

## CHAPTER 2

### THE ELEMENTS OF STRATEGIC THINKING: A PRACTICAL GUIDE

**Robert Kennedy**

With 58,000 American lives lost, 350,000 casualties, and untold national treasure forfeited, on April 30, 1975, the last Americans in South Vietnam were airlifted out of the country as Saigon fell to communist forces at the height of the Cold War. A few days earlier, with the end in clear view, a Four Party Joint Military Team, established under provisions of the January 1973 Paris peace accords, met in Hanoi, North Vietnam. At that meeting, Colonel Harry Summers, Chief, Negotiations Division of the U.S. Delegation, in a conversation with Colonel Tu, Chief of the North Vietnamese Delegation remarked: "You know you never defeated us on the battlefield." Colonel Tu responded: "That may be so, but it is also irrelevant."<sup>1</sup> So was told the story of failed strategy.

It might be facile to contend that the need for systematic thinking about U.S. foreign and security policies and defense issues peaked during the Cold War. After all, during the Cold War the Soviet Union came to pose a military threat to the United States that was unique in American history – the threat of instant annihilation. It also posed a direct military threat to our allies in Europe and Asia whom we were pledged to defend, as well as the danger of ever increasing Soviet influence around the world through proxy wars and other forms of political violence that seemed to some to represent a more subtle, more likely, and perhaps graver long-term threat to the overall security and

well-being of the United States. Thus the objectives were clear. First, counterbalance Soviet strategic power and its military might on the continent of Europe with countervailing theater and strategic forces that could deliver responses to any aggression by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) so devastating that no Soviet leader would dare take such a step. Second, contain the growth of Soviet influence through policies designed to thwart attempts by the USSR to subvert governments friendly to the United States and its allies. Though the objectives were clear, the methods to accomplish these twin tasks were not. Here systematic thinking was at a premium, albeit not always wisely undertaken.

With the demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, these dangers disappeared. Reflecting this change in environment, funds for intelligence, diplomacy, and defense were initially cut and a number of promising signs emerged. For example, the latest available data indicate there has been a marked decrease in armed conflicts. Notwithstanding Rwanda, Srebrenica, and elsewhere, the number of genocides and political murders has plummeted. The dollar value of major arms transfers has fallen. The number of refugees dropped. And five out of six regions in the developing world have seen a net decrease in core human rights abuses.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, today's world and most certainly the world of tomorrow demand no less in terms of strategic thinking than in the past. The events of September 11, 2001 (9/11) served as a painful reminder that we have not yet reached the end of history, postulated and described by one pundit as that time where conflict is replaced by "economic calculations, the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concern,

and the satisfaction of consumer demands.”<sup>3</sup> The world has become more, not less, complex. The single great adversary, fixed geographically, is gone. But in its place are multiple threats and challenges, few of which emanate from a single nation-state and few of which seem to pose the immense and immediate danger that confronted the United States during the Cold War. Today, ethnic strife threatens the stability of nations and ethnic cleansing challenges America’s most fundamental ideals. Drug cartels and transnational organized crime and their handmaiden, corruption, undermine governments and threaten our economy and the economies of our allies and friends and nations upon whom we depend for scarce resources and/or markets. Trafficking human beings is an affront to our moral values and violates our sense of what the post-Cold War order should represent. Environmental degradation challenges the health of our citizens and future economic progress. These are but a few of the challenges that we must now address.

There are, as well, some challenges, which if not carefully confronted, are likely to pose unimaginable dangers for the United States, its people, and others around the world. Among the more prominent are those resulting from the explosion of technology and technological know-how. Attacks on cyber networks can endanger national political, military, and economic infrastructures, with global implications for the safety and welfare of peoples. The increasing availability of biological, chemical, radiological, and nuclear technologies, which, if acquired by terrorists, so-called rogue states, or perhaps even malevolent individuals, could threaten the very existence of peoples and societies. These challenges are real and demand today, and in the future, careful attention and systematic

thinking if we are to preclude disaster. It will require that America bring its domestic resources to bear. It also will require that the United States build partners abroad, both with governments and with individuals ready and willing to contribute to our efforts. It will require reducing the numbers of those who collaborate with or knowingly ignore those insistent on doing harm, and increasing the numbers of governments willing to aid and individuals willing to risk their lives to provide the United States and other governments with information necessary to thwart those with dangerous designs against individuals and nations. In short, the challenges of today and tomorrow will require well-designed strategies if we are to be successful in preserving our values, our institutions, and our nation.

This will not be an easy task. In general, Americans are a pragmatic people. Frequently impatient when confronted with complex solutions to problems they must address, they tend to prefer direct approaches. They are action oriented rather than reflective, a-strategic if not anti-strategic, and all too frequently anti-intellectual, favoring simple solutions rather than the more involved. They prefer checkers to chess and the approaches of Gary Cooper at High Noon and John Wayne to the difficult tasks of examining alternative solutions to complex problems.

French conservative Lucien Romier, writing early in the last century, noted that Americans have a preference for action, for speed or practical efficiency rather than depth, and constant and lightning changes rather than enduring qualities. Writing a few years earlier, Russian political economist and sociologist M. Y. Ostrogorski observed: "Of all the races in an advanced stage of civilization, the American is the least accessible to long

views. . . . He is preeminently the man of short views, views often 'big' in point of conception, but necessarily short."<sup>4</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, in his *Democracy in America*, concluded: "democracy is unable to regulate the details of an important undertaking, to persevere in a design and to work out its execution in the presence of serious obstacles. It cannot combine measures with secrecy, and it will not await their consequences with patience . . . democracies . . . obey the impulse of passion rather than the suggestion of prudence."<sup>5</sup>

Closer to home, Clyde and Florence Kluckholm in their mid-20th century study of American culture contended that Americans believe in simple answers and distrust and reject complex ones. According to the Kluckholms, Americans also tend to be anti-expert and anti-intellectual.<sup>6</sup>

To add to the problem, generally speaking, American colleges and universities do not produce strategists. Outside of business schools, few offer courses on how to think strategically. Even in our senior military educational institutions, the study of strategy often devolves to the study of a few great strategic thinkers, coupled with the study of the national security processes (both necessary, but insufficient), rather than an analysis of what it takes to be a sound strategist. Yet the ability to think strategically is precisely the quality that will be required of America's leaders if the United States is to deal successfully with future problems.

