

HQDA-Army War College announces 2nd Strategic Landpower Symposium, posts videos for May 2022 symposium

By MAJ Justin Magula, AWC Center for Strategic Landpower 25 July 2022



US Army North Commander Lt. Gen. John Evans leads discussion of threat deterrence in the homeland, and challenges for military operations and force projection platforms in U.S., May 2022, at AWC Strategic Landpower Symposium.



Army Futures Command's BG Stephanie Ahern, Director of Concepts, engaged the AWC Strategic Landpower Symposium, exploring future war, May 2022 at Carlisle Pa. Video at www.youtube.com/usarmywarcollege.



JFK Special Warfare Center/School Commandant MG Patrick Roberson opened the 1st Strategic Landpower Symposium sponsored by Army War College and Army G3, talking Security Cooperation - the long game for Strategic Landpower, May 2022 in Carlisle, Pa.

The U.S. Army War College announces a Call for Papers for its 2nd annual Strategic Landpower Symposium, scheduled for May 9-11, 2023. Find topics and details at [USAWC Strategic Landpower Symposium \(armywarcollege.edu\)](https://www.armywarcollege.edu/USAWC-Strategic-Landpower-Symposium). This announcement follows on the heels of a dynamic 2022 symposium in May 2022.

The United States Army War College hosted the first annual Strategic Landpower Symposium May 10-12, 2022, to advance concepts associated with the role of Strategic Landpower in cooperation, competition, integrated deterrence, and Joint All-Domain Operations. Original research and candid dialogue among symposium participants examined how Landpower can help achieve national objectives in the future.

The Symposium focused research and insights on six research topics,

RELATED ARTICLES

10 Jun 2022

[MG Roberson talks cooperation: Opens Strategic Landpower Symposium](#)

RELATED LINKS

[Call for Papers, registration - for Strategic Landpower Symposium, May 9-11, 2023](#)

Podcast interviews: Shaping the

proposed by the Army CG with featured speakers and a panel of experts for each topic area. **Video presentations are available at www.youtube.com/usarmywarcollege: see the #StratLandPwr 2022** playlist.

- Cooperation and Setting the Theater – with MG Patrick Roberson, USAJFKSWCS Commandant
- Competition and Integrated Deterrence – featuring Mr. Michael Donofrio, OSD-P Strategy Director
- Homeland Defense – LTG John Evans Jr., Commander of U.S. Army North
- Strategic Landpower Integrated Research Project – with insights from Army War College student researchers
- Leadership and the Military Profession, featuring Army War College faculty.

[Theater, Setting the Stage - Strategic Landpower](#)

[Video series: Strategic Landpower Symposium 2022: Future Landpower, Homeland, Technology, All-Domain Operations, more](#)

Army War College students and faculty tackled research into landpower and Joint All-Domain Operations.

LTG Rainey, the Army G-3/5/7, and MG Gericke, the Department of the Army Military Operations – Strategic Plans and Policy (DAMO-SS), asked the USAWC Strategic Landpower Integrated Research Project (IRP) faculty to address the question: What is the future role of Strategic Landpower in cooperation, competition, integrated deterrence, and Joint All-Domain Operations? The faculty worked with a select group of students over the last year to research the challenges associated with the research question. They also received papers from other Services, PME institutions, Centers of Excellence, Army Futures Command, and other Department of Defense organizations. The students and faculty presented the results of their research at the symposium.

Landpower and Domestic Operations: see youtube video for details

Evaluating a modern and nuanced approach to Homeland Security in both the traditional, kinetic warfare sense, and in the asymmetric, gray zone and cyberwarfare environment, includes a critical analysis of U.S. Army and Homeland Security resourcing. Analysis requires an eye toward influencing adversary thinking, assumptions, processes, and will, while simultaneously preparing for the possibility that deterrence may fail. A critical insights is that the same freedoms that we enjoy in the homeland make it more difficult to secure the homeland, necessarily. Three papers were submitted for this panel, *Borek, Brown and Matisek*, and *Cavanaugh*, while three panelists presented insights: Dr. Phil Brown, Dr. John Borek, and retired Lt. Gen. Reynold Hoover.

Borek's approach represents the earliest shell of protection: influencing our adversaries' will and approach toward non-traditional warfare against our

interests. Making clear the consequences of adversary action in the gray zone of information, economic, and cyber warfare can reduce the desire of near-peer adversaries to engage in these activities. This integrated deterrence relies upon the whole-of-government approach, mobilizing all elements of DIME to preemptively dissuade damaging actions.

His perspective on homeland defense is threat-based with three main points: 1) Our current strategy and approach to Homeland Defense is outdated as it doesn't reflect current threats; 2) As the lead federal agency for homeland defense, the Department of Defense needs to develop a viable homeland defense strategy; and 3) Adoption of all domain operations presents a promising framework for this.

