

CHAPTER 6

THE ROLE OF PEACEBUILDING AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN A FUTURE AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY: TIME FOR AN “OFF SHORE” APPROACH?

Charles J. Dunlap, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

As the post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) wars in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, it is the right time to examine the role of peacebuilding and conflict management in a future American grand strategy. With the enormous cost in blood and money these efforts have tallied, it seems clear that nations, to include especially the United States, need to consider alternative approaches to accomplish their strategic goals. As unpopular as the recent conflicts have become in the American body politic, it seems inevitable that circumstances arise where peacebuilding and conflict management operations are needed.

Accordingly, it is incumbent upon the Armed Forces to develop methodologies to accomplish these missions, and to do so in a way that is supportable by the public. The purpose of this chapter is to examine what that approach might be and how it might address the existing deficiencies in peacebuilding and conflict management techniques, and to do so in the context of an American grand strategy. It will propose an “off shore” approach, one that leverages American asymmetric capabilities, while realistically assessing the difficulties occasioned by manpower-intensive approaches that are extant. The chapter begins with

a discussion of the threshold questions, the ones that will provide the necessary context for the proposal: What is grand strategy? Does America have one?

WHAT IS GRAND STRATEGY?

Answering this question presents a daunting challenge, as there are so many respected authorities who believe that America does not have a grand strategy now, and has little prospect of formulating one that is suitable for planning purposes in the near future.¹ Yet definitions for grand strategy exist. For example, the American Grand Strategy Program at Duke University defines grand strategy as a “quintessentially interdisciplinary concept, approach, and field of study.”² It goes on to say that:

- Grand strategy is the art of reconciling ends and means. It involves purposive action—what leaders think and want.
- It operates in peacetime and wartime, incorporating military and nonmilitary tools and aggregating subsidiary tactics, operations, and policies.
- Grand strategy begins with theory: leaders’ ideas about how the world is, or ought to be, and their states’ roles in that world. Yet it is embodied in policy and practice: government action and reaction in response to real (or perceived) threats and opportunities.
- It lends itself to vigorous interpretive academic debates, yet it is so realistic that practitioners can and must contribute for it to be properly understood.³

With that understood, the Duke program defines *American grand strategy* as:

the collection of plans and policies by which the leadership of the United States mobilizes and deploys the country's resources and capabilities, both military and nonmilitary, to achieve its national goals.⁴

One might say, then, that American grand strategy simply seeks to create an environment where American values can flourish, to include especially the free enterprise system as well as a liberal democratic polity. This is not intended to be yet another expression of American exceptionalism, but rather a manifestation of the idea that these two principles offer the best hope of realistically harnessing human nature for not just American interests, but for the global common good writ large.

This is not to advocate unbridled free enterprise. Free enterprise that is exploitive of individuals, especially those in a society who—for any number of reasons—feel themselves dispossessed or unable to access the means of upward mobility, can be the source of societal discontent and disorder. Additionally, free enterprise that is indifferent to the environment in a world increasingly aware of the global consequences of environmental mismanagement can generate hostility across a range of actors from individuals to non-governmental groups to nation-states and even to consortiums of nation-states.

Democracy, *qua* democracy, can itself be the source of alienation if it is permitted to devolve into majoritarian tyranny. *Liberal* democracy, with its respect for individual rights and the rule of law, has an architecture that includes freedom of the press, an indepen-

dent judiciary, and other attributes that help to avoid the kinds of pressures that can manifest themselves in violence when individuals and groups feel hopelessly subjugated by governments who simplistically cater to an undifferentiated version of “popular” will.

Yet it is nevertheless true that these concepts — free enterprise and liberal democracy — when tempered by the considerations just discussed, provide the best hope of reconciling mankind’s inherent impulse to act in its own best interests, with a parallel need to act collaboratively in a complex and interconnected world. Certainly these values have imperfect characteristics, but overall, they have proven superior to other concepts of human organization.

AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY AND CONFLICT

Quite obviously, the values of an American grand strategy so defined thrive best in a conflict-free environment. Historically — and, indeed, to this day — the primary purpose of the state is to create that environment. The means of doing so frequently was — and, it seems, still *is* — to organize the means of violence on behalf of the state — or collection of states — and to apply it whenever the condition of peace was disturbed or threatened. In a perfect world, individuals and states inclined to disrupt peace would be deterred from doing so by the prospect of conflict that, as a matter of logic, would be an inefficient and cost-prohibitive means of resolving disputes.

