

MULTINATIONAL LAND FORCES
AND THE NATO FORCE STRUCTURE REVIEW

Thomas-Durell Young

June 2000

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave., Carlisle, PA 17013-5244. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Publications and Production Office by calling commercial (717) 245-4133, FAX (717) 245-3820, or via the Internet at rummelr@awc.carlisle.army.mil

Most 1993, 1994, and all later Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) monographs are available on the SSI Homepage for electronic dissemination. SSI's Homepage address is: <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm>

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please let us know by e-mail at outreach@awc.carlisle.army.mil or by calling (717) 245-3133.

ISBN 1-58487-025-7

FOREWORD

One should empathize, if not sympathize, with NATO force planners. Since 1991, standing and mobilization forces made available by nations to the Alliance have been steadily reduced. This particularly has been the case for land forces. Equally important have been the structures the Alliance has created into which national contributions would fall on deployment. Military Committee (MC) 317, accepted by nations in 1991, provides the framework by which the Alliance organizes its forces.

However, the author of this study argues that the structures and envisaged deployment framework for land forces are a hopeless muddle. While there are arguably sufficient reaction forces to support NATO Ministerial Guidance, there are numerous weaknesses that would, and indeed have, inhibited the efficient and effective deployment of land forces in crises. More specifically, there are insufficient deployable reaction headquarters, both at the corps and component command level, that would support a commander of a NATO Combined Joint Task Force. And perhaps even more vexatious is the continued existence of what has become atavistic "practices" of nations that impede and inhibit the employment of multinational land forces by an Allied commander.

The author observes that the NATO Force Structure Review offers nations an opportunity to review these dated structures, organizations, and practices. To be sure, he argues, this, like the Long-Term Study of which this current review is the third and final part, is likely to be protracted and difficult. After all, the Alliance finds itself in this situation by its own consensus of actions and policies. However, collectively, the Alliance will soon have 10 years of experience deploying forces to international crises which should have had a salutatory effect on the thinking of planners and senior level officials as well. Since the Force

Structure Review is in its early stages, one hopes that this monograph will be useful to those dealing with Alliance affairs, as the review develops. The Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to offer this report to better inform those with an interest in improving NATO force structure.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

DR. THOMAS-DURELL YOUNG is at the Center for Civil-Military Relations, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California. From 1992 until 2000, he was a Research Professor at the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland, and is a 1990 graduate of the U.S. Army War College.

MULTINATIONAL LAND FORCES AND THE NATO FORCE STRUCTURE REVIEW

It is becoming increasingly obvious to NATO nations and Alliance officials that the multinational land force structures created since 1991 are not well-suited to meet Allied strategy.¹ Three major problems predominate. First, most existing multinational land headquarters and forces were created with a view toward Article 5 missions (i.e., collective self-defense) and, in their present configuration, are unsuited to undertake other new missions, i.e., non-Article 5 (e.g., peace-support operations). Second, operating practices under which these headquarters are currently “commanded” do not allow commanders to exercise the command authorities required to prepare their forces for their stated missions in peacetime, let alone deploy them effectively in crisis and war. Third, there are currently an insufficient number of reaction headquarters and similar forces capable of supporting the force structure benchmarks established by Ministerial Guidance for force planning.

In the fall of 1994, an important initiative was launched to begin the process of the Alliance’s internal adaptation. This effort has become known as the Long-Term Study (L-TS) of which the first stage consisted of the review of the guidance for the implementation of the Alliance’s New Strategic Concept (Military Committee—MC 400). MC 400/1 was endorsed in November 1995.² The second aspect of the L-TS was the long and laborious effort to “reform” the integrated command structure, which was finally implemented on September 1, 1999.³ The third and final aspect of this effort to effect internal adaptation, the Force Structure Review, aims to review force structure requirements to support the new command structure and ministerial guidance for defense planning.

This last review offers nations a unique opportunity to address some of the issues that have led to the current situation where force structure and practices do not adequately support the "Alliance's Strategic Concept" released at the Washington Summit in April 1999.⁴ However, for the review to help solve the three problems listed above, strict parameters need to be established to ensure that the review produces the results required to realign multinational headquarters and forces declared to the alliance. In this respect, addressing the problems uniquely associated with multinational land headquarters and declared forces needs to predominate. Land forces are the most difficult to command in a multinational setting given the requirement for multinational land force commanders to exercise greater command authority over the forces than is required for naval and air multinational forces.

