

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE CIVIL-MILITARY GAP IN EL SALVADOR

by

Colonel Rafael Melara
International Fellow El Salvador

Dr. Gabriel Marcella
Project Adviser

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 30 MAR 2007		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2006 to 00-00-2007	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Civil-Military Gap in El Salvador				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Rafael Melara Rivera				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 18	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Rafael Melara
TITLE: The Civil – Military Gap in El Salvador
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 30 March 2007 WORD COUNT: 5352 PAGES: 18
KEY TERMS: El Salvador relationship
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This paper assesses relevant historical events and values that affect differences in the political culture of civilians and military in El Salvador. Differences caused by professional experience, education, doctrine, motivation, mistrust and bias, values and ethic. The gap or different political culture exists between the two cultures at the political level, especially in democracies. The paper recommends measures to reduce the gap at the strategic level.

THE CIVIL–MILITARY GAP IN EL SALVADOR

This strategic research project (SRP) focuses on Salvadoran civil-military relation and the many changes experienced in civil-military relations throughout the political life of the nation. Consideration of historical events, it provides the big picture about how the relations between civil authority and military authority that have developed and changed over the course of the time. One goal of this analysis is to consider which circumstances have caused the greatest political differences. Attention to the largest areas of difference will help us to understand what we need to do in order to reduce the existing gaps. Accordingly, this SRP recommends measures to achieve more harmonious relations between civil and military authorities, particularly with regard to the transformation of the Salvadoran Armed Forces and their influence in the state.

Throughout Salvadoran history, both internal influences and the international political environment have played a great role in the nation's warfare. Although El Salvador has been very close to other Central American countries, the influence of the international environment and outside actors has been much greater than in most other areas of the world. In other words, the World Wars, Cold War, globalization, and the global war on terrorism have all greatly affected the history of El Salvador.

El Salvador developed through three periods. The first period began with independence; it lasted until 1979 when the last coup occurred. The second period covered the internal conflict, known as the civil war, which extended from 1980 to 1992. The third began in 1992¹, when the two main actors signed, under the auspices of the United Nations, a peace agreement, which promoted constitutional reforms, continuing through the last presidential period in 2004.

This analysis describes how the military and civil authorities began to share responsibilities in a new democratic environment, after the military completed its withdrawal from political and economic affairs. This SRP also evaluates the impact of the transfer of new institutions previously controlled by the military to control civil. In summary, this SRP examines this new military and civil relationship; in doing so, it assesses the strength of Salvadoran democracy and determines if the two dominant national institutions embraced their new roles.

Historical Events

Political differences between Salvadoran civil authorities and the military have a long history. During the colonial period, El Salvador was part of Guatemala. In 1821, El Salvador and other Central American provinces declared their independence from Spain and became part of the Mexican Empire. In 1823, the United Provinces of Central America was formed by the five

Central American states under General Manuel José Arce. When this federation dissolved in 1838, El Salvador became an independent republic. In the meantime, the Salvadoran Army was formed in 1824. From the beginning, the Army sharpened a nationalist will to help the state achieve goals in the national interest. Therefore, the Salvadoran armed forces historical mission is to establish stability in order to carry out the different activities of the State supporting the government or leading it.

Frequent changes of presidents, alternating between civil and military authorities, marked the early history of the country. Although most of the presidents were elected through a democratic process, some became president by assuming power through an overthrow or coup. Some other gained power by means of a civil-military junta. El Salvador has had 78 governments from independence, including 45 civilian, 33 with 8 governing as a civil-military junta.² This data reveals two major patterns in the political arena: civil authority and military rules. Each revealed a particular style of government during their administrations that do not belong to the same political cultures. In order to better define these differences, the cultural features of each governing authority should be examined. Culture is defined as "... including, among other things, belief about what is acceptable or unacceptable conduct within a society or group of people."³

The last two centuries show that in El Salvador, civil-military relations were not taking place in isolation from the rest of the world. Each historical event has been linked to the international order. During the independence movement of 1821, many other countries also declared their independence from Spain. During the latter part of the nineteenth century, many Latin American presidents studied in foreign countries. Perhaps the best example was General Gerardo Barrios, who studied and served as ambassador in France during the 1860's, who later was president of El Salvador.

