

United States Marine Corps
Command and Staff College
Marine Corps University
2076 South Street
Marine Corps Combat Development Command
Quantico, Virginia 22134-5068

MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

The Relevancy of the Clausewitzian Trinity to the War on Terrorism

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A DEGREE OF
MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES

Major Matthew G. Glavy, USMC

AY 2001-2002

Mentor: Lieutenant Colonel Chet Young, U.S. Army

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Mentor: Dr. John B. Matthews

Approved: _____

Date: _____

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 14-04-2002		2. REPORT TYPE Student research paper		3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-2001 to xx-xx-2002	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Relevancy of the Clausewitzian Trinity to the War on Terrorism Unclassified				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Glavy, Matthew G. ;				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS USMC Command and Staff College 2076 South Street MCCDC Quantico, VA22134-5068				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS USMC Command and Staff College 2076 South Street MCCDC Quantico, VA22134-5068				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT A PUBLIC RELEASE					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See report.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
		Public Release	55	EM114, (blank) lfenster@dtic.mil	
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER	
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified		International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007	
				Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18	

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

FORM APPROVED - - - OMB NO. 0704-0188

public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters services, directorate for information operations and reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the office of management and budget, paperwork reduction project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE BLANK)	2. REPORT DATE 14 APRIL 2002	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED STUDENT RESEARCH PAPER
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <i>The Relevancy of the Clausewitzian Trinity to the War on Terrorism</i>		5. FUNDING NUMBERS N/A
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Matthew G. Glavy		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) USMC COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE 2076 SOUTH STREET, MCCDC, QUANTICO, VA 22134-5068		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NONE
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) SAME AS #7.		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER: NONE
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES NONE		
12A. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT NO RESTRICTIONS		12B. DISTRIBUTION CODE N/A
abstract (maximum 200 words) <i>The teachings of Clausewitz have guided the American military since the end of the Vietnam War. His writing is prescriptive and not descriptive which allows his ideas to transcend time. His remarkable trinity has been the centerpiece for evaluation of the American debacle in Vietnam as well as the success in Desert Storm. Now more than ever in order to be successful in the current struggle against the evil of terrorism, the leaders of this nation must heed the Prussian General and his guidance concerning the forces which greatly affect the waging of war.</i>		
SUBJECT TERMS (KEY WORDS ON WHICH TO PERFORM SEARCH) Clausewitz, Clausewitzian Trinity, Terrorism, War on Terrorism, President George W. Bush, The Bush Doctrine, Osama Bin Laden, Al Qaeda, Leadership, Thomas Friedman.		15. NUMBER OF PAGES: 44
		16. PRICE CODE: N/A

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
DISCLAIMER.....	ii
PREFACE.....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. GLOBILIZATION	5
III. WARFARE, TERRORISM, AND CLAUSEWITZ	9
1) The Enemy	15
IV. THE CLAUSEWITZIAN TRINITY	22
1) The Government.....	23
2) The Military	30
3) The People.....	33
V. CONCLUSION	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45

<p>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</p> <p>UNCLASSIFIED</p>	<p>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE:</p> <p>UNCLASSIFIED</p>	<p>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</p> <p>UNCLASSIFIED</p>	<p>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</p>
--	--	--	---

Executive Summary

Title: CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP AND DOCTRINE: THE RELEVANCY OF THE CLAUSEWITZIAN TRINITY TO AMERICA'S WAR ON TERRORISM.

Author: Major Matthew G. Glavy, USMC

Thesis: This paper addresses the following research question: Is the Clausewitzian trinity pertinent to the successful execution of America's War on Terrorism?

Discussion: Using a technique developed by the late Colonel Harry Summers, this paper addresses the Clausewitzian trinity and its relevancy to the current war on terrorism.

Conclusion: The teachings of Clausewitz have guided the American military since the end of the Vietnam War. His writing is prescriptive and not descriptive which allows his ideas to transcend time. His remarkable trinity has been the centerpiece for evaluation of the American debacle in Vietnam as well as the success in Desert Storm. Now more than ever in order to be successful in the current struggle against the evil of terrorism, the leaders of this nation must heed the Prussian General and his guidance concerning the forces which greatly affect the waging of war.

DISCLAIMER

THE OPINIONS AND CONCLUSION EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF EITHER THE MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY. REFERENCES TO THIS STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOREGOING STATEMENT.

Preface

On the morning of September 11th, 2001, I was in my seminar at the United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College. During one of our breaks, news came up that an airliner had just crashed into the World Trade Center. I had a feeling of sadness thinking of the families of the victims of this terrible accident. Minutes later word was passed a second airliner crashed into the other tower of the World Trade Center and suddenly my feeling of sadness quickly turned to confusion and anger. My perception of an accident was erroneous and I realized that America was being attacked. Then the news flashed a third airliner crashed into the Pentagon and a fourth was in a position to strike. The theories of maneuver warfare that we previously studied were on display on live television. As the first and then the second Tower of the World Trade Center crashed to the deck, I realized we had been soundly defeated in this engagement.

This research was my attempt at using eight months of “school house” teaching and 21 years of military experience to evaluate what had happened and what our great nation must do to ensure the American dream prospers for the life of my children and their children’s children.

Since the Marine Corps was born in a bar, this is my attempt to explain to the “beer drinkers of America” what happened to the United States on September 11th and what should be done about it.

I have been fortunate throughout my Marine Corps career to work for some outstanding military officers. This year at Command and Staff College has been no different. I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Dr. John B. Matthews, USMC (Retired). Spending this year with “Blackjack” Matthews has reassured me that “heroes”, though endangered, still

survive in our mixed up world. Additionally, I want to thank Lieutenant Colonel Chet Young, USA, for his guidance throughout this project. Lastly, no Marine is complete without his family. I won the lottery when my wife Francine said “yes” that memorable day in March. Our two treasures, Jena and Ryan, make it all worth while.

Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles, you will never be in peril.

-Sun Tzu

We must be ruthlessly opportunistic, actively seeking out signs of weakness, against which we will direct all available combat power. And when the decisive opportunity arrives, we must exploit it full and aggressively, committing every ounce of combat power we can muster and pushing ourselves to the limits of exhaustion.

-FMFM 1, Warfighting

INTRODUCTION

On Sunday morning, October 23, 1983, a Mercedes cargo truck filled with 300 kilograms of Hexogene, equivalent to 12,000 pounds of TNT, driven by a smiling young man¹ of middle eastern decent drove into a building at the Beirut International Airport housing the Marines of Battalion Landing Team 1/8. On that dark day in October, 241 United States Marines, soldiers, and sailors were killed. Their executor was a well-trained terrorist who was able to cause more destruction to the United States military then the entire Iraqi Army eight years later.²

The terrorist war we now fight had begun on the streets of Beirut in 1983.

On September 11, 2001, a ruthless, aggressive, and violent foe attacked the United States while the world watched on their televisions. This enemy killed thousands of civilians in major financial, military, and governmental epicenters. The attackers synergized their effects with shocking detail, which ensured news media were in place to capture the decisive blow. The call to arms that followed was a normal reaction to an act of war. Like the attack on Pearl Harbor 60

¹ The adjective “smiling” has been used by many sources including Robin Wright in her book *Sacred Rage*. An enemy who smiles while executing his own death sentence as well as 241 United States Service members is the epitome of the evil we face in the War on terrorism.

² General Paul X. (P.X.) Kelley, USMC, 29th Commandant of the Marine Corps, “Remarks by the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Senate Armed Services Committee”, 31 October 1983. URL: <<http://www.beirut-memorial.org/history/kelley.html>> accessed 04 February 2002.

years prior and the terrorist strikes of 1983, the enemy employed speed, stealth, and violence of action in executing mass destruction on a target foreseen by him to be a just act of war. This brilliant sneak attack, like December of 1941, took place against a complacent America. The parallels may continue to reflect the world at war of the 1940s as America undertakes her response to the vicious attack levied against her most noble quality, freedom. As we saw in Afghanistan, America will have to hunt her hated foe in caves, just as in the middle of the 20th century against the Japanese in such places as Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and Guam. Like World War II, this fight will be one of annihilation. The enemy is willing to fight and die for his cause. His hatred runs deep and has produced generations of hatred. Do not underestimate him: “evil, yes, a coward, no.” As Napoleon stated, “the moral is to the physical as three to one.” General Patton latter stated “our enemies are willing – better said, anxious – to give their lives for their cause.”³ Our enemy has an iron clad will. *His lack of self-preservation is his greatest weapon.* September 11th was a major tactical success for our adversary, however, one must not forget in the Vietnam conflict the United States won every major tactical engagement to lose the war. A conversation between an American and North Vietnamese senior military official after the war illustrated this point: The American officer stated, “You know you never beat us on the battlefield”, the North Vietnamese Officer’s response, “That may be so. But it is also irrelevant.”⁴

The United States charged the terrorist network, Al Qaeda, led by Osama Bin Laden with orchestrating the deadly attack. The enemy is intelligent and ferocious, but perhaps in a strategic

³ Dr. Tony Kern, Lt Col, USAF (Ret), letter published in the wake of the attacks of September 11, “Open Letters to Americans”, 14 September 2001. Dr Kern used a World War II analogy as well as the quotes from Napoleon and Patton. URL: < <http://www.snopes2.com/rumors/tonykern.htm>>, accessed 04 February 2002.

sense, short sighted. In this fight, the world's only super power is the underdog. The great island nation is vulnerable. The terrorists are familiar with the theories of maneuver warfare and executed a strike against the gap in America created by freedom. He believes us to be impatient, self-centered cowards.⁵ This attack hit America in the heart of her "comfort zone" forcing the average American to "pay more and play less" in an attempt to erode our resolve.⁶ However, it can only work if the American people succumb to such tactics. The enormous economy of the United States propelled by globalization is the center of gravity; the will of the American citizenry is its critical vulnerability. He clearly understands our weakness at a tactical level; *the true test is can the strategic strength of the United States of America fight and destroy an irrational enemy for an indefinite period?*

The forces of the Clausewitzian Trinity, hate and enmity, probability and chance, and political policy must remain in balance if the United States is to be successful in this struggle. These forces are susceptible to external influences, which can have detrimental effects. The political force cannot succumb to the short sighted and often erroneous misdirection of the media or world opinion. *The political leaders, in particular the President of the United States, are the cornerstone to ensure the "probability and chance" of the military along with the "hate and enmity" of the people are synergized in the execution of political policy.* Clausewitz describes the leadership required in the face of many distractions: "If the mindset is to emerge unscathed from this relentless struggle with the unforeseen, two qualities are indispensable: first, an intellect that, even in the darkest hour, retains some glimmerings of the inner light which leads to

⁴ Harry G. Summers, Jr., *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1982), p. 1.

