



Parahyangan Catholic University
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Department of International Relations

Accredited A

SK BAN-PT NO:3095/SK/BAN-PT/Akred/S/VIII/2019

**Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-
2003)**

Thesis

By
Anisa Sheila Nugraha
2017330089

Bandung

2021



Parahyangan Catholic University

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences

Department of International Relations

Accredited A

SK BAN-PT NO:3095/SK/BAN-PT/Akred/S/VIII/2019

Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-2003)

Thesis

By

Anisa Sheila Nugraha

2017330089

Advisor

Idil Syawfi, S. IP., M.Si.

Bandung

2021

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Department of International Relations



Thesis Validation

Name : Anisa Sheila Nugraha
Student Number : 2017330089
Judul : Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-2003)

Has been examined in Final Examination On
Thursday, January 28th 2021
And thereby declared **GRADUATED**

The Board of Examiners

Chairperson and member of examiner

Dr. I. Nyoman Sudira

: 


Advisor

I'dil Syawfi, S.IP., M. Si.

: 

Member

Adrianus Harsawaskita, S.IP., MA

: 

Approved by,
Dean of Faculty of Social and Political Science



Dr. Pius Sugeng Prasetyo, M. Si.

Statement

I, who sign below,

Name : Anisa Sheila Nugraha

Student number : 2017330089

Department : International Relations

Title : **Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-2003)**

Hereby assert that this research is the result of my own work, it has not been previously proposed by any other party in order to attain academic degree. Any idea and information gathered from other parties are officially cited in accordance to a valid scientific writing method.

I declare this statement with full responsibility, and I am willing to take any consequences given by the prevailing rules if this statement was found to be untrue.

Bandung, 8 Januari 2021



Anisa Sheila

2017330089

ABSTRACT

Name : Anisa Sheila N.

NPM : 2017330089

Title : Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-2003)

Global War on Terror was an immediate action taken by the United States (U.S.) against the terrorism act which attacked their nation on September 11, 2001. The attack marked the new era of 21st century war where threats no longer came from States as the unitary actor but as well as non-State actors. Thus, the U.S. launched a large-scale attack against two countries which possessed a huge threat against their security and stability; Afghanistan who provided safe haven to the terrorist group Al Qaeda under the authority of Taliban government (Operation Enduring Freedom/OEF) and Iraq which was assumed had access to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) under Saddam Hussein's leadership. Donald Rumsfeld as the then-Secretary of Defense during the Bush administration formulazied a grand strategy to combat terrorism act. His revolutionary ideas which push the utilization of technology, enhancing the quality of communication and attacking from the space then became known as a military doctrine or Rumsfeld Doctrine. However, both attacks to mentioned countries resulted in a different outcome. This research will utilize the theory of Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) to answer the formulated research question from the issue: "Why was the implementation of Special Operation Forces in OEF and OIF resulted in a different outcome?" Thus, to answer said question, this research will use qualitative methods to provide deeper understanding regarding the issue and the data gathering technique used is Document Review from journals, books, news articles, reliable website content and official documents published by governments both offline and online.

Keywords: *War on Terror, Donald Rumsfeld, Military doctrine, RMA, OEF, OIF, Special Operation Forces*

ABSTRAK

Nama : Anisa Sheila N.
Student Number : 2017330089
Judul Skripsi : Donald Rumsfeld dalam *Global War on Terror* (2001-2003)

Global War on Terror merupakan reaksi dari Amerika Serikat (AS) atas tindakan terorisme yang menyerang negara mereka pada tanggal 11 September 2001. Serangan tersebut menandakan masuknya era perang pada Abad 21 yang tidak lagi terbatas pada ancaman yang hanya datang dari aktor negara. Kemudian, AS pun meluncurkan serangan kepada dua negara yang dianggap memiliki ancaman besar terhadap keamanan dan kestabilan negara AS yakni Afghanistan yang melindungi kelompok teroris Al Qaeda di bawah pemerintahan Taliban (*Operation Enduring Freedom/OEF*) dan Iraq yang diasumsikan memiliki akses terhadap senjata pemusnah massal di bawah otoritas Sadam Hussein (*Operation Iraqi Freedom/OIF*). Donald Rumsfeld sebagai Menteri Pertahanan Amerika Serikat dibawah administrasi President George W. Bush kemudian merumuskan suatu strategi untuk melawan ancaman tersebut. Ide-idenya yang mendorong kekuatan teknologi, meningkatkan kualitas komunikasi dan serangan melalui ruang udara kemudian dikenal menjadi doktrin militer atau Doktrin Rumsfeld. Bagaimanapun, kedua serangan yang berbeda tersebut membuahkan hasil yang berbeda. Penelitian ini kemudian akan memanfaatkan teori *Revolution in Military Affairs* (RMA) untuk menganalisa pertanyaan penelitian, “Mengapa implementasi pasukan operasi khusus di OEF dan OIF memiliki hasil yang berbeda?” Kemudian, untuk menjawab pertanyaan tersebut, penelitian ini akan menggunakan metode kualitatif untuk memunculkan pemahaman yang lebih mendalam mengenai isu yang diangkat dan metode pengambilan data tinjauan dokumen seperti jurnal, buku, artikel berita, konten situs yang dapat dipercaya, dan laporan resmi dari pemerintah yang dipublikasikan secara offline dan/atau online.

