

Doctrine

JOINT PUBS UPDATE

The five following titles were recently approved under the scheme of the Joint Publication System:

▼ Joint Pub 1-02, *DOD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, supplements the standard dictionary and is intended for use by the Secretary of Defense, defense agencies, military departments, and combatant commands (March 23, 1994; Joint Staff sponsor and lead agent: J-7).

▼ Joint Pub 2-01.2 (Secret), (U) *Joint Doctrine and Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Counterintelligence Support to Operations*, provides for counterintelligence (CI) in support of joint operations; lists both individuals and organizations (on the strategic through tactical levels) associated with CI infrastructure; and describes how CI assets can be integrated into deliberate and crisis planning processes, including CI collection, reporting, analysis, production, investigations, and operations in a joint environment (April 15, 1994; Joint Staff sponsor and lead agent: J-2).

▼ Joint Pub 3-01.5, *Doctrine for Joint Theater Missile Defense*, deals with countering nonnuclear tactical missile threats from conventional and chemical ballistic missiles, air-to-surface missiles, and cruise missiles to target within a theater of operations; emphasis is placed on ballistic missile and cruise missile threats, and defeating such threats through mutually supportive measures like passive defense (survivability), active defense, and attack operations (including fire support, offensive counterair, and interdiction missions); and covers sensors and processing systems, with specified C⁴I to support the joint theater missile defense structure (March 30, 1994; Joint Staff sponsor: J-7, lead agent: Army).

▼ Joint Pub 3-07.3, *Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Peacekeeping Operations*, complements Joint Pub 3-07, *Military Operations Other Than War*, with specific guidance on American participation in U.N. and non-U.N. sponsored peacekeeping operations, including approval process, command and control, coordination requirements, planning, training, and execution (April 29, 1994; Joint Staff sponsor: J-5, lead agent: Army).

Overview of Joint Publication System

Capstone Doctrine

Joint Pub 1

Joint Warfare of the U.S. Armed Forces

- ▼ joint action of the Armed Forces
- ▼ nature of American military power
- ▼ values in joint warfare
- ▼ fundamentals of joint warfare
- ▼ joint campaign

(November 1991)

Joint Pub 0-2

Unified Action Armed Forces (UNAAF)

- ▼ doctrine and policy governing unified direction of forces
- ▼ chain of command and relationships between combatant commands and the military departments
- ▼ command relationships and other authorities
- ▼ doctrine and policy for establishing joint commands

(Under revision)

Keystone Doctrine

Joint Pub 1-0

Doctrine for Personnel and Administration Support to Joint Operations

- ▼ relationships, responsibilities, and procedures for the exercise of authority by combatant commanders in conducting personnel and administrative support for joint operations
- ▼ service personnel and administrative systems and their collective effect on the capabilities of joint forces

(Scope currently being defined)

Joint Pub 2-0

Joint Doctrine for Intelligence Support to Operations

- ▼ nature of intelligence
- ▼ purposes of intelligence
- ▼ joint intelligence principles and joint intelligence responsibilities
- ▼ intelligence functions for joint operations
- ▼ joint intelligence architecture
- ▼ guidance concerning intelligence for multinational operations

(October 1993)

Joint Pub 3-0

Doctrine for Joint Operations

- ▼ strategic environment within which joint operations take place
- ▼ fundamental principles of joint operations
- ▼ planning guidelines for war and military operations other than war
- ▼ considerations for the conduct of joint operations during war
- ▼ principles for the military operations other than war
- ▼ considerations for multinational operations

(September 1993)

Joint Pub 4-0

Doctrine for Logistic Support of Joint Operations

- ▼ authorities and responsibilities for logistic operations
- ▼ logistic principles and considerations
- ▼ logistic planning
- ▼ guidance on logistics at theater level

(September 1992)

Joint Pub 5-0

Doctrine for Planning Joint Operations

- ▼ joint planning processes and concepts
- ▼ strategic direction and integration
- ▼ deliberate and crisis action planning

(Under development)

Joint Pub 6-0

Doctrine for C⁴ Systems Support to Joint Operations

- ▼ nature and fundamental objectives of Command, Control, Communications, and Computer (C⁴) systems
- ▼ C⁴ systems principles
- ▼ C⁴ systems doctrine for employment, configuration, plans, and resources
- ▼ C⁴ systems employment responsibilities
- ▼ joint and combined C⁴ systems standardization and procedures
- ▼ global C⁴ infrastructure

(June 1992)

Source: *Joint Doctrine Capstone and Keystone Primer* (July 1994).

