

INTELLIGENCE CYCLE PLANNING IN MILITARY COALITION OPERATIONS

Catalin ANTON

“Carol I” National Defense University, Bucharest, Romania

A long list of allied or coalition type military actions against entities declared as aggressors, failed or terrorist states/organizations has been recorded for the past 25 years. To reach an end state for any action planned by the military or established at any decagon-making level, usually the political one, all information must be shared throughout all coalition/allied components. That is mainly done by specialized elements that play the role of primary structures in charge of analyzing all information necessary for the military commander's decision-making process. In this context, the article aims to outline the importance of the decision-making process for military commandants, as part of large /important coalition/allied structures and the level of training required of the latter to use the intelligence cycle to fulfill their main mission in their area of responsibility.

Key words: *intelligence cycle, mission, coalition, allied, decision-making, military.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Globally developed military conflicts have lately shown that the creation of supranational military structures is necessary and justified and that these must be credible if a state becomes an aggressor, a failed one or involved directly and/or indirectly in supporting a hostile/terrorist organization (e.g. financial support or hosts it on its territory).

According to international laws, unanimously accepted by all the Member States of the United Nations (UN), an alliance/coalition must be endorsed by supranational organizations such as the UN or any other entities that have a global impact (e.g. the European Union - EU, the Arab League, African Union, etc.). The approval (justification) for the creation/existence of a coalition/alliance granted by the Security Council (SC) of the UN represents the legal framework needed and required to conduct future military operations.

In order to regain the end-state previous to conflict outbreak, the planning phase for military actions begins much earlier, before the approval of the UNSC, usually starting with the time of the assault itself. This applies to all alliances/coalitions already established and that are willing to engage in solving the conflict, as it was the case of the one occurred in Mali between 2012 and 2013, when the EU and the African Union were actively involved in stopping the conflict.

The intelligence cycle, as a key element to each military or civilian difficult situation, is a complex process which ensures continuous flow of data and information from areas of conflict/interest to the decision-making levels, both military and political. A proper functioning of the coalition/alliance is represented strictly by a political decision, usually taken under the influence of military input provided by military experts from the intelligence analysis and planning branches.

In the UNSC rarely were there situations where all five countries with veto rights reached a consensus, since each tried to protect its interests and strategic investments in the areas that were supposed to be declared area of conflict and where the established alliance/coalition was to be planned to act legally.

One recent example in this respect is the current intervention/banning of Russia inside the UNSC as a result of the conflict in the eastern part of Ukraine. The Russian Federation is dissatisfied with the fact that Ukraine has declared it “the aggressor”, based on the information obtained from the battlefield. The intelligence services from Ukraine demonstrated that the Russian Federation is involved financially, as well as with combat equipment and troops in supporting the rebels from the Lukansk and Donesk regions, which were declared by the Ukrainian legal institutions as terrorist

elements. Ukraine military is a legal defense institution internationally recognized by the international community, even by the Russian Federation according to the Budapest Treaty from 1993. Moreover, beginning with 1993, the Russian Federation was the guarantor of the integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine until the invasion of Crimea in March 2014.

The invasion of Crimea by the Russian troops deployed in Sevastopol (though Russian Federation representatives declared that they had responded to all the requests coming from the new Crimean state structures to join the Russian Federation territory based on referendum results) actually signals the end of recognition of the Budapest Treaty, regardless of the all explanations offered by Russian diplomacy.

Although it is clear that all the European and traditional partners of the United States of America (USA) adopted a common policy of force to globally isolate the Russian Federation, the latter retains enough power because of its right of veto in the UNSC, where it can thus block any attempt or initiative to stop separatists' offensives in Donetsk and Lugansk.

The same *modus operandi* was employed in Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Syria, where the Russian Federation blocked any decisions coming from permanent states in the UNSC meetings. Of course other states blocked in certain moments decisions of CS, such as China and the group of US, UK and France, which usually act as a unified group. The actions through blocking any final steps are applied to all kind of statements, from protest to those that allow military intervention under the UN mandate.

Then, after the legality of coalition's operation is determined, the realities from the area of concern are introduced into the analysis and planning cycle, and are managed by the Headquarter of the coalition / alliance. This is moment that all information is made available to those who are in charge of planning and analysis and for creating and /or completion of the operation plan, necessary for the entire multinational structure.

