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America is at war...We have kept on the offensive against terrorist networks, leaving our enemy weakened, but not yet defeated...The struggle against this enemy...has been difficult. And our work is far from over.

—President George W. Bush, 16 March 2006

Although over two years have passed since the president wrote these remarks, his words still ring true. While the United States has remained on the offensive, the enemy is not yet defeated. In Iraq alone, the United States has lost over 4,000 servicemen and women, while another division’s worth of personnel have been medially evacuated from that theater of operations. The vast majority were killed, wounded, injured or became sick in the years after major combat operations ended in May 2003. In Afghanistan, coalition casualties are increasing, and Taliban fighters are as numerous as at any time in the past six years. Globally, Al-Qaeda seems as effective as ever in spawning its terrorist ideology. The pace of operations against this threat is straining western nations, none more so than the United States, which continues to do almost all of the “heavy lifting.” Despite a defense budget that amounts to over 48 percent of total world defense spending, the U.S. military could be ready to break at the seams under the strain. Even with supplemental congressional appropriations, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) will be hard-pressed to sustain current operations, let alone be ready for another regional challenge. If, as so many have claimed, we are only in the early stages of a “long war,” then we had all better learn some serious lessons, and fast, or in the president’s words, our work will be far from over for years to come.

The pressures of the current security environment have resulted in a drive to define, dissect, understand, and meet these challenges. Although reviews of the war have been productive, they have not yet produced an epiphany. On the plus side, experienced officers like U.S. Army General David H. Petraeus and Marine Lieutenant General James Mattis have sparked a renewed interest in counterinsurgency (COIN) experts like David Galula, T.E. Lawrence, Robert Thompson, and Frank Kitson. The search for solutions has also resulted in an in-depth review of key U.S. doctrinal tenets and a complete rewrite of U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps counterinsurgency doctrine.
Among the significant changes to U.S. doctrine has been the increased attention paid to “legitimacy,” particularly during COIN operations. Legitimacy has become a defining principle for most COIN theorists, and the conflict itself, in Galula’s words, a “battle for the population,” where “the exercise of political power depends on the tacit or explicit agreement of the population.”

U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine now states clearly, “Victory is achieved when the populace consents to the government’s legitimacy and stops actively and passively supporting the insurgency.”

The term “legitimacy” is so pervasive that it appears 131 times in the new COIN field manual, FM 3-24. Even more significantly, the keystone operations doctrine of the U.S. services, Joint Publication 3-0, Joint Operations, has been rewritten to include legitimacy (and the concepts of restraint and perseverance) as “Other Principles” to join the nine traditional “Principles of War” in a new list of 12 “Principles of Joint Operations.”

We should consider the potential impact of this change carefully because the principles of war have been the bedrock of military operations in one form or another since the era of Baron Antoine de Jomini.

**Five Aspects of Legitimacy**

*No state can survive for very long exclusively through its power to coerce. . . . [A]cross time, the maintenance of social order is negotiated.*

—Christopher Pierson

While Joint Publication (JP) 3-0 introduces the concept of legitimacy, it does not define the term. The word “legitimacy” comes from the Latin *legitimare*, to declare lawful; it therefore connotes rightfulness and legality. In political science, legitimacy refers to the population’s acceptance of a set of rules or an authority. In addition, through their consent, they acknowledge a duty of obedience to that authority. Legitimacy differs from legality because it implies that the citizenry respects or consents to the authority irrespective of the existence of a legal justification of it. This is a notably important distinction, particularly in international relations, where overarching legal authority is nonexistent. While legitimacy is a complex and contested concept in political theory, it has five important aspects that have a direct impact on military operations.

**Sources of legitimacy.** German sociologist Max Weber posited three sources for legitimacy: the legal-rational source, which most Western governments enjoy, based on a framework of legal rules (e.g. the government elected in accordance with a legal framework and constitution); traditional authority, based on custom, upbringing, and birth (e.g. the governing family or clan); and charismatic authority, based on the power of personality of an individual or group.

