

CARLISLE PAPERS

Strategic Studies Institute
U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA 17013

End Game Strategies: Winning the Peace

William L. Peace, Sr.

Visit our website for other free publication
downloads

<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)



U.S. Army War College Carlisle Paper

**END GAME STRATEGIES:
WINNING THE PEACE**

**Lieutenant Colonel William L. Peace, Sr.
U.S. Army National Guard**

July 2012

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

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

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 47 Ashburn Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications may be downloaded free of charge from the SSI website. Hard copies of this report may also be obtained free of charge while supplies last by placing an order on the SSI website. SSI publications may be quoted or reprinted in part or in full with permission and appropriate credit given to the U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA. Contact SSI by visiting our website at the following address: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on the SSI website at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-537-2

PREFACE

The U.S. Army War College (USAWC) provides an excellent environment for selected military officers and government civilians to reflect on and use their career experience to explore a wide range of strategic issues. To ensure that the research conducted by USAWC students is available to Army and Department of Defense leaders, the Strategic Studies Institute publishes selected papers in its “Carlisle Papers” series.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Antulio J. Echevarria II', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

ANTULIO J ECHEVARRIA II
Director of Research
Strategic Studies Institute

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

WILLIAM L. PEACE, SR., is a lieutenant colonel in the New Jersey Army National Guard. He has been a Soldier since 1985, is a veteran of two wars, serving with the 82nd Airborne Division and the First Corps Support Command. He has commanded at the company and battalion level and held various battalion and brigade staff positions in logistics. Lieutenant Colonel Peace is currently the Policy and Plans Branch chief for the G-4 of the New Jersey Army National Guard, an 18-year veteran of the Freehold Township Police Department and currently works in the Patrol Division, is an active member of the Police Benevolence Association Local #209, is the President of the National Guard Association of New Jersey, and is a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He is a former Department of the Army Civilian Logistics Manager. Lieutenant Colonel Peace holds a master's degree in the administration of criminal justice from Norwich University, and a master's in strategic studies from the U.S. Army War College.

SUMMARY

This monograph analyzes the occupation of Germany after World War II and the occupation of Iraq after major combat operations in Operation IRAQI FREEDOM to understand the similarities between the two operations and bring out lessons learned from both. Allied forces spent much time planning and preparing for the occupation of the Axis countries, obtaining practical experience in North Africa, Sicily, and France as they pressed on toward Berlin. Unity of command and unity of effort ensured effective governance of Germany – helping to make it a vibrant country today, ranking in the top five countries in many metrics. Iraq has not been as fortunate, and has only started to move forward within the last 3 to 4 of the almost 9 years of occupation there. The United States did not have as much time to plan for the occupation, and unity of command was not achieved in the beginning, causing a lack of security during the beginning of the occupation. We can take some lessons from these operations and apply them to the future. While we cannot yet know the outcome in Iraq, there is hope that it will become a well-functioning state and a friend of the United States in the years to come.

END GAME STRATEGIES: WINNING THE PEACE

A boy, who hears a history lesson ended by the beauty of peace, and how Napoleon brought ruin upon the world and that he should be forever cursed, will not long have much confidence in his teacher. He wants to hear more about the fighting and less about the peace negotiations.¹

– William Lee Howard
Peace, Dolls and Pugnacity

The outcome of war can only be known by looking at it years or even decades later and discovering if the enemy's government and society has been made better and if we have made it a friend.² This has certainly been the case for the United States and Great Britain from the days of our revolution to now. It has also been true for the United States and Germany from World War II until now. Will it be the case with Iraq years from now? The occupations of Germany after World War II and of Iraq in the 21st century are two events in history that, while not a perfect parallel, have enough similarities that a comparison of the two can help to decide which approaches worked and which did not. While the true comparison cannot be made for decades to come, we can make some assumptions regarding Iraq based on the facts over the past 9 years.

From my research, it has become apparent that there are some striking similarities between the two occupations that can be the basis of analysis. Among these are the de-Nazification and de-Ba'athification processes, similar in design for both operations, and similar in their goal, though, importantly, not in their execution. Another is the unity of command inherent in the military-led government utilized in Germany from the end of the war in 1945 until it was fully turned over to civilian authority in 1949, and the unity of command displayed by the symbiotic relationship between Multinational Forces Commander General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker during their prosecution of the surge in Iraq.

There are also differences between the two. In World War II, the Allies brought the entire German people to their collective knees by massive force applied in the drive to take their capitol, Berlin, in order to build afterward a stable, secure, and democratic nation free from Nazi influence. In Iraq, we went out of our way to not use the term "occupation," and while we brought the Iraqi government to its knees, we went out of our way not to target the people. In Germany, there was a formal surrender, while in Iraq, there was not. The living standards of the average German citizen prior to World War II were relatively good, as it was a very developed and economically advanced country.³ Based on Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1940, the top countries in the world were the United States, the Soviet Union, Germany, and the United Kingdom (UK), in that order.⁴ The standard of living of the average Iraqi citizen prior to Operation IRAQI FREEDOM (OIF) was not as comfortable, after years of international sanctions and mismanagement by Saddam Hussein. In 2001, Iraqi GDP was estimated at \$57 billion, very near to the median of the 183 countries listed.⁵ The number of troops and the way they were used in Germany were different than in Iraq. The Allies had years to plan and prepare for the occupation of the Axis countries, combined with practical experience in