It is not, of course, a perfect world. Some individuals and states have perceived, and likely will continue to perceive, a security asymmetry that can be exploited to their benefit. What is more, for a variety of reasons —

religion, ideology, cultural identity, and more—they can rationalize a sense of entitlement of superiority for themselves. Such perceptions can translate—however illogically—into a belief that those so disposed possess the power to achieve their ends by force. Efforts to dissuade such conclusions can be effective, but have their limits simply because intransigence can also be a feature of the human mind, and one that can contaminate the thinking of entire societies, to include those who are otherwise cosmopolitan and even generally pacific.

Plato reportedly adroitly observed that “only the dead have seen the end of war.” Thus, we must accept that the nature of the human condition is such that for the foreseeable future—irrespective of *any* grand strategy—the vagaries of the human condition—not to mention humanity’s aggressive impulses—will continue to challenge the success of an American grand strategy as I defined it.

Yet the inevitability of human conflict does not mean we should abandon efforts to avoid it. Every instance of success represents lives saved and futures preserved. Even where violence cannot be avoided, efforts to ameliorate and limit its effects are patently worthy endeavors because they readily encourage a minimization of human suffering, as well as help create a space, so to speak, for liberal democracy and free enterprise to take root and prosper.

The question then is how best to create those spaces in an era of the ever present risk of violence? In an interesting article in the March/April 2012 issue of *Foreign Affairs* entitled “A Clear and Present Safety,” the authors Micha Zenko and Michael A. Cohen assert that America is safer and more secure than ever before, and faces no great power rival and no serious

threats.⁵ According to Zenko and Cohen, the United States needs a foreign policy that reflects that reality.

The article also contends that:

because of the chronic exaggeration of the threats facing the United States, Washington overemphasizes military approaches to problems (including many that could best be solved by nonmilitary means).⁶

It goes on to insist that:

although U.S. military strength has occasionally contributed to creating a conducive environment for positive change, those improvements were achieved mostly through the work of civilian agencies and nongovernmental actors in the private and nonprofit sectors.⁷

Zenko and Cohen are not alone in their views. In his recent book, *Winning the War on War*, Joshua Goldstein made a similar claim, arguing that, “in fact, the world is becoming more peaceful.”⁸ Goldstein gives great credit not to the United States, but to the United Nations (UN) for its peacekeeping and other operations that he argues could be even more successful were they better funded and supported.

While there is much to commend about Zenko and Cohen’s essay (as well as the Goldstein book), the problem with the thesis that both propound is the insufficient appreciation of what the world will be like if U.S. military power is perceived as compromised. If that were to become the case, there is the extraordinarily dangerous prospect that opportunistic nations will destabilize the world if they get the impression that U.S. military power is on the wane, let alone being deliberately diminished. Some around the globe

may cheer but, unfortunately, many are not necessarily the friends of peace.

The real value of U.S. military power is that its mere existence in many instances permits – and gives gravitas to – the very civilian/nongovernmental organization (NGO) soft power concepts Zenko *et al.* endorse. To be sure, it is quite true that many successes in the past were the product of diplomatic, humanitarian, economic, and other distinctly nonmilitary efforts, but they were accomplished in a world where enormous American military power was always lurking in the background. The reality, as uncomfortable as it may be for many, is that the U.S. military is the irreplaceable peace enabler in today's world.

There is little reason to assume that the same kind of soft-power victories that Zenko and others celebrate would be possible if the military equation is altered in a serious way. Should the overwhelming U.S. conventional – and unconventional – capability recede, adversaries may see opportunity, perhaps not today, but in the foreseeable future. Once a capability is dismantled – as has been done by the United States with the F-22 manufacturing line⁹ – it is very difficult, if not impossible, to resurrect it. We must never forget that U.S. military power takes the military option off the table for many competitors. Economic, social, political, etc., competitions remain, but creating an environment where the military option becomes conceivable is hardly a desirable outcome.

To be clear, one might rightly agree that U.S. military spending must come down to some degree in order to help get our economic house in order, and that the nonmilitary elements of American power need to be better brought to bear in the execution of American grand strategy in the years to come. Yet, some still

believe that U.S. *military* might must remain the fundamental – if not central – element of American grand strategy for as long as we can imagine.

