

THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 3, Issue 1

October - December 2000



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA
Professor D. B. Campbell, Director



INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- Landmine Alternatives Conference
- Coalition Building Exercise
- Post-Conflict Strategic Requirements Workshop
- Support to CINCCENT
- LAN Upgrades at CSL
- Improving Civil-Military Training and Education
- Russian National Security Policy
- Goldwater-Nichols Roundtable

TRACK III LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES CONFERENCE

By Professor James Kievit

Department of the Army Support Branch

In 1998, Presidential Decision Directive-64 directed DOD to pursue three “tracks” with respect to anti-personnel landmines (APL). Track I’s goal is the elimination of all non-self-destructing APL outside Korea by 2003 and within Korea by 2006. Track II’s goal is the long-range development of a suitable “material” replacement for the capabilities provided by APL. Track III’s goal is the determination of feasible current materiel and “non-material” (doctrine, organization, training, leadership, or personnel) replacements for the capabilities provided by APL.

From 8-10 November 2000, CSL hosted the Joint Staff J8-sponsored *Track III Landmine Alternatives Conference* at the Collins Center. Chaired by Brigadier General John R. Batiste, the conference brought together more than 70 individuals from the United States and several NATO nations for three days of dialogue in a sincere effort to examine any and all potential non-material alternatives to existing APL. The J8 intends to publish an initial written report, including the conference results, in January 2001, and a final report—following completion of additional assessments by Lawrence Livermore Laboratories in June 2001.

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS COALITION BUILDING EXERCISE 2000

By COL Dennis M. Murphy

Operations and Gaming Division

From 13-14 November, the Center for Strategic Leadership conducted the International Fellows Coalition Building Exercise 2000. This exercise is part of the core curriculum for the International Fellows of the U.S. Army War College Class of 2001. The exercise was divided into two parts. The first part

consisted of training on negotiating skills. The second part involved a scenario-driven negotiations exercise focused on coalition building. The forty-two International Fellows were divided into six teams representing the Ministries of Defense of their assigned nations. A U.S. expert in the region served as a mentor for each team. A control team provided the scenario drivers and played other regional and international actors.

The game, set in 2012, focused on building a coalition to respond to an unstable situation in Eastern Europe. The teams had to formulate a strategy to deal with the instability and to engage in strategic coalition building to allow a U.S.-led force to enter the region on a stability mission. In addition to coalition building, issues such as relative contributions, command and control, timelines, routes, and logistics were addressed. The U.S. contribution to the coalition was based on the U.S. Army’s proposed Objective Force; this served to introduce the International Fellows to the principles and capabilities of that force.

In addition to the International Fellows and the staff of the Center for Strategic Leadership and the U.S. Army War College, several outside experts participated in the exercise. These experts included two retired U.S. ambassadors as well as personnel from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Army Staff, and the U.S. European Command. They served as subject matter experts in the region and advised the International Fellows on the politics, militaries, economies, and cultures of the regional actors.

POST-CONFLICT STRATEGIC REQUIREMENTS WORKSHOP

By COL Peter Menk

Department of the Army Support Branch

CSL and the Office of Special Programs, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, hosted the Post-Conflict Strategic Requirements Workshop at the Collins Center

from 28 to 30 November 2000. The workshop examined the military role in the post-conflict phase of contingency operations based on scenarios in two disparate geographic regions: Montenegro and Sierra Leone. After being welcomed by the Commandant of the War College, participants were split into two groups, one for each scenario.

Ambassadors Marshall McCallie, Aubrey Hooks, and William Farrand actively participated throughout the workshop. Other participants included distinguished subject matter experts from DOS, DOJ, DOD, USAID, and the United Nations. A large number of NGOs and academic institutions were actively represented, and representatives from Australia and Great Britain also provided insights. General (Ret) Anthony Zinni and Ambassador Farrand were dinner speakers.