Therefore, the Alliance needs, for the first time, to establish new parameters under which multinational land headquarters and forces are organized, commanded, and operated. It is not sufficient to review only "forces and headquarters." For without an examination of current command practices (for want of a better word), little in the way of real reform can result. In consequence, a number of important questions need to be addressed.

1. What should be the basis of mission requirements for multinational land forces declared to the Alliance?

2. Is there a level at which national contributions to a multinational land force produce diminishing operational returns?

3. Do current national practices for declaring forces to multinational formations result in mismatches between requirements and capabilities?

4. Where should existing multinational headquarters' roles and missions be changed to improve the Alliance's overall capabilities to meet Ministerial Guidance?

5. Should existing structures be rationalized to create a leaner force structure that better supports Alliance strategy and Ministerial Guidance?

Mission Requirements of Multinational Land Forces.

NATO does not suffer from a lack of multinational land headquarters and formations declared to the Alliance. There are currently six multinational corps (which includes the ambiguously declared EUROCORPS) and four multinational divisions declared to NATO. Added to this body is an ever growing number of headquarters established by nations and Partnership for Peace (PfP) members (e.g., Multinational Peace Force South Eastern Europe Brigade). However, the latter are predominantly oriented to undertake peace-support operations, as opposed to Article 5 missions. Significantly, they are not declared to the Alliance, subject to the integrated defense planning process, and therefore fall outside of the terms of reference of the Force Structure Review.

Alliance strategy strongly endorses the concept of multinationality. That said, the effective use of multinational land forces is fiendishly difficult to achieve as political sensitivities, national laws, and financial regulations impede granting an allied commander the command authorities normally given to a national commander.⁵ Given the steep diminution in the size of NATO armies since the end of the Cold War, the Alliance now heavily depends upon the existence and effective functioning of the headquarters, should it ever deploy forces. That said, the Alliance should insist, at a minimum, that multinational land headquarters and subordinated forces are made capable of undertaking the core mission of the Alliance, i.e., Article 5 (collective self-defense). One recognizes that peace support operations have taken on an increasingly important role in Alliance defense planning since the end of the Cold War and this venue offers a unique

opportunity to engage our partners in areas of mutual benefit. Nonetheless, headquarters and forces declared to the Alliance do not exist solely for the purpose of engaging in peace-support operations, either exclusive of its partners or with them.⁶

The Force Structure Review, therefore, should establish the baseline requirement that all multinational land formations declared to the Alliance must be capable of conducting collective defense missions. Any move away from this standard might encourage nations to refocus their attention and orientation away from the basis of the Alliance.⁷ Moreover, a headquarters and subordinated forces capable of conducting collective self-defense operations should also be capable of carrying out peace support operations. Thus, the association of partner multinational headquarters linked to existing NATO-declared headquarters, while desirable and worthwhile from the long-term perspective of the Alliance, should not be allowed to interfere with their primary mission of preparing to conduct collective defense operations. Partners should be encouraged to contribute, but they should be seen strictly as complementing, vice in lieu of, forces declared for collective defense.

What is the Lowest Appropriate Level for Multinational Land Formations?

National land forces declared to the Alliance range from national corps (e.g., IV German Corps, Potsdam) to companies contributed to the Immediate Reaction Force (Land), an independent brigade-size formation (formerly known as Allied Command Europe [ACE] Mobile Force—Land).⁸ Since one of the principal objectives of the Alliance's *raison d'être* is that nations declare forces to members' collective self-defense, allied commanders are ill-positioned to refuse national declarations of forces, irrespective of size. That said, sound military judgment must be proffered that explains to nations and Alliance

officials the simple fact that there are disadvantages to having formations made up of too many small contributions. The simple reason for this is that nations have yet to come to terms with the fact that multinational land formations are, by their very nature, less efficient and less effective than a similar pure national formation. Differences in language, weapon systems, organization, logistics, and procedures, all hinder the operation of multinational formations. Compounding this truism is the added problem that the procedures by which national armies are declared to multinational headquarters have not changed appreciably since the Cold War when nations' contributions in the Central Region were made at the national corps level; i.e., self-contained organizations. Thus, the nettlesome issues of command authority requirements of a multinational force commander, transfer of command authority from a national to allied commander, establishing logistics and training standards and priorities, etc., have yet to be revisited in depth since the wide-spread introduction of multinational forces in the Central Region. As a result, the Alliance finds itself in the situation where it has transformed its diminished land forces in the Central Region into multinational formations that are largely unwieldy and difficult to prepare for war in peacetime and command in war.⁹

