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CHAPTER 8

THINKING GLOBALLY, ACTING LOCALLY: A GRAND STRATEGIC APPROACH TO CIVIL-MILITARY COORDINATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Christopher Holshek

Thank God we’re a great country. We can stand a lot of this nonsense. But let’s not test it too closely.

General Andrew Goodpaster

Given the grand strategic imperatives of the 21st century, the civil-military nexus of conflict management and peacebuilding is more relevant to international engagements and American grand strategy than ever. However, the U.S. civil-military approach to foreign policy and national security needs overhauling because it remains largely based on an outdated national security paradigm, itself predicated on an imbalanced interpretation of the fundamental civil-military relationship in American society that was forged under the exigencies of the Cold War era and revitalized since September 11, 2001 (9/11). There is plenty of evidence for this growing incongruity as of late, given the tremendous difficulties, for example, in post-conflict Iraq, in stabilizing Afghanistan, in counterterrorism operations in Africa, and in the military’s strained relations with many nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).1 Given the constraints and restraints of the emerging strategic and operational environments, however, the full potential of the civil-military nexus in international engagements cannot
come to bear unless: first, civil-military coordination is seen as strategic rather than merely operational or tactical; and second, that civil-military coordination must essentially be the application of the democratic civil-military relationship—and thus military action is through, and in support of, civilian organizations and local government entities. This is in the best interest of all stakeholders, especially the military. To attain such economies of effort, cost, and risk at all levels, the actions of uniformed state instrumentalities must be consonant with their own societal values. In policy and practice, civil-military coordination has to walk the talk.

This is actually good news for the United States, for no other nation is better suited to lead this transformation, given its dynamic, multicultural civil society and its democratic national values and tremendous social capital, as well as the U.S. military’s extensive institutional experience in civil-military coordination—if, of course, the United States makes the necessary adjustments.

This strategic opportunity requires exploring: first, how the grand strategic context for civil-military coordination has changed between the 20th and 21st centuries; second, the U.S. civil-military relationship over this time; third, understanding civil-military coordination strategically—i.e., “thinking globally”; and fourth, understanding civil-military coordination in application—i.e., “acting locally.”

A TALE OF TWO CENTURIES

The global context for civil-military coordination has changed. Top-down, power-driven Western notions of national sovereignty and security of the 20th
century are less relevant than the emerging, values-based, bottom-up human security actualities gaining ascendency in a now hyper-connected, globalized world—in other words, the referent for security is increasingly the individual or community rather than the state. The constraints of this transformed international environment, along with the restraints of growing resource scarcity and capital shortages for the United States, other Western countries, the United Nations (UN), and the wider donor community form the two grand strategic imperatives of our times. These have correspondingly transformed the functioning paradigm for security, humanitarian relief, and development across the full range of conflict prevention and management as well as for peace operations, with associated changes in the approach to the civil-military nexus as a whole.

From a broader perspective, the fundamental shift in the international order between the 20th and 21st centuries has been more inflective than intrinsic, particularly in the balance and interplay between what has been called “soft” (coercive) and “hard” (persuasive) power. National power in both its source and application is characterized by an industrial-era, state-centric, top-down, zero-sum, empirical, and calculable game of war and peace played largely by diplomats and soldiers, interest-driven, and manifested mostly in hard currency and armies. It reached its zenith in the 20th century. What is now beginning to hold greater sway is influence, derived from national, societal, and organizational strengths, rather than state-centric power—post-industrial, bottom-up, and values-based involving myriad nonstate and intrastate actors across an ambiguous spectrum (or cycle) of conflict and peace and associated complexities. In this new “ecosystem,”
Napoleon’s observation that “in war, the moral is to the physical as three is to one” takes on an even more appropriate meaning.

Concentrated military, financial, and other forms of coercive power are the ultimate expression of a state-centric international order. But what now increasingly characterizes that order is the warp and woof of a struggle for sociopolitical and economic organization in the spaces beyond and between states, amplified and accelerated by the 24/7 media and social networks that make “the narrative” predominant. In the 21st century, coercive power is losing both its dominance and appropriateness. Hard power is more threats-based, resource-intensive, zero-sum, reactive, and short-term (i.e., tactical). It is, however, faster-acting, more controllable, and more measurable. Soft power, in turn, is more suitable to collaborative, human security settings. It is community-based, largely resident in civil society and the private sector, and is more adaptable, economical, renewable, engaging, synergistic, and durable (i.e., strategic). It is normally slower to take effect across a broad, unpredictable front, although social networking technologies as of late have had accelerating and amplifying effects.

This is not to say that hard power is obsolete—just no longer as overriding. In truth, this rebalancing is a return to a historical American grand strategic equilibrium predating the Cold War. Despite National Security Council (NSC)-68’s emphasis on diplomacy’s continued lead in American grand strategy and George F. Kennan’s refrain to “first use moral authority,” the “militarization” of applied American power in the latter half of the 20th century had soft power (in policies, programs, and budgets) functioning more as a “combat multiplier.” In form as well as function, the face of
U.S. foreign policy has been a military one. In truth, what brought down the Berlin Wall was the tipping point of rising expectations of Eastern Europeans (not unlike the social unrest seen in many places today), while allied military power contained the Soviets. In other words, hard power was the holding—or containing—action, while soft power was the offensive dynamic. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) vast arsenals enabled what NSC-68 called the “corrosive power of freedom” to go to work on the self-contradictions of the Soviet state over time. Self-determination, an ideal first socialized on an international scale by President Woodrow Wilson in the wake of World War I, became a prime security mover. With the collapse of that order, the recontextualization and rebalancing that should have taken place as far back as 1989 is now more obvious a quarter-century later.

This epochal reality is truer for the United States than any other country, as the world’s only global power for the last generation. But its national strategic style goes much further back in history. Since the Civil War, the United States has looked to win its wars, deter its adversaries, and assure its allies through overwhelming industrial and technological superiority predicated on an abundance of cheap resources, cheap labor, cheap energy, and cheap capital—it could afford a wasteful, surplus mentality. Since 1945, it had been the dominant power in the world—it could afford its own interpretation of “exceptionalism,” while everyone else was internationalizing.

