

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Syllabus, 2019

6 August 2018

Scope

Evolutions of Operational Art (EOA) takes its name and inspiration from the seventeenth-century military concept of evolutions, or practices. It is a focused study of selected campaigns and major operations short of campaigns ranging from the late eighteenth century through the early twenty-first century. It is a bridge that links many concepts from Theory of Operational Art and US Army and Joint doctrine as it anticipates Strategic Context of Operational Art, Design of Operational Art, and Anticipating the Future. Moreover, several lessons incorporate or suggest events and actions that lend themselves to Morality and War.

Organizing Principles

The campaigns or operations relate to several theoretical or doctrinal developments examined in TOA or speak to interests or regions of historic and strategic concern to the United States in the twenty-first century. EOA is not, however, a survey of military history nor is it about a supposed American way of war. History serves as a lens through which to understand and evaluate the practice of what is today termed operational art. It does so through the study of past actions and how commanders and their staffs interpreted, negotiated, and translated political aims into strategy and plans and then executed those plans on the battlefield to achieve their strategic ends, or not. The lessons provide some of the historical context underpinning the American military experience, US policy and interests today, or to contemporary operations. None of the results of any of these evolutions was a foregone conclusion; nothing was inevitable, nothing is.

The course of a campaign cannot be understood without recognizing the political aims of the opposing parties and the subsequent levels of effort expended. Were the aims limited or did they seek the overthrow of the enemy and a dictated peace? Were the efforts consonant with the aims, for as Carl von Clausewitz asks, “How then is it possible to plan a campaign, whether for one theater of war or for several, without indicating the political condition of the belligerents, and the politics of their relationship to each other?”¹

Implicit within these campaigns is the combatants’ quest for decisive battle and decisive war, the chimeras of Western military thought. In their pursuit of victory, the warring countries examined have sought political decision through battle. Indeed, US Army doctrine is explicit in its advocacy for decisive battle “in breaking the enemy’s will,” and to “decisively defeat enemy forces.” Indeed, the concept of decisive battle courses through US Army and Joint doctrine.

¹ Carl von Clausewitz, *Carl von Clausewitz: Two Letters on Strategy*, ed. and trans. Peter Paret and Daniel Moran (1984; repr., Ft. Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 1984), 22.

Decision in battle or in war, however, has been a *rara avis*, only occasionally attained. Attrition, as historian Cathal J. Nolan suggests, has been the historical norm.²

Course Perspective

When great, established, or rising powers collide, it is often at the dominant or leading edge of theory and technology, real and perceived, as did France and Prussia in 1806, when the Great Powers went to war in 1914, or when German forces invaded the Soviet Union in 1941. Sometimes, however, the clashes occurred at the tenuous end of states' abilities to project, sustain, and maintain power, such as in the 1812 campaign in Russia, the 1941 battle for Moscow, the Solomon Islands in 1942, or in Afghanistan in 2001. In these wars, campaigns, and battles, commanders sought decision. In some cases, decisive battles, even decisive wars were the result. More often than not, however, enemies adapted and attrition was the result.

Many of the campaigns and operations in EOA took place under such circumstances. The limitations, enablers, disadvantages, and advantages were political, economic, cultural, conceptual, organizational, institutional, and physical. How commanders framed their operational approaches to often-complex environments, created or exploited the opportunities, overcame the challenges, how they framed and reframed their operational approaches, or did not, constitutes the heart of this course.

The readings, the staff ride, your fellow students, and your instructors will offer sometimes differing or conflicting interpretations of events or actors, all of which reflect the nature and practice of history: it is contingent, even as it recognizes continuities. It is revisionist, always subject to a mature and deliberate reexamination and reinterpretation of the evidence. It always seeks to understand the present by re-interrogating the evidence. While the facts may be mostly fixed or certain, their meanings and implications, like the outcomes of events, were and are neither immutable nor inevitable.

EOA is not about lessons learned, it is not about avoiding the repetition of the past (for neither of these trite notions is history), nor is it about identifying winners or losers. Rather it is about conditioning your mind to think broadly, deeply, critically, and in the longer term. It is about learning to appreciate focus, detail, and specificity, even as you step back, and perceive and appreciate broad rhythms and patterns, and understand more clearly the roles of ambiguity, complexity, risk, and chance in war. It is, as US Army doctrine states about warfare, a "human endeavor." History is not predictive. It enables you to prepare for the unknown and unfamiliar, to anticipate. It is a representation of practitioners in action and in reflection while in action.³

² Cathal J. Nolan, *The Allure of Battle: A History of How Wars Have Been Won and Lost* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 1-17; US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017), 1-16-1-17; US Department of Defense, *Joint Publication (JP) 3-0, Joint Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017).

³ See John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Donald Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); US Department of the Army, *Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) 3-0, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017), 1-4.

The lessons aim at depth over breadth. Moreover, they avoid the hubris of presentism by decoupling chronological proximity and the supposed (and non-existent) greater relevancy and complexity of contemporary affairs (the “good old days” when life was simpler were not, and never have been). They force you as leaders, future operational planners, and even future commanders to contextualize how contingency and continuity shaped how commanders thought, planned, and acted, and may continue to do so.

Intellectually, what we today term operational art has always existed. Intelligent commanders, even those who failed, have always sought to arrange their tactical actions in such a manner as to attain their strategic objectives and to create and exploit opportunities to do so. The practice and conceptualization of these acts, however, have always been enabled or constrained by the larger historical context of the age, by the political, social, intellectual, economic, technological, climatic, and cultural factors shaping and framing the age, and thus the conceptual and physical prospects and limitations.

Operational art is not a scripted checklist for victory. It does not guarantee success. To suggest otherwise is simplistic and naïve and degrades human thought and action to mere rote, mechanistic, lockstep action—follow this recipe and success will happen. This is patent nonsense. Such a suggestion imposes a false and prescriptive linearity upon human thought, action, agency, and contingency. It is a childish denial of reality. No matter how well commanders and staffs have planned, anticipated, and executed a campaign, no matter how well they have linked tactical actions and campaigns with military strategy and political objectives, no matter how well they framed and reframed the problem, they still failed. The reasons for failure have been and will be legion.

More prosaically, many commanders have also contended with poor or little strategic or policy guidance and have struggled to reconcile tactical actions with unclear or unattainable strategic objectives. Some commanders have been out of their element, placed in positions of responsibility that have exceeded their own capabilities, or have failed to grasp their mission. Some combatants’ aims and strategies have been mismatched. They have sought the overthrow of their opponent while employing limited means. Context matters; every evolution of operational art is discrete and unique unto itself. The past never repeats itself. That there have been evolutions of what is today termed operational art is beyond doubt; whether there has been an evolution in the practice is up to your measured and mature judgment.

EOA traces a chronological path from the last quarter of eighteenth century through the early twentieth-first century. It illuminates different concepts and practices of warfare from linear and real through absolute and much in-between, including joint and hybrid warfare, large-scale combat operations, and counterinsurgency. In each case, the campaign is linked to the greater strategic and political concerns of the actors and addresses a larger concept from the age that continues to resonate today. The chronological organization does not, however, suggest an evolution of the operational art from a simple, single-object campaign plan to a more complex, multi-focused entity.

Intent

At the end of EOA you should be able to do the following:

1. Incorporate and synthesize theory, history, and doctrine in your analyses and understanding of campaigns and operational art.
2. Craft a campaign or operational analysis and narrative that assist the commander's ability to understand, visualize, and describe the conditions and operations.
3. Understand some of the evolutions of operational art and how commanders and staffs arranged tactical actions in time, space, and purpose in order to achieve strategic goals.
4. Develop a fuller understanding of the strategic, operational, and tactical enablers and constraints acting on commanders and their forces, including the physical, doctrinal, theoretical, cultural, social, or intellectual.
5. Appreciate the complex adaptive systems in which states and other actors operate.

Learning Objectives

Terminal Learning Objective

Evaluate the historical and contemporary practice of the operational art—the arrangement of tactical actions in time, space, and purpose to achieve strategic objectives.

Enabling Learning Objectives

Evaluate the ability of military forces to adapt to changes in the strategic environment or in ill-defined missions.

1. Appraise commanders' translation of strategic and policy guidance into operational planning and execution.
2. Evaluate the role of joint operations in achieving objectives.
3. Analyze the war termination criteria in operational plans and planning.
4. Assess the practice of the theory and doctrine of operational art.
5. Analyze the planning and execution of historical campaigns and operations.
6. Evaluate the historical changes and continuities in operational art.
7. Apply theory and doctrine as analytical tools in examining historical scenarios.
8. Analyze an operational approach.

Assessment

Students shall be assessed in accordance with the standards in SAMS Assessment Policy. Material covered in EOA is subject to examination during oral comprehensive examinations. The final grade is calculated upon the following percentages:

- Participation: 20%
- Staff ride performance: 25%
- Briefing: 15%
- Final paper: 40%

Block and Lesson Breakdown

- Block 1 (lessons 1-3): Cabinet War Meets People's War: The Campaign for America, 1776-1777.
 - 1: Politics, Objectives, and Strategy.
 - 2: Joint Operations for New York.
 - 3: Hybrid Warfare for the Jerseys.
- Block 2 (lesson 4): The Clashes of Systems and the Limits of Operational Art: Napoleonic Warfare.
 - 4: The Rise, Apogee, and Fall of French Operational Art: Ulm and Austerlitz, Jena-Auerstädt, and Russia.
 - 5: Decisive Battle Denied: The Spanish Ulcer and the War at Sea.
- Block 3 (lessons 6-11): Real War, Territorial Expansion, and State Building.
 - 6: American Imperialism: The Mexican War, 1846-1848.
 - 7: American Imperialism: The Mexican War, 1848-1848.
 - 8: Policy, Politics, and State Building: The Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871.
 - 9: Policy, Politics, and State Building: The Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871.
 - 10: Upending the Old Order: The First Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895.
 - 11: Upending the Old Order: The First Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895.
- Block 4 (lessons 12-14): Theory, Planning, and Reality: The Marne, 1914.
 - 12: Decisions and Plans for War.
 - 13: The Battle of the Marne, 1914.
 - 14: The Battle of the Marne, 1914.
- Block 5 (lessons 15-18): Absolute War.
 - 15: *Bewegungskrieg*, Deep Battle, and Operational Art: Operation Typhoon and the Battle for Moscow, October-December 1941.
 - 16: *Bewegungskrieg*, Deep Battle, and Operational Art: Operation Typhoon and the Battle for Moscow, October-December 1941.
 - 17: Joint Operations and the Tenuous End of the Rope: Land, Sea, and Air in the Solomon Islands Campaign, 1942-1943.
 - 18: Joint Operations and the Tenuous End of the Rope: Land, Sea, and Air in the Solomon Islands Campaign, 1942-1943.

- Block 6 (lessons 19-21): Limited Wars: To What Purpose, to What End?
 - 19: The United States in Vietnam
 - 20: A Global War on Terrorism?
 - 21: Operation Enduring Freedom.

**Block 1 (lessons 1-3): Cabinet War Meets People's War: The Campaign
for America, 1776-1777**

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Cabinet War Meets People's War: The Campaign for America, 1776-1777
Lesson 1: Politics, Objectives, and Strategy

Introduction

On 19 April 1775, Massachusetts militiamen and British regulars exchanged fire at Lexington and Concord. What had once been a contentious and often acrimonious debate over the nature of the British constitution, virtual and real representation, and the organization and function of governance within the British Empire had devolved into open rebellion and civil war. Yet, most British colonists professed loyalty to George III. Indeed, they based their resistance on traditional English rights, privileges, and ideology. No more. When the Second Continental Congress issued the Declaration of Independence, it announced to Americans and the world the thirteen colonies' separation and claim to be "Free and Independent States." Congress had overthrown British rule. War was to decide the truth of the matter.

The ministry, led by Lord Frederick North, was in a quandary. There was no question that Britain had to quash the rebellion and restore order. The question facing the ministry was how best to suppress the rebellion while reestablishing crown rule without alienating the population. Two characters loomed large in orchestrating the suppression of the rebellion, John Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, and Lord George Germain. Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, was a skilled and experienced administrator who headed the Royal Navy. He struggled, however, to balance naval readiness with economy. Germain, First Lord of Trade and Secretary of State for North America and the West Indies, oversaw much of the British war effort. He was a tough-minded, conscientious minister who sought nothing less than the complete submission of the rebellious colonists. The ministry sought decisive victory, the overthrow of the rebels, as it waged war as economically as possible.

Several factors complicated this already challenging environment. First, British debt from the Seven Years War (1756-1763) had doubled to around £132,600,000. On the eve of the American War, the debt stood at £127,300,000. Lord North sought to suppress the rebellion without raising taxes, which had implications on the size of the army and the Royal Navy. Secondly, Britain stood friendless on the international stage. It had abandoned allies in in the wars of the Spanish (1701-1713) and Austrian successions (1740-1748), and in the Seven Years War. Britain had vanquished France and then Spain, but in doing so had thrown the European balance of power out of equilibrium. British power, in the eyes of the other European crowns, needed to be reduced and balance restored. Finally, domestic politics played a role.⁴

Issues of political and military leadership and the direction of the war, as well as the sort of peace settlement to be pursued dogged the ministry. With Britain distracted and friendless, the

⁴ John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 31; Brendan Simms, *Three Victories and a Defeat: The Rise and Fall of the First British Empire* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), especially 501-614.

other European powers sensed an opportunity to restore the balance of power. Britain and the rebellious colonies had a variety of means with which to attain their opposing ends. They did so against a complex background of domestic, imperial, and international politics and aspirations.

Student Requirements

Read (184 pages):

- George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1-19 [327.73 H567f].
- Piers Mackesy, *The War for America, 1775-1783* (1964; repr., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), xiii-xxvi, 1-87 [973.3 M157w].
- David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1-65 [973.332 W318f 2006].

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Cabinet War Meets People's War: The Campaign for America, 1776-1777
Lesson 2: Joint Operations for New York

Introduction

Brothers General William Howe and Vice Admiral Lord Richard Howe assumed command of British military and naval forces in and off the coast of the thirteen rebellious colonies. The brothers Howe were experienced officers with years of active service and command in Europe, North America, the West Indies, the Mediterranean, and European and West African waters. As aristocrats and members of Parliament, the Howe brothers were politically and socially well connected, and had the confidence of George III.

British operations in 1776 were the model for expeditionary and joint campaigning in the eighteenth century. No other country in the early modern world was as capable of mobilizing the state's fiscal-military power and projecting it on a transoceanic stage, as was Great Britain. The war for America was one of Britain's greatest efforts. Indeed, according to Piers Mackesy, the British effort in the American War (1775-1783) "was a feat never paralleled in the past, and in relative terms never attempted again by any power until the twentieth century." The Howe brothers' 1776 campaign included naval forces and a mix of British and hired German (Hessian) regulars. Following their evacuation of Boston on 17 March 1776, troops from the garrison underwent a rigorous camp of instruction in light infantry tactics at Halifax. They, and reinforcements from Great Britain, were the crown's main effort.⁵

General George Washington commanded the American army, largely one-year volunteers in the newly formed Continental Army. The army was as diverse as the thirteen colonies it represented. A handful of the officers, including Washington, had served in the French and Indian War, but none above the rank of colonel. The vast majority was learning on the job.

The British campaign provides a model of operational art and what is today joint warfare in age of linear war, the tradition that Maurice de Saxe, Frederick the Great, the Comte de Guibert, and the young Carl von Clausewitz knew well, and that continued until the age of the Napoleonic Wars and the advent of the corps system, articulated armies, and distributed maneuver.⁶

⁵ Piers Mackesy, *The War for America, 1775-1783* (1964; repr., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), xxiv.

⁶ Azar Gat, *A History of Military Thought: From the Enlightenment to the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 27-80; R.R. Palmer, "Frederick the Great, Guibert, Bülow: From Dynastic to National War," in *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, ed. Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 91-113.

Student Requirements

Read (196 pages):

- David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 66-262 [973.332 W318f 2006].

