

**Statement of  
Dr Lani Kass  
Professor of Military Strategy  
National War College, National Defense University  
February 3, 2004  
House of Representatives  
Committee on Government Reform  
Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International  
Relations**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to testify. As an American by choice rather than the fortune of birth, I'm particularly honored to be here. The views I'm about to present are my own. These views reflect over 20 years of experience as a teacher and practitioner of strategy. They do not represent the official positions of the US Government, the Department of Defense, or the National Defense University.

In May 1863, on the eve of the battle of Chancellorsville, General Joe Hooker, commander of the Union Army of the Potomac, said: *"My plans are perfect. May God have mercy on General Lee, for I will have none."* General Hooker's over-confidence had immediate, mid- and long-term consequences: First, he was crushed by General Lee. Second, he was **fired** by President Lincoln. Last, General Hooker did not go down in history as a great strategist; rather, his **name became a synonym** for--shall we say--certain ladies of the evening. The enduring lesson is that **humility** is a virtue in assessing strategic plans--your own or anybody else's.

This is so because strategy is hard to do. Strategy operates in a realm where chance, fog, friction, and ambiguity dominate. It seeks to reconcile ends, ways and means; mitigate risks; and balance present imperatives with future considerations--all in an uncertain, dynamic environment. To complicate life even further, strategy is a multi-sided affair. This means that the objectives, intentions, and reactions of both allies and opponents are difficult--if not

impossible--to anticipate and account for. Clausewitz was right: "Everything in war is very simple, but the simplest thing is exceedingly difficult." We should remember this principle as we evaluate current strategies and look for ways to do better in the future.

Strategy guides action. Thus, it is nothing but pragmatic. The focus of strategy is on how to use available means to achieve the desired ends with acceptable risk. Therefore, the first strategic question is: will this idea--this "perfect plan"--work under the special--and, usually, unknowable--circumstances of its next test. Often, that next test is the crucible of war.

Innovation, flexibility and integration are the hallmarks of successful strategies. The ability to think anew and develop creative solutions to changed circumstances is as critical as it is rare. Innovation hinges on foresight--that is, the ability to assess current and emerging trends, as well as anticipate their potential. Innovation requires courage, perseverance, and, often, readiness to "break some china"--especially in large bureaucracies.

Integration--or, "holistic thinking"--is an approach which captures both the whole and its component parts; grasps multi-dimensional, dynamic relationships as they are today and as they might evolve tomorrow; yet does not assume--nor expect--perfect coordination, clear-cut answers, or immediate, measurable results.

Moreover, successful strategies must be linked both upward and downward. The best military operation will be an abject failure if it does not support the over-arching political strategy. Likewise, a brilliant strategy unsupported--or unsupportable--by reality at the tactical and operational levels is, at best, an interesting academic exercise or, more often, a prescription for disaster.

Strategy is both an art and a structured intellectual process. Strategic effectiveness comes from an integrated, synchronized effort, sustained over the long-term, and guided by a clear vision of the desired end-state--of what it is that you are trying to achieve. Foresight and flexibility are the keys to success, as is the ability to fuse a wide variety of actions, issues, and equities into a coherent

whole. Frankly, this kind of holistic thinking is rare, precisely because it is difficult.

A logical, systematic approach is a necessary first step. I have provided the Committee with the framework we use at the National War College to educate the Nation's future leaders. Hopefully, it will help you and your Staff ask the tough questions that must be answered to validate the suitability and feasibility of any strategic design.

Asking the right questions is vitally important precisely because the Global War on Terrorism is a new kind of war imposed on us by a new kind of an enemy. This enemy is not tied to geographic boundaries; instead, it operates in non-traditional domains, employing non-traditional means, clearly unbound by established norms of international behavior. That enemy invoked religion to declare war on America--indeed, on civilization at large.

Clausewitz teaches that "the first, the supreme, the most important act of judgment that the statesman and the commander have to make is determine the kind of war upon which they are embarking, neither mistaking it for nor trying to make it into something that is alien to its nature. This is the first strategic question and the most comprehensive." What, then, is the nature of this new war?

Clearly, terrorism is not a new phenomenon. What is new is that modern technology provides individuals with destructive power that up till now was the exclusive domain of advanced militaries. What is also new is that terrorists can now operate on a global scale, in pursuit of global aims. With the world as their battlefield, and globalization as their enabler, these insurgents want to destroy the existing international system and establish a new world order, dominated by their brand of militant Islam. Thus, we're faced with a new strategic equation: an insurgency of global proportions--what I'd call a PANSURGENCY--meaning a networked, transnational **movement**, aimed at overthrowing values, cultures, and societies by means of terrorism, subversion, and armed conflict.

