STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIAL EVENTS: PLANNING REQUIREMENTS AND SUPPORT METHODOLOGY

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES R. WHITE
SSC Fellow, United States Army
TUFTS UNIVERSITY

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1999

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19990816 128

USAWC RESEARCH PROJECT

Military Assistance for Special Events: Planning Requirements and Support Methodology

(A Mission for the National Guard)

Prepared by

LTC James R. White

U.S. Army War College
ARNG Senior Service College Fellow
1999

Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy
Tufts University

Disclaimer

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

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: James R. White

TITLE: Military Assistance for Special Events: Planning Requirements and Support Methodology (A Mission for the National Guard)

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 March 1999 PAGES: 30 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States has been the site for many world events since the turn of the century. These events have allowed the nation to showcase the American way of life and proclaim the American spirit. Other countries have played host to international events. Worlds Fairs, Olympics, meetings of NATO, G-7 and sessions of the United Nations have been conducted at various locations around the world. These events were celebrations and usually conducted with little or no disruption. In 1972 the world of special events was forever changed by the terrorist attack on the Israeli athletes in Munich during the Summer Olympic Games. Every country vowed not to repeat the tragedy.

The United States, being the worlds only super power, is an inviting target for terrorists and dissident groups. The need to conduct special events in a safe and secure atmosphere has required greater involvement by the federal government. The Department of Defense was the primary supplier of assistance to organizers and law enforcement. This assistance included personnel, expertise, and equipment. The Office of Special Events in the Department of Defense was charged with this responsibility from the 1980 Winter Olympic Games in Lake Placid, New York to the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games in Atlanta. During the Atlanta Games the United States Army assumed the lead for special events.

Is the Army the right agency for the special event lead? A logical argument can be made to suggest otherwise. The Army is stretched to its limits and is having difficulty retaining and attracting soldiers. The special event mission further burdens an overworked Army.

The special event mission is ideal for the National Guard. The Guard has extensive special event experience. Special events are a logical extension of the Guard Homeland Defense role. The ongoing rift between the Army and the Guard needs to be addressed. There is a necessity for both sides to reconcile. The assignment of the special event mission to the Guard can be a therapeutic solution to this discord. It will signal to everyone the Guard is relevant and can aid the Army in mission requirements. This is a distinctive opportunity for harmony and achievement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

FOREWORD vi

WHAT IS A SPECIAL EVENT AND WHY PROVIDE SUPPORT? 4

WHO SHOULD HAVE THE LEAD? 6

THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS 13

OBSTACLES 17

RECOMMENDATIONS 19

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS 19

ENDNOTES 21

BIBLIOGRAPHY 23

ACKNOWLEDEGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the contributions of the special event's community. It is impossible to thank everyone. However, there are several who deserve recognition. Marv Smalley, a true professional and mentor, who encouraged my work. Ann Brooks, a dedicated leader, who gave me the opportunity to demonstrate my abilities. LTC Margie Garrison a stalwart friend who was always available to assist. Bill Urbanski of the New York Sate Police, Fred Gronau of the New Jersey State Police and Jon Gordon of the Atlanta Police Department, professionals who ensured the success of their events. Finally, the police officers, military personnel, and volunteers who are the real champions of Special Events.

FOREWORD

The Special Event community is an exciting assortment of people. They are professionals in a dynamic environment who bring uniformity and quality to each event. They know how to make things happen. The military has been an integral part of this community and has been vital to event success. Military personnel bring expertise not otherwise found in the civilian community, to these events. Unfortunately the role of military support if often misunderstood. Other participants in the special event world are cities, organizers and law enforcement agencies.

This assessment is based upon experience as an Indiana State Police Officer who served as a venue commander during the 1987 Pan American Games. It is further predicated on experience as a planner for the 1993 World University Games, 1994 World Cup Soccer Championships, the 1994 World Rowing Championships and the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games in Atlanta.

This is an effort to find solutions. It is not a condemnation of the Special Event community, or is it an attack on how previous events were conducted. It is an honest appraisal of special event planning and support. The desired end state is a methodology for providing military support for Special Events.

Special events are not some recent phenomena to the world panorama. International fairs and expositions have long been instruments for countries to exhibit their way of life and the progression of their society. The Eiffel Tower of Paris and the Space Needle in Seattle are two well know representations of previous World Fairs in France and the United States. International sporting events have become instruments to exhibit a country's culture and way of life. With the rebirth of the Olympic Games in 1896 they have become the preeminent special event.