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Cabinet War Meets People's War: The Campaign for America, 1776-1777
Lesson 3: Hybrid Warfare for the Jerseys

Introduction

As 1776 drew to a close, the Howe brothers and the ministry could look back upon a campaign that had largely been successful, albeit with mixed results. British forces had seized New York and its vital harbor; they had consistently defeated the Continental Army in battle after battle and pursued it through the Jerseys into Pennsylvania. General Sir Guy Carleton's attack up the Richelieu River had defeated Brigadier General Benedict Arnold's forces at Valcour Island, but the attack stalled, and Carleton's army withdrew to Canada. At sea, the Royal Navy's blockade of the American coast, around 1,000 miles, had had mixed results. The size of the North American Squadron, some seventy or so ships and other vessels, over one-third of the Royal Navy's strength, was too small to accomplish the task. Moreover, no more than one-third to one-quarter of the squadron could keep station at any one time, the remainder supporting the army or refitting in Halifax, Nova Scotia or Portsmouth, England, or in transit to or from port.⁷

The British had hoped to bring the rebels to submission, but had fallen short at this task. Indeed, the Second Continental Congress had gone so far as to declare American independence in the summer of 1776. Still, the Howe brothers, Germain, Sandwich, and George III had reason to believe that the rebellion would collapse. The Continental Army, defeated at every turn, suffering from desertions, and short on enlistments, was close to the end of its soldiers' terms of service. The momentum, however, changed in wake of the American victories at Trenton and Princeton. The resurgent Continental Army and New Jersey militia vied for control of the Jerseys in a series of hybrid actions designed to wrest control of the state.

The American counteroffensive and rollback of British control speaks to zones of control, contested areas, and the levels, logic, and localized nature of violence in a civil war that occurred within a political revolution. Imperial and revolutionary forces (regular, militia, and partisan) forces fought in a complex environment, one subject to shifting loyalties. These forces struggled not merely to destroy or drive out the other, but in a larger contest that historian John Shy termed the "triangularity of the struggle" for the "support and control of the civilian population," the majority of whom wished to be left alone. Thus, the adherence or submission of the population, its affection, and public order were among the key objectives pursued by both opponents in the larger contest for America. This was a people's war.⁸

⁷ David Syrett, *The Royal Navy in American Waters, 1775-1783* (Aldershot, UK: Scolar, 1989), 58.

⁸ John Shy, "The Military Conflict Considered as a Revolutionary War," in *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for Independence*, rev. ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 218-219. See Stathis N. Kalyvas, *The Logic of Violence in Civil War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006) on the nature and level of violence in civil wars and zones of control and contestation.

Student Requirements

Read (116 pages):

- David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 263-379 [973.332 W318f 2006].

References:

- Breen, T.H. *American Insurgents, American Patriots: The Revolution of the People*. New York: Hill & Wang, 2010.
- Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Conway, Stephen. *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gat, Azar. *A History of Military Thought: From the Enlightenment to the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Gruber, Ira D. *The Howe Brothers and the American Revolution*. 1972. Reprint. New York: Norton, 1975.
- Higginbotham, Don. *The War of American Independence: Military Attitudes, Policies, and Practice, 1763-1789*. 1971. Reprint. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1983.
- Houlding, John. *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Kalyvas, Stathis N. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kwasny, Mark V. *Washington's Partisan War, 1775-1783*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1998.
- Middlekauff, Robert. *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789*. Rev. & exp. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Murray, Williamson. "The American Revolution: Hybrid War in America's Past." In *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, edited by Williamson Murray and Peter R. Mansoor, 72-103. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- O'Shaughnessy, Andrew Jackson. *The Men Who Lost America: British Leadership, the American Revolution, and the Fate of Empire*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Robson, Eric. *The American Revolution: In its Political and Military Aspects, 1763-1783*. New York: Norton, 1966.
- Royster, Charles. *A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character, 1775-1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.
- Shy, John. *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence*. Rev. ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Simms, Brendan. *Three Victories and a Defeat: The Rise and Fall of the First British Empire*. New York: Basic Books, 2008.
- Smith, David. *William Howe and the American War of Independence*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

- Spring, Matthew H. *With Zeal and With Bayonets Only: The British Army on Campaign in North America, 1775–1783*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008.
- Stoker, Donald, Kenneth J. Hagan, and Michael T. McMaster, eds. *Strategy in the American War of Independence*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Syrett, David. *Admiral Lord Howe: A Biography*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2005.
- ———. *The Royal Navy in American Waters, 1775-1783*. Aldershot, UK: Scolar, 1989.

**Block 2 (lessons 4-5): The Clashes of Systems and the Limits of
Operational Art: Napoleonic Warfare**

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art

The Clashes of Systems and the Limits of Operational Art: Napoleonic Warfare
Lesson 4: The Rise, Apogee, and Fall of French Operational Art: Ulm and Austerlitz, Jena-Auerstädt, and Russia

Introduction

The French Revolution (1789-1799), Revolutionary Wars (1792-1802), and Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815) upset the European state order and shook the Western world as no modern event would until World War I (1914-1918). Indeed, they resonated globally. The political, social, economic, and military consequences echoed for decades and are still felt, even if unrecognized by the affected. Over the course of twenty-three years, Revolutionary and Napoleonic France fought seven combinations of European powers in the wars of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Coalitions, struggled in separate but connected conflicts in the Peninsular War against Spain, Britain, and Portugal, and against Russia in 1812, and in various peripheral contests.

This was a new and transformational age of warfare, one that represented a break from the older paradigm posed by linear warfare and the cabinet wars of princes. Nationalism, revolutionary fervor, and tradition vied against one another in a struggle to reorder or to maintain the early-modern European political order. Absolute war had overthrown real war, but even Napoleon Bonaparte had his limitations. Overcome at first by the new style of warfare, France's enemies adapted and rose in differing degrees to the challenges of modern combat and campaigning.⁹ The rough parity in talent and capability restored battlefield equilibrium of a sort as attrition exerted itself over the fleeting moments of battlefield decision. In time, the Seventh Coalition vanquished French arms and the Corsican-born would-be emperor. The victorious powers (Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia) and France's restored Bourbon monarchy imposed a conservative, even reactionary political order on Europe that mitigated or tamped down on rising tensions for nearly a century.¹⁰

Nonetheless, Bonaparte stunned the Western world and left a deep imprint on military thought that continues through this day. He was not so much an innovator as he was a gifted improviser. As David G. Chandler, the great historian of the Napoleonic Wars, notes, Napoleon "was rather the developer and perfecter of the ideas of others; he saw more clearly than any other soldier of his generation the full potentialities of the French military doctrines and armed forces of the day.... He added little to the art of war or the armies of France except victory, and this he

⁹ See Martin Van Creveld, *Supplying War: Logistics from Wallenstein to Patton*, 2d ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 40-74 for the transformation from magazine-based logistics to the French system.

¹⁰ The Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), established the sovereignty of individual states, the sometimes-obeyed principle of respect for territorial integrity, the legal equality of states, and the sometimes-ignored supremacy of secular over religious authority in politics.

gained by transforming theory into reality.”¹¹ Nevertheless, Napoleon dominated European warfare until 1815, and his legacy weighed heavily upon Western military thought until World War I. Indeed, it still casts a shadow.

Three campaigns trace in stark relief the rise, apogee, and fall of the French method of warfare and of French operational art: Ulm and Austerlitz, Jena-Auerstädt, and Russia. In December 1804, Napoleon Bonaparte, the First Consul of the Republic, had crowned himself Emperor of the French. A successful and ambitious general who had won laurels in the Revolutionary Wars, he was in the early stages of his larger effort to take personal power, centralize the authority of the French state as he shaped it to his will, and promote the new empire’s security by dominating Europe through war, law (Napoleonic Code), culture, and economic policy. His ambitions and appetite were, to say the least, boundless.

In 1804, following the brief respite afforded by the Peace of Amiens (1802), France was once again at war. The country found itself under blockade by the Royal Navy, as Napoleon planned to invade England in 1805. Unable to reach Britain, Austria made itself a target when it joined the Third Coalition. Napoleon turned the *Grande Armée* east that summer to seize the strategic initiative and attack the allied armies of Austria and Russia.

In the campaign of 1805 (War of the Third Coalition, 1803-1806), Napoleon exploited French tactical and organizational doctrine to win stunning victories over the Austrians at Ulm and the allied Austrian and Russian armies at Austerlitz. Ulm was a victory of Napoleonic strategy; Austerlitz highlighted French tactical flexibility and command. In the advance, the *Grande Armée* marched dispersed, but united to fight. It echoed Frederick II, “the Great,” in his advance through Bohemia in August 1742. The self-declared emperor administered a humiliating defeat against Austria and imposed a harsh settlement that included significant Austrian territorial cessions in the Treaty of Pressburg (1805), which also ended the Third Coalition. Thereafter, Napoleon sought to negotiate peaceful terms with Britain and Russia and to isolate Prussia.

Seeking military and economic security for France, Napoleon reorganized Germany and the death of the Holy Roman Empire. Napoleon intended that his newly created or expanded German states would serve as buffers against Prussia. In response to events, Francis I of Austria abdicated the imperial throne in August 1806, and ended an institution that had existed, if only in name, since the Middle Ages. Germany’s reorganization and Austria’s place in greater Germany (*Grossdeutschland*) had implications during Prussia’s rise in the 1860s. In 1806, however, Prussia challenged France in order to preserve its place as the dominant power in Germany.

Prussia joined the Fourth Coalition with the expectation that Russian forces would enter the fight quickly. The ensuing campaign illustrated the disparities in staff work, tactical organization, strategic thinking, and command. Once more, the army marched dispersed, but fought united. While the battles of Jena and Auerstädt resulted in the destruction of the Prussian army, they did not end the war. The Russian army entered the contest and the war continued in East Prussia, finally concluding with the Treaties of Tilsit, in which Russia joined the Continental System and became a French ally. Prussia ceded half of its territory; from it, Napoleon awarded

¹¹ David G. Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon* (New York: Scribner, 1966), 136.

land to Russia, Saxony, Westphalia, and created the Duchy of Warsaw. For the moment, France had secured its eastern borders. One problem remained: Great Britain.

Unable to strike at Britain militarily, Napoleon sought to close Europe to British trade and attack perfidious Albion's economy through the Continental System. Proclaiming the Continental System was one thing, enforcing it was another thing altogether. The embargo affected Europe as much as it affected Britain, albeit in different ways. Markets, economic systems, peoples, and princes conspired to evade the system. Enforcement thus became an exercise in French power.

The attendant pressures of French territorial and political expansion, the economic effects of the Continental System, the concern over a fully independent Poland, and frustrated ambitions over the French-allied Ottoman Empire, contributed to Tsar Alexander I's action. Pressured by the nobility, which relied upon grain exports to Britain, the tsar imposed a heavy tariff on imports from imperial France. The amity begun by the peace of Tilsit was fast crumbling. Faced with the Russian challenge, Napoleon invaded Russia with nearly half a million French and allied soldiers. The French way of warfare relied upon rapid marches and quick victories executed in the limited geographic extent of Europe. The often-well-developed road networks and rich agricultural bounty sustained the French method. Russia, however, was not Europe proper. Geographic depth, a climate of extremes, a poorly developed road network, sparse population centers, and the resilience of the Russian soldiery frustrated Napoleon's ambitions and exposed the limitations of French operational art and the ability of enemy forces to adapt. Indeed, as Clausewitz noted, "The scale of force that must be used against the enemy depends on the scale of the political demands on either side."¹²

For Antoine-Henri Jomini and Carl von Clausewitz, the Napoleonic Wars were a seminal moment. They inspired to great degree their serious reflection about war and warfare. Napoleon's wars were never far from their minds, nor, indeed, from later generations of military and political leaders.

Student Requirements

Read (186 pages):

- Rapport, Mike. *The Napoleonic Wars: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1-87 [940.27 R221n].
- Michael V. Leggiere, ed., *Napoleon and the Operational Art of War: Essays in Honor of Donald D. Horward* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 145-171, 173-197, 265-314 [940.27 dc23].

¹² Clausewitz, *On War*, 585.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
The Clashes of Systems and the Limits of Operational Art: Napoleonic Warfare
Lesson 5: Decisive Battle Denied: The Spanish Ulcer and the War at Sea

Introduction

French success in war was predicated upon decisive battle. In two theaters, the Iberian Peninsula and at sea, however, attrition and an indirect approach upended this Napoleonic paradigm. War against Spain, Britain, and Portugal in the Peninsular War (1808-1814) was a vexing and interminable affair that ate at French strength and sapped French soldiers' morale while it allowed Britain's army and Royal Navy to act jointly and support the Spanish and Portuguese armies and Spain's guerrillas. Dismissed as a sideshow to the larger and more stunning campaigns in Germany, Austria, and Russia, Napoleon begged to differ. He is reported to have said "It was the Spanish Ulcer that ruined me."

Portugal had refused to adhere to the Continental System, intended to strangle British commerce by excluding it from Europe. However, that kingdom's trade was so bound to Britain that severing that tie would have ruined the country. Moreover, Britain and Portugal had been allies since 1386. Frustrated, Bonaparte dispatched a corps under General Jean-Andoche Junot to invade the kingdom. On 30 November 1807, Junot's corps entered Lisbon after having marched some 300 miles in two weeks. It was too late; the ruling Braganza family and much of the political elite, along with the Portuguese treasury, had sailed into exile in Brazil. Meanwhile, Napoleon sensed a threat and an opportunity in neighboring Spain.

The Spanish army had mobilized, but in the aftermath of Jena and Auerstädt, the Spanish government claimed that the mobilization had been intended against Britain. Spain's chief minister, Manuel de Godoy, and other elites had soured on the Franco-Spanish alliance following the disaster at Trafalgar (21 October 1805). In March 1808, crowds overthrew the king, Charles IV, and installed as king his more popular, but conservative son, Ferdinand. Godoy, acting in the name of the king, had continued the reform program instituted under Charles III (r. 1759-1788) in the disastrous aftermath of the Seven Years' War (1756-1763). The most recent spate of reforms included abolishing bullfighting and expropriating church lands, which raised the ire of more conservative Spaniards and churchmen in general. In the meantime, three French corps under Marshal Joachim Murat had occupied much of Spain. On 2 May 1808 (*dos de mayo*), army officers and Ferdinand VII's supporters revolted. French troops brutally suppressed the revolt.

Having imprisoned both Charles and Ferdinand, Napoleon installed his brother Joseph as king of Spain. Napoleon intended to reform Spain's domestic and imperial governance so that he might exploit the empire's American riches. Spain was to be yet another planet in the French imperial orbit. Spain's discomfiture was Britain's opportunity. The Iberian Peninsula allowed the British to wage a war on the periphery of the French empire, to exploit the kingdom's maritime dominance, and give encouragement and fiscal support to continental allies.

For the next six years, British, Portuguese, and Spanish regulars and guerrillas waged a hybrid war against French troops and their supporters, *los afrancesados*. The insurgency in Spain, like all insurgencies, was localized and particular. Some guerrillas fought because they opposed Godoy's reforms, others out of hatred for the French. The insurgency's diffuse nature was one of its strengths. Where, exactly, was its center of gravity? The French army struggled mightily to suppress the insurrection as it also tried to destroy the regular forces of Britain, Spain, and Portugal, and to impose French-style governance under a Corsican-born usurper, Joseph Bonaparte. The Peninsular War, as much a people's war as a conventional struggle, was a bleeding ulcer for the French empire that also set in motion the Latin American wars of independence, which lasted until 1821.¹³

The war at sea was altogether different matter. Like air operations, naval operations are but fleeting affairs. The space occupied is momentary; control is exercised and limited by physical presence. In both instances, the forces employed always act in support of ground operations and forces (even if only indirectly). Britain's Royal Navy spent most of its time searching for enemy forces, but more often than not blockading enemy ports, escorting convoys, patrolling shipping lanes, and occasionally raiding enemy ports and other locations. Thus, fleet actions like the Glorious First of June (1794), Cape St. Vincent (14 February 1797), Camperdown (11 October 1797), the Nile (1-3 August 1798), or Trafalgar (21 October 1805) were rare. The extent of the British empire and the trade it supported demanded a global naval presence to protect merchant shipping and colonies. To a great degree, therefore, British naval operations were defensive in nature.

France's navy, on the other hand, faced a different set of challenges. Traditionally, French maritime strategy had employed the battle fleet in escort duties, transporting ground forces to colonial territories or in support of invasion plans for the British Isles. Fear of invasion, a constant theme in British strategy, forced the admiralty to concentrate large forces in British home waters. Simply keeping a fleet in being, therefore, allowed France to tie down British naval forces. Even after the Franco-Spanish defeat at Trafalgar, French naval construction and sorties kept the Royal Navy busy blockading French ports and pursuing French ships. These limitations notwithstanding, naval warfare was a significant element in French strategy. Reconstituting the fleet took time, but the naval element was always present. While shipbuilders went to work, the army marched. Not even the disaster of Trafalgar could dissuade French naval ambitions.

