AD-A210 966

THE FIVE PARAGRAPH FIELD ORDER: CAN A BETTER FORMAT BE FOUND TO TRANSMIT COMBAT INFORMATION TO SMALL TACTICAL UNITS?

A Monograph

by

Major Matthew L. Smith

Armor

MENS EST CLAVIS VICTORIA

School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

First Term AY 88-89

89-03131

89 8 08 076

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
UNCLASSIFIED	

2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College	ATZL -SWV	

6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-6900	

8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
	PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
THE FIVE PARAGRAPH FIELD ORDER: CAN A BETTER FORMAT BE FOUND TO TRANSMIT COMBAT INFORMATION TO SMALL TACTICAL UNITS ? (U)

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
MAJ Matthew L. Smith

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)	15. PAGE COUNT
Monograph	FROM _____ TO _____	88/11/29	40

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17.	COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Command and control
			Field orders
			Operation orders

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

This monograph attempts to determine whether the current US five paragraph field order is the best format to use when transmitting the commander's intentions, combat information and tasks to battalions of smaller tactical units. Historical research was conducted concerning the current US five paragraph field order to determine its foundation, how the format evolved throughout 20th century, the formats' key points, and the lessons learned concerning order formats. After completing the historical research, additional research was conducted to identify current order formats used by other nations and to determine their strengths and weaknesses. The formats researched are those used in Israel, the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. The final part of the study compared formats with the aim of determining if a better format exists of could be synthesized. This study concludes that a better

(SEE BACK SIDE)

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
☑ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	UNCLASSIFIED

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL
MAJ Matthew L. Smith	(913) 684-2138	ATZL-SWV

DD Form 1473, JUN 86   Previous editions are obsolete.

than the curent US format is not in use and that a better format can be synthesized from the strengths of all the formats studied. This synthesized format is developed and presented in Section 4. of this study. Also, this study finds that the entire order process needs to be sped up and that a mission-type order format for use by high speed armor and cavalry units needs to be developed.

The Five Paragraph Field Order: Can a better format be
found to transmit combat information to small tactical units?

by
Major Matthew L. Smith
Armor

School of Advanced Military Studies
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

29 November 1988

"Approved for public release; distribution unlimited."

ABSTRACT

THE FIVE PARAGRAPH FIELD ORDER: CAN A BETTER FORMAT BE FOUND
     TO TRANSMIT COMBAT INFORMATION TO SMALL TACTICAL UNITS
     by MAJ Matthew L. Smith, USA, 30 pages.

     This monograph attempts to determine whether the current
United States (US) five paragraph field order is the best
format to use when transmitting the commander's intentions,
combat information and tasks to battalions of smaller tactical
units.

     Initially, historical research was conducted concerning
the current US five paragraph field order to determine its
foundation, how the format evolved throughout 20th century
warfare and its strengths and weaknesses. The products of the
historical research are the presentation of formats used by
small tactical units prior to and during each major US
warfighting experience of the 20th century, the formats' key
points, and the lessons learned concerning order formats.
After completing the historical research, additional research
was conducted to identify current order formats used by other
nations and to determine their strengths and weaknesses. The
formats researched are those used in Israel, the Soviet Union
and the Federal Republic of Germany. The final part of the
study compared formats with the aim of determining if a better
format exists of could be synthesized.

     This study concludes that a better format than the
current US format is not in use and that a better format can
be synthesized from the strengths of all the formats studied.
This synthesized format is developed and presented in Section
4. of this study. Also, this study finds that the entire order
process needs to be sped up and that a mission-type order
format for use by high speed armor and cavalry units needs to
be developed.

Table of Contents

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

"The order in the field is issued under peculiar
conditions of emergency and inconvenience. It is received
sometimes in the midst of great excitement and danger; perhaps
it must be read in a rain storm where no shelter is near, or
at night by a poor light. Every care must be taken to make it
brief, in plain phrase and short sentence." Eben Swift, 1897.

A field order's purpose is threefold; to ensure
subordinate units function in a coordinated manner towards
achieving the commander's will, to limit and determine what
information is transmitted to subordinate units, and to format
the transmission of information in a standard sequence to
facilitate its development and understanding.

The purpose of this paper is to determine whether the
current United States (US) five paragraph field order is the
best format to use when transmitting the commander's
intentions, combat information and tasks to battalions or
smaller units. The five paragraph field order has been used
for decades to transmit critical information needed by US
ground forces to coordinate movement, fires, and support. Its
foundation lay in 19th century German military experiences and
was introduced to the US military by Captain Eben Swift in
1897.' The US order format has evolved throughout 20th century
warfare with the aim of keeping pace with changes in weapons,
tactics, and the tempo of modern combat.

This study is important because US ground forces will initially fight the next war using methods and techniques taught at its service schools and established in its doctrine. The current five paragraph order is embedded in US doctrine, with every level doctrinal manual from platoon through corps devoting annexes to explain how orders should be written and what information should go in each paragraph and subparagraph of the order. Current tactical doctrine stresses that the modern battlefield will require the use of orders that enable the commander to transmit to his subordinates "what to do" versus "how to do" concerning operations. Three out of four of the AirLand Battlefield tenets (agility, synchronization and initiative) establish the need for ground forces to move and deploy rapidly, in a coordinated manner, sometimes without the benefit of orders but based only on a higher commander's intent or vision of the battlefield. Doctrine concerning communications emphasizes the need to properly sequence information to facilitate its understanding and stresses the need to put the "bottom line" or most important part of the transmission up front. In addition to the doctrinal emphasis, the relativity factor plays a significant part in deciding the victor in battle. In the next war, US personnel, weapons systems, doctrine, and techniques will be pitted against its enemy's. Even if US ground forces currently employ a good system or technique, they still could lose a battle if the enemy employs a better or faster system or technique. This

2

study will examine the doctrinal foundation of the US's current five paragraph field order to help determine its battlefield functionality and worth, and it will compare the US order format with order formats used by other nations in an attempt to determine if it is the best format for transmission of information and tasks to battalions and smaller tactical units.

This work is limited to the study of battalion and smaller unit operations. The following methodology was used in an attempt to answer the research question.

-Initially, historical research was conducted concerning the current US five paragraph field order to determine its foundation and to examine how the format evolved throughout 20th century warfare. The product of this research is the presentation of formats used by small tactical units prior to and during each major US warfighting experience of the 20th century (World War I, World War II, and Vietnam). In addition to the formats, the research aimed at discovering the key points for an order format's use and also lessons learned concerning the order formats.

-After completing the historical research, additional research was conducted to identify current order formats used by other selected nations and to determine their strengths and weaknesses. The formats researched are those used in Israel, the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.

-The final part of the study compared formats with the aim of determining if a better format exists or could be synthesized. The criteria used for the comparison was:

* Battle tested.

* Critical information content.

* Brevity (elimination of redundancy or
    unnecessary information).

* Sequencing of information (Is the bottom
    line up front?).

-The study concludes with an answer to the research question and comments on its significance.

SECTION 2. THE U.S. FIVE PARAGRAPH FIELD ORDER

Prior to World War I (WWI) several different formats were used to transmit information and tasks to subordinate units. During the American Civil War, commanders sent letters of instruction that varied in detail, content, and length. Oral orders were the norm, with written orders serving as follow-on instructions.[2]

In 1897, Eben Swift introduced a format in an article published in the Cavalry Journal. Swift's order format consisted of a caption, body and ending. The body of the order was divided into five paragraphs (see figure 2.1). The

THE BODY OF SWIFT'S FORMAT

1. Information of the enemy and general situation.
    -This paragraph included information on the enemy's location and what the higher commander thought the enemy's intentions were.
    -In absences of information it was the higher commander's best guess or idea.

2. Your own plans.
    -This paragraph contains an intimation of the end in view.
    -It gave only so much of the general plan as would enable the subordinates to carry out the operations in hand.