⁵ Dr Tony Kern, "Open Letters to Americans"

⁶ Dr Tony Kern, "Open Letters to Americans".

truth; and second the courage to follow the faint light wherever it may lead.”⁷ Our leaders must have the courage to follow “the inner light.” This will be a Herculean struggle in a democracy where freedom of speech is maximized. Principle must guide the President and his Lieutenants in this war. As Clausewitz stated, “that principle is in all doubtful cases to stick to one’s opinion and to refuse to change unless forced to do so by clear conviction.”⁸ Somehow, the leadership of America will have to minimize the temptation to execute foreign policy as part of their reelection campaign. The American public has an equal responsibility not to crave the addiction of 10 second sound-bites and hollow, feel-good, dramas created by the media and sourced from minority outspoken factions with in the United States as well as “jealous” world opinion. *For the schoolbook solution to be reality, the President must provide leadership. The people respond with support. The military is their instrument to implement “the hate and enmity” and “execute policy through other means”.*

The Evening News may not reflect the support for the President and his policy. The citizens of this great nation must directly address the question of support, many of which have no say in the daily news flashed across our television sets. The “beer drinkers of America”, the average citizens, have the responsibility to be an active force in this war.⁹ His vote, his pen, his voice are the tools to ensure the “the hate and enmity” is accurately reflected in the execution of policy.

Leadership and its overwhelming effect on the success or demise of a people is the silver thread throughout the subsequent discussion. The lack of leadership allowed a culture of people

⁷ Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, eds Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976), p. 102.

⁸ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 108.

⁹ “Beer drinkers of America” is a term used frequently by Dr Jack Matthews, Associate Dean at the USMC Command and Staff College to describe the average citizens of our great nation and what matters most in their quest to achieve the American dream.

to deflect all their burdens on others. Demented and misguided leadership coordinated the evil of September 11. Ultimately, leadership must be the solution to the problem. History proves this. The discussion will start with the current stimulant to the “hate and enmity” bestowed on the United States. Then a look at who the enemy is and his method to “carry out policy by other means.” Finally, using the Clausewitzian Trinity, the problem and its solution will be suspended in the gravitation field of the forces of “hate and enmity, probability and chance, and political policy.”

How did we get here? ...

GLOBALIZATION

The global system, which emerged in the 1990s, has influenced and in some ways altered the traditional nation state system. Globalization, as described by author Thomas Friedman, “involves the inexorable integration of markets, nation states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before – in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before.”¹⁰ Mr. Friedman also brings up the negative side to this explosive growth (and witnessed in the hideous act of September 11): What happens to those left behind by the global economy? The global economy has created a “Winner Take All Society.”¹¹ Technology (communication, computers, etc) combined with free trade, reduced travel cost, and market deregulation has caused a single global market. The manufacturer or supplier with the best and cheapest products delivered in a timely

¹⁰ Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, (NY: Farrar, Strays and Giroux, 1999) p. 8.

¹¹ Thomas Friedman in his book *Lexus and the Olive Tree* devoted an entire chapter to this concept and used the analogy of the 1997 world champion Chicago Bulls to illustrate. Michael Jordan, the best basketball player in the world, made about \$80 million dollars a year. Joe Klein, another Chicago Bull, made \$275,000 a year. The gap is huge, but the demand of Michael Jordan as compared to Joe Klein is equally large. Jordan’s appeal is propelled internationally by the global economy. The disparity is exacerbated by the demand of Jordan not only in a single U.S. market but compounded by the demand for him in the world market. Michael Jordan is “the winner take all.”

fashion wins, not only in his region, but in a global economy with unlimited access, he commands the world's market. If you are a superstar in Chicago, you are probably a superstar in Budapest as well.

The nation most adept at riding the wave of globalism is the United States. Freedom, capitalism, and ingenuity propel the expansion of technology and likewise of the economy it creates. No other nation embodies these qualities more than the United States. America has never been bound to tradition. More pertinent, the lack of tradition is a part of its frontier spirit.¹² *Globalization is the natural manifestation of frontierism exalted by the American Cowboy.*¹³ Friedman uses the following analogy: "we are not the tiger, globalization is the tiger. But we are the people most adept at riding the tiger and we're now telling everyone else to get on or get out of the way."¹⁴ The American Cowboy would substitute a bronco for a tiger but the same aggressive style of life that creates both legend and hardship is documented throughout American history. Thomas Friedman explains the natural marriage of globalism and the United States.¹⁵

- 1) Ideal competitive location.
- 2) Diverse, multicultural, multiethnic population.
- 3) Diverse, innovative and efficient capital market where venture capital is a significant and critical part of the economy. (If you have a good idea someone in America is willing to give you the money to produce your dream.)
- 4) Most honest legal and regulatory environment in the world.

¹² "The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward explain American development." With these words, Frederick Jackson Turner laid the foundation for modern historical study of the American West and presented a "frontier thesis" that continues to influence historical thinking even today. For further discussion, refer to Frederick Jackson Turner's "Frontier Thesis."

¹³ Dr. Jack Matthews, the assistant Dean of the Marine Corps Command and Staff College uses the American Cowboy as an image to explain some of the brave and daring qualities of the United States. The cowboy is also unsophisticated in many respects and his aggressiveness produces negative backlash from the international community.

¹⁴ Friedman, *Lexus and the Olive Tree*, p. 309

¹⁵ Friedman, *Lexus and the Olive Tree*, p 298-303

5) Bankruptcy laws that inspire the dismounted rider to regain the reigns and try again. (Friedman goes on to describe the career ending ramifications of bankruptcy in other parts of the world, while Silicon Valley is littered with successful businesses who have tasted the bitter nectar of defeat once, twice or three times, but who were cheered on to fight another day.)

6) America is still a melting pot.

7) Democratic, flexible federal political system with a high degree of decentralized control allotted to fifty states.

8) Most flexible labor market in the world.

9) America thinks big.

The rest of the world does not distinguish between globalism and the United States.

Globalism viewed in their regions of the world has a distinct American personality. The franchising of America through such corporations as McDonalds, Coke, IBM, Apple, Microsoft and countless others, has put a small piece of America in 99% of the world. Hollywood and the entertainment industry have maximized the limitless access of the American lifestyle. The enterprising nature of the United States has assumed center stage on the world and faces the critiques both positive and negative of its performance.

The expansion of the free market system has created friction. Those who have not achieved success (or who have chosen not to attempt) have an easy alibi. The self-proclaimed fault of their shortcomings is the ugly American. The American Cowboy has many good qualities but he also has some attributes that can be harmful if not understood. The autobiography of the American Cowboy does not fit everyone. *The toughness and aggressiveness required to survive and prosper in a new frontier like the western United States in the 1800s or the global economy of the 21st century creates some negative consequences.* Just as the American Cowboy displaced the American Indian due to his inability (or perceived inability) to conform to the ways of the cowboy, so to are those who are not in the mainstream of

capitalism being "chaffed" by the tough leather skin of the American Cowboy of the global economy. It took much trial and error for the cowboys of the 1800s to respect the land and ensure its fruitfulness for years to come. The same trial and error will probably be part of the expansion of globalism.

What about the people left behind? As technology and business accelerate, is it possible for everyone to board the train of globalization? Computers and other high tech equipment require skills that were not traditional requirements for an assembly line or steel plant. The third world, which was at a disadvantage before the start of globalization does not have the basic requirements to compete in an educational, skill based environment. A free and open global economy means a supplier can supply the whole world if resources permit. Local traditions and loyalties are strained when a better product can be bought at a lower price that was produced half way around the world. Ordering such a product may be done in your own living room with the item showing up on your door step in one or two days.

Globalization is a challenge to many religions. The traditions and values of religions like Judaism, Hindu, and Islam are based on strict adherence to a certain culture. Assimilating the world in the form of a global economy threatens to have similar effect on their traditions and ways. McDonalds and Pizza Hut are not exactly what Abraham, Moses, and Mohammed had in mind when it came to food preparation. The reduction of barriers means greater competition and less protection, which has a big impact on nationalism, and in religious countries, on the sanctity of their teaching. "The winner takes all process" is very intimidating if you are not the winner or if you have no inclination to compete.

In the past, the counter to capitalism included communism, socialism, fascism, and other authoritarian regimes. World War II and the collapse of the Berlin wall spelled their demise. *The emerging counter to the current wave of capitalism transcended by globalism is manifested in terrorism.* The world's only super power is much too big to take head on. The same advantages, which have made globalism possible, also make America and other countries easy targets to large-scale terrorist attacks. Fewer barriers promote more business but also create a very large gap in security. The same Internet, which lets business occur at the speed of light provides a very inexpensive command and control facility. The Internet is an outstanding logistical tool, which allows just about anyone to tap into the global economy and purchase just about anything at the cheapest possible price.

TERRORISM, WARFARE, AND CLAUSEWITZ

Kind-hearted people might of course think there was some ingenious way to disarm or defeat an enemy without too much bloodshed, and might imagine this is the true goal of the art of war. Pleasant as it sounds, it is a fallacy that must be exposed: war is such a dangerous business that the mistakes which come from kindness are the very worst. The maximum use of force is in no way incompatible with the simultaneous use of the intellect. If one side uses the force without compunction, undeterred by the bloodshed it involves, while the other side refrains, the first will gain the upper hand.¹⁶

Globalization has produced a bipolarization of the world: those that don their computers, cell phones, and PDAs and run like hell to stay in the globalization race and those that for various reasons have decided not to participate. The problem arises when the disparity between "the Haves and the Have-nots" creates the "hate and enmity" to strike out at the perceived oppressor. Samuel Huntington in his book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* describes the manifestation of the struggle between "the Haves and the Have-nots".

¹⁶ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 75.

