.gov/; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Tax Whistleblowers: Incomplete Data Hinders IRS’s Ability to Manage Claim Processing Time and Enhance External Communication*, GAO-11-683 (Washington, DC: August 2011), available at www.gao.gov/; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Implementation of Financial Incentive Programs under Federal Fraud and Abuse Laws*, GAO-12-355 (Washington, DC: March 30, 2012), available at www.gao.gov/.
  14. *The Effectiveness of Federal Employee Incentive Programs* (Brostek statement), p. 88.
  15. The majority of wanted persons are located in the tribal areas of Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, the southern Philippines, Somalia, and Syria. See generally U.S. State Dept., *Rewards for Justice*.
  16. The possibility of this outcome is expressly discussed in DoD’s guidance for its rewards program. “[A]n average citizen and their family are at risk if they come into a sizeable amount of U.S. dollars.” *Multinational Forces Iraq, Money as a Weapon System (MAAWS)* (January 26, 2009), p. D-2.
  17. Thomas E. Ricks, “Military Plays Up Role of Zarqawi,” washingtonpost.com, April 10, 2006; Mary Anne Weaver, “The Short, Violent Life of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi,” *The Atlantic* (July/August 2006).
  18. *Multinational Forces Iraq, Money as a Weapon System (MAAWS)*, p. D-2.
  19. David McKittrick et al., *Lost Lives: The Stories of the Men, Women and Children Who Died as a Result of the Northern Ireland Troubles* (Edinburgh, U.K.: Mainstream, 2001), p. 599.
  20. *The Effectiveness of Federal Employee Incentive Programs* (Brostek statement).
  21. Paige Cornwell, “FBI’s Bus Ads Taken Down over Muslim/Terrorist Stereotyping,” *Seattle Times*, June 26, 2013, available at www.seattletimes.com/.
  22. The other major flaw was the fixed reward structure, which British officials felt “did not truly stipulate a ‘proper relationship’ between the amount paid and ‘degree of risk’ incurred by the informant or ‘effort involved in elimination’ of the wanted terrorist.” Kumar Ramakrishna, “‘Bribing the Reds to Give Up’: Rewards Policy in the Malayan Emergency,” *War in History* 9, no. 3 (2002), p. 342.
  23. Theodore M. Cooperstein, “Letters of Marque and Reprisal: The Constitutional Law and Practice of Privateering,” *Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce* 40, no. 221 (April 2009), pp. 221–59.

24. See, for example, the Cruisers and Convoys Act of 1708, discussed in John H. Owen, *War at Sea under Queen Anne: 1702–1708* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1938), app. F.
25. By mid-1946, “all pretense at comity between the British and MCP collapsed, and the Communists launched a campaign of infiltration and subversion of political, social, and labour organizations.” R. W. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect: Organization of a Successful Counterinsurgency Effort*, R-957-ARPA (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, February 1972), p. 1.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
28. Ramakrishna, “Bribing the Reds to Give Up.”
29. Robert Jackson, *The Malayan Emergency: The Commonwealth’s Wars 1948–1966* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 13.
30. Andrew Mumford, *The Counter-insurgency Myth: The British Experience of Irregular Warfare* (New York: Routledge, 2012).
31. The Briggs Plan is not a perfect analogy, because it sought both defectors and information. The plan remains instructive, as the psychological factors resulting in defection or information are the same.
32. Jackson, *The Malayan Emergency*, p. 109.
33. The plan was “both ambiguous and disingenuous—ambiguous because terrorists who wanted to leave the jungle were not clear what degree of involvement in capital crimes constituted culpability in the eyes of the police; disingenuous because police brutality against captured terrorists . . . did not inspire confidence on the part of [defectors] that the government would treat them even-handedly if they gave themselves up.” Ramakrishna, “Bribing the Reds to Give Up,” p. 337.
34. “In the conditions which existed, and still exist, in many parts of the country the only human emotion which can be expected to be stronger than fear among a terrorised population with very little civic consciousness is greed.” H. Carleton Greene, “Report on Emergency Information Service, September 1950–September 1951,” September 14, 1951, ref. KV 4/408, The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.
35. Ramakrishna, “Bribing the Reds to Give Up,” p. 334.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 333, citing Richard Clutterbuck, *Conflict and Violence in Singapore and Malaysia, 1945–1983* (Singapore: Graham Brashe, 1984), p. 243.
37. British authorities preferred defectors over information leading to the capture or killing of a wanted individual, and advertised accordingly.
38. Greene, “Report on Emergency Information Service.”
39. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect*, p. 74.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Kumar Ramakrishna, *Emergency Propaganda: The Winning of Malayan Hearts and Minds 1948–1958* (Richmond, U.K.: Curzon, 2002), p. 157.
43. Thomas A. Martin, “International Bounty Hunters in the War on Terror: Abuse and Accountability,” May 1, 2011, available at [ssrn.com/](http://ssrn.com/); Ryan P. Logan, “The Detainee Treatment Act of 2005: Embodying U.S. Values to Eliminate Detainee Abuse by Civilian Contractors and Bounty Hunters in Afghanistan and Iraq,” *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* 39, no. 5 (2009).
44. “The Secretary of Defense may pay rewards to persons for providing U.S. Government personnel . . . with information or non-lethal assistance.” U.S. Defense Dept., *Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation*, vol. 12, chap. 17. “The Attorney General may reward any individual who furnishes information.” Rewards for Information Concerning Terrorist Acts, Pub. L. No. 98-533, 98 Stat. 2706 (1984).
45. Ramakrishna, “Bribing the Reds to Give Up,” pp. 351–52.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Robin M. Hogarth, *Educating Intuition* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. 76–77; Thomas L. Good and Jere Brophy, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5th ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995).
48. Hogarth, *Educating Intuition*, pp. 76–77; Good and Brophy, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*.

49. Hogarth, *Educating Intuition*, pp. 76–77; Good and Brophy, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*.
50. Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, “When Rewards Compete with Nature: The Undermining of Intrinsic Motivation and Self-regulation,” in *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*, ed. Carol Sansone and Judith M. Harackiewicz (San Diego: Academic, 2000), p. 16.
51. Carol Sansone and Judith M. Harackiewicz, “Looking beyond Rewards: The Problem and Promise of Intrinsic Motivation,” in *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation*, ed. Sansone and Harackiewicz, p. 2.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
53. Ryan and Deci, “When Rewards Compete with Nature,” p. 37.
54. Sansone and Harackiewicz, “Looking beyond Rewards,” p. 4.
55. *Ibid.*; Fred Luthans and Alexander D. Stajkovic, “Reinforce for Performance: The Need to Go beyond Pay and Even Rewards,” *Academy of Management Executive* 13, no. 2 (May 1999), pp. 49–57.
56. Ryan and Deci, “When Rewards Compete with Nature,” p. 17.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 32–33.
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
62. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45.
63. Judy Cameron and W. David Pierce, *Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation: Resolving the Controversy* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 2002), p. 39.
64. Abraham H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, 3rd ed. (New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 15–29.
65. *Ibid.*
66. Tal Tovoy, “Learning from the Past for Present Counterinsurgency Conflicts: The Chieu Hoi Program as a Case Study,” *Armed Forces & Society* 38, no. 1 (April 7, 2011), p. 152.
67. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect*, p. 74.
68. Multinational Forces Iraq, *Money as a Weapon System (MAAWS)*, p. D-2.
69. J. M. Carrier and C. A. H. Thomson, *Viet Cong Motivation and Morale: The Special Case of Chieu Hoi*, RM-4830-2-ISA/ARPA (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1966), p. xi.
70. Ramakrishna, “Bribing the Reds to Give Up,” p. 338.
71. Vanessa Barford and Virginia Brown, “Do Rewards Help Capture the World’s Most Wanted Men?” *BBC News*, August 25, 2011, [www.bbc.com/](http://www.bbc.com/).
72. U.S. Forces Afghanistan, *Money as a Weapons System Afghanistan (MAAWS-A)*, USFOR-A Pub. 1-06 (n.p.: February 13, 2012), p. 50.
73. “We Have a Winner! MIT Red Balloon Challenge Team,” *DARPA Network Challenge*, [archive.darpa.mil/](http://archive.darpa.mil/).
74. Lance Whitney, “MIT Floats Ideas in DARPA Balloon Challenge (Q&A),” *CNET*, December 8, 2009, [www.cnet.com/](http://www.cnet.com/).
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. *The State Department’s Rewards Programs: Performance and Potential: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the Comm. on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives*, 112th Cong. (March 12, 2012) (testimony of Robert A. Hartung, Assistant Director, Threat Investigations and Analysis Directorate, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Department of State), available at [www.gpo.gov/](http://www.gpo.gov/).
79. *Ibid.*
80. Austin Long, *On “Other War”: Lessons from Five Decades of RAND Counterinsurgency Research* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2006), p. 47.
81. U.S. Defense Dept., *Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation*, vol. 12, chap. 17, §170202.



## RESEARCH & DEBATE

---

### STRATEGIC CULTURE IS NOT A SILVER BULLET

*Antulio J. Echevarria II*

Frank Hoffman's review essay "Strategic Culture and Ways of War: Elusive Fiction or Essential Concept?," which appeared in the Spring 2017 issue of the *Naval War College Review*, has mischaracterized my argument regarding strategic culture and, more generally, has misrepresented my book *Reconsidering the American Way of War*. I therefore would like to clarify both—my position on American

strategic culture and the purpose of my book—for this journal's readers. Frank Hoffman and I have agreed on many issues over the years, and I appreciate the time he put into generating a detailed review essay; yet we clearly have our differences.

On the question of strategic culture, I certainly do believe that culture is important and that we should try to understand it—ours and others'. But there are huge risks in doing so, and buyers need to be aware of them before they buy. Since Jack Snyder introduced the concept in 1977, the study of strategic culture has grown into an almost-desperate search for a silver bullet, a cure-all: if we could just fix American strategic culture, we could cure U.S. strategic thinking. But the concept has taken on a life of its own—and not a good one. The concept's proponents have failed to exercise discipline when defining it, and they have employed it too enthusiastically, without a critical eye or a healthy dose of skepticism. Buyers need to

*Professor Antulio J. Echevarria II is the editor of the U.S. Army War College quarterly, Parameters. He holds a doctorate in modern history from Princeton University, and is the author of five books—After Clausewitz: German Military Thinkers before the Great War (University Press of Kansas, 2001), Clausewitz and Contemporary War (Oxford University Press, 2007), Imagining Future War: The West's Technological Revolution and Visions of Wars to Come, 1880–1914 (Praeger, 2007), Reconsidering the American Way of War (Georgetown University Press, 2014), and Military Strategy: A Very Short Introduction (Oxford University Press, 2017)—as well as numerous articles and monographs on strategic thinking, military theory, and military history. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and the U.S. Army War College. He also has completed a NATO Fulbright Fellowship, and was a visiting research fellow at Oxford University in 2011–12. Echevarria also held the Elihu Root Chair of Military Studies at the U.S. Army War College. He currently is working on a book about the nature of America's modern wars for Cambridge University Press.*

*Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4*



know there are ample historical examples to prove almost any theory of strategic culture—as well as its opposite.

In their enthusiasm to find a cure for U.S. strategic thinking, the concept's proponents merely have paid lip service to the difficulty of defining it, then have moved swiftly on to advancing their own theories. Most of these definitions are arbitrary, not based on rigorous inductive analysis. This problem is a critical one for any social science, because if a concept cannot be defined inductively, it cannot be studied scientifically. Unfortunately, the terms *culture* and *strategic culture* have become all but ubiquitous, encompassing virtually any conceivable variable that possibly could influence a key leader's decision. Worse, the concept has become highly politicized. It is now a political catchall for every policy aim or military approach one party does not like, particularly when a war is under way, and at the same time it serves as a means to advance each party's own agendas.

Consequently, no generalizable conclusion nor observation can be drawn from the many studies of strategic culture that have proliferated over the years. In short, the field is in disarray precisely because most scholars are self-defining strategic culture, which means there is no conceptual foundation on which to build knowledge.

While this state of affairs is an academic's dream, it is a policy and military practitioner's nightmare. Academics earn their credentials and build their reputations by developing unique or contending interpretations—by challenging the status quo. But practitioners need more than unique theories, because they must bear the heavy burden of responsibility: they must decide whether to put lives and treasure at risk, and they are held accountable when things go wrong. This is not to say that academics are irresponsible; the good ones are not. But even the good ones never have to order people into harm's way; that means academics can afford to be experimental in their thinking and to advance ideas that are not quite ready for prime time. Practitioners, on the other hand, can benefit from the intellectual stimulus that such cutting-edge ideas afford. But when it comes to choosing courses of action that might have to be sold to Congress and to the public, they need concepts that have a reasonably solid foundation, especially when the stakes are high. Sadly, that is not the case with strategic culture. My argument in *Reconsidering the American Way of War* is simply that no scholar yet has made a truly compelling case for an American strategic culture, and thus it remains too nebulous and unreliable for the realities that policy and military practitioners typically face.