## **STRATEGY – AN ACTIVITY OF THE MIND**

The word *strategy* comes from Greek words *stratēgia* (generalship) and *stratēgos* (general or leader).<sup>7</sup> Historically, the term strategy has been associated with military activity. The father of modern strategic

studies, German Major-General Carl von Clausewitz, defined strategy as “the use of the engagement for the purpose of the war.”<sup>8</sup> Field Marshall Helmut Carl Bernhard Graf von Moltke contended that strategy was “the practical adaptation of the means placed at a general’s disposal to the attainment of the object in view.”<sup>9</sup> Placing less emphasis on the battles, Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart criticized Clausewitz, contending that Clausewitz’ emphasis on battles suggests that battles were the only means of achieving strategic ends.<sup>10</sup> Thus, Liddell Hart defined strategy as “the art of distributing and applying military means to fulfill the ends of policy.”<sup>11</sup> Liddell Hart’s definition suggests a somewhat wider variety of military means, and clearly emphasizes that the political objectives are the ends to be pursued by military means. Of course, Clausewitz made the latter point early in his seminal *On War* by his famous dictum “war is not a mere act of policy, but a true political instrument, a continuation of political activity by other means.”<sup>12</sup>

Increasingly in the 20th century, students of strategy extended the definition well beyond the field of military activity, applying the term regularly in such fields as business, politics, and foreign and security policy. While the Merriam-Webster dictionary, paying partial deference to earlier uses of the word in a military context, provides as its first definition “the science and art of employing the political, economic, psychological, and military forces of a nation or group of nations to afford the maximum support for adopted policies in peace and war.”<sup>13</sup> It simplifies but broadens the understanding of strategy, providing it with its modern look, in its second definition: “a careful plan or method; the art of devising or employing plans or stratagems toward a goal.”<sup>14</sup> Both definitions miss the mark. In the simplest of terms, strategy is the

*integrated* application of available means to accomplish desired ends. The emphasis is on *integrated*. The first definition misses this important point. The second definition, though perhaps too broad to be useful, does emphasize that strategy is simply a game plan. The haphazard or spontaneous employment of means cannot be considered strategy.

At the national political or military level, a more useful definition of strategy is the integrated application of the instruments of national power (e.g., political/diplomatic, psychological, economic, informational, and military) in pursuit of national interests. Strategy understood as the integrated application of available means to accomplish desired ends, of course, does not limit strategy to the use only of available means. A well-developed strategy may include efforts that lead to an enhancement of means.

Despite this seeming simplicity, strategy is a term that is frequently misused. For example, during the Cold War the security and defense community often referred to the strategy of containment. Yet strategy cannot be a simple restatement of an objective, such as containment or the containing of the Soviet threat. To do so ignores the fact that there can be multiple avenues of approach to accomplishing an objective. Nor can strategy easily be reduced to a single term. It is a multiplicity of actions, carefully integrating available means in order to achieve desired ends.

Strategy is neither strictly art nor science. Yet, in some ways, it is both. As an art, the ability to think strategically is a skill that can be acquired through experience, observation, and study. As a science, thinking strategically entails the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving, among other things, the recognition and formulation of a problem, the collecting of information, and the formulation and

testing/analysis of alternative hypotheses. However, strategy is preeminently an activity of the mind. As was war for Clausewitz,<sup>15</sup> strategy is an act of human intercourse. It is about influencing behavior. It is the formulation of a game plan designed to get inside the decisionmaking loop of others, to get them to do what they might not otherwise have done—whether in the halls of government, in the boardroom, or on the battlefield. So it was for Sun Tzu, who wrote: “. . . to win 100 victories in 100 battles is not the acme of skill. To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill;”<sup>16</sup> and, “those skilled in war subdue the enemy’s army without battle. They capture his cities without assaulting them and overthrow his state without protracted operations.”<sup>17</sup>

Reflecting a similar thought, Tu Mu, writing sometime between 619 and 905 A.D., observed: “He who excels at resolving difficulties does so before they arise. He who excels in conquering his enemies triumphs before threats materialize.”<sup>18</sup> Nearly a millennium and a half later, in a note to himself, Liddell Hart wrote: “to influence man’s thought is far more important and more lasting in effect than to control their bodies or regulate their actions . . .”<sup>19</sup>

This is not to say that well-framed national security or military strategy can always accomplish its objectives without combat. Rather, it is to say that a sound strategy (that is, the integrated application of available means) may well yield the desired political result without conflict. However, should conflict occur, sound strategy surely enhances the prospects of achieving desired military and, above all, political outcomes. It is reasonable to interpret Sun Tzu’s dictum that “a victorious army wins its victories before seeking battle; an army destined to defeat fights in

hope of winning”<sup>20</sup> as meaning that soundly prepared strategy leads to victories. On the other hand, to quote the title of Thomas Mowle’s book, *Hope is not a Plan*. The absence of a strategy increases the likelihood of defeat.

## FALSE DICHOTOMIES

The Department of Defense (DoD) defines strategy as “A prudent idea or set of ideas for employing the instruments of national power in a synchronized and integrated fashion to achieve theater, national, and/or multinational objectives.”<sup>21</sup> Gabriel Marcella and Stephen Fought find this definition “bureaucratically appealing, politically correct, and relatively useless.”<sup>22</sup> For somewhat different reasons, I would agree. First, the DoD definition raises strategy to a transcendent entity—an idea, imbuing it with an ethereal quality that is likely to mystify rather than clarify just what is intended by the term. Second, though I find myself in complete agreement with the DoD’s use of the word *integrated*, the use of the word *synchronized* might suggest to some that the available means must be employed in a synchronous or simultaneous fashion. Depending on the circumstances, however, some means may be employed simultaneously while others sequentially—as in a game plan in almost any sport. Finally, the DoD definition wrongly ties strategy to the “instruments of national power,” relegating strategy solely to accomplishing “theater, national, and or multinational objectives.”<sup>23</sup> Such a definition, of course, accords with what has generally been considered to be *grand strategy* or perhaps *national strategy*, but strips it of its utility as an important tool at every level of human endeavor. For the military, the result has been the establishment of a wall of separation

between strategy, supposedly only undertaken by senior political and military officials, and the so-called operational art, undertaken at the theater or campaign level of a conflict.