In this quasi war, each side has capitalized on its own strengths and the other side's weakness. Militarily it has been largely a war of terrorism versus air power. Dedicated Islamic militants exploit the open societies of the West and plant car bombs at selected targets. Western military professionals exploit the open skies of Islam and drop smart bombs on selected targets. The Islamic participants plot the assassination of prominent Westerners; the United States plot the overthrow of extremist Islamic regimes.¹⁷

Thomas Friedman gives further analysis to the gap created by globalization and the reaction by many in the Arab-Moslem world,

Whenever a people reduces all its problems to a conspiracy by someone else, it absolves itself and its leaders of any responsibility for its predicament – and any need for self examination...There are two kinds of blame: one that is a result of self-analysis and self criticism, and one that is an attempt to avoid self analysis and self criticism.¹⁸

A recent Gallup poll supports Mr. Friedman's analysis: "although U.S. officials say all 19 of the Sept. 11 hijackers were Arab men, only 18% of those polled in six Islamic countries say they believe Arabs carried out the attacks; 61% say Arabs were not responsible; and 21% say they don't know."¹⁹ Someone is wrong. In Kuwait, the country liberated by the United States in Desert Storm, 36% of people polled say the attacks of September 11 were justifiable.²⁰ With friends like this who needs enemies.

The terrorist network Al Qaeda with its leader Osama Bin Laden has successfully organized itself to mount a significant and bloody terrorist campaign against the United States. The attacks of September 11 are the work of a very tactically sound enemy. The results of September 11 are numerous but the pronounced war on terrorism exclaimed by the president of the United States gives the tactically superior terrorist an active adversary. The theory and nature of war will be put through a whole new series of tests as the classic battlefield is altered.

¹⁷ Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 217.

¹⁸ Thomas L. Friedman, "Blunt Question, Blunt Answer", New York Times, February 10, 2002, URL <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/02/10/opinion/10FRIE.html>, accessed 15 February 2002.

War is a very dynamic and complicated process of human interaction. Terrorism, likewise, is difficult to define in compact and credible prose. Dr. Christopher Harmon used the following definition in his presentation to the Department of State in the wake of the September 11th attacks: “Terrorism is the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear for political ends.”²¹ The more horrifying the strike by the terrorist the greater the impact on the selected target audience of his act. However, terming terrorism as war requires some explanation. Even in war some normality with respect to human dignity survives the “hate and enmity” of clashing forces. For example, in the traditional paradigm of armed struggle, deliberate attacks on citizens are not part of a just war; additionally belligerents are expected to provide humane treatment of prisoners of war. The enemy of the past has afforded special consideration to women, children, and the elderly. For the terrorist, the only rule that applies is the one that carries out his purpose in the most effective and efficient manner.²² Terrorism is a perspective of the one being terrorized. If a terrorist act were to end the power of Saddam Hussein, Muammar al-Qaddafi, or Osama Bin Laden little sympathy would be forthcoming from the United States or the rest of the western world.²³

The terrorist attacks of September 11 were reported by the media and politicians as being “barbaric”, “mindless”, and “cowardly”.²⁴ This presentation of the enemy is not accurate. Perhaps the exact opposite adjectives should be used to describe our foe. The strike on America

¹⁹ Andrea Stone, “Many in Islamic World Doubt Arabs Behind 9/11”, USA Today, 27 February 2002, URL: <<http://www.usatoday.com/news/attack/2002/02/27/usat-pol.htm>>, accessed 27 February 2002.

²⁰ Andrea Stone, “Many in Islamic World Doubt Arabs Behind 9/11.”

²¹ Dr Christopher C. Harmon, “Advancing U.S. National Interests Through Effective Counterterrorism”, remarks delivered at the Secretary’s Open Forum, U.S. Department of State, 22 October, 2001.

²² Donald J. Hanle, *Terrorism: The Newest Face of Warfare*, (Washington: Pergamon-Brassey’s International Defense Publishers, Inc., 1989), p. 106.

²³ Hanle, *Terrorism: The Newest Face of Warfare*, p. 108.

²⁴ The author has reviewed over 100 newspaper, magazine, and Internet articles and the adjectives used to describe the attack were varied. The above examples appeared throughout text published on the subject.

was a well-coordinated plan, violently executed with the same aggressiveness we hope to instill in the young warriors we want to vindicate America's honor. The enemy is intelligent but viscous. He is very familiar with the instrument of his hatred.

Terrorism is violence for effect; not only, and sometimes not at all, for the effect on the actual victims of the terrorists. In fact, the victims may be totally unrelated to the terrorists' cause. Terrorism is violence aimed at the people watching. Fear is the intended effect, not the byproduct of the force.²⁵

However, is terrorism war?

The Prussian military theorist Carl Von Clausewitz is the centerpiece of American military study of war. His work gained great momentum in the United States after the debacle of Vietnam. Clausewitz wrote *On War* in the aftermath of his own country's demise at the hands of Napoleon. America, after her loss in Southeast Asia found enlightenment in the lessons and insights of a defeated soldier. *Perhaps the greatest and most permanent knowledge gained is not found in victory but in the costly solace of defeat.* America has benefited from the torment of self-analysis, which followed the debacle of Vietnam. Thomas Friedman is quick to point this fact out in relation to the source of our current struggle:

"Look at the excruciating process of analysis, self criticism and accountability that America went through after Vietnam. Few Arab-Muslim countries have ever done anything like that after a war, let alone 9/11. Until they do, their conclusion that America or the Jews are behind all their problems is escapism, not analysis."²⁶

The American military grasping for explanations after Vietnam adopted Clausewitz as primary text for professional military education. The Naval War College was first in 1976 followed by the Air War College in 1978, and the Army War College in 1981. The United States Marine Corps published a series of doctrinal publications starting in 1989 with FMFM 1, *Warfighting*, which capsulated the prescriptive themes of *On War*. Clausewitz avoidance of

²⁵ Hanle, *Terrorism: The Newest Face of Warfare*, p. 112.

technical and ideological characteristics of his time allows his work to transcend the almost two centuries since his death. The American strategist Bernard Brodie characterized *On War* as “not simply the greatest, but the only great book about war.”²⁷ Perhaps the most striking permeation of Clausewitz at the highest levels of American government is the Weinberger Doctrine (and latter reinforced by General Colin Powell’s corollary), which has been a centerpiece to American employment of military forces since the middle 1980s.²⁸ Secretary Weinberger used six criteria to determine if the United States should execute policy through its military.²⁹

(1) . . . The United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies

(2) . . . If we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. . . .

(3) . . . If we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. . . .

(4) . . . The relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed-their size, composition and disposition-must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. . . .

(5) . . . Before the U.S. commits forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. . . .

(6) . . . The commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort.

²⁶ Friedman, “Blunt Question, Blunt Answer.”

²⁷ Michael Howard, *Clausewitz* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983) p. 1.

²⁸ Christopher Bassford and Edward J. Villacre, “Reclaiming the Clausewitzian Trinity”, *Parameters* XXV, no 3 (Autumn 1995), pp. 9-19.

²⁹ Casper Weinberger, “The Uses of Military Power”, remarks delivered by the Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, to the National Press Club, Washington DC, 28 November 1984, URL <<http://www.pbs.org>>, accessed 06 February 2002 .

Clausewitz defines war with the following two statements. First, “war is thus an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will” and the second, “war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, carried on with other means.”³⁰ Terrorism meanders from the classic nation state paradigm of warfare that Clausewitz knew and thus requires some analysis of applicability. The first half of his definition is sound; the second part requires insight. The terrorism we fight today uses a distorted interpretation of selective passages of an honorable book, the Koran, as its guiding force.³¹ Religion adds a dimension to the political not always defined in warfare. The nation state is only half of the equation of modern warfare. Religion, ethnicity, tribal ties, and criminal activities form boundaries perhaps not contiguous with the traditional nation state. Professor Bassford gives an academia response to the relevancy of Clausewitz and his focus on the nation state and “the political.”

Clausewitz's use of the German word *Politik*, which embodies the two very different concepts English-speakers distinguish as "politics" and "policy," leads to conflicting and incompatible understandings of his most famous line, "War is merely the continuation of [*Politik*] by other means." That one word encompasses the two quite different English words "policy" and "politics." ...Politics is a struggle for power between opposing forces-
-political events and outcomes are rarely if ever the product of any single actor's conscious intentions. ... Thus Clausewitz tells us that the conscious conduct of war (strategy, etc.) *should* be a continuation of rational calculation and policy, but also that war *inevitably* originates and exists within the chaotic, unpredictable realm of politics.³²

The struggle for power whether in the form of a constitutional government void of religion, a religious zealot wishing to impose his religious beliefs on all, or a tribal warlord consolidating his control over local clans falls under “the political.” Power is the common denominator, which moves religious or ethnic intentions into the realm of the political.

³⁰ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 75, p. 89.

³¹ Dr Christopher C. Harmon, “Advancing U.S. National Interests Through Effective Counterterrorism”, remarks delivered at the Secretary’s Open Forum, U.S. Department of State, 22 October, 2001.

³² Christopher Bassford and Edward J. Villacre, “Reclaiming the Clausewitzian Trinity”.

Due to the devastating effects procured at a small price in both finances and human resources, terrorism is a natural instrument of the weak. Terrorism allows smaller political organizations “to carry out policy through other means.” The strategic center of gravity a terrorist focuses all energy on is the “will” of his target audience. Like war, terrorism uses force to impose its will, a wide spectrum of force to erode the targets psychological ability to resist. If both parties resist the coercion of the other through use of force, then the clash of wills described by Clausewitz to characterize war exists. Religion, nationalism, tribalism, and crime fall under the political in the struggle for power regardless of the morality of their intentions. Globalization has opened many doors and made accessible the technology, investment, and expertise required to achieve wealth. The same doors give access to the moral, amoral, and immoral. The globalization process, which has made companies like Intel and Microsoft international powerhouses, gave rise to such terrorist organizations as Al Qaeda and its leader Osama Bin Laden (OBL). As Clausewitz stated, “once barriers-which in a sense consist only in man’s ignorance of what is possible-are torn down, they are not so easily set up again.”³³

In summary: The terrorist acts of September 11 constitute war. The enemy had clear political objectives and had chosen to carry out its political agenda through other means.

THE ENEMY

There is a very thin line between a terrorist and a freedom fighter. A terrorist who, somebody does something that you don't agree with, a freedom fighter is somebody who does something that I agree with. ... So, today's terrorist is tomorrow's freedom fighter. Or today's freedom fighter could be tomorrow's terrorist. -- Ahmed Sattar

We are dealing with a special human species.