In much the manner that Napoleon's campaigns had influenced Clausewitz's and Jomini's reflections on warfare, so too did those of the Royal Navy have an impact upon Alfred Thayer Mahan and Julian S. Corbett. Like Clausewitz and Jomini, Mahan and Corbett derived different conclusions that drew upon the past to inform their understanding of naval warfare. Their work continues to influence the thoughts, doctrines, and actions of naval commanders and staffs.¹⁴

¹³ See also Richard Hart Sinnreich, "That Accursed Spanish War: The Peninsular War, 1807-1814," in *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, ed. Williamson Murray and Peter R. Mansoor (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 104-150.

¹⁴ A selective listing of Mahan's and Corbett's pertinent works appears below in the References.

Student Requirements

Read (180 pages):

- Rapport, Mike. *The Napoleonic Wars: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 88-128 [940.27 R221n].
- Michael V. Leggiere, ed., *Napoleon and the Operational Art of War: Essays in Honor of Donald D. Horward* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 199-233, 387-473, 476-496 [940.27 dc23].

References:

- Chandler, David G. *The Campaigns of Napoleon*. New York: Scribner, 1966.
- ———. *On the Napoleonic Wars: Collected Essays*. London: Greenhill Books, 1994.
- Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Indexed ed. Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Connelly, Owen. *Blundering to Glory: Napoleon's Military Campaigns*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1987.
- Corbett, Julian S. *The Campaign of Trafalgar*. London: Longmans, Green, 1910.
- ———. *England in the Mediterranean: A Study of the Rise and Influence of British Power within the Straits, 1603-1713*. London: Longmans, Green, 1904.
- ———. *England in the Seven Years' War*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- ———. *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy*. London: Longmans, Green, 1911.
- Coulson, Bruno, ed. *Napoleon on War*. Translated by Gregory Elliott. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Esdaile, Charles. *The Peninsular War: A New History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- ———. *Napoleon's Wars: An International History, 1803-1815*. New York: Penguin, 2007.
- Finley, Milton. *The Most Monstrous of Wars: The Napoleonic Guerrilla War in Southern Italy, 1806-1811*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Gates, David. *The Spanish Ulcer: A History of the Peninsular War*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1986.
- Jomini, Antoine-Henri. *The Art of War*. New ed. Translated by G.H. Mendell and W.P. Craighill. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1862.
- Knight, Roger. *Britain against Napoleon: The Organization of Victory: 1793-1815*. London: Penguin, 2013.
- Mahan, Alfred Thayer. *The Influence of Sea Power Upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793-1812*. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1892.
- ———. *The Influence of Seapower upon History, 1660-1783*. Boston, Little, Brown, 1890.
- Mikaberidze, Alexander. *The Napoleonic Wars: A Global History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Rothenberg, Gunther E. *The Art of War in the Age of Napoleon*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- ———. *The Napoleonic Wars*. London: Cassell, 1999.

- Schneid, Frederick C., ed. *European Armies of the French Revolution, 1789–1802*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015.
- Tone, John Lawrence. *The Fatal Knot: The Guerrilla War in Navarre and the Defeat of Napoleon in Spain*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Van Creveld, Martin. *Command in War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- ———. “Napoleon and the Dawn of Operational Warfare.” In *The Evolution of Operational Art: From Napoleon to the Present*, edited by John Andreas Olsen and Martin Van Creveld, 9-34. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Paret, Peter. “Napoleon and the Revolution in War.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 123-142. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

**Block 3 (lessons 6-11): Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial
Expansion and State Building**

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building
Lesson 6: American Imperialism: The Mexican War, 1846-1848

Introduction

Territorial expansion is the imperative of empires, monarchical or republican. Their leaders seek to expand territorial holdings in order to increase state security, promote economic opportunity, and expand political power. Rationalizations for empire have ranged from securing natural frontiers, to obtaining natural resources, to fulfilling heavenly mandates, and everything between. In 1844, Democrat James K. Polk, the dark horse candidate, won the election for President of the United States. He ran on a platform dominated by the rhetoric of territorial expansion, better known as Manifest Destiny. Expansion had been a hallmark of American history from the beginning. Ideas and cultural norms of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries provided the framework and justification for mid-nineteenth century expansion. Opposition by foreign countries and other peoples was of little or no matter; it was something to be dealt with by negotiation, war, or expulsion.¹⁵

When the Army of Observation, under the command of Brigadier General Zachary Taylor, entered the Disputed Territory (the land between the Nueces and Rio Grande rivers), it provoked a war with Mexico and injected the United States into a complex environment. Revolution, civil war, and a host of other problems had plagued Mexico from its independence from Spain in 1821. Cultural and legal remnants of Spanish rule, including the privileged positions of the Roman Catholic Church and the army, and the racial and ethnic caste system, remained in force. There was little trust or common cause between the elites and the common people. Elites vied for power against one another constantly; the major contests were between Centralists, who wished to concentrate power in the national government and retain what they saw as the positive vestiges of the colonial era, and Federalists, who wanted a federative government with more state autonomy and a weaker central government. Government instability was endemic. From 1821 through 1848, Mexico had had one emperor, six interim heads of state, and perhaps thirty-seven presidents, not counting the many times that Antonio López de Santa Anna alternated the presidency with his vice-presidents. In addition to the Centralist-Federalist struggle and the revolving door presidency, Mexico had contended for years with Comanche, Apache, Navajo, and Kiowa raids that pushed back the northern line of settlement and left large, ungoverned zones rife with the potential for violence. At different times these raiders had overrun four states and large portions of three others. The Comanche and Kiowa raiders had penetrated to within 250 miles of Mexico City at one point. Into this strategic dilemma entered the imperial republic: the United States.

¹⁵ For a short and incisive treatment, see Anders Stephanson, *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1995). See also Richard H. Immerman, *Empire for Liberty: A History of American Imperialism from Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010) on the United States as an imperial power.

On the surface, the United States was everything that Mexico was not. It had declared independence in 1776 and had won formal recognition in 1783. The country had adopted republican government and institutions from its founding and operated under a written constitution. Bumptious, aggressive, and vigorous, the republic appeared stable, but beneath the veneer was another story. Regionalism, racism, and religious bigotry strained the ties that held together the union of states. Americans did not grasp the concept of the loyal opposition—to oppose the party in power was to betray the country and be unpatriotic, even treasonous. Riots were not uncommon; competing political parties, and volunteer militia and fire companies (organized by ethnic, trade, social, or political affinities) often engaged in pitched battles that frequently included muskets and bayonets and sometimes even artillery.

Nativism stoked fears of the other. Lower-middle and working-class white, native-born Americans dreaded having to compete for jobs with immigrants, or that immigrants might depress wages. They and the immigrants especially hated the thought of having to compete against slave or free-black laborers. Religious bigotry against Roman Catholics was a key element in American nativism and identity. Protestant Americans distrusted and disdained this decidedly foreign and princely religion. In 1834, nativist Protestants rioted, attacked, and burned an Ursuline convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts. Ten years later, Philadelphia nativists rioted and burned down or destroyed two or more Roman Catholic churches. Twenty or more people died in the violence. Moreover, race riots against African-American communities in northern cities were not uncommon. In the slaveholding Southern states, fear of servile insurrection created a police-state atmosphere for African-Americans, free and enslaved, as white Americans maintained their vigilance after Gabriel Prosser's Rebellion in Virginia in 1800, Denmark Vesey's Conspiracy in Charleston, South Carolina in 1822, and Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in 1831. Slavery relied upon the dehumanization and brutalization of black labor by white masters and overseers. Southern militia companies mounted slave patrols regularly. The concepts underpinning gendered identities added to the cultural mix. Mexicans were not merely racial inferiors, they were effeminate, and would not put up much of a fight or fight well. Their racialized and gendered inferiority meant that Mexicans were undeserving of their lands, and therefore Americans were entitled to seize them. Thus, in the Mexican War, two fractious, violent, and unstable republics went to war, a war provoked by the United States.

As Taylor's army marched and fought its way toward Monterrey, a separate column, the Center Division under Brigadier John E. Wool, left San Antonio, Texas, aiming to cross the Rio Grande (*Rio Bravo* to Mexicans) and turn southward to defeat Mexican forces in Coahuila. A third expedition, the Army of the West, under Brigadier General Stephen Watts Kearny, departed Fort Leavenworth bound for New Mexico and California. Kearny captured Santa Fe, New Mexico, and sent Colonel Alexander W. Doniphan and his 1st Regiment of Missouri Mounted Volunteers southward into Chihuahua, Mexico.

Taylor's army, originally the main effort of the US invasion, culminated quickly. Faced by unanticipated Mexican opposition and the harsh natural environment of northern Mexico, the advance ground to a halt. The scandalous and often criminal conduct of American volunteers made matters worse. The volunteers' indiscipline, which ranged from theft and vandalism to rape and murder, instigated Mexican guerrilla warfare and savage reprisals of a sort meted out to Indian raiders. Similar problems faced the next American effort.

President Polk closely monitored the war's progress. He had expected a quick victory, but reality had intruded and circumstances forced him to reassess the American effort, reframe his understanding of the war's evolution, and select a new course of action and commander. Polk selected Lieutenant General Winfield Scott to lead an invasion of the Mexican Gulf Coast. A student of history and the profession of arms, Scott chose to land at Veracruz, Mexico's chief Atlantic-coast entrepôt and the site of the Spanish landing under Hernán Cortés in 1519.

The city lay at the eastern terminus of the National Road, which connected it with the capital. Scott drew up a detailed plan in October and November 1846 to capture the city and advance on Mexico City. The plan appealed to Polk. There was, however, a fly in the ointment. Polk did not care for Scott personally and saw the general for what he was, a capable commander and a future political opponent from the wrong party; Polk was a Democrat and Scott was a Whig. Unable to find an accomplished or skillful general sympathetic to his leanings, Polk finally acquiesced and awarded Scott command of the invasion force. The American general would soon face General Antonio López de Santa Anna and the Mexican operational environment.

Central Mexico's natural environment constituted a major factor in military operations. Veracruz and the nearby waters were a mosquito-infested yellow fever zone. Scott and the commander of the US Navy's Home Squadron, Commodore David Conner, were well aware that the region's diseases had regularly rendered European armies and navies combat ineffective. Indeed, for European soldiers, a West Indian posting was often a death sentence, with mortality rates often exceeding fifty percent. Thus, neither force could remain for long in the Mexican littoral before the disease regime had its say.¹⁶

As the campaign evolved in northern Mexico, Kearny's column advanced from New Mexico to California. He received news of the US Navy's capture and occupation of California's key ports and towns. Kearny left the bulk of his forces in New Mexico and continued west with a handful of soldiers of the 1st Dragoons, anticipating occupation duties. Instead of peaceful submission, however, Kearny found that the *Californios* in Los Angeles had overthrown the American occupiers. Things were not quite as the general had imagined. The *Californios* had revolted against an onerous and obnoxious occupation authority, forced the invaders to retreat to enclaves or ships offshore, and recovered most of their land. Civil-military relations thus played a major role in the invasion, conquest, and occupation of Mexican lands, whether in New Mexico, California, Chihuahua, or central Mexico. Ethnic and racial animosity, patriotism, military indiscipline, martial law, guerrilla warfare, and so much more made for an operational environment fraught with frustrations and challenges.

Student Requirements

Read (186 pages):

- Peter Guardino, *The Dead March: A History of the Mexican-American War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017), 1-186 [973.62 G914d 2017].

¹⁶ See J.R. McNeill, *Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010) and Noble David Cook, *Born to Die: Disease and New World Conquest, 1492-1650* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) on the roles of disease in the Caribbean and North America.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building
Lesson 7: American Imperialism: The Mexican War, 1846-1848

Introduction

Winfield Scott and Antonio López de Santa Anna were experienced officers with years of active service. Scott had been on active duty since the War of 1812 and had served in a variety of circumstances. He was exceedingly vain, often tactically astute, but often stubborn and arrogant to the detriment of soldiers and others. Santa Anna had fought in the Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821) and was a military hero to many. He was also a self-serving and vainglorious politician and soldier who dominated Mexican history for much of the nineteenth century. Skilled in suppressing insurgencies, some even called him the “Napoleon of the West.” Scott, like Santa Anna, dominated his country’s military scene throughout much of the nineteenth century.

A dedicated student of the art of war and reformer of American tactical doctrine, Scott also had political aspirations. He had been a candidate for the Whig Party’s presidential nomination in 1840 but lost to William Henry Harrison. In 1852, he was the Whig nominee for the presidency and lost to his former subordinate, Franklin Pierce. The generals’ military campaigns reflected their understanding of the nineteenth-century art of war, their parent societies, their armies’ capabilities and natures, their subordinates’ tendencies, and their countries’ larger political, economic, and social enablers and constraints.

Upon his return to Mexico and resumption of command of the army, Santa Anna exploited the natural environment as a combat multiplier. Both he and Scott were keenly aware of environmental factors and their influence on all military operations. Santa Anna made the most of the topography, the disease regime, the arability, and the aridity of the area of operations. To suggest that environmental and climatic factors had or indeed have no effect on operations is shortsighted and foolish in the extreme. Both Santa Anna and Scott knew as much.

The campaign for Mexico City was a gamble. Scott had under his command the bulk of the regular army; a defeat would have put the entire American venture in jeopardy. Throughout the advance on Mexico City, Scott had to consider the army’s basing at Veracruz, its extended lines of communication, the army’s operational tempo and reach, but also the forces available and their composition. The volunteers, almost as undisciplined and lawless in Scott’s force as they were elsewhere, had enlisted for one year and there were no tools to compel extensions of their service. Congress had authorized several wartime regiments of regulars, but they too suffered from many of the defects of the volunteer service.

Peace eluded the United States with the capture and occupation of Mexico City. The army in Mexico, California, and New Mexico had to adjust to occupation duties as Mexican and American negotiators worked toward an acceptable settlement. US forces in northern and central

Mexico were to remain only so long as needed to compel a settlement, whereas troops in New Mexico and California assumed the duties of imperial occupation. Occupations demanded much of US and Mexican forces and of the populace. The incorporation into the United States of formerly-Mexican citizens was uneven and difficult over the decades that followed.¹⁷

Political, social, economic, and cultural complexities affected the conduct and course of the campaign as they had affected the conduct and course of the war. Both Scott and Santa Anna had to deal with these concerns as their forces engaged one another. In the end, the United States annexed from one-half to one-third of Mexico. Both republics suffered the consequences of victory and defeat, which included political, social, legal, and economic strife and civil war. Mexicans continued to struggle over the nature of their republic. In 1862, French forces invaded and installed an Austrian archduke, Maximilian von Hapsburg, as emperor. Conservatives had lost to liberals in the War of the Reform (1857-1860), and they welcomed the French, their Austrian emperor, and the centralization of political power. Over the next five years, French troops and conservatives, with the moral support of the Papacy, battled against an insurgency. Fears over Prussia following its victory in the Austro-Prussian War (1866), however, caused Napoleon III to withdraw his forces. By 1876, General Porfirio Díaz, a hero of the insurgency, was president and ruled until 1910, when yet another civil war and revolution broke out. It was not until 1921 that the military phase of the Mexican Revolution ended. In 1929, the inheritors of the revolution consolidated power through one-party rule, which lasted until 2000.

Following its victory over Mexico, the United States emerged as a continental power. Save the Gila River Valley, added in the Gadsden Purchase of 1853, the United States had achieved its full geographic extent south of Canada. It remained to be seen what would become of the territory acquired from Mexico. Politicians and citizens of all stripes debated over the future of the Mexican Cession. At the heart of the debate was whether slavery would expand into the newly-annexed lands. White Southerners generally believed that the continued success of their society depended upon the expansion of slavery. Slavery was at the heart of the white Southern political, economic, social, and cultural system. Most white Northerners opposed the expansion of the slave empire; few were abolitionists. In addition to racism (some states forbade freedmen from entering or residing), they feared that any economic competition with slaves or free African-Americans would drive down wages and degrade the value of labor because of its association with black bondsmen and women. Immigrants, concentrated mainly in the Middle Atlantic and New England states, shared these views. Despite facing often virulent nativist sentiments and working for low wages, immigrants had that much in common with most Americans. Other Northerners understood the pernicious and undemocratic effects of the Three-fifths Compromise on the House of Representatives and in the Electoral College. The South had more representatives than its free, white population merited. Its political power in the House of Representatives rested in large measure upon the unfree.