Of equal importance to the grand strategic imperative of environment constraints are resource restraints. For the first time in centuries, the United States is entering a newfound era of relative strategic scarcity. It can no longer take an abundance of resources for granted. The economic and financial basis of traditional state-
centric power is diminishing through a globalization process that the United States itself has largely set in motion. Beyond reducing America’s throw-weight in general, it is translating into an end of unilateral freedom of action. “Asymmetric” threats and the rise of regional powers have already been mitigating long-standing U.S. advantages, while global competitors can now better bankroll their own agendas. Perhaps most importantly, information and social networking technologies and low-cost socio-cultural enterprises now present inexpensive equalizers to older, more costly, and more centralized industrial-era forms of power. The moral, or psychological, is now plainly overtaking the physical.

In the 21st century, there is no dominant power as seen in the prior century. Although the United States will remain the premier world power for decades to come, its ability to wield especially more traditional forms of power will be much more constrained and restrained by factors less and less within its span of control. Indeed, the heyday of state-centric power per se in the new international arena is diminishing. Power is dissipating into more distributed forms. As the upheavals in the Middle East and North Africa are demonstrating, the dynamic is now more about the strength, influence, and reach of ideas, globally archeotypical but community-based. More importantly, it is about how these ideas communicate and work in people’s lives—in a word: innovation. In fact, the power of nation-states alone is becoming less relevant than the influence of people and organizations networked outside of and within governments. These are almost entirely civilian.

In the much more chaotic, unpredictable, and uncontrollable international order of the 21st century,
the United States no longer dominates. It can still lead, albeit with a more strategic, rather than tactical, leadership style. You can use a more coercive and directive style when you dominate; but when you do not, you have to lead more persuasively—from behind as well as the front—as will be explained later.

Along with the changed context for national and international power is the changed nature of security. Security has become more than globalized; it has also become more humanized, civilianized, and democratized. Waves of popular unrest in response to everything from jobs, food prices, public pensions, poor educational and job opportunities, wealth disparities, and energy and the environment evince a groundswell of discontent with the inability of elites to deliver on socioeconomic fundamentals and essential public services. Security, prosperity, and social welfare are increasingly intertwined, making it everybody’s business. In the American psyche, security was something someone else in a uniform did somewhere “over there.” But in an intricate, hyper-connected global ecosystem where minor disturbances can have worldwide ripple effects in a matter of hours, this is all changing.

In Africa, for example, home to the bulk of security, development, and civil-military challenges for decades, “human security”—termed “civilian security” by the U.S. State Department in predictably exceptionalist fashion—and civil society problems such as poverty and food security, rule of law and justice, governance, economic development and job creation, and public health have long defined the security problem, calling for approaches going well beyond “whole of government” to “whole of society.” Comprehensive and collaborative approaches to conflict prevention
and post-conflict operations in multilateral, human security settings are everyday for civil society organizations working there and elsewhere. They stress the long-term, legitimacy, and relationship-building characteristics of development. In this more normative paradigm, development, appropriately done, is therefore not a component of security, it is security. This is vital to understanding the difference from security in the 21st century not as simply an expansion of the state-centric national security paradigm into social disciplines—which seems to be the current interpretation in the United States government. Rather, U.S. development policy is seen more as an instrument of foreign policy, serving national (security) interests and aimed at the proliferation of the American model of political order.

Given the growing limitations of hard power commensurate with the rise of soft power, increasing interconnectivity of global communities, the integration of security and development, and burgeoning resource restraints—all driving more comprehensive, collaborative, and coordinated approaches, the recontextualization, rebalancing, and proper alignment of the civil-military nexus remains at the locus of international intervention, whether for humanitarian, development, or reasons of state interest.

Yet, the instrumentalities featured in the American approach to the world—indeed, the entire foreign policy and national security apparatus of the United States—remain predicated on a 20th century paradigm for which “national security” concerns have trumped all other prerequisites. This national security paradigm, which has pervaded practically all aspects of applied U.S. foreign and national security policy, is itself predicated on an interpretation of the funda-
mental civil-military relationship in American society that was forged under the exigencies of the Cold War era and revitalized since 9/11. (The last major overhaul of the organization of U.S. national security was the National Security Act of 1947.) It should therefore be no wonder that most U.S. civil-military approaches to applied foreign and national security policy are correspondingly out of synch.

Beyond Eisenhower’s prescient warning about the “military-industrial complex,” Americans are now accustomed to a vast national security state that, with the war on terrorism, permeates life at home and not just in policies abroad:

Since September 11, 2001, the U.S. government has created or reconfigured at least 263 organizations to tackle some aspect of the war on terror. Thirty-three new building complexes have been built for the intelligence bureaucracies alone, occupying 17 million square feet—the equivalent of 22 U.S. Capitols or three Penthagons. The largest bureaucracy after the Pentagon and the Department of Veterans Affairs is now the Department of Homeland Security, which has a workforce of 230,000 people. The rise of this national security state has entailed a vast expansion in the government’s powers that now touch every aspect of American life, even when seemingly unrelated to terrorism. Some 30,000 people, for example, are now employed exclusively to listen in on phone conversations and other communications within the United States. In the past, the U.S. government has built up for wars, assumed emergency authority and sometimes abused that power, yet always demobilized after the war. But this is, of course, a war without end.⁶

The biggest reason for this has been in how U.S. grand strategy since World War II has been threat-
based, fear-driven, and enemy-centric, embedded in American culture:

Since the end of the Cold War, America has been on a relentless search for enemies. I don’t mean a search in the sense of ferreting them out and defeating them. I mean that America seems to have a visceral need for them. Many in the United States have a rampant, untreated case of enemy dependency. Politicians love enemies because bashing them helps stir up public sentiment and distract attention from problems at home. The defense industry loves enemies because enemies help them make money. Pundits and their publications love enemies because enemies sell papers and lead eyeballs to cable-news food fights.7

THE FAULT LIES NOT IN OUR STARS . . .

