

# THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 10, Issue 3

April - June 2008



THE CENTER FOR  
STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP  
U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **Strategic Vision Workshop**
- **Unified Quest 2008**
- **Network Centric Warfare Presentations**
- **The 2008 Land Forces Symposium**
- **Modeling Intangible Factors to Support Strategic Education**
- **Albania: Observations on a Changing Nation**

## STRATEGIC VISION WORKSHOP

*LTC Art Loureiro*

*Director, Strategic Plans and Policy, OGD*

The United States Army War College (USAWC), in support of the Army Staff and in cooperation with national security faculty and researchers at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Security Studies Program, and Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, conducted a series of workshops from 7-10 April 2008 entitled *Strategic Vision Workshop: National Grand Strategy*. The Strategic Vision Workshop was organized to assist the Department of the Army in the understanding of Grand Strategy and future policy options that will prepare the Army to meet challenges in a world of persistent conflict.

The premise behind the workshop is the idea that Strategy is all about choices a nation makes given a particular strategic environment. Trends shaping America's strategic environment point toward an era that some have labeled "persistent conflict." The future is expected to be one of protracted confrontation among state, non-state, and individual actors that will use violence to achieve political, religious, and other ideological ends. Furthermore, these confrontations will be exacerbated by major shifts in wealth brought on by globalization, significant disruptions in the status quo resulting from major technology advancement, growing radicalism, massive population growth, competition for resources, climate change/natural disasters, and the threat of ungoverned spaces. This environment will force the United States to make difficult strategic choices. The workshop explored the various choices available to the U.S. through the use of the elements of national power as depicted in the D-I-M-E model (Diplo-

matic, Informational, Military, and Economic).

A CSL Issue Paper was developed that details the exposition of the choices discussed during the workshop, and can be accessed at: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP5-08StrategicVisionWorkshop.pdf>.

— CSL —

## UNIFIED QUEST 2008

*Professor James Kievit, OGD, CSL*

*Mr. John Auger, Booz Allen Hamilton*

The Collins Center hosted several Unified Quest 2008 events in the Spring of 2008: the Army Future Game (UQ08 AFG) from 4-8 May, its preparatory UQ08 STAFFEX from 29 April through 3 May, and its follow-on UQ08 Senior leader Seminar on 9 May. As the Department of the Army's Executive Agent, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) cosponsored these events together with the U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) and the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM).

The AFG is the Army's premier concept development wargame and also is the capstone event for Unified Quest, the Army's annual Future Warfare Study Plan. This year, more than 400 representatives from the joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and foreign military communities took part in the UQ08 AFG. Using a scenario initiated, seminar panel format (with embedded U.S./Allied, Adversarial, and Coalition/Neutral components), UQ08 participants employed a full-spectrum campaign planning approach to identify and examine both regional and broader strategic issues which influence campaign planning and the framing of necessary actions and objectives essential for the challenges to be addressed.

Among the UQ08 Army Future Game objectives were:

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>JUN 2008</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2008 to 00-00-2008</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>The Collins Center Update. Volume 10, Issue 3, April-June 2008</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Army War College, Center for Strategic Leadership, 650 Wright Avenue, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5049</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

- Exploring how, and to what extent, building partnership capacity could enhance the U.S. military's ability to accomplish its essential roles of assure, dissuade, deter, defeat.
- Determining the nature and scope of military activities required to support a U.S. national strategy in which building partnership capacity plays a central role.
- Exploring the application of full spectrum operations, including the use of Irregular Warfare, to establish persistent security within a strategic environment of persistent conflict.
- Exploring the nature of persistent conflict and identifying possible implications for the National Security Strategy, the National Military Strategy and/or the Quadrennial Defense Review.

To address these objectives, the UQ08 AFG design included two separate and distinct game environments. The first game environment consisted of four operational-level, regionally based panels, each working on a separate campaign plan in response to specific operational and strategic factors. The four panels were: SOUTHCOM 2013–2018, PACOM 2013–2018, AFRICOM 2013–2018, and AFRICOM 2025–2035. Each panel contained “Blue” (including an imbedded “Red Team”), Adversarial “Red,” and “Green” Team members. These teams worked an action, reaction, and counteraction methodology to frame and reframe as necessary operational issues associated with selected conceptual campaign designs.

