The Lessons of the Iraq War:

Summary Briefing

July 15, 2003

Anthony H. Cordesman
Arleigh A. Burke Chair for Strategy

Index

ANY LESSONS MUST BE PREFACED WITH THE FACT WE WON

Let me begin by making an important caveat: We won the war quickly, decisively, at a remarkably little cost to ourselves, our allies, and the Iraqi people.

- **This is always an important prelude to a "lessons" briefing.**

- **Necessarily focuses more on what we need to change than what went right, and much did go right.**

- **It is particularly important at the point in our understanding of the war, because there is much we still do not know, and it is far easier to draw lessons that it is to validate them, cost them, and establish clear priorities.**

- **In many cases, it is also difficult to know the marginal benefit that can really be achieved from acting on given lessons. It is clear that US and allied resources are very finite, and the room for improvement is almost infinite.**

REAL WAR VERSUS "PERFECT WAR"

I **also want to be careful to put the problems that did arise in context**.

Many people look at conflict like the Iraq War with the attitude that success means that almost everything should have functioned perfectly, every weapon hit its target, and every system functioned well.

Moreover, that we always understood what we were doing and our intelligence, command and control systems, and communications always worked the way they should.

I would hope that this audience has read enough military history to know that the reality is very different.

The margin between victory in war is not the difference between 80% efficiency and 90% efficiency. It is the difference between 5% efficiency and 10% efficiency.

- **"Friction" and the fog of war have not gone away.**

We did not fight a perfect war, *but* we were far, far more capable than our opponent.

SECRETARY RUMSFELD'S LESSONS*

- **The importance of *speed*, and the ability to get inside the enemy's decision cycle and strike before he is able to mount a coherent defense;**

- **The importance of *jointness*, and the ability of U.S. forces to fight, not as individual de-conflicted services, but as a truly joint force—maximizing the power and lethality they bring to bear;**

- **The importance of *intelligence*—and the ability to act on intelligence rapidly, in minutes, instead of days and even hours;**

- **And the importance of *precision*, and the ability to deliver devastating damage to enemy positions, while sparing civilian lives and the civilian infrastructure.**

- **In the 21st century "overmatching power" is more important than "overwhelming force." In the past, under the doctrine of overwhelming force, force tended to be measured in terms of mass—the number of troops that were committed to a particular conflict. In the 21st century, mass may no longer be the best measure of power in a conflict. After all, when Baghdad fell, there were just over 100,000 American forces on the ground. General Franks overwhelmed the enemy not with the typical three to one advantage in mass, but by overmatching the enemy with advanced capabilities, and using those capabilities in innovative and unexpected ways.**

* Summary presented to the Senate Armed Service Committee, June 9, 2003.

GENERAL TOMMY FRANKS' LESSONS*

Decisive combat in Iraq saw a maturing of joint force operations in many ways. Some capabilities reached new performance levels.

From a Joint Integration perspective, our experience in Operations Southern and Northern Watch, and Enduring Freedom helped to develop a joint culture in our headquarters and in our components. These operations helped to improve joint interoperability and improve our joint C4I networks as joint force synergy was taken to new levels of sophistication.

Our forces were able to achieve their operational objectives by integrating ground maneuver, special operations, precision lethal fires and non-lethal effects.

We saw for the first time integration of forces rather than deconfliction of forces. This integration enabled conventional (air, ground, and sea) forces to leverage SOF capabilities to deal effectively with asymmetric threats and enable precision targeting simultaneously in the same battle space.

Likewise, Special Operators were able to use conventional forces to enhance and enable special missions.

Operational fires spearheaded our ground maneuver, as our forces sustained the momentum of the offense while defeating enemy formations in open, complex, and urban terrain.

We saw jointness, precision munitions, C2, equipment readiness, state of training of the troops, and Coalition support as clear "winners" during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF).

* Summary presented to the Senate Armed Service Committee, June 9, 2003.

GENERAL FRANKS' AREAS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT*

Fratricide prevention suffered from a lack of standardized combat identification.

Units in theater arrived with seven different combat ID systems, and our commanders were forced to overcome these shortcomings "on the fly".

Deployment planning and execution were cumbersome, and need to be improved to meet the operational demands of the 21st Century.

Coalition information sharing must be improved at all levels.

Finally, human intelligence and communications bandwidth are also areas that will require continuing focus.

* Summary presented to the Senate Armed Service Committee, June 9, 2003.

THE CRITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF MILITARY FUNDAMENTALS

We often are so concerned with our own force transformations that we forget to remember the weaknesses of our enemy.

