

The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters

Manuscript 3182

From the Acting Editor in Chief

Conrad C. Crane

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

From the Acting Editor in Chief

Welcome to the Winter 2022–23 issue of *Parameters*. This issue consists of two *In Focus* commentaries concerning nuclear power plants and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, three forums, and the SRAD Director’s Corner.

As Dr. Echevarria’s temporary replacement as he enjoys his much-deserved sabbatical, at my first meeting to understand my new duties I found that because of a paper shortage, we have had to reduce the weight of the paper in our print edition, and deal with months delay in distribution. I have recently been told we will also have to reduce the number of printed copies because of rising costs. For those aspiring authors out there seeking to produce an article for this journal, I would encourage analysis of the American economy and industrial base. What has happened so the shutdown of one baby formula factory causes a national crisis, and our military assistance to Ukraine has caused significant strains in our own ammunition stocks? Those of us in the military have learned that “just in time” logistics often is not; it appears we have let economic efficiency override effectiveness. So, I encourage future submissions looking at such issues.

In our first *In Focus* essay in this issue, “Present Danger: Nuclear Power Plants in War,” Henry D. Sokolski argues that following Russia’s seizure of Ukraine’s nuclear plant at Zaporizhzhya, the United States must adjust its military planning and policies to cope with hostile military forces’ targeting, seizing, and garrisoning of armed forces at large operating nuclear plants. Additionally, US leadership must clarify the policies regarding possible US targeting of such plants. In our second *In Focus* essay, “Putin Chooses between a Series of Bad Options,” Jeffrey D. McCausland analyzes President Vladimir Putin’s decision to escalate the war in Ukraine. Building on this analysis, he offers insights into how Putin might further escalate the war using conventional and unconventional instruments of power, including food, energy, and nuclear weapons. He then presents strategies for the West and the world to prevent or oppose possible future escalations. There are two fine podcasts available with these authors.

The issue’s first forum, *Indo-Pacific*, includes two articles exploring an area of important strategic concern for the United States. In “Indian Perspectives: Insights for the Indo-American Partnership,” Tyrell O. Mayfield posits an understanding of the theories and ideas of Kautilya, a leading but little-studied Indian philosopher, could provide the United States with insight into Indian perspectives on strategic partnerships and silent war. In “Security Force Assistance Brigades and US Indo-Pacific Command Multi-domain Competition,” John T. Pelham IV analyzes recent US Army operational experience in security

force assistance and security cooperation in the region and identifies capability gaps and opportunities for competition.

Our second forum, *Strategy*, features two articles proposing new ways to think about strategy and its implications. In “Planning for Positive Strategic Shock in the Department of Defense,” Benjamin W. Buchholz argues that a concept of positive strategic shock would benefit the US Department of Defense’s planning processes and makes recommendations based on three methods of thinking. In “Cognitive Performance Enhancement for Multi-domain Operations,” Daniel J. Herlihy explores the increasing demands on soldier cognition and compares the Army’s current approach to its adversaries.

The third forum, *Leadership*, consists of two essays providing important insights for leadership at all levels. In “Leader Perspectives on Managing Suicide-related Events in Garrison,” Thomas H. Nassif, George A. Mesias, and Amy B. Adler provide a thematic analysis of interviews with leaders, chaplains, and behavioral health providers who responded to garrison suicide-related events and explore leader decision making. In “Why Do Senior Officers Sometimes Fail in Character? The Leaky Character Reservoir,” Everett S. P. Spain, Katie E. Matthew, and Andrew L. Hagemaster claim senior officers may fail in character because their rate of character development throughout their careers typically decreases as environmental stressors rise. They conceptualize character as an open system with gains and leaks over time and integrate existing scholarship on personality and ethical development to create the Leaky Character Reservoir framework.

Finally, in the fourth installment of the SRAD Director’s Corner, Colonel George Shatzer focuses on the relationship between Taiwan and China. He reviews *The Trouble with Taiwan: History, the United States and a Rising China* by Kerry Brown and Kalley Wu Tzu-hui and *Taiwan Straits Standoff: 70 Years of PRC–Taiwan Cross–Strait Tensions* by Bruce A. Elleman. Shatzer shows how these books might help readers better understand the contentious and violent history of cross-strait relations between Taiwan and China so they can deal with the problem today and in the future. The books also provide insights for strategists attempting to plan for security in the region.

To close, I would like to provide some more guidance for future contributors. Perusing submissions has reinforced my opinion that the most overused and misused term in the security studies lexicon is the word “asymmetric.” There are two kinds of warfare: asymmetric and stupid. All belligerents seek an edge, and no one does that better than the United States. I have seen the word *asymmetric* used when a better term would have been *nonmilitary*, or *non-kinetic*, or *irregular*. So for those of you who want to write for this journal, be prepared to carefully define that word if you use it. ~CCC