-Pakistani prison officer, December, 2001.³⁴

³³ Clausewitz, *On War* p. 593

³⁴ Edward Cody, “Protecting Bin Laden”, Washington Post, 30 December 2001. The article characterized the morale of the recently taken prisoners of the Tora Bora complex with the above statement. The prisoners were frostbitten, sleeping on stone floors, 8 per cell, but would not break under heavy interrogation.

The Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the ensuing 10 year struggle against various united factions of Afghan rebels resulted in an international aid system primarily Islamic in nature that was focused on organizing, training, and equipping the Afghans in their struggle against Moscow. With the help of the United States, the recruitment and support network grew into a worldwide organization. After the defeat and withdrawal of the Soviets from Afghanistan, the some form of the network continued to operate. Osama Bin Laden moved into the forefront and provided more then just a financial source. The network became known as Al Qaeda (The Base) with presence in countries throughout the world. Nations with active members of Al Qaeda include Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Turkey, Jordan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Syria, China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Myanmar, Indonesia, Philippines, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Yemen, Libya, Tunisia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya, Dagestan, Sudan, Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania, Azerbaijan, Eritrea, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Israel.³⁵ The list is long and not inclusive of clandestine cells, which operate in many western countries. In the wake of the September 11 attacks, the FBI has 150 ongoing investigations of suspected Al Qaeda cells in the United States.³⁶

Since 1989, Osama Bin Laden has been the hub of the network. Born in 1957, the son of a billionaire construction magnate from Saudi Arabia, he studied at the Jeddah University under Dr. Abdullah Azzam, regarded as the historical leader of Hamas. He arrived in Afghanistan in the early 1980s and took a very active role in the recruiting and financing of the Afghan cause as the deputy to his mentor Abdullah Azzam. Working through numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as well as several mosques and charities throughout the world, Azzam's

³⁵Phil Hirschhorn, Rohan Gunaratna, Ed Blanche, and Stefan Leader, "Blowback", Jane's Intelligence Review, August 01, 2001, URL<www.janes.com/>, accessed 27 December 2001.

Afghan bureau or MaK (Maktab al Khidmat lil-mujahidin al-Arab), as the original organization was known, grew to become a very large network with many financial ties. With the split of Bin Laden from his mentor and the subsequent assassination of Azzam in September of 1989, Osama Bin Laden was the intellectual and financial leader of the established network.³⁷

At the conclusion of the Soviet occupation, Bin Laden returned to Saudi Arabia. The Gulf War and American presence in Saudi Arabia sparked Osama Bin Laden to challenge the Saudi Royal family. His treason-like remarks caused his expulsion in 1991 and revocation of his Saudi citizenship in 1994. His command post traveled to Sudan. Sudan proved to be a safe haven until 1996. Under Saudi pressure and threat of UN sanctions following Sudan's alleged involvement in the attempted assassination of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in 1995, Sudan expelled Bin Laden and other terrorist groups.³⁸ He returned to Afghanistan under the sponsorship of the Taliban, which prevailed in the Afghan civil war raging since the conclusion of the Soviet occupation. With little western influence and sheltered by an Islamic fundamentalist government, the Al Qaeda network prospered.³⁹ Al-Qaeda (and directly Osama Bin Laden) opposed the United States for several reasons to include:⁴⁰

- 1) The United States does not govern nor execute foreign policy in a manner congruent with the group's strict fundamentalist's view of Islam.
- 2) The United States as the "great infidel" provides support for other infidel governments to include Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the United Nations, which were regarded as enemies of the group.

³⁶ J.T. Caruso, "Al-Qaeda International", Testimony of J.T. Caruso, Acting Assistant Director, CounterTerrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, December 18, 2001, URL <<http://www.fbi.gov/congress/congress01/caruso121801.htm>> accessed 06 February 2002.

³⁷ Phil Hirschhorn, Rohan Gunaratna, Ed Blanche, and Stefan Leader, "Blowback", Jane's Intelligence Review.

³⁸ Federation of American Scientists, "al-Qa'ida (The Base), Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders, Islamic Salvation Foundation, Usama bin Laden Network," URL<<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/ladin.htm>>, accessed 11 February 20002. Footnote is inclusive of entire paragraph.

³⁹ Phil Hirschhorn, Rohan Gunaratna, Ed Blanche, and Stefan Leader, "Blowback", Jane's Intelligence Review.

⁴⁰ J.T. Caruso, "Al-Qaeda International".

- 3) The United States led coalition in the Gulf War in 1991 as well as Operation Restore Hope in Somalia in 1992 and 1993, was believed by Al Qaeda to be the manifestation of the United States intentions to occupy Islamic land in particular the holy lands of Saudi Arabia.
- 4) The United States has arrested and imprisoned members of Al Qaeda, including Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, who was convicted in the first World Trade Center bombing.

Al Qaeda's stated goal is to "unite all Muslims and to establish a government which follows the rule of the Caliphs."⁴¹ Osama Bin Laden has stated that the only way to impose its will is through the use of force. Ultimately, Al-Qaeda's endstate is the "overthrow of all Muslim governments, which are viewed as corrupt, to drive Western influence from those countries, and eventually to abolish state boundaries."⁴² The pan-Islamic theme of Al Qaeda has appeal to Moslems all over the world not just Arabic countries. The current goal is to establish a pan-Islamic Caliphate⁴³ throughout the world by working with allied Islamic extremist groups to overthrow regimes it deems "non-Islamic" and expelling Westerners and non-Muslims from Muslim countries.

The suspected campaign of Al Qaeda against America can be traced with the below table:⁴⁴

Date	Event
Oct 3, 1993	Battle of Mogadishu in Somalia. Oct. 3, 1993, 18 American soldiers killed and 73 wounded. Estimated 5,000 Somalis killed. Al Qaeda/Bin-Laden

⁴¹ Federation of American Scientists, "al-Qa'ida (The Base), Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders, Islamic Salvation Foundation, Usama bin Laden Network," URL<<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/ladin.htm>>, accessed 11 February 2002.

⁴² Federation of American Scientists, "al-Qa'ida (The Base), Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders, Islamic Salvation Foundation, Usama bin Laden Network," URL<<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/ladin.htm>>, accessed 11 February 2002.

⁴³ Caliphate refers to a pan-Islamic jurisdiction led by a spiritual leader claiming succession from Muhammad

⁴⁴ Laura Hayes, "Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's Network of Terror," URL<<http://www.infoplease.com/spot/terror-qaeda.html>>, accessed 11 February 2002.

Date	Event
	trained Afghan Arabs were involved in operations against the American forces in Somalia in 1993. ⁴⁵
Feb 26, 1993	First bombing of World Trade Center (WTC); six killed, 1,100 injured with \$300 million damage. Egyptian cleric Sheik Omar Abd al-Rahman and nine others were convicted of conspiracy. In 1998, the believed mastermind of the attack, Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, received a life sentence. ⁴⁶
Nov 13, 1995	A car bomb exploded near a U.S. training facility in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia killing seven (five Americans) and wounding 60 (34 Americans).
Jun 25, 1996	A truck packed with explosives blew up outside the Khobar Towers, an apartment complex housing U.S. military personnel in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 and injuring 500.
Aug 7, 1998	224 people including 12 Americans were killed when the American Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania were bombed, 5,000 others were wounded. Four men suspected to be followers of Bin Laden were convicted. 13 suspects in the case including Osama Bin Laden are still at large and placed on the FBI most wanted list.
Dec 1999	Jordanian police arrested members of a cell planning attacks against Western tourists.
Dec 14, 1999	Customs agents seized terrorist smuggling explosives into the U.S. for a planned attack on Seattle during the Millenium celebration. Algerians arrested were Afghan Alumni.
Oct 12, 2000	Suicide bombers attacked the USS Cole, a guided missile destroyer, in port in Aden, Yemen on October 12, 2000. The ship was in port to re-supply and execute maintenance when a small boat came along side detonating a bomb

⁴⁵ Federation of American Scientists, "al-Qa'ida (The Base), Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders, Islamic Salvation Foundation, Usama bin Laden Network," URL<<http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/ladin.htm>>, accessed 11 February 20002.

⁴⁶ Laura Hayes, "Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's Network of Terror".

Date	Event
	which blew a 40 foot wide hole in the hull. 17 U.S. sailors were killed
Sep 11, 2001	Two hijacked airliners crashed into the World Trade Center, killing almost 3,000 people. A third airline crashed into the Pentagon while a fourth crashed into a field in Pennsylvania.

Al Qaeda has been very specific in words and actions in their “policy” towards America. Using fatwahs (Islamic religious decrees) over the past ten years, Osama Bin Laden has directed armed aggression against the United States. In 1992 and 1993 he issued a fatwah decreeing United States Armed Forces in the horn of Africa, including Somalia, should be attacked. On February 22, 1998, after the Bombings in Riyadh and Dhahran, he issued his most explicit directive, stating it is the duty of all Muslims to kill Americans. Bin Laden’s fatwah, delivered as the "International Islamic Front for Jihad on the Jews and Crusaders", which as a non cleric he has no authority to issue, read that "in compliance with God's order, we issue the following fatwah to all Muslims: the ruling to kill the Americans and their allies, including civilians and military, is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it."⁴⁷ The bombings of the American embassies in East Africa six months latter were the first blow after his public decree.⁴⁸

The investigation and subsequent trial of the embassy bombing suspects began to peel layers back from the Al Qaeda onion. The connection between the two bombings and their link to Osama Bin Laden was very strong. Phone calls between East African cells to include one from the lone survivor of the suicide bombing attack in Kenya and Osama Bin Laden’s satellite

⁴⁷ Laura Hayes, “Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden’s Network of Terror”.

⁴⁸ Laura Hayes, “Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden’s Network of Terror”.

telephone give strong proof to the amount of involvement of Bin Laden with his cells in the field.⁴⁹ The trial in New York City left little doubt of the detailed planning and coordination provided by Al Qaeda in the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. The testimony in the trial confirmed that:⁵⁰

- 1) Al-Qaeda provides funding, training, and equipment to carry out successful terrorist attacks.
- 2) Al Qaeda conducts long range planning and displays the patience to wait to conduct the attack at the right time.
- 3) Al-Qaeda conducts reconnaissance and surveillance of their targets, to include using local nationals of the target they are surveilling to enter the location without suspicion. Results of planning and surveillance are forwarded as "ops plans" or "targeting packages" with photographs, operative notes, and detailed overlays using CAD/CAM software (computer assisted design/computer assisted mapping).