3. Your dispositions.
    -This paragraph described the manner in which troops were distributed and assigned tasks to the various fractions of command.
    -It established the method of enumerating troops apart from the text, in the left margin, in a column headed "Distribution of Troops."
    -Most important distribution of troops is stated first to better impress themselves upon the memory.
    -Designates a start point and time.

4. Destination of trains.
    -Addresses the need to separate light and heavy baggage.
    -Contains all the orders needed for the trains, ammunition columns and sanitary troop.

5. Position of the commander.
    -Gives position of commander.
    -Gives hour for staff officers to report for orders.

FIGURE 2.1 - SWIFT'S FORMAT

foundation of Swift's format was the German format developed by Moltke's general staff.[3]

Swift's format had several key points. The paragraph concerning enemy intent/locations served as the foundation for the development of the rest of the order. The higher commander's end state or "intimation of the end in view" was transmitted to subordinates along with the commander's location during the battle. Swift's format established the practice of listing the distribution of troops in the left margin separate from the body of the order. Finally, Swift's format established the use of separate orders for each fraction of command (i.e. advanced guard, main body, rear body) and limited the information transmitted to subordinates to only that which they needed to know to carry out their individual parts of the operation.[4]

In general terms, Swift's orders were clear, short, precise, and complete. They avoided every form of expression that could have been misunderstood because experience showed that such orders had invariably been misunderstood. Swift's order format used positive terms so that responsibility could be placed with ease. Orders were complete in form and legible even by a bad light. They avoided conjectures, expectations, reasons or apologies for measures taken. No order was given for things which would ordinarily be done without special instructions. A sample brigade order, written by Captain Swift, is presented in figure 2.2.[5] In 1906, Swift's order

SAMPLE FIELD ORDER

"FIRST BRIGADE, FIRST DIVISION, FIRST ARMY CORPS.
                    Fort Leavenworth, Kans.,
                         11-21-95. 8:30 P.M.

FIELD ORDERS   I. The enemy is reported at
    No. 1   Winchester advancing on
                                   Leavenworth.
Distribution of Troops
         11-21   II. The brigade will seize
                                    the line of the Big
Advance Cavalry: Stranger Creek tomorrow.
  1 sq. 6 Cav. less 2 Plat.
                                III. a. The cavalry will find
                                     the enemy and screen the
Advance Guard (Col. A)   march. The bridges will
  1/2 platoon of Cav.   be held until the
  1 Inf. Regt. less 1 bat.   arrival of the infantry
  1/2 Company Engineers   when cavalry will go
                                     to the flanks.
Detachment of Bearer Co.   b. At 6 A.M. the brigade
                                     (except as above) will
Main Body and Order of   assemble near Frenchmans
    March (at 1,000 yds.)   and will march by the
  Staff of 1 Brigade   road Frenchman's 8 mile
  1/2 Platoon of Cav.   House.
  III Battalion 1 Inf.   c. The rear guard will
  Battery A, 1 Art.   send a detachment to
  2 Inf. Regt.   guard the train.
  3 Inf. Regt. less 2 Cos.
                                IV. The heavy baggage will
Det. of Bearer Co.   be parked at West End
  1/2 Amb. Co.   parade until 12 o'clock
                                    noon, when it will follow
                                    troops.
Rear Guard (at 500 yds.)   V. I will be with the main
  1 platoon of Cav.   body until 8 A.M. and
  2 companies 3 Inf.   with the advance guard
                                    after that hour.

                              B.
General   Brigadier
Dictated to Staff.
Copy by orderly to Squa . on, Battery, and Regimental
Commanders."

                FIGURE 2.2 - SAMPLE FIELD ORDER

format was approved by the War Department and incorporated into US Army Field Service Regulations.[6]

The order format used initially in WWI was Swift's modified format.[7] As the war progressed, Swift's modified format was found to be unsatisfactory. The reasons for its failure were threefold: platoons in WWI had a greater variety of armament than regiments in past warfare (rifles, machine guns, hand and rifle-grenades, and small flexible groups working in cooperation with each other, but separately); unlike open warfare, in which the commander told his subordinates what he wished done, but not how it was done, trench warfare methods of execution had to be prescribed and rehearsals conducted for the purpose of perfecting their execution on the part of every one from the private up; and lastly, large numbers of citizen soldiery required commanders to prescribe for their subordinates the mode of execution, and the details of preparation, formation, execution, and supply. Subordinates were not left to exercise their own judgment, for it would result in too great a variation in execution which meant incoherence and weakness. The bottom line was that small unit trench warfare in WWI demanded the most detailed and exact form of orders, a long order filled with minute instructions on every point was vital to a well-knit coordinated effort.[8]

New order formats were developed to compensate for the shortcomings in the pre-war format. Two sample formats, representative of the newly developed formats, are presented in figure 2.3 and figure 2.4.[9] Many lessons were learned during WWI concerning small unit operation orders.

The pre-WWI format was based on "Open Warfare" and was not specific enough for trench warfare. The intense nature of trench warfare demanded a perfection in order preparation and execution that only the most detailed and exact form of orders could satisfy.[10] Great emphasis was put on presenting every essential matter in a clear and explicit manner to ensure that it would not be neglected or misunderstood; these qualities were not sacrificed for brevity.[11]

The battalion commander was the lowest commander who issued a formal written field order.[12] Once orders were issued, they were not changed at the last minute; this helped to avoid misunderstanding and failure.[13]

Speed, in order development and issuance, had to improve and was more important than technique. Orders habitually failed to reach troops in time for their issuance and understanding. No less than 24 hours were required between the time the order left division headquarters and the hour fixed for the operation to commence.[14] It took, ordinarily, six hours for an order emanating from division headquarters to reach the platoons. It took at least the following period of

WWI BATTALION ORDER FORMAT

1-Information of the enemy.
    Our supporting troops.
    Our flanking troops.
    General plan for our forces.

2-Mission of the battalion.
    Zero day and hour.
    Limit of the zone of operations.
    Objectives.

3-(a) Artillery support.
    Time of its opening.
    Rate of advance of barrage.
    Where and when barrage will settle.
(b) Orders to each company, as to sector or direction of
advance, information, objective, distance, and intervals.
(c) Cleaning up parties.-Composition, mission of each.
Disposition of prisoners. Mission after cleaning up.
(d) Machine guns.
    Position.
    Objectives.
    Mission.
(e) One-pounder gun or 37mm gun or mortar.
    Position in the advance.
    Mission.
    Objectives.
    Position and duties in occupation.
(f) Outlining of front.
    On request of Aeroplanes.
    Hour each line will signal lights.
(g) Liaison.
    With the artillery.
    Within the battalion.

4-Plan for occupation of captured ground. Order to each
company as to:
    Organization of ground to be held.
Reconnaissance.
    Contact with the enemy.
    Further objectives.
    Patrols.
    Outposts.

FIGURE 2.3 - WWI DEVELOPED FORMAT (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Liaison.
    Within the battalion.
    With neighboring troops.
    With colonel.
    With artillery.
Machine guns.
    Mission.
    Sites.
One-pounder guns or 37mm guns or 3" Stokes mortar.
    Sites.
    Objectives.
Service of observation.
    Enemy's line.
    Observation posts.
Reports.
    Munition.
    Materiel.
    To whom sent and hour.

5. (a) Supply. Individual equipment and supplies. Additional
communication trenches to be dug or connections to be made
with trench system of old positions.
Munitions.-Depots to be established in jumping-off trench and
by whom.
Designate carrying parties.
Materials. Point where depot will be established and the
    materials to be assembled.
Carrying parties and command.
Ration and water. Amounts other than that carried by
individual soldier. For use preceding the advance and to be
subsequently carried forward.
Carrying parties.
(b) Circulation. Designating of communicating trenches for
"forward" and "rear" traffic.
    For evacuation of wounded.
(c) First aid stations. Location of.
6. Position of battalion commander and his headquarters during
the advance and in the conquered position.
Name and rank of the Battalion Commander.
How and to whom issued.

