JFQ

A Word from the Chairman

Of the many changes I have witnessed during my career, the most significant in terms of warfighting has been the increased ability of the Armed Forces to work together. There is no doubt that there has been tremendous progress in synchronizing operations on land, at sea, and in air and space. However, despite strides in organizing, training, and equipping for joint operations, there is still important work to do to create a truly integrated joint force.

Efforts toward jointness are essential given the challenges of the future. Although the United States will probably not face a hostile superpower in the near term, the world will remain a dangerous place. The nation-state, along with armies, navies, and air forces as we know them today, will remain for a long time, and the Armed Forces must be ready to defeat any foe equipped with conventional military capabilities. At the same time, these forces will certainly face adversaries who will challenge America's interests asymmetrically, using state-of-the-art technology and, perhaps more frightening, weapons of mass destruction.

for the past five years *Joint Force Quarterly* has been *the* journal of the joint warfighter

Meeting these challenges depends on making the right preparations now. In very real and tangible ways, the successes of our joint force were made possible by the past efforts of thousands of Americans in the Armed Forces. Likewise, those who will follow us will rely on our dedication and hard work to prepare them for the future. Developing the best force for the Nation requires rigorous analysis about important choices concerning new equipment, organizations, training, and doctrine.

Critical thinking about joint warfare takes place in different quarters of the military, but for the past five years *Joint Force Quarterly* has been *the* journal of the joint warfighter. *JFQ* provides an open forum where ideas and concepts about joint warfare can be proposed, debated, and refined. As General Colin Powell noted in the inaugural issue, the purpose of the journal is "to spread the word about our team, to provide for a free give-and-take of ideas among a wide range of people from every corner of the military." It has done precisely that, furnishing an arena for debate among officers from every service and of all grades, as well as civilian defense analysts from this country and abroad.

Collectively, the articles which have appeared in *JFQ* over the last five years have presented a profusion of original ideas. Some pieces have shaped operational concepts while others have explored the impact of change on doctrine, organization, and technology.

This issue offers a look back at the best of *JFQ*. The opening section discusses the nature of jointness itself. No nation has had more experience in conducting joint operations than the United States. Yet since the first extensive test of joint operations during World War II, we have

(continued on page 4)

Joint Force Quarterly

GEN Henry H. Shelton, USA
Publisher

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

LTG Richard A. Chilcoat, USA ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman

BG David A. Armstrong, USA (Ret.) ■ *Office of the Chairman*

VADM Dennis C. Blair, USN ■ *The Joint Staff*

Brig Gen Franklin J. Blaisdell, USAF ■ *Armed Forces Staff College*

A. Denis Clift ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*

Col K.A. Conry, USMC ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*

Brig Gen Jerry M. Drennan, USAF ■ *Air Command and Staff College*

Maj Gen Richard L. Engel, USAF ■ *Industrial College of the Armed Forces*

Maj Gen Timothy A. Kinnan, USAF ■ *Air War College*

Col David M. Lumsden, USMC ■ *Marine Corps War College*

RADM Thomas F. Marfiak, USN ■ *National War College*

Brig Gen Ralph Pasini, USAF ■ *The Joint Staff*

MG Robert H. Scales, USA ■ *U.S. Army War College*

RADM James R. Stark, USN ■ *Naval War College*

BG John R. Wood, USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff College*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hans Binnendijk ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman

Richard K. Betts ■ *Columbia University*

Col J. Lee Blank, USAF ■ *National War College*

Col Paul Balash III, USMC ■ *Marine Corps War College*

Eliot A. Cohen ■ *The Johns Hopkins University*

COL Robert A. Doughty, USA ■ *U.S. Military Academy*

Aaron L. Friedberg ■ *Princeton University*

Col Robert J. Garner, USMC ■ *Armed Forces Staff College*

Alan L. Gropman ■ *Industrial College of the Armed Forces*

CAPT Chester E. Helms, USN ■ *Naval War College*

Mark H. Jacobsen ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*

Thomas L. McNaugher ■ *The RAND Corporation*

William H.J. Manthorpe, Jr. ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*

John J. Mearsheimer ■ *The University of Chicago*

LTG William E. Odom, USA (Ret.) ■ *Hudson Institute*

Lt Col Robert C. Owen, USAF ■ *Air Command and Staff College*

James H. Toner ■ *Air War College*

LtGen Bernard E. Trainor, USMC (Ret.) ■ *Harvard University*

COL Douglas L. Tystad, USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff College*

COL Terry J. Young, USA ■ *U.S. Army War College*

A PROFESSIONAL MILITARY JOURNAL

(continued from page 1)

struggled with the notion of jointness. What is it? What are its limitations? More importantly, will the concept of jointness change in the future? Articles found under the heading of "The Nature of Jointness" tackle these questions head on.

Doctrine and professional education underpin every dimension of jointness. They are the mechanisms for conveying new ideas to our warfighters and are essential for translating our vision of future joint warfighting into reality. The section entitled "Doctrine and Education" addresses how joint doctrine and joint education should be revised to handle the diverse and daunting challenges of the 21st century.

One of the formidable tasks ahead is coping with technological change. How we employ technological breakthroughs can be as critical as developing the technology in the first place. Indeed, history is filled with examples of militaries that did not make the most of the technology they possessed because they held onto outmoded organizational concepts. This problem is the focus of articles in the section entitled "Innovation and Warfighting."

Two further contributions are reprinted in this issue. "The Chairman as Principal Military Advisor," an interview with General Powell, offers unique insight into the development of jointness in the wake of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. And in "Keeping the Strategic Flame," the late Carl Builder examines the American approach to war in search of enduring ideas for victory.

The articles in this edition were not selected because they present "approved solutions." Instead they offer excellent examples of well-written and insightful arguments that inspire critical thinking about the profession of arms. I am encouraged by the spirited dialogue displayed in these pieces. This is the type of debate we need to help us gain a better understanding of joint capabilities for today and tomorrow. I look forward to many more years of thought-provoking articles in the pages of *JFQ*.

HENRY H. SHELTON
Chairman
of the Joint Chiefs of Staff