¹⁷ K. Jack. Bauer, *The Mexican War: 1846-1848* (New York: Macmillan, 1974), 326-326-357, 378-391; Irving W. Levinson, *Wars within War: Mexican Guerrillas, Domestic Elites, and the United States of America, 1846-1848* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2005), 85-110; Andrew F. Lang, *In the Wake of War: Military Occupation and Civil War America* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2017), 1-37. See John Mack Farragher, *Eternity Street: Violence and Justice in Frontier Los Angeles* (New York: Norton, 2016) on the post-conquest experience in Southern California. For Northern California, see Donald J. Pisani, "Squatter Law in California, 1850-1858," *Western Historical Quarterly* 25 (Autumn 1994): 217-310.

By 1860, the American political system could no longer contain the centrifugal forces that had strained the “Cotton threads” that held the “Union together.” Led by South Carolina, eleven Southern states held secession conventions during the winter and spring of 1860-1861, declared slavery as the foundation of their would-be confederacy, staged coups d’état, and overthrew legal government following the election of Republican candidate Abraham Lincoln as president. Essayist, philosopher, poet, and Unitarian cleric Ralph Waldo Emerson had predicted in 1846, that “The United States will conquer Mexico, but it will be as the man swallows the arsenic, which brings him down in turn. Mexico will poison us.” Over 750,000 Americans died in the Civil War. The United States’ victory over the rebel states ended slavery. From 1862 through 1876, the US Army occupied the former rebel states and oversaw Reconstruction. Conservatives, however, restored the racial hierarchy following the withdrawal of US troops. The Republican Party, a Northern party, had grown weary of Reconstruction. It rejected its black allies and embraced business. Southern Democrats enacted Black Codes, Jim Crow, and disenfranchised African Americans. Domestic terrorist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan, the Southern Cross, and the Knights of the White Camelia worked hand-in-glove with local politicians and helped restore and maintain white supremacy for nearly a century. The effects of the Mexican War were far more important than being merely a training ground for future generals.¹⁸

More than a few junior officers of the US Army rose to high command during the American Civil War. Graduates of the Military Academy dominated the general officer ranks. The small size of the force during the Mexican War meant that even as lieutenants and captains they could observe how generals like Taylor and Scott fought. In some sense, the war served as a school of application. Importantly, the role, import, and impact of European theorists like Jomini upon these officers is debatable. Historian James M. McPherson cautions against reading too much into Jominian theory, its impact, or great import in American warfare. So much of it was, as he states, little more than “common-sense,” and surely Jomini did not invent that. Indeed, his name appears but three times in the 128-volume *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion* and Ulysses S. Grant confessed that he had never read Jomini (the name does not appear in Grant’s memoirs or letters). It is far more likely that the works of Winfield Scott, Dennis Hart Mahan, and Henry Wager Halleck had a greater direct role on academy-educated officers. How well the military academy or theory had prepared these future generals is questionable. Their often-amateurish performance in Civil War suggests as much. The Mexican War has had a far greater impact on the United States and Mexico than most Americans realize or even suspect. The Swiss theoretician’s chief value, therefore, is that he provides a near-contemporary chronological lens through which to analyze and understand American military operations, rather than as a formative element in them.¹⁹

¹⁸ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, with Annotations*, vol.7, 1845-1848 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913), 201, 206. J. David Hacker, “A Census-Based Count of the Civil War Dead,” *Civil War History* 57, no. 4 (December 2011): 307-348. See Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) for a survey of US history in this period. Richard White, *The Republic for Which It Stands: The United States during Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865–1896* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017) covers post-Civil War America.

¹⁹ James M. McPherson, *The Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 331-332; Carol Reardon, *With a Sword in One Hand and Jomini in the Other: The Problem of Military Thought in the Civil War North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 5; Williamson Murray and Wayne Wei-Siang Hsieh, *A Savage War: A Military History of the Civil*

Student Requirements

Read (182 pages):

- Peter Guardino, *The Dead March: A History of the Mexican-American War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017), 186-368 [973.62 G914d 2017].

References

- Arnold, Linda. "Too Few Ships, Too Few Guns, and Not Enough Money: The Mexican Navy, 1846- 1848," *The Northern Mariner/Le Marin du nord* 9, no. 2 (April 1999): 1-10 [Blackboard].
- Ball, Durwood. *Army Regulars on the Western Frontier, 1848-1861*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.
- Bauer, K. Jack. *The Mexican War: 1846-1848*. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- ———. *Surfboats and Horse Marines: U.S. Naval Operations in the Mexican War, 1846-48*. Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute, 1969.
- ———. "The Veracruz Expedition of 1847." *Military Affairs* 20, no. 3 (Fall 1956): 162-169 [Blackboard].
- Bonura, Michael A. *Under the Shadow of Napoleon: French Influence on the American Way of Warfare from the War of 1812 to the Outbreak of WWII*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Canfield, Daniel T. "Winfield Scott's 1847 Mexico City Campaign as a Model for Future War." *Joint Forces Quarterly* 55 (Fourth Quarter 2009): 95-100 [Blackboard].
- Cummings, Bruce. *Dominion from Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- DeLay, Brian. "The Wider World of the Handsome Man: Southern Plains Indians Invade Mexico, 1830-1848." *Journal of the Early Republic* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 83-113 [Blackboard].
- ———. *War of a Thousand Deserts: Indian Raids and the U.S.-Mexican War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- ———. "The U.S. Mexican War: Forgotten Foes." *Berkeley Review of Latin American Studies* (Fall 2010): <http://clas.berkeley.edu/research/us-mexican-war-forgotten-foes>.
- DePalo, William A. *The Mexican National Army, 1822-1852*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997.
- Dishman, Christopher D. *A Perfect Gibraltar: The Battle for Monterrey, Mexico, 1846*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010.

War (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016), 51. Dennis Hart Mahan, *A Treatise on Field Fortifications* (New York: Wiley & Long, 1836); Mahan, *An Elementary Treatise on Advanced-Guard, Out-Post, and Detachment Service of Troops* (New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1847); Henry Wager Halleck, *Elements of Military Art and Science* (Philadelphia: D. Appleton, 1846). When considering theories, models, or doctrines, "Remember that all models [theories, doctrines, and those who propose them] are wrong; the practical question is how wrong do they have to be to not be useful." This observation is better remembered as "all models are wrong, but some are useful." George E. P. Box and Norman R. Draper, *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces* (New York: Wiley, 1987), 74, 424, 74.

- Farragher, John Mack. *Eternity Street: Violence and Justice in Frontier Los Angeles*. New York: Norton, 2016
- Francaviglia, Richard V. and Douglas W. Richmond, eds. *Dueling Eagles: Reinterpreting the U.S.-Mexican War, 1846–1848*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, 2000.
- Gleijeses, Piero. “A Brush with Mexico.” *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 2 (April 2005): 223-54 [Blackboard].
- Greenberg, Amy S. *A Wicked War: Polk, Clay, Lincoln, and the 1846 U.S. Invasion of Mexico*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.
- Hacker, J. David. “A Census-Based Count of the Civil War Dead.” *Civil War History* 57, no. 4 (December 2011): 307-348.
- Halleck, Henry Wager. *Elements of Military Art and Science*. Philadelphia: D. Appleton, 1846.
- Hämäläinen, Pekka. *The Comanche Empire*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Henderson, Timothy J. *A Glorious Defeat: Mexico and its War with the United States*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hietala, Thomas R. *Manifest Design: American Exceptionalism and Empire*. Rev. ed. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Hollon, Cory S. ““A Leap in the Dark?: The Campaign to Conquer New Mexico and California, 1846-1847.” *Army History* (Winter 2015): 7-25 [Blackboard].
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Immerman, Richard H. *Empire for Liberty: A History of American Imperialism from Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Janin, Hunt and Ursula Carlson. *The California Campaigns of the U.S.-Mexican War*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2015.
- Johannsen, Robert W. *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Lang, Andrew F. *In the Wake of War: Military Occupation and Civil War America*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2017.
- Levinson, Irving W. *Wars within War: Mexican Guerrillas, Domestic Elites, and the United States of America, 1846-1848*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2005.
- ———. “A New Paradigm for an Old Conflict: The Mexico-United States War,” *The Journal of Military History* 73 (April 2009): 393-416 [Blackboard].
- McPherson, James M. *The Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Mahan, Dennis Hart. *An Elementary Treatise on Advanced-Guard, Out-Post, and Detachment Service of Troops*. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1847.
- ———. *A Treatise on Field Fortifications*. New York: Wiley & Long, 1836.
- Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

- Murphy, Douglas A. *Two Armies on the Rio Grande: The First Campaigns of the US-Mexican War*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015.
- Murray, Williamson and Wayne Wei-Siang Hsieh. *A Savage War: A Military History of the Civil War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Pisani, Donald J. "Squatter Law in California, 1850-1858." *Western Historical Quarterly* 25 (Autumn 1994): 217-310
- Pohl, James W. "The Influence of Antoine Henri de Jomini on Winfield Scott's Campaign in the Mexican War." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (July 1973): 85-110 [Blackboard].
- Polk, John Fleming. "Vera Cruz, 1847: A Lesson in Command." *Marine Corps Gazette* 63, no. 9 (September 1979): 61-67.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *Broadax and Bayonet: The Role of the United States Army in the Development of the Northwest, 1815-1860*. 1953, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- ———. *The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Reardon, Carol. *With a Sword in One Hand and Jomini in the Other: The Problem of Military Thought in the Civil War North*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Rodríguez Díaz, María del Rosario. "Mexico's Vision of Manifest Destiny during the 1847 War." *Journal of Popular Culture* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 41-48 [Blackboard].
- Santoni, Pedro. "A Fear of the People: The Civic Militia of Mexico in 1845." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (May 1988): 269-88 [Blackboard].
- ———. *Mexicans at Arms: Puro Federalists and the Politics of War, 1845-1848*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1996.
- Smith, Justin H. *The War with Mexico*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.
- Stephanson, Anders. *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1995.
- Watson, Samuel. *Peacekeepers and Conquerors: The Army Officer Corps on the American Frontier, 1821-1846*. University Press of Kansas, 2013.
- White, Richard. *The Republic for Which It Stands: The United States during Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Winders, Richard Bruce. *Crisis in the Southwest: The United States, Mexico, and the Struggle over Texas*. Lanham, MD: Scholarly Resources, 2002.
- ———. *Mr. Polk's Army: The American Experience in the Mexican War*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building
Lesson 8: Policy, Politics, Strategy: The Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871

Introduction

Prior to 1866, Prussia had been a second-tier player on the European continent, behind the major powers of France, Austria, and Russia. It had risen under Frederick II, momentarily, to something approaching great power status in the mid-eighteenth century. The French victories at Jena and Auerstädt, however, had ended that brief moment. Prussia was the largest power within Germany, but not the principal one. Despite the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, Austria remained the dominant power within Germany.²⁰

Prussia's geography had contributed to the country's development. Its indefensible borders had made raising a powerful army a necessity for survival. Its territories were not contiguous, thus travel and commerce within the Prussian kingdom meant passing through foreign, albeit German, realms and paying their tariffs and other fees (there were over 800 in 1819). In the years following the Napoleonic Wars through the 1830s, Württemberg, and later Prussian lawmakers, sought to reduce the tariff burden through a pan-Germanic customs union, the *Zollverein*. By 1835, the German Customs Union included most of the Germanic states, but excluded Austria for economic and then political reasons. The *Zollverein* reduced or eliminated internal barriers as it excluded others, especially Austria, through protectionist tariffs. Some historians have seen the union as an element in the growing dispute between Austria and Prussia for dominance in Germany, *Grossdeutschland* (Greater Germany led by Austria) and *Kleindeutschland* (Smaller, unified Germany led by Prussia without Austrian involvement).

In 1864, Prussia and Austria fought and won as allies against Denmark in the Second Schleswig War. More important than the victory, however, was the rise of the chief of the Prussian general staff, General Helmuth von Moltke, who introduced reforms in planning and the art of command. For Moltke, like Clausewitz, the annihilation of the enemy's forces was the object of war (*Vernichtungsgedanke*) in the pursuit of higher state aims. Chief among these aims during Moltke's tenure was the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership through the instrument that was the Prussian army. Moltke grafted his style and system of staff work and command to the Prussian way of warfare, *bewegungskrieg*: swift movement at the operational level. The campaign was at the heart of the Prussian warfare. Ideally, it led to a battle of annihilation (*kesselschlacht*). Because of Prussia's poor resource base, wars had to be short and decisive. The kingdom could not afford to fight wars of attrition; *kurtz und vives*, sharp and lively, was the order of the day.

²⁰ See Marcus Jones, "Strategy as Character: Bismarck and the Prusso-German Question, 1862-1878," in *The Shaping of Grand Strategy: Policy, Diplomacy, and War*, ed. Williamson Murray, Richard Hart Sinnreich, and James Lacey (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 79-110.

In 1866, Otto von Bismarck, Minister-President of Prussia, maneuvered Austria into declaring war against Prussia. In the spring of 1866, representatives from both kingdoms had been debating over which country spoke for Germany in the German Confederation. Italy, in the process of unification (*Risorgimento*), had marched troops near the Venetian border, which alarmed Austria. Vittorio Emmanuele II, King of Italy, had earlier announced his intention to add to Italy Austrian-occupied Venetia and the French-protected Papal States. Unknown to Austria, Italy and Prussia had signed a ninety-day alliance in April, committing the Italians to enter the war if Prussia and Austria went to war. The Austrians initiated a partial mobilization, fearing that Italy might seize Venetia. In turn, Italy mobilized for war. Threatened on two fronts and expecting French assistance, Austria declared war on Prussia in June.

The Prussian army, commanded by Moltke, conducted a seven-week campaign along exterior lines in northern Germany and Bohemia that culminated in victory at Königgrätz. It marched while dispersed, and united to fight; the army's advance echoed Napoleon and Frederick. While Moltke and the generals wanted to pursue and destroy the Austrian army, Bismarck did not seek the overthrow of Austria. This was real, not absolute, war. Prussian victory had knocked Austria out of German affairs and Italy gained Venetia in decisive battle in a decisive war.

The peace was generous; Prussia sought no Austrian territory. Bismarck had done his best to ensure that the Austrian defeat would not fester into enmity. Despite Bismarck's best intentions, Austria wanted revenge and tried to cobble together an alliance with France and Italy, Prussia's erstwhile ally, in 1868. The alliance never materialized because of Italian demands that France withdraw from Rome to allow for the Papal States absorption by Italy. Prussia formed the North German Confederation and was the undisputed power in Germany. France, however, had something to say about that.²¹

In 1870, Bismarck once again maneuvered an opponent into declaring war. Moltke and the Prussian Great General Staff had anticipated war with France and had planned accordingly. The general staff and Minister of War, General Albrecht von Roon, had taken into account or reformed conscription, the incorporation of reservists into the army, railroad schedules, tracks, and platforms, the capabilities of existing or new weapons, and tactical doctrine. Prussian military culture gave generals' broad latitude in interpreting and executing orders, sometimes termed *auftragstaktik*. Predicated on Prussia's particular history, it allowed for a remarkable operational and tactical autonomy. These scions of the *junker* class, Prussia's landed aristocracy, viewed the king as a fellow *junker* and brother officer, and thus felt free to operate with broad latitude, often at odds with one another or the larger operational plan. So much for the mistaken correlation between *auftragstaktik* and contemporary Mission Command. For better and worse, Moltke's planning took these engrained habits into account. The French army, on the other hand, made do.

²¹ Luigi Albertini, *The Origins of the War of 1914*, vol. 1, *European Relations from the Congress of Berlin to the Eve of the Sarajevo Murder*, trans. Isabella M. Massey (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), 4; Geoffrey Wawro, *The Austro-Prussian War: Austria's War with Prussia and Italy in 1866* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1-81, 274-296.

Student Requirements

Read (168 pages):

- Robert M. Citino, *The German Way of War: From the Thirty Years' War to the Third Reich* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 142-173 [355.020943 C581g].
- Geoffrey Wawro, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-137 [943.082 W356f]

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building
Lesson 9: Policy, Politics, Strategy: The Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871

Introduction

The initial engagements at Wissembourg, Spicheren, and Froeschwiller demonstrated the strengths and shortcomings of the Prussian, allied German, and French armies. Moltke's broad, mission-oriented orders relied upon the mutual trust and understanding of the chief of staff and the field army commanders, and the placement of general staff officers in the field army staffs. The trust, however, was not always warranted. Some commanders made frighteningly stupid decisions that soldiers paid for with their lives. Although the German forces had pushed into France, they had not won the war, nor had the French army lost it. Indeed, some French units fought well.