I am all for self-critical analysis, and I have written on that topic a great deal over the years. Critical thinking is the practitioner's best ally. But to solve a problem we first must understand what it is. In this case, it is not clear that we do. The problem is that the American way of war has had many more successes than

failures. The differential in favor of successes is quite significant and it applies to all kinds of wars—large, small, and in between. That needs to be explained. But existing theories of strategic culture cannot do so. The problems inherent in the concept obscure not only what is wrong with U.S. strategic thinking but how to fix it.

With regard to the overall purpose of *Reconsidering the American Way of War*, I endeavored to make that clear in the book's introduction, but perhaps I should have been more explicit. In contrast to Russell Weigley's 1973 classic *The American Way of War*, which focused mainly on our strategic theories and ideas, my aim was to look for *patterns* in the way we actually practiced war. The history of ideas has fallen out of vogue for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the gap that always exists between what people say they are doing or going to do and what they actually do. I decided to close this gap, at least in part, between Weigley's *American Way of War* as a history of ideas and the many narrative histories we already have that tell us what happened. In a sense, I played Marx to Weigley's Hegel in an effort to identify any consistent patterns in our approach to doing, rather than merely thinking about, war.

Accordingly, the book's chapters are short. It was unnecessary to describe every battle or engagement in detail; such descriptions already exist in hundreds, if not thousands, of other works. The readers of this journal likely know where to find them. Some of our largest and longest wars have been characterized by the application of strategic patterns that represented no significant changes; hence, there was no need to drag out the discussions of those conflicts. The book includes details only insofar as they affected the general pattern (or patterns) that drove a conflict. Moreover, the chapters are designed for a staff college or war college curriculum that likely would include other readings. I regret not including maps in the book, as they would have made the patterns more obvious to the reader, but the publisher vetoed that idea because it would have driven the cost of the book too high. However, the West Point military atlases serve the purpose and are available free online.

My analysis of U.S. military practice uncovered six basic patterns of military strategy in our wars: annihilation, attrition, exhaustion, decapitation, coercion, and deterrence. Interestingly, instead of overwhelming kinetic force, as Hoffman and others argue, the strategic pattern that emerges most frequently in our way of war is decapitation—the idea of replacing a leader whom we do not like with one we do, through kinetic or nonkinetic means or some combination of the two. There are various concrete reasons for the recurrence of this pattern, which I discuss in the book and thus will not repeat here. But, once again, this observation points to the gap between what we say we do strategically and what we actually do, or attempt to do, in practice.

To sum up, my argument is not that we do not have a strategic culture, or that culture itself is not important; my point is that strategic culture is not the silver bullet its proponents want it to be. Whatever American strategic culture is, was, or might be, it is too elusive to pin down. Nor can we compare it to its British or Russian counterpart to identify what is uniquely American about our way of war versus what has been imported from elsewhere, or which aspects really are driven by the conditions and requirements of warfare—modern industrial-age warfare and its reliance on wholesale attrition, for instance—rather than a general culture. To be sure, Americans do have a way of battle, as I have said elsewhere. It is also true that the evolution of operational art over the twentieth century has hampered the U.S. military’s ability to think strategically. But these conditions were not always true. I am working on a book now that will offer one defensible explanation for how and why our major failures and successes occurred. I would be very pleased to have it reviewed in this journal.

## REVIEW ESSAYS

---

### THE CASE FOR HARD POWER

*Dov S. Zakheim*

*The Big Stick: The Limits of Soft Power & the Necessity of Military Force*, by Eliot A. Cohen. New York: Basic Books, 2016. 285 pages. \$27.99.

Eliot Cohen's *The Big Stick* is a well-crafted paean to muscular interventionism. Its central argument is that only the United States can ensure international stability; that it can do so only if it continues to maintain the military superiority that has enabled it to dominate international affairs since the Second World War; and that to be credible it must be both ready and willing to employ force even when its more narrowly defined national interests are not being challenged. The book is neither a neoconservative nor a liberal-interventionist tract. Yet it is noteworthy that these are the only two political ideologies that essentially escape Cohen's critical pen.

Cohen argues that America, and only America, can preserve global order. He recognizes that Americans are war weary; the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are well into their second decades, with no end in sight. Yet he asserts that, just as withdrawal from either country would harm American interests seriously—he notes that President Obama belatedly came to the same conclusion—so too would American reluctance to go to war whenever and wherever the international order again comes under serious threat. For that reason he rightly has very little good to say about neo-isolationism, or, to be more precise, a return to America's strategic posture prior to its entry into the First World War. It is no longer enough, he posits, to focus solely on narrow self-interests and

*Dov S. Zakheim was Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) from 2001 to 2004 and Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Planning and Resources) from 1985 to 1987.*

© 2017 by Dov S. Zakheim  
*Naval War College Review*, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4

self-defense, even if leavened by participation in the global market and membership in the United Nations. There simply are no good alternatives to American leadership. The kind of global order that a China or a Russia might impose, assuming that it has the ability to impose any order at all, would undermine the values that Americans and the citizens of their allies hold most dear.

In making his case against not only neo-isolationism but the downgrading of the centrality of force in American security policy, Cohen critiques five variations of arguments to support a modern-day version of the posture first articulated by George Washington in his Farewell Address. Cohen is highly skeptical of the case put forth by Steven A. Pinker, among others, that the world is becoming a more peaceful place and America no longer need act as the world's policeman. Cohen rightly points out that the trends that underlie Pinker's calculations are belied by the horrific number of deaths in the two world wars, in particular. Moreover, Cohen argues that a significant reason for the decline in the number and magnitude of wars since the end of the Second World War is the dominant, and generally benign, influence of the United States on the international security environment. Statecraft matters: the choices politicians make can and do mean the difference between war and peace. As he puts it, "the deliberate action of one state above all—the United States—has had something to do with the relative peacefulness of the world after 1945. . . . [I]t follows that an American decision to stop acting that way could yield a far nastier twenty-first century than the one Pinker expects" (p. 10).

A prominent critic of the Trump administration during its first months in office, Cohen also assails the notion—dear to both the Clinton and Obama administrations (especially the latter)—that it was the employment of soft power that most effectively furthered American interests worldwide. *Soft power* is the concept that Harvard University professor Joseph Nye developed to describe the noncoercive ability to shape the preferences of others through the attractiveness of culture, political values, and foreign policies. Cohen does not reject the notion of soft power entirely, but his argument is that without the availability, and at crucial times the employment, of credible hard power, soft power cannot be relied on to protect America's interests and those of its allies or others whom it might wish to support. He focuses on the limits of sanctions, and offers examples to underscore his contention that soft power is not enough. Sanctions may have brought Iran to the negotiating table, but they did not put a halt to its nuclear program. Nor have sanctions stopped Russia from annexing Crimea or supporting Ukrainian separatists. Sanctions are indiscriminate, and often penalize a state's innocent populace more than its guilty leaders. Once sanctions are removed—as they were, for example, under the terms of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, better known as the Iran nuclear deal—they are almost impossible to restore.

Cohen acknowledges that sanctions are an important tool of foreign policy, and at times are highly effective, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia being prime examples. Given the limitations of sanctions, however, Cohen feels that hard power needs to be mustered to assure the United States that its policy goals will be met; in the case of Iran, he seems to call for a blockade of that country's shipborne commerce. He fails to examine what the Iranian reaction might be—the very second- and third-order consequences that worry him when discussing sanctions—or whether a blockade would involve the United States in yet another Middle Eastern war. Nor does he outline how hard power might be applied to prize Crimea from Vladimir Putin's clutches.

Cohen has little time for those who argue that America should not act as the world's policeman simply because of its “irreducible strategic incompetence” (p. 19). He examines several variants of their position, all of which derive from the assertion that America's wars since the Second World War have not been particularly successful. For example, some argue that America's bureaucratic “pathologies” prevent it from exploiting American military power to its greatest effect, while others go further and assert that American intervention is more destructive than salutary.

Cohen rightly notes that inaction can be as dangerous as action. Moreover, not all American wars have been failures: both the Korean War, which literally saved South Korea, and the 1991 Gulf War are very much examples to the contrary. Cohen goes further, however. Even the Vietnam War was not, in Cohen's view, a complete failure, since, as Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew put it, the war “bought time for the rest of southeast Asia.” Cohen may go too far in seeking a silver lining for the Iraq War. Perhaps, as he asserts, “the story is not yet fully written” (p. 21). Still, it is a bit much to argue for the value of removing a dictator with nuclear ambitions when those ambitions were not remotely realized, and in the face of both ongoing chaos in Iraq and Iran's increasing domination of Iraq, to a degree that would have been impossible had Saddam remained in power.

Cohen quickly puts paid to the argument, enunciated by President Obama, that the United States should concentrate on “nation building at home.” He notes that defense spending as a percentage of gross national product was considerably lower during the Obama era than during most of the Cold War, which nevertheless witnessed major domestic initiatives ranging from Medicare and Medicaid to the Clean Air Act. The Trump administration actually agrees with its predecessor that one cannot acquire both guns and butter on a massive scale, but its budget assigns a higher priority to increased defense spending at the expense of numerous domestic programs. Cohen's advocacy of higher spending for both military and nonmilitary programs reflects a cherished view common to all interventionists, whether of the neocon or the liberal variety. It is a policy that was enunciated

forcefully by the liberal Democratic senator Henry M. Jackson, a consistently strong supporter of the Vietnam War, whose acolytes include interventionists such as Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, Frank Gaffney, and Elliott Abrams.

Cohen reserves his most trenchant critique for so-called realists. He ascribes to realists the view that “the world having resolved itself [after the Second World War and the Cold War] into a more familiar pattern of competing powers, the United States has far less need to meddle in matters abroad” (p. 11). Just as Cohen cites Nye as the father of soft-power theory, so he cites John Mearsheimer as the archetypal “realist.” But whereas Nye truly did conceive of the concept with which he is associated, Mearsheimer hardly represents all, or even most, realists. After all, Mearsheimer considers interventionist foreign policy elites to be, as Cohen puts it, “the chief threat to the United States”—a position that actually mirrors the “irreducible strategic incompetence” school of thought.

More characteristic of the realist position are the views, and the actions while in office, of President George H. W. Bush, his Secretary of State James Baker, and Brent Scowcroft, his assistant to the president for national security affairs (known as the national security adviser). That team, which many consider to have constituted the most competent national security leadership since the Second World War, was hardheaded enough to play at most a limited role as the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact collapsed, and, for that matter, with regard to intervening on behalf of the Kurdish and Shia uprisings in the aftermath of the First Gulf War. Yet it did not hesitate to mass and deploy over a half million troops to push Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, or, on a far lesser scale, to invade Panama and spirit that country’s military dictator Manuel Noriega to Miami, where he was sentenced to forty years in prison. Realists, *pace* Cohen, do believe in intervention, only that it should be far more selective than what interventionists, whether of the neocon or liberal “responsibility to protect” variety, would prefer.

Cohen himself is inconsistent when writing about the Bush team’s policies: in one place (p. 5) he states that the 1991 war was an example of “ample quantities” of hard power; elsewhere (p. 32) he writes that the United States went to war “with the strong belief that it knew the lessons of Vietnam—make wars short, violent, conventional and end cleanly,” implying that otherwise Bush would not have employed hard power to save Kuwait. Yet Bush and his advisers had no way of knowing how long the war would last; in fact, they seriously overestimated the capabilities of Iraq’s forces. They also assumed that Hussein might resort to chemical weapons; they went ahead and attacked anyway. When Cohen then notes that the result of that war was an “escalating military action against a still defiant Iraq through the 1990s,” he neglects to point out that the Air Force’s operations over both northern and southern Iraq resulted in no losses and with monetary costs (not to mention human costs) that were a tiny fraction of those

incurred during the 2003 war and its ongoing aftermath. Moreover, it is Cohen himself who argues that a key element of hard power is the ongoing deployment of forces after fighting has died down, if not ended—which is exactly what Operations NORTHERN WATCH and SOUTHERN WATCH were all about.

Cohen also asserts that realists consider hydrogen bombs to be “the great equalizer of international politics” and, in effect, welcome nuclear proliferation. This too is a mischaracterization of all but the most extreme positions on this issue. Certainly the George H. W. Bush team did not take that position, nor do the vast majority of realist thinkers.

In Cohen’s view, “the most fundamental principle of contemporary realism[—] . . . that all states are alike, that they have interests, and will use power to protect and further those interests” (p. 12)—is true only to a point. He argues that “even a slight knowledge of history” would demonstrate that Hitler was not Bismarck, and that the reichsführer was prepared to go to far greater murderous lengths than the Iron Chancellor ever would have contemplated. Yet this argument is beside the point: it is the very nature of realism to recognize a threat for what it is. The British and French in the 1930s refused to recognize the threat that Hitler posed, not because they were realists, but because they were appeasers.

