

# COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

## A Center for Strategic Leadership and Development Newsletter

Volume 15, Issues 1 & 2

\*\*DOUBLE ISSUE\*\*

October 2012-March 2013



### INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- Senior Leader Seminar 13-01
- The Basic Strategic Art Program
- New Wargame Series
- New Series Examines Regional Hot Spots in First Three Wargames
- Northeast Asia Wargame Examines Strategic Context of WMD Threat
- Cyber Wargame Examines Policy and Strategic Issues
- Constructing Strategies in the Midst of Crises: USAWC Assists Niger in its National Military Review
- Preserving and Protecting the Cures: Examining the Specter of Antimicrobial Drug Resistance
- Unified Quest 2013 Winter Wargame
- International Fellows Experience the Complexities of International Diplomacy
- CSLD Continues to Increase and Strengthen Partnerships through the ISCNE
- CSLD Partnership with the LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas

This and other CSLD publications can be obtained free of charge online at: <http://www.csl.army.mil>.



### Senior Leader Seminar 13-01

*COL (Ret.) Al Borque*

*Department of Senior Leader Education and Training, CSLD*

From 13-18 January 2013, 112 Army Colonels and senior government civilians ignored the blustery weather in West Virginia and enthusiastically participated in the fourth iteration of the Senior Leader Seminar (SLS) Senior Leader Development Course. SLS course 13-01, planned and executed under the supervision of the U.S. Army War College's Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD), was conducted in the world-class government education facilities of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) in Shepherdstown, WV. Previous SLS courses were conducted at the Eastern Management Training Center in Southbridge, MA; the Eastern Management Development Center in Shepherdstown, WV; and the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development, Collins Hall, Carlisle Barracks, PA.

The SLS is a one-week leader development course designed to facilitate the strategic education of select Army Colonels, Command Sergeants Major, and senior Department of the Army and Inter-Agency Civilians. It is considered by Army senior leaders as preparation for their current duty or in future assignments as advisors and executive officers to strategic-level leaders. The SLS course was created in response to Army studies and surveys which identified the need to address a variety of post Senior Service College leader development issues, with a specific need to prepare select leaders for responsibility at the national level.

General Ray Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA), articulated his vision and intent for creating the Senior Leader Seminar with his charge to the class: "Those of you within our Strategic Leaders Programs will be the leaders who will ensure that the decisions we make today will be brought to fruition over the next five to ten years. I will do my part to set the Army on a course for the future, but I need you to take ownership of today's challenges. I need you to lead the next generation of our Army Soldiers and young leaders through our fiscal and strategic challenges so that we can continue to be the best Army in the world."



**General Odierno addressed Army Issues and Future Direction**

The CSA approved the SLS curriculum and the slate of Active Army SLS candidates that were identified by the Army Senior Leader Development (SLD) office and Colonels Management Office (COMO), based on their current and future assignments. The National Guard Bureau (NGB) and the Office of the Chief of the Army Reserve (OCAR) identified their attendees in a similar manner. The Sergeant Major of the Army's office identified their candidates based on current and anticipated future strategic-level assignments. The Department of the Army G3/5/7 selected

the Department of the Army Civilians (DACs) to participate. Inter-Agency Civilians attended by invitation from the CSA and were selected by their agency.

The size of the SLS course has continued to grow beyond the initial 77 students who attended the SLS pilot course in August 2011. SLS 13-01 attendees consisted of 72 Army Active Component Colonels, 6 Army Reserve Colonels, 6 Army National Guard Colonels, 7 Army Command Sergeants Major, 11 Department of the Army Civilians, and 10 Inter-Agency Civilians. Participation by senior Command Sergeant Majors and Inter-Agency Civilians were first included in SLS course 12-02; the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Commerce, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, and the National Security Staff provided attendees to SLS 13-01. The current objective for Inter-Agency Civilians is 14 attendees per course.

The SLS 13-01 curriculum consisted of several daily presentations and question and answer sessions on critical strategic topics, twice-daily small group seminar sessions, and four elective opportunities. SLS education events were facilitated by USAWC faculty and staff. Lieutenant General (Retired) David Barno facilitated discussions of strategic educational topics and experiences. The seminar featured notable strategic level practitioners from joint military, interagency, inter-governmental, non-governmental, business, media, and academic communities to address current and future strategic leadership, management, and security issues.

General Barno commented on the timeliness and relevance of the course as the Army enters a critical transition period. "After ten years focused on the demands of two wars, the Army has recognized the need to broaden the horizons of its leaders who are about to assume new roles in a changing U.S. strategic context." General Odierno

has created SLS as a major leader development tool to help prepare a combat-experienced generation for the new challenges in front of them.

Key topics and speakers for SLS 13-01 included: Army Issues and Future Direction (General Odierno); Army Senior Leader Development (General Cone, Commander of the Army Training and Doctrine Command); Senior Leaders – Avoiding Common Pitfalls and Misconceptions (LTG Vangjel, The Inspector General); Strategic Choices (Mr. Verga, Chief of Staff to the Undersecretary of Defense [Policy]); Communicating with the Public (Major General Cucolo, Commandant of the U.S. Army War College); Working with Congress (Major General Rapp, Army Chief of Legislative Liaison, and Mr. Sutey, Senate Army Services Committee Staff Member), Regionally Aligned Forces (Major General Snow, Director for Strategy, Plans, and Policy, Army G3/5/7); Strategic Communication (Ms. Van Sickler, Strategic Communication Advisor to the CSA); The Economy – Its Effect on the Army and Nation (Colonel Meese, Chairman of the Social Science Department at the United States Military Academy); Contemporary Civil-Military relations (Dr. Feaver, Duke University); Future Policy Issues (Dr. O'Hanlon, Brookings Institution); and Seven Keys to Negotiation (Mr. Weiss, Vantage Partners). All speakers participated in person, with the exception of MG Snow, who participated by video-conference from the Pentagon.