Most scholars and commentators on the subject of the civil-military relationship in the United States turn first to Samuel Huntington’s seminal work, The Soldier and the State, to begin discussion. It is more fitting, however, to go back nearly two more centuries to the Constitution of the United States, whose division of powers and authority, along with its system of checks and balances, “has succeeded not only in defending the nation against all enemies foreign and domestic, but in upholding the liberty it was meant to preserve.”8 The American way of the civil-military relationship is thus fundamental not only to the profession of arms; rather, it is fundamental to American civil society:

Civil-military relations in a democracy are a special application of representative democracy with the unique concern that designated political agents control designated military agents. Acceptance of civilian supremacy and control by an obedient military has been the core
principle of the American tradition of civil-military relations. U.S. military officers take an oath to uphold the democratic institutions that form the very fabric of the American way of life. Their client is American [civil] society, which has entrusted the officer corps with the mission of preserving the nation’s values and national purpose. Ultimately, every act of the American military professional is connected to these realities [that] he or she is in service to the citizens of a democratic state who bestow their trust and treasure with the primary expectation that their state and its democratic nature will be preserved.9

This was, by and large, the civil-military consensus in the United States until after World War II. Until then, the typical pattern was to maintain a small, professional force, which could be augmented in the event of national emergency through the militia (today’s Reserves), thus placating the general distrust of the military among the American public (reflected, arguably, in the Second Amendment). In the wake of World War II—for the first time in U.S. history—a large, standing (and eventually professional) peacetime military force has persisted. Huntington’s book appeared in 1957, the same year as Sputnik, when, also for the first time in its history, the United States was faced with the clear and present danger of nuclear Armageddon.

Given this historic departure and the existential exigencies of the Cold War, Huntington’s interpretation of the civil-military relationship is understandable. Paradoxically, Huntington concluded that to preserve democracy, society should grant the military substantial autonomy in managing international violence, in exchange for submission to civilian direction. For his theories, critics excoriated Huntington as overly militant, students staged protests during lectures, and Harvard fired him.10 Huntington’s model,
which suspended the traditional consensus and balance of the American civil-military relationship, made more sense under the conditions of the Cold War and the international order it maintained. Once those conditions changed and that order began to break down, however, first with the fall of the Berlin Wall and then resuming with the difficulties of applied American power in the post-9/11 years (as explained above), the inherent flaws of Huntington’s model became increasingly obvious: “the most significant shortcoming of Huntington’s construct was its failure to recognize that a separation between political and military affairs is not possible—particularly at the highest levels of policymaking.”11 In other words:

Huntington’s claim that an autonomous military profession should . . . develop its expertise free from outside involvement is also problematic. For one thing, it underestimates the impact of service culture and service parochialism. Left to their own devices, the services may focus on the capabilities they would like to have rather than the capabilities the country needs. Even beyond this concern, an emphasis on autonomy heightens the risk of creating a military unable to meet the requirements set out in the U.S. military’s own doctrine, which talks of the need to integrate all instruments of national power (diplomatic, informational, military and economic) to further U.S. national interests. . . . Effective partnerships in war are likely to require collaborative education, training, planning and capabilities. . . . This applies to foreign partners—military and civilian—as well as American. . . . This logic led Huntington to the extraordinary argument in his concluding chapter that the solution was for American society to become less liberal and more like the military in its culture and values. This proposed solution is extraordinary because it is a clear reversal of ends–means logic: instead of the military serving to protect Ameri-
can values, American society should change its values to serve the interest of military effectiveness. Only the existence of an existential threat would seem to justify such a proposition.\textsuperscript{12}

This idea of the military as social role model is not as arcane as one might think. President Barack Obama expressed similar ideas in his 2012 State of the Union address. After beginning his speech by lauding the achievements of the U.S. Armed Forces, he said:

At a time when too many of our institutions have let us down, they exceed all expectations. They’re not consumed with personal ambition. They don’t obsess over their differences. They focus on the mission at hand. They work together. Imagine what we could accomplish if we followed their example.\textsuperscript{13}

With the popularity of the military in American society at an all-time high and that of politicians at an all-time low, the civil-military societal imbalance that began with World War II is now over 70 years old:

The veneration and outright hero-worship, now at a crescendo, is an unhealthy distortion of our time-honored yet taken-for-granted civil-military relationship, for a number of reasons . . . over time, it has also lent to a psychology of greater readiness to call upon the military in the pursuit of our national interests abroad, or to perform tasks, such as humanitarian or disaster relief or nation-building—contributing to the ‘militarization’ of our foreign policy and the ‘securitization’ of foreign assistance. We have even seen a greater presence of the National Guard in our relief responses at home, despite the intent of the \textit{Posse Comitatus} Act of 1878. Another is the perpetuation of a military industrial complex that is now a detriment to our prosperity and which we can less afford.\textsuperscript{14}
This decoupling and distortion of the traditional American democratic civil-military relationship is not only manifest in the horizontal dysfunctions of interagency and civil-military coordination, it has also contributed to a vertical imbalance with an overemphasis on operations and tactics, leading to what strategist Colin S. Gray has called “a persistent strategy deficit” in the United States, pointing out that:

If you do not really function strategically, it does not much matter how competent you are at regular, or irregular, warfare—you are not going to collect the political rewards that American blood and money have paid for.\(^{15}\)

Interestingly, Gray points out that the “awesome” tactical power and performance of the U.S. military, in contrast to its strategic retardation, is similar to that seen by Germany during World War II—of course, a nightmarish case of civil-military “co-ordination” (Gleichschaltung)\(^{16}\) that proved catastrophic. James R. Locher III, principal architect of the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 and President of the now-defunct Project on National Security Reform, further notes that, in addition to having no grand strategy since the Cold War, the United States has had no national security strategy, either:

Yes, we have had a document that we call the ‘National Security Strategy.’ But it is a collection of goals and objectives without any actual plans for achieving them. The 2010 National Security Strategy is more of the same. It is a strategic-communications document—not a strategy. It was even written by the Strategic Communications Directorate of the National Security Staff, not the Strategy Directorate.\(^{17}\)
The vertical disparity between policy and operations is thus very real, underscoring the connection between the global and the local, between the strategic and the tactical:

As military organizations expand their work into civil governance areas, it is not only the distinction between soldiers and civilians that blurs. It is also the social coding that military and nonmilitary agents use to describe the military organization and its particular ethos and rationality. As a result, it becomes unclear what kind of organization the military is and what it could and should be used for. It becomes difficult to communicate in an exact manner about military affairs.\(^\text{18}\)