The second game environment was a Global Panel of specially selected subject matter experts (SMEs) and experienced senior leaders which independently examined a series of issues and equities (e.g., Global Force Posture, ARFORGEN, Joint Interdependence, Allied and Coalition Operations, Unity of Effort, the Human Dimension of War, etc.) that have potentially critical implications to the U.S. Army for both the current and future force.

As additional analytic fora, Integrated Product Teams of selected panel members and SMEs explored the specific areas of

Sustainment, ARFORGEN, Rule of Law/Strategy, STRATCOM, Operational Command, ISR, and Cyberspace across multiple AFG Panels' efforts.

On 9 May 2008, the UQ08 AFG initial insights were presented to a Senior Leader Seminar hosted by TRADOC Commander, General William Wallace. Other significant attendees included the Deputy the Commander of JFCOM, Lieutenant General Wood; the Director, Center for Special Operations, United States Special Operations Command, Lieutenant General Fridovich; and a number of other senior military, interagency, and multinational officials.

Ongoing and future analytic efforts by each of the UQ08-sponsoring organizations will incorporate the multiple and diverse observations, issues, and insights from the UQ08 Army Future Game as well as from the year-long UQ08 Future Warfare Study effort in order to inform Army and Joint doctrine.

Planning is already underway for Unified Quest 2009; its associated Army Future Game is projected to be held at the Collins Center in the Spring of 2009.

— CSL —  
**NETWORK  
 CENTRIC WARFARE  
 PRESENTATIONS**

*by Mr. William O. Waddell*  
 Director, Command and Control Group

As an ongoing result of the visibility of the December 2006 CSL publication of the Network Centric Warfare (NCW) study, a number of military organizations have requested further presentations on this subject. Mr. Kevin Cogan, a participant in the original study, serves as CSL's lead in addressing these requests.

NATO representatives for the Command and Control Center of Excellence in the Netherlands invited Mr. Cogan, to a May 2007 conference in Amsterdam, to deliver a presentation on NCW. Mr. Cogan's attendance at this year's IDGA NCW conference in January elicited an invitation from JFCOM for a presentation at the NATO Network Enabled Capability (NNEC) conference in Anta-

lya, Turkey, that was conducted from 30 April to 2 May 2008.

Over time Mr. Cogan has evolved the original “NCW Lessons Learned in Iraq 2003” theme into an extension of future NCW concepts. The presentation is now entitled “Sense–Shoot–Command on the Battlefield after Next.” This updated version was presented at the Joint Command and Control Conference in Washington DC in May. It will also be a lesson within a second year resident DDE elective this summer.

Mr. Cogan's participation in the Armed Forces Communications-Electronics Association (AFCEA) Joint Warfighter 2008 conference in Virginia Beach along with feedback from his NNEC presentation in Turkey has led to an invitation for him to give a presentation at the German Bundeswehr/AFCEA NCW conference in Koblenz, Germany this coming August.

The three volume *Network Centric Warfare Case Study* is still available online at: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/Studies.asp>.

— CSL —  
**THE 2008 LAND FORCES  
 SYMPOSIUM**

*by COL (Ret.) B.F. Griffard*  
 Professor of Strategic Logistics, OGD

Today's Armies must adapt to new realities. The 21st century security environment is impacted by three major elements: globalization, technology, and demographics. Globalization and its impact on information flow and personal mobility makes it difficult to deter, detect, and defend against state and non-state actors from destabilizing activities. Advances in, and the relatively easy access to, critical technologies increases the possibility of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) falling into the hands of terrorists who will exhibit no restraint in their employment. To meet these challenges, the region must capitalize on the strength of collective action.