The U.S. military borrowed the term *operational art* from the Soviets to describe the conceptualization of warfare at the campaign/theater level. Of course operational art isn't an art, or at least not solely art, thus a poor descriptor in the first place for what is intended. The DoD defines operational art as "The application of creative imagination by commanders and staffs—supported by their skill, knowledge, and experience—to design strategies, campaigns, and major operations and organize and employ military forces. Operational art integrates ends, ways, and means across the levels of war."<sup>24</sup> Now that is a lot of bureaucratese to describe thinking strategically at the operational level of warfare, which the DoD subsequently defines as:

The level of war at which campaigns and major operations are planned, conducted, and sustained to achieve strategic objectives within theaters or other operational areas. Activities at this level link tactics and strategy by establishing operational objectives needed to achieve the strategic objectives, sequencing events to achieve the operational objectives, initiating actions, and applying resources to bring about and sustain these events.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, the DoD definition of operational art suggests that designing campaign and major military operations is on an equal footing with designing strategies, rather than products of strategy.

Similarly, the military has established a wall of separation between strategy and tactics, the latter of which it regards as an activity undertaken by lower

level officials. As with the word *strategy*, the word *tactics* has a long history, derived from the Greek word *taktika* and its plural *taktikos* or fit for arranging.<sup>26</sup> The Merriam-Webster Dictionary provides as a first definition of tactics: “the science and art of disposing and maneuvering forces in combat,” amplifying that with “the art or skill of employing available means to accomplish an end.”<sup>27</sup> While the first pays deference to earlier uses related solely to military forces, the latter bit sounds curiously enough like strategy. Regrettably, the DoD defines tactics as “The employment and ordered arrangement of forces in relation to each other,”<sup>28</sup> thus condemning those who operate at the tactical level of warfare to the implementing of procedures and the employment of approved techniques – two synonymies to which one is referred for a better understanding of the term tactics. Thus, we are left with a largely useless definition for the full panoply of tasks undertaken by lower level commanders, particularly given the conditions of modern warfare.

This is, of course, not to deny that commanders at the tactical level often confront problems that are amenable to “engineered” or structured solutions in which repetitive training and the application of approved techniques and procedures significantly increase the prospects for success once militarily engaged with the enemy. However, the modern battlefield seldom mimics classical models, particular in an age of asymmetric warfare. *Ceteris paribus* seldom, if ever, applies as adversaries adjust to American strengths and probe for weakness. Thus, tactical commanders are and will increasingly be required to exercise not just *intuitive* skills based on pattern recognition and procedural responses employing approved techniques, but also reasoned analysis and judgments that bring

to bear all available tools at the commander's disposal in order to achieve success.

The point here is that, in reality, success at each level of military activity—strategic, operational, or lower levels—requires that commanders at those levels think strategically, employing in an integrated manner available means to achieve desired ends. Perhaps more importantly, these means should and often do include means beyond those of preparing military forces and engaging in combat. For example, military operations below the campaign or theater level often include working with local leaders and others to provide intelligence and force security (political), cutting of supply routes to adversaries (economic), undertaking local projects to provide safe water or the delivery of food to the local population (economic/psychological), and/or the use of deception to alter the mind set of the adversary (psychological).

Liddell Hart wrote: "In peace we concentrate so much on tactics that we are apt to forget that it is merely the handmaiden of strategy."<sup>29</sup> There is a greater truth in this statement than Liddell Hart had intended. That truth is that those generally accepted tactics (i.e., procedures and employment techniques) are there to serve the game plan of the tactical commander. They do not relieve him of his responsibility to develop a game plan that includes all instruments available to him nor do they relieve those who prepared him for tactical level command of their responsibility to educate and train him in an understanding of and ability to develop strategy at tactical levels.

## DELINKING STRATEGY FROM THE WORD STRATEGIC

Perhaps part of the problem we confront in terminology is that as the use of the word strategy was becoming more prominent in the military as well as nonmilitary fields of endeavor, there was a corresponding increase in the use of the word strategic. As a part of Allied strategy for defeating Nazi Germany, the United States and Great Britain undertook “strategic bombing” aimed at crippling Germany’s war effort and will to fight. Following the end of World War II, the United States established the Strategic Air Command, whose task it was to deliver a withering blow to the Soviet Union should it attack the United States or its allies. Strategic bombers, submarines, and missiles were defined as those that could deliver weapons over long-ranges, affecting the prospects for the survival of a nation. In juxtaposition, tactical forces were those of lesser reach, which, when employed, had little impact on the survivability of a nation. In business, industry, and education, institutions were charged with developing strategic plans detailing how they would advance their long-term objectives. Unfortunately, the word strategy, particularly through past military usage, too often has come to be linked to its derived cousin, strategic, and has come to signify only what is done at the strategic level of military or business endeavors, rather than being understood in terms of a game plan. One pernicious result is the perception that only national leaders and perhaps senior military officers are the ones who engage in strategy.

## POLICY VS. STRATEGY CONUNDRUM

It is common to contend that strategy must follow policy. For example, if it is U.S. policy to support a two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli problem, then it is the task of those charged with carrying out U.S. policy in the region to devise a strategy to meet the needs of policy. Similarly, if it is U.S. policy to support democratic movements in foreign countries, then it is the charge of those assigned to implement policy in the various regions and countries of the world to devise strategies to accomplish the task. This is policy as setting objectives.

