



The Sharp End



Sabotage by Rules of Engagement

Since the 9/11 mass murder of over 2,000 American citizens by The US left has used its power to force the US Military to abide by new laws of land warfare that severely restrict the military and reduce it to a dishonored and humiliated body that at first loses its morale and then loses its ability to win. This state of affairs is brought about by strict adherence to Rules of Engagement (ROE) and mistaken interpretations of the Geneva Convention. Both sets of incredibly restrictive rules insure that the US military's very small number of combat troops will always lose in any tactical situation.

For example, the US Army's 3rd infantry Division that smashed through the Iraqi Army to take Baghdad in 2003, has complained of constricting ROEs in its after action report:

Issue: ROE target approval authority. 3ID (M)

Discussion: The ROE for targeting structures, including traditional military facilities, was much too restrictive. Approval for targeting structures was withheld to Coalition Force Land Component Command (CFLCC), Central Command (CENTCOM), and Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) levels, even in cases of time-sensitive targets. This significantly hindered the 3ID (M) from prosecuting valid military targets in a timely manner.

Recommendation: Withhold targeting approval authority for targets within the division's AO to no higher than division commander level.

The US Marines have been so demoralized by ROEs that now they are no longer an effective fighting force. The unappointed guardian of the ROE and its political correctness is the American

media. It is they that relentlessly pressure the military to expand and abide by ROE that effectively castrates the US military. Just as political correctness is tyrannical mind control that eradicates freedom of speech, so are ROEs radically imposed role transformations on the US military. These ROEs change them from potent combat forces to impotent victims who become unable to fight as the result of fear of bad press and command retaliation, which in turn leads to demoralization and mutiny.

Rules of Engagement (ROE) determine when, where, and how force shall be used. Such rules are both general and specific.

The US military officially defines ROE as:

"Directives issued by competent military authority which delineate the circumstances and limitations under which United States forces will initiate and/or continue combat.

The ROE deal with four issues:

- When can military force be used
- Where can military force be used
- Against whom should force be used in the circumstances described above
- How should military force be used to achieve the desired ends

The ROE take two forms:

- Actions a soldier may take without consulting a higher authority, unless explicitly forbidden (sometimes called 'command by negation')
- Actions that may only be taken if explicitly ordered by a higher authority (sometimes called 'positive command').

In addition to a typically large set of standing orders, military personnel will be given additional rules of engagement before performing any mission or military operation. These can cover circumstances such as how to retaliate after an attack, how to treat captured targets, which territories the soldier is bound to fight into, and how the force should be used during the operation.

The ROE are extremely important:

- They provide a consistent, understandable and repeatable standard on how forces act. Typically they are carefully thought out in detail well in advance of an engagement and may cover a number of scenarios, with different rules for each.
- They assist in the synchronization of political-diplomatic and military components of a strategy by allowing political commanders to better understand, forecast and tailor the actions of a force.

ROE failures:

In any engagement, the ROE need to balance two competing goals:

- The need to use force effectively to accomplish the mission objectives
- The need to avoid unnecessary force

This creates room for two types of error:

- Excessively tight ROE can constrain a commander from performing his mission effectively, called a Type I error. It is typical for the political leadership to constrain the actions of military commanders. This is often a source of tension between the political leaders, who are trying to accomplish a wider objective and the military commanders, who are trying make the most effective use of their forces.
- Excessively loose ROE can facilitate the escalation of a conflict, while being tactically effective, negates to political objectives that the use of force was meant to achieve. This is a Type II or 'escalatory' error.

Rules of Engagement are directions to the graveyard!

Rod "Breaker" McCoy