

Creating Legal Pentathletes: An Argument in Favor of an Operations Training Course for Judge Advocates (JAs)¹

Lieutenant Colonel Mike Ryan²

“Critical thinking, professionally grounded in the controlled application of violence, yet exposed to a broad array of expertise not normally considered part of traditional military functions will help create [officers with] a capacity to rapidly shift cognitively to a new environment.”³

Introduction

In its annual posture statement, the Army’s senior leadership explains several of the key concepts that will shape the future of the organization. With regard to leader training, the most recent Army posture statement provides the following:

We recognize that intellectual change precedes physical change. For this reason, we are developing qualities in our leaders, our people, and our forces to enable them to respond effectively to what they will face. We describe the leaders we are creating as “pentathletes,” whose versatility and athleticism – qualities that reflect the essence of our Army – will enable them to learn and adapt in ambiguous situations in a constantly evolving environment.⁴

Echoing this sentiment, the Judge Advocate General (JAG) of the U.S. Army recently stated the following in a corps-wide e-mail message appropriately entitled, “JAG Corps Pentathletes:”

Our personnel must be adaptive and capable of rapidly transitioning between complex tasks with relative ease. . . . We must:

- Encourage and reward innovative problem-solving.
- Stay abreast of current events and always be situationally aware.
- Know foreign cultures and languages.
- Understand the cultural context in which US Forces operate.
- Anticipate and articulate the second- and third-order effects of military operations and decisions.
- Actively assist commanders in positively influencing public opinion - both at home and abroad.⁵

To maximize the considerable legal and analytical skills judge advocates bring to the fight—to make them true pentathletes—they must understand the operational context. Important legal issues are nested in every aspect of modern operations; however, these issues are rarely self-evident. Given the demands placed on judge advocates in today’s operational environment, the contemporary operational lawyer needs to know more than the black letter law. To be a full-fledged member of the operational team, judge advocates must understand and speak the language of operations—they must be able to present ideas, arguments, and insights in a way that makes sense to commanders and operators. Judge advocates can only do this if they have the right training at the right time in their careers.

This article argues that judge advocates need additional training to help them be more effective battle staff officers, and in turn, more effective operational lawyers. It examines the current Judge Advocate General’s Corps (JAGC) training system and suggests possible revisions. This article asserts that, if implemented early enough in judge advocates’ careers, the

¹ The author wishes to thank the following individuals whose input and insight contributed significantly to this article: Mr. David Graham, Mr. Pat O’Hare, Colonel Pete Cullen, Lieutenant Colonel Holly Cook, Lieutenant Colonel Ian Corey, Lieutenant Colonel Pat Huston, Major Carlos Santiago, Major Pete Hayden, and Major Brad Sutera.

² At the time this note was written, the author was Director, Future Concepts Directorate, The Judge Advocate General’s Legal Center and School (TJAGLCS), Charlottesville, Virginia. Lieutenant Colonel Ryan is currently serving as the Staff Judge Advocate, 10th Mountain Division (Light Infantry).

³ Major General Peter Chiarelli & Major Patrick Michaelis, *Winning the Peace: The Requirements for Full-Spectrum Operations*, MIL. REV., July-Aug. 2005.

⁴ U.S. DEP’T OF ARMY, 2006 POSTURE STATEMENT ii (Executive Summary) (2006), available at http://www.army.mil/aps/06/03_ExecSum.html.

⁵ Major General Scott C. Black, *JAG Corps Pentathletes*, TJAG SENDS, A MONTHLY MESSAGE FROM THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, vol. 37, no. 5 (Feb. 2006).

changes outlined here would contribute significantly to judge advocates' professional development and help them develop the knowledge, skills, and expertise necessary to be the kind of multi-faceted, full-spectrum leaders contemplated by the term pentathlete.⁶

The Army JAGC: Making a Great Team Even Better

The Army JAGC is an incredibly talented team. No matter what the challenge or how difficult the circumstances, Army judge advocates always excel. It is important, therefore, to note that this article is not an indictment of the JAGC or JAGC training. Indeed, the JAGC is an exceedingly professional organization made up of bright, talented, dedicated Soldiers. Along these same lines, it should be noted that the training currently provided to judge advocates is consistently outstanding. The officers selected to serve on the faculty of The Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School (TJAGLCS) are uniformly superb, and the instruction they provide remains the "gold standard" for military legal training worldwide.