PEACEBUILDING AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: THE LESSONS LEARNED

Of course, devising a fresh approach to peacebuilding and conflict management requires an unvarnished examination of the operations of the past decade, and there are certainly many lessons to be learned from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The effort to reorient entire societies in Iraq and Afghanistan via a strategy that was manpower-intensive and ground-centric has proven to be flawed.

Certainly, the American Soldier, given enough time and enough resources, can accomplish almost anything, to include the remaking of entire countries. The problem is that doing so first requires the application of military force to the existing ruling cadre and its instruments of power so sternly and persistently as to imprint upon the society a sense of defeat so complete that the environment is created where a completely new and – it is to be hoped – more peaceful and democratic society can emerge and the likelihood of resistance is markedly diminished.

Norman Friedman suggests this in his 2004 article *Is Modern War Too Precise?*¹⁰ In it, he indicates that for all its faults and shortcomings, the devastating World War II aerial bombardment of Germany may not have won many “hearts and minds” among the German people “but it did help preclude any post-surrender violence like what is now being seen in Iraq.”¹¹ Regrettably, in Iraq, an ill-considered “race to Baghdad” in 2003 stretched logistic lines and enabled Saddam’s Fe-

dayeen to achieve some tactical success against support troops poorly prepared for infantry combat. This became something of a “proof of concept” for Iraqi insurgents that U.S. troops were, in fact, vulnerable.

It would have been far better to have exercised more patience and allowed American air and artillery to progressively devastate Iraq’s elite military formations. Instead, they were allowed to melt away and form the core of the insurgency, which was never really crushed in nearly a decade of occupation. The Iraqi people—to include especially those who became the resistance—never internalized the shattering sense of defeat that enabled the Germans and Japanese at the end of World War II to abandon their deeply embedded militaristic, racist, and totalitarian ideologies.

Despite the experience with Japan and Germany, American leaders do not seem to fully comprehend what it takes to truly transform entire societies in a timeline shorter than several generations. Curiously, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey admitted that the aim of purging Afghanistan of the Taliban could have been achieved militarily, since the United States:

could have started at one end of Afghanistan and fundamentally overrun it, destroyed it, created a situation where we would make it a near certainty that the Taliban couldn’t come back, because there wouldn’t be anything to come back to. . . .¹²

General Dempsey hastened to add that such a forceful effort was “not who we are.”¹³ There are, of course, several observations to be made here, starting with the idea that American values extant during World War II are not necessarily ones to be abandoned. More specifically, if the suggestion is that focusing

on the destruction of the enemy—the Taliban in this instance—invariably involves the wholesale obliteration of civilians and their property, he underestimates the revolutionary capabilities of a technological revolution that allows force to be applied in a discrete way that is fully lawful and moral. That technological revolution has, according to retired General Barry R. McCaffrey, “fundamentally changed the nature of warfare” by allowing the rise of persistent, long-term reconnaissance and precision strikes.¹⁴

It is becoming increasingly clear that force—particularly in counterinsurgency (COIN) situations—is the *proven* solution, especially when rapid results are needed. As Professor Anna Simons of the Naval Postgraduate School contends:

Not only does COIN’s own history reflect the need for a stunning amount of brutality, but the fact that in campaign after campaign, commanders have found themselves desperate to be able to apply decisive force reveals what every generation ends up (re)discovering the hard way: soft approaches don’t impel enough people to change their ways fast enough.¹⁵

Her conclusion fits with that of an ever-widening range of experts. Jill Hazelton of Harvard’s Belfer Center contends, contrary to popular wisdom, that

[s]uccess in COIN does not require the protection of the populace, good governance, economic development, or winning the allegiance or the loyalty of the great majority of the population.