Notwithstanding these limitations, the Alliance is hardly in the position to refuse forces declared by nations for collective self-defense. Nonetheless, the Alliance should establish more strict guidelines and measures that ensure declared forces are capable of contributing to the Alliance's common objectives. In this respect, the suitable depth of multinational formations should be determined by a series of influencing factors, as opposed to arbitrary standards nations are likely to oppose. The factors that determine the smallest size of a land force contribution to a multinational land formation are: (1) size of declared unit, and (2) the command authorities granted by nations to the multinational force commander.

Apropos the question of establishing a threshold for the minimum effective size of a force, the minimum size of suitable forces declared to the Alliance should be, in large part, a function of their intended mission, and related readiness levels. Thus, the political value of a national contribution to an Immediate Reaction Force (3-7 days readiness), no matter how "small," should be an overriding concern, while mobilization forces can be expected to be contributed in larger formations. A proposed generic minimum standard might be:

1. Immediate Reaction Forces: select platoons, company and battalion;
2. Rapid Reaction Forces: independent brigades with organic logistics;
3. Main Defense: divisions with corps combat support and combat service support; and,
4. Augmentation: divisions and corps.

Command Authorities.

The delegation of command authorities to multinational land force commanders remains one of the least developed areas of Alliance force employment policy (see Table 1). Nations have been loath to give up command authorities over land forces to foreign commanders out of fear that, *inter alia*, they will be "fragmented" or improperly commanded. Yet, multinational land commanders require greater command authority than they currently have over forces due to the complex nature of land forces, as opposed to aerial and naval units. More specifically, the missions and inherent operational limitations of aircraft and ships are a function of their very design. Land forces, on the other hand, are combined-arms teams that need to be organized to execute a mission. Thus, cross-assignment of forces (i.e., task-organization), the need oftentimes to change missions rapidly to respond to a developing situation, and the legitimate need for a commander to establish logistics

priorities are some of the more sensitive issues nations are reluctant to give up to an allied commander.

1. Corps LANDJUT/"Multinational Corps Northeast"	OPCON/OPCOM*(in wartime)
2. I German/Netherlands Corps+	OPCON (in peacetime)# OPCOM (when employed)
3. V U.S./German Corps	OPCON (in wartime)
4. II German/U.S. Corps	OPCON (in wartime)
5. ACE Rapid Reaction Corps	
a. National Divisions	OPCON (in wartime)
b. Multinational Division (Central)+	OPCOM>^
6. 1st United Kingdom Armored Division Danish International Mechanized Brigade	OPCON (in wartime) Coordinating Authority (in peacetime)
7. 3rd United Kingdom Division Italian <i>Ariete</i> Mechanized Brigade	OPCON (in wartime) Coordinating Authority (in peacetime)
8. 3rd Italian Division Portuguese Independent Airborne Brigade	OPCON (in wartime) Coordinating Authority (in peacetime)
9. European Corps (EUROCORPS)+	OPCOM (when deployed)
10. European Rapid Operational Force (EUROFOR)+	OPCON (when deployed)

* By agreement, Commander Corps LANDJUT has OPCON of forces under his command. However, in exercises, it has been the tradition for 30 years for Commander Corps LANDJUT to exercise OPCOM.

+ "Force Answerable to the Western European Union (FAWEU)."

#The Corps Commander also now has "Integrated Directing and Control Authority." This authority provides the Commander with powers that are identical or similar to those vested in a commander of a national corps or with powers that are altogether new. Note that sovereign rights (in the narrowest sense) are excepted. That said, the Corps Commander has the right to give instructions to all subordinate military and civilian personnel and may issue directives to the binational and national elements of the Corps and set priorities.

> Multinational Division (Central) headquarters is OPCOM to Commander ARRC in peacetime.

^ Assigned brigades are under OPCON to Commander ARRC in peacetime.

Table 1. Command Authorities of NATO and European Bi-/Multinational Formations.