The Corps' positive attributes notwithstanding, the hallmark of every great team is a constant desire to improve. To that end, the time has come for the JAGC to eschew what many see as a legacy approach to judge advocate training and adopt a judge advocate training model that better prepares our officers for the realities of the contemporary operational environment. While learning the nuances of military law is critically important, our officers also need to receive more extensive training in basic staff skills, the operations process, and other key areas that will enable them to perform more effectively in operational assignments.⁷

Where the JAGC Needs to Improve and Why

Ask most judge advocates about the first time they took part in a training exercise, entered a tactical operations center (TOC), or participated in the Military Decision Making Process (MDMP)—a planning and decision-making methodology used Army-wide during training and operations—with an operational unit. When recalling this experience, few will recount being confident. Indeed, most will remember feeling a certain amount of apprehension and intimidation.

For a wide-ranging view of this topic, review any of the various publications produced by the Center for Law and Military Operations (CLAMO) or chat with any judge advocate who has served as an observer/controller (O/C) at a combat training center (CTC). In doing so, you will find that the experts—the individuals with the most first-hand experience observing and analyzing judge advocates in operational settings—uniformly agree that while virtually every judge advocate is highly competent in the substantive areas of military law, most could use improvement in *non-legal* subjects: specifically, operations and the operations process, MDMP, weapons and equipment capabilities, and targeting.⁸ Indeed, the number one observation of judge advocate O/Cs during a recent conference hosted by CLAMO was that judge advocates need more extensive training in the operations process, battle staff skills, and the warfighting functions.⁹

To its credit, TJAGLCS's cadre and faculty have attempted to bridge this training gap. For example, TJAGLCS faculty recently began instructing new judge advocates during the Judge Advocate Officer Basic Course (JAOBC) on the orders process and basic troop leading procedures. At the end of JAOBC, the International and Operational Law Department

⁶ The arguments and opinions presented in this article are based on an analysis of current JAGC training programs, After Action Reviews from combat and contingency operations, interviews with judge advocates with recent combat experience, and interviews with current and former judge advocate Observer/Controllers (O/Cs) at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC). The opinions contained herein are also based on the author's service in operational billets, including two years as the Senior Operational Law O/C at the JRTC and a recent deployment to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom III.

⁷ See U.S. DEP'T OF ARMY, FIELD MANUAL 5-0, ARMY PLANNING AND ORDERS PRODUCTION ch. 1 (Jan. 2005) (listing the components of the operations process as "plan, prepare, execute, and assess"). Emerging doctrine adheres to this notion; specifically, the final draft of *Field Manual Interim 5-0.1, The Operations Process*, states that: "the operations process is the major command and control activities performed during operations: planning, preparing, execution, and continuous assessment." U.S. DEP'T OF ARMY, FIELD MANUAL INTERIM 5-0.1, THE OPERATIONS PROCESS (5 Oct. 2005).

⁸ See generally CENTER FOR LAW & MILITARY OPERATIONS, THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S LEGAL CENTER & SCHOOL, LEGAL LESSONS LEARNED FROM AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ, VOL. I, MAJOR COMBAT OPERATIONS (11 SEPTEMBER 2001- MAY 2003) (Aug. 2004); CENTER FOR LAW & MILITARY OPERATIONS, THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S LEGAL CENTER & SCHOOL, LEGAL LESSONS LEARNED FROM AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ, VOL. II, FULL SPECTRUM OPERATIONS (1 MAY 2003 - 30 JUNE 2004) (Sept. 2005).

