

# Hearts-and-Minds: A Strategy of Conciliation, Coercion, or Commitment?

This Publication

PKSOI Website

USAWC Website

Lieutenant Colonel Karl E. Nell

ISBN: 978-0-9833514-7-4

**PKSOI PAPER**

***Hearts-and-Minds:*  
A Strategy of Conciliation, Coercion,  
or Commitment?**

**Lieutenant Colonel Karl E. Nell  
United States Army Reserve**

**September 2012**

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Authors of Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI) publications enjoy full academic freedom, provided they do not disclose classified information, jeopardize operations security, or misrepresent official U.S. policy. Such academic freedom empowers them to offer new and sometimes controversial perspectives in the interest of furthering debate on key issues. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

\*\*\*\*\*

This publication is subject to Title 17, United States Code, Sections 101 and 105. It is in the public domain and may not be copyrighted.

\*\*\*\*\*

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, U.S. Army War College, 22 Ashburn Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013-5054.

\*\*\*\*\*

All Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI) publications are available on the PKSOI homepage for electronic dissemination. Hard copies of this report also may be ordered while copies last from our homepage. PKSOI's homepage address is: <https://pksoi.army.mil>

\*\*\*\*\*

The Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute publishes a quarterly journal to update the peace and stability operations community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications and upcoming conferences sponsored by PKSOI. Each quarterly journal has a specific theme related to peace and stability operations and a commentary by the Director of PKSOI entitled *The Director's Corner*. If you are interested in receiving this journal, please subscribe on our homepage at <http://pksoi.army.mil/subscription.cfm>.

\*\*\*\*\*

This monograph won the Lieutenant General Thomas J. Plewes Reserve Components National Security Strategy Writing Award, 2012.

ISBN: 978-0-9833514-7-4

## DEDICATION

Dedicated with sincere thanks to Bill Flavin, Larry Bouchat, and Karen Finkenbinder without whose astute guidance and firm support this monograph would not have been possible.

Acknowledgement is also kindly made to *The Trustees of the Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives* for permission to include a Gerald Templar quotation from the private papers contained within their collection.



## FOREWORD

The most recent operations in Iraq and Afghanistan clearly show the contentious and multiple methods introduced by both the insurgents and military forces and how only a holistic model can bring a successful conclusion. While there are many volumes written on specific counterinsurgency (COIN) tasks for any given theater of operation, this study differs in that it traces the root evolution of COIN methodology. We are witness to the continued emergence of more socially conscience and technologically savvy insurgencies that rely on habitual evolution. Reliance on an asymmetric mental-model falls short of the realization that leaders must illuminate the competing agendas among the growing number of actors and their increased access to global audiences.

LTC Nell accurately contends that the oft cliché *hearts-and-minds* maxim, most popularly attributed to Sir Gerald Templar in the Malayan Emergency (1948-1960), transcends time and geography while the key strategy of conciliation and coercion, applied simultaneously and judiciously, drive a COIN environment. Most importantly, this work points out the value of a whole-of-government commitment—of time, troops and materiel—towards ensuring the most beneficial outcome for not only our forces but the population as well. It points to the necessity of such earnest application, while reinforcing that the military may not always have the lead.

This critical review of historically significant COIN events identifies trends and sheds light on the com-

plexity of modern hybrid warfare. While the uncovered strategy is timeless, the publication could not be more perfectly timed to recent world events.

LESLIE A. PURSER  
Major General, U.S. Army

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Lieutenant Colonel Karl Nell currently serves as G3 Operations for the Army Reserve Counter-Terrorism Unit (AR-CTU) supporting the U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for CT at the Department of State responsible for advising, assisting, and assessing the U.S. whole-of-government response to overseas terrorist incidents while helping to synchronize the DIMEFIL instruments of national power. In previous assignments, LTC Nell commanded the largest Military Intelligence battalion in the Army Reserve, a strategic ground intelligence detachment, a special operations forces MISO company, and a defense satellite communications system ground station. After 9/11, he was deployed from the Defense Intelligence Agency as the command representative to USCENTCOM/CFLCC for technical intelligence planning in Kuwait and later served as C/J2 for the Combined Joint Captured Materiel Exploitation Center in Iraq during *OIF I*. A branch-qualified Military Intelligence, Civil Affairs, MISO, and Signal officer, LTC Nell holds a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering from the University of Pennsylvania, a Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering from Boston University, and a Master of Strategic Studies from the U.S. Army War College. Serving in a civilian capacity as vice president for a Virginia-based defense consulting firm, the author has provided leadership and support to national security programs, projects, and initiatives across the intelligence community.





## SUMMARY

The efficacy of the *hearts-and-minds* concept as initially propounded by British Field Marshal Sir Gerald Templer in 1952 to address a communist guerrilla insurgency during the Malayan Emergency has subsequently assumed a storied—even jaded—reputation within Western military establishments not to mention the American psyche. Whether unfairly maligned, inappropriately modified, or simply misunderstood, *hearts-and-minds* remains at the forefront of today’s counterinsurgency (COIN) doctrine largely resulting from General David Petraeus’s successful application of its Field Manual 3-24 documented precepts during the 2007 Iraq surge. The inherent dichotomy of population-centric COIN as exemplified through the *hearts-and-minds* maxim suggests strategies both of conciliation and of coercion resulting in significant scholarly debate as to intended emphasis. This monograph presents an investigation of the concept’s colonial antecedents, inception at the onset of the Cold War, subsequent U.S. interpretation during Vietnam, and modern application to post-9/11 conflict in order to elucidate its true nature—one which can only properly be understood as commitment. By understanding this evolution over time, an enhanced appreciation of its applicability to future conflict as well as its place within the irregular warfare canon may be more properly apprehended.

Despite the undeniable ethnocentrism of many governing elites as well as the undoubted preference of most colonial populations for self-governance over even highly effective external administration, imperialism resulted in certain important advantages to the would-be counterinsurgent practitioner. Although

often desirable, the transplantability of these benefits to modern conflicts remains obviously problematic. Dissuasive pressure coupled to a Victorian-era view of the “republic’s duty to civilize” informed France’s approach to winning *hearts-and-minds* during their late nineteenth century “*pacification*” campaigns in Sudan and Madagascar. Inventing the *oil spot* principle to describe the method of expanding concentrated COIN forces ever outward from an initially localized zone, French practitioners artfully balanced zone defense of fixed forces in a *quadrillage* or gridding pattern to offensive *search-and-destroy* missions successfully launched deep within enemy territory. During the second Boer War, the British were paradoxically self-critical of their ultimately successful performance in major combat operations against Afrikaans-speaking Dutch settlers while quick to enshrine the coercive principles of *populace-and-resources control*, *cordon-and-search*, and large-scale *sweep* into their COIN doctrine. Although the antithesis of a conciliatory *hearts-and-minds* strategy, these methods were representative of many imperial anti-secessionist campaigns and informed the initial approaches to subsequent conflicts.

Inspired by the philosophy of Mao-Zedong in 1948, Chinese communists attempted to seize control of the British protectorate of Malaya by employing the classic techniques of unconventional warfare. Although important mistakes in their translation of theory into practice highlight the danger of uncritically exporting COIN lessons derived from the campaign, the insufficiency of early British methods enabled a rising tide of violence which culminated in the assassination of the British High Commissioner. Subsequent bestowal upon Sir Gerald Templer of the most extensive plenary powers of any chief executive of a British protectorate set the stage in June 1952 for the first

explicit modern invocation of the *hearts-and-minds* maxim. Significantly, the British government's overriding strategic objective for the emergency was political – that Malaya should in due course become a fully self-governing nation – and not military. Templer's staff derived the subordinate operational objective of severing communist forces from both their supporters and food supply within the populace. The duality of the Templer approach in accomplishing these aims simultaneously recognized the value of appeals engaging the emotions with a positive end-state vision of the future coupled to those confronting the intellect with decisions of immediate consequence and rational self-import. Working in concert, these measures addressed the total human psyche, and as a result, were more prone to success in the aggregate...then as well as now.

Almost a decade later, President John F. Kennedy re-iterated a vision that counterinsurgency should be viewed as a battle of minds and souls, not of weapons. Although the U.S. Marine Corps had amassed significant COIN knowledge derived from experience in the "Banana Wars" of 1915-1934 and documented in their *Small Wars Manual* of 1940, the U.S. Army considered irregular warfare an aberration preferring to place maximum doctrinal emphasis on conventional units and tactics. This mindset informed the flawed approach General William Westmoreland applied to Vietnam which instead focused on an enemy-centric strategy of attrition. Paradoxically, the phrase *hearts-and-minds* – invoked like a mantra – soon became a failed euphemism unable to hide the brutal character of the world's first televised war. The soul-searching which followed U.S. failure in Vietnam would not be purged until 1991 in the virtually-bloodless redemp-

tion of the joint information-centric, combined-arms victory of *Operation Desert Storm*.