Finally, Cohen argues that “realists have trouble taking sub-state or trans-state actors seriously” and fail to appreciate the intangibles, such as the power of faith and ideology. Moreover, when he calls realists “coolly detached secularists themselves . . . [who] find it difficult to take seriously talk of caliphates or hidden imams” (p. 13), he appears to be referring to the so-called realism of Barack Obama, who is not, as it happens, devoid of religious instincts. Indeed, many neoconservatives as well as liberal interventionists are themselves highly secular and do not have the faintest idea regarding the religious motivation of people in other parts of the world, be they substate actors or government officials.

Cohen’s critique of realists, many of whom, such as Scowcroft, opposed the intervention in Iraq, does not mean that he views the Iraq War as an unmitigated success. Still, even as he bemoans the American missteps in addressing the aftermath of the 2003 war, he seems to grasp at any opportunity to downplay the effects of those missteps. Thus he posits that “behind the intent to overthrow the regime was a desire not so much to remake the Arab world altogether, but to inflict a blow that would shock it” (p. 35). It is not at all clear that this was the case. For some officials, the intent was indeed to remake the Arab world. For others, it was to create a liberal democracy in Iraq, which proved to be nothing more than a pipe dream. Cohen also argues that the cost of the war was far less than some have estimated. He is probably correct; but nonetheless the opportunity cost of a war that consumed at least half a trillion dollars was massive.



Finally, while Cohen admits that waterboarding and similar techniques were politically counterproductive, he argues that they “probably” yielded useful information. He is correct if referring to a case in which a prisoner had actionable intelligence about a so-called ticking bomb. Yet former military officers ranging from Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis to Senator John McCain, himself a former prisoner of war, insist that more-benign techniques would have been far more successful and would not have violated international law—the latter a point that Cohen does not address at all.

Ultimately, Cohen acknowledges that the Iraq War was “a mistake,” one that cost America dearly in terms of its alliance relationships. But, having argued so strenuously against the war’s critics, his admission seems nothing more than a grudging concession to reality.

Turning to America’s diminishing military arsenal, Cohen argues vigorously for a major naval and long-range aviation buildup, which would be the most effective way to deter China in particular. He also calls for accelerated modernization of the American strategic nuclear arsenal, on the grounds that nuclear weapons actually could be used. China, Iran, North Korea, and others are expanding their arsenals; presumably they have not ruled out employing these weapons during, or even at the start of, a conflict with an adversary.

Cohen also joins the growing call for significant reform of the Department of Defense acquisition system. And he argues for maintaining, and therefore funding, America’s network of overseas bases, which not only reassure allies but ensure that conventional conflicts will not touch American shores. None of these programmatic efforts, he argues, should come at the expense of America’s unconventional forces, which will continue to be a necessary instrument for fighting nonstate actors such as jihadists, as well as for training friendly but less developed forces. Indeed, his chapters on the threats that China, Russia, Iran, and jihadists pose provide the meat of his argument for hard power and the justification for both his policy and programmatic prescriptions.

Cohen stresses the importance of space and cyberspace, which, together with the oceans, he terms “the commons,” all of which America is best positioned to defend. And he strongly advocates investments to protect American interests in all three of those domains. He also calls for American intervention in what he labels *ungoverned space*, meaning states that have collapsed or are on the verge of doing so. He recognizes that America cannot intervene in every civil war, but seems more willing to have Washington engage in such conflicts if they take place in the Middle East than in sub-Saharan Africa.

Cohen’s final chapter is a critique of Caspar Weinberger’s oft-repeated principles regarding the use of military force, which first were enunciated in 1984. He challenges Weinberger’s assertion that the United States should not commit

forces to overseas combat unless they are protecting America's vital interests or those of its allies. He notes that American interventions in Grenada, Bosnia, and elsewhere hardly affected those vital interests. Indeed, it can be argued that America should not have intervened in Bosnia, just as it did not intervene in the far worse situations in Cambodia and Rwanda, where, since genocide was involved, the moral imperative for intervention was much stronger. But Weinberger presided over the invasion of Grenada because American citizens were being held hostage by a regime supported by Communist Cuba; surely, protection of the country's citizens is an American interest. Perhaps Weinberger's definition should now include "friends and partners" as well as allies, but the principle of national interest, broadly defined—as it was with respect to Grenada—is still sound, unless, as Cohen appears to postulate, the bar for American military intervention overseas should be considerably lower.

Cohen challenges Weinberger's second condition for intervention, which calls for "the clear intention of winning." Cohen asserts that the term *winning* is not as clear as Weinberger indicates. But Weinberger's point was that the intention should be to win; if not, what exactly should be the reason for committing American blood and treasure to an overseas adventure?

Weinberger's third point was that America should commit forces to combat only if the political and military objectives are clearly defined, and if there is a clear understanding of how those forces are to achieve those objectives. In this case, Cohen is correct that there is no way to predict the outcome of the use of force. Still, there should be a clear sense of why those forces are being committed, even if the outcome is uncertain. Indeed, it is arguable that Weinberger was fully aware of the difficulty of predicting outcomes; it is evident in his fourth maxim, that the relationship between American objectives and the forces committed to achieving them must be reassessed continually and adjusted if necessary.

Cohen claims that Weinberger's fifth principle, that the United States should not commit forces to battle without "some reasonable assurance" of popular and congressional support, "assumes too much. It is often the case that the American people lend their support to successful enterprises and turn away from unsuccessful ones" (p. 215). Cohen misunderstands Weinberger's intent; "reasonable assurance" is not a guarantee. Weinberger's point was that if there was significant doubt that congressional and popular support would last throughout the lifetime of the military intervention, one should question whether to launch it in the first place.

Finally, Cohen asserts that Weinberger's principle that committing U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort "falls apart upon close inspection" because "one always has the option of giving the enemy what it wants." It is true that appeasement is an option, but Weinberger, who was hardly an appeaser, clearly did not

see it as a viable one. Moreover, Cohen implies that the use of military force should not be a last resort, yet throughout his volume he advocates the importance of diplomacy, which the United States presumably should employ prior to committing forces overseas. In sum, it is not Weinberger's principles, which reflect the views of most realists, that are not viable; they fall apart only if one adopts Cohen's interventionist philosophy.

Cohen outlines six principles of his own, none of which really contradicts Weinberger's. His first principle is "understand your war for what it is, not what you wish it to be"; that is, avoid rigid comparisons with previous conflicts. He is correct, of course, but nowhere did Weinberger advocate "fighting the last war," or any previous kind of war, for that matter. Cohen's second principle calls for adaptability as a conflict progresses and its nature changes. In so doing he is echoing Weinberger's admonition that the relationship between wartime objectives and the forces committed to conflict calls for continual reassessment.

Cohen's third principle is that the nation must be prepared for a long war even if its objective is a short one. Weinberger's emphasis on the importance of clearly defined military objectives while stressing the need for reassessing the link between forces and objectives would appear to indicate, in agreement with Cohen, that if a war must be fought for a longer period than originally anticipated to meet national objectives, then forces must be committed to that longer-term effort.

Weinberger's six principles did not address Cohen's fourth: "while engaging in today's fight, prepare for tomorrow's challenge." However, Weinberger certainly would have agreed with Cohen; the former actually coauthored (with Peter Schweizer) an entire volume on that very subject, entitled *The Next War* (Regnery, 1996). Weinberger identified possible future conflict scenarios with China, North Korea, Iran, and Russia (all of which Cohen discusses at length) and even Japan(!) (which Cohen does not). Interestingly, the book's introduction was written by Margaret Thatcher, who as prime minister led her country in a successful war that no one anticipated, the 1982 Falklands conflict, and who herself identified yet another potential threat that Cohen addresses, that of Islamic extremists.

Weinberger also would have agreed with Cohen's fifth principle: "adroit strategy matters; perseverance usually matters more." The former Secretary of Defense simply put it differently when he asserted that "if we decide to put troops in a combat situation, we should do so wholeheartedly and with the clear intention of winning." Winning may well mean something different in the twenty-first century than in Weinberger's day, but if that is not the objective, why expect the nation to persevere?

Indeed, Cohen himself refers to winning in his final principle: "a president can launch a war; to win it, he or she must sustain congressional and popular support." Weinberger's principle on this account was not really all that different:

he simply stated that a president should not commit forces to combat “without reasonable assurance” of popular and congressional support. As already noted, “reasonable assurance” is not a cast-iron guarantee. It calls for constant monitoring to validate that assurance—exactly as Cohen requires.

That Cohen’s disagreements with Weinberger may be less substantive than he feels they are should not detract from the value of his own set of principles. Indeed, the breadth of Cohen’s book is striking, and his analyses are always cogent. Finally, agree with him or not, Cohen makes one of the strongest cases on record for a robust interventionist policy. If for no other reason, his book should be required reading for analysts, strategists, and policy makers when they evaluate options for strengthening what is perceived widely as America’s currently diminished influence on the world stage.

## OPTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY PRACTITIONERS' ADVICE FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Sam J. Tangredi

*Charting a Course: Strategic Choices for a New Administration*, edited by Richard D. Hooker Jr. Washington, DC: National Defense Univ. Press, 2016. Available at [ndupress.ndu.edu/](http://ndupress.ndu.edu/). 381 pages.

*Charting a Course* is a compendium of analyses and recommendations from the scholar-fellows of the Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS), the primary research center of National Defense University (NDU), along with a few individuals from NDU colleges. It is the result of a yearlong project to address defense and foreign policy issues in a manner useful to an incoming presidential administration. It aims to make new officeholders aware of the facts and nuances the popular media often overlook. As might be expected, most of the INSS fellows are also practitioners with considerable government experience. Thus, the volume is more than a theory-based academic report; it incorporates a healthy dose of the art of the practical. It is also honest, the editor and authors admitting up front that “[w]e see no silver bullets, no elegant solutions to the complex problems we face” (p. xiii). Rather, it focuses on insights and options.

Editor Richard Hooker, director of INSS, leads off with the expected introduction to the book’s seventeen chapters, but it raises some interesting issues that the reader needs to keep in mind while reading the rest of the book. Particularly noteworthy is the question whether we can continue to treat the reemerging great powers of Russia and China as “simultaneously benign partners and aggressive adversaries” (p. ix). Hooker suggests that this divergent approach—seeking political or economic cooperation from nations that refuse to accept global norms—

makes it hard to develop a coherent strategy or respond to their actions in a consistent manner.

On a broader level, Hooker’s individual work, “American Grand Strategy” (chapter 1), seeks to refute the charge that the United States does not have a grand strategy. While admitting that no formal grand strategy document exists, he maintains that the core interests of the United States and its means of securing them have been consistent throughout America’s history as a world power.

*Dr. Sam J. Tangredi is professor of national, naval, and maritime strategy in the Center for Naval Warfare Studies of the Naval War College. His career in the U.S. Navy included command at sea and numerous assignments in strategic planning and international relations. In addition to over one hundred journal articles, he has published five books; the most recent are Anti-access Warfare: Countering A2/AD Strategies (Naval Institute Press, 2013) and, as editor, The U.S. Naval Institute on Naval Cooperation (Naval Institute Press, 2015).*

Naval War College Review, Autumn 2017, Vol. 70, No. 4

However, his definition of the term is essentially military and practical: “the use of all instruments of national power to secure the state” (p. 1). Others might wonder where messianic efforts to promote global democracy—which historians such as Walter A. MacDougall (in *Promised Land, Crusader State*) charge have been the dominant U.S. foreign policy since the 1880s—fit into Hooker’s construct; but they do not. Hooker proceeds in a highly rational manner, assessing potential actions in terms of ends, ways, and means, as befits someone with experience on the National Security Council (NSC) staff. But if only political decision making—and its end results—were that rational!

The following sixteen chapters break nicely into the two categories of functional (future conflict, defense policy, defense budget, national security reform, weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and cyber policy) and regional (Asia-Pacific, NATO/Europe, Russia, Middle East, South Asia, Africa, Latin America, central Asia, and the high north / Arctic). The “swim lanes” are therefore well established, eliminating both the overlaps and gaps that are typical in edited volumes of individual contributions. Overall, the book is well organized and superior, in terms of balance, to many other academic compendiums.

It is impossible in limited space to review every chapter; most have important takeaway ideas that could provoke many an enlightened discussion. But necessity focuses the spotlight onto those with the most original and powerful insights.

Chapter 2, “The Future of Conflict” by Thomas X. Hammes, has a fine discussion of nonstate military actors, hybrid warfare, and the proliferation of technologies, about which he has written in the past. But it also suggests that the “return of mass to the battlefield” and the “return of mobilization” will be features of future wars, two elements that strategists have discounted recently. In Hammes’s construction, *mobilization* refers more to industrial production than to manpower. Obviously, the wars he envisions will not be the short ones that many senior military leaders seem to expect.

Frank G. Hoffman’s “U.S. Defense Policy and Strategy” (chapter 3) is similarly well written. He too advises decision makers to “prepare for longer and harder wars” and emphasizes “versatility” in force design, with capabilities that are useful “across the broadest possible spectrum of conflict.” However, he takes the contrarian viewpoint even further by advising the Department of Defense (DoD) to “reestablish a ‘win two modern MTW’ [major theater war] force construct” and shift resources to the U.S. Army so it can apply decisive force on the future battlefield. Such has not been the policy of the past two decades, and many think the construct “unaffordable.”

