

The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters

Volume 45
Number 1 *Parameters Spring 2015*

Article 2

Spring 3-1-2015

From the Editor

Antulio J. Echevarria II

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



Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Military History Commons](#), [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#), [National Security Law Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Antulio J. Echevarria II, "From the Editor," *Parameters* 45, no. 1 (2015), <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/parameters/vol45/iss1/2>

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

David Johnson opens our Spring issue with a Special Commentary, “Fighting the Islamic State: The Case for US Ground Forces,” in which he argues a “clear assessment” of the nature of war the United States is engaged in against the Islamic State will point to the necessity for using American ground troops.

Our first forum, *Megacities: Pros and Cons*, features three articles with opposing views regarding the importance of megacities in future warfare. The first, “The Case for Megacities,” by Kevin Felix and Frederick Wong, contends that megacities are becoming an increasingly important in tomorrow’s rapidly evolving strategic and operational environments. The US military will likely avoid combat in megacities whenever possible; however, Felix and Wong claim operating in such environments will not always be avoidable. To neglect preparing for them is, therefore, strategically unwise. Michael Evans challenges that view in “The Case against Megacities.” Evans maintains the megacities argument is an unproven hypothesis; rushing to embrace it is like replacing “population-centric counterinsurgency with population-centric megacity operations.” Doing so without careful research and analysis is, thus, ill-advised. William Adamson’s “Megacities and the US Army” argues the Department of Defense’s current urban strategy is “on an uncertain trajectory and is need of new leadership,” and the US Army is the right service to provide it.

The second forum *Culture and the US Army*, considers three themes of cultural significance to the Army. The first, “Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future” by Matthew Morton, offers a framework to aid strategic leaders in reflecting on the last decade of conflict in order to prepare themselves to offer the “best advice they can” in the future. The second article, “Ethics and Army Leadership: Climate Matters” by Charles Allen, examines the apparent lapse in ethical conduct among the Army’s leaders and their organizations, and critiques how the Department of Defense assesses ethical climates. The third, “Military Innovation and Military Culture” by Andrew Hill, highlights important flaws in some of the more popular theories regarding culture’s moderating effect on military innovation. He also offers two principal recommendations for creating a culture of innovation.

Our final forum is *Changes in War’s Character*, which offers two articles concerning new developments in contemporary warfare. The first, “The Individualization of American Warfare” by Glenn Voelz, contends the increased focus on targeting individuals rather than formations, and on identity rather than status, by US forces amounts to a subtle but significant alteration in war’s character. Whether and how long this change will persist remains to be seen. The second, “Small Forces and Crisis Management” by Benjamin Jensen, identifies a trend toward small, multi-domain forces that can facilitate compelling an adversary to do one’s will—short of escalating to major war; however, in his view, crisis management has not yet adjusted to this trend.

In our *Of Note* section, Daniel Glickstein takes yet another look at *Why We Lost*. ~AJE