- **Iraq was a poorly organized and highly politicized enemy that had had no real military resupply since UN sanctions were imposed before the Gulf War. Its air force had effectively been defeated before the war began, much of the SEAD mission had already been executed, and the regime was too unpopular to mobilize the people.**

- **This, however, is an important lesson about the world we live in. We talk about the revolution in have military forces with no real experience with modern warfare, and many have forces that are oriented more towards domestic repression than warfighting.**

- **One lesson of the Iraq War is that we and a few of our closest allies continue to evolve rapidly in a world where most military forces at best buy equipment that they do not organize to use effectively and where many other forces are regressing or standing still.**

- **Unfortunately, this is as true of most of our allies as of our potential enemies, and in thinking about the lessons of this war, we need to remember that Iraq had fought two more major wars in the last half century than virtually all of the members of NATO, South Korea, and Japan.**

- **We and the British have become the West's only truly experienced war fighters and the only powers with real world power projection capabilities – although some elements of French forces are an exception.**

- **We are also the only power organized and equipped to project and sustain large forces in intense combat at long distances. Even Britain could not have sustained intense armored maneuver all of the way to Baghdad.**

- **Accordingly, one lesson we should draw from the Iraq War is how much it validates the need to rethink how we compare military effectiveness and force ratios, how little classic orders of battle and comparisons of equipment numbers tell us about military strength, and how careful we need to be to measure our rate of transition against both potential enemies and our allies.**

THE PRIMACY OF PROFESSIONALISM, TRAINING, READINESS, AND SUSTAINABILITY

To expand upon this point, another key lesson of the Iraq War is the value of military professionalism, actual war fighting experience, high morale and motivation, realistic training and readiness.

- **New technologies, tactics, and toys were of immense value.**

- **Yet, many legacy systems like the heavy bomber and main battle tank played a key role**

- **We probably could have won the Iraq War in close to the same time and still with limited casualties, if we have only fought using the systems and technology we had in the Gulf War.**

- **In contrast, it is far from clear that the changes in technology and tactics would have allowed us to win with anything like the same speed and casualties if we did not have such a high degree of training, readiness, professionalism, and experience.**

- **The key point is that fundamentals still matter.**

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NEW WAY OF WAR

This does not mean that we did not move forwards towards a "new way" of war. All of the buzzwords and phrases that are now being used to describe the changes in the way we fought this war were important.

- **We did greatly increase the overall tempo of our operations, and we mixed at least some elements of shock and awe with major advances in precision and focus.**

- **We did make important progress towards net centric warfare.**

- **Our IS&R (Intelligence Surveillance, and Reconnaissance), and C4I, capabilities were greatly improved over those in the Gulf War, and we greatly improved our situational awareness, maneuver capability, and targeting.**

- **We went from well under 10% use of precision weapons to well over 60%. Our delivery capabilities were far better – for example, five times as many of our aircraft were able to launch laser-guided weapons.**

- **We made major progress in moving towards "effects-based" operations.**

- **Our advances in the air were matched by similar advantages in armor, artillery, and heliborne warfare.**

- **Improved communications, jointness, and situational awareness greatly improved the value and impact of Special Operations forces.**

- **Major advances occurred in our use of space in every aware from imagery to GPS, and we also went from one form of tactical UAV in the Gulf War to 10 in the Iraq War, and our dissemination of intelligence was far better, and much more timely.**

KEY REMAINING PROBLEM AREAS WHERE LESSONS MUST STILL BE LEARNED

But, and it is a very important but, there were still many areas where progress was limited, and some areas where the war exposed major weaknesses.

- **The tempo of operations during the war must be kept in context. We talk about the sheer speed of our operations during the war, but well over 80% of our supplies still had to move relatively slowly by sea, and we remain dependent on regional allies for bases and some aspects of sustainment.**

- **Similarly, the speed of our wartime operations must be put in the context of operations from 1998 onwards that effectively defeated the Iraqi air force before the war began, and carried out much of the SEAD mission .**

- **We were in transition in many critical aspects of what we are calling net centric warfare. We never were able to test the net centric capabilities of the "digital" forces in the 4th infantry division, and our communications and battle management systems developed many gaps and holes at the division level and below.**

- **The preliminary reports of the US Army and Marine Corps forces in the field show that it was only constant improvisation and world arounds that allowed brigade and battalion level forces to operate with the effectiveness they did. Rather than a system of systems, we had people who succeeded *in spite* of the systems.**

LESSONS AFFECTING AIR AND LAND POWER

- **Precision was relative. There were times we got one true hit per weapon. There were many times it took two or three. We also had major problems in battle damage assessment, While we have reduce the lag between targeting and strikes, and made advances in time-sensitive targeting, we are far from fully "closing the loop" in net centric warfare.**

- **We were able to achieve something approaching "effects based operations" against the Iraqi Republican Guards and those regular forces that engaged in combat. We could not characterize and target irregular and infantry dominated forces with anything like our capability to strike at armored and heavy forces.**

- **We generally could not assess the value or effect of striking most fixed and rear area facilities. We could damage virtually anything we wanted, but we could never be sure of what it did or the impact of our strikes. We clearly have not solved the problem of strategic and interdiction bombing, although we have made major progress.**

- **We had virtually no idea of the nature of the threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction before and during the war.**

THE NEED TO REDEFINE "DECISIVE FORCE" - I

- **First, what would have happened if Iraq had been able to fully execute its plans to call up massive irregular forces and make use of asymmetric warfare, and if it had used its conventional forces more effectively?**