⁹ Memorandum, Director, The Center for Law and Military Operations (CLAMO), to Director, TJAGLCS, subject: Initial After Action Review, 2006 CLAMO Observer/Controller (O/C) Conference (7 Dec. 2006).

conducts a commander's update briefing exercise and includes seminar instruction on division organization and operations. Similarly, the JAGC senior leadership has directed that beginning in late 2006, judge advocates will attend the Basic Officer Leader Course (BOLC) alongside officers from other branches. While these innovations unquestionably represent steps in the right direction, today's judge advocate needs more. For the foreseeable future, operational deployments will be the norm for judge advocates. Once deployed, they will be expected (regardless of experience, time in service, or commissioning source) to participate as members of their unit's planning cells and battle staff. Unfortunately, the current JAGC professional education model does not fully prepare judge advocates for all of these challenges. A look at the current judge advocate training and education process is illustrative.

The JAGC Training and Education Model

Most judge advocates enter the Army as direct commissionees without the benefit of any prior military service.¹⁰ During their initial entry training—JAABC—they spend approximately two weeks at Fort Lee, Virginia, followed by ten weeks at TJAGLCS, in Charlottesville, Virginia. During the Fort Lee phase, students complete the necessary in-processing tasks, purchase uniforms, and begin to learn the basics of Army life.¹¹ Students also undergo a variety of elementary leadership and Soldier skills training classes.

The Charlottesville phase of JAABC consists primarily of academic instruction at TJAGLCS. During this phase, JAs receive 110 hours of criminal law instruction, 104 hours of Administrative and Civil Law instruction, 48 hours of International and Operational Law instruction, and 28 hours of Contract and Fiscal Law instruction.¹² Beginning in 2006, after completing their training in Charlottesville, judge advocates will attend BOLC, which is discussed later in this article.

During the initial phase of their careers, most judge advocates return to TJAGLCS from time to time for "short courses" that focus on specific areas of military legal practice. These classes generally consist of classroom and seminar instruction provided by TJAGLCS faculty or other subject matter experts. Sometime between their eighth and tenth year of service, judge advocates attend the Judge Advocate Officer Graduate Course.¹³ The Graduate Course consists almost exclusively of substantive military legal instruction at TJAGLCS. Graduates of the course receive a Master of Laws, or LL.M., in Military Law.

One thing noticeably absent from the current JAGC training model is the Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS3). In the past, junior Army officers, including judge advocates, attended CAS3 prior to their advanced course (in the case of judge advocates, prior to the Graduate Course). The Combined Arms and Services Staff School focused on basic battle staff skills and taught students the various planning tools, techniques, and methodologies used in operational units. A significant portion of CAS3 was devoted to the MDMP. Learning and actually practicing the MDMP helped judge advocates begin to understand staff roles and responsibilities. It also helped further their understanding of the operations process.

An added benefit of CAS3 was the opportunity for students to attend the course alongside officers from other branches. This opportunity was especially beneficial for less experienced Army officers, as it provided them with a chance to learn about the roles, missions, and areas of expertise of the other branches and to see how the various components of an operational unit staff work together during operations. Unfortunately, CAS3 was discontinued as a "stand alone" course in April 2004. The topics covered during CAS3 have since been added to, or were already taught in, the captains' career courses provided by other Army branches.

¹⁰ Telephone Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Ray Jackson, Judge Advocate Recruiting Office, Office of The Judge Advocate General, in Washington, D.C. (Dec. 15, 2005).

¹¹ While in Charlottesville, JAABC students also participate in student-led physical training (PT), performed to Army standards, three days per week. Additionally, those students competing for Airborne and Air-Assault school slots volunteer for a more intense PT program, which, for the Air-Assault candidates, includes a number of cadre-led road marches.

¹² THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL, PROGRAM OF INSTR. 5-27-C20: JUDGE ADVOCATE OFFICER BASIC COURSE—PHASE II, JANUARY TO APRIL 2005 (Mar. 2005) (maintained by Associate Dean, TJAGLCS).

¹³ OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, JAG PUB. 1-1, JAGC PERSONNEL AND ACTIVITY DIRECTORY AND PERSONNEL POLICIES, 2005-2006 app. (Nov. 2005).