The proper place to analyze which command authorities a multinational force commander requires (employing the methodology employed by the 1994/5 Central Region-Chiefs of Army Staff Talks [CR-CAST] Working Group on Command Authorities Required by a Multinational Commander—the only methodology developed to date in this area) is with the assigned mission and an examination of the mission-essential tasks (stated and implied) therein.¹⁰ (See Table 2 for definitions of NATO command authorities.) Employing the CR-CAST methodology results in the following minimum requirements for a multinational corps commander.

1. Article 5 collective defense: operational command (OPCOM).

2. Non-Article 5 peace-support operations:

a. Peace enforcement: OPCOM,

b. Conflict prevention: operational control (OPCON),

c. Peacemaking: OPCON,

d. Peacekeeping: OPCON,

e. Humanitarian aid: OPCON,

f. Peace building: OPCON.

The rationale for the requirement of a higher command authority (OPCOM) in collective defense and peace enforcement is due to the need to carry out combat operations (the most difficult and demanding) and for the commander to be capable of protecting the force. One should note that under current NATO procedures, OPCOM cannot be delegated by a Strategic Commander (he can only delegate OPCON), without prior political approval by the contributing nation.¹¹

In sum, given that multinational land forces declared to the Alliance must be capable of conducting Article 5 collective self-defense missions, it is clear that the norm governing the delegation of command authority to a

Operational Command:

The authority granted to a commander to assign missions or tasks to subordinate commanders, to deploy units, to reassign forces, and to retain or delegate operational and/or tactical control as may be deemed necessary. It does not of itself include responsibility for administration or logistics. May also be used to denote the forces assigned to a commander. 01/08/74

Operational Control:

The authority delegated to a commander to direct forces assigned so that the commander may accomplish specific missions or tasks which are usually limited by function, time, or location; to deploy units concerned, and to retain or assign tactical control to those units. It does not include authority to assign separate employment of components of the units concerned. Neither does it, of itself, include administrative or logistic control. 01/06/84

Tactical Command:

The authority delegated to a commander to assign tasks to forces under his command for the accomplishment of the mission assigned by higher authority. 01/09/74

Tactical Control:

The detailed and, usually, local direction and control of movements or maneuvers necessary to accomplish missions or tasks assigned. 01/11/80

Coordinating Authority (N.B: Not a command authority):

The authority granted to a commander or individual assigned responsibility for coordinating specific functions or activities involving forces of two or more countries or commands, or two or more services or two or more forces of the same service. He has the authority to require consultation between the agencies involved or their representatives, but does not have the authority to compel agreement. In case of disagreement between the agencies involved, he should attempt to obtain essential agreement by discussion. In the event he is unable to obtain essential agreement he shall refer the matter to the appropriate authority. 01/07/85

Source: MC 57/3, *Overall Organization of the Integrated NATO Forces*; and, AAP-6(U), *NATO Glossary of Terms and Definitions (English and French)*, January 1995.

Table 2. Definition of NATO Command Authorities.

multinational force commander should be OPCOM (without caveats), vice OPCON, with provision for revisions to the definition to include new authorities over peacetime training priorities and standards.

Multinational Practices Requiring Review.

Current Alliance procedures and the conditions under which nations declare forces and headquarters to the Alliance have not changed substantively since the end of the Cold War, when multinational land formations were the rare exception. As a result, a number of debilitating practices and conditions combine to make successful peacetime planning challenging and wartime operation problematic.

An obvious weakness is the lack of sufficient Combat Service Support (CSS) capabilities declared to formations. With the sole exception of the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps and Multinational Division (Central), no other multinational land headquarters has specific corps/division combat service support formations declared to the headquarters. Given that logistics remain a national responsibility (notwithstanding the efforts of CR-CAST and Allied Commander Land Forces Central Europe [LANDCENT] to introduce concepts of multinationality to logistics),¹² the practice of not declaring specific corps/division CSS formations limits effective peacetime planning and, potentially, wartime operation. Nations have had good reason not to declare specific CSS formations in that they are often cross-assigned to other multinational formations, or are treated as rare national treasures to be parceled out grudgingly only when absolutely required. The Alliance needs to consider establishing minimum CSS standards by which nations declare forces to multinational formations. As the conflict in the former Yugoslavia demonstrates, combat forces without organic logistics and CSS are of limited operational utility to the Alliance.