- **Second, to what extent do the strengths and weaknesses of Coalition and Iraqi forces in this war apply to other key contingencies like a war in Korea, across the Taiwan Straits, a conflict with Iran, or – more importantly – an emerging power a decade from now that has acted intelligently on the lessons of this conflict and has developed effective and well hidden means to use weapons of mass destruction both in direct warfighting and covert or proxy attacks?**

- **Third, do the US and its allies really have a reliable mix of modeling techniques, operational analysis methods, and test and evaluation capabilities to properly use a single conflict like Iraq – or the broader patterns in recent conflicts -- to analyze the real-world impact of sudden sweeping changes in forces, technology, strategy, and tactics, in ways that allow them to make sweeping and rapid trade-offs? What risks can analysis really minimize in answering how much, what, and when is enough?**

- **Fourth, are there special risks in relying on "intangible" or "new" measures of military effectiveness like speed of military maneuver and action, improvements in IS&R and C4I/battlement management systems, jointness, targeting, and effects-based operations before the very real advantages of transformation in these areas are clearly established? Is it possible to go from choosing the proper vector for change to choosing a specific direction, and leapfrogging from current to transformational forces on the basis of what is known about the Iraq War and other recent conflicts?**

- **Fifth, how much slack is there in the existing force posture of the US and its allies? Being able to say that the Coalition had decisive force in retrospect is not the same as saying it could have planned on being as decisive before the war. If one looks at actual major combat elements of force strength like combat battalions, combat-ready aircraft, and combat ready ships, the US has already cut its total deployable force strength by well over 40% since the end of the Cold War, while accepting growing de facto political constraints on its ability to inflict casualties and collateral damage.**

  Even if one looks only a crude total force numbers, the Army has cut is active force stricture from 18 to 12 divisions and total active manpower from around 800,000 to 480,000. While it only committed some 12 combat brigades to the Iraq War versus 23 in Desert Storm, this was a total of 12 out of 32 combat brigades in the army's remaining force structure. The total cuts in combat ships and combat fighter and fighter attack aircraft have been even greater, and the Marines had roughly half of its170, 000 personnel committed outside the US at the peak of the fighting.

THE NEED TO REDEFINE "DECISIVE FORCE" - II

It seems clear that the US did not have the worldwide assets during the Iraq War to effectively fight two major regional contingencies, Many US military experts feel that US forces are overdeployed and military personnel are being asked to make sacrifices that cannot be sustained. Force transformation cannot, in a democracy, ask those who do risk their lives to defend their nation while the vast majority of citizen take no risks at all, to assume either the peacetime or wartime burden of operating in a force structure that is either too small or involves too many transformational strains and risks.

- Sixth, even if all of these questions could be answered, does the US or any other Western power have the tools in terms of program management, cost analysis, effectiveness analysis, and ability to deliver given technologies and weapons systems in fully trained and converted forces to make rapid shifts in force transformation, take risks in sharply reducing legacy forces before new forces are proven to be ready, and go from "evolution" to "revolution?"

- Seventh, in the process, can the US and its allies establish a real-world balance between the ability to create new strategic and tactical concepts, as well as the technologies to implement them , on the one hand; and the ability to deal with the human factors inherent in making military forces effective and properly motivated, and with the need for the proper balance of recruitment and retention, training, basing, deployment cycles, and logistics and sustainment , on the other hand?

- Eighth, how do the answers to all of these questions, particularly for the US, affect the grand strategic posture of the nation involved in force transformation? How do they affect the motivation and interoperability of allies all over the world? How do they affect the nature of alliances? How are they perceived in terms of the political and military impact of forward presence and basing? To what extent do they deter and/or provoke potential enemies and neutral states? To what extent do they push opponents towards asymmetric warfare and terrorism, to proliferate, or use terrorist movements as proxies?

THE LIMITS OF IS&R CAPABILITY - I

- **The US did not have enough area experts, technical experts, and analysts with language skills at any level to make optimal use of its sensors and collection. This was as true at the national level as at the tactical level, and collection overload was a problem in many areas.**

- **The US had a far greater capability to target buildings than characterize what went on in the building, and the effect of strikes on most sets of structures. It could not measure the level of wartime activity in many cases (facilities with high emission levels were an exception), and this made the efforts at "effects-based" operations discussed in later chapters difficult and sometimes impossible. Moreover, estimates of the level and nature of underground and sheltered facilities and activity were generally highly problematic.**

- **The IS&R effort mistargeted leadership facilities, exaggerated the importance of C4I strikes, and overtargeted fixed military facilities. It is, however, unclear that the US and its allies had any choice. Striking more targets in the face on uncertainty was probably better than striking only those targets where a high confidence could be established as to the effect.**

- **The IS&R effort often had to take a "worst case" approach to the potential role of Iraq's security forces, intelligence services, irregular forces like Saddam's Fedayeen, and unusual military formations like the Special Republican Guards. In fairness, however, it is difficult – if not impossible – to accurately characterize the warfighting capability of forces that have never fought and which do not conduct open and realistic exercises.**

