



Military Unpreparedness and the Complexities of Landpower 1917-2010



**U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center
Historical Services Division**

Prepared By:

Conrad C. Crane, PhD
Chief, Historical Services Division

James D. Scudieri, PhD
Senior Historian

Michael E. Lynch, PhD
Research Historian

Shane P. Reilly
Contract Research Analyst

Anna S. Page
Research Intern, Wellesley College

The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or US Government.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Allies and Adversaries: Learning from Others	1
Case Study 1-01: Britain and France in 1940	2
<i>Key Observations -- Britain and France 1940</i>	4
Case Study 1-02: Malaya/Singapore 1941-42	5
<i>Key Observations – Malaya/Singapore 1942</i>	8
Case Study 1-03: Raid on Dieppe, 1942	9
<i>Key Observations – Raid on Dieppe, 1942</i>	12
Case Study 1-04: Mobile Group 100 1954	13
<i>Key Observations – Mobile Group 100 1954</i>	15
Case Study 1-05: The Arab-Israeli War 1973	16
<i>Key Observations – Arab-Israeli War 1973</i>	18
Great Expectations: Grim Realities	19
Case Study 2-01: World War I Mobilization 1917-18	20
<i>Key Observations – World War I Mobilization</i>	22
Case Study 2-02: Guadalcanal 1942-43	23
<i>Key Observations – Guadalcanal 1942</i>	26
Case Study 2-03: Chinese Counteroffensive 1950	27
<i>Key Observations – Chinese Counteroffensive, 1950</i>	30
Case Study 2-04: Operation ANACONDA 2001-02	31
<i>Key Observations – Operation ANACONDA 2001-02</i>	34
Victory Hides Failure	36
Case Study 3-01: World War II Mobilization	37
<i>Key Observations – World War II Mobilization</i>	41
Case Study 3-02: Grenada and Panama 1983/1989	42
<i>Key Observations – Grenada/Panama 1983/1989</i>	45
Case Study 3-03: Operation DESERT SHIELD/STORM 1990-91	46
<i>Key Observations – Operation DESERT STORM 1991</i>	49
Case Study 3-04: Stability Operations	50
<i>Key Observations – Stability Operations</i>	57

Executive Summary

When Gen. Gordon Sullivan was Chief of Staff of the Army, he kept two books on his desk, *The Seeds of Disaster: The Development of French Army Doctrine, 1919-1939* by Col. Robert Doughty, and *America's First Battles, 1776-1965* by Lt. Col. Charles E. Heller and Brig. Gen. William A. Stofft. Sullivan was determined that his Army would be fully prepared for the next war. Other chiefs have echoed Sullivan's concern, and the lessons learned from studying past battles are not always lost to history, yet they are sometimes forgotten.

Landpower is by its nature a complex activity, and military history is replete with examples of unreadiness or unpreparedness for battle. The case studies that follow extend those covered in *America's First Battles*. Heller and Stofft determined that the nation and its armed forces routinely arrived on the field of battle unready for the challenges they faced due to lack of adequate and timely training, miserly budgets, and an atrophied force structure. *America's First Battles* examined the first battle in each of America's wars, from the American Revolution to Vietnam, in order to gain insights into how the nation fared in these encounters. Its look at first, often disastrous, encounters presents a sobering reminder of the need for readiness. The following case studies also illustrate how complexity defines operations and affects both readiness and outcomes. The studies illustrate three themes from which insights may be drawn.

Allies and Enemies: Learning from Others

The experiences of the British and French armies in France in 1940 show that all armies must adapt, learn, and change, because their enemies and potential enemies will do so. The British learned a similar harsh lesson in the Malaya campaign the following year, accepting strategic risk while failing to recognize regional realities, losing Singapore in the process. The third case study completes the British experience with the ill-fated raid at Dieppe. The raid produced valuable intelligence and lessons learned, but lack of joint coordination and underestimation of the enemy's capabilities and defenses resulted in a large human cost.

In another example of the use of historical insights to aid in preparation for first battles, the next case study presents a description of the destruction of French *Groupement Mobile* 100 in Indochina in 1954. When then-Lt. Col. Hal Moore was on the ship with the men of his 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment, headed to that same area in 1965, the book he was rereading was Bernard Fall's epic *Street Without Joy*. He read this with a primary focus to avoid the same tragic fate suffered by those Frenchmen roughly ten years earlier. Moore would apply his insights in the upcoming Battle of Ia Drang.

Some situations lead people either to draw the wrong insights from the past or to ignore the right ones. The case study on the Arab-Israeli War (Yom Kippur War) of 1973 illustrates the danger of complacency. The Israeli Defense Force had won a great

victory against overwhelming odds in the Six Day War (1967), and became convinced of its own infallibility. The war revealed Israeli shortcomings as it faced an enemy that had adapted and improved technologically since the last war. It also exposed flaws in joint and combined arms coordination and poor assumptions about their own military capabilities.

Great Expectations: Grim Realities

The second group of case studies explores the several instances when high hopes and optimistic projections nonetheless produced defeats or costly victories. The first case study looks at Americas mobilization for World War I. In a nation whose population largely evinced an anti-war, isolationist attitude, the preparedness of the military suffered. When the danger to the US became clear, the nation deployed the largest force in its history with little more than jingoistic patriotism and overweening confidence. It quickly found itself untrained and poorly equipped to deal with industrial-age warfare. The US suffered much less than other combatants, and with additional training the Army performed reasonably well, but still paid a high price for hubris. The Army learned from those mistakes and entered the next war better prepared, but the nature of warfare had also changed.

Guadalcanal afforded the opportunity for the first American use of landpower in World War II, and exposed the difficulties of joint planning and coordination. Lack of adequate training on interservice doctrine and underestimation of the difficulty of the terrain produced high casualties. Early estimates of a quick victory proved ill-founded.

The Korean War produced the first “come as you are” war in which the US deployed large numbers of troops quickly with little additional training. The army had atrophied after World War II, and had little to deploy to Korea when the attack came. Heller and Stofft told the story of Task Force Smith, the ill-fated first attempt to get US troops into Korea. After this small operation, the US launched the stunning assault at Inchon that reversed the momentum of the war. Building on this success, General Douglas MacArthur continued the offensive through North Korea to its border with China. The third case study examines how US intelligence failures, underestimation of the potential enemy, overestimation of the capabilities of airpower, and under appreciation of the terrain and its effects on operations, produced the largest retreat in US Army history in the face of a massive Chinese counter attack.

The fourth case study, Operation Anaconda, demonstrates that even well-trained Soldiers can fail when bad assumptions and arbitrary restrictions lead to poor intelligence, *ad hoc* command-and-control relationships, inadequate combat forces, and lack of coordination with other services.

Victory Hides Failure

The third theme is perhaps the most dangerous, because the tendency is to look only at those things that went well. People often look to failure to find insights and lessons learned, but victories often hide problems from which conclusions can and should be

drawn. In truth, these lessons frequently provide critical information about failure camouflaged in victory. Harsh lessons remain to be learned even from successful operations. This is perhaps never more true than in the case of World War II, when difficulties with the mobilization effort are often lost in the glow of battlefield success. Inducting, feeding, clothing, housing, training, and deploying an Army of more than 8 million man was a complex task requiring hundreds of thousands of support personnel, billions of dollars, and hundreds of square miles of land. The first case study looks at that complex effort necessary to do that.

The lightning fast contingency operations in Grenada and Panama showed a high tech, well trained military at its best, but still exposed flaws in the joint training environment. The Army underestimated certain capabilities and failed to adequately plan for post-conflict operations. Success of the multidimensional, joint service, simultaneous consolidated coordinated attacks clearly illustrate the complexity of land warfare.

Operation Desert Storm provided a primer for combined arms, high-tech warfare, and demonstrated the full range of joint capabilities. It put the nations enemies on notice, and confirmed the validity of the Army's emphasis on tough realistic training in the years since Vietnam. The war also exposed serious internal flaws, however, in the Reserve Component integration system. The problems these units experienced were systemic rather than episodic, and revealed serious disparities in training between Active and Reserve components. Legislation corrected some of the regulatory problems and restructuring addressed others, but the glaring problem with Reserve Component training remains.

The final case study examines the US military's uneven record of success in post-conflict stability operations. This series of short vignettes demonstrates how the lack of planning, improper force mix, lack of civilian capacity, and misguided strategy have hampered efforts and tempered overall success.

This collection of case studies addresses operational challenges caused by unreadiness, lack of training, inadequate coordination, poor assumptions, and bad intelligence. The wide range of challenges presented illustrates the complexity of landpower and the difficulties inherent in training for and executing modern warfare.

Probably the most important component of readiness is intellectual preparedness. Leaders and Soldiers must think very deeply about future roles and missions, mentally preparing to execute them and trying to anticipate possible requirements. However, since we know that we can never really predict the future accurately, they must also be ready to adapt quickly when they encounter unforeseen challenges. The eminent British historian Michael Howard has emphasized that armed forces must have the capability to adapt "to the utterly unpredictable, the entirely unknown." The task of military science in an age of peace is to prevent military doctrines from being so badly wrong that they cannot be corrected quickly when they confront the realities of war.

Allies and Adversaries: Learning from Others

Case Study 1-01: Britain and France in 1940

The destruction of the British and French Armies during the campaign of 1940 was one of the greatest military disasters in history. While the German military campaign deserves the acclaim it has received, as with all great military successes, enemy mistakes helped greatly. Neither the British nor French were prepared for the war they faced, because of a distorted vision of the future, due to drawing the wrong lessons from the past. In 1918, both Allies appeared to have developed a successful model of combined arms warfare that could defeat their German opponent. The British approach relied upon heavy use of armored forces. They exploited the newly invented tank to break through German trench lines and restore movement to the battlefield. The French approach, called “methodical battle,” was a carefully choreographed and centrally controlled coordination of firepower and restricted maneuver using light tanks, artillery, and infantry. However, during the years leading up to the next world war the Allies lost their advantage, which the Germans made so evident in 1940.

Sometimes an army’s operational and tactical unpreparedness is the result of a misguided national security strategy. That argument applies to both of the Allies to some degree, but is particularly relevant to the state of the British Army in 1940. Determined to avoid the carnage of the Western Front in World War I, and dealing with the impact of the Great Depression, the British government made several policy choices that enfeebled its ground force. First, the government adopted the “Ten Year Rule,” assuming that there would no war for a decade and therefore military expenditures could be cut accordingly. Even when the resurgence of Germany dashed such hopes, the British educated elite rejected any possibility that their nation would ever again fight on the European continent. Instead they put their hopes in their traditional bastion, the Royal Navy, and a new one, the Royal Air Force. British leaders had great expectations that punishing air attacks could deter or defeat continental enemies without the need for major ground deployments. Those assumptions would be proven disastrously wrong.

The British Army also contributed to its own demise, failing to initiate a study of its performance in World War I until 1932, and then not circulating the report when it was concluded. The Army did conduct some innovative experiments with armored warfare in the late 1920s and early 1930s, but failed to incorporate any lessons from the exercises or develop any sort of common service doctrine. These experiments did, however, influence maneuver warfare theorists J.F.C. Fuller and Basil Liddell Hart, who drew much of their new doctrine from them. The Germans also observed the experiments avidly and became enthusiastic readers of Fuller and Hart.

The French knew that they could not avoid land warfare. They also knew they faced a primary potential enemy with twice the population and much greater economic capacity. To some extent, the French government was guilty of pursuing the national security strategy it could afford, not the one it needed. The government focused on capabilities more than threats, combining limited military expenditures with lots of hope that what they invested in would be adequate.

The primary foundation for the French plans for defense against Germany was the Maginot Line, a truly impressive series of underground fortresses that protected natural resources and large industrial and population centers along the northeastern border with Germany. Despite later blaming French defeat on a “Maginot Line mentality,” the fortifications actually performed their purpose very well. However, there was not enough money to cover the whole frontier, and the French feared a fortified border would offend some neutrals, thus the border with Belgium and the Ardennes forest was left unfortified. The rest of the Army would concentrate on those areas.

While the French Army hoped that Belgian armies and rough terrain would help stymie a German attack, it also prepared diligently to cover areas not protected by the Maginot Line. Though the government was not willing to give Army leaders the number of soldiers they wanted, funds were provided to develop armored forces. In fact, by 1940 the French had some of the best tanks in Europe. The Army studied its World War I experience and conducted much experimentation. Unlike the Germans, however, who concentrated their armor into Panzer divisions, the French scattered their tanks throughout the force, except for some light cavalry divisions used for screening.

But the biggest failing of the French Army was not in equipment or force structure, but in doctrine and vision. It expected to fight World War I again. The French remained prepared to fight methodical battles where tightly controlled infantry, armor, and artillery moved short distances between phase lines. Their primary emphasis remained upon firepower. Subordinates were permitted little initiative or flexibility, and there was no thought of true operational maneuver.

These flaws became painfully evident in May 1940. The French and British expected a German attack through Belgium and marched most of their armies forward to meet that obvious threat when it materialized. When the Germans launched their Panzer assault through the Ardennes, local French forces were cautious and uncoordinated. Once large German tank forces broke through there, there were no reserves to stop them, and the Panzers quickly dashed to the coast, cutting off most of the French and British forces in Belgium. Allied command and control functions were paralyzed. Some defending units fought bravely, but many more broke or stood by awaiting orders. Few seemed prepared tactically for modern warfare. Faced with the unforeseen speed of the German advance, the French high command collapsed. Though 340,000 Allied troops were evacuated from Dunkirk, all their equipment was left behind. The rest of the French Army with some remaining British support could put up little organized defense, and a new government asked for an armistice on 16 June. The whole country had fallen in only 38 days.

Key Observations -- Britain and France 1940

1. Threat based evaluations are usually superior to those focused on capabilities or cost.
2. It is difficult for any military service to overcome a flawed national security strategy.
3. Especially in military operations, past success is no guarantee of future victory. The Army must study the past, but also adapt for the future.
4. Potential enemies are always learning and changing.
5. However, one must be careful not to substitute hope for rational analysis, especially with new technologies, and expect too much from them.
6. Accordingly, armies can never perform too much experimentation.
7. Any modern military doctrine that stifles individual initiative is bound to fail.

Source materials available upon request.

Case Study 1-02: Malaya/Singapore 1941-42

The campaign for Malaya that began on 8 December 1941, ended with the surrender of Singapore on 10 February 1942. It was the worst military disaster in the history of the British Empire. The loss of Singapore shocked Britons at home, more so than the fall of Tobruk in North Africa in June the same year. Unfortunately, historical myths still surround the fiasco.

The British constructed Singapore as a major naval base for the Far East in the atmosphere of post-World War I budget cuts, force reductions, and domestic anti-military sentiment. The project thus represented a significant investment. Construction moved slowly from 1923 to 1938. Singapore was an extensive naval base, with formidable fixed defenses to its east and south. Pre-war plans viewed Singapore as the home base of a British Eastern Fleet, but British strategy for the Pacific changed dramatically as pre-war assumptions proved false. A new European war against Germany from September 1939 began badly. In 1940 Italy became an enemy in the Mediterranean, France collapsed rapidly in June, and the homeland was under heavy aerial assault from August to October

This early war period rendered the Far East a third priority, after home defense and the Middle East, based on guidance from Prime Minister Winston Churchill. His disagreement with Chief of Imperial General Staff (CIGS) Field Marshal John Dill over prioritization of the Middle East rather than the Far East led to the latter's ultimate relief in November 1941.