However, there is another way of looking at policy, that is, policy as a means. For example, the two-state policy set by the U.S. Government is likely to be a part of a broader set of policies with grander objectives. Other policies might include restricting arms flows to Hamas, encouraging human rights and greater democracy in the region, opening a dialogue with Syria in order to find common ground for cooperation, encouraging outside actors to support U.S. efforts in the region, etc. Taken together, these policies thus serve as a means to achieve broader national goals. Such goals might include reducing the probability of conflict, increasing the general welfare of the region's citizenry, reducing likelihood that the region's problems serve as a breeding ground for terrorism, stabilizing the region to ensure the orderly flow of oil from the region and increased stability in world oil markets, and improving global cooperation on vexing problems that threaten the international community. Thus the sum total of such policies, in fact, is (or at least should be) a product of a grander strategy. Under such circumstances, one could properly conclude that policies serve strategy.

Strategy comes first. Then follow policies as the means to accomplish one's strategic design.<sup>30</sup>

This is important to keep in mind, because as one moves from grand or national strategy to policies at multilevels below grand strategy, one must remain aware of the fact that lower level policies are but a means to accomplish national level tasks. Furthermore, as means they remain among a variety of choices governments can make to accomplish desired ends. The danger is always in allowing lower level policies, which serve as means, to become national level objectives. Perhaps this was the case, for example, during the 1960s and 1970s, when, in pursuing the objective of enhancing the security of the nation, the United States engaged in a long war in Vietnam in order to check the worldwide growth of communism. Indeed, for years Vietnam was considered a vital national interest—one worth the shedding of the blood of many young Americans. Following the defeat of South Vietnamese forces by the North, Vietnam ceased to be a vital interest. Had we for many years transformed a means into the end itself, failing to realize, until the administration of President Nixon, that there were other means to enhance the security of the nation?

A more insidious problem in the policy vs. strategy, chicken vs. egg, debate, particularly where military strategy is concerned, is that the very separation of these two terms suggests that there are two clearly identifiable realms of activity. In fact, where national security policy is concerned and the instruments of military power are to be employed (e.g., covert operations, displays of force, deployments, and the wide range of potential employment options), judgments by policymakers must be formed only in close consulta-

tion with their military advisers. As Clausewitz noted in his tactical letter to General Muffling: "The task . . . is mainly to prevent policy from demanding things which are *against the nature of war* (italics in original), and out of ignorance of the instruments from committing errors in their use."<sup>31</sup> More importantly, those whose task it is to undertake military activity on behalf of the political goals set by the nations leaders must be well-educated in the strengths and weaknesses of all the instruments of national power, so that they can advise best on what other instruments should be employed and in what manner so as to maximize the usefulness of the military options that might be chosen.

To better illustrate this point, during the troubled times in Central America and the Caribbean in the late 1970s, the U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute was called upon to undertake a study of the role of the military in that region. When the study was completed, it recommended the United States undertake a number of political/diplomatic and economic initiatives in conjunction with recommended efforts by military personnel. When this study was briefed to a senior military official, that official asked why he needed to know about the political/diplomatic and economic initiatives, since his task was to salute and undertake whatever military tasks were assigned. In response, the briefing team noted that the probability of success of any specific military option hinged on its careful selection from and coordination with the other instruments of national power. Thus, it was the task of senior military leaders to ensure that the nation's political leaders were well aware of the need for a strategy that integrated the instruments into an effective plan to advance U.S. interests in the countries of the region.

## ELEMENTS OF THINKING STRATEGICALLY

Some years ago, Kenichi Ohmae in his seminal *The Mind of the Strategist* said: “successful business strategies result not from rigorous analysis but from a particular state of mind.”<sup>32</sup> He went on to contend:

[In] the mind of a strategist, insight and a consequent drive for achievement . . . fuel a thought process which is basically creative and intuitive rather than rational. Strategists do not reject analysis. Indeed, they can hardly do without it. But they use it only to stimulate the creative processes, to test the ideas that emerge, to work out their strategic implications, or to ensure successful execution of high-potential “wild” ideas that might otherwise not be implemented properly.<sup>33</sup>

One might infer from such a statement that strategists are born, not made. Not so, Ohmae responded, “There are ways in which the mind of the strategist can be reproduced or simulated, by people who may lack a natural talent for strategy . . . there are some specific concepts and approaches that help anyone develop the kind of mentality that comes up with superior strategic ideas.”<sup>34</sup>

If Ohmae is correct, what then are these concepts and approaches that, if taught, can help develop good strategists? What then are those universal elements that constitute sound approach to dealing with a problem? What are the concepts that, through practice, will train the mind to think rationally and methodically, yet serve to stimulate the creative processes and thus lead to the development of well-framed game plans, elements that can be applied at all levels of human interaction, whether one is dealing with a crisis, an immediate confrontation, or engaged in long-term planning?

I would suggest seven broad categories of inquiry – (1) defining the situation, (2) detailing your concerns and objectives, those of your principal antagonist(s)/competitor(s), and those of other important players, (3) identifying and analyzing options that might be pursued, in terms of such factors as costs, risks, and probabilities of success, (4) options selection and alternatives analysis in the light of potential frictions, (5) reoptimization in light of changing events, (6) evaluation of the option in terms of its success in achieving desired results, and finally, (7) option modification or replacement. The proposed processes are rational and methodical; yet involve thinking that is nonlinear as well as multidimensional, thus stimulating creativity. In examining each of the elements, I will refer to the development of strategy at the national level. However, the model can be applied at all levels of activity.

### **Defining the Situation.**

The first step in developing a sound strategy for dealing with a problem is to detail the facts of the situation: what the actual situation is as best can be known at this point—i.e., the objective, not subjective reality. In a military environment, this would include an elaboration of the characteristics of the operating area, including political, economic, and sociological factors that may affect operations and a detailing of enemy, as well as friendly, forces, much akin to that what is often provided in the Commander's Estimate of the Situation, though not so cursorily drawn, as is too often the case. Unconfirmed reports or speculative information must be set aside for further investigation—perhaps intelligence tasking. Statements of values and the ascribing of intentions to

any of the actors should be avoided. Facts are value neutral. At this point, any introduction of values and speculation about the intentions of other players will cloud rather than help clarify the situation. Similarly, interjecting one's concerns and one's own objectives, though one could argue are indeed facts, are steps that should only be taken after the factual situation has been clearly defined. On first blush, this may seem a bit mechanical. However, it provides a necessary clarity essential for the development of effective strategies.