Kata kunci: *War on Terror*, Donald Rumsfeld, Doktrin militer, RMA, OEF, OIF, Pasukan operasi khusus

Foreword

In the name of Allah, the almighty. First and foremost, the author would like give the highest gratitude for the guidance and the dedication given by Mr. Idil Syawfi S.IP., M.Si., during the process of the research. With his assistance, the author has completed the thesis titled “**Donald Rumsfeld in the Global War on Terror (2001-2003)**”. This thesis was created for the purpose of obtaining a bachelor degree in the Department of International Relations, Parahyangan Catholic University, Bandung.

The author hopes this research could serve a purpose to help readers in understanding the role of Rumsfeld Doctrine during the operational of major combats to fight against terrorism during the time of the Global War on Terror. Specifically, the role of his revolutionary ideas on how to increase the U.S. military capability through technology, network, and air combats to achieve victory for the State. The author acknowledges that the result of this research is far from the word perfect. Mistakes such as an error and misinterpretation might be found throughout the research. Therefore, the author welcomes a constructive criticism and comments or suggestions which could increase the quality of this thesis.

Acknowledgements

The first person I'd mention is of course, my mom. She has been through a lot and I admit I haven't been the best daughter for her, and I might mess up from time to time too. But however, through all that, she still provides me with unconditional love and support which I'd never trade with anything in this world. Thank you, mother. You are the best mother I could ever ask for.

Then, of course, my dad and my sister. The numerous laughter we shared actually keep me going. I never wanted to make anyone proud as much as I want to make my family proud. Thank you, dad, for showing me what a father truly means. Thank you, Nabila, for being an annoying little sister that I treasure so much.

For my thesis supervisor, Mr. Idil Syawfi S. IP., M. Si. Thank you for guiding me throughout the process of this thesis. Your guidance and inputs were able to bring me to this point. As well as your *Kajian Strategis* class! If I did not take that class I could not possibly think of this thesis at all.

Then, my dearest friends, starting from **Syifa Nanda**, who was once nothing but a kid I'd give deathful glare to. We've grown so much ever since we met. Things have changed and so does our friendship, but all I know is that our friendship has changed for the better. We've become way closer than back when we were like, 14? Well, I know for sure this friendship isn't going to end here and we will continue talk as if we were sisters shared the same blood. Good luck, it's your turn soon!

Then, **Jasmine** and **Claudia**, the two little devils which made my stay in college even more colorful. It's not a lie if I say that I owe you both *a bunch*. Like, a whole bunch. The knowledge you shared with me, the help you both have continuously give me when I was struggling. Through my ups and downs, you both were there. Truthfully, I wouldn't have made it through this degree if I had not decided to become closer with you both. Call this an exaggeration, but it's the truth. Thank you! Let's head to the top together.

And, **Janelle**! Both of us have the worst memory ever and we seem could not remember clearly how we started being friends in the first place. But you've been there for me more than anyone did. You actually have the biggest influence on me when it comes to character-growth and I could proudly say that I have a pretty good character, and that's all thanks to you. Let's continue wasting our money on k-pop merch and eyeshadow palettes!

Last, to the people who made my college years colorful, **Tasha, Tiravy, Virgi, Alvin**, my very first friends in UNPAR. The group of friends which has the widest scope of interests and specialization. Truly one of a kind, if I might say. I'm grateful that I started being friends with all of you. You've never made me felt left out and I thought I found a place where I belong. I love you all bunch and I know all of you will be successful in near future.

And to my other friends, **Nicholas, Adhi, Tricia, Efraim, Sonia, Rahma, Chy, Jonathan, Rossy** who made my last years in college memorable. Thousands of thank you couldn't even express my gratitude, but thank you.