**THINKING GLOBALLY: UNDERSTANDING THE CIVIL-MILITARY NEXUS AS FUNDAMENTALLY STRATEGIC**

In truth, the alignment of civil and military inflections of power and influence has always been the central challenge to anyone and everyone involved in trying to prevent, mitigate, or manage conflict and enforce, keep, or build peace. Given the grand strategic imperatives of the 21st century, however, this locus has only grown in significance. Context being what it is, if there is to be a paradigm shift in civil-military approaches—viewed from both sides—more in line with the emerging *Zeitgeist*, then two fundamental realities must be appreciated. First, civil-military coordination (cooperation and operations) is inherently thinking globally (or strategically). Second, to be both effective and credible, civil-military coordination must be an application of the democratic civil-military relationship that is morally consistent and symmetric—as above, so below.
With respect to the first insight, when looking from the more global, human security vantage point of the 21st century, a more comprehensive and collaborative understanding of civil-military engagement becomes possible. As such, context takes precedence over content, partnership more than predominance, strategy more than operations and tactics, and human more than organizational enterprises. In the information age, legitimacy and credibility—expressed through and conveyed in “the narrative”—preponderates.

This is no doubt especially true in the culturally charged Muslim world, where the United States, having broken the eggs of autocracy in Iraq, can perhaps help Arab civil society make the omelet of self-governance, albeit in a more indirect and limited way. Ironically, a good example of the moral over the physical is how the United States is currently paying for its less than credible image on the Arab Street earned over the years, especially in its inability to be an agent of change in Egypt. In this sense, therefore, the most important lesson of the war in Iraq is not that better planning, operational approaches, and tactics may have changed its outcome. “Instead, the real solution is re-thinking American grand strategy.” This insight may be leading the Obama administration, for example, to shift delivery of aid and technical assistance through international civil society organizations, the UN, and other partners rather than directly from U.S. Government run programs—in a sense, “leading from behind” in fostering peace as it did in supporting the war in Libya. The Middle East and North Africa Incentive Fund proposed for Fiscal Year 2013 will also work much this way.

It is also true, as the United States shifts its global geopolitical priorities away from its near-obsession
with the Middle East and Central Asia to East Asia and the Pacific: “When the only global power becomes obsessed with a single region, the entire world is unbalanced. Imbalance remains the defining characteristic of the global system today.” The growing competition between American and Chinese models in Asia-Pacific societies and bodies politic will define the real, ongoing challenge there, as opposed to the latent contingency of some kind of great showdown between U.S. and Chinese forces. In fact, civil-military coordination as a “strategic enabler” for the U.S. Pacific Command took place more than a half-dozen years before the Obama administration. Within the context of its theater engagement strategy, the Pacific Command has long been conducting “civil affairs projects” to help secure basing rights and, conversely, deny them to potential adversaries such as China.

The relevance of human security is most apparent in the weak and fragile states of Africa—more important than a lower-level U.S.-Chinese competition than in the Asia-Pacific region. Africa, where the nation-state is hardly the established operating organizing principle of governance (and in some places may never be), is where the majority of conflicts, fragile and failing states are concentrated globally. Particularly in Africa, security is as much a socio-psychological issue as it is a power political issue:

Most of today’s African fighters are not rebels with a cause; they’re predators. That’s why we see stunning atrocities like eastern Congo’s rape epidemic, where armed groups in recent years have sexually assaulted hundreds of thousands of women, often so sadistically that the victims are left incontinent for life. . . . Child soldiers are an inextricable part of these movements. The LRA, for example, never seized territory; it seized
children. Its ranks are filled with brainwashed boys and girls who ransack villages and pound newborn babies to death in wooden mortars. In Congo, as many as one-third of all combatants are under 18. Since the new predatory style of African warfare is motivated and financed by crime, popular support is irrelevant to these rebels. The downside to not caring about winning hearts and minds, though, is that you don’t win many recruits. So abducting and manipulating children becomes the only way to sustain the organized banditry. And children have turned out to be ideal weapons: easily brainwashed, intensely loyal, fearless, and, most importantly, in endless supply.  

While the kind of human security challenges such as youth and gender-based violence in Africa may characterize the greatest threats to international security, they simultaneously present the greatest opportunities for influence and partnering on many levels and in many ways. The development community’s greater attention to and collaboration on these two issues is one evidence of this.  

Despite numerous advances in policy and doctrine, the “paradigm shift” in U.S. international security approaches has yet to occur. Not until changes in policy and doctrine are reflected in programs and budgets: Dollars continue to flow overwhelmingly to defense over diplomacy and development—throughout American involvement in Afghanistan, “the vast majority of aid went to the Afghan security forces and not development.” The military, for quite understandable reasons, has espoused many tasks civilian agencies have been either slow or incapable of taking up. The truth of the matter is that, while commentators argue that a deeper merging of civil and military objectives and capabilities has taken place, evidence from the ground informs us that the sophisticated
wording of academics and policymakers (such as concerted action, integrated approach, ‘3D’, holistic approach, security-development nexus) seldom find their way into the concrete conduct of applied civil-military relations—or civil-military coordination.25

The problem with the “militarization of foreign policy” and the “securitization of aid,” of course, is that the U.S. military’s chief focus is security, so its relief and development activities emphasize winning the ‘hearts and minds’ of a population, not the humanitarian imperative of saving lives, doing no harm, and ensuring local ownership of reconstruction efforts.26

This largely explains the rub with humanitarian organizations. Yet, size or assignment should not matter—with the possible exception of major combat operations, the Department of Defense (DoD) is not (nor should ever be) the lead agency. Even then, beyond Carl von Clausewitz’s famous dictum that “war is merely an extension of policy by other means,” strategist B. H. Liddell Hart reminds us that “the aim in war is to achieve a better peace.”