Again sidelined, however, irregular warfare would not come to the fore until circumstances in *Operation Iraqi Freedom* forced another doctrinal re-evaluation this time coupled to a concomitant U.S. troop surge. Significantly, the turning point in Iraq occurred prior to the introduction of additional combat forces when the rational calculus of Sunni tribal sheikhs convinced them that coalition allegiance was preferable to either government-condoned Shi'a death squads or the Salafist fundamentalism and sectarian targeting of al-Qaeda. Had the U.S. been more attuned to the complexities of the conflict—the nature and animosities of the various actors—this confluence of interests might have been achieved earlier through appropriate application of purposefully-designed conciliatory and coercive *hearts-and-minds* initiatives. Although initiated prior to *Operation Iraqi Freedom*, the battle for *hearts-and-minds* in *Operation Enduring Freedom* remains contested, and even after more than a decade of effort since 2001, the prognosis remains less than encouraging as pragmatic Afghans await expiration of the U.S. withdrawal deadline to grant their allegiance.

Clausewitz astutely discerned that the nature of warfare is unchanging; nevertheless, its inherent *complexity* is inexorably changing—not simply in the technical execution of war-fighting functions as commonly recognized, but more subtly, in the variety and extent of its possible actors. Success in winning *hearts-and-minds* must account for a new norm wherein the speed of information enables routine third and even fourth-party exploitation of otherwise bipolar engagements. Identification and subsequent decoupling of competing agendas among numerous antagonists all

vying for legitimacy will prove critical for future Joint Force Commanders synchronizing operational methods with *hearts-and-minds* initiatives while trying to ascertain the kind of struggle in which they are engaged. Addressing the entire human psyche, successful future strategy must simultaneously be one of conciliation and of coercion; however, even an enlightened balance of the two is insufficient for success without adequate – typically exceptional – *commitment* of time, troops, and materiel.



***HEARTS-AND-MINDS: A STRATEGY OF  
CONCILIATION, COERCION,  
OR COMMITMENT?***

The answer [to the uprising] lies not in pouring more troops into the jungle, but in the hearts and minds of the people.

Sir Gerald Templer, speech in Malaya, 1952<sup>1</sup>

...food control is the most effective weapon we've got and... the only tool which we have to apply it properly is the British soldier.

Sir Gerald Templer, letter to Liddell Hart, 1955<sup>2</sup>

**INTRODUCTION.**

The preceding quotations—expressing superficially discordant sentiments—might serve as sound admonishments for two entirely distinct civil-military problems faced by two separate Joint Force Commanders. In fact nothing could be further from the truth. Enjoying unprecedented plenipotentiary power as British High Commissioner in Malaya, Lieutenant General (later Field Marshal) Sir Gerald Templer (1898-1979) described the approach he employed prosecuting the most successful and consequently prototypical counterinsurgency (COIN) in modern history, the Malayan Emergency (1948-1960), in precisely these terms. The first observation, widely circulated, is synonymous with his vision for the campaign—lessons from which were encapsulated in United States (U.S.) Army and Marine Corps Field Manual (FM) 3-24.<sup>3</sup> The second remark, articulated only through private correspondence and little-known, is contextu-



ally clear in adamantly expressing equivalent intent. The inherent dichotomy of population-centric COIN as exemplified through the *hearts-and-minds* maxim therefore suggests strategies both of conciliation and of coercion. This monograph charts the evolution of these ideas over time while attempting to elucidate their true meaning—one which can only be properly understood as commitment.

Writing in the fourth century BC, the Greek philosopher Plato was the first to draw clear distinction between the appetitive, spiritual, and rational elements of human nature thereby setting a precedent for future scholars including Judeo-Christian theologians who considered the heart as the center of physical, emotional, and spiritual life (the appetitive and spiritual soul) while resident within the mind was all intellectual activity (the rational soul).<sup>5</sup> Winning *hearts-and-minds*, therefore, equated in a classical sense to subjugating the total person. This perspective informed Clausewitz when he described war as a “remarkable trinity” uniquely characterized by the interplay of primordial violent emotion, the creative human spirit empowered by chance, and calculating reason which actively subordinates means to ends.<sup>6</sup> As each archetype is best exemplified by one of war’s principal actors—people [*P*], military [*M*],<sup>7</sup> or government [*G*—the dynamic interplay of all inevitably engage the totality of man within the society at large. The irregular warfare (IW) problem which encompasses violent struggle for legitimacy and influence over relevant populations by both state and insurgent [*i*] adversaries demonstrates this most acutely.<sup>8</sup> Diagramming the Clausewitzian trinity for each type of conflict will clarify how the efficacy of winning *hearts-and-minds* also sheds light upon the complexity of future warfare. See Figure 1.




Figure 1. Clausewitzian actors in traditional and irregular warfare.<sup>4</sup>

### COLONIAL ANTECEDENTS.

Most imperial powers reached their high-water-mark prior to the start of the First World War. Consequently, irregular warfare campaigns conducted during and just prior to the first half of the twentieth-century were in response to the inherent decay of empire occurring against a backdrop of pre-existing colonial institutions, robust “nation-building” best practices, and deeply ingrained indigenous expectations. Despite the undeniable ethnocentrism of many governing elites as well as the undoubted preference of most colonial populations for self-governance over even highly effective external administration, colonialism resulted in certain important advantages to the would-be counterinsurgent practitioner—most particularly the British. Although often desirable, the transplantability of these benefits to modern conflicts remains problematic. According to Colonel (retired) Michael Crawshaw writing on evolution of British COIN for the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense Joint Doctrine Publication 3-40, these advantages included:<sup>9</sup>

- Simple and effective civil-military administrative structures from the sub-district to national level coupled to clear policy directives
- Prevalence of a “government on the ground” ethos which encouraged and expected initiative by even the most junior officer or administrator
- Benign media environment permitting liberal rules of engagement (RoE) favoring the typically superior firepower of the counterinsurgent
- Alignment of boundaries across civil, police, and military areas of responsibility
- Developed law enforcement (LE) intelligence networks (albeit typically insufficient to support war-time demands)
- Public works departments for essential services which injected needed cash into local economies as a by-product of labor-intensive methods
- Long-term organic outlook on growth of civil service and political institutions

Dr. John Nagl author of *Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam* and key contributor to the U.S. counterinsurgency manual applauds the British Army as a learning institution even under the stress of combat.<sup>10</sup> This pragmatism stems from its imperial policing experience suggesting the following additions to Crawshaw’s observations:

- Organizational culture focused on preventing colonial uprising through good administration and security
- Willingness to adapt military doctrine while in-contact with the enemy

- Regional and cultural awareness

### ***“Pacification” Campaigns in Sudan (1886-1899) and Madagascar (1890-1902).***

France applied similar techniques to those of the British during their *“pacification”* campaigns in Sudan and Madagascar. The principal French theoreticians – Marshal Joseph Gallieni (1849-1916) and subsequently Marshal Louis-Hubert Lyautay (1854-1934) – fully recognized that irregular conflicts require a combination of force and politics to achieve lasting resolution. Dissuasive pressure coupled to a Victorian-era view of the “Republic’s duty to civilize” informed their version of winning *hearts-and-minds*.<sup>11</sup> Their battlefield tactics, however, proved even more enlightened. Inventing the *oil spot* principle to describe the method of expanding concentrated COIN forces ever outward from an initially localized zone, Lyautay artfully balanced zone defense of fixed forces in a *quadrillage* or gridding pattern to offensive *search-and-destroy* missions successfully launched deep within enemy territory.<sup>12</sup>

### **Second Boer War (1899–1902).**

The second Boer War also known as the South African War pitted Afrikaans-speaking Dutch settlers against the British Empire in a struggle for independence of the Transvaal Republic and Orange Free State. The first two phases of conventional conflict during which the initially successful Boers were soundly defeated in maneuver warfare by British regulars transitioned into a guerrilla phase wherein Lord Herbert Kitchener (1850-1916) implemented dra-

conian *populace-and-resources control* (PRC) including well poisoning, farm burning, crop destruction, and forced non-combatant internment within concentration camps coupled to deep jungle counter-guerrilla (CG) operations. Ultimately successful in annexing both regions under the dominion of South Africa at the cost of ravaged civilian populations and scorched earth, the British were paradoxically self-critical of their performance in major combat operations (MCO) while quick to enshrine the principles of coercive PRC, *cordon-and-search*, and large-scale *sweep* into their COIN doctrine.<sup>13</sup> Although the antithesis of a *hearts-and-minds* strategy, these techniques were representative of many imperial anti-secessionist campaigns and informed the initial approaches to subsequent conflicts.