These same procedures are very similar to the United States military leadership acronym BAMCIS (Begin planning, Arrange for reconnaissance, Make reconnaissance, Issue the order, and Supervise). The products produced are not very much different than those of a crisis action team of a Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU).

The enemy we face is tough and resilient. He is a mature foe at the tactical level of war. His ability to achieve strategic goals through operational campaigns is the fight we currently wage. Our counter attack against him must continue to match his intensity and vigor. The counter offensive we have embarked on will draw heavily from the three forces Clausewitz described in his trinity.

⁴⁹ J.T. Caruso, "Al-Qaeda International".

⁵⁰ J.T. Caruso, "Al-Qaeda International".

CLAUSEWITZIAN TRINITY

It is natural, as we face our next foe in what is certain to be a war which encompasses the entire world, to look closely at the current paradigm of war and in particular the three forces of the Clausewitzian trinity. According to Clausewitz:

War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a remarkable trinity--composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone.⁵¹

Historian, author, and soldier, Colonel Harry Summers used the trinity with surgical precision in his analysis of the Vietnam and Kuwaiti conflicts. His primary tool for analogy utilized Clausewitz's further explanation of the trinity,

The first of these three aspects mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government. The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people; the scope which the play of courage and talent will enjoy in the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army; but the political aims are the business of government alone.⁵²

The people, the military, and the government explain much with respect to warfare of the nation state. Clausewitz continues his analogy: "Our task therefore is to develop a theory that maintains a balance between these three tendencies, like an object suspended between three magnets."⁵³

This analogy is not a linear triangle but rather it illustrates the highly complex and irreproducible trajectory of a metal object suspended among three magnets.⁵⁴ The pattern produced is unique to

⁵¹ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 89.

⁵² Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 89.

⁵³ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 89.

⁵⁴ Alan D. Beyerchen, "Complexity, Global Politics, and national Security, Clausewitz, Nonlinearity, and the Importance of Imagery", URL<<http://www.ndu.edu/ndu/inss/books/complexity/ch07.html>>, accessed 18 September 2001.

each demonstration. There is no way to predict the path the metal object will take once released within the magnetic fields.

THE GOVERNMENT: “The instrument of policy that makes it subject to reason alone.”

A common theme throughout Clausewitz’s work is the relationship between the military and the political. No other discussion regarding the application of military might can be more pertinent than the intimacy of policy and military strategy. The political objective “sets the limits” of war—be they limited or unlimited. Therefore, political policy has an impact at every level of an armed conflict to include the tactical. It is relevant to the field marshal as well as the fire team leader. The degree to which force will be applied—if at all—should reflect the political aims of the national strategy. The symmetry of the military objective to that of the political objective is crucial to the overall success of any potential armed engagement. Clausewitz builds his trinity with the detailed explanation of the political object. The political objective provides the continuity to ensure the fight is not abandoned even after the emotional fuel is spent. The political object is the force that ensures the momentum of the fight as well as defines its end state. The ultimate success on the battlefield is relative to the attainment of the political goals for which the fight was initiated. Throughout Clausewitz writings, he never passes up the opportunity to reinvigorate this theme.

Traditionally in the wake of an international stimulus, American Presidents have made doctrinal policy to combat perceived threats to the United States. Examples of presidential doctrine include:

- 1) **The Monroe Doctrine** declared that the any extension of European power “to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.”⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1994), p. 35.

- 2) **The Truman Doctrine** provided aid to Greece and Turkey to combat communist aggression; proclaimed “the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”⁵⁶
- 3) **The Eisenhower Doctrine** was a threefold Middle East program of economic aid, military assistance, and protection against communist aggression. “First America’s vital interests are worldwide, embracing both hemispheres and every continent. Second, we have community of interest with every nation in the free world. Third, interdependence of interests requires a decent respect for the rights and the peace of all peoples.”⁵⁷
- 4) **The Nixon Doctrine**, in an attempt to avoid another “Vietnam”, assured the United States would “provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security.” However, in non-nuclear aggression the United States would “look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for defense.”⁵⁸
- 5) **The Carter Doctrine** declared the oil supplies of the Middle East to be a vital American interest. This policy gave rise to the forerunner of United States Central Command and implemented the Maritime Preposition Force program originally referred to as Near–Term Prepositioning Ships (NTPS).⁵⁹
- 6) **The Reagan Doctrine** was the economic and military arms race against the Soviet Union. The administration bucked the status quo of containment to take a more offensive policy to aid in the self-destruction of the Soviet economy.⁶⁰

At the United Nations Headquarters in New York City a few blocks from the location of the attacks of September 11, President George W. Bush proclaimed to the world the doctrine of the United States in its war against terrorism. The Bush Doctrine is concise and leaves little room for interpretation. In his opening paragraph the president states, “Every civilized nation here today is resolved to keep the most basic commitment of civilization: We will defend

⁵⁶ Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 452.

⁵⁷ Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 549.

⁵⁸ Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 709.

⁵⁹ Harry Summers, *On Strategy II: A Critical Analysis of the Gulf War*, (New York, Dell Publishing, 1992), p. 88.

⁶⁰ Jack Wheeler, “The Bush Doctrine: Hunt Down Terror”, NewsMax.com, URL <<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/9/16/144851.shtml>>, accessed 01 January 2002.

ourselves and our future against terror and lawless violence.” The speech to the United Nations outlines the policy of the United States in its war against terrorism:⁶¹

- 1) “For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice.”
- 2) “Every United Nations member has a responsibility to crack down on terrorist financing. We must pass all necessary laws in our own countries to allow the confiscation of terrorist assets. We must apply those laws to every financial institution in every nation.” (Security Council Resolution 1373)
- 3) “We have a responsibility to share intelligence and coordinate the efforts of law enforcement. If you know something, tell us. If we know something, we'll tell you. And when we find the terrorists, we must work together to bring them to justice. We have a responsibility to deny any sanctuary, safe haven or transit to terrorists. Every known terrorist camp must be shut down, its operators apprehended, and evidence of their arrest presented to the United Nations. We have a responsibility to deny weapons to terrorists and to actively prevent private citizens from providing them.”

Additionally President Bush understood the wake created by globalization and addressed United States responsibility for aid to the “have nots”:⁶²

- 1) I can promise, too, that America will join the world in helping the people of Afghanistan rebuild their country.
- 2) My country is pledged to encouraging development and expanding trade. My country is pledged to investing in education and combating AIDS and other infectious diseases around the world. Following September 11th, these pledges are even more important. In our struggle against hateful groups that exploit poverty and despair, we must offer an alternative of opportunity and hope.

The Bush Doctrine calls on national governments to be "either with us or against us" in the global anti-terrorism campaign. The response by the international community has been generally positive and a success for United States foreign policy. NATO was first to act with an

⁶¹ President George W. Bush, “REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY”, U.N. Headquarters, New York, 10 November 2001, released by the Office of the Press Secretary.

⁶² President George W. Bush, “REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY”.

unprecedented Article 5 declaration of the 1949 Washington treaty, which declares an attack on one is an attack on all.

The aim of the United States in its proclaimed war on terrorism is two fold:⁶³

1) focus on Al Qaeda and its Taliban sponsors

and then...

2) other terrorist groups with global reach-as well as their supporters wherever and whoever they may be.

As President Bush stated, "Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there."

The United States government has prefaced their intentions to strike back at terrorism by stating "the second dimension of the campaign will last for years or even decades."⁶⁴ The President was very up front with the American people. His speech on September 20, 2001 at the Capital before a joint session of Congress was his declaration to the American people of his vision and guidance. Exerts from that speech reflects a statesman with a clear understanding of the Clausewitzian Trinity. President Bush announced foreign policy as well as focused the "hate and enmity" of the people.

Tonight, we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done. On Sept. 11, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars, but for the past 136 years they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war, but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning.⁶⁵

The President detailed who the enemy was and was not,

⁶³ President George W. Bush, "REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY".

⁶⁴ Richard N. Haas, "The Bush Administration's Response to September 11th -- and Beyond", Director, Office of the Policy Planning, Staff Remarks to the Council of Foreign Relations, New York, NY October 15, 2001, URL <http://www.state.gov/s/p/rem.html> accessed 01 January 2002.

⁶⁵ President George W. Bush, "Text of President Bush's speech to Congress", President Bush's address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress transcribed by eMediaMillWorks Inc., posted at 7:44 p.m. PDT Thursday, Sept. 20, 2001, Associated Press URL <http://www0.mercurycenter.com.html> accessed 01 January 2002.

The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends. It is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists and every government that supports them. Our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.⁶⁶

His candor with America was well crafted; his words well chosen. The successful paradigm America is familiar with in waging war on its enemies will be altered in the war on terror. The American public was a spectator to the wars fought in Southeast Asia, Southwest Asia, and the Balkans. Television and the Internet have made the media industry a viable intelligence tool. The wars America fights are viewed in the living rooms of her populace.

The President addressed the “chance and probability” of the U.S. Armed Forces, “And tonight a few miles from the damaged Pentagon, I have a message for our military: Be ready. I have called the armed forces to alert, and there is reason.”⁶⁷ The President was very keen to leave all available tools open to the military to execute his policy. Unlike the war in the Balkans, when the United States political leadership stated American troops would not be committed to fight a land war, the President in front of Congress and on international Television in front of the world left every option on the table.

Americans are asking, “How will we fight and win this war?” We will direct every resource at our command -- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence and every necessary weapon of war -- to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network. Now this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat. Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes visible on TV and covert operations secret even in success.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ President George W. Bush, “Text of President Bush’s speech to Congress”, President Bush’s address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

⁶⁷ President George W. Bush, “Text of President Bush’s speech to Congress”, President Bush’s address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

⁶⁸ President George W. Bush, “Text of President Bush’s speech to Congress”, President Bush’s address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

The President had a very clear message to the rest of the world,

And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime. Our nation has been put on notice, we're not immune from attack. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans.⁶⁹

The attacks on September 11 did not come without warning, however. In the wake of numerous threats, previous terrorist acts, and the issued fatwahs against the United States, the Clinton administration chartered the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century co-chaired by Senator Gary Hart, Democrat from Colorado and Senator Warren Rudman, Republican from New Hampshire. The elite think tank was made up of an equal number of democrats and republicans. Examples of the cross-pollination of the team include Congressman Newt Gingrich and Ambassador Andrew Young. The Hart-Rudman Commission mandate was to evaluate an ever-changing world and determine if institutions designed in the past are relevant to the future. The report was completed in three phases:⁷⁰

- 1) Describe the world emerging in the first quarter of the next century.
- 2) Design national security strategy appropriate to that world.
- 3) Propose necessary changes to the national security structure in order to implement that strategy effectively.

