

SCIENCE AND CULTURAL DIPLOMACY IN MULTINATIONAL OPERATIONS

Colonel (ret.) Professor Gruia TIMOFTE, Ph.D*
(Academy of Romanian Scientists, 3 Ilfov, 050044, Bucharest, Romania,
email: secretariat@aosr.ro)

Abstract: *This article presents the main connections between science, culture, diplomacy and politics for using multilateral forces in different alliances, coalitions, or other form of organization, etc., taken in account that every country is keeping total authority over own forces during their mission and taken total authority when the mission is completely accomplished. The principal conclusion is that every country participating with forces in coalitions, alliances, in multilateral operations, etc., must keep the authority and control over own forces in cooperation with all factors with responsibilities in operations.*

Keywords: *science, culture, diplomacy, multinational forces, politics, interoperability and security.*

DOI **10.56082/annalsarscimilit.2025.2.96**

1. Introduction

Modern Science had its beginnings in the 17th century in Europe with the natural philosophy of Galileo and Newton. Different factors contributed to its flourishing. Among them: a process that led to the *independence of scientific theories* from myths, religion and theology; *the interaction among the different European cultures*, that stimulated creativity through new ways of thinking and new paradigms for the observation of Nature; *the foundation of the scientific academies*, which contributed to scientific progress through the dissemination of new knowledge¹.

Science and Technology are interrelated and reinforce each other. In all countries the use of new technological products stimulates the curiosity of people not only for technology, but also for science. It is therefore fair to state that in the last few centuries Science has had a strong influence on cultural values all over the world. In developing countries science education based on Western concepts and culture, and taught by teachers for whom Science is often unrelated to their culture, leads children to deny the validity and authority of the knowledge transmitted to them. In conclusion, Western Science is deeply rooted in Western Culture and has a great influence not

* Full member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, Military Sciences Section, email: timofte.gruia@gmail.com.

¹ MAURITIO IACCARINO, *Science and culture*, Academy of Sciences, Scripta Varia 105, Vatican City, 2003.

only in Europe and North America, but also all over the world. Science educates people to a rational and tolerant approach to everyday problems. On the other hands the use of scientific knowledge causes social tensions of different types in different parts of the world².

2. Science and Culture

Science and culture are inextricably linked, each influencing and shaping the other in profound ways. Scientific advancements have revolutionized societal structures, beliefs, and values, while culture provides the context in which scientific inquiry takes place and influences its direction.

Science's impact on Culture:

- Shifting worldviews: scientific discoveries have challenged traditional beliefs and worldviews, leading to a more rational and empirical understanding of the natural world;
- Technological innovations: science-driven technological advancements have transformed daily life, reshaping communication, transportation, and other aspects of society;
- Medical progress: medical breakthroughs have extended lifespans, improved healthcare, and impacted societal attitudes towards health and well-being.
- Influence on arts and humanities: science has inspired artistic and literary works, influencing themes, styles, and perspectives in various creative fields;
- Shaping social norms: scientific knowledge has influenced social norms and practices, such as hygiene, nutrition, and family planning.

Culture's Influence on Science:

- Funding and research priorities: Cultural values and priorities influence the allocation of resources for scientific research, shaping the direction of scientific inquiry;
- Public perception and acceptance: Cultural beliefs and values influence how scientific findings are interpreted and received by the public, impacting scientific discourse and policy;
- Ethical considerations: Cultural norms and values play a crucial role in shaping ethical guidelines for scientific research and development, particularly in fields like biotechnology and genetic engineering³;
- Scientific communication: Cultural contexts influence how scientific information is presented and disseminated, impacting public understanding and engagement with science;

² JOELLE LE MAREC, BERNARD SCHIELLE, *Cultures of Science*, ACFAS Magazine, Quebec, 2018.

³ KRIS RUTTEN, STEFAAN BLANCKE, and RONALD SOETAERT, *Perspectives on Science and Culture*, Purdue University Press, Indiana, 2018.

- Science education: Cultural values and beliefs shape how science is taught and learned, influencing educational approaches and curricula.