Table of Content

ABSTRACT.....	i
<i>ABSTRAK</i>	ii
Foreword	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Content.....	vi
List of Table	viii
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	5
1.2.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT	5
1.2.2 RESEARCH SCOPE	7
1.2.3 RESEARCH QUESTION.....	8
1.3 THE AIM AND PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH	8
1.3.1 THE AIM OF THE RESEARCH	8
1.3.2 THE PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH.....	8
1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
1.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
1.5.1 REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS.....	13
1.6 RESEARCH METHOD AND DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUE.....	18
1.6.1 RESEARCH METHOD.....	18
1.6.2 DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUE	18
1.6.3 RESEARCH STRUCTURE	19
CHAPTER II.....	21
RUMSFELD DOCTRINE	21
2.1 DOCTRINE IN THEORY	21
2.2 RUMSFELD DOCTRINE	23
2.3 OPERATIONAL OF RUMSFELD DOCTRINE IN DEFENCE POLICIES	29
CHAPTER III	38
MILITARY OPERATIONS OF THE U.S. IN OEF AND OIF	38
3.1 OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM	38
3.1.1 OPERATION ANACONDA	44

3.2 OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.....	47
3.2.1 SPECIAL OPERATION FORCES.....	48
3.2.2 OPERATION VIKING HAMMER.....	49
3.2.3 TAKING OVER BAGHDAD	51
CHAPTER IV	54
IMPLEMENTATION OF RMA DURING OEF AND OIF	54
4.1 STRATEGIC LEVEL	54
4.2 OPERATIONAL ART LEVEL.....	58
4.3 TACTICAL LEVEL	62
CHAPTER V.....	70
CONCLUSION.....	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	vii

List of Table

Table 1.1 Military Science Hierarchies.....	15
Table 2.1 Level of Operations.....	22
Table 2.2 Military Transformation Pillar	28
Table 2.3 Goals and Objectives in Combatting Terrorism	36
Table 3. 1 Weapons Used in OEF.....	42
Table 3. 2 Weapons Used in OIF.....	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

A shift of the United States military strategy and operation occurred after the brutal attack against the world's great power on September 11, 2001. After a terrorist group hijacked commercial planes and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon headquarters in Washington, and a field in Pennsylvania, the U.S. was left in shock due to the high number of fatalities.¹ The attack of 9/11 brought a new perspective for both the U.S. and other States that the world is now facing a new threat and has moved on past through the Cold War era. Therefore, a new strategy was urgently needed by the U.S. to carry out a self-defence act against the terrorists.

After identifying Al Qaeda as the perpetrator of the attack, the Bush administration launched the term *War on Terror* which included policies and principles of how the U.S., in this case, aims to provide a self-defence strategy against the terrorists located in Afghanistan.² Donald H. Rumsfeld was the brain behind the military transformation of the U.S. army during the War on Terror.³ His revolutionary ideas of the U.S. military troops were also supported by Bush. The

¹ Pamela Engel, Ellen Ioanes, "What happened on 9/11, 18 years ago," Business Insider, September 10, 2019, <https://www.businessinsider.sg/what-happened-on-911-why-2016-9/?r=US&IR=T>.

² Stephen D. Reese, Seth C. Lewis, "Framing the War on Terror," in *Journalism* 10, No. 6 (2009): p. 777.

³ "Donald H. Rumsfeld: Former Secretary of Defense," Biographies, *U.S. Department of Defense*, accessed August 24, 2020, <https://www.defense.gov/Our-Story/Biographies/Biography/Article/602800/>.

former President stated that forces should be “agile, lethal, readily deployable, and require a minimum of logistical support” during his speech in 1999.⁴ Under the direction of Rumsfeld, later grew the term *Rumsfeld Doctrine* which shaped the U.S. military strategy during the Global War on Terror.

Previously, the Powell Doctrine which endorsed overwhelming power and force in practice to obtain military objectives and was actively implemented during the Gulf War in 1991 was number one strategy for the U.S. military. Powell Doctrine promoted the idea of “full spectrum dominance” against their foes.⁵ In comparison, the main ideas of Rumsfeld Doctrine include how the U.S. should now be aware of 21st-century foes instead of assuming that enemies would come from the former Soviet.⁶ Another main idea of the doctrine is how the military should increase their speed to deliver a more ‘effective’ offense to the enemy; rather than focusing on the structure of the war, Rumsfeld put more focus on ‘how’ the U.S. should fight.⁷ Therefore, during the War on terror, Rumsfeld shifted the military doctrine into a force which is expected to deliver faster and efficient practice yet with minimum ground troops. Thus, he utilized Special Operation Forces in OEF and OIF in order to achieve the military objectives.

The first step taken was President Bush’s demands towards Al Qaeda and the Taliban government in Afghanistan who provided the terrorist group within their

⁴ Robert D. Kaplan, “What Rumsfeld Got Right” in *The Atlantic Monthly* 302, Vol. 1 (July-August, 2008): P. 72.

⁵ Jessica Willard, “Completing the Powell Doctrine: Theorizing Post-War Instability in Iraq,” *Intersections* 10, No. 3 (2009): 43-4.

⁶ Donald H. Rumsfeld, “The Agony of Surprise” in *Known and Unknown* (New York: Penguin Group, 2011), p. 333.