▼ Joint Pub 3-11, *Joint Doctrine for Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Defense*, provides for planning and executing nuclear, biological, and chemical defensive operations; focuses on NBC threats, national policy, and the strategic, operational, and logistic considerations peculiar to NBC defense (April 15, 1994; Joint Staff sponsor: J-5, lead agent: Army) **JFQ**

JOINT DOCTRINE WORKING PARTY

U.S. Central Command hosted the 13th Joint Doctrine Working Party (JDWP) on April 28, 1994 at MacDill AFB. Sponsored by the Director for Operational Plans and Interoperability (J-7), Joint Staff, semi-annual working party meetings are designed to involve the combatant commands and services as well as the Joint Staff in the joint doctrine development process.

This meeting approved two publications. The first, "HUMINT [Human Intelligence] Support to Joint Operations," will integrate and coordinate component efforts for JTF commanders, and address linkages among the Defense HUMINT Service, other agencies, and the services. JDWP members voted unanimously to develop joint tactics, techniques, and procedures for HUMINT for inclusion in Joint Pub 2-02, *Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Intelligence Support to Joint Task Force (JTF) Operations*, as a formal change to that publication for which J-2 serves as both Joint Staff sponsor and lead agent.

The second publication approved was "Joint Doctrine for Multinational Operations" which will expand on Joint Pub 3-0, *Doctrine for Joint Operations*, by consolidating guidance on both alliances and coalitions now scattered

throughout joint doctrine. It will also capture lessons learned from recent operations and exercises. J-7 is Joint Staff sponsor and lead agent for this pub, and the National Defense University will write it as the primary review authority.

JDWP members also got a substantive briefing on the Universal Joint Task List (UJTL) and the Joint Training Master Plan (JTMP). As presented by J-7 this is a task-based joint training methodology that accommodates joint doctrine; the system derives capability requirements which are converted into plans and programs, and executed in exercises and other training. Evaluations and assessments generate feedback in various areas to include doctrine. This system will help to align capability requirements with plans and programs.

The next JDWP meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 1994 and will be hosted by the Joint Warfighting Center. **JFQ**

DEFENSE LIBRARY on CD-ROM

Over 220,000 records including items in the fields of international security affairs, defense policy, military history, resource management, and the art of war.

For information about the Defense Library on Disc contact:

National Defense University Library

ATTN: Systems Librarian

Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

(202) 287-9474 / DSN 667-9474

or

Pentagon Library

ATTN: Systems Librarian

Room 1A518, The Pentagon

Washington, D.C. 20310-6080

(703) 697-4658 / DSN 227-4658

LESSONS LEARNED

Examinations of success and failure are familiar preoccupations after every military action, but the availability of a formal system that documents *joint* lessons learned is less widely known. For that reason the following survey is provided as both a primer on joint lessons learned and an introduction to a regular TJW column on individual lessons from joint operations and exercises.

CJCS MOP 53, "Military Capabilities Reporting," requires unified combatant commands to submit After Action Reports (AARs) on joint operations as specified in Joint Pub 1-03.30, *Joint After Action Reporting System (JAARS)*. Lessons are recorded in the Joint Universal Lessons Learned System (JULLS) format. Joint Pub 1-03.30 also identifies requirements for After Action Reports covering CJCS-directed, CINC-sponsored joint exercises.

Operational and exercise AARs submitted by CINCs can be found in the "Joint Center for Lessons Learned" (JCLL), a master database

maintained by the Evaluation and Analysis Division (J-7), Joint Staff. JCLL contains over 8,500 lessons learned gathered over the past seven years as well as AARs for both CJCS No Notice Interoperability Exercises (NIEXs) and independent CJCS Observation Reports on certain CINC-sponsored exercises and operations. Resident databases are kept by the combatant commands and services and updated twice a year.

The largest single JCLL entry (over 500 JULLs) is the CENTCOM AAR on Desert Storm. Recent AARs include Operation GTMO (ACOM/Haiti), JTF Somalia (CENTCOM/UNITAF), and Distant Runner (EUCOM/Rwanda); interim reports include Southern Watch (CENTCOM/Iraq), Provide Promise including Deny Flight, Able Sentry, and Sharp Guard (EUCOM/ex-Yugoslavia), and UNISOM II (CENTCOM/Somalia). There are also major CINC-sponsored reports on Bright Star '94 (CENTCOM/deployment; host nation), Fuertes Defensas '93 (SOUTHCOM/crisis action; SOF), and Tandem Thrust '93 (PACOM/crisis action; JFACC). The current CJCS reports include Eligible Receiver '94-1 (NIEX/PACOM), Bright Star '94 (CENTCOM/exercise evaluation), and Agile Provider '94 (ACOM/exercise evaluation).