However, even if the multinational structure was created, which includes its analysis and planning elements, each nation will continue to exercise the right powers over their national structures for identifying, processing, analyzing and promotion of the

information that is useful for future military operations forces and for coalition itself.

Also we can assess that the actual coalition (composed of EU, US, Norway, Canada and other countries) which has imposed numerous economic barriers to Russian Federation in the Summer of 2014, particularly financial, can be considered a kind of conflict coalition/alliance typology, but this one no longer needs the approval of the UNCS, because of the two sides have openly stated that they will not use military forces. It will be appreciated, however, that this conflict is one of heavy attrition, "Cold War" by type. In this respect, the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, was saying in a meeting in Budapest in February 2015, in order to stress the size of the conflict, that "the EU and Russia are engaged in a very tough conflict".

2. MODERN INTELLIGENCE PLANNING CYCLE

General situation of the global risks and General situation of the global risks and threats to the enshrined values of the states or even to the states themselves, led to the development of a high level of deep concern which was finally materialized in a major adaptation of the internal intelligence systems regarding to collection, processing, analysis and dissemination of the intelligence. The adaptation was hastened by the transformations that took place inside enemy's structure, which was no longer a classical one by shape, color and content.

Streamlining the general characteristics of the enemy has led to a new type of occurrence among military and civilian organizations, especially for those structures involved in the identification, control and destruction of the elements which can affect the security of the state or alliance/coalition. The need for change and permanent transformation has occurred due to the lack of clarity inside the old intelligence structures, which turned in shortly in a lack of vision and even failure.

The attacks against the USA (on 11 September 2001) and Spain (on 11 March 2004) demonstrated that the intelligence structures could not act together to prevent those actions, as they had an obsolete intelligence system which was overwhelmed

by the new types of threats, that exploited their own advantages, but also the gaps inside the legal intelligence systems. Thus, the slowly old intelligence system (based on direct answers to direct questions, especially answers as elements of a predetermined pattern) has needed a rapid adaptation to a new model which supposed to be supple, flexible and transformable. As police structures have in some countries many types of codes to identify a specific criminal phenomenon, the same pattern was used by the intelligence structures to respond to all intelligence requirements. In this way the reorganization had to be consistent with the evolution of new risks and threats, especially with their results.

This phenomenon, of reflowing the opponent from its basic typology: state, clear, rational (not always) sized structures, etc., to the new dimension: non-state, unbalanced, without constraints of any kind, acting on behalf of any and anyone, without form, without substance, denying (little green men) has overturned the whole intelligence systems, which in some cases had to reinvent themselves.

If the intelligence structures system had taken in time a status of stability regarding shape and dimension, after 1990, all states have understood that the classical form of combat is very difficult to build and use and the perverse and perfidy typologies can replace them. The speed of manifestation of the new challenges was so great and fast that the intelligence systems have adapted slowly to the new requirements of military and political decision makers, somehow as complicated as the decision inside the EU, especially to the certain and direct threats, where for obtaining offensive results is required to be clear and to have unanimous decision.

The rapid evolution of all forms of risks and threats has led to a complete analysis of the entire spectrum of national and/or alliance/coalition security. In this respect intelligence structures have become more dynamic and flexible, adapting quickly to counter both direct and indirect risks and threats, for rapid information of the decision makers as well as for identifying all vulnerabilities (from inside) and their stopping process.

The complex evolution of global security system and the huge amount of data

/information which have to be identified, verified and analyzed have led to a new concept inside NATO (need to know and need to share) and also for the EU (sharing and pooling). Thus, almost all members of the alliance have developed few complex intelligence network structures to respond effectively to all risks and threats coming from enemy's organizations (particularly terrorist), which were created by the new enemy.

In support of these new situations many states have developed a system of mutual trust between intelligence structures, but also with those structures belonging to supranational structures (the alliance/coalition, EUPOL, INTERPOL, etc.) leading to an establishment as a joint planning and analysis centers where information is analyzed by the most qualified specialists and converted into final reports for the decision process. Modern cyber infrastructure, created specifically for this activity, ensures the flow of data and information necessary to analysis and planning structures and in reverse, analyzes and reports being done for all military and civilian decision makers.

