

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 30-10-2008			2. REPORT TYPE <p style="text-align: center;">FINAL</p>		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <i>Raiders of the Lost Art – Recovering and Implementing the Intellectual Lineage of Campaign Planning for 21st century joint planning</i>					5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
					5b. GRANT NUMBER	
					5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) <p style="text-align: center;">Lieutenant Colonel Charles D. Lawhorn</p> Paper Advisor (if Any):					5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
					5e. TASK NUMBER	
					5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Joint Military Operations Department Naval War College 686 Cushing Road Newport, RI 02841-1207					8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)					10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
					11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; Distribution is unlimited.						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES A paper submitted to the Naval War College faculty in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Joint Military Operations Department. The contents of this paper reflect my own personal views and are not necessarily endorsed by the NWC or the Department of the Navy.						
14. ABSTRACT The rise of prevalent irregular warfare challenges to United States instruments of national power, more especially its military power, has brought to light the renewed importance of campaign planning. Challenges from rogue states, the rising military power of other states, and transnational threats representing violent extremist ideologies have all highlighted the need for an intellectual rebirth of campaign planning. A specific focus on campaign planning has been largely missing since World War II. Notwithstanding ambiguity in current joint doctrine that warrants correction, principally in Joint Publication 5-0, campaign planning exists as a unique and distinct type of planning that more easily adapts to the operating environment; provides the potential for better integration with the interagency process; and establishes creative linkages between operational, theater-strategic, and strategic-level objectives and end states. A renewed emphasis on campaign plans and more strategic-centric planning, as evidenced in the new 2008 GEF and JSCP, is critical for the 21st century and provides additional emphasis for more thorough development of campaign planning methodology.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Recovering the lost art of campaign planning for 21st century military planners						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			Chairman, JMO Dept	
				33	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) <p style="text-align: center;">401-841-3556</p>	

**NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
Newport, R.I.**

**RAIDERS OF THE LOST ART – RECOVERING AND IMPLEMENTING THE
INTELLECTUAL LINEAGE OF CAMPAIGN PLANNING FOR 21st
CENTURY JOINT PLANNING**

by

Charles D. Lawhorn

Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army National Guard

A paper submitted to the Faculty of the Naval War College in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Joint Military Operations.

The contents of this paper reflect my own personal views and are not necessarily endorsed by the Naval War College or the Department of the Navy.

Signature: _____

30 October 2008

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

Table of Contents

Introduction – The Search and Its Relevance	1
Background and Challenges – The Future is Now	3
Discussion / Analysis – Unearthing the Art of the Campaign	11
Conclusions / Recommendations – The “Art” of the Matter	21
Bibliography	27

Abstract

Raiders of the Lost Art – Recovering and Implementing the Intellectual Lineage of Campaign Planning for 21st century joint planning.

The rise of prevalent irregular warfare challenges to United States instruments of national power, more especially its military power, has brought to light the renewed importance of campaign planning. Challenges from rogue states, the rising military power of other states, and transnational threats representing violent extremist ideologies have all highlighted the need for an intellectual rebirth of campaign planning. A specific focus on campaign planning has been largely missing since World War II. Notwithstanding ambiguity in current joint doctrine that warrants correction, principally in Joint Publication 5-0, campaign planning exists as a unique and distinct type of planning that more easily adapts to the operating environment; provides the potential for better integration with the interagency process; and establishes creative linkages between operational, theater-strategic, and strategic-level objectives and endstates. A renewed emphasis on campaign plans and more strategic-centric planning, as evidenced in the new 2008 GEF and JSCP, is critical for the 21st century and provides additional emphasis for more thorough development of campaign planning methodology.

“They’re digging in the wrong place!”

-- Indiana Jones in *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, commenting on the mistake of those looking for the Ark of the Covenant buried in Egypt’s desert sands.¹

INTRODUCTION – THE SEARCH AND ITS RELEVANCE

In the George Lucas and Steven Spielberg classic movie *Indiana Jones and the Raiders of the Lost Ark*, a group of pre-World War II era Nazis and malevolent profiteers are looking to find, and possess, the legendary Ark of the Covenant mentioned in the Old Testament of the Bible. They are the “raiders”, and seek the Ark for riches, glory, and power, including the Ark’s purported supernatural capabilities as a military instrument and weapon of supreme power, enabling them to dominate the world in support of evil causes. Dr. “Indiana” Jones is the archetypical hero of the story, a college professor, archeologist, scholar, and famed adventurer, who is thrust into the middle of the Nazi’s brutal quest for the Ark. Upon knowing the Ark is being sought by the Nazis, and being aware of their ultimate intentions, Professor Jones enters the search and tries to find the Ark first and prevent it from falling into the wrong hands. Professor Jones wants to preserve the legacy of history, and see that this legendary artifact from antiquity shares that great legacy with everyone as an archeological treasure. The Ark, for Jones, is to be shared with the world and used only for the more noble purpose of historical learning. And for Jones, the power of the Ark is to be used to promote peaceful ends, and not to be allowed to fall into the hands of evil.

Modern day military thinkers, facing challenges of the 21st century, are themselves in a race against a different type of “raiders”. Military minds of today are all searching for that edge in anticipation, that advantage in security, to be gained by effective use of military

¹ *Indiana Jones and the Raiders of the Lost Ark*, DVD, Paramount Pictures, 1981.

planning. The search is, in essence, one not for the lost “*Ark*” as in Indiana Jones’ pursuit, but one for the lost “*Art*” of campaign planning. To its detriment, in the last several decades the art of campaign planning has been lost, and not effectively practiced by the United States and its military. It is the thesis of this paper that reclaiming a focus on campaign planning as a distinct and overarching approach and theme for U.S. national security planning is essential to 21st century strategic and operational success, and effective integration of the military and other instruments of national power enabling joint, interagency, and coalition action.

Without renewed emphasis on campaign planning, further productive development of effective approaches to address security challenges for the new century, including the effective use of the military instrument of power in concert with the other elements of national power (Diplomatic; Informational; and Economic), remains unlikely. It is not exactly clear the United States is “digging in the right place” with its military planning efforts as directed by the joint publications designed for that purpose – Joint Publication (JP) 5-00.1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning*, and JP 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning*.² While the “raiders” – current or potential enemies of America or those entities challenging the leadership role, values, or security of the United States – may be “digging in the wrong place” in their search through doctrine, and in development of their own ideas relative to campaign planning, self-examination by the United States military regarding where it stands in the process is warranted. This includes examination regarding the military’s role in national strategic planning, and inputs into that process.