The German Confederation's battlefield successes did not translate into political victory. The unplanned capture of Napoleon III led to the collapse of the French Second Empire and left no government to negotiate terms. France's stubborn defense, an uprising in Paris, a hybrid war in the countryside, the French ability to raise new forces, growing German casualty lists and unhappiness with the war, and strained and extended lines of communication threatened the breakup of Bismarck's coalition. French irregulars, *francs-tireurs*, forced the allied German army to detail over 100,000 soldiers to guard its lines of communications. Political and military leaders reframed and adjusted their planning and actions according to the changing political and military environments. In the end, the German arms and negotiations succeeded.²²

Political and military leaders took notice of the Wars of German Unification, particularly the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars. Wars could be sharp and lively (*kurtz und vives*), as well as decisive. A highly-educated and historically-minded general staff was the key to "Bewegungskrieg... the war of movement on the operational level." Armies were to stress maneuver, the offensive, and were to be led by flexible, almost autonomous, commanders guided by broad, mission-oriented orders (*auftragstaktik*) as they sought a battle of annihilation (*kesselschlacht*). These wars and their supposed lessons captured the imaginations of many military thinkers. They set the standard of expectations for planners in the years leading up to 1914.²³

²² Marcus Jones, "Fighting 'this nation of liars to the very end': The German Army in the Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871," in *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, ed. Williamson Murray and Peter R. Mansoor (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 171-198. See Van Creveld, *Supplying War*, 75-108, on Prussian logistics.

²³ Robert M. Citino, *The German Way of War: From the Thirty Years War to the Third Reich* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), xiii-xv, 143.

Student Requirements

Review:

- Helmuth von Moltke, *Moltke on the Art of War: Selected Writings*, ed. and trans. Daniel J. Hughes, trans. Harry Bell (New York: Ballantine Books, 1993), 171-224 [355 M729m].

Read (176 pages):

- Geoffrey Wawro, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 138-314 [943.082 W356f].

References

- Bucholz, Arden. *Moltke and the German Wars, 1864-1871*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Craig, Gordan A. *The Battle of Königgrätz: Prussia's Victory over Austria, 1866*. 1964, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- ———. *The Politics of the Prussian Army, 1640-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Echevarria, Antulio J. "Helmuth Carl Bernhard Graf von Moltke." In *Chief of Staff: The Principal Officers behind History's Great Commanders*, vol. 1, *Napoleonic Wars to World War I*, edited by David T. Zabecki, 89-103. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2008.
- Foley, Robert T. *German Strategy and the Path to Verdun: Erich von Falkenhayn and the Development of Attrition, 1870-1916*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Holborn, Hajo. "The Prusso-German School: Moltke and the Rise of the General Staff. In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 281-295. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Howard, Michael. *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Invasion of France, 1870-1871*. 1961. Reprint. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Hull, Isabel V. *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Kovacs, Arpad F. "French Military Institutions before the Franco Prussian War." *The American Historical Review* 51, no. 2 (January 1946): 217-235.
- Jones, Marcus. "Fighting 'this nation of liars to the very end': The German Army in the Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871." In *Hybrid Warfare: Fighting Complex Opponents from the Ancient World to the Present*, edited by Williamson Murray and Peter R. Mansoor, 171-198. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- ———. "Strategy as Character: Bismarck and the Prusso-German Question, 1862-1878." In *The Shaping of Grand Strategy: Policy, Diplomacy, and War*, edited by Williamson Murray, Richard Hart Sinnreich, and James Lacey, 79-110. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Moltke, Helmuth von. *Moltke on the Art of War: Selected Writings*. Edited and translated by Daniel J. Hughes, translated by Harry Bell. New York: Ballantine Books, 1993.

- Rothenberg, Gunther E. *The Army of Francis Joseph* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1976).
- ———. Moltke, Schlieffen, and the Doctrine of Strategic Envelopment.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 296-325. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Schneid, Frederick. “A Well-Coordinated Affair: Franco-Piedmontese War Planning in 1859.” *The Journal of Military History* 76, no. 2 (April 2012): 395-425 [Blackboard].
- Showalter, Dennis. *The War of German Unification*. 2nd ed. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- ———. “The Retaming of Bellona: Prussia and the Institutionalization of the Napoleonic Legacy, 1815-1876.” *Military Affairs* 44 (April 1980): 57-63 [Blackboard].
- ———. “Soldiers into Postmasters? The Electric Telegraph as an Instrument of Command in the Prussian Army.” *Military Affairs* 37 (April 1973): 48-52 [Blackboard].
- Van Creveld, Martin. *Command in War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Wawro, Geoffrey. “An ‘Army of Pigs’: The Technical, Social, and Political Bases of Austrian Shock Tactics, 1859-1866.” *The Journal of Military History* 59, no. 3 (July 1995): 407-433 [Blackboard].
- ———. *The Austro-Prussian War: Austria’s War with Prussia and Italy in 1866*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wetzel, David. *A Duel of Giants: Bismarck, Napoleon III, and the Origins of the Franco-Prussian War*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art

Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building

Lesson 10: Upending the Old Order: The First Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895

Introduction

China's "Nine Dash Line," its construction of artificial islands with airbases, its growing blue water navy, and aggressive foreign policy with its neighbors has deep roots in the First Sino-Japanese War. The war was, and remains, a shock to Chinese leadership and its sense of place in the world. It not only influenced Chinese elites' perceptions of the country, it also shaped Western views of China and the Chinese. The war also caused Western politicians and others to reevaluate their impressions of Japan and the Japanese. Following the war, Japan's stock rose as China's declined. While the war was a two-party affair, its larger Asian-Pacific context involved Russia, Korea, and Formosa (Taiwan). Indeed, the repercussions of the First Sino-Japanese War continue to resonate in Chinese foreign and military policy, within the two Koreas, in Russia's Asian policy, and with the Republic of China (Taiwan). Thus, the background and results of this war are pertinent to the United States' larger engagement and activity in the Pacific and in Asia. The bone of contention in this case was Korea.²⁴

Three imperial powers eyed Korea for similar reasons. The Hermit Kingdom was a vassal state of China, but suffered from political instability. Chinese leadership was concerned about its own security and the possibility that invaders might use the peninsula as an invasion route into Manchuria and northern China. Russia's eastern provinces were sparsely populated. The tsar's advisors feared that Korea could be used as an avenue to enter Siberia. Like China and Russia, Japan's leaders also saw Korea as a springboard for invasion. The calculus was simple; the country that controlled Korea enhanced its own security as it threatened that of others.

China had long been the dominant political, economic, military, and cultural power in Asia. Its elites viewed the Middle Kingdom as the center of the civilization. The basic concepts of the Westphalian state system did not hold sway. China's neighbors were vassals; those countries outside of China's orbit were barbarians. There was no in-between. The Confucian order reigned supreme. China's leaders desired little from the outside world. Despite losing the First (1839-1842) and Second (1856-1860) Opium wars, the resulting concessions or Westerners' commercial presence in the treaty ports, European and American influence and import were slight. Japan's experience with the West was different.

In 1853, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, commanding a US Navy squadron, began the process of forcing Japan to open its doors to trade with the United States and the West. Forced to open its ports to the West, Japanese leaders adopted selected Western ways and adapted them to suit the Japanese context. In the years following the Meiji Restoration (1868), Japan adopted the veneer of a Western-style parliamentary system (an oligarchy drawn from prominent families

²⁴ See Yin Pumin, "The Defeat that Changed China's History," *Beijing Review*, 21 August 2014, for a journalistic account of the war's ramifications.

in Satsuma and Choshu provinces ruled in the emperor's name) and created, with the help of Western advisors, arms, equipment, and ships, a modern army and navy. Japan put these forces to use to increase its security and elevate itself to great power status. War served policy.

Student Requirements

Read (221 pages):

- “The Legacy of a War,” *Beijing Review*, 21 August 2014 [Blackboard].
- S.C.M. Paine, *The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: Perceptions, Power, and Primacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-195 [952.031 P147s].
- David C. Evans and Mark R. Peattie, *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887-1941* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1997), 32-51 [359.00952 E92k].
- Frederick R. Dickinson, “Globalizing ConflictSpace: The View from East Asia,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7 (2011): 189–195 [Blackboard].

Map of Operations:

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/26/Operations_of_the_China-Japan_War.png

Korea, Manchuria, and Japan: <http://sinojapanesewar.com/1894map.htm>

The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: As Seen in Prints and Archives:

<https://www.jacar.go.jp/english/jacarbl-fsjwar-e/index.html>

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars, Unlimited Aims: Territorial Expansion and State Building
Lesson 11: Upending the Old Order: The First Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895

Introduction

The performance of the Chinese and Japanese armies and navies shined a light on the strengths and weaknesses of the countries' armed forces and how they envisioned war in relation to achieving policy ends. In short order, Japan had driven the Chinese army from Korea and destroyed a major portion of the Chinese navy. Throughout the war, the armed forces of both countries displayed, by contemporary Western norms, callous, even brutal treatment of prisoners, the wounded, and civilians. Japan's government, attuned to Western critiques, took measures to present its cause as just and its conduct as "civilized." Adhering to international norms was an element in Japan's larger effort to enter the ranks of the great powers. Its military performance had certainly demonstrated impressive capabilities at sea and on the land.²⁵

The Imperial Japanese Army was poised to advance into Manchuria, home of the Qing dynasty and its traditional seat of power, and thenceforth to Beijing. Foreign intercession in the form of the Triple Intervention (Russia, France, and Germany), however, brought an end to the war in the Treaty of Shimonoseki. The Japanese were not wholly satisfied with the treaty. The empire's leaders felt that Russia had diplomatically slighted and deprived Japan of its justly won prizes. Nonetheless, Japan had upended the old Confucian order and now stood as a great power. China had lost face, while Japan had gained face. Within China, the ethno-political divide between the ruling Manchu and subject Han Chinese intensified.

Russia became a special object of enmity for both China and Japan, but China was prostrate and unable to exercise any power or influence. In the negotiations, Russia had succeeded in expelling Japan from Korea and the Liaodong Peninsula and its naval base at Port Arthur in China. For its part, Russia viewed, and not incorrectly, Japan as the most likely challenger to its interests in China. France, which had recently signed an entente with Russia, supported its partner, as did Germany, which wanted to divert Russian attention away from Europe. The three acted in concert, albeit for their own ends. Shortly after China and Japan had signed the treaty, the three powers "declared that Japanese possession of the Liaotung Peninsula represented an obstacle to peace and stability in the Far East, and 'recommended' that Japan relinquish its rights there." Japan's government accepted the demands and waited for the opportunity to exact revenge for the humiliation, which it did in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), contributing to the 1910 Japanese annexation and occupation of Korea until 1945.²⁶

²⁵ Douglas Howland, "Japan's Civilized War: International Law as Diplomacy in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895)," *Journal of the History of International Law* 9, no. 2 (2007): 179-201.

²⁶ Yoji Koda, "The Russo-Japanese War: Primary Causes of Success," *Naval War College Review*, 58, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 15.

The memory of the occupation remains a touchstone of Korean nationalism. Russia's sensitivity to the physical proximity of powerful countries remains acute. Its sparse population in the east and inability to populate much of the region compounds that sensitivity. In the wake of Japan's victory over China, Japan and the European powers submitted demands to the Manchu court for concessions and extraterritorial zones, including naval bases. China has not forgotten the shame.²⁷

Student Requirements

Read (196 pages):

- S.C.M. Paine, *The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: Perceptions, Power, and Primacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 196-370 [952.031 P147s]
- Douglas Howland, "Japan's Civilized War: International Law as Diplomacy in the Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895)," *Journal of the History of International Law* 9, no. 2 (2007): 179-201 [Blackboard].

References

- Beasley, W.G. *Japanese Imperialism, 1894-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Drea, Edward J. *Japan's Imperial Army: Its Rise and Fall, 1853-1945*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009.
- Dreyer, June Teufel. *Middle Kingdom and Empire of the Rising Sun: Sino-Japanese Relations, Past and Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Duus, Peter. *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Elleman, Bruce A. *Modern Chinese Warfare, 1795-1989*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Evans, David C. and Mark R. Peattie. *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887-1941*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1997.
- Fanell, James E. and Kerry K. Gershaneck. "White Warships and Little Blue Men: The Looming 'Short, Sharp War' in the East China Sea over the Senkakus." *MCU Journal* 8, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 67-98.
- Graff, David A. and Robin Higham, eds. *A Military History of China*. Updated ed. Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 2012.
- Kim, Kyu Hyun. "The Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895): Japanese National Integration and Construction of the Korean 'Other'." *International Journal of Korean History* 17, no. 1, (February 2012): 1-25 [Blackboard].
- Koda, Yoji. "The Russo-Japanese War: Primary Causes of Success." *Naval War College Review*, 58, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 10-44.
- Kowner, Rotem, ed. *The Impact of the Russo-Japanese War*. London: Routledge, 2007.

²⁷ Yoji Koda, "The Russo-Japanese War: Primary Causes of Success," *Naval War College Review*, 58, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 15; James E. Fanell and Kerry K. Gershaneck, "White Warships and Little Blue Men: The Looming 'Short, Sharp War' in the East China Sea over the Senkakus," *MCU Journal* 8, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 67-98.

- Kuehn, John T. “Grudging Respect? Kaigun Through the Lens of the US Navy at the Time of the Sino-Japanese War.” *The Northern Mariner/Le marin du nord* 26, no. 3 (July 2016): 259-274 [Blackboard].
- Lone, Stewart. *Japan's First Modern War: Army and Society in the Conflict with China, 1894–1895*. New York: St. Martin's, 1994.
- Paine, S.C.M. *Imperial Rivals: China, Russia and Their Disputed Frontier*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- ———. *The Wars for Asia, 1911-1949*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Papastratigakis, Nicholas. *Russian Imperialism and Naval Power: Military Strategy and the Build-up to the Russo-Japanese War*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Patrikeef, Felix and Harold Shukman. *Railroads and the Russo-Japanese War: Transporting War*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Platt, Stephen R. *Imperial Twilight: The Opium War and the End of China's Last Golden Age*. New York: Knopf, 2018.
- Steinberg, John W., Bruce W. Menning, David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, David Wolff, Shinji Yokote, and Steve Marks, eds. *The Russo-Japanese War in Global Perspective: World War Zero*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2005-2007.
- Steinberg, John W. “The Russo-Japanese War and World History.” *Education About Asia* 13, no. 2 (Fall 2008): 19-24.
- ———. “Was the Russo-Japanese War World War Zero?” *The Russian Review* 67, no. 1 (January 2008): 1-7.
- Yin, Pumin. “The Defeat that Changed China's History.” *Beijing Review*, 21 August 2014 [Blackboard].

**Block 4 (lessons 12-14): Fear, Honor, and Interest: Theory, Planning,
and Reality, 1914**

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Fear, Honor, and Interest: Theory, Planning, and Reality, 1914
Lesson 12: Decisions and Plans for War

Introduction

In 1914, after nearly a century of peace, the great powers of Europe went to war. The Concert of Europe had suppressed revolutions, prevented or localized European wars, and prevented them from exploding into major conflicts. Despite the many opportunities for a general conflagration, war was not inevitable. National leaders, advised by small inner groups, decided to take their countries to war. There was no drift, no sleepwalking, no accident that brought on World War I. Alliances and treaties did not bring about the war. They were, and are, only as meaningful as the signatories wanted them to be; nothing could compel a state to act against its own interests. Thus, the decisions were deliberate and based on the assessments and advice of coterie of political and military elites. All of this notwithstanding, why did Europe not manage to maintain the peace? Why did the Concert of Europe, so carefully crafted in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, fail? What matters of national fear, honor, and interest drove the considerations for war in each country? What did they hope to attain through war?