North Africa, Sicily, and France as they pressed on toward Berlin. While it is not known what the combined British, Canadian, French, and American force totaled at the end of World War II in Germany, by the end of 1946, the number of American forces in their sector of occupied Germany was approximately 200,000, equaling one soldier for every 85 Germans.⁶ Compared with the 125,000 Coalition soldiers of the Multinational Force in Iraq after major combat operations, we had only one soldier for every 193 Iraqis. What many fail to mention however, is that there were also 125,000 contractors in Iraq performing soldier functions, which gave the Coalition forces virtually the same ratio – one Coalition member for every 85 Iraqis – as existed in the U.S. sector of the occupation of Germany. But while the occupier-occupied ratios in the two situations were comparable, the planning and experience which preceded the occupation of Germany was far greater than that of Iraq. This enabled the WWII Allies to develop a detailed and thoughtful plan for the occupation, and while there were setbacks and successes, Germany is a vibrant country today, even after the reunification in 1990. Iraq has not been so fortunate, and is only now starting to show noticeable improvement after almost 9 years of operations. The United States had only from December 2001 until May 2003 to plan OIF,⁷ and despite recent occupation experience from Bosnia and Kosovo, it did not utilize this experience wisely. Overall, to understand what happened in Iraq, we must look first at Germany before and after Operation ECLIPSE, the plan to occupy and rebuild Germany.

GERMANY

The occupation of Germany, while not a perfect process, was successful, as can be seen by that country's standing in the world today. The Allies definitively defeated the German Army and demoralized the people before accepting the German government's unconditional surrender. The process of rebuilding the infrastructure, the economy, and the government was then started in earnest. The Allies worked together, and the American sector, specifically, had unity of command under the Department of War with enough resources to secure the country, rebuild the German security apparatus, continue governmental services (after a period of severe food shortages brought about by the war), and get the economy growing. The Allies found a German people with a single voice in a country that had always believed in nationalism. Germany had previous experience with democracy and capitalism, which aided the rebuilding process.⁸ To understand where Germany is today, we need to understand where it came from.

In 1933, Hitler came to power in a demoralized, poor, and broken Germany that had lost much on Armistice Day at the end of World War I. The Allies at the time wanted to exact revenge on Germany for the war and to ensure that it would never be able to wage war in Europe again.⁹ The Allied peace settlement ensured that the German citizens were poor, hungry, and angry. This set the conditions for Hitler to climb to power, which he did in brutal fashion by orchestrating the deaths of his opponents and focusing the German people on an outside enemy. On taking control of Germany, Hitler immediately tackled unemployment and pushed Germany toward becoming one of the most industrialized countries in the world, bringing economic prosperity to a tired citizenry. Within the first year, he disbanded the provincial legislative bodies and transferred power to the central government in Berlin, which then appointed local governments. In 1938, he was able to incorporate Austria and the Sudetenland into the "Reich" (the German

empire) without going to war, which emboldened him. Not satisfied, he wanted more resources for Germany, and more territory, accomplishing this by invading and annexing Poland, Denmark, Norway, and France. He next drove the British Expeditionary force into the sea at Dunkirk and began to threaten the British Island.¹⁰ All of this gave the German people a rising surge of nationalist pride. This background set the scene for what would become a crushing defeat by the Allied forces of the German army and the German people, a demand for unconditional surrender, and a rebirth of Germany as a democracy. As John Gimbel of the 2nd Military Government Regiment said, "Ironic as it may be, for the second time in the 20th century, Germany's democratic development was heavily influenced by a military establishment, albeit not by the same one."¹¹

Once victory was won, the peace had to be won as well. General George C. Marshall the U.S. Army Chief of Staff, and General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe (SACEUR), knew from World War I something of the challenges of governing a defeated country. They ensured that both the Army and the Navy played the leading role in developing the plans and policies for war termination and the subsequent postwar occupation, both in Germany and in Japan.¹² Lieutenant General Sir Frederick E. Morgan, the Chief of Staff for SACEUR, began planning occupation operations for Germany on May 22, 1943, because of the possibility of the German collapse being imminent. This process would be ongoing until the Axis countries were liberated in mid-1945.¹³

During the planning phase, meetings were held between the Allies to decide what their goals would be for the war and how the Axis powers would be treated after victory. At a meeting in Potsdam in mid-1945, the United States, the UK, and Russia agreed on what would be done with Germany. The goals were clear: the destruction of the Nazi party and its institutions; the prevention of Nazi or militaristic activity and propaganda; the abolition of Nazi laws; the arrest and punishment of war criminals, Nazi leaders, and Nazi supporters; and the removal from positions of authority of all members of the Nazi party who had more than just minor participation.¹⁴ Subsequent to these immediate goals was the overarching one, of reestablishing a functioning German state that would control and care for its people while not being a threat to its neighbors or to world peace. Each of the Allies, to include France, would be given a part of Germany to administer, with an Allied Control Council being established to provide single oversight of the four sectors.

After Victory in Europe (VE) day, May 8, 1945, the plan was executed. The War Department had direct responsibility for governing the U.S. sector of Germany from the end of the war until May of 1949, with the acquiescence of the Department of State and the President. The State Department was more than happy to hand the reigns to the War Department, because it felt it did not have enough people or resources to handle the occupation.¹⁵ Because the mission to govern Germany was performed by the War Department through its European command, unity of command was achieved easily. The military had all of the resources and all of the tasking authority, and owned all of the personnel and equipment required to perform the mission. The U.S. sector was placed under the management of the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS).

Based on U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Directive 1067, the goal of OMGUS was to establish a ". . . [s]tern, all-powerful military administration of a conquered country, based on its unconditional surrender, impressing the Germans with their military de-

feat and the futility of any further aggression.”¹⁶ This directive outlined the plan for de-Nazification, demilitarization, control of all communication and education, and the decentralization of the German government. Heavily influenced by U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., there was a discouragement of imported relief supplies for what were considered a guilty German citizenry. Great debates arose about such things as how much industry to allow to be rebuilt and how much food to allow to be grown, so that the German government could care for its people, but never disturb the peace of Europe again.