Rather than using terrorism to change a single society or government, terrorism has gone international in pursuit of global aims. Organizations such as Al Qaeda have established a worldwide network of operatives, with links to other terrorist organizations to provide mutual support and assistance. This network has developed links with organized crime, drug trafficking, state sponsors, and companies and corporations sympathetic to its causes. Cumulatively, a virtual nation has been created that possesses the means to conduct war--and in fact has declared war on the world--posing a significant military and foreign policy challenge to which the United States has had no preplanned response. At the heart of this interconnected network of terror lie terrorist groups that seek to alter the global status quo.

The breathtaking scope of the insurgents' goals is mirrored by their desire to inflict mass casualties, virtually anywhere in the world--be it New York or Riyadh; Washington or Nairobi; Dar-al-Salaam or Jerusalem; Bali or Baghdad; Ankara or Jakarta. They seek weapons of mass destruction and will not hesitate to use them. They truly believe they're on a mission from God; they are ready to destroy everything and die trying. They are well-financed, networked, adaptive, flexible, and patient. They also know us much better than we know them.

What is also new is the explicitly religious nature of al Qa'eda's ideology. Religiously motivated violence is different for the simple reason that, for the true believer, there is no compromise about the sacred; there can be no bargaining, nor accommodation, nor truce. In this context, killing becomes an end in itself, rather than one instrument among others, to be used rationally to attain the desired objectives. Thus, this first war of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is as deeply rooted in the ancient past as it is in the imperatives of the information age. It might also be the first deliberate effort to re-introduce religion into international relations since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia effectively banished considerations of creed from the repertoire of acceptable reasons to wage war.

It has been said that terrorists want a lot of people watching rather than a lot of people dead. If so, religiously-motivated terrorists are fundamentally different: They do want a lot of people dead and may not care whether a lot of people are watching, as long as God sees what has been done in his name. God's partisans cannot bargain over the fulfillment of his will, because doing so would substitute man's judgment for God's. In this construct, total, global war is simply unavoidable.

The last time the US fought a "hot" war on a global scale was 60 years ago. Like the current Global War on Terrorism, the Second World War started with a surprise attack on US territory; it called for a total commitment and quick adjustment to unexpected imperatives. In both cases, US forces faced conditions they had not planned on or prepared for, requiring us to adapt in the midst of a fight, learn from experience, and quickly evolve new approaches and procedures--and, often, field new, untested technologies--to solve emerging problems. Intellectual agility and strategic adaptability--the ability to innovate--along with war-fighting and organizational skills, proved to be the keys to victory in WWII. These very same skills will be necessary to win the Global War on Terrorism.

The Second World War and the Cold War are useful paradigms to think about the Global War on Terrorism--in terms of scope, duration, the desired end-state, and, most importantly, the level of national will and commitment that were required over the long haul. It is also important to remember that both World War II and the Cold War were battles of ideas: democracy and capitalism against fascism and communism. In the end, our ideas triumphed: fascism and communism were relegated to the "ash heap of history." That is where al Qa'eda's ideology belongs.

Terrorism is the societal evil of our time; the war on terrorism is our generation's greatest challenge. This evil must be abolished and universally delegitimized like slavery, piracy, and genocide. There must be an international taboo against the deliberate targeting of innocent civilians. We must create a global environment hostile to both terrorist organizations and terrorism. . Though acts of terror can never be completely prevented, terrorism must be reduced to a

level that is isolated, rare, and clearly irrational--that is, useless as an instrument of policy. This will ultimately allow terrorism to be combated as criminal activity within single states, not as a global war.

The ultimate defeat of this global insurgency will only come through the synergistic, steadfast, and systematic application of all the elements of national power--diplomatic, economic, informational, financial, law enforcement, intelligence, and military--simultaneously across four dimensions: We must *defeat* terrorist organizations; we must *deny* them sponsorship, support, and sanctuary; we must win the battle of ideas and *diminish* the underlying conditions that allow terrorism to flourish--all while *defending* the US.

The **centers of gravity** of terrorist groups include leadership, supporting ideology, finances, command and control network, and sanctuaries. To defeat existing terrorist groups, the United States, its allies, and coalition partners need to: Identify and isolate terrorist organizations at each level; Disrupt support infrastructure and sanctuaries; Discredit al Qa'eda's ideology; and Destroy terrorist networks and leadership.

While it is unrealistic to hope to eliminate every single terrorist who desires to threaten innocent civilians, it is possible to eliminate the synergy created by cooperation of disparate terrorist organizations. This effort will reduce the operational scope and capabilities of global and regional terrorists to the point that they become threats only at the individual state level. At this level, the threat can be combated as criminal behavior, which will allow a narrower focus to attack their centers of gravity and allow full engagement of law enforcement mechanisms.