The four elective presentations were: The Army Profession (Dr. Snider, Center for the Army Professional Ethic), Senior Leader Resiliency (Dr. Williams, Senior Leader Development and Resiliency), the DOD Budget (Professor Lord, School of Strategic Landpower), and a Strategic Advisors Lessons-Learned Panel (Colonel Dawson, Army Heritage and Education Center, and Professors Evans and Tisson, U.S. Army War College). LTG (Ret.) Barno also conducted a well-received lecture and question and answer session on the Way-Ahead for Afghanistan, based

on his extensive personal experience and knowledge of that challenging topic.

Throughout the long days and nights of this intellectually demanding course, the speakers continued to challenge the SLS attendees to think past their personal experiences and biases. They encouraged them to embrace the challenges of directly facilitating solutions to the complex strategic problems that face the nation and its military forces today and tomorrow.

Based on survey data, participants enthusiastically praised the course curriculum, guest speakers, seminar discussions and NCTC educational facilities. One participant noted that "the SLS was the best educational program she had attended in her 25 years of service." This comment was echoed in numerous other student surveys and post-event communications. The next SLS event, course number 13-02, is currently scheduled to be conducted at NCTC from 11-16 August 2013.

## — CSLD —

### **The Basic Strategic Art Program**

*LTC Mike Shekleton, Dr. Mike Matheny, and Prof. Steve Kidder  
Department for Senior Leader  
Education and Training, CSLD*

In October 2012, the Basic Strategic Art Program (BSAP) transitioned from the Department of Military Strategy, Planning, and Operations (DMSPO) to the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) as part of the United States Army War College's re-organization. Within CSLD, BSAP was assigned to the Department for Senior Leader Education and Training (DSLET). While BSAP changed organizations, its purpose still remains the same as when the course was founded in 2003: To provide officers newly designated into Functional Area 59 (FA59, Strategist) an introduction to strategy and to the unique skills, knowledge, and attributes that provide

the foundation for their progressive development as Army Strategists. With nearly 300 graduates from 23 classes, BSAP, while serving as the qualification course for the functional area, also serves a vital role in binding together the functional area through acculturating officers to the role of the functional area; providing a shared, common foundational experience; and assisting officers in becoming part of the broader FA59 community.

The typical officer attending the course is a senior Captain or junior Major that has completed troop, battery, or company command and has either recently accessed into the functional area or has completed a single FA59 assignment. Officers serving in the functional area, which was created in 1998, lead multi-disciplinary groups and facilitate senior leader decision-making by assessing, developing, and articulating policy, strategy, and plans at the national and theater levels. Through education and experience, Strategists integrate the instruments of power across the Army, Department of Defense, and throughout the Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational (JIIM) environment. The nearly 450 Regular Army FA59s are assigned within the Army at Division, Corps, Army Service Component Command, and the Department of the Army Headquarters; within the Joint Force at Combatant Commands and the Joint Staff; and a

small segment are assigned within the Interagency. Thus, the curriculum for the course focuses on providing graduates the tools and perspective to bridge the gap between their tactical/operational background at the company grade level and the challenges of operating at the grand-strategic and theater-strategic level of war and policy while serving senior generals on joint staffs..

The course is 14 weeks long and three 16-seat seminars are offered each year. The curriculum contains six modules: Strategic Theory, Strategic Art, National Security Decisionmaking, Contemporary Strategic Challenges, Joint and Army Systems, and Joint and Army Planning. Supplementing the classroom instruction, students participate in a robust guest speaker program, allowing them to engage with and learn from influential policymakers and academics, and conduct staff rides to the Interagency in Washington DC as well the Overland, Petersburg, and Appomattox Campaigns of 1864 and 1865. The guest speaker opportunities and staff rides all serve to reinforce classroom instruction and provide salient examples of the formulation and execution of policy and strategy.

Lastly, as part of the physical transition to CSLD, a BSAP “campus” was created in Collins Hall, consisting of two classrooms, a conference room, a mini-computer lab, and offices for the BSAP faculty team, all co-located. This

campus will help facilitate the diverse requirements of the course, ranging from standard instruction to guest speaker sessions to specialized planning exercises. As the course looks towards the future, it is looking to expand its students beyond Army FA59s. It will welcome its first multi-national student from New Zealand in the fall of 2013, and it is seeking to add Army students from outside the functional area, the joint community, and the interagency to enrich the seminar experience.

— CSLD —

## New Wargame Series

**COL John Mauk**

*Director, Operations Research, CSLD*

In his April 11 interview with the PBS News Hour’s Margaret Warner, General Ray Odierno, Army Chief of Staff, discussed the need to understand the future roles and missions of the Army. He noted that “this is a time of evolution, not revolution...What we are doing now is a part of an iterative process to get national security right.” He added: “What we have to do is continue to evolve as we look to the future. We have to look at what capabilities we need to have as the world changes around us.”

General Odierno’s statements to the U.S. Army’s 2013 Strategy Conference encapsulate the purpose of the U.S. Army War College’s Strategic Wargaming Series being conducted by the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development’s Department of Landpower Concepts, Doctrine, and Wargaming (LCDW).

This new wargaming series examines the strategic environment surrounding emerging security issues facing the nation in order to gain an understanding of the drivers of potential conflict and the roles of the U.S. military, and principally Landpower, plays in future conflict. These emerging issues are characterized by significant complexity, unpredictability and often ambiguity about the competing interests of stakeholders and their responses to U.S. actions. Ideally these wargames help



us understand the emerging strategic environment and identify the capabilities required to secure U.S. interests while also discerning how we might avoid conflict.