During the first thirty years of the twentieth century, most of the presidents were civilian⁴. When international communism spread throughout much of the world, El Salvador overcome a communist revolt and the military then came to control the government. This military rule continued into the Cold War era. Military presidents governed from 1932 until 1979, when President General Carlos Romero was deposed by a coup.

The age of military government and coups also gave rise to national political parties, which has bolstered the democracy process and free elections of presidents. Although some elections have been criticized, others have been perceived as fair. The oldest parties lost legitimacy due to the claim that they conducted unfair elections. This lack of legitimacy, along with other grievances, allowed leftist ideology supported by Cuba, China, and Russia to take

advantage of this situation. Then antagonistic politics prevailed in the 1970's. An ideological fight was waged in the political arena, but in the military field a struggle between the military and another part of the society, which was largely associated with communist or socialist movements. Elections in 1972 and 1977 were criticized. Then in 1979 a segment of the military establishment joined with the leftists to support a coup with socialist goals. The following three years of socialist control (1979-82) ended a civil-military junta. This junta designed a revolutionary form of government to lead the country. It sought to promote agrarian reform⁵, which consisted of transferring property to cooperatives (farmers' association), nationalization of the bank, price control and give birth to individual ownership of large holding of land.

However, the revolutionary government formed by civilians and military⁶, was not able to keep control over, which in 1982 called for a provisional president who then called for elections in 1984. By this time, the civil war had begun and the society was polarized. However, many interests emerged because of ideological, social and economic differences. These differences tended to divide the people into two groups: those who preferred a communist form of government and those who advocated democracy. Likewise, new political parties were created⁷

All the reform in special case the agrarian reform did not achieve its goal and instead gave birth to grievances, which were motivation for revenge and terror within Salvadoran society. This event established a new political era, which started to conflict in the military, political and ideology fields. The military, with support of political parties, had influence in the national life. Nevertheless, political, ideological, and military strife began in 1979 and developed into internal conflict, until 1992 when internal conflict in El Salvador ended, and a peace agreement signed.

Salvadoran society lived divided during twelve-years of the struggle due to the political differences. The institution of government and the military looked to protect democracy, liberties, and republican government. Other political forces such as the movement for liberation sought to establish other ways of government, supported by Cuba and Nicaragua. During this period the oldest parties lost legitimacy, because they did not stand for the majority, although they survived in the political environment, it was only after the provisional president⁸ in 1982, called for elections in 1984.

Because of the lack of legitimacy, the oldest parties had little influence and a new political party founded by the retired Major Roberto D'Aubuisson arrived in the political arena. This party was the Nationalist Republican Alliance (ARENA). The older Democratic Christian party, led by Napoleon Duarte, survived and achieved the presidency by democratic elections in 1984. Then in 1989, ARENA won the elections, achieved the peace agreement, took the government, and has kept it to the present time.

Having the peace agreement as a framework, the major peace accord was completed in 1990, when the parties agreed to ensure respect for human rights between the parties, the military, and liberation movement. To verify this and future agreements, the United Nations Security Council established in 1991 the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL).⁹ The core of this agreement was the reduction of the army, and constitutional reform when the military handed over the internal security to the police. This event was a benchmark to establish a new doctrine in the Armed Forces of El Salvador.

After the peace agreement under the auspices of United Nations¹⁰ which was resolution 693 (1991) of 20 May 1991, ONUSAL was established to verify implementation of all agreements between the government of El Salvador and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation (FMLN). The peace agreement provoked constitutional reforms that established a new role and doctrine for armed forces. The formal end of the 12-year conflict was proclaimed in December 1992, as FMLN troops completed their demobilization. Likewise, there followed a 50 percent reduction in the Salvadoran army and the departure of officers allegedly responsible for human rights violations and named in the Truth Commission's report.