THE LIMITS OF IS&R CAPABILITY - II

- **The IS&R sensor and analytic effort focused more on major combat forces, with heavy weapons, than on infantry or irregular forces. It could do a much better job of locating and characterizing weapons platforms and military emitters than dealing with personnel and forces that relied on light vehicles. It was generally difficult or impossible to locate distributed forces in a built-up or urban environment until they were forces into some form of open military activity and the US often lacked the density of specialized assets like UAVs to carry out this mission even when open activity took place.**

- **The IS&R effort did much to reduce collateral damage and the risk of civilian casualties. It was neither organized nor capable, however, of assessing either civilian or military casualties.**

- **The speed and intensity of the war seems to have led to a major breakdown in the battle damage assessment (BDA) process. Quite aside from the many gaps and uncertainties reaming in the BDA process, the IS&R system could not close the cycle in terms of target-shoot-assess on a timely and accurate basis which remains a critical challenge in creating true net centric war.**

- **The IS&R effort was not able to characterize and target the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction effort before or during the war, or provide reliable warning of the tactical threat. It seems to have been somewhat better in dealing with potential delivery systems, but the level of improvement relative to the inability to locate the Iraqi chemical, biological, and nuclear effort is unclear.**

PROBLEMS IN COLLECTING DATA ON IRAQI WMD CAPABILITIES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS - I

- **Iraq and other powers sophisticated enough to proliferate are also sophisticated enough to have a good understanding of many of the strengths and limitations of modern intelligence sensors, the timing and duration of satellite coverage, and the methods use to track imports and technology transfer.** They have learned to cover and conceal, to deceive, and to create smaller and better disseminated activities.

- **Intelligence collection of relies heavily on finding key imports and technology transfers. Such reports, however, only usually cover a small fraction of the actual effort on the part of the proliferating country, and the information collected is often vague and uncertain, in part because importers and smugglers have every incentive to lie and are also familiar with many the ways to defeat intelligence collection and import controls.** When information does become available, it is often impossible to put in context, and a given import or technology transfer can often be used in many difficult ways, often was other than proliferation. Such import data can hint at the character of a proliferation effort, but give no picture of the overall character of the activity.

- **Even when data are available on given imports or technology transfers, they generally present three serious problems.** One is that there is no way to know the end destination and use of the import and how it is integrated into the overall effort. The second is there is no way to know if it is integrated into an ongoing research and development effort, a weapons production effort, being procured or stockpiled for later use, or simply an experiment or mistake that is never further exploited. The third is that many imports have civilian or other military uses. These so-called "dual-use" imports may have legitimate use.

- **The very nature of arms control agreements like the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NNPT), Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and Chemical Weapons convention (BWC) encourages proliferating nations to lie and conceal as effectively as possible.** The same is true of supplier agreements like the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) and Australia List, and any form of sanctions. Arms control only encourages compliance among non-proliferators and non-sellers, and current enforcement efforts are too weak to be effective while their provisions effective license technology transfer to those nations who succeed in lying or concealing.

- **The technology of proliferation generally permits the research and development effort to be divided up into a wide range of small facilities and projects. Some can be carried out as legitimate civil research.** Others can be hidden in civil and commercial facilities. As proliferators become more sophisticated, they learn to create dispersed, redundant and parallel programs, and mix high secret covert programs with open civil or dual-use programs. Chemical, biological, and cruise missile programs are particularly easy to divide up into small cells or operations. However, this is increasingly true of nuclear weapons

centrifuge programs, plutonium processing and fuel cycles, and the testing and simulation of nuclear weapons that does not involve weapons grade materials. Many key aspects of ballistic missile R&D, including warhead and launch system design fit into this category.

- **Iraq and most other proliferators have, in the past, focused on creating stockpiles of weapons for fighting theater conflicts against military forces. These stockpiles require large inventories, large-scale deployments, and generally mixes of training and warfighting preparations that create significant intelligence indicators. There are, however, other strategies and many proliferators may now be pursuing them.** One is to bring weapons to full development, and to wait until a threat becomes imminent to actually produce the weapon. A second is to follow the same course, but create large dual-use civil facilities that can be rapidly converted to the production of weapons of mass destruction. These can include pharmaceutical plants, food-processing plants, breweries, petrochemical plants, and pesticide plants, but key assembly lines can be concealed in a wide range of other commercial activities. Weapons production facilities can be stockpile for a later and sometimes sudden breakout. A third is to focus on creating as few highly lethal biological or nuclear weapons to attack key political or civilian facilities in a foreign country, rather than its military forces. Highly lethal non-infectious or infectious biological agents are one means of such an attack, biological weapons directed at crops or livestock are another.

- **Countries can pursue very different strategies in dealing with their past inventories of weapons.** They can disclose and destroy them, knowing they do not face an urgent warfighting need, better weapons are coming, and this suits current political objectives. They can claim to destroy and hide the remaining weapons in covert areas known only to a few. They can claim to destroy, or lie, and disperse weapons where they can be used for warfighting purposes. In many cases, intelligence collection may not be able to distinguish between such strategies, and a given proliferator like Iraq can pursue a mix of such strategies – depending on the value of the weapon.