The ramifications of Churchill's prioritization were considerable. The original "Singapore Strategy" required a powerful, balanced Eastern Fleet which could threaten Japanese beach landings and ensure sea lines of communications. Now the estimated time for a formidable battle fleet to reach Asian waters kept lengthening, from 30-60 days to 6 months. Hence, Air Chief Marshal Sir Robert Brooke-Popham's Far East Command (FEC), a Joint Force Command (JFC) equivalent for air and land forces, did not rely upon a "Fortress Singapore" mindset. Instead, the defense rested heavily on airpower operating from forward air bases protected by the Army. The theater's low strategic priority never provided the trained and ready land forces and sufficient airpower to implement the plan.

Conversely, the British correctly identified the Japanese landing areas on the northeast coast of the mainland and invasion routes south. This realistic assessment identified some very specific wartime actions. The challenge in executing them however, was the conflict between diplomatic concerns and military necessity.

British defensive operations rested upon Operation Matador, which required a preemptive move into the key eastern-shore landing beaches of Singora and Patani in Siam (Thailand), to present the Japanese with opposed landings. Seizing and holding the key terrain feature known as "The Ledge" in southern Siam inland and west of the beaches became an important contingency plan. This hill mass would block the

Japanese advance within Thailand and secure the flank of friendly forces defending the eastern Malayan coast. However, as late as 7 December 1941, the British ambassador in Bangkok emphasized that any British move without an actual Japanese invasion would lead to diplomatic crisis and war. Yet the crux of British war plans rested upon the positioning of forces prior to Japanese hitting the beach.

Brooke-Popham asked the British Chiefs of Staff (COS) in London on 21 November 41 for circumstances to approve implementation of Matador. The response on 25 November was that the Government would only give permission within 36 hours of confirmed Japanese movements. Brooke-Popham noted that Japanese forces could land within 33 hours of leaving Saigon. A query on November 30 of American opinion on British seizure of Singora went unanswered. Finally, on December 5, the COS authorized Brooke-Popham to execute Matador if the Japanese were in or near Siam. He learned on December 6 that Japanese convoys had left Saigon and Cam Ranh Bay, approaching the Gulf of Siam. He could not confirm projected landings against both Siam and Malaya on December 7 as a reconnaissance flight over that area did not return. The 11th Indian Division from III Indian Corps was on alert from 2320 hours that night to execute Matador at dawn--virtually the entire focus of their brief, theater training. By midnight Brooke-Popham had not decided what missions to assign to Lt. Gen. Archibald Percival, the equivalent of today's combined force land component commander (CFLCC).

The decisive campaign for British South East Asia began with their concession of the Siamese landing beaches and "The Ledge," because of the unreconciled conflict of diplomatic and military imperatives. Japanese landings began sometime before 0730 on December 8. The COS granted permission for Matador at 0800. The update reached Singapore at 0945, but Percival was in a Legislative Assembly meeting till 1100. Indian III Corps obtained clearance to move at 1300 and 11th Indian Division at 1330. So much time had elapsed that their orders were to implement the alternative "Jitra Option," in Malayan territory close to the west coast.

The Japanese did not attack with overwhelming force; only four divisions were available. One never deployed and one was combat untested. The Japanese Army Air Force provided aviation support with limited Navy support for the landings. The Japanese could not attain air and naval superiority early in the campaign. All services were stretched to continue operations in China and conduct simultaneous attacks on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines.

The British deployed 4 to 5 division equivalents, but they were not all available simultaneously. They poured additional assets into Singapore through January 29, 1942. These reinforcements had to move by sea; the tyranny of distance cost time. Additionally, too many troops were in hurriedly-raised, wartime expansion units. They had inadequate training and lacked much equipment. There were no tanks. Leaders wanted to avoid civil disruption, assumed that the British had time, and seriously underestimated Japanese capability.

Contrary to popular belief, the Japanese were not veteran jungle fighters. They received some hasty supplemental training. Rather, they maintained extremely aggressive fire-and-maneuver tactics with imaginative use of tanks. Rubber plantations provided maneuver areas that avoided jungle.

Ironically, the high state of British modernization with motorization encouraged road-bound techniques. British, Indian, and Australian forces fought some credible actions. Nonetheless, scattered tactical success could not compensate for an operational void, i.e. the inability to execute Operation Matador or even to reach and hold "The Ledge."

Similarly, incomplete joint coordination and poor understanding of the foe under wartime conditions affected air and seapower. The famous sinking of HMS *Prince of Wales* and HMS *Repulse*, the only capital ships available pending the dispatch of a powerful, balanced fleet, did not result from a lack of aircraft. The Royal Air Force and Royal Navy coordinated a dedicated fighter squadron for the naval element. The coordination faltered over misunderstanding of available air cover time windows and unbroken naval radio silence. The ships veered well off course to intercept a reported additional Japanese landing, which proved to be false. Commanders had excessive faith in the efficacy of extant air defense capability. Of greater impact was the unexpected capability of Japanese torpedo bombers to range the fleet. There were no enemy carriers. The Japanese launched twin-engine, land-based naval bombers from Indochina—without fighter escort, but the British were unable to exploit that vulnerability.

The British never achieved the initiative, constantly reacting to Japanese moves and seemingly unable to stem the tide. The Japanese moved inexorably down the Malayan peninsula. The loss of the two British capital ships eliminated any British ability to intercept further Japanese landings and made the sea line of communications ever more precarious. The Japanese, on the other hand, brought a light carrier into the fight in late January.

The Japanese never intended to assault Singapore from the east or south into the teeth of British prepared defenses. Lt. Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita brought in heavy artillery reinforcements and assembled some 300 boats. He attacked Singapore Island from the mainland north on the night of 8 February across the narrow Johore Strait.

Percival surrendered within a week, confounding British expectations of a stalwart stand for two to three months. There had been a steady decline in morale at all levels. Arguably, the true Achilles heel at this final stage was the water supply. Yamashita purposefully herded civilian refugees into the city. Another issue was the absence of any comprehensive, integrated civil-military defense plans for the campaign in general and the city in particular. There was clearly no will for a diehard last stand. Some 85,000 soldiers entered captivity.

Key Observations – Malaya/Singapore 1942:

1. When theater commanders and regional diplomats cannot resolve conflicts, war plans, and pre-war diplomacy, the most senior civilian leaders at home must make the choices, cognizant of the strategic risks.

2. Pre-war plans require constant reevaluation to account for evolving real-world conditions.

3. Poor understanding of the contemporary operating environment has many causes. Intelligence failure is one aspect among political, military, economic, social, informational, and cultural misperceptions.

4. Hurriedly-raised, “wartime” expansion units cannot deal with a competent foe. Inadequate training, personnel, and low equipment levels compromise individual Soldier skills, collective training, and mastery of equipment. Such units lack cohesion, agility, and resiliency. They suffer significant psychological and morale impediments when confronted with repeated failure.

5. Technology cannot eliminate the tyranny of distance worldwide in deploying land forces to the needed theater, especially rapidly.

Source materials available upon request.

Case Study 1-03: Raid on Dieppe, 1942

In June 1942, Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, Chief of the British Imperial General Staff, opined to Prime Minister Winston Churchill, “No responsible General will be associated with any planning for invasion until we have an operation at least the size of the [upcoming] Dieppe raid behind us to study and base our plans upon.” That raid became one of the great tragedies of World War II. At Dieppe, assault forces of inexperienced and ill-equipped troops, with inadequate naval and aerial support, attacked heavily manned static defenses. In less than 8 hours, 2 Canadian brigades and 2 Commando units were repulsed, sustaining heavy casualties. Only one-third of the troops returned to the United Kingdom. Political pressure and inaccurate assessments had led to a hurried operation based on limited intelligence. The lessons learned at Dieppe would be instrumental in the development of future amphibious operations, including Operation OVERLORD, as predicted by Brooke.

The spring of 1942 looked desolate for the United Kingdom. German armies dominated Western Europe while in the Soviet Union Nazi armored columns drove towards the oil-rich Caucasus Region. In North Africa, German tanks neared Alexandria, targeting the oilfields beyond it. On the high seas, Germany’s U-boat arm dispatched numerous merchant ships, depriving Great Britain of badly needed materials. In the Far East, the expansion of the Imperial Japanese Empire continued unabated towards Australia and India. The US formally entered the conflict at the end of 1941, but was far from contributing to land efforts in Europe. The Government of Prime Minister Winston Churchill continually received urgent requests from Moscow to open a second front in Europe, but manpower and resource limitations inhibited Great Britain’s ability to execute such a complex operation. The UK did, however, possess resources to conduct raids against German defensive positions in France. Successful raids against the coast would achieve several objectives including providing intelligence on the state of German defenses along the Atlantic Coast and placating Premier Josef Stalin until a large scale invasion of Europe could be planned and executed.

The planning of raids fell under the purview of the Combined Operations Headquarters, commanded by Lord Louis Mountbatten. The concept of Operation RUTTER, which would become the basis for Operation JUBILEE, was for an assault force to land, attack, and hold its objective for roughly 12 to 15 hours, and then withdraw by naval watercraft. The assault force was to cause the maximum amount of damage possible and gather information on enemy defensive positions, weapons systems, and tactics. The port town of Dieppe, located on the Normandy coast, 108 miles north of Normandy and 95 miles south of Pas-de-Calais, became the target for the operation. Intelligence assessed that it was more lightly defended than other areas (i.e., Pas-de-Calais) and was within range of the Royal Air Force (RAF) fighters for close air support. The wide dispersion of British and Commonwealth Forces from the Far East to North Africa limited the available force pool to inexperienced units.

Volunteers of the Canadian 2nd Division arrived in Britain in January 1940 and were not deployed during the ill-fated French campaign of that year. The Canadians,

military and civilian alike, were eager to get into the fight. After continuous urging, the 4th and 6th Brigades of the Canadian 2nd Division (including tanks from the 14th Tank Regiment), were selected as the main assault force. Training for RUTTER began in May 1942. Reconnaissance revealed two heavy gun batteries near Dieppe, one east and one west of the town. These batteries posed the largest threat to the naval fleet and troops from the British 1st Battalion, Parachute Regiment were tasked with their destruction.

Mountbatten's requests included a battleship for fire support and high level bombing in advance of the landing. The Admiralty and the Royal Air Force denied the requests. The Royal Navy feared losing another capital ship following the loss of the *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* to Japanese aircraft the previous December off Malaya. The Royal Air Force argued that high level bombing would only alert the German defenders and create rubble, impeding the progress of the assault force. Out of the 273 watercraft and vessels involved in the operation, only 8 destroyers armed with small 4-inch guns provided fire support. Only about half of those directly supported the assault. Two secured the flanks of the force and two were used as floating headquarters. In the air, the RAF provided more than 800 fighters with the primary mission of engaging and destroying local German *Luftwaffe* units. Ground support was a secondary objective.

The terrain of Dieppe favored the defenders. To the east and west of the town, elevated headlands concealed a number of machine gun positions and pillboxes aimed directly at Dieppe's waterfront. Two heavily defended and narrow causeways were the only way to traverse the steep cliffs located between the beach and the high ground. The beach consisted of deep deposits of fragile shale and baseball-sized hard, rounded stones. Inland stood a five-foot sea wall topped with concertina wire. The Germans rigged the beach with anti-tank artillery and machine guns, creating interlocking kill zones. The garrison consisted of the soldiers of the German 302nd Infantry Division. Requirements for men and equipment in Russia drained experienced German troops from the division and replaced them with conscripted personnel from occupied territories. The modern equipment also went east, being replaced by outdated weapons systems. The excellent defensive bunkers, machine gun and artillery positioning offset the problems with the inexperienced troops and antiquated weapons systems.

Operation RUTTER involved the landing of 5,000 assault troops at four separate points along five miles of beachfront. The force would then advance inland securing an airstrip and attack the German divisional headquarters. East and west of the town paratroops would drop to destroy two heavy gun batteries named Hess and Goebbels. Battery Hess was located east of the main town and Battery Goebbels was situated west of Dieppe. These batteries posed the greatest threat to naval support and their neutralization was critical.

By July the training was completed, but on July 7, 1942, a German fighter patrol attacked the anchored naval fleet off the coast of Isle of Wight on England's southern coast. The force strafed and dropped bombs on two ships without sinking or causing extensive damage. Fearing the mission compromised, Combined Operations postponed RUTTER. Mountbatten's staff re-worked the original plan, creating Operation JUBILEE. It replaced the airborne assault with an attack by two seaborne Commando units.

Number 4 Commando would destroy Battery Hess; Number 3 would immobilize Battery Goebbels. Airborne operations required favorable weather conditions and any changes could postpone or cancel the entire operation.

The execution date for Operation JUBILEE was set for August 19, 1942. Problems beset the operation from the outset. Four of the craft carrying Commando 3 turned back due to mechanical failures and the 19 remaining craft were compromised by a German naval patrol, dispersing the attack force. After a brief engagement, the commander of Number 3 Commando recalled his force and returned to Britain. The orders were not received by all of his units and seven boats continued to sail towards the objective, landing 120 men by 0515. In the meantime, more than 250 men of Number 4 Commando landed and began their advance towards Battery Hess.

The initial assault forces landed in the pre-dawn darkness. German defenders alert to the attack engaged the exposed infantrymen attempting to move inland from the beach. At 0520, additional infantry regiments landed directly opposite the town exposing the tanks to withering fire from German positions ringing the town. Ten minutes later, the first Landing Craft Tanks (LCT) arrived and offloaded the armor on the beach. The deep, soft shale combined with the heavy weight of the Churchill tanks bogged them down, immobilizing them. Large round stones caught between the road wheels and the track caused the two parts to separate, disabling more of the vehicles. Many of the LCTs were disabled or destroyed by artillery while offloading the tanks. Successive waves of LCTs took 30 minutes to offload the entire tank regiment.

By 0530 the entire German garrison was alerted, and two companies were dispatched to intercept the understrength Commando 3. The Commandos were forced back to the beach with most of their extraction craft disabled or destroyed. After suffering 37 killed, the remaining Commandos surrendered. At 0545, on the western flank, a mortar round fired by Commando 4 hit an exposed magazine of Battery Hess, destroying and disabling the large guns. By 0630, with their mission complete, Commando 4 withdrew and was retrieved by waiting watercraft.

Opposite the town, some of the infantry and armor began to fight their way off the beach and into Dieppe. In an attempt to sustain the momentum, the operational commander and commander of the Canadian 2nd Division, Maj. Gen John Roberts ordered his reserve regiment to land, but it was unable to advance due to heavy fire. The group that advanced into the town could not sustain its progress and was forced back to the beach or captured. Roberts decided to call off the operation at 0900 and focused efforts on retrieving the beleaguered assault force. Operation Jubilee ended at 1240 when the fleet, after recovering as many troops as possible, steamed toward England. The Second Division paid a high price for its first engagement, more than 66% of the force were either killed, captured, or wounded. In their attacks, the Commandos suffered 270 casualties. The RAF suffered high losses as well, and destroyed 48 enemy planes at cost of 106 of its own.

