



ARROYO CENTER

THE ARTS
CHILD POLICY
CIVIL JUSTICE
EDUCATION
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
NATIONAL SECURITY
POPULATION AND AGING
PUBLIC SAFETY
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
SUBSTANCE ABUSE
TERRORISM AND
HOMELAND SECURITY
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
WORKFORCE AND WORKPLACE

This PDF document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

Support RAND

[Purchase this document](#)

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore the [RAND Arroyo Center](#)

View [document details](#)

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND PDFs to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND PDFs are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation monograph series. RAND monographs present major research findings that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors. All RAND monographs undergo rigorous peer review to ensure high standards for research quality and objectivity.

Unfolding the Future of the Long War

Motivations, Prospects, and
Implications for the U.S. Army

Christopher G. Pernin, Brian Nichiporuk, Dale Stahl,
Justin Beck, Ricky Radaelli-Sanchez

Prepared for the United States Army

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited



RAND ARROYO CENTER

The research described in this report was sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. W74V8H-06-C-0001.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Unfolding the future of the long war : motivations, prospects, and implications for the U.S. Army / Christopher G. Pernin ... [et al.].

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-8330-4631-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. United States—Military policy—Forecasting. 2. Islamic countries—Military relations—United States—Forecasting. 3. United States—Military relations—Islamic countries—Forecasting. 4. War on Terrorism, 2001—Forecasting. 5. Military planning—United States. 6. United States. Army—Planning. 7. United States—Armed Forces—Planning. I. Pernin, Christopher G., 1973—

UA23.U46 2008

355'.033573—dc22

2008050573

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

RAND® is a registered trademark.

Cover photo courtesy of AP Photo/Todd Pitman

© Copyright 2008 RAND Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from RAND.

Published 2008 by the RAND Corporation

1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050

4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2665

RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>

To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact

Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;

Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: order@rand.org


Summary

The United States is currently engaged in what has been characterized as the “long war.” The long war has been described by some as an epic struggle against adversaries bent on forming a unified Islamic world to supplant Western dominance, while others characterize it more narrowly as an extension of the war on terror. But while policymakers, military leaders, and scholars have offered numerous definitions of the long war, no consensus has been reached about this term or its implications for the United States. To understand the effects that this long war will have on the U.S. Army and on U.S. forces in general, it is necessary to understand more precisely what the long war is and how it might unfold. To address this need, this study explores the concept of the long war and identifies potential ways in which it might unfold as well as the implications for the Army and the U.S. military more generally.

Framework for Understanding the Long War

As seen in Figure S.1, one way to think about the potential threats the United States faces in the long war is to consider the confluence of three problems raised by the war: those related to the ideologies espoused by key adversaries in the conflict, those related to the use of terrorism, and those related to governance (i.e., its absence or presence, its quality, and the predisposition of specific governing bodies to the United States and its interests). The goal of this report is not to determine which of these areas is the key problem. Instead, we take the stance that to ensure that this long war follows a favorable course, the United States will need to make a concerted effort across all three domains.

Figure S.1
Long War as the Confluence of Terrorism,
Governance, and Ideology



RAND MG738-S.1

Also important for understanding the long war is a definition of the adversary. Because several of the adversaries that have attacked the United States have espoused an ideology laced with Islamic motifs and juridical justifications, this study examined groups operating within predominantly Muslim countries and organized them into categories based on an understanding of their motivating ideas and goals:¹

- Doctrinaire jihadists, whether global in orientation or internally focused, who adhere to a version of Islam known as Salafi-jihadism. This interpretation of Islam rejects modernism and emphasizes the concepts of *jihad* (holy struggle) and *takfir* (declaring another Muslim an infidel).
- Religious nationalist organizations such as Hezbollah and HAMAS that participate in the political process but that are also willing to

¹ For the purposes of this report, we use the term “Muslim world” to denote those states with predominantly or large Muslim populations. Many of these states are located in the Middle East and northern Africa, and others span south and southeast Asia through to Indonesia.

use violence, sometimes against their own people, to dominate a particular community, region, or nation.