The negotiation between the government and FMLN, where the military participated as part of the government, required discussion of difficult and sensitive topics. However, there was this political will to achieve an agreement, including a ceasefire and related measures, reform and reduction of the armed forces, creation of a new police force, and reform of the judicial, electoral systems, human rights, land tenure, and other economic and social issues¹¹. After the signing of the peace agreement and constitutional reforms in 1992, the former guerrilla organization known as FMLN was embedded in the political arena and the former leadership could participate in the congressional election in the democratic process in 1994. At the request of the government, ONUSAL observed the 1994 elections, won by the ruling party, the Republican National Alliance (ARENA), with FMLN emerging as the main opposition party.

The armed forces took on a new national role in the name of the apolitical mission, and avoided participating in political life. They started a process of transformation, embedded in the society, and working together without being politically parties. The new doctrinal relationship with the political authorities gave a new role to the military and a new civil-military relationship. The people perceived the changes, and other institutions between them started to change too. The best accomplished of peace agreement was the army, which was said by the UN.

Political Differences or Gap

The military and civil authorities in El Salvador seek to achieve the national interests, but this task is not easy due to many factors or differences as follows: First, professional experience, education and doctrine; second, the motivation, mistrust, and bias; third, how the role of the military would be in society and finally the values and ethic.

Why are these factors so important if both share the same society and live in the same country? The gap, or political difference, exists between the two cultures at the political level, especially in democracies. The culture is a first difference, or gap, and researchers have identified a "civil-military gap," an observable cultural distinction between members of the military and the civilian society especially in Latin America.

In order to identify political differences, national interest is the first issue that caused imbalance between civilians and the military. The existence of the Army is as old as the state, because the nation has always needed to support its legal authority by means of the armed forces. Likewise, the state can only carry out its ends when the peace and the security, whether external or internal, are guaranteed. That guarantee could not be left to an improvised institution. An organized, equipped, and well-trained and educated military institution can provide it in order to fulfill the demands of the Constitution.

Constitutionally¹² the Armed Force of El Salvador is a permanent institution at the service of the nation. It is obedient, professional, apolitical and not deliberative. It has the mission of defense of the sovereignty of the state, which resides in the people, and of the integrity of the territory.

Exceptionally, by order of the President of the Republic, in accordance with the Constitution, it will participate in the maintenance of internal peace. In addition, the legislative, the judicial and the executive branches of the state will be able to have the armed forces to make effective the dispositions adopted inside their respective constitutional areas of competition, in order to enforce the constitution. It will also collaborate to benefit the public as commanded by executive branch. Finally, it will support the people in cases of national disaster.

The above-mentioned mission started from the constitutional reforms of 1992. There are marked differences from the mission assigned before this date. The main changes from the older constitution are that the newly defined mission of the armed forces omitted maintaining the peace, tranquility and guarding public security. Also, the compliment of the constitution and other current laws; to guard the government's republican form and the representative

democratic regime; ensure the alternation norm is not violated by the Presidency of the Republic and vote is guaranteed, and the respect for the human rights.

The influence that the military had in the political arena had been supported by the constitution. In this way, every time the national life faced a crisis, or experienced a political vacuum, it was filled by the military. Civilians kept the legislative and judicial branches.

Similarly, the main purpose of the civil-military relationship is national security. Throughout history, the society has contributed a great deal to the security, personal as well collective. Society developed a system that could provide a minimum level of security, and let it carry out its activities in a stable environment with few threats.

The evolution of the concept resulted in national security, which is viewed as essential in democracies. However, in 2003 Peter Feaver proposed the 'agency theory' on what he called the 'civil-military problem'. He argued it is valid in Latin American due to the permanent reality that the military must be able to do their job of providing security to the society without themselves being a threat to the political environment.

In El Salvador, the situation did not develop in a different way. Since independence was gained, and the army was founded, a national feeling existed that addresses the Salvadoran state, functioning through the security of the national interests. Thus, we can relate the armed forces' existence with the accomplishment of the necessary security in order to carry out the different state activities. The nation had not used the concept of national security since its birth, but the representatives of the civil and military elites knew its significance. Although they were not developed in formal studies at civilian institutions, these issues are being implemented by the military in their studies center.