The United States has been the host for many world class special events since the turn of the century. These events have allowed the nation to showcase the American way of life and proclaim the American spirit. World Fairs have been held in Saint Louis, Chicago, New York City, and Seattle. The United Sates has been the host for four Olympic Games, more than any other nation. The first Games were in St. Louis in 1904. Los Angles hosted the Games in 1932 and 1984. Atlanta was the host to the Centennial Olympic in 1996. The Olympics, along with the Pan American Games in Chicago in 1959 and Indianapolis in 1987, the 1990 Seattle Goodwill Games and the 1994 World Cup Soccer Championships at nine US cities have been exhibitions of world athletes and venues for America.

Other countries have played host to these International special events. In recent years Japan, Korea, France, and Norway have been the host for winter and summer Olympic Games. Spain was the site of a Worlds' Fair and summer Olympics in 1992. International meetings of the G-7 countries and NATO and United Nations conferences have taken on the aura of special events.

Special events have long been conducted in an atmosphere of peace. While they have garnered much scrutiny from the press and interest from participants, they have not been targets for disruption. All of this changed in 1972 when the Israeli athletes were attacked by terrorists at the Summer Olympic Games in Munich. This attack forever changed the atmosphere of special events.

The specter of terrorism would be linked to all International special events. Terrorism not only changed the special event's world but caused security and law enforcement to assume a greater role in the planning strategy. Subsequently the military forces of the United States became major providers of assistance to special events here at home and around the world. The potential for terrorism became the focus of every nation hosting a special event. Each vowed to avoid a repeat of Munich. The 1980 Winter Olympic Games in Lake Placid was the first major event held in the United States after Munich. It was also the first time military support played a prominent part.[1] Support for the 1980 Winter Games consisted of explosive ordnance, military working dogs, aviation, communication, and some personnel support. The primary law enforcement and security role was the responsibility of the New York State Police with assistance from the FBI and other Department of Justice and Treasury agencies. This amalgamation of different views and interests, while not always harmonious, ensured the games' safety and success.

The 1984 Summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles saw an enlargement of military support for special events. The Los Angeles Police Department was the lead law enforcement agency for the Games. They were assisted by the California Highway Patrol, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and a host of southern California law enforcement agencies. The FBI and the Departments of Justice and Treasury again played a significant security roles in the Games. The military role expanded substantially over the Lake Placid Games. Like the Lake Placid Games the planning process was one of frustration for all parties, albeit much improved over the 1980 Winter Games.

The magnification of military support continued to increase through the years. Support was provided for the following events:[2]

-1987 Pan American Games (Indianapolis, IN)

-1988 Summer Olympic Games (Seoul, Korea)

-1989 World Alpine Ski Championships (Vail, CO)

-1989 Universal Postal Congress (Washington, D.C.)

-1990 Goodwill Games (Seattle, WA)

-1990 Economic Summit of Industrialized Nations (Houston, TX)

-1990 Winter Torch Run (New York State)

-1991 Freestyle World Championships (Lake Placid, NY)

-1991 Special Olympics (Minneapolis, MN)

-1992 Universal Worlds Fair (Seville, Spain)

-1992 Summer Olympic Games (Barcelona, Spain)

-1993 World University Games (Buffalo, NY)

-1993 Olympic Festival (San Antonio, TX)

-1994 World Cup (Chicago, IL; Dallas, TX; Foxboro, MA; Pontiac, MI; Pasadena, CA; East Rutherford, NJ; Orlando, FL; Stanford, CA; Washington, D.C.)

-1994 World Rowing Championships (Indianapolis, IN)

-1994 Goodwill Games (St. Petersburg, Russia)

-1994 Summit of the Americas (Miami, FL)

-1995 Special Olympics (New Haven, CT)

-1995 UN 50 Commemoration (San Francisco and New York City)

-1996 Summer Olympic Games (Atlanta, Ga)

-1996 Paralympic Games (Atlanta, GA)

The lead for providing military support in these events was the Office of Special Events in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. The Army had a significant role and the other branches of the services were instrumental in providing assistance. Agencies of the Departments of Justice and Treasury were providers of support to these events. The Office of Special Events clearly defined the planning and support process. This was an achievement of considerable measure. All participants clearly understood their roles and how to obtain military support.

WHAT IS A SPECIAL EVENT AND WHY PROVIDE SUPPORT?