² See Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Publication 5-00.1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, 25 January 2002) (hereinafter JP 5-00.1), and Joint Publication 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, 26 December 2006) (hereinafter JP 5-0). The prior version of JP 5-0 was published 13 April 1995. JP 5-00.1, published in-between the versions of JP 5-0, was withdrawn as doctrine with the 2006 publication of the revised JP 5-0. The 2006 version of JP 5-0 was said to have “incorporat[ed] relevant information from JP 5-00.1.” See JP 5-0 (2006 version), p. iii (summary of changes).

The nation that draws too great a distinction between its scholars and its warriors will have its thinking done by cowards and its fighting done by fools.

-- Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication 1-1, *Strategy*³

BACKGROUND AND CHALLENGES – THE FUTURE IS NOW

The United States military is responsible for its role in “national strategic planning,” and is to contribute by engaging in joint strategic planning, shaping strategic planning at the national level, and through the process of joint strategic planning provide the vital inputs required.⁴ In executing its planning responsibilities, the military may not neglect its role in national strategic planning, and in helping to guide the coordinated use of U.S. national power (DIME). Where the military element of national power is concerned, notwithstanding civilian control of the military, it is the Armed Forces themselves who are the subject matter experts providing input for national strategic planning, and the military may not abrogate or delegate that duty. Military planners and leaders are the warrior-scholars considering that subject matter, carefully thinking through and addressing strategic and operational planning linkages governing the role and use of military power as part of the DIME. The military must provide the best information, acting within its areas of expertise, to civilian leadership. “A general-in-chief cannot excuse himself from responsibility for his faults,” according to Napoleon, “by pleading an order of his sovereign or the minister, when the individual from

³ Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication (MCDP) 1-1, *Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Navy, Headquarters United States Marine Corps, 12 November 1997) (hereinafter MCDP 1-1), p. 7. MCDP 1-1 cites the source for this quote as “unknown”.

⁴ JP 5-0, p. I-1

whom it proceeds is at a distance from the field of operations, and but partially, or not at all, acquainted with the actual condition of things.”⁵

The military and its leaders, then, have a duty to utilize their expertise and knowledge of the “actual condition of things” in the military realm, and contribute to the planning process. The military may not delegate that responsibility to the civilian leadership they advise. “Hence it follows,” continues Napoleon, “that every general-in-chief who undertakes to execute a plan which he knows to be bad, is culpable. He should communicate his reasons, insist on a change of plan and finally resign his commission rather than become the instrument of his army’s ruin.”⁶ The coordination and integration of all the elements of national power together to achieve a synergistic effect requires planning at the national level. Commanders and military planners should actively engage in the formulation of objectives, and carefully monitor the direction of planning, while also remaining aware of efforts by potential competitors in the same realm.

The 21st century realm where United States Armed Forces must provide subject matter and planning expertise is described by the 2008 *National Defense Strategy* (NDS) as one increasingly defined by irregular warfare.⁷ Among the more significant and complex changes in the operational environment discussed in the NDS is the prevalence of a global struggle by violent extremist ideologies against the international state system, and other irregular threats like rogue states seeking nuclear weapons and the rising military power of other states.⁸ Current and potential challengers of United States military superiority, cast in

⁵ Napoleon Bonaparte, “Military Maxims of Napoleon,” p. 429, in *Roots of Strategy*, Thomas R. Phillips, trans. and ed. (Harrisburg, PA: The Telegraph Press, 1940), pp. 401-441.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ U.S. Department of Defense, *National Defense Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary of Defense, June 2008).

⁸ Ibid. In describing the strategic environment, the *National Defense Strategy* (NDS) identifies a global struggle “against a violent extremist ideology that seeks to overthrow the international state system,” and “other threats,

the role of 21st century national security competitors, have already laid the doctrinal foundation of theater-strategic and campaign planning methodology. Arguably, in some cases potential competitor-challengers of the United States have acted significantly earlier than the United States in developing doctrines for the new century, proceeding with modified variants of that doctrine.

Two prominent examples of competitor foundational documents that may have particular relevancy for U.S. development of campaign planning are *Unrestricted Warfare*, a product of Chinese thought, and *The Quranic Concept of War*, a Pakistani approach to warfare self-identified as originating from Islamic thought. Both serve to highlight current challenges, and the need to remain astute and persevere with our own pursuit of campaign planning. A review of either *Unrestricted Warfare*,⁹ published in 1999 by two Chinese military officers, or Pakistani Brigadier General S.K. Malik's *The Quranic Concept of War*¹⁰ published in 1979, will enhance a representative understanding of competitor doctrinal approaches in an irregular warfare environment. *Unrestricted Warfare* exists as an example of the People's Republic of China (PRC) elaborating upon a "completely new method of warfare called 'modified combined war that goes beyond limits.'"¹¹ In *The Quranic Concept of War*, Malik's writing identifies an approach arguably grounded in possible Islamist

including a variety of irregular challenges, the quest by rogue states for nuclear weapons, and the rising military power of other states." NDS, p. 2.

⁹ Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui, *Unrestricted Warfare* (Beijing, China: PLA Literature and Arts Publishing House, February 1999).

¹⁰ Brigadier S.K. Malik. *The Quranic Concept of War* (Delhi, India: Adam Publishers & Distributors, 1992) (1992 Indian Reprint). This writing by Brigadier Malik, then a general in the Pakistani Army, was not readily available and extremely difficult to obtain for quite a long time. It is still not well known in the West, and was first published in 1979.