The importance of Weber’s observation on charismatic leadership is clear to anyone who considers Osama bin-Laden’s status in certain parts of Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas, and in fact, all three sources of legitimacy are at play today in both Iraq and in Afghanistan.

**Legitimacy and obligation.** Legitimacy and obligation are two sides of the same coin. At the very least, accepting some authority as legitimate implies some level of consent on the part of the population to the actions of that authority. This further implies the obligation to accept that authority’s decisions, even if some decisions are undesirable. The implication for emerging governments or military forces operating in an area is that local populations will accept even significant infringements on their rights and freedoms if the demands come from an authority they view as legitimate. The inverse, of course, also applies: the people will resist even the slightest imposition from an authority they view as illegitimate.

**Legitimacy and force.** The ability to apply force does not confer legitimacy. Weber identified one of the most salient features of the state as “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory.” While Marxist theory suggested that the surreptitious threat to exercise this monopoly on violence was what kept capitalist governments in power, even neo-Marxists today accept that “without some level of legitimacy, it is hard to see that any state could be sustained.”

Political philosopher Hannah Arendt observed, “Since authority... people will resist even the slightest imposition from an authority they view as illegitimate.
always demands obedience, it is commonly mistaken for some form of power or violence. Yet authority precludes the use of external means of coercion; where force is used, authority itself has failed...If authority is to be defined at all, then, it must be in contradistinction to...force.”

Military officers implicitly understand this when tasked to support civil authorities at home. Any actual use of force implies that authority has already failed to some extent, at least with some sector of the population. Interestingly, studies of police forces in the United States suggest that increased police violence erodes police legitimacy. In fact, studies show that reducing police use of force has a positive effect in reducing violent crime. The findings of further research into police legitimacy show that it “changes the basis on which people decide whether to cooperate with legal authorities” and has a “significant influence on the degree to which people [obey] the law”; it also shows that police “fairness and effectiveness are not mutually exclusive, but mutually reinforcing.”

In short, using force unnecessarily, inappropriately, or out of proportion to the requirement to do so undermines police legitimacy and effectiveness. If that is the case with peaceful populations at home in North America, surely the relationship between force and legitimacy is something military forces should carefully consider when operating in foreign theaters where legitimacy is more tenuous.

Perceptions and legitimacy. The fourth aspect of legitimacy that military commanders must understand is that the legitimacy is relative to the audience. For example, a military force operating in Iraq must primarily be concerned about the local Iraqi population’s perception of Iraqi government legitimacy. The less legitimate an operation seems, the less support it can expect. If the people regard it as legitimate, a U.S.-led operation to track an IED cell that killed hundreds of civilians can elicit local assistance. On the other hand, the people may regard a cordon-and-search operation in an area where insurgents have harmed few locals as unnecessary and less legitimate. In the same vein, the international community will be less supportive of actions deemed arbitrary, if the force has intervened illegitimately in a territory or conducted overly aggressive operations. In addition, the domestic audience is also critical to success, as the United States learned during the Vietnam era. Once the people viewed that war as illegitimate back at home, the likelihood of a successful conclusion to it became more remote. Finally, the men and women of the deployed military force make up an important audience that questions the force’s legitimacy as rigorously as any other audience does. Once the mission loses legitimacy in their eyes, whether due to immoral or excessive action, regaining effectiveness will take a complete overhaul of trust, which may well be impossible. Forced obedience in such circumstances will never compensate for willing obedience lost with squandered legitimacy.

Contested legitimacy. A final characteristic of legitimacy is that it applies to both sides in a conflict. Often, coalition officers will point out that the enemy targets innocent civilians, tortures and beheads hostages, and refuses to observe any rules of combat. We know from experience that all of this is true, but we must also consider whether such conduct is an effective strategy for the enemy in the long run. General David H. Petraeus notes, “Al-Qaeda’s indiscriminate attacks...have finally started to turn a substantial proportion of the Iraqi
population against it.”