Prof. Mike Pasquarett of CSL's Operations and Gaming Division (OGD) headed the AWC effort; COL Dennis Murphy and COL Jerry Johnson, also from OGD, served as team leaders for the two groups. The Peacekeeping Institute provided COL George Oliver, Prof. Jim McCallum, and Mr. Bill Flavin, who served as group facilitators, and the War College's Strategic Studies Institute provided the valuable insights of Dr. Conrad Crane.

Each group presented and discussed their findings in a joint plenary session. An immediate canvas of the participants indicated that these presentations provided accurate and significant insights into the process and the tasks of the military in the post-conflict phase.

SUPPORT TO CINCCENT: INTERNAL LOOK 01

By Professor B.F. Griffard

Joint and Multinational Issues Branch

One of the most difficult training tasks facing the geographic and functional commanders-in-chief is that of creating a sufficiently stressful environment within which they can train their battle staffs. A key element of this training environment is the creation of a knowledgeable and credible National Command Authority (NCA) cell that provides the necessary external inputs to



BRIGADIER GENERAL KEITH J. STALDER, USMC, the Deputy Director of Plans and Policy (CCDJ5), fields questions during a practice press conference. These press conferences were held daily during Internal Look.

force the CINC staff to look up—as well as down—the chain of command. Since 1994, CSL—initially in direct support of the CINCs, then as an agent of USJFCOM—has been developing this NCA role-playing capability. Most recently, CSL provided NCA role-players PROF B.F. Griffard and CDR Chris Janiec to support USCINCCENT's Internal Look 01 (IL 01) exercise.

Internal Look is the USCINCCENT's major biannual command post exercise (CPX), focused on joint battle staff warfighting at the strategic and operational levels of war. This year USCINCCENT exercised as a Combined Forces Headquarters (CFH) with the support of functional component commanders. As the exercise developed, the staff's primary objective was to look at the transition from offensive to post-hostilities operations.

During the execution phase, 11-17 November 2000, Prof. Griffard operated with the Joint Exercise Control Group (JECG) Forward at the Thunder Village complex, MacDill Air Force Base, FL. CDR Janiec was located with the JECG Main at the Joint Training and Analysis Center, Suffolk VA. A back-up cell, manned by CSL personnel, supported the role-players from the Collins Center. By providing a credible representation of the NCA, CSL's team provided

USCINCCENT with the events and reporting requirements necessary to successfully train his staff, including emphasis on the impact of political considerations on the achievement of the military end state.

LAN UPGRADES

By Mr. Jerry Stankunas

Science and Technology Division

CSL's Science and Technology Division (STD) recently completed a number of upgrades to the Local Area Network (LAN) in Collins Hall. The first upgrade doubled the available LAN connections for the second floor exercise/gaming rooms. Ninety-six multimode fiber cables, ranging from 150 to 320 feet, were installed in the sub-floor cable trays that connect the second floor to the first floor communication closet. CSL saved approximately \$150K by performing all the planning, installation, and testing with in-house personnel. The extra 24,000 feet of cable provides increased bandwidth to all computers in each gaming room and improves flexibility for mixed domains usage.

Additionally, a Gigabit, or 1000 Mbps, Ethernet connection was installed between the CSL unclassified LAN and the Army War College Campus backbone. This upgrade used existing network hardware and eliminated the requirement to purchase an ATM (Asynchronous Transfer Mode) switch. Standardizing on Ethernet protocols reduces the CSL network complexity and enhances troubleshooting capabilities.

Lastly, STD has recently completed installation of fiber for LAN connectivity for the new Media Room location ahead of schedule. This upgrade, which provides the flexibility to connect to the Carlisle Barracks CIO LAN, was completed ahead of schedule and is a marked improvement over the old configuration.

IMPROVING CIVIL-MILITARY TRAINING AND EDUCATION

By COL Peter Menk

Department of the Army Support Branch

CSL and the National Interagency Civil-Military Institute (NICI) are engaged in a cooperative effort to improve the efficiency

and effectiveness of joint civilian-military initiatives through education and training.

Personnel from CSL's DA Support Branch are providing instruction for the NICI's *Military Support to Civil Authority* course, the *Executive Military Support to Civil Authority* symposium, and the *Preparing for and Managing the Consequences of Terrorism* course.

In addition, the National Interagency Civil-Military Institute has extended a formal invitation to the Army War College personnel to attend the tuition-free courses offered at San Luis Obispo, California and at selected locations nationwide in the Counterdrug, Drug Demand Reduction, and Emergency Preparedness arenas.

POSITIVE RESPONSE

By Professor B.F. Griffard

Joint and Multinational Issues Branch

As part of the annual training requirement to familiarize Joint Staff, Service, and Interagency personnel in mobilization processes, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) sponsored Exercise Positive Response 2001-1B (PR 01-1B) from 12-14 December 2000. Hosted by CSL in the Collins Center, PR 01-1B used a complex contingency operation scenario set in Africa. The scenario challenged the participants to determine the strategic and operational issues posed by the scenario and to develop appropriate sections of a Mobilization Estimate, with supporting recommendations. This product was briefed to a group of senior officers on the final day.



PR 01-1B familiarized the over one hundred participants with the processes and procedures necessary to prepare and staff mobilization and deployment-related documents during crisis management. It also identified the coordination required to obtain

interagency, Service, Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and Department of Transportation consensus on mobilization and deployment decisions during an expanding crisis action.

As part of its support for this exercise, CSL provided facilitators for each focus group. Prof. B.F. Griffard facilitated Group 1, Presidential Reserve Call-up Authority; Prof. Thomas Sweeney facilitated the Focus Group 2 discussions on actions required for increasing readiness and providing support to the deployed force; and Mrs. Kathy Perry assisted Focus Group 3 in the development of a recommendation to invoke STOPLOSS and other management actions to support the mobilization. The U.S. Army War College Department of Command, Leadership, and Management added depth to the overall discussions by providing players in each focus group.

PR 01-1B was the second in this series of CJCS-sponsored exercises.

RUSSIAN NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY: PERCEPTIONS, POLICIES, AND PROSPECTS

By Professor Michael Crutcher

U.S. Army War College Support Branch

In early December 2000, CSL brought together over twenty-five specialists to examine Russian national security policy. The workshop examined that policy in terms of its overall perceptions, current Russian policies, and prospects in key regions of the world.

Looking first at the roots of Russia's security outlook, it was pointed out that there is a great deal of commonality between the Russian and Soviet outlooks, in spite of the significant differences in the positions and resources of the two countries. This should not be surprising because, in part, it is usually hard to break with the past, perhaps especially so when we consider national security policy. To some degree, this is determined by objective factors such as geography, resources, and traditions that are built over an extended period. Another factor is that national interests are defined by a nation's elites, and in Russia's case, core Russian security beliefs include great power

aspirations that date back to Peter the Great. Unfortunately for the Soviet Union and for Russia, elites and their views were ossified for an extended period, and while the security elites (Party, military, and security services in the Soviet era) benefited themselves, society became less flexible and less able to respond to change in the international arena.

Domestically, perhaps the greatest challenge is the Russian economy, improvement of which has been largely the result of the recent high prices for energy. The country still faces the challenge of establishing a rule of law in the economic realm before it can expect any significant and sustained economic recovery. Absent major reforms, the economic recovery will soon sputter, and the economy likely will reverse its recent favorable course.

Conditions in the Russian military also are not good. Efforts at military reform over the past decade have been marked by false starts, a lack of will to undertake real reform, and politicization of the armed forces. Only 7-10 of the divisional structures probably have any semblance of being combat ready. The war in Chechnya and the loss of the Kursk are indicative of the problems facing the military. However, the exception to this may be the nuclear forces, upon which the Russians have had to depend as their conventional capabilities have declined. At the strategic level, the Russians see the U.S. drive towards a national missile defense (NMD) as a destabilizing factor in the strategic balance. Beyond the military-technical issues, there also has been little progress in establishing true civilian, democratic control over the armed forces.

Abroad, Russia continues to try to identify its interests and define policies to meet those interests.

- US-Russian relations over the near future are likely to continue to be beset by friction and intense competition stemming from fundamentally different worldviews. Efforts by both capitals to maintain an ongoing dialogue in all areas of interest and conflict are essential if the powers are going to avoid a total deterioration of relations.
- With regard to Europe, Russia's outreach to the region can be seen in its traditional effort to sunder the Atlantic alliance,

dividing the United States from Europe; but there also may be another element to this policy, that is, Russia—recognizing it is no longer the true equal of the United States—seeking out “equal” partners with whom to conduct a dialog.

- Russia’s approach to the Caucasus and Central Asia under Putin is seeing the political elite’s continued pursuit of private interests, centered on self-aggrandizement, beginning to clash with concrete emerging Russian national interests and efforts to build a strong state. However, conference participants agreed that key Russian policymakers still lack a coherent strategy to guide them.
- In the Far East, Russia’s relationship with Japan will remain tied to Japanese hesitancy to invest where there is little prospect for real economic returns and to Japanese attitudes toward the territorial issue outstanding between the two countries. The Sino-Russian relationship likely will bring short-term gains for both, but from a security standpoint, China poses a significant long-term threat to Russian interests in the Far East, including possibly a threat to Moscow’s control over its Far East territories.

The current challenge for Russia’s leadership abroad is to recognize that it must choose between a course of seeking to play the role of a major regional power, attempting to impose its will on others, or one of seeking real integration into the world community.

Also contributing to this article were Dr. Stephen Blank, COL James Holcomb, Dr. Marybeth Ulrich, and Prof. Anthony Williams.

TITLE 10 - GOLDWATER-NICHOLS ACT ROUNDTABLE

By Professor James Kievit
Department of the Army Support Branch

As part of its Joint and Multinational Initiatives Program, CSL conducts Title 10-Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA) round-tables and workshops. These roundtables and workshops are specifically designed to provide a forum that brings together selected senior military leaders who previously held positions of high responsibility within the DOD to examine critically the statutory Title 10 responsibilities of the Services in the post-GNA environment.

This year’s two-day roundtable focused on organization and process within both HQDA

and the DOD combatant commands to support the Chief of Staff, Army, in his role as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during crisis response. MG and Mrs. Ivany hosted a dinner at the Commandant’s quarters on the first evening. Following dinner, BG Joseph R. Barnes, U.S. Army Legal Services Agency, provided an excellent informal presentation on some statutory constraints of the GNA. Four sessions of thoughtful and spirited dialogue consumed the following day. Distinguished roundtable participants included GEN (Ret) Gordon Sullivan, GEN (Ret) Dennis Reimer, GEN (Ret) Binford Peay III, GEN (Ret) Ron Griffith, and GEN (Ret) John Tilelli.

Insights from this year’s roundtable will be incorporated into the Crisis Prediction and Management Study currently being prepared by CSL.



Goldwater-Nichols Roundtable participants. Clockwise from left: BG Joseph R. Barnes, Assistant Judge Advocate General for Civil Law; and Litigation, U.S. Army; GEN Gordon R. Sullivan, U.S. Army Retired; Prof. Jim Kievit, OGD, CSL; GEN Ronald H. Griffith, U.S. Army Retired; MG Robert R. Ivany, Commandant, USAWC; GEN J.H. Binford Peay, U.S. Army Retired; GEN Dennis J. Reimer, U.S. Army Retired; Prof. Doug Campbell, Director, CSL; GEN John H. Tilelli, Jr., U.S. Army Retired.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
Center for Strategic Leadership
650 Wright Avenue
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049