¹¹ Liana and Xiangsui, op. cit., p. 181.

militancy, or at least evidencing, a problematic proclivity of some Islamic military states to potentially adopt a doctrine of war at odds with the Global War on Terror (GWOT).¹²

China, as the “sleeping giant,” has entered the 21st century expanding its economic and military influence as a regional hegemon, capturing the attention of the world with the 2008 Summer Olympic Games, and moving ever closer to a possible near-peer status with the United States as an emerging superpower. “Pakistan,” an Islamic nation that possesses nuclear weapons, has in the eyes of some “become the United States’ most trusted ally in the global war on terrorism.”¹³ Nevertheless, Brigadier Malik postulated a treatise on war proclaiming itself to be one coming directly from Allah,¹⁴ again raising a real issue concerning a “divine” origin of power not unlike that allegedly contained within Indiana Jones’ Ark of the Covenant in the fictional *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, and providing a fertile doctrinal base of religious and ideological support for the campaigns of terrorists.¹⁵

Whatever position it may occupy today in Pakistan, if any, Malik’s *Quranic Concept of War* was legitimized at the time and endorsed by General M. Zia-Ul-Haq, then Army Chief of Staff and Pakistan’s military ruler (later Pakistani president), and Allah Bukhsh K. Brohi, ambassador for Pakistan to India.¹⁶ General Zia-Ul-Haq drafted the foreword for Malik’s book, and Bukhsh K. Brohi wrote the preface.¹⁷

¹² Malik, op. cit.

¹³ Brigadier General Tariq Gilani, “US-Pakistan Relations: The Way Forward,” *Parameters* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2006-07), pp. 84-102, at p. 92. At publication, Brigadier General Gilani was a brigade commander in the Pakistani Army, and a 2006 graduate of the U.S. Army War College.

¹⁴ Malik, op. cit., p. 6, contrasting the “divine concept of war” from the Qur’an with “man-made theories and philosophies.” “Together with their application by the Holy Prophet,” writes Malik, “these divine revelations give a complete and comprehensive coverage to the Quranic concept of war.” Ibid.

¹⁵ Joseph C. Myers, “The Quranic Concept of War”, *Parameters* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2006-07), pp. 108-121, at pp. 110, 118, and 120.

¹⁶ Malik, op. cit. (foreword and preface).

¹⁷ Ibid.

Unrestricted Warfare and *The Quranic Concept of War* show the strategic patience and forward-thinking of the PRC conflict model, and the goal of strategic exploitation by Islamist movements tying one of the world's great religions to a political ideology of war with terror as both its method and end. In the case of *Unrestricted Warfare*, the authors have further sought to add context, and perhaps even refine their approach, and more specifically espouse their thinking of *Unrestricted Warfare* for application to the 21st century.¹⁸ While there have been no known updates or additions to *The Quranic Concept of War* from Malik or any Pakistani officials (and probably with good reason given the rise of various terror threats even toward Islamic countries like Pakistan by Islamic-based terrorists, including threats to Pakistan and Afghanistan along the border that exist in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, or "FATA"), one does not have to look too far to find a corollary to Malik's approach in the writings of Al-Qaeda.¹⁹

Al-Qaeda and other terror groups have implemented terror as a means, and terror as an end, in ways perhaps unforeseen by the pious and pragmatic Malik. However, reliance by Al-Qaeda and Al-Qaeda Associated Movements (AQAM), or other terrorist groups like the Muslim Brotherhood, on scriptural reference in the Qur'an as justification for their murderous ideology is nevertheless supported by Malik's exposition establishing the use of terror as foundational in Quranic verse, and synonymous with a religious duty to utilize terror in the divine exercise of Allah's will.²⁰ For Malik, "in war 'the point where the means and the end meet' is in terror. He formulates terror as an objective principal of war; once terror is

¹⁸ Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui, "Unrestricted Warfare Authors: Idea is 'Beyond Limits', not 'Unrestricted' (Shanghai Guoji Zhanwang in Chinese 01 November 2005) (original published in Jianchuan Zhishi, March 2000).

¹⁹ See Shaykh Usama Bin-Muhammad Bin Ladin, Ayman al-Zawahiri, et al., "Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders – World Islamic Front Statement", 23 February 1998, Ciaonet.Org, <http://www.ciaonet.org> (accessed 24 October 2008). See also Ayman Al-Zawahiri, "Letter to al-Zarqawi", 09 July 2005, <http://www.opensource.gov> (accessed 24 October 2008).

²⁰ See, generally, Myers, op. cit.

achieved the enemy reaches his culminating point. ‘Terror is not a means of imposing decision upon the enemy; it is the decision we wish to impose’”²¹

The mere fact that either or both of these documents exist is not particularly comforting given nuclear proliferation issues and continuing efforts to prevent terrorist acquisition of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Of course, both the PRC and Pakistan possess nuclear weapons, suggesting that inquiry into exactly how nuclear issues might be part of an approach under either *Unrestricted Warfare*, or *The Quranic Concept of War*, is a prudent goal of U.S. military thinkers.

For forward-thinking U.S. military planners, then, *Unrestricted Warfare* and *The Quranic Concept of War* are examples of doctrinal approaches to warfare that employ campaigns containing operations with related lines of operation²² tied through those campaigns to strategic ends that originate from two of the most prevalent areas of concern where future conflict may arise – the PRC; and transnational terrorism associated with Violent Extremist Organizations (VEOs) like Al-Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood. As Frederick the Great noted in the 1747 instructions to his generals, when speaking of the “Projects of Campaign”, “[o]ne should know one’s enemies, their alliances, their resources, and the nature of their country in order to plan a campaign.”²³ There is inherent value in being aware of writings like *Unrestricted Warfare* and *The Quranic Concept of War* for the knowledge and understanding they impart, and for the development of one’s own planning.

²¹ Ibid., p. 117.

²² For a general discussion of lines of operation (LOOs) as they relate to operational art, see JP 5-0 (26 December 2006), pp. IV-19 to IV-23. “Normally, joint operations require commanders to synchronize activities along multiple and complementary LOOs working through a series of military strategic and operational objectives to attain the military endstate.” Ibid. at p. IV-19.

²³ Frederick the Great, “The Instruction of Frederick The Great for His Generals – 1747,” p. 314, in *Roots of Strategy*, Thomas R. Phillips, trans. and ed. (Harrisburg, PA: The Telegraph Press, 1940), pp. 301-400. Frederick the Great, later King of Prussia, was a 35-year old prince at the time the instructions were delivered. Ibid. at p. 309.

And as Frederick also observes, one should also know their friends: “One should know what to expect of one’s friends, what resources one has oneself, and see the future effects to determine what one has to fear or hope from political maneuvers.”²⁴

Additionally, from a GWOT perspective, it is reasonable to suggest that even though the overt demonstration of Pakistani nuclear capability to the international community did not occur until later, Malik would logically have anticipated how his writings might impact future nuclear issues since the Pakistani nuclear program was well under way when his book was published. What this all demonstrates is not just the obvious nature of a multi-layer threat that should be studied. Rather, for our purposes here it illustrates the extent to which potential competitors of the United States (and thereby our Armed Forces) are themselves involved in a “process” of planning, and are themselves actively involved in the creation of campaigns that link operational activities with campaign plans to achieve strategic objectives.