None of the powers expected a long war. Prussia had set the standard for expectations through its wars with Austria and France. Indeed, Germany's Schlieffen Plan, perhaps more properly termed a concept, was predicated upon the Prussian traditions of *kurtz und vives*, *bewegungskrieg*, and *kesselschlacht*. The concept of speed drove all of the powers in their planning; the quicker the mobilization, the quicker the victory. This was especially the case with Germany, which, since the 1870s, had feared a two-front war against France and Russia. As early as 1875, Moltke the Elder had recognized that France was too powerful to fight in a prolonged war and that the improvements and additions to French fortifications would greatly hamper any German attack. A negotiated end might be the best that Germany could hope for in such a case. Moltke's concerns notwithstanding, German planners continued to wrestle with the problem. By 1897, and thereafter successively reexamined and adjusted, the *Grosser Generalstab* (Great General Staff) under General Count Alfred von Schlieffen hit upon what it believed was the solution, albeit one "permeated with hedge words such as 'if,' 'when,' 'perhaps,' and 'hopefully.'" Hope was a key element in German planning.²⁸

²⁸ Richard F. Hamilton and Holger H. Herwig, eds., *The Origins of World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 153; Gerhard Ritter, *The Schlieffen Plan: Critique of a Myth* (London: Oswald Wolff, 1958), 146-155.

Student Requirements

Read (264 pages):

- Richard F. Hamilton and Holger H. Herwig, *Decisions for War, 1914-1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1-46, 70-91, 112-145, 225-251 [940.311 D2942]²⁹
- Richard F. Hamilton and Holger H. Herwig, eds., *War Planning, 1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1-23, 48-79, 143-197, 226-256 [940.31 W253]

²⁹ *Decisions for War, 1914-1917* is an abridgement of Hamilton and Herwig's *Origins of World War I*, an edited anthology featuring the work of several authors.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Fear, Honor, and Interest: Theory, Planning, and Reality, 1914
Lesson 13: The Battle of the Marne, 1914

Introduction

When Germany, France, and Great Britain went to war, they did so with the forces, weapons, doctrine, and planning that spoke to the type of war they anticipated. Their general staffs had reviewed and updated their planning in the years leading to 1914. They all had expectations about how and where their armies would fight. They had similar expectations regarding how their allies and enemies would fight. Naturally, their expectations and planning anticipated how and when they expected to win. Detailed planning and exquisitely timed mobilization schedules, however, went out of the window once reality rudely intruded. The rate of the German army's advance and its logistics once deployed from the railhead were firmly rooted in the age of horse, musket, and pike: soldiers' feet and horses' hooves could only do so much. The commanders and staffs of the armies had to adjust to their enemies' actions and the tyranny of human and equine muscle and flesh.³⁰

As German armies tramped westward, Belgian and French civilians experienced the trauma of war. The German Army had a particular fear and loathing of partisans, *francs-tireurs*, dating to the Franco-Prussian War. Gunfire, whether real or imagined, sparked harsh reprisals by the German Army against civilians, including the taking of hostages, the execution of civilians, and the burning of towns. Other soldiers meted out private revenge. Thousands of Belgian civilians perished in front of German firing squads and from soldiers acting outside of military discipline. The burning of Louvain, Belgium was particularly shocking. In the university's library, soldiers deliberately poured gasoline over some 300,000 books and manuscripts dating to the Middle Ages and set them ablaze. British propagandists deemed the German Army's conduct as the "Rape of Belgium." Moreover, German authorities ordered the deportation of tens of thousands of civilians in occupied Belgium and France for forced labor. German conduct brought into question the country's legal, moral, and ethical underpinnings as it contributed to the country's loss in the battle for the narrative. Nevertheless, the army continued its advance across Belgium and into France. Schlieffen's great left wheel ground on.³¹

The French army was the ideal instrument for General Joseph Joffre's Plan XVII—against another enemy and under other circumstances. In the Battle of the Frontiers, the German army had thrown it back and had inflicted heavy casualties in southern Belgium, Alsace, and

³⁰ See Van Creveld, *Supplying War*, 109-141 for an examination of German logistics in 1914.

³¹ Alan Kramer, "Atrocities," 1914-1918 Online: International Encyclopedia of the First World War, accessed 6 August 2017, <https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/atrocities>. See also John N. Horne and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), Jeff Lipkes, *Rehearsals: The German Army in Belgium, August 1914* (Leuven, Belgium: University of Leuven Press, 2007), and Larry Zuckerman, *The Rape of Belgium: The Untold Story of World War I* (New York: New York University Press, 2004).

Lorraine. French *élan*, the spirit of *l'offensive à outrance*, and direct fire light artillery were no match for machine guns and indirect fire heavy guns. French attacks recoiled. On the Allied left, the German army drove back the British Expeditionary Force, the “contemptible little army.” By late August, the German army appeared to be on the cusp of success. The Battle of the Frontiers had ended by 24 August. Despite the heavy casualties, over a quarter of a million apiece for France and Germany, battlefield success seemed to be validating German planning, training, equipping, and doctrine.

Student Requirements

Read (171 pages):

- Holger H. Herwig, *The Marne, 1914: The Opening of World War I and the Battle That Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2009), xi-xix, 3-158 [940.421 H581m]
- John Horne and Alan Kramer, “German ‘Atrocities’ and Franco-German Opinion, 1914: The Evidence of German Soldiers’ Diaries,” *Journal of Modern History* 66, no. 1 (March 1994): 1-33 [Blackboard].

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Fear, Honor, and Interest: Theory, Planning, and Reality, 1914
Lesson 14: The Battle of the Marne, 1914

Introduction

The illusion of German success was not quite what it appeared. Belgian resistance had been stiffer than anticipated and had delayed the right wing of the German attack. To the east, Russia's mobilization had proceeded much more quickly than anticipated. On 25 August, General Helmuth von Moltke, the Younger, ordered two corps to East Prussia to shore up Eighth Army. In France, Allied resistance grew stronger as the Germans advanced. The deeper the Germans advanced, the greater their fatigue grew and their lines of communication stretched. Nonetheless, victory seemed at hand. Relying upon broad, mission-oriented orders from the general staff and the tradition of a commander's relative autonomy with the mission (*auftragstaktik*), German commanders arranged their tactical actions in order to hasten the strategic goal of defeating France within a few weeks.

General Alexander von Kluck, commander of First Army, exercised what might be termed disciplined initiative as he deviated from the original concept of the operation. Instead of swinging west of Paris, Kluck elected to pursue retiring French forces to the east of the city and exposed his right flank to the enemy. Following the setbacks in the Battle of the Frontiers, General Joffre reassessed the course of the battle, reframed his understanding of the environment, and acted. French and British tactical actions achieved long-lasting strategic results. The Battle of the Marne, a series of large tactical actions, set the course for the remainder of the war in France. In the longer term, the two great opening battles of the war, the Marne and Tannenberg, transfixed German officers in the interwar period and into World War II. The Marne and its attendant attrition signaled all that could go wrong when a commander lacked the inner strength and character to go forward boldly, to ignore temporary setbacks, and execute the plan vigorously and violently. Never again. Tannenberg, on the other hand, represented all that might accrue to a bold commander. Colonel General Paul von Hindenburg, aided by his chief of staff Major General Erich Ludendorff, succeeded in nearly destroying the Russian Second Army and most of the First Army in a series of engagements in East Prussia. The German Eighth Army, outnumbered, but fighting from an interior position, had performed magnificently.

Herein was the fly in the German ointment: the continued fixation and fetishization of the tactical engagement above all else. Interwar German theorists rightly celebrated the tactical and operational dexterity and leadership of Hindenburg and Ludendorff but ignored the larger and more profound picture. Russian forces withdrew, regrouped, and returned to the offensive. Germany fought a two-front war of attrition. By 1917, revolution had shaken Russia, and by 1918 the Romanov dynasty was no more. The Bolshevik government signed a separate peace with Germany and then went to war with counter-revolutionary Tsarist forces, the White Russians. Had Germany fought solely against Russia, then Tannenberg might have earned more justly the accolades accorded it, and only if the German Army had been able to link the battles in time,

space, and purpose toward accomplishing a larger strategic goal. Yet, it was the Marne in a larger sense that more precisely suggested the real nature of warfare and the impetus toward attrition.

Student Requirements

Read (160 pages):

- Holger H. Herwig, *The Marne, 1914: The Opening of World War I and the Battle That Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2009), 159-319 [940.421 H581m]

References

- 1914-1918 Online: International Encyclopedia of the First World War <https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/themes/>
- Bönker, Dirk. *Militarism in a Global Age: Naval Ambitions in Germany and the United States before World War I*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Brose, Eric Dorn. *The Kaiser's Army: The Politics of Military Technology in Germany during the Machine Age, 1870-1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Bucholz, Arden. *Moltke, Schlieffen, and Prussian War Planning*. New York: Berg, 1991.
- Craig, Gordon A. *The Politics of the Prussian Army, 1640-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Doughty, Robert A. *Pyrrhic Victory: French Strategy and Operations in the Great War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Foley, Robert T. *Alfred von Schlieffen's Military Writings*. New York: Frank Cass, 2003.
- ———. *German Strategy and the Path to Verdun: Erich von Falkenhayn and the Development of Attrition, 1870-1916*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Geyer, Michael. "German Strategy in the Age of Machine warfare, 1914-1945." In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 527-597. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Hamilton, Richard F. and Holger H. Herwig, eds. *Decisions for War, 1914-1917*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hart, Peter. *Fire and Movement: The British Expeditionary Force and the Campaign of 1914*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Hastings, Max. *Catastrophe 1914: Europe Goes to War*. New York: Vintage, 2014.
- Horne, John N. and Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Howard, Michael. "Men against Fire: The Doctrine of the Offensive in 1914." In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 510-526. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Hull, Isabel V. *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Levy, Jack S. and John A. Vasquez, eds. *The Outbreak of the First World War: Structure, Politics, and Decision-Making*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lipkes, Jeff. *Rehearsals: The German Army in Belgium, August 1914*. Leuven, Belgium: University of Leuven Press, 2007.
- MacMillan, Margaret. *The War That Ended Peace: The Road to 1914*. New York: Random House, 2013.

- Mitchell, Allan. *Victors and Vanquished: The German Influence on Army and Church in France after 1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Porch, Douglas. *The March to the Marne: The French Army, 1871-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Rothenberg, Gunther E. Moltke, Schlieffen, and the Doctrine of Strategic Envelopment.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 296-325. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Showalter, Dennis E. *Tannenberg: Clash of Empires*. 1991. Reprint, Washington, DC: Brassey’s, 2009.
- Strachan, Hugh. *The First World War*. Vol. 1, *To Arms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Van Creveld, Martin. *Supplying War: Logistics from Wallenstein to Patton*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Zuckerman, Larry. *The Rape of Belgium: The Untold Story of World War I*. New York: New York University Press, 2004.

Block 5 (lessons 15-18): Absolute War

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Absolute War

Lesson 15: *Bewegungskrieg*, Deep Battle, and Operational Art: Operation Typhoon and the Battle for Moscow, October-December 1941

Introduction

On 22 June 1941, three German army groups invaded the Soviet Union. Two monstrous and murderous empires clashed in one of the greatest land wars in history. The German Army (*Heer*) and Air Force (*Luftwaffe*) applied their tested and successful tenets of *bewegungskrieg*. Working in tandem, they captured and killed countless numbers of Soviet soldiers and destroyed massive quantities of equipment in a series of encirclements, or cauldron battles (*kesselschlacht*). As German forces advanced deeper into the Soviet Union, they also set about, in conjunction with mobile killing units under the command of the SS (*Schutzstaffel*) and SD (*Sicherheitsdienst*), the *Einsatzgruppen* (task forces acting as extermination battalions) murdering Jews, Gypsies, Soviet officials, and others deemed undesirable or threatening. Mass murder and genocide were central elements of the German strategy of annihilation (*vernichtungskrieg*); all branches of the armed forces, the entirety of the *Wehrmacht*, participated in it and German generals had no qualms about soldiers' participation in genocide. How else could Germany achieve its destiny and expand in its quest for living space (*lebensraum*)?³²

The advance seemed unstoppable, but that came to an end as the Soviet Union recovered its balance. Indeed, upon inspection and reflection, German strategists and planners had proved themselves as arrogant, myopic, and amateurish as had been their predecessors in World War I. Their attention to logistics and sustainment was risible. Despite propaganda films showcasing the motorization and mechanization of the army, its methods more often harkened to the nineteenth century in its reliance on hundreds of thousands of horses for transport. This new generation of commanders and staff officers had confused their prowess and sheer luck against other armies and in smaller geographic extents with an innate quality and superiority that transcended all other armed forces. Arrogance, self-deception, and miscalculation coursed through German planning. Theirs was an army best suited to wars that were *kurtz und vives*, not at all for modern war and the nature of most wars, attrition. As the offensive drove deeper into the Soviet Union, its strength dissipated. Clausewitz had stated as much when he observed that the attacker's strength diminished by the need to "occupy" rear areas, to "secure...lines of communication," and to "exploit" the enemies' resources. In the case of the German Army, this included murder, the seizure of private property, and rounding up and supervision of slave labor. A "weakening of the defense" might have compensated for the weakened attack, but that was not the case. Germany's

³² David Stahel, *Operation Barbarossa and Germany's Defeat in the East* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 95-104. See also, Stahel, "The Battle for Wikipedia: The New Age of 'Lost Victories'?", *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 31, no. 3 (July-September 2018): 396-402. For a Nazi jurist's view on partisans, see Carl Schmitt, *Theory of the Partisan: Intermediate Commentary on the Concept of the Political*, trans. G.L. Ulmen (New York: Telos, 2007).

invasion of the Soviet Union put on display two competing theories of operational art, two competing political systems, and two competing economies. All art, no matter the medium, is enabled, inspired, and constrained by the talents and limitations of the artist and the materials available. Only in brutality and disregard for humanity did these regimes have much in common, albeit for different ideological and political systems.³³

Following the surrender of the Central Powers and the end of World War I in 1918, both Germany and Russia were the international order's pariah states. The victorious Allied powers had placed responsibility for the war on Germany's shoulders and had imposed a harsh settlement on the country, including indemnities, occupation, and limitations on the size and composition of the armed forces. Wilhelm II, Kaiser of Germany and King of Prussia, abdicated, and a shaky republic, Weimar, replaced the Hohenzollern and other monarchies of the federated Second Reich. Communists, *Freikorps*, police, and the army fought pitched street battles as they tried to overthrow the republic or defend it. To the east, Russia, renamed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1922, a new political order, the Communist Party, consolidated power in the aftermath of the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty, murder of the imperial family, Russian Civil War (1917-1922), and Russo-Polish War (1919-1921). Germany was to be punished and the Soviet Union shunned.

The general staffs of the German and Soviet armies anticipated a future war. Drawing from their countries' histories, the histories of their armies, and their recent conflicts, the German *Truppenamt* (Troop Office, the cover name for the general staff) and Soviet *Stavka* focused on how best to fight and win the next war. They embraced mechanization, the close coordination with tactical airpower, and emphasized speed, momentum, and firepower in order to destroy, not shock, enemy forces. Future war would be fluid, not static as it had been on the Western Front in World War I. In building their theories these thinkers emphasized or retained certain traditions, such as the relative autonomy of German commanders operating within broad mission orders. Within the Soviet general staff, officers such as Alexander Svechin, Mikhail Tukhachevskii, Georgii Isserson, and Vladimir Triandafillov created the first formal theory of operational art, deep battle. The Soviets also gave serious attention to operational logistics. Joseph Stalin's purge of the Red Army (1937-1939), however, destroyed much of the army's expertise, as the Winter War with Finland (1939-1940) demonstrated. When Germany attacked, the Soviets paid a high price in battle.

Despite the impressive initial showings of the German Army, deep structural problems manifested themselves early on in the campaign. The German Army was at its best in a geographically constrained area of operations, fighting a short, intense campaign. The vast reaches of the Soviet Union were not the appropriate stage for German military prowess, something Napoleon and the *Grande Armée* had discovered in 1812. Another trinity, "space, time, and striking power," worked against Germany. German arms had failed to land an early crushing blow against the Red Army, which proved far more resilient than expected. Moreover, the Soviets had operational depth, superior manpower, and the industrial might demanded in modern warfare. Furthermore, within the first week of the invasion, the United States offered material assistance to the USSR through Lend-Lease. For the second time in its short history as a unified country,

³³ Stahel, *Operation Barbarossa*, 51-54; Clausewitz, *On War*, 527.