This strategic wargame series informs senior Army decision-makers as they plan for, as General Odierno said, preventing conflict, shaping the environment in pursuit of peace and stability, and identifying the conditions that will help the Army to win the nation's war when called upon. The USAWC has quickly turned this series into a powerful capability that provides timely and insightful analysis of a select set of strategic challenges. The wargaming series seeks to effectively fill an information gap, recognizing that the strategic environment is ever changing where understanding multiple, fast moving trends and evolving threats represents a significant planning challenge to the Geographic Combat Command, Army Service Component Command, Headquarters Department of the Army and Joint Staffs.

The LCDW plans and executes a new wargame every eight weeks for a total of seven to eight wargames each year. This frequent analytical tempo is intended to meet senior leader needs for responsive, focused strategic decision support that reflects their planning timelines. The LCDW team analyzes wargame results and produces a report within a few weeks. A typical wargame report includes an eight to ten page analysis of the key strategic findings and most salient themes raised by the wargame participants. The wargaming results are intentionally kept to less than 12 pages to ensure focus on the most important issues and provide a short, effective information tool for senior leaders.

This high impact wargaming series leverages a diverse set of expertise and perspectives from across the Department of Defense, Academia, and Think Tanks. Within the Army War College, faculty and students with expertise in specific wargame topic areas are employed to maximize our substantial resident

expertise and experience. Whenever possible, LCDW seeks the expertise of our International Fellows to inform our regionally focused wargames. Thus far, 26 International Fellows have participated in the regionally focused wargames. International Fellow participation brings a powerful set of expertise and insights that add to the richness of the discussion. Specifically their participation is invaluable in adding their unique understanding of complex regional equities, as well as cultural, capability and capacity issues that might otherwise go undiscovered.

A critically important feature of the wargaming series are strict rules of non-attribution. We gain invaluable insights and perspectives by ensuring that all of our participants (U.S. and international) understand we will not attribute any comment or opinion to an individual or organization. This policy enables participants to freely offer up their best judgment about how a particular scenario or situation will impact the US and Army equities.

The articles that follow will highlight wargames and topics examined in the first three events in the USAWC Strategic Wargaming Series. They represent a good sample of this important effort to develop strategic insights and meet the senior leader imperative for timely, relevant decision support.

— CSLD —

### **New Series Examines Regional Hot Spots in First Three Wargames**

***Dr. Richard L. Winslow and  
Colonel Scott A. Forsythe***  
*Center for Strategic Leadership and  
Development*

The Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) examined three regional hot spots in the first three wargames in the new U.S. Army Strategic Wargaming Series. The first, the Syria Analysis Game, was conducted 13-14 September 2012 and

focused on potential Army requirements in the ongoing Syrian conflict. This wargame leveraged the regional expertise of International Fellows as well as faculty subject matter experts and the Army G-35 to derive findings and recommendations to inform senior leader understanding of the conflict. The second wargame, on 7-8 November 2012, convened a group of regional subject matter experts to assess security implications resulting from Malian instability and to identify potential U.S. Army contributions to strategic security in northwest Africa. The third wargame, focused on the Democratic Republic of Congo, was conducted 15-16 January 2013 to assess the security implications resulting from ongoing instability in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).

#### ***Syria***

The Syria wargame focused on gaining insights into regional partner equities and reactions that might shape U.S. responses. Participants evaluated alternative scenarios to assess their likelihood and the likely positions their nations would take in each alternative. Unsurprisingly, the most important objective for regional partners was restored regional stability. To that end, a key finding is that regional partners would accept Assad retaining power conditioned on an agreement to a brokered transition of power over time. A smaller number of participants wanted to see Assad go as soon as possible. These conflicting positions clearly placed current U.S. policy at odds with regional partner desires. These conflicting partner equities have certainly been played out in the continuing situation within Syria. Regional partners did identify roles and missions for U.S. military involvement but they specifically recognized the issues involved with overt U.S. military action within Syria. The only exception, from the participants point of view, would be actions to secure Syrian chemical weapons. The game also identified what participants considered

the worse case result: Syria devolving into separate states along sectarian lines.

The game identified key issues that needed more study such as: developing responses to assist regional partner nations with a sudden increase in refugees; concurrently developing a response to internally displaced persons within Syria that may require humanitarian assistance; and developing responses to secure chemical weapons or otherwise prevent their loss of control/accountability.

### ***Mali***

In the Mali wargame, participant perceptions of the nature of the problem, what is at stake, and what might improve the situation varied widely. The discussions identified similar differences of perspective among U.S., international, regional and Malian stakeholders.

Participants concluded that U.S. African regional and global counterterrorism policies intersect in Mali. A U.S. national interest – regional stability – is threatened; U.S. counterterrorism policy objectives may be threatened if Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM), and the Movement for Oneness and Jihad in West Africa (MOJWA) are allowed to operate in the region unchecked.

It was recognized that Mali represented a very complex problem for policy makers because three distinct yet interlocking security issues coexist: 1) The lack of a legitimate or functioning government undermines both internal and regional stability; 2) Ungoverned space in northern Mali provides an environment conducive to the transformation of a local extremist threat into a threat across and beyond the region; and, 3) Internal conflict over power and resources in northern Mali complicates and potentially undermines resolution of the north-south issue.

The de facto split of Mali poses multiple challenges for regional partners: it may encourage Tuareg secession movements in other states with Tuareg minorities; ungoverned space in northern Mali facilitates transnational crime; internal fighting for control of northern Mali

could spill over to southern Mali and regional neighbors; the security vacuum could worsen the humanitarian crisis by generating additional IDPs and refugees; and it could spread radical Islam to neighbors.

It was recognized that extremist groups pose a direct threat to significant numbers of Europeans in the region (principally French), and pose an unacceptable threat in European states with significant Malian migrant communities (principally France).