Michael J. Meese approaches his quantitative measures in “The American Defense Budget 2017–2020” (chapter 4) from the same perspective that former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mike Mullen expressed: “[t]he single

biggest threat to national security is our debt” (p. 62). Given all other expenditures, Meese sees no way that an increase in the defense budget can be financed. However, he would like the administration to recognize that DoD already has made greater efforts to cut personnel costs (witness the changes to the retirement system) and health care than any other government agency, and Congress needs to make similar cuts in entitlement programs. He also notes that there are too many flag and general officers for the size of the current force.

Christopher J. Lamb’s “National Security Reform” (chapter 5) is a summary of his previous writings advocating specific steps to reform national security decision making, particularly the NSC system. The problem, as Lamb describes it, is that “[a]s the security environment grows increasingly complex and dynamic, the current system remains unable to coordinate multiple elements of power” (p. 83). Lamb sees the need for three steps in particular: (1) legislation that allows the president to empower “mission managers” to lead interagency missions, (2) a concerted effort by the president to create collaborative attitudes and behaviors among cabinet officials, and (3) adoption of a new model of an assistant to the president for national security affairs (known as the national security adviser [NSA]). The first two recommendations are necessary to ensure that mission managers (who would be subject to Senate confirmation) get the resources to actually carry out policy, not just draft it.

The new-model NSA would manage and deconflict the mission managers, while also being an honest broker concerning cabinet equities. But the mission managers would be responsible for the results, not the “omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent” NSA that many expect today, but that “does not exist and never has.” (Sorry, Dr. Kissinger.) Lamb uses the example of General James Jones, USMC (Ret.), as NSA. Jones was praised for his collaboration and process management, but was criticized for not working “himself into a state of utter exhaustion” by dominating policy debates, putting cabinet members in their places, and shadowing the president continuously. Lamb maintains that it is the process, not the person, that can deliver success. (Sorry again, Dr. Kissinger.)

Among the regional chapters, James J. Przystup and Phillip C. Saunders lay out a concise statement of U.S. national interests in the Asia-Pacific (chapter 9), with the maintenance of rules-based norms of international behavior (such as in the South China Sea) being the most difficult to achieve. However, they point out a factor often overlooked in all the media and business hype about China’s inexorable economic growth: “The relationship with Beijing will be challenging, but Chinese internal economic and political problems are likely to give U.S. policymakers more leverage” (p. 198). Perhaps it is time to wish for an Asian “color revolution”?

While not as contrarian toward current policies, the chapters on NATO (by Charles L. Barry and Julian Lindley-French) and Russia (by Peter B. Zwack) do suggest that NATO must both deter and reassure Russia, and that expansion beyond the current membership probably would give Putin and his successors an excuse to divert Russian attention from the country's declining economic condition. However, the alleged U.S. promise not to expand NATO made to then-Russian president Boris Yeltsin cannot be found in writing and cannot be verified, despite what current Russian president Vladimir Putin believes.

In his chapter on South Asia, Thomas F. Lynch III points to an "escalating proxy war between India and Pakistan in Afghanistan," something that certainly has not received a lot of press in the United States (beyond that concerning the Kabul parliament building and Salma Dam [the "Afghan-India Friendship Dam"]) (p. 271). Lynch includes intelligence activities the two nations have conducted in Afghanistan as but one piece of his overall discussion of competition throughout Asia and India-Pakistan tensions in particular. One hopes that he or other scholars will research this proxy war in greater detail.

Although not the most detailed discussion, that in chapter 12, Denise Natali's "The Middle East," has one of the most direct recommendations concerning U.S. decision making: "the United States should not attempt to fix failed states. Nor should it seek to resolve protracted conflicts without the necessary requisites in place, namely political conditions and regional actors committed to making necessary compromises" (p. 258). Instead, the United States "should selectively engage and support traditional partners who can serve as strategic anchor points in the region" (p. 249). The first irony of these recommendations is that the George W. Bush administration came into office with the same view (or at least the president did), but did an about-face after 9/11, attempting to use the invasion of Iraq to redirect the Middle East toward (at least somewhat) democratic governance. The second irony is that our pre-President Carter foreign policy was to rely on Saudi Arabia and Iran as the "strategic anchor points in the region." Iran is now hostile and near-nuclear and Saudi Arabia is a kingdom forged by force that seems to promote religious extremism. Israel is, of course, a democratic pillar. But reading Natali's chapter makes one think the United States should just step away from the Israeli-Palestinian peace process until the actors are "committed to making necessary compromises"—another contrarian recommendation (and one with which former president Carter certainly would not concur).

After lauding the stronger chapters, it is appropriate to identify the problematic. Chapter 8, "Cyber Policy," is one of the longest chapters, but also the most contradictory and—to anyone concerned about the potential dominance of government bureaucracy over the private sector—the scariest. The authors begin by



creating an excellent model of the relationships among technology (“the range of the possible”), law (“the limits of what is permissible”), and government policy (“the realm of the preferable”) (p. 151). But, as in the rest of the chapter, the authors’ enthusiasm becomes a runaway engine, and they proclaim their model to be a “common operating picture” when it is only a conceptual model.

The authors excoriate the federal government for its “industrial age” organization of departments and agencies that results in a “pile-up of ‘cross-cutting’ issues—particularly those generated by the disruptive information/digital age,” and they recommend a bewildering array of “issue-specific fusion centers” run by “supervisory czars.” While similar in concept to Lamb’s proposal, it diverges in scope, with potentially sixty-five centers for cyber issues alone (if I read their diagram correctly) (p. 152). Where we would get the people and funding is unexamined. Worse, they appear to contradict themselves, suggesting the creation of a Department of Cyber, with U.S. Cyber Command located under it instead of DoD. They justify this as “[f]ollowing the U.S. Coast Guard precedent of having one of the Armed Forces report to an agency other than DOD” (p. 155). Obviously, U.S. Cyber Command is not its own armed force, and it exists primarily to support the other combatant commanders—hard to do if you are funded and directed by a nondefense agency.

The authors conflate information (data, television, film, music, etc.) with information technology / cyber, and there seems no aspect of cyber in which they do not want the government involved: reviewing, requiring, investing in, establishing connections with nonstate actors, tapping private-sector research, etc. It is as if government, not the private sector, is the driver of information technology, rather than but one of its consumers. Some of the recommended actions border on the patronizing: “[c]onduct outreach to address public fears that AI [artificial intelligence] may cause loss of jobs or that autonomous machines may threaten public safety” (p. 164). At this point in AI’s development, who can say that it will *not* cause the loss of jobs or threaten public safety? Part of the chapter’s seeming breathlessness is caused by the authors’ desire to reinforce their insistence that cyber is a war-fighting domain “fully as significant as the land, sea, air, and space domains.” But is not cyber a tool, an enabler that facilitates action *within* the physical domains? Have we not become dependent on cyber *voluntarily*? The authors conclude with a campaign promise–like statement: “The potential opportunities found within the domain of information and cyberspace are seemingly limitless” (p. 168). That overweening attitude is what makes their chapter (and recommendations) so scary.

While not as problematic, chapter 7, “Combating Terrorism,” is the shortest chapter and comes across as weak. Perhaps that is because terrorism is discussed

in the regional chapters as well. However, the chapter does have a good treatment of the rivalry between the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and al Qaeda that points to the fact that local terrorist groups ally with the most successful umbrella organization. The definition of *successful* seems determined by which organization currently gets the most media coverage. There is a notably brief suggestion that the attack in San Bernardino, California, was connected to ISIL; however, that incident is not mentioned again, whereas other attacks are given more detail. One wonders whether that simply reflects the Obama administration's reluctance to tie the San Bernardino attack to Islamic terrorism, lest it give a hoodlum an excuse to attack a mosque.

The author provides a good discussion on the threat of veteran Islamist foreign fighters from the various Middle Eastern wars returning to commit terrorist acts in their home countries, but then makes the following curious statement: "Some countries, such as Russia, have decided to revoke the citizenship of their foreign fighters. But it is not in the interest of the United States to allow these fighters to remain in Syria or relocate to another conflict" (p. 143). But where do we want them to go? Not San Bernardino. The solution—which is not one—is that "[t]he issue of returnees should receive more diplomatic emphasis, forethought, and planning," and United Nations help is suggested (p. 143). Guantánamo or its equivalent is not discussed.

In summary, *Charting a Course*—including those chapters not reviewed—is an excellent and up-to-date summary of the national security issues that President Trump's administration will face, written by the most practical group of experts one might assemble. Whether one does or does not agree with the recommendations, most are argued logically and boldly. As the new DoD officials wait to be confirmed, they should read this book before they are inundated by policy papers. So should all other students and practitioners of national security affairs.



## BOOK REVIEWS

---

### ROUGH WATERS

*Exporting Security: International Engagement, Security Cooperation, and the Changing Face of the US Military*, by Derek S. Reveron. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2016. 256 pages. \$98.95.

*Exporting Security* will surprise even the most learned defense experts in its framing of the extraordinary changes to U.S. military force employment today. Faced with new threats, or security deficits, from “subnational, transnational, and regional challenges to global security” (p. xi), today’s national leadership has directed defense forces to take on a new and more meaningful peacetime role. This revision of Dr. Reveron’s 2010 book on security cooperation and the changing face of today’s military will reshape views of the armed forces’ role in national security by highlighting its new focus on developing partnerships. These changes are additive. Defending our nation and our way of life through the maintenance of superior war-fighting capabilities is still primary, but the national approach to addressing the gaps between stability and conflict is remarkably different and requires close scrutiny.

The term *security cooperation* has been in use for less than twenty years, apparently first used when Congress renamed the Defense Security Assistance Agency the Defense Security Cooperation

Agency in 1998. Yet in that short span the practice has evolved quietly into “a key pillar of military strategy” (p. 4), one that thus far has stirred limited academic or government dialogue. That is changing, and Reveron skillfully lays out the context within which this dialogue should be conducted.

*Exporting Security* explains the popularity of security cooperation among presidential administrations through well-targeted examples of recent armed forces engagement, chosen to illustrate specific purposes. Security deficits have root causes. In some cases, security cooperation activities are designed to address these causes, while others are intended to help partner nations develop the capacity to address both cause and deficit. In almost every case, security cooperation activities additionally serve to build trust. Trust—and common security deficits—form the foundation on which desired defense partnerships and coalitions are built.

Reveron invests considerable effort in examining the government’s rationale for developing security partnerships.

Pursuing global stability today requires more than just unilateral Defense Department actions to address security deficits that may be “simultaneously military, economic, social, and political” in nature (p. 8). Security cooperation provides the United States with tools to shape partnerships so as to build coalitions, gain access, strengthen national governance, build partner nation security capacity and confidence, deter bad actors, and fulfill alliance responsibilities; however, Reveron emphasizes that security cooperation efforts, more often than not, fail to achieve these objectives. Nonetheless, he contends that the value of the successes outweighs the cost of the failures; but the U.S. taxpayer deserves a better return on investment.

A full chapter is committed to explaining sources of resistance to the military’s changing role. Some officials express concern about the military’s growing influence in shaping foreign policy through peacetime engagement, while others perceive these activities as taking resources and attention from the military’s primary war-fighting role. Elaborating on these concerns, Reveron examines government interagency dynamics related to foreign policy implementation, especially those between the State and Defense Departments. Is Defense, with its new authorities, becoming too autonomous, at the cost of State’s role in leading foreign policy? Regardless of the answer, the recent proliferation of Title 10 (Defense Department) programs literally has forced the agencies to find more-productive ways to plan and integrate their efforts. This is a dynamic that *Exporting Security* might have addressed in greater detail.

Reveron consistently emphasizes the preventive intent behind cooperative

engagement. Military activities in support of maritime domain awareness, counterinsurgency efforts, combating terrorism, antipiracy campaigns, disaster relief, medical/dental deployments, education in good governance, and similar efforts garner most of the book’s attention. These efforts with partner nations form the cooperative basis for addressing today’s security deficits, and successes in these arenas are win-win scenarios. But today’s changing focus also brings a new approach to coalition war fighting—with similar preventive effect, one hopes—through initiatives such as increased international officer presence on U.S. military staffs, cooperative deployments, and high-end foreign military sales acquisition. Added attention to these influences on coalition war-fighting capabilities would have made the book’s message more complete.

Combatant-command and U.S. Security Cooperation Office (SCO) staffs scattered globally deserve more attention. Combatant-command staffs are charged with synchronizing engagement activities to develop effective theater campaign plans. The proliferation of security assistance programs, partnerships, and engagement activities conceived to address security deficits makes it increasingly difficult for staffs to succeed in these efforts. For the same reasons, SCO staffs are challenged to orchestrate security cooperation efforts effectively in each country. Failure to equip properly these components of the security cooperation community—which operate outside the Washington beltway, and therefore with less visibility—puts their ability to accomplish partnership development objectives at risk.