The Interplay of Science and Culture:

- Science as a cultural product: Science is not simply a detached body of knowledge but is also a product of culture, influenced by social, economic, and political factors;

- Mutual influence: Science and culture are in a constant state of interaction, with each influencing the other's evolution and development;

- The importance of dialogue: Open dialogue and critical engagement between science and culture are essential for addressing complex challenges and promoting societal well-being;

- Cultivating scientific literacy: Increased scientific literacy among the general public is crucial for informed decision-making and responsible engagement with scientific advancements;

- Promoting inclusivity and diversity: Encouraging diverse voices and perspectives in science is important for ensuring that scientific advancements reflect the values and needs of all communities.

In conclusion, science and culture are intricately interwoven, and their relationship is dynamic and ever-evolving. Understanding this relationship is crucial for navigating the complexities of the modern world and fostering a society that embraces both scientific progress and cultural values.

3. Cultural Democracy

Cultural diplomacy uses cultural exchange and promotion to foster mutual understanding, build lasting relationships, and strengthen international cooperation. It leverages soft power, focusing on people-to-people connections and the exchange of ideas, values, and traditions to achieve diplomatic goals, distinct from traditional diplomacy's focus on political and economic negotiations⁴.

Definition: Cultural diplomacy involves using cultural elements like art, music, language, and traditions to promote understanding and cooperation between nations. It goes beyond simply showcasing a nation's culture and aims to build lasting relationships and foster mutual understanding.

Distinction from Traditional Diplomacy: While traditional diplomacy primarily focuses on political and economic agreements, cultural diplomacy emphasizes soft power and the attraction of a nation's culture and values.

Purpose and Goals: Cultural diplomacy aims to:

⁴ADAM BLY, *Science is Culture*, Harper Collins e-book, Conversations at the New Intersection of Science and Society, New York, 2010.

Promote Mutual Understanding: By sharing cultural aspects, nations can dispel stereotypes and misconceptions, leading to deeper appreciation for different cultures.

Build Relationships: Cultural exchange can foster lasting relationships among individuals, communities, and organizations, serving as a foundation for collaboration.

Enhance International Relations: By fostering mutual understanding and trust, cultural diplomacy can strengthen international cooperation and pave the way for dialogue and peace.

The term *Cultural Democracy* describes an approach to arts and culture that actively engages everyone in deciding what counts as culture, where it happens, who makes it, and who experiences it. It is not a new concept, but it's one that seems to be gaining focus across arts and culture. It's also often misunderstood or misused within the cultural sector⁵.

Embedding Values of the Cultural Democracy

The interviews that were studied have helped identify five key values. These are reflected in the case studies and are described here as principles to underpin greater Cultural Democracy within arts and cultural organizations. Leader as facilitator Achieving Cultural Democracy requires traditional models of leadership to be reconsidered or challenged, and some power over decision-making to be relinquished. The sector has been defined by a relatively small number of leaders who decide what constitutes art and culture. This 'top-down' approach closes off access to many potential participants who may feel little agency or opportunity to feel part of formalized culture. Recasting the leader as key facilitator opens up culture to far wider numbers of artists, audiences and participants. Here, the skills of a leader become much more about asking the right questions than having the answers:

Leader as facilitator; Agency and permission; Valuing everyone – equality of expertise; Active participation; Valuing process and product equally, etc.

If people feel they have permission to be involved, that they have something to contribute, that their opinions matter, then they are more likely to want to be included.

3.1. Public Democracy

Public diplomacy, a form of diplomacy that engages directly with foreign publics to achieve foreign policy objectives, is a key tool in international relations. Unlike traditional diplomacy, which focuses on interactions between governments, public diplomacy aims to influence

⁵ LEA SHAVER, *The right to the science and culture*, Yale Law School, Wisconsin, 2009.

perceptions, build relationships, and promote cooperation through public communication. It's used to shape narratives, foster understanding, and build support for a country's goals abroad.

*Key Aspects of Public Diplomacy in International Relations*⁶:

Targeting Foreign Publics: Public diplomacy directly addresses foreign audiences, including opinion leaders, civil society organizations, and the general public;

Strategic Communication: It employs various communication channels, such as cultural exchange programs, educational initiatives, social media, and public relations campaigns, to reach and influence foreign audiences;

Building Trust and Relationships: Public diplomacy aims to build trust, understanding, and cooperation between countries by fostering positive relationships with foreign publics;

Promoting National Interests: It helps a country promote its values, interests, and foreign policy objectives by shaping public opinion and gaining support abroad;

Complementing Traditional Diplomacy: Public diplomacy is often used in conjunction with traditional diplomacy to create a more favorable environment for negotiations and agreements between governments.