Concerning the issue of command authorities, the minimum requirements for the command authorities required by a multinational land force commander were addressed in the previous section. However, the Force Structure Review should examine the definitions of command authorities. The four recognized command authorities (i.e., OPCOM, OPCON, Tactical Command, and Tactical Control) have not been revised since the end of the Cold War.¹³ For example, two important issues for the success of a multinational force are not covered by current definitions. First, peacetime training remains a national, vice Alliance, responsibility. A compromise solution would be for the Alliance to establish an agreed set of tasks, conditions, and standards. The Military Committee, therefore, should direct the development of a robust "mission-essential task list" for land forces which could be used by multinational force commanders to validate established training standards.¹⁴

While perhaps only applicable to the 1 German/Netherlands Corps where deep integration has been established as an essential political objective, the development by those two nations of "Integrated Directing and Control Authority" may provide a useful example of what can be accomplished in this area. This unique command authority provides the Corps Commanding General with powers that are identical or similar to those vested in a commander of a national corps or with powers that are altogether new. Of course, sovereign rights (in the narrowest sense) are excepted from the commander's purview. That said, the Corps Commander has the right to give instructions to all subordinate military and civilian personnel and may issue directives to the binational and national elements of the Corps and set priorities.¹⁵

Second, closely related to the issue of command authorities and training is the question of when do forces "transfer" ("transfer of authority—TOA) from nations to a multinational land force commander? It is unrealistic to assume that nations will surrender the operational

employment of their forces well before their deployment. Indeed, greater clarity in doctrine is needed as to when forces should transfer to a multinational force commander, i.e., prior to, or immediately upon, arrival in the theatre of operations. Frictions between multinational force commanders and nations can be expected until such time that important issues like training priorities and standards are addressed.

A final question relates to the lack of “interoperability” of multinational land headquarters. There remains no standard organizational “template” to which the multinational land headquarters declared to the Alliance adhere. As demonstrated in the Stabilization Force (SFOR) experience, three NATO division headquarters were deployed to the theater under the Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC). These divisions included subordinated forces with which these headquarters had had no peacetime habitual training relationships (to include units from non-NATO nations). Headquarters declared to the Alliance, therefore, should be required to adhere to a number of basic standards, the better to enable them to integrate forces with which they do not have a peacetime planning and exercising relationship.

1. Headquarters declared to NATO should have NATO international legal personality to facilitate their employment by the Alliance.¹⁶ The NATO Status of Forces Agreement should serve as the basis to govern the status of foreign forces.

2. Headquarters declared to NATO should adopt as a minimum those procedures and practices established in formal Military Committee guidance to NATO Military Authorities, NATO Standardization Agreements (STANAGS), Allied Tactical Publication 35 (Land Force Tactical Doctrine), and the planning guidelines emerging from Bi-Major NATO Command working groups supporting Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept development; e.g., “MNC’s Guidelines for Operational Planning (GOP).”¹⁷

3. Headquarters declared to NATO must use English as the headquarters' official language, with greater provision for the use of French when requested.

Changing Roles and Missions of Existing Headquarters and Forces.

Multinational corps in the Central Region were established in the early 1990s to provide nations the ability to operate competently within a corps structure, but with smaller force structures. With the obvious exception of the ARRC, all other multinational corps have an Alliance main defense mission. Notwithstanding the fact that some have the ability to engage in peace-support operations, the ARRC remains the Alliance's sole reaction corps.

There are currently insufficient suitable headquarters and forces capable of supporting the force structure benchmarks established by Ministerial Guidance for defense planning. For example, the Alliance has created three Commander, Joint Task Force (CJTF)-designated headquarters (Regional Commander North, Regional Commander South, and Commander Striking Fleet Atlantic). Additionally, guidance from ministers and the Defense Review Committee hold that Strategic Command Europe must be prepared to undertake two non-Article 5 contingencies, as well as a collective defense contingency.¹⁸ Yet, the Alliance has available for rapid reaction missions only two land component commands to support a CJTF, i.e., ACE Rapid Reaction Corps and the Immediate Reaction Force-Land (the later of which is only capable of commanding and controlling a large brigade). For this reason, the Alliance has been forced to accept the use of the EUROCORPS as a follow-on headquarters in Kosovo (Kosovo Force—KFOR)¹⁹ due to the lack of suitable reaction headquarters declared to the Alliance. Thus, there is a need for additional multinational land headquarters, declared to the Alliance, with a reaction focus, vice largely less useful headquarters and forces with main defense

missions. The very lack of a ground component headquarters for the entire ground operation in Kosovo was singled out by Commander-in-Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe Admiral James Ellis as constituting a major mistake in the conduct of the campaign against Serbia in 1999.²⁰

Six points should guide the designation and creation of new reaction corps headquarters.