In actual world, there is information everywhere and in everyone's reach and their elements are connected in an on-line network. Today, information sharing is done only in real time, providing largely enough time to avoid strategic surprise. Moreover information exchange is connected to a wide strategic network that allows horizontal and vertical flows, and could thus avoid blocking information in transit through the old type nodes where can occur obstruction of data flowing due to outdated and/or slow mechanisms.

3. MODERN ALLIANCE BALANCE

Although modern typology alliance/coalitionAlthough modern typologies of alliances/coalition have a size covering the acceptance of honest citizen who vote, in fact these exist primarily for creating or safeguarding the states interests. Alliances from 18, 19 and 20 centuries followed closely the achievement of all political goals, and especially the economic one.

Rupert Smith, a British General, trendy highlights in his book *The Utility of Force* that the ninetieth century has represented the failure of the communism ideology

and its military bloc, the Warsaw Pact, and the USSR colossus and its satellite states succumbed due to US and western countries economic exhaustion programs. This situation, according to Smith's analysis led to the creation of numerous gaps into the global balance, though most former communist states had at that time an important arsenal, a high production capacity and numerous warehouses for military equipment, but today we all know that they were technologically obsolete and a lot of throw-out as final products.

Crossing the border between communist ideology and democracy, by the states under the Soviet Union's sphere of influence, is in fact the biggest gain for NATO or the US and Western European community. This move was in fact a logical move and a moral solve of what was happened at the end of the World War II, when Stalin "negotiated" the future of the Eastern European states, having already his military men (little green men from NKVD) in those countries.

It can be considered that the approach of creating alliances/coalitions has never changed for centuries, each aiming to ensure the supremacy of economic, political and military goals. Intelligence flow will continue to be directed to those elements involved in the decision making process, thus the protection of interested areas to be ensured.

4. CONCLUSION

Intelligence typology for XXI century will represent a permanent and rapid adaptation such as the opponent to be strategically surprised. Proactive work will be carried out continuously at all levels horizontally and vertically, so that the elements involved in collection, processing, analysis and dissemination have to ensure to all levels of decision, necessary reports and summaries that can show and depict a clear image/vision and can highlight an immediate response. In the field of knowledge the intelligence work must pass easily from national to collective for maximum operational flexibility, of course inside alliances/coalitions.

The new type of culture organization based on collective complexity will be

enhanced and strengthened according to exponential growth of the mutual trust, so the new strategic networks to operate smoothly.

Decision making process at all levels of management should be harmonized and the parity in the decision-making power must be eliminated starting with increasing of value or by improving analysis and planning structures, be the each state or coalition/alliance. The highest degree of professionalism among specialists will be achieved through continuous training of specialized analysis and planning sectors and through assuring a maximum protection of all elements inside each network which provide intelligence to decision making levels, both military and civilian.

REFERENCES

- [1] Matthew J. MARTIN, Unifying Our Vision: Joint ISR Coordination and the NATO Joint ISR Initiative, <http://ndupress.ndu.edu/Media/News/NewsArticleView/tabid/7849/Article/8323/jfq-72-unifying-our-vision-joint-isr-coordination-and-the-nato-joint-isr-initia.aspx>, 12.02.2015, 2011.
- [2] IHS Jane's Defense Weekly, Vol.51, Issue 12, March 2014.
- [3] Ecaterina Livia TĂTAR, Decident - Decizie - Transformare, Concepții de gestionare a transformării în analiza militară – posibilități de aplicare în Armata României, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „CAROL I”, București 2012.
- [4] Costică Țenu, Lucian STĂNCILĂ, Constantin POPESCU, Probleme fundamentale ale științei militare, Studii strategice, Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „CAROL I”, București 2010.
- [5] Rupert SMITH, The Utility of Force, The art of war in the modern world, Random House, Inc., New York, 2007.B

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was possible with the financial support offered by Zone Operational Program of Human Resources Development 2007-2013, POSDRU/195/1.5/S13822, bearing the title "Transnational network for Integrated Management of Doctoral and Postdoctoral Intelligent Research, in the fields of "Military Sciences", "Security and Information" and "Public Order and national Security". Continuous Training Program of Elite Researchers – "SmartPODAS".