A special event can best be described as a singular or noteworthy occurrence. Simply stated it is beyond the normal. Special events have national or international significance to the United States of America. This applies to events within and outside the country. All events have some significance. However, the United States is the major world power with interests throughout the globe. Because of the stature of the United States, it is imperative for world events to be conducted in a safe and secure environment. The expertise and cost of staging these events are often beyond the capabilities of most cities, states and countries. Consequently the United States has become a provider of support to the preponderance of international events.

There are several reasons to support special events. The first is safety and security. The military, along with the law enforcement community can ensure an event is held an atmosphere free from worry. Another important consideration is the critical importance of the event to the prestige of the United States. This in reality is tied to the need for security. The United States is the preeminent power in the world. Thus, any special event connected with the United States is an inviting target for terrorists or dissident factions. Cindy Gillespie, the lead legislative lobbyist for the 1996 Olympic Games and the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee cites the strategic importance

of special events to the United States as a symbol of leadership to the world community. She believes special events portray the United States in a positive light. Consequently she believes the resources of the country and the government are essential to the success of the events. She believes it is money well spent as the event legitimizes the prominence of the United States as a world leader.

The criticality of a special event to the nation is the most prevalent rationale for support. It is difficult to argue the importance of a safe and secure event. Similarly it is important for the event to portray a positive image of the United States. These factors alone are justification for support. However, the real reason for support is political. Like money, politics is a driving force behind the scene in all special events. The securing of the event requires political support. The construction projects and funding all require political advocacy. Consequently assistance for events has political overtones. Politics need not be construed as a dirty word relative to special events, or for that matter, in any other instance. We live in a political society and our form of democracy requires the intervention of politics into almost every facet of our lives. Nineteen ninety six was a Presidential election year. The White House, understandably, had a vested interest in the fortune of the Atlanta Games. Representatives of the White House were intimately involved in the oversight of the Games. Because of the political nature of the event, many political accommodations were sought out to ensure success. This is reality and is prevalent in almost every event. The secret may be in the understanding of politics and the role it plays. In special events it plays an enormous role. Once understood the support role becomes easy to understand.

Special events are important to the nation and they are political in their nature. The end result is they have and will continue to be supported by the United States government. The Defense community, and in particular the Army has a prominent role in the support equation.

WHO SHOULD HAVE THE LEAD?

The world of special events is exciting, unfortunately, it is also one of controversy. The ongoing scandal swirling around the 2002 Winter Games in Salt Lake City, the International Olympic Committee, and the United States Olympic Committee are a facet of the special event's community. These controversies may cause a rethinking of support efforts. Likewise, a similar controversy exists in the Defense camp. Who should have the lead for special events? The question revolves around the issue of funding. Special events, if nothing else, are about money.

Since the 1980 Winter Olympics the Office of Special Events (OSE), Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness was the provider of support for events around the world. The Office of Special Events had an outstanding reputation among the law enforcement agencies in the United States and other countries. In short they were very successful in providing support. Currently the Army's Director of Military Support has the lead for all military support to special events.

The Office of Special Events operated more as a clearing house and facilitator of support. They had the unique capability of going to all of the services and requesting support for an event. The most important aspect of the operation was the cadre of "experts" they could muster for events. They engaged current and former military personnel and law enforcement officers to assist them. This expertise included individuals with past event experience. Some of the areas of proficiency were aviation, bombs and explosives, military working dogs, emergency response operations, crowd control, event operations and management, communication, physical security, logistics and training. Most of the experts had extensive contacts inside the law enforcement and military communities. The Office of Special Events could bring these experts to the event site and place them along side local

event planners to help prepare for the event. This resulted in a unique blending between the local planners and the event experts. The experts became members of the event planning staff. Because of their experience, they were able to nurture the planners. This eliminated many fears and created an atmosphere of trust and cooperation. This addition to the local planning team consisted, in most instances, of an on site cadre of less than twenty individuals. The contributions of these experts were more than tenfold.

Another notable aspect of the Office of Special Events operation was the request process for support. This process, because of the onsite experts, was a work in progress. The experts and the local planners would review operational plans. They determined training needs, equipment specifications, and personnel requirements. The experts, because of their previous experience, were particularly adept at determining the "bare" minimum required to accomplish the mission. Once the request had been scrubbed at the local level it was forwarded to the Washington office for action. This process was a positive situation for everyone. It ensured a coordinated planning process and built teamwork. A significant feature was it's simplicity and responsiveness. There were no outside agencies to consult. Most importantly it assured the leadership in Washington of the validity of the request.

