

# THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 6, Issue 3

April - June 2004



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- Unified Quest 2004
- Joint Land, Aerospace, and Sea Simulation (JLASS)
- Strategic Crisis Exercise 2004
- Force Structure for Stability Operations
- Environmental Security and Disaster Preparedness
- Military Robots

## UNIFIED QUEST 2004 REVISITS FUTURE WAR

*By Professor James Kievit*  
*Department of the Army Support Branch*

The Center for Strategic Leadership and the U.S. Army War College hosted the *Unified Quest 2004* Operations Workshop from 17-23 April and the *Unified Quest 2004* War Game from 2-7 May at Carlisle Barracks.

*Unified Quest*, cosponsored by the Army and U.S. Joint Forces Command, is an annual year-long series of simulations, experiments, and seminars focused on military transformation. The *Unified Quest* War Game is the capstone event for the series and the Army's ongoing Future Warfare Studies Program. Participants this year were approximately five hundred national and international military officers and representatives of other governmental and non-governmental agencies, including forty-two active and retired flag officers and Senior Executive Service personnel. This group came together to explore and examine multiple aspects of operational and tactical warfare in the second decade of the twenty-first century. *Unified Quest 2004* extended last year's *Unified Quest 2003* scenario to permit continued learning and insights into the requirements for and capabilities of future stability and support operations and transitions from military to civil control. It also included integration of selected issues from recent real-world operations, experimentation with distributed participation of a Joint and Interagency Coordination Group, and increased participation of multinational players.

The *Unified Quest 2004* Operations Workshop, in some ways a "dress rehearsal" for the War Game, began over the weekend, 17-18 April, with player registration and information briefing rehearsals. Players planned and executed game moves Monday thru Thursday noon, and the Operations Workshop concluded on Friday, 23 April, with executive-level outbriefs in the main conference room of Collins Hall. The majority of participants then departed, returning to Carlisle Barracks on Saturday, 1 May, for the *Unified Quest 2004* War Game.

On Sunday, 2 May, a plenary welcoming session with remarks by Major General David H. Huntoon, Commandant of the War College; General Byrnes, Commanding General of the Training and Doctrine Command; and Admiral Giambastini, Combatant Commander of Joint

Forces Command, initiated the week-long *Unified Quest 2004* War Game.

War Game analytical activities continued 3-7 May at the Collins Center with detailed assessments based upon the activities of the opposing Blue and Red player cells involved in different near simultaneous crises in both the southwest Pacific and the Caspian Sea regions (as well as Homeland Defense/Security issues in U.S. territory).

In addition to supporting *Unified Quest 2004* throughout the week, the War College also provided Dr. Doug Johnson and his transformation elective resident students to form the core of the *Unified Quest 2004* "CASEA" player cell. Utilizing the Caspian Sea region scenario, this planning team cell explored the employment of proposed future concepts by current and emerging Army organizations, such as the "modular" brigade combat teams being formed by the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, Georgia.

The *Unified Quest 2004* War Game concluded with an initial insights plenary session in Bliss Hall the morning of 7 May. Those insights were subsequently refined and presented to the Chief of Staff of the Army and other senior defense leaders in a briefing in Washington D.C. on 10 May. It is expected that the Joint Forces Command and the Training and Doctrine Command's Futures Center will publish a comprehensive *Unified Quest 2004* report later this year as well as a road map for all *Unified Quest 2005* activities. Meanwhile, collaborative planning efforts for hosting the *Unified Quest 2005* Operations Workshop and War Game at Carlisle Barracks in the late spring next year are already underway.

## JOINT LAND, AEROSPACE, AND SEA SIMULATION (JLASS)

*By COL Eugene Thompson*  
*Joint and Multinational Initiatives Branch*

Sixteen Army War College students along with seventy-seven students from the other Senior Level Colleges participated in the annual Joint Land, Aerospace, and Sea Simulation (JLASS) from 16 to 21 April at Maxwell Air Force Base. Building on the Army War College core course curriculum, the JLASS elective is a practicum in the design and execution of theater-level campaign planning. In JLASS, Army War College students developed and fought campaign plans with students from the other Senior Level Colleges in a free-play computer-assisted war game.

The objective of JCLASS is to promote joint professional military education of all participants by addressing key issues at the strategic and operational levels of war. Specific U.S. Army War College objectives included: Employment of Operational Art, integration of JOPES for land warfare, response to and employment options for Weapons of Mass Destruction, development of information operations/warfare, translation of national strategy into military objectives, and investigation of emerging technology on future battlefields.

To accomplish these objectives, this year's scenario included issues of terrorism and homeland security, along with regional crises set in the year 2014. In the scenario, attacks on the U.S. homeland occurred while armed conflict threatened the U.S., its allies, and friends in the Persian Gulf, Southeast Asia, and North Africa.