*Exporting Security* “offers a framework to understand the change and to

illustrate how the military is changing from a force of confrontation to one of cooperation” (p. 224). But this strategic pillar is still a work in progress, as the United States seeks out the most effective formulas for achieving national objectives via security cooperation. Congressionally approved security assistance programs will be shaped more effectively. Interagency policy and planning will be refined. Better assessment, monitoring, and evaluation methods will be implemented. Military services will learn to execute engagement activities that simultaneously sharpen war-fighting skills and build partner capacity. The underrepresented tool to accelerate this progress is insightful academic and government dialogue. Dr. Reveron has laid a solid foundation on which this dialogue should build. Then perhaps the taxpayer can look forward to a better return on security cooperation investment.

MICHAEL MCCRABB



*How Everything Became War and the Military Became Everything: Tales from the Pentagon*, by Rosa Brooks. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016. 448 pages. \$29.95.

This is a history of modern war, particularly America’s war against terrorists since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Rosa Brooks analyzes the forces and principles underlying modern conflict, including history, international relations, international law, political-military relations, and domestic politics. She has produced a fascinating, realistic, and at times humorous look at our struggles to make sense of it all.

The book begins with a Pentagon meeting whose purpose is to decide

whether and when to launch a drone attack on an Al Qaeda operative. Brooks takes the reader on a journey that ultimately addresses two simple but important questions: Is war or peace the norm, and what rules apply?

Brooks reviews conflict in Rwanda in 1994, Bosnia in 1995, and Kosovo in 1999, parts of a continuum stretching until today. Since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, sovereign states have formed the basis of international relations, but recently civil wars and revolution have spilled across state borders, upsetting international law and order. Many of these states, such as Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Afghanistan, never enjoyed a firm footing in statehood. Interstate conflicts with fixed beginnings and ends, such as the two world wars, are distant memories. Modern war is both boundless and endless.

Using historical examples, Brooks argues persuasively that war is the norm, peace the exception. Our concept of peace arose only around the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1863, the Lieber Code codified law-of-war traditions for Union troops in the American Civil War. In 1864, the International Committee of the Red Cross was founded to ease the burdens of war. Our international institutions are predicated on the belief that we can limit war in space and time while maintaining our humanity. Our current “war” against terrorists, however, does not fit this paradigm. Use of “enhanced interrogations” and targeted drone attacks, and even our definition of our enemy, push our notions of law into uncharted territory.

How do common notions of human rights fare in this environment? Brooks revisits this idea throughout. Do states have a responsibility to protect

their citizens? Do other states have a responsibility to intervene when citizens' states do not? Do human rights trump sovereignty? For over two decades, we have failed to answer these questions. If the "international community" has no answer, how can we expect fighters—a young soldier battling Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan or a drone pilot sitting in an operations center tracking a suspected terrorist in Yemen—to answer them? The received law of war was not designed for this.

Efforts to fit modern war into this structure create more problems in turn, undermining both domestic and international law. The rule of law, Brooks argues, is critical to all societies and to international order. One solution she suggests is to update our laws and international structures, as challenging as that task might be. We should think of war and peace as poles on a spectrum, and envision that we move closer to one or the other over time. We should reject rigid definitions of war as an all-or-nothing concept.

Brooks argues that endless war undermines American institutions as well as the rule of law. The Department of Defense has assumed missions that it is ill equipped by culture and training to perform—such as nation building and civil reconstruction—at the expense of other agencies that traditionally have carried out American public policy and diplomacy overseas, such as the State Department. Brooks submits that, for policy implementation, the military has become a one-stop shopping center—like Walmart.

Brooks's tale also chronicles a personal journey. As the child of antiwar activists, then throughout her career as a law professor, human rights

lawyer, State Department lawyer, and Defense Department official, she has experienced and here relates her close encounters with most of the subjects about which she writes, in part owing to her marriage to an Army Special Forces officer. Anyone who has served in the Pentagon in any capacity will get a chuckle or two from Brooks's tales of her time in this unique place.

This book is informative, enlightening, and entertaining. As director of national security legal studies at the Army War College from 2000 to 2006, I struggled to answer the same questions Brooks addresses in her book. *How Everything Became War and the Military Became Everything* should be required reading for anyone interested in military strategy and national security, or anyone who wonders how we got where we are today and how we might find a better way.

THOMAS W. MCSHANE



*Rough Waters: Sovereignty and the American Merchant Flag*, by Rodney P. Carlisle, with Bradford Smith. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2017. 304 pages. \$31.95.

*Rough Waters* is a historical review of the use and significance of the port of registry (which yields a "flag state") of merchant vessels. Author Rodney Carlisle has revisited his prior work *Sovereignty for Sale: The Origins and Evolution of the Panamanian and Liberian Flags of Convenience* (Naval Institute Press, 1982, out of print) and augmented it with his other prior periodical work to provide a deeper history of the use of merchant ship flags.

Generally speaking, *Rough Waters* is well researched—with the profound

exception of the defamatory analysis of and allegations about the Liberian registry during the period 2001–2003. The source of most of this misinformation is provocative allegations deriving from a commercial lawsuit, as well as an inaccurate reference to a UN report. The lawsuit was withdrawn and the allegations were never substantiated, as they were and remain patently false. Furthermore, the author's incorrect and loosely referenced opinion that the Marshall Islands flag constitutes a de facto second U.S. registry cannot go unmentioned. Contrary to the statement that the Marshall Islands flag registry has been structured along the Delaware domestic model to aid U.S. strategic interests, the reality is that the Marshall Islands registry was formed by copying Liberian law and constitutes an impropriety constructed for commercial purpose and private financial gain. For these reasons, this reviewer is unable to recommend *Rough Waters*, or to endorse it as an accurate review of the impact of foreign flags on the American merchant fleet.

*Rough Waters* attempts to address the role of foreign flags in the decline of the American merchant marine. Despite providing some evidence to the contrary, the author articulates a one-sided thesis that foreign flags predominantly are used for sinister or nefarious purposes. He further suggests that commercial interests, in their taking advantage of less-developed nations, were the predominant cause of the collapse of the U.S.-flag fleet. Curiously, the book chronicles, yet fails to highlight, that one of the most prevalent flags of convenience throughout history was the British flag—and the greatest facilitator of alternative registration of U.S.-owned ships was the U.S. government.

*Rough Waters* describes in interesting detail the intentional use of nonnational flags as a means to mislead, to dissuade, and often to evade pursuit by navies and other authorities. Whether it was the slave trade, the Southern or Northern fleets on either side of the U.S. Civil War, rum-running during U.S. Prohibition, or U.S. involvement in World War I and the early half of World War II, the lack of technology during these eras meant that identification of a ship's nationality depended on visually sighting the flag flying on its stern. This made use of the flag ripe for manipulation.

While some of these practices indeed were nefarious, others served legitimate purposes, and the U.S. government encouraged them. During the Civil War, ships changed flag because the Northern and Southern governments could not protect them. In the 1870s, building ships in the United States was expensive, so shipowners sought to construct and register ships abroad—a situation that continues today. In the lead-up to both world wars, the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Shipping Board facilitated transfer of the majority of U.S. ships to the Panamanian flag. Despite the assertion in *Rough Waters* that use of Panama's flag was immoral, the political landscape and the rise of fascism in Europe made use of a foreign flag a political necessity.

Of particular interest to *Review* readers may be elements of Alfred Thayer Mahan's theories on sea power. *Rough Waters* illustrates the practical impossibility of even the world's greatest navy protecting domestically registered commercial ships in all the far reaches of the earth. History provides only a very few examples of the U.S. Navy coming directly to the aid of a merchant ship. In



each of those cases, logistical convenience and a specific political interest were the determining factors for intervention. If a merchant vessel possesses strategic interest, its flag has never prevented the U.S. Navy from taking action.

Currently, almost 75 percent of the world's global trading merchant fleet is registered with ten flag states. Of these ten, only those of Greece and the People's Republic of China are considered "national flags." The remaining 64 percent of these commercial ships are registered in Panama, Liberia, the Marshall Islands, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malta, the Bahamas, or Cyprus. *Rough Waters* fails to consider or identify the impacts of shifts in global trade and trade economics, technology, and ship ownership, construction, financing, and crewing, which are the realities that underlie the choice of a flag state. Very few ships are owned by "pure" U.S. companies, and the global use of global flags did not cause the collapse of the U.S. merchant marine.

SCOTT BERGERON



*Practise to Deceive: Learning Curves of Military Deception Planners*, by Barton Whaley. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2016. 256 pages. \$39.95.

This is a quirky yet ultimately enjoyable book. The association of the author, Barton Whaley, with the U.S. intelligence services dates back to the Korean War. He earned his undergraduate degree from Berkeley and his PhD from MIT. Over the course of his career Whaley worked with or for the U.S. Army, the Naval Postgraduate School, and the director of national intelligence.

A. Denis Clift, president of the National Intelligence University, referred to Whaley as "the undisputed dean of U.S. denial and deception experts." Whaley died in 2013, leaving behind several completed volumes and a legacy as a man with a passion for and an encyclopedic knowledge of military deception.

A central assumption of *Practise to Deceive* is that the only tool that has a hope of "dispelling the fog of war" is intelligence—but it is the task of the deception planner to keep that fog thick. When deception planners do their job right, the enemy must deal with uncertainty, and surprise can be achieved. This is not exactly new ground. Many students of history, as well as most current members of the national security enterprise, are aware, at least to some degree, of famous deception operations. These range from the Trojan horse of Odysseus to the deployment of the imaginary First U.S. Army Group to southeast England in the months before D-day 1944. Whaley reminds us that deception plans do not just appear; they are the brainchildren of talented individuals—the deception planners. *Practise to Deceive* neglects neither deception plans nor deception operations, but its primary intent is to shed light on those planners and how they *think*. As it turns out, that is a pretty tall order. In addition, Whaley tells readers they should walk away with an awareness of the threats that enemy deception efforts pose and how we can improve our own efforts.

Unfortunately, the book's structure does not lead the reader to a rapid understanding of the mind of the deception planner. Indeed, most readers, particularly those unfamiliar with the subject, will be well served to

read the executive summary first to get some understanding of the nature of deception in all its many aspects.

The book also contains a discussion of the personality type of the successful deception planner. Readers will not be surprised to learn that such persons differ greatly from successful military commanders. Those commanders are vital, however, as they possess the power to approve the deception plan, must play an active role in deception planning to increase the odds of success and victory, and often serve as a bridge between the freewheeling planner and the more rigid military hierarchy. A short introduction and part 1, written in Whaley's own voice, lay out his ideas about the commander, the deception planner, and the deception plan.

Part 2, the heart of the book, consists of eighty-eight individual case studies of deception operations. Arranged thematically, the cases range chronologically from the biblical period to the modern day, and in scope from brief tactical encounters to drawn-out strategic operations on a massive scale.

The cases themselves are something of a hodgepodge. Some, such as the decision by Sir Garnet Wolseley to approach Egyptian defenses at Tel el Kebir at night, are only a few paragraphs in length. Others are painfully sparse on information, such as the case study that consists merely of an acknowledgment that Admiral William F. "Bull" Halsey had a "dirty tricks department." In contrast, other case studies are very detailed with regard to personalities and actions. Among these is an excellent look at Operation BOLO, designed by the legendary Colonel Robin Olds, USAF, who used electronic deception to lure in North Vietnamese MiGs with Air Force

Phantoms. The action is described in detail, as is the personality of Colonel Olds.

As with Olds, Whaley is not shy about discussing the personal character and attributes of many of the officers featured in the case studies. Douglas MacArthur is acknowledged for mastering the Machiavellian art of "divide and conquer" among his subordinates. General Orde Wingate and T. E. Lawrence both are identified as "duplicitous." Several individuals are examined at different points in their careers, allowing the reader to appreciate their approach to deception operations over time. These include the actor Douglas Fairbanks Jr. when serving as a USN lieutenant commander during 1944 in Italy. Also covered are Fidel Castro, First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill, and Ian Fleming's older brother, Peter.

Part 3 of *Practise to Deceive* lays out a rather detailed approach to planning a deception operation and a discussion of the major factors to be considered. These include such topics as policy constraints, the relationship of commanders to their staffs, and various cultural factors. Two actual examples of deception plans are provided: the first is the deception plan the Germans created to support Operation BARBAROSSA; the second is a British tactical-level plan that Peter Fleming authored to support operations against the Japanese in Burma.

It is easy to see how, in the hands of a lesser author and editor, *Practise to Deceive* could lose an audience rapidly. But Whaley's passion for deception shines throughout the book, and over time the author's dry and ready wit becomes more and more pronounced, to good effect. Readers who, on the basis of prior experience, expect compilations of many case studies to be dull and plodding

examples of the writer's art will be pleasantly surprised, for thought-provoking and fascinating assertions abound. For example, Whaley believes that some societies are more deceptive than others, "but only during any given slice of time." Deception is also, according to Whaley, a mind game that can be learned, although certain types of people, including magicians and practical jokers, may find the game easier to master.