James Fallows adds: “What they have done is to follow the terrorist’s logic of steadily escalating the degree of carnage and violence—which has meant violating the guerrilla warrior’s logic of bringing the civilian population to your side . . . [I]n surgents have slaughtered civilians daily . . . But since American troops are also assumed to be killing civilians, the anti-insurgent backlash is muddied.”

Al-Qaeda leaders at the highest levels recognize the negative impact of violence on their strategy. According to Peter Bergen, “It was Al-Zawahiri who wrote a letter to Al-Qaeda’s leader in Iraq, Abu Mousab Al-Zarqawi, gently suggesting that he stop his habit of beheading hostages because it was turning off many Muslims.” Similar negative responses occurred in the fall of 2005 after bombs exploded in Amman, Jordan, and in Bali, Indonesia. In the day-to-day struggle for legitimacy, both insurgents and counterinsurgents wrestle on the fulcrum of the relationship between force and legitimacy.

**Strategic and Operational Legitimacy**

*If you just look at how we are perceived in the world and the kind of criticism we have taken over Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib and renditions, whether we believe it or not, people are now starting to question whether we’re following our own high standards.*

—Colin Powell, 2007

Before examining legitimacy’s role during military operations overseas, we must ask how the legitimacy of the strategic decision to deploy a military force affects the legitimacy of the force itself. Traditional just war theory examines the justness of a war on two scales: *jus ad bellum*, the justness of the decision to go to war; and *jus in bello*, the justness of how military forces prosecute it. *Jus ad bellum* considerations ask if the cause for war is just, if the good toward which the war aims is greater than the evil the fighting causes, if a legitimate authority made the decision to go to war, if war was the last resort, and if there is a reasonable chance of success. All of these questions arose during the debates over the U.S. administration’s decision to go to war against Iraq in 2003.

A war’s legitimacy, or strategic legitimacy, is not something a Soldier can influence; we should not hold him responsible for the justness of the decision to go to war. He or she must simply follow orders and make the best moral choices during the ensuing operations. Under international law, the military commander is protected by what Francisco de Vitoria described five centuries ago as “invincible ignorance” to distinguish between the justness of the war itself and the justness of specific military actions during the war. Nevertheless, military commanders would be foolish not to understand the context in which they operate, including the perceived legitimacy of their cause.

Commanders on the ground sometimes see legitimacy as water in a bucket. Both strategic and operational decisions affect the volume of the water. If the decision to deploy is suspect, the commander starts his operation with a reduced volume of water (or none). How the force conducts the operation will define how quickly he uses it up (or whether the force can regain greater legitimacy through operationally effective and morally virtuous actions on the ground).
Military leaders can do little about the legitimacy of the decision to go to war, but they can assert and protect the legitimacy of operations, or operational legitimacy. Overzealous use of force can undermine even the most legitimate intervention. Actions on the ground should demonstrate *jus in bello* considerations of proportionality. Quite simply, all military operations should discriminate clearly between combatants and non-combatants and any use of force should be proportional only to the military end and avoid unnecessary collateral damage. Both concepts are difficult to apply in what General Rupert Smith called “war amongst the people,” in which combatants wear no uniforms and operate from population centers. Even so, restraint and focused application of force are critical to sustaining the support of both local and U.S. populations. I will now turn to the conduct of recent military operations to examine their impact on operational legitimacy.

**Operational Legitimacy in Iraq and Afghanistan**

*This I realized, now watching Dienekes rally and tend to his men, was the role of the officer... To fire their valour when itflagged and rein in their fury when it threatened to take them out of hand.*

—Steven Pressfield, *Gates of Fire*

Security actions must be balanced with legitimacy concerns. Restricting the use of force, restructuring the type of forces employed, and ensuring the disciplined conduct of the forces involved may reinforce legitimacy.