Given previous discussion, some may nevertheless argue whether *Unrestricted Warfare* and *The Quranic Concept of War* are in and of themselves irregular warfare campaign plans; statements of strategic purpose; or something else altogether. Arguably, they are examples of a campaign plan-like approach for the 21st century by potential challengers to the U.S. sphere of influence. Comparison of *Unrestricted Warfare* and *The Quranic Concept of War* to current joint doctrine is helpful and provides a point of departure where the role of joint U.S. doctrine may also be examined. That they evidence a pattern of thought not unlike one from the Joint Operational Planning Process (JOPP) found in JP 5-0, and provide a formulation for action linking the employment of military power with strategic objectives, would seem to suffice as a rationale for labeling them as documents that are part-and-parcel of campaign planning under our own doctrinal definitions.

²⁴ Ibid. at p. 314.

According to JP 5-0: “Joint operation planning is the overarching process that guides joint force commanders (JFCs) in developing plans for the employment of military power within the context of national strategic objectives and national military strategy to shape events, meet contingencies, and respond to unforeseen crises.”²⁵ Using one of those treatises as an example, Joseph Myers, in his discussion of the *Quranic Concept of War*, would seem to agree: “Malik makes clear that the *Quran* provides the doctrine, guidance, and examples for the conduct of Quranic or Islamic warfare.”²⁶ And the *Unrestricted Warfare* authors discuss U.S. military doctrine, and “joint campaigns and joint plans,” in the context of “total dimensional warfare” and their own articulation of “modified combined war that goes beyond limits.”²⁷

Establishing new constructs for campaign planning, and adopting adaptive approaches designed to counter, and even exceed, novel applications of doctrine like those in *Unrestricted Warfare* or *The Quranic Concept of War*, allows United States military thinkers to bring a renewed sense of purpose, creativity, and connectivity back to the realm of planning and help address problems of an increasingly complex nature that characterize the 21st century. It is in this fashion that the United States military, and those charged with the pursuit of military planning, to include campaign planning, may renew the search for the “lost Art” of campaign planning. The United States was, once upon a time, very involved in the conceptualization, development, and execution of campaigns – during World War II. In much the same fashion as Indiana Jones looking for the Ark in *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, doctrine writers and the planners who implement doctrine can look to the past examples; learn how we came to be where we are today; and acting upon available information and

²⁵ JP 5-0, op. cit., p. ix (Executive Summary).

²⁶ Myers, op. cit., p. 118.

²⁷ Liana and Xiangsui, *Unrestricted Warfare*, pp. 103, 181.

noting what tools are available, “dig” in those most “fertile sands” to recover manifestations of the “lost Art” of campaign planning and preserve an American “empire of liberty”.²⁸

**I met a traveller from an antique land
Who said: Two vast and trunkless legs of stone
Stand in the desert. Near them on the sand,
Half sunk, a shatter'd visage lies, whose frown
And wrinkled lip and sneer of cold command
Tell that its sculptor well those passions read
Which yet survive, stamp'd on these lifeless things,
The hand that mock'd them and the heart that fed.
And on the pedestal these words appear:
"My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!"
Nothing beside remains: round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare,
The lone and level sands stretch far away.**

-- Percy Blysshe Shelley, *Ozymandias of Egypt*²⁹

DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS – UNEARTHING THE ART OF THE CAMPAIGN

In his sonnet “Ozymandias”, the poet Shelley introduces the reader to an early 19th century scene in the sands of Egypt where the once great realm of a pharaoh (Ramesses the Great) has been swallowed by those same sands, leaving his “shatter’d visage” of sculpted stone to look out upon what the millennia had left of his “works”. It is a story of empire; a story of might; and a story of irony. And it is a story set in the sands of Egypt like Indiana Jones’ search for the Ark of the Covenant, the same Ark allegedly containing the historic Ten Commandments brought down from the mountain by Moses after the Jewish people were delivered from bondage during Ramesses’ (Ozymandias’) reign.

²⁸ Antulio J. Echevarria II, “Towards an American Way of War,” March 2004, p. 8, Strategic Studies Institute website, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssj> (accessed 27 October 2008) (quoting author Max Boot).

²⁹ Percy Bysshe Shelley, “Ozymandias ” (1818), Wikipedia.Org, [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ozymandias-\(Shelley\)](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ozymandias-(Shelley)).

Ozymandias reminds the military planner, especially those in the relatively young country of the United States, of the transitory nature of nations if threats over time are not considered and addressed. Ozymandias also reminds planners of the care that must be utilized in the modern sense to carefully plan, and employ, the military instrument of national power (“M”) in concert with the other elements of power (the full “DIME”). Though existing in a different form perhaps, all elements were also part of the ancient arsenal in Land of the Pharaohs, and at Ramesses’ exclusive disposal. Ozymandias beckons us forward into those sands to join Indiana Jones in searching for knowledge buried within, and through our quest to locate the “lost Art” of campaign planning.

It is appropriate, then, to examine how the United States and its military forces have been progressing in the development of campaign planning. As the Chinese were developing *Unrestricted Warfare*, and Malik writing *The Quranic Concept of War*, the United States was working to end the Cold War. For the United States, World War II represented a veritable renaissance in planning with the development of campaigns. It is interesting to note that during the global conflict that was World War II, the confluence of events and the spread of modern warfare across multiple continents impacted the entire globe in a fashion exceeding that even of World War I (the “War to end all wars”), and led to the creation of multiple campaigns, and campaign plans, to accomplish theater-strategic and strategic objectives. The names of those military campaigns are even known today to history not only by name, but by the ingenuity they represented that is still discussed in military circles – names like *WAR*

PLAN ORANGE (campaign for the defeat of Japan)³⁰ and *CAMPAIGN PLAN GRANITE* (Campaign Plan for operations in the Pacific Ocean Areas during 1944).³¹

Surprisingly, however, from the end of World War II until the publication this year of the new Guidance for Employment of the Force (GEF) and the 2008 Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP),³² the United States remained curiously silent in its development and pursuit of “campaigns.” Having triumphed in World War II, and used campaigns effectively at that time by linking them to strategic ends, why then would the United States military, and civilian political leaders, have moved away from campaign planning until now?

