International Logistics Cooperation: The US-ROK Experience

Robert W. Beckstead

This paper presents an international logistics definition followed by a discussion of (1) some general principles of international logistics including the role of governments, weapon systems acquisition and logistical support and (2) the US-ROK cooperative logistics experience.

International logistics focuses on the political, economic and military dimensions that provide for national security through multinational means. Only governments can exercise political, economic and military processes to arrange, generate, maintain and sustain international resources. In the case of the US and ROK governments, the Mutual Defense Treaty (1954) and successive agreements have set the bases for the mutual defense of South Korea.

Greater political, economic and military cooperation is called for with collective security as the watchword and economic interdependency as a way of commerce. A nation’s technology and financial assets establish the nature and scope of logistics cooperation. As nations move up the industrial development ladder technologically and financially, each seeks to provide its own weapons through codevelopment and coproduction agreements rather than be dependent upon foreign sources. Such cooperation promotes transfers of design, manufacturing, management, and human technologies and ultimately upgrades the industrial capacity and quality of countries’ economic infrastructure, which in turn provides the bases for breadth in mutual logistical support.

Combined organizations, logistics policy and transfer of intelligence exist for the defense of South Korea. Korean host nation support is comprehensive, and a high level of interoperability exists between US and ROK weapons and equipment. The problem of maintaining an interoperable system is likely to increase as more of the South Korean forces are equipped with Korean-designed and -produced weapons. What is required by the US and ROK is that future need statements especially for sophisticated weapon
systems recognize bilateral (multinational) applications and that the supportability of such weapon systems incorporate bilateral (multinational) logistic support systems.

Operationally logistics remains a national responsibility and consequently the US and ROK logistics doctrine and operations remain separate and different. The pursuit of rationalizing these differences is continuous. Much can be accomplished in harmonizing logistics procedures and operations by conducting joint or combined logistics exercises. Nevertheless, the combined economic and industrial power of the US and ROK coupled with the logistics policy and support systems provide a formidable deterrent to help secure the cultural, political, social and economic integrity of the Republic of Korea.
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“We must seize the opportunities of this new age to shape a better world, one built on shared interests, responsibilities and ideas. We must create an environment for continued US and world economic growth by promoting democracy and democratic values and by supporting regional security and stability....”

Admiral Charles R. Larson
Commander in Chief of US Pacific Command

The globalization of business and defense industry reflects the strong trend that international economic interdependence has taken since the end of World War II. Multinational and now transnational businesses have been formed to take advantage of low labor costs, a skilled labor force, technology, plentiful natural resources, profitability, access to markets, and host nation support. This has lead to such organizations focusing on global markets rather than only national ones. The opening up of markets worldwide dramatically changes the industrial structure of nations. The impact that open markets have on an economy makes no distinction between consumer or defense industries. This is particularly true among the basic industries that all nations seek to own in order to enhance their economic development and national security. Later on, even the high-tech industries are affected, particularly when their operations call for large amounts of capital and skilled labor.

Strong political, economic and military ties have existed between the
United States and the Republic of Korea beginning with the Korean War. This relationship was forged in the heat of battle on the ground, in the air and on the sea facing common foes. From the ashes of the Korean War also came the stark realization and the need for economic ties that would help establish a modern industrial state with economic prosperity and well being for the Korean people. In turn the United States furnished needed capital and markets for Korean goods. Thus the United States became the most prominent market for the Republic of Korea and Korea eventually became the seventh largest trading partner of the United States.

International logistics focuses on the political, economic and military dimensions of national security. Since no nation is self-sufficient in supplying all its economic requirements, there is always some element of dependency upon other nations to cover deficiencies. Open markets have exacerbated these deficiencies because of the industrial transformation that has taken place in response to competitive pressures. Thus, economic interdependence is a real world phenomenon and countries' logistics systems must adapt prudently to this reality. Also worldwide reduction in military budgets attests to the need for greater cooperation between nations across the entire spectrum of logistics, if only to take advantage of accompanying economies of scale in line with the size of the market.

The paper will first present an international logistics definition followed by a discussion of (1) some general principles of international logistics including the role of governments, weapon systems acquisition and logistical support and (2) the US-ROK cooperative logistics experience. Finally, a brief statement of conclusions will be presented.

