

## THROUGH AMPLITUDES OF THE MILITARY PROFESSION EVOLUTION

Albert Mullai

" Rarely the fighting positions failed because they are destroyed, normally because leaders have the self-determination that this position shouldn't continue to be maintained.." <sup>1</sup>.

A. A. Vandergrift

### ABSTRACT

Currently nowadays we are living at a time when the meaning of the term "profession" is related essentially and conceptually to the rapid and profound transformational changes that taking place in the Armed Forces everywhere, and of course also to the Albanian AF. In this regard, even the comments, debate or ideas on this subject would do nothing but resonate with the intensity and variety of today's engagements, as well as facing the challenges that tomorrow brings to our Armed Forces, as an integral part of society. The "military profession" as a notion is as early as the Armed Forces itself. While believing that the profession of the military comes with the same parameters as all other professions, it rarely raises discussions, opinions, ideas, debates, proposals, and at the same time presents extremely controversial limits that naturally reflect in the conceptual field. "In this line, maybe we ourselves often lie in the mist of the debate without being able to cope with the pressure to regain value"<sup>2</sup>.

**The soldier is a profession.** In our common terminology when we express theoretical and motivational outlines of what the soldier should or should express, there is in fact little or no room for how to be a professional soldier, or simply to explain the concept " military profession ".

This is perhaps a consequence of the fact that in this area, we in the Armed Forces ourselves describe and deflect ourselves more as an institution rather than as a genuine profession. I think, therefore, neglecting a precise description of what can be considered a profession in the Armed Forces can be the starting point for finding oneself, to draw attention to relationships with other professions, and then to accurate determination of professional duties and responsibilities. Many people simplify this dilemma by addressing it only in the theoretical dimension, namely whether the theory related to the profession of officer is art or science. And then, for a few who believe it's just purely art, it becomes difficult to conceive the officer as a genuine profession. For those who consider the object of the officer as a science, it becomes simple just like all the other sciences he seeks to have on the basis of a proper education system.

While in the West such a dilemma no longer exists, since they have long since passed this "dilemma" and are in the acknowledgment of the fact that the object of the profession of officer is in both the spaces and science and art. Europe has solved this 'dilemma' more than

---

<sup>1</sup> Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.

<sup>2</sup> "The indirect approach" Robert H. Scales, 1998

200 years ago. For years we continue to weave not for the dilemma but for the amateurism of the complexes and to move to the stage of improvisation that we rarely find outright. Even, if only for this reason, knowledge of the security and defense field gives us all the chances to re-evaluate and reconsider the profession of the military and to apply the best model to educate the younger generation approaching volunteering in the Armed Forces.

**For a contemporary military science:** Indeed, we are still in the dilemma where the choice between the terms of art and science in the concept of war is still not final. And no one is still in a situation to know exactly based on what it can be decided, although at first glance it does not seem so complicated. It is always accepted that "knowing-science" is something different from "doing art". In this sense, we seem to face with concepts or treaties that are so different that boundaries should be visible while the spaces are so narrow that they can be confused with each other. "To be able to do" - or as otherwise art is defined, you can't face it in its final form, and perhaps may be for this reason; art can never be the title of any book. Today under the name of art theory, or simply art, and on the other hand, the branches of knowledge - which are commonly considered pure science, necessary for art practice, are mixed up. "... they, art and science come under two not always parallel lines, and therefore the continuity of the underlying foundation of this distinction is accepted to be acceptable as art everything when the object consists of" doing "(to be skilled), and science when defined knowledge is for object"<sup>3</sup>. The integration of elements of art and science is almost afflicted in all fields and perhaps even where it is literally accepted to talk about pure art or science. And so, in any kind of art there may be included science or defined elements of scientific disciplines, this is more than acceptable, and shouldn't confuse us.

**Mixture and clarifications:** The first concept of "art of war" is clearly the science for the preparation of the Armed Forces. Formally, the term "art of war" or "science of war" is not understood at all by the total number of science branches involved, the application, the art, the abilities defined by apparent things. The patterns and the preparation or the way of using weapons, the building of fortifications and entrenchment, the force organization and the mechanism of its movement and transformation, are and remain subject to the branches of knowledge (science) and the possibilities (arts) for which refer. But despite and above all the purpose is, building armed forces, able to be used at the war. All of these, merely linked to the apparent world and in a one-sided activity, are nothing more than an activity advanced by a low escalation into a complicated type of art. The relationships of all these elements in the war process itself are almost the same as art relations. Engaging in the moments of danger and in situations of a constant reciprocal action of the specific energies of the mind and spirit in the direction given is on a still not very controversial.