Antulio Echevarria postulates that the problem exists because of how planning in the United States may be viewed as a process unnecessarily bifurcated by those involved – a “separation of power and policy” some believe is “an acceptable price to pay for the preservation of civilian control over the military.”³³ For Echevarria, U.S. political leadership, in approaching conflict, seems more focused on the military itself and the achievement of military victories vice concentrating on their role in policy and strategy development, and promotion of the full “DIME.”³⁴ The military confuses matters by not focusing on concepts outside of “jointness” and military endstates, and looking to winning battles (what they most want to do) rather than seeking methods to tie the military action directly into the policy and strategic realm where ultimate goals are realized.³⁵ One of the

³⁰ Edward S. Miller, *War Plan Orange* (Annapolis, Maryland: United States Naval Institute, 1991).

³¹ Commander in Chief, Pacific Ocean Areas, *Campaign Plan Granite*, A 16/Ge, Serial 0004, 13 January 1944, Record Group 38: Strategic Plans Division records, Plans and Strategic Studies, 1942-1946 (Series IX), Box 138, Folder: Desecrate . . . Hotfoot, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

³² The GEF and JSCP are classified documents. It is problematic to contemporaneously attempt to quote, discuss, and analyze classified source material even utilizing select, non-classified portions. To address this issue and avoid any inadvertent compromise of classified information or context, the author of this paper will utilize an approved, unclassified summary as made available by the U.S. Naval War College.

³³ Echevarria, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 17.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-16.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

main problems Echevarria identifies is that “political and military leaders must habituate themselves to thinking more thoroughly about how to turn combat successes into favorable strategic outcomes.”³⁶

This problem exists for Echevarria partly because “the American way of war tends to shy away from thinking about the complicated process of turning military triumphs, whether on the scale of major campaigns or small-unit actions, into strategic success . . . the American style of warfare amounts to a way of battle more than a way of war.”³⁷ “The chief similarity in the views of defense intellectuals and OSD resides in the lack of emphasis on the end game, specifically, on the need for systematic thinking about the processes and capabilities needed to translate military victory into strategic success.”³⁸ A means of addressing these problems, in the words of Pierre Lessard, lies in a realization that the “current Western interpretation of campaign design must thus reunite with its strategic roots of ends and means in its quest to seek ways of winning both the war and the peace in the post-9/11 era.”³⁹ A way to accomplish this, of course, would be to pursue another renaissance in campaign planning.

In the context of military thinking, and the need to develop a sound doctrinal basis for campaign planning that does not fall into the trap of a “style of warfare amount[ing] to a way of battle more than a way of war”, it is high time to meet the intellectual challenges represented by the 21st century and develop an approach to campaign planning commensurate with the need. “Superior military commanders have for millennia made good campaign plans in complex operational environments, in multi-layered and unstable political

³⁶ Ibid., p. 17.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

³⁹ Pierre Lessard, “Campaign Design for Winning the War . . . and the Peace,” *Parameters* 35, no. 2 (Summer 2005), pp. 36-50, at p. 37.

environments, charged with religious tensions.”⁴⁰ The United States can ill-afford to rest on its intellectual laurels, complacent in our current planning approaches, and fail to address this challenge while shortcomings in our current approach exist. Moreover, an absence of military vigor in regaining the intellectual lineage of campaign planning demonstrates a lack of vision and adaptation while others like the PRC and Pakistan (or at least, those who conveniently rely on the arguments in the Pakistani writing) remain actively engaged in their doctrinal efforts as we remain static.

The lack of movement in planning doctrine following World War II, specifically what appears to be an abandonment of a campaign planning methodology and the existence of campaign planning as a unique type of planning, has not been remedied. There are problems in current joint doctrine for planning, and they go beyond those identified by Echevarria. “While US doctrine states that ‘campaign planners’ should never lose sight of the fact that strategic objectives must dominate the campaign planning process ‘at every juncture,’” observes Lessard, “they are admonished two paragraphs later that ‘above all, the [operational] concept must make it explicitly clear that the focus is on the destruction of neutralization of the adversary’s [centers of gravity]’”.⁴¹

At the heart of the matter is the question of whether joint doctrine accomplishes the desired goal of establishing the intellectual basis for the development of campaigns, and thereby the attainment of military objectives, by clearly defining the terms. An examination of the varied uses of the terms “joint planning,” “joint strategic planning,” and “joint

⁴⁰ Michael Collender and Matthew Deller, “Scoping Complex Systems for the Joint Task Force Commander,” *Campaigning* (Fall 2008), pp. 35-79, at p. 69.

⁴¹ Lessard, *op. cit.*, p. 37. Lessard is citing to the prior JP 5-00.1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning* (2002), which was later abrogated in the publication of JP 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning* (2006). See also footnote 2.

operation planning,” and how they are not-so-carefully interchanged within JP 5-0, illustrates a problem in terminology at the outset.

“Bad terminology,” according to American billionaire and financier Warren Buffett, “is the enemy of good thinking.”⁴² And there is “bad terminology” spilling from the pages of JP 5-0. “Joint strategic planning,” says JP 5-0, provides strategic guidance and direction to the Armed Forces of the United States,” and “occurs primarily at the national- and theater-strategic levels to help the President, Secretary of Defense (SecDef), and other members of the National Security Council formulate political-military assessments, define political and military objectives and end states, develop strategic concepts and options, and allocate resources.”⁴³ “Joint strategic planning” is the military’s contribution to the “national strategic planning [that] consists of joint strategic planning with its three subsets: security cooperation planning, joint operation planning, and force planning.”⁴⁴ That settles the matter, then, right? Actually, it does not, since on the very same page (much as Lessard noted when examining JP 5-00.1) JP 5-0 says it is simply “[j]oint planning [that] integrates military actions with those of other instruments of national power and our multinational partners in time, space, and purpose to achieve a specified end state.”⁴⁵

These definitions seem amazingly close in how they relate to national strategic planning and the process inputs required from the military. Is “joint strategic planning” a subset of “joint planning,” or vice versa? When does the term “joint” cease to be productive and become a meaningless catch-all word?

⁴² Warren Buffett, Berkshire Hathaway, *2001 Annual Report*, p. 10. Buffett’s quote, a popular one, is also cited by General Montgomery Meigs in a discussion of asymmetric warfare. See Montgomery C. Meigs, “Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare,” *Parameters* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2003), pp. 4-35.