Importantly, she says it “does not require building up all of the institutions of the state.”¹⁶ The grim realities of which she speaks should give pause to

COIN theorists who disparage the efficacy of force. In April 2011, the *Washington Post* reported that in Afghanistan, the:

security improvements have been the result of intense fighting and the use of high-impact weapons systems *not normally associated with the protect-the-population counterinsurgency mission*.¹⁷

Nevertheless, because the U.S. military establishment was dominated by ground-centric thinkers, the “solution” to the challenge of peacebuilding and conflict management necessarily had to involve ground forces, and lots of them. In the case of COIN, that solution doctrinally eschewed force. Such was the nature of *Field Manual* (FM) 3-24,¹⁸ published in 2006. It was, as one pundit put it, “warfare for northeastern graduate students” and other “people who would never own a gun.”¹⁹ Among other things, it called for enormous numbers of counterinsurgents (to comprise about 5 percent of the populations), with each Soldier prepared, as the FM said, to become “a social worker, a civil engineer, a school teacher, a nurse, a boy scout.”²⁰ Nation building quite obviously was a critical element of the doctrine.

Executing the doctrine espoused in FM 3-24 justified huge increases in the size of American ground forces. Unfortunately, it ignored some key history about COIN operations and the presence of a large number of foreign troops. COIN expert William R. Polk insists that the “fundamental motivation” for insurgents is an “aim primarily to protect the integrity of the native group from foreigners.”²¹ Likewise, in 2008, former Army Chief of Staff General John Wickham warned that “[l]arge military forces alien-

ate local populations, succeed less and cost more.”²² More recently, John Brennan, Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, pointed out:

Countries typically don’t want foreign soldiers in their cities and towns. In fact, large, intrusive military deployments risk playing into al-Qa’ida’s strategy of trying to draw us into long, costly wars that drain us financially, inflame anti-American resentment and inspire the next generation of terrorists.²³

THE FUTURE: “OFF SHORE” PEACEBUILDING AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

So what does all this mean for the future of peacebuilding and conflict management, given the grand strategy I have outlined? At the outset, it is essential to understand that it does *not* mean that the United States should abandon peacebuilding and conflict management efforts. Nor does it mean that it is utterly inconceivable that the United States might again conduct a large-footprint operation *à la* Iraq or Afghanistan. What it does mean, however, is that large-footprint operations for peacebuilding and conflict management missions need to undergo fundamental rethinking.

Part of this requires the acceptance, however unwanted, of certain cold political realities, which include the fact that public support for the large-footprint war in Afghanistan is collapsing. Not only do 78 percent of Americans favor withdrawing troops,²⁴ 66 percent believe that the war has not been “worth fighting.”²⁵ With respect to the latter, beyond the human cost, our present strategy is extremely costly. The

expense of deploying one American Soldier to Afghanistan for 1 year has ballooned to \$1.2 million,²⁶ a figure to which planners must be especially sensitive now that the U.S. public is supporting substantial cuts in defense spending.²⁷

While it does seem that it might be cheaper to deploy civilians to accomplish many of the nation-building tasks currently performed by the military, the viability of that option is suspect.²⁸ As a Congressional Research Service report dated February 2, 2012, entitled *Building Civilian Interagency Capacity for Missions Abroad: Key Proposals and Issues for Congress*, reveals, the U.S. Government's ability to conduct such missions remains deeply flawed, if not in disarray.²⁹ In any event, there is a tyranny of numbers involved, as even the most optimistic assessments do not contemplate many more than 2,000 experts would be involved, even if resources outside of government were tapped.³⁰

Just as problematic is the sheer difficulty of peace-building and conflict management in deeply flawed societies under circumstances where, as indicated above, the political decision has been made not to use force to the extent that has proven successful in past situations, even if it can be applied in a way that is fully lawful and moral. Still, in conflict management situations, force will necessarily have to be employed, but likely not via large numbers of American ground forces. The models for the future are more likely to be along the lines of the Kosovo intervention of the late 1990s and Libya in 2011. As the *New York Times* put it:

Libya proved that the leaders of some medium-size powers can be overthrown from a distance, without putting American boots on the ground, by using weap-

ons fired from sea and air with the heaviest load carried by partner nations — in the case of Libya, European allies and even some Arab states.³¹

In essence, this might be called “offshore conflict management.” This is not an especially new concept, and has been suggested for a number of scenarios of potential conflict. Retired Marine Colonel Thomas X. Hammes has, for example, developed a proposal he calls “Offshore Control” aimed at leveraging U.S. technical advantages as a means of addressing the security challenge of China without necessarily putting a large mass of American troops on the Chinese mainland.³²

