

# Joint Doctrine Update

## Joint Chiefs of Staff J7 Joint Education and Doctrine Division

**J**oint Publication (JP) 1, *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*, states, “Joint warfare is team warfare.” The lubrication between the various parts of the joint team is common understanding, which is built on the broad shoulders of joint doctrinal thought expressed in standardized terms that are widely known and used.

Crisp and clear definitions of ideas, capabilities, and authorities are at the heart of joint doctrine. Descriptive language—different from defining language—amplifies understanding by providing context and color. The former tells us what a thing *is*; the latter only tells us about *aspects* of the thing. The mantra “precise terms used precisely” is therefore a doctrinal catechism and should be a core competency of all members of the U.S. profession of arms.

In service of common understanding is the Joint Terminology program administered by the Joint Staff J7. JP 1–02, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, sets forth standard U.S. military terminology that is approved for general use by all components of the agency.

JP 1–02 serves as the primary repository of approved terms and definitions and should be consulted when preparing correspondence, to include policy, strategy, doctrine, and planning documents. JP 1–02 does not replace a standard English language dictionary, but rather serves as a supplement containing terms that have distinct military meanings not adequately covered in a common dictionary.

It is important to note up front that JP 1–02 is not the source of terms. It is the box where the approved terms are held for easy reference. Terms in JP 1–02 come only from four sources: joint doctrine, specific notation in Office of the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) policy issuances, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)–agreed terminology, or by direct order of the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense or the CJCS.

But not all military terms are appropriate for JP 1–02. Service-specific, functional-

ity specific, or highly technical terms are considered specialist terminology and should reside in glossaries written for a specific audience. Frequently, definitions are provided for a limited use (that is, for a single document); future concepts under development may also generate new terms and definitions (or new definitions for extant terms). None of these are considered JP 1–02 definitions by default.

Of the four approved sources, joint doctrine is the most preferred method for establishing terminology as its narrative format provides room for amplifying descriptive text. Next in preference are policy issuances, specifically DOD directives, DOD instructions, CJCS instructions, and DOD directive-type memorandums; these statements lack the space to provide full contextual meaning. Next, NATO-agreed terminology may be entered in JP 1–02 to delineate its usage in an Alliance context, particularly when a NATO definition may be different from a U.S. definition. Finally, and least preferred, directed terms are incorporated in JP 1–02 when the meaning of a term requires an authoritative decision for resolution between competing perspectives. (Recent examples of the latter are the current definitions of *cyberspace* and *cyberspace operations*.)

The J7 administered process for including terms in JP 1–02 involves DOD-wide<sup>1</sup> staffing. During the staffing process, any component may comment on a proposal recommending approval, disapproval, or modification. The CJCS, through the J7, is responsible for resolving any contentious issues that arise during coordination.

Terminology standardization, while a structured and orderly process, is a field that is responsive to the needs of the joint force. Most notably, there is an ongoing effort to annotate each entry in JP 1–02 with a source publication. Source documents are helpful because they identify the authoritative context for each term. Additionally, source documents enable terms to be reviewed and updated regularly as part of the normal revision cycles of their source publications.

The initial effort for identifying source documents started in 2008 when the J7 identi-

fied 1,354 of approximately 6,000 terms in JP 1–02 that were not used in joint doctrine publications and could not be attributed to a source document. The staffing of these terms to the Services, combatant commands, and Office of the Secretary of Defense yielded 900 obsolete entries that the Director of the Joint Staff approved for deletion in March 2010. This sourcing effort is ongoing and seeks to ensure that JP 1–02 remains the relevant, up-to-date source for DOD terminology and a foundation for common understanding and cooperation within the joint force.

Questions about the Joint Terminology program can be directed to JEDDSupport@js.pentagon.mil.

### NOTE

<sup>1</sup> DOD components that review terminology proposals are the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, the CJCS and the Joint Staff, the Office of the Inspector General of the DOD, the combatant commands, the DOD agencies, field activities, and all other organizational entities in the DOD.

### Proper Citation

When citing a term found in JP 1–02, one should refer to the source document and not JP 1–02; it is *not* proper to state, “In accordance with JP 1–02, the definition of *Irregular Warfare* is. . . .” Proper citation is “Per JP 1–02, the definition of *Irregular Warfare* is. . . .”

### JPs Revised or Under Review

- JP 1, *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*
- JP 1–0, *Personnel Support to Joint Operations*
- JP 1–04, *Legal Support to Military Operations*
- JP 2–01, *Joint and National Intelligence Support to Military Operations*
- JP 2–01.2, *Counterintelligence and Human Intelligence Support to Joint Operations*
- JP 2–03, *Geospatial Intelligence Support to Joint Operations*
- JP 3–0, *Joint Operations*
- JP 3–01, *Countering Air and Missile Threats*