Despite taking the reader on a rather fast-paced ride over centuries of deception efforts, Whaley makes several points with care. The first is that deception operations are not guaranteed success. Two failures cited are the Bay of Pigs invasion, for which Whaley holds CIA veteran Richard Bissell responsible, and the 1980 Iranian hostage rescue mission, with Jody Powell coming in for censure. The second point is that deception operations are not important in and of themselves; they are only as important as the degree to which they support the commander's operational plan and allow the attainment of desired objectives. As we face a future in which deception operations can be expected to flourish, Whaley's cautionary note is well worth remembering.

RICHARD J. NORTON



*Meeting China Halfway: How to Defuse the Emerging US-China Rivalry*, by Lyle J. Goldstein. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2015. 400 pages. \$29.95.

Numerous Western observers—expert and otherwise—have opined about the implications of the rise of China. A small number address the implications for hundreds of millions of people

who have moved from subsistence living into the middle classes. A few more address the consequences for the world's economy, environment, or rule of law. But most focus on an emerging rivalry with the United States and the possibility it will lead to superpower conflict. Of these, Naval War College professor Lyle Goldstein is virtually alone in mapping out specific plans to avoid friction, de-escalate tensions, and cultivate peaceful coexistence; the others offer "realist" solutions designed to isolate, deter, or defeat China.

Dr. Goldstein—the founding director of the College's China Maritime Studies Institute, and fluent in Mandarin—brings the right tools to the task of analyzing the United States–China rivalry and setting a course toward peaceful coexistence. A political scientist with strong appreciation for the influence of history on strategy, he has read widely in Chinese and English to understand how academics and leaders in each country view their nation's experience, interests, and destiny. By sorting out these perspectives, Goldstein works like a mediator to chart the narrow and winding pathways to trust and cooperation. He dedicates nine chapters to distinct issues that divide the United States and China, categorized by region (for instance, Japan or the South China Sea) or by sector (the economy or the environment). After describing the overall picture, each chapter examines interpretations in the West and then in China, offering particularly valuable insights into the perspectives of Chinese military and strategic thought leaders.

Having toured the strategic horizon and explained the relevant attitudes and interests, the author then lays out "cooperation spirals"—plans whereby

each side can take concrete, sequential steps to reduce the threat they are perceived to pose and to increase opportunities for cooperation. These plans generally start out small, then grow in ambition. Many focus on measures that reduce the appearance of an aggressive U.S. militarized posture—for example, standing down AFRICOM or reducing the number of troops stationed on Okinawa. In recognition of the fact that the United States can afford some rebalancing, subsequent steps include expanding China's military commitments—for instance, to a joint antipiracy force for Aden or a trip-wire force based in North Korea. Meeting China halfway is not just a slogan. Goldstein understands that the Chinese (indeed, much of the world) view America's history as one of nearly continuous aggression, and they need to see retrenchment before they will trust the United States not to threaten their regime.

Written in 2014 and published in 2015, the book is still highly topical and informative about Chinese-U.S. relations, and the concept of cooperation spirals remains appealing. Readers will note, however, that we live in interesting times. The Philippines' position has undergone two dramatic shifts, first in prevailing in the South China Sea arbitration and then with the election of Rodrigo Duterte and the subsequent warming toward China. Likewise, the new U.S. president, Donald Trump, canceled the Trans-Pacific Partnership, announced a withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord, and is taking a much more aggressive attitude toward Iran—each of which moots one of Goldstein's cooperation spirals. Finally, China's trillion-dollar commitment to the Belt and Road project

likewise signals a shift in ambition and interests. So, while Goldstein's insights and his concept for reconciliation remain powerful, policy makers today will need a new set of plans.

This remains an important book for anyone seeking to understand U.S.-Chinese relations, particularly those seeking peaceful solutions so as to avoid the so-called Thucydides trap.

MARK R. SHULMAN



*Sea Power: The History and Geopolitics of the World's Oceans*, by James Stavridis. New York: Penguin, 2017. 384 pages. \$28.

Admiral James Stavridis's maritime opus, *Sea Power*, is a tour de force that ranges across the global commons of the world's vast sea-lanes and both near-littoral and distant shores. With four decades of distinguished maritime service in the U.S. Navy, the admiral (now retired) is uniquely qualified to evaluate current geopolitical maritime realities. Stavridis brings that strategic perspective to his historical contextualization of how and why oceans have impacted seafaring and landlocked civilizations and nation-states differentially.

Stavridis is a prolific author, having first been published, early in his naval officer career, in U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings*. As someone who has embodied that institution's motto to "dare to write, think, and speak to advance the understanding of sea power," he now fittingly serves as chair of the institute. As he does in that role, in *Sea Power* Stavridis continues to lead and shape the intellectual conversation surrounding sea power and the sea services.

These contributions to scholarly maritime and policy discourse run deep—but they are not silent. The lessons that *Sea Power* offers should echo around the globe, like pulses of sonar, ready to be received and analyzed by an internationally dispersed community of naval and military strategists in allied and competitor nation-states. In particular, the admiral's clear-eyed warnings and policy prescriptions regarding China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and ISIS are sure to make waves on distant shores.

*Sea Power* is the most recent link in a chain of American maritime strategy that connects back to Alfred Thayer Mahan's seminal treatises of the 1890s. Stavridis revisits Mahan's underappreciated work *The Problem of Asia: Its Effect upon International Politics* through a twenty-first-century lens—its discussion of a persistent geopolitical choke point resonates today. In fact, Stavridis invokes Mahan to articulate an updated case for an American naval supremacy and strength that—when closely aligned with the efforts of allied nations—can ensure the U.S. Navy's ability to defend the homeland, project power, deter aggression, and maintain open sea-lanes for global commerce, communications, and freedom of navigation.

Notwithstanding *Sea Power's* ambitious subtitle—*The History and Geopolitics of the World's Oceans*—the book should be comfortably navigable by a broad range of readers, even those less familiar with naval history or maritime strategy. As he did in his earlier book *The Accidental Admiral: A Sailor Takes Command at NATO* (Naval Institute Press, 2014), the author writes with a dry wit and an engaging manner, highlighted by numerous historical insights and cultural references. Moreover, Stavridis's

autobiographical anecdotes draw from his fascinating, globe-spanning naval career that began with service as a surface warfare officer and culminated with a stint as Supreme Allied Commander Europe—the first Navy admiral in history to hold this command. The reader is treated to frequent, self-deprecating life lessons in leadership, including a vignette illustrating how a carton of cigarettes may have determined whether he ran his ship (and future) aground in Egyptian waters earlier in his career.

Dedicated “to all the sailors at sea,” *Sea Power*, like the works of Mahan, is destined to become required reading for midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy and the officer candidates in Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs before they embark on careers in the U.S. Navy. It is no accident that this admiral has been a mentor to many men and women who have served with him in the U.S. Navy “wherever the wind and waves have taken them,” buoyed by the wise counsel and leadership lessons evident in *Sea Power*.

PHILIP M. BILDEN



*Outsourcing War: The Just War Tradition in the Age of Military Privatization*, by Amy Eckert. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 2016. 183 pages. \$39.95.

In what proves to be both an insightful and informative book, this latest publication on the just war tradition integrates the disciplines of applied ethics, international politics, and military strategy. As associate professor of political science at Metropolitan State University of Denver, Amy Eckert draws attention to the development of

private military companies (PMCs) as nonstate actors in support of warfare. In this provocative work, Eckert sets out to detail the phenomenon of the privatization of the military as a paradigm shift in recent years and its repercussions for strategic programming. Eckert contextualizes the growth of PMCs within the evolving history of just war theory and presents the ethical justification for war as a dynamic core of principles that have been reconceptualized and applied in different time frames. Accordingly, Eckert proposes a series of qualifications to the current use of PMCs through a reformulation of just war principles.

Eckert notes the rapid expansion of PMCs, contrasting the First Gulf War, during which the ratio of contractors to military personnel was one to fifty, with the later U.S.-led Iraq and Afghanistan campaigns, in which PMC contractors outnumbered military members altogether. The end of the Cold War, the reluctance of nations to subsidize large militaries, the lack of public support for foreign endeavors, and the trend toward a market ideology that seeks the cost-effective savings that private corporations can provide explain in part the rapid increase of PMCs within the state's arsenal of logistical and operational support.

The advantages of PMCs, as Eckert outlines, include executive privilege, by which governments generally can hire PMCs without congressional oversight, public debate, or headlines publicizing casualties or losses; the economic savings of military outsourcing, which proponents argue is conducive to fiscal responsibility and a corporate search for the lowest costs in a competitive global market; and deniability, because, while a government may not be involved

in kinetic conflict officially, it can deploy PMCs covertly to accomplish national security objectives. PMCs, observes Eckert, offer "maximum freedom with minimal responsibility."

However, Eckert highlights a number of disadvantages of PMCs. Owing to the private/public divide, corporate contractors have very little accountability to the states that hire them. Travesties such as the Abu Ghraib scandal reflect ethical and legal violations outside the reach of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. High-profile PMC failures, such as the Blackwater incidents in Iraq (2005–2007), can become embarrassing liabilities for the governments that hire PMCs. The government lacks control once the PMC contracts are signed. And PMCs—like any other private company—act out of a profit motivation, and are directly obligated to their corporate shareholders, not the military chain of command.

Consequently, Eckert reformulates the *jus ad bellum* (law of going to war) requirements in ways that address the role of PMCs. For instance, when a state deliberates whether to wage a war, policy makers must evaluate the criterion of proportionality. That is, even for a war with a just cause, the potential gains must outweigh the costs. Eckert argues that, in contrast with their contemporary practice, states that hire PMCs must include the deaths of PMC personnel in past conflicts in their public records, then extrapolate from the public records potential contractor fatalities as a factor in their calculations of whether, in a projected pursuit of war, the gains will outweigh the losses. Equally dramatic in effect, Eckert recommends that for *jus in bello* (the law of conducting war) PMC employees have the status of "civilian

combatants,” with both the protections and restraints implied, and that PMCs, along with the state governments, have a shared responsibility to conduct the war in a way that is consistent with command and control accountability.

*Outsourcing War* is a compelling analysis of the reemergence of nonstate actors in the implementation of warfare.

With scholarly credibility and political savvy, Eckert displays an understanding of both the past and the present as the just war tradition impacts the future development of PMCs, offering reasonable solutions to the current problems posed by the outsourcing of war. In applying the *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* modifications to the status and conduct of PMCs, Eckert’s central assertion in *Outsourcing War* makes us wonder whether these modifications negate the very reasons for using PMCs in the first place. This question raises even further the critical issue of whether it is more important to alter PMC practices to align with just war principles or to alter just war principles to align with PMC practices. Eckert seems to advocate a middle course that balances the time-honored principles of the just war tradition with the reality of contemporary PMC practices through responsible applications, and that balance is one for policy makers, academics, and warfighters to debate in the outsourcing of war to PMCs.

EDWARD ERWIN



*Napoleonic Warfare: The Operational Art of the Great Campaigns*, by John T. Kuehn. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2015. 249 pages. \$60.

John Kuehn’s objective is to analyze the Napoleonic Wars “along principally operational lines” (p. xi). Kuehn claims that, of the three levels of war, “the one that is least understood and written about resides in that always uncomfortable middle ground, the operational level” (p. x). He explains that he chose the period of the French Wars (1792–1815) because they lend themselves “particularly well to an operational-level analysis” (p. ix). His goal is to provide “something of an impressionistic result that suggests the operational-level approach adopted here illustrates effectively the more esoteric concept of operational art—how military genius, as best defined by Clausewitz, operated in space and time in the uncertain environment at the operational level during the era of a veritable ‘God of War’” (p. xi). In particular, Kuehn, who holds the General William Stofft Chair for Historical Research at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, maintains that “an operational examination of Napoleonic campaigns has value because so many of their characteristics resemble current American military thought and practice” (p. 9).

The book begins with an interesting discussion of the evolution of the operational art as a level of war to be studied. Kuehn provides definitions and an explanation of his methodology, which is to analyze Napoleonic operations through the frameworks provided by the Soviet school and by James Schneider, formerly of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Successive chapters generally follow the chronology of the coalition wars that France fought between 1792 and 1815. Chapter 3, which covers the War of the Second Coalition, examines Russian and

French operations in Italy and Switzerland but does not include Napoleon's second Italian campaign. Chapter 4 is devoted to an interesting study of the naval war between Great Britain and France, in particular the operational art of Admiral Horatio Nelson, which is well done. Kuehn concludes his book with a very short epilogue that covers Napoleon's last campaigns in 1814 and 1815. No bibliography is included.

