

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Special Forces

in a Hurry

Small units, outsized effects

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 40

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 45

Bibliography 54

The Whole Thing in One Page

The public image of special forces is a dark room, a suppressed weapon and a face hidden behind night-vision equipment. It is an arresting image and a poor definition. Some special operations end with a raid. Others consist of watching, advising, linking a local force to outside support, recovering a person, finding a target or preventing a crisis from becoming a war. The person through the door is the visible tip of a system whose decisive work may already have happened elsewhere.

Special operations are missions designed for conditions in which ordinary military methods are too conspicuous, too slow, too blunt or politically unusable. Many states call the forces that conduct them elite, and often with reason, but the label is not a universal rank. National systems draw the boundary differently. The common thread is the fit between an unusual mission, specialised methods and a setting where ordinary employment is inadequate. A highly trained infantry unit may fight the hardest battle in a campaign and remain conventional because its task is still to seize, defend or destroy by concentrated military force. A small special operations unit instead concentrates information, access, specialised skill, surprise and delegated judgement at one selected point. It does not become stronger than an army. It becomes locally superior for a short time, where superiority matters most.

Smallness helps. Fewer people leave a smaller signature, can move with less notice and can know one another well enough to make decisions without waiting for a headquarters. Smallness also imposes the limit. A team cannot hold much ground, absorb many losses, govern a population or repair a political settlement. It needs aircraft, maintainers, intelligence analysts, communicators, doctors, diplomats, lawyers, conventional troops and often local partners. The celebrated handful may depend on thousands who never approach the target.

The modern institution grew from the Second World War. British commandos struck occupied coasts. The Special Air Service learned, after a

disastrous first parachute operation, to use desert mobility and surprise. The Special Operations Executive and American Office of Strategic Services sent tiny liaison teams to work with resistance movements whose members supplied the numbers, language and local knowledge. The pattern was already complete: small units produced large effects only by connecting forces that were larger than themselves.

Later missions exposed both sides. At Entebbe, Israeli forces rescued hostages at long range through intelligence, speed and state support. At Desert One, an American rescue attempt collapsed before reaching Tehran because dust, mechanical failure and a complex joint plan defeated the force; eight US servicemen died. The failure helped produce institutional reform. In Afghanistan in 2001, small American teams helped local allies direct air power against the Taliban. Twenty years later, the wider political project collapsed. At Abbottabad, the assault team killed Osama bin Laden, but years of intelligence and support made the minutes inside the compound possible.

This is why the subject matters beyond admiration. Special forces reveal the difference between the completion of a task and the achievement of a purpose. They can create access, shock, information and choice out of proportion to their headcount. They cannot make a bad policy wise, a weak partner legitimate or a temporary advantage permanent. Their smallness is both the source of the effect and the boundary around it.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

Before dawn on 25 April 1980, burning wreckage lit a patch of Iranian desert called Desert One. No hostile force had defeated the American rescue mission. The aircraft had travelled hundreds of miles, elite troops were waiting and the hostages in Tehran were still unaware that an attempt was under way. Then dust, mechanical failure, communication problems and a plan assembled from units that had scarcely worked together reduced the available helicopters below the required number. The mission was aborted. During the withdrawal, a helicopter struck a transport aircraft. Five airmen and three Marines died.

That failure is a better doorway into special forces than a successful assault. Courage was present. Selection had worked. The weapons were good. None of it could compensate for a system that had asked too many fragile pieces to meet at the same time without enough joint practice or authority. The wreckage helped drive reforms that eventually created the United States Special Operations Command, giving special operations forces a stronger institutional home, common resources and a chain capable of making the parts work together.

The lesson changes what you notice in every famous mission. The operator is one scarce resource among several, and not always the limiting one. Access may be scarce. Reliable intelligence may be scarce. A pilot able to arrive in bad weather, a translator trusted by a local commander, a secure radio link, a legal permission or an extraction route may decide whether skill can be used at all. A unit can be excellent at the final act and still fail because the preceding system was weak.

Special operations also show how governments use force when ordinary war is too large for the problem or too costly to admit. A state may need to rescue citizens, collect information in a denied area, help an ally resist invasion, disrupt an armed group or create time for diplomacy. A small force offers leaders speed and control. It can look cheaper, cleaner and more reversible than a conventional campaign. That appearance is politically

valuable and often misleading. Secrecy can hide risk as well as protect a method. Precision can reduce some harm without removing error. A partner force can provide reach while bringing its own interests, abuses and dependencies.

The distinction matters to citizens because these missions sit close to executive power. Their speed and secrecy can be necessary, yet the same qualities reduce the time available for scrutiny and make public claims hard to test. A photographed success may dominate attention while years of intelligence, foreign cooperation, failed leads and political bargaining disappear. A failed mission may become known in detail because wreckage cannot be classified. Success and visibility therefore have an awkward relationship: the public record is least complete where confidence is often highest.

The same subject therefore contains two stories that are usually separated. One is about extraordinary competence: people selected, trained and trusted to act under pressure where mistakes are final. The other is about the seduction of concentrated power: the belief that an exact military instrument can solve an inexact political problem. Both are true. Refusing either produces propaganda.

By the end, you should be able to look past the insignia and ask better questions. What effect is required? Why must the force be small? What information creates the advantage? Who supplies access and support? What happens after the target is reached? Which result belongs to the team, which to the larger system and which cannot be produced by force at all?

Those questions explain success more reliably than stories about toughness, and they matter most when public evidence is incomplete. They also expose failure before the helicopters reach the desert.

The Core Ideas

Smallness Is a Design Choice

Prestige dominates public definitions of special forces: the people who passed the hardest course, wear the rarest badge and do the jobs others cannot. NATO itself calls special operations forces elite military units, then defines them through designation, organisation, training, equipment, techniques and modes of employment. That apparent untidiness is useful. These forces are often elite, but special is not a universal league table. National systems draw the boundary differently. The durable definition is relational: a state builds and designates a force for missions whose setting requires specialised methods, unusual access, discretion or political control.

That distinction matters because elite conventional troops can be exceptional without conducting special operations. Paratroopers may seize an airfield as part of a division. Marines may storm a defended coast. Guards may fight at the centre of a conventional battle. Their quality does not turn every task into a special operation. Conversely, a small advisory team may conduct one without firing a shot. The mission demands unusual access, discretion, political sensitivity, specialised methods or work through partners. The organisation is built around that demand.

Smallness is one of the design choices. A compact team can travel with a lower signature, conceal its purpose more easily and maintain a dense web of trust. Fewer layers sit between observation and decision. A specialist who notices that the plan no longer matches the ground can speak directly to the person responsible for changing it. That compression matters in conditions where delay is dangerous and a radio call may expose the force.

William McRaven called the advantage relative superiority: a smaller attacking force obtains a decisive local advantage over a larger or protected opponent for a limited period. The phrase is useful if both adjectives remain attached. The superiority is relative, not general. It expires. Surprise fades, defenders recover and numbers begin to count again. A team that has reached the right room may be dominant there and vulnerable everywhere

around it.

This temporary geometry explains why special operations favour selected objectives rather than broad destruction. A bridge control, a hostage room, a communications node or a trusted local headquarters can matter more than the ground around it. The unit tries to place scarce capability where a small change will propagate. Choosing the wrong point leaves a brilliant force applying pressure to something the enemy can ignore or replace.

Smallness therefore reduces some problems by accepting others. It limits ammunition, medical capacity, redundancy, endurance and the ability to absorb casualties. It cannot search a large area quickly, hold a city or guard every route. Even the headcount can mislead. A raid by several dozen operators may depend on aircraft crews, intelligence staffs, rescue forces and conventional units numbering in the hundreds or thousands. The assault element is small because concentration at the selected point is useful, not because the whole undertaking is small.

This is the first rule of the subject. Do not begin by asking how elite the people are. Ask why the mission requires a force of this shape. If there is no gain from low signature, specialised access, unusual trust or delegated judgement, smallness may be theatre. If those gains exist, they still have to outweigh the loss of mass and staying power. Special operations begin with a trade, not a superpower.

Information Creates the Opening

A conventional force can sometimes compensate for uncertainty with mass. It can send more aircraft, occupy more ground and search by contact. A small force has less room for error. It must know which building matters, who is inside, what pattern is normal, which road has changed, whom a local commander trusts and what political consequence follows if identification is wrong. Information does not replace access, transport, skill, force or authority. It creates the opening in which those scarce means can be concentrated.

Targeting is often imagined as finding coordinates. The harder task is

establishing meaning. A person may use several names. A house may contain relatives, guests or workers. A local armed group may be an ally in one district and a predator in another. A partner who supplies access may also be settling a private dispute. The same vehicle, radio or meeting can indicate different things in different settings. Technical collection can narrow the picture, but human relationships and regional knowledge determine what much of it means.

The Abbottabad operation makes the hierarchy visible. Barack Obama's public account described years of intelligence work, an uncertain lead, months of development and repeated decisions before a small American team entered the compound. The minutes that became famous rested on a long effort by people who did not go on the raid. Even then, the intelligence did not produce certainty in advance. The operation was authorised because decision-makers judged the probability, alternatives and consequences, not because a screen displayed an unquestionable answer.

Special reconnaissance exists because sometimes the information is the effect. A team may observe a route, confirm a capability, identify a pattern or answer a question that satellites and distant sensors cannot settle. Its success may be a report that prevents a larger force from acting on a false assumption. This work attracts less public attention because nothing explodes and the best result can be an operation that is cancelled.