- Other groups whose primary motivation is secular, such as communists, Arab nationalists, or Ba'athists.

In addition to these groups, other nonviolent organizations operating within predominantly Muslim nations can sometimes provide a “gateway” for entrance into more radical organizations.

This categorization scheme helps illustrate the diversity of groups plausibly involved in a long war with the United States and indicates the assortment of economic, social, and political factors and grievances that can motivate adversaries. Some groups in this scheme pose a greater or lesser relative threat than do others (e.g., doctrinaire jihadists with an external focus constitute the greatest threat) and thus require the United States to have a range of approaches available to deal with them.

Alternative Trajectories

The study identified eight alternative “trajectories,” or paths, that the long war might take. The trajectories emphasize not what the future looks like, but the ways in which it might unfold. The eight trajectories discussed in this report are listed and briefly defined in Table S.1.

Strategies for Addressing the Trajectories

In addressing the future of the long war, we identified a number of trends and uncertainties associated with the future combat environment. This analysis, combined with our understanding of the components of the long war, provided the basis for a set of seven strategy options for the United States in the long war.

Divide and Rule

Divide and Rule focuses on exploiting fault lines between the various Salafi-jihadist groups to turn them against each other and dissipate their energy on internal conflicts. This strategy relies heavily on covert action, information operations (IO), unconventional warfare, and support to indigenous security forces. Divide and Rule would be the obvious strategy choice for the “Narrowing of Threat” trajectory as the United States and its local allies could use the nationalist jihadists to launch proxy IO campaigns to discredit the transnational jihadists in the eyes of the local populace. In the “Holding Action” trajectory, Divide and Rule would be an inexpensive way of buying time for the United States and its allies until the United States can return its full attention to the long war. U.S. leaders could also choose to capitalize on the “Sustained Shia-Sunni Conflict” trajectory by taking the side of the conservative Sunni regimes against Shiite empowerment movements in the Muslim world.

Shrink the Swamp

Shrink the Swamp tries to slowly reduce the space in the Muslim world in which Salafi-jihadist groups can operate. It is an “outside-in” approach that seeks to stabilize the outer geographic edges of the Muslim world to the point where those countries are inoculated against Salafi-jihadist ideology. This strategy is particularly germane to the “Narrowing of Threat” trajectory. After isolating the transnational jihadists from the rest of the jihadist movement, the United States could work to eradicate the transnational jihadist presence from the outer geographic rings of the Muslim world—i.e., Indonesia, Malaysia, and Morocco—by working intensively with local security forces to eliminate the funding, educational, and recruitment mechanisms that support al-Qaeda and its affiliates in those countries. The strategy might also apply to the “Steady State” and “Sustained Sunni-Shia Conflict” trajectories.

Inside Out

This strategy holds that the United States should use decisive conventional military force to change the regime in certain key Muslim countries and impose democracy in its place. The theory here is that the geopolitical