The scenario succeeded in creating issues of national security policy and coalition warfare, as well as resource prioritization and allocation.

Participants role-played the Joint Staff, the unified and functional commands (PACOM, CENTCOM, EUCOM/NATO, STRATCOM, and TRANSCOM), the NSC staff, Department of Homeland Security, and opposing forces (Iran, Algeria, China, and Indonesia). During the distributive phase, students used the Crisis Action-Planning (CAP) model as a guide. Using CAP, students experienced interagency cooperation, coordination, and competition as they developed and coordinated their campaign plans. The exercise culminated at Maxwell AFB during the wargaming execution phase, where the students came together to execute their plans in a dynamic free-play environment.

The exercise, guided by the participants' own goals and objectives, and not by scripts or the Master Scenario Event List (MSEL), challenged the students to increase their understanding of the interagency process, the elements of national power, emerging technology, transformation, and joint and combined operations in a fast-paced dynamic environment. This unique and dynamic nature of the exercise makes JCLASS one of the U.S. Army's more valuable tools in its mission



JCLASS brings together students from all Senior Level Service College

to prepare the leadership for the challenges of tomorrow.

This marks the twenty-first year for JCLASS, which is a Center for Strategic Leadership sponsored elective course and the responsibility of the Joint and Multinational Initiatives Branch of the Operations and Gaming Division.

## STRATEGIC CRISIS EXERCISE 2004

*By Col Bill Wimbish  
U.S. Army War College Support Branch*

The tenth Strategic Crisis Exercise (SCE), the U.S. Army War College's capstone student educational event was held 23 March to 2 April 2004. The exercise is the largest, most complex strategic political-military student exercise within DoD and involves all 340 students, most of the teaching faculty, and over 200 outside experts and distinguished visitors from senior levels of the government, military, academia, and the private sector.

The SCE allows the students the opportunity to take the theory and concepts they have studied in the core curriculum and Term II electives and apply this knowledge in an experiential learning exercise that reflects the tempo and conflicting focus of the real world. The students role-play strategic leaders, policymakers, and military planners in a virtual global strategic security environment that is volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA). SCE is dynamic and reflects the most current national security challenges. A series of crises covering the globe, from regional instability to natural disasters and from global terrorism to major wars drive student actions and decisions.

This year's exercise was set in the year 2017. As projected, DoD and service transformation were reaching their goals. The Army of 2017 was a strategically mobile, hybrid "Brigade-based" force of current Stryker and Future Combat Brigades. Future Air Force, Navy, Marine and Coast Guard forces were posited to rapidly deploy worldwide as well. The National Guard and each service's reserve continued to play their important role in the U.S. national security structure.

Role-playing in this exercise places the student at the nexus of national security policy and military strategy. The students play strategic leaders and staffs within the President's advisory councils, cabinet-level departments, the Pentagon Military's Joint and Service staffs, the five Regional Combatant Commands, NATO, and the United Nations as they formulate and coordinate national security policy and conduct military planning to address numerous crises at home and abroad.

Students work within the framework of Joint Crisis Action Planning (CAP) and interagency



Students testify to members of Congress via VTC during SCE '04

processes. They are required to formulate and coordinate national security policy, considering and using all elements of National Power, Diplomatic, Informational, Military and Economic (DIME), and to develop and execute military plans in a resource-constrained environment. Also, relative to their roles as senior leaders, they are tasked to conduct press conferences, interviews, testify before Congress, and build coalitions.

During the course of the exercise, all students rotate among the leadership and staff positions. This provides each student maximum exposure to different organizations and processes. The objective is to place as many students as possible in strategic leader positions, asking each to face the media, interact with Congress and with other senior national security, business, and academic leaders.

The Strategic Crisis Exercise is reviewed, revised, and updated annually to reflect the realities of the national and international strategic environment in order to provide the students with a relevant, realistic, and rigorous educational experience.

The scale and complexity of the exercise and the challenge of coordinating, communicating, and building consensus on U.S. policy plans and actions with a multitude of national and international security players provides Army War College students a solid foundation to build upon as they assume future leadership positions at the strategic level.

## THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME?

*By LTC Thomas P. Kratman  
Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute*

How are the United States and other international actors to meet the need for force structure for current and future stability operations? Shall we build a new military organization? If so, where are the bodies to come from; what cost in personnel can we afford to pay? Should some future stability operations force be civilian? Is there any currently existing civilian organization capable of commanding and administering such a force? Can some currently existing agency expand its administrative and command capabilities to oversee such a force? Or, should we create a military headquarters dedicated to

Stability Operations with no troops to command, receiving command of military organizations only after victory on the battlefield is secured? If so, might that not come so late as to lose the peace the war was fought to gain?