**Definition**

The military has long known about the importance of a nation's economic strength in order to carry out its mission. Over time what has become ever more apparent to the military is its reliance upon foreign sources for materiel to achieve its goals and objectives. Logistics has long been defined simplistically as "the science of planning for and providing for goods and services." 

---

Today the process of planning for and providing for goods and services needs to focus upon both public and civilian elements of the economy.

A nation's support for and reliance upon allies and friendly nations for support and armaments calls for a more comprehensive concept and definition of logistics. In an international setting, such a definition needs to address the actions of negotiating, planning, coordinating and implementing logistics arrangements between nations, both their military and civilian components. It needs to include exchanging major end items, facilities, technologies, and other materiel and services; intermeshing policies, programs, procedures, activities and components of military and civilian systems; and utilizing nations' logistic systems and procedures in order to achieve security requirements.2

The overall goal of international logistics is to provide for national security through multinational means. This is achieved by exercising political, economic and military processes to arrange, generate, maintain and sustain multinational resources. Of course, it is essential that the resources are compatible and coordinated for military and civilian purposes during times of peace, crises, or war.

A move toward greater international cooperation and coordination in a political, economic and military sense requires forging common ground among nations. The difficulty of achieving this becomes apparent when common threats disappear, and domestic political and economic performance is disappointing and public expectations fail to be realized. In order to develop greater international cooperation and coordination, countries must base their international policies and agreements upon long-term trends and perspectives and not limit their focus to short-term events and troubles even though they may have serious overtones.

Because logistic matters rest at the heart of readiness and sustainability of military operations, dwelling upon the reasons for problems pose security risks in a public forum. Needless to say, most of the problems stem from the principle that logistics is a national responsibility. Also, there is ever present

---

an aim for national independence and secrecy when it comes to national security matters. Thus, military and industrial proprietary information and technologies are kept on very close hold. Likewise, cultural and societal differences add to the complexity of the situation.

The Role of Governments

National governments are pivotal to the formation of international logistics agreements and to any successful execution of logistics plans, policies and procedures. A central role of government is international relations aimed at preserving the integrity of the nation. National governments outline the structure of that relationship with other countries by entering into formal treaties, e.g., the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea, as well as generating less formal agreements. Collectively, greater security is achieved more readily than when nations stand alone. Coalition security not only deters aggressors but it also makes more efficient use of defense resources.

An integral part of collective security is multinational logistics, the sharing of defense assets. Collective security encompasses a wide range of activities in which national governments can participate together. Certain aspects of logistics are sensitive and centered in secrecy because they relate closely to a state of readiness and sustainability. Nevertheless, in order for collective security to be effective, the logistics support systems need to be coordinated and interoperable. Therefore, it is only prudent for nations to cooperate as extensively as possible in the logistics process resulting from thoughtful government-to-government negotiations and agreements.

To enhance the standardization and interoperability of weapon systems, government agreements provide for shared defense industrial bases for the codevelopment and coproduction of weapon systems, the transfer of technology, and logistical support systems. Industrial cooperation establishes the ability for countries to acquire facilities, equipment and labor skills to maintain and repair military equipment and hardware. For nations whose industrial base and technological expertise are not developed enough to produce the weapons needed, government agreements allow and provide financial assistance to purchase such weapon systems along with associated logistics support.

In addition to acquiring weapon systems, there are other aspects of logistics
that call for government agreements. Host-nation support arrangements assist in sharing the stationing costs of foreign armed forces to maintain regional defense. Likewise, special access rights are agreed to allow over-flight landing rights and access to seaports and airports, accommodate prepositioning of war reserve stocks and materiel, and make available the civil infrastructure that includes utilities, transportation, communication, medical, and sanitation facilities. All of these arrangements must conform to the laws within the nations and must be respected. In the end a goal of logistics cooperation is to raise the level of deterrence at the lowest cost and to support crises response rapidly and decisively.