FIGURE 2.3 - WWI DEVELOPED FORMAT (CONTINUATION)

WWI BATTALION ORDER FORMAT

1. Information of the Enemy.
2. Mission of the Regiment. Attack formations.
    Phases and objectives. Commander's intent.
3. Limits of the Front.
4. Mission of Each Company.
5. Attack Formation of the Battalion.
6. Formation Prior to the Assault.
7. Cleaning up. Positions. Mission.
8. Advance. How it will take place, the barrages
    use of signals.
9. Machine gun company. Mission, route of advance,
    position, the objectives.
10. One-pounder guns/mortars. Positions; route of advance and
    objectives.
11. Divisional Group of Machine Guns.
12. Tanks. Missions.
13. Liaison. with the battalion, neighbors, with
    artillery.
14. Marking out the Front. Arrangements for indicating the
    front when halted or on the request of an aviator.
15. Organization of the Captured Ground,
16. Dress, Equipment, Pack of the Men.
17. Supplies. Organization, location of depots,
    munitions and fire-works. Rations, water, other
    materiel (tools, barbed wire, sand bags).
18. Medical Services. Locations of first-aid stations.
19. Prisoners. Measures to be taken.

FIGURE 2.4 - WWI DEVELOPED ORDER FORMAT

time for a complete distribution of formal orders to reach the lowest unit concerned:

For a regiment - 1 1/2 hours

For a brigade - 3 hours

For a division - 6 hours

Time was figured from the hour the order was signed and included the time required at brigade, regimental, battalion, and company headquarters for each to read and digest the order from the next higher commander and to prepare its own order.[15]

Battalions initially fought World War II with three order formats established in doctrine; developmental order format, attack order format, and defense order format (See figure 2.5 for attack order format and 2.6 for defense order format).[16]

The emphasis concerning orders was placed in the following areas. Order format and preparation were made uniform throughout the service to promote clarity and prevent misunderstanding.[17] Orders avoided the use of technical expressions if there was any danger of misunderstanding.[18] In the interests of simplicity and clarity the affirmative form of expression was used.[19] Orders were concise and gave subordinate units only so much detail or method of execution as was necessary to insure their conformity with the plan for the force as a whole.[20] Orders prescribed the tactical plan only so far as reasonable estimates for hostile resistance could be expected.[21] Brevity in orders preparation was deemed to be unit training level dependent.[22]

BATTALION ATTACK ORDER

1. (a) Information relative to the enemy.
   (b) Situation and missions of friendly troops; adjacent units; supporting artillery, tanks, and aviation; covering troops.

2. Battalion plan of action, objectives, zone of action, line of departure, direction of attack, hour of attack.

3. Tactical missions for subordinate units.
   (a) Base of fire: general position area of heavy weapons; target areas or sectors of fire.
   (b) Assignment of rifle companies to attacking echelon and reserve; objectives and missions.
   (c) Antitank measures; mission of antitank units.

4. Administrative matters.
   (a) Supply: disposition of company carriers and unit trains; establishment of initial ammunition point; method of distribution of ammunition and other combat supplies.
   (b) Initial location of aid station; distribution of medical section.

5. Communications; initial command and observation posts and message center; telephone and radio; light wire local systems; panel stations and dropping grounds; signal light conventions.
ps291/21A

FIGURE 2.5 - WWII BATTALION ATTACK ORDER

BATTALION DEFEND ORDER

1. Information relative to the enemy and friendly troops including the mission of the regiment, units on the flanks of the battalion, covering forces, artillery, antitank and aviation support.

2. General plan of defense; boundaries of battalion defense area; exact course of the main line of resistance; distribution of rifle units to combat echelon, reserve and where necessary, the combat outpost; any attachments to rifle companies.

3. Defensive areas (boundaries) of rifle companies of the combat echelon; mission and location of reserve; departure positions for counterattack; positions for flank defense.

4. Missions and distribution of heavy machine guns; emplacements and target areas of battalion mortars; emplacements and sectors of fire of antitank weapons.

5. Security elements; location and mission of combat outposts and advance detachments.

6. Supply: location of battalion ammunition point; aid station; arrangements for ammunition distribution, including amount to be dumped on the position if required; disposition of carriers and unit trains.

7. Communications: location of battalion command and observation posts and message center; telephone and radio, light wire local systems, panel stations and dropping grounds, signal light connections.

FIGURE 2.6 - WWII BATTALION DEFEND ORDER

After three years of fighting, battalions still employed three order formats but their content and degree of specificity were greatly increased (see figure 2.7 and 2.8 for modified attack and defense formats).[23] The WWII lessons learned concerning small unit operation orders were numerous and diverse.

The battalion order had to be complete, covering all details of the operation.[24] At battalion level, mutual understanding and coordination were assured by issuing oral orders to assembled subordinate commanders.[25] Oral orders were considered standard.[26] Written orders were seldom employed below regiment or combat command.[27] Simple, clear, concise language was used when issuing an oral order.[28]

When time permitted, oral orders were supplemented with written orders of the overlay-type. In an overlay-type order, both the written portion of the order and the graphic portion were placed on an overlay.[29]

WWII orders were brief as clarity permitted, but clarity was not sacrificed for brevity. The use of short sentences made orders more easily understood. Clarity was more important than technique.[30] Detailed instructions for a variety of contingencies, that were a matter of training did not inspire confidence and had no place in an order.[31]

Orders had to be issued in sufficient time to allow subordinate commanders to make their reconnaissance and prepare plans for combat.[32]

BATTALION ATTACK ORDER

1. a. Information of the enemy.
   b. Information of friendly troops.
      (1) Situation and mission(s) of the regiment
          and adjacent units.
      (2) Supporting fires of artillery, cannon,
          antitank, tank, and aviation units.
      (3) Security elements in vicinity.
2. Mission(s) and general plan of the battalion.
   a. Plan of maneuver including objective(s).
   b. Formation.
   c. Line of departure.
   e. Zone of action.
   f. Time of attack.
3. Instruction to subordinate units.
   a. Specific instruction to each rifle company in
      attacking echelon.
      (1) Zone of action.
      (2) Objective(s).
      (3) Security mission(s).
   b. Instruction to the heavy weapons company.
      (1) Plan of supporting fires.
      (2) General position area(s).
      (3) Targets or sectors of fire.
      (4) Conditions or time for opening fire.
      (5) Conditions or time for forward displacement
          if that can be foreseen.
   c. Instructions to the antitank platoon.
      (1) Uncoupling areas.
      (2) Firing position area(s).
      (3) Sector of responsibility and principal
          direction of fire.
      (4) Conditions for opening fire.
      (5) If guns are to be held mobile, platoon
          location and mission(s).
      (6) Special instructions concerning
          coordination with other antitank units.

FIGURE 2.7 - MODIFIED ATTACK FORMAT (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

d. Instructions to the reserve.
    (1) Initial location.
    (2) Contemplated employment, if determined.
    (3) Security or other special missions.
e. Instruction applicable to more than one unit
    of the command.
    (1) Alterations or additions to standing
        operating procedure.
    (2) General security measures.
    (3) Provisions for secrecy.

4. Administrative instructions and information.
    a. Ammunition supply.
        (1) Initial location of ammunition supply point.
        (2) Route of ammunition advance.
        (3) Alterations or additions to standing
            operating procedure for ammunition supply.
    b. Instructions relative to company transport and
        the battalion train.
    c. Initial location of aid station.

5. Communication instruction.
    a. Index to signal operations instruction in
        effect.
    b. Restrictions, if any, on use of radio.
    c. Special pyrotechnic signals.
    d. Locations and times of opening of battalion and
        company command posts; alternate locations of
        battalion command posts; location of battalion
        observation post.
    e. Axis of signal communication.
    f. Location of battalion commander.