Table S.1
Short Description of the Eight Trajectories Discussed in This Report

1	Steady State	Baseline case largely reminiscent of current actions and environment. In this vision, the threat continues to be the broad universe of radical Salafi-jihadists, including both transnational and sometimes regional groups.
2	War of Ideas	Shift to information-based campaign with the goal of isolating jihadists and their infrastructure from the broader global Muslim population. Plans to confront Iran militarily over its nuclear program are shelved for the time being.
3	Major Muslim Nation Goes Bad	Radical shift in a regime brought on when a critical state in the Muslim world is taken over by radical extremists. Two of the most plausible and most threatening scenarios to American interests would be a military coup in Pakistan or a successful fundamentalist insurgency in Saudi Arabia.
4	Narrowing of Threat	Conflict arising between jihadists leads the U.S. to take a “divide and conquer” approach in order to exploit cleavages among transnational jihadists and local/regional jihadists. Consequently, the U.S. would adopt a more flexible position toward local and nationalist Islamist groups like HAMAS and Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) in the Philippines.
5	Expanding Scope	Expanded scope of the long war threat beyond a major terrorist attack against U.S. interests to include radical Shiism, the Iranian state, regional terrorists, and/or some non-Islamic terror groups. In this formulation, the long war would become a true global war on terror.
6	Holding Action	A series of geopolitical shocks (e.g., an attempt by China to shift the balance of power in the Western Pacific or a sudden, violent implosion of North Korea) would compel the U.S. to temporarily scale back its efforts against Salafi-jihadists in order to focus on more traditional threats that require a response involving conventional forces and diplomatic capital.
7	Sustained Sunni-Shia Conflict	Widespread violence between Shia and Sunni groups, resulting in deep fault lines between Shia and Sunni communities throughout the Muslim world. As a result, the U.S. is led to concentrate, in the short term, on shoring up the traditional Sunni regimes in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Pakistan as a way of containing Iranian power and influence in the Middle East and Persian Gulf.
8	Chronic Insurgencies/Instability	Serious insurgencies and unrest around the world that drain the resources of the U.S. and its allies and decrease regime legitimacy. The insurgencies are driven largely by dissatisfaction with inefficient and ineffective governmental structures, dilapidated infrastructure in terms of basic services, and questions of legitimacy of the current leaders.

earthquake caused by regime change will empower democratic forces throughout the Muslim world and force much of the Salafi-jihadist warrior community to come out into the open to fight U.S. conventional

forces, thus giving the United States a better chance of crushing them decisively. This strategy is part of the “Steady State” because of the continuing focus on building democracy at some level in Afghanistan and Iraq. Although the notion that the birth of democracy in those two countries would cause it to spread throughout the entire Middle East has long since been discredited, one can still argue that the existence of two democratic states in the middle of the Muslim world would create two likely security partners and potential allies for the United States over the long term. In the “Sustained Sunni-Shia Conflict” trajectory, the United States might take an aggressive stance by seeking to overthrow the Iranian regime and replacing it with a moderate one that does not rely on Shiite chauvinism for its legitimacy.

State-Centric

State-Centric aims to spread effective governance throughout the Muslim world by strengthening established regimes, giving them more resources, and making them less brittle. The theory here is that the main driver behind the Salafi-jihadist surge is the existence of ungoverned spaces (like the tribal areas of Pakistan) and public administrations that cannot deliver basic services to ordinary people. The State-Centric strategy applies across all eight trajectories. For example, in the “Steady State” trajectory, the United States would continue to bolster existing regimes against insurgencies, terrorism, and social instability while nudging them toward improvements in the provision of basic services to the population. In the “Sustained Sunni-Shia Conflict” trajectory, the United States would work to build the institutional capacities of at-risk Muslim states so that their security forces could contain sectarian violence effectively. In the “Chronic Insurgencies/Instability” trajectory, State-Centric would be useful in countries that have stabilized their domestic security situation to the point where the insurgents are not gaining territory or influence.

Contain and React

Contain and React is a fundamentally defensive strategy that seeks to hold a “perimeter” in the Muslim world and only act strongly if that perimeter is breached (i.e., a U.S. ally is threatened with collapse or overthrow).

As a predominantly defensive strategy, the threshold for U.S. involvement would be high and would be contingent on a good relationship between the United States and its ally in the region. At the point of intervention, the United States would react with general purpose forces from a geographic perimeter location. This contrasts with other strategies such as Inside Out, where proactive U.S. actions would entail more aggressive actions across a broader group of states in the region.

This strategy has applications for several trajectories. For example, in “Major Muslim Nation Goes Bad,” Contain and React would seek to position U.S. military forces in neighboring states to deter the newly radicalized state from threatening its neighbors. In “Expanding Scope,” this strategy could be used to try to fence off groups like Hezbollah in finite swaths of territory with stepped-up border enforcement as well as periodic strikes and raids. Contain and React would be the preferred choice for the “War of Ideas” because the ideational campaign would be an ideal, low-cost, low-visibility tool for containing al-Qaeda and Salafi-jihadist ideologues.

