

# The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters

---

Volume 44  
Number 4 *Parameters Winter 2014*

Article 2

---

Winter 12-1-2014

## 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](#), and the [National Security Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Antulio J. Echevarria II, "From the Editor," *Parameters* 44, no. 4 (2014), doi:10.55540/0031-1723.2964.

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

---

Our Winter issue opens with a Special Commentary, “Considering *Why We Lost*,” by Tami Biddle. As she examines LTG (Ret.) Daniel Bolger’s argument in his sharply critical book, *Why We Lost: A General’s Inside Account of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars*, she also considers what it means to say “we lost,” and how that verdict might have been avoided.

The first forum, the “Asia-Pacific,” features four articles concerning China. David Lai’s “China’s Strategic Moves and Counter-Moves” uses the ancient game *Go* and the theory of great-power transition as analytical frameworks for understanding Sino-American relations in the Asia-Pacific region. Thomas Kane’s “China’s ‘Power Projection’ Capabilities” underscores the fact that Beijing’s interests extend well beyond the Asia-Pacific, and any grand or military strategy protecting the interests of the United States must be truly global in scope. Timothy Thomas’ “China’s Concept of Military Strategy” explores some of the essential differences between Chinese and American strategic thinking. Christopher Johnston’s “China’s Military Merchantilism” argues Beijing’s grand strategy and foreign policy are fragmented and in danger of being driven by commercial interests backed by military force; the aim of US policy and strategy, therefore, ought to be to decouple the link between China’s merchantilism and its military planning.

Our second forum consists of two essays concerning the ongoing crisis in the “Middle East” over how to deal with the radical militant group referring to itself as the Islamic State. BG (Ret.) Huba Wass de Czege offers an insightful commentary on a “Core Strategy” for defeating this group. Paul Rexton Kan discusses the advantages of using a combined “Financial-Military Strategy” to undermine the group’s territorial control and reach.

The third forum returns to the theme of “A War Examined,” and presents opposing views of the 2014 Gaza conflict. In “Israel’s Attrition vs Hamas’ Exhaustion,” Eitan Shamir and Eado Hecht compare Israel’s use of a strategy of attrition to Hamas’ employment of a strategy of exhaustion, and offer an assessment of the relative effectiveness of those strategies. In “Hamas’ Strategic Calculus,” Glenn Robinson argues Hamas enjoyed some short-term successes, and suggests this “calculus” will influence Hamas’ strategies in the future.

Our fourth forum, “Civil-Military Relations & Military Ethics,” offers two essays. The first, “The US Army’s Domestic Strategy 1945-1965” by Thomas Crosbie, analyzes how the US Army of the post-World War II era managed its relations with the American public through a domestic political strategy. In the second essay, “Battlefield Euthanasia: Should Mercy-Killings Be Allowed?” David Perry explores a difficult and yet seldom discussed phenomenon. Mercy-killings have happened in every war and, even with revolutionary advances in medicine, will likely occur in the future. Nevertheless, despite abundant and obvious moral justifications, their legalization remains both unlikely and unwise.~AJE