FIGURE 2.7 - MODIFIED ATTACK FORMAT (CONTINUATION)

BATTALION DEFEND ORDER

1. a. Information of the enemy.
    b. Information of friendly troops.
        (1) Situation and mission(s) of the regiment and
            adjacent units.
        (2) Supporting fires of artillery, cannon, anti-
            tank, tank destroyer, chemical mortar,
            rocket, and aviation units.
        (3) Covering forces and other security elements
            in vicinity.
2. Battalion general plan of defense.
    a. Boundaries of defense area.
    b. General course of main line of resistance.
    c. Limiting points.
    d. Distribution of rifle companies.
    e. Formation of rifle companies.
3. Instructions to subordinate units.
    a. Specific instructions to each rifle company on
        main line of resistance.
        (1) boundaries and limiting points.
        (2) Security mission(s).
        (3) Conditions or restriction on opening fire.
    b. Specific instructions to the heavy weapons
        company.
        (1) Mission and distribution of machine guns,
            both heavy and light.
        (2) General firing positions and missions for
             81-mm mortars; primary target
            areas and areas for the massing of fires.
        (3) Conditions or restrictions on opening fire.
    c. Instruction to the antitank platoon and attached
        tank destroyers.
        (1) Firing position area(s).
        (2) Sector of responsibility and principal
            direction of fire.
        (3) Conditions for and restriction on opening
            fire.
        (4) Special instructions concerning coordination
            with other antitank units.
        (5) Location of mine fields and obstacles.

d.   Instructions to the reserve (counterattacking forces).
     (1) Composition.
     (2) Mission(s).
     (3) Location.
     (4) Priority for planning counterattacks against assumed penetrations.
e.   Instructions to attached tank units.
     (1) Mission(s) (direct fire supporting or reinforcing artillery fires, and supporting counterattacking force).
     (2) Position(s) to be occupied.
     (3) Route(s) to attack position(s).
     (4) Conditions or restrictions on opening fire.
     (5) Location of mine fields and obstacles.
f.   Instructions to attached chemical mortar and rocket units.
     (1) General firing positions and missions.
     (2) Primary target areas and areas for the massing of fires.
g.   Instructions applicable to more than one unit of the command.
     (1) Alterations or additions to standing operating procedure.
     (2) Organization of the ground, to include priorities
     (3) Composition, location, and mission of the combat outpost..

4. Administrative instructions and information.
    a. Ammunition supply.
       (1) Location of battalion ammunition supply point.
       (2) Arrangements for distribution of ammunition, including amount to be placed on position.
       (3) Alterations or additions to standing operating procedure for ammunition supply.
    b. Instructions relative to company transport and battalion train.
    c. Location of battalion aid station.
    d. Instructions for feeding.

5. Communication instructions.
    a. Index to signal operations instructions in effect.
    b. Restrictions, if any on use of radio.
    c. Special pyrotechnic signals.
    d. Location and times of opening of battalion and company command posts.
     e. Alternate locations of battalion command post.

FIGURE 2.8 - MODIFIED DEFEND FORMAT (CONTINUATION)

The operation order format, content, and specificity differed based on the unit type (armor, cavalry or infantry), the unit's mission, and the situation. Armor and cavalry commanders normally were issued mission-type orders telling the commander what to do but not how to do it. Mission-type orders stated the mission clearly but gave the recipient maximum latitude in execution. Mission-type orders encouraged initiative by subordinates and required minimum time for issuance.[33] The reasons for the use of mission-type orders were the speed of armor actions, the rapidly changing tactical situation during mobile warfare, the need for freedom of action to take advantage of favorable changes in the situation and the battlefield was more complex and unpredictable than in past warfare and required decentralized responsibilities.[34] Mission-type orders were a requirement if the most was to be obtained from a command. They provided the following information to subordinate commanders;

> *They clearly stated what the
> commander issuing the order wanted to
> accomplish.
> *They pointed out limiting or controlling
> factors that must be observed for
> coordinating purposes.
> *They allotted the resources and support
> for subordinate units.[35]

While the use of mission-type orders had the potential to improve a unit's combat effectiveness, they required initiative, promptness, and resourcefulness from small unit leaders and staff officers which was not always forthcoming.[36] Operation orders developed based on a mission to attack a fortified position normally were issued in great detail.[37] The night attack operation order went into much greater detail than for a day attack order.[38]

Between WWII and the Vietnam Conflict, the use of separate formats for developmental, defense and attack operations ended. The US ground forces fought the entire Vietnam Conflict with a single operation order format established in their doctrine (See figure 2.9).[39]

The emphasis concerning orders was placed in the following areas. An order had to convey the exact meaning and intentions of the commander. Subordinates were told in unmistakable terms exactly what their commanders wanted them to do.[40] Orders were always issued following a prescribed format which facilitated completeness and note-taking.[41] An operation overlay or map complemented the order and promoted clarity, accuracy, and brevity by conveying information and instructions graphically. An overlay was prepared to portray graphically those instructions that could be represented pictorially by the use of conventional symbols. If the written part of the order was brief, it was also written on the overlay (overlay-type order).[42]

VIETNAM ORDER FORMAT "BODY"

1. SITUATION

   a. Enemy forces: Information of the enemy pertaining to
the operation, such as locations, dispositions, strength,
activities, and capabilities.
   b. Friendly forces: Mission of next higher unit, location
and missions of adjacent units, and missions of nonorganic
supporting elements which may affect the actions of the units.
   c. Attachments and detachments: Elements attached to, or
detached from, the unit for the operation, including the
effective time of attachment or detachment.

2. MISSION

   A clear, concise statement of the task to be accomplished
by the unit.

3. EXECUTION

   a. Concept of operation. In the concept of operation, the
commander states his scheme of maneuver-as derived from his
estimate of the situation (his decision) and his use of fire
support for the operation. "Concept of operation," is used to
convey the tactical concept and missions of major maneuver
units. This technique permits mentioning units in order of
importance to the role they are to play, without regard to
numerical designation: e.g. in an attack situation the unit
making the main attack is mentioned first, followed by
supporting attack(s), then the reserve. Thus, in oral orders,
subordinates may grasp readily the overall scheme of maneuver
while at the same time receive their specific missions or
instructions. When missions for the maneuver units are
clearly stated in the "concept of operation," they need not be
repeated in the subparagraph for that unit.
   b. Unit missions or tasks not stated in the "concept of
operation" may be specified to units concerned after the
concept is stated. These would include contingency or "be
prepared" instructions to the maneuver units, as appropriate,
and missions for the combat support units. In assigning an
element its mission, attachments or detachments are indicated,
unless specified in the task organization.

FIGURE 2.9 - VIETNAM ORDER FORMAT (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

c. The final subparagraph of paragraph 3 is entitled "Coordinating Instructions" and contains tactical instructions and details of coordination and control applicable to two or more units. (For example: line of departure, final coordination line, boundaries, provisions for troop safety, control measures for assault, or restrictions.) Full use of the subparagraph, together with the task organization and paragraph 3a, will expedite issuance of oral orders and facilitate understanding on the part of recipients.

4. ADMINISTRATION AND LOGISTICS

This paragraph contains information or instructions pertaining to rations, ammunition; location of distribution points, company trains, medical support, and prisoner-of-war collecting point; transportation; and other administrative and supply matters. Only necessary information is included.

5. COMMAND AND SIGNAL

a. Special signal instructions, which include such items as prearranged signals and restrictions on the use of radio or other plans of communication.
b. Location of the commander and command post during the operation.