Professor Kuehn makes it very clear that his conclusions are not based on archival research or a fresh look at the primary sources: "[M]ost of the sources used for this book are secondary and may appear dated with respect to their interpretations. They are used to get basic facts, which at the operational level of war are largely established" (p. xi). His notes demonstrate a heavy dependence on David Chandler, John Elting, Steven Ross, Christopher Duffy, Rory Muir, Gunther Rothenberg, and Charles Oman. One curious omission is the works on 1806, 1807, 1809, 1813, and 1814 by the early-nineteenth-century British staff officer Francis Loraine Petre, who provides much better operational studies than does Chandler. Moreover, only a handful of references were drawn from recent scholarship by Roger Knight and Alexander Mikaberidze. Completely missing from Kuehn's notes are Huw Davies's groundbreaking 2012 work *Wellington's Wars: The Making of a Military Genius*, which might have persuaded Kuehn that his interpretation of Wellington's way of war needed some revision, and John H. Gill's three volumes on 1809, *Thunder on the Danube*. Conversely, Kuehn consulted Gneisenau's life of Blücher, which must be used with extreme caution because at times it borders on fiction. For example, the *Krümper*

system did not produce 150,000 trained men in three years (p. 175).

The problem with Professor Kuehn's research is that the "basic facts" these dated works provide are the material from which he draws his conclusions, and they are not always accurate. Moreover, the work is replete with generalizations and oversimplifications that likewise are not always accurate. For example, Yorck did not conduct "extensive negotiations" with Clausewitz in December 1813 (p. 174) but with the Russian general Diebitsch; Germany did not explode in revolt in early 1813 (p. 179); and the "ubiquitous Czernicheff and his Cossacks" were not responsible for the destruction of Girard's division on August 27, 1813 (p. 195)—that was the work of Prussian general Hirschfeld's mainly *Landwehr* (militia) brigade of twelve thousand men, supported by Czernicheff's five Cossack regiments, at the battle of Hagelberg. Blücher's army in 1815 was not "a veritable Prussian *Grande Armée*" (p. 209), as it lacked any reserves or specialized units at the army level, and 75 percent of one of its four corps consisted of newly raised *Landwehr*, while another corps was 50 percent *Landwehr*.

This reviewer had hoped that with ABC-CLIO's acquisition of Praeger some quality-control measures would be introduced to the latter's publishing process; sadly, this has not been the case. Although no fault of his, Kuehn's book is in dire need of professional copyediting. Misspellings, omissions and commissions in punctuation and capitalization, missing diacritical marks and nobiliary particles, redundant vocabulary, and less-than-clear sentences mar this book. Kuehn is not entirely blameless. Minor yet irritating errors such as "the army of



Prussia created by Frederick the Great and his father Frederick William II” (p. 16) undermine the author’s credibility. Austria’s Hofkriegsrat was not “also known as the Aulic Council” (p. 24); they were very different entities.

Maps are an issue as well. The maps in this book would have been considered archaic fifty years ago; today they are abominable and practically illegible—a magnifying glass might be of some assistance. Any operational study depends on good maps to help the reader understand the course of the campaigns, but this reviewer gave up on trying to use this book’s maps.

It is difficult to state where this book fits in the massive literature on the Napoleonic Wars. This study can be seen as an extension of Robert M. Epstein’s 1994 work *Napoleon’s Last Victory and the Emergence of Modern War*. Kuehn does accomplish his stated goal of describing the Napoleonic “campaigns, armies, and leaders using the lens of operational art” (p. 10). However, the descriptions of the campaigns are not detailed enough for any but a Napoleonic Wars expert to grasp the points that Kuehn is trying to make. He admits that some will object to his use of twentieth-century military theory to explain eighteenth- and nineteenth-century events (p. xi). Kuehn does have moments of brilliance, especially in the chapters on the evolution of the operational art and the naval duel, as well as the short paragraphs he employs to summarize his chapters, but in the end an analysis based on outdated scholarship provides a weak foundation that jeopardizes the stability of the entire structure.

MICHAEL V. LEGGIERE



*Hunters and Killers*, by Norman Polmar and Edward Whitman. Vol. 2, *Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2016. 272 pages. \$49.95.

*Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943* is the second volume in a comprehensive history of the impact of the submarine on maritime warfare. Engaging their significant expertise in the history of naval warfare and military technology research and development, authors Norman Polmar and Edward Whitman chronicle the development and employment of the submarine as a weapon of war at sea and the resulting response by navies to counter the effectiveness of the submarine through antisubmarine warfare (ASW). This book examines submarine and antisubmarine technology, tactics, and doctrine chronologically, commencing with World War II submarine operations in the Atlantic and Pacific and culminating with twenty-first-century ASW concepts and contemporary issues.

This history captures the asymmetry between the submarine and antisubmarine warfare as these two forms of maritime warfare competed for tactical and operational superiority. The book discusses contributions the science and technology community made to ASW, as well as the actions of operational and tactical innovators. The scientists and innovators collectively developed ASW capabilities that reignited further competition between the submarine and the ASW operator. The book’s chronological approach studies the pace and trajectory of evolutionary and revolutionary changes in submarine operations and antisubmarine warfare by explaining the tactical and operational

challenges facing submarines and ASW forces. The authors then describe and assess the subsequent reactions of navies to mitigate or eliminate each advantage. The book stimulates the reader to assess retrospectively the inflection points at which the hunters became the hunted.

Of particular value is the authors' examination of antisubmarine warfare across the broad spectrum of ASW methods, technology, doctrine, and tactics. *Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943* includes study of the contributions to antisubmarine warfare made by ships, submarines, and aircraft, but also the maturing science and technologies that enabled other forms of ASW. For example, the book explains the development and employment of acoustic systems by describing the development and use of active and passive shipborne, air, and fixed sonar systems. In addition, the authors examine the impact on ASW of nonacoustic methods, illuminating the important contributions made by espionage, cryptographic systems and communication intercepts, electromagnetic effects, infrared and laser systems, and subsurface wake detection.

In the first four chapters of *Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943*, the authors evaluate submarine warfare and antisubmarine warfare during World War II in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Numerous engagements are detailed describing the tactical contributions of World War II ASW ships, aircraft, and submarines to U.S. and Allied efforts to wrest the advantage away from the Axis submarine force. The book captures the multidomain approach to the period's ASW operations. Not surprisingly in a study of antisubmarine warfare after World War II, five chapters of the book identify and analyze

Cold War influences on submarine operations and antisubmarine warfare. This history captures the nature and intensity of the U.S.-USSR Cold War ASW competition. That competition is placed in the context of national military strategies, technological developments, operational doctrines, and tactics. These chapters reflect on submarine and antisubmarine warfare during a long period of not-quite-war, but definitely not peace, in the security environment.

*Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943* is a holistic study of antisubmarine warfare that provides an opportunity to think critically about history's most impactful developments in submarine warfare and ASW operations. Readers might expect the authors to engage their expert knowledge of ASW history to assess which events or developments in anti-submarine warfare were most impactful in the competitive and dynamic relationship between the submarine and ASW forces, but the authors allow readers to develop their own assessments and judge the short-term and enduring significance of ASW technological and tactical initiatives and developments over the history of antisubmarine warfare.

*Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943* will be of great interest to readers with tactical and technical ASW experience. For an ASW expert, the book offers the opportunity to reflect on previously obtained knowledge and experience and holistically reflect on antisubmarine warfare and submarine operations across the broad spectrum of ASW concepts. For the ASW novice, this book provides historical perspective on and context for decades of ASW developments. An appealing feature of this book is that the authors eliminate the incredibly detailed technical parameters that can

dominate any discussion or assessment of ASW operations. For the reader seeking that type of detail, the book's extensive footnotes and bibliography are valuable sources for research on several types of technical information, tactics, and historical events.

*Anti-submarine Warfare from 1943* stimulates the reader to think critically about the trends and inflection points in the lethal relationship between the submarine and ASW operations.

SEAN SULLIVAN



*Honor before Glory: The Epic World War II Story of the Japanese-American GIs Who Rescued the Lost Battalion*, by Scott McGaugh. Boston: Da Capo, 2016. 304 pages. \$25.99.

What is as stirring as a tale of a “lost battalion”? The story elements are simple. A hard-fighting group of American soldiers gets out in front of advancing troops and eventually is surrounded by the enemy. A prolonged fight ensues as the battalion fights for its life, while other U.S. and allied forces mount repeated attempts to find and then rescue the lost battalion.

Perhaps the most famous of all U.S. lost battalions was a force of slightly more than 550 men, primarily from the 308th Battalion of the 77th Division, during the Meuse-Argonne offensive of October 1918. Low on food, water, and other supplies, the battalion withstood repeated German attacks for six days. When finally “rescued,” the battalion had only 194 men. On relief of the 308th, the battalion's commander, a bespectacled major from Wisconsin named Charles Whittlesey, was promoted

immediately and soon after received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In World War II, the title of “the lost battalion” was worn by the 1st Battalion, 141st Infantry Regiment of the Army's 36th Infantry Division. The 141st was a Texas National Guard outfit and, like the 308th twenty-six years earlier, it had its brush with fame during a wet and cold October in France. On October 23, 1944, the 141st was ordered to advance into the Vosges Mountains. Members of the 141st were assured that a “strong force” would follow them. The terrain was steep and heavily forested, with but a single logging road. The Germans, with their usual tenacity and competent generalship, conducted a tenacious defense over ground they knew well.

The battalion made good progress on the 23rd, advancing four miles along the logging road, and the advance continued the next day; the battalion reached its objective after covering six more miles. Shortly afterward the Germans conducted a heavy artillery bombardment. An effort was made to reinforce the battalion with light tanks and artillery, but it failed owing to the dense forest. By dusk, the 1st Battalion was surrounded—cut off from resupply, medical aid, and reinforcements. If not relieved, destruction by or surrender to the Germans appeared inevitable.

Major General John Dahlquist, commanding the 36th Division, set about organizing a relief. He chose the 442nd Regimental Combat Team to serve as his primary assault force. Although the 442nd troops had just been taken off the line for some well-deserved rest and resupply, their reputation as highly competent assault troops was a major factor in Dahlquist's decision.

Colonel Charles Pence, commanding the 442nd, was not surprised by the selection. Word of the 1st Battalion's difficulty had spread quickly, and Pence already had ordered planning to begin.

The men of the 442nd, although annoyed at having to leave their rest areas almost as soon as they arrived, got the job done. During five days of intense fighting the unit advanced, through terrible terrain and against good defenses. The 141st's situation remained precarious, with only intermittently successful airdrops and propaganda-leaflet shells used to resupply the troops. Senior leaders grew increasingly frustrated and personality clashes more frequent, especially when General Dahlquist, fearing he would be relieved for failure in command, became more and more micromanagerial in directing the rescue effort. On October 30, lead elements of the 442nd made contact with the surviving members of the 141st. According to one scholar, the 442nd lost fifty-four men killed in action and 156 wounded in reaching the lost battalion; 211 soldiers of the 1/141 were rescued.

If this were all there was to the story, it still would be worth the telling; however, there is more. The 442nd was a nisei outfit. Its ranks were filled with Japanese Americans from Hawaii and elsewhere in the United States. Many of the latter had left internment camps to fight for the country that had forced their families from their homes and placed them under armed guard and behind barbed wire. Yet the 442nd was the most decorated unit of its size in the U.S. Army. (Sadly, McGaugh reminds the reader, superior service would not be enough to protect at least some members of the 442nd from unyielding race prejudice even after the war.)

McGaugh—a former newsman, the author of more than half a dozen books, and the current marketing director of the Midway Museum—knows a good war story when he sees one. *Honor before Glory* is a battle study, a tale of shared hardship and forged bonds similar to Stephen Ambrose's *Band of Brothers*. The work also may be read as a broader story of nisei soldiers, who were subjected to pernicious racism, institutional bias, and belated attempts to right past wrongs.

With so many potential avenues to explore, it should not be a surprise that *Honor before Glory* sprawls. Although all the aforementioned elements are touched on, none are developed as fully as they might be. To some degree, there was nothing McGaugh could do about this. The problem with writing the next *Band of Brothers* is that there are not that many “brothers” left. Ambrose's book was published in 1992, McGaugh's in 2016; in the intervening twenty-four years, the survivors of the Second World War have continued to dwindle in numbers, and neither the 442nd nor the 141st has been spared in this regard. For a group memoir to be successful, there needs to be some undefined, yet real, critical mass of memories. The remaining voices of the 442nd continue to tell an exceptional story, but there were only fifty or so oral interviews from the men of the 442nd, and considerably fewer from their counterparts in the 141st. To his credit, McGaugh tried to find German voices to add to the story, but time has taken a toll on former enemies as well.

*Honor before Glory* also could use some improvement as a battle study, beginning with more and higher-quality maps and illustrations. For all its difficulty, the relief of the 1/141 was a small battle.

Although McGaugh provides a glossary of names and an order of battle, more is needed, including a detailed time line. McGaugh also would have been well served by including more information on German movements and actions. Of course, it may have been that the men of the 716th Volksgrenadier Division and other German units did not feel the same sense of urgency to capture the battalion as U.S. commanders felt to save it, and simply did less than U.S. forces. More information regarding the quality of German troops and the types of equipment each side carried would be welcome. However, again to be fair to McGaugh, given the passage of time, the loss of records, and the inherent difficulty of identifying exact locations on a seventy-year-old battleground, answering these challenges is not easy.