When the wargame was conducted, the evolving terror threat in northern Mali was not considered a global threat because fissures between indigenous groups and AQIM existed. Although AQIM was affiliated with al Qaeda, it was a separate entity with a regional, not global, agenda. Thus, the indigenous Malian groups had separate agendas from foreign radicals. Because of these distinctions, any counterterrorism actions needed to be informed by clear understanding of and differences between the radical Islamists and other groups with more secular agendas.

Given significant ethnic complexities in Mali, it was recognized that military action that may be attributed to the United States in northern Mali could be counterproductive; U.S. military action would likely fuel anti-American sentiment, and could serve to increase recruiting by radical actors.

The wargame found that addressing security issues in northern Mali required establishment of an acceptable power-sharing arrangement between north and south; success of any power sharing arrangement must be agreed by a Malian national government in Bamako that is accepted as legitimate in both northern and southern Mali and recognized by international actors.

Intervention of an Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) force into Tuareg/Arabic/Songhai areas was viewed as very likely to be perceived as foreign intervention and met with a violent response. The currently envisioned 3300-man ECOWAS force

did not appear to possess the necessary capabilities and capacity to succeed in stability and counterterrorism operations over the vast expanse of northern Mali.

It was agreed that the U.S. should make every effort to avoid putting U.S. service members on the ground in Mali, but the U.S. Army should begin planning now to increase training of ECOWAS forces for this mission; strengthen military-to-military contacts with Arab partners; and, broaden regional capacity building.

### ***Democratic Republic of Congo***

Wargame participants assessing the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) largely affirmed conventional understanding of the conflict with regard to the underlying causes of conflict; corruption and the malign roles various armed groups and regional actors are playing in the conflict. They indicated the critical elements of long-term stability in the DRC are the need for a viable economic framework and adequate governance capacity. Capable governance institutions are predicated on implementation of an effective national security strategy and the capability to enforce it. As such, experts viewed the role of external military forces in the DRC as limited to establishing and enforcing security and the rule of law while other entities focus on capacity building. Commitment of forces in this environment creates a potentially open-ended proposition that demands clear definition of objectives and end state conditions.

-----  
Participation of U.S. Army War College faculty, U.S. students and especially International Fellows enriched each of these wargames, bringing together diverse perspectives and insights. At the same time, the wargames applied lessons learned in the classroom by affording the students an opportunity to think about real world problems at the strategic level. As we watch events in Syria and Mali continue to unfold, our appreciation for the collective wisdom of the participants in each of these events has grown.

The insights gained from these wargames, leveraging the unique capabilities of the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development to design wargames at the strategic and high operational levels, help to inform the Army leadership and other Army and Joint audiences on critical national security issues.

— CSLD —

## Cyber Wargame Examines Policy and Strategic Issues

*Lieutenant Colonel Rob Purvis and Colonel Scott A. Forsythe  
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development*

On 27-28 March 2013, the Strategic Wargaming Division conducted a Cyber Wargame to examine policy and strategic issues concerning government response to cyber hostilities. Forty participants from interagency, military, academia, and private industry examined current policy options and strategic decisions relative to cyber hostilities, identified potential national and Army mission area shortfalls based on “titled” roles and responsibilities, and explored potential response options couples with their potential second and third orders effects.

In this wargame, the catalyst for discussion was a three phased scenario of cyber hostility against the United States’ financial sector. Participants represented three separate groups considering policy requirements: the Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Department of Justice (DoJ). Each group responded to specific questions targeted to each phase to elicit responses in relation to policy options and strategic issues.

The overarching theme made clear by this wargame is the effects of a cyber attack would quickly spread to all sectors of the United States and have global impact. While this wargame focused on those actions against the financial network, this would also apply against other sectors of critical infrastructure.

With a diverse group of participants, two other points were made clear as well. First, there is a need for a common lexicon in relation to cyber. Cyber terminology and definitions require standardization across the spectrum for use throughout the government and private organizations. Secondly, there are barriers to cooperation between the three groups with conflicting stakeholder equities hampering information sharing. Private sector equities directly conflict with government objectives frequently resulting in a lack of trust. Different government agencies have different equities with regard to their missions; criminal prosecution, Homeland Security, and National Defense.

The insights about the policy and strategic issues of cyber gained from this wargame, leveraging the unique capabilities of the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development to design wargames at the strategic and high operational levels, help to inform the Army leadership, other Army and Joint audiences as well as the private sector on critical national security issues.

— CSLD —

## Northeast Asia Wargame Examines Strategic Context of WMD Threat

*Dr. Richard L. Winslow and Colonel Scott A. Forsythe  
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development*

The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) poses a significant threat to U.S. national interests and its regional friends and allies in East Asia because it possesses nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and is aggressively pursuing long-range delivery means. On 6-7 March 2013, CSLD’s Strategic Wargaming Division conducted the Northeast Asia Wargame to examine the strategic environment in Northeast Asia relative to WMD threats. Twenty-five regional and subject matter experts

examined WMD threats to regional security and U.S. interests in Northeast Asia, potential U.S. responses to the events portrayed in the wargame scenario and identified possible consequences and implications for the United States and its regional security partners. The game was co-sponsored by the United States Army War College and the Army G-3/5/7.

Within the construct of this wargame, the strategic environment presented constraints and restraints that limited U.S. response options and, if ignored, presented major risks. China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Russia, and the United States are all major stakeholders in Northeast Asia. The most salient feature of the strategic environment made clear by this wargame was the presence of overlapping and competing national interests of the major stakeholders. This creates opportunities for cooperation among the stakeholders (even those that are traditional rivals), but also limited possible solutions and provided fuel for conflict among the stakeholders where their interests collided or were mutually exclusive. This feature, when coupled with the potential consequences of the use or loss of control of WMD, made it imperative for the United States and the other major stakeholders to clearly state their own interests and intentions and clearly understand the interests and intentions of every other major stakeholder. Thus, every threat and every considered action had to be carefully evaluated against a complex set of interests. The unpredictability and opacity of various states and players raised the likelihood that small missteps could have major and longstanding, disastrous, implications.