FIGURE 2.9 - VIETNAM ORDER FORMAT (CONTINUATION)

Orders were clear, concise and timely. Clarity was not sacrificed for brevity.[43] It was the first essential with partially trained troops and staffs; the use of technical expressions in operation orders was avoided if there was any chance of misunderstanding. Expressions like, "attack vigorously", "secondary attack", "try to hold", and "as far as possible" were avoided.[44] Words of common understanding were used even at the sacrifice of brevity.[45] The positive form of expression was used throughout the order in the interest of simplicity and clarity.[46] Abbreviations were used to save time and space.[47]

Orders giving missions to subordinate units prescribed only those details that were necessary to insure the actions of the subordinate unit conformed to the overall plan of operations.[48] If an order was too detailed, important directions were lost in the mass of unimportant data; if too brief, essential information was omitted.[49]

The lessons learned in Vietnam concerning small unit orders were as follows. The use of the five paragraph format was cumbersome to small units.[50] In small unit operations, the mission was the first and primary requirement and should be listed first in an operations order.[51] A three-paragraph format was developed and used instead of the five-paragraph format.[52] The three-paragraph order consisted of the following paragraphs;

* The unit mission and the concept of operation
  complete in all available detail.

* Additional essential information to include
  enemy, support available, terrain, and command
  and communication details.

* Essential supply and evacuation details.

In summary, the historical look at the US battalion
order format reveals;

- The US began fighting in WWI with a single, brief,
simple format that proved to be unsatisfactory due to the need
to coordinate weapons and movement, lack of skilled soldiers
and leaders, and the need for a detailed and rehearsed plan to
overcome fortified enemy positions. As WWI progressed, long,
detailed order formats were developed that eliminated the
deficiencies of the pre-war format.

- Unlike pre-WWI"s single order format, the US entered
WWII with three brief simple formats (developmental, attack,
and defend). These brief simple formats again proved to be
unsatisfactory for reasons similar to WWI and longer, more
detailed formats were developed to eliminate the deficiencies.
In addition the requirement for a mobile warfare order format
was identified and mission-type orders were developed for use
by high speed armor and cavalry units.

- The Vietnam Conflict was fought using a single long
detailed order format and the WWI/WWII deficiencies (not

enough information or detail and not geared to a semi-trained citizen army) did not appear. In addition the need for a mission-type order format was reenforced and a three paragraph mission order format was developed and used by some units.

The current US battalion operation order format reflects its historical evolution and is presented in Figure 2.10.[53]

The emphasis concerning the current US battalion operation order is placed in the following areas. An order should be clear (use accepted military terminology), and complete. Orders should reflect the commander's intention and will. Subordinates should be told in direct and unmistakable terms exactly what the commander wants them to do, but they are not normally told how to accomplish it.

The order should emphasize the authoritative expression. Indecisive, vague, and ambiguous language should be avoided because it leads to uncertainty.

Orders must be issued in a timely manner. The battalion commander should issue warning orders and observe the one-third - two-thirds rule (The higher commander uses only one-third of the available time for his order planning, development and issuance, thus leaving two-thirds for his subordinate units to plan, develop and issue their orders).[54]

The strengths of the US format are as follows. The format has evolved through nearly a century of warfare, it has been modified based on lessons learned, and it can be considered battle tested. The order format requires that

14

CURRENT US ORDER FORMAT " BODY"

1. Situation.
      (a) Enemy forces. This subparagraph contains enemy information.
      (b) Friendly forces. This subparagraph contains the verbatim mission statements of higher, adjacent, and supporting or reinforcing units, and the brigade commander's intent for the operation.
      (c) Attachments and detachments.
2. Mission - clear, concise statement of the task(s) to be accomplished and its purpose. Addressed the WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE, and WHY of the operation.
3. Execution.
      (a) Concept of operation. Expands on the why of the mission statement to explain the "big picture" or master plan. Commander's concise personal summary of intent.
            *Maneuver. Describes the movement or placement of all major subordinate maneuver elements. Discusses the battle from start to finish, and describes HOW the operation will progress.
            *Fires. Integrates tasks for fires with the scheme of maneuver.
            *Obstacles, mines and fortifications.
            *Intelligence and electronics warfare. Commander's intelligence collection priorities and electronic warfare priorities.
            *Other support activities. Concept of enemy air defense , air defense fires, and rear area combat operations.
      (b) Subordinate unit subparagraphs. The specific tasks to be accomplished by each subordinate element.
            *Fire support. Discussion of air support, chemical operations, field artillery, naval gunfire, and nuclear fires.
            *Air defense, aviation, engineer, and military intelligence.
            *Reserve.
      (c) Coordinating instructions. Details of coordination and control applicable to two or more elements.
4. Service support. Contains combat service support instructions and information relating to the operation. The administrative/logistics order format is recommended.
      (a) Materiel and services.
      (b) Medical evacuation and hospitalization.
      (c) Personnel.
      (d) Civil-military cooperation.
      (e) Prisoner of war procedures.

FIGURE 2.10 - CURRENT US ORDER FORMAT (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

5. Command and signal.
   (a) Command includes the initial location of the commander; includes the command post location and the CP axis of displacement.
   (b) Signal lists the SOI index in effect for the operation as well as any changes; list alternate or emergency signals; and signal restrictions.

FIGURE 2.10 - CURRENT US ORDER FORMAT (CONTINUATION)

detailed information and instructions be transmitted to
subordinate units concerning the enemy, maneuver, support,
services and the nuclear/chemical threat. This information
allows the commander to coordinate movement, the fight,
supporting fires, and sustainment. The commander's intent is
included in the order.

The weaknesses in the US format are as follows. The
order format is very long (The explanation in FM 71-2 of what
goes in each paragraph is over four typed pages long). The
sequence of the order is flawed. Current US communications
doctrine stresses putting the "bottom line" or most important
information of a transmission up front.[55] The US format leads
with the "enemy situation." The enemy situation, due to its
fragile and ever changing nature, should not be considered the
most important information. The only reason found for leading
with the "enemy situation" is that the original 19th century
German order format (adopted and modified over time and
experience by US ground forces) began with the enemy
situation. The most critical information in the order,
learned through actual combat experience, is the commander's
intent or purpose.[56] The US order format de-emphasizes the
most important information in the order by addressing
commander's intent as part of a subparagraph in paragraph 3 of
the order.

SECTION 3. OTHER NATIONS' FORMATS

The US is not alone in its need to transmit information

and tasks to small tactical units. Many modern armies today

have this requirement and have developed and use standard

formats to meet these requirements. This chapter will present

two formats, the Israeli and the Soviet. These formats will

be compared later in the study with the US format to determine

the best format or to create a synthesized format. The Soviet

Union's format was chosen because they are the US's primary

threat. The Israeli format was chosen because of their

worldwide recognition for excellence in mobile warfare. The

West German format was researched, but found to be nearly

identical, by agreement with STANAG 2016, to the US format.

The current Israeli format is presented in figure 3.1.[57]

The Israeli format has the following strengths. The

"bottom line" or most important information in the order is up

front. The Israeli format emphasizes the higher commander's

intent. The Israelis believe a detailed plan is only good

until the first bullet is shot. After that changes to the plan

will have to be made based on the current situation. The one

element of the plan that should not change is the higher

commander's intent or aim. This is why the Israelis regard

this as the most important element of the order. The first

information passed to subordinates is exactly what the higher

THE CURRENT ISRAELI FORMAT

1. Friendly forces.
    (a) Intent or aim of the higher.
    (b) Unit's mission.
    (c) Adjacent forces missions.
    (d) Additional forces missions.
        1) Engineers.
        2) Artillery.
        3) Direct support.
        4) General support.

2. Terrain.
    (a) General description.
    (b) Axis.
    (c) Main obstacles.
    (d) Trafficability/deployment areas.
    (e) Key terrain and vital terrain.
    (f) Summary of effects of terrain on friendly plan.