⁷ Kaplan, “What Rumsfeld Got Right,” p. 72.

territory through his speech ten days after the attack. The demands include returning their citizens held captive within the Afghan territory, ensuring transparency in regards to the location of terrorist camps to make sure they are no longer active, and surrendering any individual who is involved or considered as Al Qaeda militants to the U.S. Army.⁸ However, Taliban refused to comply with the U.S. and in return, the U.S. was outraged with the arrogance of the Taliban government. Thus, one month later, the U.S. planned a bombing campaign as a form of retaliation. The bombing campaign has the main objective to weaken the enemy's military capability by attacking their strategic infrastructures and put the Taliban and Al Qaeda militants in a vulnerable position.⁹ This operation would later be referred to as Operation Enduring Freedom which was carried by the U.S. military troops.¹⁰ The operation successfully overthrew the Taliban and officially ended their regime by the end of 2001. On December 9, 2001, Mullah Omar—the leader of the Taliban group along with his followers, retreated from Qandahar.¹¹

While the U.S. elites were formulating the strategy to invade Afghanistan, many policymakers including then-Vice President Dick Cheney supported an argument that claimed Iraq—who, according to the U.S. intelligence informant—possessed an imminent threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Especially, with the territory back then was under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, the risk of another

⁸ “Transcript of President Bush’s Address,” *CNN*, September 21, 2001, <https://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/>.

⁹ “The History of the Afghanistan War,” *BBC*, March 7, 2012, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/newsround/15214375>.

¹⁰ “President Bush says Taliban paying a price,” *CNN*, October 7, 2001, <https://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/10/07/ret.bush.transcript/>.

¹¹ Kenneth Katzman, Clayton Thomas, “Afghanistan: Post-Taliban Governance, Security, and U.S. Policy,” Congressional Research Service, December 13, 2017, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL30588.pdf>.

possible terrorist attack could happen if the U.S. strategy-maker do not involve invasion of Iraq in the scope of combatting terrorism. Thus, as a result, after the major combat in Afghanistan ended in 2003, the U.S. shifted its attention; both in policies and military operations to Iraq's Saddam Hussein.¹²

The U.S. invasion of Iraq later was conducted under the name of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) under the 2002 resolution on the Use of Military Force Against Iraq. Under Bush's authority as the President of the United States, he ordered the deployment of military troops in Iraq's territory to fight against what the U.S. perceived as a threat and shall be taken care of immediately. This strategy was a matter of U.S. national security according to the U.S. strategy-makers. The objective of the OIF itself was to locate and eliminate the Weapons of Mass Destruction possessed by the Iraqi government under Saddam Hussein's regime.¹³ The U.S. government demanded that Hussein have to leave Iraq within the given 48 hours, which Hussein refused to comply with. Faced with rejection upon said demand, the U.S. launched OIF to Iraqi territory.¹⁴ The objectives of OIF itself is almost similar to what the U.S. tried to achieve in Afghanistan—to remove Saddam Hussein from Iraq's government, remove his influence among the Iraqis, and reconstruct Iraq into a more democratic State.¹⁵ These revolutionary ideas were put into practice under the leadership of Donald Rumsfeld.

¹² Gary L. Gregg II, "George W. Bush: Foreign Affairs," Miller Center, accessed February 28, 2020, <https://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/foreign-affairs>.

¹³ Barbara Salazar Torreon, "U.S. Periods of War and Dates of Recent Conflicts," Congressional Research Service, August 27, 2019.

¹⁴ Barbara Salazar Torreon, "U.S. Periods of War and Dates of Recent Conflicts," Congressional Research Service, August 27, 2019.

¹⁵ Catherine Dale, "Operation Iraqi Freedom: Strategies, Approaches, Results, and Issues for Congress," CRS Report for Congress, March 28, 2008.

1.2 PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

1.2.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Upon refusing to fulfill the demands given, the U.S. immediately planned an offensive strategy to bring down the Taliban government by Operation Enduring Freedom. Rumsfeld's strategy started with the combination of Saudi's Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) and U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) to execute the whole plan. Secretary Rumsfeld also successfully secured diplomatic relations with President Islam Karimov which gave the U.S. another air base in Uzbekistan.¹⁶ Rumsfeld aimed to deny the Taliban's authority in Afghanistan through the first phase of OEF.¹⁷

The first attack started on the night of October 7, 2001—almost one month after the 9/11 attack—with 31 main targets, heavily focused on the Taliban and Al Qaeda's combat infrastructures and facilities. The first phase of OEF which relied on air-combat took 11 days long until the front-line of the enemy's territory. However, after that phase, U.S. combat forces started to struggle as the number of strikes in a day started to decrease which marked the first sign of U.S. failure in conducting OEF.¹⁸

The SOF teams continued their attacks through Kandahar, pushing the Taliban's position into the corner. However, even with the intensive offense, it took 63 days since the campaign started to finally push the Taliban out of Kandahar. The

¹⁶ Donald P. Wright, "The American Response to Terror: Planning Operation Enduring Freedom," in *Different Kind of War* (Washington: Combat Studies Institute Press, May 2010), p. 38.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, 43.

