

Executive Summary

Recently I taught a lesson here at National Defense University on war termination. The required readings included a chapter from Fred Iklé's seminal work, *Every War Must End* (Columbia University Press, 1971). Dr. Iklé initially published this book as the United States was looking for an exit from the Vietnam War. This classroom reading was a part of what turned out to be a timely and spirited discussion as the drawdown of forces in Afghanistan continues and events unfold around the likely U.S. response to Syria's use of chemical weapons on its own citizens.

General Colin Powell credits *Every War Must End* with giving him an understanding of how to end the first Gulf War. In his revision of the work published in 2005, Dr. Iklé criticized Washington's handling of the Iraq War. He identifies the hard questions that all parties involved in a conflict wrestle with, including determining what the goal is, how it can be achieved, and when will it be obvious that end has arrived. Dr. Iklé offers many historical cases to show the complexity of war as viewed from many vantage points, including the parliaments and chateaus of World War I, the end of war with Japan, the geostrategic challenges in the 1950–1953 Korean War, the secret negotiations in Paris during the Vietnam War, and more.

As with every good book, the author must have a main purpose for writing it. I believe that Dr. Iklé works hard to provide the insight that both civilian and military strategists and planners rarely spend as much time working on how to end a war as they do on beginning one. His examples are plentiful enough to describe this condition as one that is historically true for more than just Americans.

But more than *identifying* the problem, Dr. Iklé places the burden of seeking to limit war on the world's "leading democracies . . . to create a new political order" with "the purpose of this endeavor to bring every war to an end without unleashing the cataclysmic destruction made possible by modern technology."¹ His concern was over the remaining size of the nuclear, biological, and chemical stockpiles that we still recognize as a global threat. After some 20 years, the democratic nations of the world are again wrestling with the primary strategy equation of ends, ways, and means—mixing in a good amount of technology along the way as we collectively seek order in this unsettled world. *Joint Force Quarterly* seeks to publish thoughtful articles that should help the reader find insight in how best to meet the continuing challenges the new world order brings.

In this edition's Forum, we present four valuable views that offer you the opportunity to consider new uses for existing capabilities in order to calculate the resource implications and review legal issues emerging from combat operations in Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya. Given the current entropic global environment, these authors provide a diverse set of views on modern warfare, which we believe are essential reading. One of the evolving capabilities of the joint force resides with the U.S. and coalition partner airborne forces. Major General John Nicholson, Lieutenant Colonel Jason Condrey, and Major Claude Lambert explain how the forcible entry capability, resident within the joint force and growing in our partners, remains a requirement to assure forces can gain access to conflict areas when required. They also discuss the value added internationally when U.S. airborne forces provide essential training to our partners as a means

to more effectively deal with global crises as they arise.

Next, from the National War College, Ambassador Gregory Schulte takes us back to a time just before the current period of war by discussing the Kosovo air war's strategic lessons. Having been at the center of American air power employment at the start of the Libyan campaign, Major General Margaret Woodward and Lieutenant Colonel Philip Morrison next provide the logic behind that effort to protect civilian populations, while engaged in a similar effort a decade later. On the domestic political front, as the White House seeks congressional approval prior to any military action in Syria, James Terry's article on Libya and the War Powers Act should be placed at the top of any serious policymaker's must-read list. Collectively, these articles offer a significant set of considerations given the situation in relation to what the United States might do militarily to respond to Syrian attacks on its population. It is rare that *JFQ* is able to offer such important thinking at the moment such events unfold, but this is exactly what we hope to do when we are able.

This edition next presents the 2013 7th Annual Secretary of Defense and 32nd Annual Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Essay Competition winners in each of the three categories. This year's competition has yielded some outstanding writing on a much wider range of topics than usual. The judges from across the joint professional military education community all commended the students for their critical thinking skills and writing talent. In the winning Secretary of Defense essay, Colonel Jonathan Rice discusses the most important questions that must be answered when issuing cyber attack guidance. Lieutenant Colonel Joel Luker won



President meets with National Security Staff in Situation Room to discuss Syria

in the Chairman's strategic essay category with a timely review of how culture within the Defense Department is key to solving its current budget issues. In the Chairman's strategic article category, in which the author has to successfully develop and defend a theme in 1,500 words or less, Gina Bennett explores the difficulty of seeking to defeat al Qaeda. In addition to these winners, *JFQ* will feature additional high quality essays from this year's contest in future editions.