⁴³ JP 5-0, p. I-1

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

Then there is another element, “joint operation planning,” part of the triad of “joint strategic planning” that includes security cooperation, joint operation planning, and force planning, but identified also by the same or nearly identical definition as “joint strategic planning.” “Joint operation planning” “is the overarching process that guides joint force commanders (JFCs) in developing plans for the employment of military power within the context of national strategic objectives and national military strategy to shape events, meet contingencies, and respond to unforeseen crises.”⁴⁶ JP 5-0 “focuses predominately on joint operation planning.”⁴⁷ “Joint operation planning” would seem to fit as a subset of “joint strategic planning”, though the references to employment of the military power element of the “DIME” “within the context of national strategy objectives” does perhaps confuse the issue somewhat. “Joint operation planning” is defined again later in JP 5-0 as a “key term” and described as “planning activities associated with the preparation of joint operation plans and operation orders for the conduct of military operations by joint force commanders.”⁴⁸

Without unnecessarily belaboring the point, it becomes somewhat obvious that JP 5-0 is rather fast and loose with the way it defines planning terminology. If someone is engaged in the process, and does not take the time to try and read the doctrinal manual and the definitions it contains, then perhaps there is no *overt* problem, but the endemic problem remains.

Chapter IV of JP 5-0 discusses operational art and design, and introduces the concept of a “campaign” which was alluded to in idea (though not in name) in prior chapter discussion of global capabilities. “A campaign is a series of related military operations aimed at accomplishing strategic and operational objectives within a given time and space.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. I-11.

Planning for a campaign is appropriate when the contemplated simultaneous or sequential military operations exceed the scope of a single major operation.”⁴⁹ That definition is sound, complete, and logically relates the “how” of linking operations, even major operations, together (as a whole) to accomplish strategic or operational objectives. Given that definition, the past successes of “campaigns” like ORANGE and GRANITE, and the need to effectively orchestrate joint operations and operational objectives to meet theater-strategic and strategic national end states (attainment of national strategic planning objectives), it is difficult to not see the benefits of a campaign approach to all operational planning. With “campaigning”, the integration of the interagency, and the developing of linkages across time, space, and force, is a natural product of a “campaign” that is not limited to a military operation itself, joint or otherwise. Thinking in terms of “campaigns” that are “joint,” and by their nature an integral part of the conceptualization of theater-strategic or strategic objectives, as opposed to thinking simply of operations that are joint, is intellectually different.

The idea that campaigns are “unique” in approach would logically have provided a supporting rationale for the publication of JP 5.00-1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning*, published in 2002 and now “extinct” through incorporation into the most recent version of JP 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning*.⁵⁰ JP 5-00.1 illustrated a conceptual link between campaigning and operational design by stating that “the operational design process is primarily an *intellectual exercise* based on experience and judgment. The result of this process should provide the *conceptual linkage* of ends, ways, and means for *the campaign*.”⁵¹ (Emphasis added.) JP 5-00.1 further defined “campaign plans” as joint plans that adopt “a comprehensive view of the combatant commander’s theater and define[e] the framework in

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. IV-2.

⁵⁰ See footnote 2.

⁵¹ JP 5-00.1, p. II-1 (emphasis added).

which an OPLAN fits . . . Through theater and subordinate campaign plans, strategic and operational planners synchronize national and theater ends, ways, and means to attain national strategic, supporting theater strategic, and operational level objectives.”⁵² “Theater-level campaign planning,” as conceived by JP 5-00.1, “is mostly art.”⁵³

Following the publication of JP 5-00.1 with its unique approach, and considering the effort that went into producing the doctrine, it is somewhat puzzling that almost as quickly as it appeared, JP 5-00.1, like an “old soldier,” simply “faded away.” A look at the development of the published 2006 version of JP 5-0 helps to track what occurred. Following the etiology of joint doctrine is a difficult task, especially when all prior draft documents, and notes circulated in coordinating the drafts, are not available. Sometimes even locating drafts or information about doctrinal development is nearly impossible. However, there are some observations that can be made from what information is available.

JP 5-00.1 was published 25 January 2002.⁵⁴ It was followed by internal work at the Joint Staff level on a new JP 5-0 (Second Draft) completed on 10 December 2002.⁵⁵ Almost three years later, another JP 5-0 draft of 10 AUG 2005 (Revision Third Draft) was completed.⁵⁶ Both JP 5-0 drafts maintained a discussion about “campaign planning”, and incorporated elements of campaign planning concepts from JP 5-00.1 without appearing to supersede JP5-00.1, and actually appeared to complement it. When the new JP 5-0 was published in 2006, it was clearly intended to make JP 5-00.1 obsolete. Besides the “Summary of Changes” indicating that relevant information from JP 5-00.1 had been

⁵² Ibid., pp. I-5 to I-6.

⁵³ Ibid., p. II-1.

⁵⁴ JP 5-00.1.

⁵⁵ Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, JP 5-0, *Doctrine for Joint Planning Operations, Second Draft* (Washington, D.C.: 10 December 2002).

⁵⁶ Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, JP 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning, Revision Third (3) Draft* (Washington, D.C.: 10 December 2002).

incorporated, the 2006 JP 5-0 stated: “Joint operation planning and planning for a campaign are not separate planning types or processes.”⁵⁷ The emphasis given is in the original, and the type style in JP 5-0 for the sentence is also all bold in the original. Finally, JP-5-0 added: “Campaigns are joint – functional components (air, land, maritime, and special operations) and Service components plan and conduct subordinate and supporting operations, not independent campaigns.”⁵⁸ The text for this sentence, also, in the original is bolded.

JP 5-00.1, and the 2002 and 2005 drafts of JP 5-0, all contained similar references to the fact that campaigns were “joint.” It is not clear from any available sources the author could locate as to why JP 5-00.1 was eliminated, rather than updated, and replaced by JP 5-0; or why JP 5-0 went to such great lengths to imply the existence of only “joint operations” and suggesting that “campaign planning” was not a separate type of planning or part of a different process. If the goal was to emphasize the importance of following a standardized process (like the JOPP) it was unnecessary to remove the logical distinction from JP 5.00-1 and historical examples like ORANGE and GRANITE of the “campaign” as “joint” but conceptualized somewhat differently and oriented at a higher level of planning linkage – operational to theater-strategic to national-strategic. That very linkage, and conceptualization, is exactly the sort of action writers like Echevarria appear to have been recommending. The short “revival” of campaign planning as a unique concept, then, which arose following World War II after many years with the discussion and then publication of JP 5-00.1, was over. And the sands of the desert were again covering the location of the “lost Art.”