The Office of Special Events over the years acquired a vast amount of equipment for event application. This included radios, telephones, fencing, magnetometers, computers, undercarriage camera systems, intrusion detection systems, and security monitoring cameras. Other items included office furniture, linen, dog kennels, water coolers, and cots. Most of this equipment was obtained through the Defense Reutilization Management Office or other branches of government. If OSE didn't have the equipment, they would search throughout the United States government to find the

item. This led to the acquisition of many useful items which were used repeatedly at subsequent events. This innovative methodology derived incalculable savings for the American taxpayer.

The ability of Office of Special Events to petition the branches of the military for assistance cannot be overstated. The Office of Special Events tasking had the weight of the Secretary of Defense and could not be ignored. This ensured the required equipment and personnel were assigned to the event. In most instances this was accomplished with little or no upheaval to the services. It did require extensive coordination, but again the Office of Special Events experts were very proficient in working with the various branches of the military to acquire assistance.

The 1987 Pan American Games in Indianapolis are considered by many in the special event community to be the model event and the standard for success. Upon completion of the Games the Office of Special Events and members of the Indiana law enforcement community formulated a handbook for law enforcement special event planning and operations. The "how to" handbook describes the planning process and explains in detail the Office of Special Event request procedure. The "cookbook" as it has been dubbed, has been instrumental in all subsequent events. It is a useful tool for all planners and organizers. This is another example of the level of professionalism found in the Office of Special Events.

The Office of Special Events is an organization often misunderstood. It is a hybrid of military and civilians who have special event experience. They bring professionalism to events. The credentials of the Office of Special Events are well known throughout the special events community. The law enforcement agencies of previous events consider them to be indispensable assets and still seek their guidance. They are considered to be the true professionals of special events, an uncommon distinction for a government institution.

The Army has always been involved in special events. They were instrumental in both the 1984 and 1996 Olympic Games. The Army brings considerable expertise to special events. Planning and personnel resources are two areas where the Army excels. The Army planning process is institutionalized and easily understood by every soldier and Army civilian. The Army, being the largest of the uniformed services, has the personnel to support special event operations. Unfortunately, the Army lacks a key ingredient for special events. Their event experience is minimal and what exists is transitory. Unlike the Office of Special Events, Army personnel move from assignment to assignment. Their primary focus is on military operations, not special events planning and events. This isn't a condemnation of the Army, rather, it is reality. Thus, the Army does not have a cadre of event experts to draw upon for service. This may change with the assignment of the special event tasking to the office of the Director of Military Support. Still, the acquisition of special events experts, like building a team, takes time and cannot be accomplished straightaway. The freedom of operation given to the Office of Special Events cadre of experts is somewhat foreign to Army personnel. Some may argue special events are analogous to Operations Other Than War, but historically the Army is noted for centralized command and control. Special events require innovation and have proven to be successful when decentralized.

Another drawback for the Army is the lack of institutional acceptance. The Office of Special Events law enforcement team of experts has a decided advantage over Army planners. Their years of service give them instant credibility with law enforcement, who are the primary security planners. This is a monumental challenge, and one seldom overcome by Army planners. It isn't that Army planners are not considered professional by the law enforcement officers. There is a similarity of experience among law enforcement officers, unfortunately they are a closed fraternity and rarely allow

others to enter. The same institutional bond between service members is difficult for the law enforcement officers to broach. Consequently the strong bonds of each group are an obstacle to success and are a source of frustration.

The planning process is somewhat foreign to law enforcement. Police work is by its nature is reactive. Most of the planning is of short duration. One of the most difficult tasks for special events' organizers is to get law enforcement to become a part of the overall planning process. The experts of the Office of Special Events understand the nature of law enforcement. Because of their credibility, the Office of Special Events team can prevail upon law enforcement for the need to be a part of the planning process. The planning process is second nature to soldiers. They can plan for almost any eventuality. Unfortunately, the Army planning process and special events are not a good mix. Agility, while a tenet of war fighting, is not one of the hallmarks of Army planning. It is rigid and not conducive to special events. Special events are "special" and they require new and innovative approaches to planning. The Army process, although excellent for planning military campaigns isn't responsive to the ever-changing paradigms of a special event.