### **Malayan Emergency (1948-1960).**

Effective against low to moderate threats, colonial administration was certainly vulnerable to the challenge of legitimacy. Inspired by the philosophy of Mao-Zedong (1893-1976), Chinese communists<sup>14</sup> attempted to seize control of the British protectorate<sup>15</sup> of Malaya in 1948 by employing unconventional warfare (UW) techniques—i.e., forming an indigenous resistance movement or insurgency [*i*] to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government while facilitating guerrilla, auxiliary, or other underground paramilitary forces [*ρ*] within denied territory.<sup>16</sup> The British were initially unprepared for the communist guerrilla fighter who aspired to “move within the population like a fish in water”<sup>17</sup> and rushed to conduct Foreign Internal Defense (FID)—i.e., participation by civilian and military agencies of one government in the action programs taken by another to protect its society from

subversion, lawlessness, and insurgency.<sup>18</sup> Restriction of movement, control of space, ruthless targeting of facilitators, and enemy-centric *search-and-destroy* operations developed during the Boer War were quickly re-applied to the “emergency” – purportedly so named to avoid insurance default by Lloyds of London against economically lucrative rubber plantation and tin mining concerns.<sup>19</sup>




Figure 2. Malayan Emergency compared to the textbook FID-UW paradigm.

Comparison of the Clausewitzian trinities in Figure 2 suggests several significant mistakes in the communist application of UW theory to the circumstances in Malaya and concomitantly highlights the danger of uncritically exporting COIN principles derived from the campaign. Predisposed to the idea of protracted struggle, communist leader Chin Peng (1924-present)

exposed his agenda prematurely by inciting trade union strikes, sabotage, and intimidation before he could fully exploit the ensuing chaos.<sup>20</sup> In contradistinction his communist paramilitary Malayan Peoples Liberation Army (MPLA) [ $\rho$ ]—a direct descendant of the British-supported anti-Japanese forces of the Second World War—was mobilized slowly, never numbered more than 8000 guerrilla fighters, and primarily operated in the jungle environment relying almost exclusively on the civilian Min Yuen (ethnic Chinese sympathizers) [ $i$ ] for supplies, intelligence, and liaison with the masses.<sup>21</sup> With negligible external support (lack of a common border limited aid from China to ideological as opposed to practical means), distinguishable facilitators who were an ethnic minority within polyglot Malay society, political as well as physical isolation from the population (a majority of whom favored British-promised independence), and sabotage tactics which damaged the economic well-being of potential advocates, his guerrilla campaign ultimately proved a chimera.<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, the insufficiency of early British methods enabled a rising tide of violence which culminated in the assassination of Sir Gerald Templer's predecessor in October 1951 and resulted in the subsequent bestowal of the most extensive powers of any chief executive or commander-in-chief of a British protectorate—a key factor to Templer's success.<sup>23</sup> Thus the stage was set in June 1952 for the first explicit modern invocation of the *hearts-and-minds* maxim applied to counterinsurgency.<sup>24</sup> Subsequent historical events left no doubt as to when (but not necessarily why) the turning point in the conflict had occurred. The adaptability required to successfully address complexity inherent in any IW campaign has, how-

ever, afforded historians long debate concerning the proportion and weighting to be attributed to three specific causal factors:<sup>25</sup>

- Leadership
- *Hearts-and-Minds*
- *Populace-and-Resources Control*

Independent of weighting, management of the dynamic tension between these factors in response to threat action and varying circumstance drove an overriding need for commitment and staying power in their earnest application—a lesson as equally true then as now... as well as for the future.

Leveraging access to confidential papers of the Malayan government, Anthony Short outlining what has come to be known as the leadership, or stalemate, hypothesis posits that Templer's "supercharged activity" broke a deadlock in the crisis<sup>26</sup>—a perspective also shared by writer Donald Mackay who served as a reserve officer in the Highland Light Infantry and as a rubber planter in Malaya during the Templer period.<sup>27</sup> Simon Smith observes that while "any claims to originality are suspect, the single mindedness and clarity of purpose with which Templer prosecuted counter-insurgency were not only novel, but also crucial in extinguishing the insurrection... so that by the end of 1954 their eventual defeat became apparent."<sup>28</sup> Dr. Richard Stubbs, Associate Director of the Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies, University of Toronto, champions the case for Templer's ability to give "form and substance" to the *hearts-and-minds* strategy while injecting "urgency and energy into the Government's campaign." He adds presciently that exploiting his previous background as Director of Military Intelli-



gence at the War Office during the Second World War, Templer built a police special branch intelligence infrastructure in Malaya which was “key to the success of any operation.”<sup>29</sup>

The antithesis of the stalemate hypothesis, argued by historian Karl Hack and supported by Dr. Andrew Mumford of the Strategic Studies Institute, suggests that the tide was turning *before* Templer’s arrival due to the decisiveness of PRC as implemented under the inherited Briggs Plan (e.g., intensive food rationing and forced relocation of ethnic Chinese squatters into “new villages”) coupled to latent effects of a change in strategy by the communists.<sup>30</sup> However, even Hack admits that the mechanism of winning *hearts-and-minds* was essential – albeit of secondary importance – and was affected through “linked application of threat and inducement, minimum force, political concessions... and social provision.”<sup>31</sup> Co-opting defectors, collaborating with locals, and calibrating operational boundaries to insurgent actions also played important but tertiary roles.<sup>32</sup> Clearly, the weighting of emphasis was dynamic, and the commitment to see it through critical.

As honorary advisor to the Malayan Chinese Association and chief Templer critic, Dr. Victor Purcell writes contemporaneously with the departure of the High Commissioner in 1954, “Britain cannot ‘build a Malayan nation’, but she can delay the growth of one, and that is what she is doing... On the one hand there is barbed-wire, curfews, and abuse; on the other hand a large army of European welfare workers trying to infuse life and hope into the bare shacks of the ‘new villages.’ Imagine the aftermath of a moderate earthquake and you have a fair picture of much of rural Malaya today.”<sup>33</sup> Lamentably, this sentiment is neither

unknown to current COIN practitioners nor without recent adherents such as Caroline Elkins, Associate Professor of African Studies, Harvard, writing in *The New Republic*.<sup>34</sup> In hindsight, Purcell's attacks were shown to be overstated; nevertheless, the obvious fact that there will always be detractors – even in Malaya the most successful COIN campaign in recent history – highlights the essential importance once again of commitment to the objective.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton (later Lord Chandos) (1893-1972), communicated to Templer prior to his appointment as High Commissioner that the overriding strategic objective for Malaya was political, not military: "The policy of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is that Malaya should in due course become a fully self-governing nation. His Majesty's Government confidently hope that nation will be within the British Commonwealth."<sup>35</sup> Templer's staff derived the operational objective as severing communist paramilitary and insurgent forces from both their supporters and their food supply within the populace as the best means to force capitulation. In achieving these aims Templer made seven decisive decisions:

- Reprioritized the COIN campaign as the main effort for civilian government<sup>36</sup>
- Established civil-military executive committees to create unity-of-effort (UoE)
- Articulated his vision of *hearts-and-minds* and the objective of independence
- Aggressively implemented the Briggs Plan (i.e., PRC and small-scale CG *search-and-destroy*)

- Reformed special branch intelligence and police training<sup>37</sup>
- Maximized use of military information support operations (MISO, aka PSYOPS)
- Created in-theater mechanisms for disseminating lessons-learned and training

**Table 1. Significant *hearts-and-minds* initiatives under Templer.<sup>40</sup>**

CONCILIATION	COERCION
Explicit Policy for Malayan Self-Rule	Detention Without Trial for Up to 2 Years and Deportation (i.e., Regulation 17D)
Creation of 450 "New Villages" with Real Security, Economic, and Civic Advantages	Forced Relocation of 500,000 Rural Malaysians (i.e., Predominantly Ethnic Chinese)
Sponsorship of Citizenship and Right to Vote for All Malaysians (including Ethnic Chinese)	Intensive Food Rationing and Control
<i>Operation Service</i> (e.g., Professionalizing Local Police)	Highly Constraining Movement Control
Use of Minimum Force	Small-scale CG <i>Search-and-Destroy</i>
Creation of Home Guards (i.e., Citizen Volunteer Units) to Support Local Security	Collective Punishment Imposed by Curfews and Fines
Relaxation of Regulations for Designated Insurgent-free "White" Zones (e.g., <i>Oil Spot</i> )	Death Penalty for Carrying Weapons
Effective MISO Campaign Matching Words with Deeds (e.g., Rewards for Defectors)	Censorship of the Press

Table 1 categorizes the significant elements of his *hearts-and-minds* campaign based upon their subjectively assessed conciliatory or coercive affect. The duality of the Templer approach which simultaneously recognized the value of appeals engaging the emotions with a positive end-state vision of the future coupled to those confronting the intellect with decisions of immediate consequence and rational self-import address

the total human psyche – and as a result were perhaps more prone to success in the aggregate... then as well as now.<sup>38</sup> They also, incidentally, mirror the scholarly dialectic in opinion just discussed between leadership/stalemate and PRC-centric hypotheses – thus undercutting the debate: Templer intended *hearts-and-minds* to be carrot and stick! Historian Kumar Ramakrishna even argues that Templer supporters fail to go far enough, suggesting that Templer’s most decisive contribution was an infusion of confidence<sup>39</sup> – and certainly one which engendered commitment on all levels.