⁵⁷ JP 5-0 (26 December 2006), op. cit., at pp. iii, IV-2.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

A plan of campaign should anticipate everything which the enemy can do, and contain within itself the means of thwarting him. Plans of the campaign may be modified ad infinitum according to the circumstances, the genius of the general, the character of the troops, and the features of the country.

-- Napoleon, *Maxims of War*, 1831⁵⁹

CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS – THE “ART” OF THE MATTER

The great French military genius Napoleon Bonaparte, known for his many military campaigns including those in the land of Ozymandias, brings us full circle from our initial inquiry and search, following the example also of the scholar and adventurer Indiana Jones and “digging” in the desert sands for the “lost Art” of campaign planning. Campaign planning, as an approach to problem-solving and a “higher-level” intellectual conceptualization of linkage between the operational and strategic levels of war, allows for a unique and productive approach to planning across the range of military operations in the complex environment of the 21st century heavily influenced by irregular warfare. Campaign planning also allows for coordinated execution of the “DIME” in support of national strategic objectives, and joint strategic planning that assists in the development of inputs into the processes that drive the integration of “policy – strategy – operations” in the accomplishment of national objectives.

On the face of it, campaign planning, which by its very nature is “joint” and “interagency” because of its breadth and scope, seems to fit well into the concept of national strategic planning discussed earlier in this paper. Through integrated security cooperation planning, at the combatant command-level, the command interfaces with U.S. interagency players (Department of State, United States Agency for International Development, etc.);

⁵⁹ Napoleon Bonaparte, op. cit., p. 407.

regional partner nations; non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations; and other important actors. This same interface can also be accomplished by functional combatant commands in their realm of responsibility, or by a combatant command in the execution of “global” campaign plans like “GWOT” or “Combating WMD”. The “interagency” are also important players that interact with the military within the other elements of joint strategic planning, including force planning and joint operation planning.

It was ill-advised for joint doctrine writers to identify “campaign planning” in JP 5-0 as simply another type of joint operation planning that is indistinct. Campaign planning does follow the same general process as other types of joint planning, but is in fact a distinct form and type of planning. By its very nature, campaign planning goes beyond the realm of “operations” and into the realm of other activities of the DIME that may be integrated with the military and non-kinetic as well as kinetic activities. Outside of the historical examples of past campaign plans, perhaps the best new evidence of support for campaign planning is contained in the 2008 GEF and JSCP. The 2008 GEF and JSCP are a positive, and proactive, initial step supporting collaborative “DIME” efforts, including the military, in support of a “campaign” approach to planning.

The GEF “directs combatant commanders to create campaign plans to achieve theater and functional strategic end states.”⁶⁰ Campaign planning allows for the incorporation of current military operations with security cooperation, contingency, and crisis action planning. The JSCP, expanding from a previous construct focused more squarely on priority contingency plans, “translates strategic policy end states from the GEF into military campaign and contingency plan guidance for combatant commanders (CCDRs),” and

⁶⁰ Patrick C. Sweeney, “A Primer for: Guidance for Employment of the Force (GEF), Joint Strategic Capabilities Plans (JSCP), and the Adaptive Planning and Execution (APEX) System,” (Newport, RI: Naval War College, Joint Military Operations Department, 14 May 2008), p. 2.

“expands guidance to include global defense posture, security cooperation, and other steady state activities.”⁶¹ “Another critical element of this new “strategy-centric” paradigm is the forcing mechanism to synchronize global campaign plans with theater campaign plans,”⁶² an action that helps to better link operational, strategic, and national-level objectives.

To reintroduce the idea of campaign planning, and better focus military efforts in support of higher-level objectives, the GEF directs that “DOD consolidate[] and integrate[] five separate guidance documents into a single strategic directive” in “recong[iti]on [of] the inefficiencies of the existing practice of strategic guidance dissemination.”⁶³ The five types of guidance consolidated were: security cooperation; contingency planning; global posture; global force management; and nuclear weapons planning.⁶⁴

“Perhaps the greatest change created by the GEF / JSCP guidance is the requirement for CCDRs to develop campaign plans in support of their theater (or functional) strategies.”⁶⁵ By forcing this change, the GEF drives CCDRs to carefully craft their own strategies at the theater-strategic level that complement directives from the national level; bridge any gap between national level guidance, and objectives at the operational level required for successful mission accomplishment; and support execution of theater campaign plans. Finally, for “global campaign plans likely [to] impact multiple theaters, regional CCDRs must develop subordinate plans in support of the global campaign plans . . . that are then embedded in the regional CCDR’s own theater campaign plan.”⁶⁶

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., p. 3.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 1.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 3.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 4.

The new GEF and JSCP support the thesis idea that campaign planning is a special and distinct type of planning, and that there is inherent value in utilizing campaign planning as a distinct and overarching approach to planning that is likely to yield operational success in the 21st century. A campaign planning-approach, as an intellectual foundation for viewing the art of planning, provides a framework for analysis and development of friendly and competitor campaigns, and promotes awareness and understanding of competitor campaign plan initiatives by those potential competitors of the United States utilizing irregular as well as conventional warfare. Further, that framework demonstrates the potential implications of those other competitor approaches on friendly objectives. Campaign planning, while “joint,” is conceptually different from simple joint operation planning, and presents a broader view of planning, and a more effective method of orchestrating the elements of national power, especially military power, in a consolidated manner to achieve national-level objectives.

Re-writing the 2006 version of JP 5-0 to better define the various types of joint planning, and the interrelationship between them, would be a productive way to address some of the current doctrinal ambiguities for planning, and bring joint planning doctrine back in line with the campaign planning and “strategy-centric” initiatives represented by the 2008 GEF and JSCP. There is one area, however, where the renewed emphasis of the GEF and JSCP on COCOM campaign plans, and thereby a campaign planning construct, may also be improved. Conspicuously absent from the GEF and JSCP and their stated goal of a “strategy-centric” approach to planning is a lack of direction in specifically mandating that COCOMs create their own strategies that link theater-strategic and national-strategic goals.

