Executive Leader Course

Professor James W. Shufelt, Jr.
Senior Leader Development, CSLD

The Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD), U.S. Army War College (USAWC), successfully executed the second pilot course for the Executive Leader Course (ELC) from 1-12 December 2014. Originally called the Command Sergeant Major/Sergeant Major (CSM/SGM) Executive Education Course (CSEEC), ELC is designed to prepare nominative CSM/SGMs for their duties as senior enlisted advisors (SEA) and staff section sergeants major for commanders of 1-2 star Army commands. ELC is conducted by direction of Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA) Raymond F. Chandler III and is a key element of the NCO2020 Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development System (NCOPDS) concept.

Twenty senior CSMs and SGMs from throughout the Army, to include two Army Reserve and two Army National Guard CSM/SGMs, participated in the course. Course content was developed based on critical knowledge gaps developed through analysis of surveys and interviews of Army senior officer and NCO Leaders conducted by TRADOC’s Institute for Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development (NCOPD) and HQ DA’s Sergeant Major Management Office (SMMO), along with SMA guidance and student feedback from the May 2014 Pilot I course.

Course activities included lectures from USAWC faculty and external speakers with follow-on facilitated seminar discussions on a wide variety of topics, ranging from national security, the economy, and communicating strategically to civilian personnel management, contracting, senior leader resiliency, the Army Professional Ethic and the NCO 2020 project. A two day trip to Washington, DC; a strategic leader staff ride of the Gettysburg Campaign; and discussion sessions with serving and retired strategic leaders were
Execution of ELC was a whole-of-USAWC effort, guided by USAWC CSM Malcolm Parrish and CSLD's Senior Leader Seminar team; USAWC Staff and Faculty members who served as ELC instructors included Prof. Frank Jones, Dr. Tom Williams, Prof. JEF Troxell, Prof. Muddy Waters, Prof. Chuck Allen, COL Tarn Warren, Mr. Steve Knott, COL Robert Harney, Ms. Karen Kurzendoerfer, Prof. Julie Manta, Ms. Carol Kerr, Dr. Don Snider and Dr. George Woods.

Other notable course speakers included the SMA, the USAWC Commandant, the Deputy Inspector General, the SOUTHCOM Senior Enlisted Leader (SEL), the Principal Deputy Chief of Army Legislative Liaison, Congressman Tim Walz (MN-D), Congressman Chris Gibson (NY-R), senior Congressional committee staffers, the DA G3 Force Management Director, the DA G8 Force Development Director, The DA G3 Collective Training Director, DA Protocol and Public Affairs leaders and the TRADOC CSM. Course activities also included student book reviews and individual learning plan development. A two day trip to Washington, DC; a strategic leader staff ride of the Gettysburg Campaign; and discussion sessions with serving and retired strategic leaders were highlights of the course, according to participant surveys.

Initial student feedback for the course is very positive; detailed survey and after action review comment review and analysis will assist CSLD in refinement of the ELC concept and preparation of plans for the first full ELC course, tentatively planned for Carlisle Barracks in June 2015.

**CSLD**

**Visionary Support to Argonne National Laboratory**

**Professor Bert B. Tussing and Dr. Allen S. Miller**

**Center for Strategic Leadership and Development**

The Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) is engaging with the Homeland Defense and Security Issues (HDSI) group of United States Army War College’s Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) to develop what Dr. Sheila Ronis has descriptively coined “visionarios.” A visionario can be thought of as a scenario created from plausible conditions of the future, which when combined in a storyline, paint a prospective picture. That picture may be very different from one drawn through a paradigm founded on the status quo. Rather than strictly following patterned responses built around past and current perspectives, the visionario tries to deliberately avoid seizing upon solutions that are a sum of their perceived parts. Instead, the visionario is a product of systems approach to exercise scenario development.

In December, Ms. Pam Sydelko and Dr. Sheila Ronis from the Argonne National Laboratory requested a series of meetings with Professor Bert Tussing and Dr. Allen Miller of HDSI for the purpose of developing visionarios to address Transnational Organized Crime. The request came as an extension of work already being done by ANL, which in turn was an offshoot of a forum conducted by CSLD in September of 2013. That event, undertaken in support of the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM), the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), and the United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM), focused on how the military could most effectively fulfill its role in the implementation of the 2011 national Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime. ANL’s intent is to develop visionary scenarios that leverage existing futures and foresight work, while incorporating the results of surveys taken among an audience identified as “strategic, visionary thinkers.” The focus of the visionarios will be on security issues associated with transnational organized crime, ranging from law enforcement to defense.