Recognizing the importance of CAS3 for judge advocates, the JAGC has developed a distance learning program designed to teach officers some of the subjects formerly covered during the course.¹⁴ This initiative is an important first step in improving the existing judge advocate education model, and it will undoubtedly go a long way toward improving the baseline operational knowledge of most judge advocates. The following question—upon which reasonable minds may disagree—remains: is a distance learning program adequate to solve the problems identified in this article? If not, can and should the JAGC do more to make judge advocates better battle staff officers? A closer look at the judge advocate training and education process may help to frame the debate.

Identifying Gaps in JA Training and Education

Presently, a judge advocate's military education, up to and including the Graduate Course, does not include detailed instruction in critical battle staff skills, the operations process, the Army's organizational structure, or the Army's basic battle tactics and strategy. The distance learning initiative notwithstanding, the first chance most judge advocates will have to learn these areas in any detail may well come when they attend Intermediate Level Education (ILE)—a milestone they will not normally reach until they have completed at least one assignment *after* the Graduate Course. While on this topic, it is worth noting that ILE is not a primer on staff skills and operations for new Army officers. To the contrary, ILE is designed to prepare officers for staff assignments at the brigade level and above.

As a practical matter, this delay in education means that the average judge advocate will serve between ten and twelve years on active duty and likely will complete a number of operational assignments *before* he receives any formal, hands-on training in the concepts, terminology, and systems that are the mainstays of life in an operational unit. While most judge advocates will have had a certain amount of on-the-job training on these subjects by this point in their careers (and upon implementation of the distance learning program they will have been exposed to some of these concepts via their computers), the situation still invites the following question: Is this educational gap preventing operational judge advocates from achieving their full potential?

Given the training model discussed above, judge advocates may well arrive at their first operational assignment without a sufficient understanding of how the Army really works in an operational setting. While judge advocates are eager to serve and to work hard, many will simply be unacquainted with unit capabilities and the various command posts, boards, centers, and cells within their headquarters. Some judge advocates will have never prepared a staff estimate, given a staff briefing, or participated in the targeting process. Others will have never written or reviewed an operations order or one of its annexes. Unfortunately, most will not fully understand operational terms, operational graphics, or the basic tenets of tactics and strategy. These judge advocates will have never participated in mission analysis, deliberate planning, or the MDMP. They will have a limited understanding of the roles and missions of the various branches of the Army, and they will not know the kinds of operations the Army conducts as a matter of doctrine.¹⁵ Most, if not all, operational unit judge advocates will be called on at some point to provide expert advice on the use of force, rules of engagement (ROE), and complex targeting issues. While these questions are virtually guaranteed, the JAGC training model does not currently address the capabilities and limitations of the weapons, ordnance, and delivery platforms regularly employed by the Army and the joint force.

The Timing Problem

As noted, the first in-depth, hands-on training that a judge advocate will receive in battle staff-related topics, will probably come during ILE. Given that most judge advocates attend ILE as senior majors, this training arguably comes too late. A high percentage of judge advocate assignments in the operational Army¹⁶ are performed by captains. As a result, the

¹⁴ The Training Developments Directorate at TJAGLCS is currently developing a distance learning course called the Judge Advocate Tactical Staff Officer Course (JATSOC). The JATSOC subcourses will include: Combined Arms Defense and Offense, Map Symbology, MDMP, Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield Overview, Joint Operations, Military Briefings, Army Organizations, and Staff Roles and Coordination.

¹⁵ Army doctrine currently recognizes four types of operations: offense, defense, stability, and support. See U.S. DEP'T OF ARMY, FIELD MANUAL 3-0, OPERATIONS pt. 3, chs. 7-10 (June 2001). The new *FM 3-0*, due to be released in 2007, lists the Army operations as offense, defense, stability, and civil support.