The mission of governing was made less difficult with the use of trained military government teams. These teams were trained by the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) and had already proved their worth in the invasions of North Africa and Sicily. They quickly got essential services back in place and ensured a process was in place to restore order and stability; they also ensured a successful handoff to civilian control. The problem became not having enough officers specially trained in military government. A program of training had begun at the University of Virginia in early 1942, but it did not have the capacity to turn out the required number of officers. As a fix, another school was started at Fort Custer, Michigan, in November 1942, where officers received basic military training and then moved to other universities to obtain the specialized training required for governance.¹⁷

Through the ASTP, several thousand military government specialist officers from both the Army and the Navy were trained for staff and field work. In his lecture, “War in the Ruins: The American Army’s Final Battle Against Nazi Germany,” Dr. Edward G. Longacre described the ASTP as a specialized program in which college-educated, high-I.Q. civilians were inducted into the army for special programs, one of which was military government.¹⁸ The Army organized an elaborate system of country units, missions, G-5 (military government and civil affairs) staffs, and field detachments to be used throughout the world in handling military government problems.¹⁹ These military government teams moved forward with the fighting forces, and then remained behind in the cleared areas to ensure that all government functions remained operational, and that no fanatical Nazi member remained in control – enabling the combat forces to move further into Europe. By partnering with combat forces, ASTP teams were able to disarm, secure, control, and begin the rebuilding of Germany even before VE Day.

The de-Nazification plan for the European theater of operations was a more difficult problem, and not all leaders agreed with it. The Allies chose a hard line to ensure that the people knew that the Nazi party would be erased from the face of the earth, even if this caused short-term issues within the new government due to inexperienced personnel. General George Patton, commander of the Third Army, was made the military governor of Bavaria in May 1945. He felt, and was often quoted as saying, that Nazi party membership had been required in order to work and survive in Germany during the Reich, and that these workers were not true Nazis and were indispensable as administrators. He felt that the only people who could be proved as anti-Nazi had not held office since 1933, and they had little useable experience or knowledge about how current government operated. He was quoted as saying, “It is no more possible for a man to be a civil servant in Germany and not have paid lip service to Nazism than it is for a man to be a postmaster in America and not have paid at least lip service to the Democratic party or

Republican party when it is in power.”²⁰ He disagreed with the way de-Nazification was practiced and was often in trouble for expressing his views.

It must be noted that the Nazi party developed programs to integrate every phase of life under its control. From Nazi teachers’ associations, to the Nazi culture front, to the Nazi civil servants’ group, to the Hitler Youth organization, all aspects of German life were controlled by the Nazi party. Citizens participated, or they were shunned and could not earn a living.²¹ Patton’s position meant he was in constant trouble with senior leaders for not doing enough to remove Nazis and for discussing his opinions with the press.

General Patton also proved to be unprepared for military governorship. While understanding why military government had to be accomplished, he felt that it was not as important as other military operations. He chose not to use his trained military government specialists, but instead used combat officers, leaving the specialists with nothing to do. This meant governmental functions were not always performed correctly. The Seventh Army, under Lieutenant General A. M. Patch, was the exact opposite. Patch understood and believed in the art of military government and operated with this as his vision. He gave his government specialists great latitude and responsibility and ensured that they received the full support of his combatants. With two commanders in the American sectors, each applying standards in a different way, unity of command and unity of effort were not achieved and may have yielded different outcomes. This organizational structure was quickly changed, however. General Patton was removed as the commander of Third Army and as the military governor of Bavaria in September 1945, due to his inability to follow orders from the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force and the difficulty of working with him.²² Early in 1946, as the Seventh Army was sent home, all areas of Germany under American control were organized under one command headed by General Lucius D. Clay, who was appointed as the military governor.

The appointment of one military governor for the entire American sector provided a unity of command that had not existed previously. General Clay had experience as an Engineer officer, and had not been present for much of the fighting in Europe. He had performed admirably by quickly stabilizing and rebuilding the Cherbourg Harbor in France after the Germans destroyed it, making it a viable port that was critical in keeping supplies flowing to the front lines.²³ Clay was typical of most military leaders in that he did not want to be the military governor, stating in no uncertain terms, “After all, we were still fighting a war, and to be the occupying deputy military governor in a defeated area while the war was still going on in the Pacific was about as dead-looking an end for a soldier as you could find.”²⁴ However, he did his duty, and did it well.

With 61 American divisions totaling 1.6 million men in Germany at the end of the war (not to mention British and other Allied forces in their sectors of occupation), there were more than enough troops to secure Germany. After VE day, May 8, 1945, the American public demanded that “their boys,” some of whom had been gone for over 4 years, be brought home as soon as possible. Military planners had set the requirement for the occupational force troop strength at over 400,000 soldiers, which they later reduced to 370,000. Because of increasing pressures to either send soldiers to the Pacific region, or to demobilize them, there were only 290,000 American soldiers left to occupy and secure

the U.S. sector of Germany after VE Day. Germany, then, consisted of a little over 17 million citizens, or about one soldier for every 58 Germans. By the end of 1946, this strength had dropped to around 200,000, or one soldier for every 85 Germans.²⁵ While there were some security issues, including the murder of the American installed mayor of Aachen, Franz Oppenhoff,²⁶ after VE day, Germany remained fairly secure and stable because of the use of American soldiers to secure the populace.

