X Congreso AECPA

Murcia, 7 al 9 de septiembre de 2011

GT 6.1 Estudios estratégicos en el s. XXI: Análisis y Gestión de los nuevos conflictosWorking

"Un cuarto de siglo de participación española en guerras asimétricas: Leccions aprendidas"

Rafael Martinez

(Universidad de Barcelona):



"Spanish Asymmetric Warfare Experience"

SAMPLE:

	Officers	NCOs	Rank & File	Total
Air Force	5			5
Navy	6	5	20	31
Army	19	10	27	56
Total	30	15	47	92

- (i) Navy: Marines, submarines and auxiliaries navigation (Sonar, radio operator, machinery, administration...). The interviews were conducted in San Fernando (Cadis), Cartagena (Murcia) and Rota (Cadis)
- (ii) Army: Infantry (Light Infantry, Armoured Infantry, Parachutists), Artillery, Engineers. The interviews were conducted in Segovia, Madrid and Canary Islands
- (iii) Air force: Pilots. The interviews were conducted in Madrid, Zaragoza and Seville

Preliminary Conclusions

- a/International missions are regarded as a positive experience by military
- b/ Contacts with local population are good and cordial, whereas interaction with international troops is generally excellent
- c/ Military tend to regard the mass media with great suspicion
- d/There is a clear difference between the institutional/occupational military models,
 - (i) Motivation: Rank and file tend to seek personal growing (i.e., economically), whilst officers and most NCOs seek professional growing
 - (ii) ROE's: rank and file have no clear opinion, while officers and most of NCO's have quite negative opinions
- f/ Missions do not cause serious family-related problems. In case problems arise, relatives are the most important support to solve the situation
- g/Generally speaking, there are no serious problems readapting to normal life caused by missions



Missions

The Missions

1.-Name: ISAF, UNIFIL, KFOR, Operation Atalanta, Iraqi Freedom, EUFOR ALTHEA, MINUSTAH, EUFOR CHAD RCA, Solidarity Response

2.-Place: Afghanistan, Lebanon, Somalia, Kosovo, Bosnia, Iraq, Haiti, Chad, Indonesia

3.-Duration: average of 4-6 months

4.-Role: pilots, shooters, machine gunners, drivers, liaison officers, sonar operators, boat machine operators, clerical staff

First impressions.

a / Cultural (whether westernized or not)	9.5%
b / Poverty, misery, inequality, underdevelopment	18.3%
c / Tranquility, peace	14.4%
d / Destruction, devastation	7.7%
e / Unease ("this is a war"), anxiety, disorientation	8.7%
f/Newness	14.4%
g / Differences between missions	1.9%
h / Other	15.4%
i/ No answer	9.6%

No contact with local or international actors: None

1.- With local actors

2.1.Armed Forces

a/ No answer, 2.9%

b/No, 40.6%

56.5%

Contact Types:

Assessment

39.6% - Patrol,

-Check-point set, 13.2%

- Training, 13.2% a/Positive,

b/ Negative due to suspicion or mistrust, 14.5%

c/ Negative due to non-cooperation, 12.9%

d/ Negative, giving no reason, 6.4%

e/ No answer, 16.1%

50%

2.2. Authorities

a/No answer 7.7, %

b No, 54.8 %

c/Yes, 37.5%

Type of authorities:

a / Mayor, 50%

b / Religious leaders, 25%

c / Political leaders, 25%

Assessment

-Positive, 57.9%

- Negative for parasitism ("they

try to get anything from us"), 5.3%

-Negative for other reasons, 13.2%

- No answer, 23.7%

2.3. Local population

```
a/ No answer, 2.9%, b/ No, 11.5%
```

c/Yes, 85.6%,

Contact type:

Sportive, 3.65%

Humanitarian (medical, food), 14.6%

Military bases' local civilian personnel, 18.3%

Reconstruction tasks (infrastructures), 3.65%

Educational, 3.65%

Assessment:

