

A Word from the Chairman

Eight years ago, as the Berlin Wall crumbled and the Cold War began to fade, two themes dominated media reports about Europe. First, many pundits argued that while our hearts might remain in Europe our central strategic and economic interests would lie elsewhere in the future. For some, our focus would be primarily on the Middle East, for others on Latin America, and for still others on the Asia-Pacific region. But most agreed that Europe's criticality had waned.

Second, other observers predicted that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), absent a new overwhelming threat, would wither away or disappear. Their reasoning was simple: no threat, no alliance; no Warsaw Pact, no NATO.

But three Presidents knew better. While recognizing the growing importance of other regions, the United States chose not to turn its back on Europe or the Alliance. Indeed, as this issue of *JFQ* goes to press, heads of state of Alliance nations are about to meet to determine which of the many candidates will become new members of NATO.

The future value of the Alliance has to be calculated in light of its past accomplishments. In testament to its influence, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has said:

NATO has always been more than a defensive shield. It was the roof over our heads when we rebuilt postwar Europe. It was the floor on which the first structures of European unity were laid. It was the door through which one time adversaries were welcomed into our family of democracies. And because of its strength and the courage of its members, it has been a mighty deterrent to aggression.

For nearly fifty years NATO's successes have been phenomenal; and they constitute a major reason why it remains a powerful force for peace and security:

- NATO has been essential to maintaining the transatlantic link, the mechanism which was so vital to deterrence during four decades and which today keeps the West united on security issues

- NATO's consultative mechanisms have been a positive force for stability on the Continent and were central to the solution of bilateral problems among its members

- NATO forces, policies, and procedures proved to be an essential and irreplaceable foundation for the coalition's success in Operation Desert Storm

- NATO forces from 15 allied nations—backed by 22 other countries, including Russia—are keeping order in Bosnia-Herzegovina today, a peace brought about by the force of NATO arms.

In the future, Europe will remain a center of wealth, democracy, and power. For the United States, it will remain a region of vital interest. According to our national security strategy, "Our objective in Europe is to complete the construction of a truly integrated, democratic, and secure Eu-



During a break in the international meeting on Bosnia in July 1995, General George A. Joulwan, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, reviews draft U.S. position statement with the Chairman.

rope with a democratic Russia as a full participant." This, of course, is what we started out to accomplish fifty years ago when we launched the Marshall Plan and created NATO.

The new strategic environment in Europe has caused the United States to change its orientation from deterrence of war to shaping the environment to work against instability and the conditions that cause war. While we withdrew two-thirds of our Cold War force, we remain committed to the continuing deployment of some 100,000 troops in theater. Trade with Europe, of course, has taken care of itself, doubling in value over the past decade.

(continued on page 4)

GEN John M. Shalikashvili, USA
Publisher

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Lt Gen Ervin J. Rokke, USAF ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman
- BG David A. Armstrong, USA (Ret.) ■ *Office of the Chairman*
- VADM Dennis C. Blair, USN ■ *The Joint Staff*
- MG Richard A. Chilcoat, USA ■ *U.S. Army War College*
- A. Denis Clift ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*
- Col K.A. Conry, USMC ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*
- MG John S. Cowings, USA ■ *Industrial College of the Armed Forces*
- BG Robert F. Dees, USA ■ *The Joint Staff*
- Col Jerry M. Drennan, USAF ■ *Air Command and Staff College*
- BG Joseph R. Inge, USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff College*
- Col Paul V. Kelly, USMC ■ *Marine Corps War College*
- Brig Gen William R. Looney III, USAF ■ *Armed Forces Staff College*
- RADM Michael A. McDevitt, USN ■ *National War College*
- Maj Gen D. Bruce Smith, USAF ■ *Air War College*
- RADM James R. Stark, USN ■ *Naval War College*

EDITORIAL BOARD

- Hans Binnendijk ■ *National Defense University*
Chairman
- Richard K. Betts ■ *Columbia University*
- COL William D. Bristow, Jr., USA ■ *U.S. Army Command and General Staff 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*
- Col Douglas N. Hime, USAF ■ *Naval War College*
- Mark H. Jacobsen ■ *Marine Corps Command and Staff College*
- Thomas L. McNaughton ■ *The RAND Corporation*
- William H.J. Manthorpe, Jr. ■ *Joint Military Intelligence College*
- CAPT Rosemary B. Mariner, USN ■ *National War 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 Lawrence B. Wilkerson, USA ■ *Marine Corps War College*
- COL Terry J. Young, USA ■ *U.S. Army War College*

(continued from page 1)

NATO has also adapted to meet new conditions. It changed its mission, altered its organization, and will soon expand its membership. At the same time, not wishing to redivide Europe, NATO has improved its relations with Russia. With the Founding Act, signed earlier this year, the Alliance has created a solid basis for future relations with Russia. NATO has also widened its influence through the Partnership for Peace (PFP) program, which includes 27 nations. In turn, PFP has created the groundwork for better interoperability and more effective peacekeeping.

I recently visited Cooperative Nugget '97, the third U.S.-hosted training exercise oriented on enhancing interoperability and peacekeeping. Conducted under the auspices of U.S. Atlantic Command, this impressive exercise at the Joint Readiness Training Center put platoons from 22 partner and NATO nations through a rigorous 37-task training experience. The gain in interoperability and peacekeeping skills was significant, as was the tangible increase in good will and understanding of how the armed forces of democratic nations operate in the gray area of military operations other than war. In all, Cooperative Nugget was a visible reminder of NATO's contribution to peace and security from Western Europe to central Asia and beyond.

The JFQ Forum on NATO and European affairs in this issue is most timely. As we refine *Joint Vision 2010* and implement the Quadrennial Defense Review, we must examine where we have been and where we are headed in each of our geographic areas of responsibility. Thus these articles offer an excellent primer on the problems NATO will face in the future: the pace of Alliance enlargement, the management of NATO-Russian relations, the future of SFOR in the Balkans, the shape of Alliance command and control architecture, and the maturation of a European security and defense identity.

In all, we will have our work cut out for us in Europe; but our vital interests there, the importance of the transatlantic link, and NATO's contribution to peace and security throughout the world will more than justify our efforts.

JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI
Chairman
of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

THE WINNERS OF THE 1996

Joint Force Quarterly

“Essay Contest on the Revolution in Military Affairs”

sponsored by the National Defense University Foundation, Inc.

FIRST PRIZE

“The Second Revolution”

by Captain James Stavridis, USN

Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate (J-5), Joint Staff

SECOND PRIZE

“The Profession of Arms in the Information Age”

by Lieutenant Colonel Arsenio T. Gumahad II, USAF

Office of Space and Technology, Headquarters, Department of the Air Force

THIRD PRIZE

“Black Lights: Chaos, Complexity,
and the Promise of Information Warfare”

by Professor James J. Schneider

School of Advanced Military Studies, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College

JUNIOR OFFICER PRIZE

“A Revolution in Military Theory: Dynamic Inter-Dimensionality”

by Major Antulio J. Echevarria II, USA

Future Battle Directorate, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

Prizes of \$2,000, \$1,000, and \$500 were presented to the first, second, and third place winners, respectively, and a prize of \$500 was awarded for the best entry by a junior officer (major/lieutenant commander or below). The winning essays plus two other contributions on the revolution in military affairs appear on the following pages of this issue.