On January 31, 2001, the commission issued 50 recommendations. Two extracts from the executive summary of the report are particularly alarming:

⁶⁹ President George W. Bush, "Text of President Bush's speech to Congress", President Bush's address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

⁷⁰ United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century*, Phase I, (Arlington, Va.: The Commission, 1999), preface.

- 1) “the combination of unconventional weapons proliferation with the persistence of international terrorism will end the relative invulnerability of the U.S. homeland to catastrophic attack.”⁷¹
- 2) “A direct attack against the American citizens on American soil is likely over the next quarter century.”⁷²

The alarms were many and started with the publication of phase I of the report in 1999, “America will become increasingly vulnerable to hostile attack on our homeland, and our military superiority will not protect us...States, terrorists, and other disaffected groups will acquire weapons of mass destruction, and some will use them. Americans will likely die on American soil, possibly in large numbers.”⁷³ The commission published 50 recommendations to include:⁷⁴

- 1) The creation of an independent National Homeland Security Agency with responsibility for planning, coordinating, and integrating various U.S. government activities involved in homeland security.
- 2) The National Guard be given homeland security as a primary mission.
- 3) The Secretary of Defense cut by ten to fifteen percent the staffs of the Office of Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military services, and the regional commands.

The Bush administration in the first year of its term did not fully embrace the recommendations of the commission. The White House course of action was issued in May, 2001 and called for Vice President Cheney to lead a study of the potential problem of domestic terrorism and assigned primary responsibility for dealing with terrorism in the United States to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The two and half year study conducted

⁷¹ United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century*, Phase III, (Arlington, Va.: The Commission, 2001), Executive Summary.

⁷² United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century*, Phase III, Executive Summary.

⁷³ United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century*, Phase I, p. 141.

by the elite Hart-Rudman Commission specifically stated the danger of terrorism needed far more attention than just what could be provided by FEMA.⁷⁵

Senator Hart responded, "Frankly, the White House shut it down. The president said 'Please wait, we're going to turn this over to the vice president. We believe FEMA is competent to coordinate this effort.' And so Congress moved on to other things, like tax cuts and the issue of the day." The Senator was also quick to point out the media gave very little print to the issue, "The national media didn't pay attention... We're in an age where we don't want to deal with serious issues, we want to deal with little boys pitching baseballs who might be 14 instead of 12."⁷⁶

Not all preached the inevitability of an attack on the United States. Ian Roxborough of the Strategic Studies Institute published in his monograph in September of 2001,

In fact the notion that globalization is likely to produce a backlash from Third World, and particularly Islamic societies, has very little to support it. The monograph argues that the work of the commission is based on poor social science and there is the risk that this has produced an inaccurate diagnosis of the causes of conflict in the 21st century.⁷⁷

The "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" means there are many voices to listen to. In the midst of free speech, the key to success is deciphering the voice of reason.

THE MILITARY: "the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army"

The role of the U.S. military "to carry out policy by other means" in the war on terrorism will be a significant departure from the cold war paradigm of warfare. Clausewitz describes the

⁷⁴ United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century*, Phase III, Executive Summary.

⁷⁵ Jake Tapper, "Commission warned Bush", Sept. 12, 2001, Salon.com, Washington DC, URL <www.salon.com/html>, accessed 12 November 2002.

⁷⁶ Jake Tapper, "Commission warned Bush".

⁷⁷ Ian Roxborough, "The Hart-Rudman Commission and Homeland Defense," Strategic Studies Institute, September 2001.

challenge currently undertaken, “The first, the supreme, the most far-reaching act of judgement that the statesman and commander have to establish... the kind of war on which they are embarking; neither mistaking it for, nor trying to turn it into, something that is alien to its nature. This is the first of all strategic questions and the most comprehensive.”⁷⁸

Post Desert Storm has witnessed an incomplete transition of the U.S. military from a large standing army equipped to fight on the plains of Europe to an expeditionary force attempting to attain the responsive nature to a rapidly changing world. The aggressive pace of technology and its manifestation on the battlefield has spurred on the evolution of military affairs. The U.S. military through numerous reviews to include the Bottoms Up Review after Desert Storm to the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), September 2001, has attempted to ensure the responsiveness, effectiveness, and efficiency of U.S. armed forces. Specifically, the Defense Department in the Quadrennial Defense Review set out “to establish a new strategy for America’s defense that would embrace uncertainty and contend with surprise, a strategy premised on the idea that to be effective abroad, America must be safe at home.”⁷⁹ The QDR cited four essential goals:⁸⁰

- 1) Assure allies and friends, the United States will fulfill its security commitments.
- 2) Dissuade adversaries from undertaking programs or operations that pose a threat to U.S. interests or those of her allies and friends.
- 3) Deter aggression and coercion by deploying forward the capacity to swiftly defeat attacks and impose severe penalties for aggression on and adversary.
- 4) Decisively defeat any adversary if deterrence fails.

Even before September 11, Homeland Defense and the possibility of an asymmetrical attack on the United States were a focus of the QDR. The new Defense Department strategy to

⁷⁸ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 89.

⁷⁹ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, p. IV.

deal with the myriad of possibilities, which the United States may face as a result of globalization will be “capabilities based.” This approach focuses on “how” an adversary may fight rather than the traditional “who” the enemy may be.⁸¹ The new force-sizing variables are based on four requirements.⁸²

- 1) Defend the United States.
- 2) Deter aggression and coercion forward in critical regions.
- 3) Swiftly defeat aggression in overlapping major conflicts while preserving for the President the option to call a decisive victory in one of those conflicts-including the possibility of regime change or occupation.
- 4) Conduct a limited number of smaller scale contingency operations.

The strategy and requirements formulated by the QDR was a deviation of the threat based formula in a “two Major Theatre War” (MTW) scenario.⁸³

Not since the War of 1812, has defending our nation meant the soil of the continental United States. The strategies of containment, flexible response, engagement and enlargement were all focused externally to the United States to ensure democracy and free markets prospered. Nuclear deterrence and the duties of NORAD were (perceived to be) sufficient for the threats focused against the American populace during the cold war. As its highest priority, the Department of Defense must defend the nation from enemies who intend on striking the United States. The attacks of September 11 have fulfilled the prophecy of many to include the Hart-Rudman Commission that the United States is vulnerable to the asymmetrical environment of fourth generation warfare.

⁸⁰ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, p. IV.

⁸¹ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, p. 17.

⁸² Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, p. 17.

⁸³ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, 30 September 2001, p. 18.

In the midst of the response to the attacks of September 11, the Bush administration has continued strong support for Global Missile Defense. Though the likelihood of an attack on U.S. soil with an intercontinental ballistic missile is extremely remote, the administration is willing to invest billions of dollars in a continental missile defense shield designed to protect the U.S. from exactly that. Perhaps missile defense is the very beginning of a space base weapon with many uses. Dr Jack Wheeler of the Freedom Research Foundation made the below suggestion:

Despite the protestations of anti-missile defense types, full funding and rapid deployment of missile defense systems is now a given. Further, however, these systems must be quickly put to anti-terrorist purposes. High-energy chemical lasers (such as the U.S. Army's THEL, which has been successfully tested) can be positioned in space to target individual terrorists. ..Hit by such a beam, all the fat molecules in an individual terrorist's body would be instantly vaporized in a pillar of fire, leaving only a small pile of charcoal and ashes as residue. Terrorists would have to remain hidden in deep bunkers to prevent their vaporization, as the beam can penetrate vehicles and most buildings. Such a space-deployed anti-terrorist HECL system would appropriately be called The Hammer of Thor.⁸⁴

The U.S. Army has successfully tested the Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL). During flight tests in 2000 and 2001, the THEL destroyed more than 25 Katuyusha rockets. "One advantage of laser weapons is that they are remarkably precise. You can do a visual identification and there is no time lag from ID to shoot. So you have a tight control over the situation."⁸⁵ The evolution of warfare is accelerated by the remarkable progress of technology.

THE PEOPLE: "primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force"

Not every war need to be fought until one side collapses. When motives and tensions of war are slight we can imagine that the faintest prospect of defeat might be enough to cause one side to yield. If from the very start the other side feels that this is probable, it

⁸⁴ Jack Wheeler, "The Bush Doctrine: Hunt Down Terror".

⁸⁵ Quote is from Don Slater the program manager of the Boeing produced Advanced Tactical Laser (ATL) in the January 2001, National Defense feature article "Directed-Energy Weapons Low Cost Per Kill by Sandra I. Erwin.

will obviously concentrate on bringing about this probability rather than take the long way around and totally defeat the enemy.⁸⁶

Many believed our demise in Vietnam was the fault of the American people. National support did not sustain us to impose our will on our adversary. General Fred C. Weyand, the U.S. Army Chief of Staff in 1976 stated,

Vietnam was reaffirmation of the popular relationship between the American Army and the American people. The American Army is a people's army in the sense that it belongs to the American people who take a jealous and proprietary interest in his involvement. When the Army is committed the American people are committed, when the American people lose their commitment it is futile to try to keep the Army committed. In the final analysis, the American Army is not much an arm of the Executive Branch as it is an arm of the American people. The Army, therefore, cannot be committed lightly.⁸⁷

It is Colonel Summers belief that the senior ranking military members of the Vietnam era needed to advise President Johnson and Secretary McNamara on more than just beans, bullets, and band-aids, but as Clausewitz stated 150 years earlier, "it would be an obvious fallacy to imagine war between civilized peoples as resulting from a rational act on the part of the Government and to consider war as gradual ridding itself of passion."⁸⁸ Committing the American Army without committing the American people is a formula for disaster.⁸⁹

The American people and the Armed Forces are inextricably linked together. The 1939 Army Field Service Regulations stated, "The Congress determines the strength and composition of the peace and war establishments and decides what citizens are available for military service." The composition of the Army is made up of the Regular Army, the National Guard, the Army Reserve, and the "unorganized militia which comprises all persons...who have been or may be declared by the Congress to be liable to perform military duty in service of the United States."⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 97.

⁸⁷ Harry G. Summers, Jr, *On Strategy*, p 11.