3. Enemy.
    (a) Intentions.
    (b) Deployment and strength.
    (c) Most probable course of action.

4. Commander's intention (when, what, and why).

5. Method.
    (a) Scheme of maneuver and fire support.
    (b) Time phasing and objectives.
6. Forces and tasks.

7. Combat support (general).

8. Administrative and logistics (general).

9. Control.
    (a) Location of CP's by stages.
    (b) Radio procedures.

FIGURE 3.1 - CURRENT ISRAELI FORMAT

commander wants the subordinates to achieve (the commanders
intent or aim of the operation). The commander tells his
subordinates what is to be done and where, establishes time
limits, and reservations concerning the method of operation.

The Israeli format contains a paragraph addressing
terrain. The terrain paragraph is developed with the overall
intent of providing information on how dominating terrain
features can affect the operation. Also, information about
terrain that the higher commander determines as key or vital
(terrain that has to be controlled in order to win) is
provided to the subordinates.

The Israeli order format requires the commander to time-
phase his scheme of maneuver and task accomplishments to
better coordinate the combat, combat support and service
support elements. This time-phasing greatly aids supporters
and maintainers in their assistance efforts. The Israeli order
was battle tested in the 1973 October War and deemed
functional.

The Israeli format contains the following weaknesses.
The format is long, consisting of nine paragraphs. The
Israelis allot four hours for the battalion to develop and
issue orders down to the platoons. The format lacks
information needed to fight on an integrated nuclear and
chemical battlefield. No mention is made of MOPP levels,
dosage rates, or risk factors.

The format lacks information needed to coordinate the
following combat support elements or functions.

     *Intelligence

     *Air defense

     *Engineers

Some general points concerning the Israeli order format
and orders issuance are as follows. Israeli company commanders
attend the brigade level orders briefings. Their platoon
leaders attend the battalion orders briefings. The company
commander's order is the lowest level order issued. No
platoon order is given. The complete company attends the
company order.

The current Soviet format is presented in figure 3.2.[58]

Soviet format strengths are in the following areas. The
format contains a detailed discussion of the enemy;

     *In the attack order, enemy units are identified,
located, and strongpoints and nuclear prepared positions are
analyzed. Also enemy reserves actions and locations are
factored in.[59]

     *In the defense order, the composition, position, and
the nature of the enemy attack, his main thrust, nuclear
targets and probable time frames for going over to the
offensive are provided.

The Soviet format provides detailed information on how
weapons from higher units are going to be deployed in the

THE CURRENT SOVIET FORMAT

1. Assessing the enemy.
    -to his front.
    -to adjacent unit's front.
    -information varies with mission assigned.

2. Unit's mission assigned by senior commander.

3. Senior commander's employment of weapons within
    units zone.

4. Unit commander concept of operation.
    -which enemy to rout and in what sequence.
    -main effort sector.
    -enemy targets to destroy by weapons.
    -combat formation and nature of maneuver.

5. Task to subordinate units.
    -varies offense/defense.
    -the "I order" paragraph listing tasks for subordinate
units.

6. Readiness time for action.

7. Command posts.
    -place and time for deployment of CP's.

8. Chain of command.
    -names deputy commander.
    -who assumes control in event the commander is put
    out of action.

FIGURE 3.2 - CURRENT SOVIET FORMAT

subordinates zone or sector.   This allows subordinate

commanders to take into account how the senior commander's

employment will affect the accomplishment of their missions.

This paragraph is needed due to the centralized control of

combat support elements.[60]

The Soviet format requires a detailed listing of tasks

to be accomplished by subordinate units;

*In the attack order, subordinate units are told axis

of attack ,which enemy to rout, axis of subsequent advance,

who supports, the boundary lines, times for crossing following

lines/points and reinforcements.

*In the defense order, subordinate units are told the

areas to strongpoint, where to position security and

composition of security, how flanks are supported and who is

doing the support, axis for deployment of counterattack

forces, and firing lines for repelling tank attacks.[61]

When developing an order, the Soviets stress that

consideration for the level of unit training, experience, and

the subordinate commanders' skills must be taken into

account.[62] Commanders are required to inspire confidence in

subordinates for his plan through his external appearance,

behavior, and diction when giving the order. The old saying,

"Tell me how you give your order and I will tell you how it

will be executed." is stressed.   Commanders are required not

to vacillate, appear nervous, or use rough tones.[63]

At battalion and lower echelons, written or graphic operations documents are not used. The only document produced is the working map.[64] Battalions and lower echelons issue only oral operations orders, which are recorded in a notebook by the battalion commander or battalion chief of staff. After the Soviet battalion commander issues his order, he or the battalion chief of staff personally check their subordinates' notes and maps for corrections.[65]

The format for the oral order is the same as the written order. Standard forms have been developed and are used to facilitate the development and writing of the operation order.[66] Both the battalion commander and battalion chief of staff can issue orders.[67]

The Soviet format contains the following weaknesses. The order format's content and sequence are flawed. The Soviet format does not provide the senior commander's intent or "big picture" of how he sees the battle being fought and won. The order is based on centralized control and employment of combat support and service support assets. In a rapidly changing environment, the battalion commander lacks the abilities and information needed to understand the coordination, control, and interaction of artillery, antitank, air defense, and engineer systems not organic to the battalion. The order fails to coordinate the fight with supply, maintenance and personnel functions. The format contains no personnel or logistical information.

The order format sequence seems flawed due to the
separation of the unit's mission and concept of the operation,
by the "Senior commander's employment of weapons within units
zone" paragraph. This separation hinders understanding and
order clarity.

SECTION 4. COMPARISON OF THE FORMATS

In this section the formats will be compared using the
following criteria;

- -Battle tested
- -Information content
- -Brevity
- -Sequencing of information

The product of this comparison will be the selection of the
best format or the synthesis of a new format that maximizes
the studied formats' strengths, while minimizing their
weaknesses.

Battle Tested

The formats that can be considered battle tested are the
Israeli and US formats.

The Israeli format was tested during the 1973 October
War. It is established in Israeli doctrine and taught at
their company commanders' training course. Additionally, the

Israeli format is put through numerous combined arms live fire exercises during training.

The current US format is considered battle worthy due to the changes made based on the lessons learned from WWI, WWII, and Vietnam. During those wars, formats similar in content and detail to the current US format were used and found to be satisfactory. The requirements for detailed orders in past battles were to coordinate the effects of a multitude of weapon systems, to compensate for the lack of trained and skilled soldiers, staff officers and commanders, and to have units fight as cohesive elements instead of as independent agents. These three requirements or conditions will exist in tomorrow's mobilized and expanded US army, thus requiring the need for long detailed orders at the level of command that coordinates systems, men, movement, fighting, fires and support.

The Soviet Union's format is considered not battle tested because the entire Soviet method of fighting battalions has changed since WWII with the requirement of battalions to be innovators and planners instead of just implementors of regimental written field orders (The Soviet experience in Afghanistan has not been included in this study due to lack of research material).[1] The current Soviet format still contains many of the WWII centralized control features that may no longer be functional on the future, rapidly changing, battlefield.[2]

Information Content

All three formats are deficient in critical information content. The US format lacks any mention of terrain and also fails to establish a time phasing or time relationship with the maneuver elements and their support and service support elements. This lack of basic time information, such as how long the commander thinks it should take for his maneuver units to move from position to position, seize an objective, or hold a defensive position, could significantly affect the combat supporters' and service supporters' abilities to assist in or maintain the fight. The Israeli format lacks information in several areas concerning combat support and survival on an integrated nuclear and chemical battlefield. No mention of MOPP levels, dosage rates, electronic warfare, or intelligence priorities are made. The Soviet format, while detailed in some areas, lacks the ability to coordinate the interactions of a variety of forces and weapons, artillery, antitank, air defense, and engineer systems not organic to the battalion.