¹⁶ The terms "operational Army" and "operational force" refer to those organizations within the Army that provide essential landpower capabilities to combatant commanders. The operational Army is distinguished from the "institutional Army," which includes those units and organizations that exist to support the accomplishment of the Army's Title 10 functions. These functions include accessions, training, doctrine development, human resource management, medical support, civil infrastructure support, acquisition, and procurement. See U.S. DEP'T OF ARMY, FIELD MANUAL 1, THE ARMY ch. 2 (June 2005).

average judge advocate can reasonably expect to serve in an operational unit early in his career—often as soon as the first or second assignment. Given the Army’s commitments in the Global War on Terror (GWOT), a junior judge advocate’s first operational assignment may very well include a lengthy deployment to a combat or contingency operation.

Solving the Problem Sooner Rather Than Later

Critics who see no need for the type of training advocated by this article will probably maintain that the JAGC has served the Army exceedingly well for 230 years without non-legal training and that it will continue to do so in the future. Others may argue that the JAGC mission is to provide legal services to the Army and that this can best be accomplished by focusing judge advocate training exclusively on the core legal disciplines.¹⁷ While both of these viewpoints have some merit, they are, to a certain extent, rooted in the past. These viewpoints do not provide sufficient grounding for judge advocates to meet the myriad challenges they will face in the twenty-first century.

The Army is at war and in the midst of the most dramatic period of change in its history. While it is decisively engaged in the GWOT and homeland security, new and elusive threats from non-state entities, and other missions across the full spectrum of military operations, the Army is simultaneously transforming its force structure to a brigade-focused, modular design.¹⁸ The implications of these two events are staggering and well beyond the scope of this article; however, two salient points for the JAGC merit discussion. First, the U.S. Army is engaged in a protracted war in which the mission profiles and the complexities of the battle space are incredibly unique. Because a non-linear, non-contiguous battlefield and complex, decentralized operations will be the norm for the foreseeable future, today’s judge advocate cannot expect to spend his time in “the rear” focused solely on the core legal disciplines. Indeed, events have shown that there is no “rear” when facing an asymmetric threat.¹⁹ Additionally, the modern operational judge advocate is a key member of the battle staff whose input is essential during the planning and conduct of operations. In order to fully contribute, judge advocates must understand the concepts, processes, and lexicon used by the operational force. This knowledge should be gained during a judge advocate’s formal education, not left to happenstance or developed in an ad hoc manner on the job.

Second, in keeping with the Army’s new modular design and its brigade-centric focus, future operations may require a battalion or brigade task force to operate in a semi-autonomous manner for an extended period, often without the luxury of a “parent division” in close proximity. As a part of the Army transformation process, the JAGC has permanently assigned operational legal teams, consisting of judge advocates and paralegal soldiers, to brigade-level staffs for conventional forces and to battalion-level staffs in Special Forces groups. As a result, operational judge advocates must be prepared to participate in the planning and assessment of sophisticated operations at lower levels of command. Similarly, they must arrive at their units ready to provide timely advice on critical decisions, without needing to seek information or guidance from higher headquarters. Without the necessary staff skills and the proper background and training in the essential elements of operations, judge advocates may be less effective, especially in an isolated environment in which decisions will be time sensitive and “reachback” is limited.

What About BOLC?

In considering the dilemma discussed thus far, many will suggest that the judge advocate training problem will be solved when judge advocates attend BOLC. The BOLC is a six-week training course soon to be implemented Army-wide, which is designed to train new Army officers in basic combat and leadership skills. The course will focus primarily on small unit leadership and platoon level operations. At first glance, this suggestion appears valid, and certainly, as of this writing, the Corps’ leadership has committed to participation in BOLC.²⁰

¹⁷ U.S. DEPT. OF THE ARMY, FIELD MANUAL 27-100, LEGAL SUPPORT TO OPERATIONS ch. 5 (1 Mar. 2000) (identifying the JAGC’s core legal disciplines as Administrative Law, Civil Law, Military Justice, International Law, Legal Assistance, and Claims).

¹⁸ See U.S. Army, The Army’s Modular Forces, <http://www.army.mil/modularforces/> (last visited May 25, 2006).