Ink Blot (Seize, Clear, and Hold)

Ink Blot is a global counterinsurgency (COIN) strategy that aims to seize, clear, and hold strategically important areas throughout the Muslim world by working actively with local security forces. Under this strategy, the United States would work with key allies like Algeria, Egypt, and Yemen to remove all Salafi-jihadist elements from certain areas through a classic COIN approach that concludes with infrastructure restoration and the formation of local self-defense militias. The hope here would be that over time the Salafi-jihadist groups would be relegated to the geographic margins of the Muslim world and cut off from one another. In the “Chronic Insurgencies/Instability” trajectory, Ink Blot would be reserved for those insurgencies and areas of instability in which the insurgents are gaining ground and influence. The approach might also be applicable to the “Steady State” and “Narrowing of the Threat” trajectories.

Underlying Causes

Underlying Causes holds that the United States needs to attack the broad underlying socioeconomic problems of the Muslim world on a regional, rather than country-specific, basis. The United States would work steadily to deal with the demographic, resource scarcity, labor market, and public health problems that create poor living conditions and social frustration in the Middle East, South Asia, and North Africa. Over time, the theory is that better basic socioeconomic conditions would reduce the appeal of radical Salafi-jihadist ideas and create support for free market openness. This strategy would entail only a small role for the U.S. military. Under the “Holding Action” trajectory, the United States might adopt a longer-term and less aggressive stance in the Middle East. Nonmilitary organizations such as the U.S. Agency for International Development, the State Department, the Peace Corps, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Justice would become the focus of the new U.S. strategy.

Implications for the U.S. Army

We now describe some implications for the Army arising from the trajectories.

Steady State

In the “Steady State” trajectory, the role of the Army would be dominated by any continuing commitment to Afghanistan and Iraq. The Army is unlikely to be stretched in this scenario unless the Afghanistan or Iraq deployments continue to be large. If the United States chooses to engage in more peacekeeping and enforcement roles to prevent the growth of Salafi-jihadism, the Army would require some different skill sets from those needed in major combat, and some specialized equipment might also be useful (e.g., nonlethal weapons). If the United States decides to provide support to governments in an attempt to reduce the number of insurgencies and instability in particular countries, such operations could involve large numbers of troops but not nearly as many as Iraq. The continued use of Army special operations

forces (SOF) for global operations against al-Qaeda could compel an increase in SOF force structure beyond that currently programmed.

War of Ideas

There would be two implications for the Army here. First, the Army would need to improve all facets of its IO capabilities, including target audience analysis, message creation, and message delivery. The Army would also need to learn how to synchronize strategic and tactical IO lines of operation. Second, to make tangible progress in the “War of Ideas,” the Army would need to do its best to reduce collateral damage during kinetic operations. This implies the need for better systems for all-source intelligence fusion as well as weaponry to support the discriminatory nature of the IO campaigns and reduce unwanted collateral damage.

Major Muslim Nation Goes Bad

If the United States were to decide on a strategy of containment, then intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) as well as human intelligence (HUMINT) assets would be required to detect and monitor the flow of weapons/WMD components and people across the border of the “bad nation.” Since it is unlikely that the United States would commit to long-term border patrols, these ultimately would need to be handled by the forces of the neighboring nations, and the Army might be required to take on training or monitoring roles.

At least three proactive strategy components can be envisioned, including the need for strike capabilities against WMD facilities to prevent them from falling into the hands of the incoming government (which would not involve the Army heavily) as well as SOF, seize-and-hold, or stabilization operations, which could require a larger Army role.