International Logistic Functions

It is duly recognized that international logistics includes the whole span of resource allocation dealing with national security. What is presented in this section principally deals with system acquisition and general logistical support. The economic realities of competition and competitiveness have fostered international economic interdependence and in turn have promoted the globalization of defense industries. In fact, what encouraged defense industries to form global networks through joint ventures and offset purchase arrangements is the realization of better access to capital, technologies, and ultimately entrance into foreign markets. One effect of such a globalization of defense industry has been that nations have less control over their own defense than in prior times.

Acquiring Weapons Systems

Fundamentally, in order for nations to acquire large quantities of weapon systems and especially the highly sophisticated ones, there is a significant requirement for technological and financial assets. The degree to which a nation has these will determine the variance in policy options open to it and the extent of dependence it has upon foreign sources. Naturally, nations for

security reasons seek to be self-reliant in contrast to being dependent. However, no nation possesses all of the required resources; so the state of dependency is simply relative.

It is argued that when nations have both large technology and financial assets, they will opt for developing and producing their own weapons systems, even when comparable weapons systems may be available elsewhere. At the same time, when the opposite is true i.e., low technology and financial assets, nations will be largely forced to acquire weapons from abroad, especially the more sophisticated ones. For national security reasons nations prefer the former and despise the latter.

The self-governing behavior of nations such as the United States has sprung from national wealth both technologically and financially and consequently countries have shown a propensity for self-reliance. As desirable as this option may be, more and more countries are finding it necessary for specific raw materials, piece parts, and components to come from foreign sources. What seems essential, however, is that the manufacturing or assembling of the weapons be accomplished domestically. At the same time, when countries have technological skills and abilities but lack sufficient financial resources, they enter into industrial cooperation by joining together in consortium to develop weapons systems. Under these latter circumstances there is a blending of technical assets as well as assembling of sufficient financial funding to guarantee successful completion of a program.

In cases where nations such as the Republic of Korea lack certain technical capabilities but do have the necessary funding, technologies are acquired in sufficient quantities through partnerships with other countries to enable them to coproduce the weapons. The essential requirement for such partnerships to form is the willingness to share technologies. This becomes more than a simple nation-to-nation agreement but requires a willingness upon firms to share developed technologies that have placed them in an advantageous position relative to competitors. Consequently, the protection of intellectual property rights becomes a crucial feature with these arrangements.

In a financially interdependent world and where more nations are entering into the ranks of industrial countries and developing nations are becoming stronger economically, there has become evidence that the answer to acquiring weapon systems will move ever more toward codeveloping and coproducing arrangements. Thus, the future will see an even greater globalization of defense industry with complementary technology transfers—the economic
realities make it so.

**General Logistics Support**

Known by the military for ages is the direct linkage that exists between weapon system acquisition and general logistics support. With international industrial cooperation and collective development and production of weapons systems becoming ever more prevalent, multinational logistics cannot be far distant. The driving forces behind international logistics are the realities of collective security, rapid and dynamic changes in regional events, a need for harmonized multinational logistics systems, and cost reduction of general logistics through cooperation and mutual support. Weapon systems dictate logistics especially with regard to matters of supply, e.g., spares, components, piece parts, equipment, and consumables, as well as for maintenance and repair operations. In fact, issues central to standardization and interoperability have their origin in which weapon systems are adopted.

One of the most notable results of industrial cooperation is the leveling and commonality effects upon labor skills and technical capabilities among countries performing sophisticated logistic functions, ranging from management of information systems to refabrication and retrofitting of major weapon systems. Along with improvement in technical labor skills and a greater regional industrial resource base, a broader array of maintenance and repair activities becomes workable domestically, in contrast to sending major components and parts back to foreign suppliers for repair.

Technology advances have had multiple effects on logistics. For example, electronic equipment has revolutionized procedures of managing contracting and financial transactions, optimizing inventories, matching available materiel with work orders, and distributing goods and services to the final user. Likewise, the technical nature of weapons gives direction as to how maintenance and repair activities can best be managed, e.g., the appropriate inventory size, the array and form of items stored, and where and by whom maintenance and repair work is performed whether on site or at a depot. By analyzing various economic trade-offs one such principle emerges: the more technical expertise required to perform necessary repairs, the better the repair support will be in both quality and efficiency at the depots.