Education

Education is a factor that needs to be identified. It was significant in the civil-military relations during the last two centuries, because El Salvador is a developing country, and this situation created elites. The elites formed a group that independently stayed in charge of the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Higher education favored them, giving them an opportunity to participate in the political process. Thus, the people with higher education and economic resources or political influence could access the government. This point was depicted in the historical events. In the twenty-first century, this situation has changed. Now everybody can participate in political affairs, and get good education. Although the elites kept a little influence, this is not a determining factor due to the new democratic environment letting any citizen to run for the elections.

Historically, different presidents requested military cooperation in order to professionalize the armed forces. Support came from Germany, France, Spain, Chile and the United States. The institution that stands for this professionalism was the Military Academy, because in their history it was in charge of military education. The instructors developed new techniques and transformed the military. The highest education for the military was supported by political education. Therefore, during the first Chilean mission in El Salvador, Colonel Carlos Ibañes del Campo was named as Director of the Military Academy. Later, he twice became president of Chile in 1927 and 1952. At the same time, the military academy started a new era in 1929,¹³ and changed its name from Polytechnic School to the Military School. This year graduated the first class of officer and the officer who obtained the distinguished honor roll, became a president in 1950.

Likewise, military leaders went to study various courses in foreign countries, especially the staff college. The President of El Salvador studied military education in various terms in other countries. For example: Lieutenant Colonel Julio Adalberto Rivera and Colonel Oscar Osorio, studied in Italy, General Fidel Sanchez Hernandez in USA, Colonel Arturo Molina studied in Mexico. After this period, civilians were presidents and had similar experiences: Napoleon Duarte studied at the University of Notre Dame, U.S., and Alfredo Cristiani studied at Georgetown University.

Therefore, the foundation for the political organization of El Salvador was set at the beginning of the twentieth century. However, the national situation found that the only organized institution inside Salvadoran society able to take the reins of the political power was the armed forces. This establishment, supported by the economic sector, became "the Artificial Heart of the Political Power in El Salvador"¹⁴ staying as the guarantor of the stability of the state, and at the same time directing the destination of the country from the executive branch.

Before the peace agreement, the military education system developed its own doctrine, and conducted its own studies. Before 1979 the military academy was known as the School of Presidents due to the fact that the senior class officer conducted the presidency. In other words, the officers who obtained the distinguished honor roll had a chance for the presidency in the future. The military profession gathered the best teachers and trainers within the society, or civil authority had to take decisions or proposals that its political education produced. This situation developed and influenced all education and stimuli received during the life of an officer. In this way, the constitutional reform let armed forces set up the Education and Doctrine Military Command, which systematized the education of civil-military relations in all their schools and higher institutes of strategic studies. In short, a broad variety of political learning exists,

including a big number of non-governmental organizations that provide funds to scholars and activists.

After the constitutional reforms in 1992, the military mission was modified, starting with a widely distributed new doctrine based on respect for human rights and organizations. This led to building a new institution to support the police, participate in international missions, and create a new relationship with the civil authorities, irrespective of their political affiliation.

At the same time, the civil authorities started to develop control over the military, without a great knowledge of the national security issues. This relationship was difficult, due to the long period of the military influence. The civilians and military were able to create a harmonious relationship, especially with the professional behavior for military.

One of the great achievements, it helped to reduce the differences in both cultures, was the higher institutes of strategic studies, which share the academic environment between civilian and military.

Mistrust and Bias

Salvadoran armed forces have always played a central role in national affairs – occasionally assuming responsibility for political, social, and military functions-. At times when the armed forces assumed responsibilities beyond their military role, they brought discredit on themselves. Under the current constitution, the Salvadoran military will have a new limited role to support the government and to assume the stability of the state.

Historically, however, the military was constrained to assume total responsibility for the government in order to preserve the state. Then the military gained control of the nation's economy and became a privileged class, thereby losing the people's trust. Politicians sought military support, and contributed to military elitism. Prior to 1979, politicians catered to the military in order to solidify their power.

During the 1950', the military became responsible for public security, which allowed political leaders to use the military to control the populace. Indeed the 1962 constitution extended this military influence by authorizing a military take-over of public services in emergencies.

As the military supported popular leaders, Salvadorans began to distrust the military due to the long presence. Civil authorities, fearing military reprisal, passively accepted the expansive role of the military, Richard Wron wrote "A Dangerous Separation" warn of the peril of a schism between the nation's military and its people. Indeed, during the cold war, this schism destabilized El Salvador as Cuba exported its communist revolution throughout the region.

Communism appealed to the people, but the military supported the government. Democratizing countries like El Salvador were specially vulnerable to Soviet supported communism insurgencies, which drove formidable wedges between the military and the people

The military should not be involved in partisan politics in a democratic system. Further, the military should not make policy, rather it should accept civil control and this support legitimate policy. Likewise, the military should share the civilian culture, it should be regarded as a part of the larger culture, not apart from that culture.

Although the military professionalism was evident, the presence in political issues of the national life, started to erode the trust in the military.

Civil and Military Relations

Samuel Huntington has made a classic study of the role of the military in society; He believes that ultimately civilians and soldiers share the same perspective in democratic society.

He says that in the military-civil relationships there are a multiplicity of connections or multilateral relationships "among institutions, interests and military people, and the different and frequently opposed to each other interests, institutions and non-military people."¹⁵

There is a definite gap between the civilian and military cultures of the El Salvador. Throughout Latin America, civilians share a widespread mistrust of the military. Many Latin Americans believe their militaries have been too powerful in national affairs, perhaps an oppressive influence. Even so, they acknowledge a proper role for the military, although they have bitter memories of military "mala praxis".

The advance of democratic processes in the region has promoted greater military professionalism, a more discriminate use of the military, and a gradually more favorable usage of the military. In the aftermath of El Salvador civil war, the nation's military has accommodated itself to its new constitutional role and its acceptance of civil control of military activities. The nation's democratic charter now urges the state democratic institutions to more actively support a representative democracy for all group in the society. The charter strongly advocates peace, stability and regional development. Such idealistic movements may eventually "out law" armed conflict and thus dispense with the military. For now, they have achieved constitutional civilian control of the military.

Sociologists have thoroughly examined the civil-military relationship in various cultures. They have found that as the political situations changes, so also does the civil-military relationship change. In the "The Soldier and the State" Samuel Huntington, discusses soldiers social responsibility, public service, and comparative identity, He believes that military

professionals' intervention into politics is antithetical to their professional obligations, In times of crisis, catastrophe, or war, the military should be prepared to respond effectively, to the advantage of the society. Then the people and other agencies praise the military for their performance. The people depend on their military to solve problems, not to deliver on political promises.

The Salvadoran military contributed to a unity of effort in response to the 2001 earthquake, to volcanic eruption and to the 2005 hurricane Stam. The military's performance on these occasions, favorably covered in the media, enhanced the military's image and narrowed the gap between the people and the military. We cannot neglect the media's role in this matter: The media are instrumental in representing the military to the larger world.

The military can improve their image by supporting national development of the infrastructure, and by contributing to national well-being through humanitarian assistance, protecting the environment, delivery of health care, and improvement the educational system. Likewise, military responses to natural disasters and collaboration in peacekeeping serve to improve military image. However, past participation in counter insurgencies and the Vietnam War only widened the gap between the military and the people. When the people support the military mission, the gap narrows. When the people oppose the military mission, the gap widens. When the people benefit from the military mission, the gap narrows quickly. When the people induce hardships because of the military mission, the gap widens considerably.

Values and Ethic

In the matter of values and ethics, the civilian and military cultures often differ. Whereas the military in a democratic society support its institutions and protect its people and territory, politicians simply strive to gain the vote and stay in office. Also the military have the experience, training, and education to understand the strategic environment and thus to offer worthwhile advice on policy and strategy, However, civilian leaders art force to refuse this advise and to implement bad policy and strategy, which must then be executed by the military. In effect, soldiers are more inclined to act on national interest, but civilian leaders are more inclined to act on self-interest or partisan interest.