⁸⁸ Clausewitz, *On War* p. 76.

⁸⁹ Summers, *On Strategy* p 13.

⁹⁰ Summers, *On Strategy*, p 14.

The writers of our Constitutions were also veterans of the American Revolutionary war. They knew first hand the problems of public support to carry out the policy of a new nation. “Drawing on their successful wartime experiences, they not surprisingly formally incorporated into the new constitution the informal but effective relationships developed in that war.”⁹¹ A declaration of war is the transmission by the Congress of the American peoples’ voice.⁹² As Alexander Hamilton stated in The Federalists Papers:

The whole power of raising armies [is to be] lodged in the Legislature, not in the Executive; This Legislature [is] to be a popular body consisting of the representatives of the people, periodically elected...The power of the President would be inferior to that of the Monarch...That of the British King extends to the Declaring of war and to the Raising and Regulating of fleets and armies; All which the constitution would appertain to the Legislature.⁹³

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution articulates, “The Congress shall have power...To declare war...To raise and support armies...To provide and maintain a navy. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for calling forth...organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia...”⁹⁴

Our forefathers were very careful to craft the constitution to ensure a separation of powers. The oppressive monarchs of Europe fostered their quest to leave tyranny behind for the freedom of the frontier. Their hardship made possible the American dream, which we live today. Their journey from oppression to colonization to autonomy is marked with blood, sweat, and tears. The American frontier was not a place for the weak of heart or spirit. The bedrock laid by our forefathers is based on freedom. To strike at American freedom is to “let loose” the most powerful weapon of the American arsenal, the pride and nationalism of her citizens. Clausewitz

⁹¹ Summers, On Strategy, p 14.

⁹² Summers, On Strategy, p 14.

⁹³ Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist No 24 (December 19, 1787) and The Federalist No 69 (March 14, 1788), Harry Summers, On Strategy II p 12.

⁹⁴ Summers, On Strategy II, p 12

describes the center of gravity as “the hub from which all power and movement, on which everything depends”.⁹⁵ The popular world opinion is the strength of the United States is its gigantic economy manifested through her military. The creation of that economy and the fuel that makes it go comes from the citizens. Ho Chi Minh got it right. He befriended the American public while the U.S. government alienated it. President Johnson was so enamored with his own domestic policy he never actively sought American support for a noble cause in Southeast Asia. In his words, “History provided too many cases where the sound of the bugle put an immediate end to the hopes and dreams of the best reformers: the Spanish American War drowned the populists spirit; World War I ended Woodrow Wilson’s New Freedom; World War II brought the new deal to a close.”⁹⁶ He quickly forgot how important the battle cry, “Remember the Maine” was to inspiring a country to undertake armed conflict in a limited war at the turn of the century. In Vietnam, the strongest economy in the world had could not subdue a physically inferior foe. The ability of the American economy to feed, cloth, and supply an Army of nearly a million men halfway around the world for over five years was an astonishing feat. What is more astonishing is that the United States lost.⁹⁷ Determining the source of all power for America is a classic example of the chicken or the egg. The worst mistake of any belligerent of the United States is to underestimate the will of the American people. President Bush is attempting not to repeat history and is aware of the exponential power of the people, “America is successful because of the hard work and creativity and enterprise of our people. These were the true strengths of our economy before Sept. 11, and they are our strengths today.”⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Clausewitz p 595-596

⁹⁶ Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War*, p. 12.

⁹⁷ The theme of this paragraph is reflective of Colonel Summers’ ideas throughout *On Strategy*. He used the battle cry “remember the Maine” to illustrate the power of the people.

⁹⁸ President George W. Bush, “Text of President Bush’s speech to Congress”, President Bush’s address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

Has Al Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden made a mistake conducting a campaign against American people on American soil? Enemies from the past to include Kaiser Wilhelm, Adolf Hitler, Hideki Tojo, Kim Il Sung, Muammar al-Qaddafi, Manuel Noriega, and Saddam Hussein tempted the will of the American people unsuccessfully and in most cases to their utter demise.⁹⁹

CONCLUSION:

But our resolve must not pass. Each of us will remember what happened that day and to whom it happened. We will remember the moment the news came, where we were and what we were doing. I will not forget the wound to our country and those who inflicted it. I will not yield, I will not rest, I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people.¹⁰⁰

-President George W. Bush

The Japanese strategic plan in 1941 was to capture the Southern Resource Area to ensure the growth of their Co-Prosperity Sphere in the Pacific. The Japanese, like the Americans 140 years earlier, had adopted a Monroe Doctrine of their own; the Co-Prosperity Sphere was its manifestation.¹⁰¹ The surprise attack on December 7, 1941 was an attempt to make a decisive and bloody attack on the United States in order to destroy her Pacific Fleet and break the will of her people. The Japanese estimated, without the support of her citizens the American government would sue for peace and the Japanese-Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere would be intact.¹⁰² To fuel Japanese perceptions western democracies in Europe with the United States standing on the sidelines executed a policy of appeasement towards Nazi Germany in order to avoid bloodshed. The conceived theory was democracy produced a soft, casualty-averted populace.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Summers, On Strategy II, p 14.

¹⁰⁰ President George W. Bush, "Text of President Bush's speech to Congress", President Bush's address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress.

¹⁰¹ J.A.S. Grenville, *A History of the World In the Twentieth Century*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1994) P277

¹⁰² Augustine H. Kobayashi, "They Underestimated the Americans", U.S. Naval Institute, December 2001 Vol. 127/12/1,186, p50.

¹⁰³ Augustine H. Kobayashi, "They Underestimated the Americans", p. 51.

The attacks of September 11 may have been devised with a similar premise. The campaign of Al Qaeda starting in the battle of Mogadishu has been countered with very little “hate and enmity” by the United States. Certainly the American government did not stand idly by as U.S. service members were killed throughout the Middle East and civilians were killed in the first attack of the New York World Trade Center. But is also a long shot to say freezing a few assets and launching some Tomahawk missiles is the true reflection of “the hate and enmity” of the American people.

President Bush gave the American people a difficult mission and one perhaps that can be misinterpreted,

I ask you to live your lives and hug your children. I know many citizens have fears tonight, and I ask you to be calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat... I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy...It is my hope in the months and years ahead life will return almost to normal. We’ll go back to our lives and routines, and that is good.¹⁰⁴

Perhaps the President should have expanded more on the “almost normal” aspect of his guidance. His message should contain elements of an article written by Dr. Jack Matthews titled “Keep Your Head in the Game.” Dr. Matthews points out that the American people have to stay focused on more than just their lively hoods and creature comforts.¹⁰⁵ They must remain aware of their surroundings, after all the American public is the target. The complacency that has resulted in a series of successful terrorist attacks against the United States military and state department since 1983 must be eradicated to ensure a similar pattern of success does not occur within the continental boundaries of America. Dr. Matthews offered these words of advice to America:¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Text of President Bush’s speech to Congress posted at 7:44 p.m. PDT Thursday, Sept. 20, 2001, Associated Press.

¹⁰⁵ Dr Jack Matthews, letter written titled “Keeping Our Heads in the Game”, 01 October 2001.

¹⁰⁶ Dr Jack Matthews, “Keeping Our Heads in the Game”.

- 1) Trust your instincts. They're good, and if your gut says something's wrong, then something's probably wrong.
- 2) Be sensitive to the rhythms of your community. In other words, endeavor to maintain a situational awareness with respect to your environment.
- 3) This is a time for grown-ups. We all need to set the example. Don't "bitch and moan" when inconvenienced by people of authority who are just trying to do their jobs. Follow the advise in the popular TV commercial and, "Just do it."

September 11th is not the first terrorist attack directed against America with large-scale effects. In the early morning of October 23, 1983, the First Battalion, 8th Marines Headquarters building was destroyed by a truck bomb driven by a ruthless, hate-filled enemy of the United States who was willing to die for his cause. The attack killed 241 Marines, Sailors, and Soldiers.¹⁰⁷ In the words of President Reagan in a speech to the American people in the aftermath,

This past Sunday, at 22 minutes after 6 Beirut time, with dawn just breaking a truck, looking like a lot of other vehicles in the city, approached the airport on a busy, main road. There was nothing in its appearance to suggest it was any different than the trucks or cars that were normally seen on and around the airport. But this one was different. At the wheel was a young man on a suicide mission.¹⁰⁸

As witnessed by the tragedy in Beirut the enemy is not ignorant. A Sunday, at dawn, on a headquarters building, using a weapon that fits the local scenery. The tactics are solid.

What did the United States learn in the tragedy in Beirut? The Weinberger Doctrine was delivered in the aftermath and gave a more focused approach to the deployment of U.S. Forces to execute American policy. Terrorism, Anti-terrorism, and Counter terrorism became buzzwords through out the military and government. But with time, the disaster in Beirut is primary limited

¹⁰⁷ General Paul X. (P.X.) Kelley, USMC, 29th Commandant of the Marine Corps, "Remarks by the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Senate Armed Services Committee", 31 October 1983. URL: <<http://www.beirut-memorial.org/history/kelley.html>> accessed 04 February 2002.

¹⁰⁸ President Ronald Reagan, "Televised address to the United States of America", 27 October 1983.

to a small stretch of highway in Jacksonville, North Carolina where a memorial stands to those who gave their lives for their country.

The stakes were raised on September 11. Will the United States be in such a rush to “return to normal” that we become equally vulnerable to another attack? As Clausewitz states warfare is the clash of opposing wills. He uses the analogy of wrestlers grappling in a ring. Each has an independent will and wishes to impose it on the other. To assume one will quit without a decisive maneuver or series of maneuvers is embracing defeat.

The attacks of September 11 caused a huge wave of American patriotism. The American flag was everywhere. Flags were purchased at a rate never before recorded. From pickup trucks, to stately mansions, to office buildings everywhere the flag was flown with a sense of pride rarely displayed. Past American successes like World Wars I and II and recently Desert Storm, the flag was very much in fashion. The Vietnam conflict was mistakenly not a flag flying war. The American people and patriotism were purposely avoided for the sake of domestic policy.

As stated earlier, America thinks big. Corporate America accelerated the phenomenal growth of patriotism. From Hollywood to the National Football League, the American red, white and blue is found everywhere. During the 7th inning of every game during the 2001 Major League Baseball playoffs and World Series, the song God Bless America was sung with a sense of duty and pride that only comes from the heart. A small red, white and blue, ribbon is on every American professional sports team's jersey remembering the attacks of September 11.