The insights about the strategic environment in Northeast Asia gained from this wargame, leveraging the unique capabilities of the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development to design wargames at the strategic and high operational levels, help to inform the Army leadership and other Army and Joint audiences on critical national security issues.

## Constructing Strategies in the Midst of Crises: USAWC Assists Niger in its National Military Review

**Professors Bernard F. Griffard and Bert B. Tussing**

*Center for Strategic Leadership and Development*

In September 2012, at the behest of the United States Africa Command and the country of Niger, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development began a series of sessions with that country's military to construct a National Military Strategy. Working with the Nigerien Armed Forces and Gendarmerie, a travelling contact team (TCT) composed of Professors Bernard F. Griffard and Bert B. Tussing introduced the Nigerien Armed Forces (FAN) to the Strategy Development Model developed for the students of the United States Army War College.

That initial session was framed against severe resource constraints that characterize much of the world today, in both industrialized and developing nations. The "workshop" concluded with the FAN's commitment to developing what they considered to be the central military objectives to serve the greater national "ends."

The second session was conducted in Niamey, Niger at the Headquarters of the Gendarmerie from 4-8 March 2013. Between the two events, the strategic environment of West Africa had changed appreciably. As the September 2012 meetings were concluding, the security forces of Niger were facing crises associated with the flow of nomadic Tuareg peoples seeking refuge from the turmoil in Libya. In the ensuing months however, a more pronounced crisis emerged as Islamist extremists in Northern Mali began movement to the south threatening the Nigerien border. Against this rising set of man-made threats – that would have to be viewed alongside natural disasters that traditionally plague the Nigerien

people – the gathered officials continued the process of developing a National Military Strategy.

Remaining true to the forum's charter, and following the model taught in the September session, the assemblage began by identifying what they perceived to be their country's national interests, and then prioritized them in terms of *vital*, *important*, and of *peripheral* concern. To optimize the time available for discerning the strategic development concept, the body concentrated its examination on vital national interests and the *military objectives* required to promote and preserve these interests.

The military objectives are designed to meet the national strategic ends – but the *ways* to meet those ends was the focus of the second session. Accordingly, the forum was charged by the TCT to develop *Strategic Concepts* to support each of the designated military objectives.

Both intentions and time constraints prevented the assembly from addressing all of the identified national interests (and, in turn, the military objectives in support of those interests); but the participants began a process that would, by design, continue beyond the week's forum. Directing their attention to military objectives in support of vital national interests, the participants arrived at strategic concepts in support of each.

This identification and prioritization, the final component of the strategy development cycle, is tentatively scheduled to take place in September 2013. At that time the participants will be charged with translating their military concepts into force structure guidance, desired capabilities, and resources to support those capabilities. In the course of doing so, the leadership will have to meet the challenge of deliberately constrained resources by proffering prioritization guidance in deference to both requirements and limitations. Finally, the September forum will be called to measure their solutions against a risk management framework that will cause those prioritizations to be tested,

validated, and, as necessary, adjusted to meet the national interest.

The Nigerien Military Strategy Review continues to bear fruit on multiple planes. The dedicated focus of the military leadership in support of the civil leadership is reflected in every step of the strategy's development. Likewise, the need for regional cooperation in meeting shared challenges in responding to hazards, be they natural or manmade, has been clearly expressed in the interaction between the organizers, the generals, and their workgroups. Both trends give credence to optimism on the part of the U.S. Africa Command, as they portend an era of greater stability for Niger and other emerging democracies in the frequently turbulent region of West Africa.

— CSLD —

## Preserving and Protecting the Cures: Examining the Specter of Antimicrobial Drug Resistance

**Professor Bert B. Tussing**

*Director, Homeland Security and Issues Branch, CSLD*

In a clinical understatement, the World Health Organization recently declared that, "antimicrobial resistance is a critical problem that needs urgent action." Since the 1940s the military has, with the rest of the world, used antibiotics and antimicrobial agents to treat infectious diseases, and greatly reduce illness and death among patients. However, due to the widespread overuse, misuse, and under use of such drugs, infectious organisms that antibiotics are designed to kill have adapted to them, making drugs less effective or in some cases not effective at all.

Amidst growing concern over this issue, the Institute on Science for Global Policy (ISGP) convened a three-day conference, "Emerging and Persistent Infectious Diseases: Focus on Antimicrobial Resistance," at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston Texas.

Representatives from the appropriate science, policy-making, academic and think-tank communities were brought together to balance a range of implications in this burgeoning threat, and arrive at “actionable decisions.”

Accompanying the obvious health implications of this resistance that has taken place over time against antibodies, one could expect significant societal and economic impacts ranging from workforce reductions, to rising health costs, to a very public angst emanating from a discovery that controls against common infections were no longer automatic. No where would those expectations prove more pronounced than in the austere environment that characterizes military ground operations. Tens of thousands of lives have been saved in the field since World War II through the introduction of antibiotics. However, microorganisms’ resistance, combined with the severe declines in antimicrobial drug development, could one day cause us to look back longingly to the battlefield medicine of the last century.

In responding to the challenges envisioned here, there are obviously two camps of consideration. The first, and most important, is the scientific community, which must respond to the obstacles and opportunities that characterize an era that is at once rich in technological achievements and overburdened in requirements. The second camp is composed of those governmental organizations—national and international—charged with discerning the import of these achievements and requirements, and translating them into policies to serve their citizenry. Unfortunately, the gap between science-based understanding and governmental agendas is frequently extensive. ISGP has been an attempt to close this divide, and through forums such as this has brought together both camps in seeking “actionable decisions” for implementation against issues that are enormously complex, and increasingly urgent.