As editor, I am fortunate to have the opportunity to blend the writing of both new authors and journal alumni. This edition's Commentary section has a wealth of great thoughts from both on the constantly evolving world of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities, the value of strategy, and how best to organize the joint force for effective employment as we go forward. On the ISR front, General Robert Cone calls for a restructuring of how the U.S. Army is organized at the operational level to take advantage of the experiences of the last decade war and to ensure the joint force and the Army are best positioned to exploit the advantages that reconnaissance and surveillance provide beyond the tactical fight. He suggests that even as the Army shrinks, this deeper and higher level integration is critical to determining enemy intent over time. Andrew Robert Marvin develops new approaches to how ISR could be effectively tailored to address the operational problems inherent in joint force employment to locations where adversaries are prepared to present commanders and units with antiaccess/area-denial issues.

Dr. Colin Gray follows up his popular article published in *JFQ* 67 on strategists as heroes with his views on strategy focusing on five perspectives that include concepts, ethics, culture, geography, and technology. As always with Professor Gray's writing, there is something for everyone interested in the subject to contemplate. If seeking to understand strategy remains high on your list of necessary tasks, then Professor Daniel McCauley offers a set of important ideas on how to deal with the complexities of the globalized world in which the joint force must operate.

In the Features section, we have three discussions focused on how we can continue to develop the joint force as we assist host nations in building for a better future and two perspectives in the on-going debate on missile defense in Europe. Drawing on the Iraq experience, Dr. Keith Boyer and Lieutenant General Robert Allardice, USAF (Ret.), provide a good primer on how to assist a host nation in building better governance beginning with improving its ministerial capacity. Next, Lieutenant General Robert Caslen, Colonel Dean Raab, and Lieutenant Colonel Geoffrey Adams present a set of useful recommendations for improving joint security cooperation doctrine, as well as the requisite authorities needed to execute this critical mission. Security cooperation and host nation capacity-building have not been without their own sets of risks. The recurring problem of host forces attacking coalition forces, especially in a training setting (so called "green-on-blue" attacks), is the subject of Eric Jardine's article, which looks into why

these horrific events happen in Afghanistan. If there is armed resistance to placing our joint force where it can assist the host nation to develop along peaceful lines or if an outright effort to oppose the application of military force is at issue, the United States and its allies have options.

In this issue, we return to the ongoing discussion in *JFQ* of missile defense in Europe. Karen Kaya provides an in-depth report on North Atlantic Treaty Organization efforts in Turkey. After recent heated debates over missile defense both on political and technical grounds, Marvin Schaffer discusses what comes next in the Alliance after the planned European Phased Adaptive Approach completes.

The Recall section takes us back to the trenches of World War I, where Brad Clark examines the strategic leadership lessons we can take from the infamous Ludendorff Offensives of 1918. Two of our Joint Staff doctrine partners, James Parrington and Mike Findlay, offer us a detailed discussion on mission command, along with their joint doctrine publication update. As always, we bring you three important book reviews that we hope you will find useful.

As I have mentioned in an earlier edition of *JFQ*, change is a constant and nowhere more so recently than here at NDU Press. One of our longest serving staff members, George Maerz, retired this spring after more than 40 years of U.S. Government service, most of which was with National Defense University and NDU Press. George was the lead editor on thousands of pages of national and international security writing produced by students and scholars as well as from national and internationally renowned thinkers and doers. All of us who have benefited from his work owe George thanks for all of the quiet excellence he added to every page he touched.

We continue to look ahead for new and engaging writing on issues important to the joint force, and I encourage you to find the time to write and engage us in a conversation about the world you see ahead. **JFQ**

—William T. Eliason, Editor

NOTE

¹ Fred Charles Iklé, *Every War Must End*, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), xv.