

From the Editor

Our Spring issue opens with a forum considering the strategic implications of *Mission Command*. Anthony King's article, "Mission Command 2.0: From an Individualist to a Collectivist Model," describes how mission command has evolved to facilitate synchronizing the decisions of key leaders. King uses the leadership models of Generals James Mattis and Stanley McChrystal to illustrate his case. Russell Glenn's contribution, "Mission Command in the Australian Army: A Contrast in Detail," points out the general similarities but subtle differences between the American and Australian models, and what they might mean for cooperation between the two in multinational operations. Thomas-Durell Young's essay, "Legacy Concepts: A Sociology of Command in Central and Eastern Europe," raises important questions regarding the incompatibility of Western notions of mission command with the "legacy concepts" that still dominate the leadership styles of several formerly Communist countries. As NATO develops ways to address Russian adventurism, it would do well to consider the possible effects of asymmetries in the command philosophies of some of its recently added members on its courses of action.

The second forum, *After 15 Years of Conflict*, offers critical insights into the ways the United States has conducted military interventions thus far in the twenty-first century. The first contribution, Charlotte Blatt's "Operational Success, Strategic Failure: Assessing the 2007 Iraq Troop Surge" compares two perspectives on the outcomes of the troop surge and identifies essential strategy decisions that significantly affected the region's stability. Stanley Wiechnik's "Tracking Democratization: Insights for Planners" provides some much needed clarity regarding the issues of state- or nation-building, and what they mean for Western strategists. Ellen Klein's article, "Immunity in Contingency Operations: A Proposal for US Contractors," suggests ways to reduce strategic and operational friction in contemporary military interventions. The US military increasingly relies on contractor support, but several issues stand in the way of making that support seamless and cost-efficient; the United States needs to consider how to protect contractors from the bureaucratic ambiguities of a host-nation's policies over the long term. The final essay, "Enhancing Resilience in an Operational Unit" by Douglas Sims and Amy Adler, discusses measures to increase unit resilience. One of the key characteristics of recent military interventions is they are marathons, not sprints. Are we doing enough to prepare US troops for that reality?

Our third forum, *Modernization among US Partners*, offers a look at how two of America's strategic partners, Australia and France, are moving forward into the twenty-first century. In "Australia's Offset and A2/AD Strategies," Ian Langford discusses the capabilities Australia's political and military leaders chose to pursue as part of their modernization strategies. In "The French Army at a Crossroads," Rémy Hémez describes how the French Army plans to accomplish its dual-missions of expeditionary warfare and homeland security with acceptable risk.

~ AJE