### **Kenyan Emergency (1952-1959).**

Often touted but less frequently implemented, Templer’s *hearts-and-minds* strategy theoretically informed British approaches to IW in Kenya (1952-1959), Cyprus (1955-1959), the Aden Emergency (1963-1967), and Oman (1962-1975).<sup>41</sup> In Kenya as well as Cyprus, Britain again invested a single officer with authority to coordinate all civil-administrative and military aspects of these campaigns which proved highly effective.<sup>42</sup> Also in the case of Kenya, General Sir George Erskine (1899-1965) writing the forward to *A Handbook on Anti-Mau Mau Operations* even credits Templer’s equivalent publication, *The Conduct of Anti-Terrorist Operations in Malaya*, as providing useful insight.<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, significant in-contact trial and error were still required in order to tailor successful approaches which resulted in broad ratification of the following tactics:<sup>44</sup>

- UoE across civil, police, and military operations
- Integrated intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) picture

- Small-scale CG *search-and-destroy*

Large-scale *sweep* was substantially discredited while the suitability of Home Guards (i.e., citizen neighborhood-watch), forced resettlement, and *hearts-and-minds* were found predominately situation dependent.

Population security often proved impractical or too costly to achieve opening the way for insurgent reprisals which consequently hampered inchoate *hearts-and-minds* initiatives. For instance, a majority of the Cypriot population sympathized with the political views of the insurgency, the breadth of fighting across remote as well as urban areas surpassed local security measures, and significant insurgent aid flowed from Greece rendering a conciliatory approach impossible. Even though the Mau Mau were poorly organized and led, British operations in Kenya resulted in the bloodiest de-colonialization campaign of the era with over 12,000 insurgents killed, large-scale detentions, racial overtones, and atrocities on both sides.<sup>45</sup> With subsequent emphasis principally on coercive PRC and associated allegations of abuse coupled to an incomplete appreciation of the unique circumstances insipient to its formulation in Malaya, IW theoreticians soon became dubious of *hearts-and-minds* as a universally applicable COIN strategy.

### **Algerian Insurrection (1954-1962).**

In contrast the Algerian Insurrection proved a turning point for French IW when the official *Guide de l'Officier des Affaires Algeriennes* baldly stated, "The rebellion would have probably not broken out or would have been quickly crushed if it had not found a suitable breeding ground that had been created by

our own shortfalls: lack of infrastructure... poor administration... loss of contact... poor knowledge of Islamic culture and mindset."<sup>46</sup> Drawing upon his experience in Algeria, Lieutenant Colonel David Galula (1919-1967)—popularly dubbed “the Clausewitz of Counterinsurgency” in the U.S.—developed his four laws of COIN:

1. Support and security of the populace must be the main effort
2. Advocacy of an “active minority” must be maintained to win over the “neutral majority” so that together a “hostile minority” can be neutralized
3. Popular support always remains conditional requiring continuous commitment to maintain
4. Concentration of resource must occur in accordance with the *oil spot* principle

His version of *hearts-and-minds* articulated in his masterwork *Counterinsurgency Warfare, Theory and Practice* states, “Victory is not only this, but also the final break-up of the bonds between the insurgents and the population, not at the population’s expense, but with its support.”<sup>47</sup> He further recommends instantiating democratic processes by recruiting local leaders and facilitating creation of a reinvigorated government. The antithetical contemporary of Galula, Colonel Roger Trinquier (1908-1985), advocated an enemy-centric “fighting fire with fire” approach employing “exceptional legislation,” exclusively coercive PRC, reprisals, and torture—the efficacy of which were substantially discredited in Algeria.<sup>48</sup>

## U.S. COLD WAR APPLICATION: WHAT WENT WRONG?

Subsequent to the Eisenhower administration, U.S. policy to fight communism was reoriented to emphasize economic development, political reform, and military assistance. President John F. Kennedy (1917-1961) outlined a vision that counterinsurgency was a “battle for minds and souls” not one of weapons, that “counter-guerrilla efforts cannot succeed where the local populace is too caught up in its own misery,” and that “a new and different kind of military training” be deployed to achieve these aims.<sup>49</sup> Although the U.S. Marine Corps had amassed significant COIN knowledge derived from experience in the “Banana Wars” of 1915-1934 and documented in their *Small Wars Manual* of 1940, the U.S. Army considered IW an aberration preferring to place maximum doctrinal emphasis on conventional units and tactics.<sup>50</sup> This mindset informed the flawed approach General William Westmoreland (1914-2005) applied to Vietnam which instead focused on an enemy-centric strategy of attrition supported by three sequential operational concepts:<sup>51</sup>

1. *Search-and-Destroy*
2. *Clear-and-Hold*
3. *Securing*<sup>52</sup>

President Lyndon Johnson (1908-1973) adopting the rhetoric of his predecessor stated that “ultimate victory [in Vietnam] will depend upon the hearts and the minds” of the Vietnamese – overtly attempting to link the sentiment to founding father John Adams who described the American Revolution as present “in the

hearts and minds of the American people, a change in their religious sentiments of their duties and obligations.”<sup>53</sup> Paradoxically, the phrase *hearts-and-minds*—invoked like a mantra—soon became a failed euphemism unable to hide the brutal character of the world’s first televised war. Even Sir Gerald Templer an early supporter, distanced himself from “this despicable phrase he thought he had invented” as quoted by the Singapore newspaper *The Straits Times* in 1968.<sup>54</sup>

### **Vietnam War (1960-1975).**

The 1954 Geneva Accords terminated the anti-colonial Indochina War between France and the Viet Minh insurgency splitting Vietnam along the 17<sup>th</sup> parallel. Although intended to be temporary pending a re-unification vote, elections were never held resulting in the emergence of two polarized sovereign states—a communist-controlled North Vietnam led by Ho Chi Minh (1890-1969) and a U.S.-backed Republic of South Vietnam. Building upon the teachings of Mao-Zedong as well as their previous wartime experience, Viet Minh agents renamed as the National Liberation Front (NLF, aka “Viet Cong” or VC) created a parallel or shadow government [*g*] that exercised de facto control over large rural areas of South Vietnam and began amassing paramilitary guerrilla forces [*ρ*].<sup>55</sup> The U.S. responded by sending thousands of military advisors, encouraging a coup in 1963 which replaced the ultra-conservative government in Saigon, and then escalated conventionally attempting to forestall invasion. Nevertheless, the unanticipated 1968 Tet Offensive saw coordinated attack by the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) and indigenous paramilitary forces which—although repulsed—differed so radically from the officially-advertised *hearts-and-minds*



campaign supposedly being waged that public opinion ultimately forced U.S. withdrawal.




Figure 3. Vietnam War during the Tet Offensive.

### Comparison of British and American Approaches.

Prior to 1963, Vietnam was experiencing a rural insurgency similar to that in the Malayan Emergency; however, expansion of the irregular war resulting from creation of a viable shadow government in the South coupled to the overlay of a traditional Westphalian conflict exacerbated both the complexity of the situation as well as the level and extent of the violence.<sup>56</sup> Compare Figure 3 with that of Figure 2. Under-prioritizing and under-resourcing *hearts-and-minds* initiatives enabled the NLF insurgency and shadow government to fill the void while MCO escalation became a self-fulfilling prophecy engendering increased levels of external conventional and paramilitary support.<sup>57</sup> The British avoided both mistakes in Malaya properly applying a balanced civil-military operations (CMO) approach (after some preliminary mistakes), making maximum use of LE means coupled to human intelligence fusion, and emphasizing CG effectiveness over overwhelming firepower.<sup>58</sup>

The U.S., of course, did not enjoy the advantages of working with an effective host government, an insurgency which was substantially hostile to the people, or a previous wartime alliance with its military counterpart as had the British. It did, however, have access to the advice of Sir Robert Thompson (1916-1992) – wartime *Chindit*, Permanent Secretary of Defense for Malaya during Templer’s term, and head of the 1961-1965 British International Advisory Mission (BRIAM) to South Vietnam.<sup>59</sup> His warning not to bomb villages went unheeded as did his dismissal of U.S. preference for conventional prowess over population-centric COIN; however, BRIAM put pressure on South Vietnam facilitating the coup, and his PRC recommendations coupled to acceptance of the *oil spot* principle led to key elements of the U.S. “*pacification*” campaign. Regrettably, neither proved as efficacious in implementation as intended.