General Clay, while not perfect, was an exceptional governor. He played a decisive part in ensuring that America and its Allies moved away from the punitive measures of the Morgenthau Plan.²⁷ This plan, developed by U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., sought to dismantle German industry, give its mineral rights to other countries, and break it into two separate states so that it could never be a threat to the world. This was strikingly similar to the punishment inflicted on Germany after World War I. General Clay's savvy paved the way for the Marshall Plan, which ensured money and resources were given to Germany (and other European countries affected by the war) to help stabilize the economy and enable Germany to become self-governing. He was diligent in his efforts to solve problems with food supplies, housing, healthcare, governance, monetary concerns, and other areas affecting citizens under his charge, including the correct application of de-Nazification. As tensions with the Soviets over Berlin and West Germany became heated, the Soviets blockaded Berlin on June 24, 1948, ensuring that no food or other supplies came into the city, in an effort to starve the people for political coercion purposes.²⁸ The famous Berlin Airlift, or "Operation VITTLES," as the pilots called it, was planned and executed by General Clay and succeeded in eventually breaking the blockade on May 12, 1949. Clay's actions as military governor were in large part the reason for the successful lifting of the blockade.²⁹

General Clay was directly responsible for the unification of the Western zones of Germany, with the British merging their zone into the American zone in January 1947 and the French finally relinquishing their zone with the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1949. The Soviets refused to allow their zone to reintegrate into a greater Germany, instead creating the German Democratic Republic, which remained separate until 1990.³⁰

By May 1949, the first elections were held in the Western Zone, creating the Federal Republic of Germany and establishing Konrad Adenauer as the first Chancellor. The German government administered the Federal Republic of Germany at a national level, with the Allied High Commission, reformed from the Allied Control Council in September 1949, retaining ultimate sovereignty in order to oversee the new government. The Allied High Commission was disbanded in May 1955, and West Germany became a sovereign country and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).³¹ Germany remained a divided country for the next 35 years.

With major political change occurring in the Eastern Bloc countries of Poland and Hungary and civil unrest in the German Democratic Republic, that government on November 9, 1989, authorized its citizens to visit West Germany. Citizens on both sides began to chip away at the infamous Berlin Wall, with reunification finally taking place on October 3, 1990.³² Today, the Federal Republic of Germany has the 6th largest GDP in the world and the largest economy in the European Union (EU).³³ It is a federal parliamentary republic consisting of 16 states with over 81 million inhabitants. It is currently

a nonpermanent member of the United Nations (UN) Security Council and is by every metric a world leader.

The course that led Germany to this place was a long one. Germany's army was defeated and forced to sign an unconditional surrender, and the German people were demoralized through a crushing defeat. The Allies carefully planned the occupation, from the beginning of the U.S. entry into the war in late 1941 until the occupation began in the liberated countries of Europe. The Allies perfected the plan as they governed other countries while making their way to the heart of Germany. De-Nazification helped to legitimize the new government. Unity of command and unity of effort were leveraged, leading the Allies toward the same set of goals. All led to a successful occupation and handoff to Germany. Has the occupation of Iraq, especially in light of the 2007-08 surge and new strategy, gone as well?

IRAQ

The occupation of Iraq has not been a smooth process by any means. It may finally be successful with the advent of an updated strategy later referred to as "the surge." This strategy was two pronged: secure the populace, and assist in the building of a legitimate and effective government. As the United States and the rest of the Coalition significantly reduce their presence in Iraq, only time will tell if the surge worked. To understand where Iraq is today, we need to understand where it came from.

The geographical area that is now Iraq has always been home to many Bedouin tribes who moved around Arabia in South West Asia. Colonialism on the part of many countries, including the UK, created borders and nation-states in the region and installed various forms of government – usually following an organization similar to the colonial master, or with a ruler who was closely allied with it. During World War I, the British Army had begun to push the Turkish Ottoman Empire out of Mesopotamia. The man who helped them greatly was a charismatic Arab named Faisal bin Hussein, who worked with the famed Thomas Edward Lawrence, known popularly as "Lawrence of Arabia." Lawrence's plan was to assist in an Arab revolt to harass the Turks, and help to gain victory for the British. While Faisal's Sharifian Army was not enough to overthrow the Turks, as a direct descendant of Mohammed he could count on help from many of the fractious tribes of Arabia. Faisal successfully led this Arab Army, helping to take Damascus and ultimately leading to an Armistice between Turkey and the UK near the end of World War I.³⁴ The UK would soon enlist his help with leading the country of Iraq.

Faisal became the first king of Iraq in 1921, gaining 96 percent of the vote.³⁵ With his great leadership and charisma, he was able to move beyond the Sunni-Shia divide, promoting pan-Arabism and helping Iraq to become a great country in the region as a constitutional monarchy, with a parliamentary system similar to that of the UK. His death in 1933 led to his son, Ghazi, ruling for a time before he was killed in an automobile accident soon after a coup d' etat by the Iraqi Army. Ghazi did not have his father's strong leadership, and the dividing differences of the Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds began to create problems in Iraq. Ghazi's 4-year-old son, Prince Faisal II, became the next ruler, although his uncle Abdullilah, the son of King Ali of the Hejaz region, acted as regent. Faisal II assumed the throne in 1953 at the age of 18, with Nuri Said serving

as his prime minister. Said's support for the UK in the conflict against Egypt over the Suez Canal proved to be his undoing. On July 14, 1958, the king was assassinated in a bloody coup, and Said was murdered by a mob. A military group led by Abdul Karem Kassim seized power and established Iraq as a Republic. Then Kassim was assassinated, and his government removed by the Ba'ath Socialist party in 1963.³⁶ This party had been in existence since the 1930s and was based on socialist and Arab nationalistic views. It was also inspired by Fascist movements, including Nazism, and continued to foment a fascist ideology. After a number of coups and military rule, a young officer named Saddam Hussein rose to power in Iraq.