Examples of Public Diplomacy in International Relations:

Educational Programs: Promoting exchange programs and scholarships can help build long-term relationships and understanding.

Social Media Engagement: Governments use social media to reach and engage with foreign audiences, sharing information about their policies and culture.

Advocacy Campaigns: Governments can use public diplomacy to advocate for their interests on international issues, such as human rights or climate change.

In essence, public diplomacy is a powerful tool for shaping international relations by building relationships, fostering understanding, and promoting a country's interests on a global scale.

Public diplomacy is the practice of engaging with foreign audiences to strengthen ties, build trust, and promote cooperation.

4. Politics of Multinational Operations

Today, few countries fight alone; most fight as allies or partners in multilateral campaigns. The end of the Cold War opened a window of opportunity for Multinational Military Operations (MMOs) ⁷. These have

⁶ CHINTAMONI RAO, *Science as a Culture. A Critical Appreciation*, Academy of Sciences, Vatican City, 2003.

⁷Danish Ministry of Defense, *Military Manual, On International Law Relevant to Danish Armed Forces in International Operations*, 2018, pp. 280-283.

seen varying degrees of participation, enthusiasm, and success. This special forum is devoted to the politics of multilateral warfare including their formation, maintenance, and durability. The introduction sketches past research and derives some key questions of continuing relevance. In sum, this forum offers a fresh look at the politics of MMOs, including conceptual contributions to the study of national restrictions, domestic constraints, and coalition warfare.

One country may support another's cause, but will never take it so seriously as it takes its own. A moderately-sized force will be sent to its help; but if things go wrong the operation is pretty well written off, and one tries to withdraw at the smallest possible cost.

The politics within and between coalition partners continue as the fighting goes on. Yet we do not have a good grasp of the politics of MMOs as most of the work on alliances and coalitions focuses on their formation their duration. Only recently have scholars started to turn to how alliances and coalitions operate during conflicts and how politics at home and at headquarters shape the conduct on and near the battlefield.

This topic is of great importance as very few countries can fight on their own, and nearly all conflicts today are conducted by alliances, coalitions, and international organizations—21st century war is almost always multilateral. While many factors determine whether a particular war or campaign is successful, dynamics within national capitals and within organizations can greatly shape the effectiveness of multilateral military efforts. This special forum addresses politics and processes that make coalition warfare both possible and problematic. As the individual contributions within this special forum demonstrate, cooperation in battle among even like-minded countries is difficult, yet, with much effort and learning, cooperation does occur.

The starting points to the debate about the politics of MMOs are:

(1) countries do not give up their sovereignty when they join a coalition or alliance;

(2) democracies do not give up civilian control of their armed forces when they deploy as part of a multilateral effort; and

(3) foreign campaigns implicate domestic politics and vice versa. First, the reality of alliance warfare is that countries may transfer control of their contingents to the actors leading the military campaign, but that transfer is conditional and temporary. It is not a surrender of authority, as each contingent will have someone authorized to say “no” if they are asked to do something that is immoral, illegal, contrary to the national guidance, or just plain stupid. The so-called “red card” is always available to be played, so those commanding the multinational force have to be aware that they simply cannot treat every military unit as if they were all from their home country. Indeed, for some countries in some operations, those wearing

the hat of the multinational organization may not even be authorized to command troops from their own country.

Second, civilian control of the military is a fundamental attribute of modern democracy. Consequently, democracies must retain some control over their forces when they participate in multilateral efforts. However, democracies vary substantially when it comes to political oversight of the military and, more generally, parliamentary involvement in security matters. Recent studies show that parliamentary war powers can have a tangible constraining influence on government use of military force. Yet, there can also be unintended consequences of parliamentary involvement, which can have a debate-dampening effect and lead to elite collusion.

Third, when countries transfer control of a unit to a multilateral force, as much as they might like, they do not transfer responsibility. Leaders will be held accountable for what their planes, ships, and soldiers do abroad, whether that is killing combatants or non-combatants or becoming casualties. Democratic publics and opposition parties may have selective attention, but they will call on the government to answer questions when the forces that have been deployed abroad make the news for good or ill. Whether the mission abroad becomes central to political debates at home varies, as more than a few democracies have managed to implicate opposition parties in these campaigns. However, such efforts to quell criticism still require sustained effort⁸.