The story of the nisei is too big for this book, even when the focus is narrowed to only the nisei in the 442nd, but McGaugh makes the most of the opportunity. He reminds the reader that the nisei went through basic training in Louisiana and other southern locales where race prejudice was palpable. In discussions of the 442nd's exemplary combat record, a frequently encountered explanation is that the men of the 442nd felt they had something to prove—they wanted to lay down irrefutable evidence that they were as good as or better than any other U.S. soldiers.

McGaugh offers two alternate or supplementary explanations to this more common one. The first—and more disturbing—is that the 442nd gained more combat decorations and awards for heroism because it deliberately was used in dangerous situations and missions—and this was because the men, being

nisei, were seen as expendable. Some of the survivors of the 442nd voice this theory with conviction, but similar claims are likely to issue from any unit that had fought hard, then was pulled out of a rest area to fight some more. Having allowed this notion to see the light of day, McGaugh just leaves it, without refutation, confirmation, or even a personal opinion, requiring readers to make up their own minds. The other possible explanation is more intriguing. McGaugh suggests that the nisei may have fought so well *because they were nisei*. Concepts of honor and duty were part of their identity. Many owned and some wore the *senjinbari*, the “belt of 1,000 stitches” that female relatives made to protect their loved ones from harm. Perhaps the men of the 442nd fought so well because they had been brought up amid a blend of powerful social/civic expectations and community values that owed as much to Japan as to the United States. Unfortunately, having brought up this possible explanation for the demonstrated valor of the nisei, McGaugh again simply leaves the reader to individual speculation.

In the final portion of the book, McGaugh illuminates yet another way in which the nisei were undervalued by the nation they served. Dozens of nisei soldiers were nominated for the Medal of Honor during the war; only two of the awards were approved. In 1997, the Army reviewed the original nominations, and the review board subsequently recommended that twenty-two of the nisei soldiers be awarded the Medal of Honor, as their immediate commanders had intended. McGaugh provides descriptions of the combat actions of three of these men, and those accounts leave little doubt

that in these three cases, at the very least, the upgraded award was justified.

Being identified as “the lost battalion” rankled survivors of the 141st, who claimed they were neither lost nor rescued. The first claim is true: the battalion’s location was known from beginning to end. The second claim is harder to adjudicate. As the five days wore on, food, ammunition, medical supplies, and other necessities dwindled to dangerous levels, and the battalion was judged unable to effect its own extraction. McGaugh makes a compelling case that this was indeed a rescue.

At the end of the day, despite minor flaws, *Honor before Glory* is a book worth reading. The story of the nation’s nisei families and their soldier sons’ battle experiences remains well worth telling as an example of extraordinary patriotism and courage in the face of reprehensible actions taken out of pain, prejudice, and fear.

RICHARD J. NORTON



*Routledge Handbook of Ethics and War: Just War Theory in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Fritz Allhoff, Nicholas G. Evans, and Adam Henschke. New York: Routledge, 2015. 418 pages. \$245.

In an anthology of provocative and insightful essays both comprehensive and diverse in nature, the editors of this work on just war theory make a significant contribution to the genre of applied ethics. Allhoff, Evans, and Henschke enlist professors, retired military officers, journalists, theologians, and computer scientists as essayists to examine the efficacy and applicability of the just war tradition vis-à-vis the latest developments in technology, culture,

and politics. Although the writing style is accessible to the novice who wants to understand better the essentials of just war theory, this collection of essays provides the scholar-warrior and professor with substantive research and the latest modifications to a theory that has been tried and trusted for millennia. The editors incorporate a wide range of theorists, including both those who reject the just war tradition as obsolete, given the evolution of warfare, and those who support just war criteria as reliable principles for the conduct of warfare in the twenty-first century.

In this exciting forum of ideas, opponents and proponents of just war theory introduce concepts worthy of serious consideration. While the book resembles a recent installment of the *Star Wars* movies in its probing of the morals of unmanned drones, lethal autonomous robots, cyberspace nonkinetics, and more, the writers call on the great philosophers of the past to help address the latest trends and projections of national security measures. Under the category “Theories of War,” contributors critique and defend the criteria to justify the commencement of war (*jus ad bellum*), the criteria by which war is conducted (*jus in bello*), and the criteria by which war is concluded with postconflict stabilization, reconstruction, and humanitarian assistance (*jus post bellum*). The editors do not stack the deck to bias the reader toward or against just war theory, and this illustrates the distinct virtue of this scholarly undertaking: its diversity of themes and perspectives.

Whether it is Jeff McMahan’s argument that the soldier has an epistemic responsibility to ascertain whether the war in which he or she fights is just, or Richard Werner’s psychological thesis that most

wars are justified as in-group exceptionalism and collective self-deception, or Jeff Whitman's insistence that just war theory in its criteria toward war and in war minimizes the suffering of combat, the editors expose the reader to age-old debates and new-age innovations. For instance, what are the moral implications of the child-soldier who constitutes a lethal force but in some ways is still not accountable as an adult warrior? How does just war theory interface with the increasing use of private military contractors within the world's armed services, as combatants or civilians? Are robotic warriors morally culpable, or are their software programmers? Can scientists produce research papers on the positives of the latest medical breakthrough without also considering the multiuse of viruses for human harm? Can nonkinetic information attacks on, say, banks constitute acts of aggression that warrant a kinetic response of self-defense? Are torture and indefinite imprisonment acceptable as an ethics of exceptionalism for terrorists? All these questions and more acquaint scholar and student alike with the burgeoning moral dilemmas of war in the last decade.

Poised between the idealism of pacifism on the one hand and the cynicism of realism on the other, theorists on all sides of the debate directly state or indirectly insinuate the value of just war theory. Critics suggest just war theory's value by making improvements that presuppose its core principles as foundational standards from which

to upgrade. Just war advocates and revisionists apply the necessary criteria to the changing landscape of war, maintaining that the principles are flexible enough to embrace the latest invention, yet firm enough to respect the collective wisdom of bygone centuries.

The just war tradition is not a static canon of dogmatic tenets, but rather a dynamic canon of robust precepts that are adaptable but faithful to the central concepts of justice. After all, policy makers and warfighters, in contemplating the tremendous costs of war and peace, cannot easily turn a deaf ear to great thinkers such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Aquinas, to name only a few. Indeed, to deny the validity of the just war tradition would be to countermand the Geneva Conventions, international humanitarian law, and the UN Charter, all of which are predicated in some way on the insights of those ancient and ageless core premises known as just war theory. As long as philosophers and ethicists deliberate the values of justice and peace pertaining to statecraft, just war ideas will be relevant, and so will any compendium of essays that explore the topics of *jus pax* (the law of peace). Illuminating and profound in scope, the *Routledge Handbook of Ethics and War* is one of the best additions to the just war dialogue in many years and promises to inform the scholar-warrior on the most challenging issues of our day.

EDWARD ERWIN

---

#### OUR REVIEWERS

*Scott Bergeron* is the chief executive officer of the Liberian registry, the U.S.-based manager of the world's second-largest ship registry, and is responsible for ensuring the regulatory compliance of

over 4,200 commercial ships representing 150 million gross tons. Mr. Bergeron has seagoing experience with the U.S. Merchant Marine and gained practical knowledge of vessel ownership and technical management throughout his career.

*Philip Bilden* is a philanthropist and national security advocate. He graduated magna cum laude with a bachelor of science in foreign service from Georgetown University, where he also received the President's Cup as the top graduate of Georgetown's Army ROTC brigade. He is an MBA graduate of Harvard Business School.

*Edward Erwin* serves as command chaplain of Naval Air Station Sigonella, Sicily, Italy. He holds a doctorate in theology and ethics from Duke University.

*Michael V. Leggiere* is professor of history and deputy director of the Military History Center at the University of North Texas. He is the award-winning author of five books on Napoleon and his wars.

*Michael McCrabb* is the strategic planner for the Naval Education and Training Security Assistance Field Activity in Pensacola, Florida. He is a retired naval officer who graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1978 and the U.S. Naval Staff College in 1991.

*Thomas McShane* is a retired U.S. Army colonel who was an Army judge advocate general (JAG). He served in Operation DESERT STORM and in Europe during the Kosovo campaign. He taught at the Army JAG School, at the Army War College, and, following his retirement, at the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Gordon, Georgia, where he was an associate professor and campus director. He has published articles in *Parameters*, *Military Review*, and *Army Lawyer*.

*Richard J. Norton* is a professor of national security affairs at the Naval War College. He is a retired naval officer and holds a PhD from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

*Mark R. Shulman* teaches and writes on international law and history topics, with a special focus on great-power relations.

*Sean Sullivan* is an associate professor at the Naval War College and a retired U.S. naval officer who served for more than a decade at sea in surface combatants, destroyer and amphibious squadrons, and the Third Fleet, participating in the planning and execution of U.S., allied, and coalition antisubmarine warfare operations, exercises, and training events.



## REFLECTIONS ON READING

---

*Professor John E. Jackson of the Naval War College is the Program Manager for the Chief of Naval Operations Professional Reading Program.*

**T**he Chief of Naval Operations Professional Reading Program (CNO-PRP) encourages sailors at all ranks and grade levels to seek to enhance their professionalism by reading books of consequence. The CNO has identified more than 150 titles for consideration in such professional-development efforts.

We begin with a question: What is the true measure of a sailor's identity? We often wrap ourselves in the defining terms of rates, designators, skills, and rank. Of course, these are important—they give structure to a system that manages talent and promotes individuals on the basis of performance and ability, establish incentives and organize pay scales, and create a unique culture that both pervades our institutional identity and transcends history. This is the identity of the Navy as a whole, not of the individual, and rightly the focus is on the organization, the unit, and the collective nature of sailors deploying together in harm's way.

Another question should be asked, however, especially when considering the old adage that the whole is often greater than the sum of its parts. Is the measure of an individual really a matter of collar devices, chevrons, or warfare devices? Or is it the individual's qualities—innate or learned—that engender a sense of purpose, or simply place weighted value on the characteristics that sailors should reflect—the core values, if you will? Together, sailors adopting the Navy's core values make the organization stronger. These values are primarily personal, but they are intertwined with the core attributes delineated in the CNO's "Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority."

Cohesion of a fighting force depends on having trust and confidence in each other and in the chain of command. Sailors are called on to serve the ship and each other, especially in combat, and trust in one's shipmates must be based on shared principles and a core identity. As stated in the Design, "Four core attributes of our *professional* identity will help to serve as guiding criteria for our decisions and actions. If we abide by," or internalize, "these attributes"—integrity, accountability, initiative, and toughness—"our values should be clearly

evident in our actions.” Deckplate education provides skill development through hardscrabble work and the satisfaction of knowing a job has been done well. A classroom, even if that classroom is a berthing space or barracks room, provides space for intellectual growth that supplements and strengthens the person and the organization.

The CNO-PRP provides a list of books that discuss core attributes of a professional identity. Books on leadership, management, philosophy, ethics, learning, perseverance, and teamwork—all terms familiar to sailors—blend stories of success and failure that shape the world in which we live and the nation and Navy we serve. Reading others’ stories, theories, and philosophies entertains and educates, but it also allows us to grapple with ideas that are not our own. We learn by fusing the lessons of history with our own knowledge, beliefs, and values. The core attributes are foundational in our professional lives, but we must dedicate time and effort to reflecting on why they are important. In doing so, we permanently embed these attributes in the foundation of our Navy for the current and future generations of sailors.

Thankfully, we have some resources to guide us.

- *Integrity*—upright and honorable conduct—requires conscious decisions in tough situations. Consistent adherence to our core values defines who we are as individuals and builds trust among people. In the CNO-PRP, Joseph J. Ellis’s book *His Excellency: George Washington* and *The Road to Character* by David Brooks offer testimony on the worth of personal integrity.
- *Accountability*—holding each other to objective standards—keeps us focused on the mission. Often we bemoan the repetition of general quarters and man-overboard drills, but when the time comes we must be able to stand shoulder to shoulder, with the understanding that everyone knows how to do the job. General Stanley McChrystal’s *Team of Teams* and Simon Sinek’s *Leaders Eat Last* are powerful tomes that argue that we are better in groups than as individuals acting alone.
- *Initiative*—approaching situations with open minds and ownership—promotes a willingness to challenge the status quo, but always with the mission in mind. “Ship, shipmate, self.” *Leadership on the Line* by Ronald A. Heifetz and Marty Linsky and *The Rules of the Game* by Andrew Gordon illustrate the importance of accountability.
- Books such as *The Conquering Tide* by Ian W. Toll and *Matterhorn* by Karl Marlantes illustrate the importance of *toughness*. Resilience in combat and an ability to carry the fight to the enemy despite overwhelming odds are hallmarks of our service. We “Don’t give up the ship.”

These examples found under the Core Attributes section of the CNO-PRP website are complemented by many other titles, many available in e-book or audiobook format. We encourage all sailors to visit the website or social media pages of the CNO-PRP and the Navy General Library Program. The resources are free of charge to sailors and are an essential part of the self-education so critical to the future of our Navy.

CAPTAIN TIMOTHY URBAN, USN, DEPUTY PROGRAM MANAGER, CNO-PRP