—Joint Publication 3-0, *Operations*

The story of current coalition operations is generally a story of heroism, courage, and self-sacrifice. During the initial stages of Operation Iraqi Freedom in particular, there were many daring acts that should take their place in the annals of military history. One of those actions occurred on the night of 31 March 2003 near the town of Haditha in west-central Iraq. After an overland infiltration across unproven territory, B Company of 3rd Ranger Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment secured objective Lynx, which was critical to ensuring that Saddam Hussein’s regime could not sabotage the Haditha Dam and unleash a humanitarian disaster on the Iraqi citizens of the Tigris and Euphrates valleys. Operating with adequate but incomplete intelligence, the Rangers secured the dam after a four-hour firefight. Over the next six days, this lightly armed Ranger company, with air force combat controllers and later reinforced by two M1 tanks, fought off a series of uncertain counterattacks to secure the dam and destroy 29 enemy tanks and over 65 artillery, air defense, and mortar pieces. This small operation is a fine example of light forces demonstrating agility, courage, and determination in an honorable cause against a numerically superior enemy while respecting the rules of engagement and laws of armed conflict. As such, it deserves to be remembered.

Only four years later, however, the historical record of Haditha reads very differently. In the public imagination, the events at the dam have long been overshadowed by the actions of a small number of other U.S. servicemen, who, it is alleged, murdered 24 Iraqi civilians, including women and children, during a vengeful rampage after an improvised explosive device (IED) killed a 20-year-old lance corporal on the morning of 19 November 2005. The initial press release about the incident gave a plausible explanation, which suited the expectations of military personnel: “A U.S. Marine and 15 civilians were killed yesterday from the blast of a roadside bomb in Haditha. Immediately following the bombing, gunmen attacked the convoy with small arms fire. Iraqi army soldiers and [U.S.] Marines returned fire, killing eight insurgents and wounding another.” An Iraqi human rights organization began to investigate almost immediately, but it was not until *Time* obtained a video in January 2006 and subsequently gave it to U.S. authorities for comment that the U.S. launched significant military investigations.

The evidence is damning. The video shows blood spattered on walls inside family bedrooms; there was testimony from a survivor whose family members (but for one sibling) were killed in their night clothes in their rooms; while some adult males
were killed, many of the deceased were women and children ranging from 2 to 14 years of age. There was no evidence of bomb fragments on any of the civilian bodies and no evidence of crossfire outside the houses. The director of the local hospital stated that “no organs were slashed by shrapnel. . . . Most of the victims were shot in the chest and head—from close range.” Undeniably, something went terribly wrong in Haditha.

While the legal process brought against accused murderers will demonstrate U.S. determination to apply U.S. values and the rule of law to its own citizens, it will not in itself address the event’s broader implications. Criminals may exist in any military force, but the killings at Haditha require more basic self-examination by a military force that dedicates itself to promoting security and the rule of law and protecting innocents. When innocent civilians die during stabilization, humanitarian, or combat operations, we must ask hard questions. How could highly trained, disciplined, and selected personnel commit such an act? How could authorities not discover and deal with the criminal nature of the incident for four months? How could a chain of command fail to ask more questions in the days immediately after the events?

To answer these questions, Major General Eldon A. Bargewell examined the broader issues related to the killings. His report, completed in June 2006, focused on the reporting of the incident as well as the command climate within the Marine Corps’ leadership in western Iraq. While the Bargewell Report did not find direct evidence of an orchestrated effort above squad level to cover up the incident, he found complicity from platoon to division level to ignore indications of serious misconduct and “an unwillingness, bordering on denial, on the part of the battalion commander to examine an incident that might prove harmful to him and his Marines.” The Marine Corps relieved the battalion commander and three other officers of their duties and charged them with violation of a lawful order, dereliction of duty, and making a false statement.