How long will it last?...

Could the terrorist be right? In Beirut, we exited four months after the tragic bombing of the BLT headquarters. In Somalia 18 American soldiers were killed and we quickly transformed our role on the horn of Africa. After almost 6,000 African casualties in two United States

embassy bombings, we launched a few Tomahawk missiles, hardly retaliation. We absorbed the Khobar Tower and USS Cole attacks. The list goes on.

All three elements of the Clausewitzian trinity must be evident in the everyday lives of Americans and visible to allies, friends, and foes. The return to normalcy should be referred to in years rather than months. Our resolve must sustain in good times and bad if we are to prevent another hideous act on American soil. The opposing will we face is not ready to give up the fight. For every suicide bomber who executed his mission on September 11 there are thousands more ready to do the same.

The President must lead. He must follow the inner light and not be tainted by the negative effects of politics. America cannot be afraid to be powerful. He must speak bluntly and back it up with the economic strength and the raw power of the United States. The test of political will for the President started in earnest after his State of the Union Address. His comments in reference to Iran, Iraq, and North Korea, “States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world” has caused major diplomatic tremors worldwide.¹⁰⁹ The response from abroad was primarily negative. Only six months after the attacks on America, our European allies have this to say in their newspapers:

Americans may not yet be fully aware of this, but the fact is anti-American sentiments are resurfacing in Europe. It was striking how short the period of widespread solidarity and sympathy with the United States was in the wake of September 11.¹¹⁰

Night after night, I have found myself listening to Londoners’ diatribes against the sheer weirdness of the American citizenry. The attacks on America are routinely discounted. American patriotism, obesity, emotionality, self-centeredness: these are the crucial issues.”¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ President George W. Bush, “State of Our Union Has Never Been Stronger”, State of the Union address, Tuesday, 29 January 2002, NewsMax.com, URL: <<http://www.newsmax.com/cgi-bin>>, accessed 05 February 2002.

¹¹⁰ Oliver Libaw, “View From Abroad,” abcnews.com, 27 February 2002, URL: <<http://www.abcnews.com>>, Accessed 27 February 2002.

¹¹¹ Oliver Libaw, “View From Abroad.”

These same Europeans thought the American public was “silly” to have such a negative reaction to the scandalous relationship of President Clinton with a 19-year-old intern in the sanctity of the White House. With respect to world opinion and in particular Europe, the guidance from the European Clausewitz is the wise council required: “If the mindset is to emerge unscathed from this relentless struggle with the unforeseen, two qualities are indispensable: first, an intellect that, even in the darkest hour, retains some glimmerings of the inner light which leads to truth; and second the courage to follow the faint light wherever it may lead.”¹¹² The great European leader Winston Churchill, who was voted out of office after “willing” his country to victory in World War II gives a compelling argument for leadership and direction in time of challenge, “What is our aim? ...victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror; victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival.”¹¹³

Freedom creates a gap that only can be defended by a ruthless protector. Those who abide by the rules of freedom prosper; those that do not must be destroyed. *The military must be the sword with its lack and luster to execute the policy of the government when diplomacy fails.* Semper Paratus, always prepared, must not only be the battle cry of the United States Coast Guard but the cornerstone for all branches of service. The post Vietnam self-analysis, which produced the decisive weapon unleashed in Desert Storm, must continue to exist in the military to remain relevant to the ever-changing threat. The transformation process is continuous. The “chance and probability” of success on the battlefield is increased in favor of those most familiar with their art: “Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles, you will never be in peril.”¹¹⁴

¹¹² Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, eds Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976), p. 102.

¹¹³ Jonathan Sandys, “Churchill Would Fight Tyranny of Terrorism,” NewsMax.com, 26 September 2002, URL: <<http://newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/9/23/134135.shtml>>, accessed 25 February 2002.

¹¹⁴ Sun Tzu, *Art of War*, translated by Samuel B. Griffith, (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 84.

The people must provide the support when required and the disapproval when appropriate. America grew up very quickly in the wake of September 11. The threat is real and not just “print” in books and magazine articles. Like the great generation of Americans whom fought and ensured our prosperity in the 1940s, the current generation of Americans must have the maturity to ensure the longevity of the American dream is handed over to the next generation. Their courage may not be displayed in uniforms on battlefields like their forefathers but rather in their mature reflection and evaluation on current events and future threats. The media will continue, as it should, to provide criticism on the front pages of newspapers from coast to coast. The nation that is satisfied with its current accomplishments is ripe for exploitation. Complacency is rooted in the status quo. No nation beats up the United States better than the United States. Vietnam may have been the propellant to make America the great nation it is today. The force of “hate and enmity,” which comes from the people must be an intelligent force based on the rights so valiantly earned in the American Revolutionary War: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The goal of every American should be to go to bed proud and wake up humble and hungry. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt captured the essence of the American dream in the midst of a national crisis in 1941 with his famous four freedoms speech:¹¹⁵

I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call... In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression - everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way - everywhere in the world.

¹¹⁵ Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "FOUR FREEDOMS" SPEECH, January 6, 1941 to the Congress of the United States, URL: <http://history.acusd.edu/gen/WW2Text/wwt0047>, accessed 13 March 2002

The third is freedom from want - which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peace time life for its inhabitants -everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear - which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor - anywhere in the world.

In the same decisive leadership style, which characterized the great FDR, President Bush has added a freedom to the historic speech – Freedom from Terror.

Bibliography

- Bassford, Christopher and Edward J. Villacre. "Reclaiming the Clausewitzian Trinity", *Parameters* XXV, no 3 (Autumn 1995).
- Beyerchen, Alan D. "Complex Global Politics, and National Security, Clausewitz, Nonlinearity, and the Importance of Imagery". URL: <http://www.ndu.edu/ndu/inss/books/complexity/ch07.html>>. Accessed 18 September 2001.
- Bush, George W., President of the United States. "REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY". U.N. Headquarters, New York, 10 November 2001. Released by the Office of the Press Secretary.
- Bush, George W., President of the United States. "Text of President Bush's speech to Congress", President Bush's address Thursday, 20 September 2001 to a joint session of Congress transcribed by eMediaMillWorks Inc., posted at 7:44 p.m. PDT Thursday, Sept. 20, 2001, Associated Press URL <http://www0.mercurycenter.com/html> accessed 01 January 2002.
- Caruso, J.T. "Al-Qaeda International". Testimony of J.T. Caruso, Acting Assistant Director, CounterTerrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, December 18, 2001. URL: <http://www.fbi.gov/congress/congress01/caruso121801.htm>> accessed 06 February 2002.
- Clausewitz, Carl Von. *On War*. Ed. Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976.
- Cody, Edward. "Protecting Bin Laden", *Washington Post*, 30 December 2001.
- Federation of American Scientists. "al-Qa'ida (The Base), Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders, Islamic Salvation Foundation, Usama bin Laden Network." URL: <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/ladin.htm>>. Accessed 11 February 2002.
- Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999.
- Friedman, Thomas L. "Blunt Question, Blunt Answer", *New York Times*, February 10, 2002. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/02/10/opinion/10FRIE.html>>. Accessed 15 February 2002.
- Grenville, J.A.S. *A History of the World In the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Ma: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1994.
- Haas, Richard N. "The Bush Administration's Response to September 11th -- and Beyond", Director, Office of the Policy Planning, Staff Remarks to the Council of Foreign Relations, New York, NY October 15, 2001. URL: <http://www.state.gov/s/p/rem.html>>. Accessed 01

January 2002.

Hanle, Donald J. *Terrorism: The Newest Face of Warfare*. Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers, Inc., 1989.

Harmon, Christopher C. "Advancing U.S. National Interests Through Effective Counterterrorism", remarks delivered at the Secretary's Open Forum, U.S. Department of State, 22 October, 2001.

Hayes, Laura. "Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's Network of Terror." URL: <http://www.infoplease.com/spot/terror-qaeda.html>. Accessed 11 February 2002.

Hirschkom, Phil, Rohan Gunaratna, Ed Blanche, and Stefan Leader. "Blowback". *Jane's Intelligence Review*, 01 August 2001, URL: <http://www.janes.com/html>. Accessed 27 December 2001.

Howard, Michael. *Clausewitz*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.

Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Kelly, P.X., General, Commandant of the Marine Corps. "Remarks by the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Senate Armed Services Committee". 31 October 1983.

Kern, Tony. "Open Letters to Americans". Letter published in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 14 September 2001. URL: <http://www.snopes2.com/rumors/tonykern.htm>. Accessed 04 February 2002.

Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1994.

Kobayashi, Augustine H. "They Underestimated the Americans." *U.S. Naval Institute*, December 2001 Vol. 127/12/1,186.

Laden, Osama Bin. "Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders". World Islamic Front Statement, 23 February 1998.

Matthews, John B. "Keeping Our Heads in the Game." Letter written 01 October 2001.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Department of Defense, 30 September 2001.

Reagan, Ronald. President of the United States. "Televised address to the United States of America." 27 October 1983.

Roxborough, Ian. "The Hart-Rudman Commission and Homeland Defense." Strategic Studies Institute, September 2001.

Stone, Andrea. "Many in Islamic World Doubt Arabs Behind 9/11", USA Today, 27 February 2002, URL: <<http://www.usatoday.com/news/attack/2002/02/27/usat-pol.htm>>. Accessed 27 February 2002.

Summers, Harry G., Jr. *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1982.

Summers, Harry G. Jr. *On Strategy II: A Critical Analysis of the Gulf War*. New York, Dell Publishing, 1992.

Sun Tzu. *Art of War*. Translated by Samuel B. Griffith. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Trapper, Jake. "Commission warned Bush". Salon.com, Sept. 12, 2001. URL: <www.salon.com/html>. Accessed 12 November 2002.

United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century, Phase I*. Arlington, Va.: The Commission, 1999.

United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century, Phase III*. Arlington, Va.: The Commission, 2001.

Weinberger, Casper W. "The Uses of Military Power", remarks delivered by the Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, to the National Press Club, Washington DC, 28 November 1984. URL: <<http://www.pbs.org>>. Accessed 06 February 2002.

Wheeler, Jack. "The Bush Doctrine: Hunt Down Terror". NewsMax.com, URL: <<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/9/16/144851.shtml>>. Accessed 01 January 2002.