The exchange that occurred over the 3 days in Houston (19-22 March) left an indelible impression on representatives at the forum from the National Security establishment. With particular regard to the impacts these issues can produce within the military, the concerns raised there should not remain isolated in the science community, but should serve as alarms to policy makers inside and out of the Pentagon.

The event in Houston is only one of many that have been conducted on issues of this nature by the Institute. The ISGP fora are unique not only in content, but likewise in structure. Led by Dr. George Atkinson (a member of the U.S. Army War College Board of Visitors), each event brings together an audience of 50 participants, composed predominantly of scientists from around the world. Interspersed among the scientists, however, are members of the policy making community; individuals who will translate wisdom into doctrine; and other representatives of communities who will be called upon to explain the complexities of issues that may amaze us or may alarm us, but cannot remain isolated from us. This intersection of science and strategic communication is at the core of existence for the Institute on Science for Global Policy. By their own description, ISGP’s conferences are

*...designed to provide articulate, distinguished scientists and technologists opportunities to concisely present their views of the credible S&T options available for addressing major geopolitical and security issues.*

In as much, the Institute champions the essential link between knowledge in the scientific community and understanding among those that must apply it. The importance of that link to the military cannot be overstated.

The final recommendations of the March conference, along with recommendations from other forums of similar concerns, are available from the Institute, accessible at [www.scienceforglobalpolicy.org](http://www.scienceforglobalpolicy.org).

## Unified Quest 2013 Winter Wargame

*Professor Jim Kievit  
Department of Senior Leader  
Education and Training, CSLD*

Following a week of preparatory activities to set the building with the proper room layouts and information technology support structure, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development hosted the Army’s Unified Quest 2013 (UQ13) Winter Wargame at the Collins Center from 9-15 February 2013.

Unified Quest is the Army Chief of Staff’s annual Title 10 Future Study designed to examine issues critical to current and future Army force development. It is the Army’s primary mechanism for exploring enduring strategic and operational challenges, and this fiscal year included smaller multiple analytical events and several larger wargames.

As the Army’s Executive Agent for all UQ13 activities, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), co-sponsored the Winter Wargame event with the Joint Staff’s Joint Development, Joint and Coalition Warfighting Division (J7).

Conceived, designed, and developed via an extensive effort led by TRADOC’s Army Capabilities Integration Center, the Winter Wargame focused on exploring concepts for the Army of 2020 to 2030. Specifically, the UQ13 Winter



Lieutenant General Walker



Wargame explored several possible worst-case scenarios (including operations in remote and dispersed locations, involving conventional and irregular enemy forces, complex and difficult terrain, inclement weather, and weapons of mass destruction) across the globe.

The Wargame brought together approximately 100 subject matter experts and leaders from joint and multinational military forces, academia, national security think tanks and several non-DoD government agencies and organizations. Participants were divided into two groups; one group utilized current doctrine and the second group examined the same situations using proposed or potential future concepts. Each of these working groups assessed capabilities, risks, and implications of emerging Army and Joint concepts in the game's scenarios. While there were many valuable insights and findings from the Winter Wargame, Lieutenant General Keith Walker, Deputy Commander, Futures and Director of the Army Capabilities Integration Center, Training and Doctrine Command, stated that a significant overarching theme that came out was the need for greater "unity of effort" between the Army and its multiple Joint and coalition partners.

Following several other UQ13 events held elsewhere, the Collins Center is currently scheduled to again host the Unified Quest 2013 STAFFEX event in August, as a lead-in event for the Unified Quest 2013 Summer Wargame slated for September.

---

## CSLD

---

### **International Fellows Experience the Complexities of International Diplomacy**

***Ritchie L. Dion***

*Department of Senior Leader  
Education and Training, CSLD*

For 14 years, the United States Army War College has conducted the International Fellows Strategic Crisis Negotiation Exercise, an event that places primary emphasis on understanding the

diplomatic element of power. As the name implies, the exercise was designed exclusively for the Army War College's International Fellows Program.

The most recent exercise was conducted over a period of three days, from 5-7 March 2013. Within the exercise the International Fellows role-played diplomats and honed their abilities to practice international diplomacy, negotiation techniques and strategic decision making.

While the exercise has changed in structure and length since it was first introduced in the fall of 2000, the mainstay continues to be the scenario, which centers on a crisis in the South Caucasus region some ten years in the future and is inextricably tied to a real-world conflict. The central issue of both the scenario and the real-world situation is the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the territory known as Nagorno-Karabakh, an ethnic-Armenian area within western Azerbaijan, and international efforts to resolve the conflict before the crisis can re-erupt. This conflict has been "frozen" in place since a cease-fire agreement was reached in 1994, and continues to fester even to this day with no real solution in sight. While the scenario is fictional, it closely depicts the real situation in the South Caucasus region, which helps demonstrate to the IFs the complexity of these types of situations. Each year the scenario is refined to incorporate improvements and to maintain its close relationship with the actual events in the region.

Other countries with interests in the region and involved in the negotiations include neighboring Iran and Turkey, regional heavyweight Russia and, as the lone superpower, the United States. The territory of Nagorno-Karabakh has its own government and represents its own interests. This year, due to the growing size of the IF class (71 this year and projected to reach a maximum of 80), the country of Georgia was added as an eighth country team.

Entering into the exercise, the International Fellows were divided

between the eight country teams and, in addition to the scenario and other exercise materials, were provided confidential instructions from their governments which spell out their leader's guidance concerning overarching national interests, guiding principles, desired end-states, and specific negotiation instructions. Each team was assigned a mentor, a retired U.S. ambassador with extensive regional experience.

