

Combined operations capitalize on our peacetime training, help generate and sustain international support, and enable our forces to provide the high-leverage capabilities required to achieve decisive outcomes against any adversary.

—National Military Strategy (1995)

Opening ceremonies
for Peace Shield '96,
Ukraine.



DOD (R.D. Ward)

DOCTRINE for Combined Operations

By GEORGE A. JOULWAN



F-16 and A-10 during
Deny Flight.

Combat Camera Imagery (Jamie Boxman)

EDITOR'S Note

Combined operations have become a reality and necessity for almost every type of mission. Joint doctrine contributes to combined operations by ensuring a common understanding among the Armed Forces which, in turn, projects a consistent operational view to allies and coalition partners. Developing combined doctrine similar to that produced for NATO and in Korea will help. Collectively, our joint and combined doctrine provides a model for other militaries. But we can't expect that other nations will always accept our doctrine. Success in combined operations also is based on communicating individual perspectives, resolving differences, and working toward a shared vision.

National military strategy directs, current global security demands, and reality requires that the Armed Forces be prepared to conduct the full range of military operations in concert with the militaries of other nations. *Joint Vision 2010* puts it this way:

It is not enough just to be joint when conducting future operations. We must find the most effective methods for integrating and improving interoperability with allied

and coalition partners. Although our Armed Forces will maintain decisive unilateral strength, we expect to work in concert with allied and coalition forces in nearly all of our future operations, and increasingly, our procedures, programs, and planning must recognize this reality.

Whether through an alliance or coalition, or simply because of proximity and shared goals, we must work with the militaries of other nations. Indeed, U.S. European Command (EUCOM), as the intercontinental link in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), conducts operations in a joint and combined environment on a routine basis. Recently, such operations have illustrated that multinational challenges are also joint challenges.

Over thirty nations—including Russia and other non-NATO partners—deployed in support of Joint Endeavor in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Able Sentry in Macedonia is a U.N. operation. Sharp Guard, a maritime embargo of the former Yugoslavia, was a combined Western European Union-NATO operation. Deny Flight was a NATO air operation in support of the U.N. Protection Force. Assured Response, a noncombatant evacuation in Liberia, found our forces working with a cease fire monitoring group of the Economic Community of Western African States that operated under a mandate from the Organization of African Unity. During Support Hope, a humanitarian mission in Rwanda, U.S. forces supported the U.N. Assistance Mission and French in Operation Turquoise. Moreover, Provide Comfort in northern Iraq, Quick Response in the Central African Republic, and other multinational operations have been expressions of a real capability, not theory. While no two are the same, these joint and combined operations will be the rule in the future, not the exception.

As Bosnia has proven, our forces will not work in isolation. They will coordinate military operations with a

growing range of nonmilitary organizations: national, international, and private. All governments and private support agencies are involved today in the most prevalent operations, including peace support, humanitarian, and disaster relief. The United Nations, non-governmental agencies, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and Organization of African Unity are only some of the groups that EUCOM sees as assuming greater roles in multinational military operations within our area of responsibility.

This plethora of activity makes it critical for the Armed Forces to have a mutually acceptable approach to operations, namely joint doctrine. Moreover, we need an agreed way for doctrine to capture how we deal with multinational and interagency operations.

The EUCOM experience with the Partnership for Peace (PFP) program, the joint contact team program, and multinational exercises have indicated that training and shared ideas (about such issues as operations, organization, and commitment to civilian control of the military) are paramount to multinational and interagency operations. And the key to the military aspects of multinational operations is doctrine. Common doctrine describes how to plan and conduct operations from the preparatory stage to follow-through and redeployment. Mutual understanding of doctrine provides a basis for the training required to work together to accomplish a mission.

PFP and other multinational exercises furnish the common bond that has enabled the forces of nations as diverse as Russia, Sweden, Estonia, and Turkey to combine in Joint Endeavor. But despite these successes we must do better.

For example, the Navy is improving its ability to conduct combined operations. The Naval Doctrine Command has taken a major step in this direction with the development of multinational maritime operations doctrine. Although oriented on the maritime medium of warfare, the objective of this effort is writing doctrine for multinational maritime operations with non-NATO countries, which puts

emphasis on multinational operations where it belongs. Formal alliances and regional security arrangements usually have codified procedures to enable their members to work together. When none exist, however, as in coalitions organized in response to emerging crises, coordinated operations are difficult. And even absent the pressure crises bring, multilateral training to prepare for them is fragmented and inefficient when the arrangements are ad hoc.

First Steps First

In order to reduce its dependence on ad hoc arrangements, the United States must complete the development of its own joint doctrine. Partners and friends often model their doctrine on ours. We must thus be consistent in applying our doctrine. For instance, when Navy officers are asked how air-ground operations are coordinated, they

future military operations will primarily be joint and require a solid base of joint doctrine

should provide the same answer as Army and Air Force officers. Notwithstanding the fact that we do not have a full complement of joint doctrine, frequently we are not familiar with even that which is available. We have made major strides over the last few years but still have hard work ahead.

Future military operations will primarily be joint and require a solid base of joint doctrine. Most multinational operational interface occurs on a level that is inherently joint to some extent. This does not imply that service doctrine is unimportant. There is a large amount of interface in multinational operations that requires detailed knowledge of service doctrine. Thus it is even more important that service doctrine conforms to joint doctrine. When cultural, linguistic, political, and military differences come into play, it is too much to demand that other nations detect that we conduct military operations one way within services but differently in joint operations.