Saddam Hussein was a member of the family that ran the Ba'ath party and by 1979, had taken over the presidency of Iraq from his cousin.³⁷ Within a year, he invaded Iran, and a war ensued for almost 8 years. In 1990, Hussein invaded and occupied Kuwait, until being forcibly removed by a Coalition led by the United States. After the cease-fire agreement that ended open hostilities between the Coalition and Iraq, Hussein made many more provocative moves, continuing to seek weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and earning himself a UN resolution forbidding this activity. He continued on this course, crushing a Shiite challenge to his Ba'athist regime in the south, killing tens of thousands, and destroying over 150,000 homes by draining the marshes at the mouths of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. He terrorized Kurds in the north as well, seeing them as a threat to his governance. These actions caused the UN Security Council to establish a "No-Fly Zone" over southern Iraq and another over northern Iraq, and promulgate another UN resolution directing Iraq to stop oppressing its civilians. Other activities by Hussein included support to terrorist groups and a plot to assassinate former President George H. W. Bush in Kuwait in April 1993.

By the end of 2002, Iraqi forces were firing weapons at Coalition aircraft in the No-Fly Zones on an almost daily basis, with little penalty. With the perception that most, if not all, of the diplomatic and economic sanctions were failing, the United States and the UK decided to enforce the 16 previous UN resolutions and go to war in 2003 to force a regime change. This military operation was called Operation IRAQI FREEDOM (OIF). The planning process, unlike in Germany during World War II, was much shortened and hindered by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and his staff when they imposed their views in place of the facts. Rumsfeld and his staff were further seen as disregarding the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their team's experience in post-conflict operations in Bosnia and Kosovo, and left them out of the decisionmaking process.³⁸

At the start of OIF, the Coalition force utilized a strategy of "Shock and Awe" with small numbers of forces and cutting-edge technology. It effectively and quickly devastated the government, forcing the military and security forces to disband and go into hiding to avoid retribution. As major combat operations came to an end in May 2003; there was never an official surrender from the Iraqi government, which just ceased to exist, and no definitive defeat of the army.

After much jubilation, lawlessness followed for a time, unchecked by what many considered an understrength and unwilling coalition. While Ambassador Paul Bremer, head of the Coalition Provincial Authority (CPA), states in his book that he gave the order to stop the looting, he felt that there were not enough troops to accomplish the mission and that they lacked the willingness to stop the violence. Assumptions on the num-

ber of soldiers required to provide post-conflict security were largely based on a study conducted by the Rand Corporation. It concluded that the security requirement was 20 soldiers for every 1,000 residents, or a ratio of 1 to 50, which concurs with the latest army counterinsurgency (COIN) manual.³⁹ With nearly 25 million Iraqis, this put the troop level requirement at 500,000. In the period just after major combat operations, there were approximately 160,000 Coalition soldiers in Iraq.⁴⁰ Not accounted for in the Rand study however, were the contributions of contractors, which in effect boosted troop strength. Although the exact number is not known, according to the Congressional Budget Office, there was approximately one contractor for every soldier, with 78 percent of them operating on Department of Defense (DoD) contracts as opposed to State Department or U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) missions.⁴¹ This placed the number of contractors performing soldiers' jobs at approximately 125,000, giving a total of approximately 285,000 personnel, of the 500,000 calculated by Rand to be required. When compared with the number available in Germany at the end of 1946, however, the ratio is virtually the same: one occupier for every 85 occupied.

While not a scientific study of manpower, we see that the issue may not have been troop strength. The real issue was a lack of guidance from a national command authority concerning security. Military commanders on the ground at the time felt that it was not their responsibility to stop the looting.⁴² The unchecked lawlessness reduced the much-needed prestige and trustworthiness of the Coalition forces, attributes that are important for an occupying force. Once a victor loses prestige and the trust of the people, it is hard to gain it back.⁴³ This pushed the country into decline and aided in a rising insurgency, which eventually gained support from other groups such as al-Qaeda.

An intact Iraqi army and security force might have made the difference in securing the country. The Ba'ath party, however, became a symbol of the Iraqi regime under Saddam Hussein, just as the Nazi party under Hitler symbolized the German regime. It was the belief of some in the U.S. Government that just as Eisenhower had abolished the Nazi political apparatus in Germany, Bremer would have to do the same in Iraq. De-Ba'athification was necessary for a new and legitimate Iraq to emerge. Others disagreed. For example, according to Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith, General Franks said that ". . . the Ba'athists were a political party, and if we were going to promote democracy, we shouldn't be banning political parties."⁴⁴ Some believed that just as in the former Nazi Germany, Iraqi professionals had to maintain membership in the dreaded Ba'ath party in order to continue to work in their professions. A concentrated effort to forge political unity and power sharing among Iraq's main groups would be the only chance to hold the country together.

Ambassador Paul Bremer's first act complicated those chances. He established Decree #1 on May 16 and Decree #2 on May 23. Much as in the de-Nazification process, Decree #1 denied jobs to the top leaders of the Ba'ath party, which included thousands of professionals at state-run institutions such as universities, hospitals, food depots, schools, water works, electrical plants, and oil refineries. Just as in de-Nazification, this decree was to be applied only to the most senior leadership, but difficulty in identifying these individuals led to removing people who were imperative to the operation of those agencies, and who were not hard-core Ba'athists.⁴⁵

Decree #1, for example, was responsible for removing all of the professors from Mosul University prior to students graduating in the spring. Major General Petraeus,

governing Mosul at the time, was able to get the professors temporarily reinstated for the graduation, by enabling a local vetting council to vouch for them. This was a short-term fix, as it was later overturned by a centrally operated Iraqi commission on de-Ba'athification.⁴⁶

Decree #2 abolished the security and intelligence services, which had already scattered, along with the million-man army, and no attempts were made to bring them back to work. Major General Petraeus again intervened in his area of operations by requesting to have a retirement ceremony and to award medals to senior officers in his area, before asking them to rejoin the new army. This proposal was rejected by Ambassador Bremer's CPA.⁴⁷ Bremer states in his book that within weeks, his organization announced a transition payment program to all but the senior Ba'athist officers, and made an announcement calling for ex-soldiers to join the new Iraqi Army that was unsuccessful. His Bremer's feelings were expressed in words later on, however, when he admitted that it would be very difficult to ask torturers and the tortured to defend Iraq side by side.⁴⁸ A better course of action might have been to bring in members of the army and police forces with former Ba'athist ties and reeducate them, while using strict discipline and enticements to shift Sunni leadership from opposition to support of a new democratic Iraq.⁴⁹