Information also has a clock. A pattern confirmed on Monday may be useless by Thursday. A person may move, a guard routine may change and a political permission may expire. Collection, interpretation and decision therefore have to form one loop. Speed without verification creates confident error. Verification without a decision path produces knowledge that arrives after the opportunity has closed.

Information also flows in both directions when special forces work with partners. Local fighters know families, terrain, dialect and memory. Outside forces may bring communications, surveillance, medical support and access to national systems. The relationship can produce leverage, but it also creates dependence and distortion. A foreign team can mistake the

partner's interests for local truth. A partner can learn to present every rival as a shared enemy. Trust is necessary and never sufficient.

The temptation is to treat more collection as the cure. It is not. Large systems can gather more data than anyone can interpret, while secrecy prevents inconvenient knowledge from travelling. Analysts may know the target but not the neighbourhood. Operators may understand the ground but not the political bargain. Headquarters may possess each fragment and fail to join them in time.

The decisive information is therefore the answer to a bounded question, delivered to someone able to act and challenge it. Who or what must be affected? What evidence would disprove the identification? Which uncertainty remains? What will change if the mission succeeds? A special operation becomes possible when the force knows enough to concentrate. It becomes responsible when it also knows what it does not know.

Surprise Is Manufactured

Surprise is often presented as darkness plus silence. Both can help, but neither explains the result. A force can be seen and still surprise an opponent through timing, direction, speed, deception or an unexpected purpose. It can remain physically hidden and fail because the defender anticipated the method. Surprise is not a condition supplied by night. It is a temporary mismatch between what one side expects and what arrives.

Creating that mismatch requires work. Security limits what the opponent can learn. Intelligence reveals routines and assumptions. Rehearsal exposes delays before they occur in the real place. Transport creates access. Deception gives an observed movement the wrong meaning. Clear purpose prevents the force from spending its brief advantage on secondary tasks. McRaven's case studies reduced this logic to six principles: simplicity, security, repetition, surprise, speed and purpose. The list is memorable because the parts reinforce one another. It is not a law that guarantees success.

The raid on St Nazaire in March 1942 shows surprise without invisibility. The

attackers crossed open water in an old destroyer converted into a delayed explosive charge, with commandos and smaller craft beside it. The ship could not remain unseen as it approached a defended harbour. Deception delayed recognition, speed shortened the defenders' response and a narrow purpose kept effort fixed on the dock gate and machinery. The charge exploded after the ship had struck. Surprise supplied access to a strategic piece of infrastructure, then ended. The attackers paid heavily once the defenders understood the design.

The effect at St Nazaire came from choosing a piece of infrastructure whose loss constrained a much larger naval problem. Surprise created access to it; it did not make the force invulnerable or the price small. Once the defenders understood the attack, the raiders faced numbers, fixed weapons, distance and the difficulty of getting home. This is the recurring shape: temporary advantage must be converted before ordinary military arithmetic returns.

Entebbe in 1976 depended on a different surprise. Hostages were held more than two thousand miles from Israel under the protection of Ugandan forces. Intelligence, long-range aviation, rehearsal and a rapid assault compressed the defenders' time to understand what was happening. More than one hundred hostages were freed. Three hostages and the assault commander Yonatan Netanyahu were killed during the rescue, and another hostage was later murdered in Uganda. Operational success did not erase human cost or the dispute over entering Ugandan territory.

Rehearsal matters for the same reason. It does not predict every event. It builds shared responses and reveals where one delay will propagate through the plan. Special operations tend to join systems that do not usually meet: intelligence agencies, diplomats, aircraft, ships, local agents and assault forces. Each component can perform correctly while their interfaces fail. Desert One demonstrated that a plan can accumulate so much dependence that surprise over the adversary is defeated by friction inside the force.

Surprise also decays institutionally. Once a method succeeds, opponents study it, copy it and build defences. A famous unit can become less

surprising because its reputation announces a set of likely approaches. Technology that once supplied privileged access spreads. Procedures harden into doctrine, then into habit. The organisation must keep learning or its special method becomes a predictable convention with expensive equipment.

The useful question is not whether the force is stealthy. It is what expectation is being exploited, how long the resulting advantage will last and what must be completed before it closes. Surprise is manufactured in advance, spent quickly and rarely recoverable once lost.

The Mission Chooses the Force

The public story compresses special operations into direct action: short attacks, captures, rescues and destruction of selected targets. Direct action is real and sometimes necessary. It is one family among several, and treating it as the whole subject creates bad policy because every problem begins to resemble a target.

Special reconnaissance seeks information in places where ordinary collection cannot answer the question. Unconventional warfare supports resistance or insurgent forces against an occupying or hostile power. Foreign internal defence helps another government protect itself against subversion, insurgency or lawlessness. Security force assistance develops selected capabilities in partner institutions. Counterterrorism can include intelligence, disruption, partner support and protective work as well as raids. Hostage rescue and personnel recovery require their own combinations of intelligence, negotiation, access, medical preparation and force. Nations organise and name these activities differently, but the distinctions prevent one instrument from swallowing the rest.

The two broad families are direct and indirect. In the direct approach, the special operations force acts on the object: it observes, seizes, destroys, captures or rescues. In the indirect approach, it changes what other people can do. A team may train, advise, connect, supply or accompany a partner whose members bring numbers, local standing and persistence. The

indirect method is less photogenic and can create the larger effect because the outside force multiplies capability rather than substituting for it.

It also changes the timescale. Direct action may be judged in minutes against a named task. Partner work unfolds across years and is entangled with institutions, promotion systems, corruption, local rivalries and public confidence. The outside team can transfer a technique faster than the partner state can build maintenance, lawful command or political legitimacy. An impressive training result may therefore be real and still sit inside a failing system.

The Jedburgh teams dropped into occupied Europe in 1944 make the mechanism plain. These were tiny multinational groups, usually including a radio operator, sent to work with resistance organisations. Their value did not lie in fighting Germany as miniature armies. They linked local networks to Allied commands, communications, supplies and the movement of conventional forces after the landings. Remove the resistance and the team had little mass. Remove the radio and the team lost much of its leverage. Remove the advancing armies and sabotage could irritate without liberating France.

Mission choice includes political questions that a unit cannot answer for itself. Is the partner legitimate enough to strengthen? Will assistance make it more capable of abusing rivals? Is a capture preferable to a killing because information or law requires it? Does a rescue attempt increase danger to hostages? Will entering another state without consent create a crisis larger than the target? The force can advise on feasibility. The government owns the purpose and consequences.

Names add confusion. In the United States, Special Forces with capital letters refers specifically to the Army organisation commonly called the Green Berets, whose central traditions include unconventional warfare and work with foreign forces. Special operations forces is the wider category, including units from several services. In ordinary international use, special forces often covers the wider field. The terminology matters less than asking what function the organisation is designed to perform.

A mission-led system resists prestige. It may decide that the best option is surveillance, a partner unit, a conventional battalion, police action, negotiation or no action. The special force is special because it is fitted to a narrow problem. Using it where that fit is absent turns rarity into ornament and skill into waste.

Selection Is for Judgement, Not Supermen

Selection films make suffering visible because suffering is easy to film. Candidates carry weight, lose sleep, navigate alone and continue while cold, wet or exhausted. These tests matter where the job demands physical reserve and reliable action under strain. The mistake is to treat pain as the product. A unit does not need people who can suffer impressively. It needs people whose judgement, self-control and usefulness survive when suffering removes the easy version of them.

Physical capacity sets a role-specific threshold rather than one global standard. Once a candidate clears it, the decisive qualities become harder to measure: learning speed, honesty about error, emotional control, attention, initiative, patience and the ability to alternate between leading and following. A person who dominates every room may be dangerous in a team that relies on shared expertise. Someone who never asks for help can convert a manageable problem into a casualty. Someone who hides uncertainty to preserve status can destroy the information advantage on which the mission depends.

Selection systems therefore try to reveal behaviour, not merely endurance. Ambiguity may show whether a candidate invents certainty. Repetition tests whether standards decay when novelty disappears. Group tasks expose how competence survives comparison and frustration. No course can reproduce every mission or manufacture all the required qualities. Training, experience, supervision and team integration then develop a common language across specialisms. The medic, communicator, weapons specialist and engineer are not interchangeable, yet each needs enough understanding of the others to keep the team functioning when the plan breaks.

Judgement includes restraint. A person trusted to use force far from supervision must recognise when the legal authority, identification or mission conditions are absent. Aggression can help in one moment and corrupt the next. Professionalism therefore appears as the ability to stop, report doubt and protect people who are inconvenient to the task. A culture that rewards only momentum will eventually produce avoidable harm.

USSOCOM expresses the force-generation problem as an institutional maxim: special operations capability cannot be mass produced. This is a warning about organisations, not a biological law. The bottleneck is accumulated experience, instructors, standards, trust and opportunities to practise as a team with the wider system. Expanding too quickly can fill posts while diluting the relationships and judgement that made the organisation useful. A force may buy more aircraft faster than it can develop crews, planners and leaders able to employ them together.

The superman myth also hides ordinary human limits. Selected people become tired, frightened, overconfident and loyal to bad ideas. High cohesion can improve coordination and discourage dissent. Secrecy can protect a professional culture and allow harmful practices to persist without challenge. A record of success can make headquarters reluctant to question a celebrated unit. Selection reduces some risks. It does not repeal psychology or institutional self-interest.