The request process, notably during the 1996 Games, was confusing to the Atlanta Olympic community. This is understandable as the Army came on the scene late in the planning sequence. The inclusion of the Army into the request process further confused the planners and subsequently disaffected the Army. Requests previously thought to be approved were found to be under further review by the Army. Deputy Chief Jon Gordon, Chief Olympic planner for the Atlanta Police, reports the confusion took a toll on his office and caused unnecessary duplication of work. This was not an isolated instance. The Office of Special Events had been on the scene for more than three years and had an established request policy. This practice was understood and productive. Upon arrival of the

Army all approved requests, along with subsequent requests, were revisited. This duplication was a major point of frustration for not only the Atlanta police, but all requesters of assistance. A consequence of the Army involvement in the Atlanta request process is a mind-boggling procedure which is even more complicated. A Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense in 1998 is awkward and will further complicate the request process.[3] This new formula calls for the Department of Justice to review all requests. The Attorney General of the United States will then review and certify the request as appropriate and forward it to the Secretary of Defense for support. While this might ensure all requests are bonafide it will be ponderous and time consuming. The Department of Defense is virtually removed from the approval loop and becomes subservient to the Department of Justice. This is akin to asking John if you can borrow Caroline's car. It is Caroline's car yet John is the grantor of approval. The Department of Defense has the resources, yet the Department of Justice is the approving authority. This is doable, but assuredly does not pass the "common sense" test.

The issue of military personnel support to the 1996 Olympic Games caused numerous inquiries. A running joke was there were more union soldiers in Atlanta than any other time since the Civil War. More than 13,500 National Guard Soldiers supported the Games.[4] One hundred fifty-five soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and civilians made up the Joint Task Force-Olympics (JTF-O.)[5] Another three hundred service members provided aviation, explosive ordnance disposal, communications, and transportation support for the Games. In a February 20, 1996 letter Senator John McCain, Republican from Arizona, to then Secretary of Defense William Perry, questioned the use of military personnel in support of the Atlanta Olympics.[6] He voiced concern over the appropriate use of military personnel and the burden upon the defense budget. He further noted the Atlanta

Games were expected to gross $1.7 billion in revenue.[7] Senator McCain raises serious questions that have yet to be answered to anyone's satisfaction. Many believe the military has no role in special events. Senator McCain's uneasiness is the inappropriate use of military personnel for domestic chores in special event operations.[8] He further cites the dwindling defense budget and the drain of already short military funds and resources to support these events. Senator McCain's questions are substantial and call into question the military involvement in future events.

A perfect example of the Army's reliance on the use of military personnel for special events is a December 3, 1996 letter from then Forces Command, Chief of Staff, Lieutenant General George A. Fisher, JR to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Logistics, and Environment on a proposed Table of Distribution and Allowances for the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games Joint Task Force. General Fisher recommends a staff of two hundred sixty-two military personnel to plan, coordinate and support contingency operations for the Games.[9] This is greater than the number Forces Command engaged for the Atlanta Games. The Winter Olympics are one-third the size of the Summer Olympics. An expectation is for the military staffing operation to reflect this reduction. This manifests the inexperience of the military in special events planning and operations and further demonstrates the reliance on large numbers of military personnel. A lesson learned in Atlanta is the planning and operations staff need not be large. The traditional military mind set is to approach every operation with a significant number of personnel. Special events are "special" and require distinctive approaches. In these unique cases, less may indeed be better.

A case can be made for more involvement of the agencies comprising the Departments of Justice and Treasury. The FBI and United States Secret Service have historically played prominent roles in past events. United States Customs Service has provided support and manpower. Since the

Munich Olympics the Department of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms has always performed a significant role. Why shouldn't the Departments of Justice or Treasury have the lead for support? Simply put, they do not have the resources or personnel to accomplish the mission. The Federal Emergency Management Agency might be a possibility for the lead. They have countless resources and have a long history of planning for eventualities. The biggest drawback to their employment, is their continuous disaster response mission. Consequently, by default, the military has assumed the role.

THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The Army's mission is to fight and win our nation's wars. If you read, the mission statement found on the Army Home Page there is imbedded a requirement to conduct other missions.[10] Special event support falls into this category. The Army does not budget for special event operations. As a result it must take funds from the Operations and Maintenance budget to pay for special events. This detracts from the Army's ability to conduct other operations and maintain equipment and facilities. Realistically speaking does the military, and more importantly the Army, have a niche in special event operations? Curiously the answer might be no, at least not at the current level of involvement.