### **Identifying One's Concerns.**

Once the facts of the situation have been detailed, then one should clearly define just what it is that is of concern. What is it that is causing that uneasy state of blended interests, uncertainty, and apprehension? What is it that disturbs or creates angst? Here the trained strategist is disciplined to avoid simply restating the facts, for example, country X has invaded country Y, but rather why should we care? Why should we be concerned? He or she also avoids exaggerating the dangers. Exaggeration of the potential dangers, more often than not, impedes rather than advances the prospects for the emergence of effective strategies, as fear conquers rationality.

Furthermore, the trained strategist will consider not just immediate concerns that emanate directly from the existing problem, but also broader, short-, medium-, and long-term concerns that might be the product of the nonresolution of the current problem. Thus the mind must be trained to wander beyond the confines of the existing issue and the immediate parties to the broader arena of issues among a wider range of parties and interests that might be affected. For example, the

testing by North Korea of missiles capable of putting a satellite in orbit, when coupled with their continued development and acquisition of nuclear weapons, not only raises concerns about stability on the Korean peninsula, but also a wide variety of concerns ranging from the future of stability, arms races, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia to the future dangers such developments might pose for America's security.

Where a developing situation raises multiple concerns, as is most often the case, concerns then must be prioritized. For example, if a country such as Iran is seeking to acquire nuclear technology ostensibly for the production of nuclear energy, the U.S. President may be concerned that those materials might be used in the production of nuclear weapons. He also might be concerned that such weapons, if developed, might upset the balance of power in the region in which the country is located, undermine U.S. interests and those of friends and allies, and result in a further breakdown in efforts to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the spread of such technologies to terrorist groups and others bent on doing harm. Furthermore, the President might well be concerned that such weapons could be used against one or more friendly countries in the region, or might result in a preemptive or preventive attack by one of the threatened countries and subsequent regional conflagration, eventually forcing the United States to take military action with its attendant loss of innocent lives and potential regional and global political and economic implications. Additionally, he might be concerned that any failure to act on his part may be perceived by Iran as well as others, including some in the United States, as weakness. Countries in the region might start paying

deference to Iran, and/or other countries reliant on the security provided by the United States might lose confidence in those guarantees. All of such concerns are not of equal weight. Prioritizing concerns before making recommendations to the President enables the strategist to analyze and evaluate options for dealing with the problem in terms of their ability to address, if not all concerns, the most critical ones.

### **Identifying One's Objectives.**

Once concerns have been identified and prioritized, it is then time to specify one's short-, medium-, and long-term objectives for the country, region, and worldwide objectives. A number of objectives may be long-standing in nature or an outgrowth of current events or both. For example, in the Iranian example noted above, an objective of preserving or improving regional stability not only would be a reflection of long-standing American policy, but also the result of concerns raised by the emerging crisis.

However, objectives should also be viewed in an expansive context. Sound strategic thinking at the national level demands that seemingly unrelated regional and global objectives also be understood and delineated. In today's globalized world, crises and their solutions seldom exist in isolation. Actions in one part of the world often beget actions, even if not equal and opposite, in other parts of the world. Thus, it is imperative that strategists have a well-rounded understanding of the broader policy objectives before undertaking analyses of potential options for dealing with given situations.

Though the contention that the Chinese pictograph for crisis is made up of two characters, one standing

for opportunity, the other for danger, is a matter of dispute, history is replete with examples of opportunities derived from danger. Peoples have been mobilized, decisions made, and energies expended that would not otherwise have occurred in the absence of a crisis and the dangers it entailed. Thus nearly every crisis affords the opportunity to advance or, depending on the policy options chosen, endanger the successful accomplishment of broader objectives. Thus, for example, the United States might have such broader political objectives as improving relations with Russia and China, forging a just peace in the Middle East, and further advancing cooperation with and among our European allies. A clear understanding of such broader objectives would permit strategists seeking solutions, say to the Iranian dilemma noted above, to evaluate policy options in terms of their impact on such broader objectives.

Perhaps more importantly, where policy objectives are unclear, poorly articulated, and/or in conflict with one another, the strategist must be a visionary, identifying the road ahead, clarifying objectives, and engaging in carefully articulated discussions with those responsible for setting the broader national or military objectives. In simple terms, to travel the correct road, you need to know where you are going. For example, at the end of World War II, President Truman ultimately rejected the plan of Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., which, among other things, would have divided Germany, allowed for the annexation of parts of Germany by its neighbors, and reduced Germany to an agrarian state. President Truman opted instead for a united Germany and a policy of economic reconstruction. By 1951 the Truman administration also had spent about \$12.4 billion under the Marshall

Plan to assist Europeans in their economic recovery. Such efforts gave both the Germans and others hope of a brighter future, which has resulted in a historically unprecedented era of peace and cooperation in all of Western Europe.

No such vision accompanied U.S. assistance to Afghanistan following the 1979 Soviet invasion. When the last Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan on February 15, 1989, following nearly a decade of war, the United States abandoned Afghanistan. Thus Afghanistan was left to deal with its own problems of political and economic stability and the explosion of Taliban influence and subsequent human rights violations. Today the United States continues to suffer the consequences of this lack of foresight.

Like concerns, objectives also should be prioritized. Failure to do so may ultimately lead to choosing options for dealing with a situation that, while they successfully resolve the current problem, place in jeopardy higher priority regional and global goals. For example, some have argued that, while it may have been laudable for the United States to remove the brutal dictator Saddam Hussein, the invasion of Iraq became the poster child for recruiting terrorists around the world, thus undermining a major post 9/11 objective of American foreign policy.

### **Identifying the Objectives and Concerns of Others.**

Understanding the objectives and concerns of the principal antagonist(s), as well as other principal players, is of paramount importance in devising any game plan. Here informed speculation can play a significant role. One can seldom know with a high degree of certainty the objectives and concerns of others,

particularly nation-states. Indeed, actions often may reflect bureaucratic, institutional, or political factors that are not easily accounted for in a simple rational actor model of behavior. Thus, in-depth knowledge of such factors as the country's history, culture, past actions, and those bureaucratic, institutional, and political factors that might affect the country's decisionmaking processes is required. Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara correctly identified one of the major reasons for our failed strategy in Vietnam, noting that our judgments of friend and foe, alike, reflected our profound ignorance of the history, culture, and politics of the people in the area, and the personalities and habits of their leaders.<sup>35</sup>

A trained strategist does not necessarily require such knowledge, though it would enhance his ability to undertake informed speculation. However, in the absence of such skills, the strategists must surround themselves with those who do, and be trained to ask the right questions.