¹⁹ At this writing, nineteen JAGC personnel have been wounded in action in Iraq and Afghanistan, and, sadly, five have been killed in action. These figures illustrate that in modern operations, JAGC Soldiers are more likely to find themselves in harm’s way than ever before. See The Judge Advocate General’s Corps, In Memoriam, [https://www.jagcnet.army.mil/JAGCNETINTRANET/JAGCSTRA.NSF/\(JAGCNetDocID\)/IN+MEMORIAM?OpenDocument](https://www.jagcnet.army.mil/JAGCNETINTRANET/JAGCSTRA.NSF/(JAGCNetDocID)/IN+MEMORIAM?OpenDocument) (last visited May 25, 2006) (“Honoring JAGC Regiment Members who died in a combat zone while answering their call to service”).

²⁰ The author has been one of the members of the Corps’ planning team working the issue of JAGC participation in BOLC since July 2004. Judge advocates began attending BOLC in February 2007.

Unfortunately, BOLC is not the antidote to the problems outlined in this article. While BOLC will make judge advocates better officers and more confident leaders, it is not designed to teach battle staff skills or the essentials of the operations process. According to the U.S. Army Infantry School, the proponent for the course, BOLC is designed to “[e]nsure each lieutenant graduates with the skills [necessary] to lead a platoon [that] will close with and destroy the enemy.”²¹ In addition, each student will be developed into leaders who “[a]re familiar . . . with squad and platoon dismounted battle drills and command selected collective tasks.”²² These are laudable goals, and this type of training is long overdue for judge advocates, but the course will not necessarily prepare judge advocates to serve specifically as members of an operational unit’s battle staff.

Additionally, the inclusion of BOLC in the Corps’ education model may have certain unintended consequences. Specifically, the Fort Lee phase of JAOBC has been shortened to make time for BOLC and certain pre-BOLC training, and some of the operations-oriented training classes that judge advocates formerly received at Fort Lee are no longer provided.

Some Possible Solutions

The JAGC could conceivably solve many of the problems outlined in this article by modifying its existing educational model. Using a new educational construct, JAGC training should include an introduction to Army organizations and capabilities, a primer on staff skills, a discussion of key components of the operations process, and some hands-on experience with the MDMP.

Training could take place at TJAGLCS, the Corps’ Regimental home, and should occur as early as practicable in a judge advocate’s career. With a few notable exceptions, the proposed training could be taught by judge advocates. There are, and will continue to be, numerous judge advocates with operational, practical, and academic experience who are either assigned to TJAGLCS or otherwise available. Considering that this proposed course probably would be taught no more than three times per year, it makes sense to leverage the knowledge and expertise found within the JAGC.²³ When an area is not within the capabilities of the JAGC (intelligence preparation of the battlefield, for example), a subject matter expert could be brought in to teach that block of instruction and provide the necessary perspective and insight.

The training contemplated under this new educational construct would not be designed to make judge advocates operations experts. Rather, it would fully familiarize judge advocates with the key terms, concepts, and methodologies they will encounter in the operational force. Figure 1 shows a list of proposed training topics. If these topics were addressed in the time frame suggested, the course could be taught in the same amount of time as an existing TJAGLCS short course (i.e., four to five days). The list of topics is not all inclusive, and seminar discussions and practical exercises could be incorporated to enhance the learning experience. Three possible courses of action (COA) for this training are outlined below.

COA #1: Extend the Length of the Basic Course

A first option is to extend the length of JAOBC by one week. The advantages of this COA are that students are already located at TJAGLCS; they are settled into the quarters and facilities; and they are accustomed to the academic routine. Because this training would occur after JAOBC, this option would not impact the existing JAOBC academic program of instruction. Additionally, it precludes students from having to leave Charlottesville, report to their units, and later return to TJAGLCS for the additional training in a costly temporary duty (TDY) status. Critics of this COA note that at this point in their careers, judge advocates have little understanding of the Army; therefore, they lack the requisite “context” for a detailed study of the operations process and the other topics advocated by this article. In response, one could assert that judge advocates are smart, capable, well-educated people. If approached correctly, there is no reason they could not benefit from this training and begin to form a solid base of understanding in this area.