### **U.S. “*Pacification*” Campaign.**

General Creighton Abrams (1914-1975) who succeeded Westmoreland in 1968 emphasized the population-centric *clear-and-hold* approach over enemy-centric *search-and-destroy* while accelerating four “*pacification*” measures:<sup>60</sup>

- Combined Action Program (CAP)
- Civilian Irregular Defense Group (CIDG)
- Strategic Hamlet Program (SHP)
- Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS)

Contrasted to police-trained Home Guards of the Malayan Emergency, CAP embedded U.S. Marine Corps squads into village militias to perform civic

action and support rudimentary development. Although comparatively inexpensive and often successful in improving security through elimination of local guerrillas, the program required a level of cooperation not easily replicable on a broader scale and diverted needed forces from MCO.<sup>61</sup> Similarly, CIDG employed U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF) in recruiting paramilitary commandos from malcontented minorities such as the Montagnards to strengthen and broaden COIN while curtailing VC impressment.<sup>62</sup> Compared to Templer's 450 "new villages" which provided substantive security, economic, civic, and in many cases educational advantages, the 8000 strategic hamlets of SHP, according to Thompson, unfortunately became a means without an end.<sup>63</sup>

- Deployment was haphazard depriving any one area of complete support
- Military operations particularly in the Mekong Delta were not synchronized with the advance of new hamlets leaving many vulnerable
- Security was insufficient to adequately separate residents from the VC
- Economic development was generally neglected

The innovative but belated interagency CORDS program successfully consolidated and synchronized all CMO projects under one headquarters. Led by Robert W. Kromer and subsequently by U.S. Ambassador William Colby (1920-1996), CORDS linked development assistance and human intelligence collection (e.g., *Phuong Hoang*, aka *Phoenix project*) to the marked advantage of both. Every region in which it was implemented saw a measurable decline in shadow government control.<sup>64</sup> Ironically, as most representa-

tive of Kennedy's vision for a COIN main effort and the closest philosophical descendant of the Templer *hearts-and-minds* approach, this attempt at UoE was thwarted by lack of resources and a bureaucracy resistant to change—illustrating by counterpoint Dr. Nagl's thesis concerning the commitment necessary for building a learning institution.<sup>65</sup> As events unfolded, “*pacification*” proved to be too little, too late.

### **POST-9/11 RE-DISCOVERY: WHAT WENT RIGHT?**

The soul-searching which followed U.S. failure in Vietnam that culminated some two decades later in the virtually-bloodless redemption of *Operation Desert Storm* in 1991, again sidelined IW and COIN in favor of a new American way-of-war. Subsequently tested after 9/11 in *Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)* and *Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)*, joint information-centric, combined-arms doctrine proved insufficient to the irregular and transnational warfare (TW) challenges into which both conflicts ultimately transformed. In 2005 before the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, President George W. Bush (1946-present) unwittingly presaging the 2010 *Arab Spring* as well as perhaps a more population-centric warfighting vision—through a speech intended to justify U.S. involvement in both conflicts—stated, “across the world, hearts and minds are opening to the message of human liberty as never before.”<sup>66</sup> Born the same year in which Sir Gerald Templer articulated his famous maxim, General David Petraeus (1952-present) together with Australian Lieutenant Colonel David Kilcullen (1967-present) and Lieutenant Colonel John Nagl (1966-present) were simultaneously readying the new U.S. counter-

insurgency doctrine—heavily influenced by Galula and recent combat experience—for publication in FM 3-24 and for imminent trial in Iraq and Afghanistan.

### ***Operation Iraqi Freedom (2003-2011).***


Although initiated in 2003 as a traditional Westphalian campaign to end the Saddam Hussein (1937-2006) regime, remove the Ba'ath party from power, and eliminate weapons of mass destruction (WMD), *OIF* rapidly transitioned from six weeks of unprecedentedly successful MCO against Special Republican Guard (SRG) and Republican Guard (RG) forces into years of bloody irregular and transnational conflict. Replacement of Sunni-dominated institutions with a coalition-sponsored representative democracy put the sixty-percent Shi'a majority into power.<sup>67</sup> This coupled to unenlightened de-Ba'athification measures (e.g., elimination of pensions and government-sector job eligibility for all Iraqi field grade officers and senior civil servants) furnished *raison d'être* for a Sunni-led insurgency [*i*] comprised of disaffected Ba'ath members, unemployed military personnel, and criminal elements.

As beneficiary of the resulting shift in regional balance-of-power, Iran quickly moved to increase its influence while thwarting U.S. interests by sponsoring Moqtada al-Sadr's (1973-present) paramilitary Jaish al-Mahdi (aka Mahdi Army) [*ρ*]. Simultaneously, al-Qaeda's super-empowered elites [*ε*]—such as Usama bin Laden (UBL) (1957-2011) residing in Pakistan—capitalized upon the ensuing chaos to channel transnational terrorists [*τ*] into Iraq through Syria and masterfully manipulate ensuing global media messaging. Figure 4 diagrams the increase in complexity over

previously described conflicts due principally to the variety and extent of involved actors some espousing transnational agendas. Discounting (the majority of) the U.S.-led coalition, all state and non-state parties differed between inception and the U.S. troop surge of 2007. The reasons for the conflict were entirely co-opted as a result of this transformation.

Significantly, the turning point occurred in October 2006 *prior* to the introduction of 28,500 additional combat forces when the rational calculus of Sunni tribal sheikhs in Anbar province convinced them that coalition allegiance was preferable to government-condoned Shi'a death squads or the Salafist fundamentalism (and sectarian targeting) of al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI).<sup>68</sup> Had the U.S. been more attuned to the complexities of the conflict—the nature and animosities of the various actors—this confluence of interests might have been achieved earlier through appropriate application of purposefully-designed conciliatory and coercive *hearts-and-minds* initiatives. (Kilcullen's proposed exploitation of cultural knowledge and recommended manipulation of social networks is a theoretically analogous concept albeit lacking in visionary prescriptive for a better indigenous end-state as additionally implied by *hearts-and-minds*.<sup>69</sup>) Fortunately, local U.S. commanders were receptive to the *Sunni al-Sahawa* (aka *Awakening*) as it occurred facilitating its spread to Baghdad and the city's easily segregable enclaves (an unwelcome but serendipitous result of earlier Mahdi Army ethnic cleansing). The endorsement of senior Sheikh Sattar backed by U.S. funding won the nationwide support of additional tribes thereby creating conditions favorable to the population-centric COIN approach of FM 3-24. This markedly improved security by removing one belligerent actor, enhancing ISR-driven counterterrorism (CT) operations (i.e.,

small-scale *search-and-destroy*), and enabling dispersal of newly available U.S. forces into otherwise exposed forward operating bases within residential districts.<sup>70</sup>



**Figure 4. Operation Iraqi Freedom at inception and prelude to the surge.**

A fortuitous confluence of events coupled to updated COIN doctrine and superb leadership proved the OIF surge successful; however, deep problems remain. Despite expenditure of \$33 billion for reconstruction and development to enhance Iraqi quality-of-life after years of neglect (Saddam stalled most infrastructure projects under a decade of UN-imposed sanctions notably excepting palace construction), the anticipated

*hearts-and-minds* return on investment (RoI) did *not* accrue as might have been expected.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, prior to the *Sunni Awakening*, CAP-like Security Force Assistance (SFA)—i.e., activities designed to enhance both the capacity and the capability of host nation security forces and their associated sustaining institutions<sup>72</sup>—proved fruitless in developing Sunni national guard battalions as contrasted to modest successes achieved with Kurdish peshmerga and even Shi’a militias.<sup>73</sup> Plagued by conflict between competing local and central elites in Maysan as well as Basra, the vaunted British approach to winning *hearts-and-minds* “for much of the period since 2003... came to be characterized by a low degree of intervention within Iraqi society” according to Dr. Glen Rangwala of Cambridge writing in 2009.<sup>74</sup> Finally, following U.S. withdrawal of combat forces in August 2010, some Sunni—and even Shi’a—tribes reverted back to former anti-coalition alliances.<sup>75</sup>

Why did these failures—at odds with recently espoused COIN wisdom—occur in the manner they did? Dr. Thomas Henriksen, senior fellow at both the Hoover Institution and the Joint Special Operations University (JSOU), argues for a return to fundamentals. In his JSOU report, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, Henriksen admonishes that economic assistance is secondary to forging the critical link which connects a people to their government—a link typified, for instance, by the sincere respect earned by SOF while sharing in the privation and danger of the Montagnard people which subsequently proved impossible, however, to transfer to the government of South Vietnam.<sup>76</sup> Expanding upon the inference, long-term COIN success hinges upon (1) sufficient time for solidification of pragmatic local loyalties based first on mutual security and then on trust,



(2) de-conflicted creation followed by widespread perception of host nation legitimacy, and (3) the essential transferral of local allegiance to representative central authority. The commitment in time required to shape *hearts-and-minds* – and not simply an enlightened balance of conciliation and coercion – therefore cannot be bypassed.