Because of constitutional and political requirements, politicians will generally be careful and reluctant: They will not always agree to join a multilateral military effort; when they do, they are likely to impose conditions on how their forces are used; and they may be quick to leave if the effort is not worth the political costs back home.

The contributors to this special forum focus on overlapping underexplored dynamics that shape who participate in MMOs. One of the challenges in this area is that scholars have leapt in without establishing the basic concepts.

So, the first two contributions directly address some of the core ideas that are applied by those who study coalition and alliance efforts and the first step in the next generation of research is to consider whether the lessons in this work apply to other multilateral efforts.

Second, the contributions to this special forum draw mostly on single country case studies, so future work should endeavor to apply other methods such as large statistical analyses or comparative research designs to determine which factors matter more generally.

⁸ DR. NICK WILSON, *Cultural Democratic in Practice*, 2017, available at <http://www.cd.org/cd.html>, accessed on 15.06.2025.

Third, the focus on very recent conflicts faces a significant hurdle—that national restrictions and their observation are often classified. Historical work, with more declassified records, may help to uncover some of the political dynamics at play. For instance, one of the greatest challenges to studying national restrictions and alliance behavior is that we know far less about what Special Operations units are doing and where they are deployed by whom. However, there is some indication that governments are increasingly reliant on such units, both because of the nature of the current conflicts and precisely to avoid political oversight.

Fourth, the burden-sharing debates both within NATO and in the scholarly literature should engage questions raised in this forum about the complexity of multilateral military operations. Spending more does not mean doing more.

Fifth, much of the current work, including that presented here, assumes that doing something, even token contributions, provides some influence and checks some boxes, so we need to study how coalition leaders respond to the varying efforts of their partners⁹.

Despite alliances and coalitions having a long history in International Relations, we are only getting started on examining how they operate in wartime.

4.1. Fundamentals of Multinational Operations

Multinational operations are conducted by forces of two or more nations, usually undertaken within the structure of a coalition or alliance. Other possible arrangements include supervision by an international organization such as the United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe¹⁰.

Strategic Context. Nations form regional and global geopolitical and economic relationships to promote their mutual national interests, ensure mutual security against real and perceived threats, conduct foreign humanitarian assistance, conduct peace operations, and promote their ideals. Cultural, diplomatic, psychological, economic, technological, and informational factors influence multinational operations and participation. However, a nation's decision to employ military capabilities is always a political decision.

Nature of Multinational Operations. The tenets of multinational operations are respect, rapport, knowledge of partners, patience, mission focus, team-building, trust, and confidence. While these tenets cannot

⁹ US Department of Defense, Joint Staff, JP3-16, *Multinational Operations*, Washington, DC, 2019, Executive Summary, pp. 9-10, 17-18.

¹⁰ CHRISTOPHE PERNIN, ANGELA O'MAHONY, and MATHEW LAME, *Chasing Multinational Interoperability*, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 2020, pp. 21-23, 44.

guarantee success, ignoring them may lead to mission failure due to a lack of unity of effort. National and organizational norms of culture, language, and communication affect multinational force interoperability.

Security Cooperation advances progress toward cooperation within the competition continuum by strengthening and expanding the existing network of the allies and partners, which improves the overall warfighting effectiveness of the joint force and enable more effective multinational operations.

International rationalization, standardization, and interoperability is important for achieving practical cooperation; efficient use of research, development, procurement, support, and production resources; and effective multinational capability without sacrificing some capabilities¹¹.

Command and Coordination Relationships. Although nations will often participate in multinational operations, they rarely, if ever, relinquish national command of their forces. As such, forces participating in a multinational operation will always have at least *two distinct chains of command*: a national chain of command and a multinational chain of command.

National Command which includes the authority and responsibility for organizing, directing, coordinating, controlling, planning employment of, and protecting military forces. Command authority for a multinational force commander is normally negotiated between the participating nations and can vary from nation to nation. In making a decision regarding an appropriate command relationship for a multinational military operation, the commander carefully considers such factors as mission, size of the proposed force, risks involved, anticipated duration, and rules of engagement. Command authority will be specified in the implementing agreements that provide a clear and common understanding of what authorities are specified over which forces.