These failings, like the killings themselves, are individual acts of commission or omission, and Bargewell could therefore deal with them on an individual basis, but he discovered a systemic problem with the collective attitudes of the chain of command:

All levels of command tended to view civilian casualties, even in significant numbers, as routine and as the natural result of insurgent tactics . . . Statements made by the chain of command during interviews for this investigation . . . suggest that Iraqi civilian lives are not as important as U.S. lives, their deaths are just the cost of doing business, and that the Marines need to ‘get the job done’ no matter what it takes. These comments had the potential to desensitize the Marines to concern for the Iraqi populace and portray them all as the enemy even if they are noncombatants.

Bargewell further noted that the regimental combat team commander “expressed only mild concern over the potential negative ramifications of indiscriminate killing based on his stated view that the Iraqis and insurgents respect strength and power over righteousness.” While Bargewell does not suggest that the chain of command directly condoned any of the actions at Haditha, he reported some fault with the command climate within the 2d Marine Division at the time.

As an isolated event, Haditha is a tragedy and potentially a crime that tarnishes the reputation of all who serve. It was the culmination of a number of factors, triggered by the death of a U.S. Marine by an IED and stoked by the tensions of operations and a command climate that seems to have implicitly condoned the attitude that Iraqi civilians are different from U.S. civilians and suspect. The real problem, however, is that Haditha was not an isolated incident.

On 26 April 2006, a group of U.S. Marines reportedly took Hashim Ibrahim Awad, a disabled father of 11 children, out of his home, beat him, and then shot him to death. Authorities charged seven Marines and a navy hospital corpsman with crimes ranging from murder and kidnapping to conspiracy, making false official statements, and larceny. Again, this incident is clearly a criminal act, perhaps as some suggest, the act of a few “bad apples” that does not reflect the conduct of the vast majority of coalition Soldiers in Iraq.

Nevertheless, like most such events, it resulted from multiple factors, including a command climate that either condoned mistreatment of Iraqi civilians or at the very least, was unable to enforce the Marine
Corps’ commitment to its core values. As they collected evidence, they discovered other unrelated assaults, some weeks before the Awad murder. In one case, Second Lieutenant Nathan P. Phan allegedly beat, choked, and threatened detainees in Hamdani earlier in 2006. Phan acknowledged ordering his men to choke a detainee because he believed it was necessary to gather information from suspected insurgents. He also pressed an unloaded pistol against the mouth of another detainee to frighten him. In an unsubstantiated but telling admission intended to justify the assault, Phan’s attorney stated that “the information [Phan] gained from these terrorists was highly important and valuable in saving Marines’ lives.” Not only can this justification not be proven, but also such acts are contrary to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, The Law of Land Warfare (FM 27-10), the Geneva and Hague Conventions, the U.S. Constitution that officers swear to defend, and, significantly, the core values of the U.S. Marine Corps. Such actions supplied subordinates with a leadership example that would have tragic consequences for all concerned.

Some suggest that the attitudes displayed toward Iraqi civilians in the above incidents are simply the tip of an iceberg. In his book Assassin’s Gate, George Packer describes the detention of two suspected insurgents at a U.S. airfield in Iraq. After witnessing the verbal abuse heaped on two detainees, Packer wrote, “It wasn’t Abu Ghraib, just the ugliness of a bored and probably sadistic young man in a position of temporary power. But I left the airfield . . . with an uneasy feeling. I’d had a glimpse under the rock of the occupation; there was bound to be much more there.” While it may be that the two detainees were insurgents, the unprofessional handling techniques Packer observed did nothing to gain the detainees cooperation or conversion. The acts simply added to their disdain for America and the U.S. military.

Thomas Ricks provides further evidence of the attitudes of U.S. Soldiers and their leaders toward the Iraqi population. One brigade commander in early 2004 reportedly told a civil affairs officer that his forces were there to “kill the enemy, not win their hearts and minds,” while his division commander later wrote, “Most nights we fired H&I fires [harassment and interdiction], what I call ‘proactive’ counter-fire . . . artillery plays a significant role in counterinsurgency.” A psychological affairs officer reported, “4th ID fueled the insurgency . . . guys would come up from Fallujah, set up next to a farmhouse, set off a mortar, and leave. In addition, the 4th ID would respond with counterbattery fire. The 4th ID’s CG [commanding general] would foster that attitude. They were cowboys.” Another U.S. officer reported, “I saw so many instances of abuses of civilians, intimidating civilians. Our jaws dropped.”