1. There are existing corps-size multinational main defense headquarters that could be redesignated to command reaction forces.

2. There are sufficient reaction force divisions declared to the Alliance generally to meet current Ministerial Guidance 1999 requirements.

3. Reaction force divisions and corps CSS should be declared to newly designed reaction corps headquarters to ensure the development of habitual working relationships.

4. Efforts to create effective multinational land formations heretofore have been almost exclusively limited to Region North armies. The Force Structure Review offers nations the opportunity to establish potentially similar structures that offer many non-defense advantages in Region South. Region North nations and armies, in particular, should participate more actively in a Region South reaction force headquarters and to declare reaction forces and corps CSS in order to bring their technological expertise and to contribute to establishing a conducive working and operating environment.

5. The designation of certain headquarters as "light" and "heavy" oriented would result in limiting Alliance deployment options as opposed to increasing them. Reaction force headquarters, perforce, must be capable of operating within the full spectrum of missions and conditions.

6. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, any new reaction force headquarters must adhere to the principles of

multinationality outlined above in order to be capable of integrating subordinated forces and serving effectively as a CJTF's multinational land component command headquarters.

The Alliance should consider a multifaceted approach to meeting the requirement for an increased number of headquarters capable of serving as a land component headquarters under a CJTF. Major political decisions need to be made by nations and financial resources committed to this objective if the Alliance is to achieve this ambitious goal.

Options for Reform.

*ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC).*²¹ The ARRC (Mönchengladbach) has a proven record as a multinational reaction force headquarters (Implementation Force [IFOR] and KFOR operations) and is the only one with declared corps CSS. That it remains largely British-dominated (60 percent of the headquarters is British) is a political weakness that can be overcome by an increase in other corps-sized reaction force headquarters. That said, additional reaction force corps, perforce, should draw upon the current unwieldy 11 divisions declared to it since it is only capable of commanding four divisions.

V US/II German Corps. The U.S. Army in Europe is the best prepared to conduct reaction force missions in Europe. However, its corps headquarters, being national, would require the most internal reform. Currently, in wartime, V US Corps (Heidelberg) has a wartime arrangement to cross-assign divisions with II GE Corps (Ulm). The Alliance would be very well-served indeed if V US and II GE Corps were merged, with the United States as the lead nation, and transformed into an Alliance reaction force headquarters with international personality. Divisions currently declared to the ARRC could be reassigned to the new corps.²²

1 German/Netherlands Corps. This formation (based in Münster) was initially designed for main defense missions and, in effect, to merge the two armies. However, the Royal Netherlands Army is undergoing a significant restructuring and reorganization, the better to enable it to engage in power-projection missions. The German Army has also made progress in creating crisis reaction forces. Both nations should strongly consider reorienting the headquarters primarily toward a reaction force. The headquarters's strong adherence to NATO standards and the use of English make it a highly suitable headquarters. Divisions declared to the ARRC could be reassigned to give it greater force structure depth. To be sure, it would be unique in that it would not be a lead nation formation, but rather bi-national.

EUROCORPS. Because this formation (located in Strasbourg) includes the French Army, it offers considerable operational advantages to the Alliance, especially given France's extensive experience in power-projection. However, the French Army remains equally unfamiliar with basic NATO procedures. An example of its heretofore "distant" relationship with NATO is that only as of September 1, 1999, was English made the operational language of the headquarters. Moreover, the corps is multi-roled, is not combat ready for use as a reaction force, and enjoys, at best, an ambiguous relationship with the Alliance.²³ The nations participating in this formation could make a major contribution to the Alliance if they were to: (1) clearly declare the headquarters to the Alliance, (2) reorganize the headquarters to adhere to standards outlined above, and (3) adopt, unambiguously, a reaction force mission and orientation.