Positive,		60%
Negative for being perceived as an ir	nvading army,	13.3%
Negative for the religious factor,		4.4%
Negative for they don't feel they rec	eive benefits,	2.2%
Negative for lack of cooperation (ind	lifference),	5.6%
Negative for other reasons,		3.3%
No specification,		11.2%

3.- With international actors

```
3.1.Armed Forces
```

a/No answer 4.8%,

b/ No, 11.5%

c/Yes, 83.7%

Types of contact:

Informal,

Formal,

30.8%

69.2%

Assessment:

Negative,	6.7%
Positive for learning new procedures,	6.7%
Positive for knowing other cultures,	1.1%
Positive for they are positive allies (sol	idarity), 4.5%
Positive for working together,	1.1%
Positive, with no explanation,	62.9 %
No answer,	16.9%
Language as a relationship factor:	

diomatic differences are a barrier to interact with foreign troops,

Has no problem to interact with foreign troops,

37.2%

List of countries with whom the Spanish Armed Forces have worked together:

Country (good relationship / total)

France	(21/21)	Nepal	(1/1)
United States	(19/20)	Chile	(1/1)
Italy	(16/17)	Bulgaria	(1/1)
Germany	(9/9)	Japan	(1/1)
Poland	(6/7)	Norway	(1/1)
United Kingdom	(5/5)	Cyprus	(1/1)
Indonesia	(5/5)	Indonesia	(1/1)
China	(3/3)	Australia	(1/1)
Ireland	(2/2)	Denmark	(1/1)
Portugal	(2/2)	Morocco	(1/1)
Malaysia	(2/2)	Croatia	(1/1)
Netherlands	(1/1)	Canada	(1/1)

3.2. International Organizations (institutions)

a/No answer, 6.7%

b/No, 71.2%

c/Yes, 22.1%

Which ones?:

UN World Food Program, 33.4%

ACNUR, 8.3%

Other UN agencies 32.3%

NATO civilian staff 26%

3.3. NGO		1Typologies:	
a/ No answer,	4.8%	- International,	3.3%
b/No,	66.3%	-National,	6.6%
c/Yes,	28.9%	-AECI (Spanish Agency for	
		the Development Cooperation),	20%
		-No specification,	70.1%

2.-Assessment:

Positive (giving no reason),	40%
Positive for collaboration, mutual learning,	6.7%
Negative for they don't pay attention to our suggestions,	3.3%
Negative for they don't have clear goals,	3.3%
Negative for we have different objectives,	10%
Negative for they just want security,	6.7%
No specification,	30%

4.- Journalists:

56.7% b/ Yes, 43.3% 1.-Type of journalist:

Working for the Ministry of Defence, Not working for the Ministry of Defence,

26.6%

No specification,

4.4%

2.-Assessment:

Two previous issues must be taken into account:

1: Talking to journalists is prohibited, unless a permission is given. They convey the information through the information board

2: Military personnel is given patterns of answers before the press interviews

Positive (giving no reason),

48.6%

Negative for distrusting,

20%

Negative for the pressmen distort the information,

8.5%

Negative for they don't appreciate our work,

5.7%

Negative with no specification,

17.2%

On the overall:

Positive, 48.6%

Rules Of Engagement (ROE)

c/Inadequate for they're too restrictive on the use of force, d/Inadequate for they're not clear, e/Inadequate for they impede a quick reaction time, f/Inadequate for other reasons, 1%	a/No answer,	23.1%
d/Inadequate for they're not clear, e/ Inadequate for they impede a quick reaction time, f/ Inadequate for other reasons, 1%	b/ Adequate,	34.6%
e/Inadequate for they impede a quick reaction time, 1% f/Inadequate for other reasons, 1%	c/Inadequate for they're too restrictive on the use of force,	27.9%
f/Inadequate for other reasons,	d/ Inadequate for they're not clear,	4.8%
	e/Inadequate for they impede a quick reaction time,	1%
g/ Inadequate with no specification, 7.7%	f/Inadequate for other reasons,	1%
	g/ Inadequate with no specification,	7.7%