If the United States were to become directly involved in a counter-coup, Army units might be required to train the friendly forces or serve as advisers. A more direct confrontation between U.S. forces and the new governments might be seen as similar to the “regime change” operation in Iraq. Lessons from this operation are well known and will not be repeated here. A radicalized state without weapons of mass

destruction or effect (WMD/E) capabilities could require a less immediate response from U.S. forces, such as the stationing of a couple of U.S. Army brigades in neighboring or regional countries as a deterrent to aggressive moves. The Army might also expect to be involved in significant IO operations in neighboring states to help contain the fallout and reduce the influence of Salafi-jihadist propaganda.

Narrowing of Threat

Because of the nature of the nationalist terrorist groups, any assistance would be mainly covert and would imply advanced IO capabilities so that it could aid other government agencies and host nations in the effort to promote cleavages within the jihadist movement. Much of this work would not necessarily be done by the Army. However, a narrowing of the threat could also allow the U.S. forces to focus their efforts more broadly on COIN campaigns currently being bolstered by transnational terrorists. In these cases, the military, and the Army in particular, could see an expanded role for COIN to target the more subtle places those groups are providing aid.

Expanding Scope

It is likely, assuming that commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan have been reduced, that the U.S. Army would not be stretched by the addition of another long war enemy. However, if there is still a significant deployment in Iraq or Afghanistan, opening up a war on an additional front may stretch the Army in terms of personnel. One of the more significant capability needs would be for HUMINT capabilities able to penetrate the new non-Salafi-jihadist targets, although such capabilities are likely to be developed in conjunction with the intelligence community rather than solely in the Army. It would also be useful for the Army to accelerate its research on counter-rocket, artillery, mortar (CRAM) technologies.

Holding Action

In this trajectory, the United States faces a conventional foe, or other threat, that forces it to reduce its focus on the long war. The implications for the Army of this other threat are not discussed here. In regard

to the long war, the Army might revert to a training and advisory role in countries where it might prefer to have an active presence. It is unlikely that in the face of this new threat the United States will continue to have “boots on the ground” where they are not desperately needed, but if ground troops do remain fighting the long war, then they will have to make do with fewer resources and less equipment. Additionally, there might be an increased need to operate with allies who might be required to aid the United States in offsetting the diminished U.S. commitment in foreign internal defense (FID) and counterterrorism missions. Depending on the nature of the conventional conflict, this trajectory could be extremely stressful on the Army, but it would not be the long war causing this stress.

Sustained Sunni-Shia Conflict

If the United States attempts to exploit the conflict to avoid having to confront a united Islamic world (possibly a very unwise strategy), then there will be little role for the Army. The exception would be the FID missions to train host nation security forces with the possible insertion of advisers, but this might be handled by other agencies. The United States may also seek to end the conflict through peacekeeping operations. Here there would be a substantial role for the Army.

A third option would be to take sides in the conflict, possibly supporting authoritative Sunni governments against a continuingly hostile Iran. The level of U.S. involvement would dictate the type of operations requirement by the Army, which might, at the higher end, require the Army to provide troop lift, logistical support, and other types of aid, or direct involvement in the conflict, which may look partly like an insurgency and partly like conventional war. At the latter level, the U.S. Army would call upon rapid precision strike systems and would have to balance aggressive operations with an IO campaign.

Chronic Insurgencies/Instability

If the United States chooses to get involved in a large number of the insurgencies, then the Army could find itself stretched in terms of numbers of specialty capabilities such as Special Forces (SF), Civil Affairs (CA), and psychological operations (PSYOPS). As the numbers grow,

the insurgencies might become “core Army business.” In such a situation, the Army may consider a significant restructuring to focus its forces on fighting insurgencies rather than major combat operations.

The capabilities required to fight insurgencies are different from those required for conventional warfare and would cause the Army to change some of its training and equipment. The United States would also need a capability to rebuild foreign infrastructure that was damaged during the conflict. This role has traditionally been taken on by agencies other than the Army, but it has often been fulfilled by the Army.