The operational lessons learned during Operation JUBILEE became hallmarks of future Allied amphibious operations: employment of large capital ships (i.e., battleships, heavy cruisers) for fire support; extensive aerial bombing of enemy positions prior to the invasion date; and multiple divisions of infantry landing on a concentrated front to seize

key objectives in securing the beachhead. This allows follow-on mechanized units to break through enemy positions and seize the initiative. The tactical lessons included: ensuring landing forces are properly equipped to breach enemy obstacles (i.e., Bangalore Torpedoes, wire cutters, and scaling ladders); establishing a communications center on the beach to relay real-time information to the command elements in off-shore vessels; and developing specialized vehicles designed to traverse the terrain at the landing site.

Key Observations – Raid on Dieppe, 1942

1. Air and naval support must be able to destroy key enemy defensive positions and fortifications to avoid heavy casualties on the assault force.
2. The size of the assault force must be sufficient to advance inland and secure operational objectives.
3. Underestimation of the enemy's capabilities led planners to identify unobtainable objectives and request minimal resourcing and support from the other branches.
4. An inadequate intelligence preparation of the battlefield led to soldiers of the assault force unprepared to breach natural and manmade obstacles.
5. Contingency plans must be made for mechanical failures that are inevitable in an operation.
6. Plans must consider the possibility of equipment failures that are inevitable in all operations.

Source materials available upon request.

Case Study 1-04: Mobile Group 100 1954

Soon after arriving at the base camp of the First Cavalry Division at An Khe, Vietnam in August 1965, Lt. Col. Hal Moore took his command sergeant major, a shotgun guard, and a jeep ten miles along Route 19 to *poste kilometrique* (PK) 15. There stood a six-foot, battle-scarred stone obelisk inscribed in Vietnamese and French, "Here on June 24, 1954, soldiers of France and Vietnam died for their countries." The men walked the battleground for two hours, over ground littered with bone fragments, vehicle parts, and shell casings, trying to envision what it would be like to engage the same enemy that had destroyed an elite French force.

Groupement Mobile (GM) 100 was indeed among the best units in the French Army. The regimental size force was built around the famous battalion that had fought with the Americans in Korea, most notably with the 23rd Regimental Combat Team of the 2nd Infantry Division at the critical battle of Chipyeong-Ni. The 1st and 2nd Korea Battalions included many veterans from the 1950-53 fight in Korea, along with a couple companies of Vietnamese. GM 100 also included the 2nd Group, 10th Colonial Artillery Regiment; a battalion of tough and experienced French and Cambodian troops from the 43rd Colonial Infantry; and the 3rd Squadron, 5th Armored Cavalry. The 3,498 men were highly trained with the best equipment.

First deployed into action in December 1953, the Korea veterans soon learned they were in a different kind of war, filled with ambushes on convoys, night attacks on isolated outposts, and an enemy that quickly melted away into the jungle. The same array of vehicles that provided speed and mobility also tied GM 100 to the roads. That would prove its undoing.

As the summer of 1954 approached, the French faced a dire situation in Indochina. Much of available military strength had been expended in the futile defense of Dien Bien Phu, which fell in early May. Most of the rest had been committed to clearing the Red River Delta. GM 100, based in An Khe, had a semi-static defense mission for the whole central plateau area. In the third week of June 1954, the French high command, with no remaining reserves, realized that Communist forces were about to make a major push into the plateau. They ordered GM 100 and its attached Vietnamese units to fall back to Pleiku, over 80 kilometers of enemy held road.

GM 100 was 25% below strength, but well supplied. It began its withdrawal on June 24. There was no secrecy, the many planes evacuating civilians and destruction of ammunition that could not be taken away made the departure very evident. The enemy quickly realized what was happening, and their 803rd Viet Minh Regiment raced through the jungles to cut Route 19.

Those hardy infantry would win the race against French vehicles. The initial target for day one of the move had been kilometer marker PK 11, but growing attacks on the rear guard led the group commander to split his force into four serials, each with its own infantry and artillery, and continue on after a short rest. Commanders believed that each element could defend itself, and a relief force from the 1st Airborne Group, and small GM 42 formed from local mountaineers awaited GM 100 near the Mang Yang

Pass at kilometer PK 22. A jungle commando patrol had found the enemy north of the road and relayed that information to GM 100 headquarters. Artillery and air support was also arranged. The situation appeared well in hand.

But the intelligence about the enemy presence never reached the first serial, the 43rd French Colonial Infantry, probably because of a shortage of skilled radio operators. When the 43rd stumbled upon signs of enemy presence at PK 15 it stopped and began to reconnoiter. The other serials had to slow down behind it. It soon became evident that the enemy was no longer north of the road. The Viet Minh had established a full regimental size ambush, with heavy mortars, bazookas, and recoilless rifles. The Vietnamese units broke almost immediately. The first two elements of the convoy were quickly decimated. The arrival of the last two, with the two Korea battalions, helped stabilize the situation somewhat, as they burst through the roadblocks of destroyed vehicles and set up a defensive perimeter along with a drop zone for supplies. The Viet Minh had quickly identified and wiped out group headquarters, so the senior officer remaining alive in the trap was the commander of 2nd Korea. At 1715, three hours after the ambush began, he received orders to abandon vehicles and equipment and break through to PK 22. That also meant leaving behind the wounded, over a hundred men, almost all of whom would die on the murderous march to prison camps that followed.

The commander ordered his soldiers to break out in platoon sized formations. The night featured many running battles in the jungle. The Viet Minh knew the French would have to eventually return to the road to get to the pass and set up more ambushes along Route 19. The last elements of GM 100 staggered into PK 22 at 1900 on June 25, after 40 hours of fighting. The force had ceased to exist as an organized unit. The area around PK 22 was indefensible, so survivors were herded through the pass and the whole force of mountaineers, paratroopers, and GM 100 remnants retreated towards Pleiku. The Viet Minh also swarmed units to the area take advantage of the vulnerable target. The 108th Viet Minh Regiment sprung the next ambush, on June 28 at Dak Ya-Ayun within 30 kilometers of Pleiku, and then again the next day almost at Pleiku. But the terrain was more open, French air support was very punishing, and the Korea veterans continued to fight well. The force reached the safety of Pleiku on June 29.

GM 100 lost 85 percent of its vehicles and 100 percent of its artillery. Fewer than 50% of the troops, less than 1,600 men, reached Pleiku. The French high command tried to reorganize it with scraps and remnants from other locations, but the unit had lost its mobility, and much of it was decimated again during an ill-advised operation on July 17 that culminated in another ambush slaughter at Chu-Dreh Pass. Eventually the remaining survivors would be reorganized into a heavy infantry battalion, withdrawn from Indochina after the armistice, and sent to a new war in Algeria.

As previously mentioned, Lt. Col. Hal Moore of 1-7 Cav studied the GM 100 defeat extensively on the ship heading to Vietnam and was determined not to underestimate his adversary nor suffer the same fate in what would become the Army's first major battle in Vietnam in 1965.

Key Observations – Mobile Group 100 1954

1. Hal Moore wrote that his lesson from his staff ride to the ambush site at kilometer marker PK 15 was “Death is the price you pay for underestimating this tenacious enemy.”

2. From Bernard Fall

a. French veterans of the Korean War had been spoiled by abundant American support there, and were not prepared for more meager French resources in Indochina. That included everything from medevac assets to artillery and close air support.

b. Experienced local forces such as the 43rd Colonial Infantry were an important asset, but other Vietnamese units deployed in unfamiliar areas away from families threatened by the Viet Minh had poor motivation and were less effective.

c. GM 100 was unprepared to deal with a nonlinear war without fronts so different from Korea.

d. The French were too road bound, and did not realize until too late that the war would be won by well-trained combat infantrymen who could stay in the jungle, not tanks or mass-produced conscripts.

3. History is not always a good, direct guide for the current fight. We must avoid trying to refight the last war, or even a concurrent one, although we can learn about adaptability, estimation of new enemies, and open our mind’s aperture to possibilities and opportunities.

4. There are often valuable insights to be gained from staff rides of past battlefields.

Source materials available upon request.

Case Study 1-05: The Arab-Israeli War 1973

Despite a well-earned reputation for military prowess, the Israelis have a spotty record about interpreting their successes to properly prepare for the next conflict. In 2006 they were not ready for the complex defenses Hezbollah had prepared in Lebanon. Based on past experience, the Israelis had underestimated their enemy and prepared for a low technology irregular fight. Instead they were surprised by a conventional hedgehog defense system with modern weapons combined with an adept information campaign mixed with some irregular tactics. Such hybrid warfare had not been foreseen. This was not the first time they have been victimized by a combination of wrong lessons, bad assumptions, and technological surprise.

The Israeli victory in the Six Day War in 1967 was impressive and overwhelming. Spurred by inaccurate Soviet intelligence that the Israelis were preparing an offensive, the Egyptians cut off access to the Gulf of Aqaba, and along with the Jordanians and Syrians, began to build up forces for their own attack. Instead of sitting back to receive it, the Israelis launched a preemptive strike early on 5 June. They quickly decimated Arab air forces, insuring air superiority, and then defeated the Egyptians, Jordanians, and Syrians in turn. The resulting capture of Jerusalem, the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, and Golan Heights gave the Israelis new strategic depth, while further complicating diplomatic efforts to lessen regional tensions.

The Israelis looked at the rapid and decisive success of their armored columns and reorganized their ground forces around that element. The number of tanks in their brigades increased while supporting infantry and artillery were reduced. They assumed that these heavy forces with unchallenged air superiority would again dominate the future battlefield against incompetent Arab foes who were easily gauged by Israeli intelligence.

In 1973, the Israelis would pay for their bad assumptions with much blood and treasure. First, their intelligence failed badly. The new president of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, reformed his armed forces and obtained much modern weaponry. He also did a much better job coordinating with his Arab allies. Israeli intelligence did not pick up any indications of an Arab buildup until early October, and even then downplayed the signs because they did not think any Arab force would attack during the fasting month of Ramadan. By the morning of 6 October, ground force commanders in the Sinai and Golan Heights had brought their forces to higher alert because of increased activity, but Prime Minister Golda Meir refused to launch another preemptive strike in order to avoid looking like an aggressor. She did order mobilization to begin.

Meir, however, had made the decision too late for any effect to be felt before the Egyptians and Syrians attacked that afternoon. Not only was it the Jewish Sabbath, it was Yom Kippur. Israeli defenders along the Bar Lev line, a series of sand fortification along the Suez Canal, had been lulled into a false sense of security by repetitive Egyptian assault drills. On 6 October, the drill became a real attack. Five infantry

divisions crossed the canal in 1000 assault boats and then used high pressure water hoses to destroy the sand berms. They soon established a large bridgehead three or four kilometers deep. By 9 October the foothold was 10 to 12 kilometers deep. The Syrians also attacked in the Golan Heights but had less success in very costly engagements.

There were many more nasty surprises to come for the Israelis. The Egyptians established an integrated air defense network over the canal that was 100 miles long and 20 miles wide. A mix of missile and gun systems were lethal up to 50,000 feet. Israeli electronic countermeasures could not cope especially with the new low-level SAM-6 missile system, which was also a very elusive target because of its mobility. During the first week of the war, the Israeli air force lost a quarter of its frontline strength trying to attack Egyptian forces secure under their air defense umbrella.

When three Israeli armored brigades tried to attack into the zone, they also were beaten back with heavy losses, mainly due to new Sagger antitank missiles. Without infantry and artillery support, Israeli tanks were sitting ducks for the wire-guided weapons. The new organizations did not have the combined arms capability to overcome the technological surprise from the Sagers, especially without expected air superiority.

Eventually, however, the Egyptians overplayed their hand. On 14 October they charged out from under the air defense umbrella. The largest tank battle since Kursk in 1943 involved about 2,000 tanks. Assisted by TOW missiles shipped hastily from the United States, and aircraft no longer hampered by the integrated air defenses, the Israelis beat back the divided Egyptian forces and started their own counterattack. The best and surest way to destroy air defenses is from the ground and not the air, and that is what the Israelis did. They jumped the canal and were headed for Cairo when international diplomacy forged a cease-fire.

While the Israelis appeared to be victorious when the fighting ceased, their losses were heavy; 3000 were dead, and their aura of invincibility was gone. The Arabs believed they had won an important psychological victory. Their ensuing oil embargo of Israel's supporters, especially the United States, displayed a new Arab ability to influence Western political priorities. The signing of the Camp David Accords in 1978 followed by a formal peace treaty in 1979 seemed to stabilize relations between Israel and Egypt, though the action irritated other Arab states and did nothing to solve problems with the Palestinians or the fragility of Lebanon.

Among the very close observers of the war were the Americans. A team led by Col. Donn Starry roamed the battlefields soon after the fighting stopped. His reports, along with other observations, contributed to the implementation of new Active Defense doctrine by TRADOC commander Gen. William DePuy. It was designed to "win the first battle" in a new very destructive technological war. Starry reached three main conclusions. First, it was possible to fight outnumbered and win, as the Israelis had on the Golan Heights. Second, that the lethality of modern weaponry had vastly increased,

which had to be overcome with movement and combined arms. Third, the tank was the dominant land system, though ironically he seems to have missed the combined arms imbalance that had cost the Israelis dearly. Starry's reports, however, also helped drive the development of the M1 Abrams tank that would achieve so much success on future battlefields. Probably the most unfortunate result of the American focus on the 1973 conflict was that it reinforced the propensity of the American armed forces to distance themselves from the unpleasant experience in Vietnam, ignoring any lessons from that conflict and instead concentrating on the conventional warfare they favored and expected to fight against the Soviets.

Key Observations – Arab-Israeli War 1973

1. Enemies adapt. Just because they falter in one conflict does not mean they will in the next. Don't underestimate them based on past performance.
2. Technological surprise should always be expected. We must always be ready to respond accordingly. Enemies will always come up with something new we had not predicted. We should also not expect to maintain monopolies on new developments.
3. There is no substitute for the synergy of joint and combined arms.
4. Air superiority in future conflicts cannot always be assumed. We must be prepared to deal again with contested airspace and possible limitations on our use of airpower.
5. Do not expect the last conflict to be an adequate model for the next. Intellectual readiness is at least as important as any other factor in preparing forces for the future. While leaders must always think ahead, they must also be prepared to adapt on the fly to respond to unexpected developments on the battlefield.