Nor is one inherited profile automatically the right one for every mission. A system designed around raiding may undervalue language, patience and social judgement. A narrow recruiting culture can exclude useful talent because it confuses tradition with task. Standards should remain demanding where failure has real consequences, but the demand must trace back to the work. Otherwise the badge begins selecting for resemblance to previous members rather than capability against the next problem.

The strongest special operator is therefore not the person who looks most exceptional in isolation. It is the person who improves the team's decisions, preserves standards under pressure and can be trusted with authority far from supervision. Toughness earns attention. Judgement earns delegation.

The Team Sits on an Invisible Army

Official descriptions of special operations contain a useful embarrassment: most missions require support from forces that are not special operations forces. The statement cuts through the lone-team image. A small assault group may be the final instrument, but aircraft deliver it, maintainers keep the aircraft usable, analysts build the picture, communicators connect decisions, medical teams prepare for failure and conventional forces secure bases, airspace or extraction routes.

Desert One exposed the cost of weak integration. The rescue plan combined helicopters, transport aircraft, special operators, Rangers, agents, drivers, translators and several stages across great distance. Each requirement made sense on its own. Together they formed a chain with too little tolerance for weather, mechanical loss and confusion between organisations. When the number of usable helicopters fell below the minimum, the mission had no sound way to continue. The later collision turned an operational failure into a human disaster.

The reform lesson was not that elite troops needed to become tougher. It was that the state needed a command able to organise the whole system. The creation of USSOCOM in 1987 gave American special operations stronger joint authority, resources and advocacy. Similar logic appears elsewhere in dedicated aviation, intelligence links and permanent counterterrorist structures. Repeated relationships matter because the first time a pilot, planner and assault force work together should not be above hostile ground.

Interdependence changes how readiness should be measured. Counting trained teams says little if aircraft availability, secure communications, intelligence processing or medical evacuation cannot support them. A force can possess elite personnel on paper and lack an employable capability. The relevant unit of readiness is the mission system, including the least glamorous link that can cancel it.

Local partners belong inside this system, not at its edge. In Afghanistan in

2001, small American teams did not defeat the Taliban by personal firepower. They worked with Afghan forces and connected them to American air power, intelligence and communications. The leverage was large because local mass, outside technology and a collapsing enemy position met at the right time. Describing the result as a handful of foreigners conquering a country erases the Afghans who fought and teaches the wrong mechanism.

Partnership also reveals a hidden bill. The outside force may control aircraft, maintenance, salaries, intelligence and emergency support that the local organisation cannot sustain alone. Capability can look indigenous while its critical functions remain external. RAND's work on special operations partnerships and later investigations of Afghan collapse show why tactical proficiency in selected units does not equal a self-supporting security system. When the external links disappear, the visible unit may lose far more than advice.

The support tail is political as well as technical. Diplomats arrange access. Lawyers assess authority and rules. Civil servants manage notification, detention and evidence. Leaders prepare for escalation if an aircraft is lost or a border crossed. A mission that looks small on television may consume attention across a government and impose risk on allies who were never shown.

This does not make the operator incidental. The final team carries a concentration of danger and must act when support can no longer correct the moment. It does make the effect collective. The cleanest way to understand any special operation is to draw the invisible army around it: who found, transported, supplied, authorised, interpreted, protected and followed through. The answer is the real size of the force.

Tactical Brilliance Has a Strategic Ceiling

Military activity operates at several levels. Tactics concerns how a fight or mission is conducted. Operations connect actions into a campaign. Strategy connects military means to political purpose. A special operations force may be excellent at the first and influential at the second. It cannot settle the third by itself, because strategy depends on policy, resources, adversary response and the political order beyond the unit.

A raid can destroy the nominated object. That proves task completion. It does not prove that the object was decisive, that the opponent cannot replace it or that the political situation improved. A rescue can save hostages and still damage relations with the state whose territory was entered. An advisory mission can make a partner unit more effective while strengthening an abusive government. The same action can therefore be tactically successful, operationally useful and strategically harmful without contradiction.

Evaluation therefore needs a causal chain rather than one victory label. Reaching the objective establishes task completion. A changed military condition establishes an immediate effect. Strategic value appears only if that effect survives adaptation, assists the wider campaign and makes the political purpose more attainable. These results can separate. Without tracing the links, the easiest statistic to count, such as missions completed or targets removed, begins substituting for the outcome that policy required.

Leadership targeting shows the problem. Removing a commander may interrupt decisions, expose communications or create a succession fight. It may also promote a more capable replacement, strengthen group solidarity or change little because the organisation has routines, deep social support and distributed authority. Jenna Jordan's study of leadership removal across many cases finds no universal collapse mechanism. Organisational structure and community ties matter. A name at the top is not the same thing as the system beneath it.

Afghanistan supplies the largest warning. In late 2001, special operations

teams, Afghan allies, intelligence and air power helped overturn Taliban control with striking speed. The operation demonstrated the model of concentrated leverage. It did not answer how Afghanistan would be governed, how a durable political order would gain legitimacy, how outside support would be reduced or how Pakistan and the regional war would be handled. Those were strategic questions. Two decades of additional military activity did not turn them into targets.

Political leaders are drawn to special forces because the instrument appears bounded. A small footprint may reduce exposure, public attention and immediate cost. A precise mission can be authorised faster than a large campaign. Success then encourages reuse. Raids become a measure of effort, target lists become a substitute for political theory and secrecy makes weak effects harder to contest. The force remains busy while the purpose becomes less clear.

James Kiras argues that special operations acquire strategic force when sustained and connected to wider campaigns, not when admired as isolated feats. The St Nazaire raid mattered because disabling the dock constrained German naval options within a larger war. Jedburgh teams mattered because resistance, supply and advancing armies formed one system. A hostage rescue has a naturally bounded purpose. A campaign against a replenishing organisation does not.

The same feature that created the advantage now completes the loop. Smallness permits discretion, speed and concentration. It also prevents the force from supplying mass, administration, legitimacy or settlement. Leaders can use special operations to create a choice, open a route, buy time, obtain information or strike a genuine bottleneck. They cannot use them to escape the need to decide what the war is for.

The final test is brutally plain. After the small unit leaves, what continues to produce the desired effect? If the answer is nothing, the operation may still be brave, skilful and necessary. It is not yet a strategy.

How It Actually Works

The raider is older than the institution

Armies have always used scouts, raiders, guides, sappers and men sent through places where formed troops could not go. Ancient commanders selected volunteers for dangerous work. Sailing states attacked harbours. Frontier wars depended on people who could cross between languages and ways of fighting. None of that created modern special forces by itself.

The institution required a modern state behind it. Aircraft, radios, compact explosives, motor transport, photography and intelligence staffs made small teams more connected and more destructive. Mass conscript armies created a useful contrast: a specialist force could be selected for one unusual task while the larger military carried the main war. Central government supplied money, secrecy and political authority. The small unit became powerful because an industrial system could place national resources behind a few people at a chosen point.

The Second World War brought all of those conditions together. Occupied Europe created denied territory. Britain needed ways to strike before it could return with an army. Resistance movements required supplies and communications. Long distances and new machines made raids possible while multiplying the ways they could fail. The modern family was born under pressure, with direct attack and work through others developing beside each other.

The new units were organisational experiments as much as battlefield ones. Conventional commanders worried that they removed the best men from ordinary formations, consumed scarce transport and encouraged raids whose publicity exceeded their effect. Sponsors protected them, failures threatened them and success attracted imitation. From the beginning, special forces had to prove that concentration produced more value than the capability lost elsewhere.

Britain after Dunkirk

After the evacuation from Dunkirk in 1940, Britain could defend itself and bomb Germany, but it could not reopen the land war in western Europe. Commandos offered action at a scale the state could afford. Volunteers trained for coastal raids, demolition and movement across sea and rough ground. Early operations varied from nuisance attacks to serious tests of German defences. Their military effect was uneven. Their political effect was immediate: Britain was no longer waiting without touching occupied Europe.

The commandos also exposed a permanent argument about scale. A raid could force Germany to guard a long coastline and demonstrate offensive intent, but it could also spend trained men on a target repaired within days. The name of the unit did not answer whether a mission was worth its cost. That depended on reconnaissance, target value and connection to the wider war.

Operation Chariot at St Nazaire in March 1942 turned raiding into strategic leverage. German battleships operating in the Atlantic needed repair facilities. The Normandie Dock was the only dock in western France capable of taking Tirpitz. A British force used the old destroyer HMS Campbelltown as an explosive charge against the dock gate while commandos attacked machinery around it. The ship struck the target. Hours later, its concealed explosives detonated. The dock remained unusable for the rest of the war.

The raid succeeded because the object mattered beyond the harbour. It reduced the options available to a far larger German ship and supported the wider naval campaign. It also showed the price of access. Many of the attacking force were killed or captured, and most of the small craft failed to return. Five Victoria Crosses marked courage; they did not make the losses disappear. Special operations could exchange people for a constraint on enemy choices. Whether the trade was sound depended on the value of the chosen point.

The SAS learns by failing

David Stirling formed L Detachment, Special Air Service Brigade, in Egypt in 1941. The title was partly a deception, suggesting a larger airborne formation than the sixty-seven men who existed. Stirling's idea was to place small teams behind Axis lines to attack airfields and logistics. The first mission, Operation Squatter, was launched by parachute into severe weather in November. Aircraft scattered the men, equipment was lost and only twenty-one of the fifty-five who set out returned.