The second element of the 3-D Strategy of Abolishment focuses on deterring future acts of terrorism. To establish a credible deterrent, the United States and the international community should develop and maintain a set of capabilities and mechanisms that clearly communicate to potential terrorists and their supporters that the costs of terrorism far outweigh any perceived benefits. The deterrent message should be sent not only to terrorist organizations but also

to states that sponsor them, nonstate actors that provide a front for their activities, and individuals who may contemplate joining or supporting them. The goal of deterring terrorism supports the strategic aim of abolishing it by convincing individuals, organizations, and states to seek alternate methods of political change because terrorism is no longer a viable option. Sending an effective message to each of the four audiences associated with terrorism requires:

*Deterring terrorist organizations.* Terrorist organizations believe that they can conduct operations with impunity. Capabilities, particularly improved intelligence, should be acquired to detect, thwart, and destroy such groups and bring their members to justice. Actions should be taken to create certainty that terrorists will be captured and imprisoned rather than becoming martyrs for their cause. Political, social, and religious leaders must understand that their organizations will be destroyed if they choose terrorism to advance their aims.

*Deterring state actors.* States must be deterred from providing support or sanctuary to terrorist organizations. This can be done by broadening international norms against terrorism and demonstrating the resolve to replace the leadership of any state that continues to sponsor terrorism. States must clearly understand that the costs will far outweigh any perceived benefits of engaging in acts of terrorism.

*Deterring nonstate actors.* Nonstate actors must be deterred from providing aid and assistance to terrorist organizations. This can be achieved by establishing an international environment of greater financial transparency, "naming and shaming" organizations involved in terrorist support, and lowering barriers to asset seizures and freezing of funds.

*Deterring individuals.* Efforts to deter individuals from joining or supporting terrorist organizations include educating potential recruits on the sinister nature of specific organizations and of terrorism in general, dispelling the notion that terrorism results in positive gain, and demonstrating that terrorists will be brought to justice.

Although some believe that terrorists are undeterrable, a strong argument can be made to the contrary. Without question, state and nonstate actors can be

deterred from providing assistance. The tougher challenge applies to the actual terrorist organizations and their followers. Deterrence of these will take time. The bottom line is that terrorists must believe that ultimately their efforts would be futile.

Efforts to diminish the underlying causes of terrorism comprise the third element of the 3-D Strategy of Abolishment. Through an aggressive, long-term campaign, the United States and its allies should strive to mitigate the underlying conditions that foster the formation of terrorist groups and their support elements. To do this, the United States and its allies should directly or indirectly engage vulnerable regions and disparate ideologies and peoples.

The major contributors to the underlying causes of terrorism are: Economic and social inequity in societies marked by both abject poverty and conspicuous affluence; Poor governance and economic stagnation or decline that alienates many segments of a state's population; Illiteracy and lack of education that lead to widespread ignorance about the modern world and resentment toward Western values; Widespread resentment toward America's foreign policies, particularly regarding the Middle East.

To mitigate these underlying causes, the United States should renew efforts to remind the international community that America stands not only against terrorism but also for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all peoples of the world. To win the war of ideas, the US should increase foreign development assistance and use it to promote accountable and participatory governance along with an environment favorable to sustained economic growth; Promote literacy and education in the Islamic world and underdeveloped nations; Engage in information operations to denigrate the concept of terrorism and discredit supporting ideology; and reenergize efforts for peace and stability in the Middle East.

While the United States engages in overseas activities to combat terrorism, it should simultaneously defend the homeland. The US faces an enemy determined to disrupt the American way of life and undermine the safety and

security of US citizens everywhere. On the home front, the United States should remain vigilant and ready by establishing collaborative relationships between Federal agencies, law enforcement, public health and emergency management entities, professional associations, and private partners. To that end, the United States should use every power available to defend the homeland against terrorist attack while executing its overarching offensive strategy to abolish terrorism. The US should be postured to provide an effective defense in three areas:

*Prevent terrorist attacks.* To the maximum extent possible, would-be terrorists and the weapons they intend to use must be denied entry into the United States. Weapons of mass destruction must be detected and intercepted before they can be employed. Collaboration at all levels of government, along with private sector and individual citizens, is essential to disrupting terrorist aims.

*Protect critical assets.* To minimize the probability of a successful terrorist strike in the homeland, the United States should fortify critical infrastructure and other potential terrorist targets.

*Prepare responses.* To reduce the impact of terrorism, the United States should be prepared to mitigate the consequences of an attack. This is particularly critical when responding to attacks from weapons of mass destruction. Again, collaboration among all agencies at the Federal, state, and local level is essential.

The United States should be safe and secure at home to preserve its way of life, maintain economic growth and stamina, and remain engaged in the international effort against terrorism. Without an effective defense, the United States might be driven to focus on matters at home, allowing terrorists to continue operating on a global scale.

In sum, this Nation is engaged in a war that demands a long-term commitment of national will, blood and treasure. It also demands a well-orchestrated, consistent and focused strategy to achieve the desired end state: A world free of organized terrorism and a global environment in which terror can never again flourish. The American people and their elected representatives should not expect a quick or easy victory. Yet, we must all realize that this is

truly an existential fight--a war of necessity, which we must win. Simply put, failure is not an option.