The GEF and JSCP establish the requirement for a campaign plan that supports COCOM regional or functional strategies, but they stop short of establishing the

development of those strategies as a further requirement. Without the express requirement for COCOM strategies, any review of the interrelationship between strategic-centric approaches and the campaign are at best peripheral, and would not be part of the “In-Progress Review” (IPR) process with the Secretary of Defense to review campaign and contingency plans.⁶⁷ That omission in failing to establish a requirement for strategy development in equal emphasis with the campaign, in essence, could be viewed as putting the “cart” (the campaign plan) before the “horse” (the COCOM strategy). The GEF and JSCP appear to “assume” that COCOMs will develop robust strategies to inform the campaign plan, and thus mandate only the creation of a complementary campaign plan that further conforms to content and format standards.⁶⁸

Logically, given that campaign plans and campaign planning methodology was a missing element of U.S. military planning following World War II, a fact demonstrated also in part by the short-lived publication in 2002 of JP 5.00-1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning*, it makes perfect sense that the GEF and JSCP now mandate campaign plan creation. Following the same logic, it is inconsistent to assume the existence of COCOM military strategies that if properly developed would have themselves suggested the creation of campaign plans. Establishing a requirement in the GEF and JSCP for the “strategy-centric” linkage to ensure that COCOMs bridge the gap between the operational and strategic levels of war – mandating COCOM-theater, COCOM-regional/function, or other strategies – completes the strategy-centric focus and campaign planning approach inherent in the GEF and JSCP.

⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 7, 9. The GEF and JSCP provide for regular feedback from the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) as part of an assessment process that includes “In-Progress Reviews” (IPRs) as part of the plan development process.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 3. While allowing for some “latitude in how the campaign plan might be constructed,” the GEF and JSCP do establish specific standards for elements that must be included within campaign plans.

By adding an express strategy requirement to the GEF and JSCP not currently present, a GEF and JSCP revised in that manner increases consistency and further enhances creation of an intellectual nexus between a renewed emphasis on campaign planning and the “strategy-centric” approach they espouse. Therefore, necessary modification of JP 5-0 as previously discussed, combined with clarification of the GEF and JSCP by adding explicit direction for a strategy requirement also subject to direct review through the IPR process with the Secretary of Defense, proactively addresses the intellectual vacuum now present in joint doctrine.

Campaign planning is a distinct and overarching approach and theme for U.S. national security planning essential to 21st century strategic and operational success, and facilitates effective integration of the military and other instruments of national power, enabling more successful joint, interagency, and coalition actions that are the hallmark of operations in this new century. In a return to campaign planning, the metaphorical prize of the lost “Ark,” and the power and insight it lends, manifests itself in the rediscovery of the lost “Art” of campaign planning, and could result in an intellectual renaissance in military planning not seen since World War II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Zawahiri, Ayman. "Letter to al-Zarqawi." <http://www.opensource.gov> (09 July 2005). (accessed 24 October 2008).
- Bin Ladin, Shaykh Usama Bin-Muhammad, al-Zawahiri, Ayman, et al. "Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders – World Islamic Front Statement." Ciaonet.Org, <http://www.ciaonet.org> (23 February 1998) (accessed 24 October 2008).
- Bonaparte, Napoleon. "Military Maxims of Napoleon." *Roots of Strategy*, Thomas R. Phillips, trans. and ed. Harrisburg, PA: The Telegraph Press (1940).
- Buffett, Warren. Berkshire Hathaway, *2001 Annual Report*.
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Publication 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense (26 December 2006).
- _____. Joint Publication 5-0, *Doctrine for Joint Planning Operations, Second Draft*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense (10 December 2002).
- _____. Joint Publication 5-0, *Joint Operation Planning, Revision Third (3) Draft*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense (10 December 2002).
- _____. Joint Publication 5-00.1, *Joint Doctrine for Campaign Planning*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense (25 January 2002).
- Collender, Michael and Deller, Matthew. "Scoping Complex Systems for the Joint Task Force Commander." *Campaigning*. Norfolk, VA (Fall 2008).
- Commandant of the Marine Corps. Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication 1-1, *Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Navy, Headquarters United States Marine Corps (12 November 1997).
- Commander in Chief, Pacific Ocean Areas. *Campaign Plan Granite*. A 16/Ge, Serial 0004, 13 January 1944, Record Group 38: Strategic Plans Division records, Plans and Strategic Studies, 1942-1946 (Series IX), Box 138, Folder: Desecrate . . . Hotfoot, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.
- Echevarria II, Antulio J., II. "Towards an American Way of War." (March 2004). Strategic Studies Institute website, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi> (accessed 27 October 2008).
- Frederick the Great. "The Instruction of Frederick The Great for His Generals – 1747." *Roots of Strategy*, Thomas R. Phillips, trans. and ed. Harrisburg, PA: The Telegraph Press (1940).

Gilani, Tariq. "US-Pakistan Relations: The Way Forward." *Parameters* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2006-07).

***Indiana Jones and the Raiders of the Lost Ark.* DVD. Paramount Pictures, 1981.**

Lang, Qiao and Xiangsui, Wang. *Unrestricted Warfare.* Beijing, China: PLA Literature and Arts Publishing House (February 1999).

_____. "Unrestricted Warfare Authors: Idea is "Beyond Limits", not "Unrestricted". (Shanghai Guoji Zhanwang in Chinese 01 November 2005) (original published in Jianchuan Zhishi, March 2000).

Lessard, Pierre. "Campaign Design for Winning the War . . . and the Peace," *Parameters* 35, no. 2 (Summer 2005).

Meigs, Montgomery C. "Unorthodox Thoughts about Asymmetric Warfare." *Parameters* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2003).

Miller, Edward S. *War Plan Orange.* Annapolis, Maryland: United States Naval Institute (1991).

Myers, Joseph C. "The Quranic Concept of War." *Parameters* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2006-07).

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. "Ozymandias" (1818). Wikipedia.Org, [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ozymandias-\(Shelley\)](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ozymandias-(Shelley)).

Sweeney, Patrick C. "A Primer for: Guidance for Employment of the Force (GEF), Joint Strategic Capabilities Plans (JSCP), and the Adaptive Planning and Execution (APEX) System." Newport, RI: Naval War College, Joint Military Operations Department (14 May 2008).

U.S. Department of Defense. *National Defense Strategy.* Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary of Defense (June 2008).

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)