Probably the Alliance's biggest challenge is to establish a reaction force headquarters that fosters improved interoperability among Region South armies. Traditionally, the armies of this region have had limited opportunity to work together in a peacetime multinational setting, let alone on deployment. And, indeed, the decision by the

Alliance not to create land component commanders in Regions North and South (whereas there are air and sea component commanders) places obstacles in the path of improving this situation. As a result, there will not be a suitable land-focused headquarters acting to integrate armies during peacetime, let alone providing a capability to the Alliance to act as a land component command under a CJTF. Nonetheless, at the level of forces and headquarters, the Alliance can work to overcome this current lack of multinationality. The most obvious option relates to the European Rapid Operational Force (EUROFOR—Florence), a division-size headquarters currently not declared to the Alliance. Participants include Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal. As is the case with the EUROCORPS, the current status of EUROFOR contributes little to Alliance preparations and planning, although it has potential. Being in Italy, it is located in the central Mediterranean and enjoys modern and extensive infrastructure. Greece and Turkey should be encouraged to declare reaction forces to it. The headquarters should: (1) be expanded eventually to the size of a corps staff, (2) be declared to the Alliance, (3) be reorganized to adhere to standards for headquarters outlined above, (4) assign North American and Region North staff officers to the headquarters, and, in time, (5) declare to it North American and Region North forces.

Rationalization of Headquarters?

The above analysis intentionally did not address the suitability of Multinational Corps North East (Stettin) and IV GE Corps (Potsdam). There is merit in maintaining a number of multinational corps with largely a main defense orientation. However, those formations that retain this mission-orientation would contribute greatly to the Alliance's main defense capabilities by inviting the armies of the new members to declare forces to the formations and participate in the headquarters' staffs. Other Alliance

members should second staff officers also to these formations and contribute to their operation.

The Way Ahead.

Nations face considerable challenges in reforming the structures and practices regulating the operation and command of multinational land headquarters. The Force Structure Review offers a unique opportunity for nations to reexamine these problems and *lacunae* in stated Alliance strategy and Ministerial Guidance on the one hand and current structures and capabilities on the other. On the negative side of the task, nations have traditionally been reluctant to offer up land forces to foreign commanders and national laws make a multinational land force commander's influence over such issues as logistics, challenging at best. However, on the positive side, there is little need for nations to create new forces and headquarters. Rather, they need to reexamine the missions of current existing headquarters. That said, let there be no doubt that without a fresh review of the practices and authorities under which multinational land force commanders currently command their forces, a mere redesignation of headquarters' missions will be for naught.

ENDNOTES

1. For a superb historical analysis of the NATO force planning system, see John S. Duffield, *Power Rules: The Evolution of NATO's Conventional Force Posture*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995. See particularly pp. 269-273 for a description and analysis of force structure reforms of the early post-Cold War era.

2. MC 400/1, "MC Directive for Military Implementation of the Alliance's Strategic Concept," NATO CONFIDENTIAL, June 14, 1996. MC 400/1 contains:

. . . a description of the security situation and pronouncements about the military contribution to the execution of the tasks of NATO, the classified document contained basic principles which the future command and forces structures would have

to satisfy. . . . The most important part of the document was, however, devoted to the military contributions to Alliance roles and missions, the mission requirements and basic principles for the command and force structures.

The principal differences between the first and second iteration of this key planning document is that MC 400/1 has replaced the earlier document's specific principal mission elements by more general principle mission areas. Rob De Wijk, *NATO on the Brink of the New Millennium: The Battle for Consensus*, Brassey's Atlantic Commentaries, London: Brassey's (UK) Ltd., 1997, p. 105, as well as pp. 101-106. For an unclassified description of the first iteration of this document see *Ibid.*, pp. 40-44, *BASIC Reports on European Arms Control*, No. 20, February 19, 1992, pp. 6-7; and Ad Hoc Group on Review of NATO's Military Strategy, "Public Line to Take on Military Guidance for the Implementation of the Alliance's New Strategic Concept," SRG(91)59, Bruxelles, NATO, December 10, 1991.

3. For an analysis and critique of the new command structure, see author's essay, "NATO's Double Expansion and the Challenge of Reforming NATO's Military Structures," in *Europe in Change: Two Tiers or Two Speeds. The European Security Order and the Enlargement of the European Union and NATO*, edited by James Sperling, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999, pp. 103-120.