Brown and Matisek suggest a more active preparation for defense against gray zone activities, most especially those adversarial gray zone activities that are integrated or embedded into the US supply chain and contractor support enterprise. Using a fictional red-team scenario as a catalyst, this approach suggests a more active homeland role by the U.S. Army in understanding our adversaries' motivations at a more basic, cultural level, while building or interpreting policy through the lens of a worldwide battlefield in the gray zone space, not buffered by the traditional security provided by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. To an extent, Brown and Matisek, too, support the information warfare role to influence our adversaries' activities, but with less of an eye toward preemptive dissuasion and more focused on steering those activities to more palatable ends.

In the panel presentation, Brown presented four main points: 1) the homeland is not a sanctuary, 2) we are in a contested environment; 3) This homeland should be under the auspices of our thought processes of our theater of war, and 4) as a result, the things the CCMD has to do to set the theater have to be different. Americans are accustomed to thinking that American power projection is almost automatic, but what if in the next security crisis, the adversary decides to interrupt logistics, infrastructure, and our ability to mobilize to our ports?

Cavanaugh's paper represents the most traditionally-minded approach to homeland defense. Though mentioning cyberwarfare briefly, it focuses heavily on kinetic warfare capabilities and deep-strike threats from a growing number of state actors. Cavanaugh suggests that reallocation of troops, headquarters, and equipment to consolidate around the homeland is the next logical step to supporting homeland defense.

Lt. Gen. (ret) Hoover completed the panel with an in-depth discussion of

the authorities under which the DOD in the homeland much operate. Most notably, anytime the DOD conducts activities in the homeland, it must critically analyze under what authority it's operating, who or what the DOD is supporting, and what the limitations and permissions of that authority entails. All disasters are inherently local, and supporting local and other federal agencies requires long-term relationship building efforts ahead of time.

The Profession: Civil-Military Relations, Enterprise Readiness, and more

This panel focuses heavily on the Organization, Leadership, and Personnel dimensions of DOTMLPF, the overall framework for the aspects of a military that, when approached separately but with awareness of the whole, can support the overall mission effectiveness of that force. In the light of three of the Secretary of the Army's priorities (building a positive command climate, ensuring that we can recruit and retain the best talent, and reducing harmful behaviors), with two papers presented (*Galvin et al.* and *Lacquement and Galvin*), and four presenting panelists (Richard O'Donnell, Thomas Galvin, Richard Lacquement, and Lt. Col. Anastasia McKay), the panel gives perspectives on organization design (and how to best evaluate organizational design), leadership in the context of the various complexities of war, and the study of war as a profession.

Lacquement and Galvin takes a deep dive into the profession of the military and the conflict inherent in the view of that professionalism from within and outside the military itself. Presenting this as a professional crisis where there are major issues that confront the military profession as a whole, the paper investigates the competitive and overlapping nature of the of civil-military relations and compare this to other professions' relationship analogues. *Lacquement and Galvin* further explores the hierarchy of the military profession and the threats to the professional nature of the military.

Dr. Lacquement as a panelist in particular highlights a series of contemporary challenges to growing the military profession: The changing character of war, the broad view of the applicability of military capabilities, the missing strategic effectiveness in our recent middle east operations, pressures to conform to new societal norms in diversity and inclusion, the politicization of the armed forces, and general societal rejection of professionalism. Dr. Galvin complements this with a look at the challenge of military professionalism through the lens of *System of Professions*, Abbott's 1988 publication on the subject. Galvin expands on *Abbott*, however, by looking more deeply at the military profession's collaborative

and cooperative nature, and how we model these collaborations.

While discussing his second entry on the panel's topic, and in *Galvin et al.*, Dr. Galvin introduces the concept of Enterprise Readiness, or, "the capacity of the force to develop and implement effective and efficient strategies and plans at echelon. Enterprise readiness can be evaluated through five outputs or measures: Environmental analysis, concepts & doctrine, organizational design, requirements articulation, and outreach. Using the transition of V Corps to Combined Joint Task Force-7 during Operation Iraqi Freedom as a canvas, they present the concept of enterprise readiness as a means of predicting a complex organization's success in a dynamic environment of warfare.

Richard O'Donnell on the panel focused on how the Army is attempting to identify the key attributes in future leaders that signal future success, then how to assess these attributes effectively. These are the components for which "more is better." O'Donnell complements this discussion with insights into the applicability of these attributes' assessments in the Battalion Commander Assessment Program (BCAP) and Colonels Command Assessment Program (CCAP).

Lt. Col. Anastasia McKay argued for the idea that Army surgeons are best employed in the Army's reserve components, not its active component, highlighting the need for surgeons to exercise their skillsets in ways the Army, short of kinetic warfare, cannot provide.