The question, of course, that always arises is: What if the adversary behaves irrationally? Without disputing the fact that individuals and groups may act irrationally, their actions, from their point of view, seldom, if ever, are perceived as irrational. Thus, an understanding of what motivates the behavior of leaders, what they seek, what they fear, what may drive them to make decisions that from our perspective may seem irrational, is essential in the formulation of sound political and military strategies.

The absence of an understanding of such factors may have led to a profound strategic failure that culminated in the 2003 Iraq War. The White House continued to believe, despite significant if not overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that Saddam Hussein had

weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In August 1995 General Hussein Kamal, the defecting son-in-law of Saddam Hussein, had reported to senior United Nations (UN) officials: "All weapons—biological, chemical, missile, nuclear were destroyed."<sup>36</sup> UN inspectors, despite having the best available intelligence from the United States and other countries, were unable to discover any WMD. Other evidence suggesting that Saddam Hussein had continued or renewed his efforts to acquire WMD rested on thin reeds.<sup>37</sup> One can imagine that from the White House perspective, given the circumstances of an impending attack by the United States and other allied forces, it simply would have been irrational for Saddam Hussein not to take all steps necessary to assure the United States that Iraq did not possess such weapons. But, according to the post-invasion Duelfer Report which confirmed that no WMD could be found, Saddam, greatly weakened following the war with Iran which ended in 1988 and the Gulf War of 1991 and concerned about his enemies, did not want to appear weak and therefore was deceiving the world about the presence of WMD.<sup>38</sup> The result: a long war that has cost the United States dearly in lives, treasure, and reputation, and more than likely added fuel to the flames of terrorism.

### **Options Identification and Analysis.**

The next step in the process is to identify potential options that might exist that can advance one's objectives, while allaying or limiting one's concerns and to analyze the costs and risks that each option or group of options entails. At the level of grand/national strategy, options usually include one or more instruments of national strategy, which are the

multifaceted means that are to be used to accomplish desired ends. Such instruments usually fall into such categories as political/diplomatic, informational, economic, psychological, and military. Options may include the use of two or more instruments simultaneously or sequentially or both or primary reliance on a single instrument.

For example, during the Gulf crisis and war of 1990-1991, the administration of George H. W. Bush, determined that Saddam Hussein's occupation and annexation of Kuwait should not be allowed to stand, reached into its tool bag of implements, and selected a number of political/diplomatic, economic, and military instruments. Among those instruments used, diplomacy initially was employed primarily to garner support for the removal of Saddam's forces from Kuwait. Economic sanctions, though often imperfect in effect, were employed to demonstrate to Saddam and others the severity of the situation and perhaps as a necessary step in the process of getting later approval for the employment of force. Since publics and nations often expect the use of all means short of war before agreeing to the use of force, the economic instrument may play both an economic and a psychological role. Later the economic instrument, including promises of aid, debt forgiveness, and direct payments, was used in conjunction with the diplomatic instrument to encourage support by other nations for military efforts to expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Additionally, significant numbers of ground, air, and naval forces were deployed to the region to prevent Saddam's ambitions from extending to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to serve as a warning that failure to comply with UN resolutions calling for a withdrawal of forces might result in war, and later to force Iraqi withdrawal.

Shortly following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the psychological instrument also was employed. To those concerned about what kind of order the post-Cold War world would involve, Bush linked the success of a “new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations,”<sup>39</sup> with the international community’s response to the invasion of Kuwait. To those appalled by such overt aggression, the Bush administration raised the specter of another Hitler, this time in the Middle East. To those concerned about the cost of living and future economic progress, the administration linked failure to firmly confront Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait with high oil prices, and declining economies. The psychological instrument proved helpful in securing the support of the American public and a favorable Congressional vote to authorize the use of military forces to end Iraqi occupation of Kuwait.

This was a nonlinear, multidimensional, simultaneous, and sequential use of multiple instruments of national power to achieve national objectives – in short, a well-framed strategy. On August 2, 1990, the very day Iraq invaded Kuwait, all five permanent members and nine of the other 10 members (Yemen did not vote) of the UN Security Council voted in favor of UN Security Council Resolution 660, condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and demanding the withdrawal of Iraqi troops. Four days later, 13 members of the UN Security Council voted in favor of Resolution 661, placing economic sanctions on Iraq (Cuba and Yemen abstained). On November 29, 1990, 12 members of the UN Security Council voted in favor of Resolution 678 (Cuba and Yemen voted against and China abstained), which gave Iraq until January 15, 1991, to withdraw from Kuwait and authorized “all necessary means to

uphold and implement Resolution 660,"<sup>40</sup> a diplomatic formulation authorizing the use of force. On January 12, the U.S. Congress authorized the use of U.S. military forces. On January 17, the air war began. On February 24, allied ground forces began their attack. Thirty-four countries lent their support. Within about 100 hours of the initial ground assault by allied forces, the world's fourth-largest army was defeated.

On the other hand, there are times when a single instrument of power has been the primary tool in attempts to advance American policies. This, for example, has been for the most part the case in U.S. attempts to achieve a just settlement in the Middle East, where it has often relied primarily on diplomacy with an occasional suggestion of the use of the economic instrument in efforts to cajole parties in the Middle East to the American point of view.

Understanding the objectives and concerns of the adversaries or potential adversaries and other principal players—what they seek, what they value, and what they fear—is a major ingredient in identifying how their behavior can be influenced. Thus, the option(s) ultimately selected not only should promise to allay U.S. concerns and advance U.S. objectives within bearable costs and risks, but also should be formulated in such a way that failure on the part of the other actors to adopt behavior in line with U.S. preferences would lead to an increase in their concerns and a reduction in the possibility that they would achieve their objectives. Ideally, adoption of the U.S. preferred option(s) also would allay some, if not all, of their concerns and advance some of their objectives. In other words, at the national level wise policies seek to create the perception, if not the reality, of a win-win scenario. This, of course, was the strategy pursued by the United

States and the Soviet Union as they entered into arms control negotiations begun in Helsinki, Finland, in 1969.