4. See "The Alliance's Strategic Concept," Press Communiqué, NAC-S(99)65, Bruxelles, NATO Press Service, April 24, 1999, point 59. This point was stressed in stronger language in the 1991 version of the Strategic Concept. See "The Alliance's New Strategic Concept," Press Communiqué S-1(91)85, Bruxelles, NATO Press Service, November 7, 1991, point 47.

5. See Jon Whitford and Thomas-Durell Young, "Command Authorities and Multinationality in NATO: The Response of the Central Region's Armies," in *Command in NATO after the Cold War: Alliance, National and Multinational Considerations*, ed. by Thomas-Durell Young, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1997, pp. 53-73.

6. For an analysis of new missions and tasks for Alliance forces, see author's monograph entitled *Multinational Land Formations and NATO: Reforming Practices and Structures*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1997, pp. 11-13.

7. This point is admirably argued in David S. Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*

Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998, p. 295-296.

8. For greater details of the formations discussed here, see *Multinational Land Formations and NATO*, Appendixes A through K.

9. Albeit written subtly, the frustrations of a former Commander of the ARRC are evident in Michael Walker, "ARRC in Action," *NATO's Sixteen Nations*, Vol. 41, No. 2, 1996, see particularly p. 44.

10. Thomas-Durell Young, *Multinational Force Command Authorities Handbook: Proceedings of the Central Region-Chiefs of Army Staff (CR-CAST) Working Group on Command Authorities Required for a Multinational Force Commander*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, September 1, 1995.

11. For greater discussion of command authorities, see Whitford and Young, "Command Authorities and Multinationality in NATO," pp. 55-64.

12. For a brief survey of the issue of multinational logistics, see *Multinational Land Formations and NATO*, pp. 21-22.

13. MC 57/3, "Overall Organization of the Integrated NATO Forces," July 23, 1981, NATO CONFIDENTIAL.

14. An initial first effort of this type of document can be found in the Bi-NMC draft document, "NATO Task List," 1st Draft, March 13, 1997.

15. *1 (GE/NL Corps)*, Sankt Augustin: CPM Communications Presse Marketing GmbH, 1999, pp. 8-9.

16. They should all fall under the "Protocol on the Status of International Military Headquarters set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty," Paris, August 28, 1952.

17. See Mario da Silva, "Implementing the Combined Joint Task Force Concept," *NATO Review*, Vol. 46, No. 4, Winter 1998, pp. 16-19.

18. Anthony J. Faith, OBE, "A New Military Command Structure for NATO: But at what expense?" *NATO at 50: Special Edition*, ed. by Andrew Dorman and Thomas-Durell Young, *Defense Analysis*, Vol. 15, No. 3, December 1999, pp. 273-82. Additional criticism is found in "NATO Double Expansion and the Challenge of Reforming NATO's Military Structures," in *Europe in Change*, pp. 103-120; and Rafael Estrella, "CJTF and the Reform of NATO," Bruxelles, North Atlantic Assembly, Defence Committee, AN 230, October 24, 1996, point 37.

19. See *Defense News*, Washington, DC, February 21, 2000.

20. Admiral James O. Ellis, U.S. Navy, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe; Commander, Allied Forces Southern Europe; and Commander, Joint Task Force Noble Anvil during Operation Allied Force, "A View from the Top," unclassified briefing slides, n.d.

21. To reiterate, details on these formations can be found in *Multinational Land Formations and NATO*.

22. For additional justification for this proposed reform, see *Ibid.*, pp. 47-49.

23. The corps can be transferred (OPCOM) to the Strategic Commander Europe for both Article 5 and peace support operations, via the coordination agreement among the Chiefs of Defense of France and Germany and the Strategic Commander Europe. That said, France does not participate in the integrated military planning process of the Alliance. A copy of this agreement is available in German ("SACEUR-Abkommen") in *EUROKORPS und Europäische Einigung*. Bonn: Kunst & Kommunikation Ernst Martin, 1996, pp. 600-601.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr.
Commandant

STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.

Director of Research
Dr. Earl H. Tilford, Jr.

Author
Dr. Thomas-Durell Young

Director of Publications and Production
Ms. Marianne P. Cowling

Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel

Composition
Mrs. Christine A. Williams

Cover Artist
Mr. James E. Kistler