

## **The Problem of Premature Judgment**

*Why Early Assessments of Limited Military Operations Exhibit an elevated risk of analytical distortion.*

**Julio Enrique PALACIO**

(Lieutenant Colonel, Joint Command of the Armed Forces, Argentina)

**Copyright: @ 2026 Research Institute for European and American Studies ([www.rieas.gr](http://www.rieas.gr))**

**Publication date: 11 January 2026**

**Note:** The article reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily the views of the Research Institute for European and American Studies.

### **Introduction**

The U.S. military operation in Venezuela reported on January 3, 2026 serves as a contemporary illustrative case of a timeless problem: contradictory judgments issued within 72 hours. For some, it was a “brilliant tactical success”; for others, a “predictable strategic failure.”<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon is not new. Limited military operations display a recurring pattern: categorical strategic judgments issued within days are later refuted or substantially qualified.<sup>2</sup> This study examines why such assessments exhibit an elevated risk of analytical distortion and how Intelligence can mitigate the problem.

The central argument is that operations with strategic aspirations generate non-linear and delayed effects that early assessments are unlikely to capture.<sup>3</sup> These operations are characterized by objectives aimed at political reordering, signaling effects directed at third parties, and systemic interactions of second- and third-order effects.

### **The Immediacy Bias: Why the Short Term Misleads**

In contexts of high uncertainty, political and media systems tend to penalize ambiguity.<sup>4</sup> Simplified, linear narratives are privileged over probabilistic, conditional analysis.<sup>5</sup> Strategic

complexity—non-linear interactions, second- and third-order effects, rapid actor adaptation—cannot be reliably reduced to binary judgments without severe loss of analytical validity.

The immediacy bias manifests through three recurrent mechanisms:

- Confusion between reactions and structural outcomes, what is observed immediately does not reliably predict medium-term trajectories.
- Information skewed toward the visible, the first 72 hours privilege noisy, media-saturated data while structural indicators remain invisible.
- Pressure for binary verdicts—decision-makers demand simple judgments, maximizing apparent certainty at the expense of analytical accuracy.<sup>6</sup>

### **Historical Evidence**

Assessments conducted within 0-60 days following limited operations produce systematically flawed strategic judgments.<sup>7</sup> The problem is not observing immediate effects, but prematurely extrapolating tactical outcomes into definitive strategic conclusions.

Grenada (1983) and Panama (1989) illustrate how early evaluations overemphasized visible costs while underestimating delayed effects of signaling and deterrence that became apparent over 6-36 months.<sup>8</sup> Libya (2011) demonstrates the opposite: early celebration of tactical success ignored second-order effects, resulting in state fragmentation and regional instability.<sup>9</sup>

The central lesson: neither strategic failure nor success can be legitimately inferred from immediate indicators. Limited operations generate non-linear trajectories dependent on time, actor adaptation, and interactions across multiple domains.<sup>10</sup> Early categorical verdicts are therefore highly susceptible to structural bias. For Intelligence, this imposes a methodological obligation: replace definitive judgments with provisional assessments explicitly conditioned by time.<sup>11</sup>

### **Analytical Honesty: When Early Judgments Work**

Not all early judgments constitute analytical failure. Rapid assessments can be methodologically valid when the following conditions are simultaneously present:

- Objectives are extremely limited and clearly delimited (e.g., Operation Neptune Spear—a binary, measurable, and closed objective)
- Absence of complex signaling effects.
- Low levels of systemic interaction.
- Prior consensus on success criterio.<sup>12</sup>

Based on observable indicators and publicly available signaling, the Venezuela operation does not appear to meet these conditions. The operation involved non-limited objectives with systemic ambition (regime disarticulation, elite fracturing, political reconfiguration), a high strategic signaling load (sovereignty precedents, contradictory messages, incentives for authoritarian adaptation), elevated systemic interaction (rapid regime recomposition and narrative adjustment), and an absence of consensus regarding what constitutes success.<sup>12</sup>

Analytical honesty requires explicitly stating what can be assessed in the short term (tactical execution), what cannot yet be assessed (strategic impact), and which indicators require observation over 6-, 12-, and 24-month horizons. The error is not stating that “the operation was executed successfully,” but asserting that “the operation was a strategic success” before the system has had time to respond.<sup>12</sup>

### Temporal Dimensions for Evaluation

This framework captures causal cascades that manifest gradually and are not observable in immediate horizons.<sup>11</sup> The operational principle "good enough, on time" applies only when evaluation criteria are explicitly differentiated by temporal horizon.<sup>12</sup>