Broad Observations

From the consideration of the implications of the proposed trajectories for the United States, we conclude with a number of broad observations.

As Appropriate, the Military Should Define and Set Appropriate Goals for Any Engagements Associated with the Long War in Terms of the Confluence of Governance, Terrorism, and Ideology

Rhetorical use of the term “long war” aside, the basic tenets of the governance, terrorism, and ideology (GTI) construct provide one means of ensuring a more systemwide view of any engagements in the Muslim world. Defining future engagements too narrowly may not provide the effects desired and may only exacerbate situations. For instance, in the case of the “Chronic Insurgencies” trajectory, viewing the problem as solely a peacekeeping mission may not directly address the governance issues underlying the insurgencies. Likewise, not tailoring responses to the variegated motivations behind individual groups and their respective ideologies may create short-term local effects that do not address the longer-term and chronic unrest. Articulating the overall objectives from a systems point of view will help to better construct individual military missions and understand the impacts of those missions across GTI.

The Army Should Plan and Prepare to Be Involved with Aspects from Across the GTI Construct

The fight against international terrorism implies some U.S. military action; however, the key role tends to fall upon Special Forces or agencies other than the U.S. Army. In any case, an overall strategy should be well established that deals with the near-term tactical problems of Salafi-jihadism without forgetting the more nascent and growing terror networks and influences. Acquisition of WMD is a pivotal unknown in dealing with terrorist capabilities, and thus counter-WMD activities remain paramount.

The role of U.S. forces in governance is clearer. Typically, any large-scale efforts associated with post-conflict situations will be the military's responsibility. Reactive operations associated with restoration and improvement through SSTRO² activities with a host nation are done with ground forces through Civil Affairs and other specialties. When considering the implications of nation building, SSTRO, and post-conflict border security, key issues concern the needed specialization for such activities and the overall capacity required. The U.S. Army in particular is implicated in such activities because of its size and experience in such operations. Some of these activities, especially reconstruction of civilian governance infrastructure, are not usually thought to require an Army role. However, the lack of large-scale, deployable units from other government agencies may mean this role is performed by the U.S. Department of Defense and at least in part by the Army. For instance, the Iraq Study Group Report (Baker and Hamilton, 2006) calls for the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to manage the reconstruction of the courts and legal system in Iraq. However, if the DOJ is incapable of performing such tasks in areas lacking security, this role is to be left to the military.

A more immediate step is to better understand the implications of military actions on ideologies and ideologically driven groups across the full spectrum of operations and address gap issues as appropriate across DOTMLPF.³

² Stability, support, transition, and reconstruction operations.

³ Doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel, and facilities.

The Army Should Consider Mission Sets That Allow for a More Proactive Effect Across the GTI Construct

A potentially more significant implication of the long war concerns proactive operations to shape countries before they become significant security problems. Being able to address issues across GTI before conflict or immediate need for direct involvement is a pivotal capability in ensuring that the long war does not escalate.

Trajectories explored during this study—for example, “Major Muslim Nation Goes Bad” and “Expanding Scope”—escalate current conflicts to broader groups of actors. In the former case, the proliferation of an ideology garners enough support to bring down an established regime. The proactive forces here are the establishment clergy that counterweigh the radicalized ideologies. To date, U.S. involvement with these groups has been limited, and it may be difficult for the Army to develop and exercise appropriate mission sets and relationships to proactively engage faltering states. Similarly, “Expanding Scope” implies escalation of nonstate actor capabilities that increase risk to U.S. national security. The proactive mission here includes developing policing and internal security capabilities within a number of states.