The Departments of Justice and Treasury have a fundamental law enforcement role that can encompass the special event function. They bring law enforcement expertise and training to events. Like the Army, their expertise is transitory and their resource's minimal.

Obviously local law enforcement and emergency service units do not have the resources to assume the lead for safety and security of special events. Likewise local and state government entities do not have the assets to provide for the special event's requirements. Money is the paramount issue in every circumstance. Special events require great expenditures of capital and resources. The United

States government is the only organization with the resources and funds to underwrite special events.

The question remains, who should have the lead for special events? The Office of Special Events is almost completely dissolved. Their cadre of experts has, for the most part, moved into the private sector. The Army finds itself taxed by operational requirements and personnel shortfalls. The retention and recruiting numbers give everyone cause for alarm. Special events are a mission the Army acquired by politics and default. It is a mission requiring the Army to commit operational and personnel resources that could be better utilized for other purposes. The Departments of Justice and Treasury do not have the resources of the Army. The Federal Emergency Management Agency is involved in other operations. Thus, they are not suited for the lead.

A viable alternative is the National Guard. The National Guard has an extensive record of service in civil military operations. The Guard is a part of every state emergency service response plan. They have a working relationship with law enforcement and the emergency response agencies. The inclusion of special events in the Guard mission is viable and doable. In this period where all of the services are searching for missions, the special event role compliments the Guard's novel mission set of service to State and Nation. Army Chief of Staff, General Dennis J. Reimer writes in his "One Team, One Fight, One Future" (U.S. Army White Paper on AC/RC Integration) of new ideas and relevant missions.[11] The idea behind the reserve components is to assist the active Army. The Army is presently stretched to its limits. Soldiers are leaving at an alarming rate. The reason most often given for their departure is the operations tempo. The special event mission further strains the Army and is an added obligation to an overburdened set of mission requirements. By giving the special event mission to the National Guard the Army achieves two items. First, it sends a message to the National Guard by including the Guard in a "real" mission. Second, it sends a message throughout

the Army community of the commitment to the One Army concept. This will require vision and leadership. Heretofore the One Army concept has been rhetoric. This is an opportunity to confirm the inclusion of the Guard into the Army.

There are several arguments for the Guard to assume the lead for the special event tasking. The Guard has a long history of special event participation. State Governors have exercised the Guard for crowd control at sporting events and other large gatherings. In most states the Guard is an extension of law enforcement and often is called upon to assist in disaster relief and labor strife. Unlike the active Army, Guard personnel are less transitory. It is common for Guard members to serve their entire career in one unit. This allows units to build and maintain expertise. Many Guard members are community leaders. Teachers, civil service workers, business owners, police officers, and fire fighters are found throughout the ranks of Guard units. These leaders understand the military and civilian world and are adroit in both mediums. It makes sense to tap this wealth of knowledge and give them a mission they can accomplish. If we endeavor to eliminate the rift, which permeates the active and reserve components this is the occasion. The special event mission is one the Army can relinquish to the Guard. As with all special events, money and politics are impediments. This is an unequaled opportunity to bring fruition to the One Army concept. Failure to seize this prospect will doom the Army to more acrimony and disharmony between the active and reserve forces. This opening must be secured.

Another compelling reason for Guard involvement is the Posse Comitatus act of the Constitution.[12] This act prohibits military forces from becoming involved in domestic law enforcement. For this reason the National Guard was the primary contributor of forces to the 1998 Olympic Games.[13] This factor alone makes the special event mission a sensible one for the Guard. If

the Guard is to be the primary supplier of forces, why not give them the planning and command and control requirements to professionally employ these forces?

A factor often overlooked is the Guard's active participation in special events. The Guard has provided resources and personnel since the Lake Placid Games. The Georgia National Guard was significant to the success of the Atlanta Games. The Indiana National Guard provided the largest contingent of troops for Atlanta. They also participated in the 1987 Pan American Games in Indianapolis. The New York and New Jersey National Guard were prominent providers of assistance in the 1993 World University Games and the 1998 Goodwill Games. The Washington Guard was a contributor of resources during the 1989 Goodwill Games. The Connecticut National Guard was a participant in the 1995 Special Olympics. National Guard units from Massachusetts, New Jersey, Florida, Texas, Michigan, Illinois, California, and the District of Columbia were contributors to the success of the 1994 World Cup Soccer Championship. Currently the Utah National Guard has an active planning cell for the 2002 Winter Olympics. The National Guard has considerable institutional event experience and knowledge. Unlike the active components this knowledge has not been lost through personnel reassignments.