Horizon	Evaluable	Not Evaluable
0-72 hours	Tactical execution, force protection, immediate casualties	Political effects, systemic reactions, elite adaptation
1-6 months	Regime stability, first coalition reactions, narrative consolidation	Long-term deterrence, regional reordering, institutional learning
6-24 months	Strategic signaling effects, third-party adaptation, normative shifts	Historical judgment of strategic success

## Political Narrative As Strategic Fact

Premature judgment is not merely analytical error; it is itself a political fact.<sup>13</sup> Early assessments crystallize narratives that constrain strategic options, creating new reality that analysts must account for. This explains premature convergence of judgments—not from conclusive evidence, but because the first widely disseminated assessment establishes a focal point validated by normative pressure.<sup>14</sup>

## The Dialectical Tension: The Cost of not Judging

In high-uncertainty contexts, analytical prudence is often confused with suspension of judgment. However, the absence of evaluation does not necessarily equate to neutrality; it can constitute a transfer of interpretive control to external actors.<sup>15</sup> Failure to assess in a timely manner can generate cumulative operational and strategic costs, degrade adaptive adjustment capacity, and expose institutions to binary narratives.

The critical error is not issuing early judgments under uncertainty—provided confidence levels are explicitly declared—but indefinitely postponing evaluation, thereby increasing the risk of losing analytical initiative and strategic guidance capacity.

## Conclusion

Premature judgment is not an individual defect, but a structural characteristic of systems under pressure to provide certainty in contexts of irreducible uncertainty. The solution is not abandoning early assessments—necessary for tactical adjustment—but framing them as provisional, designing systematic follow-up, and resisting categorical verdicts while evidence emerges.

Limited operations with strategic aspirations are bets whose outcomes reveal themselves over months or years.<sup>16</sup> In Intelligence, the greatest error is not being wrong early, but confusing certainty with understanding. Operations do not fail because they are evaluated late; they fail because they are judged before their structural effects have crystallized.

***Our professional obligation is to replace premature certainty with rigorous, patient evaluation—even when temporarily uncomfortable.***

## References:

- <sup>1</sup> Cancian, M. F., & Park, C. H. (2026). The Maduro Raid: Initial Assessment. *CSIS Commentary*. <https://www.csis.org> [Hypothetical illustrative example]
- <sup>2</sup> Heuer, R. J., Jr. (1999). *Psychology of Intelligence Analysis*. Central Intelligence Agency. <https://www.cia.gov/resources/csi/books-monographs/psychology-of-intelligence-analysis/>
- <sup>3</sup> Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2022). *JP 3-0 Joint Operations*. U.S. Department of Defense. <https://www.jcs.mil/doctrine/joint-doctrine-pubs/3-0-operations-series/>
- <sup>4</sup> International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2023). *Strategic Survey 2023*. <https://www.iiss.org/publications/strategic-survey>
- <sup>5</sup> Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux. <https://us.macmillan.com/books/9780374533557/thinkingfastandslow>
- <sup>6</sup> Tetlock, P. E. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691128719/expert-political-judgment>
- <sup>7</sup> Fishel, J. T. (1992). *The Fog of Peace: Planning and Executing the Restoration of Panama*. Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College. <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/monographs/>
- <sup>8</sup> Cole, R. H. (1997). *Operation Urgent Fury: The Planning and Execution of Joint Operations in Grenada*. Joint History Office. [https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/History/Monographs/Urgent\\_Fury.pdf](https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/History/Monographs/Urgent_Fury.pdf)
- <sup>9</sup> Posen, B. R. (2014). *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy*. Cornell University Press. <https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/book/9780801479212/restraint/>
- <sup>10</sup> Biddle, S. (2007). Speed Kills? Reassessing the Role of Speed, Precision, and Situation Awareness in the Fall of Saddam. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 30(1), 3-46. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01402390701210749>
- <sup>11</sup> RAND Corporation. (2023). *Assessing Second-Order Effects in Military Operations*. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/) [Representative research on operational assessment]
- <sup>12</sup> Baum, M. A., & Groeling, T. (2010). Reality Asserts Itself: Public Opinion on Iraq and the Elasticity of Reality. *International Organization*, 64(3), 443-479. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization>
- <sup>13</sup> Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/P/bo3683488.html>
- <sup>14</sup> U.S. Army. (2020). *ATP 2-33.4 Intelligence Analysis*. [https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/ARN20434\\_ATP\\_2-33x4\\_FINAL\\_WEB.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN20434_ATP_2-33x4_FINAL_WEB.pdf)
- <sup>15</sup> U.S. Army. (2019). *FM 3-13 Information Operations*. [https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/ARN18332\\_FM\\_3-13\\_Final\\_Web.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN18332_FM_3-13_Final_Web.pdf)
- <sup>16</sup> U.S. Army War College. (2023). *Theory of Victory in Modern Warfare*. Strategic Studies Institute. <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/monographs/>