Over the three day exercise, teams worked through the issues, scheduled and held negotiation sessions, consulted with their fictional governments and with the UN representative in the attempt to negotiate a resolution to the conflict. The exercise concluded with all teams attending a closing plenary session, chaired by former U.S. Ambassador David T. Johnson acting as the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative to the region, each team brought their revised positions to the table in an effort to secure a diplomatic breakthrough.

After the exercise, the overarching consensus of the Fellows was that this was an important exercise and one of the best academic-based exposures to the diplomatic element of power they had experienced. All participants agreed that the mentors made a good exercise a great one. Their firsthand knowledge and experience in the region and with negotiating settlements gave all International Fellows a realistic and powerful glimpse at the complexity and limitations involved in the diplomatic element of power.

---

## CSLD

---

### **CSLD Continues to Increase and Strengthen Partnerships through the ISCNE**

***Ritchie L. Dion***

*Department of Senior Leader  
Education and Training, CSLD*

The outreach efforts of the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development through the conduct of the International Strategic Crisis

Negotiation Exercise (ISCNE) continued to thrive during the current academic year, with returns to several educational institutions with whom established partnerships continued to strengthen, and premiering at two others, beginning new partnerships.

This past Fall saw a return to Georgetown University for the exercise's ninth annual iteration, to the Patterson School at the University of Kentucky for a third year, to the Center for International and Strategic Studies (CSIS) for the first of two iterations in AY13, and for the first time at the School of International Affairs at Penn State University.

The Winter schedule was compressed into the month of February and early March with a return to Georgetown, separate exercises held at the LBJ School at the University of Texas and for the Student Conference on International Affairs (SCONA 58) at Texas A&M University, followed by a second iteration at CSIS.

Over 350 students and young professionals participated in the exercises, demonstrating the continued popularity of this type of exercise in an academic environment and the making this period one of the most prolific for CSLD's outreach efforts.

During the Fall, the major highlight was the new partnership between CSLD and the Penn State School of International Affairs (SIA) under the leadership of Ambassador Dennis Jett. In February 2012, CSLD and Penn State University agreed to a partnership that included alternating biannual events with Penn State's President's Leadership Academy (PLA) and the SIA. The PLA event was conducted at Carlisle Barracks in February 2012, with the second iteration to be scheduled for the same time period in 2014. The SIA event took place in mid-October on the Penn State campus in recently opened Katz Hall. Over 40 undergraduate students participated, navigating through the complexities of the Nagorno-Karabakh situation between Armenia and Azerbaijan struggling over the same contentious issues that have stymied U.S., Russian

and French negotiators for almost 20 years. At the end of the exercise Ambassador Jett requested, and it was agreed, that CSLD conduct the exercise for their students every year, rather than every other year.

One of the many highlights of the Winter period was the premier of a new scenario for SCONA. As the name implies the Student Conference on National Affairs is a student-run conference, in fact one of the oldest such events in the country, now in its 58<sup>th</sup> year. Each year the organizers select a relevant theme of national significance around which to ground the event, key its presentations and discussions, and inform their selection of invited guest speakers. In 2011 CSLD was invited by SCONA to hold the ISCNE as an additional for a select group of participants who arrive a day early. While the exercise was quite popular, the region did not necessarily align with the SCONA theme. However, since the next SCONA theme is decided in the spring of the year prior to the February conference, there was sufficient lead-time to write a theme-specific ISCNE scenario. Such was the case last spring with the decision to chose the United States Rebalancing to the Pacific as the 2013 theme. This allowed CSLD to craft a strategic level negotiation exercise around the real world developing crisis between China, Vietnam and the Philippines over the South China Sea (SCS). The resulting scenario pitted Vietnam and the Philippines against Chinese SCS claims and brought in the

United States as a balancing power, along with India and Japan as relevant regional powers in an effort to broker a negotiated settlement. The exercise was a great success; so much so that the SCONA leaders requested that future exercises be lengthened by a half-day.

Lastly, in early February, at the request of the Georgetown School of Foreign Service undergraduate program, a CSLD representative helped oversee the execution of a scaled down, one-day version of the ISCNE for a group of 18 students employing a Cyprus scenario. This smaller scale, time-challenged exercise was an interesting diversion from the normal longer, larger ISCNEs. It was particularly interesting in the way the students had to approach the who-what-when-where-and how in building a negotiation strategy, and ended with an intriguing closing plenary session, where all the negotiation teams were able sit around the same table and delve into a long, in-depth and intelligent discussion of the paramount issues led by a State Department Foreign Service Officer experienced in the region. As is the case with all experiential learning exercises of this type, the degree of learning they achieved was inextricably tied to the level effort they put into to it. Despite the brevity of the exercise, it was clear that this group was no different than the other groups in their level of preparation and seriousness of intent.

Although not highlighted here, one of the enduring indicators that the ISCNE



**The Turkish Delegation holds a team meeting during the inaugural ISCNE for the Penn State School of International Affairs**

series does indeed make a difference comes from the two exercises that were conducted at CSIS, one in late November 2012, and one in early March 2013. Some of the participants in the March exercise had also participated in the November iteration. When one of them was asked why they returned, she noted that she works on “the Hill” and that her job is negotiations and this exercise is the best thing she does to hone her skills.

What was conclusively drawn from this academic year’s series was that the ISCNE continues to be an important and meaningful program that serves the war college’s outreach mandate by building partnerships with other educational institutions, and within those partnerships richly enhances the learning of students and young professionals alike.