In a sense, options for conflict management that avoid large troop deployments seem consonant with the Barack Obama administration’s emphasis on counterterrorism operations aimed at key enemy leaders conducted by drones and special operations forces. In fact, the President recently explicitly stated that in Afghanistan, his “goal is not to build a country in America’s image” but rather “to destroy [al-Qaeda].”³³ To the extent this involves drone attacks against al-Qaeda leadership, it has enormous support from the American people, with 83 percent approving of their use.³⁴

Of course, not all conflict management can be accomplished by drones, or even special operation ground strikes like that which eliminated Osama bin Laden. That does require American ground forces, but with rare exceptions, the face of such operations ought to be indigenous personnel. In order to build the kind of capacity that host nations need, on-site trainers and mentors may be required, as is currently being done in Afghanistan. On-site mentorship does, however, carry an increased risk of a rogue killing a foreign

trainer. As of this writing, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) lost 19 soldiers to such attacks in 2012 alone.³⁵

A FRESH ENVIRONMENT

How, then, to do it? Perhaps what is needed is a *massive* program to take people out of their environment—to include even to the United States—so they can focus on the kind of transformative training, indeed, *thinking* that is essential to truly reforming and remaking the societies of failed or failing states. Doing so can also facilitate access to the necessary training personnel and resources. This would be as applicable for building expertise in the civilian sector—government administrators as well as people from private enterprises—as it would be for the security services.

There is strong rationale for such an approach. Now retired Army Colonel-turned-university professor Peter Mansoor noted in a 2005 interview that training Iraqi forces outside of Iraq had its benefits:

The great advantage is the security is much better. You don't have to guard the installation to the degree you have to in Iraq. . . . Another advantage is if it's staffed by foreign officers, they don't have to come into Iraq and become targets in order to teach. Also, existing facilities can be used that don't require a lot of renovation or rebuilding, as is the case with many buildings in Iraq.³⁶

Obviously, a similar approach elsewhere would not eliminate the risks. But the chance of a rogue arising in such an environment can be minimized with careful vetting. The advantages are, in any event, manifold. For example, the difficulties of recruiting

and deploying skilled and experienced civilians to remote and dangerous locales would be markedly eased, especially if facilities could be located in the United States. Importantly, there are models already existing in the U.S. military of such programs working successfully. For example, the U.S. Air Force operates the Inter-American Air Forces Academy at Lackland Air Force base in San Antonio, Texas, where technical courses are taught, “in Spanish and in English, to students from more than 22 countries every year.”³⁷

To be successful, the scope of such schools and other educational facilities must be large and diverse. Even for a country the size of Afghanistan, this could involve tens of thousands of individuals each year. While certainly costly, it can hardly compare with the \$1 million plus cost of sending a U.S. person to Afghanistan for a peacebuilding operation. Creating such a structure within the United States (or, perhaps, another country) may not be practical, but it may be possible to build a dedicated program within the existing American educational structure. For example, a program for advanced education might be constructed under the aegis of Kennesaw State’s Program in International Conflict Management, where international students are given the opportunity to learn in the relative safety and security of an authentic American setting – and evaluate for themselves the potential application to their native country.

An important element of such an “off shore” approach would be the availability of training and education in the native language of the students, while at the same time making English-language instruction available. Further, opportunities could be crafted for the students to learn about American culture and values. This is, emphatically, *not* intended to displace the

culture and values of the students' home countries, but rather to help dispel the misperceptions of the United States that can arise in nations needing peacebuilding and conflict management.

This educational process can be supplemented by in-country and online programs (in the indigenous language) by means of equipment and facilities supplied by the United States but manned by local nationals. Moreover, mentoring relationships can be built and maintained through daily interactions via Skype or similar technologies, to include social media formats. Again, the physical presence of some U.S. personnel cannot (and, likely, should not) be eliminated, but the numbers could be reduced to the level that realistically can be accommodated by programs such as the Civilian Response Corps.

CONCLUSION

The proposal this chapter advocates is certainly not a perfect one and will not satisfy every stakeholder. Unquestionably, for example, this kind of "off shore" proposal can be rightly criticized as a too lengthy, costly, and political capital-consuming methodology. Yet this back-to-basics approach may be the only way to realistically create the environment for genuine change, a process that can well take several generations. The "quick fixes" (e.g., build a school, equip a clinic, or grade a road) so attractive to the American mindset just do not work as effectively as one might hope.