While most of the incidents that undercut U.S. military legitimacy have occurred in Iraq, operations in Afghanistan have not been without problems. On 4 March 2007, an element from a newly formed Marine special operations company was patrolling in Nangahar Province in eastern Afghanistan when a suicide bomber in a van ambushed it. A preliminary investigation revealed that the Marines started firing and continued shooting at no fewer than six locations, miles beyond the site of the ambush. According to a draft report the Washington Post obtained, they fired at stationary vehicles, passersby, and others who were “exclusively civilian in nature” and had made “no kind of provocative or threatening behavior.”

Central Command quickly ordered the company out of Afghanistan, and the Marine Special Operations Command relieved the company commander and senior non-commissioned officer.

While one can argue that strategic legitimacy in Afghanistan was more persuasive than in Iraq, both theaters have experienced varying levels of success in maintaining operational legitimacy. The response to the Marine’s actions in Nangahar Province was predictably hostile locally where anti-coalition sentiment runs high, but the national response was rather muted. In Iraq, where U.S. strategic legitimacy was weak from the start, overcoming such incidents has been challenging. Efforts to buttress U.S. legitimacy through humanitarian and reconstruction operations have not been successful, and
the shocking revelations at Abu Ghraib exacerbated the situation.

The handling of detainees has done more damage to U.S. strategic and operational legitimacy in the past few years than any other single issue. American and world public opinion has been harshly critical of the handling of detainees since Seymour Hersh first broke the story of the Abu Ghraib photos in April 2004. The furor and rioting sparked in May 2005 after Newsweek reported that the Qur’an had been mishandled at Guantanamo demonstrates that the implications of abuse go far beyond issues of internal military discipline. The August 2004 Schlesinger Report was damning in its criticisms of the policy, command, and disciplinary failures that contributed to the shocking level of abuse of detainees that occurred. On 6 May 2005, through a report to the UN Committee Against Torture, the United States formally explained the results of its nine detainee investigations to the world and said it is dealing with over 300 recommendations to improve detainee handling, accountability, investigation, supervision, and coordination. The detainee issues are by now well-known, and the effect on U.S. legitimacy has been devastating. Sheik Mohammed Bashir summed up Iraqi frustrations at Friday prayers in Um al-Oura, Baghdad, on 11 June 2004: “Freedom in this land is not ours. It is the freedom of the occupying Soldiers in doing what they like . . . abusing women, children, and the old men and women whom they arrested randomly and without any guilt. No one can ask them what they are doing because they are protected by their freedom . . . No one can punish them.”

The real impact of Abu Ghraib, Haditha, Hamdani, and other de-legitimizing incidents is not just a reduction in local cooperation for U.S. efforts, censure by the international community, and fading U.S. domestic support for the operations. The real impact is to strengthen the enemy. RAND researcher David Gompert has suggested that “careless COIN violence, indiscriminate arrests, nonjudicial detention, and cruel interrogation can delegitimize the governing power, validate the jihadist story, legitimize terrorism, and spawn new martyrs.” From January to September 2006, Iraqi approval rates for attacks on U.S. forces grew from 47 percent to 61 percent. Among Sunnis, support for targeting U.S. troops has dropped significantly from its high of 92 percent only because U.S. force commanders under General Petraeus finally started getting the message. Based on polling results, Gompert notes, “When more than a third of American Muslims—known for their moderation—believe that their own government is ‘fighting a war on Islam,’ one can begin to fathom the difficulty of persuading non-American Muslims that this is not the case.”

