provide a 350-500 word review and critique of the peer’s operational approach.

Answer the following questions which directly address aspects of operational effectiveness:

What were the major strengths of the approach (if any) in terms of its doctrinal soundness and effectiveness?

What vulnerabilities, seams, or unresolved issues (if any) might be revealed or exacerbated by enemy action?

What improvements would you suggest to mitigate vulnerabilities or otherwise strengthen the approach?

One problem statement has is facing an indo Paycom theater that was slowly turning over to Chinese control China was taking over territories that were previously designated belonging to other nations freedom of navigation was being threatened violent extremist organizations were operating freely in the region there was the potential for some economic changes with companies leaving China for other cheaper sources of Labor so as China's perceived window of opportunity begins to close the CCP will continue to take stronger actions to secure and expand its nation's foothold in the next generation this foothold will be at the expense of US and partner nation interests and at the expense of regional the following desired end states have been identified to help minimize or eliminate this impact maintain US partner nation superiority in the region as well as global economic stability to the maximum extent possible on the right side of the term we have our desired added states decreased Chinese influence in the region enable partners to retake disputed territories limiting enemy Gray zone activities deter and prevent attacks on US resources eliminate violent extremist organizations ability to operate in the region and deter the prolific desperation and creation with weapons of mass destruction we will be achieving these desired end states to the lines of effort noted on the left side diagram several different Louise will be carried out affecting multiple of our desired end states the hopes are that this energy will show a combined front in a much more effective approach when dealing with the country such as China who largely operates in non kinetic grazing the ultimate end goal is to remain non kinetic ourselves to use show force as our main means of achieving our goals starting off with civil affair campaigns we will be using civil affairs to help sway and guide local populations to more US controlled and friendly operations we'll be conducting freedom of navigation exercises in the region smaller ships using more direct approaches and closer approaches to Chinese controlled territories to maintain our own ability to navigate within the region freely next to that we'll be using carrier fleet they will deploy a carrier fleet to the Philippine islands or to Australia as larger more direct show of force in the region conducting a cyber campaign against China will help deter Chinese aggression in the region we will also be employing a special operations forces advise and assist campaign with partner nations to help build up their own capabilities as well as our ability to assist their potential strength in a conflict and will be partnering with the state department by investing in foreign manufacturing facilities by encouraging U.S. companies to do the same and by also allowing for partner nations in the region to invest in these facilities to help wrestle control from China themselves through these actions we have listed here we can better achieve our strategic goals and bring about our desired state..

**Review and Critique of the Operational Approach**

Hi Fancis, you have provided a comprehensive strategy to counteract Chinese influence. The major strengths of your approach are as follows. First off, the approach aligns with established U.S. joint doctrine, emphasizing non-kinetic means, partnerships, and the integration of multiple LOEs. The use of civil affairs campaigns, freedom of navigation operations (FONOPS), cyber campaigns, and special operations forces (SOF) advisement reflects a cohesive, whole-of-government approach. Secondly, the desired end states—such as maintaining regional superiority, minimizing Chinese influence, and securing economic stability—are linked to broader U.S. national interests. The focus on preventing escalation into kinetic conflict is particularly prudent given the stakes in the region. Additionally, the inclusion of SOF to advise and assist partner nations strengthens regional stability and deters aggression by bolstering local capabilities. Encouraging foreign investment in manufacturing also empowers regional partners economically, reducing their reliance on China. Finally, the proposal incorporates innovative measures, such as targeted cyber campaigns and economic incentives for U.S. companies to relocate manufacturing, which address both short-term tactical goals and long-term strategic objectives.

As far as the vulnerabilities of the analysis, they can be summarized as follows. First off, the approach relies heavily on diverse and simultaneous efforts, including civil affairs, naval deployments, cyber operations, and economic initiatives. This breadth could strain U.S. resources and reduce the effectiveness of individual LOEs. Additionally, the reliance on multiple agencies and partners introduces seams in coordination. Disjointed efforts or conflicting priorities between U.S. entities and regional allies may weaken the overall effectiveness. Finally, the strategy does not sufficiently address the subtle and persistent nature of Chinese gray zone tactics, such as island-building, economic coercion, and disinformation, which require more sustained and adaptive countermeasures.

For the improvements, I think we could, first off, focus initial efforts on high-impact, low-risk activities, such as economic investments, while preparing contingency plans for higher-risk LOEs like cyber operations and FONOPS. Additionally, increase emphasis on information operations and counter-disinformation campaigns to directly combat Chinese narratives and gray zone activities, particularly in vulnerable nations. Finally, conduct risk assessments for FONOPS and cyber operations to avoid unintended kinetic conflicts. Transparent communication with allies and adversaries will further reduce misunderstandings.