Consider the work of researchers Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson. Although not focused on peacebuilding *qua* peacebuilding, their research leads them to the relevant observation that nations fail "when they have extractive economic institutions,

supported by extractive political institutions that impede and even block economic growth.”³⁸ This cannot be offset merely by digging wells, building clinics, or even economic development projects; it may necessitate dramatic changes in attitudes among leadership and other elites. Indeed, without appropriate institutional leaders, any physical assets provided become yet one more cause for conflict as corrupt power brokers scramble for control of anything of value.

It is a mistake to underestimate the difficulty of rooting out venality writ large in less than a generation. This is one reason our efforts in Afghanistan remain stymied. As General David Petraeus said in 2010, “there’s no question that corruption has been, for however long this country has probably been in existence, been part of the—literally the culture,”³⁹ a point reiterated recently by former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta.⁴⁰ Indeed, “too much corruption,” along with “too many Afghan deserters” and “too few NATO trainers,” has been reported as a key obstacle to training Afghans to take over security duties once NATO departs.⁴¹

Even those disposed to be optimistic about the outcome in Afghanistan have no illusions about the depth of this societal flaw and what it will take to overcome it. Major General H. R. McMaster, who led a task force to root out corruption, was recently reported as saying that:

[T]he root of Afghanistan’s corruption problem goes deeper, to three decades of ‘trauma that it’s been through, the legacy of the 1990s civil war . . . [and] the effects of the narcotics trade.’ Add to that the unintended consequences of sudden Western attention starting in 2001: ‘We did exacerbate the problem with lack of transparency and accountability built into the

large influx of international assistance that came into a government that lacked mature institutions.’⁴²

While it may not necessarily take decades to excise the corruption endemic to Afghan society, it is clearly a long-term task. Selected uses of force employing off-shore and light-footprint capabilities for conflict management can help buy time for nonmilitary processes to work if, and only if, a major effort is made to grow the next generation of political, military, and economic leaders with a sophisticated understanding of the damaging effects of corruption on Afghanistan’s future. Much the same can be said for other—and future—“Afghanistans” around the globe.

There are many unique factors about Afghanistan that make it an imperfect example of the kind of peacebuilding and conflict management issues that will arise in the coming years as the United States grapples with building an approach that meets the needs of U.S. grand strategy, yet is one that is sound in the political reality of an austere funding environment. To be politically viable, we must develop options that are less demanding in blood and money.

Off-shore peacebuilding and conflict management will not work in every instance, but the basics of it—that is, the idea of a light footprint approach that leverages America’s asymmetric advantages in high technology⁴³—might perhaps be a useful starting point when the next such challenge arises, as it inevitably will. At the end of the day, the approach must be grounded in the idea that notwithstanding whatever assistance any outside entity can provide, the ultimate responsibility is upon the people themselves, and developing *their* capabilities (as opposed to ours, *per se*) is the central task of peacebuilding and conflict management as we look ahead.

ENDNOTES - CHAPTER 6

1. See, for example, Rosa Brooks, *Obama Needs a Grand Strategy*, *Foreign Policy*, January 23, 2012, p. 1, available from www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/23/obama_needs_a_grand_strategy?page=0.

2. *What is Grand Strategy?* Durham, NC: Duke University Program in American Grand Strategy, available from www.duke.edu/web/agsp/index.html#grandstrategy.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Duke American Grand Strategy*, Durham, NC: Duke University Program in American Grand Strategy, available from www.duke.edu/web/agsp/index.html.

5. Micha Zenko and Michael A. Cohen, "A Clear and Present Safety," *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2012, p. 79.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

8. Joshua S. Goldstein, *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide*, Boston, MA: Dutton/Plume (Penguin), 2011.

9. John Tirpak, "The F-22 and Clout Deficit," *Air Force Magazine*, July 23, 2012, available from www.airforce-magazine.com/DRArchive/Pages/2012/July%202012/July%2023%202012/TheF-22andCloutDeficit.aspx, quoting Air Force Chief of Staff Norton Schwartz as saying there is "no chance" of restarting the F-22 manufacturing line.

10. Norman Friedman, "Is Modern War Too Precise?" *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, December 2004, p. 4.

11. *Ibid.*

12. *A Conversation with General Martin Dempsey*, Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May 1, 2012, available from carnegieendowment.org/files/050112_transcript_dempsey.pdf.