With this in mind the 2008 Land Forces Symposium brought together Army Commanders or their representative

from 22 countries within the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) region to discuss the *Adaptability of Land Forces to 21st Century Security Challenges*. For the third year in row, the Center for Strategic Leadership supported this event by providing Professor Bernard F. Griffard to serve as the symposium moderator. Co-hosted by General George W. Casey, Jr. Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and Lieutenant General James J. Lovelace, Commander, U.S. Army Central, the 2008 Land Forces Symposium (LFS) was conducted April 14-17, 2008 in Stone Mountain GA, just outside of Atlanta. The major goal was to provide a forum for the region's land force commanders to meet and collaborate on mutual security concerns. To stimulate these exchanges delegates participated in a series of panels addressing "Sub-regional and Regional Cooperation," "Transitioning from War to Peace," and "Military Support to National Security and Stability."

Given the diversity of the nations within USCENTCOM's region, such an exchange of ideas is invaluable in moving towards increased cooperation. Though faced with similar problems the context and solution sets differ greatly from one sub-region to another. It is important that these differences be recognized, and as this forum matures it should lend itself to more detailed discussion of regional and sub-regional cooperative issues. Such discussions, though not leading to immediate remedies, will prove valuable in shaping security cooperation efforts.

A CSL Issue Paper on this event can be accessed at: [http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP6\\_08\\_LandForcesSymposium.pdf](http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP6_08_LandForcesSymposium.pdf).

— CSL —

## **MODELING INTANGIBLE FACTORS TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC EDUCATION**

*by LTC Edward McLarney  
Chief, Modeling Analysis Team,  
Science and Technology Division, CSL*

Modeling Political, Military, Economic, Social, Infrastructure, and Information (PMESII) factors is an emerging

field with great potential to enhance strategic education. The Army War College curriculum recognizes PMESII factors in the current and future Joint, Inter-agency, Intergovernmental, Multinational (JIIM) environment. The capstone Strategic Decision Making Exercise (SDME) stresses non-combat PMESII play, requiring students to think outside the military tactical and operational "box" where they have spent most of their time operating. The SDME team conducted a PMESII modeling trial for one scenario in the 2008 exercise and found the models lent credibility to the scenario and reinforced several learning objectives. The Center for Strategic Leadership's (CSL) Science and Technology Division (STD) led the PMESII model search, working with the Operations and Gaming Division (OGD) to identify opportunities for model demonstration and evaluation.

PMESII modeling is in its infancy. Over the years, combat, transportation and other "tangible" models have evolved; they are well-understood and accepted in military exercises. Combat and transportation models have been used since the inception of the SDME to lend credibility to exercise scenarios by assessing feasible deployment timelines, attrition rates, and force movement rates. There are many current efforts to model PMESII factors, however significant evolution must occur before PMESII models reach the maturity and acceptance of their combat modeling brethren.

The team hypothesized emerging PMESII models and simulations can be employed similarly to combat and transportation models to lend scenario credibility. Following a brief survey of emerging efforts, the SDME team, in conjunction with PMESII modelers from Joint Forces Command J9 (Joint Experimentation), decided to explore political, social, and economic modeling for the notional, exercise-only Cuba scenario set in 2021. The JFCOM team consisted of Booz-Allen Hamilton (BAH) contractors who developed the Integrated Gaming System (IGS), and Simulex, Inc. contractors who developed the Synthetic Environment for Analysis and Simulation (SEAS). The JFCOM effort fit nicely into CSL's trial use

of PMESII modeling—they were sponsoring ongoing PMESII work integrating IGS and SEAS to provide a combined regional and national modeling capability, and they had a good start on a notional future Cuba model representation.

The SDME authors provided JFCOM with written scenario products, which were used to grow their scenario to match CSL's notional 2021 Cuba scenario. The PMESII models were used to observe the mid-term political affiliation, economic progress, infrastructure recovery, and personal stability for various groups following major combat operations. Model runs considered three courses of action (COA) for Security, Stability, Transition and Reconstruction Operations (SSTRO): a U.S.-led coalition, a UN or OAS-led coalition, or Cuban-only efforts.