Overall: Adequate, 34.6% Inadequate, 42.4%

Rules Of Engagement (ROE)

List of missions and % of adequate / in	adequate / no answer on ROE
---	-----------------------------

Mission	Number of Missions	Adequate	Inadequate	No answer
Lebanon	45	44%	40%	16%
Afghanistan	22	45%	36%	19%
Somalia	19	21%	47%	32%
Kosovo	15	26%	60%	14%
Bosnia-Herz.	16	44%	38%	18%
Iraq	9	66%	22%	12%
Haiti	5	20%	20%	60%
Chad	1	o%	100%	0%
Indonesia	1	100%	0%	0%
Total	133	40%	41%	19%

Training and education

1.-Length

```
      a/ 6 months (4 generals, 2 specifics),
      42.4%

      b/ 15 days,
      15.2%

      c/ Few days,
      42.4%
```

2.-Assessment

a/Adequate (it helps to fulfil the objectives),	58.7
b/ Inadequate for it is null or even inexistent ,	8.7
c/Inadequate for scarce specialization and cultural tips),	11.5
d/ Inadequate for too brief in time,	1
e/ Inadequate for it does not reflects the mission features,	4.8
f/Inadequate for the equipment used during the training and	
during the mission are not the same,	7.7
g/ Inadequate, giving no reason,	3.8
h/No answer ,	3.8

Operational experiences

Experience

1.- Casuistic:

a/ No answer,	2.8%
b/ Apply the acquired knowledge ,	35.1%
c/ Know other cultures,	49.3%
d/Shortage of resources, compensated by professionalism,	4.2%
e/ A larger budget is needed,	5.5%
f/Abandonment,	1.5%
g/ International coalitions work too slowly,	1.5%

2	$H \cap$	ctil	A ti	ıra.
4 .	\cdot	JUI	U I	пС.

b/No,	75%
c/No answer,	10.6%

3.- Performance

a/ Fulfilment of the objectives of the mission, 20.2%
b/ Personal performance, 74%
c/ No answer, 5.8%

Global evaluation of missions

F.- Enrichment:

1.- Cultural

a/Warfare tourism, 33.4% b/Clash, 36.3% c/Comparison of the culture of each mission,

2.- Personal

a/I get to appreciate my life and everything I have , 21% c/ Maturity, 6.4% d/I gain self-confidence 2.1%

30.3%

Improvements

a/ No, 57.7%

b/Yes, 42.3%

Which ones:

-Equipment (weapons, vehicles, facilities),	69.2%
-Life conditions,	2.2%
-Spare time,	6.6%
-Shorten the duration of the mission,	4.4%
-Stop limiting the number of personnel to be	
deployed	4.4%
- Idiomatic skills of the military personnel,	4.4%
-Higher autonomy of decision and action	
to the commanders on the field,	8.8%



a/No answer, 1% b/Compulsory, 4.8%

c/I follow my unit, 18.3%

d/ I volunteer, 75.9%

Motivations for going voluntarily:

Earn money,

Live and adventure / personal experience,

Live a professional experience,

Feel useful,

Implement training formation

20.2%

17.7 %

41.8%

27.8%



a/No, 76% b/Yes, 24%

Types:

Partner,

Support of the family,

48%

52%

Pressure, tension or stress

```
a/ No answer, 1.9%
```

```
b/ No, 83.7%
```

c/Yes, 14.4%

1.-Types

- (i) Pressure,
- (ii) Overwork,
- (iii) Mission work pace too demanding, 53.3%
- 2.- How did you manage it?
 - (i) Support from the mates, 37.5%
 - (ii) Practicing sport, // 12.5%
 - (iii) Being busy,

40%

6.7%

Post-Mission problems

Problems readapting to everyday life

a/ No, 59.6%

b/Yes,

40.4%

How long did they last:

Matter of days,

50%

Matter of weeks,

31%

No specification,

19%



Murcia, September 9th, 2011