*True science appears in the art of tension.*<sup>4</sup> In this art, we first perceive a certain degree of intellectual ability over the visible force placed under control, but usually as embodied in tangible forms such as passages, entrenchment, obstacles, batteries etc., and each step in which this action is taken. This is just the thread that is placed in a way that connects these objects according to a defined rule. After all that we have said above, in other words, tactics try to give the mechanism a link to a general-trend character. They are built in a certain space, whose character really drives the battlefield. But instead of orienting it in a free direction of

---

<sup>3</sup> John Keegan, *The Mask of Command*, 1987), 1-4.

<sup>4</sup> Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), 111.

activity, in an armed force it is directed as a mechanism. His strict formations and orders in battle move entirely in respect of this orientation, almost as a scorpion of a timepiece. Reflections on military events brought the demand for a theory<sup>5</sup>. While diving into the idea of war continues to grow, and its history every day gets more critical character, an urgent demand appears in the need to support more with principles and strict rules. This seems to come to the intent that contradictions naturally arise over the combat moments. War opinions are also accepted to come at the same point. This exposition of opinions that does not revolve in any central axis nor is it aligned with any legitimacy may not always be very unlikely.

The WWI and WW2 were the ones that gave the greatest impetus to developments in military science as a system of knowledge about the laws and of the strategically nature, organizational development and the armed forces preparation as well as other elements of war, but even combat methodology. Today it is acknowledged that the theory of war has been generalized and developed in the most spectacular way. It has become increasingly clear that the interpretation of the structure and content of military science always depends on understanding the essence of war and the technical, military and social aspect. In the same sense, the level of development of military science in general and theoretical and methodological principles in particular are related to the nature and specifications of the infrastructure of military problems, the nature of economic and social political relations, but also the political and state systems as well as the nature of the trends of every particular age, including contradictions and trends.

Based on experience, analysts, scholars and theorists offer the vision of a system of scientific knowledge and their role in the formation of the structure and content of military science. They also demonstrate that today's efficiency in dealing with security concerns at the national level is directly related to the level of development of the methodology of military science studies. Some military scientists point out today that the *"military science situation tends to modern demands, and many of its principles, conclusions, and recommendations are not timely .... rules and principles that were indisputable became unnecessary, while many others were formulated in a difficult language because this is a process where different schools give different explanations"*.<sup>6</sup>

It is acknowledged today that military science is not in its best days. There is a fall in the efficiency of military affairs in the context of democratic transformations. *"In the general context, there is a particular link between science (including military issues) and military doctrine."*<sup>7</sup> In these terms, the doctrine expresses views and views about the possibilities and ways of achieving the political goals of nations and states by means of military means. The military doctrine has a special status because it is formulated on the basis of advanced military-theoretical knowledge and concrete military-political practice; and includes the most important theoretical bases. It develops in relation to many other sciences, but with its own specifics as today it can't be considered simply an integral part of military theory.

---

<sup>5</sup> Perry M. Smith, *Taking Charge: A Practical Guide for Leaders* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1986), 108.

<sup>6</sup> "The User of Leadership Theory" (*Michigan Business Review*, January 1973), James Owen

<sup>7</sup> "Insight the news", Lijid ,2000

Nowadays it is claimed that the scientific-military terminology in different countries reflects military knowledge and notions that are coming far more different than 20-30 years ago. In my opinion, all the notions and military scientific terms have undergone a radical reform in recent years, and to be more precise at the beginning of the 21st century. Nevertheless, military terminology is interpreted as a collective term that includes all problems related to military theory and practice, but also with the organizational development, preparation and operation of armed forces in peace, crisis and combat situation. In a narrower sense it presents the system of knowledge and techniques that prepare it to fulfill the combat task.

At the same time, a new interpretation of the concept of military science is offered as "*a knowledge system about the strategic nature and laws of war, organizational development and preparation of combat forces, but also includes the fighting techniques...*"<sup>8</sup>

Fighting is the subject of military science research, and it has been observed together with other social, natural and technical sciences. The subject of military science also deals with the problems faced in the leading of various fighting and conflicts. These definition of the term "military affairs" and "military science" provide speculations about military and scientific theory of war.

The change of historical epochs has led to changing the nature of international relations. Changes of the core factors have reflected trends in changing the space of organizational development of the armed forces, the preparation of troops, and changes in doctrines refers to the military art. Some of these changes have resulted in a situation where some of the previous principles being emptied and a new part reflected by giving a new picture of science. Perhaps at this moment we are facing a new picture of the structure nature but also of the content not only of military science but of military issues in general term.

The 1990s were the rapidly change years when the geopolitical situation dramatically changed, after the collapse of the bipolar world. "... *The only remaining superpower, the US, was placed in a completely different position as analysts ran to call it the "New American Century.."*"<sup>9</sup>. The distinctive feature of this period is that the number of conflicts, especially those with a local or regional base, has not decreased at all, but has probably expanded their complexity in different parts of the world. If we will analyze their content will see that they (conflicts) capture nearly all spheres of life and include almost all forms and methods of collision, from which armed ones are not always the main one.

Fundamentally new collision types as well as the methods used have taken on a different form, role, and importance in combat spaces. The airspace integrated with the information technology tremendously has increased its influence not only on the course, but also on the results of the wars. These radical changes have raised the need for development and use in modern wars (armed conflicts) of some totally new forms and methods of military operation. Just as it is natural, this has required that new methods of predicting phenomena or military tendencies come close to a common focal point with the general and specific problems of military science.

In this situation, it seems that a new stage of development of theoretical thinking has begun, reflecting new phenomena in the content of local or regional conflicts of the 21st century, and

---

<sup>8</sup> Grau, Lester and Jacob Kipp. "Small Wars," Spring 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.

reflecting the influence of economic, social, military capabilities and capacities, as well as the military organization in which modern conflicts will tend to develop. "... *The outcomes of the wars will be interdependent from the technological developments of confrontation, or rather on how the opposing powers will have sufficiently precision weapons and be able to cope with the challenges of information technology...*"<sup>10</sup>. In this context it is necessary to specify the laws of war which are of particular importance for the content and structure of military science.

In the new phase of military theoretical thought, military science is heading to its efforts in the social, natural and technical factors of modern forms of development of the war, viewed as a whole, but also in particular conflicts. Just as before, specific aspects of combat, found only in military science and in any of the other disciplines, will be the object of recognition. Of course, it is about aspects that have to do with the character of combat, laws and principles, but also the methods that reflect in conflict and that may be of strategic, operational and tactical levels.

While aiming at the content of combat, military science is thought to continue at the same time to assess the nature of the war links with the general laws of combat, but also with other factors that have specific impact as those of a socio-economic nature and social - political. At the same time, military science will formulate strategic ideas for the doctrine of combat and security theory. At the new stage of developing theoretical military thinking, military science will also reflect on itself as a system of knowledge about the main military and strategic character of wars and armed conflicts, ways to stop them, organizational development and the preparation of forces armed. Following it will include military security but also the rules, principles, forms and methods of fighting to protect the territory and national interests in a wider space.

There is no doubt that military science as a system of military scientific knowledge that captures a large number of discipline subjects and the interrelated theories between them will have a complex structure. "... *It will be more than necessary to use the principles of a logic that will seek to select specific theories that can't be duplicated. ...*"<sup>11</sup>. The structure of military science should reflect its influence in the establishing of scientific research structures such as research institutes, scientific centers, specialized laboratories, but also other research organizations in the future. This will help to determine with a higher accuracy the participation of other sciences in military research by promising important results. This interaction will also be of great help to prepare scientists as well as to guide their qualification.

In this correlation, the structure of military science must be seen at the new stage of its development, in accordance with the new political and military realities not only in our country but also beyond. Today in the modern world, it is viewed as a system of knowledge about war and military security with a totally related component: general theory, military art theory, the theory of organizational development of the armed forces, theory of military education and leadership, control theory and command control of the armed forces, theories of support, weapon systems theory, military history theory, weapon service theory, special

---

<sup>10</sup> Vince Crwaley "Terror Alert," *Army Times*, November 2000.

<sup>11</sup> "The indirect approach" Robert H. Scales, 2009

theories for other forces within military organization. What is commonly noticed is that the models in the system of knowledge about war, forces, and defense were originally treated and displayed in a general form. Meanwhile the radical changes that have occurred in this period oblige in a special and urgent way the need to make re-evaluations of the content and structure of military science.

Military science at the new stage of theoretical military thinking is the core of the entire system of knowledge of the combat theory. This system will be strictly linked to basic social sciences and military doctrine, just like with natural and technical sciences that specifically address military issues as a support of war issues. *"... As a coordinated nucleus, military science will enrich other sciences with concrete knowledge of prospects and developments in military issues by orienting them towards more fragile issues and later moving towards with them toward defined paths, and of course by splitting up concepts, categories, laws, and research methods"*<sup>12</sup>. But reflecting interdependence with these sciences, it will actively achieve to yield more fruitfully the results achieved by these sciences by including them in its content.

Another important component of military science, highly debated by researchers, will be the security theory that studies aspirations and strategies in the security areas of society, the armed forces and the state itself against external and internal political, economic and social risks, military, technological as well as ecological. It is entirely related to information and other elements by considering the resources and capabilities of the armed forces, but also resources of the state in close coordination with the exact sciences as well as those of the science twins of military science. In the new situation, the knowledge system will continue to replenish on social, natural, technical sciences related to military security and the development of combat methods. Perhaps more simply, the military component of these sciences will reflect on military science.

As evident from the evolution of military science, its structure is never unchangeable. *"... The structure of military science will be specified and improved in line with its own developments, but also with the emergence of new demands, striving for growth in radius, achievement and total knowledge."*<sup>13</sup>. There will be new components or breakdowns as well as interaction between them that will require further modification. The process of integration and change of knowledge features of modern science, which will also influence and include military science, will help in this orientation.

At the new stage of developing theoretical military thinking, the general theory will reflect the impact of studying the laws of modern war, which express the essential ties with these phenomena. An important factor, as before, will be the requirements of a general methodology for a scientific logic that the recognition of phenomena is seen in the non-extracted ratio, but in reference to all the laws and logic categories as well as the interdependence between them. It is worth pointing out that the general theory of military science should possess basic principles of an integrated methodology for all its components. *"... As in the past, the general theory will study the object, subject, structure and methods of*

---

<sup>12</sup> Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.

<sup>13</sup> Rick Atkinson, "Desert Storm's Angry Caesar," *Washington Post National Weekly*, 4-10 October 2008.

*military science, role and place in the theoretical military knowledge system..*"<sup>14</sup>. It will also identify and recognize the categories, rules and the principles of fighting, but also the organizational-structural development of the armed forces in connection with the general knowledge about the war.

Convincingly, military art theory will remain one of the components of military science at this new stage of military thinking, and will continue to study and recognize the character, rules, principles, forms and methods that are being followed in preparing for fighting management at varying degrees. At this stage, the theory will be based also on objective laws and will use assumptions and conclusions to be transplanted to other military science sectors, but also to branches of other natural or technical sciences as well as in investigating of military issues.

Taking into the consideration that the relationship between strategy, operational art and tactics are changing constantly, the role of each of them is indisputable. In this interdependence, the objectives of military art theory should be subject to certain attributes. *"... quite naturally, more than ever, the theory of military art will be focus on principles, features, forms of methods of preparing military operations.."*<sup>15</sup>. But specifically, at the stage we are the content is going to reflect the change.

*"The strategy as a theory will remain one for all the armed forces and will continue to be the leading position in the theory of military art.."*<sup>16</sup>. Despite the fact that internal and external fighting factors will change constantly, the future operations will be characterized by the co-ordination of all elements of strategic, operational and tactical combat in an increasingly complicated situation and in all combat sphere. Under these circumstances and taking into consideration the above changes, it is exactly the strategy theory that will be able to develop, at the new stage, the bases of military security, the identification of the potential character of modern wars and ways to prevent them as well as the revision of the new rules of combat. At the same time, it will show determination for the missions faced today by the armed forces, the development of bases for their planning and implementation. Moreover, the strategy will be engaged in studying and developing various strategic views and opportunities for war, as well as in the strategic evolution of possible military operations.

Operational art theory is known as defined for essential specifics. *"The recent debate about the role and importance of the combat space, the role of armament, now based on sophisticated technology and new combat methods, has preceded and dictated the requirements to present an adapted scientific knowledge system, and not only but also all military science in the recognition, preparation and development of the theory of operational art..."*<sup>17</sup>. The main objective of this theory most probably will be: to recognize and study the new trend of future-oriented operations content, identify new methods of preparation and management, as well as their engagement within strategic and operational formations. This will be combining with combat formations preceding demands in respect of the

---

<sup>14</sup> "The human terrain of Urban Operations" R. Peters Parameters, 2000

<sup>15</sup> Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, *Management of Organizational Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982), 86

<sup>16</sup> John A. Shaud, "The 'Staff Experience' and Leadership Development," (Spring 2007).

<sup>17</sup> Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 2007, 39.

organizational structure and armaments of the armed forces, always specifying the bases of command-control in combat formations in the operational sphere.

While the theory of tactics is related to the theory of operational art, substantial changes will make the knowledge system about the corresponding specifications directly affect the enrichment of variable elements. Under these circumstances, the tactic will continue to focus on the character and content of the engagements, to develop new ways and methods, to study characteristic of the weapons and their performance on weapon technology, patterns and their impact on the battlefield. On the other hand, tactics, like theory, will have objectives such as: to study the character and content of modern combat, to study the impact of the engagement rate and the results of intense fire, assault, movement and maneuver, identify rational methods of preparation and leading of activity. This theory will determine the optimal conditions for recognizing combat capabilities of weapons and defense equipment. Further on, it will probably determine missions for formations as well as elements in different types of activity and changing combat situations. This theory, in the process and further, will determine the methods of organizing and coordinating units and combat elements, and will present recommendations and provide technical, military support

Changes in the social system and acceptance of the structural development concept would require generating a system of knowledge of laws and principles, but also the improvement of technical methods and firepower. Under the new conditions maybe a theory of structures development that will have its main purpose: to determine the level of rational powers, the new organizational structure, the relationship and the role of services and weapons in the armed forces, in the specification of roads in power-up and technical development procedures, give recommendations on how military organisms, staff troops train and determine all kinds of reserves. The structure of this theory can include the principles of fighting and mobilization, but also the readiness and preparation of personnel.

Military education and leadership is in one of the advance stages of development, especially in theoretical thinking. Art, weapons, equipment, and weapon use methods continue to be the underlying factors that will drive the demand for a knowledge system that will emerge in content, form and method of preparation. Military education will even have to focus on knowledge of the laws and the education process applied to the armed forces, in organizing, planning and controlling the process, as well as in the methods of information transmission. Under these conditions, the theory of military education as in many countries deals with: "... *the scientific specification of the basic recommendations on how to lead the military to morality and high combat psychology, combat qualities and capabilities, performance and fighting capacities, as well as keeping up the readiness of the armed forces to protect the country.....*"<sup>18</sup>.

The marksmanship theory will certainly be a system of scientific knowledge of military science. Under the new circumstances, this system will be a system of development of armaments and equipment knowledge. The technical-military aspects, the scientific progress of military problems will be subject to study. The content of the armament theory objectives most likely will remain unchanged. Perhaps it will further analyze and generalize the development experience, improve the development of weapons in new conditions, draw conclusions, draw lessons from the analysis, focus and develop the methodological principles

---

<sup>18</sup> "The indirect approach" Robert H. Scales, 2010

of theory, laws, principles and requirements for prospects, identify the organization's methods to study and give recommendations on how will be the combat future trends.

At a glance at recent fighting, more arguments are given that C2 theory will aim fundamental changes in the development of theoretical military thinking. It is unlikely that under the new conditions the command-control system of forces in different types of activity is thought to be modified. "... *Possibly under the new conditions the C2 theory will be aimed at: studying operational, organizational and technical aspects at all levels, identifying principles and trends in the organization and functioning of systems in peace and war times, in identifying opportunities and ways to improve and develop systems, organizational forms and control methodology* " <sup>19</sup> . Further, perhaps, present practical proposals and recommendations on how the command should work and improve the form and content of combat documents by consider the advantages of using contemporary technology, the automated control system and prepare to manage combat operations, develop research methods in control issues as well as on evaluation criteria and methods

Military history, if recaptured as a theory, will continue to study wars and armed forces in the past, their dependence on material, technical, economic and social conditions, but also political. "... *As distinct from other fields of military science, it will indeed face the factors, events and processes by looking at them critically from the current position* " <sup>20</sup> .

The above is a weaving and perhaps an attempt to move on to a nearly-proven military science system. The analysis we went through, albeit not easy, essentially intends to show that what is being prepared and managed today from the lowest levels to the major colleges is a single feature system, features and priorities that emanate from a tradition, experience, coexistence, and influence on the general system of knowledge. What can be stated for sure is that simply observing the order of recognizing the structure and pattern of the military science will help to utilize all the inputs that come clearly from military science.

**Reflections:** As stated above, although in a short form, there is no doubt what is and how to see military as a profession. Meanwhile it remains strange that the forms to realize that often are turned into amateurs. This is as clear as sometimes the institution of preparation see their self in a skeptical position. S. Huntington emphasize "...*That unlike any other profession, the officer spends nearly 1/3 of his career in the process of education and qualification ...*" this is unique. We can't find any other profession to compare. "*One aspect of professionalism, not uncommonly appreciated, is the responsibility of members to understand the spaces of the profession, contributing to the integrity of the knowledge that helps keep the profession up and running, and totally progressive ...* " <sup>21</sup> .

Ironically, long before the "information age", the military appeared much more active, casting their ideas or opinions on paper, reflections coming from different points of view. The soldiers faced a number of professional papers, arguing about the tactics, the art of operation, the strategy, the modernization of the force, or even in many directions that were relevant to the profession. Most of those articles are still required in educational institutions or training sites. Today, the number of soldiers who share their views through writing is just a minority.

---

<sup>19</sup> "Back to the future with asymmetric warfare" Parameters f.26

<sup>20</sup> John A. Kline, "Communications for the Leader" (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University, 1990), 261.

<sup>21</sup> B. H. Liddell Hart "Low-Intensity Operations, 2004

The information age, was supposed to create the instrument to make the process more effective and to create enough space for other directions, including the scriptures. What is reality is that the information age has unequivocally given a different effect; has increased the workload and has left little time for reflection.

Encouraging discussion and debate. Discussions and debates within the profession are important, but they come down day by day. Discussions, which do not reach the level of writing, take complex assessments, often they are seen as complaints, and new ideas rarely find ground to be debated. The free exchange of viewpoints and ideas, whether they are in the same line with the superior, make the profession capable of reacting to new opportunities and spaces, as well as coping with challenges.

Of course, we play in a space that has nothing similar with the place where people sit around and twist philosophies about the dangers of the world, or even to turn the discussions into dissidence. Once leaders make decisions, all those who call themselves professionals support them, all while having the freedom to use the intellect and the professional dialogue in the problems that affect the future of the profession will create more commitments to implement the decision. Healthy dialogue stems professional reflections on problem solving, and provides opportunities to look into more options, developing critical thinking that is indispensably needed by leaders in dealing with the circumstances of the time. Effective ideas exchange through publication, discussions and other alternative forums is a process that enables leaders to solve critical and necessary problems, from what the society has not been able to solve before.

The way forward is clear crystal. We need to revitalize our profession by redefining workmanship, by expanding jurisdiction and reconfiguring its legitimacy. Only by educating the military to be professional, calculating professional standards and putting emphasis on fruitful debates about development, we can contribute to aligning with profession ideals. As Vandergift stated, *"Rarely, the fighting positions have been lost because they have been destroyed, but the leaders have the self-determination that this position can't continue to be maintained."*

## REFERENCES

1. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976),
2. Perry M. Smith, *Taking Charge: A Practical Guide for Leaders* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1986),
3. John Keegan, *The Mask of Command*, USDU 1987
4. B. H. Liddell Hart *"Low-Intensity Operations, CGSC 2004"*
5. Back to the future with asymmetric warfare, Parameters September 2012
6. John A. Kline, "Communications for the Leader" (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University, 1990).
7. Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, *Management of Organizational Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982)
8. John A. Shaud, "The 'Staff Experience' and Leadership Development," (Spring 2007).
9. Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 2007
10. Rick Atkinson, "Desert Storm's Angry Caesar," *Washington Post National Weekly*, 4-10 October 2008.

11. R. Peters “ The human terrain of Urban Operations” Parameters,2000
12. Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.
13. Vince Crwaley “Terror Alert,” *Army Times*, November 2000.
14. Robert H. Scales “The indirect approach” , War College 2009
15. Grau, Lester and Jacob Kipp. “Small Wars,” Spring 2000.
16. Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.
17. The User of Leadership Theory" (*Michigan Business Review*, January 1973), James Owen
18. “Insight the news”, Lijd ,2000
19. Roderick R. Magee, "Building Strategic Leadership for the 21st Century," *Military Review*, February 1993, 39.