These types of novel mission areas would allow the military to proactively get ahead of the problems and reduce the need to be reactive. Typically, these operations are largely contained under “Peacetime Military Engagement” operations, which entail military-to-military engagements, education and training programs, advisory roles, border enforcement, and long-term intelligence support. However, these should be considered more broadly in relation to the long war description in this report and understood in terms of how they interact with the governance, terrorism, and ideology.⁴ These programs

⁴ One case for this expanding mission set includes the effects of early actions in Operation Unified Assistance (tsunami relief in the Indian Ocean). The swift military assistance program, while nominally included under “humanitarian assistance,” engendered sudden support for the United States in that part of the world, changing Indonesian public opinion the most (Pew, 2005, p. 2). The tsunami was also implicated in bringing the regional insurgent group GAM together with the government, and it fostered a more open dialogue between the United States and various Muslim states in the affected areas. The U.S. part of the relief could not have been successful if not for a few core capabilities of the U.S. military—logistics, operational planning, and the ability and capacity for swift, large-scale action.

would be conducted as part of an interagency approach to the situation, and may be very far removed from any warfighting.

The Enduring Missions of the Force Combined with the Evolving Responses to the Long War Imply an Agile and Flexible Military

As described in this study, the focus of the long war could expand to include a broader focus on nonstate actors (“Expanding Scope”), narrow to emphasize simpler or more specific threats (“Narrowing of Scope”), or be overcome entirely by conventional threats (“Holding Action”). Any actions taken to change the force based on the long war should weigh the effects they will have on longer-term planning horizons, and the enduring missions of the force. In these terms, maintaining flexibility in the force is critically important, both to prepare for the various ways in which the long war might evolve and to allow the Army to remain ready for other contingencies while it wages the long war. Flexibility is more important in the case of the long war than in the conventional arena, since the long war enemy is able to adapt much more quickly than potential conventional foes.

The Military Should Consider the Vulnerability of the Assumption That Major Combat Operations Will Be Their Most Pressing Issue in the Medium and Longer Term

The assumption that major combat operations (MCO) would remain the primary mission in the timeframes considered in the report may not continue to hold beyond those timeframes. If this assumption were to change in the future, then resources spent on MCO capabilities could be redirected toward those better suited for fighting the long war, however it has evolved. If the assumption about the predominance of conventional conflict changes, then the Army, and the rest of the Department of Defense, would need to restructure in order to fight the long war in the most optimal fashion.

Similarly, in the future the Army may be relieved of MCO requirements by the other services and those resources redeployed to focus on COIN and SSTRO. Some of the trajectories explored in this study, namely “Expanding Scope” and “Chronic Insurgencies,” might imply considerable size and capabilities from the Army that could be

strengthened with a focus on those missions instead of conventional conflicts.

The Military, and More Specifically the Army, Should Plan for Potential Involvement in Medium- to Large-Scale Stability Operations and Nation Building

Depending on the chosen strategy, medium- to large-scale stability operations and nation building are possibly part of the long war. Many of the trajectories require the Army to use substantial counterinsurgency operations and/or nation building capabilities. Counterinsurgency operations are increasingly being seen as an Army role, whereas nation building has predominantly been the domain of other agencies. In the wake of Iraq, however, it is clear these other agencies lack the capability to conduct these operations, especially in an insecure environment. It may be necessary for the Army to take on these roles if other solutions cannot be found. Thus the military needs to understand the tradeoffs and risks involved with any assumptions about its capacity to perform such duties as the long war unfolds.

The Army Should Continue to Identify and Adopt Niche Capabilities to Prosecute the Long War

A more detailed examination of the trajectories described in this monograph will undoubtedly uncover capabilities necessary for successful operations. Examples of niche capabilities across the trajectories described in this monograph and evident in small-scale, low-intensity operations that the U.S. military might consider increasing include specific high-value, low-density capabilities such as: various ISR platforms; soldier skills for diplomacy; theater- and longer-term specific knowledge of areas and cultures; language skills; unconventional warfare and counterterrorism capabilities; tactical to strategic IO integration and development; and FID advisers. More detailed scenario planning would be useful to determine the biggest operational needs and potentially missing capabilities. In any case, the trajectories seen here indicate a reliance on many special skill sets, and developing, integrating, and balancing those capabilities within the larger bevy of military capabilities will remain a challenge.