Yet, “bad-guy baiting” has long been the way for congressional appropriation of national security driven security assistance or foreign aid funding. U.S. operations abroad thus remain threats-based and command-and-control managed. They are primarily operational and tactical in their focus, and rarely representative of regional let alone grand strategy. It is not only that such “legacy” approaches to security and civil-military coordination are less and less effective—witness the growing realization of the inefficacy and ephemeral effects of “winning hearts and minds”—they are no longer affordable.27 Civil-military coordination and other engines of 21st century collaboration must be more strategic from the outset. In fact, Soldiers themselves must become “post-modern.”28
The potentialities and economies of effort, cost, and risk at all levels of the central civil-military nexus of international engagements cannot, therefore, reach fulfillment unless this nexus is understood from a fundamentally strategic perspective:

• Civil-military coordination is inherently comprehensive and collaborative. Like strategy itself, it is holistic, cumulative, and convergent in ends, ways, and means. It is best suited to manage the seams of power and the gaps between organizations and processes.

• Civil-military coordination inherently bridges (state centric) whole of government with the whole-of-society/community. It leverages all forms of power and inflections of influence at all levels in order to create conditions for a transition to greater civilian lead and control and promote self-sustained civil society. In doing so, it keeps hard power more implied than applied at best; or at worst, minimizes or mitigates its costs and risks when it must be applied.

• Civil-military coordination is inherently informational—a human search engine that evaluates and offers a coping mechanism for uncertainty and complexity. As such, it helps minimize fog and frictions existing in seams, gaps, and transitions, as well as facilitates collaborative decision cycles—a key strategic and operational advantage over competing entities.

• It is synergistic, innovative, and persuasive—enabling, moderating, and balancing. It promotes unity of purpose and economy of effort while managing change, risk, and expectations. Like “Generation Flux,” it draws together dis-
parate players across “stovepipes” toward a medium of cooperation and crowd wisdom largely through brainstorming and co-creation—but for which information transparency and sharing is absolutely vital.

- Civil-military coordination is inherently socio-cultural. Because it is a human enterprise, it is in essence about relationship-building, which is how things get done in human security environments. Because it involves engagement of the local populace, it demands cultural awareness, helping the credibility and legitimacy of the whole effort.

- By enabling a more proactive use of civilian and soft power, it elicits the military principle of offense. By enabling more effective leveraging of less costly and more sustainable civilian power over more costly and risk-laden hard power, it evokes the military principle of economy-of-force (or economy of effort, cost, and risk).

- Civil-military coordination is inherently anticipatory (and less reactive) due to the need to collaborate in advance in order to reach desired common objectives or manage disparate interests. It calls for an approach more like Hall of Famer Wayne Gretzky, who observed: “A good hockey player plays where the puck is. A great hockey player plays where the puck is going to be.” In other words, it induces its practitioners to think and act with greater foresight.

- Applied civil-military coordination involves a strategic, enabling style of leadership, invoking persuasion, political bargaining, collaboration, consensus and relationship-building. Another way to describe the strategic leadership style
is “leading from behind”—creating conditions for the success of others so the full menu of options may be brought to bear (and blood and money spared). Moreover, it should emphasize managing expectations all-around.

• Finally, it is adaptive and co-creative, more characteristic of learning organizations, as it is inherently a learning activity, constantly conscious of situation and environment.

In essence, civil-military coordination at its best is a form of applied grand strategy. In other words, it is thinking globally and acting locally—or, in military terms, thinking strategically at the operational and tactical levels. It is a compass, not a cookbook; a mindset, rather than a skill set.

The paradox of strategically applied civil-military coordination is that, while it can generate transformative outcomes, the operational purpose of civil-military coordination is not to transform the host country—only the host country can do that, with the assistance of external actors, among them a foreign military. The purpose of civil-military coordination is more pragmatic—to channel the military’s engagement efforts in such a way as to maximize their impacts while minimizing the commitment of military resources, preserving them for core security tasks.

**ACTING LOCALLY: THE APPLIED CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONSHIP AND DEMOCRATIC VALUES**

In order to realize the above potentialities of civil-military coordination, policymakers and practitioners need to do more than think globally (or strategically).
Civil-military coordination in local action must, in turn, be reflective of and conducive to this strategic conscientiousness. The focus here is thus on the nature of the relationship between civil and military elements and players.

This is where one aspect of Huntington’s analysis of the civil-military relationship is constructive:

The military institutions of any society are shaped by two forces: a functional imperative stemming from the threats to society’s security and a societal imperative rising from the social forces, ideologies, and institutions dominant within the society. Military institutions which reflect only social values may be incapable of performing effectively their military functions. On the other hand, it may be impossible to contain within the society military institutions shaped purely by functional imperatives. The interaction of these two forces is the nub of the problem of civil-military relations.\textsuperscript{31}

What we could say about the current imbalance in terms of civil-military coordination is that there has been too much emphasis on the functional imperative in an era when the societal imperative is more appropriate. What we could also say is that, as in civil-military relations, strategically driven civil-military coordination is managing the tensions between those two imperatives. Thus, civil-military coordination in practice (in whatever form or institutional point of reference) is mainly about two things:

- First, managing the relationship and interaction between civilian and military actors that maximizes the comparative advantages of these actors as they apply to the situation; and,
- Second, enabling, shaping, and supporting the process of transition to peace, stability, and
self-sustained development along civil-military lines, with the aims of “civilianizing” external assistance and “localizing” essential internal public services and governance functions.

Civil-military coordination is thus first and foremost a management function—specifically, the risk-reward structure. As the private sector is teaching us:

What accounted for fundamental shifts in longer term advantage was not operational-level innovation. It wasn’t technology or product innovation, or new business models, or a new way of thinking about the whole industry. Again and again, it was management innovation—breakthroughs in how to organize and mobilize human capabilities.32

Given an understanding of the “nub” of civil-military relations, the basic management functions of civil-military coordination, and a more global and strategic understanding of civil-military coordination in an environment mostly in human security terms, it becomes clear that civil-military coordination is not just a matter of linking strategy and tactics, security with development, and hard and soft power. It is a matter of “how to organize and mobilize human capabilities.”