In much the same way as with weapon systems, the civilian infrastructure of a nation is significantly affected by its technical and financial assets.
Greater economic interdependence through more openness in trade brings with it improvement in nations' civilian infrastructure. The degree to which host-nation support can be achieved depends upon the advancement of the economy's infrastructure. It is not merely the sharing in the cost of military operations but it is having the necessary support facilities, i.e., transportation, communications, medical, and utilities, to support military operations. In addition, it is important to have compatible financial accounting systems and to allow joint access to supplies—consumables, recoverables and equipment. Although management systems vary among nations, plans and procedures need to be developed to harmonize the logistics support system such that military operations will be facilitated and not hindered.

In a world where collective security action is becoming more commonplace, international logistics cooperation is a necessity. Consequently, future need statements for weapon systems should recognize multinational applications and the supportability of such weapon systems should recognize multinational logistic support.

**The US–ROK Experience**

The foundation of mutual cooperation has substance by the United States' and the Republic of Korea's entering into treaties and agreements. On January 7, 1952, over eighteen months after North Korea invaded South Korea, a Mutual Security Agreement was signed that put in motion the transfer of funds, equipment and materials from the United States to conduct the defense of the Republic of Korea. In a broad sense it also provided for the mutual security and collective defense of the Republic of Korea and the free world. Right after the end of the Korean War, a Mutual Defense Treaty was signed in October 1953 and took effect in November 1954. This treaty and the US Mutual Security Act of 1954 established the United States and the Republic of Korea as allies in strengthening collective defense for the preservation of peace and security on the Korean peninsula.

Following the 1954 treaty, subsequent defense agreements were entered into that further defined and strengthened the alliance with an aim of preparing the Republic of Korea to assume the leadership role in its defense and the United States to take a supportive role. These agreements stemmed from major issues discussed at annual security consultative meetings between the countries, political and military leaders and included the Status of Forces

Initially for the United States the treaty was designed to provide a basis for the presence of US forces in South Korea and to establish a framework for mutual cooperation through providing grants or loans and by transferring equipment, materials and services for the common defense. Over time the Republic of Korea was to develop the military and economic capability to lead in this comprehensive security partnership leaving the United States with a supportive role. The reality of Korean leadership has become progressively more apparent with each passing year.

**The Nature of Logistics Cooperation**

The general guiding principle that has governed the field of multinational logistics is that “logistics is a national responsibility.” Attaining or preserving a self-reliant logistics system remains a desired goal. This concept has prevailed even though some major weapon systems, components, piece parts, consumables and service support have been provided by foreign sources. Consequently, there are emerging broader principles for multinational logistics that should be applied and they are (1) cooperation between countries is essential, (2) collective responsibility for logistics support is necessary and (3) provision of logistic resources to support multinational forces is made secure through cooperative government arrangements. These latter principles are crucial for establishing conditions in support of the logistical concepts of rationalization, standardization and interoperability.

**Host Nation Support**

Whether during peace, crisis or war, host-nation support is an integral part of defense cooperation. By the nature of defense requirements, host-nation support is very broad in scope. For instance, the host nation needs to make available its economic infrastructure in support of national security requirements.
In the broadest sense this infrastructure includes public health, educational and legal systems; water treatment and distribution systems; garbage and sewage collection, treatment and disposal; public safety systems; communications, public utilities and transportation systems. More specifically, foreign military forces require host nations to allocate land, facilities and equipment, and provide service support for their operations and maintenance.

United States forces in Korea have relied upon the Korean economy and business enterprises to supply goods and services for their operations and maintenance. According to the US Department of Defense, Probase Database, the Department of Defense has entered into over 2,100 contracts with firms located in Korea valuing $2,312 million from 1987 through 1993. About 85 percent of the total value of these contracts was with Korean businesses and the remainder with US firms located in Korea to support US forces. The majority (52.5 percent) of the contracts were for fuel, fuel oils, fuel storage facilities and other petroleum services. The remainder was divided among professional and utility services (24.8 percent), facilities and maintenance of facilities (15.3 percent), equipment and maintenance and repair of equipment (6.2 percent) and miscellaneous (1.2 percent).

The Republic of Korea has in other ways fiscally supported US forces stationed in its country since the Korean War. Although there may arise differences of opinion as to what types of costs should be included in a cost-sharing equation, there is no question that the Republic of Korea has supported both directly and indirectly the US forces stationed in Korea. From the Korean perspective, its share of the defense burden of stationing US forces amounted to $1,639 million in 1991, as compared to the US burden of $2,474 million.\(^5\) Korean support has taken the form of providing land, facilities and personnel and paying for a portion of the management and maintenance expenses of combined organizations and functions. In addition, it has agreed to pay a share of the maintenance cost of US forces in Korea—$45 million, 1989; $70 million, 1990; $150 million, 1991; $180 million, 1992; and $220 million, 1993.\(^6\) Such monies provide support in six principal areas: labor costs, storage and maintenance costs of caring for US war materiel

---

stockpiles, costs of maintenance of equipment, combined defense activities and military construction, and assisting in the costs of the Combined Defense Improvement Program. Ultimately by 1995 the Korean share of the defense costs, even discounting the value of land and facilities that the US does not directly recognize, will amount to one third of the won-based cost of stationing US forces in Korea.7

**Weapons and Support Services**

Great reliance has been placed on the United States as a source of weapon systems and support by the Republic of Korea. This was in part a necessity because of the security partnership with the US and because the defense industry of South Korea did not come into being until the 1970s. A logistical benefit of such arrangements was the achievement of a high degree of interoperability among the military hardware possessed by US and ROK forces on the peninsula.

According to data provided by the US Security Assistance Agency in the Department of Defense, from 1950 through 1993 (fiscal years) the United States conducted with the ROK defense and commercial sales and provided military assistance of defense articles and services amounting to nearly $14 billion or an equivalent of $28 billion in constant 1987 dollars (see Table). Over these 44 years the flow of defense equipment and services from the US peaked during the decade of the 1970s and declined thereafter as the Korean defense industry matured and began providing an array of conventional military hardware. Likewise, there was a shift in the manner in which Korea gained the necessary hardware to equip and modernize its forces. While the country’s economy was emerging from the ashes of the war, acquisitions came from the US military assistance program through grants. Beginning with the decade of the 1970s, progressively larger proportions of military acquisitions came from cash purchases; no aid from military assistance programs has been received from the United States since 1986.

Closely aligned with the acquisition of military hardware was providing military training for Korean personnel in Korea and in the United States. There is a significant bonding that occurs when multinational forces experi-
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7 The Republic of Korea Embassy, p. 1.
ence common education and training. Also, knowledge of military doctrine, organization, operations, and support provides for greater blending of the two forces even when cultures and institutions are very different. From 1950 through 1993 over 37,000 Korean military have participated in educational and training programs and courses at a cost to the US of $173 million ($4,700 per person) or an equivalent of $631 million in constant 1987 dollars (see below).

The economic achievements of the Republic of Korea are well documented and often are referred to as an "economic miracle." What is less known but just as significant is the accelerated growth of South Korea’s defense industry. It has been reported that the Korean defense industry includes over eighty companies and produces over 280 major components and parts of nearly all categories of conventional weapons, e.g, KIFV, K-88 tank, destroy-

### US Foreign Military Sales and Assistance plus Commercial Exports to the Republic of Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign military sales</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>6,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial exports</strong>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military assistance</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and training</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,994</td>
<td>7,748</td>
<td>8,084</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>28,038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Dollar value of defense articles and defense service delivered.
2. Dollar value of deliveries made against purchases of munitions-controlled items.
3. Dollar value of materiel and services delivered for which the US government receives no reimbursement.
4. Dollar value for training military students.

Source: Calculated from Probase data supplied by the Department of Defense, April 1994.
ers, submarines, etc. Initially defense manufacturing was made possible by US technology transfer in defense services and technical data, licensed production, and coproduction; but later on South Korea began making its own weapon modifications and versions. With the development of a sophisticated defense industrial base, increasing amounts of industrial cooperation between the US and ROK have taken place. It is acknowledged that M-16 rifles, M-60 machine guns, F-16 fighters, UH-60 Black Hawk Helicopters, and AN-PRC radio sets are being produced by licensed production agreements. Also, 20 mm Vulcan air defense guns, M-109 (155 mm) self-propelled howitzers and Hughes 500-MD helicopters are produced under a coproduction agreement with the United States. The future sees South Korea producing even more of its own version of weapon systems as well as relying upon nations besides the United States to provide conventional weapon systems. Such a development will complicate even further the logistic management systems that seek standardization and interoperability as a basic principle. Also, with the passage of the Uruguay Rounds of the General Agreement on Tariffs and trade, intellectual property rights have been made more secure and the consequent benefit of such security should be greater industrial cooperation with the transfer of technology occurring more freely.