Source materials available upon request

Great Expectations: Grim Realities

Case Study 2-01: World War I Mobilization 1917-18

American intervention in World War I in April 1917 demanded the explosive growth of the Army to unprecedented size. This massive expansion filled the ranks using three broad approaches: bringing the regular army to authorized strength; the federalization of the National Guard, formerly the Organized Militia; and the use of draftees to fill new reserve formations. The results were astounding. The pre-World War I Regular Army possessed some 125,000 troops scattered at small posts from the West Coast to the Philippines. America declared war on Germany in April 1917. By November 1918 the total force boasted over 3.7 million men in 62 divisions, of which 43 were overseas: 31 combat divisions, six depot support divisions, and six others skeletonized to provide replacements. The Allied nations pushed for immediate commitment of fresh American troops to refill English and French formations bled white by three years of war. The Allied Supreme War Council's planning assumed that American divisions needed nine months' home training and six months in France. President Woodrow Wilson's intent was to provide a force that would be able to make such an important and impressive contribution to winning the war that he would have sufficient leverage to influence the final settlement to fit his vision of a lasting peace. While the American mobilization effort was prodigious, there were just too many readiness hurdles to overcome to achieve the Commander-in-Chief's intent. While the quantity of forces provided was impressive, the quality was not.

The force was not intellectually prepared for war, and had many leadership deficiencies. The need for competent senior officers soon became critical. Gen. John J. Pershing wrote to the War Department, encouraging the deployment of division commanders fit to endure the rigors of warfare on the Western Front. He was very dissatisfied with CONUS promotion and assignment policies, and President Woodrow Wilson authorized him to relieve officers once they arrived in theater. The Army also quickly found itself short of trained and capable staff officers. Pershing's American Expeditionary Force (AEF) staff itself was small and *ad hoc*. The need for staff officers became so great that the Army established a special school for them at Langres, France.

The American industrial base never had enough time to gear up for war, and governmental agencies struggled to coordinate such efforts. The AEF depended upon its allies for the bulk of its combat equipment, with the exception of American-produced tactical vehicles. The gradual production of American artillery and ammunition stocks provided enough materiel for only CONUS-based training.

The divisional force structure of the time included two brigades, each with two infantry regiments. Each regiment split shortly after forming, and provided cadre to another unit. New junior officers reporting in found that the units lacked weapons and equipment of all kinds; the Soldiers had only the uniforms they were issued. Typical of many of these units, the 4th Infantry Division encountered unusual difficulties during training that winter of 1917-18. Camp Greene, North Carolina, experienced heavy

snowfalls and an unusually harsh winter, and the division logged only 16 training days in 3 months. Weather delays, unit moves and reorganizations, and the urgent push to get units overseas, meant that training suffered greatly. At least one Infantry Regiment arrived in France in June 1918 without ever having fired any of its weapons.

The lack of intellectual preparedness did not just apply to officers. The Army also had its first experience with a large conscript army with widely varied educational backgrounds. One officer in a machine gun company found that the new technology of the weapon was beyond the reach of some of his Soldiers:

That was one of our problems. The educational advantage of most of our men was mid-high school or better, but there were some men who were illiterate and that had to be taken into consideration in their assignment to duty, especially a weapon like the machine gun which involved clinometers, compasses, and clearance in feet and yards.

Despite the lack of adequate individual training or any combined arms training at all, American commanders and Soldiers alike chafed at being assigned to British and French units for training after arrival in France. Pershing believed that the spirit of American élan would sweep the Germans from the battlefield using open order tactics that ignored the realities of trench warfare. That hubris, combined with a legitimate desire to see American armies succeed on their own, drove General Pershing to demand an independent sector for American troops, and to turn down training assistance from the more experienced British and French. The AEF suffered terrible losses in very clumsy and poorly supplied operations, more than 321,000 casualties in just six months of combat, and was looked down upon by the Allies. The Allied generals minimized any American contribution to the final victory. One of the last casualties of the war would be President Wilson, whose spirit and health would be broken by his unsuccessful fight to get the peace settlement that he desired. The AEF's efforts were inadequate to give him the influence he required at Versailles.

Key Observations – World War I Mobilization

1. In modern warfare, quality is more important than quantity. It does no good to get a large number of Soldiers to the battlefield if they are not ready to fight.
2. Deployment preparedness includes more than just manning units, It also requires training, equipping, and resourcing personnel. Intellectual preparation is also essential. Modern warfare is a complex activity requiring much mental readiness and agility. All these requirements take extensive facilities and lots of time.
3. Experienced allies can provide much critical assistance with intelligence and training.
4. The need for officer and NCO education and training is critical and constant, both in peacetime and wartime.
5. Translating battlefield success into political advantage is difficult. Military leaders must always keep in mind the political objectives their civilian leaders are trying to obtain, and shape operations accordingly.

Case Study 2-02: Guadalcanal 1942-43

After the Allied victory at the Battle of Midway in May 1942, a window of opportunity opened for the United States to halt the Japanese in the South Pacific. The Joint Chiefs of Staff devised a plan to halt Japanese advances towards US communication lines between the US, Australia, and New Zealand. Part one of the operation, commanded by Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, included the seizure and occupation of Guadalcanal and adjacent islands. The seizure of Guadalcanal and neighboring islands in the southern Solomons was the first land assault of the war, and the beginning of land campaigns in the Pacific.

What US officials thought would be an easy and cheap victory turned into a 6-month battle lasting from August 7, 1942 until the beginning of February 1943 and costing over 7,100 Allied lives. At the beginning of the battle, Maj. Gen. Ernest Harmon, Commander of US Army Forces in the South Pacific Area (USAFISPA), voiced his concerns over the ability of US forces to complete their mission. He wrote, "We have seized a strategic position from which future operations in the Bismarcks can be strongly supported. Can the Marines hold it? There is considerable room for doubt." Though successful, the battle of Guadalcanal showed Harmon's doubts had some validity. Guadalcanal provides lessons in the need for joint-service coordination, comprehensive logistical planning, and effective force training.

Guadalcanal turned the war in the Pacific in favor of the Allies and shifted US strategic posture. However, at the onset of the battle, the US appeared grossly underprepared to launch a counteroffensive against the Japanese. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 forced America into a defensive position. Meanwhile, Japan quickly initiated movement in the South Pacific and gained advantageous strongholds. Between January and July 1942, the Japanese garrisoned and fortified more than 10 islands. They moved towards the Solomon Islands and landed on Tulagi and Guadalcanal, and began building an airfield from which they could launch land-based attacks against Allied forces. Japanese aircraft also patrolled the seas, monitoring US movements. Each day that passed and each new island controlled by the Japanese added additional challenges for Allied commanders.

Rushed and faulty planning contributed to the unpreparedness of US to fight at Guadalcanal. The Marine Division, about 16,000 Marines with attachments, received the missions and completed some preliminary rehearsals. The need to capture the islands before the Japanese could put the airfield into operation reduced training time. Due to the perceived urgency of the situation, commanders sacrificed complete rehearsals to accelerate the invasion's timeline. Logistics, such as how to unload necessary supplies from transport ships, remained unplanned. This slowed the initial inland assault at Guadalcanal, hindered the force's ability to build and maintain defenses at key positions on the island, and affected troop health and morale.

Along with training failures, each US force had limited and contradictory intelligence reports about the island of Guadalcanal. Ground forces had no opportunity to conduct island reconnaissance prior to the landing. Thus, they could not assess the difficulty of the unfamiliar jungle terrain into which they would traverse. Naval forces and the 1st Marine Division also had different maps of Guadalcanal, neither version very accurate. Thus, across the board, US joint forces were not adequately trained and did not initially share a unified tactical and operational vision about the battle of Guadalcanal.

The initial landing of troops on Guadalcanal's Beach Red went smoothly. The 1st Marine Division began landing on Guadalcanal and the adjacent islands of Tulagi and Florida on the morning of August 7, 1942 and by the afternoon all remaining forces had come ashore. No Japanese met the US forces on the Guadalcanal beaches during this entire operation, but they resisted fiercely on the other islands. The troubles began when equipment and forces started to move inland. The naval battles at Coral Sea (May 4-8 1942) and Midway (June 3-7 1942) had been costly victories for the US Navy, which lost 2 aircraft carriers and several surface ships, while one aircraft carrier and other ships were badly damaged. The battles had temporarily slowed the Japanese advance through the Pacific, but these losses so soon after the destruction of most of the US battleship fleet at Pearl Harbor had made some US commanders more cautious. When Japanese naval forces attacked the amphibious force at sea during the Guadalcanal landing, the Navy withdrew the carriers and support ships to protect the Marines. This left the Marines ashore without all the support required for operations.

Not anticipating Guadalcanal's terrain and climate, US forces struggled to maneuver to their objectives as equipment stuck into the sand and mud and humidity fatigued the men. The Japanese discovered the landings belatedly, and began defending the island fiercely. Marines captured the airfield quickly and began putting it into operation. Once the airfield, dubbed Henderson Field, was in operation, it became the focus of all Japanese offensive efforts. The Japanese realized the strategic value of the airfield, and began attacking US naval forces and landing reinforcements on the island.

The Marines, now reinforced by the Army's 164th Infantry Regiment, successfully repulsed an attack by a larger Japanese force in October, and with further reinforcements launched several raids in November. Finally, by January, American troops at Guadalcanal received enough reinforcements and had become familiar enough with the jungle terrain and the Japanese unconventional warfare to execute a final counteroffensive. The Japanese began evacuating the island on February 4, 1943, and by February 9 the island was completely in US hands.

US forces received their first harsh introduction to the jungle diseases and maladies that would plague them throughout the war in the Pacific. The official US Army history of the campaign concluded that "the greatest single factor reducing troop effectiveness on Guadalcanal was disease, particularly malaria. For every man who became a casualty in combat, five fell to malaria. Until a more effective prophylaxis

became available, tropical diseases would continue to degrade the efficiency of ground operations in tropical areas.” Like other logistics, medical support figured very little into the planning and preparation for the battle. The difficult terrain the infantry encountered presented nearly impossible obstacles for medical evacuation of casualties. The Marines established a small medical facility at Henderson Field, but it also took many casualties whenever the Japanese attacked the airfield. Ironically, despite the lack of planning, opportunity and necessity led to the development of a new concept: medical evacuation by air. Since the Navy could not re-supply Guadalcanal by sea, the Army Air Corps began running transport planes to the island from other secure bases. Henderson Field was under constant attack, and transport planes were too few and valuable to be left there, so they simply discharged their cargo and left again. Surgeons attached to Marine forces began loading the wounded and seriously ill aboard these planes for evacuation to rear areas. Transports evacuated some 7,000 men from Guadalcanal and continued the process throughout the Pacific campaigns.

The Guadalcanal campaign included fierce and costly naval battles. At the battle of Santa Cruz in October, the US Navy lost 1 aircraft carrier, 1 battleship, and 1 destroyer sunk, with 1 carrier and 2 destroyers badly damaged, the following month, the Japanese sank 2 cruisers and 7 destroyers at the naval battle of Guadalcanal. These battles, while inflating much greater losses on the Japanese, demonstrated that US Navy use of radar had been uneven and ineffective. The Navy had also yet to effectively counter the torpedo threat. Naval leaders anticipated torpedo attacks and had doctrinal strategies for defending against them, but underestimated the Japanese Navy’s ability to complete such attacks.

One official Navy report on the battle concluded that, “The firepower of our battleships, however, was overwhelming, and our destroyers clinched this advantage for us by absorbing the enemy's vastly superior torpedo strength.” The heavy toll on destroyers in these battles reflects this wry assessment.

The Japanese also had planning failures. Japanese officials did not think Americans would launch a counterattack until well into 1943. They also underestimated Allied land force strength and morale level. Because of this, they did not initially posture defensively on Guadalcanal, leaving openings for an American attack. After almost exactly 6 months of fighting, the Japanese evacuated Guadalcanal. The enemy’s failure to plan helped the US seize Guadalcanal. However, the US cannot always rely on enemy mistakes when going into battle.

Key Observations – Guadalcanal 1942

1. Logistical considerations must be given to ensure the success of combat missions. Re-supply and transportation plans as well as conducting rehearsals to test these plans are essential. The adage “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” applies to warfighting.

2. In addition to logistics, medical considerations must be included in operational and contingency planning at all levels.

3. Understanding other services’ doctrine is critical, as is understanding and properly using available technology. Each commander must understand the interdependencies inherent in joint warfare.

Source materials are available upon request.

Case Study 2-03: Chinese Counteroffensive 1950

In mid-November 1950, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, sent a congratulatory note to Lt. Gen. Edward "Ned" Almond, Commander of the US X Corps: "Heartiest congratulations, Ned, and tell Dave Barr [Commanding General of the US 7th Infantry Division] that the 7th Division hit the jackpot." The hero of Inchon was referring to the advance of the 7th Infantry Division to the shores of the Yalu River, which marked the border between North Korea and Chinese Manchuria. In June 1950, North Korea had shocked the world by attacking across the 38th Parallel and crushing South Korean forces, swiftly taking the capital of Seoul. South Korean troops withdrew southward into a small perimeter around Pusan on the southeastern edge of the peninsula strengthened by US and United Nations troops. In September, General MacArthur launched a swiftly planned and executed amphibious landing at Inchon on the western coast of Korea. The landing was intended to cut off the North Korean forces besieging Pusan. The Communist forces hastily broke their siege and withdrew to avoid encirclement. Beginning in October 1950, American, UN, and South Korean forces pressed into North Korea. The Eighth United States Army under Lt. Gen. Walton Walker advanced up the western side of the Korean peninsula with Almond's X Corps advancing in the east, reaching the Yalu by November.

Walker planned to launch an offensive to the Yalu River in order to establish a continuous front along the river with Almond's X Corps on his right. The attack was set for November 24, 1950. Raiding and intelligence gathering efforts found nothing unusual; the Chinese Communist Forces appeared to abandon their positions, leaving behind token forces to man isolated outposts. In Japan, MacArthur's Far East Command worked on post-war occupation plans. The major concern for American commanders was limited communication between the Eighth Army and X Corps. The Taebaek Mountain Range ran through the center of the peninsula from north to south. This terrain feature prohibited communication efforts between the two main forces of the UN Command. Warnings received from diplomatic sources cautioned that any Allied advances past the 38th Parallel in the center of the peninsula would result in Chinese intervention. MacArthur and his staff dismissed the credibility of the reports, though they knew large Chinese armies were deployed near the border. Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer, Commander of Far East Air Forces, also promised that his bombers could prevent any major Chinese incursion if they tried.

However, due to technological surprise, MacArthur and his air forces were blind. On 1 November Russian-piloted MiG-15 fighters swarmed over the Yalu from Manchuria, achieving air superiority over much of North Korea and all the border regions. American airmen and UN forces were unprepared for the new threat. No one had expected the Soviets to be able to develop such an aircraft, and it would take some time to gather enough F-86 fighters to challenge it. In the meantime, during the critical month of November, UN forces were denied all aerial reconnaissance over Chinese infiltration routes and positions. MacArthur had no viable backup intelligence sources, and operational planning was based on speculation, not hard data.