Thus, the replication of the civil-military relationship in democratic societies in operational approaches in human security settings becomes all-important. It demands unprecedented moral and ethical commitments, in which the military is subservient to and supportive of “civilian power” (to use the term in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review) and that the military’s role—as the major (but not leading) civil-military actor—is that of an enabler, especially
with respect to the security sector. More appropriate civil-military approaches are thus an application of Liddell Hart’s strategy of the indirect approach, demonstrably placing the military in a supporting and not supported role. They are less concerned with “winning hearts and minds,” which is a tactic and not a strategy:

The goal is not simply to be liked. It is to be more influential and therefore more effective at lower cost. In a world where foreign public opinion has ever greater impact on the success or failure of vital American national interests, it should be weighed in making policy decisions and should shape how the United States pursues its policies and how U.S. leaders talk about American policies. Listening, understanding and engaging makes for better policy, helps to avoid unnecessary conflicts, and should ideally allow policymakers to foresee and pre-empt objections to policies that sound worse in the field than they do in Washington.33

More democratic civil-military approaches have currency and effect on the narrative not because of their direct appeal to democracy per se, but because they resonate with more universal values, such as those encoded in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that lead to democracy. Even in hard power terms, it appears to be no coincidence that democracies are unusually successful in war. The reasons for this seem to be superior human capital, more harmonious civil-military relations, and Western cultural values and norms—once again, invoking Napoleon’s dictum.34

Civilian control of the military is inclusive within and not exclusive from civil society—something very much taken for granted in the United States but yet
far from a given in most developing countries. Yet, “civilian control means more than the absence of a military coup. As long as the military possesses autonomous decisionmaking power, the democratically elected authorities’ power to govern and the quality of democracy remain limited.” $^{35}$ Harmonized with the democratic civil-military relationship, civil-military coordination as explained in this chapter is an application of democratic values, a way to an end and not an end in itself. More importantly, it helps to close the “say-do” gap that has bedeviled especially American applied foreign and national security policy for decades. It also reduces the image of U.S. domination and strong-arming and facilitates internationalizing the overall effort, thus giving it greater cumulative power, persuasiveness, and influence and making it much more difficult to counter. Moreover, it helps promote a democratic culture in general in which the military itself becomes a civil society organization:

Democratic military professionals do not pursue their responsibilities to the state in isolation. They are part of a broader national security community comprised of national security professionals from both the civilian and military spheres, other actors such as journalists and academics who contribute intellectual capital and foster debate, legislative bodies with constitutional responsibilities to oversee and provide resources for national security policy, and, finally, the public at large to whom all of the above are ultimately responsible. $^{36}$

Whether for us or them, the full integration of the military in civil society, and reflexively its integration into the engagement of that society, including its government institutions and the private sector—with the all-important caveat of the primacy of civilian
authority—will ensure that the civilianization of security occurs more than the militarization of aid and development. The idea of “third-generation” civil-military coordination is intriguing, and deserves further examination. The Focused District Development (FDD) program in Afghanistan, as an example of this approach, is certainly more collaborative, partnering, and “broadens the civil-military relationship contact face to local governance and political authorities.” However, “the FDD is a military-driven mentoring program.” Thus, precisely because the distinction between military and civilian work practically vanishes under this concept, the supreme qualifier of civil authority becomes even more vital:

If militaries are to be mobilized to assist in addressing the challenges facing much of Africa, the clear expectations need to be established and safeguards need to be put in place. . . . Trust can only be built if the military communicates effectively and regularly with the population. . . . In pursuing this mobilization goal, the essential element that helps ensure success is maintaining civilian oversight of the military and its projects. Doing so begins with clearly defining the military’s new role as temporary and supplemental to the public and private sectors. Projects should be designed in such a way that it is always clear that the military is not taking over or dominating but rather is assisting the other sectors and alleviating the pressure being placed upon them. . . . The circumstances in which the military can be mobilized to deal with nontraditional security concerns need to be clearly outlined in the state’s national security policies and in law.

Although a more democratic approach to civil-military coordination has yet to be socialized across the board, there are numerous examples of exceptional
best practices, including the author’s own experience as Chief of Civil-Military Coordination for the UN Mission in Liberia:

... the CIMIC [civil-military coordination] intent in Liberia has been to use the capabilities of the Force to ‘... enable and multiply civilian initiatives, and conducted in coordination with the UNMIL [United Nations Mission in Liberia] civil component (jointly) and UN agencies as well as NGOs and the GoL (collaboratively).’ This entails a more indirect role for military assets—more clearly in support of civilian agencies and leading less from the front and more from behind the UNMIL civil component, UN agencies, and the GoL, aligned with them and their frameworks and benchmarks, in order to promote local ownership of civil administration and essential public services responsibilities, and to help build civil authority and public confidence. To de-emphasize ‘winning hearts and minds,’ the moniker for UNMIL CIMIC became: ‘it’s not about us; it’s about them.’

Like good aid workers, good practitioners of civil-military coordination engage in an enabling process of helping their civilian partners build local capacity as well as confidence—teaching locals how to fish rather than simply giving them a fish. As a former Commander of the NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan stated: “At the end of the day, it’s not about their embrace of us, it’s not about us winning hearts and minds; it’s about the Afghan government winning hearts and minds.” Put another way:

Military involvement in aid is driven in part by the ‘winning hearts and minds’ (WHAM) theory. This operates on the basis of a charity paradigm, which sees beneficiaries as the deserving poor, and provides
handouts and services while ignoring the complexity of the local context, and the unintended consequences of injecting resources into conflict-affected communities. NGOs have been working for many years to erase the handout mentality, emphasizing the importance of ‘ownership,’ involvement and empowerment of beneficiaries.41

The visualization of this more strategic, indirect, and democratic approach to civil-military coordination, as applied in Liberia, is depicted in Figure 8-1. The idea is to work the military out of a job by providing its stabilization efforts increasingly through civilian and local entities in an enabling process.

Figure 8-1. Civil-Military Echelons of Assistance.

Another important aspect of this approach is that, in order to facilitate the end state depicted in Figure 8-1, the military must adopt the rule sets, ways, measures, and means of the civilians it is supporting. Another CIMIC aphorism used at UNMIL: “Their game plan is our game plan.”

While this model was designed originally with transitional civil-military coordination (the second major management function of civil-military coordination) in mind, the principles of “civilianizing” ex-
ternal assistance and “localizing” essential internal public services and governance functions by gradually placing the military to the rear of the assistance chain (behind civil society organizations and local government structures) and taking on an increasingly indirect and enabling role do not apply just to post-conflict transition management. Indeed, it could apply to conflict prevention and “building partner capacity” efforts such as in the Horn of Africa and the Trans-Sahel. U.S. involvement, for example, in low-level counterinsurgency operations in the Philippines after 9/11 eventually took the approach of following local lead in civil action programs. “Filipino doctors, dentists and veterinarians come in to provide free care. Of utmost importance . . . is putting a Filipino face on all these operations.”