This did not occur, and Coalition troops were not used to secure the population. According to the staff judge advocate section of a 3rd Infantry Division after action report, the United States was an occupying power as a matter of law and fact, but it failed to act, among other things, to control the population. This created a power vacuum. Senior planners had felt that civilian planning staffs did not expect an extensive rebuilding operation in Iraq, which was fine with a military that had always focused on combat operations and was not interested in rebuilding, assuming that it was someone else's job. Secretary Rumsfeld's feelings were clear in a press conference. When asked about the looting, his statement was: "Stuff happens!" He later said that there was in fact a plan in place, and that ". . . free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things."⁵⁰ At the same time, he was demanding a rapid increase in Iraqi security forces to solve the situation, while pushing to reduce the number of American forces in Iraq.⁵¹ Bremer knew that he needed to move fast, but he was wary of speeding the process too much. He was willing to work but wanted the force ". . . to be professional, not the sort of incompetent criminals Saddam had in his police."⁵² The lack of security forces set the stage for a Sunni purge and the Shia uprising against the government, leading to a possible civil war.

In his book, Bremer states that the de-Ba'athification order was given to him by Under Secretary Feith on the order of Rumsfeld, who, Feith said, wanted the decree carried out ". . . even if implementing it causes administrative inconvenience."⁵³ This echoed sentiments of de-Nazification from World War II. Bremer echoed previous sentiment as well, saying that the Iraqi people had joined the party as a way to get a professional job, or were coerced, and that the order was targeted at the upper levels of the Ba'ath party leadership. These totaled about 20,000 people, mostly Sunni Arabs. Bremer felt vindicated with the decision to issue Decree #2, disbanding the security and intelligence forces, upon speaking to two Kurdish leaders just prior to his departure. Jalal Talabani, the leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, told him that the decision to disband

the Iraqi army was the best decision made by the Coalition. Massoud Barzani, head of the Kurdish Democratic party, told Bremer that after fighting the Ba'athist army since it came into power, the Kurds would have seceded and fought a civil war against the Coalition if it had kept Ba'athists in power.⁵⁴ It seems, then, that as with de-Nazification in Germany, de-Ba'athification, while difficult, was imperative in Iraq in order to give legitimacy to the new Iraqi government.

Attempts at rebuilding the infrastructure, the economy, and the government were hampered by the ongoing violence from looters, sectarian violence between Shia and Sunni, and a growing insurgency. Battles in cities like Najaf were fought for a second or third time. The 1st Cavalry Division lost 70 tanks during its 1-year tour.⁵⁵ Prior to OIF, Iraq's once-thriving oil-based economy had already seen degradation from war with Iran in the 1980s and the first Gulf war and the sanctions that followed.

Iraq had not previously been a capitalist economy, and the state had managed most institutions, such as universities, hospitals, food distribution depots, schools, water works, power plants, oil refineries, and all other services. These services were also distributed based on political and social status. All of this posed challenges to post-Saddam Iraq.

Bremer found that power plants, due to a lack of resources and maintenance, generated only 4,000 megawatts of electricity per day prior to OIF, when there was a demand for 6,000. This power was normally provided to those who actively supported Saddam's government and was withheld from those he did not agree with, such as the Shiite and Kurdish peoples. While power plants were generating only about 300 megawatts directly after major combat operations ended in April 2003, the Coalition authorities worked quickly to rebuild what was outdated and stripped by looters. Iraq had almost 12,000 miles of power lines containing valuable copper, and security was required to stop its rampant scavenging by looters.⁵⁶

Things were getting better by October 2003. Electrical output was beyond pre-war levels at 5,000 megawatts, a new currency was set to be circulated, and all schools and clinics had been reopened, along with many of the banks. Oil production had reached almost two-million barrels a day.⁵⁷ The key to a continued improvement in these areas and a chance at a free market democracy lay in securing the country.

Security finally came as the result of a new military strategy called "the surge." Multinational Force Commander General David Petraeus and newly appointed Ambassador Ryan Crocker intensified efforts to achieve situational awareness in 2007. This awareness was achieved by the military's operating forces with significant support from intelligence agencies, and was used in an effort to locate terrorists and provide security to the Iraqi population.⁵⁸ Coalition forces were aligned to provide security to the Iraqi people, something they had not been willing or able to do in the past.⁵⁹

President Bush spoke to the American people about the new strategy in a televised address on January 10, 2007. He explained that more troops would be sent to Iraq to work with Iraqi units within a well-defined mission. The goal was to help Iraqis clear and secure neighborhoods, protect the local population, and ensure that the Iraqi forces were able to secure Baghdad. There would also be a surge of political and economic measures designed to help the Iraqis help themselves. Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki promised to reduce political and sectarian interference within the government. Debate about

Iraq prior to this strategy had been less strategic and more tactical, concentrating on troop strengths rather than problems and objectives.⁶⁰ This mold was finally broken by the new team of Petraeus and Crocker.

General Petraeus's team, along with Ambassador Crocker's staff, built a plan to operationalize the President's surge strategy and realized that they needed to work closely to accomplish the new objectives. Whether there is a military governor, an ambassador, or a team of ambassador and commanding general, it is important that there is unity of effort. During World War II, General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and General Eisenhower, the SACEUR, both understood this from the experience of World War I. They pushed for a single military commander in Europe and a single military governor for Germany.