²¹ 1st Battalion, 11th Infantry Regiment, Basic Officer Leader Course II (BOLC II), Commander’s Vision, https://www.infantry.army.mil/BOLC/content02_Vision.htm (last visited May 25, 2006).

²² *Id.*

²³ Additional duties are rarely popular; however, they are a necessary and time-honored aspect of service as an Army officer. It is also important to remember that the Army sends its officers to school with the anticipation of obtaining a return on its investment. Officers who are graduates of ILE, and other forms of “higher education” provided by the Army, have an obligation to share their knowledge and experience with their fellow Soldiers.

COA #2: Create a Stand-Alone Course

A second option is to create a stand-alone short course not unlike those already taught by the various academic departments at TJAGLCS. The primary advantage of this COA is flexibility. Specifically, officers could leave the basic course, attend BOLC, report to their assignments, and when practicable, return for the operations training course that best fits their schedules. Likewise, the course could accommodate officers at various points in their judge advocate careers and officers from sister services.

The principle disadvantage of this option is that it would be expensive. Generally, TDY trips to short courses are funded by the judge advocates' parent unit. More importantly, this COA would not ensure that every new judge advocate is adequately trained on these important topics at the time when he requires the instruction the most—early in his judge advocate career. Also, if this training were organized as a stand-alone short course, it would have to compete for time, space, and resources with the other short courses already on the TJAGLCS academic calendar.

COA #3: “Salami Slice” Current Basic Course Curriculum

A third option would entail reviewing the current JAOBC curriculum, deleting selected subjects presently taught to basic course students, and using the time saved to teach the topics proposed in figure 1. The primary advantage of this option would be that it would not involve lengthening Phase II of JAOBC, and it would not require judge advocates to return to TJAGLCS in a TDY status. The major disadvantage of this COA is that it would mean the elimination of certain blocks of instruction currently deemed essential to a judge advocate's professional education.

Conclusion

In these critical times with so much at stake, the JAGC must ensure its officers are experts in military law, capable of effectively functioning as members of an operational unit's battle staff. The outstanding legal training provided as a part of the current Corps' education model satisfies this first requirement, but the JAGC must transform other aspects of this model to address the second requirement. The suggestions offered in this article offer one view on how to begin to accomplish these goals. With the right training, future judge advocates can enter operational assignments with confidence and continue to improve the already stellar reputation of the Army JAGC.

Proposed Judge Advocate Operations Training Course (JAOTC)

Day 1: How The Army is Organized
Army/Joint Force Overview
The Army's Mission
Branches of the Army – Missions and Capabilities
Distribution of Army Forces Worldwide
Operational Force Overview
Echelons Above Division – Organizations, Stationing, and Capabilities
Divisions – Organization, Stationing, and Capabilities
Brigade Combat Team and Support Brigade Overview
Day 2: Battle Staff Organization and Operations
Staff Organization, Roles, and Responsibilities
Coordinating Staff, Special Staff, and Personal Staff
Staff Planning Tools, Procedures, and Methods for Synchronization
Types of Orders (Warning Orders, Fragmentary Orders, Operation Orders, and Order Annexes)
Briefing Types and Briefing Techniques
Overview of Operational Terms and Graphics
Intro to IPB
Intro to the MDMP
Day 3: How the Army Fights
Operations Overview: Offense, Defense, Stability, and Support
Battlefield Organization: Decisive, Shaping, and Sustaining Operations
Doctrinal Warfighting Functions
The Operations Process: Plan, Prepare, Execute, and Assess
Command Post Operations (Tactical Operations Center, Tactical Action Center, etc.)
The Targeting/Combat Synchronization Process (Lethal and Non-Lethal)
Briefing Practical Exercise
Day 4: What the Army Uses to Fight and CPX – Planning PE
Major Army Weapons Systems
Joint Force Weapons Systems
Major Army Communications Systems
Culminating Practical Exercise (Mission Planning)

Fig. 1