- **In many cases, there is no clear way to know whether a program is R&D, production and weapons deployment, or production capable/breakout oriented.** The problem is further complicated by the fact that Iraq and other countries have learned to play a "shell game" by developing multiple surface and underground military facilities and dual-use facilities and to create relatively mobile mixes of trailer/vehicle mounted and "palletized" equipment for rapid movement. Large special-purpose facilities with hard to move equipment often still exist, but they are by no means the rule. Intelligence collection takes time and may often lag behind country activities.

- **Unless a country keeps extremely accurate records of its programs, it is often far easier to estimate that maximum scale of what it might do than provide an accurate picture of what it has actually done.**

PROBLEMS IN COLLECTING DATA ON IRAQI WMD CAPABILITIES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS - II

- **In most cases, it is impossible to know how far a given project or effort has gotten and how well it has succeeded.** The history of proliferation is not the history of proliferators overcoming major technical and manufacturing problems. It is the history of massive management and systems integration problems, political failures, lying technical advocates and entrepreneurs, project managers who do not tell their political masters the truth, and occasional sudden success. Short of an intelligence breakthrough, it is rarely possible to assess the success of a given effort and even on the scene inspection can produce vary wrong results unless a given project can be subjected to detailed technical testing. For example, UNSCOM and the IAEA found that virtually all of their preliminary reporting on Iraq's nuclear effort in 1992-1993 tended to exaggerate Iraqi capabilities once they had had the time to fully assess the efficiency of key efforts like the Calutron and centrifuge programs.

- **The only definitive way to counter most of these collection problems is to have a reliable mix of redundant human intelligence (HUMINT) sources within the system or as defectors.** The US, however, has never claimed or implied it had such capabilities in any proliferating country, and the history of US, British, UNSCOM, and UNMOVIC efforts to deal with Iraq makes it painfully clear both that such transparency was totally lacking in Iraq and that most Iraqi defectors and intelligence sources outside Iraq made up information, circulated unsubstantiated information, or simply lied. Breakthroughs do occur, but HUMIMT is normally inadequate, untrustworthy, or a failure, and these shortcomings cannot generally be corrected with data based on other intelligence means. Either inside information is available or it is not. When it is, imagery and signals intelligence generally do far more to indicate that HUMINT is wrong or suspect than to reveal the truth.

- **In many cases, even the leaders of a proliferating country may not have an accurate picture of the success of their efforts, and most probably do not have a clear picture of the accuracy, lethality and effects, and reliability of their weapons.** US and British research efforts have long shown that even highly sophisticated technical models of the performance and lethality of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and delivery systems can be grossly wrong, or require massive levels of human testing that simply are not practical even for closed authoritarian societies. No declassified intelligence report on any proliferation effort in any developing country has yet indicated that Iraq or any other proliferator has sophisticated technical and testing models in these areas. Intelligence cannot collect data that do not exist.

PROBLEMS IN ANALYZING IRAQI AND OTHER COUNTRY WMD CAPABILITIES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS - I

- **The uncertainties surrounding collection on virtually all proliferation and weapons of mass destruction programs are so great that it is impossible to produce meaningful point estimates.** As the CIA has shown in some of its past public estimates of missile proliferation, the intelligence community must first develop a matrix of what is and is not known about a given aspect of proliferation in a given country, with careful footnoting or qualification of the problems in each key source. It must then deal with uncertainty by creating estimates that show a range of possible current and projected capabilities – carefully qualifying each case. In general, at least three scenarios or cases need to be analyzed for each major aspect of proliferation in each country – something approaching a "best," "most likely, " and "worst case."

- **Even under these conditions, the resulting analytic effort faces serious problems.** Security compartmentation within each major aspect of collection and analysis severely limits the flow of data to working analysts. The expansion of analytic staffs has sharply increased the barriers to the flow of data, and has brought large number of junior analysts into the process that can do little more than update past analyses and judgments. Far too little analysis is subjected to technical review by those who have actually worked on weapons development, and the analysis of delivery programs, warheads and weapons, and chemical, biological, and nuclear proliferation tends to be compartmented. Instead of the free flow of data and exchange of analytic conclusions, or "fusion" of intelligence, analysis is "stovepiped" into separate areas of activity. Moreover, the larger staffs get, the more stovepiping tends to occur.

- **Analysis tends to focus on technical capability and not on the problems in management and systems integration that often are the real world limiting factors in proliferation.** This tends to push analysis towards exaggerating the probable level of proliferation, particularly because technical capability is often assumed if collection cannot provide all the necessary information.

- **Where data are available on past holdings of weapons and the capability to produce such weapons – such as data on chemical weapons feedstocks and biological growth material – the intelligence effort tends to produce estimates of the maximum size of the possible current holding of weapons and WMD materials.** While ranges are often shown, and estimates are usually qualified with uncertainty, this tends to focus users on the worst case in terms of actual current capability. In the case of the Iraq, this was compounded by some 12 years of constant lies and a disbelief that a dictatorship obsessed with record keeping could not have records if it had destroyed weapons and materials. The end result, however, was to assume that little or no destruction had occurred whenever UNSCOM, UNMOVIC, and the IAEA reported that major issues still affected Iraqi claims.