To begin to answer these questions, on 16 April 2004, the United States Army's Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute hosted a workshop on the subject of force structure for stability operations. Attendees included a representative from the Italian Embassy, the United States Institute for Peace (USIP), and the Secretary of Defense's Office for Special Operations and Low Intensity Combat. Speakers, among them Brigadier General Claudio Graziano—Embassy of Italy, Michael Dziedzic, and Col. (Ret.) Dallas Brown, presented various options and experiences in terms of future force structure.

One proposal put forth was that, in the long run, only a civilian organization could be successful. Others believe that this reflected a lack of in-depth understanding of the problems inherent in building an organization of this kind, including the creation of a pay scale, a disciplinary code, a body of regulations, and a training program. Before a civilian organization could assume this mission, these and many other questions must be answered.

To enable the armed forces to conduct this mission until such time as a civilian agency exists, or until such a time as a future agency could relieve the armed forces in place, an alternative proposal was raised at the conference: that the United States should create a specialized Stability Operations command, approximately division size, although much differently structured.

The participants highlighted several issues associated with such a force.

1. Shape of the organization: would we be better off by pre-task-organizing to enhance regional expertise or by the creation of branch pure "regiments" to enhance functional expertise?

2. Logistic austerity: with an Army that is becoming used to conducting logistically austere combat operations, a stability operations force may not be logistically sustainable until such a time as combat is past. At that point, the Army may well find that the assets in theater, minus perhaps the required headquarters with the required expertise, are sufficient or nearly so for the stability operation.

3. Losing the peace: the logistically driven late commitment of an existing stability force (or retasking of units from the combat force as combat winds down) may cause the stability operation to begin too late to "win the peace" or to win it easily. Alternatively, we may find that waiting to conduct combat operations until both the stability force and its logistic tail are in place forces us into waging war under sub-optimal conditions.

A major question raised concerned the effectiveness of conventional combat forces in the Stability Operations mission. Some participants held that regular armed forces were perfectly capable of conducting stability operations with only minimal retraining, clear and appropriate rules of engagement, and—critically—some supplementation from Stability Police such as Italy's Carabinieri or the French Gendarmes.

Since, however, the United States does not have (and is not in the future likely to have) a national police force of the experience and quality of the Carabinieri or Gendarmes, this option is not open to the United States. Yet the existence and availability of such Stability Police is essential if we are to use regular combat forces in the Stability Operations mission without having to give to those combat forces extensive retraining in ways that could well undermine their combat effectiveness. What the United States does have in terms of police available for deployment—a still half conceptual volunteer police reserve—may not prove adequate for the mission.

## ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY AND DISASTER PREPAREDNESS: MOVING FROM TALKING TO DOING

*By Professor Bernie F. Griffard  
Joint and Multinational Initiatives Branch*

At the invitation of U.S. European Command (USEUCOM), CSL's Professor B.F. Griffard participated in the 12th Annual Partnership for Peace (PFP) Environmental Conference. Conducted from May 31 to June 4, 2004, the conference was hosted by the Romanian Ministry of National Defense (MoND) and held in the Marriott Grand Hotel, Bucharest, Romania. Attendees included Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Canada, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden, and Ukraine. On the opening day of the conference, Professor Griffard presented an update of CSL efforts in support of the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) entitled, *Regional Military Environmental Cooperation in the Caspian Basin and Central Asia*.

During the past five years, the CSL has teamed with USCENTCOM and the Office of the U.S. Deputy Undersecretary Of Defense for Installations and Environment (ODUSD (I&E)) in security cooperation efforts to promote regional collaboration for response to natural, accidental, or terrorist-induced environmental disasters, including acts related to the trafficking of weapons of mass destruction in the Caspian Basin and the Central Asian states. Over that period, the effort has evolved from a focus on environmental issues that affect national security interests, environmental security, to disaster preparedness. This evolution was driven by

world events and the increasing threat to regional stability posed by non-state actors.

Conducted in 2001, 2002, and 2003, these conferences were fora for the exchange of information and the identification of requirements. At the conclusion of the 2003 conference, conducted in Almaty, Kazakhstan, it was the consensus of the participants that it was time to move from talking to doing. As a result, USCENTCOM refocused its efforts by combining the strengths of the disaster response conferences with the highly successful United States Army National Guard state partnership efforts of the International Workshop for Emergency Response (IWER). IWER capitalized on the United States Army National Guard's extensive experience in supporting domestic emergency response missions. The first event, the Central Asian States Disaster Preparedness Workshop will be conducted in Tashkent, Uzbekistan in September 2004.