Unified action during multinational operations involves the synergistic application of all instruments of national power as provided by each participating nation; it includes the actions of nonmilitary organizations as well as military forces.

4.2. General Planning Considerations

The composition of a Multinational Force (MF) may change as partners enter and leave when their respective national objectives change or force contributions reach the limits of their nation's ability to sustain them. Numerous factors influence the military capabilities of nations. The operational-level commander must be aware of the specific operational limitations and capabilities of the forces of participating nations and

¹¹ DAN ADAMS, *A Brief Guide to Cultural Democracy*, 2018, available at <http://www.cd.org/PDF>, accessed on 16.06.2025.

consider these differences when assigning missions and conducting operations. MF commanders at all levels may be required to spend considerable time consulting and negotiating with diplomats, host nations official, local leaders, and others; their role is underestimated¹².

Building a MF starts with the national decisions and diplomatic efforts to create a coalition or spur an alliance into action. Discussion and coordination between potential participants will initially seek to sort out basic questions at the national strategic level.

The MF's staff should conduct a detailed mission analysis. This is one of the most important tasks in planning multinational operations and should result in a revised mission statement, commander's intent, and the MF's planning guidance. As part of the mission analysis, force requirements should be identified; standards for participation published (e.g., training-level competence and logistics, including deployment, sustainment, and redeployment capabilities); and funding requests, certification procedures, and force commitments solicited from an alliance or likely coalition partners.

This topic is very important when a very few countries can fight on their own, and nearly all conflicts today are conducted by alliances, coalitions, and international organizations. The cooperation in battle among countries is difficult, with much effort and learning. The starting points to the debate about this politics comprise the following principles: countries do not give up their sovereignty when they join a coalition or alliance; democracies do not give up civilian control of their armed forces when they deploy as part of a multilateral effort and foreign campaigns implicate domestic politics and vice-versa.

4.3. Operations of Multinational Forces

Land Operations. In most multinational operations, land forces are an integral and central part of the military effort. The level and extent of land operations in a multinational environment is largely a function of the overall military objectives, any national caveats to employment, and the forces available within the MF. National doctrine and training will normally dictate employment options within the MF. Nations with common tactics, techniques, and procedures will also experience far greater interoperability. Effective use of security activities may significantly reduce interoperability problems even for countries with widely disparate weapons systems.

Maritime Operations. During multinational operations, maritime forces can exercise sea control or project power ashore, synchronize their operations with the other MF components, and support the MF's intent and

¹² DR. ANNA BULL, *Toward Cultural Democracy*, 2017, available at <http://www.klc.ac.uk>, accessed on 16.06.2025.

guidance in accomplishing the MF mission. Maritime forces are primarily navies and coast guard; however, they may include maritime focused air forces, amphibious forces, or other government departments and agencies charged with sovereignty, security, or constabulary functions at sea.

Air Operations. Air operations provide the MF Commander with a responsive, agile, and flexible means of operational reach. The MF can execute deep operations rapidly, striking at decisive points and attacking centers of gravity. Further, transportation and support requirements can be greatly extended in response to emerging crisis and operational needs. Multinational air operations are focused on supporting the MF's intent and guidance in accomplishing the MF mission and, at the same time, ensuring air operations are integrated with the other major MF operational functions (land, maritime, and special operations forces).

Information. All military activities produce information. Informational aspects are the features and details of military activities observers interpret and use to assign meaning and gain understanding. Those aspects affect the perceptions and attitudes that drive behavior and decision making. The joint force commander/MF leverages informational aspects of military activities to gain an advantage; failing to leverage those aspects may cede this advantage to others¹³.

Cyberspace Operations. Cyberspace is a global domain within the information environment consisting of the interdependent network of information technology infrastructures and resident data, including the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, space-based resources, and embedded processors and controllers. Cyberspace uses electronics and the electromagnetic spectrum to create, store, modify, and exchange data via networked systems. Cyberspace operations seek to ensure freedom of action throughout the operational environment for MF forces and our allies, while denying the same to our adversaries. Cyberspace operations overcome the limitations of distance, time, and physical barriers present in the physical domains. Cyberspace links actions in the physical domains, enabling mutually dependent operations to achieve an operational advantage.