The December meeting in Carlisle will be followed by another on-site session at the Chicago Argonne National Laboratories in January. These anticipated visionarios that will be drawn from these sessions will be designed to facilitate strategic thinking in support of national level defense and other security requirements. Moreover, they will serve to assist in strategic planning surrounding these issues, and strategic exercises to validate those plans. They will explore the interaction of social, technological, economic, environmental and political events in a plausible future; and present that interaction in storylines that incorporate joint, interagency, intergovernmental and international response.

Rep. Tim Walz (MN), retired ARNG CSM, discusses Congress with ELC participants
Land Component Command in a Complex World

Professor Bernard F. Griffard
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development

The U.S. Army’s Operating Concept, published in October, 2014, is appropriately titled “Win in a Complex World.” With the withdrawal of U.S. Forces in Iraq and the cessation of major combat operations by U.S. Forces in Afghanistan, the challenge of preparing for land component command has gotten more complex, not simpler. Today’s senior leaders face an operational environment that has a momentum that exceeds any era in history. The enemy may be a state or a non-state threat. Whichever, the enemy will be both capable and elusive. To be effective the land force commander must understand the capabilities and enabling factors of cyber, space, and the maritime, air, and special operations functional commands.

To assist the U.S. Army Chief of Staff in preparing his land force commanders for these challenges, the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) conducts a Combined/Joint Force Land Component Commander (C/JFLCC) course three time a year. The purpose of the course is to prepare senior leaders to function effectively as land component commanders or as senior staff in a joint/combined, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational (JIIM) environment. During the week of November 3-7, 2014, the USAWC’s Center for Strategic Leadership and Development conducted C/JFLCC course 1-15 at the Collins Center, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA. In attendance were 14 general/flag officers and senior civilians, representing all the armed services, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the United Kingdom and Canada.

Land component commanders must understand the strategic context within which they will be operating. The commitment of land forces in a military intervention indicates that the national decision makers consider that a vital national interest of the United States is at stake. For senior officers to function effectively as land component commanders in a JIIM environment it is important that they understand how land intervention discussions are framed for national decision makers; the uniqueness of strategic-level leadership, especially within the national security decision making process; and, comprehend the complexity of preparing for the emerging global security environment in the first quarter of the 21st century and the exercise of U.S. diplomatic, informational, military, and economic power.

The key conduit between the national strategic-level decisions and the operational-level land component commander, is the Geographic Combatant Commander. For C/JFLCC course 1-15, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command reviewed the methodology employed to keep the land component planners current with the goals and objectives of the national decision makers. The harsh realities are that interventions are never fast, easy, or cheap; International support fades quickly...pressure to “bring ‘em home”; and post-war efforts cannot be sustained indefinitely. The central task of the international mission is to “manage down” the continuing local conflict in stages so the peace process can be sustained over time. To succeed the land component commander must be adept at working with the several coalitions necessary to achieve the desired national strategic end state. These coalitions may include a political coalition, a relief coalition, a military coalition, a rule of law coalition, an institution building coalition, an economic reconstruction coalition, and a donor coalition. Each coalition will have its own structure, leadership, participants, operating parameters, and planning capacity. Intervention planning and diplomacy go hand-in-hand. Gaining consensus among coalition partners is key.

The importance of the lessons learned in the courses initial presentations were brought home to the attendees through two case studies and a scenario-driven exercise. One case study looked at the formation of the C/JFLCC for Operation Iraqi Freedom, the second at the response to the Ebola breakout in West Africa. The exercise challenged the attendees with a hybrid that required both deterrence and humanitarian relief.

As the U.S. Army adapts to the complexities of the 21st century security environment, doctrine and organizations will continue to change. This evolution must account for the expanding challenge of operating in and among the people, in an era of diminishing resources. As the operational environment becomes even more complex and uncertain, the United States military, and the Army and Marine Corps especially, must have Commanders that can quickly organize, train, and lead a large land headquarters, regardless of mission. As the Army’s senior warfighting professional continuing education course, C/JFLCC will continue to meet this requirement.