## — CSLD —

### **CSLD Partnership with the LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas**

***Ritchie L. Dion***

*Department of Senior Leader Education and Training, CSLD*

The United States Army War College, as part of its Outreach program, has increased its efforts to partner with civilian academic institutions. For its part, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development has employed the International Strategic Crisis Negotiation Exercise (ISCNE) as one of its main outreach tools with great success. This effort began in 2003 with the conduct of the ISCNE at Georgetown University and it has grown exponentially, especially in recent years.

What began a single exercise at Georgetown University has grown to include masters’ degree programs at top-tier international affairs schools, such as the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; the Maxwell School, Syracuse University; the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, University of Kentucky;

the George H.W. Bush School of Public Service, Texas A&M University; the Penn State School of International Affairs and the Presidential Leadership Academy; and the Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) School of Public Affairs, University of Texas. It has also become an integral part of larger annual student-led events such as Academic Assembly at the Air Force Academy and the Student Conference on International Affairs at Texas A&M University. Recently the ISCNE has expanded to include other types of organizations, such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the largest and most prolific of the Washington DC area think-tanks, and the Triangle Institute of Security Studies, a consortium between Duke University, University of North Carolina and the North Carolina State University.

Given this expansion, it became desirable to expand the number of scenarios available to employ. The original scenario explored the ongoing situation between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the unrecognized region of Nagorno-Karabakh. In 2011, a second scenario was completed; this one concentrating on the current situation between Greek and Turkish Cypriots on the island of Cyprus. Most recently, given the United States Rebalancing to the Pacific theme addressed at this year’s SCONA conference, a South China Sea scenario was created for that event.

CSLD’s partnership with the LBJ School of Public Affairs, with the enthusiastic support of their school’s leadership, has been excellent and most enriching. In the Spring of 2012 the LBJ School and CSLD agreed to increase the level of their partnership by creating a Policy Research Project (PRP) graduate-level course specifically focused on the production of a strategic-level negotiation scenario. Offered to second year Master of Global Policy Studies students, the course was designed as an intense study of a particular region of the world focusing on a specific real world crisis or set of interrelated crises from which they would develop their scenario. According to the LBJ School, PRPs are designed to give

second year students real-life experience working in teams on primary research and policy analysis for an external client. Conducted over the course of the academic year, students are expected to manage the project from concept stage to final delivery and presentation to the client. The PRP experience builds valuable teamwork, management, client relationship, analysis and presentation skills, in addition to strengthening students’ research credentials. While the PRPs are supervised by an LBJ faculty member, they are designed to put the students “in the drivers’ seats.”

For this particular PRP, CSLD requested students’ focus on Africa, specifically sub-Saharan Africa. With 18 students signed up for the PRP, the fall semester started with the CSLD team conducting an abbreviated version of the ISCNE using the Cyprus scenario on-site at the LBJ School, in Austin. This exercise was critical to student understanding of the objectives, structure and nature of the exercise.

Given the number of students, they were split into three groups, and each group decided on a region and related crisis to investigate and present as a potential exercise scenario for development. The students identified three possible scenario topics concerning long-standing conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa, with a focus on discerning where these conflicts were “intractable, yet negotiable” and “significant enough to attract international involvement in the negotiations.” The students decided to focus on Sudan-South Sudan, Somalia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. They spent approximately four weeks conducting SME interviews and background research, as well as writing succinct proposals for each possible scenario, a period their faculty noted as “an incredibly intense period of work.”

These preliminary proposals were presented via VTC to a board composed of CSLD staff and War College African subject matter experts and a retired U.S. Ambassador in mid-October. The board evaluated each proposal and ultimately

decided that Sudan/South Sudan held the most promise as a complex and enduring crisis that involved enough players to make it a viable addition to the ISCNE series.

For the rest of the year the students were occupied by research, which included several SME interviews conducted with scholars and practitioners around the world via phone, Skype and VTC. The students divided themselves into working groups focused on negotiation chapters and actors, and later redivided into groups to draft the history, chapters background, and confidential instructions. They also developed a “materials team” that focused on finding primary documentation such as treaties and maps, as well as formatting all the materials into the appropriate form. They

went through several rounds of peer review and editing. In early March, they conducted a ‘dry run’ of the scenario with other master degree students, USAWC Fellows, and university undergraduates. This provided valuable feedback which allowed the group to identify problems in the materials and priorities for revision.

As part of the program, the students were invited to travel to Carlisle in two groups. The first group visited from 6 to 8 March to participate in the International Fellows Strategic Crisis Negotiation Exercise as assistants to the retired United States Ambassadors that mentor each of the country teams. They also benefited from their time interacting with the International Fellows. The students presented an update on the progress on the scenario and the feedback from the

dry run they had just completed. The second group visited the Army War College from 26 to 28 March, and provided the final update and discussion of their scenario to a CSLD panel, observed and participated in a CSLD wargame and two war college electives of their choice, and took a guided tour of the Gettysburg Battlefield, led by a War College faculty member.

Given the success of this initial PRP, the LBJ School has already committed to continue this program in AY14. According to Dr. Kate Weaver, the LBJ School’s lead faculty advisor, “overall, this was a very valuable experience for the students on many levels. The active involvement of the USAWC at various points in the year was tremendously useful for the students in terms of receiving feedback, helping to discern client interests, and providing strong motivation to produce high quality work.” The students themselves found it to be an intense and rewarding experience, especially knowing that the situation they developed and the challenges it presents would become part of the ISCNE series and that the complex problems and challenges they built would be wrestled with by other graduate students in schools across the nation for years to come. This initiative proves the value of a robust outreach program, not only for the U.S. Army War College, but for the entire Army family, and exemplifies what military-civilian relations, as well as academic outreach, can and should be.



Colonel Sam White (standing) and Ambassador Carey Cavanaugh (seated at left) address the LBJ School PRP class

*Collins Center Update – Double Issue – Fall 2012 and Winter 2013*

**U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development  
650 Wright Avenue  
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS**