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VIGILANT WARRIORS 2002

By Professor James Kievit
Department of the Army Support Branch

During the week of 21-26 April, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) conducted Vigilant Warriors 2002, its annual Army Transformation Wargame (ATWG), at Carlisle Barracks and the Collins Center. The ATWG is a major contributor to TRADOC’s overall efforts in support of the Army’s Transformation to a future “Objective Force.” The U.S. Army War College and the Center for Strategic Leadership hosted approximately 500 participants for Vigilant Warriors 2002, and provided extensive information technology, audiovisual, and infrastructure support to every aspect of the ATWG effort.

Vigilant Warriors 2002 was designed to explore the dynamics of twenty-first century conflict and to generate informed discussion of the Army’s Objective Force across the entire spectrum of conflict. Seventeen player teams of various sizes grappled with multiple crises spanning the globe from Eastern Europe through Central Asia and the Southwest Pacific into Northwest Asia, including significant “Red” attacks on the U.S. homeland.

In addition to hosting and supporting this year’s ATWG, Army War College personnel participated in significant player positions during the wargame. The USAWC Commandant, MG Robert Ivany, acted as Commander of the Blue player Joint Task Force for the scenario in Central Asia, supported by Colonel John Bonin of the Department of Military Strategy, Plans, and Operations and Colonel Jerry Johnson from CSL’s Department of the Army Support Branch. Fifteen Army War College resident course students, members of Professor Doug Johnson’s “Transforming the Army” elective course, served as players and analysts in various game cells.

Preliminary Vigilant Warriors 2002 insights and findings were provided to the Chief of Staff, Army, and other Joint and Army senior flag officers during the Senior Leader Seminar session held in the Normandy Conference Room of Collins Hall on the afternoon of 26 April. These insights and findings were related to:

- Strategic and intra-theater lift requirements and capabilities,
- Operational Maneuver concepts,
- Strategic Reserve and Mobilization needs,
- Homeland Security concepts and requirements,
- Army organizational echelonment,
- Global Sustainment,
- Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR), and
- Readiness, training, and leader development.

Considerable additional analytical work remains to be accomplished by both the TRADOC Analysis Center at Fort Leavenworth and by TRADOC Deputy Chief of Staff for Doctrine personnel at Fort Monroe before the final findings and releasable reports on ATWG 2002 can be written. Nonetheless, it is already clear that Vigilant Warriors 2002—enabled by the technical capabilities of the Collins Center and the professional expertise and flexibility of the USAWC supporting staff—clearly accomplished its fundamental mission of providing a venue to explore and demonstrate the strategic contributions of the Army’s future Objective Force.

JOINT LAND AEROSPACE AND SEA SIMULATION (JLASS)

By COL Bob Hesse
Joint and Multination Support Branch

Twenty-six Army War College students along with ninety-one students from the other Senior Service Colleges participated in the annual Joint Land, Aerospace, and Sea Simulation (JLASS) from 18 to 25 April at Maxwell Air Force Base. Building on the Army War College core course curriculum, JLASS is a practicum in the design and execution of theater-level cam-
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paign planning. In JLASS, Army War College students developed and fought campaign plans with students from the other Senior Service Colleges in a free play, computer-assisted war game.

The objective of JLASS is to promote the joint professional military education of all participants by addressing key issues at the strategic and operational levels of war. Specific Army War College objectives included: employment of operational art, integration of the Joint Operations and Planning Execution System (JOPES) for land warfare, response to and employment options for weapons of mass destruction, development of information operations/warfare, translation of national strategy into military objectives, and investigation of emerging technology on future battlefields.

To accomplish these objectives, this year’s scenario was modified to include post 9/11 issues of terrorism and homeland security along with regional threats set in the year 2010. In the scenario, attacks on the U.S. homeland occurred while armed conflict threatened the US and its friends in the Persian Gulf, the South China Sea, Taiwan, and on the Korean peninsula. The scenario succeeded in creating issues of national security policy and prioritization, coalition warfare, and resource prioritization and allocation.

Participants’ role-played the Joint Staff, unified and functional commands (PACOM, CENTCOM, Combined Forces Command, SPACECOM, and TRANSCOM), the National Security Council staff, a Homeland Security Office, and opposing forces (Iran, Iraq, and China). During the distributive phase, students use the crisis action planning (CAP) model as a guide. Using CAP, students experienced interagency cooperation, coordination, and competition as they developed their campaign plans. At Maxwell AFB during the war gaming phase, they came together to execute their plans in a dynamic free play environment.

A Center for Strategic Leadership sponsored elective course, JLASS is the responsibility of the Joint and Multinational Initiatives Branch of the Operations and Gaming Division.

LANDPOWER OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN STATES

By Dr. Kent Butts
National Security Issues Branch

The Center for Strategic Leadership co-sponsored the Partnering for Environmental Security Cooperation in Central Asia and the Caspian Basin Conference for the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) at Chiemsee, Germany, 3-5 April 2002. Other cosponsors were the Department of Defense Deputy Secretary for Defense, Installations and Environment (DUSD-IE), and the George C. Marshall Center.

The event was designed to support Operation Enduring Freedom by enhancing security cooperation on destabilizing environmental security issues with the landpower components of the Central Asian States (CAS). This conference was a sequel to last year’s, which was praised by the Deputy Commander in Chief (DCINC) as the reason for the successful basing and security cooperation between the US and the Central Asian states during the war. As a result, environmental security is CENTCOM’s primary security cooperation vehicle for the region. Top environmental security issues for the region include: Caspian Basin energy access, nuclear tailings ponds, biological agent sites, unstable mountain dams, and the Aral Sea.

This year’s conference brought high-level delegations from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, as well as international academic, donor, and military speakers (including Rear Admiral Gaidis A. Zeibots, USAWC graduate and Deputy Commander of the Latvian Armed Forces). The U.S. delegation included the CENTCOM DCINC, LTG Michael Delong and six other general officers, Mr. Raymond DuBois, DUSD (I&E), and representatives of DOS, DOE, EPA, and USAID.

The conference was highly successful, using workshops to elicit a prioritized plan for multilateral cooperation from the CAS representatives and using a U.S. interagency, four-phase process to promote U.S. national security and CINCENT objectives for the region. A CSL National Security Issues team of Prof. Bernie Griffard, COL (RET) Art Bradshaw, COL Jeff Reynolds, and Dr. Kent Butts, developed the conference content and agenda, recruited the speakers, and facilitated the workshops.

ANTON MYRER LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

By Professor Larry Blotzer
U.S. Army War College Support Branch

From 17 to 18 June, a select group of senior business, civilian government, military, and academic leaders met at the Collins Center to examine “Leadership During Crises.” Sponsored by the Army War College Foundation, this was the fourth annual leadership symposium in honor of Anton Myrer’s superb novel on military leadership, “Once An Eagle.” The symposium focused on the following areas:

- Similarities and differences in how strategic leaders prepare for and respond to crises in each type of organization;
- What the leaders of each type of institution might learn from each other regarding leadership during crises, and;
- How to better educate strategic leaders.

The symposium was centered around three speakers, one from government, one from academia, and one from the business community.

Drawing upon a broad range of experience in the federal government and providing specific illustrations from three case studies, the government speaker encouraged the group to look beyond the idea that “by definition, if there is a crisis, there’s been a failure of leadership” or to simply “search for new and creative ways to do damage control,” and instead, recommended four rules for leaders in a crisis situation: be patient; be proactive; be consistent, and think about the long-term effects.

The workshop’s academic speaker provided insights into how organizations function from a chaos and complexity theory perspective. He highlighted how leaders need to create organizations that are less hierarchical in order to deal with complex situations—particularly rapid change. In addition, leaders should identify areas where decentralization is appropriate, but recognize that it is not applicable in all situations. Leaders should foster organizational adaptability, even though it might undermine their
authority. Throughout all these efforts, the leader’s judgment is always in action on multiple issues at multiple levels, which underscores the complex nature of leadership.

The business community speaker emphasized the key role that business leaders play in periods of crisis. Business leaders responding to crises must immediately seize the initiative, embrace their central leadership role, acknowledge what they know and do not know about the situation, carefully delegate authority, engage subject matter experts from outside the company or industry, and quickly work to identify the company or industry with the interests of those who have suffered from the crisis. The speaker pointed out that the manner in which a company responds in the first minutes of a crisis will greatly influence not only public perceptions but also the manner in which the company will handle the overall crisis. Leaders in such situations need to be able to respond to three basic questions: 1) What did you know? 2) When did you know it? and 3) What steps are you taking to ensure that this situation never happens again? Additionally, the author pointed out that legal advisors will often argue against such a proactive and contrite approach, particularly when the company bears some responsibility for the crisis.

MISSILE DEFENSE ACTIVATION REHEARSAL AND TESTING (MDART)

By COL Dale Eikmeier
Joint and Multinational Support Branch

Collins Hall hosted the Missile Defense Agency’s (MDA) Missile Defense Activation Rehearsal and Testing (MDART) exercise the week of 3 June 2002. MDART’s primary objective was to “Integrate execution of Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD), formerly known as National Missile Defense, test events across organizations, functions, and ranges between June 2002 and the first interceptor launch (3d Qtr FY 05) from Kodiak Launch Complex.” More simply, MDART was a technical rehearsal to insure synchronization of key players and events leading up to a test launch in FY 05. Participants included representatives from the MDA, U.S. SPACECOM, Army Space and Missile Defense Command, the state of Alaska, Alaska Command, National Guard Bureau, U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the test ranges, and others. The exercise organized participants into two main groups, site teams and functional teams, which focused on the dominating issues, critical events, and actions in their area. Site teams included Colorado Springs, Kodiak Launch Complex, Fort Greely/ Eareckson AS, Regan Test Site, and Vandenberg/Beal AFB. Functional teams covered facilities/construction, transportation/logistics, range safety, communications, environmental issues, and security and force protection.

The exercise concluded with a plenary session and a Senior Leader Seminar on 7 June that discussed the program’s plan, issues and recommendations, indicators of failure, and unfunded requirements. MDART successfully met its objectives of integrating test and evaluation programs across the sites, refining the test bed plans and documenting and analysing test bed issues.

JOINT PEACE OPERATIONS SEMINAR 2002

By COL George Oliver
U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute

The U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute and the Center for Strategic Leadership hosted the Eighth Annual Chairman-directed Joint Peace Operations Seminar from 11 to 13 June 2002 in Collins Hall. The Director of the Plans and Policy Directorate (J-5) of the Joint Staff, sponsored the seminar. The theme was “The Power of Information in Peace Operations.” The seminar was organized to accomplish two specified aims:

- Examine the United States’ ability to influence opinions, attitudes, and actions prior to and after Global War on Terrorism military operations in order to shape the environment for subsequent peace operations.

- Provide a forum for attendees to share information regarding capabilities provided by their service, agency, or organization, share lessons learned from Global War on Terrorism operations, and recommend process changes or improvements to better achieve U.S. objectives.

The seventy-nine seminar participants included a broad spectrum of the U.S. Government’s national security community, from the Departments of State and Defense, the Joint Staff, the unified commands, and the Service staffs, and representatives from foreign militaries, academia, and NGOs. Work group facilitators were drawn from the faculty of the Army War College.

General Montgomery Meigs, Commanding General, U.S. Army Europe and Seventh Army, opened the seminar with a presentation that focused on the fundamentals of successful Information Operations. His presentation was followed by two panels discussing international and interagency coordination in Information Operations.

The first panel, International and Interagency Coordination: Balkans; discussed the challenges of coordinating Information Operations among diplomatic, military, and civilian organizations. The discussions included comparing the different objectives, perspectives, and staffing requirements for Information Operations based on experience in Bosnia and Kosovo. The common thread among organizations was the need to develop trust, coordinate efforts, establish a “targeting” process, and provide feedback.

Panel Two, Interagency and International Coordination: Afghanistan; provided insights on issues associated with Information Operations in the War on Terrorism. Combat operations in Afghanistan presented new challenges associated with a war against an organization and not a country. The United States had to address the issue of “Why do they hate us?” had to educate the public on its true objectives, and had to dispel perceptions that it was not a war against Islam, but a war against the Taliban and the al Qaeda terrorist organization. The panel also discussed the fact that operations ten time zones away caused the coalition to be outside the news decision cycle and behind in answering allegations made in the media.

Dr. Barry Fulton, Director, Institute for Public Diplomacy, George Washington University, concluded the first day’s agenda by providing an in-depth review of public diplomacy. That evening’s dinner was held at the Allenberry Playhouse Restaurant, where Mr. Kevin Klose, President, National Public Radio, spoke on the power of truth in Information Operations.

The second day began with Ambassador Christopher Ross, Special Advisor to the Under Secretary of State for the
Information War on Terrorism, speaking on public diplomacy and the “War on Terrorism.” Three work groups in two sessions then discussed the strategic and operational level implications of Information Operations:

- Defining Information Operations for the twenty-first century and describing how we approach Information Operations at the strategic level;
- Planning and executing Information Operations at the operational level.

The concluding day of the Seminar included a presentation by Dr. Stephen Shaffer, Director, Office of Research, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, describing the Interagency Information Operations effort and the results of a number of surveys that showed international, primarily Arab countries, views of the United States and the War on Terrorism—most were highly unfavorable to the US. COL George Oliver, Director of the U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute, concluded the seminar by reviewing his briefing on the results of the workgroup’s deliberations, which he had prepared for the J-5 of the Joint Staff, LTG George Casey. COL Oliver briefed LTG Casey at the Pentagon on 21 June.

ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION BETWEEN SECURITY FORCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL INSTITUTIONS

By Professor Bernie Griffard
Joint and Multinational Support Branch

Trade and transit of illegal drugs, urban pollution, water usage, hazardous waste disposal, desertification, and wetlands and forest resource management are major environmental security issues in the Southern Cone of South America. These problems are transnational in nature and require regional cooperation for their resolution. In addition to being major sources of instability, such problems can create the conditions for a major natural or man-made disaster.

With the goals of enhancing environmental cooperation between defense and environmental authorities of the region’s states and of examining opportunities for multilateral and interagency cooperation, the Center for Strategic Leadership, along with the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment (DUSD, I&E), and the U.S. Embassy Asunción, Paraguay, cosponsored USSOUTHCOM’s Regional Environmental Security Conference, “Strengthening The Bonds Of Environmental Cooperation Between Security Forces And Environmental Institutions.” Co-hosted by the Paraguayan Ministries of Defense and the Environment, the conference was conducted from May 28th to 31st, 2002, in Asunción. In addition to representatives from the host country, key military and civilian leaders at the flag officer and vice-ministerial level represented Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay.

A major outcome was a regional initiative requesting USSOUTHCOM’s support and participation in institutionalizing environmental security and disaster response cooperation within the civilian and military structures of the participating governments. The initiative included a request for assistance in integrating military environmental stewardship and disaster response concepts into the professional military education (PME) programs of all six countries.

With this regional proposal as a framework, USSOUTHCOM can focus the resources of the interagency community’s future efforts along three major lines of operation: cooperation to minimize the environmental impact of military operations; the improvement of regional capabilities to respond to disasters; and, training and information exchange to better manage the Transboundary Rivers of the Plata Basin.
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