¹⁸ Benjamin S. Lambeth, "Summary," in *Air Power Against Terror: America's Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2005), p. xvii.

Taliban created another defense line at the caves of Tora Bora which became the new focus for the SOF to attack. Similar to the first phase of OEF, the Battle of Tora Bora also focused on the non-stop bombing for three whole weeks. Unfortunately, bin Laden still succeeded in escaping to the border with Pakistan. The biggest obstacle during OEF showed up when the U.S. began Operation Anaconda. This operation took place in high mountains which became the first for the army during the OEF. Not only location but the lack of fire support to fight against both Al Qaeda and Taliban became a disadvantage for the U.S. Therefore, Operation Anaconda was already failing from where it began—what was planned to be a three days offense ended up lasting for two whole weeks.¹⁹

Although the initial focus of the War on Terror was first to ‘fight back’ against Al Qaeda for the 9/11 tragedy, U.S. policymakers decided that it is as important to prevent such tragedy from happening. Therefore, the possession of WMD specifically in Iraq also became another focus for the U.S. However, different from the implementation of OEF in Afghanistan which faced many obstacles in between; the OIF was considered a success for the U.S. Army in achieving its goal—overthrowing Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

Major combat between the U.S. and Iraq lasted from 19th March 2003 until 14th April 2003. Though many have expected the victory of the U.S. against Iraq, they did not predict the length of time the army was able to take down the Iraqi

¹⁹ Lambeth, “Summary,” in *Air Power Against Terror: America’s Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom*, p. xx-xxi.

military in such a short period. The U.S. Army was able to take down Baghdad in only 21 days.²⁰

Many pointed out military transformation was able to assist the U.S. to victory in Iraq. For instance, sensor coverage of the troops and their air attacks were also assisted with precision guides.²¹ Moreover, SOF played a crucial part in the execution of Operation Iraqi Freedom. One of the distinct operations in OIF that utilized SOF was Operation Viking Hammer which successfully seized Ansar Al-Islam's base camp, an international terrorist group residing in Iraq, in only two days.²²

In comparison to the length of the operation, the major combat of OIF only lasted for a few weeks. Meanwhile, OEF struggled to achieve its goal for months even when both operations mostly utilized the use of SOF in their military operations.

1.2.2 RESEARCH SCOPE

Furthermore, taking into account how the operations were conducted, this research will only focus on the SOF used during major combat of both OEF and OIF from range time 2001 to 2003. With the benchmark being the battles to take over the enemies' base in the capital city; Kandahar of Afghanistan and Baghdad of Iraq. The author will also create limitations in the actors involved from Donald H. Rumsfeld as the Secretary of Defense which will be the main responsible actor

²⁰ Walter L. Perry, et al., "Summary," in *Operation Iraqi Freedom: Decisive War, Elusive Peace* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2015), p. xxiii.

²¹ Ibid, p. xx-xxi.

²² Ibid, p. 110.

while discussing ‘Rumsfeld Doctrine’, then-President George W. Bush, other government-bodies and fellow ministries under the Bush administration, and possibly responsible military lieutenants and generals which actively led the operations during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

1.2.3 RESEARCH QUESTION

The author reached a conclusion to identify U.S. military strategy as the main focus of this research. Thus, the formulated research question that the author will try to answer within this thesis would be:

Why was the implementation of Special Operation Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom resulted in a different outcome?

1.3 THE AIM AND PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

1.3.1 THE AIM OF THE RESEARCH

Following the formulated Research Question of this research proposal, the Author further aims to describe and elaborate further how Rumsfeld Doctrine played a crucial role in leading the U.S. military strategy and operation to combat terrorism during War on Terror specifically in Afghanistan and Iraq.

1.3.2 THE PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to point out how ‘Rumsfeld Doctrine’ helped the U.S. military strategy in combating terrorism using the best suitable theoretical framework to help explain the phenomena.

1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

Various pieces of literature, in a form of journal articles and/or chapters within specific books, have discussed a similar discussion as this research paper. However, each journal displays different perspectives and arguments regarding the issue. The first example of literature used for this research is *The American Way of War: Afghanistan and Iraq* written by Maria Luisa Parraguez Kobek.