PROBLEMS IN ANALYZING IRAQI AND OTHER COUNTRY WMD CAPABILITIES AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS - II

- **Intelligence analysis has long been oriented more towards arms control and counterproliferation rather than war fighting, although DIA and the military services have attempted to shift the focus of analysis.** Dealing with broad national trends and assuming capability is not generally a major problem in seeking to push nations towards obeying arms control agreements, or in pressuring possible suppliers. It also is not a major problem in analyzing broad military counterproliferation risks and programs. The situation is very different in dealing with war fighting choices, particularly issues like preemption and targeting. Assumptions of capability can lead to preemption that is not necessary, overtargeting, inability to prioritize, and a failure to create the detailed collection and analysis necessary to support warfighters down to the battalion level. This, in turn, often forces field commanders to rely on field teams with limit capability and expertise, and to overreact to any potential threat or warning indicator.

- **The intelligence community does bring outside experts into the process, but often simply to provide advice in general terms rather than cleared review of the intelligence product.** The result is often less than helpful. The use of other cleared personnel in US laboratories and other areas of expertise is inadequate and often presents major problems because those consulted are not brought fully into the intelligence analysis process and given all of the necessary data.

- **The intelligence community does tend to try to avoiding explicit statements of the short comings in collection and methods in much of its analysis and to repeat past agreed judgments on a lowest common denominator level – particularly in the form of the intelligence products that get broad circulation to consumers.** Attempts at independent outside analysis or "B-Teams," however, are not subject to the review and controls enforced on intelligence analysis, and the teams, collection data, and methods used are generally selection to prove given points rather than provide an objective counterpoint to finished analysis.

LESSONS AFFECTING CONFLICT TERMINATION AND NATION BUILDING

- **Some of the most important lessons affect what we did see as critical, high resource tasks.**

- **We were not prepared for victory in the sense of winning the peace as well as the war. We did not organize or carry out the peace-making mission effectively, and we were not ready for conflict termination.**

- **We failed to proper predict the nature of the nation building mission, and our jointness in war fighting was sadly lacking both within the military and within the US government as a whole. Winning the peace is critical to winning the war.**

PROBLEMS IN INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION

- **It may have been impossible to shape an international consensus as to how to deal with the problems involved, but the US and UK did not seem to have a clear plan to either seek such a consensus within the UN, or a clear back up plan if that effort failed.**

- **The Coalition drew on many Arab allies for bases and support in war fighting but failed to get the level of regional support for peacemaking and nation building it needed after the fighting.**

FAILURES IN US POLICYMAKING AND LEADERSHIP

- **The Bush Administration had received advice from a number of sources that US experience in Panama, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo showed it was critical to introduce a trained constabulary or military police force immediate into urban areas after the fall of local and national authority to prevent looting, civil unrest, and acts of revenge. US military forces do not have training for these missions, however, and the countries that do did not participate in the Coalition. As a result, there were no personnel on the ground with the dedicated mission of maintaining order and with the training and skills to do so.**

- **The Coalition conducted a psychological warfare campaign, but failed to conduct a meaningful campaign to tell the Iraqi people how it planned to allow them to shape the peace, and what the Coalition would do to make that possible. Iraqis had no clear idea of what to expect when the Coalition arrived and many had a conspiracy theory picture of its goals and motives.**

- **At least some senior US political leaders ignored warnings from intelligence, military, and regional experts that the Coalition forces would not be greeted as liberators, and that the Coalition should expert to deal with a mixture of anti-Western/anti-colonial sentiment and deep ethnic and religious tensions and divisions.**

- **The US failed to develop a coordinated interagency approach to planning and executing peace making and nation building before and during the war. Much of the benefit of detailed planning efforts was lost or made ineffective. This reflected a broader and continuing failure of leadership within the Bush Administration. The National Security Council acted largely in an advisory role and did not force effective interagency coordination.**

- **Deep divisions occurred between the State Department and Department of Defense during the US effort to plan for peacemaking and nation building. When Defense was put in charge in late 2002, evidently because the problem of establishing security was given primacy, much of the State Department and other interagency efforts were dropped or given low priority.**

- **The military correctly understood that the enemy had to be fully defeated, the remnants of the regime had to be purged, and order had to be established to allow effective nation building to be established. It did not, however, properly size and train its forces for these missions. It did not properly train forward and combat units for dealing with activities like looting and the problems in distinguishing between hostile and non-violent civilians and irregular forces and enemies. In many ways, troops**

were trained to fight asymmetric warfare but not to deal with the consequences of victory.