Brevity

All three formats are long and detailed with brevity playing second fiddle to the need to coordinate a multitude of different weapon systems, personnel, fires, movement and

sustainment efforts against an equal multitude of threats.
The shortest format appears to be the Israeli's; next is the
US and then the Soviet Union.

Sequencing of Information

The best format for sequencing is the Israeli's. They
initiate the order with the most important information, the
commander's intent and the unit's mission. It is followed by
terrain and then the enemy, concept of operation, support,
logistics and control. Having personally developed, briefed
and observed numerous orders using the Israeli format, I found
the sequence to be very logical and functional.

The US format's sequence is flawed because it fails to
address the most important information of the order, the
commander's intent and the unit's mission, in the first
paragraph. Additionally, the sequence of briefing the mission
and then the commander's intent is flawed because the
"mission" is a part of the whole, the commander's intent.
Logic dictates that it is better to brief the whole first,
then the part.

The Soviet format's sequence is flawed similarly as the
US's concerning the commander's intentions and the unit
mission. In addition, the repeated jumping from "Senior
Commanders" portions and "Unit" portions tends to confuse and
could lead to misunderstanding.

Synthesized Format

The comparison of formats revealed enough deficiencies with the three formats to determine the need to synthesize a format. The synthesized format is presented as the best format to use when transmitting information and tasks to battalion or smaller units.

SYNTHESIZED FORMAT

1. Friendly forces.

    (a) Intent or aim of the Higher Commander.

    (b) Unit's mission.

    (c) Adjacent forces missions.

    (d) Additional forces missions.

        1) Engineers.

        2) Artillery.

        3) Direct support.

        4) General support.

2. Terrain.

    (a) General description.

    (b) Axes.

    (c) Main obstacles.

    (d) Trafficability/deployment areas.

    (e) Key terrain and vital terrain.

(f) Summary of effects of terrain on friendly plan.

3. Enemy.

    (a) Intentions.

    (b) Deployment and strength.

    (c) Most probable course of action.

4. Execution.

    (a) Concept of operation.

      * Commander's intentions (expands on the when, what, and why of the mission statement to explain the "big picture" or master plan).

      * Maneuver. Describes and time-phases the movement or placement of all major subordinate maneuver elements. Discusses and time-phases the battle from start to finish, and describes HOW and HOW LONG the operation will progress and take to accomplish.

      * Fires. Integrates tasks for fires with the scheme of maneuver.

      * Obstacles, mines, and fortifications.

      * Intelligence and electronics warfare. Commander's intelligence collection priorities and electronic warfare priorities.

      * Other support activities. Concept of enemy air defense ,air defense fires, and rear area combat operations.

    (b) Subordinate unit subparagraphs. The specific tasks to be accomplished by each subordinate element.

* Fire support. Discussion of air support, chemical operations, field artillery, naval gunfire, and nuclear fires.

* Air defense, aviation, engineer, and military intelligence.

* Reserve.

(c) Coordinating instructions. Details of coordination and control applicable to <u>two or more elements</u>.

5. Service support. Contains combat service support instructions and information relating to the operation. The administrative/logistics order format is recommended.

    (a) Material and services.   •

    (b) Medical evacuation and hospitalization.

    (c) Personnel.

    (d) Civil-military cooperation.

    (e) Prisoner-of-war procedures.

6. Command and signal.

    (a) Command includes the initial location of the commander; includes the command post location and the CP axis of displacement.

    (b) Signal lists the SOI index in effect for the operation as well as any changes; list alternate or emergency signals; and signal restrictions.

The synthesized format incorporates the strengths of the Israeli format (sequencing, terrain information, and time-phasing) and the strengths of the US format (detailed instructions, integrated battlefield information, and combat support and service support coordination information) and eliminates the respective individual format weaknesses. The end product is a format that can be considered battle tested, complete (contains all necessary information), and with information sequenced in order to put the most important information up front.

SECTION 5. CONCLUSION·

The research question asked if the current US five paragraph operation order format was the best format to use when transmitting information and tasks to battalions or smaller combat units. After researching the historical foundation of the US order format and after examining the current US battalion operation order format and order formats from several other nations it was determined that the current US format was not the best format to use. A synthesized format was developed incorporating the studied formats' strengths and eliminating the studied formats' weaknesses and the synthesized format was determined to be the best format for use when transmitting small unit information and tasks.

This study is important because a better order format has been synthesized and is available for use by US ground forces. The synthesized format incorporates battle tested stre·.;ths and eliminates deficiencies. If the synthesized format was adopted and established as doctrine it could improve the fighting effectiveness of small tactical units through its prioritized sequencing of information, its inclusion of terrain information, and its time-phasing of maneuver and task accomplishments.

Due to the need to transmit long detailed orders, this study recommends that further research be conducted with the aim of speeding up the entire order process through the use of standard order format forms, small unit playbooks or drills, or technological aids (computers, reproduction machines and televisions). A standard order format form that provides a "fill in the blank" order production capability could significantly cut down on the time required to produce an order. Small unit playbooks or drills could reduce or even eliminate the need for commanders to issue or produce lengthy explanations concerning how he wants his subordinate units to maneuver or to react given a combat situation. The use of technological aids to reduce or eliminate the need to manually write, draw and reproduce orders and graphics would greatly reduce the time required to produced an order, thus significantly speeding up the entire order process.

In addition, this study supports the need to develop a mission-type order format for use by high speed armor and cavalry units conducting pursuit or reconnaissance missions. That order would be an abbreviated version of the recommended format. It would look like this:

MISSION-TYPE ORDER FORMAT

1. Friendly forces.

    - Intent of the higher commander.

    - Unit's mission.

    - Adjacent forces' missions

2. Terrain.

    - Key and vital terrain.

3. Enemy.

    - Intentions.

    - Deployment and strength.

4. Execution.

    - Brief concept of the operation highlighting unit commander's intent.

    - Limiting or controlling factors that must be observed for coordinating purposes.

    - Combat support resource allocation.

5. Service Support.

    - Essential supply and evacuation details.

6. Command and Signal.

   - SOI index in effect for the operation, emergency
signals and signal restrictions.

[1]C.H. Corlett, Evolution of Field Orders. Coast Artillery Journal, June 1925, P. 513.

[2]Ibid, p. 512.

[3]Eben Swift, Field Orders, Messages and Reports. Journal of the United Stated Cavalry Association, September 1897, p. 221.

[4]Ibid, p.221-225.

[5]Ibid. p. 226-228.

[6]Corlett, p. 513.

[7]Harry A. Smith, Field Orders. Journal of the Military Service Institute of the United States, July-December 1914, p. 26.

[8]United States War Department Phamphlet No. 798, Tactical Order for Small Units in Trench Warfare, May 1918, p. 7.

[9]Ibid, p. 10-13. And United States War Department Phamphlet No. 802, Instructions for the Offensive Combat of Small Units, May 1918, p. 30-31.

[10]Phamphlet No. 798, p. 7.

[11]Ibid, p. 10.

[12]Ibid, p. 9

[13]Instruction for the Training of Division for Office Action, Army War College, December 1916, p.13.

[14] Ibid, p. 13.

[15] Combat Orders, Fort Leavenworth, 1922, p.35.

[16] FM 7-5, Infantry Field Manual, the Infantry Rifle Battalion, (May 1940), p. 291 and 296.

[17] FM 101-5, Staff Officier's Field Manual, (April 1940), p. 49.

[18] Ibid, p. 51.

[19] FM 101-5, p. 51.

[20] Ibid, p. 49.

[21] FM 7-5, p. 41.

[22] FM 7-5, p. 4.

[23] FM 7-20, Infantry Battalion, (October 1944), p. 114-116 and p. 211-213.

[24] FM 17-33, Tank Battalion, (September 1949), p. 160.

[25] FM 7-20, p. 21.

[26] Ibid, p. 160.

[27] FM 17-7, Armor Operations, (1949), p. 55.