13. *Ibid.*

14. As General Barry McCaffrey, USA (Ret.) has observed:

We have already made a 100 year war-fighting leap-ahead with MQ-1 Predator, MQ-9 Reaper, and Global Hawk. Now we have loiter times in excess of 24 hours, persistent eyes on target, micro-kill with Hellfire and 500 lb. JDAM bombs, synthetic aperture radar, and a host of ISR [intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance] sensors and communications potential that have fundamentally changed the nature of warfare.

General Barry R. McCaffrey, *Memorandum for Colonel Mike Meese, United States Military Academy, Subject: After Action Report*, October 15, 2007, p. 5 (*italics added*), available from www.mccaffreyassociates.com/pages/documents/AirForceAAR-101207.pdf.

15. Anna Simons, "Soft War + Smart War? Think Again," *E-Notes*, Philadelphia, PA: Foreign Policy Research Institute, April 2012, available from www.fpri.org/enotes/2012/201204.simons.soft-war-smart-war.html.

16. Jacqueline L. Hazelton, "The Hearts-and-Minds Approach Versus The High-Force Low Accommodation Approach," *Compellence and Accommodation in Counterinsurgency Warfare*, September 2010 (unpublished manuscript on file with author) (*Italics added*).

17. Rajiv Chandrasekaren, "In Afghanistan's South, Signs of Progress in Three Districts Signal a Shift," *Washington Post*, April 16, 2011, available from www.washingtonpost.com/world/in-afghanistans-south-signs-of-progress-in-three-districts-signal-a-shift/2011/04/14/AF7gBwqD_story.html (*Italics added*).

18. *Field Manual 3-24, Counterinsurgency*, U.S. Department of the Army, December 15, 2006, p. D-8 (hereafter FM 3-24), also des-

ignated by Headquarters Marine Corps Development Command, Department of the Navy, as *Marine Corps Warfighting Publication No. 3-33.5, Counterinsurgency*, December 15, 2006, p. 1, available from www.scribd.com/doc/9137276/US-Army-Field-Manual-FM-324-Counterinsurgency.

19. The full paragraph stated:

[The COIN Manual's] reception reflected Petraeus's considerable media networking skills as well as the appeal of counter-insurgency doctrine among sections of the country's liberal-minded intelligentsia. This was warfare for northeastern graduate students—complex, blended with politics, designed to build countries rather than destroy them, and fashioned to minimize violence. It was a doctrine with particular appeal to people who would never own a gun. The field manual illustrated its themes with case-study vignettes whose titles suggested the authors' ethical ambitions: "Defusing a Confrontation," "Lose Moral Legitimacy, Lose the War."

See Steve Coll, "The General's Dilemma," *The New Yorker*, September 8, 2008, available from www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/09/08/080908fa_fact_coll?currentPage=all.

20. FM 3-24, note 18, para 2-42.

21. William R. Polk, *Violent Politics: A History of Insurgency, Terrorism & Guerrilla War, from the American Revolution to Iraq*, New York: Harper, 2007, pp. xiv-xv.

22. John A. Wickham, "Why a Smaller Footprint is Good," *Arizona Daily Star*, November 9, 2008, available from gunnyg.wordpress.com/2008/11/15/large-military-forces-alienate-local-populations-succeed-less-and-cost-moreby-john-adams-wickham/.

23. Remarks of John O. Brennan, Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, *The Ethics and Efficacy of the President's Counterterrorism Strategy*, Washington, DC: The Wilson Center, April 30, 2012, available from www.wilsoncenter.org/event/the-ethics-and-ethics-us-counterterrorism-strategy.

24. Fox News Poll (conducted by Anderson Robbins Research (D) and Shaw & Company Research, April 22-24, 2012, available from www.pollingreport.com/afghan.htm.

25. ABC News/*Washington Post* Poll, April 5-8, 2012, available from www.pollingreport.com/afghan.htm.

26. Todd Harrison, *Analysis of the 2012 Defense Budget*, Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and Budgetary Analysis, July 15, 2011, p. 7, available from www.csbaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2011.07.16-FY-2012-Defense-Budget.pdf.

27. R. Jeffrey Smith, "To Trim the Deficit, Americans Favor Much Deeper Reductions at the Pentagon than Their Leaders Do," iWatch News, Washington, DC: Center for Public Integrity, May 10, 2012, available from www.iwatchnews.org/2012/05/10/8856/public-overwhelmingly-supports-large-defense-spending-cuts.