Germany had fallen short of decisive victory. It found itself fighting a war of attrition, exactly the sort of war for which it was not prepared or capable of waging for long.³⁴

Operation Typhoon, a two-pronged offensive directed north and south of Moscow, picked up where Operation Barbarossa had failed. The *Ostheer* (Eastern Army) was to have captured Moscow within four months. It did not. Germany had incurred casualties it could not sustain. Battle and the wear and tear on tracked and wheeled vehicles also took their toll. A large proportion of the army's transportation fleet consisted of seized civilian automobiles and trucks, unsuited for military usage. Countless horses, the prime movers for much of the artillery and for infantry logistical transport, had also suffered and died. Construction crews retrofitted wide-gauge (5 feet, inner rail to inner rail) Soviet railroads to standard-gauge (4 feet, 8.5 inches) widths, often replacing rails destroyed by the retiring Red Army. By September, the advance had ground to a halt, thus German commanders envisioned Typhoon as an operation to jump start Barbarossa, prevent the looming attritional war, and avoid a winter campaign.

Kicking off in October 1941, Army Group Center attacked. Within a week of the attack's commencement, temperatures had begun dropping, snow had fallen and melted, followed by rain, and then more snow, snow melt, and rain. Spring and autumn were the seasons of the *rasputitsa*, the season of mud. The poor drainage and clay soils of the Ukraine and eastern Soviet Union turned the unpaved roads into axle and even deeper quagmires. Paved roads crumbled under the excessive wear from tracked and wheeled vehicles and the lack of upkeep. Sustainment efforts failed from a combination of factors including the traditional short shrift given to serious logistical thought and the Reich's failure to shift to a war footing. Soviet counterattacks, some quite serious, compounded all of these problems. Moreover, soldiers of all ranks struggled with morale and belief in the success of the operation. Hope constituted a major element of the German effort. The time of deep penetrations and sweeping encirclements was over. Tactical virtuosity was a thin veneer masking strategic dilettantism.

Student Requirements

Read (209 pages):

- Geoffrey Megargee, *Inside Hitler's High Command* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 102-169 [940.5343 M496i].
- David Stahel, *The Battle for Moscow* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 1-142 [940.5421731 S781b 2015].

³⁴ Stahel, *Operation Barbarossa*, 23.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Absolute War

Lesson 16: *Bewegungskrieg*, Deep Battle, and Operational Art: Operation Typhoon and the Battle for Moscow, October-December 1941

Introduction

Following the brief operational pause and the Orsha conference in mid-November, Operation Typhoon recommenced. The *Ostheer* had taken a desperately needed operational pause, but the Red Army's counterattacks denied it the rest it so desperately needed and forced it to expend limited stocks of ammunition and fuel, not to mention the losses of life. As the army waited, logisticians struggled to supply it with fuel, ammunition, food, winter uniforms, and spare parts. They failed at the highest levels of government and the army. Germany's economy was unable to produce the requisite amounts demanded by modern warfare, and even when logisticians received what they needed, the transportation network, down to rails, roads, and vehicles fell short in numbers, capacity, or maintenance. The army's most senior officers subscribed to hope and willpower as the antidotes to materials wants. Surely, they believed, it was but a matter of better and more resolute leadership. Drawing upon the supposed lessons of 1914, if only German commanders had shown greater willpower at the Marne, Germany would have won the great opening battle of World War I, this generation of generals steeled themselves for a renewed effort.

The German attack resumed in mid-November. The ground was frozen and mobility restored. Roads were more trafficable, if punctuated by embedded vehicles, deep ruts, and frozen, spiked mud that ripped out oil pans, wrecked suspension systems, and damaged vehicles in myriad other ways. Fields sustained the tracked movement, but lengthy cross-country movement wore down tanks and other tracked vehicles at a faster rate than did roads. Spare parts were in short supply, and the motley of wheeled and tracked vehicles only made the effort to sustain forces that much more difficult.

Environmental, operational, and industrial factors, among others, degraded limited *Luftwaffe* capabilities. Soviet pilots contested and dominated the airspace with Soviet, American, and British aircraft. The weather took its toll on the primitive dirt and sod airstrips, German airframes, and the aircrews. Retiring Soviet forces had cratered and rendered barely usable the Red Air Force's airfields. Germany's strategic overreach and the need to respond to threats in northwest Europe and the Mediterranean dispersed its increasingly scarce air assets. As the campaign advanced in time, so too did the over-commitment and attrition of the air force. On 11 December 1941, Germany declared war on the United States, the world's financial and industrial power. This was Germany strategy in action.

By late-November, Lend-Lease materials began flowing into the Soviet ports of Archangel and Murmansk. While small amounts at first, British and American industry stepped up to the task by December. Shipyards turned out more merchantmen to carry the goods and the

escorts to battle U-boats. As the war progressed, the tonnage delivered grew, and easily outpaced German capabilities, yet the *Oberkommando des Heeres* (army high command) and the command of Army Group Center persisted in believing that its forces would succeed in capturing Moscow. The general staff's and senior leadership's beliefs notwithstanding, growing numbers of commanders at field army, corps, division, and below questioned the wisdom behind Operation Typhoon, and some even the war itself, Germany's chances of defeating the Soviet Union, or even winning the larger war.

As German forces culminated in the offensive, the Soviet Union struck back. *Stavka* had created and massed reserve armies beginning in October, but had withheld the bulk of them in anticipation of a counteroffensive. The Soviet general staff realized early in the autumn that the *Wehrmacht* had shot its bolt, and that it was a matter of time, massing forces, and waiting patiently for the appropriate moment to strike back. Withdrawal and defeat did not curb the offensive spirit of the Red Army. Even as the *Heer* advanced, the Soviets counterattacked.

German forces struggled mightily as the Red Army drew from the Soviet Union's vast manpower reserves and regenerated its combat power. Factories relocated deep inside the country, beyond the range of the *Luftwaffe*, and Lend-Lease materials continued to flow. Partisans, aircraft, and specialized troops attacked all manner of targets in the German rear areas and laid waste to anything that might sustain or give shelter to the enemy, even as it deprived Soviet citizens of their homes and sustenance. Winter was a Soviet combat multiplier. *Stavka* and the army's commanders took note of their earlier performance and learned from their mistakes. Strategic depth, sustaining high-intensity operations, and avoiding culminating were just a few of the lesson learned. Tactical brilliance devoid of a realistic and attainable strategy was meaningless. In June 1944, Allied forces landed in Normandy and within two months landed on France's Mediterranean coast. Save limited and strategically pointless counterattacks, Germany was on the defensive, and attrition had once again vanquished *kurtz und vives*. Once again, Germany faced a two-front war. Unlike World War I, the Allies sought nothing less than unconditional surrender.

Student Requirements

Read (196 pages):

- Geoffrey Megargee, *Inside Hitler's High Command* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 170-191 [940.5343 M496i].
- David Stahel, *The Battle for Moscow* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 143-318 [940.5421731 S781b 2015].

References

- Citino, Robert M. *Death of the Wehrmacht: The German Campaigns of 1942*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007.
- Geyer, Michael. "German Strategy in the Age of Machine warfare, 1914-1945." In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 527-597. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

- Glantz, David M. *Colossus Reborn: The Red Army at War*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- ———. “Soviet Operational Art Since 1936: The Triumph of Maneuver War.” In *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, edited by Michael D. Krause and R. Cody Phillips, 247-267. Washington DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005.
- ———. *Stumbling Colossus: The Red Army on the Eve of World War*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.
- Glantz, David M. and Jonathan House, *When Titans Clashed: How the Red Army Stopped Hitler*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Hill, Alexander. *The Red Army and the Second World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Isserson, G.S. *The Evolution of Operational Art*. 2nd ed., rev. and exp. Translated by Bruce W. Menning. 1937. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2013.
- Kipp, Jacob W. “The Origins of Soviet Operational Art, 1917-1936.” In *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, edited by Michael D. Krause and R. Cody Phillips, 213-246. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005.
- Müller, Rolf-Dieter. *Hitler’s Wehrmacht, 1935-1945*. Translated by Janet W. Ancker. University Press of Kentucky, 2016.
- Merridale, Catherine. *Ivan’s War: Life and Death in the Red Army, 1939-1945*. New York: Picador, 2006.
- Overy, Richard. *Russia’s War: A History of the Soviet Effort: 1941-1945*.
- Rice, Condoleezza. “The Making of Soviet Strategy.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 648-676. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Rutherford, Jeff. *Combat and Genocide on the Eastern Front: The German Infantry’s War, 1941-1944*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Schmitt, Carl. *Theory of the Partisan: Intermediate Commentary on the Concept of the Political*. Translated by G.L. Ulmen. New York: Telos, 2007.
- Stahel, David. *Kiev, 1941: Hitler’s Battle for Supremacy in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- ———. *Operation Barbarossa and Germany’s Defeat in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- ———. “The Battle for Wikipedia: The New Age of ‘Lost Victories’?” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 31, no. 3 (July-September 2018): 396-402.
- ———. *Operation Typhoon: Hitler’s March on Moscow, October 1941*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Svechin, Aleksander A. *Strategy*. Edited by Kent Lee. Minneapolis: East View, 1993.
- Stone, David R. “Misreading Svechin: Attrition, Annihilation, and Historicism.” *Journal of Military History* 76 (July 2012): 673-693.
- Triandafillov, V.K. *The Nature of the Operations of Modern Armies*. London: Frank Cass, 1994.
- Turbinville, Graham H., Jr. “Soviet Operational Logistics, 1939-1990.” In *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, edited by Michael D. Krause and R. Cody Phillips, 293-326. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005.
- USSR People’s Commissariat of Defense. *Field Service Regulations, Soviet Army, 1936*. Translated by Charles Borman. Washington, DC: Army War College, 1937.

- Ziemke, Earl F. *Stalingrad to Berlin: The German Defeat in the East*. Washington, DC: US Army Center of Military History, 2002.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Absolute War

**Lesson 17: Joint Operations and the Tenuous End of the Rope: Land, Sea, and Air in the
Solomon Islands Campaign, 1942-1943**

Introduction

The Solomon Islands campaign was the United States' first effort in the much larger island-hopping offensives against Japan. The battle of Guadalcanal was the first step. American ground, air, and naval forces had previously fought the Japanese in an unsuccessful attempt to defend the Philippines. Japanese forces had also taken on and defeated British, Australian, French, and Dutch forces in the air, on land, and at sea, thus American victory was not inevitable. At the battles of the Coral Sea (4-8 May 1942) and Midway (4-7 June 1942), the US Navy fought against the Imperial Japanese Navy in the first aircraft carrier battles in history. In these two engagements, the Japanese lost four fleet carriers, suffered damage to a fifth, and lost one light carrier, whereas the United States lost two fleet carriers and had suffered damage to a third. Both navies had inflicted serious casualties on one another, but neither one had a telling advantage over the other. Japan, however, had the preponderance of aircraft carriers in 1942 and the advantage of the central position in a one-ocean war. At the start of the Solomon Island campaign, the Imperial Navy possessed six fleet and two light carriers, whereas the United States Navy had but four fleet carriers, but it fought a two-ocean war. As important as aircraft carriers were, surface warships still mattered greatly. As was the case with naval aviation, gunnery and torpedo actions between the fleets were contests between doctrine, skill, training, technology, and the ability and willingness to adapt.³⁵

Japanese forces launched Operation Mo, a four-phased operation, in May 1942. Their intent was the capture of Port Moresby, New Guinea, an Australian territory, in order to isolate Australia and New Zealand. The first action took place when Japanese forces seized and occupied Tulagi, near Guadalcanal, on 3 May. Tulagi's harbor was one of the larger and better anchorages in the Solomons. The island was to serve as base for future operations to the southwest in the Coral Sea. It would also help protect the approaches to the Japanese air and naval bases at Rabaul, to the northwest in the Bismarck Archipelago.

Landings at Port Moresby were to follow on 7 May. As the invasion force sailed for Port Moresby, the Japanese launched airstrikes against the target on 5 and 6 May in preparation for the landings. Following the battle of the Coral Sea, the Japanese ordered the invasion forces to return to port. Japanese losses in the battle of the Coral Sea put an end to Operation Mo and its follow-on joint operation, FS (the seizure and occupation of Fiji, Samoa, and New Caledonia), but not to their efforts in the Solomons. In July, Japanese engineers began building an airfield on Lunga Point, on the island of Guadalcanal, to provide basing for long range aircraft to cover future offensive operations.

³⁵ Jonathan Parshall and Anthony Tully *Shattered Sword: The Untold Story of the Battle of Midway* (Dulles, VA: Potomac Book, 2005), 3-91, 397-443.

At Guadalcanal (Operation Watchtower), US naval, air, and ground forces assumed the offensive and fought Japanese naval, air, and ground forces in a desperate struggle to control the island, especially its airfield, in an attempt to secure the sea lines of communication to Australia. Intelligence, shipping, tonnage, and the ability to secure and maintain sea lines of communication in order to project power were central to the waging of Japanese and American expeditionary warfare. Both navies practiced what Mahan and Corbett had preached.³⁶

More than any previous campaign in US military history, the battles for the Solomon Islands demonstrated the challenges, effectiveness, and power of joint planning and execution. Land, sea, air, and intelligence operations reinforced the inherent strengths of one another. When synchronized, their collective action multiplied their effectiveness. Marines, and later soldiers fought to secure Henderson Field and extend its security perimeter as the Japanese fought to retake it. Warships and aircraft supported ground forces as they landed and fought to expand their lodgments in order to establish basing for future operations. Supply ships sustained those actions. The pattern continued throughout the Pacific as soldiers and marines seized islands for air and naval basing and logistics hubs to sustain offensive momentum, extend operational reach, and prevent culmination.

Early in the campaign, the US Navy, cognizant of its shortage of fleet carriers, avoided unduly risking them. Fleet carriers, aircraft, and crews were far more difficult to produce than marines or soldiers. Japan, similarly, sought to shield its carriers even as it flew sorties from Rabaul that taxed aircrews and aircraft. The level, quality, and flexibility of planning and cooperation between naval, air, and ground elements at the tactical and operational levels mirrored that on the strategic stage. Indeed, despite the United States' commitment to a Europe first strategy, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt ordered shipping destined for European waters diverted to the Pacific to support the actions in the Solomons.

Early in 1942, the United States created the Joint Chiefs of Staff to coordinate the global war effort and advise the president. The service chiefs also acted, and generally successfully, to smooth out inter-service rivalries and jealousies. Japan's equivalent, the Imperial General Headquarters, did the same in theory, but was more often dysfunctional. Neither the army nor the navy trusted one another. Each service was jealous of its prerogatives and prioritized its own wars: the army focused on China, whereas the navy gave its attention to the United States. Issues of offensive operations and imperial expansion versus consolidation and defense further divided the services and even created divisions within them. The battle for Guadalcanal and much larger campaign for the Solomons exposed many of these strengths and weaknesses at the strategic level, much as it highlighted combatants' doctrinal, operational, tactical, and other differences.

Student Requirements

Read (214 pages):

- John Prados, *Islands of Destiny: The Solomons Campaign and the Eclipse of the Rising Sun* (New York: NAL Caliber, 2012), xv-xviii, 1-159 [940.5426593 P896i]

³⁶ For forces arrayed, see appendices 1-4, Richard B. Frank, *Guadalcanal: The Definitive Account of the Landmark Battle* (New York: Random House, 1990), 619-646.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Absolute War

**Lesson 18: Joint Operations and the Tenuous End of the Rope: Land, Sea, and Air in the
Solomon Islands Campaign, 1942-1943**

Introduction

From August through October 1942, the Japanese fought hard to retake Henderson Field and secure Guadalcanal. American forces had fought just as hard. By 13 October, the US Navy had lost twelve ships, supply and combatant, including the carrier *Wasp* and four cruisers, including HMAS *Canberra*. The Japanese had damaged another thirty-five ships, some more than once in the naval battles, which highlighted the different national and service cultures. The Imperial Japanese Navy had more than demonstrated its prowess in the battles of Savo Island, the Eastern Solomons, and Cape Esperance. It had suffered one light carrier, three cruisers, and three destroyers sunk, and four cruisers damaged.

On the ground and in the air, marines, soldiers, and airmen contended with a skilled, but increasingly desperate enemy. Japan had resorted to high-speed convoys or resupply missions with destroyers but was never able to deliver enough material to fully sustain its ground forces. Attrition through combat, starvation, and disease sapped Japanese strength. Cooperation between the Japanese army and the navy, never strong, grew progressively worse.