In 2003, while National Security Presidential Directive 24 stated that the DoD had responsibility for the post-war control of Iraq,⁶¹ this had not been strictly adhered to. General Tommy Franks referred to needing "... *wingtips* on the ground . . ." – meaning civilian leadership was required for the administration of the new Iraqi government. In a conversation with Secretary Rumsfeld, Franks was told that retired U.S. Army General Jay Garner would be responsible for this activity and would work for Franks in Iraq.⁶² Garner would head up the Office for Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance (ORHA), which had been established on January 20, 2003, to act as a caretaker administration in Iraq until the creation of a democratically elected civilian government. With less than 4 months to plan the occupation effort, Garner and his team arrived in Iraq in April 2003. He was replaced abruptly less than a month later by L. Paul Bremer and the CPA, which would now answer directly to the President. They had even less time to plan for the occupation. General Franks was not alone in believing that civilian leadership should administer the interim government of Iraq. Historically, military leaders have been less than willing to become governors, such as was the case with General Patton. While not enthusiastic about being the military governor in Germany, General Clay did his duty, and he did an excellent job.

The military chain of command, when properly utilized, inherently creates a unity of command and a unity of effort, but at times it needs to mesh with civilian authorities. Ambassador Bremer unfortunately did not seem able to build a unity of effort with commanders on the ground in Iraq. However, Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus saw the need for unity of command and unity of effort, and they successfully leveraged these principles. They maintained connected offices, both in their original building, and in the newly built embassy building, whose plans they had altered to keep their offices close. They shared meetings, coordinated activities, and even jogged together alone and with their staffs. This led to a fused political-military team during the surge in Iraq.⁶³ General Petraeus requested that a team from the Joint Center for Operational Analysis be established to conduct a study of "the surge" in 2007, to find out what was successful so as to capture lessons learned. The findings of the team were published in late 2009, and showed the lines of effort by which General Petraeus, Ambassador Crocker, and Lieutenant General Raymond Odierno, commander of Multi-National Corps – Iraq, were able to turn back the tide and start Iraq moving forward. To do this, they concentrated on a number of interrelated "lines of effort."

The first and most important line of effort was securing the population. Baghdad, which had been secured by approximately 40,000 Soldiers and Marines at the start of the occupation,⁶⁴ was now secured by almost 92,000 Coalition forces, including Iraqi units, during the surge. Even though this number was still less than one soldier for every 50 citizens, security was effective because of how General Petraeus's team chose to place these troops on sectarian "fault lines" within the city to focus their efforts.⁶⁵ The next line of effort was the utilization of resources and money to balance long-term national development with short-term security investments. Another line of effort was a fusion of resources, in order to understand effectively the environment in all of its complexity and to understand what type of conflict was being fought. Petraeus, Crocker, and Odierno built a civil-military team with highly qualified professionals, and utilized a comprehensive approach to civil-military cooperation. They empowered subordinates and ensured that their successes were broadcast throughout the command and utilized in other similar situations.

Another line of effort was in the utilization of kinetic and nonkinetic targeting within an overall COIN fight. Another was the improvement of the legitimacy of the Iraqi government by letting it take the lead in governing and securing the country. Still another line of effort was fostering reconciliation with those insurgents who were moderate and the utilization of diplomacy with all parties in order to split the insurgency, while building the Iraqi national security forces and gathering intelligence on those insurgents who were not reconcilable. The last line of effort was engaging in and winning the battle of ideas with information operations designed to spread the truth more quickly than the enemy, enabling rumors and lies to be dispelled.⁶⁶ Successes were made during the surge, with great improvement observed by the end of 2008, more than 5 years after the war began.

Today, Iraq is an Islamic, democratic, federal parliamentary republic. It sits at number 66 out of 227 nations in GDP.⁶⁷ It has developed a parliamentary constitution that directs that the government be led by an elected Coalition of Representatives (COR), consisting of 440 members as of 2009. The COR is made up of province councils who each elect a provincial council chairperson, and then elect by absolute majority a governor and deputy governors for that province.⁶⁸ There is broad representation of Iraqis within the COR, including Shiites, Sunnis, Kurds, and Christians, with women also serving. The government is in the process of learning how democracies work, and trying to reach beyond religion, ethnicity, and corruption.

It has been a surprise to many people that protests, seemingly similar to the "Arab Spring" uprisings surging through the Middle East and North Africa in places like Libya, Tunisia, and Egypt, have not come to Iraq. This is because Iraq's government has been legitimately elected by the people. There have been small protests throughout the various segments of Iraqi society due to a perceived lack of government focus on stabilizing services, such as electricity for its citizens.⁶⁹ The Iraqi government has been taking steps to deal with citizen demands, such as significantly altering its current budget to increase financial assistance and improve services. In other countries, the protests have been provoked by heavy-handed security forces and are as much about a lack of pluralism and corrupt governance, as about rising poverty. Iraq has not had this issue, as its security forces have become more professional and a free press maintains checks and balances. Iraq has also been vocal about Iranian and Bahraini uses of force to quell disturbances

in those countries.⁷⁰ The successful solution to these problems will strengthen Iraq in the future.

THE WAY FORWARD

There are differences between the occupation of Germany and the occupation of Iraq. The outcome of war can only be known by looking at it objectively years, if not decades, later and discovering if the government has been made better and if we have made a friend of our enemy, as Germany is today. While the Iraqi occupation is very recent, we can take some lessons from operations there and identify a general approach for future occupations, in the event the military is tasked to undertake them. We must take advantage of planning and incorporate facts on the ground along with past experience, and ensure clear objectives are developed. We must keep in mind the end state, continually reframing it throughout combat operations and into stability and reconstruction. We must remove devout members of an oppressive regime, along with criminals, and have a plan in place to stabilize the government and secure the nation so that rebuilding can be accomplished effectively. We must make sure reconcilable members of the regime are given an opportunity to be reintegrated into society. We must ensure unity of command and unity of effort are observed with a whole of government approach working toward the same set of goals. After almost 9 years of occupation, Iraq is only now starting to turn around. While we cannot yet know the outcome, there is hope that it will become our friend in years to come.

