

CHAPTER 2

ASSUMPTIONS

2-1. GENERAL: Four fundamental assumptions were made in areas which were beyond the influence of the study. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 does not clearly define the term "forces" nor does it exclude Hawaii, Puerto Rico and other US territories and possessions which are in the geographic areas of unified combatant commanders. The Army assigns forces to the Army component commander of a unified command. The command and control of the Army component command of a unified command is not within the scope or influence of this study. Army doctrine may require some changes based on the DOD Reorganization Act of 1986; however, the extent of the changes, if any, are not known at this time. The following paragraphs provide the basis and implications of the study assumptions in these areas.

2-2. FORCES.

a. Assumption: The term "forces" as used in Title 10, United States Code, Section 162 (a)(4), is defined as Army Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) and Modified Table of Organization and Equipment (MTOE) organizations.

b. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 requires the Secretary of the Army to assign all Army forces to unified and specified combatant commanders. It also provides that all forces operating in the geographic area assigned to a unified combatant commander shall be assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander. However, the Act does not define what constitutes "forces".

c. Army units organized under Modified Tables of Organization and Equipment (MTOE) are organized to perform assigned combat missions. MTOE units perform combat, combat support or combat service support missions and are capable of prolonged periods of combat. They are designed for overseas deployment. MTOE units may have a Table of Distribution and Allowance (TDA) augmentation to provide personnel and equipment needed to perform an added non-TOE mission. The organic elements of Army tactical forces at Corps and below are MTOE units. There appears to be no question that the term "forces" as used in the DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 would include Army MTOE units.

d. Army units organized under a Table of Distribution and Allowances (TDA) are generally non-deployable units organized to fulfill mission, function, and workload obligations of a fixed support establishment in CONUS or overseas. TDA units are uniquely developed to perform a specific support mission. They usually include civilian manpower. TDA units include such varied organizations such as Theater Army Headquarters, INSCOM Field Stations, and a two person medical research unit. The majority

of the OCONUS elements of CONUS based organizations are TDA units. Many of these organizations do not contribute to the warfighting capability of the unified combatant commander, depart the theater at some point in the escalation of hostilities, and primarily perform Secretary of the Army functions as defined in the Act. It would appear that the Congress, while its primary intent was to include deployable Army MTOE units in the category of forces to be assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander, did not exclude TDA units from the forces which may be assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander. For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the term "forces" as used in the Act includes both Army MTOE and TDA units.

2-3. GEOGRAPHIC AREA.

a. Assumption: The term "geographic area assigned to a unified combatant command" as used in Title 10, United States Code, Section 162 (a)(4), does not include CONUS and mainland Alaska (including the islands which are not within the geographic area of a unified commander).

b. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 requires the Secretary of the Army to assign all Army forces to unified and specified combatant commanders. It also provides that all forces operating in the geographic area assigned to a unified combatant commander shall be assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander. The Act made no distinction between deployable and non-deployable forces located in the CONUS sustaining base or on US territory.

c. CONUS and mainland Alaska (including some islands) are not located in the geographic area of a unified combatant commander; therefore, it is assumed that, for the purpose and scope of this study, Section 162 (a)(4), Title 10, US Code does not apply to non-deployable Army forces located in CONUS and mainland Alaska. These organizations are part of the CONUS sustaining base and most perform Secretary of the Army functions which would exclude them from assignment to a unified or specified combatant commander as provided in Section 162 (a)(2), Title 10, US Code. Therefore, this study will not address Army organizations located in CONUS and mainland Alaska.

d. Although the assignment of Army organizations in CONUS is not within the scope of this study, the requirement in Section 162(a)(1) to assign all Army forces, except those that perform Secretary of the Army functions, to unified and specified combatant commanders, has a direct affect on the assignment of the CONUS headquarters and CONUS elements of the US Army Information Systems Command and the US Army Intelligence and Security Command since these two MACOM's do not appear to perform a Secretary of the Army function listed in Section 3013(b), Title 10, US Code. Any assignment decision concerning the CONUS parent organizations would affect the assignment decisions concerning

the OCONUS elements. For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the assignment of the parent organizations in CONUS will remain essentially unchanged.

e. The Congress did not exclude non-deployable Army forces located OCONUS in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and US overseas territories and possessions; therefore, it is assumed that Section 162 (a)(4), Title 10, US Code, applies to non-deployable forces located in these areas as well as foreign areas. These US areas are part of the geographic area of a unified combatant commander and, although most of the non-deployable forces perform a Secretary of the Army function and could be considered part of the CONUS sustaining base, some non-deployable Army organizations located in these areas have potential use for a unified combatant commander in wartime. This study addresses the subordinate organizations of CONUS based organizations located OCONUS in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and US overseas territories and possessions.