On the battlefield, of course, this non-zero sum, win-win approach often fails the test of reason, since the object of combat is defeat of the enemy. Yet the basic principles remain, where available means are used to alter and direct the behavior of an adversary, perhaps luring him to actions that favor his defeat. The use of deception as a tool to affect the psychology and thus decisionmaking of Hitler prior to the invasion at Normandy is a prime example.

The options development phase of strategy is the phase that demands the greatest degree of creativity. Too often this is the weakest point. Options are frequently too narrowly drawn. Choices are sometimes framed in terms of three options – one at one extreme, the other at the other extreme, and one somewhere between – that all reasonable decisionmakers are expected to elect. Or perhaps choices are framed even more narrowly – concede/surrender or fight. All too often, options are the product of linear thinking. Typical of a linear approach is a formulation and analysis of options that focus solely on solutions to the existing problem. Thus, linear thinking often fails to consider an option's medium- and long-term impact on the objectives and concerns of other players, as well as on the objectives and concerns that seemingly stand quite apart from the contemporary problem, perhaps relating to issues and countries not directly affected or involved in the current situation. In short, the strategist must have an understanding of the entire strategic environment at his or her level of activity if an effective strategy is to be devised.<sup>41</sup>

The well-trained strategist also understands that, “as with other aspects of life, there may be problems

for which there are no immediate solutions. . . . At times, we may have to live with an imperfect, untidy world."<sup>42</sup> On the other hand, good strategy is not risk free. Seeking risk free options is a common prescription for inaction or failure.

### **Options Selection and the Frictions and Fog of Events.**

This is the final stage of the initial process of strategy building. Each multifaceted option, having been rationally examined in terms of its costs and risks, is exposed to the scrutiny of the strategist in terms of its probability of allaying concerns and advancing objectives. It is at this stage that intuition can play a significant role. Intuition is not a guess. It is the "power or faculty of attaining direct knowledge or cognition without evident rational thought and inference."<sup>43</sup> It is a quick and ready insight, that immediate understanding that comes from previous knowledge and experience. Thus a successful strategist is likely to be one who has a sound understanding of the players (at the national level—other nations or nonstate actors; in military situations—of opposing forces and their leadership), a well-rounded knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of the various instruments at his or her disposal, and enough experience to know that seldom if ever do things go according to plan.

Of course this is what Clausewitz labeled "friction." To paraphrase Clausewitz, everything may look simple, the knowledge required may seem to be at hand, and the strategic options may seem obvious. However, once the clash of wills is engaged, stuff happens. Or as Moltke put it: "No plan of operations survives the first collision with the main body of the enemy."<sup>44</sup> However, it would be wrong to conclude as

Moltke that under such circumstances strategy is little more than a “system of expedients.”<sup>45</sup> Rather it is to underscore and broaden the context of a view of war held by Marshall Maurice de Saxe: “. . . it is possible to make war without trusting anything to accident.”<sup>46</sup> Factoring in the potential for frictions to arise and for situational changes that may affect the game plan is a part of thinking strategically. Thus it is at this stage that the strategist must be trained to ask the “What if” question. What if things do not go according to plan? What additional alternatives remain? Again, not unlike sports, all other things being relatively equal, success comes to those who are best able to respond flexibly, to plan for and pursue alternative courses of actions should their preferred approach fail to succeed. Indeed, to paraphrase a cardinal principle of French General Pierre-Joseph de Bourcet, who was infected by thinking similar to that of de Saxe: a game plan should have several branches.

One should study the possible courses of action in the light of the obstacles to be overcome, of the inconveniences or advantages that will result from the success of each branch, and, after taking account of the more likely objections, decide on the part which can lead to the greatest advantages, while employing diversions and all else that one can do to mislead the enemy and make him imagine that the main effort is coming at some other part.<sup>47</sup>

Failure to ask the “What if” question and plan for alternative approaches may well have been the single most significant factor that has resulted in a long-term, costly engagement in Iraq. Though warned beforehand that large numbers of forces would be required to keep the peace in Iraq following any successful invasion, President George W. Bush chose the comfort of rosy

predictions rather than ask such critical questions as: What if chaos ensued and things went south? What might be the resulting implications for the American game plan? What steps should be taken ahead of time to either preclude chaos or bring quick order to Iraq to prevent an ensuing breakdown in the social order that surely would be costly in terms of additional lives lost and might threaten the very success of the objectives sought by the invasion in the first place?

## **FOLLOW-ON ACTIVITIES**

Sound strategies never end with the implementation of the selected option. Constant vigilance is demanded with an eye toward ever evolving situations. Thus any selection of means will require a re-optimization in light of changing events and then evaluation in terms of the success in alleviating concerns and achieving objectives relative to the current situation, as well as other short-, medium-, and long-term concerns and objectives. Modifications will be made, which in turn will require further evaluation, in a continuing process, which may see major alterations to the original plan. In this regard, strategists must retain a flexibility of mind until such time as the designated objectives are achieved.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Strategy can best be understood as the integrated application of available means to achieve desired ends. At the national level such means usually include a combination of political/diplomatic, informational, economic, psychological, and military instruments. However, the need to think strategically permeates

all levels of decisionmaking. False dichotomies, which suggest that strategy is what is undertaken at higher levels of government or the military and tactics is what lower levels undertake, are not only misleading, but also counterproductive. Individuals must be trained to think strategically at all levels. Only then can they employ the means at their disposal in ways that maximize the probability of achieving success.

Also misleading is the artificial separation of policy and strategy. Policies understood as objectives cannot succeed without a corresponding strategy for achievement. Likewise, the aggregation of policies, understood as means when well thought through and well-integrated, constitute a strategy.