The failure could have killed the unit. Instead it changed the method. The Long Range Desert Group already knew how to cross the desert, navigate and move small parties over great distances. Its patrols carried the SAS to and from targets. Jock Lewes, Paddy Mayne, Stirling and others developed attacks using vehicles, local adaptation and repeated learning. The important invention was not one weapon or personality. It was the marriage of raiding with a transport and reconnaissance organisation that already possessed access.

Success produced myth at once. Claims about numbers of aircraft destroyed vary, records are incomplete and unit memory rewarded the most dramatic account. The secure lesson is narrower and better. The SAS survived a disastrous concept of entry by changing its relationship with another force. Special units endure when they can discard a method without treating the failure as a verdict on their identity.

Stirling was captured in 1943, yet the organisation continued under other leaders and expanded. SAS formations later operated in France and elsewhere in north-west Europe, supporting resistance and attacking movement behind German lines. The shift mattered institutionally. A unit built around one founder and one desert problem became a transferable capability only when practices, leaders and support survived the founder's absence.

Working through others

The Special Operations Executive was created in 1940 to support resistance, sabotage and subversion in occupied countries. The American Office of Strategic Services later combined intelligence and special operations functions. Both depended on people inside occupied societies who faced the greatest risk and would remain after foreign personnel left.

Jedburgh teams provide the cleanest example. From June 1944, more than ninety small teams parachuted into France. A typical team included officers and a radio operator, often drawn from more than one Allied country. They linked resistance groups to Allied headquarters, requested supplies, passed information and helped coordinate activity with the conventional advance. Their effect expanded because the resistance supplied networks and fighters, the radio supplied connection and the invasion supplied a moving front.

The radio was the hinge and the danger. It allowed a few people to request aircraft-delivered supplies and report information across great distance, while transmissions could be detected and operators were vulnerable if security failed. A team's communications discipline affected whole resistance networks. Technical skill and political trust were joined in one person carrying a set that could connect a village to an army.

This history resists a tidy heroic ownership. Resistance movements had their own politics and rivalries. Some had fought and organised long before an Allied team arrived. Reprisals fell mainly on local people. Foreign governments chose whom to arm and sometimes prepared postwar influence while speaking only of liberation. Working through others gives a small force reach. It also means the effect cannot be separated from the partner's agency, legitimacy and goals.

Disbandment and return

Victory seemed to remove the need. Britain disbanded the SAS and several related units in 1945 after a War Office review found little place for them in the postwar military. The judgement lasted only a few years. A Territorial Army SAS regiment preserved part of the lineage, and a squadron deployed to the Malayan Emergency in 1951 under the name Malayan Scouts. In 1952 it entered the regular army as 22 SAS.

Malaya shifted emphasis from desert raiding to long patrols, intelligence and work among rural populations. It also placed special operations inside a colonial counterinsurgency that used detention, resettlement, food control and coercive state power. The unit's tactical development cannot be turned into a clean story of professional progress detached from the political system it served.

The United States followed a related route. Aaron Bank, an OSS veteran, became the first commander of the 10th Special Forces Group when it was activated in 1952. Its central purpose was unconventional warfare against a Soviet occupation or through resistance behind enemy lines. The Green Berets later became closely associated with training and advising foreign forces. Cold War competition expanded the indirect approach because governments wanted influence and local capability without deploying a conventional army to every crisis.

Labels never converged. The Russian term *spetsnaz*, meaning special purpose or special designation, has covered formations with different narrow specialities and chains of command; it is not a direct equivalent of NATO SOF. Other states dispersed specialist units across armed forces, police, intelligence and border services. Similar methods could therefore sit under different legal authorities. The broad public label hides different organisations, permissions and relationships to the state.

This made special forces useful across an unstable spectrum and vulnerable to confused purposes. Advisers could help a partner resist invasion, improve internal security or become implicated in repression. The

same skill in language and local relationships served policies of different moral quality. Technique did not supply legitimacy.

Hostage rescue and Entebbe

International terrorism and aircraft hijacking created another requirement. The murder of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics in 1972, after a failed West German rescue attempt, prompted West Germany to create GSG 9 inside the Federal Border Guard. Israel used military commandos at Entebbe four years later. The contrast matters: a shared hostage problem did not produce one universal organisational answer. Whatever the badge, these forces needed close integration with intelligence, negotiators, aviation and the relevant police or military authority. The target was smaller than a battlefield and less forgiving. Hostages occupied the same space as the people threatening them.

In June 1976, hijackers seized Air France Flight 139 and diverted it to Entebbe in Uganda, where Idi Amin's government supported their presence. Most non-Israeli passengers were released. More than one hundred hostages remained. Israel faced distance, uncertain intelligence, foreign sovereignty and the danger that delay would end in killings.

On 4 July, Israeli aircraft carried a rescue force to Entebbe. Commandos reached the terminal, killed the hijackers and fought Ugandan troops while other elements secured aircraft and the route out. The force brought 102 of the 106 captives out. Three hostages died during the rescue, Yonatan Netanyahu was killed and Dora Bloch, an elderly hostage left in a Ugandan hospital, was later murdered by Ugandan agents.

The operation became a model of long-range rescue because intelligence, rehearsal, aviation and political decision formed one system. It was also an armed entry into another state without consent. Israel argued necessity and self-defence; critics disputed the legal basis. Operational clarity did not remove political and legal argument. It made the argument unavoidable.

Hostage rescue is a special case because delay can strengthen negotiation or destroy the chance to act. Intelligence changes while the hostages

remain exposed. A government must decide under uncertainty whether talks, pressure or force offers the least dangerous path. The rescue unit can prepare options and estimate risk. It cannot turn a tragic choice into a technical calculation with one correct answer.

Desert One and reform

Four years later the United States attempted to rescue embassy hostages in Tehran. Operation Eagle Claw asked aircraft and units from several services to meet at Desert One, refuel, move the assault force closer to Tehran and continue through further stages. Eight Navy helicopters launched; six were judged necessary. Dust storms, mechanical problems and confusion left only five usable at the rendezvous. Commanders aborted.

During departure, a helicopter collided with an EC-130 transport aircraft. The fire killed five Air Force personnel and three Marines. Equipment and bodies were left in the desert as the surviving force withdrew. The images gave Iran a propaganda victory and the United States a public lesson in the cost of fragmented command.

The Holloway investigation found no single villain. It identified weaknesses in planning, command, communications, joint training and the suitability of equipment. Problems during the invasion of Grenada in 1983 added pressure for reform. Congress passed measures that strengthened joint military command and, through the Nunn-Cohen provisions, established a dedicated special operations command. USSOCOM was activated on 16 April 1987.

Institutional reform did not abolish friction. It gave special operations a headquarters able to control resources, develop forces and integrate the services before a crisis. Desert One had shown that the heroic element could be ready while the mission system was not. The command was designed around that distinction.

Reform also gave special operations a stronger voice in national policy. That solved neglect and created a new risk: an organisation with protected funding, direct access and a reputation for solving urgent problems would be

asked to solve more of them. Institutional survival no longer depended on one wartime sponsor. Restraint now depended on leaders remembering that a capable option can still be the wrong policy.

The direct and indirect wars after 2001

The attacks of 11 September 2001 moved special operations towards the centre of American war. In Afghanistan, Army Special Forces detachments entered in October and worked with Afghan factions already fighting the Taliban. Teams linked local forces to American intelligence, communications and air power. Taliban positions and cities fell quickly. Photographs of Americans on horseback captured the improvisation and concealed the balance: Afghan fighters supplied most of the ground force, while the United States supplied an air and information advantage the Taliban could not match at that moment.

The early campaign looked like proof that a small footprint could replace conventional war. It proved something narrower. Special operations could accelerate a favourable local alignment and help overturn a regime whose military position was brittle. Once the question became how to build a legitimate Afghan state, sustain national forces and settle a regional conflict, the same instrument had no comparable leverage point.

Across Afghanistan, Iraq and other theatres, special operations expanded in size, resources and tempo. Direct-action forces developed a fast cycle of finding, fixing and raiding targets. Other teams trained partners, collected information and worked through local networks. Each approach supported the other. Captured material generated leads; partners extended reach; raids disrupted armed groups. The system could become highly efficient at producing the next operation.

The human consequences did not become mechanical. Targeting errors, incomplete intelligence and partner reporting could place civilians inside the chain. Night raids could remove armed leaders and frighten families whose cooperation the wider campaign needed. Official efforts to improve civilian-harm mitigation arose partly from recognition that precise weapons

and selected forces do not guarantee correct identification or proportionate effect. Learning requires records, investigation and a willingness to examine successes as closely as failures.

Efficiency created its own danger. A campaign measured by people detained or killed could appear successful while the organisation recruited replacements and the political conditions remained. Partner units could fight well while relying on foreign aircraft, contractors, maintenance and intelligence. Afghanistan's commandos were among the state's stronger forces, but they could not compensate for national command failures, collapsing morale, external dependence and a government losing legitimacy. The fall of Kabul in August 2021 did not invalidate every tactical achievement. It revealed their strategic boundary.

Abbottabad and the image problem

The operation against Osama bin Laden on 2 May 2011 returned the raid to its purest public form. After years of intelligence work, the United States assessed that bin Laden might be living in a compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan. Obama authorised a mission without informing Pakistan in advance. A small Navy special operations team entered by helicopter, killed bin Laden and recovered material from the compound. One helicopter was damaged on landing and destroyed before the force left. No American was killed.

The mission achieved a narrow purpose that had remained important since 2001: locate and kill the leader and symbol of al-Qaeda. It also risked a clash inside a partner state, and Pakistan condemned the violation of its sovereignty. Bin Laden's death did not end al-Qaeda or armed jihadism, a limit Obama acknowledged in his announcement. The operation was both a major counterterrorist success and something less than the defeat of the wider phenomenon.

