A relatively new occurrence in the development of doctrine is that the services

must now consider if their doctrine is consistent with that developed by the Joint Staff. Several important changes began with the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 to include vesting overall responsibility for the development of joint doctrine with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint doctrine is now both comprehensive and authoritative. This paper analyzes whether the comprehensive doctrine and model of conflict proposed in the draft version of the 1998 FM 100-5 is consistent with joint doctrine. This study begins by examining the nature and purpose of military doctrine and provides a brief history of the role doctrine plays in the U.S. Army. Next, this monograph reviews the evolution of capstone joint doctrine since 1986 and the model of conflict currently accepted by the joint community. This discussion is followed by an introduction to FM 100-5 (Coordinating Draft) with a primary focus on the manual’s model of conflict, categories of operations, and its comprehensive principles of operations. A comparative analysis is conducted of the models of conflict between FM 100-5 (Coordinating Draft) and joint doctrine to determine if the two models are fundamentally different in their explanation of war, conflict, and military operations. This study concludes that while there are numerous similarities between the doctrine offered by FM 100-5 (Coordinating Draft) and joint doctrine, the two models of conflict and their associated principles are fundamentally different. This study also concludes that since joint doctrine is applicable to Army forces, FM 100-5 (Coordinating Draft) should be modified to better reflect the core concepts of joint doctrine. The study then proposes several recommendations for the modifications of proposed new FM 100-5.
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