FAILURES AT THE FIELD AND TACTICAL LEVELS - I

- **The direction of the nation building effort initially lacked the kind of driving leadership needed for success, and few involved had real area expertise or experience with peacemaking and nation building.**

- **Humanitarian efforts and expertise were sometimes confused with a very different mission, and weeks were wasted making the transition from planning to deal with a non-existent humanitarian crisis to very real and immediate problems in peacemaking and nation building. Key issues like jobs and economic security were address much later than should have been the case.**

- **Looting and criminal activity were not seen as major problems during the war or in preparing for conflict termination in spite of several thousand years of warning that this could be the case, and the fact that it was clear that Iraq 's prewar economy was driven by nepotism and influence and much of Iraq's population had reasons to feel it was justified in acting against the regime and strong reasons to do so.**

- **The US failed to create an effective structure for managing the peace making and nation building effort in the field, to clearly subordinate the military to General Garner and Ambassador Bremer on a timely and effective basis, and to task the military accordingly.**

- **The lack of civil-military coordination greatly complicated the practical problems in actually providing aid and keeping promises.**

- **Military commanders do not seem to have fully understood the importance of the peacemaking and nation-building missions. They often did not provide the proper support or did so with extensive delays and little real commitment.**

- **The "jointness" that helped the US win the war was almost totally lacking during the conflict termination and peacemaking stage. No US commander seemed to have responsibility. Even within the Army, major difference emerged in how given units performed their tasks (The 3rd Infantry Division favored reacting to incidents; the 4th Division aggressively patrolled.) There was no cohesion to the military effort.**

- **Even where military resources were clearly available, too little emphasis was placed on immediately securing key urban areas and centers of government.**

FAILURES AT THE FIELD AND TACTICAL LEVELS - II

- **In urban areas, the initial security efforts were generally reactive rather than part of a cohesive effort to provide security for the entire area. This left constant gaps in coverage and allowed looting, firefights, and ambushes to occur before an effort was made to act.**

- **US forces lacked enough people with the necessary language and area skills, and the limited numbers of such experts that were available were dedicated to warfighting tasks.**

- **The US and its allies failed to assess the motives and competence of the outside Iraqi opposition. Members of the Iraqi opposition had their own goals and ambitions and often proved to be unreliable in such roles.**

- **At least initially, the US tried to select leaders and representatives from within Iraq on the basis of its views of what Iraq should be, rather than letting such leaders emerge from within key Iraqi ethnic and sectarian groups.**

- **The "De-Ba'athifcation" effort was handled in too rigid a way for a country that had been under the same dictatorship for nearly three decades. Senior officials and officers were excluded from the nation-building role simply because of rank and Ba'ath membership, rather than screened on a person-by-person basis. The end result was to compound the power vacuum created by the systematic murder and purging of secular opposition from 1979 onwards,**

- **The problem of establishing an actual interim authority was addressed by creating a semi-civilian body unprepared to enter and operate a still hostile country at the earliest possible period.**

- **Humanitarian organizations and non-governmental organizations do not operate in hostile military environments, but demand high levels of protection to perform humanitarian missions with short term goals that ignore the need to fully secure areas and create the political basis for nation building. In contrast, military organization have not yet adapted to the need to provide suitable protection for humanitarian organization and NGOs. Both sides need to change their present procedures.**

KEY LESSONS OF NATION BUILDING (AS DRAWN BY CARL BILDT)

Lesson 1: It is imperative to establish a secure environment very fast. **In Bosnia, we failed in the critical transfer of territories in Sarajevo. In Kosovo, the mandate for the troops was clearer, but we still failed to protect minorities. In both cases, we still suffer from the consequences of these initial failures. In Afghanistan there are grave question marks over the consequences of limiting the international security presence to Kabul. As long as the gun remains the fastest way to power and property, there simply will not be room for democratic politics and entrepreneurship. With national police in disarray and international police always taking time to recruit, there is no alternative to using soldiers and armies to keep order.**

Lesson 2: The central challenge is not reconstruction, but state-building. **Reconstruction of the physical scars of war is certainly important, and it can be costly and take time. But building a political infrastructure that unites competing forces and ensures some sort of order, and an infrastructure of economic governance that promotes jobs and growth, is far more complex. Priorities must be right.**

Lesson 3: To build a state, you need to know what state to build. **Normally this requires some sort of a peace agreement or constitution. When this is not the case as in Kosovo any initial success risks being short-lived. In the Balkans, we have seen the immense challenge of doing so in a multiethnic environment. We must recognize that Iraq has some issues in common with other former parts of the Ottoman Empire, such as Kosovo and the Kurdish region. The potential of Iraq for disintegration is obvious, as are the consequences if this was to happen. Thus there has to be an early and fast agreement on a constitutional structure that will unite Arabs, Kurds, Turkmen and Assyrians of different beliefs in a state structure acceptable to them all.**

Lesson 4: While humanitarian problems are always in the focus in the initial phase, it is dangerous to let them predominate over the long-term issues. **There must be an early focus on economic questions such as currency, customs, taxation systems, commercial law, banking, debt restructuring and accessing international capital markets.**

The sanctions that were provoked by Saddam Hussein have destroyed much of Iraq's economy. Because Iraq has experienced a population explosion, oil income per capita is unlikely to be substantially more than a tenth of what it was in the early 1980s. Job creation and bringing back a vibrant middle class are the keys to long-term stability.

Lesson 5: There has to be a benevolent regional environment. **In the Balkans, regime change in Zagreb and Belgrade was key to improving prospects in Bosnia and Kosovo; in Afghanistan, the open or tacit cooperation of Pakistan**

and Iran is critical. If neighbors try to destabilize, they will sooner or later succeed.