Other Multinational Operations. Stabilization is the process by which military and nonmilitary actors collectively apply various instruments of national power to address drivers of conflict, foster host nation resiliencies, and create conditions that enable sustainable peace and security. Stability is needed when a state is under stress and cannot cope. MF's supporting stabilization efforts should consider the use of fundamentals of stabilization and the principles of multinational operations to plan and

¹³ANDRE BURINHA, THOMAS RENARD, *Cyber Diplomacy: The Making International Society*, Global Affairs, DOI:10.1080/23340450.2017.1414924

execute military activities to facilitate long-term stability. The fundamentals are conflict transformation, host nation ownership, unity of effort, and building host nation capacity.

Special Operations. Special operations forces (SOF) can provide the MF with a wide range of specialized military capabilities and responses. SOF can provide specific assistance in the areas of assessment, liaison, and training of host nation forces within the MT operational area.

Joint Electromagnetic Spectrum Management Operations. To prevail in the next conflict, an MF must win the fight for EMS superiority. Devices whose functions depend on the EMS are used by both civilian and military organizations and individuals for intelligence; communications; positioning, navigation, and timing; sensing; command and control; attack; ranging; and data transmission and information storage and processing.

5. Conclusions

The main ideas this special analyze forum are useful starting points for further research on the dynamics of multilateral military efforts¹⁴.

So, *the first step* in the next generation of research is to consider whether the lessons in this work apply to other multilateral efforts, including United Nations peacekeeping missions or operations under the auspices of regional organizations. *Second*, the contributions to this special forum draw mostly on single country case studies, so future work should endeavor to apply other methods such as large-N statistical analyses or comparative research designs to determine which factors matter more generally. *Third*, the focus on very recent conflicts faces a significant hurdle—that national restrictions and their observation are often classified. For instance, one of the greatest challenges to studying national restrictions and alliance behavior is that we know far less about what Special Operations units are doing and where they are deployed by whom. However, there is some indication that governments are increasingly reliant on such units, both because of the nature of the current conflicts and precisely to avoid political oversight. *Fourth*, the burden-sharing debates both within NATO and in the scholarly literature should engage questions raised in this forum about the complexity of multilateral military operations. Spending more does not mean doing more. *Fifth*, much of the current work, including that presented here, assumes that doing something, even token contributions, provides some influence and checks some boxes, so we need to study how coalition leaders respond to the varying efforts of their partners.

¹⁴ Patrick Mello, and Stephen Saideman, *Contemporary Security Policy*, pp. 30-37, DOI:10.1080/13523260.2018.1522757.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS D., *A Brief Guide to Cultural Democracy*, 2018, available at <http://www.cd.org/PDF>;
- BLY A., *Science is Culture*, Harper Collins e-book, Conversations at the New Intersection of Science and Society, New York, 2010;
- BULL A., *Toward Cultural Democracy*, 2017, available at <http://www.klc.ac.uk>;
- BURINHA A., RENARD T., *Cyber Diplomacy: The Making International Society*, Global Affairs, DOI:10.1080/23340450.2017.1414924;
- IACCARINO M., *Science and culture*, Academy of Sciences, Scripta Varia 105, Vatican City, 2003;
- LE MAREC J., SCHIELLE B., *Cultures of Science*, ACFAS Magazine, Quebec, 2018;
- MELLO P., SAIDEMAN S., *Contemporary Security Policy*, DOI:10.1080/13523260.2018.1522757;
- PERNIN C., O'MAHONY A., LAME M., *Chasing Multinational Interoperability*, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 2020;
- RAO C., *Science as a Culture. A Critical Appreciation*, Academy of Sciences, Vatican City, 2003;
- RUTTEN K., BLANCKE S., SOETAERT R., *Perspectives on Science and Culture*, Purdue University Press, Indiana, 2018;
- SHAVER L., *The right to the science and culture*, Yale Law School, Wisconsin, 2009;
- WILSON N., *Cultural Democratic in Practice*, 2017, available at <http://www.cd.org/cd.html>;
- Danish Ministry of Defense, Military Manual, *On International Law Relevant to Danish Armed Forces in International Operations*, 2018;
- Department of Defense, Joint Staff, JP3-16, *Multinational Operations*, Washington DC, 2019, Executive Summary.