ENDNOTES

1. Robert Debs Heinl, Jr., *Dictionary of Military and Naval Quotations*, Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute, 1966, p. 148.

2. Fred Charles Ikle, *Every War Must End*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1971, p. xi.

3. James Dobbins, John McGinn, Keith Crane, Seth Jones, Rollie Lal, Andrew Rathmell, Rachel Swanger, and Anga Timilsina, *America's Role in Nation-Building: from Germany to Iraq*, San Diego, CA: Rand, 2003, p. xix.

4. Mark Harrison, *The Economics of World War II: Six Great Powers in International Comparison*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

5. *The World Fact Book 2001*, Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, available from www.umsl.edu/services/govdocs/wofact2001/index.html.

6. Dobbins *et al.*, *America's Role in Nation-Building*, p. 10.

7. The planning for OIF was begun at the request of Secretary Rumsfeld at the end of November 2001. At the same time the command responsible for the plans, U.S. Central Command, was focused on Operation ENDURING FREEDOM in Afghanistan. Tommy Franks and Malcolm McConnell, *American Soldier, General Tommy Franks*, New York: HarperCollins, 2004, p. 328.

8. Robert Wolfe, ed., *Americans as Proconsuls: United States Military Government in Germany and Japan, 1944-1952*, Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984, p. 322.
9. Ikle, p. xi.
10. Frederick Taylor, *Exorcising Hitler: The Occupation and Denazification of Germany*, London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2011, p. xxiii.
11. Wolfe, p. 102.
12. Amos Jordon, William Taylor, Michael Meese, and Suzanne Nielsen, *American National Security*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009, p. 172.
13. Kenneth O. McCreedy, *Planning the Peace: Operation Eclipse and the Occupation of Germany*, Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1995, p. 7.
14. Wolfe, p. 205.
15. Allen Keifer, *Lessons Forgotten: Comparing the Occupation of Germany with Iraq*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, March 3, 2008, p. 14.
16. Dobbins, *et al.*, p. 7.
17. Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany*, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947, pp. 6-7.
18. Edward G. Longacre, *War in the Ruins: The American Army's Final Battle Against Nazi Germany*, Kleber Memorial Reading in Military History, Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center, U.S. Army War College, November 3, 2011.
19. Zink, p. 3.
20. Martin Blumenson, *The Patton Papers: 1940-1945*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974, pp. 735, 738.
21. Zink, pp. 135-136.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 25-28.
23. Taylor, pp. 171-172.
24. Wolfe, p. 104.
25. Dobbins *et al.*, p. 10.
26. Taylor, p. 41.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 344.
28. Lucius D. Clay, *Decision in Germany*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1950, p. 365.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 381.

30. Dobbins *et al.*, p. 15.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
33. Central Intelligence Agency, *The World Fact Book*, available from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2001rank.html>.
34. Janet Wallach, *Desert Queen*, New York: Doubleday, 1996, p. 201.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 320.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 376-377.
37. Douglas J. Feith, *War and Decision: Inside the Pentagon at the Dawn of the War on Terrorism*, New York: Harper Collins, 2008, p. 183.
38. Stephen M. Saideman, *More than Advice? The Joint Staff and American Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 37.
39. Linda Robinson, *Tell Me How this Ends: General David Petraeus and the Search for a Way Out of Iraq*, New York: Public Affairs, 2008, p. 124.
40. Paul L. Bremer III, *My Year in Iraq*, New York: Simon and Shuster, 2006, p. 10.
41. Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office, *Contractors' Support of U.S. Operations in Iraq*, Washington DC: Congressional Budget Office, August, 2008, pp. 9-11.
42. Thomas E. Ricks, *Fiasco*, New York: The Penguin Press, 2006, p. 151.
43. Ikle, p. xiv.
44. Feith, p. 418.
45. Bremer, pp. 39-45.
46. Robinson, p. 70.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 71.
48. Bremer, p. 58.
49. Ikle, p. xii.
50. Ricks, pp. 36, 151.
51. Bremer, p. 155.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
54. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40, 59.

55. Ricks, p. 395.
56. Bremer, pp. 69, 112.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
58. Richard A. Best, *Intelligence Issues for Congress*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, October 20, 2011, p. 15.
59. Robinson, pp. 32-33.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-29, 43-44.
61. L. Elaine Halchin, *The Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA): Origin, Characteristics, and Institutional Authorities*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 2005, p. 1.
62. Franks and McConnell, pp. 422-423.
63. Robinson, pp. 149-150, 531.
64. Bremer, p. 14.
65. Robinson, p. 124.
66. Joint Center for Operational Analysis, *The Comprehensive Approach: An Iraq Case Study*, Norfolk, VA: U.S. Joint Forces Command, February 16, 2010, pp. 17-18.
67. Central Intelligence Agency. *The World Fact Book*.
68. Kenneth Katzman, *Iraq: Politics, Governance and Human Rights*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, September 30, 2011, p. 21.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
70. Sterling Jensen, "Middle Eastern Upheavals: Iraq Weathers the Political Storm," *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Summer 2011, pp. 32-34.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

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

STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

**Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.**

**Director of Research
Dr. Antulio J. Echevarria II**

**Author
Lieutenant Colonel William L. Peace, Sr.
United States Army National Guard**

**Director of Publications
Dr. James G. Pierce**

**Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel**

**Composition
Mrs. Jennifer E. Nevil**



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE



FOR THIS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS, VISIT US AT
StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil

ISBN 1-58487-537-2



9 781584 875376



90000>



This Publication



SSI Website



USAWC Website