It also demonstrated the political concentration of special operations. A small number of officials considered intelligence, sovereignty, escalation and the possibility of American casualties in secret. That concentration

protected surprise. It meant that democratic accountability arrived mainly after the fact, when the narrow success made the risk easier to defend.

Its image contains the central distortion. The assault took minutes and supplied the film. The intelligence search took years and supplied the possibility. Aircraft, crews, planners, analysts, decision-makers and contingency forces supplied the route. Political authority accepted the risk. The operators carried the final danger, but the visible handful was not the whole cause.

Modern special operations continue to span direct attacks, reconnaissance, resistance support, partner warfare and crisis response. Technology changes the access problem without removing it. Drones, sensors and digital communications can extend reach while creating new signatures and dependencies. The enduring question remains older than the equipment: where can a small, connected force alter a larger system, and who will turn the temporary opening into a political result?

How we know

Special operations leave an unusually distorted record. Governments publish successful missions to demonstrate competence and classify methods to preserve future access. Failures become visible through wreckage, inquiries and bereaved families, though the surviving documents may still protect institutions. Memoirs supply texture and self-justification in the same pages. Unit histories often preserve names and chronology while reinforcing the unit's preferred lineage.

The account here relies first on official doctrine, inquiry reports, archives and contemporary public statements, then checks them against scholarly studies and critical histories. Operational details that do not change the model are omitted, especially where sources conflict or disclosure could turn history into instruction. Exact destruction and casualty claims are avoided when definitions or records are unstable.

The evidence is also geographically uneven. British, American and Israeli cases are unusually accessible and heavily published. Soviet and

post-Soviet terminology, and a German police example, show why one national category cannot be silently universalised; they do not amount to equal comparative coverage. Chinese, African, Asian and Middle Eastern traditions receive less space than their importance warrants because comparable records are scarcer, less open or beyond a one-hour scope. The safest conclusions concern mechanisms visible across different settings: information, access, support, temporary advantage and the gap between a completed mission and a political outcome.

What People Get Wrong

"Special forces are the best soldiers"

The phrase feels harmless because selection is demanding and the work can be exceptional. It still teaches the wrong hierarchy. A reconnaissance specialist, a submarine crew, a fighter pilot and an infantry section solve different problems. Ranking them as one ladder confuses scarcity with superiority.

Special operations forces are selected for a particular combination of autonomy, access, judgement and specialist employment. Elite conventional units may be better at sustained fighting, holding terrain or integrating heavy firepower. Police may be better placed to arrest a suspect where law and jurisdiction permit it. A local unit may understand a community that a foreign team cannot read. The best force is the one fitted to the mission and supported well enough to perform it.

The myth persists because badges, secrecy and difficult courses create status, while popular culture shows the final assault rather than the ordinary work of others. It matters because prestige distorts allocation. Governments use rare forces to signal seriousness, commanders hoard high performers and units may be sent where their name is more useful politically than their capability is militarily. "Best" is admiration pretending to be analysis. It also undervalues the conventional forces whose mass creates the conditions in which a small unit can be used.

"A small team works alone"

A photograph can contain twelve people and leave the cause outside the frame. The mission may depend on aircraft crews, maintainers, analysts, communications staff, medical teams, diplomats, lawyers, conventional security forces and local partners. NATO states the dependence directly: most special operations require non-special-operations support.

The lone-team story became persuasive because secrecy removes the supporting cast and because the people at the target accept the sharpest immediate risk. Their courage is real. It does not make fuel, intelligence, weather, access or extraction optional. Desert One failed through the interfaces between capable parts. Afghanistan in 2001 worked because small teams connected Afghan forces to American air power and information. The visible headcount explains neither case.

The correction changes how capability is measured. A country does not acquire special operations by copying a uniform or running a harsh course. It needs the system that can find, move, sustain, authorise and recover the team. Counting operators while ignoring the support chain is like counting pilots and forgetting aircraft. The number is exact and useless. Even a mission that never fires a shot can consume months of collection, planning and political negotiation.

"Selection creates supermen"

Selection screens out many candidates and samples behaviour under designed stress. It does not create a different species. Selected personnel remain vulnerable to fatigue, fear, overconfidence, group loyalty, trauma and moral error. A strong unit culture can produce trust and discourage challenge in the same movement.

The myth is sustained by controlled glimpses of selection, where physical suffering is visible and the harder qualities are not. Endurance can be filmed. Quiet judgement, cultural patience, honest reporting and the decision not to use force cannot. The public therefore mistakes the test for the job and pain tolerance for professional worth.

Evidence from failed operations and institutional scandals offers the necessary restraint: technical excellence and courage do not protect a team from bad intelligence, unlawful direction, weak command or its own culture. Selection must be followed by training, supervision, mental-health support, legal discipline and independent accountability. The correction matters because hero worship makes ordinary safeguards look insulting. They are the safeguards required precisely because unusually trusted people are still people, and because distance from supervision increases the cost of private error.

"Precision means clean"

A precision weapon can strike a smaller area than an artillery barrage. A selected force can observe more closely than a distant platform. Neither fact guarantees that the right person has been identified, that civilians are absent or that the political effect is beneficial. Precision describes control over delivery. It does not certify the information or the decision.

The clean-war image became persuasive after advances in surveillance, navigation and guided weapons made operations look measurable. Video can show a crosshair reaching its nominated point while hiding how the nomination was made. Partner reporting may be biased. A pattern may be misread. People may enter the area after the last observation. A legally valid target can still produce civilian harm and strategic backlash.

Official civilian-harm reforms in the United States acknowledge the gap by emphasising tracking, investigation, learning and response. Oversight in 2024 and 2026 found continuing implementation and measurement gaps, a reminder that adopting a plan is not the same as completing it. These are US-specific findings, not a measure of every special operation. The correction is not an argument for indiscriminate force or paralysis. It is a demand to separate three questions: can the force hit the chosen point, was the choice right and did the result improve the situation? A perfect strike on a mistaken premise is still a mistake.

"Kill the leader and the organisation collapses"

Some organisations are built around one person. Others have deputies, routines, social roots and a cause that survives succession. Leadership removal can disrupt planning, expose networks and create fear. It can also promote a harder replacement, decentralise authority or turn the dead leader into a symbol.

The myth persists because leadership is visible. Governments can name the person, announce the operation and mark the result. Organisational resilience is slower and harder to display. Jenna Jordan's comparative work on leadership decapitation shows that outcomes vary with age, size, structure and communal support. There is no universal collapse switch at the top.

Osama bin Laden's death was a major result against a leader with exceptional symbolic and operational importance. It did not end al-Qaeda, its affiliates or the wider jihadist movement. That does not make the mission pointless. It fixes the claim at the right level. The useful question is which function the leader performs and how replaceable it is. A target list without an organisational theory is administration with aircraft. Sometimes removal buys time. Time has value only if somebody uses it.

"Secrecy proves success"

Secrecy can be necessary. It protects sources, methods, partners and future access. It also prevents outsiders from checking claims, hides the denominator of failed attempts and gives institutions control over their own legend. "You would be impressed if you knew" is not evidence. It is an invitation to suspend evidence.

Successful missions are often disclosed selectively because they serve deterrence, morale or political credit. Failures emerge through inquiries, court cases, leaks or wreckage. Routine advisory work remains obscure even when it matters more than a raid. The resulting public record is not merely incomplete; it is selected by organisations with interests in funding, reputation and freedom of action.

The correction requires disciplined agnosticism rather than automatic suspicion. Classified activity may be effective and lawful. The public may be unable to know. Democratic systems still need cleared legislatures, inspectors, courts, record-keeping and chains of responsibility able to examine what cannot be published. Secrecy changes who can verify a claim. It does not turn verification into disloyalty, nor does the absence of scandal prove the presence of control.

"Special forces can replace a strategy"

The promise is seductive: use a small footprint, remove dangerous people, help local allies and avoid the cost of a conventional war. Sometimes that is the right design for a bounded objective. It becomes false when a method for creating temporary advantage is treated as a substitute for political purpose.

The myth grew after visible tactical successes in Afghanistan, Iraq and counterterrorist campaigns. Small forces produced rapid results, and rapid results encouraged repetition. Yet raids do not govern territory, settle rival claims, reform corrupt institutions or make a partner legitimate. A low foreign headcount can rest on extensive air power, contractors and local casualties. Small footprint does not mean small consequence.

The correction is to specify the conversion mechanism before the mission. What durable condition follows from the temporary opening? Who maintains it? What happens when outside support leaves? Where is the stopping rule? St Nazaire connected a raid to a naval campaign. A hostage rescue ends when the hostages are safe. An endless sequence of successful missions can instead reveal that strategy has never supplied an end. The busiest force may be evidence of political avoidance.

Use It

Find the leverage point

Special operations begin with a question most organisations avoid: where can a small change alter a much larger system? The answer is rarely the largest or most visible object. St Nazaire mattered because one dock constrained the choices of a battleship. A radio made a Jedburgh team useful because it connected local resistance to distant supply and command. The target was valuable through its relationship to everything around it.

Use the same lens when judging any proposed intervention. Identify the desired effect, then work backwards through the chain that produces it. Which link is scarce, fragile and consequential? What happens if it changes? A bottleneck is not merely a difficult task. It is a point whose removal releases something larger. Prestige encourages leaders to send exceptional people towards dramatic problems. Leverage asks whether success at that point will propagate.

The discipline includes a counterfactual. If the selected point disappears tomorrow, what does the opposing system do? If it reroutes, replaces or ignores the loss, the force has found a target rather than a lever. The smaller the instrument, the less room there is to confuse the two.

Price the access

The decisive part of a mission may be reaching the place where skill can matter. Access can come from aircraft, geography, language, a local relationship, diplomatic permission, secrecy or a partner willing to accept risk. It is never free. The route may depend on another state, expose an intelligence source, compromise a local ally or create an obligation that survives the operation.

Ask who supplied access and what they receive in return. A partner who guides a foreign team is acting for reasons of their own. A government that permits basing may expect protection or political support. Entry without

consent may achieve the task and damage a wider relationship. Entebbe and Abbottabad show why physical feasibility and political permission are separate questions.

This lens corrects the easy assumption that capability equals availability. A force may be able to perform a task in training and unable to reach the real problem without unacceptable cost. Access should therefore appear in the decision before excitement about the final act. The route in often determines the route out, and both can carry more strategic risk than the minutes at the objective.

Draw the invisible force

When someone attributes an effect to a small elite group, draw a circle around everyone required to make the claim true. Include collection, analysis, transport, maintenance, communications, medicine, law, diplomacy, local forces, conventional protection and follow-on action. Then identify which link has no substitute.

This changes how readiness, cost and credit are judged. A team can pass every internal test while the aircraft are unavailable or the intelligence process is too slow. A partner battalion can appear capable while foreign contractors maintain its vehicles and foreign aircraft recover its wounded. An operation described as cheap can shift cost and casualties onto allies rather than remove them.

The drawing also improves accountability. If the visible team made one decision from information supplied elsewhere, responsibility cannot end at the trigger. If success depended on local fighters, they belong in the history. If a mission failed because several organisations could not coordinate, blaming the final unit may protect the system that needs repair. Desert One became useful only when the inquiry widened the frame from brave individuals to command and integration.

Separate completion from effect

Replace the word success with a sequence of questions. Was the assigned task completed? Did the immediate military condition change? Did that change help the campaign? Did the political purpose become more attainable? Did the effect last after the force left? One answer cannot stand in for the others.

This sequence prevents impressive activity from becoming its own justification. A target can be removed and replaced. A partner can win a fight while losing public support. A hostage rescue can complete a bounded purpose even if it produces diplomatic cost. The categories allow mixed judgements without forcing every operation into triumph or disaster.

Time is part of the test. Immediate results are easiest to observe and easiest to claim. Organisational adaptation appears later. Political consequences may take longer and have several causes. Do not demand that one raid solve a war. Do demand that leaders explain the mechanism by which the completed task contributes to something larger. Where that mechanism is missing, operational tempo is a measure of motion, not progress.

Write the ending before the entry

A special operation concentrates attention on entry: how the force reaches a denied place, gains surprise and completes the task. Strategy begins after that sentence. Who holds the ground, protects the rescued people, uses the intelligence, replaces the outside support or manages retaliation? What condition allows the mission to stop?

Write those answers before authorising the beginning. For direct action, specify the follow-on and the expected adaptation. For partner work, identify which functions must become locally sustainable and when external support can decline. For a crisis mission, state the boundary beyond which the force is no longer the right instrument. A stopping rule is not pessimism. It is the part that prevents a temporary method from becoming a permanent policy.

The rule should also survive success. Institutions find it harder to stop an activity that works tactically because every completed mission supplies evidence for another. The question is not whether the team can continue. It is whether continuation still changes the condition for which the team was sent. Small units create options. Leaders must decide when the option has done its job.

The limits

These lenses do not turn civilian readers into operational planners, and this book has deliberately omitted procedural detail that would confuse understanding with instruction. Real missions require classified information, legal authority, national systems and professional judgement. The history cannot tell an individual how to conduct one.

Nor should military language be imported carelessly into ordinary organisations. A business project is not a raid, employees are not commandos and commercial competition is not war. Small autonomous teams can be useful, but the analogy breaks where violence, sovereignty and life-or-death authority begin. Treating every workplace as a battlefield usually produces secrecy, burnout and leaders who enjoy the costume more than the result.

The evidence has limits too. Public accounts overrepresent Western forces, famous raids and disclosed successes. Indirect work is harder to see. Classified failures may remain unknown. Tactical facts may be clear while strategic causation is contested. Use the model to ask better questions, not to convert an incomplete record into certainty.

The one thing to keep

Never look at the small team and see only the team.

The dark room, the aircraft on a distant runway, the twelve people in a photograph: each is a point where a larger system has concentrated. Information found the place. Access opened it. Selection and rehearsal made rapid judgement possible. Maintainers, analysts, partners, doctors,

lawyers, diplomats and conventional forces created the conditions. Political authority decided that the risk was worth taking. The people at the objective carried the sharpest danger, but they did not arrive from nowhere.

Then look beyond them in the other direction. Ask what follows. A lever has value because something larger moves. If no durable mechanism connects the task to the purpose, the image may record courage without progress. Desert One showed a system failing before the assault. Afghanistan showed tactical systems continuing after the strategy had lost its answer. St Nazaire showed a narrow action connected to a real constraint. The same kind of force can reveal institutional mastery, institutional failure or political evasion.

What should change permanently is where your eye goes. Admire skill, but look for the architecture around it and the purpose beyond it. Small units can produce outsized effects because they concentrate a state's resources at one selected point. They remain small units. The first fact explains the power. The second protects you from the myth, and forces every claim of precision back into politics, support and consequence.

Terms

The words used here, and the distinctions lost when every selected unit is called elite.

Special operations. Military activities conducted by forces specially designated, organised, trained and equipped for hostile, denied or politically sensitive conditions through distinctive techniques and modes of employment. National doctrine varies; no phrase creates one global organisational chart.

Special operations forces, or SOF. The wider category of military organisations a state designates, organises, trains and equips for special operations. National definitions and command structures differ, so the initials describe a family rather than one universal model.

Special Forces. In American usage, the capitalised name for US Army Green Berets, whose central traditions centre on unconventional warfare

and partnership with foreign forces. It is narrower than US special operations forces.

Commando. A name for a trained raider or a unit organised for demanding assault tasks. Its meaning varies by country and does not establish a special-operations mission.

Direct action. A short strike or small-scale offensive action against a selected target. It can include capture, recovery, seizure or destruction and usually seeks a specific, bounded result.

Special reconnaissance. Observation or collection in hostile, denied or sensitive environments where ordinary means cannot answer the question. The information may be the entire purpose.

Unconventional warfare. Activity that enables a resistance or insurgent movement to coerce, disrupt or overthrow an occupying or hostile power. Mass and local legitimacy usually come from the partner.

Foreign internal defence. Support by outside civilian and military organisations to another government's programme against subversion, lawlessness or insurgency. It includes more than training and can implicate the sponsor in partner conduct.

Security force assistance. Work to develop capabilities in another state's military or security institutions. Tactical skill can improve faster than maintenance, lawful command, finance or public legitimacy.

Counterterrorism. Measures to prevent, disrupt and respond to terrorism. Special operations may contribute intelligence, partner support or force, while the term also covers policing, finance, diplomacy and protection.

Hostage rescue. Recovering people held where captors and hostages share the same space. It requires intelligence, negotiation, medical preparation and political authority as well as an assault option.

Personnel recovery. The effort to recover people who are isolated, missing, detained or unable to return. Search and rescue is one part of the

wider category.

Relative superiority. William McRaven's term for the temporary local advantage a smaller force can obtain over a larger or protected opponent. It is limited to the chosen point and must be converted quickly.

Low signature. Reduced physical, electronic, political or organisational visibility. Fewer people can help, but communications, aircraft, partner activity and diplomatic preparation may produce a large signature elsewhere.

Denied area. A place where an opponent controls access or normal military entry is impossible, dangerous or politically unacceptable. Denial can be physical, legal, diplomatic, electronic or social.

Operational security, or OPSEC. Identifying information an opponent could use and reducing the available clues. It protects intent and capability; excessive compartmentalisation can also obstruct coordination inside the force.

Intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, or ISR. Systems and activities used to collect, process and distribute information. The acronym can hide interpretation, challenge and remaining uncertainty.

Targeting. Linking an objective to a selected object or person and an action. Coordinates are one part; identity, legal authority, expected effect and alternatives are part of the decision.

Insertion. Delivering a force into its operating area. Air, sea, land and partner access each impose different constraints, and the route may carry more risk than the task.

Extraction. Removing a force or recovered people from the area. A plan that reaches the objective without a credible way home has solved only half the access problem.

Interoperability. The ability of different units, agencies or countries to work together without interface failures. Common communications, procedures,

trust and repeated practice matter more than matching labels.

Enabler. A capability that allows the visible force to act, such as aviation, intelligence, communications, logistics, medicine or legal support. The word should not imply secondary importance.

Joint. Involving forces from more than one military service. Joint command seeks to combine different capabilities while preventing the coordination failures exposed by missions such as Desert One.

Spetsnaz. Russian shorthand for formations of special purpose or special designation. The term has covered varied specialist units across military and security organisations, so treating it as a direct synonym for NATO SOF erases institutional differences.

Partner force. A local or allied organisation through which an outside force works. Partners supply reach and agency while bringing their own interests, legitimacy, rivalries and dependencies.

Indirect approach. Producing an effect through partners or institutions rather than acting directly on the target. It can create persistence but transfers less control than a raid.

Train, advise and assist. A description of support to partner forces. Training transfers skills, advice influences decisions and assistance supplies capabilities; combining the words can conceal which functions remain externally dependent.

Rules of engagement. Authorised directions on when, where and how force may be used. They translate law, policy and mission requirements into constraints but do not replace individual judgement or legal obligations.

Mission command. A philosophy giving subordinates clear purpose and freedom to adapt. It depends on competence, trust and shared understanding rather than the absence of control.

Strategic effect. A change advancing the political purpose for which force was used. Destroying the assigned target is a tactical result; strategy asks

what larger and lasting condition changed because of it.

Go Deeper

Four routes into the subject, each correcting a different weakness in the public picture.

The accessible history. Ben Macintyre, *SAS: Rogue Heroes: The Authorised Wartime History* (Viking, 2016). This is the quickest way into the people, improvisation and institutional fragility of the wartime SAS. Macintyre had unusual access to records and writes with speed. Read it as an authorised British unit history rather than a neutral history of special operations. It is strongest on how a failed first method became a workable organisation. Pair its vivid personalities with the quieter lesson that access came from the Long Range Desert Group and continuity outlived the founder. The drama is useful; the support relationship is the explanation.

The operating theory. William H. McRaven, *Spec Ops: Case Studies in Special Operations Warfare: Theory and Practice* (Presidio Press, 1995). McRaven develops relative superiority through historical raids and arranges the explanation around six reinforcing principles: clear purpose, a simple plan, security, repetition, surprise and speed. The cases make the theory memorable. The warning is selection: the book concentrates on direct-action missions and successful examples, so it explains a demanding part of the field rather than its full political range. Its model works best where the objective is identifiable and the result can be completed quickly. Partner warfare, legitimacy and long campaigns require other tools of judgement.

The strategic interpretation. James D. Kiras, *Special Operations and Strategy: From World War II to the War on Terrorism* (Routledge, 2006). Kiras asks the question most raid histories postpone: how can repeated small actions contribute to strategic success? The answer places special operations inside campaigns, organisations and processes of attrition. It is scholarly and denser than Macintyre, but it is the best next step for testing the central claim of this book. It treats strategic effect as cumulative and

relational rather than as a property of one spectacular mission. Readers interested in why tactical success so often disappoints should start here after the overview.

The failure in primary evidence. James L. Holloway III, chair, *Rescue Mission Report* (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1980). The official review of Operation Eagle Claw is sober, technical and sometimes bureaucratic. That is its value. Instead of a legend assembled after success, you see investigators separating courage from planning, command, communications, equipment and joint integration. Read the summary and conclusions first, then follow one problem backwards through the report. It is the clearest document on why the mission system, not the badge, is the proper unit of analysis. Because it was written close to the event for institutional learning, it also reveals which defects officials could identify before later reform supplied a cleaner story.

Notes and Sources

Definition, scope and terminology

The opening definition follows NATO's current public account of special operations: activities conducted by specially designated, organised, trained and equipped forces using distinct techniques and modes of employment. NATO also calls these forces elite, states that they may act independently or with conventional, interagency, local or surrogate forces, and notes that most operations require non-SOF support. The page was updated on 7 March 2024 and rechecked on 4 September 2026. It is an alliance definition, not a universal settlement. States use different labels, place units under different ministries and divide military, police and intelligence functions differently.

The distinction between special operations forces and US Army Special Forces follows official American usage. USSOCOM's current Core Activities page supports the definitions of direct action, special reconnaissance, unconventional warfare, foreign internal defence, security force assistance

and counterterrorism. Hostage rescue, personnel recovery and allied practice are described more broadly because national doctrine differs. The book uses special forces in the international, lower-case sense promised by the title, while retaining capitals for the named US Army organisation.

The distinction between special operations forces and elite conventional troops is analytical and mission-led; it does not rank professions. NATO's account itself combines the language of elite units with a definition based on designation, organisation and employment. A 2025 *Joint Force Quarterly* primer on Ukrainian special forces demonstrates the danger of applying a NATO or US template to a different tradition: *spetsnaz* can denote a broader and differently distributed family. German federal police material confirms that GSG 9 was created after Munich inside the federal border police, while Entebbe used military commandos. These examples support variation in institutional placement, not a claim that the missions or legal powers were identical.

Relative superiority and the six principles

Relative superiority and the six principles of simplicity, security, repetition, surprise, speed and purpose come from William H. McRaven's *Spec Ops*. His model was built from selected direct-action case studies, many successful, and should not be extended without qualification to long advisory campaigns, resistance support or institution-building. The manuscript narrows the idea to temporary local advantage at a selected point. James D. Kiras and Robert G. Spulak Jr. supply the wider strategic and theoretical checks.

McRaven's book is also the source for the emphasis on converting surprise before ordinary numerical advantage returns. This is an interpretive model, not a measured law. Counterexamples include missions where secrecy is lost but speed or deception still creates an advantage, and missions where a small force never seeks combat superiority because information or partner capability is the objective.

Commandos and St Nazaire

The chronology of British commandos after Dunkirk and Operation Chariot follows Imperial War Museums material, the National Archives and official naval histories, checked against modern accounts. HMS *Campbeltown* struck the Normandie Dock gate at St Nazaire on 28 March 1942. Its delayed charge exploded later that morning. The dock was unusable for the rest of the war. The narrower strategic claim is that its loss denied *Tirpitz* a suitable Atlantic dry dock and constrained German options; the manuscript does not claim that the raid alone deterred or defeated the battleship.

Casualty and capture totals differ slightly across summaries because authors count naval crews, commandos and later deaths in different ways. The body therefore states only that many were killed or captured and most small craft did not return. The award of five Victoria Crosses is secure. Full battle detail belongs to *Great Battles in a Hurry* rather than this title.

The first SAS operation and adaptation

The National Army Museum's account of David Stirling and the origins of the SAS supports the formation of L Detachment in 1941, its nominal strength of sixty-seven men, the fifty-five who departed on Operation Squatter and the twenty-one who returned. Ben Macintyre's authorised wartime history is consistent with the broad sequence. The precise return figure is retained because it demonstrates the scale of the failure, not because every loss category is reconstructed in the body.

The Long Range Desert Group's role in carrying and recovering later SAS parties is established across unit histories and specialist accounts. Claims for exact numbers of Axis aircraft destroyed are excluded because wartime reports, later memoirs and popular retellings do not always match. The material conclusion is organisational: the SAS abandoned a failed insertion method and borrowed access from a formation already expert in desert movement.

Stirling's capture in 1943 and the unit's later activity in north-west Europe are included only to show that practice and command outlived the founder.

The manuscript does not present the wartime SAS as the sole origin of modern special forces or treat its authorised history as a neutral global survey.

SOE, OSS and Jedburgh teams

The Special Operations Executive's remit in sabotage, subversion and resistance support follows the UK National Archives research guides and official records. The Office of Strategic Services combined intelligence and operational functions in an American structure that does not map neatly onto later organisations. This book mentions both only where they explain the indirect method; *Espionage in a Hurry* owns intelligence institutions in depth.

The account of Jedburgh teams draws on Will Irwin, official Allied records and historical summaries by the CIA and US Army. More than ninety teams deployed to France from June 1944. Team composition varied, but three-person multinational groups with officers and a radio operator were common. Their effect depended on resistance organisations, communications, air supply and advancing conventional forces. The manuscript avoids assigning resistance achievements to the foreign teams and states that local people bore most reprisals and long-term risk.

Postwar survival and the Cold War

The disbandment of the wartime SAS in 1945, the Territorial Army continuation, the deployment of the Malayan Scouts in 1951 and the regular formation of 22 SAS in 1952 follow National Army Museum and regimental historical material. Colonial counterinsurgency is not treated as politically neutral. The Malayan Emergency involved detention, population resettlement, food control and coercion beyond the special operations unit. A complete account belongs to a wider decolonisation or counterinsurgency history.

The activation of the US Army's 10th Special Forces Group in 1952 and Aaron Bank's command follow US Army institutional histories. Its early European purpose centred on unconventional warfare in the event of Soviet invasion. The later association of the Green Berets with foreign-force work is

secure, but policy, scale and command changed across Korea, Vietnam and later decades. Those wars appear only at mechanism depth.

The statement that other national traditions do not fit one Anglo-American family tree is deliberately broad and cautionary. No global inventory is attempted. French, Soviet, Russian, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, South African and many other experiences would require their own archives and political histories. Their relative absence is the principal external-validity limit of this one-hour account.

Munich and Entebbe

The Munich Olympic massacre occurred in September 1972. The failed West German rescue and the deaths of eleven Israeli team members prompted West Germany to create GSG 9 inside the Federal Border Guard and encouraged wider investment in dedicated counterterrorist and hostage-rescue capability. Official Bundespolizei material identifies the unit's post-Munich origin and police status. Israel's use of military commandos at Entebbe supplies a contrasting institutional choice. The wording does not claim that Munich created every such unit or that no specialist capability existed beforehand.

The Entebbe chronology and casualty statements are based on Israeli archival releases, contemporary records, Saul David's synthesis and United Nations documents. Air France Flight 139 was hijacked on 27 June 1976 and taken to Entebbe. Most non-Israeli passengers were released before the raid. Of the 106 people left in captivity, 102 were taken out by the Israeli force. Three hostages died during the rescue. Lieutenant Colonel Yonatan Netanyahu was killed. Dora Bloch, who had been taken to hospital before the raid, was later murdered by Ugandan agents. The body uses the less brittle phrase more than one hundred hostages were freed.

Accounts differ over some tactical timings, Ugandan losses, destroyed aircraft and the exact contribution of individual intelligence sources. Those details are omitted because they do not change the model. The legal dispute is not resolved by the operation's success. Israel defended its action

in terms of necessity and self-defence, while Uganda and several other states called it aggression. United Nations Security Council meetings from 9 to 14 July 1976 record the disagreement; no proposed resolution secured adoption.

Operation Eagle Claw and institutional reform

The authoritative base for Desert One is the *Rescue Mission Report* chaired by Admiral James L. Holloway III. The attempt began on 24 April 1980 in the United States and reached Desert One after midnight in Iran on 25 April. Eight RH-53D helicopters launched from the carrier; six were considered necessary for continuation. Mechanical problems and dust left five available at the rendezvous, and commanders aborted. During departure, a helicopter collided with an EC-130. Five Air Force personnel and three Marines died.

The Holloway report's value lies in rejecting a single-cause story. It identified defects across planning, command and control, communications, joint training and equipment. Later reform had several causes. Desert One was the strongest warning, and problems during Grenada in 1983 added pressure. The Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Nunn-Cohen provisions reorganised joint command and special operations authority. USSOCOM was activated on 16 April 1987. Susan Marquis and official USSOCOM histories provide the institutional sequence.

The manuscript does not claim that one report directly produced one command. Congress, service resistance, individual advocates and further operational evidence intervened across seven years. The causal wording is therefore helped drive or added pressure, not caused by itself.

Afghanistan after 2001

The account of the opening Afghan campaign draws on Charles H. Briscoe and colleagues' official history, *Weapon of Choice*, and later scholarship. Army Special Forces detachments worked with Afghan factions already fighting the Taliban and connected them to American communications, intelligence and air power. The familiar twelve-person detachment is a common organisational form, not a claim that only twelve people produced any battle or city-level result.

The model of partner leverage is strongest in the opening campaign and should not be generalised to every district or phase. Afghan factions had distinct interests, records from the winning coalition are selective and the Taliban's military and political position varied. The manuscript avoids the popular claim that a few Americans conquered Afghanistan. It attributes ground mass and agency to Afghan forces and treats outside air and information systems as the added advantage.

Austin Long and co-authors' RAND study supports the discussion of relationship-building, partner capacity and dependencies in Afghanistan, Iraq and Colombia. SIGAR's November 2022 report on the Afghan government's collapse and February 2023 final report on the security forces support the wider conclusion that Afghan institutions remained dependent on foreign forces, contractors and systems, while political leadership, corruption, centralisation, morale and the withdrawal decision also contributed. The book does not make special operations dependence the sole cause of August 2021.

The claim that Afghan commandos were among the state's stronger forces is common in official and analytical reporting, but relative tactical performance is not the same as national sustainability. This distinction, rather than a unit ranking, is the retained point.

Abbottabad

The official public baseline is President Barack Obama's address of 2 May 2011. He described years of intelligence work, a lead developed from the previous August, authorisation of a targeted operation and the death of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad. Later official and journalistic accounts add detail, sometimes inconsistently. The manuscript retains only the stable outline: entry by a US Navy special operations team, bin Laden's death, recovery of material, the loss and destruction of one helicopter, no American fatalities and Pakistani condemnation of the unauthorised entry.

The wording does not claim that bin Laden's death ended al-Qaeda. Obama himself said the organisation would continue to pursue attacks. The operation achieved the bounded objective and had symbolic, intelligence and organisational effects whose scale is harder to isolate. Its connection to the wider decline or adaptation of al-Qaeda is not quantified.

Leadership removal and strategic effect

Jenna Jordan's *Leadership Decapitation* supports the correction that removing a leader has no universal organisational effect. Her analysis links resilience to factors including institutionalisation, age and communal support. Other research reaches different estimates for selected organisations and time periods, so the book does not claim that leadership targeting never works. It asks which function the person performs, whether it can be replaced and what the operation is meant to buy.

James Kiras supports the wider distinction between spectacular tactical action and strategic contribution. The manuscript's five-step evaluation chain, from task completion to lasting political effect, is an analytical tool rather than a quoted doctrine. It is designed to stop one observed result from answering a different question.

Precision, civilian harm and accountability

The distinction between accurate delivery, correct identification and beneficial effect follows the 2022 US Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response Action Plan, the Government Accountability Office's 2024 review and a May 2026 Inspector General evaluation. The 2026 report was published after the plan's FY2022-FY2025 implementation period and assessed progress by February 2025 and completion through the end of FY2025. It found progress but no objective fully implemented by the deadline. These are US-specific implementation findings, not casualty data or a measure of every special operation. They cannot establish whether selected forces cause more or less harm than conventional alternatives.

The International Committee of the Red Cross supports the discussion of legal obligations and risks in partnered military operations. Responsibility depends on facts, law and relationships that cannot be reduced to the label adviser or partner. The body avoids legal conclusions about unnamed operations.

The accountability discussion distinguishes operational secrecy from absence of oversight. Public disclosure can damage sources and future access. Cleared legislatures, inspectors, courts and internal records can still examine classified action. Which arrangement is adequate depends on the constitutional system. The manuscript offers a democratic principle, not a comparative legal survey.

Final evidence limits

The public record overrepresents famous raids, Western forces and operations governments chose to disclose. Failed or routine missions may remain classified. Memoirs can establish experience while protecting reputations. Official histories can document chronology while celebrating institutions. The manuscript therefore uses failures as well as successes, attributes local partners, narrows unstable numbers and avoids tactical details that add excitement without improving the mental model.

The strongest unresolved limitation is representation. British, American and

Israeli cases carry more explanatory weight than a global title would ideally allow. The model is presented as a bounded synthesis of mechanisms visible across available cases, not a complete comparative history of every special operations tradition.

Bibliography

Official and primary material

Briscoe, Charles H., Richard L. Kiper, James A. Schroder and Kalev I. Sepp. *Weapon of Choice: U.S. Army Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan*. Fort Leavenworth: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2003.

Bundespolizei. *BUNDESPOLIZEI kompakt*, no. 2 (2022), special issue, "Die GSG 9 der Bundespolizei: Einblicke in die Spezialeinheit." Accessed 4 September 2026.

Department of Defense. *Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response Action Plan*. Washington, DC, 25 August 2022.

Department of War Office of Inspector General. *Evaluation of the DoW's Implementation of the Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response Action Plan*. Report DOWIG-2026-084, 13 May 2026.

Holloway, James L. III, chair. *Rescue Mission Report*. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, August 1980.

Imperial War Museums. "Operation Chariot and the Raid on St Nazaire." Collections and historical material. Accessed 4 September 2026.

International Committee of the Red Cross. *Allies, Partners and Proxies: Managing Support Relationships in Armed Conflict to Reduce the Human Cost of War*. Geneva: ICRC, 2021.

National Army Museum. "David Stirling and the Origins of the SAS." Accessed 4 September 2026.

NATO. "Special Operations Forces." Updated 7 March 2024. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President on Osama bin Laden." White House, 2 May 2011.

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. *Why the Afghan Security Forces Collapsed*. SIGAR 23-16-IP, 28 February 2023.

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. *Why the Afghan Government Collapsed*. SIGAR 23-05-IP, 15 November 2022.

United Kingdom National Archives. "Special Operations Executive Personnel Files." Research guide. Accessed 4 September 2026.

United Nations Security Council. *Official Records, 1939th to 1943rd Meetings*. New York, 9 to 14 July 1976.

United States Army Special Operations Command. "10th Special Forces Group (Airborne): History." Accessed 4 September 2026.

United States Government Accountability Office. *Civilian Harm: DOD Should Take Actions to Enhance Its Plan for Mitigation and Response Efforts*. GAO-24-106257, 14 March 2024.

United States Special Operations Command. "Core Activities." Accessed 4 September 2026.

United States Special Operations Command. "SOF Truths." Accessed 4 September 2026.

Books and research

David, Saul. *Operation Thunderbolt: Flight 139 and the Raid on Entebbe Airport, the Most Audacious Hostage Rescue Mission in History*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2015.

Irwin, Will. *The Jedburghs: The Secret History of the Allied Special Forces, France 1944*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2005.

Jordan, Jenna. *Leadership Decapitation: Strategic Targeting of Terrorist Organizations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Kiras, James D. *Special Operations and Strategy: From World War II to the War on Terrorism*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Long, Austin G., Todd C. Helmus, S. Rebecca Zimmerman, Christopher M. Schnaubelt and Peter Chalk. *Building Special Operations Partnerships in Afghanistan and Beyond: Challenges and Best Practices from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Colombia*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2015.

Macintyre, Ben. *SAS: Rogue Heroes: The Authorised Wartime History*. London: Viking, 2016.

Marquis, Susan L. *Unconventional Warfare: Rebuilding U.S. Special Operations Forces*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997.

McRaven, William H. *Spec Ops: Case Studies in Special Operations Warfare: Theory and Practice*. Novato: Presidio Press, 1995.

Robinson, Linda. *One Hundred Victories: Special Ops and the Future of American Warfare*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2013.

Spulak, Robert G. Jr. *A Theory of Special Operations: The Origin, Qualities, and Use of SOF*. JSOU Report 07-7. Hurlburt Field: Joint Special Operations University Press, 2007.

Stringer, Kevin D., and Taisiia Vivdych. "A Primer on Ukrainian Special Forces: Beyond Joint." *Joint Force Quarterly* 119 (4th Quarter 2025): 54-63.