By November 24, the Soldiers of the Eighth Army were in position, 75 miles south of the border ready to advance. Walker intended to advance northwards to the Yalu, encircling and destroying enemy forces, establishing a solid front along the river with X Corps. Simultaneously, on the eastern side of the peninsula, Almond planned attacks on enemy positions near the coast to tie up additional opposition forces. Intelligence estimated the strength of the Chinese forces at 70,000, far less than the 130,000 Soldiers of the Eighth US Army and the 84,000 men of Almond's X Corps. These numbers belied the facts that these numbers included inexperienced troops of the Republic of Korea, and that forces were spread out among the unforgiving hills and valleys, isolating regiments and battalions from each other. The Eighth Army and X Corps were tethered to two separate supply lines; logistical support for the Eighth Army originated at the port of Inchon on the west coast and moved northwards while the port of Hamhung in the northeastern area of the country supplied the X Corps. The "Home by Christmas" offensive initially encountered minimal resistance as Chinese and North Korean forces evacuated their positions and retreated northwards. The operation progressed as planned, albeit for a very short period of time.

The Chinese Communist Forces opposing the UN troops in reality numbered 300,000, far more than the 70,000 estimated by MacArthur's intelligence service. General Almond typified American hubris in reacting to Chinese prisoners, he "snorted at them and gave them no credit whatsoever." This hubris was in part, one of the reasons for the impending disaster. While underequipped in terms of weapons, the Chinese military possessed a wealth of combat experience from the war against the Japanese and the subsequent civil war. When the UN offensive began, 9 undetected Chinese armies divided into 2 army groups were poised ready to strike.

The Eighth Army advanced with two South Korean divisions securing the right flank of the line. On the night on November 25, 1950, the Chinese attacked. Six armies totaling nearly 180,000 troops attacked along the entire front. The pressure of the attacks collapsed those South Korean divisions, and the left and center were forced back.

The Chinese offensive broke out in the X Corps sector on November 27, when the Chinese Ninth Army attacked the 1st US Marine Division and supporting units positioned near the Changjin (Chosin) Reservoir. The 30,000 Allied troops desperately held out against the repeated attacks of the 67,000 Chinese besieging them. The following day, MacArthur summoned Walker and Almond to discuss the troubling events of the previous days and determine a future strategy in face of the onslaught.

At his headquarters in Tokyo, the Eighth Army and X Corps commanders provided MacArthur with grim situation reports in their areas of operation. After evaluating the information, MacArthur reasoned that the greatest threat was to Walker's Eighth Army on the western side of the peninsula and directed him to withdraw his force to the south. This authorization left the X Corps exposed. Almond received authorization to secure the port of Hamhung and prepare for an amphibious evacuation. Almond concurred, but also requested and received authorization to assist the force engaged around the Chosin Reservoir.

The fight around the reservoir lasted until the December 7, when the Allied troops were able to break the encirclement and begin the retreat towards Hamhung. Simultaneously, Almond withdrew the remainder of X Corps into a defensive perimeter around Hamhung. Barr's 7th Infantry Division guarded the center of the perimeter with the 3rd Infantry on his left and the I South Korean Corps on the right. The 7th Infantry paid a high price for its advance to the Yalu and subsequent retreat, sustaining more than 2,700 casualties in a two-week period. By December 25, Almond evacuated X Corps from the north and was preparing to sail south.

The 2nd Infantry Division fared no better than the 7th. By November 25, the "Indianhead" Division held a fifteen-mile portion of the Eighth Army's front. It was located precariously between the US 25th Infantry Division on its left and the two inexperienced South Korean divisions holding the Army's right flank until they collapsed. On the night of November 25, the 2nd became the focal point for the Chinese 39th and 40th Armies. Over the next two weeks as the Allied line contracted, the 2nd Infantry held the right flank of the Eighth Army against successive enemy attacks and paid a high price to do so. Fighting through enemy roadblocks near Kunu-ri decimated the unit. The 2nd Infantry Division suffered more than 4,900 killed, wounded, missing, or captured, rendering it combat ineffective. The actions of the 2nd Division and those of the other Eighth Army units allowed Walker to skillfully withdraw the Eighth Army south by moving from delay line to delay line. This tactic allowed him to delay the enemy advance and allow his troops to retreat without the possibility of being enveloped or encircled by the Chinese forces. By December 23, the Eighth Army's line reached the 38th Parallel.

Only six weeks after launching its offensive into the north, the United Nations Command had stood on the precipice of victory. Its armies were only hours from the Manchurian border, but underestimation of the enemy's capabilities and inaccurate intelligence led to an unimagined disaster. Commanders did their best to react, but in the end they were overwhelmed by events and forced to retreat. The Chinese Counteroffensive of 1950 illustrates the dangers that overconfidence and poor intelligence assessments pose to a trained and well-equipped force close to achieving its operational objectives.

Key Observations – Chinese Counteroffensive, 1950

1. Sometimes diplomatic warnings must be taken seriously. Both President Truman and General MacArthur had dismissed Chinese messages.
2. Technological surprise is inevitable, especially in this modern age of innovation. The Army must be prepared to deal with unexpected weapons and tactics. It must also have backup and alternative systems in case the enemy can deny key capabilities. This is especially relevant concerning current space and cyber capabilities.
3. Beware of overconfidence. After the success at Inchon, General MacArthur discounted enemy will and capabilities and considered his forces unstoppable.
4. Airpower is a great tool, but leaders often expect too much from it. MacArthur's hubris was reinforced by an air commander who promised more than he could deliver.
5. Terrain still matters. The mountainous landscape of Korea forced commanders to disperse their units into battalion, company and platoon sized elements among hilltops and other key terrain features impairing their ability to provide mutual support. Chinese infiltration tactics took full advantage of such deployments.

Source materials are available upon request

Case Study 2-04: Operation ANACONDA 2001-02

When military operations in Afghanistan were initiated in October 2001, the “strategic movement to contact” did not expect quick results. There was no detailed campaign plan. While Special Operations Forces (SOF) went into the country to work with the Northern Alliance, elements of the 10th Mountain Division deployed to Uzbekistan with the concept to seize an airfield in northern Afghanistan in preparation for a major offensive in 2002. Everyone was surprised by the quick collapse of the Taliban and requests to add conventional forces to the fight were refused until after SOF and allied tribes could not contain foreign fighters at Tora Bora in November 2001 and the remnants escaped into Pakistan. When another enemy concentration was discovered in the Shahikot Valley in late winter 2002, the 10th Mountain would get involved in what has been called “America’s first battle of the twenty-first century.” As for Tora Bora, the plan was to push the enemy out of its positions to then be destroyed by a strong blocking force and aerial fires.

Deployments had already revealed significant shortcomings with peacetime command and control structures. A DoD ordered plan for a 10% reduction in the Joint Staff was quietly shelved immediately after 9/11. Almost invariably, cuts that seem prudent in peacetime have to be made up quickly in crises, resulting in untrained and poorly-coordinated staff teams at multiple levels. When Operation ENDURING FREEDOM was launched in 2001, the US Central Command (CENTCOM) staff was authorized 1,254 personnel, and manned with 1,199. It was quickly augmented with 1,246 additional personnel from all over the military to meet its demanding requirements. Some of those augmentees came from Third Army/Army Central (ARCENT) headquarters, which was already at the lowest possible authorized level of organization (ALO) for an insufficient structure to begin with. That headquarters then reached down into US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) to get augmentation from the very tactical units that would soon be fighting in Afghanistan. Reserve call-ups of very uneven quality also filled holes in the staffs. For instance, a reserve component major working as a librarian at the Army Heritage and Education Center in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was called up to fill a slot at a Tactical Operation Center (TOC) in Afghanistan that was supposed to be manned by an colonel and senior service college graduate. The pernicious ripple effect of those grab-bag reinforcements was to create staffs with little experience or cohesion, and led a frustrated ARCENT participant at an August 2002 After Action Review (AAR) for the Afghanistan campaign to proclaim that the Army in Afghanistan “was playing the Super Bowl with a pickup team.”

The situation in the theater was made worse by force caps imposed by DoD and the rejection of Time Phased Force Deployment List (TPFDL) requirements, in an attempt to keep a small footprint in keeping with the Secretary of Defense’s vision of modern warfare, and in response to fears of getting “bogged down” there like the Soviets. When the 3rd Brigade of the 101st Airborne was ordered to Afghanistan, the Combined Forces Land Component Commander (CFLCC) could only get permission to allow them to bring 2,200 out of 5,000 Soldiers, basically an infantry battalion and assorted support units. Among the elements eliminated when DoD scrubbed

deployment lists were artillery and attack helicopters. The assumption was that abundant Air Force and Navy aircraft could furnish necessary fire support, just as they had assisted the Northern Alliance. Faced with tough choices about numbers to deploy, some units left behind organic mortars, and more headquarters got cut. Fire support coordinators who were supposed to be stationed at the Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) to work with the Air Force had to be kept back at 10th Mountain headquarters to allow their FSC cell to be manned for 24 hour operations. That would contribute to the ensuing problems with close air support for ANACONDA, as the CAOC and 10th Mountain staff never did establish adequate coordination. In general, the division staff allowed in Afghanistan was inadequate to perform the CJTF functions required.

The lack of staff coordination plagued all levels. SOF A-teams with Task Force Hammer, including a few hundred local tribesmen, had a different concept of the operation than the 101st TF Rakkasan. Both forces were assigned by 10th Mountain with the mission to push the enemy into the blocking position. TF Hammer also expected more of an aerial bombardment than was really planned, especially since it viewed itself as the main effort, an opinion not shared by the 10th Mountain staff. In addition, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) had picked up intelligence that not only might enemy forces be higher in the mountains instead of in targeted villages in the valley, but also might be three times as numerous as the attacking forces suspected. Unfortunately, due to organizational stovepipes, that information never got to the 10th Mountain. Even without that CIA input, an intensive pre-battle reconnaissance effort focused every available surveillance and target acquisition system on a small ten-by-ten kilometer battlefield. Despite that effort, fewer than 50% of enemy fighting positions were discovered prior to ground contact. Most fire received by troops would come from unseen and unanticipated places. The enemy had learned well from previous engagements, and proved adept at exploiting the rocky and mountainous terrain.

Bad weather postponed the operation until the morning of March 2, 2002. Navy Special Warfare (SEAL) units and Delta force reconnaissance teams infiltrated the area on the night of February 28, and discovered many unexpected enemy positions. When last minute requests for increased bombing support were sent to CENTCOM via Video Teleconference (VTC), CENTCOM was not prepared to adapt so quickly to changing conditions.

Task Force Hammer's plan did not survive departure from the assembly area. Bad roads and overloaded vehicles slowed them. Due to a failure in its inertial navigation system, an AC-130 gunship misidentified their location and decimated the column. Then instead of the one hour supporting bombardment they expected, the wounded force witnessed one B1-B drop only six bombs, which proved to be the entirety of the bombardment, due to the 7th bomb getting stuck in the B1's bomb bay, and confusion among other aircraft over "cease fire" calls from TF Hammer in response to the AC-130 attack. The force was stopped far short of its objective, where it was supposed to link up with an air assault of troops from 2nd Bn., 187 Inf. Reg. of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).

The conventional forces also experienced great difficulties and friction in what was their first battle of this new war. Fire support proved a significant shortfall. Weather and high altitude capabilities separated the first three Chinooks from supporting Apaches. The Soldiers had left their 60 mm mortars behind to make room for more riflemen, and soon came to regret that decision as they were besieged. They quickly expended the 35 rounds they brought for their 120 mm mortar. Three Chinook loads of 10th Mountain troops setting up the blocking position experienced a similar fate. Instead of engaging a fleeing enemy as expected, they were being attacked. The recon teams in the hills had a better perspective on enemy firing positions, but the air landed troops in the valley had priority for air strikes. Eventually those teams got through to controllers to better direct the bombs, but ended up very frustrated with attempts to suppress enemy mortars and machine guns with JDAMs. The air strikes were not responsive enough to keep up with a moving enemy. But their recon vantage point provided the best view of the ongoing battle. While TF Hammer was in full retreat, and Task Forces Rakkasan and Mountain were pinned down, the enemy was suffering heavy losses. When 10th Mountain headquarters, interpreting the operations as a failure, decided to withdraw all troops on the afternoon of March 2, the recon teams received a message through that the battle was going well from their perspective. Division commander Maj. Gen. Franklin "Buster" Hagenbeck then changed his mind and decided to reinforce the apparent success.

In the meantime, the local tribesmen of TF Hammer, battered by the enemy and disgusted with the lack of air support, had had enough. They turned around and went back to where they had started, accompanied by the two A-teams. Since their blocking position was not necessary with the enemy attacking instead of fleeing, the TF Mountain troops were withdrawn without a loss. TF Rakkasan moved during the night and was reinforced. The SEAL and Delta force teams continued to inflict heavy casualties on the enemy, but while shifting positions one helicopter was shot down after losing a SEAL off the back ramp. Arriving AC-130s had not been briefed on the mission, which caused confusion in arranging air support. In fact there was similar confusion in headquarters at all levels, as everyone tried to figure out what was going on. Despite a massive effort to rescue the lost SEAL, he was eventually captured and executed by the enemy. A similar effort to save the crew of the downed Chinook was more successful, though another Chinook was shot down in the nasty firefight that ensued. Eventually a Quick Reaction Force of Army Rangers came in to help clear the bloody hilltop. Seven SEALs died, and most of the Rangers were wounded.

The rest of TF Rakkasan, from 1st Bn., 187 Inf. Reg., deployed into battle on March 3 with much more organic firepower, including two 120 mm mortars and two 81 mm mortars, all with plenty of rounds. The battle plan also changed to allow A-10 Thunderbolts and Apaches to carry most of the combat load. TF Rakkasan remained static, while Afghan troops were brought in to get some credit for the action. By the time they showed up on March 12, there was no enemy left to fight.

The operation was officially declared over on March 18. Despite claims of enemy dead as high as 800, the best intelligence estimates are between 150 and 300. Given that US commanders eventually thought there were 1,000 enemy fighters in the valley,

it is safe to assume that more escaped than were killed. Only one senior Taliban leader was killed in the action, and it appears that one of the escapees was Al Qaeda's Ayman al-Zawahiri. Eight Americans died, and 72 were wounded. Afghan militia casualties are unknown, but were numerous.

There were many recriminations in the press and between the services about Operation Anaconda. Maj. Gen. Hagenbeck penned some articles criticizing the lack of adequate close air support. The Air Force fired back with much justification that they had not been brought into operational planning. Eventually the two services held a productive series of meetings to patch up relations and develop better procedures for coordinating fires. By July, the 10th Mountain forces had left Afghanistan to be replaced by a more robust contingent from the 82nd Airborne Division. In August, the Army conducted a thorough AAR of the early stages of ENDURING FREEDOM and NOBLE EAGLE at Carlisle Barracks, but by the time the final report was published, the United States was embroiled in another war in Iraq, and the findings got little notice.

Key Observations – Operation ANACONDA 2001-02

1. Enemies adapt. It is dangerous for any battle plan to assume they will repeat mistakes, do what is expected, or not develop means to counter our advantages.
2. Aerial surveillance is no guarantee of adequate intelligence.
3. Joint capabilities atrophy easily. They must be exercised often to be retained.
4. There can never be enough communication.
5. Modern airpower, as good as it is, cannot substitute for organic fire support from mortars and artillery.
6. Every effort should be made to share intelligence across all agencies.
7. Modern warfare with all its complexities requires large and well trained staffs, especially in austere theaters. Trying to expand minimized staffs when a crisis arrives risks command, control, communications, and intelligence deficiencies that can be disastrous.
8. Current American systems to develop and execute campaign plans are too unwieldy for the pace and nature of a "fast break war" requiring quick reactions in a global arena. The Joint Operation Planning System; Time-Phased Force and Deployment Lists; and Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System were all products of a Cold War mindset expecting more sequential operations with build-up and lead times. Instead the global war against terrorism has featured simultaneous complex missions with relatively short windows for planning and execution.