Maria first explained that the objective of the Global War on Terror was initially to show the world that if anyone; States or Non-state actors dare to attack the United States, they would pay an even bigger price than the cost. Therefore, when Al Qaeda decided to attack the U.S., the Bush administration was quick to plan a strategy to attack the terrorist group. The beginning of the military operation went rather smoothly for the United States as they were able to push back Al Qaeda's militants and weaken both Al Qaeda and the Taliban's infrastructure for combat. However, Maria stated that OEF was not strong enough to beat Al Qaeda. Without the help of the international community (in this context, UNSC), the U.S. will not be able to push the Taliban out of Kandahar.²³

Furthermore, Maria also argued that even when the U.S. was confident enough in its strategy. The military struggled even more after the Taliban retreated to Tora Bora cave. The military ground troops deployed for Operation Enduring Freedom were lacking in many ways, both quality and quantity. Even when they requested

²³ Maria Luisa Parraguez Kobek, Mariana Gonzales Rodriguez, "The American Way of War: Afghanistan and Iraq," in *Revista Enfoques* XI, No. 18 (July, 2013): p. 84-85.

reinforcement, the Bush administration was quick to disapprove. Furthermore, the U.S. failed to achieve its goal in capturing Osama bin Laden with OEF and later decided to shift its focus to Iraq at the end of 2001.²⁴

On the other hand, OIF went rather quickly and smoothly for the U.S., even though the U.S. once again had to work together with the allies to achieve its goal of overthrowing Saddam Hussein and dispatching the WMD seized by Iraq's government under Saddam's authority. However, in the end, the U.S. still failed to achieve one of its goals in destroying or even locating the WMD. However, with both operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, Maria agreed that the U.S. was successful in showing their 'power' to the world.²⁵

The second article was written by Dr. Fotios Moustakis and Rudra Chaudhuri in their writing *Counting the Cost of an American Unilateralist Policy: A Superpower at Risk?* which was published in August 2006. The article suggested many of Rumsfeld's strong arguments in forming the U.S. strategy and military operation, especially during OEF.

According to Moustakis and Chaudhuri, Rumsfeld always had the vision to transform the U.S. armed forces to help Bush and his administration to 'bring the battle to the enemy'. This vision was able to be put into practice through OEF in Afghanistan. The military operation had few prerequisites which are Precision Guided Munitions (PGMs), a minimum number of troops, speed, agility, and quick victories. Rumsfeld doctrine successfully destroyed the terrorist training camps

²⁴ Kobek, Rodriguez, "The American Way of War: Afghanistan and Iraq," in *Revista Enfoques* XI, No. 18, p. 85-6.

²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 86-7.

along with their infrastructure and weakened their capability significantly. However, Rumsfeld and his general failed to achieve the other two main objectives which were to contain the aftermath of the attack and the stability after the operation.²⁶

Then, Robert D. Kaplan, in his article *What Rumsfeld Got Right* discussed more about how Rumsfeld saw Iraq's government as an 'easy' target to practice the military transformation he had planned for the U.S. troops. Iraq was also a strategic target for the U.S. to remove potential threats within the Middle East. However, according to Kaplan, even with a revolutionary idea of transforming the military, Rumsfeld only got the transformation 'half right.'²⁷

According to Kaplan, Rumsfeld was right about the technical transformation for the U.S. military troops, however, the former Secretary of Defense did not put how the enemies would respond to their offense or how they could sustain the 'peace' after the war. Supporting Kaplan's argument, Thomas Donnelly, a fellow researcher for American Enterprise Institute said that Rumsfeld's ideas of transforming the military troops was self-referential and focused more on the United States' military capability than what the enemies could possibly do during the war.²⁸

The next literature chose a different approach to understanding Rumsfeld's vision and interest in the U.S. strategy. Jeffrey Record in his writing *Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq: Making Strategy after 9/11*, argued that Rumsfeld

²⁶ Fotios Moustakis, Rudra Chaudhuri, "Counting the Cost of an American Unilateralist Policy: A Superpower at Risk?" Conflict Studies Research Centre, August, 2006, page 2-5.

²⁷ Kaplan, "What Rumsfeld Got Right," p. 67.

²⁸ Kaplan, "What Rumsfeld Got Right," p. 66.

was never a “democratic imperialist” which suggested that Rumsfeld, in creating his strategy against security threats during the War on Terror, never put much consideration on the nation-building part of the strategy. His thinking was also supported by then-Vice President, Dick Cheney. The record stated that both of them would prefer a friendly authoritarian Iraq rather than an unfriendly Iraq with the possession of WMD which could be a big threat for the U.S. somewhere in the future even if Iraq itself was already a democratic country. Thus, the ‘Rumsfeld Doctrine’ began to be put into practice upon his arrival to the office. He immediately persuaded a transformation of the military strategy and capability which went against what other army generals believed. The others believed that small special operation forces would not be enough to win a war. This resulted in Rumsfeld and those with the same perspective get labeled as an “obsolete legacy.”²⁹

Pieces of literature above are relevant to the formulation of this academic writing’s research question. It can be concluded that the U.S. has a different approach and different urgency when it comes to invading Afghanistan and Iraq during the Global War on Terror which, also affects the output of each mission. The author echoes the argument coming from Robert Kaplan which stated that Rumsfeld’s idea on transforming the military capability was indeed necessary for the United States to launch a large scale of invasion towards said countries; however, the lack of understanding of the enemy’s perspective was the lacking part in Rumsfeld’s ideas.