Iraq is now a fragile zone in one of the most volatile areas of the world. Just about everyone recognizes that if the liberation of Iraq from tyranny is not followed by the liberation of Palestine from occupation giving true security to Israel, too the presence of U.S. and other NATO forces in Iraq will be an extremely challenging operation.

Lesson 6: Nation-building takes a longer time, and requires more resources, than most initially believe. **As the first High Representative in Bosnia, I was told that everything should be concluded within a year. When the folly of this was recognized, a new deadline of two years was given. But five years after that has expired, the fourth High Representative is hardly less busy than the first. Bosnia and Kosovo might be easy cases compared with Afghanistan and Iraq. Peace-building requires an abundance of patience.**

Lesson 7: The greater the international support, the easier the process. **If there is international disagreement over the state-building process, this sooner or later risks translating into conflicts in the country in question. Some sort of UN framework normally helps, although it is not a guarantee. Building peace is a far more fragile, complex, costly and drawn-out process than fighting a war. So a peace coalition normally needs to be much broader than a war coalition.**

CONCLUSION

There is a final point I would like to make. Some of this discussion may sound as if I feel we somehow failed or had a daunting list of avoidable problems.

- The reality is very different. We have recently tended to oversell a false image of near Aristotelian perfection when we talk about war.

- We act as if we did not have decades to go in perfecting many of the capabilities we used in this war.

- The fact is, however, that most of the problems we faced were far smaller than in any previous war, and that most of the tactics and technology we used were in the process of transitions where we had already programmed more than a decade of improvements before the war began.

- There is no point in claiming a false perfection. It is enough to be decisively better than anyone else.

"NEW WAY OF WAR" BACK-UP: QUADRIENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

The US did implement many elements of a new "new way of war" as laid out in it force transformation documents and testimony issued by Secretary Rumsfeld and his staff. In one form or another, the course of the fighting described in Chapter IV can be have said to have shown that the US forces fighting in the Iraq War major significant progress in achieving each of the six goals laid out in the Quadrennial Defense Review:

- **First, to defend the U.S. homeland and other bases of operations, and defeat nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their means of delivery;**

- **Second, to deny enemies sanctuary—depriving them of the ability to run or hide—anytime, anywhere.**

- **Third, to project and sustain forces in distant theaters in the face of access denial threats;**

- **Fourth, to conduct effective operations in space;**

- **Fifth, to conduct effective information operations; and,**

- **Sixth, to leverage information technology to give US joint forces a common operational picture.**

"NEW WAY OF WAR" BACK-UP: IS THERE A RUMSFELD DOCTRINE?

The conduct of the war also followed many of the military principles laid out in what some have started to call the "Rumsfeld Doctrine," although there is no consensus on what this doctrine is.

One report described it as an emphasis on "Rapid Decisive Operations," that stressed:

- Fast-moving, lighter forces, that can be moved quickly into battle,

- Flexible decision-making, allowing field forces to react quickly to changes in the battle,

- Joint operations involving army, navy, air force and marines working together,

- Use of strategic airpower to attack simultaneously hundreds of targets, and

- Use of high technology in smart bombs and battlefield intelligence gathering.

Another report described the Rumsfeld doctrine as being based on:

- Civilian control of the war plan and its execution,

- Speed and maneuver,

- Flexibility in execution,

- Heavy use of Special Operations forces, precision though massive air strikes, and unprecedented integration of the different service branches or "jointness," and,

- Taking advantage of newer technologies, such as pilotless drones providing real time pictures of the battlefield.

"NEW WAY OF WAR" BACK UP: CEBROWSKI LESSONS

Arthur K. Cebrowski, summarized the initial lessons of the war in the following evolutionary terms:

- **The growing implementation of network centric warfare, and its role in shifting the balance of power through new forms of air-land battle and dynamics. He termed this a long process driven by better sensors, good, networked intelligence, high-speed decision-making, and the ability to exploit the non-contiguous battlefield, the battlefield without a front.**

- **The need for increased connectively in net centric warfare.**

- **The increased use, interdependency, and effectiveness of all forms of indirect fire: artillery support, close air support, and aerial battlefield interdiction.**

- **A possible reduced dependence on helicopters on the battlefield for vertical lift.**

- **Increase value of Special Forces and for increased knowledge of regional factors, the ability to work with friendly local forces, and provide more SOF-like forces to support IS&R.**

- **The need for still further improvements in joint planning, particularly in codifying a clear doctrine for joint endeavors and the creation of a joint road map for force transformation.**

- **Increased need for strategic mobility, possibly merging inter and intratheater lift, providing high-speed sealift, and possibly airships.**

- The need to accelerate the speed of command and control.

"NEW WAY OF WAR" BACK UP: JOINT VISION 2020

<u>Joint Vision 2020</u> emphasized four concepts of operations that seem remarkably familiar in terms of both the war plan used in the Iraq War and the force transformation goals of Secretary Rumsfeld:

- **Dominant maneuver,**

- **Precision engagement,**

- **Focused logistics, and**

- **Full dimensional protection.**