The lessons learned range from the strategic to the tactical level of war, from the big picture to the seemingly trivial. In any joint force, however, certain issues invariably emerge to illustrate the different approaches of warfighting CINCs. They include crisis action planning, JOPES, and early augmentation of personnel in support of JTFs; designating, organizing, and manning JTFs; JFACC, targeting, and SOF integration/deconfliction; combined multinational operations and C⁴I. For example, crisis action planning in standing up a JTF (especially if it is a component staff with no joint billets) presents problems which both PACOM and ACOM are alleviating through the use of deployable planning teams (PACOM Deployable JTF Augmentation Cell and ACOM DJTF-140) to provide joint expertise and personnel. EUCOM provides augmentees (from service compo-

ment staffs) as cadre to assist crisis action planning and in initially standing up JTFs. These approaches have all proven to be effective in joint operations from Hurricane Iniki to Provide Promise.

Joint planners can access AARs through CINC or service staffs. By arrangement lessons in JULLs can be downloaded via WWMCCS and other means; it is also available on CD-ROM from the Navy Tactical Support Activity; telephone (202) 433-3678 / DSN 288-3678 for details. For information on JAARs and recent AARs, contact the Joint Staff at (703) 695-4604 / DSN 225-4604.

—Contributed by
CAPT Rosemary B. Mariner, USN
Exercise and Analysis Division (J-7)
Joint Staff **JFQ**

Documentation

ROLES AND MISSIONS

The Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces, which was established by the National Defense Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-160, November 30, 1993), held its first meeting in May. Under its charter the commission must report its findings and recommendations to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within a year. The commission is intended to provide the Congress, Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with an independent review of current allocations of roles, missions, and functions among the services, and to make recommendations on changes in defining and distributing roles, missions, and functions. The specific duties of the commission are to:

- ▼ review the types of military operations that may be required in the post-Cold War era taking into account both the requirements for successfully conducting various types of operations and official DOD strategic planning (operations to be considered include defense of the United States; warfare against other national military forces;

participation in peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and other nontraditional activities; action against nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons capabilities in hostile hands; support of law enforcement; and other operations as specified by the chairman of the commission)

- ▼ define broad mission areas and key support requirements for the military establishment as a whole

- ▼ develop a conceptual framework for the review of the organizational allocation among the Armed Forces of roles, missions, and functions which considers static efficiency (such as duplicative overhead and economies of scale); dynamic effectiveness (including the benefits of competition and the effect on innovation); interoperability, responsiveness, and other aspects of military effectiveness in the field and fleet; gaps in mission coverage and so-called "orphan" missions that are inadequately served by existing organizational entities; division of responsibility on the battlefield; exploitation of new technology and operational concepts; the degree of disruption that changes in roles and missions would entail; and the experience of other nations in this area

- ▼ recommend the functions for which each military department should organize, train, and equip forces; the missions of combatant commands; and the roles that Congress should assign to various DOD elements

- ▼ address the roles, missions, and functions of civilian portions of DOD and other national security agencies to the extent that changes in these areas are collateral to changes considered in military roles, missions, and functions

- ▼ recommend a process for continuing to adapt the roles, missions, and functions of the Armed Forces to future changes in technology and in the international security environment.

Members of the commission were appointed by the Secretary of Defense from the private sector based on their "diverse military, organizational, and management experiences and historical perspectives." The commission is chaired by John P. White, director of the Center for Business and Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The commission members include Les Aspin, lately Secretary of Defense and former

chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; Antonia H. Chayes, a lawyer affiliated with Endispute, Inc., who was Under Secretary of the Air Force during the Carter administration; Jan M. Lodal, director of the Aspen Strategy Group and president of the Intelus Corporation, who served on the NSC staff

during the Nixon administration; Franklin D. Raines, vice chairman of Fannie Mae, an economist who was a coordinator for the Clinton transition and associate director of OMB during the Carter administration; GEN Robert W. RisCassi, USA (Ret.), former Commander in Chief of the

U.N. Command and ROK-U.S. Combined Forces Command; and LtGen Bernard E. Trainor, USMC (Ret.), director of the National Security Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, who was Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Policies and Operations, at Headquarters, Marine Corps. Also,

1994 CJCS ESSAY COMPETITION

The 13th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) Strategy Essay Competition was held on May 26, 1994 at the National Defense University. This competition challenges students from both intermediate and senior colleges to write on an aspect of international security, defense policy, or military affairs, with special emphasis on joint matters. The top honors this year were shared by two winning entries, while nine other essays were cited for their distinction.