Rebuilding Legitimacy

Military action can address the symptoms of a loss of legitimacy. In some cases, it can eliminate substantial numbers of insurgents. However, success in the form of a durable peace requires restoring legitimacy, which requires the use of...
all instruments of national power. A COIN effort cannot achieve lasting success without the HN [host nation] government achieving legitimacy.
—FM 3-24, Counterinsurgency

Rebuilding U.S. legitimacy for current operations will require a long-term, multi-agency effort at the strategic and operational levels, but there are already signs that the effort may be worthwhile.

First, although U.S. legitimacy in Iraq remains weak, Muslim support for the Taliban or Al-Qaeda’s vision of the world is at less than 10 percent. As one observer put it, “Many people would like to see Bin-Laden and Zarqawi hurt America. But they do not want Bin-Laden to rule their children.”

While we have not won the war, we are far from losing it. Improving the perceived legitimacy for the Iraqi government and the U.S.-led effort in Iraq will save Iraqi and coalition lives, as well as serve to undermine insurgent and Al-Qaeda recruiting efforts.

The second note of optimism is the genuine effort we are making to correct the situation. Whether in determined pursuit of justice against wrongdoings, thorough doctrinal review, or selection of commanders with proven counterinsurgency experience, the U.S. military has taken the first steps in recognizing and correcting the problem. To complete the process, six important strategies are prerequisites for success.

Create a truly integrated list of principles of joint operations. The recent changes to U.S. doctrine have renamed the military operations other than war principles—legitimacy, restraint, and perseverance—as “other principles” and made them subordinate to the traditional principles of war as if to suggest that one should not consider legitimacy until some magic moment when it is time to replace one set of principles with another. Suggesting that a shift in mentality will occur on demand brings to mind the comments an officer made as the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment arrived in Iraq in 2003: “Their attitude in terms of rules of engagement suggested to me that they had not made the change from combat operations to stability operations.” Officers cannot begin thinking about legitimacy, restraint, and perseverance in Phase IV. During modern combat operations, we must consider these principles long before Phase IV begins. A mind-set that still views high-intensity combat as the only real work for Soldiers will result in confusion. Serving the Nation can take on many forms, all of which require professionalism and reflection on bedrock principles, among which legitimacy must urgently take its place. Soldiers need to learn that reinforcing legitimacy is a core business of all combat forces.

Recognize that professional officers are protectors of legitimacy. The administration’s decision to support harsher interrogation methods may have produced some information of intelligence value, but its negative impact has far outweighed any value gained. Many, particularly in the judge advocate branch, saw the crisis looming, but were marginalized by non-military advisors suggesting that “the new paradigm rendered the Geneva Convention obsolete” and “rendered quaint some of its provisions.” The reality was, however, that senior officers requested, accepted, and implemented these provisions, often with insufficient oversight given the risks involved. Senior officers must consider their organization’s long-term legitimacy when requesting or implementing such extraordinary measures.

State the unstated clearly. Leaders at every level must recognize that they could have prevented many actions that eroded legitimacy were it not for the tacit approval that the troops assumed their senior leaders had given for such actions. Second Lieutenant Phan’s example of poor leadership in Hamdani reflects an attitude of implicit justification. The Schlesinger Report’s observation that “leaders conveyed a sense of tacit approval of abusive behaviors towards prisoners” verbalizes what many in the military could feel—a command climate where restraint was not a clear concern. Comments about complacency in the Bargewell Report on Haditha also reinforce conclusions that leaders at all levels clearly failed to state how legitimacy fit into the concept of the operation.

Consider a tactical operation’s impact on legitimacy. Soldiers like kicking in doors. It gives them an adrenaline rush and a sense of accomplishment.

**Soldiers need to learn that reinforcing legitimacy is a core business of all combat forces.**
and cuts the boredom. Unfortunately, it also creates new enemies. Hard intelligence must guide cordon-and-search operations and 0200 hours takedowns. If the local police could ring the doorbell the next morning with the same effect, should a platoon have to break its way in? Can we leave the small fish behind until after we catch the big fish in order to ensure the locals understand our intent? Can special operations forces (SOF) deal with this target? Are SOF too focused on direct-action missions instead of the more subtle paths to victory? As the staff war games all options, it must consider the longer-term results of the tactical actions.