CSLD

Support to CENTCOM: Theater Security Cooperation and the UAE

Professor Bert B. Tussing and Dr. Allen S. Miller
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development

Early in 2014, after introductory engagements with the United Arab Emirates (UAE) through their Theater Security Cooperation (TSC) programs, the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) requested support from the U.S. Army War College’s Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) in conducting a series of workshops on national security strategy development. CENTCOM’s focus, reflecting the desires of the host nation, was divided between traditional national defense strategies and strategies more focused on what could be thought of as the domestic, or homeland environment. The first workshop in the series was executed in Abu Dhabi, UAE, from 27-30 October. The Emirates
original intent was to delve immediately into constructing strategies focused on border security and interdiction of weapons of mass destruction. However, after consultation between CENTCOM and the host country coordinators, the first session was designed along a broader strategic front. Accordingly, Professor Bert Tussing began the forum with a presentation and follow-on discussions surrounding critical thinking involved in strategic development. Following that, Professor Tussing led the assemblage through a presentation on the national strategy development process taught to the War College classes in Carlisle.

The atmosphere during the exchange was most receptive, and facilitated by the United Arab Emirates’ recent release of their own strategic guideline, “Vision 2021.” The Vision is constructed along four pillars:

• **United In Responsibility**: An ambitious and confident nation grounded in its heritage.
• **United In Destiny**: A strong union bonded by a common destiny.
• **United In Knowledge**: A competitive economy driven by knowledgeable and innovative Emiratis.
• **United In Prosperity**: A nurturing and sustainable environment for quality living.

These pillars depict a clear set of national values and purpose which should serve as the foundation of national interests. Those interests, in turn, will drive the set of strategic visions that must underpin and reinforce “Vision 2021.” From a security perspective, in terms of defense and in terms of law enforcement, the Emirate hosts have made it obvious that their concerns were not limited to the immediate topics of border security and WMD interdiction. A host of adjoining and overlapping strategic issues have become topics of urgency to the Emirate people, to include port security, maritime security, and protection of other critical infrastructure. In the course of the Abu Dhabi discussions, it was clear that the host nation wanted strategies to address all of these. But over the four days of the initial session, it became equally clear that the Emirates were growing to accept the notion that an overarching national security strategy was essential in orchestrating and prioritizing these disparate requirements. The importance of that kind of prioritization was emphasized by Dr. Allen Miller in his series of presentations on Risk Management as a function of Homeland Security. Portraying homeland security as an enterprise rather than a national government function, highlighting the importance of local and provincial government, regional and international partners, the private sector and (especially) the citizens in the enterprise, he struck a chord with a people focusing more and more on an inclusive and engaged society.

During and after the workshop, representatives from both Central Command and Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) commented that the exchange between the presenters and the participants by far exceeded any that they had ever witnessed in previous forums. The commitment of the host nation participants laid the ground work for success in these exchanges, bringing to the table representatives from across their national government. These included:

• The Ministry of Defense, including especially, representatives of the Chemical Defense Command
• The Ministry of the Interior, including Port Security Officials, Customs and Border Officials
• The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and
• Members of the Emirate National Laboratories.

Both CENTCOM and DTRA representatives reported being pulled aside for comments lauding the direction and execution of the session, envisioned as breaking ground for subsequent strategy development efforts. Likewise, CENTCOM and our Emirate hosts declared and reiterated a desire to build upon the initial successes of this event. Accordingly, CSLD is preparing to support follow on requests to serve as a conduit for development of strategies for border, port and maritime security over time, with the next sessions towards those ends occurring as early as the spring of 2015. Plans are already underway to reach out to the Department of Homeland Security in these endeavors, incorporating expertise from the U.S. Coast Guard, the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other stakeholders in areas of mutual domestic security concerns between the United States and our Emirate allies. From the Center’s perspective, this event was the essence of outreach – leveraging strategic theory and practice to improve relations with one of our highly valued partners, and ultimately contributing to improved regional and global security.

**FDIC Cyber Revelation and Cyber Security**

**Professor Bill Waddell**

**Director, Mission Command and Cyber Division, CSLD**

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) conducted its second annual cyber wargame series on October 1 and 2 at their headquarters in Arlington VA. Professor Jim Shufelt, Dr. Jeff Groh (DDE) and Mr. Bill Waddell facilitated the discussions in this highly successful set of scenarios designed to enhance the cyber security preparation at FDIC. The wargames provided both executive leadership and middle management the opportunity to discuss and consider events in cyberspace that affect the financial sector of critical infrastructure. Internal and external communications and the establishment of standard procedures were the focus of the discussions. The Chairman of FDIC, Mr. Martin Gruenberg, attended the entire session on October 1, indicating the high level of interest that FDIC has in Cyber security.

