

Executive Summary

The two focus areas in this issue of *Joint Force Quarterly* are highly complementary. In the Forum, we explore lessons learned in the war on terror, and in the Special Feature section, the spotlight is on U.S. Joint Forces Command—a combatant command uniquely organized to ensure that the lessons learned by joint forces are not too severe. In addition to the excellent lineup of articles addressing both areas, *JFQ* has interviewed key leaders to provide broader coverage of the issues, pursuant to our mandate for continuing education in joint, integrated operations.

The war on terror is really a war on intolerance, and in this struggle the enemy targets the public will to resist and persevere. Success against movements opposed to personal freedom depends upon diplomatic, informational, and economic achievements because, as one of our authors points out, the struggle is very much one for words and ideas. To counter an enemy that seeks to justify the murder of innocents and all manner of criminal activity, our employment and understanding of legitimate force, military restraint, and cultural nuance are critical. Victory depends on U.S. ability to anticipate the behavior of a learning, adaptive enemy in the face of our simultaneous innovation, transformation, and success. To do this, public patience is critical, leaving little room for error.

The Forum begins with the insights of the Honorable Thomas O’Connell, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict. Secretary O’Connell gives a detailed overview of his responsibilities before addressing Department of Defense reorganization to optimize for success in the war on terror. He goes on to outline the changes that he hopes to see in joint professional military education and to underline the high morale of the force, buttressed by the public’s support and commitment to this effort. If you read no other portion of this interview, read the Secretary’s answer to our final question.

Philip Wasielewski continues the Forum with an analysis of the war on terror inspired by the Clausewitzian admonition to understand, with precision, the nature of a prosecuted war. For those who have not studied the cultural roots of this conflict, Colonel Wasielewski traces the modern employment of terror from anarchism to al Qaeda in a very readable fashion. He concludes with three implications of his study for our evolving security strategy.

The next essay is a counterpoint to Secretary O’Connell’s assertion that there is no need for a unified commander (other than the President) in the war on terror. Kevin Stringer argues that unity of command demands a supreme military commander and makes his case in the context of global non-state terrorist networks and the risk of U.S. inefficiency, opportunity cost, and campaign

incoherence. Dr. Stringer supports his assessment with three historical case studies that reveal the “pitfalls associated with commands structured for political reasons.” Is the return of a five-star billet necessary to preserve unity of command?

Our fourth Forum entry is a fascinating report from U.S. Special Operations Command, Pacific, and its success in a theater of the war on terror that attracts few headlines. It addresses the question that General Pace posed to students at the National Defense University in December 2005: “How do we fight an enemy inside of countries with whom we are not at war?” General David Fridovich and Colonel Fred Krawchuk recommend an “indirect approach” to this situation.

The fifth installment is a provocative piece that makes the case for a new Service component as a natural evolutionary development following the establishment of U.S. Special Operations Command as a combatant command. D. Robert Worley explains that the archaic notion of Services with primacy in warfare tied to the elements of land, sea, and air generates fundamental inefficiencies that are intolerable in the present conflict. Moreover, the skills, techniques, procedures, and experience critical to the conduct of small or decentralized wars are neglected or institutionally marginalized by Services focused on conflicts of greater severity. Dr. Worley challenges the viability of entrenched Service roles and recommends a comprehensive solution.

Our final lesson learned in this Forum is a timely exploration of the routes that our enemies may attempt to exploit in their expressed desire to deliver weapons of mass





CALL for Entries

THE 2007

CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF STRATEGIC ESSAY COMPETITION

destruction (WMD) on American soil. History, tradition, and practical experience have established legal precedent for the interdiction of WMD by land and sea, but aerial interdiction remains a thorny challenge that neither joint nor Service doctrine adequately addresses. Colonel J. Wesley Moore emphasizes that U.S. weakness in this necessary aspect of counter-WMD doctrine must be dealt with now, to help the world community inhibit proliferators more effectively.

A few words are in order concerning *JFQ*'s third change of command. All leaders bring to an organization a fresh perspective, and as a longtime reader and contributor, I have mine. As do our forces in the war on terror, the journal must learn and adapt to support our readership as adroitly as they themselves serve this great nation against threats to liberty. In this endeavor, we introduce for the first time additional content available only on our Web site in a format suitable for local reproduction and distribution. *JFQ* has always received excellent manuscripts that were not selected for publication because they either were too technical or spoke to a narrow readership. Henceforth, we are expanding our contents to include articles that are only viewable at ndupress.ndu.edu.

Beyond the Forum and Special Feature, readers will find essays truly worth their time, reflection, and feedback. I would like to call special attention to the final article in this issue by the celebrated historian Max Boot. Mr. Boot has been very generous to those of us in the profession of arms, lecturing at most major military schools and serving on the U.S. Joint Forces Command Transformation Advisory Group. Our Recall installment is an excerpt from his new book, *War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History*. **JFQ**

—D.H. Gurney

For over a quarter of a century, the Chairman has challenged students at the Nation's senior war colleges to think and write creatively about national security issues in the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Strategic Essay Competition. National Defense University (NDU) Press will host the 26th annual competition on May 22–23, 2007, and judges from the participating colleges will select the winning essays—"the best of the best."

This year's competition is open to joint professional military education students from all intermediate, advanced, and senior Service and joint schools, plus the Joint Forces Staff College. There are two categories: research essay and strategy article.

Start planning now. The deadline for nominated papers to be submitted to NDU Press via parent institutions is April 17, 2007.

Winners Published in *JFQ*

NDU Press will publish the 2007 winners as a Special Feature in the 4th quarter issue of *Joint Force Quarterly* (October 2007).

In addition, competition essays have made the grade in their own colleges, and NDU Press will consider all entries for publication in future issues of the journal.

For detailed information, visit
www.ndu.edu/inss/Press/NDUPress_CSEC.htm.



The Chairman's Strategic Essay Contest is conducted by NDU Press with the generous financial support of the NDU Foundation. The NDU Foundation is a nonprofit 501 (c)(3) organization established in 1982 to support and enhance the mission and goals of National Defense University, America's preeminent institution for military, civilian, and diplomatic national security education, research, outreach, and strategic studies. The main campus is located at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC.