

Seven Pillars of Destruction: Counterinsurgency and Civilians

Matthew Gibson, Xavier University

During World War I, British military officer Thomas Edward Lawrence led a force of Arab-rebel fighters in an insurrection against the Ottoman Turks. The British failure at the Battle of Gallipoli signaled a shift in military strategy that differed from the stalemate, brutal conditions of trench warfare taking place on the Western Front on the continent of Europe. While most of the world was practicing the Clausewitzian theory of war, which was to invoke as much destruction as possible, Lawrence would use indirect warfare to ensure a victory in the Middle East. Insurgency and indirect warfare are nothing new to history, but Lawrence would become a household name after his successful campaigns in the Middle East. With his written interpretation of insurgency and the new elements implemented, Lawrence's contribution to counterinsurgency was to make war limited, precise, and bloodless, and his legacy was carried on and modified by Sir Basil Liddell Hart and Orde Charles Wingate. Ultimately, Lawrence's methods evolved into destructive warfare that affected – and continues to affect – civilian populations.

The military historiography surrounding Lawrence is difficult because most authors classify him as a teacher of insurgency instead of counterinsurgency. For example in Matthew Hughes book, *The British Way in Counter-insurgency: A Historical Perspective*, Lawrence is described as an insurgent, and he is compared in the likes of another famous insurgent, Mao Zedong.¹ On the other hand, other authors such as Andrew Mumford and Douglas Porch use Lawrence as a case study for counterinsurgents to learn about insurgency tactics.² Most of these authors use Lawrence's famous book, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, as the foundation of their research.

Military Strategy before Lawrence

Before World War I, most European countries used Carl von Clausewitz famous book, *On war*, as the basis of military strategy in colonial affairs and World War I. Clausewitz was a Prussian General who experienced the horrific conditions of the Napoleonic wars. After his military career, Clausewitz dedicated the remainder of his life to using his military knowledge in a theoretical way.³ Clausewitz denounced military thinkers during the Enlightenment because they believed war “ought to come under the domination of

¹ Matthew Hughes, *British Ways of Counter-Insurgency: A Historical Perspective* (Routledge, 2016), 25.

² Andrew Mumford, *The Counter-Insurgency Myth: The British Experience of Irregular Warfare* (Routledge, 2012) 17, 19; Douglas Porch, *Counterinsurgency: Exposing the Myths of the New Way of War* (Cambridge University Press, 2013) 173.

³ “Carl von Clausewitz | Prussian General | Britannica.com,” accessed July 12, 2016

reason”.⁴ Clausewitz argued that war and human affairs are separated and that war has a “nonlinear logic”⁵. War consisted of military geniuses coordinating strategy, uncertainty and chance, and changing historical conditions. Through the aftermath of the French Revolution and his experience in the Napoleonic wars, Clausewitz sees limited war as non-existent and wars immutable essence, nature, concept and guide of all military action by the forces of complete and utter destruction of the opponent.⁶ Intelligence and the superiority in numbers are key concepts that would set the foundation of defensive warfare, known as trench warfare, war of exhaustion, and absolute war, which are key tactics of Clausewitz that would shape the course of history and military strategy during the age of Imperialism.

Before getting into the tactics, it is important to see how intelligence, information, and the superiority in numbers set the foundation for the important tactics. In terms of intelligence in war, Clausewitz defines it as “every sort of information about the enemy and his country – the basis, in short of our own plans and operation”.⁷ Without information, the war effort collapses, and strategic planning regarding numbers of troops needed is hindered.⁸ The superiority of numbers determines the victory when elements such as time, place, and engagement are eliminated.⁹ During this time, Europeans were relatively equal in terms of military technology and strategy, which helped set rules of engagement. Clausewitz calls this “relative superiority”, and the rules are that the largest army possible should be put in the field; and take the field in the greatest possible strength to either get the upper hand, or to make sure the enemy does not get the upper hand.¹⁰ Clausewitz gives examples of generals such as Frederick the Great and Napoleon Bonaparte. This strategy worked because these men had to determine the correct appraisal and decisive points of where to focus their troops, which would shape the planning process for defensive wars, wars of exhaustion, and absolute war.

Regarding the use of defensive wars, Clausewitz saw the use of offensive strategy as important but in certain circumstances. The offensive can result from a successful defensive strategy that creates more casualties for the enemy. Clausewitz closely defines defense as the defender waiting for the attacker in a position that is erected in solid defense where the individual can see their enemy. The type of defense that ought to be used is “one or more parallel trenches...to inflict heavy losses on the enemy at low cost to himself as the attack passes through the successive stages of resistance until it reaches the heart of the position”.¹¹ With the fragmentation of the beaten army, this leads to defeat.

⁴ “Carl von Clausewitz | Prussian General | Britannica.com.”

⁵ “Carl von Clausewitz | Prussian General | Britannica.com.”

⁶ “Carl von Clausewitz | Prussian General | Britannica.com.”

⁷ Carl von Clausewitz, Michael Howard, and Peter Paret, *On War* (Princeton University Press, 1989), pg. 117.

⁸ Ibid, 118.

⁹ Ibid, 194.

¹⁰ Ibid, 195-96.

¹¹ Clausewitz, Howard, and Paret, *On War*, page 390.

Vulnerability, or flanking, was a factor that still affected defense. As Clausewitz assumed, and as did most of the generals from the First World War, that such defensive position could be turned. However, in regards to strategy, defense could frequently rest on flanks which provide security, “where the line of defense may run from sea to sea or from neutral country to another.” This was exactly the situation on the western front by the end of 1914.¹² Even outside of the western front in places such as China, Chinese “coolies” were ordered to transport supplies and dig trenches.¹³ But to demonstrate the impact of Clausewitz belief on defensive wars

European military observers had gone to the American Civil War of 1861-5 or to that between Turkey and Russia in 1877 and seen for themselves how a combination of well-prepared defensive positions including trenches in combination with rapid firing had devastated the attackers and caused much larger losses among them than the defenders.¹⁴

Other countries were already using methods of trench warfare decades before World War I. With the evolution of military technology, countries were able to find ways to maximize destruction from a defensive standpoint.

On the basis of exhaustion, Clausewitz believed this would never change in warfare. He described this style of fighting by stating that “Gradually, the units engaged are burned out, and when nothing is left but cinders, they are withdrawn and others take their place.”¹⁵ The use of strategy here is important because it is needed to gather enough men to deliver the final blow to the exhausted enemy. Therefore, the psychological effect are important because it exhaustion, leaves the commanders in a tough position to make the right judgment.¹⁶ Clausewitz made this element of war seem natural, and it is evident within World War I because of the psychological effects of the generals. For example, thinking of Franz Conrad in Austria and Helmuth Von Moltke in Germany, both men experienced the exhausting aspects of war, which made them feel helpless in the face of doom.¹⁷ This is important because both men were prestige decision-makers during the war, which helps aid the allies to a victory even though they were exhausted as well.

Finally, the first two elements point to the final strategy of annihilating the enemy. After setting up important defensive positions, with the end goal being to counterattack, and the exhausting psychological strain on both sides, annihilation will soon commence by the side that quickly recuperates. Annihilation was the most important aspect that

¹² “Strachan-ClausewitzAndTheFirstWorldWar.pdf,” accessed July 10, 2016, pg. 378.

¹³ Margaret MacMillan, *The War That Ended Peace: The Road to 1914* (Random House Publishing Group, 2013), pg. xxiv.

¹⁴ MacMillan, *The War That Ended Peace*, pg. 327.

¹⁵ Clausewitz, Howard, and Paret, *On War*, page 226.

¹⁶ “Strachan-ClausewitzAndTheFirstWorldWar.pdf,” pg. 377.

¹⁷ MacMillan, *The War That Ended Peace*, 600.

World War I generals took away from Clausewitz. For example in general Alfred Von Schlieffen's forward to "On War" Schlieffen writes that the principal lesson to be drawn from Clausewitz was that the overriding aim in war was the destruction of the enemy's armed forces, and that the highest rule in war was the decision by force of arms.¹⁸ This was potent in Schlieffen's invasion of Belgium and France in 1914. Schlieffen further explains why this method is easier and more affective. He states, "Clausewitz stressed the need to judge each war according to its own character, and that the soldier should not be so bound by abstract theory as to fail to recognize the evidence of his own eyes."¹⁹ There's no theory in war; the reality of war, what the soldier sees in front of them, is all that matters. It is the Generals or high-ranking official's jobs to think how the strategy they create fits within the war they are fighting, but this still requires no abstract theories.

Analyzing Clausewitz own written depiction of destruction, it is as basic as Schlieffen interprets it. Clausewitz sees destruction of the enemy forces as the means to the universal end in warfare, which is victory.²⁰ Clausewitz divides destruction into two different categories direct and indirect destruction. Indirect destruction is merely taking a fortress or territory away from the enemy that will contribute to further destruction. Clausewitz does not mention the destruction of supplies or materials when he is talking about indirect destruction, which makes it completely different from tactics used in indirect warfare. After analyzing all of the elements of Clausewitz theory on war

Clausewitz felt it necessary to assert repeatedly that violence is the essence of war, and dismiss his reiteration as a pedantic insistence on the obvious. But Clausewitz stressed the point not only because experience and the study of the past had convinced him of its truth; he was also responding to the surprisingly numerous theorists who continued to claim that wars could be won by maneuver rather than bloodshed.²¹

This warfare of bloodshed, exhaustion, and continuous stalemates as well as the boost in military technology made World War I one of the bloodiest wars of all time.

T.E. Lawrence's Strategy in World War I (Middle East)

The method of warfare that Lawrence used against the Turks is known as indirect warfare, which is known as or used to describe other methods of war such as insurgency and counterinsurgency. This type of warfare has evolved from complete destruction of the enemy to focusing on small infantry units and hit and run tactics. Insurgencies and

¹⁸ Strachan-*ClausewitzAndTheFirstWorldWar.pdf*," 372.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 372.

²⁰ Clausewitz, Howard, and Paret, *On War*, page 529.

²¹ *Ibid*, 20.

counterinsurgencies are not new. The first documented insurgency took place within the Akkadian empire where they strove to completely annihilate their enemy with huge quantities of soldiers, and the first counterinsurgency took place in the Roman empire and the Assyrian empire where they would assassinate insurgency leaders, destroying and overwhelming the enemy with enormous armies, minimal psychological warfare, divide rebellion groups and pit them against each other.²² Most ancient history examples are similar to Clausewitz theory of war. Eventually, insurrections would evolve into smaller, irregular forces and implementations of guerrilla war tactics. For example, guerrilla wars such as the American, Haitian, Greek, and Italian Revolutions.²³ In terms of counterinsurgencies, examples such as the Boers War, and wars similar to it, used small infantry forces, but they were described as police actions and controlled civilian populations to diffuse the insurrection.²⁴ Police actions in colonial situations never went on the offensive to eliminate the enemy. The contribution to Lawrence brought to military strategy is structure, precision and limitation to insurgency but for counterinsurgency, Lawrence would implement the same tactics from insurgency to counterinsurgency. For example, offensive strategies, which were aimed to make counterinsurgencies bloodless. This would challenge Clausewitz theories on the basis of war being unlimited and violence being the main goal of war, especially within counterinsurgencies because until World War I, it was acceptable for Western governments to use brute force to stamp out insurgencies.²⁵

Around 1916, Lawrence received the job of commanding the insurgency force because of his knowledge on the efficiency of Turkish airplanes and the whereabouts of Turkish forces located within the Arabian Peninsula.²⁶ This originates from his love of military history, and his archeological escapades in the Middle East before World War I. As the leading commander of the Arab insurgency fighters, Lawrence became a ground agent for the British military, but he understood that he could not transform the Arab fighting force into a conventional European-style army. As a result, the British had to accept the Arab way of war and adapt their strategies and expectations accordingly.²⁷ Since the beginning of the war, Lawrence disliked the strategy being used in the Middle East, which was identical to Clausewitz teachings. Incorporating Clausewitz teachings into the war effort in the Middle East, resulted with the failure at Gallipoli, which was the turning point and the reason Lawrence received the opportunity to take charge. With the combination of Lawrence's intelligence, and the familiarity of the land by Arab rebel

²² Max Boot, *Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2013), 14, 19, 20-23, 25.

²³ *Ibid*, 59.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 184.

²⁵ David French, *The British Way in Counter-Insurgency, 1945-1967* (OUP Oxford, 2011), 2.

²⁶ Scott Anderson, *Lawrence in Arabia: War, Deceit, Imperial Folly and the Making of the Modern Middle East*, Reprint edition (New York: Anchor, 2014), pg. 199-200.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 209

fighters, the Arab insurgency force was created. In his article, *Evolution of Revolution* published in the Army Quarterly in 1920, Lawrence describes his job as the head of the Arab insurgency. He states,

My own personal duty was command, and I began to unravel command and analyze it, both from the point of view of strategy, the aim in war, the synoptic regard which sees everything by the standard of the whole, and from the point of view called tactics, the means towards the strategic end, and the steps of its staircase. In each I found the same elements, one algebraically, two biological, and third psychological.²⁸

Lawrence sees time and space as an algebraic element. Specifically, the amount of square miles between the combat force and its enemy as well as the amount of time one has to evade or attack the enemy if needed. For example in his campaigns, he calculates the square miles between the Turks and his forces and from there, he would calculate how well the Turks could defend all of the territory they occupy. Since the Turks used trench warfare, Lawrence concluded that in order to maximize that square mile of defense, his forces must move like "...an influence, an idea, a thing invulnerable, intangible, without front or back, drifting like a gas...we might be a vapour blowing where we listed"²⁹. Lawrence knew that the Turks were foolish, and they would fight the Arab rebellion as if it were an absolute war meaning as if the Arab rebel fighters were a standing army with precise locations.

Biologically, Lawrence defines this element as "...the breaking-point, life and death, or better, and tear".³⁰ While most military theorists would attach Lawrence's interpretation of biological tactics to the wear and tear of the human body, Lawrence sees supply and materials as the key factor that will lead to the wear and tear of the human body in war. For example in World War I, Lawrence believed the Turkish Army materials were scarce and precious. Ultimately, the death of a Turkish bridge or railway was more profitable to his forces than the death of a Turkish soldier, which is evident in his battles at Aqaba and the small encounters with Turkish armies in his attempt to take over Damascus³¹. The main goal was to become superior in some aspect of war, which to the insurgent fighters the destruction of materials was the only way as opposed to military thinkers prior to Lawrence who only focused on the destruction of soldiers or physically having more soldiers. The biological element contributes to the overall goal of fighting a war of "detachment", which was to contain the enemy by silent threats through vast unknown desert and not disclosing themselves to the enemy until the

²⁸ T.E. Lawrence, "Evolution of Revolutions," accessed June 24, 2016, pg. 7.

²⁹ Ibid. 8.

³⁰ Ibid, 8-9.

³¹ Ibid, 9.

moment of attack, because the insurgent army's aim was to minimize casualties while carrying out the most destructive acts against their enemy's material, which would then result in the lack of supplies being used on the front line and make it easier for Lawrence's men to starve their enemy and kill them.

The last factor to Lawrence's method of insurgency is the psychological element. Lawrence divides the audience of psychological warfare into five categories, which are his soldiers, the enemy, people who are neutral, the nation supporting their fight (British Empire), and the hostile nation. He states,

We had to arrange their minds in order of battle, just as carefully and as formally as other officers arranged their bodies: and not only our own men's minds, them first: the minds of the enemy, so far as we could reach them: and thirdly, the mind of the nation supporting us behind the firing-line, and the mind of the hostile nation waiting the verdict, and the neutrals looking on.³²

Lawrence saw this element of war as the most ethical for their fight. Their weapon of choice was the printing press, which is what the Arab fighters mainly depended on in regards to victory. Lawrence regards the printing press as the greatest weapon in the armory of the modern commander because Lawrence and his forces were amateurs of command, but their weapon attacked people socially.³³ What this means is that through propaganda, Lawrence was able to bring the war to his home country as well as other tribal groups to get involved in the fight against the Turks. This was the new weapon of war while most twentieth century generals continued to use the oldest weapon in history, which were human beings.³⁴

Lawrence believed that this psychological weapon is metaphysical meaning that it is an abstract concept that requires theory and creativity. He believed this weapon should not go unused during World War I. For example, Lawrence says "We had won a province when we had taught the civilians in it to die for our ideal of freedom".³⁵ Lawrence uses a verbal form of propaganda so that he can appeal to the civilians and win the "hearts and minds" of the people, which promotes civilians to fight with them since freedom is the reason why the Arab fighters chose to rebel in the first place. Another example of the psychological element being used against his enemy is in the invasion of Medina. Instead of assaulting Medina, Lawrence's strategy was to keep the enemy in Medina. With factors such as food and water coming into play, this would force the enemy to relocate to the railways. The idea was to keep the railways working to slightly boost the enemy's confidence but as soon as the enemy attempts to use the railways to transport

³² Ibid, 11.

³³ Ibid, 11.

³⁴ Ibid, 11.

³⁵ Ibid, 12.

troops, Lawrence and his men would attack or blow up railway cars and railroad tracks.³⁶ The end result was to psychologically discomfort the enemy. Ultimately, Lawrence expanded his paper on the evolution of revolution and publishing it in the 1929 version of the Encyclopedia Britannica.³⁷ In this version, Lawrence adds in two new sections titled “Range over force” and “The exact science of guerrilla warfare”. The latter discusses how guerilla warfare is two percent in striking force and ninety-eight percent passively sympathetic, and the first section discusses how being an invisible force is more important than gunpowder.³⁸ Lawrence’s analysis of his own campaigns in the Middle East transformed indirect warfare by providing a guideline and limitations. While Lawrence’s strategy was different from Clausewitz teachings in regards to indirectly harming the enemy, the goal of Lawrence’s indirect approach was bloodless warfare for both civilians and the enemy. Unfortunately, this was not the case, but his teachings resonated with military officials after the First World War.

In addition to the analysis of his own insurgency campaign, Lawrence began thinking of counterinsurgency in ways to defend the Empire in the Middle East with the use of airplanes. From the advent of the airplane until after World War I, British combat airplanes were used for reconnaissance in colonies and the Middle East during the war.³⁹ Primarily in Lawrence’s campaigns, planes were used to resupply his insurgent fighters, which was a rare occasion considering the main focus of the First World War was to save Europe.⁴⁰ With the wake of the Iraqi revolt in the 1920s, Winston Churchill was working with a community of Arab intelligence agents, such as Lawrence, to familiarize himself with Arab fighters and the terrain. Churchill and his cohorts looked to cut back on infantry in the Middle East because of other rebellions taking place in the Empire and because of the vast mysterious terrain of the Middle East that consisted of harsh weather conditions and the inability to navigate the desert. At the beginning of the war, there were about ninety thousand troops, and the British government continued to ask for more troops even though British soldiers dying in large numbers.⁴¹ Lawrence believed that in order to avoid the same calamities on the Western Front in Iraq, he states, “What the Arabs did yesterday the Air Force may do to-morrow...yet more swiftly”.⁴² Lawrence understood the success of his insurgency tactics implemented in the Arab insurrection

³⁶ Ibid, 12.

³⁷ “T.E. Lawrence on Guerrilla Warfare | Guerrilla Warfare | Britannica.com,” accessed July 22, 2016, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/T-E-Lawrence-on-guerrilla-warfare-1984900>.

³⁸ “T.E. Lawrence on Guerrilla Warfare | Guerrilla Warfare | Britannica.com,”

³⁹ Robert F. Grattan, *The Origins of Air War: Development of Military Air Strategy in World War I* (I.B.Tauris, 2009), 152

⁴⁰ Ibid, 139.

⁴¹ “A Report on Mesopotamia by T.E. Lawrence - World War I Document Archive,” accessed June 26, 2016, https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/A_Report_on_Mesopotamia_by_T.E._Lawrence; T. E. LAWRENCE., “Arab Rights,” *The Times*, July 23, 1920, The Times Digital Archive

⁴² Priya Satia, “The Defense of Inhumanity: Air Control and the British Idea of Arabia,” *The American Historical Review* 111, no. 1 (February 1, 2006): 16–51, doi:10.1086/ahr.111.1.16, 29.

against the Turks and to combat that, the airplane could do exactly what the insurrection forces could do, which was pressing everywhere yet assailable nowhere.⁴³ By 1922, the strategy changed for the rebellion with fighter planes and bombers becoming more of a force and pivot point in the revolt, but large numbers of infantry were still implemented in the war.

Ultimately, Lawrence's strategy of using a few airplanes to conduct bombardment campaigns, reconnaissance, and resupplying, in cooperation with tactical infantry, was taken out of context. The Royal Air Force missions totaled 4,008 hours; 97 tons of bombs were dropped; 183,861 rounds were fired; nine pilots killed and seven wounded; and eleven aircrafts destroyed behind enemy lines.⁴⁴ Along with these statistics, pilot disorientation, visibility problems, and the inability to identify objects such as friendly armored cars and Arab tribes migrating throughout the country resulted in various inaccuracies and incidents that resulted in innocent civilians dying. Economically, this war cost the British government forty million pounds, which was more than the cost of the British funded Arab insurrection against the Ottoman Empire in 1917 to 1918.⁴⁵ During the war, Lawrence displayed his disgust with the British governments over exploitation of combined aerial and ground tactics in a newspaper entry in the *Sunday Times*.⁴⁶ With the killing of innocent people and the atrocities of the Iraqi revolt looking similar to the destruction of World War I, Lawrence walked away from his RAF position and the Imperial office position to continue working on military literature and further developing his book *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. Lawrence was distraught by the results of the Iraqi revolt because from his campaigns, he understood irregular warfare as bloodless because it depended on less attacks. His superior officers took terror as the underlying principle of the strategy, which is something that continued to happen in most counterinsurgency campaigns.⁴⁷ Although Lawrence was upset by the misuse of his strategy in the 1920 revolt, his military writings earned him an enormous amount of attention by military thinkers and officials who sought to reform the British military due to the calamities of World War I.

The Legacy Continues

After the War, Lawrence's tactics caught the attention of many military tacticians, but the two most notable men are Liddell Hart and Orde Wingate. Liddell Hart was a military thinker and historian. Hart was gazetted second Lieutenant in the King's Own

⁴³ Ibid, 29; Quoted in Liddell Hart, "T.E. Lawrence," 438. See also Lawrence, "Twenty-seven Articles"; Lawrence, "Evolution of a Revolt" 107, 112-113, 116, 122; Lawrence, *The Seven Pillars*, 192, 196.

⁴⁴ The Guardian, Jonathan Glancey, 19 April 2003, Retrieved 16.05.2012.

⁴⁵ Vinogradov, Amal. "The 1920 Revolt in Iraq Reconsidered: The Role of Tribes in National Politics," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.3, No.2 (Apr., 1972): 138; The Guardian, Jonathan Glancey, 19 April 2003, Retrieved 16.05.2012.

⁴⁶ "A Report on Mesopotamia by T.E. Lawrence - World War I Document Archive."

⁴⁷ Priya Satia, "The Defense of Inhumanity: Air Control and the British Idea of Arabia," 34.

Yorkshire light infantry on the Western Front.⁴⁸ From his experience on the Western Front, Hart began pushing against the notion of direct warfare and began leaning towards indirect warfare. His motives were mainly to improve war-fighting techniques in which J. F. C. Fuller, who was an army officer, focused on the quick intelligence in the South African Wars, and quick tank mobility in World War I. This influenced Hart and was the beginning of his change in military thought.

Under the influence of Fuller, Hart published great works such as *Paris, or, The Future War*, and *The Remaking of Modern armies*, which would help Hart acquire an international reputation as a military critic.⁴⁹ Eventually, Hart began constructing larger theoretical and historical structures of indirect warfare that would soon overshadow Fullers theorems. Hart ultimately took Fuller's theorems in new, more radical directions, and indeed began to surpass him in influence. Originally, Hart used William T. Sherman, the American General during the Civil War, as a case study for his theorems on indirect warfare, but this was limiting because Sherman was dead, and Hart needed recent historical examples to point to. He still released a biography about Sherman, which emphasized the indirect approach that Sherman used during the Civil War, but it didn't quite encapsulate indirect war because Fuller released his biography on Ulysses S. Grant, which received good reviews as well. Hart wanted to do more for military theory because he had already contributed indirect warfare as a new interpretation of war, but he needed something or someone that would put a wedge between his theory and Fuller's theories.⁵⁰ For Hart's theorems on indirect war, he closely analyzes movement, deception and surprise, resulting in the "dislocation of the enemy's psychological and physical balance".⁵¹ The influence of Fuller and Sherman would eventually be replaced by T.E. Lawrence as both his new character of influence and his living embodiment of indirect-approach theory. Lawrence's interpretation of his own campaigns reformed his interpretation of British military strategy, which is seen through his conversations with Liddell Hart.

When Hart began writing his famous book, *The Decisive Wars of History*, which set the groundwork for his theory on indirect warfare, Hart reached out to Lawrence in a letter to discuss the theme of his book. He states "It's theme was, in brief, that a direct approach to one's mental object, or physical object, tends to stiffen resistance and this leads to a negative result as well as a waste of strength; and that the dislocation of opposition, psychological and physical, should precede the attempt to overcome it."⁵²

⁴⁸ H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison, eds., "Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart" in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁴⁹ Matthew and Harrison, "Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart".

⁵⁰ Matthew and Harrison, "Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart".

⁵¹ B. H. Liddell Hart, *The Decisive Wars of History*, 1929, 5.

⁵² T. E. Lawrence, *T.E. Lawrence to His Biographer, Liddell Hart; Information about Himself, in the Form of Letters, Notes, Answers to Questions and Conversations*. [1st ed.] (New York,: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1938), 5.

Military theorist such as Hart have been writing about indirect warfare before Lawrence, but indirect warfare was simply a theory that reverted back to older historical figures such as Sherman. Now that Lawrence has experienced indirect warfare, indirect approach is no longer just a theory that is dependent on old historical examples. It is now a theory with the perfect practitioner that can give advice and critique indirect approach theories, which is Lawrence of Arabia.

Hart writes to Lawrence saying that in his youthful war studies, he had a strong natural tendency towards the manoeuvre thesis, also known as the manoeuvre theory, which is a theory that is similar to Clausewitz opinion of the offensive but was not practiced during World War I because trench warfare was more appealing. Hart believed his natural inclinations were yielded because of popular opinion, which according to other generals, they advocated for trench warfare. In his immature days, he was always ready to assume that popular opinion was right until facts proved popular opinion contrary.⁵³ With the lively evidence of Lawrence's success in manoeuvre warfare, Clausewitz battle dogma of stationary warfare was now being challenged. Lawrence responds to Hart's comments with a few comments of his own along with a few pointers about indirect approach and manoeuvre warfare, which mainly deals with the number of soldiers that are on the battlefield. In Lawrence's response to Hart, he agrees with Hart's firm belief in pushing away from the Clausewitz dogma. Lawrence critiques Clausewitz theory as having "no humanity", which makes it an inanimate science that has no form of art.⁵⁴ Basically, Lawrence is saying that Clausewitz warfare, disregards human life at the expense of victory and completing objectives. On the other hand, he praises military generals such as Maurice De Saxe, who implemented surprise attacks in his military campaign in Prague. Saxe's methods were written down his famous book, *Mes Reveries*, but they would soon be eclipsed by Clausewitz interpretation of war as the end goal being mass destruction of the enemy. Lawrence believed that Saxe's interpretation of war contained elements of art and it breathes life.⁵⁵ Saxe's interpretation of war does not implement the same elements that Lawrence's strategy entails, instead it implements elements of a smaller army defeating a larger army in head to head combat, but to Lawrence, this entails that the underdogs use logical approach in warfare as oppose to Clausewitz approach that is illogical because it only equates to numbers and destruction.

Furthermore, his comments on Hart's interpretation of the Persian army where he gives a few pointers about indirect approach and manoeuvre warfare, which mainly deals with the number of soldiers that are on the battlefield. When Lawrence analyzed Hart's depiction of the Persian standing army, he states, "The size of the Persian army imposed 'direct' approach. Very few people will use skill if brute force will do the trick. The worst

⁵³ Ibid, 6.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid, 7.

thing for a good general is to have superior numbers, only an Allenby can resist that temptation".⁵⁶ Lawrence points out to Hart that numbers don't mean everything but unfortunately, most British generals don't believe that except General Allenby, which is the only British officer that gave Lawrence a chance to use a different strategy outside of attrition.

Historically, this interaction between Lawrence and Hart is important. It's important because although Lawrence died in 1935, Hart would carry on his legacy in a crucial time when the British Empire would experience the horrific effects of The Great Depression, and the loss of colonies that fought for independence during the interwar period because of Woodrow Wilson's statements of "self-determination" after the war. For example, vital colonies to the British Empire such as Egypt, Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa as well as revolts taking place in Palestine, brought the British into conflicts all over the world.

In order to defend the Empire and its colonies from further insurrections, Liddell Hart is important because of works such as *Europe in Arms*, and *The Reorientation of the Regular Army for Imperial Defence*, which would catch the attention of Neville Chamberlain. The focus of these papers were about the cutback on infantry troops fighting on different continents in exchange for small-mechanized mobility, which is quick transportation for small infantry soldiers that are accompanied by a few light tanks for back up.⁵⁷ In fact, Lawrence talked about this method of fighting as well as using this strategy before Hart would ever put his strategy on paper, but it was in reference to the Arab fighters fighting against the Turks. Lawrence states, "Tactically we must develop a highly mobile, highly equipped type of army, of the smallest size, and use it successively at distributed points of the Turkish line, to make the Turks reinforce their occupying posts beyond the economic minimum of twenty men".⁵⁸ At the same time, Lawrence is quoted in Hart's book, *Europe in Arms*, advocating for the use of airplanes in suppressing insurrections.⁵⁹ The same tactically small army and airplane usage that Lawrence proposed is similar to Hart's idea of a reformed British military. This mobile and small tactical force is economically manageable, and the response times are acceptable for an Empire like Britain that has to maintain the remaining colonies that they have leading into World War II.⁶⁰ This would all be put into practice in the Palestinian revolt of 1936 to 1939, but it would be executed by a soldier who was fairly close to Lawrence.

Unfortunately, the reorientation of the Regular army into small tactical forces did not happen during World War II on the continent of Europe, but it happened in colonies where the British defended from the Japanese and the Italians. During the interwar

⁵⁶ Ibid, 7.

⁵⁷ Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *The Memoirs of Captain Liddell Hart* (G. P., 1965), 56.

⁵⁸ T.E. Lawrence, "Evolution of Revolutions," accessed June 24, 2016, 13.

⁵⁹ Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Europe in Arms* (Random house, 1937), 255.

⁶⁰ Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Europe in Arms* (Random house, 1937), 145,149.

period and World War II, campaigns such as Orde Wingate's were funded and similar to Lawrence's campaigns in the Middle East. Orde Wingate, Lawrence's distant cousin, would carry on Lawrence's legacy of irregular warfare but under the strategy of British counterinsurgency in the Palestinian Revolt of 1936 to 1939. Originally, the policy was to use British officers to train Jewish fighters, but the Palestinian revolt spiraled out of control.⁶¹

Although most scholars have noticed that Orde Wingate has engaged in counterinsurgency before the mass publication of Lawrence's work, military officials notice the vast similarities between Lawrence and Wingate. For example, Archibald Wavell writes, "It was not till the later stages of our acquaintance that I knew of his kinship with T.E. Lawrence. There were obvious likenesses between the two and just as obvious difference. [Both men] cutting through conventional practice and tradition where necessary and caring little for received forms".⁶² Seeing the success of Lawrence in World War I could've ultimately inspired more British generals to fund Wingate's counterinsurgency campaigns in the Palestinian revolt and after. Both men were assigned jobs that required them to infiltrate the enemy behind enemy lines, which required the neglect of higher officers coordinating their campaigns. The big difference between Lawrence and Wingate is the fact that Lawrence was an amateur of war while Wingate had a professional background. Lawrence, dealing with nomad Arab fighters, was apt to scoff at questions of transport and supply and to leave them to take care of themselves; Wingate, who had to use town-bred men for partisan warfare, supplied his forces by original methods, but he devoted the greatest care and attention to it".⁶³ Wingate brings more political order to the counterinsurgency strategy than Lawrence. Considering Lawrence didn't care for the British political motives after World War I, Wingate actually cares about the internal security strategy that is supposed to enhance the states imperial control.⁶⁴ Outside of that, Lawrence's strategy of small indirect war is still implemented in the standing army during the Palestinian revolt.

By September 1936, Wingate arrived in Palestine to correct the insurgencies in the Palestinian region due to the British's contradicting policies in the Middle East. Under the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, Britain had promised that once they had cleared the Ottoman Turks out of the Holy land they would use their best endeavors to bring about a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. At the same time, the document they created inflicted acts of discrimination to the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities.⁶⁵ Tensions flared and as a result, the Palestinian

⁶¹ "A Policy For Palestine," *The Times*, July 8, 1937, The Times Digital Archive.

⁶² Archibald Percival Wavell Wavell (Earl of), *The Good Soldier* (Macmillan, 1948),

⁶³ Wavell, *The Good Soldier*.

⁶⁴ Major Mark D. Lehenbauer, *Orde Wingate And The British Internal Security Strategy During The Arab Rebellion In Palestine, 1936-1939* (Pickle Partners Publishing, 2014), 5.

⁶⁵ John Bierman and Colin Smith, *Fire in the Night* (Pan Macmillan, 2015), 57.

Mayor of Haifa imported rifles from outside sources to defend the Arab population, which brought the British government into the conflict.⁶⁶ Beginning as an intelligence officer, Wingate quickly realized who the British allies were, which the Jews were. Wingate proposed that “a) arm the Jews b) proclaim martial law and arrest and exile every Arab notable to find ourselves able to master the revolt with no more than the eight battalions already here...”⁶⁷ Just like Lawrence, Wingate’s main goal is to isolate the enemy and weaken the enemy by exiling important Arab leaders. With the basis of his strategy created, the formation of the Anglo-Jewish guerilla army, Special Night Squad, was created. This Special Forces group was mixed with both British troops and Jewish fighters, they attacked at night, and the goal was to create a small, flexible unit led by junior British leadership that required a move away from “conventional” approaches in both the organization and tactics.⁶⁸

With the start of World War II, the revolt in Palestine was a sideshow to a sideshow.⁶⁹ With the invasion of France and Czechoslovakia by Hitler, there were not enough military resources to go around, which is similar to Lawrence’s circumstances of the Western Front overshadowing the affairs dealing with the Turks. Wingate ultimately called his strategy “moving ambushes” where they would raid cities and villages.⁷⁰ Ultimately, these moving ambushes were the offensive implications that both Hart and Lawrence, primarily Lawrence, theorized for counterinsurgency. Unfortunately, these night raids began to produce negative affects once friendly fire became an issue that would place Wingate in the hospital for a few months. Once Wingate was release, his tactics, direction, and the quality of the intelligence he was getting began to produce success that were not common for units that only contained one-hundred and fifty soldiers.⁷¹ One tactic that was picked up by Wingate’s rebel fighters were the planting of land mines instead of direct engagement with the enemy, which is a practice that is still used by Israelis today along the West Bank and Gaza Strip.⁷²

With continuing success, Wingate would soon change the insurgency tactics that were similar to Lawrence in which he began to coordinate a special relationship between artillery and infantry to guarantee even faster maneuvering by his counter-guerilla fighters.⁷³ This relationship would eventually guarantee him victors in places like Akavia. His notoriety would come at the expense of his relationship with Liddell Hart.

⁶⁶ “The Palestine Inquiry,” *The Times*, January 25, 1937, The Times Digital Archive.

⁶⁷ Bierman and Smith, *Fire in the Night*, 65.

⁶⁸ Lehenbauer, *Orde Wingate And The British Internal Security Strategy During The Arab Rebellion In Palestine, 1936-1939*, 15.

⁶⁹ Bierman and Smith, *Fire in the Night*, 89.

⁷⁰ Lehenbauer, *Orde Wingate And The British Internal Security Strategy During The Arab Rebellion In Palestine, 1936-1939*, 50.

⁷¹ Bierman and Smith, *Fire in the Night*, 109.

⁷² Bierman and Smith, *Fire in the Night*, 109

⁷³ Bierman and Smith, *Fire in the Night*, 114.

Wingate and Hart had a relationship of their own. At this time Hart was working as an advisor to Secretary of State for War, Leslie Hore-Belisha, and his main job after writing his essay on the reorientation of the British army was to supply her with documented evidence that small mobile forces worked. In return Wingate supplied Hart with documentation of the Special Night Forces strategies and success rate.⁷⁴ Originally Hart was supposed to coordinate a meeting between Wingate and Winston Churchill, but Wingate's success stories on the battlefield caught the attention of Churchill before Hart could schedule the meeting.⁷⁵ Churchill began refer to Wingate as another Lawrence of Arabia.⁷⁶

In their meeting, Churchill introduced Wingate to President Roosevelt and other high-ranking officers in 1943. The audience was so impressed that Churchill, Roosevelt, and the U.S. generals provided Wingate with his own air force and navy to improve his long-range penetration unit, which were exactly the same implementations that Hart quoted Lawrence saying in his book, *Europe in Arms*. The No. 1 Air Commando unit was born, and their job was to supply Wingate and his troops with supplies and "artillery" from the sky.⁷⁷ The recognition from Western leaders that Wingate received for his strategy, which was similar to Lawrence's strategy of insurgency and his theoretical work on reforming the British army, set the basis for British counterinsurgency. Unfortunately with the evolution of military technology after World War I and Lawrence's inability to explicitly talk about the treatment of civilians during counterinsurgencies, or insurgencies, left the door open for officials like Wingate, and generals after him, to allow their men to treat civilians however they wanted even though there were international rules against brute force used against civilians.

What does this mean for Civilians?

Lawrence believed that the main goal for civilians was to win the "hearts and minds of the people", so they had to be treated well.⁷⁸ This phrase is broken down into two segments, which is winning the "heart" means to persuade people and their interest and winning the "mind" is to convince people that resistance is pointless.⁷⁹ The only problem is that Lawrence never explicitly stated what treating civilians "well" meant. Along with the evolution of military technology coming out of World War I and the interwar period, this would have severe ramifications on the civilian population. For example during the

⁷⁴ Lehenbauer, *Orde Wingate And The British Internal Security Strategy During The Arab Rebellion In Palestine, 1936-1939*, 61.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 61.

⁷⁶ Boot, *Invisible Armies*, 31.

⁷⁷ Ibid, 31.

⁷⁸ T.E. Lawrence, "Evolution of Revolutions," accessed June 24, 2016

⁷⁹ "The New (and Old) Classics of Counterinsurgency | Middle East Research and Information Project," accessed June 23, 2016, http://www.merip.org/mer/mer255/new-old-classics-counterinsurgency?ip_login_no_cache=bf61b4e8e8539492122c455e7fdc5ff6.

Palestinian revolt, there are known documentation of the Special Night Forces committing inhumane and horrific acts of terror against the Arab civilian populations in Palestine.

Most important was the establishment of the Special Night Squad by Ode Wingate, a British officer, who 'went out to beat the Arab gangs at their own game. His methods were extreme and cruel'. The Special Night Squads, Jewish volunteers under British officers, were what today would be called 'death squads', torturing and summarily executing prisoners and suspects. While the Jewish agency cooperated with the British, the Revisionists through their underground militia, the Irgun, carried out a series of terrorist bombings on Palestinian civilian targets.⁸⁰

The fact that British officers are allowing their men and their units to commit inhumane acts on civilian populations are actually a violation of rules that were made for their imperial army. According to military pamphlets such as *Notes on Imperial Policing in 1934*, and in 1937, the *Duties in the aid of the Civil Power*, these pamphlets were clear on how soldiers and military officials should act in colonial conflicts when it comes to civilians. For example, soldiers were not allowed to mistreat or steal from civilians.⁸¹ Soldiers were seen as citizens and held under military law, so any violation of rules that were within the two pamphlets stated above would result in punishment. Although these were the rules and maxims for the British military, there were plenty of ambiguities. For example, there was a legal framework to shoot rioters, and allowed for collective punishment.⁸²

Neither pamphlets actually provided a clear definition of collective punishment, but for soldiers the law was clear, which was to use collective punishment and retribution as a last resort against any religion, race or class. Unfortunately, the 1929 law authorized collective punishment in places where terrorism needed to be checked. In places where armed insurrection was present, the justification to use any degree of force necessary was implemented against anyone and everyone.⁸³

In terms of soldiers being convicted, this was a rare occasion because infantry units could not be charged as a collective but instead, soldiers were convicted as individuals, which would rarely occur. Within the colonies, the military had a freer hand than in Britain.⁸⁴ By 1936, British soldiers could not be susceptible to civil court trials. Along with British military laws, there were laws of war. At conventions such as Geneva and The Hague before 1936, War laws were only geared towards Prisoners of War and not

⁸⁰ John Newsinger, *The Blood Never Dried: A People's History of the British Empire* (Bookmarks, 2006), 139.

⁸¹ M. Hughes, "The Banality of Brutality: British Armed Forces and the Repression of the Arab Revolt in Palestine, 1936-39," *The English Historical Review* CXXIV, no. 507 (April 1, 2009): 316.

⁸² *Ibid*, 316.

⁸³ *Ibid*, 317.

⁸⁴ *Ibid* 317.

civilians. Therefore, until 1945, the British were able to treat civilians in their colonial domains however they pleased. In terms of prisoners of war, the military classified the Arab revolt as an internal insurrection and not an international war and Prisoners of War were treated poorly. As a result, the British treated captured Arab guerillas fighters as civilian criminals subject to ordinary civil law, which would result in most Arab fighters receiving the death penalty.⁸⁵ The British would also raid villages, capture civilians, and classify the as POW's in areas that they thought were in affiliation with insurgents.

While Arab fighters were receiving the death penalty and other cruel and unusual forms of punishment, civilian populations were suffering at the hands of the British Military as well. As a part of collective punishment and British counterinsurgency tactics in Palestine, troops would destroy Palestinian property across rural and urban areas along with vandalism.⁸⁶ At the beginning of the war this was justified because of the lack of air support, radio communication and intelligence in order to fight the rebel groups. Once these factors were implemented, the British launched a two-pronged military approach that targeted enemy fighters and the civilians to further draw out the enemy. The mistreatment of civilians in counterinsurgency would continue even after the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human rights and the amended Geneva Protocols after World War II.⁸⁷ These inhumane acts would continue but in different forms such as population resettlement, which undermined the insurgent's political appeal and created a psychological barrier between them and the civilian population.⁸⁸ The goal is to physically destroy the insurgents by isolating them from the civilians, an idea that was advocated by Lawrence but taken to the extreme. This would take place in later examples of British counterinsurgency such as Malaya and Kenya where civilians were placed in villages that were enclosed with barbed-wired fences where living conditions were horrific.⁸⁹ The strategy became both a psychological and physical control over the civilian population, but counterinsurgency would continue to be widely used in contemporary situations. A recent example is the war in Iraq in 2003. Today, British and American counterinsurgency field manuals still cite aspects of previous British counterinsurgency campaigns as examples of best practice, for example Malaya and Kenya, which were quite similar to Palestine and Burma campaigns that were under the command of Orde Wingate.⁹⁰

Lawrence's practice of insurgency became the basis for British counterinsurgency. With the evolution and notoriety of indirect warfare in the British military by Liddell Hart, and the ruthless strategy that was adopted and modified by Orde Wingate,

⁸⁵Ibid, 318.

⁸⁶Ibid, 320.

⁸⁷Howard Zinn, *Terrorism and War* (Seven Stories Press, 2011), 123 Appendix A.

⁸⁸French, *The British Way in Counter-Insurgency, 1945-1967*, 3.

⁸⁹Ibid, 6.

⁹⁰Ibid, 1-2.

counterinsurgency would go on to influence the British military for the remainder of the 20th century. Not only did Lawrence's strategy, and the strategy used during the Palestinian revolt influence the British military, it also influenced the U.S. military as well in Iraq. In the U.S. Army/Marines corps field manual, General David Petraeus calls for leaders who are both nation builders and culturally astute leaders.⁹¹ Culturally, this is similar to Lawrence because Lawrence embodied Arabic culture, which helped him interact with the Arab fighters. Petraeus isn't asking for his men to be as extreme as Lawrence, but what he is asking for are cultural specialists.⁹² He ordered his senior officers to read Lawrence's *Twenty-Seven Articles* so that they could learn how to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people through the embrace of Arabic culture. Unfortunately, Petraeus skipped over the fact that Lawrence's article only applied to Bedouin's, who are a small ethnic group in the Middle East which equated to two percent of the Iraqi population, so interacting with Arab townspeople required a different method eventually.⁹³

In Iraq, mobile mechanized infantry, artillery, and the air force to increase mobility for infantry forces are similar to the tactics used in Palestine in the late 1930s. The combination of air and ground raids were used to maximize and enhance the "time and speed" and not the firepower of the war, which is something the Counterinsurgency Field Manual and its cohorts would take from Lawrence and emphasize in the war.⁹⁴ Time was definitely important in Iraq considering the use of counterinsurgency in Vietnam, which turned into a long and drawn out war. In order to maximize time, the U.S. military used small-scale "cordon and search" operations, which created a whole new set of dangers for military and police personnel because they made themselves static targets at checkpoints or on patrol through the streets for snipers, suicide attacks and improvised explosive devices.⁹⁵ Once U.S. troops experienced the horrific dangers of an Iraq that differed from the one the British fought in the twentieth century, U.S. troops knew they had to psychologically and logistically prepare for a long haul battle.⁹⁶

There are multiple reasons why the Iraq war did not succeed, but the parameters that previous British counterinsurgencies were conducted under were not applicable to the recent Iraq war. The U.S. war manual cited Lawrence as saying, "Do not try to do too

⁹¹ John A. United States Army and United States Marine Corps, *The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual* (University of Chicago Press, 2008), Forward xlvi.

⁹² James Hevia, *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia* (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 263.

⁹³ Anderson, *Lawrence in Arabia*, 347.

⁹⁴ "The New (and Old) Classics of Counterinsurgency | Middle East Research and Information Project," accessed June 23, 2016, http://www.merip.org/mer/mer255/new-old-classics-counterinsurgency?ip_login_no_cache=bf61b4e8e8539492122c455e7fdc5ff6.

⁹⁵ Andrew Mumford, *The Counter-Insurgency Myth: The British Experience of Irregular Warfare* (Routledge, 2012), 18.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 18.

much with your own hands. Better the Arabs do it tolerably than that you do it perfectly. It is their war, and you rare to help them, not to win it for them.”⁹⁷ The keyword in Lawrence’s advice was “tolerably” and since the Iraqi government could not perform, the U.S. had to step in as a counterinsurgency force.⁹⁸ The problem with this interpretation is that the Iraqi government was the enemy, and the host nation’s army was destroyed and disbanded. There were insurgency forces that were alive and active along with Al Qaeda presence in Iraq, but Saddam Hussein and his forces were the original enemy of the U.S. in this situation. As a result, the insurgency was created and did not happen naturally. The U.S. didn’t start training Iraqi police counterinsurgency forces until after the Invasion of Iraq was complete in 2003 and move into the occupation phase.⁹⁹ Therefore, the U.S. could not use Lawrence’s advice of “tolerable” performance, because the people of Iraq never had counterinsurgency fighters to fighter against Saddam Hussein and his army to begin with. The Iraq war was a speculation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD’s), the potential harboring of terrorists, and religious conflicts between Sunni and Shi’ite Muslims. It was not a case of insurgency and counterinsurgency forces battling.

As the growth of failure continued, the U.S. did not succeed in psychologically swaying their enemy, their allies, the American public, and the Iraqi public. With heavy bombardments in the invasion, totaled roughly 3,200 to 4,300 civilians died, but a few scholars believe that around 7,500 civilians died during the invasion phase in which U.S. forces killed roughly thirty seven percent of civilian victims.¹⁰⁰¹⁰¹ Insurgent’s definitely played on the American and British unpopularity after the general public would see these numbers as well as the Iraqi population.¹⁰² With the advancement of communication technology, Lawrence’s tactics of isolating the enemy, known today as territorial concepts, would not work because of technology such as the Internet and social media.¹⁰³ These would be the driving forces behind the continuation of the insurrection and longevity of the war to last quite a long time. Allies such as Tony Blair, Prime Minister of England, believed that Iraq was a mistake and with the combination of aerial destruction, ground troop destruction, and the fragmentation of the Iraqi government led to the rise of ISIS after the war.¹⁰⁴ While Blair’s statement alludes to situations that

⁹⁷ John A. United States Army and United States Marine Corps, *The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual* (University of Chicago Press, 2008), 50.

⁹⁸ Ibid, 18.

⁹⁹ “Iraqi Police Service (IPS),” accessed July 24, 2016, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/iraq/ips.htm>.

¹⁰⁰ *“Iraq Body Count: A Dossier of Civilian Casualties in Iraq, 2003–2005.”* Archived from the original on 9 November 2009. Retrieved 2 May 2007.

¹⁰¹ *“The Wages of War: Iraqi Combatant and Noncombatant Fatalities in the 2003 Conflict.”* Commonwealth Institute of Cambridge. Archived from the original on 2 September 2009. Retrieved 13 September 2009.

¹⁰² Andrew Mumford, *The Counter-Insurgency Myth: The British Experience of Irregular Warfare*, 19.

¹⁰³ Ibid, 19.

¹⁰⁴ Tony Blair apologises for 'mistakes' over Iraq War and admits 'elements of truth' to view that invasion helped rise of Isis, *The Independent*, Richard Osley, October 25, 2015 Retrieved 28 October 2015.

are taking place right now, the elements of Lawrence's advice that were used in Iraq are outdated because today's complex of insurgencies are tactically savvy with the implementation of new age technology. Therefore, Lawrence's strategy was taken completely out of context.

In conclusion, Lawrence's written interpretation of insurgency and the new elements implemented, Lawrence's contribution to counterinsurgency was to make war limited, precise, and bloodless, and his legacy was carried on and modified by Sir Basil Liddell Hart and Orde Charles Wingate. Ultimately, his methods evolved into destructive warfare that affected civilians, which are still present in contemporary examples. Lawrence already had close ties and influence with Imperial War Ministers such as Winston Churchill, but his counterinsurgency tactics using aerial vehicles would be taken out of context and used for destructive purposes. With his first practice of counterinsurgency in the Iraqi revolt in the early 1920s, Lawrence continued to expand on his counterinsurgency strategy because of the horrific casualty statistics that he was exposed to as the war went on.