²⁹ Jeffrey Record, “Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq: Making Strategy after 9/11,” *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 2, No. 2 (Summer, 2008), Page 81-85.

Furthermore, the difference in urgency between the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq also played a crucial part in the outcome; the invasion of Afghanistan was because the Taliban and Al Qaeda had to ‘payback’ for the attack they did to the U.S., and the latter should be able to portray the ‘great power’ they possess. However, back then, Iraq had no direct connection to the 9/11 attack. The sense of possible threat coming from Iraq due to the possession of WDM then created a security issue for the U.S., pointed out by Rumsfeld.

1.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To provide readers with a comprehensive and detailed analysis and to help answer the research question of this research, the author will utilize **Revolution of Military Affairs** to answer the stipulated research question.

1.5.1 REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS

To help the author answer the research question of this academic writing, the author will utilize the theory of Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA). Although a concrete definition of RMA has not yet existed, most scholars agree that RMA plays a huge role especially in the strategic, operational art, and tactic level of a military operation in its practice. Before continuing the discussion further, first and foremost the author needs to define what is a military revolution. According to Collin S. Gray, a military revolution happens when new enhanced technologies are then applied to certain levels of a military operation which affect its operational function and organizational adaptations. This ‘upgrade’ then could improve the combat

power of a certain actor's military capability along with its effectiveness in combat.³⁰ Therefore, most of the definition of RMA would immediately connect with the utilization of technology upgrade within its armed forces be it within the scope of ground troops, navy, or air force.

When the theory of RMA is applied to military practice, various assumptions would rather be connected to technological supremacy, the crucial role of airstrikes during the war, and the strengthening airpower for each involved actor. In regards to technological supremacy, with the existence of RMA, it is best to assume that whichever actor has the 'best technology' or 'the best weapon' would have the upper-hand during the war and has a bigger chance to come out victorious or at least dominating the war. Then, as technology develops, war will mostly happen from the air; specifically through airstrikes. With the help of improved technology applied in armed forces, airstrikes are believed to be able to break through all defenses of the opposing party.³¹

For the Western scholars, within military science or art, there are certain hierarchies which if RMA is applied will then affect these hierarchies with its practice. Those hierarchies being said are:

³⁰ Colin S. Gray, "Strategy, Complex and Sometimes Nonlinear," in *Strategy for Chaos: Revolution in Military Affairs and The Evidence of History* (London: 2005): p. 4.

³¹ Bjørn Møller, "The Revolution in Military Affairs: Myth or Reality?" *Copenhagen Research Institute* (2002): 4-5.

Table 1.1 Military Science Hierarchies

Military Science	Definition	Responsibility	Instruments
Politics	Politics fall in military science in accordance to Clausewitz's conception which defines war as <i>the continuation of politics by other means</i> .	Government	Economy, industrial structure, demography, sociology, and strategic culture
Grand Strategy	Almost similar to security policy which mirrors the ends of the State and how to achieve these ends through military and other power.	Government	
Strategy	It mostly discusses how to fight and win the wars. Many Clausewitz's successors defined strategy in a broader term which encompass the use of power in military form for deterrence.	General Staff, Service, and Corps commands	Military posture
Operational Art	The 'art' of fighting and winning wars through its realm.	Corps, Army, Fleet commands	System of Systems Corps and armies, Fleets
Tactics	The direct engagement of armed forces within wars.	Regiment, Company, Battalion commanders	Weapons, logistics, "Systems" Troops

Source: Møller, "The Revolution in Military Affairs: Myth or Reality?" Page 6-8.

Andrew Marshall—or known as “the Father of the RMA” defined RMA as progressive changes within the planning or the conduction of military operations through major technology changes within the war theatre. He stated that RMA does not only affect the operational level of the military but also military doctrine and organizational concepts.³² Marshall explained that after the Cold War, possible

³² Jeffrey McKittrick, James Blackwell, Fred Littlepage, George Kraus, Richard Blanchfield, Dale Hill, “The Revolution in Military Affairs,” in *The Battlefield of the Future: 21st Century Warfare Issues* (Air University: 1998), p. 65.

major “power” holders within global politics would increase and not the other way around.³³ Thus, for states to gain the upper hand during the war and uphold their military hegemony within the international realm, it is important to keep upgrading the technology used for their forces. Utilizing technology would give benefits for states, be it in a short-term or a long-term.

The technology used would affect the whole hierarchies of military science especially in terms of strategy and below. This could happen due to the upgraded communication system as well, which could make the top commanders even the head of a government itself to then involve themselves in the battlefield through communication with the troops deployed. This change then no longer makes it a ‘hierarchy’ but instead a ‘network’ of the military.³⁴ Assuming that a military operational art was led by fleet commands, if there was a dramatic improvement in their communication system, then the elites—such as the Ministry of Defense—then could also lead the battlefield and how troops shall conduct the military operational art. Through this, RMA could also be affecting the organizational concept of the state's military power.