### ***Operation Enduring Freedom (2001-present).***

The battle for *hearts-and-minds* in *OEF* – although initiated prior to *OIF* – remains contested, and yet after more than a decade of effort since October 2001, the prognosis is less than encouraging due to the substantive absence of the above-mentioned factors. Rapidly identifying Afghanistan as a terrorist safe-haven for al-Qaeda and the governing transnational elites responsible for 9/11, the U.S. invoked a newly conceived Bush Doctrine<sup>77</sup> deploying SOF to facilitate the indigenous, multi-ethnic Northern Alliance insurgency in unilaterally overthrowing a complicit Taliban government principally composed of Sunni-fundamentalist Pashtuns. A textbook UW campaign appeared virtually complete with installation of Hamid Karzai (1957-present) as chairman of the interim administration in December 2001 and his subsequent election as president during the 2002 *Loya Jirga* (aka *Grand Assembly*). Regrettably, al-Qaeda senior leaders escaped across a porous border with Pakistan linking up with sympathizers to continue their global jihad, and a resurgent Taliban created an effective shadow government within the southern provinces of Afghanistan increasingly challenging a corrupt Karzai regime since 2006 while U.S. attention remained focused on Stability Operations (STABOPS) in Iraq. Similar to cir-

cumstances in *OIF*, Iran again expanded its influence by supporting anti-Western forces with weapons, materiel, and training further complicating the crisis and increasing the violence.

Distracted from the original objective of avenging 9/11 and eliminating terrorist safe-havens, subsequent U.S. emphasis on nation-building, support to civil administration (SCA), economic development, and population security necessitated an *OEF* surge of 30,000 troops in 2009. Although recognizing the importance of offensive CT in Afghanistan as well as Iraq, the new International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) commander General Stanley McChrystal (1954-present) quickly declared, “the measure of effectiveness will not be enemy killed. It will be the number of Afghans shielded from the violence.”<sup>78</sup> Nevertheless, escalating the *hearts-and-minds* as well as the kinetic campaign against Mullah Mohammed Omar (1957-present) and the Taliban came with an Achilles heel of a Presidentially-directed timeline – all surge forces would be removed from Afghanistan by the end of 2012. All U.S. combat forces would redeploy not later than 2014. No fortuitous confluence of events is anticipated to assist the U.S. in achieving success in *OEF*. Insurgent and counterinsurgent continue to vie for legitimacy... but which is which?

Installed as a result of successful UW by a foreign power, the Karzai administration exacerbated its lack of legitimacy by allowing ethnic Tajiks to dominate leadership of the newly-created Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) – including national army, national police, and intelligence services – at the expense of disenfranchised Pashtuns.<sup>79</sup> Recruiting local warlords overtly involved in narco-trafficking to supplement fledgling ANSF units in southern Afghanistan, Karzai

also indirectly facilitated Taliban shadow governors gaining allegiance of rural populations in twenty-four of thirty-four provinces by 2010.<sup>80</sup> Meanwhile, parliamentary elections saw twenty-one candidates who were otherwise winning in their respective districts disqualified due to fraud and twenty-percent, or 1.3 million, of cast ballots invalidated amid widespread claims of illegitimacy. Avoiding the mistakes of AQI, the Taliban adhered to the classic Maoist model of out-governing their competitor through locally-administered dispute resolution popularly based upon Sharia law, institution of checkpoints and travel permits fostering security, and a moderated educational policy strengthening madrassas as well as private schools at the expense of state-run institutions.<sup>81</sup>

Unlike the Malayan Emergency when surplus rubber and tin revenue funded Templer's "new villages" as a byproduct of Korean War (1950-1953) demand, U.S. expenditure of almost \$23 billion for Afghanistan infrastructure rehabilitation and development—a pittance compared with the need—consists of borrowed funds and is consequently limited in magnitude as well as impact.<sup>82</sup> With access to almost forty-percent of the world's opium production for illegally financing their activities, the Taliban are not similarly constrained. Furthermore, recognizing a weakness in their ability to deliver economic assistance, the Taliban now vet projects of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) proscribing those too closely associated with ISAF, taxing some, and imposing employment conditions on others while garnering a certain amount of popular credit in the process.<sup>83</sup> Neither a CORDS-inspired Human Terrain System nor civil affairs (CA) directed Provincial Reconstruction Teams—both commendable ISAF *hearts-and-minds* initiatives—address the

underlying need for parsimonious solutions which yield good governance, effective security, and timely transferral of local allegiance to central authority as espoused by Henriksen.

In addition to lack of RoI from ISAF-sponsored development, application of modern COIN doctrine to *OEF* faces challenges in the prescriptive use of minimum force. Subjected to the most intense fighting since the Korean War, British troops based in Helmand province—cradle of both the Taliban movement and an associated collective memory of nineteenth-century British colonial occupation in the region<sup>84</sup>—acquiesced in late 2006 to a controversial truce effectively barricading themselves within their forward operating bases.<sup>85</sup> French units in Kapisa and Surobi followed a policy of deterrence as opposed to combat seeking instead to “foil the enemy’s plans in plain view of the population” — not so much a COIN strategy as an alternation of political negotiations with limited military action.<sup>86</sup> General Sir Michael Jackson, Chief of the General Staff of the United Kingdom from 2003-2006, drawing upon experience in Northern Ireland commented upon the requirement for force in COIN: “If you are too timid you will be seen as faint-hearted by the people whose hearts and minds you seek to influence. If you are too harsh, that will also be seen... Fine judgments are required.”<sup>87</sup> In implementing McChrystal’s *hearts-and-minds* guidance, fine judgments may not have always prevailed.

As pragmatic Afghans await expiration of the withdrawal deadline to grant their allegiance, ISAF *hearts-and-minds* initiatives suffer as do civic programs under the Karzai government. Although initially promising, long-term efficacy of ISAF social engineering policies which challenge cultural norms — such as

ANSF multi-ethnic integration, police/military officer opportunities for women, and extensive literacy education for young girls—remain equally vulnerable.<sup>88</sup> Had a third alternative been proffered at the outset of *OEF* to more starkly frame the legitimacy decision-space—as equally acceptable to the U.S. as unacceptable to the Afghans—the outcome might have been different. Sunni chieftains of the *Awakening* once deprived of the Ba’ath party option had easy choice between transnational terrorism and Iranian-backed death squads or a democratically-elected, coalition-supported government. Pashtuns are confronted with a corrupt Karzai administration from which they feel disenfranchised or a resurgent Pashtun Taliban. End of Afghan sovereignty by a date certain (albeit inversely tied to ISAF STABOPS progress) with division of territory going to neighboring Pakistan, the central Asian republics, and Iran as diplomatically negotiated by the U.S. might have proven an important motivator of *hearts-and-minds* and a less-palatable alternative than working with ISAF.

**CONCLUSION:  
*HEARTS-AND-MINDS* IN CONTEXT.**

Clausewitz astutely discerned that the nature of warfare is unchanging; nevertheless, its inherent *complexity* is inexorably changing—not simply in the technical execution of war-fighting functions<sup>89</sup> as commonly recognized, but more subtly, in the variety and extent of its possible actors. The 1648 Pact of Westphalia in helping solidify the modern conception of nation-state as “a political entity inclusive of a co-located population within defined territory which derives legitimacy through service to a sovereign”

concomitantly differentiated what is considered non-state. Thus the irregular *dual* of the “remarkable trinity” of government [G], military [M], and people [P] would naturally be comprised of actors who retain all attributes of their nation-state counterparts absent “legitimacy,” specifically: shadow government [g]; paramilitary, guerrilla force, or revolutionary army [ρ]; and civilian insurgency [i]. Although these latter have been present on the world stage far longer than the nation-state,<sup>90</sup> recent technological progress – e.g., global communications, 24/7 news media, cyberspace – has enabled new forms of social organization obviating the additional requirement for “defined territory” while empowering transnational *duals* to each of these irregular actors, specifically: criminal mega-corporation or NGO [c], transnational terrorist or equivalent cellular group [τ], and super-empowered individual or elites [ε].




Figure 5. The “remarkable trinity” – squared.