28. Yochi Dreazen, "Afghanistan's Civilian Surge Comes with Enormous Price Tag and Uncertain Results," *The National Journal*, September 8, 2011, available from www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/afghanistan-s-civilian-surge-comes-with-enormous-price-tag-and-uncertain-results-20110908.

29. Nina M. Serafino, Catherine Dale, and Pat Towells, *Building Civilian Interagency Capacity for Missions Abroad: Key Proposals and Issues for Congress*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, January 23, 2012, available from fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/183725.pdf.

30. Nina M. Serafino, *Peacekeeping/Stabilization and Conflict Transitions: Background and Congressional Action on the Civilian Response/Reserve Corps and other Civilian Stabilization and Reconstruction Capabilities*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, January 12, 2012, available from www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL32862.pdf.

31. Thom Shanker and Eric Schmitt, "Seeing Limits to 'New' Kind of War in Libya," *New York Times*, October 21, 2011, available from www.nytimes.com/2011/10/22/world/africa/nato-war-in-libya-shows-united-states-was-vital-to-toppling-qaddafi.html.

32. Thomas X. Hammes, "Offshore Control: A Proposed Strategy," *Infinity Magazine*, Spring 2012, p. 10, available from www.infinityjournal.com/article/53/Offshore_Control_A_Proposed_Strategy.

33. Transcript of President Barack Obama's speech from Bagram Air Base, Afghanistan, May 2, 2012, available from worldnews.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2012/05/01/11492424-transcript-of-president-barack-obamas-speech-from-bagram-air-base-may-2?lite (Italics added.)

34. Scott Wilson and Jon Cohen, "Poll Finds Broad Support for Obama's Counterterrorism Policies," *Washington Post*, February 8, 2012, available from www.washingtonpost.com/politics/poll-finds-broad-support-for-obamas-counterterrorism-policies/2012/02/07/gIQAfrSEyQ_story.html.

35. "NATO Soldier Killed in Afghan Shooting," *Al-jazeera*, May 6, 2012, available from www.aljazeera.com/news/asia/2012/05/201256131119330234.html.

36. Lionel Beehner, Interview with Colonel Peter Mansoor on Training Iraqi Forces, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, October 6, 2005, available from www.cfr.org/publication/8984/interview_with_colonel_peter_mansoor_on_training_iraqi_forces.html.

37. See Inter-American Air Forces Academy, U.S. Air Force, Lackland AFB, TX, available from www.lackland.af.mil/iaafa/index.asp.

38. Warren Bass, Book Review of *Why Nations Fail*, by Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Washington Post*, April 20, 2012, available from www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/books/book-review-why-nations-fail-by-daron-acemoglu-and-james-a-robinson/2012/04/20/gIQAChs8VT_story.html (quoting the authors).

39. Kate McCarthy, "Petraeus Denies Resignation Threat; Backs President Karzai," ABC News, December 5, 2010, available from abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2010/12/exclusive-gen-david-petraeus-denies-resignation-threat-backs-president-karzai/.

40. Secretary Panetta Interview with Judy Woodruff at the Pentagon, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, May

3, 2012, available from www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=5025:

Corruption, you know, has been part of that culture, just as it was in Iraq, just as it is in other areas of the Middle East. It's one of the things you've got to deal with. If you eventually want to develop a stable, governing operation there that provides stability, they're going to have to do a better job in trying to control the level of corruption that's there.

41. Julie Cavanaugh, "Why It's So Hard for NATO to Train Afghan Forces," *Christian Science Monitor*, April 22, 2012, available from www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2010/1202/Why-it-s-so-hard-for-NATO-to-train-Afghan-forces.

42. David Feith, "H. R. McMaster: The Warrior's-Eye View of Afghanistan," *Wall Street Journal*, May 11, 2012, available from online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304451104577392281146871796.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop#printMode.

43. See, for example, General Douglas M. Fraser, USAF and Major Wendell S. Holmes, "Haiti Relief: An International Effort Enabled through Air, Space, and Cyberspace," *Air & Space Power Journal*, Winter 2010, p. 5, available from www.airpower.au.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj10/win10/2010_4_03_fraser.pdf.