In El Salvador, the military has accepted civilian control and has properly identified the nation's military mission. However, its civilian leaders have not provided sufficient resources to execute the mission. Pion Berlin contends that Latin American civilian leaders are now sufficiently educated and knowledgeable to assume that the military fulfill its role. However, in "Civil-military Relations in Latin America" Thomas Bruneau and Richard Goetze claim that the

Latin American militaries have superior knowledge and competence in matters of national security. Although democratically elected politicians have become more competent, they must still depend on the military for much advice. Hew Strachan claims that the principal purpose of civil-military is to produce effective strategy. He warns that in democracies leaders forget that civil military relations serve as a mean to an end; rather they see hence relations as an end in and of themselves.¹⁶ Rather than focusing on formulating an effective strategy, democratic leader focus only on assuming civilian control of the military. In this entire welter of concern, strategy is somehow lost.

In all of our concern for closing the gap between civilians and military, we tend to overlook Clausewitz's contribution that the gap poses no great problem in the execution of war. Rather, Clausewitz insists that leaders must sustain a proper balance among the contributions of the government, the army, and the people as the nation wage war. Clausewitz focuses on balance, not on a gap. He claims:

...the professional man who pursues the values of professional competence and obedience and the political man who pursues power as an end in itself are two different types.

In this recent era of coalition warfare, civilian leaders must now decide whether to commit their militaries to join with other militaries in a common operation or mission. Even though these leaders may be inclined to support the mission, they may be reluctant to yield control of their militaries to a coalition commander. Such problems plague United Nations peacekeeping operations. Even so, security cooperation programs support regional partnerships. Accordingly, El Salvador joined the coalition in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and is committed to winning the Global War on Terror. Salvadoran political leaders have been challenged to gain congressional support for these expeditionary missions. Likewise, El Salvador has provided military support to U.N peacekeeping missions¹⁷. The values and ethic of civilian, especially in the legislative branch, are confronting according to political partisanship. The country leading the coalition or peacekeeping operations depends on this support.

Other consideration is the role of the media and internet, No current analysis of civil military relations would be complete without mentioning both elements. Marszalek discusses their role in "Soldier and Citizens". Clausewitz stresses the Trinitarian role of the people, the army and the government in waging war: *"These three tendencies are like three different codes of law, deep-rooted in their subject and yet variable in their relationship to one another. A theory that ignores any one of them or seeks to fix an arbitrary relationship between them would conflict with reality to such an extent that for this reason alone it would be totally useless."*¹⁸

Clausewitz thus describes the spirit of democracy. Ultimately, civil and military leaders focus on the ends, ways, and means for waging war. Ultimately, the three “tendencies” are inseparable in the effort to win the war.

The 2002 Salvadoran National Plan (Plan de Nacion) envisioned the Clausewitzian consensus on matters of national security. This plan reflects new political thinking about how to leverage instruments of national power in pursuit of national interests. The Ministry of Defense’s 2006 White Book¹⁹, likewise endorses their holistic commitment to national security. This emerging doctrine represents the fruit of a 1992 initiative to establish the El Salvador College of Grand Strategy, which brought together diverse individual non-ideologically committed to pursuing the nation’s strategic interest. This group got off to an inauspicious start, but 15 years later, its efforts have born rich fruit.

Reducing the Gap at the Strategic Level

Samuel Huntington, in the “Soldier and the State” expresses the chapter referred to a new equilibrium that the military must try to avoid the participation of the military in political partisan, because of the higher officer “...*could not participate in the “good” politics of policy without also becoming enmeshed in the “bad” politics of partisans*”²⁰. This quotation, is key in this research, due to the military must be more professional and focus in their mission gives by the constitution

Even though the military must remain under civil control, both civilians and military leaders must work cooperatively to integrate their effort to secure the nation. Likewise, civilian leaders must put aside political differences in the interest of national security, just as military leaders must remain apolitical. Prospects for an integrated effort will be enhanced if civilians and military leaders share an intensive course of strategic instruction prior to assuming the highest position of leadership.

The U.S. Army War College serves as excellent model. It provides a yearlong course in strategy for participant from all branches, all services, intelligence agencies, foreign services officers, defense civilians, and 40 international officers. Similarly, we must cooperatively develop a national security strategy, supported by an appropriate national plan. This effort must encourage habitual cooperation an interagency decision-making process in matters of national security. Our institutions of higher learning and our Military Academy must have rigorous courses in political science, and our early school must learn their owns lessons. Nothing is more important for our national security than a well-educated, apolitical professional military lead by enlightened civilian leaders.

On other hand, the civilians and military must look to the well being of the people, without thinking to which group they belong. According to the fifth pattern of civil-military relations²¹ presented by Huntington, “...*Promilitary ideology, low military political power, and high military professionalism.*” He said these general relations among power, professionalism and ideology make possible these types of civil military relations.

Finally, the relations described along this analysis, showed the gap between military and civil in some periods are so narrow and other so wide. In order to reduce this difference at the strategic level, the two parts would share responsibilities and recognize the difference among individual interests and national interests. A good balance among parts, with special attention in democratic environment, is military withdrawal from political and economic affairs. This SRP evaluated the impact of the transfer the government previously controlled by the military to control civil.

In summary, this SRP examined what is the best political environment to develop military and civil relationship; through learning and practicing values, ethic, education, we can reduce political differences and increase trust in each other.

Endnotes

¹ Peace Agreement January 16, 1992, Chapultepec Mexico, available from <http://www.elsalvador.com/noticias/especiales/acuerdosdepaz2002/index.html>; Internet; accessed 19 November 2006.

² Current, Casa Presidencial, Republic of El Salvador, "President of el Salvador 1821-2004," available from <http://www.casapres.gob.sv/presidentes>; Internet; accessed 04 December 2006.

³ Jennifer J. Deal and Don W. Prince, Developing Cultural Adaptability, "How to Work across Differences," Center for Creative leadership, North Carolina, 2003, 8.

⁴ Current, Casa Presidencial, Republic of El Salvador, "President of el Salvador 1821-2004," <http://www.casapres.gob.sv/presidentes>

⁵ Proclamation of the Armed Forces, October 15, 1979, available from http://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Proclama_de_la_Fuerza_Armada_de_la_Republica_de_ElSalvador; Internet; accessed 14 November 2006.

⁶ Revolutionary Government Junta, ruled El Salvador between October 15, 1979 and May 2, 1982. It contained 2 military (colonels), and 3 civilians, available from [http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Junta_Revolucionaria_de_Gobierno_\(El_Salvador\)](http://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Junta_Revolucionaria_de_Gobierno_(El_Salvador)); Internet; accessed 17 November 2006.

⁷ Nationalist Republican Alliance (ARENA), founded by the retired Major Roberto D'Aubuisson in 1982.

⁸ Dr. Alvaro Magaña, provisional president 1982, available from [http:// www.casapres.gob.sv/presidentes](http://www.casapres.gob.sv/presidentes); Internet; accessed 19 December 2006.

⁹ United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operation. Past operation, Americas ONUSAL (El Salvador), background.

¹⁰ United Nations Security Council Resolution 693 (UNSCR 693), 20 May 1991, available from [http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/ NR0596/29/IMG/NR059629.pdf](http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0596/29/IMG/NR059629.pdf); Internet; accessed 19 December 2006.

¹¹ Peace Agreement, Documents, United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping operation. Past operation, Americas ONUSAL (El Salvador)

¹² Constitution of Republic of El Salvador, Title VI, Chapter VIII, Articles 211-212.

¹³ Military School Capitán General Gerardo Barrios, San Salvador, El Salvador, Fourth epoch.

¹⁴ Escobar Galindo, Lecture Army Staff School, El Salvador, 1994. He signed the Peace Agreement.

¹⁵ Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State. The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1957).

¹⁶ Hew Strachan, "Making Strategy: Civil Military After Iraq," *Survival* 48 (Autumn 2006): 59-82.

¹⁷ Richard M. Wrona Jr., "A Dangerous Separation," *Word Affairs* (Summer 2006): 25.

¹⁸ Clausewitz, Carl Von. "The Consequences for Theory," in *On War*, (Princeton: Princeton University, Press, 1984), 89.

¹⁹ Ministry of Defense, *White Book* (San Salvador, El Salvador, 2006).

²⁰ Huntington, 460.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 97.