JFCOM PMESII personnel ran the three PMESII COAs on a high-performance computing cluster and provided CSL various charts and graphs. One group of graphs showed economic production and infrastructure repairs—they improved most rapidly with US-led efforts, with parallel, but slightly-delayed improvement with the UN/OAS-led coalition. This reinforced the idea that coalition team building must begin early in order to be as effective as rapid, unilateral action. Other graphs portrayed little movement in public opinion over time among several highly-polarized groups. This highlighted the concept that a robust strategic communication campaign must be applied early, often, and in-force, and must highlight tangible progress. The lack of movement among polarized opinions also emphasized that some groups may never change their minds, therefore strategic communication is perhaps better-spent on others. Overall, the PMESII modeling output graphs stimulated intuitive insights and supported the SDME authors' concepts for the scenario, lending credibility in the process.

During SDME execution, SOUTHCOM role players were briefed on the PMESII modeling effort, to include showing how political, economic, social, and infrastructure measures had changed over time for each COA. The role players were engaged in the discussion and understood

the PMESII graphs after varying amounts of explanation, which was encouraging. However, the role players did not explicitly pass PMESII modeling outputs to the students. It seemed the role players “got it” in discussion, but the PMESII modeling concepts and graphs were too new to be consumed and embraced along with all the other available products, reports, and messages during execution. In addition, students tended to drift back to the combat aspects of some scenarios, regardless of the methods used to push them out of the “combat box.” This led to discussion of several causes, but most apparent was the student preference for addressing tactical and operational level problems when faced with multiple crises scenarios. In addition, the military has a well-understood set of icons and control measures used to depict (draw) military operations; no similar set of PMESII drawing tools yet exists. So, while military leaders can immediately understand a combat map depiction, they require more effort to study, interpret, and internalize graphical PMESII products.

The SDME PMESII modeling trial run validated that emerging PMESII models and simulations can be effectively employed to lend credibility to strategic-level educational scenarios. Although its use was limited during the 2008 SDME exercise, it proved-out a concept that merits further study. In addition, PMESII terminology and graphical control measures and icons require definition, standardization, and promulgation in order

to enable at-a-glance comprehension by operators and decision-makers. Finally, given sufficient time to prepare the scenarios, PMESII modeling and simulation can provide combatant command planners useful input. CSL plans to continue exploring the emerging field of PMESII modeling in support of future strategic education events.

— CSL —

## ALBANIA: OBSERVATIONS ON A CHANGING NATION

by *COL (Ret.) B.F. Griffard*  
*Professor of Strategic Logistics, OGD*

Two historical personages—George Kastrioti Skanderbeu (Skanderbeg) and Enver Hoxha—shaped the modern Albanian psyche. Skanderbeg, an Albanian nobleman taken hostage as a child and trained as an Ottoman Janissary, represents all that is great in Albanian history. Standing in contrast was Enver Hoxha, a confirmed Stalinist, under whose rule Albania became the most backward and poorest country in Europe.

Since the collapse of communism in 1991, Albania has progressed by fits and starts towards democracy and integration into the European Community (EC). On the military side, the goal was inclusion into an enlarged NATO, a steep climb for a country with Albania’s past. In support of this effort the Commander, U.S. Euro-

pean Command (USEUCOM) deployed a three-man U.S. Army War College (USAWC) team to Tirana February 4-8, 2008 to conduct a Joint Operations Planning, Roles, and Functions Seminar for members of the Albanian Armed Forces (AAF). Since many of the participants were graduates of U.S. and NATO country military education or training programs, the seminar discussions focused on joint operations, multi-national command and control, and contingency planning. These subjects proved timely due to the Albanian Armed Forces deployments in support of NATO and U.S. missions.

On April 2, 2008 NATO offered Albania membership in the Alliance. For a country once described by Prussian Chancellor Otto von Bismarck as no more than a “geographical expression,” this was a reward for a long tortuous journey through history. By bringing Albania under the NATO umbrella a message is sent not only to the Albanian government, but to its neighbors, that there are rewards for support of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Following on the heels of the 2004 accession of Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovenia, this action brings stability in the Balkan region closer to reality.

A CSL Issue Paper covering this subject can be accessed at: [http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP\\_4\\_08\\_AlbaniaObservationsOnAChangingNation.pdf](http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/publications/IP_4_08_AlbaniaObservationsOnAChangingNation.pdf).

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

**COLLINS CENTER UPDATE – SUMMER 2008**

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