The distinctiveness of these three categories each still exhibiting all three cross-cutting Clausewitzian aspects “like different codes of law, deep-rooted in their subject”<sup>91</sup> should be apparent from the preceding historical examples with the aid of the diagram on the left side of Figure 5. Success in winning *hearts-and-minds* must therefore account for a new norm wherein the speed of information enables routine third and even fourth-party exploitation of otherwise bipolar engagements. Traditional warfare can be redefined as conflict between actors within the same category and conventional warfare (absent WMD) as a subset among exclusively Westphalian participants (e.g., *OIF* 2003). Asymmetric warfare is any conflict between *duals* (e.g., IW: Malayan Emergency, TW: *Global War on Terrorism*, IW-TW: *Sunni Awakening*) while hybrid warfare is simultaneous state-on-state, irregular, and transnational conflict (as presaged by the 2006 Israel-Hezbollah War,<sup>92</sup> *OIF* 2007, and *OEF* 2009). Identification and subsequent decoupling of competing agendas among numerous antagonists all vying for legitimacy will prove critical for future Joint Force Commanders synchronizing war-fighting functions and *hearts-and-minds* initiatives—i.e., trying to ascertain the kind of struggle in which they are engaged.

The right side of Figure 5 maps MCO, IW (i.e., CG/CT, UW, FID/SFA, COIN, STABOPS),<sup>93</sup> CA (e.g., SCA, PRC, foreign humanitarian assistance or FHA),<sup>94</sup> and LE methods to specific actors where gaps suggest the need for enhanced authorities or doctrine (e.g., the law of land warfare and associated operational methods need further codification as applied to transnational actors—post-9/11 legislation notwithstanding<sup>95</sup>). Appropriate application of purposefully-designed conciliatory and coercive *hearts-and-minds* initiatives

must simultaneously negotiate and balance this lattice. For completeness, defense support to civil authority (DSCA)—albeit only applied domestically—is depicted as the equivalent of STABOPS which encompasses activities conducted overseas in coordination with other instruments of national power to maintain or reestablish a safe and secure environment, provide essential governmental services, emergency infrastructure reconstruction, and humanitarian relief.<sup>96</sup> UW is conducted against belligerents within hostile territory while FID is employed exclusively in support of allies. Strategic communications (STRATCOM) and information operations (IO)—i.e., electronic warfare, computer network operations, military deception, MISO, and operational security<sup>97</sup>—due to the immediacy with which their influence reaches relevant populations are increasingly likely to be the center-of-gravity in such complex contests for legitimacy that hybrid warfare portends.

As the foregoing discussion has attempted to elucidate, winning *hearts-and-minds* equates to subjugating the total person by appealing both to the emotions with a positive end-state vision of the future and to the intellect by presenting decisions of immediate consequence and rational self-import. Addressing the entire human psyche, the strategy is simultaneously one of conciliation and of coercion; however, even an enlightened balance of the two is insufficient for success without adequate—typically exceptional—*commitment* of time, troops,<sup>98</sup> and materiel to achieve:

1. Solidification of pragmatic local loyalties based upon mutual security and trust
2. De-conflicted creation followed by widespread perception of legitimacy



3. Transferral of allegiance to representative central authority<sup>99</sup>

Sir Gerald Templer's seven decisive decisions made during the Malayan Emergency when properly updated are virtually canonical:

- Establish clarity of purpose for political as well as military objectives and RoE
- Foster UoE at all levels among coalition, inter-agency, and host nation
- Balance *hearts-and-minds* initiatives across the lattice (Figure 5)
- Employ small-scale CG/CT but only as the supporting effort
- Ensure robust, networked ISR and create a shared common operating picture
- Maximize STRATCOM and IO seizing initiative over "the narrative"
- Encourage in-theater adaptation and dissemination of lessons learned

The words of T. E. Lawrence writing in *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom: A Triumph* concerning his experience with the *Arab Revolt* during the First World War remain as prescient for the irregular conflicts of today as for the hybrid wars of tomorrow – the degree to which this aim may be realized or thwarted is commensurate with the character of the victory to be attained: "It seemed to me proven that rebellion must have an unassailable base, guarded not only from attack but from fear of attack. These bases we had in the Red Sea ports: in the desert, in the minds of the men we converted to our creed."<sup>100</sup>

## Endnotes

1. Brian Lapping, *End of Empire* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, March 1990), 224.

2. Gerald Templar, Letter to Sir Basil Liddell Hart (11 June 1955), King's College London, UK: Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, LH 1/682. Acknowledgement for permission of use is kindly made to *The Trustees of the Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives*.

3. U.S. Department of the Army, *Counterinsurgency*, Field Manual 3-24 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 2006), 5-1.

4. Since publication of the 2005 National Defense Strategy, the term "traditional warfare" has doctrinally referred to "recognized military capabilities and forces in well-understood forms of military competition and conflict." Adoption of the term "conventional warfare" might have proven more appropriate since many military historians consider traditional warfare as having a non-Western and pre-industrial origin making the term somewhat synonymous with IW. Nevertheless, the descriptors "traditional" and "conventional" when referring to types of conflict will be used interchangeably within this paper and as counterpoint to irregular warfare.

5. Plato, "The Republic," trans. Benjamin Jowett, *Great Books of the Western World*, vol. 7, (Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), 421.

6. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 89.

7. In his enumeration of the remarkable trinity, Clausewitz specifically associated the second archetype with "the commander and his army" principally confining his *On War* analysis to landpower. I have expanded this second identity to Military [M] (i.e., not simply Army [A]) in order to explicitly encompass

maritime and aerospace forces when these latter are employed either: (1) in close operational synchronization with land forces or (2) while actually performing in traditional landpower roles. Such circumstances while common in modern coalition warfighting were unknown or impossible during the Napoleonic period of Clausewitz' experience. No generalization is intended beyond the scope of these stipulations.

8. Kumar Ramakrishna, *Emergency Propaganda: The Winning of Malayan Hearts and Minds, 1948-1958* (Richmond, UK: Curzon Press, 2002), 11.

9. Michael Crawshaw, "The Evolution of British COIN," *Security and Stabilisation: The Military Contribution*, Joint Doctrine Publication 3-40 (Shrivenham, UK: U.K. Ministry of Defense, November 2009): 4.

10. John A Nagl, "Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife: British and American Army Counterinsurgency Learning during the Malayan Emergency and the Vietnam War," *World Affairs* 161 (Spring 1999): 195.

11. Centre de Doctrine d'Emploi des Forces (CDEF), "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan" (Cahier de la Recherche, France: November 2011), 42.

12. *Ibid.*, 43.

13. Michael Crawshaw, "The Evolution of British COIN," *Security and Stabilisation: The Military Contribution*, 10.

14. Edgar. O'Ballance, *Malaya: The Communist Insurgent War, 1948-1960* (London, UK: Faber & Faber, 1966), 77.

15. One year after the end of the Second World War, Britain reasserted control over the eleven states comprising the crown colony of Malaya with the formation of the Malayan Union. On 31 January 1948 due to opposition from Malay nationalists, the union was replaced by the Federation of Malaya which restored symbolic positions to the rulers of the Malay states and placed British administrators into an advisory capacity. This proved

equally unpopular particularly to Chinese communists many of whom were not granted citizenship in the Federation.

16. U.S. Department of Defense, *Irregular Warfare: Countering Irregular Threats*, Joint Operating Concept Ver. 2.0 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, 17 May 2010), B-5.

17. Mao-Zedong, *On Guerrilla Warfare* (New York, NY: Classic House Books, 1937, 2009), 41.

18. *Ibid.*, B-2.

19. Chin Peng, *Alias Chin Peng – My Side of History* (Singapore: Media Masters, 30 September 2003), 10.

20. Gene Z. Hanrahan, *The Communist Struggle in Malaya* (New York, NY: International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1954), 65.

21. *Ibid.*, 69.

22. R.W. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect: Organization of a Successful Counterinsurgency Effort* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1972), v.

23. Robert Jackson, *The Malayan Emergency: The Commonwealth's Wars, 1948-1960* (London, UK: Routledge, 1991), 24.

24. Templer's predecessor, Sir Henry Gurney (1898-1951), prefigured his *hearts-and-minds* maxim in a 1951 Legislative Assembly statement recounted in the annual compilation of the Singapore newspaper, *The Straits Times*, in 1952: "This war is not to be won only with guns or the ballot-box or any other material instrument which does not touch the hearts of men."

25. Karl Hack, "The Malayan Emergency as Counter-Insurgency Paradigm," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (June 2009): 392.