**Logistics Organization**

An organizational structure has been developed to foster cooperation and provide the means for coordinating multinational logistics policy and programs between the United States and the Republic of Korea. The policies and programs deal with acquisition and modernization of weapon systems, procurement, size and management of war reserve stocks, the pre-positioning of military materiel, and requirements and current level of logistics support. These and similar issues are formatted by the Military Logistics Cooperation Committee for consideration and agreement at the annual meeting of the US-ROK Security Consultative Meeting of the US Secretary of Defense and the Korean Minister of National Defense.9

---

The adaptation of such strategic policies and agreements for cooperation and integration of forces falls upon the Combined Forces Command. This command likewise provides recommendations for combined improvements in weapons, equipment, support, doctrine, training, organization, financial accounting systems, as well as command, control, communication and intelligence. The function of enhancing military logistics coordination and integration through exchanging logistics support data and information rests with the Assistant Chief of Staff for Logistics within the Combined Forces Command.

Nevertheless, at the operational level military logistics remains basically a national responsibility. Each country is expected to support its respective forces from its own inventories. Whenever exchanges of resources are made necessary in order to cover emergencies or momentary shortages, repayment is made with the same or equivalent parts, equipment or consumables.10

Operationally the level of interoperability of weapon systems remains high, and consequently logistics problems of maintenance and repair have been manageable. Logistic complications are apt to arise, however, as more Korean systems enter the force and special attention will be needed for logistics support procedures. Basically, logistics doctrine and support procedures remain separate and different. This is to be expected because the United States doctrine and tactics have been developed to meet various contingencies around the globe. On the other hand, South Korea's doctrine and tactics have been devised to meet the North Korean threat on a relatively small peninsula with available resources within a constrained defense budget. New initiatives on harmonizing the logistics doctrine and procedures will pay significant future dividends in efficiency and effectiveness.

Conclusions

The prevailing international political and economic trends point toward a world of uncertainty and rapid change, and the Korean peninsula is no exception. Greater political, economic and military cooperation is called for with collective security as the watchword and economic interdependency as a way

of commerce. Formal treaties and informal agreements among nations such as the United States and the Republic of Korea provide the bases for continued dialogue and constructive cooperation. The drive to lower costs will spawn greater willingness of nations and defense industries to cooperate in developing and producing weapon systems. Such cooperation will naturally promote transfers of design, manufacturing, management, and human technologies among allies and friendly nations. These technology transfers will upgrade the countries' industrial capacity and quality of their economic infrastructure, which in turn provide the bases for breadth in mutual logistical support.

The Mutual Defense Treaty signed by the United States and the Republic of Korea and follow-on defense agreements have established the structure of political, economic and military cooperation. The economic growth and development of South Korea has created a substantial economic infrastructure, industrial base and technical expertise to provide sophisticated logistical support. The United States remains the major supplier of sophisticated weapon systems and the ROK provides its forces with most of its conventional weapons. As such there still exists a high degree of standardization and interoperability among the combined forces. However, with Korea's increasing its capabilities to produce sophisticated weapons as well as procuring weapons systems from countries other than the United States, much effort is required to maintain a high level of interoperability among weapons and support equipment in the US and ROK inventory. Likewise, logistics operationally remains a national responsibility and naturally the US and ROK logistics doctrine and operations remain separate and different. The rationalization of these different logistics doctrines and operations remains a continuing effort. Much could be accomplished in harmonizing logistics procedures and operations by conducting joint and combined logistics exercises. Nevertheless, the economic and industrial power of the United States and the Republic of Korea coupled with the logistics policy and support systems provide a formidable deterrent for securing the cultural, political, social and economic integrity of the Republic of Korea.