The Guard is a part of every state government. Guard units are indispensable components of communities throughout their state. They are trusted agents who provide service. Each state headquarters focuses on military support to communities. The special event mission would be a logical extension of military support.

OBSTACLES

There are several impediments to the Guard assuming the special event charter. The most delicate is

the Guard posture. The National Guard and the Army have wrestled with missions and relationship. The Guard has long asked to be a part of the total Army, yet it has been unwilling to assume needed changes. The Guard wants to be a fighting force. In its present configuration it isn't a viable force. The days are forever gone when the United States will have the luxury of activating and training entire Divisions for a combat mission. Expeditionary forces appear to be the forces of choice for future combat operations. The Guard must accept this fact and reinvent itself into a realistic force package. Brigade size combat forces are the most logical configurations. The Guard must analyze their role as a maneuver force. In all likelihood only company size maneuver forces can be integrated into the active components. The Field Artillery mission is viable and should be the focus of the Guard, not Infantry and Armor. These are the truths the Guard cannot and must not continue to eschew. It must change! Failure to do so will render the Guard irrelevant.

The active Army must also transform its attitude toward the Guard. No longer is the Guard soldier a "weekend" warrior who goes to the armory to drink beer and play cards. The typical Guard soldier attends the same training as their active Army counterpart. Being in the Guard is far from a one weekend a month and two weeks a year proposition. Guard soldiers often receive additional training and are frequently activated for state and federal missions. The active Army must be willing to accept the Guard as an equal partner. This acceptance must be manifested in terms of resources. The Guard for years has lived at the end of the distribution chain. Many Guard units have equipment older than most of the soldiers. If the Guard is going to be a true player in the Army force structure then it must be embraced as a true partner, not as an afterthought or stepchild. This issue has generated countless levels of hollow rhetoric. The Guard and the Army must come to grips with this issue and bring it to closure.

The special event mission is a vehicle to heal this long standing schism. Recently the Guard has been charged with the missions of homeland defense and weapons of mass destruction. The role of domestic emergency response has long been a Guard function. The special event tasking can be construed as an enlargement of these missions. This already fits into the interaction between the Guard and state and local governments in the development of disaster response plans. The Guard has compacts or mutual assistance agreements with Guard units in other states. This allows the Guard to access personnel and resources to augment their abilities to impact upon emergency response actions. These compacts were instrumental in bringing Guard units to the Atlanta Olympics. Posse Comitatus allows Guard personnel, as an extension of the Governors' law enforcement responsibilities, to perform limited law enforcement functions. This is an advantage over the use of active component forces. When active duty personnel are employed, they must support local law enforcement officers and are prohibited from initiating any enforcement action.

The most logical reason for employing the Guard is the downsizing of the military. The active components are at their lowest levels of personnel since the end of the Korean War. The commitment to operations around the world is as extensive at any time in our history. The Guard has not seen the corresponding cuts in their force or a meaningful expansion of missions. The Guard can and should supplement the active force. The active force role is combat operations. The Guard, while having a combat role, is a home defense force and a responder to domestic emergencies. There is no valid rationale for the active forces to assume an additional mission of special events. There is however a tenable justification for the Guard to assume the special event mission.

RECOMMENDATIONS

-Entrust the National Guard with the special event mission.

-Establish an Office of Special Events at National Guard Bureau and staff it with members of the defense community who have previous special event experience.

-National Guard Bureau should assume the role of the higher headquarters for all special events.

-Power down the special event operational mission to the states.

-Allow the Guard to command the operation. This includes the placement of active component personnel under Guard Commanders.

-Revise the special event request process. Currently it is cumbersome and awkward for everyone. The supplier of resources should be the approving authority.

-Continue to utilize the Office of Special Events ("Cookbook") Handbook for Law Enforcement Special Event Planning and Operations as the guide for future events.

-Cause the Army to budget for special event operations.

-Limit special event assistance to security and law enforcement operations.