Ultimately, Lawrence served as a practicing model and advisor to Liddell Hart's interpretation of indirect warfare. Hart carried on Lawrence's legacy, and he went on to write books that would cite Lawrence's advice of using small-mechanized infantry and small aerial units to support the mechanized ground troops with the end goal being the reformation of the British regular army. Unfortunately, British involvement in World War II was on the horizon but in some parts of the Empire, these counterinsurgency tactics were put into practice, for example in places like Palestine during the revolt of the late 1930s, where Orde Wingate would continue to carry on Lawrence's tactics in practice.

Orde Wingate and his Special Night forces were a huge success. In turn, he would work with Hart and supply him with documents to show the government the success rates of small tactical armies in counterinsurgency campaigns. His success would also earn him a meeting with Churchill, President Roosevelt, and U.S. military officials who supplied him his own air force and his own implementation of artillery support, thus creating the long-range penetration tactic that would be used in Burma campaigns during World War II and suppressing insurrections.

The evolution and legacy of Lawrence's contribution to counterinsurgency became deadly for the civilian population. In Palestine, farms, buildings, and innocent people were caught in the crossfire between insurgents and counterinsurgents, which violated imperial hand books at the time and Prisoner of War laws as well. Even after the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Protocol, civilians during the Palestinian, Malayan and Kenyan campaigns would endure horrific conditions in villages. Lawrence's strategy was taken out of context, and terror and destruction became the underlying principle of counterinsurgency. These examples would go on to serve as

a successful reference for counterinsurgency in the invasion of Iraq in 2003, but the same strategy was not applicable considering the complexity of modern day insurgencies.

Bibliography

Anderson, Scott. *Lawrence in Arabia: War, Deceit, Imperial Folly and the Making of the Modern Middle East*. Reprint edition. New York: Anchor, 2014.

“A Policy For Palestine.” *The Times*. July 8, 1937. The Times Digital Archive.

“A Report on Mesopotamia by T.E. Lawrence - World War I Document Archive.” Accessed June 26, 2016.

https://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/A_Report_on_Mesopotamia_by_T.E._Lawrence.

Army, John A. United States, and United States Marine Corps. *The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual*. University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Bierman, John, and Colin Smith. *Fire in the Night*. Pan Macmillan, 2015.

Boot, Max. *Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.

Brown, Malcolm. *T. E. Lawrence In War And Peace: An Anthology of the Military Writings of Lawrence of Arabia*. Frontline Books, 2005.

“Carl von Clausewitz” | Prussian General | Britannica.com.” Accessed July 12, 2016. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Carl-von-Clausewitz>.

Clausewitz, Carl von, Michael Howard, and Peter Paret. *On War*. Princeton University Press, 1989.

French, David. *The British Way in Counter-Insurgency, 1945-1967*. OUP Oxford, 2011.

Grattan, Robert F. *The Origins of Air War: Development of Military Air Strategy in World War I*. I.B.Tauris, 2009.

Hart, Sir Basil Henry Liddell. *Europe in Arms*. Random house, 1937.

———. *The Memoirs of Captain Lidell Hart*. G. P., 1965.

Hevia, James. *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hughes, M. "The Banality of Brutality: British Armed Forces and the Repression of the Arab Revolt in Palestine, 1936-39." *The English Historical Review* CXXIV, no. 507 (April 1, 2009): 313–54.

Hughes, Matthew. *British Ways of Counter-Insurgency: A Historical Perspective*. Routledge, 2016.

"Iraq Body Count Press Release 12 (19 Jul 2005): Iraq Body Count." Accessed July 24, 2016. <https://www.iraqbodycount.org/analysis/reference/press-releases/12/>.

"Iraqi Police Service (IPS)." Accessed July 24, 2016.
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/iraq/ips.htm>.

"Iraqi Police Service (IPS)." Accessed July 24, 2016.
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/iraq/ips.htm>.

"Lawrence.pdf." Accessed June 24, 2016.
<http://www.cgsc.edu/carl/download/csipubs/lawrence.pdf>.

Lawrence, T. E. *Seven Pillars of Wisdom, a Triumph*. [Harmondsworth, Middlesex]: Penguin Books, n.d. <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/u516586>.

———. *T.E. Lawrence to His Biographer, Liddell Hart; Information about Himself, in the Form of Letters, Notes, Answers to Questions and Conversations*. [1st ed.]. New York,: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1938. <http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/u849114>.

Lehenbauer, Major Mark D. *Orde Wingate And The British Internal Security Strategy During The Arab Rebellion In Palestine, 1936-1939*. Pickle Partners Publishing, 2014.

MacMillan, Margaret. *The War That Ended Peace: The Road to 1914*. Random House Publishing Group, 2013.

Matthew, H. C. G., and B. Harrison, eds. "[No Title]." In *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34440>.

———. eds. “[No Title].” In *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33737>.

———. eds. “[No Title].” In *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36978/74917>.

Mumford, Andrew. *The Counter-Insurgency Myth: The British Experience of Irregular Warfare*. Routledge, 2012.

Newsinger, John. *The Blood Never Dried: A People’s History of the British Empire*. Bookmarks, 2006.

Wavell, Archibald Percival. *The Good Soldier*. Macmillan, 1948.

Our Middle East Correspondent. “British Policy in Shifting Sands.” *The Times*. May 19, 1961. The Times Digital Archive.

Peters, Ralph. “No Silver Bullets Fighting the Insurgency in Iraq: [1].” *Armed Forces Journal*, January 1, 2006, 36.

Porch, Douglas. *Counterinsurgency: Exposing the Myths of the New Way of War*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Satia, Priya. “The Defense of Inhumanity: Air Control and the British Idea of Arabia.” *The American Historical Review* 111, no. 1 (February 1, 2006): 16–51. doi:10.1086/ahr.111.1.16.

“Strachan-ClausewitzAndTheFirstWorldWar.pdf.” Accessed July 10, 2016. <https://www.clausewitz.com/bibl/JMHarchives/Strachan-ClausewitzAndTheFirstWorldWar.pdf>.

“Task Forces (Hansard, 23 February 2000).” Accessed June 29, 2016. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/2000/feb/23/task-forces#S5LV0610P0_20000223_HOL_71.

T. E. LAWRENCE. “Arab Rights.” *The Times*. July 23, 1920. The Times Digital Archive.

“T.E. Lawrence on Guerrilla Warfare | Guerrilla Warfare | Britannica.com.” Accessed

July 22, 2016. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/T-E-Lawrence-on-guerrilla-warfare-1984900>.

“The New (and Old) Classics of Counterinsurgency | Middle East Research and Information Project.” Accessed June 23, 2016.

http://www.merip.org/mer/mer255/new-old-classics-counterinsurgency?ip_login_no_cache=bf61b4e8e8539492122c455e7fdc5ff6.

“The Palestine Inquiry.” *The Times*. January 25, 1937. The Times Digital Archive.

“The Wages of War: Iraqi Combatant and Noncombatant Fatalities in the 2003 Conflict. PDA Research Monograph 8, 20 October 2003. Carl Conetta.” Accessed July 24, 2016.

<http://www.comw.org/pda/0310rm8.html#3.%20Iraqi%20noncombatant%20fatalities%20in%20the%202003>.

“Tony Blair Apologises for ‘Mistakes’ over Iraq War and Admits ‘Elements of Truth’ to View That Invasion Helped Rise of Isis | People | News | The Independent.” Accessed July 24, 2016. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/tony-blair-apologises-for-mistakes-over-iraq-war-and-admits-elements-of-truth-to-view-that-invasion-a6707776.html>.

Zinn, Howard. *Terrorism and War*. Seven Stories Press, 2011.

