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Readers will want to note the edifying, if contentious, exchange between two distinguished soldier-scholars, Charles Dunlap and Conrad Crane. Each holds strong views regarding the assumptions and attendant expectations that have underpinned and continue to shape the American way of fighting. We also wish to draw readers’ attention to the thoughtful responses we received to our “Women in Battle” forum (Summer 2013), and the authors’ replies.

Our first forum looks at four “Dilemmas for US Strategy.” One factor that makes formulating strategy difficult, especially for a global power, is that policy choices in one region can reduce alternatives in another. David Sorenson’s “US Options in Syria” weighs America’s military and nonmilitary options against the goal of containing the Syrian civil war, noting that the failure of the current containment strategy could lead to dire consequences for the region. In “Pitfalls in Egypt,” Gregory Aftandilian discusses how antipathy toward the United States grew during the Morsi presidency, and how America can chart a better course by using aid packages to encourage democratic reform. Richard Weitz’s “Transition in Afghanistan” suggests that NATO’s withdrawal may be too soon to avoid a renewal of the Afghan civil war. Dennis Hickey’s “Imbalance in the Taiwan Strait” examines four alternatives for addressing the military imbalance between Taiwan and China, and recommends combining two of them for a better way ahead.

The second forum presents “US Landpower in Regional Focus.” In the first article, Brigadier General Kimberly Field, Colonel James Learmont, and Lieutenant Colonel Jason Charland explain the rationale and principal components of the Regional Alignment of Forces concept. Andrew Terrill’s “Strategic Landpower and the Arabian Gulf” describes how the US Army has played a stabilizing role for the Arab states along the Persian Gulf, and can continue to do so. John Deni’s “Strategic Landpower in the Indo-Asia-Pacific” discusses the US Army’s contributions to deterring aggression and to promoting security in the region. In both cases, it is clear the strategic application of landpower offers much more than compellence.

Our third forum, “Lessons from Limited Wars,” highlights what we might learn from some of America’s limited conflicts. It opens with “A War Examined: Afghanistan” by Todd Greentree, which considers the ambiguous results of America’s most recent conflict and what these might mean for the concept of limited war. David Brooks’s “Cutting Losses: Ending Limited Interventions,” offers three case studies to analyze how US presidents decided when the costs of a limited intervention exceeded its benefits.

This issue also offers a mini-forum on “Examining Warfare in Wi-Fi.” Contributions by Paul Kan and Jeffrey Groh review some of the latest literature on cyberwar and cyber warfare, a topic of increasing interest. ~AJE