-Require the organizer's of special events to reimburse the Department of Defense for assistance.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Army Chief of Staff, General Dennis J. Reimer calls for energetic leadership and effective communications in his, "One Team-One Fight-One Future," paper for AC/RC integration.[14] Douglas MacGregor in his book "Breaking the Phalanx" calls for the disestablishment of the National Guard division structure.[15] Both are right in their assessment. The Guard must critically evaluate itself and offer alternatives. The Army must agree to compromises and allow the Guard to assume missions of importance. This will require reconciliation and honest dialog between the two components. Both

need to be candid brokers. This requires leadership with vision and the determination to bring about change. General Reimer has taken the first step. The Guard needs to pursue a comparable pathway. If the Army were to bestow the Guard with the special event mission, they would provide them with a viable and essential commission. This must include the ability to utilize and command active component forces. There can be no caveats. The Guard must curb their political proclivities and perform this mission in a flawless manner. This is a unique opportunity to change the force structure of the American Army. We are at a critical juncture in our history. Now is the time for fundamental change.

Ultimately special events come down to politics and money. The National Guard must refrain from politics. The Army must forget internal politics. Both must come together to and proclaim a willingness to work together for the betterment of the Army.

Money is always an issue. By assigning the Guard the special event mission, and budgeting for the mission, the Army will save money. The Guard will be invested with a mission which makes them vital to the country and the Army. As General Reimer states in his White Paper, "This principle recognizes the importance of establishing clear, mutually understood missions for each unit. We believe *missioning* all units is essential because it establishes the purpose and relevancy of the force."[16] The real question is this rhetoric or a new beginning?

ENDNOTES

1. Office of Special Events, OUSD (Personnel & Readiness), 1996 Olympics After Action Report, Washington, D.C., August, 1997, 9.

2. Ibid., 9-10.

3. The Department of Justice and the Department of Defense, Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Support for Security for Civilian Sporting Events, Washington, D.C., February 10, 1998.

4. National Guard Bureau, Olympic After Action Review, Washington, D.C., December 1996, 1.

5. Office of Special Events, OUSD (Personnel & Readiness), 1996 Olympics After Action Report, Washington, D.C., August, 1997, 158.

6. Senator John McCain, letter to Secretary of Defense William Perry, Washington, D.C., February 20, 1996, 1.

7. Ibid., 1.

8.p Ibid., 1-2.

9. LTG George A. Fisher, Jr., Headquarters United States Army Forces Command, Proposed Table of Distribution and allowances (TDA) for the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games Joint Task Force, Fort McPherson, GA., December 3, 1996, 8.

10. United States Army Home page, Washington, D.C., 1999.

11. GEN Dennis Reimer, Headquarters United States Army, One Team, One Fight, One Future (U.S. Army White Paper on AC/RC Integration), Washington, D.C., 1998, 11.

12. The Constitution of the United States of America, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1992

13. National Guard Bureau, Olympic After Action Review, Washington, D.C.,. December1996, 1.

14. Ibid., 7.

15. Douglas A. Macgregor, Breaking the Phalanx, A New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century, Praeger Publishers, 1997, 192.

16. GEN Dennis Reimer, Headquarters United States Army, One team, One Fight, One Future (U.S. Army White Paper on AC/RC Integration), Washington, D.C., 1998, 8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atlanta Police Department, 1996 Centennial Olympic Games Security Preparations and Operations After Action Report, Atlanta, GA: 1996

Boston Globe, The Globe Newspaper Company, Boston MA: 1999

Constitution of the United States, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.: 1992

Departments of Defense and Justice, Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Support for Security for Civilian Sporting Events, Washington, D.C.: 1998

Fisher, George A. Jr., LTG, USA, Memorandum to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Proposed Table of Distribution and allowances (TDA) for the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games Joint Task Force, Fort McPherson, GA: 1996

Georgia Department of Defense, After Action Report, Operation Centennial Guard, Atlanta, GA: 1996

Indiana State Police, 1987 Pan American Games After Action Report, Indianapolis, IN: 1987

Macgregor, Douglas A., Breaking the Phalanx a New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century, Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997

McCain, John, U.S. Senator, Letter to Secretary of Defense William Perry, Washington, D.C.: 1996

National Guard Bureau, 1996 Olympic After Action Review, Washington, D.C.: 1996

New York State Police, 1993 World University Games Security, Executive Summary, Albany, NY: 1993

Office of Special Events, Handbook for Law Enforcement Special Event Planning and Operations, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.: 1988

Office of Special Events, 1996 Olympics After Action Report, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.: 1997

Reimer, Dennis J., GEN., U. S. Army Chief of Staff, One Team-One Fight-One Future, Washington, D.C., 1998