26. Anthony Short, *The Communist Insurrection in Malaya, 1948-1960* (London, UK: Frederick Mueller, 1975), 342.

27. Donald Mackay, *The Malayan Emergency 1948-60: The Domino That Stood* (Washington, DC: Brassey's, 1997), 140.
28. Simon C. Smith, "General Templer and Counter-Insurgency in Malaya: Hearts and Minds, Intelligence, and Propaganda," *Intelligence and National Security* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 75.
29. Richard Stubbs, *Hearts and Minds in Guerrilla Warfare: The Malayan Emergency, 1948-1960* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1989), 191.
30. Andrew Mumford, "Puncturing the Counterinsurgency Myth: Britain and Irregular Warfare in the Past, Present, and Future," *Advancing Strategic Thought Series* (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, September 2011), 17.
31. Karl Hack, "The Malayan Emergency as Counter-Insurgency Paradigm," 410-411.
32. *Ibid.*, 412.
33. Victor Purcell, *Malaya: Communist or Free* (London, UK: Gollancz, 1954), 8.
34. Caroline Elkins, "Why Malaya Is No Model for Iraq," *The New Republic*, <http://www.tnr.com> (13 December 2005, accessed 21 December 2011).
35. A.J. Stockwell, ed., *Malaya: Part II: The Communist Insurrection, 1948-53* (London, UK: HMSO, 1995), 372.
36. Harry Miller, *Jungle War in Malaya: The Campaign against Communism, 1948-1960* (London, UK: Littlehampton Book Services Ltd., 1972), 86.
37. Brian Stewart, "Winning in Malaya: An Intelligence Success Story," *Intelligence and National Security* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 276.
38. Paul Dixon, "Hearts and Minds?" *British Counter-Insurgency from Malaya to Iraq*, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (June 2009): 363.

39. HQ Malaya Command, *The Conduct of Anti-Terrorist Operations in Malaya* (Kuala Lumpur, Malay Federation: Federal Director of Emergency Operations, 1958), IV-1 – IV-13.
40. Kumar Ramakrishna, "'Transmogrifying' Malaya: The Impact of Sir Gerald Templer (1952-1954)," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. 32 (Winter 2001): 80.
41. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 27.
42. Walter C. Ladwig, "Managing Counterinsurgency: Lessons from Malaya," *Military Review* (May-Jun. 2007): 65.
43. General Headquarters, East Africa, *A Handbook on Anti-Mau Mau Operations* (Nairobi, Kenya: The Government Printer, 1954), Forward.
44. Bruce Hoffman and Jennifer M. Taw, *Defense Policy and Low-Intensity Conflict: The Development of Britain's "Small Wars" Doctrine During the 1950s* (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, 1991), 21.
45. Caroline Elkins, *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya* (New York, NY: Henry Holt, 2005), xvi.
46. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 49.
47. David Galula, *Counterinsurgency Warfare, Theory and Practice* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005).
48. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 45-46.
49. Andrew J. Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine, 1942-1976* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2006), 223-225.
50. Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, ed., *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford, UK: Osprey, 2008), 55.

51. Andrew J. Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine, 1942-1976* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2006), 368-369.

52. In practice *securing* proved to be little more than consolidating gains made during step two and represented a lost opportunity to incorporate substantive *hearts-and-minds* objectives into the strategy. This has subsequently been redressed in the *clear-hold-build* construct of modern COIN doctrine.

53. Elizabeth Dickson, "A Bright Shining Slogan: How 'hearts and minds' came to be," *Foreign Policy*, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/08/13/a\\_bright\\_shining\\_slogan](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/08/13/a_bright_shining_slogan) (September-October 2009, accessed April 2012).

54. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 65.

55. Andrew J. Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine, 1942-1976* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2006), 305.

56. Joseph C. McAlexander, "Hearts and Minds: Historical Counterinsurgency Lessons to Guide the War of Ideas in the Global War on Terrorism" (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Press, 2007): 15.

57. Sam C. Sarkesian, *Unconventional Conflicts in a New Security Era: Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993), 104-105.

58. R.W. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect: Organization of a Successful Counterinsurgency Effort*, 79-81.

59. Robert Thompson, *Defeating Communist Insurgency: The Lessons of Malaya and Vietnam* (New York, NY: Praeger, 1966), 50-58.

60. Joseph C. McAlexander, "Hearts and Minds: Historical Counterinsurgency Lessons to Guide the War of Ideas in the Global War on Terrorism," 13-14.

61. Robert M. Cassidy, "The Long Small War: Indigenous Forces for Counterinsurgency," *Parameters*, Vol. XXXVI (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, Summer 2006): 57.

62. *Ibid.*, 58.

63. R.W. Komer, *The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect: Organization of a Successful Counterinsurgency Effort*, 83-84.

64. John A. Nagl, *Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002), 195.

65. *Ibid.*, 164-170.

66. Elizabeth Dickson, "A Bright Shining Slogan: How 'hearts and minds' came to be."

67. Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, ed., *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 241.

68. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, Joint Special Operations University (JSOU) Report 12-1 (MacDill Air Force Base, FL: The JSOU Press, 2012): 34.

69. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 68.

70. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 35- 36.

71. *Ibid.*, 40.

72. U.S. Department of Defense, *Irregular Warfare: Countering Irregular Threats*, Joint Operating Concept Ver. 2.0, B-3.

73. Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, ed., *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 247.

74. Glen Rangwala, "Counter-Insurgency amid Fragmentation: The British in Southern Iraq," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (June 2009): 505.



75. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 37.

76. *Ibid.*, 38.

77. According to syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer who apparently coined the phrase in June 2001, the Bush Doctrine has evolved four distinct U.S. foreign policy meanings during the George W. Bush presidency: (1) unilateralism exemplified by U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty and Tokyo protocols, (2) "with us or against us" counterterrorism policy exemplified by *OEF*, (3) pre-emptive war philosophy exemplified by *OIF*, and (4) the mission to spread democracy post-*OIF*.

78. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 44.

79. Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, ed., *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 228.

80. Antonio Giustozzi, "Hearts, Minds, and the Barrel of a Gun: The Taliban's Shadow Government," *Prism*, Vol. 3, Issue No. 2 (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press: March 2012): 72.

81. *Ibid.*, 74-76.

82. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 14.

83. Antonio Giustozzi, "Hearts, Minds, and the Barrel of a Gun: The Taliban's Shadow Government," 77-78.

84. Matthew W. Williams, "The British Colonial Experience in Waziristan and Its Applicability to Current Operations" (Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2005); 45.

85. Andrew P. Betson, "Slow Learners: How Iraq and Afghanistan Forced Britain to Rethink COIN," *Armed Forces Journal* 149, no. 4 (November 2011): 26-27.

86. CDEF, "Winning Hearts and Minds: Historical Origins of the Concept and its Current Implementation in Afghanistan," 55-57.

87. Michael Jackson, "British Counter-Insurgency," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (June 2009): 350.

88. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 52-53.

89. U.S. Department of the Army, *Operations*, Field Manual 3-0 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, February 2011), 4-1.

90. Frank A. Miller, "Irregular Warfare—Perhaps Not So 'Irregular'" (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, March 2006): 2.

91. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, 89.

92. David E. Johnson, *Hard Fighting: Israel in Lebanon and Gaza* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2011), xxv.

93. U.S. Joint Forces Command, *Irregular Warfare Special Study* (Norfolk, VA: U.S. Joint Forces Command, 4 August 2006), I-1.

94. U.S. Department of the Army, *Civil Affairs Techniques, Tactics, and Procedures*, Field Manual 3-05.401 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, July 2007), 5-1.

95. General Orders No. 100 prepared by Francis Lieber (1798-1872) and promulgated by President Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865) in 1863 specifies with elegant clarity the legal status of irregular actors and the treatment they might expect at the hand of a hostile power. See specifically, Section IV. Partisans - Armed enemies not belonging to the hostile army - Scouts - Armed prowlers - War-rebels. The Lieber Code subsequently informed the First Geneva Convention and serves as an essential model for developing an equivalent—albeit not necessarily identical—legal framework for transnational actors. Such codification and subsequent international acceptance are essential to avoid loss of

legitimacy as occurred during the *Global War on Terrorism* with handling of the Guantanamo Bay detainees.

96. U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations*, Field Manual 3-07 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, October 2008), Glossary-9.

97. U.S. Department of Defense, *Information Operation*, Joint Publication 3-13 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, 13 February 2006), x.

98. In 2010 the Institute for Defense Analysis examined forty-one IW conflicts in an attempt to develop methodologies for estimating force requirements for large-scale STABOPS concluding that “a force density of 20 troops per 1000 inhabitants in the area of operations is the minimum required... force densities on the order of 40 per 1000 inhabitants provide a significantly higher likelihood of success.” Their assessment was noticeably more pessimistic than the 20-25 troops per 1000 espoused in FM 3-24.

99. Thomas Henriksen, *WHAM: Winning Hearts and Minds in Afghanistan and Elsewhere*, 38.

100. T. E. Lawrence, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom: A Triumph* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1938), <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/t/telawren411683.html> (1922, accessed May 17, 2012).

**U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE**

**Major General Anthony A. Cucolo III  
Commandant**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**PEACEKEEPING & STABILITY OPERATIONS  
INSTITUTE**

**Director  
Colonel Cliff D. Crofford**

**Deputy Director  
Colonel Lorelei E. Coplen**

**Author  
Lieutenant Colonel Karl E. Nell**

**Chief, Research and Publications  
Ms. Karen Finkenbinder**

**Publications Coordinator  
Mr. R. Christopher Browne**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**Composition  
Mrs. Jennifer E. Nevil**