Perhaps even more illustrative of the shifting paradigm is the U.S. civil-military response to the earthquake in Haiti, where the military clearly played a supporting role, and the U.S. Government sought to work within multilateral frameworks rather than expend the resources to create a parallel structure, exemplifying a prepositional term that has gained currency among U.S. civil affairs and other special operations personnel—”by, with, and through”:

Early on, the United States decided not to create a combined Joint task force. With the UN already on the ground, a robust multinational force was in place. In addition, MINUSTAH countries contributing additional resources and personnel already had links to their local UN representatives. Creating a combined Joint task force would have conflicted with those efforts. Instead, Joint Task Force-Haiti deployed to conduct humanitarian assistance and disaster response operations. The purpose of Joint Task Force-Haiti was
to support U.S. efforts in Haiti to mitigate near-term human suffering and accelerate relief efforts to facilitate transition to the Government of Haiti, the UN, and USAID. The military possesses significant capabilities that are useful in emergencies, but long-term plans for relief and reconstruction are best left to nonmilitary government agencies.43

As mentioned earlier, however, the paradigm has not yet shifted for everyone. From its inception, AFRICOM has been beset with problems of credibility on the continent, due largely to the “say-do gap” of an essentially military organization—a regional combatant command—that originally tried to look and act like a whole-of-government organization.

The new U.S Africa Command was created with the intention of a more deliberate (rather than ad hoc) civil-military and interagency teaming approach—from the top down, and with a much heavier civilian content and lead, and thus with more soft than hard power at play, than in other combatant commands. . . . The real problem, however, at AFRICOM is that, despite its large civilian component, it still largely serves military missions (in particular, counterterrorism) rather than vice-versa—at least on the ground. This conflicts with AFRICOM’s central message. By and large, the military staff there defines security requirements. This is one of the reasons why AFRICOM has had such great difficulty in gaining credibility and acceptance in Africa—the greatest evidence for which is that it is still headquartered in Stuttgart, Germany. This is a strategic and not an operational issue.44

Indeed, focusing more on the democratic civil-military relationship as an operational application, not only in terms of security and defense sector reform and partnership capacity development but also
under the rubric of the country team, can only improve the strategic effectiveness of “comprehensive engagement” as defined in the 2010 National Security Strategy. This is because by walking the talk, closing the say-do gap, and leading through civilian power, U.S. civil-military practitioners would then be doing abroad what they do at home, clearly connecting strategy with operations and the whole-of-society with the whole of government.

It does more than this. With respect to building partnership capacity, demonstrating the democratic civil-military relationship helps address the concern expressed by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gate’s admonition that, beyond the traditional national security centric tendency to focus almost exclusively on operational development of the armed forces:

... there has not been enough attention paid to building the institutional capacity (such as defense ministries) or the human capital (including leadership skills and attitudes) needed to sustain security over the long term.45

In Liberia, for example, the Office of Security Cooperation is synchronizing AFRICOM’s Operation ONWARD LIBERTY program designed to enhance military institutional leadership and DoD’s Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI, similar to the Ministry of Defense Advisory program in Afghanistan) to build capacity among the Ministry of Defense staff providing civilian oversight. This kind of applied foresight and synchronization of stovepipes, however, was more the result of personalities than policies or programs.

Systemically, U.S security assistance efforts in places like the Horn of Africa and particularly the
Trans-Sahel, are based on a counterterrorism model—the coup in Mali being only the latest example of a problematic approach to U.S. security sector reform focused almost entirely on operational rather than institutional capacity building and with almost total disregard of the civil-military relationship:

... something is very wrong about the U.S. approach to counterterrorism cooperation in the Sahel. ... Indeed. The two-pronged military-civilian strategy has been to (a) build security capacity of the Malian and other regional militaries to control territory and fight terrorists and (b) take steps to prevent the spread of violent extremism. ... Unfortunately, the early signs aren’t good that the USG really recognizes the scale of the problem. ... If we really believe that fighting terrorism in Africa is in our national interest, then the disaster still unfolding in Mali begs for an honest and aggressive rethinking of both the what and the how.46

Another outcome of a more democratic approach to civil-military coordination is that it tends to go far to mitigate the nettlesome strains from military force employment of humanitarian methods to “win hearts and minds” in the face of the NGO claim of exclusivity in humanitarianism. Such a civil-military approach is inherently more supportive of the efforts of these organizations, which are more appropriate for humanitarian and nation-building tasks formerly performed by military organizations, at least in U.S. experience.

On the other hand, civil society organizations must, in turn, recognize that military organizations, for better or worse, are themselves extensions of civil society and thus have a role in making peace, albeit more indirect than direct. More pragmatically, it facilitates an eventual relationship with indigenous military,
paramilitary, and police forces and encourages them to maintain an appropriate balance between Huntington’s imperatives in their own security sector, having seen that example in foreign forces. Beyond helping external militaries work their jobs, it helps achieve a more sustainable security sector reform process and a more secure and stable environment for both the civil society organizations and the emerging government institutions long after those forces leave.

Thus, both kinds of entities need to employ a qualitative blend of realism and idealism, respecting and accommodating, as best as possible, particular principles and equities. This can only come through establishing relationships, dialogue, and even rule-sets for operational civil-military interaction in order to learn about comparative advantages as well as limitations:

CSOs generally take a long-term, relationship-based approach to development. Because of security, political and economic pressures, U.S. government and military officials often attempt shorter-term, quick-impact development. The challenge is to design short-term programming that contributes toward long-term goals and to design long-term programming that supports short-term objectives. Addressing the contradictions in timeframes requires more extensive discussion between CSOs and ISAF policymakers.47

Another insight thus comes into play—what you do in the steady state (strategically) cultivates the capital you draw upon for crisis response or in the field in general (operationally). It is mainly because, in the 21st century security and development engagement environment, relationships, and influence matter more than throwing weight. This critical strategic and operational capital—beneficial to both sides—is,
at best, difficult to obtain once the operation begins. This is a common, yet still underappreciated, lesson.