Take a lesson from American history. As police forces in the United States increased in professionalism, they learned hard lessons about legitimacy. In 1965, two years before some of the worst riots in Detroit history, Detroit Police Commissioner George Edwards wrote the following: “Although local [white] police forces generally regard themselves as public servants with the responsibility of maintaining law and order, they tend to minimize this attitude when they are patrolling areas that are heavily populated with Negro citizens. There, they tend to view each person on the streets as a potential criminal or enemy, and all too often that attitude is reciprocated . . . It has been a major cause of all recent race riots.”

The tendency to view most citizens as potential enemies is often the default setting for coalition forces. While no Soldier should be naïve, the assumption that most people in the streets just want to get on with their lives peacefully is probably correct. The respect Soldiers show to those citizens should be similar to the respect they show to U.S. citizens during responses to domestic crisis.

Recognize that legitimacy in a single operation is influential and enduring. U.S. legitimacy in Iraq affects how people in Afghanistan, Yemen, and the Philippines view U.S. operations. The Abu Ghraib revelations had a direct impact on attitudes around the world. The success of the U.S. in regaining legitimacy in Iraq will have an impact on some future operation in another region of the world. A single operation will have an affect on all future operations in the region because local memories
tend to last longer than the institutional memories of deployed forces. In 1979, the anger of Iranian students who took 54 citizens of “the Great Satan” hostage shocked the U.S. In fact, a long-term view of U.S. legitimacy in the region influenced Iranian students who used the phrase. From the local perspective, the hostage taking was a form of insurance against a repeat of the clandestine U.S. intervention of 1953 that overthrew a popular prime minister in favor of the pro-U.S. and authoritarian shah. Whatever reputation one sets today in a region will have second- and third-order effects years from now.

NOTES
4. While there is much debate over what constitutes a defense expenditure, the 48 percent figure comes from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/200603.pdf>. Complete reporting of coalition casualties is available at <icasualties.org/afsl>. 5. Too many useful references on counterinsurgency exist to provide a full list here. Full bibliographical references as well as reviews can be found at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in Fort Leavenworth website at <www.cgsc.army.mil/cat/resources/biblio/CAC_counterinsurgency.asp> or at the very useful Small Wars Journal website at <http://smallwarsjournal.com/reading-list>.
10. For discussions on legitimacy as a political concept, see Andrew Heywood, The Modern State (London: Routledge, 1994), 17.
13. Larry Johnston, Politics: An Introduction to the Modern Democratic State, 16-17.

Conclusion
For we must consider that we shall be as a citty upon a hill. The eies of all people are upon us.
—John Winthrop, 1630

To achieve long-term successes, the U.S. must conduct all military operations with the concept of legitimacy in mind. While military officers must play the hand that fates deals them in geopolitics, they can influence how people view their actions on the ground. Good influence requires an integrated force that comprehends the importance of legitimacy. The objective may be the first principle of all operations, but legitimacy ranks second. MR
ANNOUNCING the 2008 James Lawton Collins Jr. Special Topics Writing Competition

★ Contest closes 1 August 2008 ★

The U.S. Army Center of Military History invites Army officers in the rank of major or below, warrant officers, and noncommissioned officers to submit an original unclassified essay about a small U.S. Army unit or team, no larger than a company, engaged in the War on Terrorism in Afghanistan. Submissions must be received by 1 August 2008.

Competition enrollment forms and further information about the competition will be posted at <http://www.army.mil/cmh-pg/2008Contest.htm>

Questions about the contest should be directed to Jon Hoffman at the Center of Military History (202) 685-2360 or DSN 325-2360 or by email at hoffmanjt@hqda.army.mil