9. Units have juggled budgets in readiness accounts and lost training opportunities to support new missions. Headquarters have had to utilize scores of individual Requests For Forces to build organizations in key theaters instead of formal TPFDL, leading to turmoil in the personnel system and ad hoc relationships. The fact that terrorist organizations tend to gravitate toward isolated and austere zones for bases has put a great burden on logisticians, faced with a structure and procedures more suitable for large unit deployments in areas with some infrastructure. A better system needs to be devised to direct and coordinate the resources and forces necessary for this new kind of war. (From OEF AAR, available from AHEC)

Source materials are available upon request.

Victory Hides Failure

Case Study 3-01: World War II Mobilization

World War II provides a lesson in why victory often hides failure. The afterglow of V-E Day and V-J Day obscures the difficulties and complexities of the challenges to achieving victory. The Army in early 1940 consisted of fewer than 200,000 Soldiers, but grew to over 8,000,000 Soldiers by August 1945. This 4,000 percent increase in manpower required a simultaneous expansion of infrastructure, units, and war production. The nation's industrial base, though large, required a huge expansion to meet the greatly increased demand. Feeding, clothing, housing, equipping, and training that Army while establishing the infrastructure to support it was a staggering undertaking.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, remarked in 1940 that *"Mobilization in a time of peace in a democracy is a heavy task for one in my particular position."* He assumed office on September 1, 1939, the same day the Nazi juggernaut rolled into Poland. Marshall immediately recommended to President Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Regular Army end strength be increased to 280,000 and the National Guard to 475,000. The President balked at these figures but agreed to moderately higher strengths of 227,000 for the Regular Army and 235,000 for the National Guard. Roosevelt told Marshall that the public was not yet ready for such large increases, but told him to quietly plan for them as conditions allowed.

After World War I, the Army had reduced from a wartime high of nearly 2.9 million Soldiers in 1918 to fewer than 150,000 just four years later. The result of these changes produced a skeletonized structure with reduced manning. Using the wisdom we have come to regard as common after any conflict, that is, "we'll never fight another war like that," War Department planners believed that the nation would never again become involved in a European war, so the Army needed to be configured to fight in North America. Strange as this may seem today, a series of unstable Mexican governments and revolutions during the period seemed to present a credible threat to US security.

The War Department focused on the division as the building block for the Army, which at that time about 20,000 Soldiers. Planning for manpower typically centered on building the "right" number of divisions. The "Victory Plan," developed in the fall of 1941, originally called for 213 divisions, but competing pressures, and eventually battlefield success, led Marshall to limit the number to 90 in 1943.

After World War I, the nation longed to "Return to Normalcy," in the words of President Warren G. Harding's campaign slogan. Normalcy meant civilian life and a growing industrial economy, not military preparedness. After an initial short period of prosperity, the US economy slumped into recession, and the War Department did not enjoy a funding priority in Congress. With the onset of the Great Depression, military preparedness sank even further in the nation's priorities. President Roosevelt's New

Deal instituted a series of public works projects beginning in 1933 designed to create jobs and build infrastructure, but funding for these programs came at the expense of the War Department.

The Army suffered during those lean years. This benign neglect applied not only to operational funds but Research and Development (R&D) dollars as well. With research dollars repeatedly slashed, however, the Army was forced to eliminate R&D for most items and focus on fully equipping the force with the best gear currently available. The results were mixed: the Army fielded the already obsolete 37mm anti-tank (AT) gun, but also the 60mm and 81mm mortars. The 37mm AT gun was the best currently available, but would be no match for German AT weapons and completely ineffective against German tanks. Despite these funding difficulties, the War Department General Staff and the Army War College constructed all manner of mobilization and potential war planning. These plans yielded valuable information and procedures for eventual execution.

The Army spent most of the 1920s and 1930s operating on shoestring budgets with very small force structure. By 1939, however, the world situation had changed. The threat to Europe from the Nazis, and to Asia from the Japanese military, was becoming clearer to Roosevelt and some military and political leaders, even if it was not yet fully defined. After years of declining budgets, the existing Army structure did not allow for rapid expansion and mobilization.

The number of Soldiers on active duty is itself misleading, because the combat strength of the Army is only a fraction of the total strength. The Army in 1940 was not only 180,000 Soldiers short of wartime strength, but almost 77,000 short of peacetime strength. Moreover, even these numbers are unhelpful in grasping the magnitude of the problem. The “other” number includes separate infantry and cavalry units, as well as constabulary units scattered throughout the country and in Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Panama in some 130 small posts, camps, and stations, housing some few hundred Soldiers.

The Nazi capture of the Scandinavian countries and the Low Countries in May 1940, followed by the fall of France the following month, spurred the President and the War Department to further action. War Department planners believed that the urgency of a mass mobilization would be too great to allow time to adequately coach the poorly trained and equipped National Guard, so Roosevelt federalized the entire National Guard for one year for training, beginning in the fall of 1940.

The federalization of the National Guard coincided with the beginning of the nation’s first peacetime draft, which allowed the Army to start filling the shortages in both the Regular Army and National Guard divisions. Marshall had begun eliminating overage officers, and that took out many key leaders

As the mobilization continued, however, political pressure began to build on the War Department to release Soldiers, especially the National Guard, from active duty.

The war in Europe seemed to have hit a lull in fall and winter of 1940-41, and many legislators began to call for the Guard's release. The Guard also lost many men working in critical industries who returned to their civilian jobs. Between June 1940 and June 1941, the National Guard lost over 91,000 enlisted Soldiers, released from active duty for either family dependency or defense related jobs. This number is the equivalent of four and one-half divisions.

Moreover, Roosevelt had won an unprecedented third term in office, against stiff isolationist opposition, based on the assurance that the United States would not enter the war, just like his World War I predecessor, Woodrow Wilson. By the fall of 1941 the President had reversed his previous position and ordered General Marshall to begin reducing the Army. The War Department developed plans to inactivate units and reorganize them to meet the reductions; only the attack on Pearl Harbor prevented the plans from being executed.

Other force structure changes affected the Army's ability to build units as well. The ground Army competed for troops with the Army Air Corps and the service forces, each with large, legitimate, and growing requirements. The summer of 1940 brought additional end strength increases for the Army, but the President also ordered an increase in the Air Corps. This heralded what would become constant competition for resources between ground and air forces.

The Army inducted Soldiers at a specific rate, and activated divisions and other units on a prescribed schedule. Supply ordering required a precise sequence so that equipment would arrive when Soldiers did. After Pearl Harbor, the War Department developed a schedule that activated divisions at the rate of more than two per month from February 1942 to September 1943.

In order to organize those divisions quickly as possible, the Army introduced the "cadre" concept. As each "new" division (1942 and later) activated, it received "cadre" or officer and NCO leadership from an "old" or "parent" (pre-1941) division. The divisions activated on a sequential schedule, and the "parent" divisions provided cadre for divisions activating later. Each new division received 172 cadre officers and 1,190 NCOs and Soldiers prior to activation, and then received the balance of its "filler" Soldiers directly from the reception centers. The Replacement Training Centers were not yet fully ready to function to train large numbers of Soldiers for the divisions. As the 1942 divisions activated, they became "parents" to 1943 divisions as well. This wrought havoc with unit training plans, as "old" divisions struggled to fill their own vacancies, and then provide adequate cadre to a new unit. The War Department activated 38 divisions in 1942 and 16 more in 1943, bringing the total activated for the war to 90.

There were other significant challenges to training a division during World War II, including the time required to do so. There was no centralized training for the first couple of years, so each division trained its Soldiers using a year-long training plan. Inductees needed first to be medically screened and tested for aptitude, which eliminated a percentage of Soldiers. When the units were finally full (usually 2-8 weeks

after activation), they began individual training, followed by small unit training, large unit training and finally combined arms training. The division tested at each phase before moving on to the next.

The units lost personnel through the training process, to fill requirements from the Air Corps, Officer Candidate School (OCS), and cadre for other divisions. These personnel losses disrupted the unit and delayed training, since they often took out key leaders. Of the 89 divisions deployed overseas during World War II, 63 were regular infantry divisions. Fifty-five of these divisions experienced significant training disruption for 30 days or more (two others lost up to 60 days) for personnel turbulence. On average, those 55 divisions lost 7 months of training due to personnel turnover, with two of them losing 20 or more months. Fifteen out of the 55 divisions (27 percent), lost 12 months or more. The Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) sent qualified Soldiers to college to learn technical skills that could then be used in the Army. ASTP caused the divisions to lose an average of 4 months training time. Officer Candidate School (OCS) caused losses averaging 5-7 months. The 89th Infantry Division provided one of the more extreme examples. It activated in July 1942, but did not deploy until January 1945 due to personnel losses throughout 1944.

Logistics presented another challenge. The nation's industrial plant in 1939 was hardly the giant war machine required by the end of the war. After World War I, most of the Army's facilities disappeared. Buildings on leased property were torn down, and the land returned to the owners. Some of the infrastructure was already in place on existing bases, but the mobilization required installation development on an unprecedented scale. War mobilization plans developed during the 1920s and 1930s did not envision requirements for new construction, yet that quickly became necessary. The facilities required to induct, train, feed, clothe, house, and deploy such a large number of troops far surpassed the available real estate at the time. The Army's Quartermaster Corps and Corps of Engineers (mostly Soldiers, with a few contractors) built barracks, mess halls, chapels, headquarters buildings, and recreation areas for each of the new or existing bases. But mobilization requires much more than just housing: it also required seaports, airports, large maneuver areas, arsenals, motor pools, supply and ordnance depots, coastal fortifications, and road networks. While some of these existed in the civilian sector, they did not have the capacity necessary for military operations and required upgrades. The results were staggering: the War Department completed some 23,000 construction projects during the war, and increased the size of military facilities from 2.1 to 45.8 billion acres, an area larger than the six New England states. This construction did not include the large effort to build camps in Britain for the nearly 4 million Soldiers preparing for the invasion of Europe.

The Army had scrapped many of the nation's munitions plants after World War I. This left the nation woefully unprepared when it needed to mobilize again. For instance, the Army did not own enough semiautomatic rifles to equip the entire Army before mobilization and existing armories could only produce 200 weapons per day. There was no capacity at all to produce tanks, large guns, and other newer materials. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson remarked in 1943, "*We didn't have enough powder in the whole*

United States [in mid-1940] to last the men we now have overseas [in early 1943] for anything like a day's fighting. And, what is worse, we didn't have powder plants or facilities to make it; they had all been destroyed after the last war."

The War Department depended upon civilian industry to re-tool their plants for war production, but most were unable to do so without government funding. Some facilities, such as critical weapons plants, needed to be owned and operated by the War Department. Conversion of industry involved some increased production, but most required development of different products. The technical specialists in the War Department developed not only new equipment and weapons, but also the manuals and tools to go with them so that Soldiers could use them in the field.

The end of the war brought the same quick demobilization as after World War I. General Marshall remarked after the war, "*It wasn't a demobilization, it was a rout.*" The US maintained most of its industrial facilities after World War II, to avoid the problems encountered during the mobilization, yet in the intervening years much of that industrial capacity has been reduced or outsourced altogether.

Key Observations – World War II Mobilization

1. Contemporary mobilization difficulties are often rooted in the results and realities of past conflict. The threads of domestic priorities, political expediency, and industrial development are not unique to the interwar period and find echoes today.
2. Manning, training, and equipping an Army is as complex as the combat operations it supports. Our experiences in World War II did indeed set a precedent for our planning since 1945, but the nature of warfare and the nation's role in it have changed over the last 70 years.
3. Current plans call for an expansible army, while enjoining planners to plan for reversibility. Yet to build an expansible Army requires much of the infrastructure that has been sacrificed over the years.

Source materials are available upon request

Case Study 3-02: Grenada and Panama 1983/1989

Operations URGENT FURY and JUST CAUSE are good to examine together for a number of reasons. They show the growth and reform of the American military as it recovered from the low points of the hollow force and the failed Iranian hostage rescue mission. They were the first combats of a new era in warfare that would culminate with DESERT STORM. They also reveal much about the ability of the military to learn and adapt from its experiences, or ignore them in some cases.

President Reagan ordered the execution of Operation URGENT FURY on October 22, 1983, in response to a breakdown of law and order on the Caribbean island of Grenada that appeared to threaten the safety of Americans, mostly medical students. He soon expanded the scope of the mission to restoring democratic government there and eliminating Cuban influence, which included their building of a major air base. Though Grenada is a small island only 30 kilometers long and 12 wide, assaulting it on very short notice presented many difficulties. These included inadequate planning time, long distance deployments, a wide variety of participating forces, and poor intelligence. The operation was initially envisioned as a simple Marine amphibious landing, but erroneous intelligence estimates that predicted resistance from ten combat battalions of Cubans and People's Revolutionary forces necessitated the addition of air-delivered Army forces as well.

Initial Navy Special Warfare (SEAL) operations on October 23-24 did not go well, except for securing the British Governor General, though that team was besieged at his house for three days. But heliborne Marines quickly secured Pearls Airport and the town of Grenville on the morning of October 25th. Army forces had a tougher time. Rangers from the 1st Bn., 75th Infantry Regiment (Ranger) jumped into Port Salinas airfield from 500 feet through strong antiaircraft fire. They eventually secured the airfield and rescued the first students. They were reinforced that afternoon by paratroopers from the 82nd Airborne, who like the Rangers had flown 3,000 kilometers to get there. Ironically, though the units were headquartered about a block apart at Fort Bragg, they did not know they would both be on the operation until they met on the ground.

Eventually a Marine amphibious assault relieved the force at the Governor General's house. Two battalions of paratroopers eventually attacked successfully out of the airfield, overwhelming Cuban defenders and capturing large weapons warehouses. Though at first the commander of the Marine helicopters refused to let any Soldiers use them, eventually the Rangers persuaded him to transport them north to Grand Anse to rescue more students. By the October 27, the 82nd had six battalions on the ground, and they soon finished securing the island along with the other forces. During the final operations, a Navy A-7 wounded sixteen Soldiers by strafing the paratroopers' 2nd Brigade headquarters, and two Marine helicopters collided, killing or injuring a dozen men.

URGENT FURY revealed many problems with the American conduct of joint operations. There was confusion about command and control, and the Navy, Marines, and 82nd had no direct radio communications with each other. The Army and Air Force had trouble cobbling together air transport for the long flight from North Carolina, and coordinating close air support. Intelligence also remained inadequate throughout the operation. President Reagan imposed a total ban on press coverage for the first two days of the operation and maintained tight control of the media after that. That strained relations between the media and military and heightened the barrage of criticism that ensued in the news.

Army units realized they had to do better in planning and execution. One battalion commander from Fort Salinas talking to cadets at West Point a few months later lamented with a mix of wistfulness and amusement about the amount of time he had to spend training his Soldiers how to hotwire Cuban dump trucks to get transportation off the airfield. He observed that ten years before, he would not have had to train most of his Soldiers how to do that. The nature of the force was definitely changing with the impetus of the Reagan defense budgets and rebuilding rapport between the American people and their military.

Six years later, the U.S armed forces demonstrated how much had been learned from the minor operation in Grenada. Operation JUST CAUSE against Panama was unique in military annals for many reasons. It began very early on 20 December 1989 with the first bombing mission by two new F-117A stealth fighter-bombers flying from Nevada, undetectable by Panamanian radar. The air was soon saturated with C-130 and C-141 transports carrying Rangers, vehicles for assault landings, and paratroopers from the 82nd Airborne Division; UH-60 Black Hawk, UH-1E Hueys, and CH-47 troop carrying helicopters; a variety of gunships including new AH-64 Apaches and a dozen AC-130s; and Air National Guard A-7 Corsairs from Ohio and South Dakota along with local A-37 Dragonflies for more fixed-wing fire support. On the ground, the airborne assault meshed with attacks by elements of the 5th and 7th Infantry Divisions along with the 193rd Infantry Brigade, while Navy SEALs attacked Paitilla Airport. And this all happened at night. While everything did not go perfectly, as Clausewitzian fog and friction remain constants of warfare, after a day the hardest task remaining would be finding the elusive Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega. He eventually scuttled into the Vatican Embassy. Hard rock music blaring at the Embassy was soon replaced by hard negotiating, and Noriega finally surrendered on January 3, 1990.

At an American cost of 23 dead and 347 wounded, JUST CAUSE did more than just bring down an abusive and drug-running dictator. It was a textbook example of the quality of the new armed forces and doctrine developed in the United States, encompassing the simultaneous assault of 27 different targets at night. The successful operation put to rest the ghosts of the DESERT ONE debacle, demonstrated that the tenets of AirLand Battle such as agility and synchronization were just as applicable against a non-Soviet foe, and reasserted the pre-eminence of American military power.

Unlike for URGENT FURY, the crisis period for this contingency was exceptionally long, beginning with public revelations about General Noriega's nefarious activities in June 1987 and culminating with the execution of Operation JUST CAUSE in

December 1989. Planning for military intervention began as early as February 1988. When Noriega annulled the election of May 1989, sent his paramilitary thugs to assault opposition candidates, and increased his harassment of Americans, the United States executed Operation NIMROD DANCER. This show of force, executed by US Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), was designed to show further American resolve, in the hope that it would pressure Noriega to change his behavior. While there was no obvious modification, those newly deployed forces would play key roles when JUST CAUSE was launched. After a botched coup attempt on October, American ire increased, and when a Navy lieutenant and his wife were assaulted by Panamanian Defense Forces at a road block in December, President Bush had had enough. He directed the execution of JUST CAUSE.

The operations in Panama leading to the overthrow of the Noriega regime were touted as a model use of quick and decisive American military force, but post-conflict activities did not go as smoothly. Due to a focus on conducting a decisive operation and not the complete campaign, the aftermath of this smaller scale contingency proved very messy. Planning for the post-conflict phase, Operation PROMOTE LIBERTY, was far from complete when the short period of hostilities began. Missions and responsibilities were vague, and planners failed to appreciate adequately the effects of combat operations and removing the regime. Though guidance from SOUTHCOM on post-hostility missions was fairly clear, tactically oriented planners at the XVIII Airborne Corps in charge of the joint task force carrying out the operation gave post-conflict tasks short shrift. For instance, the campaign plan assigned the lone Military Police battalion the responsibility for running a detention facility, protecting all of the numerous convoys, and providing security for many key facilities, as well as for being prepared to restore law and order. Though the battalion was mainly concerned with a relatively small geographic portion of the country, it was quickly overwhelmed by its responsibilities.

With the elimination of the Panamanian Defense Force, the task of restoring law and order became particularly demanding, as looting and vandalism spread throughout the country. Chaos reigned as American forces scrambled to restore some semblance of order. Military policemen trained in law and order missions did not perform well in unfamiliar combat operations and were inadequate in numbers to deal with the problems they faced in the aftermath. They also could not handle all the prisoners of war (POWs) and refugees for which they were now responsible. Similarly, there were not enough civil affairs personnel or engineers for the rebuilding effort. Personnel deficiencies were exacerbated by slow and disorganized Reserve call-ups relying on volunteers. Political-military interagency cooperation was also poor, as many agencies were excluded from DoD planning and the embassy was severely understaffed.

Senior commanders admitted afterwards that they had done poorly in planning for post-conflict operations and hoped the Army would remedy that situation in the future. Despite these deficiencies, the United States Military Support Group, activated in January 1990 to support the growth of independent Panamanian institutions, was able to be deactivated just one year later in a much more stable country. The fact that a legitimate governing authority was easily reconstituted with leaders who had already

been properly elected earlier made the transition relatively easy. Such fortuitous conditions might not exist in the future. But there was no systematic study of the problems with post-hostilities activities, contributing to their reappearance in 2003 in Iraq.

Key Observations – Grenada/Panama 1983/1989

1. Executing unplanned contingencies is always difficult.
2. Maintaining joint capabilities requires continuous practice.
3. There is no substitute for good intelligence.
4. The Army has always been reluctant to study and embrace post-hostilities activities. Consolidating lasting gains won during combat operations requires the same degree of planning and resourcing as does the fighting, and usually takes much longer to achieve.
5. When it comes to combat, however, no one learns and adapts quicker than the American military.

Source materials available upon request

Case Study 3-03: Operation DESERT SHIELD/STORM 1990-91

The mobilization of three National Guard “Roundout” brigades during Operations DESERT SHIELD and STORM illustrates the challenges of transitioning Reserve Component combat units from a strategic to an operational reserve. The problems included pre-mobilization training, personnel readiness, unit collective training and professional development. New policy changes included: increased support from the active Army, Congressional legislation improved the readiness of Guard personnel. The role of Reserve Component units within the Total Army also changed as a result of the lessons learned during Operation DESERT STORM.

Lt. Gen. Edward Partain, departing commander of V Corps, wrote a prophetic end of tour report in April 1985. He focused primarily on the readiness of Reserve Component forces. He assessed that “the truth of the matter is that with exception of very few of the combat support/service support units, essentially none are capable of going to war with less than 8 weeks...training.” Partain concluded that “no group of soldiers, however intelligent, dedicated, well-equipped they may be are going to be able to attain in 38 days what an equally intelligent, dedicated, well-equipped of soldiers can attain in 365 days.” The mobilization of three roundout units in the waning months of 1990 and early 1991 proved Partain’s assessment correct.

Following the Vietnam War, the Congressionally-directed budget and manpower reductions slashed the Army strength from 1.5 million Soldiers in 1968 to 785,000 by 1975. The new Total Force Policy transformed the Reserve Component from a strategic to operational reserve by using reserve units to provide maneuver, fires, combat support, and service support. The Army also implemented the “roundout” program, which designated National Guard and Army Reserve combat brigades to augment active Army divisions, serving as the division’s third brigade in time of war. Position realignment and employment of the roundout units gave the Army the ability to maintain 13 divisions and the ability to expand to 16 in wartime. By 1990, programs and policies created by the Total Army Policy constituted 58% of the Army’s combat support, 74% of its combat service support capability, and 54% of its combat power—including six roundout brigades in the Reserve Component. The first test of this “Total Army” took place during Operation DESERT SHIELD/STORM.

The invasion of Kuwait in 1990 provoked a massive US response. President George H. W. Bush issued a Presidential Select Reserve Call-up (PSRC) on August 22, 1990, activating 200,000 Reserve Soldiers for up to a maximum of 180 days (ninety days plus a ninety day extension) without Congressional authorization or a declaration of war. U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) alerted the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized) and the 1st Cavalry Division in August. Both active Army divisions contained two organic brigades and one roundout brigade from the National Guard. The the 48th Infantry Brigade (Mechanized), Georgia Army National Guard, rounded out the 24th Infantry Division, while the 155th Armored Brigade, Mississippi Army National Guard, rounded out the 1st Cavalry Division. FORSCOM determined that the two

National Guard brigades were not ready to deploy with their parent divisions and instead alerted two active Army brigades. The two National Guard brigades received their alert notifications in November, reporting to their mobilization stations at the end of the month.

The 197th Infantry Brigade provided the training cadre for the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia, and conducted regular collective unit training. The personnel strength for the brigade was at 97% when it received orders. Five of its battalions had completed a rotation at the National Training Center (NTC) between October 1989 and July 1990. It redeployed with the 24th Infantry Division.

The 1st Brigade, 2nd Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas, was training for a rotation at the NTC when it was notified of the change in mission. The 1st Brigade qualified all of its tank crews on required gunnery tables and more than 90% of its officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs) completed professional educational requirements prior to deploying with the 1st Cavalry Division. After their return from Operation DESERT STORM, FORSCOM re-flagged these brigades and made them organic to the divisions they supported.

The decision not to deploy the roundout brigades with their Active Army divisions received intense Congressional inquiries from state representatives. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney defended the Army's decision, articulating that force planners did not request them and that the maximum of 180 days of activation (limited by PSRC) was not enough time for the roundout units to complete post-mobilization training and deploy to theater.

Both National Guard units encountered problems immediately upon mobilization. For example, a third of the personnel between the two brigades were assessed at Category III or IV following dental examinations. The two brigades also identified 1,350 Soldiers who required comprehensive physicals due to age. The mobilization process also identified individual and unit training problems. Both units were sorely deficient in professional development. Only 50% of captains had completed their required Officer Advanced Course; less than 10% of eligible senior NCOs had completed the required First Sergeants Course; and only an average of 36% of the NCOs in the two roundout brigades completed Primary Leadership Development Course.

Both brigades were ordered to complete an NTC rotation to test their ability to perform their wartime mission. This training exposed deficiencies in crew and unit vehicle gunnery. The 48th qualified only 50% of its tank crews on the gunnery range; the 155th qualified 100% of its crews on the range, but required 17-24 days to qualify, three times longer than it took their Active Army counterparts.

The austere conditions at Fort Irwin exposed other unit problems as well. Prior to the war, unit vehicles and other equipment were kept at a centrally located Mobilization and Training Equipment Site (MATES) and maintained by a full-time civilian staff. This limited the access of vehicle crews and maintenance personnel to the equipment during

the training year. This lack of training resulted in an average of 50% of assigned combat vehicles being listed as inoperable during training rotations of both units at NTC. The 48th Inf. Bde completed its post-deployment training requirements and was validated by its trainers on February 28, the day of the ceasefire in Kuwait. The 155th Armored Brigade continued its training at NTC and completed all requirements, but was not officially validated since the conflict ended before the unit completed its rotation. The combination of a lack of leadership training and limited peacetime training opportunities for the crews to qualify on live-fire ranges contributed to these units' poor performance. The systematic problems encountered throughout the post-mobilization process identified the need for wholesale changes, including Congressional legislation and modifications to existing training programs to help better prepare Reserve Component forces for future conflicts.

The problems that maneuver roundout units encountered did not affect all Reserve Component units. The 142nd Field Artillery Brigade, Arkansas Army National Guard and the 196th Field Artillery Brigade, Tennessee Army National Guard Brigades, deployed and actively participated in the ground war. These Corps-level units activated at the same time as their maneuver counterparts. The mission of corps-level fire support, while complex in itself, differed from the requirements of a fully-integrated mechanized combined arms team.

The lessons learned during the mobilization of the roundout units during Operation DESERT STORM translated into changes made within the Army in the management of Reserve Component units, such as the elimination of the roundout program and the implementation of BOLD SHIFT. These deep-rooted problems required Congressional legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act of 1992 and modifications to the Presidential Reserve Select Call-up to improve the readiness of the Reserve Components and avert the missteps of the roundout program during Operation DESERT STORM.

Key Observations – Operation DESERT STORM 1991

1. Large, mechanized Reserve Component units require a minimum of 90 days of post-mobilization training due to the complexity of their mission.
2. It is difficult for Reserve Component units to achieve proficiency in all individual and collective tasks during only pre-mobilization training.
3. Issues related to medical readiness of the Soldiers of the roundout brigades required the passing and implementation of Congressional legislation to enforce medical readiness standards for all personnel.
4. Reserve component maneuver units are incompatible with rapid deployment forces due to the lengthy post-mobilization train up time required prior to deployment.
5. The maximum amount of active duty time for Reserve Component units under the Presidential Select Reserve Call-Up, 180 days, was insufficient for many units to complete post-mobilization requirements and deploy; later increased to 270 days.
6. Rotations at NTC exposed the deficiencies of officers and NCOs, who failed to complete the professional development requirements of their rank.

Source materials are available upon request

Case Study 3-04: Stability Operations

There is a popular perception that American involvement in stability operations, including military government, is a recent phenomenon. That is false. While this analysis focuses on experience since 1945, the US Army has played a major role in what we consider “Phase IV” operations for over a century. Maj. Gen. Winfield Scott captured Mexico City in September 1847, only to discover the pressing need to establish some sort of military government. He began by seeking the city mayor. Perhaps the most frustrating example for the Army was Reconstruction in the South between 1865 and 1877. Victory in the Spanish-American War brought new opportunities in Cuba and the Philippines. The American Expeditionary Force (AEF) participated in the Allied occupation of Germany and the former Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918-23 in the midst of fears of the specter of an advancing Bolshevik tide.

World War II remains an oft-cited example of successful stability operations, specifically post-war military government in Germany and Japan. This experience was an anomaly. The US had mobilized for total war. The Army had the concerted assistance of the complete range of American “brain trusts” throughout society, including academia and the business realm, much of it through the draft. Disturbed by its poor performance in the occupation of Germany after World War I, the Army not only established a school for military government in 1942, but also produced micro-detailed DA Pamphlets for very specific areas of particular societies and economies. Army planners also identified a dysfunctional relationship in roles and mission between the State and War Departments which required immediate resolution at war’s end.

Even with that preparation, post-World War II occupations were a mixed bag. Italy and Austria were more problematic, though final results were good. In Asia, the Philippines became independent on schedule in 1946, but the rest of the former Japanese Empire was a mess. The American occupation of Korea was disastrous. There was no previous planning for that mission, and forces there were just looking for a way out. When they departed in 1949, they left behind a fractured South Korean government with a weak army, ongoing insurgency, and covetous neighbor. As a result the United States would have to return the next year to fight a three year war. The price of poor stability operations and premature withdrawal in this case was very steep.

Operations in Panama leading to the overthrow of the Noriega regime have been touted as a model use of quick and decisive American military force, but post-conflict activities did not go as smoothly. The crisis period was exceptionally long, beginning with public revelations about Gen. Manuel Noriega’s nefarious activities in June 1987 and culminating with the execution of Operation JUST CAUSE in December 1989. Planning for military intervention began as early as February 1988. When Noriega annulled the election of May 1989, sent his paramilitary thugs to assault opposition candidates, and increased his harassment of Americans, the United States executed Operation NIMROD DANCER. This show of force, executed by US Southern Command

(SOUTHCOM), was designed to show further American resolve, in the hope that it would pressure Noriega to modify his behavior. When there was no obvious modification, President George H. W. Bush directed the execution of Operation JUST CAUSE. A textbook example of the quality of the new armed forces and doctrine developed in the United States, it encompassed the simultaneous assault of 27 targets at night.

Due to a focus on conducting a decisive operation and not the complete campaign, the aftermath of this smaller scale contingency (SSC) did not go as smoothly, however. Planning for the post-conflict phase, Operation PROMOTE LIBERTY, was far from complete when the short period of hostilities began. Missions and responsibilities were vague, and planners failed to appreciate adequately the effects of combat operations and overthrowing the regime. Though guidance from SOUTHCOM on post-hostility missions was fairly clear, tactically oriented planners at the XVIII Airborne Corps (in charge of the joint task force carrying out the operation) gave post-conflict tasks short shrift. For instance, the plan assigned the lone Military Police (MP) battalion the responsibility for running a detention facility, conducting security for all of the numerous convoys, and providing security for many key facilities, as well as for being prepared to restore law and order. Though the battalion was mainly concerned with a relatively small geographic portion of the country, it was quickly overwhelmed by its responsibilities.

With the elimination of the Panamanian Defense Force, the task of restoring law and order became particularly demanding, as looting and vandalism spread throughout the country. Chaos reigned as American forces scrambled to restore some semblance of order. Military policemen trained in law and order missions did not perform well in unfamiliar combat operations, and were inadequate in numbers to deal with the problems they faced in the aftermath. They also could not handle all displaced personnel and the enemy prisoners of war for which they were now responsible. Similarly, there were not enough civil affairs personnel or engineers for the rebuilding effort. Personnel deficiencies were exacerbated by slow and disorganized Reserve call-ups relying on volunteers. Political-military interagency cooperation was also poor, as many agencies were excluded from Department of Defense (DoD) planning and the embassy was severely understaffed.

Senior commanders admitted afterwards that they had done poorly in planning for post-conflict operations and hoped the Army would remedy that situation in the future. Despite these deficiencies, the US Military Support Group, activated in January 1990 to support the growth of independent Panamanian institutions, was able to be deactivated just 1 year later in a much more stable country; though whether it or Panamanian leaders deserved most credit for this success was unclear to observers.

The intervention in Somalia illustrates the importance for peacekeepers also to be capable of warfighting, and that task forces configured primarily for humanitarian missions might not be able simultaneously to conduct effective peace enforcement. The two basic problems involved in relieving the widespread suffering in Somalia were

delivering adequate food, water, and medicine throughout that troubled nation while insuring supplies were not stolen by bandits, clans, or warring factions. The Army's unique transportation capabilities with trucks and helicopters insure the Army will always be critical in delivering relief to isolated or undeveloped regions of the world, and its ability to provide ground security for any SSC is the most important ingredient for achieving success.

Operation PROVIDE RELIEF from August to December 1992 consisted primarily of airlifts of supplies, but the deteriorating security situation caused the United Nations to expand its mandate to include restoring order. The nucleus for the Joint Task Force (JTF) in Operation RESTORE HOPE was a Marine Expeditionary Force, but Army organizations comprised 44 percent of the total force deployed in the theater, including much of the 10th Mountain Division and many support units. After 5 months the first peacekeeping operation directed by the United Nations (UN) under the auspices of Chapter VII of its charter replaced the initial force. While the actual combat power of the new force was reduced, its mission was actually expanded to include disarming Somali clans. Most of the 4,500 Americans serving in the UN operation were Army support personnel, but the 10th Mountain Division provided over a thousand combat Soldiers for a Quick Reaction Force. The Marines also kept a Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) offshore. The Army eventually reinforced its contingent with Task Force Ranger as well. There was a poor transition from one force to another, and a lack of appreciation for the increasing security problems and capabilities of the armed threats in the country. One problem with short rotations is the loss of institutional knowledge that results. The failure to properly coordinate humanitarian, military, and diplomatic requirements, and the jumble of nation-building tasks added by the newest UN mandate, meant that determinants of mission success were vague at best. There were critical shortfalls in communications units, intelligence personnel and procedures, and liaison between military and civilian agencies.

Resistance to nation-building contributed to "mission creep" as those tasks were forced upon unprepared American units or fell to them by default. Forces were not structured or resourced to accomplish all their required missions, and this culminated in the debacle in Mogadishu in October 1993. President Clinton withdrew all American forces 5 months later, and, without a US ground presence, the relief effort in Somalia foundered. The country reverted into "a madhouse of violence and corruption" with a wretched population. From 1992-95 the United States spent more than two billion dollars for operations in Somalia, and about three-quarters of that was expended through DoD. These costs included considerable logistics support for UN forces and the rebuilding of much of the nation's basic infrastructure, missions falling primarily under Army purview.

Like Panama, Haiti was another SSC in response to a long-festering crisis. It began with the military overthrow of President Jean-Bertrande Aristide by Lt. Gen. Raoul Cedras in September 1991. On April 1, 1993, the JCS sent the first alert order to US Atlantic Command (LANTCOM) to begin planning for contingency operations in Haiti. Planning for active intervention intensified in October of that year after armed

protesters in Port Au Prince turned away a ship loaded with UN peacekeepers. During the next year, international pressure on the military leaders of Haiti increased, and was intensified even further by obvious American preparations for an invasion. The decision of the Haitian government in September 1994 to return President Aristide to power was to a large extent taken because they knew Army helicopters and 10th Mountain Division Soldiers aboard the USS *Eisenhower*, along with elements of the 82nd Airborne Division deployed from Fort Bragg, were heading for Haiti. In fact, General Cedras did not begin to negotiate seriously with the American diplomatic delegation until he had confirmed that the 82nd Airborne contingent was in the air. The overwhelming force deployed in the initial occupation and the Soldiers' professional and disciplined conduct and appearance in continuing operations did much to deter and control the actions of potential troublemakers.

The long lead time between the beginning of the crisis and actual military intervention, combined with lessons learned from operations like those in Panama and Somalia, greatly facilitated planning for Operation UPHOLD DEMOCRACY. LANTCOM prepared operational plans for both forced and unopposed entry, while the DoD conducted extensive interagency coordination. Its Haiti Planning Group, with the assistance of other government agencies, prepared a detailed "Interagency Checklist for Restoration of Essential Services." The lead agency for all major functional areas was the US Agency for International Development (USAID), with DoD support (mostly from Army units) in reestablishing public administration, conducting elections, restoring information services, assisting the Department of Justice with setting up and training a police force, planning disaster preparedness and response, running airports, and caring for refugees. Military units did have primary responsibility for security measures, such as explosive ordnance disposal (EOD), protecting foreign residents, and demobilizing paramilitary groups. These were mostly Army functions, and the service provided 96 percent of deployed military forces.

These plans and their execution were affected by the desire of military leaders to avoid getting involved with "nation-building" missions such as those that had led to so much grief in Somalia. Army lawyers wrestled with interpreting humanitarian requests for reconstruction to classify them as related to the mission or as nation-building. Those requests that fell into the former category were approved, while those interpreted as nation-building were denied. Medical units were told to focus on supporting the Joint Task Force (JTF) and not humanitarian assistance, as leaders were concerned about not replacing the medical facilities of the host nation. This reluctance to embrace peacekeeping or nation-building had its most regrettable result on September 20, 1994, when restrictive rules of engagement prohibited American forces from intervening as Haitian police killed two demonstrators. The next day, American officials expanded the rules of engagement to allow more military involvement in restoring and maintaining law and order.

Similar expansion of Army roles and missions happened in most other areas of the restoration efforts. The attorneys eventually rationalized that any action that made

Americans look good lessened security risks and could therefore be approved as mission-related. Other governmental agencies were slow to arrive or build up

resources, so the military picked up the slack. Generally, the other departments had not done the detailed planning that DoD had, and often wanted more support than DoD had expected to provide. A typical example was when the Ambassador to Haiti asked for military advisers to help new government ministries get established until efforts from USAID and the State Department could begin to bear fruit. The result was the hasty deployment of a ministerial advisor team from the 358th Civil Affairs (CA) Brigade, the first large-scale implementation of a civil administration effort since World War II. The scope and pace of CA missions increased so rapidly that they threatened to get out of control, and raised fears that such actions would only heighten Haitian expectations that US forces could fix all the nation's problems, and thus set the people up for great disappointment later.

These expanded missions caused many other problems, to some extent because CA units are relatively small organically and require considerable support from other organizations. Engineer planning, equipment, and personnel were inadequate for their required civil affairs and reconstruction projects. Soldiers had to develop new policies and procedures to help set up internal security forces and expend funds. This often required "working around" Title 10, US Code, restrictions. They assumed expanded roles in maintaining law and order, including manning and operating detention facilities and developing new crowd control techniques. Items like latrines and police uniforms were in short supply. Doctrine and personnel were not available to establish proper liaison with the myriad civilian organizations working in the country. Intelligence assets were severely taxed, and the force in Haiti had to rely heavily on theater and national intelligence assets to make up for deficiencies.

However, the military in general, and the Army in particular, received much praise for its performance in Haiti. Nonetheless, once the last American troops left the island in April 1996, the situation there deteriorated to conditions approaching those early in the 1990s. Without long-term military involvement, most US policy goals were frustrated. The civilian agencies that replaced military forces did not have the same resources available, and persistent flaws in the Haitian economy, judicial system, and political leadership obstructed reform. American officials soon decried the results of elections, and admitted the failure of their policies. Even the Secretary General of the UN recommended against renewing the mission there. Between 1992 and 1995, the United States spent over \$1.6 billion for operations in Haiti. Over \$950 million of that was expended through DoD, and mostly for Army operations, to include the administration of large refugee camps. One key lesson from that frustrating experience is that the redeployment of military forces should be predicated on the achievement of designated measures of effectiveness, and not based on time limits. Another is that follow-on civilian agencies must be capable of maintaining those standards as well as achieving new ones.

The US Army picked up its usual predominant load of post-conflict tasks requiring several thousand troops in Bosnia and Kosovo, and remains committed to the region. American operations in the Balkans again reveal how force and mission requirements change during the post-conflict phase. Eighteen months after the signing of the agreement between NATO and the Yugoslav Army over Kosovo, US Army troops there were still engaged in “peacekeeping with an iron fist.” They were primarily focused on establishing a safe and secure environment under the rule of law, with patrols backed by armored vehicles and detention centers to control troublemakers.

The UN-NATO justice system was heavily criticized, and a Judge Advocate General Legal Assessment Team found the UN mission in Kosovo so severely short of facilities and personnel to establish the rule of law that it recommended teams of 15 Army lawyers be rotated through the country to reinforce the UN effort.

By then efforts in Bosnia were more advanced, and the environment more secure and peaceful. Deployed Army task forces became lighter with every rotation, and moved from immediate security concerns towards enhancing long-term stability. By late 1997 it became apparent to the Stabilization Force (SFOR) that a large disparity existed between the ability of military forces to achieve their initially assigned tasks of the General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP) and that of their less-capable civilian counterparts to meet their own implementation requirements. SFOR realized it could not disengage with such a large “GFAP Gap” remaining, and expanded its mission to assist international organizations to set the conditions for civilian implementation of the GFAP in order to transition the area of operations to a stable environment. US military leaders on the scene recognized they were moving into the area of nation-building, but saw no alternative if SFOR was ever going to be able to withdraw or significantly reduce its commitment without risking the peace.

As the nature of the stability operations in Bosnia evolved, so did the requirements of the peacekeeping force. It needed fewer combat troops and more engineers, military police, and civil affairs personnel. Intelligence requirements changed and expanded. After-action reports highlighted many shortfalls in the Balkans force structure and peacekeeping policies, many of them common to previous SSCs. Army lawyers again proved adept at thinking outside traditional fiscal rules and applications to support operational requirements. The roles of military policemen expanded to include performing as maneuver battalion task forces and working with international law enforcement agencies. Difficulties with tactical MPs trying to perform law and order missions reappeared.

There were problems again with shortages and recall procedures for Reserve Components engineer, military intelligence, and civil affairs augmentation. The massive engineering requirements for Operations JOINT ENDEAVOR and JOINT GUARD especially highlighted branch deficiencies with command and control, construction unit allocations, and bridging. A split-based logistics system trying to meet requirements in the Balkans and back in the Central Region of Europe required considerable augmentation, but still strained combat support and combat service support assets

considerably. Liaison officers were in great demand, not just as Joint Commission Observers with the Entity Armed Forces, but also to coordinate with the myriad non-governmental organizations and other civilian agencies. There were shortages of linguists throughout the theater, which especially exacerbated problems with intelligence. Military intelligence doctrine was completely inadequate for supporting peace operations, and understaffed intelligence units had to adapt as best they could for the complex multi-service, multi-agency, and multi-national situation further complicated by a host of treaty requirements.

A Defense Science Board study later concluded that Balkan operations revealed many shortcomings in psychological operations as well, especially in planning and in providing resources to support engagement and post-conflict activities for all the geographic combatant commanders. Even with all these problems, Army units in Bosnia continued to compile a superlative record of accomplishments. However, the GFAP Gap has never really been filled, with recurring UN problems coordinating and directing civilian agencies. Elections are still dominated by continuing political divisiveness, reflecting the limited progress in changing people's attitudes. However, while military leaders have complained about American or NATO troops remaining in the Balkans, the fact that decisions about their redeployment have been based on achieving measures of effectiveness and not on reaching a time limit has at least insured stability in the region.

Recent campaigns in both Afghanistan and Iraq have again illustrated the importance of operations after Phase III. In Iraq we are again paying the price for the premature withdrawal of American ground presence. The final fate of that country, as well as Afghanistan, is still to be determined.

Key Observations – Stability Operations

1. Assumptions about lack of American will for long-term, open-ended stability missions have proven erroneous.
2. Stability operations underline the complexity of land warfare:
 - a. Quality units require full personnel and equipment fills with realistic pre-deployment training. Strict troop discipline with restraint and patience in the face of provocation is essential to deal with civilian populations.
 - b. Metrics are problematic. Stability operations highlight how politics—and ethnic, social and economic factors – are local. Experience showcases the need to analyze and synthesize a wide range of local conditions and results.
3. Stability operations require significant investment in landpower forces:
 - a. Future contingencies must have detailed analysis of remaining Army force structure capability, capacity, and availability to inform planning assumptions. Stability operations require much more than just combat forces. Often combat support and combat service support capabilities are more important.
 - b. A recurring, rotational theater requirement necessitates three units, not one: one is preparing, one is executing, and one is recovering.
4. Proper understanding of “what happened and why” must look at the entire duration collectively over time, not selected snapshots in time.
5. Technology cannot eliminate the tyranny of distance worldwide to deploy land forces, troops, and equipment to the needed theater, especially rapidly.
6. In almost every case of a major American military deployment, long term ground presence has been essential to achieve national policy goals. The Army is the service that always finishes campaigns.

Source materials are available upon request