**AMERICAN LEADERSHIP**

All of this is actually good news for the United States. Despite the incongruities of its overwhelming national security, hard-power psychology, the United States, whose foundation of strength in its national ethos of *e pluribus unum* has been always morally based, is still the most ideally suited lead nation. Its dynamic, multicultural civil society and its democratic national values represent tremendous social capital. The democratic civil-military ethos of the United States is most clearly depicted in a symbol more than 2 centuries old—namely, the obverse of the Great Seal of the United States. The state, symbolized by the eagle, aspires for peace and civil society, looking in the direction of the olive branches in one talon while holding the arrows of war in reserve (or support) in the other. The Great Seal elegantly illustrates the alignment and application of these civil-military priorities. (See Figure 2.)

More concretely, for example, the United States possesses a unique comparative advantage, as it is already demonstrating in isolated cases, in assisting foreign governments and militaries in improving civil-military linkages and mechanisms, at all levels, due to its own program equities in areas like civil affairs. The problem is that these equities are not consistently arrayed in a comprehensive and coordinated way, in accordance with the realities of the 21st century and the need to find more democratic balance in Huntington’s imperatives as applied overseas.
Besides addressing the sheer imbalances in budgets and authorities, “civilianizing” security, “demilitarizing” foreign policy and “developmentalizing” foreign aid, there are other areas to address. There are no civilian counterparts, for example, to the geographic combatant commander at the Department of State or the U.S. Agency for International Development, let alone a counterpart regional coordination entity, that would go far to facilitating a more comprehensive, civilian-led U.S. strategy in the geographic regions of the world.48

Civil affairs—the only true civil-military coordination entity in the U.S. Government, going back over a century, has evolved from military government, which is a suspension—not an extension—of democracy. Civil affairs must also transform from recent “bad guy” centric counterinsurgency and counterterrorism and become more strategic than tactical, with greater steady state linkages to and operational partnering with, for example, the State Department’s Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, from which civil affairs should take greater strategic direc-
tion. In yet another example, there should be a more strategically-driven synchronization of programs such as DoD’s DIRI program and the State Department’s Global Peace Operations Initiative and Africa Contingency Operations Training & Assistance program in order to build partnership civil-military teaming capacity and confidence in the civil-military relationship in democratic societies.

There are many more changes to mention. Moreover, their scope and extensiveness spell implications for U.S. foreign policy and national security are profound and far-reaching. This runs not just from Washington to the field, but from the field to Washington. Locher remarks that:

We have always been able to win ugly by throwing money at a problem, but that is no longer the case. We have lost our margin for error and we are headed for a decade of austerity, when even great programs are being killed. The times call for a national security system that is effective, efficient, participatory and agile. Unfortunately, we don’t have it—we have the opposite of that, a system that is archaic, designed 63 years ago, that still clings to Cold War concepts. At PNSR, we have a saying, ‘How can we secure our children’s future with our grandparents’ government?’ We are not going to win the future with that government.49

There is greater impetus for this kind of transformation not only from the strategic imperatives observed abroad, but from the American people themselves. In a remarkable study conducted by the Fund for Peace, involving scores of town hall type meetings around the United States held over a 2-year period, a major conclusion was that, while Americans still expected the United States to maintain its global leader-
ship role, “It leads best when it’s true to its values and when it works with others.” Additionally:

. . . there was remarkable consistency that America must lead in the world—but it leads most effectively when it ‘walks the talk,’ i.e., adheres to its own stated principles. . . . America’s ideals impel it to lead in the world, and the world looks to America to play that role. But how America leads is as important as whether it leads. . . . Reorienting American policy priorities not only would enhance U.S. global leadership, but was seen as yielding lasting influence. . . . America was a stronger nation when it listened to people, and indeed, could learn from different countries, cultures, and experiences. . . . Finally, there was significant discussion in most forums about the differences between ‘American power’ and ‘national strengths.’ Many participants associated the former with an emphasis on coercive behavior in the world, while they viewed the latter as concerning principles and values, such as democracy, liberty, and tolerance. While coercive means might be necessary in some cases, an over-reliance on them was seen as counterproductive and even disastrous; whereas pursuing policies on the basis of the nation’s strengths was seen as the most effective way to produce lasting influence in the world. In addition, people viewed a predominantly coercive approach as out of touch with new global realities.50

While the perils of the 21st century are coming more or less on their own, the promises emerging from the same paradigm are not as such. This calls for greater, not less, American international leadership, for no other nation is better suited to exploit and lead this transformation.

There was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. No divine providence or unfolding Hegelian dialectic required the triumph of
democracy and capitalism, and there is no guarantee that their success will outlast the powerful nations that have fought for them. Democratic progress and liberal economics have been and can be reversed and undone. The ancient democracies of Greece and the republics of Rome and Venice all fell to more powerful forces or through their own failings. The evolving liberal economic order of Europe collapsed in the 1920s and 1930s. The better idea doesn’t have to win just because it is a better idea. It requires great powers to champion it.  

The qualitative difference between then and now, however, is that “real leadership is not dominance.”  

Every military officer learns that the most effective, persuasive, and durable form of leadership is by example—whether from the front or behind. This is as true for nations as it is for individuals. Practicing at home what you preach abroad is a demonstration that what matters over there also matters over here, as Harry S. Truman observed in his message to Congress that launched the civil rights movement, in which he concluded:

If we wish to inspire the peoples of the world whose freedom is in jeopardy, if we wish to restore hope to those who have already lost their civil liberties, if we wish to fulfill the promise that is ours, we must correct the remaining imperfections in our practice of democracy. We know the way. We need only the will.  

When Americans think globally and act locally, making their actions consonant with their core values and embracing a new ethos of collaborative engagement, in view of adversaries and partners alike, they transform both their environment and themselves. A more enlightened approach to civil-military coordina-
tion is not a tradeoff between idealism and realism, it is a fusion of both. It is a fusion of art and science that combines practical critical thinking with an imaginative synthesis of the most appropriate methods. It is at the heart of American grand strategy for the 21st century. Failure to recognize this risks further deterioration of American global leadership and the security and prosperity that comes with it.
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