2-4. ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES.

a. Assumption: Army forces assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander of a unified command are also assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander of the geographic area.

b. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 requires the Secretary of the Army to assign all Army forces to unified and specified combatant commanders. It also provides that all forces operating in the geographic area assigned to a unified combatant commander shall be assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander. This raises an issue concerning the command and control of the OCONUS Army components of unified commands which is out of the scope of this study but impacts on the assignment of the OCONUS elements of CONUS based organizations.

c. The OCONUS elements of CONUS based organizations provide support at Echelons Above Corps or are tenant organizations located in the geographic area that provide support to organizations outside the geographic area or mission of the unified combatant commander. According to Army doctrine as contained in FM 100-16, Support Operations: Echelons Above Corps, the Theater Army commander and the Field Army commander, either of whom could be the Army component commander within a unified command, are under the command of the Department of the Army or some designated higher Army headquarters which may be outside the geographic area of the unified commander. In wartime the Theater Army commander remains under an Army command, less operational command which is exercised by the unified combatant commander. The Theater Army commander retains command, less operational control, of Army combat and combat support units which are transferred to tactical commands.

d. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 brings these doctrinal command and control relationships into question. Since the OCONUS elements of CONUS based organizations operating OCONUS provide support at Echelons Above Corps, under Army doctrine, if they were to be assigned to a command in the geographic area, they would be assigned to the Army component commander. The command relationship of these organizations to the unified commander would depend on the command relationship of the Army component commander to the unified commander. Since this relationship is outside the scope of this study, for the purposes of the study, it is assumed that forces assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander of a unified command are also assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander of the geographic area. Therefore, in this study, the term "assigned to and commanded by the unified combatant commander" means that an organization would actually be assigned to and commanded by the Army component commander of the unified combatant command.

2-5. DOCTRINE.

a. Assumption: Army Echelons Above Corps (EAC) support operations doctrine remains valid except that forces located in the geographic area of a unified combatant commander which are not assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander will require approval by the Secretary of Defense for exception.

b. Under current Army doctrine as contained in FM 100-16, Support Operations: Echelons Above Corps, the US Army component commander (Theater Army, Field Army, etc.) of a unified command should command and control all US Army forces in the theater. However, Army doctrine states that, in practice, this is not always feasible. Statutory requirements, economy-of-scale considerations, and other conditions cause this to be impractical in some instances. Exceptions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. US Army forward-deployed forces during peace and war, as well as forces involved in contingency situations, may deviate in some degree from the basic doctrine.

c. FM 100-16 cites as major examples of deviations from doctrine, three CONUS-based functional MACOM's which are of concern to this study.

(1) The theater communications command (Army) (TCC(A)) elements functions under the command of the US Army Information Systems Command (USAISC) and under the operational control of the Army component commander.

(2) The intelligence, security, and electronic warfare brigade/group functions under the command of the US Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) and under the operational control of the Army component commander, with the exception of measurement and signatures intelligence (MASINT),

d. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986 brings these doctrinal command and control relationships into question. Since the OCONUS elements of CONUS based organizations operating OCONUS provide support at Echelons Above Corps, under Army doctrine, if they were to be assigned to a command in the geographic area, they would be assigned to the Army component commander. The command relationship of these organizations to the unified commander would depend on the command relationship of the Army component commander to the unified commander. Since this relationship is outside the scope of this study, for the purposes of the study, it is assumed that forces assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander of a unified command are also assigned to and under the command of the unified combatant commander of the geographic area. Therefore, in this study, the term "assigned to and commanded by the unified combatant commander" means that an organization would actually be assigned to and commanded by the Army component commander of the unified combatant command.

2-5. DOCTRINE.

a. Assumption: Army Echelons Above Corps (EAC) support operations doctrine remains valid except that forces located in the geographic area of a unified combatant commander which are not assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander will require approval by the Secretary of Defense for exception.

b. Under current Army doctrine as contained in FM 100-16, Support Operations: Echelons Above Corps, the US Army component commander (Theater Army, Field Army, etc.) of a unified command should command and control all US Army forces in the theater. However, Army doctrine states that, in practice, this is not always feasible. Statutory requirements, economy-of-scale considerations, and other conditions cause this to be impractical in some instances. Exceptions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. US Army forward-deployed forces during peace and war, as well as forces involved in contingency situations, may deviate in some degree from the basic doctrine.

c. FM 100-16 cites as major examples of deviations from doctrine, three CONUS-based functional MACOM's which are of concern to this study.

(1) The theater communications command (Army) (TCC(A)) elements functions under the command of the US Army Information Systems Command (USAISC) and under the operational control of the Army component commander.

(2) The intelligence, security, and electronic warfare brigade/group functions under the command of the US Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) and under the operational control of the Army component commander, with the exception of measurement and signatures intelligence (MASINT),

signals intelligence (SIGINT), and offensive counterintelligence operations (OFCO).

(3) The logistics wholesale elements of the Army Materiel Command (AMC) remain under the command of AMC in peacetime and function under the provisions of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the Army component commander.

d. The DOD Reorganization Act of 1986, brings these deviations from basic doctrine into question. If the Army intends to continue these doctrinal deviations in command and control, it would now appear that an exception by the Secretary of Defense is required for those forces located in the geographic area of an Army component commander which are not assigned to and under the command of the Army component commander. For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that this is the case.