During discussions, the USEUCOM environmental theater cooperation planners came to the same conclusion as their counterparts in USCENTCOM; it was time to refocus the environmental cooperation efforts with the PFP countries from large conferences to smaller regional workshop efforts. To accomplish this goal, the conference workgroups were tasked to develop regionally focused issues that could be addressed in smaller regional workshops. The region of interest for this new direction was the ONYX workgroup, which comprises Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine. Facilitated by Professor Griffard, the ONYX members conducted an active dialogue to identify applicable workshop topics in each of the member countries. Primary concerns were information sharing, hydrocarbon contamination cleanup, and soil and water remediation techniques. As a result of the ONYX workgroup recommendations, USEUCOM is planning its initial effort for the fourth quarter of 2005. They will sponsor a workshop to demonstrate low-cost remediation techniques at a former Soviet airbase in Ukraine.

As USCENTCOM and USEUCOM refocus their environmental theater cooperation and



disaster preparedness efforts, an immediate goal is the establishment of a working regional information management and exchange system. A start point for this effort is more effective implementation of the existing capabilities of the Partnership for Peace Information Management System (PIMS) that already exists in most of the affected nations. With the establishment of a central clearinghouse that catalogs existing environmental issues, remediation techniques, regional resources, and disaster preparedness and response capabilities, the first step in effective regional military environmental cooperation will have been accomplished. It is the goal of both USCENCOM and USEUCOM to use their planned workshops to accelerate the move in this direction.

Assisting and facilitating the Combatant Commanders' environmental security and disaster preparedness efforts is a primary strategic communications goal of the Collins Center for Strategic Leadership. Both USCENCOM and USEUCOM have invited CSL to continue its support of their initiatives in Uzbekistan and Ukraine.

## MILITARY ROBOTS AT THE WAR COLLEGE

*By Mr. David Cammons and Mr. John Roley  
Information Warfare Group*

On May 13th, Army War College students viewed the future. Robotic systems from Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), Rapid Equipping Force (REF), and AAI Corporation (AAI) were displayed and demonstrated.

The military robots included everything from PackBots, small robots designed for urban



The Rapid Equipping Force's PackBot with "teeth" (shotguns).

operations, that can be used to survey locations and to detect gunshots, to an Unmanned Ground Combat Vehicle (UGCV), a seven-ton vehicle that can be remotely operated to investigate areas too dangerous for a manned vehicle. In addition, an 18-ton Stryker was on display, showing its sensor capabilities. Some of the prototypes will be sent to Iraq to be tested by the troops. Other prototypes are already on duty in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Included among the displays were Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV). The REF flew their microUAV, a small (43 inch wingspan) radio-controlled aircraft, with a TV camera, allowing students to view what the microUAV saw on a large screen. Also displayed was the AAI's Shadow 200 TUAV, the newest performer in the family of Shadow UAV systems. It is the current choice of the U.S. Army to act as "the eyes of brigade commanders to see first, understand first, and act first—decisively."

Ground-based systems include CMU's Navlab 11, a robot Jeep Wrangler equipped with a wide variety of sensors for short-range and mid-range obstacle detection, and REF's PolarBots. ARL's Demo III, an XUV designed for developing, integrating, and demonstrating technology, will enable a single soldier to manage the tactical operation of up to four unmanned vehicles while they maneuver autonomously.

"I've been working at the Pentagon for the last several years as a comptroller, and the vendors constantly bring things to display," said Lt. Col Leon Smith, USAWC Class of 2004 member. "But it's tough to get a feel for what they are working on because of the limited space of the Pentagon's courtyard. Here there is enough space to see everything and understand what this equipment is doing."

Robots are popping up everywhere from the skies over Iraq, the streets of Baghdad, and the caves of Afghanistan, to sports fields full of soccer-playing robots. Robots will play an ever-increasing role in today's military forces. Robotics Day was designed to increase USAWC student awareness of the recent advances in robotics systems, especially those being fielded for use in ongoing operations as well as those now in development in such laboratories as the Army Research Laboratory and Carnegie Mellon University. Current efforts within the Army's Transformation process, such as the Future Combat System, will include robotic systems in the force structure. Hands-on events such as the USAWC's Robotics Day are intended to stimulate the students to consider future trends in the state-of-the-art, doctrinal issues, and implications for future joint and combined operations across the entire spectrum of military operations.

The War College's Information In Warfare Working Group is developing a Robotics Elective designed to give students an opportunity to understand the implications of developing future robotics technology. The ARL will cosponsor the course with the objective of providing future senior leaders a greater understanding of the potential of robotics while benefitting from the varied experiences of War College students in order to identify additional Army operational requirements for autonomous machines.

This publication and other CSL publications can be found online at <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/index.asp>.

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
Center for Strategic Leadership  
650 Wright Avenue  
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
COLLINS  
CENTER  
UPDATE