Co-Winning Essays

Lieutenant Colonel Frank Stech, USAR (Army War College)
"Preparing for More CNN Wars"

Colonel Gerard A. St. Amand, USA (Army War College)
"Schizophrenic Sanctioning: A Failed U.S. Policy Toward China"

Distinguished Essays

Major Jay M. Parker, USA (Naval War College)
"Into the Wind, Against the Tide: Change and the Operational Commander"

Desiree A. Millikan, Department of State (Air War College)
"U. S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World: Options and Constraints"

Lieutenant Colonel Bradley L. Moffett, USAF (Army War College)
"Expanding Our Vision of Jointness: Pursuing Joint Force Development Strategies"

Commander Gerald Roncolato, USN (National War College)
"Military Theory and Peace Enforcement Operations"

Lieutenant Colonel Jan Van Pelt, USAF (National War College)
"Five Deficits and a Physics Problem: Restructuring the Military Services"

Robert D. Warrington, Central Intelligence Agency (National War College)
"International Conflict and U.S. National Security Policy into the 21st Century"

Robert D. Warrington, Central Intelligence Agency (National War College)
"The Helmets May be Blue, But the Blood's Still Red:
The Dilemma of U.S. Participation in U.N. Peace Operations"

Douglas A. Hartwick, Department of State (National War College)
"America's Asia Policy: Preparing for the 21st Century"

Bruce C. Bade, Office of the Secretary of Defense (National War College)
"War Termination: Why Don't We Plan for It?"

three advisors have been named to the commission: ADM Leon A. Edney, USN (Ret.), former commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, and Vice Chief of Naval Operations; Jeffrey H. Smith, a partner in the law firm of Arnold and Porter who headed the Clinton defense transition team; and Gen Larry D. Welch, USAF (Ret.), president of the Institute for Defense Analysis, who was Chief of Staff of the Air Force and commander, Strategic Air Command. **JFQ**

PEACE OPERATIONS

Last year the President ordered an interagency review of peacekeeping activities in order to develop a comprehensive framework suited to the realities of the post-Cold War era. That review was completed in May 1994 and resulted in a Presi-

dential Decision Directive (PDD) on reforming multinational peace operations. The PDD identifies critical factors to be evaluated in considering any military commitment to multinational peace operations. The directive requires that disciplined, coherent choices be made regarding which peace operations are supported and that specific criteria be addressed in endorsing a proposed peace operation. Moreover, if enforcement (chapter VII) operations are likely to involve combat, further criteria must be satisfied. A recommendation to the President on peace operations has to be based upon the cumulative weight of all criteria (see accompanying chart), with no single factor necessarily acting as sole determinant. **JFQ**

The National Defense University (NDU) will sponsor the following events in the coming months:

TOPICAL SYMPOSIUM

“Counterproliferation: Security Dimensions of WMD Proliferation”

will be held in Washington, D.C., on November 16 and 17, 1994

PACIFIC SYMPOSIUM

will be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on February 22 and 23, 1995 with the cosponsorship of the U.S. Pacific Command

NATO SYMPOSIUM

will be held in Washington, D.C., on April 24 and 25, 1995 with the cosponsorship of the NATO Defense College

To obtain registration information—or to be placed on the mailing list for announcements of future symposia—please write or call:

Institute for National Strategic Studies
ATTN: Symposia
National Defense University
Fort Lesley J. McNair
Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

(202) 287-9230 / 9231 or DSN 667-9230 / 9231
FAX: (202) 287-9239 or DSN 667-9239

Presidential Guidance on Peace Operations

Factors for Supporting Peace Operations

- Multilateral involvement advances national interests
- International interest in dealing with the problem multilaterally
- Conflict represents threat to or breach of international peace or security
- Operation has clear objectives
- For traditional peacekeeping operation, a ceasefire is in place
- For peace enforcement operation, a significant threat to international peace and security is perceived
- Forces, financing, and appropriate mandate are available
- Inaction judged to have unacceptable political, humanitarian, and economic consequences
- Operation's duration is linked to clear objectives and realistic criteria

Factors for Participating in Peace Operations

- Participation advances U.S. national interests
- Risks to American personnel are considered to be acceptable
- Personnel, funds, and other resources are available
- U.S. participation deemed necessary for the operation's success
- Role of the Armed Forces is tied to clear objective
- Endpoint of the participation can be identified
- American public and Congress support the operation
- Command and control arrangements are acceptable

Factors for Participating When Operation Is Likely to Involve Combat

- Clear determination exists to commit sufficient forces to achieve clearly defined objectives
- Plan to achieve objectives decisively
- Commitment to reassess or adjust size, composition, and disposition of forces if necessary

Source: Compiled by William H. Lewis, Institute for Strategic Studies, National Defense University.