However, other than the utilization of technology and an upgraded network, other operational concepts especially military doctrine played an advantage as well in transforming the military. According to Colin S. Gray, military doctrine became an important concept since transforming the military needs certain measures to

³³ “Marshall at the Revolution,” *Air Force Magazine*, May 2, 1994, <https://www.airforcemag.com/article/0511keeperfile/>.

³⁴ Møller, “The Revolution in Military Affairs: Myth or Reality?” p. 8.

understand the complexity of war's institution itself. Therefore, a various strategies need to be applied for a military to be flexible.³⁵

Colin in his book added another point by Richard O. Hundley that said although the enhancement of technology is important for the RMA, without a military doctrine and the force employment, even the best weapon would not function efficiently nor a revolution would happen.³⁶ Therefore, the existence of military doctrine, or in this case, the Rumsfeld doctrine is crucial to be able to transform the power of U.S. military in the prospect of future warfare.

Thus, RMA necessarily transformed the military systems in many levels focusing on the military effectiveness of armed forces, which by definition does not refer to large amount of forces but the conduct of conflict and/or implementation of armed forces in battleground.³⁷ According to Anthony H. Cordesman, for the military capability to adapt with the unfamiliar or future warfare environment, the use of intelligence, network, and specially trained Special Forces shall be implemented to counter the enemy.³⁸

³⁵ Colin S. Gray, "Recognizing and Understanding Revolutionary Change in Warfare: The Sovereignty of Context," *Strategic Studies Institute* (February, 2006): p. 44.

³⁶ *Ibid*, 8.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 5.

³⁸ Anthony H. Cordesman, "21st Century Conflict: From "Revolution in Military Affairs" (RMA) to "Revolution in Civil-Military Affairs" (RCMA)," *Center for Strategic International Studies* (July 2, 2015): p. 8.

1.6 RESEARCH METHOD AND DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUE

1.6.1 RESEARCH METHOD

The research will be conducted in a qualitative research method. The method involves more in understanding and assessing the detailed quality instead of quantity from sources gathered by the author. However, certain measures in a qualitative method are still relevant to further understand, analyze, and elaborate further regarding the issue.³⁹

The method used for this research would be Phenomenological research. Phenomenological research involves experiences of individuals within a phenomenon and based on the description of their experiences the research would result in effective analysis for this research.⁴⁰ The author suggests that qualitative research methods could help the author to answer their research question or as well as understand deeply regarding Rumsfeld's role and influence in formulating the U.S. Strategy during the War on Terror.

1.6.2 DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUE

The writer will use the Document Review as the data-gathering technique. The source will come from documents that have been published, both hard copy or internet-based documents.⁴¹ Preferably the data collected from libraries or from

³⁹ Laura Roselle, Sharon Spray, "Defining and Operationalizing Your Variables," in *Research and Writing in International Relations* (Pearson Longman: London, 2010), p. 39.

⁴⁰ John W. Creswell, "Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches," SAGE Publication, p. 42.

⁴¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Data Collection Methods for Evaluation: Document Review," *Evaluation Briefs* No. 18, August 2018, <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief18.pdf>.

official government publications to ensure the reliability of the data.⁴² The documents gathered would help the author in resolving the research question, collecting necessary information and data to support the arguments, and understanding the depth of the issue itself.

1.6.3 RESEARCH STRUCTURE

Chapter I : The first chapter of this thesis will introduce the background of the topic, identification of the issue, the writer's research scope, research question formulated, aim and purpose of the research, literature review, theoretical framework of Revolution in Military Affairs and the research method and data gathering technique used by the writer. All of the aforementioned subsections are the main argument for this research paper.

Chapter II : The second chapter would be divided into two subsections. The first section would discuss the definition of Military Doctrine to help readers understand why Rumsfeld ideas were identified as a doctrine. Thus, the next sub-discussion will further elaborate what are Rumsfeld's transformational ideas in regards to the U.S. military capability and the defence policies he formulated to put mentioned ideas to practice.

Chapter III : The third chapter would then start to discuss the operation of Rumsfeld Doctrine during major combat of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. This chapter will include the technologies,

⁴² Roselle, Spray, *Research and Writing in International Relations*, p. 39.

the weapons, the issues and the accomplishments the U.S. army went through during the war.

Chapter IV : This chapter will provide further analysis done by the author to answer the determined Research Question, utilizing the theory of Revolution in Military Affairs.

Chapter V: The conclusion of the research process of this thesis will be provided within this chapter. It includes the highlights and formulations of the thesis, input and opinion from the author, and certain limitations which the author encountered during the process of research.