

# The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters

---

Volume 32  
Number 2 *Parameters Summer 2002*

Article 4

---

5-14-2002

## From the Editor

Robert H. Taylor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/parameters>

---

### Recommended Citation

Robert H. Taylor, "From the Editor," *Parameters* 32, no. 2 (2002), doi:10.55540/0031-1723.2090.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by USAWC Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters by an authorized editor of USAWC Press.

# From the Editor

---

From *Parameters*, Winter 1995-96, p. 2.

---

## In This Issue...

Richard A. Chilcoat defines the challenges facing the War College as it adapts time-honored education methods to the Information Age. After tracing the institution's heritage and analyzing the skills and attributes most useful to future graduates, he describes how the college--even as it reaffirms its basic precepts--is using technology to enhance the learning process and prepare graduates for a world increasingly influenced by that same technology.

Ralph Peters touches all of the themes in the feature on intervention as he describes an environment in which the US military could be required to operate in the next several decades. He makes another call for attention to issues and challenges that many would rather ignore.

Richard Halloran examines Japanese perceptions of the need for more robust military forces in the context of the United States' role as guarantor of Japan's security. He analyzes recent tensions between the two nations that could affect long-standing assumptions about that role.

Michael H. Hoffman finds no justification for peace enforcement operations under the law of war or the law of peace. Concluding that many Chapter VII operations are in fact "interventional armed operations," he proposes to redefine them and manage them under the law of war.

John M. Collins offers a checklist for those who must plan and justify peace operations. In the absence of a standard analytical method for developing policy options for such operations, his list provides a basis for describing and preparing for them.

James T. Quinlivan briefly examines several stability operations as he defines and analyzes post-Cold War requirements for peace support. He then describes the effects of interventions on the relatively small number of soldiers and Marines in the active and reserve components capable of conducting them.

Richard K. Betts notes that intervention operations could produce vigorous reactions by or on behalf of the state in which the intervention takes place. He then asks what it would take to deter the United States from acting in its own interests in a crisis.

Michael R. Boldrick contends that there is much more and much less than meets the eye in the recent Nuclear Posture Review, noting particularly risks and vulnerabilities related to the triad and the industrial base.

Patrick J. Garrity's region-by-region analysis of nuclear policy options reinforces the theme of deterrence that preoccupies several authors in this issue. His article reminds us that the cost for any nation to acquire and maintain a modest nuclear capability is relatively cheap when compared to the cost to develop and maintain a conventional force for global or regional deterrence.

Donald W. Boose, Jr., recounts how the United States decided to occupy Korea in 1945, noting how certain decisions shaped later Cold War events.

---

Reviewed 21 March 1996. Please send comments or corrections to [carl\\_Parameters@conus.army.mil](mailto:carl_Parameters@conus.army.mil).