The scenario utilized was an increasingly severe series of aggressive cyber events
against FDIC servers and communications systems, escalating to a data breach situation, and attributed to a foreign nation (fictional for purposes of the wargame). The executives looked at the problem from the perspective of all-of-government responses and communications, the middle management focused more on the internal procedures and collaboration requirements. The first day was focused on policy and strategy, while day two was more technical and procedural in nature. Both days were successful at getting the participants to the desired level of discussion and consideration, and the control group was satisfied with the results. Post event surveys were extremely supportive of the event and the facilitation.

This ongoing wargame series and interaction with FDIC is an outstanding opportunity to reach out to other agencies who are engaged in national Cyber security, and also provide them with information and education concerning military planning and integration into all levels of cyber security. Additionally, the learning experience for the USAWC facilitators is excellent.

--- CSLD ---

**Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives: Flexibility of the Strategic Staff Ride Program**

**Colonel John Valledor**
Director, Senior Leader Development Division, CSLD

On 17-20 November 2014, the Center for Strategy Leadership and Development hosted an inaugural Strategic Leader Staff Ride (SLSR) Program for mid-to senior-level Assistant Special Agents in Charge (ASACs) from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. An organization more commonly known by their alias—the ATF. The Army prides itself for having a record of empowering junior leaders, all leaders, to be innovative and adaptive in the current operating environment. Seldom are manifestations of this ethos tested beyond what 13 years of war have witnessed on the battlefields of Iraq, Afghanistan, or today in West Africa. So, when internal ATF senior staff trainers arrived in Collins Hall earlier in August seeking opportunities to expose their ASACs to the unique leadership laboratory locally known as the Gettysburg National Military Park and blend it into an internal training package, the staff of CSLD were presented with an opportunity to tap into this ‘adaptive’ ethos.

After hearing the details behind the ATF internal training module and desired objectives that included historical ATF case study crisis presentations from field operations and the unique execution of “on-scene” commander management of a hostage negotiations crisis in a “table top exercise” format—the staff at CSLD saw an opening to demonstrate agility within the existing SLSR program.

Studying the Gettysburg battle and its enduring leadership lessons made coupling its benefits to the ATF training requirements above a natural fit. Hostage negotiations events are ambiguous scenarios and typically require split-second command decisions where the risk of loss of life is ever present. Therefore, the risky, split-second life or death decisions demonstrated by leaders at all levels and opposing sides of the Gettysburg battle 151 years ago—often made with incomplete and imperfect information—layered nicely with the objectives of the ATF training scenario.

In the end, the 25 ASACs that participated and completed this first of its kind adaptation of the U.S. Army War College SLSR program emerged from their training with a better appreciation of the intricacies required to manage fluid, ambiguous, life and death crises situations. The U.S. Army War College historian was able to weave relevant ‘leadership bridges’ from the commanders in the pitch three-day battle in Gettysburg to those required in today’s law enforcement environment to diffuse high-risk hostage rescue scenarios that can befall ATF ASACs at any point in their careers. Lastly, the staff at CSLD was able to form new bonds with unique members of our domestic law enforcement community while simultaneously demonstrating the value of flexibility and adaptiveness that the Army demands of all its leaders and organizations.

--- CSLD ---

**SIMULEX 2014**

**Major Joseph Chretien**
Wargaming, Exercise, and Simulation Support Division, CSLD

In Eastern Europe, a key last minute multilateral negotiation between Russia, NATO, and key non-NATO States is the final attempt at ending escalated tension in the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania). Simultaneously, NATO forces were conducting offensive missions North of Baghdad, Iraq and air strikes in Southern Turkey in an effort to push the Islamic State Caliphate (ISC) out of both countries. Thus ended SIMULEX 2014, a crisis and consequence management exercise held annually since 1978 at the Fletcher School, Tufts University Graduate School of International Affairs.

The Fletcher School’s SIMULEX 2014 was supported by a United States Army War College (USAWC) Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) control team, Senior Service College Fellows Program (SSCFP) mentors, other government agencies, and national level simulation centers and sister services to provide a whole of government approach to the simulation exercise.

Of particular note, the control center incorporated a graphic control and force laydown cell (GCFL) in coordination with the Intelligence Cell and the Red Team. The three teams worked seamlessly together to provide real-time assessments, intelligence and threat locations to the students, which could be used in the decision-making processes to resolve contentious issues during the exercise. Another key aspect of
SIMULEX is the control team’s ability to alter the scenario and incorporate those changes into the next move. The dynamic changes, transparent to the teams, follow from the actions the teams take during the previous move and further the educational experience of the students without bogging down the exercise.

Robert Pfaltzgraff, Ph.D., professor of International Politics, Fletcher School authored this year’s SIMULEX scenario based on a Baltic State crisis with a simultaneously escalating conflict in the Middle East. Tufts students role-played nation-state and non-state actors including the United States, Iran, Iraq, Israel, EU/NATO, Alawistan (Syria), the Baltics, Russia, and the Islamic State Caliphate. This year’s SIMULEX touched upon numerous issue areas: State Actors with weapons of mass destruction, cyber warfare, military forces, and social media as a weapon. Such complexity combined to create a realistic crisis management scenario. Additionally, the simulation scenario, which projects a conflict environment into the future while anchored in history and current events, required player participants to think and act through the decision making process as the situation escalated. Colonel John Dinges, Director of CSLD’s Wargaming, Exercise, and Simulation Support Division, summarized: “SIMULEX is a three-move, two-day, reality-based exercise that provides graduate students with an opportunity to develop strategic objectives as a member of a specific country team and then employ the various elements of national power to achieve them.” SIMULEX thus becomes the graduate students’ practical exercise pushing them to pursue their strategic objectives while negotiating a rapidly changing international security environment scenario given tight time constraints. In summary, the combination of the U.S. Army War College’s expertise, the world-class experts from across the various agencies and universities, and the Fletcher School’s realistic scenario provide a world-class practical exercise in international conflict resolution at the strategic level.

The U.S. Army’s unique role in university exercises and simulations allow for future diplomats and leaders of international government organizations and non-profit organizations to see the Armed Forces role and capabilities in the development of national security strategy and policy. The United States Army War College and CSLD expect to continue its close relationship with Tufts University and is prepared to engage with other universities seeking realistic experiential learning in national security issues conducted at the strategic level of leadership.

--- CSLD ---

**NATO Futures Wargame Examines NATO Challenges**

**Lieutenant Colonel Ned Ritzmann**  
Center for Strategic Leadership and Development

As part of its strategic wargaming series, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Development conducted a strategic wargame on NATO. The Strategic Wargaming Division hosted the event in Collins Hall on 10 and 11 December 2014. There were 18 participants from the War College faculty and staff, including select International Fellows, NATO, academia, and from think tanks in both the U.S. and Europe.

The wargame’s purpose was to examine the internal challenges that NATO faces in the execution of its three-fold mission of cooperative security, crisis management and collective defense, and determine how these challenges would impact NATO missions. The goal was to see how NATO’s challenges would affect the U.S. Army, both in terms of the Army’s ability to execute operations in a NATO structure, and how the U.S. Army might help address or mitigate NATO’s challenges.

The game was held over two days, first focusing on identifying the challenges, then categorizing and prioritizing the impacts and then offering solutions and mitigations. The game concluded with an opportunity for each group to brief their insights to their colleagues in the other group, and select senior members of the War College faculty and staff.

The game received positive comments from the participants and from the executive out-brief panel. The significant findings included that NATO was conceived during the Cold War and its structure and processes were designed for that environment. The international order has changed over the last two decades, with changes in threat perspectives, the emergence of hybrid threats (conventional, unconventional, cyber, etc.), and the rise in power of non-state actors and organizations. NATO should adjust its structure and processes to ensure it can operate effectively in the changed strategic environment.

Another key insight was that, despite ongoing operations in Afghanistan, the U.S. Army is suffering from degraded NATO proficiency. To mitigate this, the Army can consider how it fills NATO assignments and increasing exposure to NATO in existing PME. Finally, the Army will likely have to continue to shoulder the burden for several capabilities not extant in large capacity in other NATO countries (expeditionary logistics, robust communications, ISR, air defense, etc.)


--- CSLD ---
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