General George A. Joulwan, USA, is commander in chief, U.S. European Command, and also served as commander in chief, U.S. Southern Command.



Unloading relief supplies for Kurds in northern Iraq.

Combat Camera Imagery (Efrain Gonzalez)

Russians arriving at Tuzla for Joint Endeavor.

U.S. Air Force (Ken Bergmann)

The change in warfare from a primarily symmetrical to a coordinated asymmetrical activity conducted at the speed of a data byte has dictated that all the services more closely harmonize their efforts. The challenge is to capture service experience and move ahead jointly. This may demand a compromise by all parties but the potential payoff to operations across the spectrum is staggering.

As the Chairman pointed out at the joint doctrine working party meeting in October 1995, the first round of joint doctrine development was heavily predicated on service level doctrine out of necessity. Future development must be based on a shared vision of military operations—*JV 2010*. But while moving forward to genuinely joint doctrine, we have not slain the

dragon which stands in the way of completing the first round. This must not continue.

We have been debating joint doctrine—which is critical to joint and combined operations—too long and too acrimoniously. Joint Pub 3-56, *Command and Control of Joint Operations*, has been in and out of preparation since 1987. How can we presume to lead, train, or coordinate with other nations when we cannot agree on something as fundamental as command and control? Joint Pub 3-01, *Joint Doctrine Countering Air and Missile Threats*, is another case in point. This area must be tightly coordinated in a coalition effort, yet we do not have approved doctrine for this important mission. I'm not suggesting that multinational operations can't succeed without a full complement of joint doctrine publications. On the contrary, EUCOM

has proven its ability to execute many combined joint operations. However, agreement on joint doctrine would make the process much easier. Also, without such doctrine the chance for mistakes increases and that can translate into more friendly casualties in military operations.

We have found a good basis in EUCOM through PFP exercises for conducting operations with our NATO allies, partners, and friends. This step underscores my contention that successful military operations are far more likely when there is general understanding and agreement on how to conduct joint and combined operations. The speed with which military alliances and coalitions are put together today and expected to react



Latvian members
of Baltic battalion.

DOO (R.D. Ward)

does not allow time for debating procedures when our political leaders choose the military option. The first critical step towards successful multinational operations is comprehensive doctrine that incorporates multinational dimensions in each joint pub.

Two titles being developed—Joint Pubs 3-16, *Joint Doctrine for Multinational Operations*, and 3-08, *Interagency*

to expect all partners to accept our doctrine outright is unrealistic and unnecessary

Coordination During Joint Operations—will fill some of this doctrinal void. But the former volume will not resolve the larger issue of working with other militaries. In fact, it may engender a perception that multinational operations are exceptions. I contend that they are the rule and that a more holistic approach is needed. As *JV 2010* states, “Future joint doctrine must articulate the process required for successful joint planning but must be flexible enough to serve as a broad framework to guide our forces in joint and multinational operations.”

Moving Forward

Once we have settled joint and service doctrine, the next stage will be to produce broadly based doctrine for a myriad of future international alliances, coalitions, and interagency situations. To expect all partners to accept our doctrine outright is unrealistic and unnecessary. In some cases combined doctrine will be developed as it was in the past with NATO and Combined Forces Korea. In others we can only hope to explain our doctrine to partners. At the same time, we must also be prepared to discern their doctrinal concepts. Harmonizing differences will be one of the greatest hurdles faced by commanders on all levels. It was one of the biggest initial challenges in Bosnia. Even with NATO allies and years of exercises and cooperation, we had to reconcile differences in approaching peace enforcement operations. Joint Pub 3-07.3, *Joint Doctrine for Peace Support Operations*, will eventually address some of our own national issues. But in Bosnia, despite some existing service doctrine, we were unprepared down to the lowest levels

in explaining our doctrine for peace enforcement.

That last point is critical. Joint and combined operations place tremendous responsibility on junior and noncommissioned officers. A firm foundation in joint doctrine will develop an ethos that both impels the right choices and demonstrates doctrinal leadership to our allies and partners. This foundation must be nurtured in one’s formative years and reinforced over a career. Anything less will not yield the cultural change needed to meet national security challenges in the future.

The world has changed and so have the problems confronting the Armed Forces. We must squarely face tough issues as a joint team rather than as a collection of superstars coming together for an all-star game. Combined joint operations are not the wave of tomorrow but the reality of today. We cannot afford to focus on national doctrine without considering its implications for combined operations. EUCOM believes that, although we have a separate publication on this subject in draft, doctrine for multinational operations must be seamlessly woven into our joint doctrine. In concert with the doctrine development process, we seek a cultural change—to be members of a seamless joint team that executes all the plays from the same book. This demands that determined education and training prepare new members of our team to operate on their doctrinal instinct, even in a complex multinational environment.

This journey will not be easy. *JV 2010* is an excellent blueprint. We must move ahead to develop doctrine that facilitates effective and efficient joint and combined operations and continue to actively deploy it on all levels throughout the Armed Forces. In both EUCOM and NATO it has been a matter of one team-one fight, and advancing the development of joint and combined doctrine will only improve on our team’s efforts. JFQ