Sustaining the air elements at Henderson Field and the ground forces that protected it required massive amounts of shipping. The tyranny of distance affected American and Japanese forces. Both countries projected power at the tenuous ends of their logistical ropes. For every two marines or soldiers deployed to Guadalcanal, five could have easily been supported in Europe. Issues of sustainment, operational reach, and tempo loomed large in the fight for Guadalcanal and throughout the Pacific theater.

By the end of 1942, Imperial Headquarters had determined that it could no longer continue the fight. It initiated an evacuation of Japanese forces in late January that lasted into early February. The United States had secured the extended sea lines of communication to Australia, sea lines that helped secure the continent and supported the counteroffensive on New Guinea. The battle for Guadalcanal validated and cast doubt on some prewar concepts and techniques from the strategic through the tactical. It tested command relationships, doctrine, theory, and developing concepts of joint command and control.

Following the Japanese withdrawal from Guadalcanal in early 1943, US forces expanded and improved Henderson Field, built additional runways at Lunga Point, and a bomber field at Koli Point. At Guadalcanal and nearby Tulagi and Florida islands, US engineers built extensive naval and logistical facilities to support the thrust up the Solomons, while Guadalcanal served as a forward staging area for ground forces in preparation for Operation Cartwheel.

Strategically, the US and Allied forces had seized the initiative from the Japanese, who now assumed a largely defensive posture throughout the Pacific. Organizationally, the Imperial Japanese Navy adopted a command structure similar to the Allies, with a joint commander responsible for all operations in a particular sector. As US commanders and planners took stock, they refined ideas for an advance up the Solomons and the isolation of Rabaul. Operation Cartwheel, like all plans, evolved as commanders and their staffs reassessed and reframed their understanding of the operational environment. Cartwheel marked the US and Allied assumption of the offensive in the Pacific. The island-hopping campaign had begun.

Student Requirements

Read (202 pages):

- John Prados, *Islands of Destiny: The Solomons Campaign and the Eclipse of the Rising Sun* (New York: NAL Caliber, 2012), 160-362 [940.5426593 P896i]

References

- Bartsch, William H. *Victory Fever on Guadalcanal: Japan's First Land Defeat of World War II*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2014.
- Beasley, W.G. *Japanese Imperialism, 1894-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Bergerud, Eric M. *Fire in the Sky: The Air War in the South Pacific*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 2001.
- Bullard, Steven, trans. *Japanese Army Operations in the South Pacific Area: New Britain and Papua Campaigns, 1942-43*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial 2007.
- Bullard, Steven and Tamura Keiko, eds. *From a Hostile Shore: Australia and Japan at War in New Guinea*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 2004.
- Corbett, Julian S. *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy*. 1911. Reprint, Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1988.
- Cronin, Francis D., *Under the Southern Cross: The Saga of the Americal Division*. Washington, DC: Combat Forces Press, 1981.
- Drea, Edward J. *Japan's Imperial Army: Its Rise and Fall, 1853-1945*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009.
- Dull, Paul S. *A Battle History of the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1941-1945*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1978.
- Evans, David C. and Mark R. Peattie. *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887-1941*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1997.
- Frank, Richard B. *Guadalcanal: The Definitive Account of the Landmark Battle*. New York: Random House, 1990.
- Griffith, Samuel B. *The Battle for Guadalcanal*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963.
- Hammel, Eric, *Carrier Clash: The Invasion of Guadalcanal & the Battle of the Eastern Solomons August 1942*. St. Paul, MN: Zenith Press, 1999.

- Hone, Trent. *Learning War: The Evolution of Fighting Doctrine in the U.S. Navy, 1898-1945*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2018.
- ———. “Learning to Win: The Evolution of U.S. Navy Doctrine During the Guadalcanal Campaign.” *Journal of Military History* 82, no. 3 (July 2018): 817-841.
- Hornfischer, James D. *Neptune's Inferno: The U.S. Navy at Guadalcanal*. New York: Random House, 2011.
- James, D. Clayton. “American and Japanese Strategies in the Pacific War.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, 703-732. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Jersey, Stanley Coleman *Hell's Islands: The Untold Story of Guadalcanal*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008.
- Kennedy, Paul. *Engineers of Victory: The Problem Solvers Who Turned the Tide in the Second World War*. New York: Random House, 2013.
- Mahan, Alfred Thayer. *The Influence of Seapower upon History, 1660-1783*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1890.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. *History of United States Naval Operations in World War II*. Vol. 5, *The Struggle for Guadalcanal, August 1942-February 1943*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1958.
- O'Brien, Phillips Payson. *How the War Was Won: Air-Sea Power and Allied Victory in World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Parshall, Jonathan and Anthony Tully. *Shattered Sword: The Untold Story of the Battle of Midway*. Dulles, VA: Potomac Book, 2005.
- Rigby, David. *Allied Master Strategists: The Combined Chiefs of Staff in World War II*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2012.
- Spector, Ronald. *Eagle Against the Sun: The American War with Japan*. New York: Free Press, 1985.
- Stoler, Mark A. *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and U.S. Strategy in World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Toland, John. *The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire, 1936-1945*. New York: Modern Library, 1970.
- Toll, Ian W. *Pacific Crucible: War at Sea in the Pacific, 1941-1942*. New York: Norton, 2011.

Block 6 (lessons 19-21): Limited Wars: To What Purpose, to What End?

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars: To What Purpose, to What End?
Lesson 19: The United States in Vietnam

Introduction

United States conventional forces entered the Republic of Vietnam in 1965. What had begun as an advisory and training mission in the 1950s had increased into a larger force in the 1960s, with the US assuming greater responsibility for the planning and conduct of operations. Fought against the greater backdrop of the Cold War, the US effort was comprehensive and exhaustive, yet not quite enough. For policy makers and strategists, the threat of war with the USSR loomed in the background. China's intentions also concerned American political and military leadership. The war, which was both an insurgency and a civil war, was challenging. The enemy seemed to be everywhere but was not easily identifiable. There were no clear lines. Soldiers and marines struggled to develop effective metrics for gauging success or failure, but as commanders and their staffs discovered, battlefield metrics were one thing, but measuring progress against an insurgency was another.

The commander of US forces for much of the war was General William C. Westmoreland, an experienced combat officer with service in World War II and the Korean War. It was Westmoreland's task, assisted by his staff, to translate directives, and at times to negotiate, with policy makers and to develop American strategy in the Vietnam War. Westmoreland was the operational commander charged with accomplishing the strategic ends established by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Westmoreland communicated most frequently with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

When the United States entered the Vietnam War, it did so with a wealth of knowledge and experience. World War II was but twenty years in the past, the Korean War even nearer. Counterinsurgencies and the doctrine to address them were not new. Americans had advised the Greek government in the aftermath of World War II; they had observed the French and British during in Asia and Africa. The task was to develop a feasible and acceptable strategy to insure the survival of the South Vietnamese government and prevent the expansion of communism in Asia. Along the way, planners had to develop the proper measures to gauge progress. Finally, units in the field had to implement the strategy at the tactical level in order to attain the strategic end state.

Counterinsurgency and pacification within colonial holdings were one thing; assisting a sovereign government in its attempts to extend its writ, to earn popular support, and establish its legitimacy was another. Imperial forces fought to maintain the position and presence of the metropolitan power within its colonial holdings. The British and French experiences come to mind most frequently, but the United States also had experience in its suppression of the Philippine Insurrection (1899-1902) and in its various wars against American Indians throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those cases, the US intent was long-term possession or

annexation and incorporation into the United States. The Vietnam War was an altogether different matter. Vietnam, a country not a war, was not the United States' to win or lose.

Student Requirements

Review:

- George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 702-823 [327.73 H567f].

Read (189 pages):

- Gregory A. Daddis, *Westmoreland's War: Reassessing American Strategy in Vietnam* (New York Oxford University Press, 2014), xix-xxv, 1-183 [959.70434 D121w]

References

- Bradley, Mark Phillip. *Vietnam at War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Daddis, Gregory. *No Sure Victory: Measuring U.S. Army Effectiveness and Progress in the Vietnam War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- ———. *Withdrawal: Reassessing America's Final Years in Vietnam*. New York. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Dalloz, Jaques. *The War in Indochina, 1945-54*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1990.
- Hennessy, Michael. *Strategy in Vietnam: The Marines and Revolutionary Warfare in I Corps, 1965-1972*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.
- Herring, George. *America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975*. New York: Wiley, 1979.
- Hunt, Richard. *Pacification: The American Struggle for Vietnam's Hearts and Minds*. Boulder: Westview, 1995.
- Lawrence, Mark Atwood. *The Vietnam War: A Concise International History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lawrence, Mark Atwood and Fredrik Logevall, eds. *The First Vietnam War: Colonial Conflict and Cold War Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Lockhart, Greg. *Nation in Arms: The Origins of the People's Army of Vietnam*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1989.
- Logevall, Frederik. *Embers of War: The Fall of an Empire and the Making of America's Vietnam*. New York: Random House, 2103.
- McMaster, H. R. *Dereliction of Duty: Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies that Led to Vietnam*. New York: HarperCollins, 1997.
- Moyar, Mark. *Triumph Forsaken: The Vietnam War, 1954-1965*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Nguyen, Lien-Hang T., *Hanoi's War: An International History of the War for Peace in Vietnam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Prados, John. *Vietnam: The History of an Unwinnable War, 1945-1975*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009.

- Sorley, Lewis. *The Vietnam War: An Assessment by South Vietnam's Generals*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2010.
- Thompson, Wayne. *To Hanoi and Back: The U.S. Air Force and North Vietnam, 1966-1973*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.
- Tucker, Spencer. *Vietnam*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999.
- Wiest, Andrew, Mary Kathryn Barbier, and Glenn Robins, eds. *America and the Vietnam War: Re-examining the Culture and History of a Generation*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Wiest, Andrew. *Vietnam's Forgotten Army: Heroism and Betrayal in the ARVN*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars: To What Purpose, to What End?
Lesson 20: A Global War on Terrorism?

Introduction

At 8:46 a.m., EST, on 11 September 2001, American Airlines Flight 11, bound for Los Angeles from Boston, slammed into the north tower of the World Trade Center in New York City. At 9:03 a.m., United Airlines Flight 175, also flying from Boston to Los Angeles, struck the south tower. A third airplane, American Airlines Flight 77, flying from Dulles to Los Angeles, flew into the Pentagon at 9:37 a.m. United Airlines Flight 93, flying from Newark to San Francisco, plunged into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania at 10:03 a.m. Americans watched much of this tragedy on television as it happened. The attacks, launched by al-Qaeda, killed some 3,000 people, including the nineteen hijackers. Fifteen of the hijackers were from the United States' ally, Saudi Arabia.

The background and motives underpinning the attacks were a motley of events and reasons that wove together the variegated strands of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the US backed *mujahedeen*, Islamic fundamentalism, politicized Islam, the First Gulf War, the United States' long involvement in the Middle East, repressive Arab regimes, the Sunni-Shia divide, the Afghan civil war, and more. Clearly, the United States needed to respond. The attacks had originated in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan, which had provided al-Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden a safe haven. US planners began the process of campaign planning. Broadly, the intention was capturing or killing bin Laden, overthrowing the Taliban regime, and installing a friendly government. Unsurprisingly, the operational environment was complex and anything but simple.

In his State of the Union address on 29 January 2002, President George W. Bush proclaimed that Iran, Iraq, and North Korea constituted an "axis of evil." On 12 September, the president declared to the United Nations that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, and that the country posed a "grave and gathering danger."³⁷ President Bush suggested in his State of the Union address on 28 January 2003 that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons. Protests in cities across the United States and in Europe greeted the apparent drive toward war. Less than two months later, US and coalition forces invaded Iraq in Operation Iraqi Liberation, quickly changed to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Meanwhile, there was also a war in Afghanistan.

The motives, intentions, and decisions to go to war in Afghanistan were clear, whereas those behind the war against Iraq were decidedly less so. The Global War on Terrorism, later renamed the Global War on Terror, was war against a tactic, but to what purpose and to what end?

³⁷ 13 September 2002, *New York Times*.

Student Requirements

Review:

- George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 916-964 [327.73 H567f].

Read (193 pages):

- Beth Bailey and Richard Immerman, eds., *Understanding the U.S. Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 1-16, 21-48, 54-72, 77-94, 99-120, 124-143, 147-166, 220-234 [956.70443 U55b 2015].
- Donald P. Wright, et al., *A Different Kind of War: The United States Army in Operation Enduring Freedom, October 2001-September 2005* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2006), 5-24, 27-51 [958.1047 D569 2010].

US ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE
School of Advanced Military Studies
Advanced Military Studies Program

Evolutions of Operational Art
Limited Wars: To What Purpose, to What End?
Lesson 21: Operation Enduring Freedom

Introduction

In little more than a month after the 11 September attacks, the United States and coalition forces launched Operation Enduring Freedom. Special Operations Forces, acting in conjunction with anti-Taliban Afghans, and supported by close air support, overthrew the Taliban regime and installed Hamid Karzai as president. By December the Taliban had largely retreated to two strongholds, the Shahi Kowt Valley in Paktia Province and the Tora Bora Valley in Nangarhar Province. Both sites had sheltered *mujahedeen* during the Soviet occupation. Bordering Pakistan's nearly ungovernable Northwest Frontier provinces, their porous borders offered refuge beyond Afghanistan. Having accomplished two elements in the larger strategy, US and Afghan forces set their sights on capturing or killing Osama bin Laden. Intelligence indicated that bin Laden was hiding in the Tora Bora Valley. The operation, running from 6-21 December 2001, failed to capture or kill bin Laden.

Despite the less-than-satisfactory results of the battle at Tora Bora, the campaign appeared to have been largely successful. Coalition forces began winding down combat operations and planning for redeployment to home stations. Meanwhile, there were clear indications from the president, vice-president, and others that the US was edging toward a war with Iraq. Yet, the fight in Afghanistan was anything but concluded. Intelligence suggested that large numbers of Taliban fighters had concentrated in the Shahi Kowt Valley and that their activity had increased. Thus, as the United States prepared its case for war in Iraq, US and coalition forces launched Operation Anaconda in the Shahi Kowt Valley in March 2002. The fight was not what planners and commanders had anticipated. One year later, US and coalition forces invaded Iraq.

Nearly sixteen years later, US and NATO forces are still in Afghanistan. Over thirteen years have elapsed since US and coalition forces overthrew Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Forces unleashed by the overthrow of the regime continue playing out in Iraq and now throughout the Gulf region. The length, expense, and ongoing results of the wars speak to US strategy and the wars' myriad and unanticipated consequences. The promises of quick and decisive battle, among other things, did not materialize. The wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq have created unforeseen opportunities for adversarial state and non-state actors. How this complex and ever shifting situation plays out is yet to be determined.

Student Requirements

Read (226 pages):

- Donald P. Wright, et al., *A Different Kind of War: The United States Army in Operation Enduring Freedom, October 2001-September 2005* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2006), 57-68, 71-88, 93-121, 127-140, 172-174, 181-203, 209-233, 237-269, 277-308, 317-329 [958.1047 D569 2010].
- Beth Bailey and Richard Immerman, eds., *Understanding the U.S. Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 286-304, 308-325 [956.70443 U55b 2015].

References

- Baumann, Dr. Robert F. *Russian-Soviet Unconventional Wars in the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Afghanistan*. Leavenworth Papers No. 20. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, Command and General Staff College Press, 1993.
- Briscoe, Charles H., Richard L. Kiper, James A. Schroder, and Kalev I. Sepp. *Weapon of Choice: US Army Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2003.
- Grau, Lester W., ed. *The Bear Went Over the Mountain: Soviet Combat Tactics in Afghanistan*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1996.
- Grau, Lester W. and Dodge Billingsley. *Operation Anaconda: America's First Major Battle in Afghanistan*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2011.
- Jalali, Ali Ahmad and Lester W. Grau. *The Other Side of the Mountain: Mujahideen Tactics in the Soviet-Afghan War*. Quantico, VA: U.S. Marine Corps, Studies and Analysis Division, 1999.
- Grau, Lester W. and Michael A. Gress, eds. *The Soviet-Afghan War: How a Superpower Fought and Lost*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2002.
- Naylor, Sean. *Not A Good Day to Die: The Untold Story of Operation Anaconda*. New York: Berkley Caliber Books, Paperback ed., 2006.
- Stewart, Richard W. *The United States Army in Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom, October 2001–March 2002*. CMH Publication 70-83-1. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, 2006.