The primary task with which we are confronted is to educate and train individuals to think strategically at all levels of endeavor. This chapter has identified those elements that, if practiced iteratively, will help train the mind to think methodically, rationally, and creatively, that is, to think strategically. There are those who come by such methods naturally but, as with good artists and scientists, most are educated to their profession. As we look to the future, the need for strategic thinking and sound strategists will be at a premium. We must therefore develop a solid cohort of those who can do so, whether they are dealing with a crisis, handling an immediate confrontation, or engaged in long-term planning.

## ENDNOTES - CHAPTER 2

1. Harry G. Summers, Jr., *On Strategy: The Vietnam War in Context*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1981, p. 1.

2. "Overview," *The Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 1.

3. Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, Summer 1989, p. 18.

4. Moisei Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, Vol. 2, Frederick Clarke, trans., New York: MacMillan Co., 1902, p. 579.

5. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. 1, The Henry Reeve Text as revised by Francis Bowen and further edited by Phillips Bradley, New York: Random House Vintage Books, 1990, p. 235.

6. Clyde Kluckholm, who died in 1960, had an enduring influence on the anthropological study of culture.

7. Walter W. Skeat, Rev., *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1980, p. 522.

8. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, Michael Howard and Peter Paret, eds. and trans., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976, p. 177.

9. Quoted in B. H. Liddell Hart, *Strategy*, London, United Kingdom: Faber & Faber Ltd, 1967, p. 320.

10. Liddell Hart was well aware of the greater subtleties of Clausewitz's approach to strategy. He noted that Clausewitz admitted that "the object of a combat is not always the destruction of the enemy's forces," and "its object can often be attained as well without the combat taking place at all." His criticism of Clausewitz was that everyone would catch such ringing phrases as "We have only one means in war—the battle," "The combat is the single activity in war," "We may reduce every military activity in the province of strategy to the unit of single combats," and "let us not hear of generals who conquer without bloodshed." See B. H. Liddell Hart, *The Ghost of Napoleon*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1935, pp. 124-126.

11. Liddell Hart, *Strategy*, p. 321.
12. Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 87.
13. Merriam-Webster Online, available from [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strategy](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strategy).
14. *Ibid.*
15. Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 149.
16. Samuel B. Griffith, *Sun Tzu: The Art of War*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 77.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
19. B. H. Liddell Hart, "Thoughts on Philosophy, Politics and Military Matters," June 7, 1932, Liddell Hart Papers II/1932/20, quoted by Christopher Bassford, *Clausewitz in English: The Reception of Clausewitz in Britain and America, 1815-1945*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
20. Griffith, *Sun Tzu: The Art of War*, p. 87.
21. See *Joint Publication (JP) 1-02, Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, April 12, 2001, as amended through October 17, 2008, p. 525.
22. Gabriel Marcella and Stephen O. Fought, "Teaching Strategy in the 21st Century," *Joint Force Quarterly*, Issue 52, 4th Quarter 2009, p. 60, note 2.
23. *JP 1-02*. p. 525.
24. *Ibid.*, available from [www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod\\_dictionary/](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/).
25. *Ibid.*, p. 399.

26. Skeat, *Etymological Dictionary*, p. 539.
27. Merriam-Webster Online, available from [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tactics](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tactics).
28. JP 1-02, available from [www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod\\_dictionary/](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/).
29. B. H. Liddell Hart, *Thoughts on War*, London, UK: Faber and Faber, 1944, p. 48.
30. On the other hand, if one understands policy in terms of one of the definitions provided by Merriam-Webster, as "a high level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures, especially of a government body", then at the national level policy is strategy by another name. Unfortunately, however the term policy seldom seems to reflect the degree of integration of available means to achieve desired ends that is conveyed by the term strategy.
31. Daniel J. Hughes, ed., *Moltke on the Art of War: Selected Writings*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1993, p. 36.
32. Kenichi Ohmae, *The Mind of the Strategist: The Japanese Art of Business*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1982, p. 4.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
35. Robert S. McNamara, *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam*, New York: Times Books. 1995, p. 322.
36. On August 22, 1995, the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission, along with a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and another member of the Special Commission met with General Hussein Kamal in Amman, Jordan. For a transcript of that meeting, see "Note for File," UNSCOM/IAEA Sensitive, available from [www.fair.org/press-releases/kamel.pdf](http://www.fair.org/press-releases/kamel.pdf). For the specific quote, see page 13.

37. For example, see Robert Kennedy, *Of Knowledge and Power: the Complexities of National Intelligence*, Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, 2008, pp. 84-85, 95-100, 149-157.

38. See “Regime Strategic Intent,” *Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the DCI on Iraq’s WMD*, September 30, 2004, available from [https://www.cia.gov/library/reports/general-reports-1/iraq\\_wmd\\_2004/index.html](https://www.cia.gov/library/reports/general-reports-1/iraq_wmd_2004/index.html).

39. George H. W. Bush, *Address to the Nation Announcing Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf*, January 16, 1991, George Bush Presidential Library and Museum, Public Papers 1991, available from [bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public\\_papers.php?id=2625&year=1991&month=01](http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2625&year=1991&month=01).

40. United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, available from [daccess-dds-ny.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/575/28/IMG/NR057528.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds-ny.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/575/28/IMG/NR057528.pdf?OpenElement).

41. See Richard Yarger’s sixth premise. Richard Yarger, *Towards A Theory of Strategy: Art Lykke and the Army War College Strategy Model*, available from [dde.carlisle.army.mil/authors/stratpap.htm](http://dde.carlisle.army.mil/authors/stratpap.htm).

42. McNamara, *In Retrospect*, p. 323.

43. Merriam-Webster Online, available from [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intuition](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intuition).

44. Hughes, *Moltke*, p. viii.

45. Hughes, *Moltke*, pp. ix, 47.

46. Liddell Hart, *Ghost of Napoleon*, p. 30. Marshall de Saxe (1696-1750), considered by some as the greatest European general and military intellectual in the early to mid-1700s, was a French military commander whose *Mes reveries* (My Reflections), later published in English as *Reveries upon the Art of War*, framed the efforts of many military officers who followed. See *Ibid.*, pp. 30-50.

47. Liddell Hart quoting Bourcet. See Liddell Hart, *Ghost of Napoleon*, p. 56.