[28] Ibid, p. 21.

[29] FM 17-1, p. 55.

[30]FM 17-33, p. 160.

[31]FM 100-5, Field Dervice Regulations, Operation, (June 1944), p. 40.

[32]FM 7-20, p. 21.

[33]FM 17-1, p.55.

[34]Ibid, p. 18.

[35]Bruce C. Clark, Mission-Type Orders, Armor, November-December 1961, p. 24-25.

[36]Ibid, p. 24.

[37]FM 17-33, p. 382.

[38]FM 7-20, p. 146.

[39]FM 7-11, Rifle Company, Infantry, Airborne, and Mechanized, (April 1965), p. 260-261.

[40]FM 17-1, Armor Operations, (October 1966), p. 315.

[41]FM 7-10, The Rifle Company, Platoon, and Squads, (April 1970), p. B-1.

[42]FM 17-1, Armor Operations, (October 1966), p. 316.

[43]Ibid, p. 315.

[44]FM 101-5, (July 1960),p. 69.

[45]Ibid, p. 315.

[46]FM 17-1, Armor Operations, (October 1966), p. 315.

[47]Ibid, p. 315.

[48]Ibid, p. 316.

[49]FM 101-5, Staff Officer's Field Manual, (July 1960), p. 70.

[50]H.E. Kelley, Forum: Operation Order, Infantry, May-June 1969, p. 31.

[51]Ibid, p. 31.

[52]Ibid, p. 31.

[53]FM 71-2, The Tank and Mechanized Infantry Battalion Task Force, (January 1988), p. B8-B13.

[54]Ibid, p. B-2.

[55]Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-67, Effective Writing for Army Leaders, (June 1986), p. 3.

[56]FM 100-5, Operations, (May 1986), p. 4.

Clarke, p. 24.

Marshall, p. 36.

[57]All information concerning the Israeli order format and order issuance procedures were obtained from my personal notebook that was compiled while attending the Israeli Company Commanders' Course in the spring of 1981. No other research material could be found to suport my notes or update any changes that may have been made since 1981.

[58]D.A. Ivano and others, <u>Fundamentals of Tactical Command and Control-A Soviet View</u>. Moscow: All-Union Copyright Agency, 1977, p. 238-241.

[59]Ibid, p.239.

[60]Ibid, p. 240.

[61]Ibid, p. 242.

[62]Ibid, p. 242.

[63]Kerry Blount, Troop Control. <u>How They Fight</u>, April-June 1988, p. 4.

[64]Ivano, p. 242.

[65]Ibid, p. 244.

[66]Blount, p. 4.

[67]Robert M. Frasche, <u>The Soviet Motorized Rifle Battalion</u>, Defense Intelligence Report, September 1978, p. 49.

[68]Blount, p. 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antal, J.F. "Mission Tactics. " Armor. May-June 1987.

Arrison, J.M. "Battle Orders." United States Institute
          Proceedings. July 1984.

Blount, K. "Troop Control." How They Fight. April-June
          1988.

Clark, B.C. "Mission Type Orders." Armor. November-
          December 1961.

Cole, James and Schoonmaker, Oliver. Military Instructor's
          Manual. New York: Edwin N. Appleton, 1917.

Combat Orders. Fort Leavenworth: General Service School
          Press, 1922.

Corlett, C.H. "Evolution of Field Orders." Coast Artillery
          Journal. June 1925.

Creveld, M.V. Command In War. Cambridge: Harvard University
          Press, 1985.

Crockett, I.C. "Streamlining Command and Staff Procedures."
          The Cavalry Journal. January-February 1941.

Dragunskiy, D.A. and others. The Motorized Rifle (Tank)
          Battalion in Combat. Soviet Union Military Affairs
          1986.

Esteves. L.R. Combat Training. Harrisburg:
          Military Publishing Company, 1943.

Frasche, R.M. The Soviet Motorized Rifle Company.
          Directorate of Intelligence Research, Defense
          Intelligence Agency, October 1976.

Filiberti, E. The Standard Operation Order Format.
          Monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies,
          Ft. Leavenworth, KS: US Army Command and General
          Staff College, 5 December, 1987.

The German Army's Mission-Oriented Command and Control.
          Armor, January-February 1987.

Instruction for the Training of Divisions for Officer Actions.
          Washington: Government Printing Office, December
          1916.

Ivano, D.A. and others. <u>Fundamentals of Tactical Command and</u>
<u>Control - A Soviet View</u>. Moscow: All-Union Copyright
Agency, 1977.

Judge, C.V. Format of the New Marine Corps Operation Order.
<u>Marine Corps Gazette</u>, July 1955.

Kelly, H.E. Forum: Operation Orders. <u>Infantry</u>. May-June
1969.

Khlebtsov, V. "Orders and Initiative." <u>Soviet Military</u>
<u>Review</u>, September 1984.

King-Harmon, A.L. "Staff Procedures in the Field." <u>Royal</u>
<u>University Scientific Institute</u>. May 1957.

Knowles, R.T. and others. "Five Paragraphs to Victory."
<u>Military Review</u>, October 1954.

Lind, W.S. <u>Maneuver Warfare Handbook</u>. Boulder and
London: Westview Press. 1984.

Lossow, W. "Mission-Type Tactics versus Order-Type
Tactics."; <u>Military Review</u>. June 1977.

Marshall, G.C. "Profiting by War Experience."
<u>Infantry Journal</u>. January 1921.

Mildren, F.T. "What has Korea Taught Us." <u>Infantry School</u>
<u>Quarterly</u>. October 1953.

Mountcastle, J.W. "On the Move: Command and Control of
Armor Units in Combat." <u>Military Review</u>, November
1985.

Pendleton, A. "On Combat Orders." <u>Infantry Journal</u>. March-
April. 1936.

Popel, N.N. and others. <u>Troop Control in the Great Patriotic</u>
<u>War</u>. Arlington: Joint Publications Research Service,
1975.

The Rifle Company. <u>Infantry Journal</u>. February 1943.

Smith, H.A. "Field Orders." <u>Journal of the Military Studies</u>
<u>Institute of the United States</u>. July-December. 1914.

Swift, E. "Field Orders, Messages and Reports." Journal of the United States Cavalry Association. September, 1897.

Tactics and Techniques of Infantry, Advanced Volume III. Harrisburg: Military Service Publishing Company, 1942.

U.S. Department of the Army. FM 7-5 Infantry Field Manual: The Infantry Rifle Battalion. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940

U.S. Department of the Army. FM 7-10 The Rifle Company, Platoons and Squads. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, April. 1970.

U.S. Department of the Army. FM 7-11 The Rifle Company, Infantry, Airborne and Mechanized. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, April. 1965.

_____. FM 7-20 Infantry Battalion, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, October. 1944.

_____. FM 17-1 Armor Operations-Small Unit, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949.

_____. FM 17-1 Armor Operations, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, October. 1966.

_____. FM 17-33 Tank Battalion, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, September. 1949.

_____. FM 71-2 The Tank and Mechanized Infantry Task Force, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, January. 1988.

_____. FM 101-5 Staff Officer's Field Manual, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

_____. FM 101-5 Staff Officer's Field Manual, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

_____. Pamphlet 600-67 Effective Writing for Army Leaders. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1986.

US War Department. Field Service Regulations United States Army, 1914 corrected to May 21, 1918. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, March. 1914.

_____. Field Service Regulations United States
        Army, 1944. Washington D.C.: Government Printing
        Office, June 1944.

US War Department. Pamphlet 802. Instructions for the
        Offensive Combat of Small Units. Washington D.C.:
        Office of the Adjutant General, May 1918.

US War Department. Pamphlet 798. Tactical Order for
        Small Units in Trench Warfare. Washington D.C.:
        Office of the Adjutant General, May 1918.

Wilson, B.T. "Quickening the Army System." Military Review,
        December 1956.