

Admiral MOORER. He is in the chain of command by practice, anyway. So it legitimizes, you might say, a procedure that has been in effect, at least was in effect in toto during the time I was Chairman.

Mr. STRATTON. That was what I wasn't clear about. My impression was that the Chairman was sort of the fellow who would send out the instructions, but that he was not really directly in the chain of command.

Admiral MOORER. The effect of that legislation is to guarantee that no directive will be given to the Military Forces to conduct combat action without passing through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. STRATTON. You say this has always been the case. I wasn't aware of that. I am very much in favor of it, because, if I remember correctly, one of the problems that occurred during the Cuban missile crisis was that the Chief of Naval Operations resented the fact that Mr. McNamara was in there trying to tell the destroyer skippers where to go and what to do, as I recall.

Admiral MOORER. I don't blame him. I would have, too.

Mr. STRATTON. I think if the Chairman is in the chain of command, then he would be next to the Secretary and you would have a uniformed officer who would be giving the directions.

Admiral MOORER. Yes, sir. I think, to go back to your point about the Cuban missile crisis, at that time, you see, Admiral Anderson was assigned as the director of that operation. The Joint Chiefs of Staff was just beginning to come of age then. If you had this law in effect then, Mr. McNamara could not have assigned the Chief of Naval Operations.

That was a kind of awkward arrangement in my opinion. I don't think that is a good example of the thing. That shouldn't have been done that way in my opinion.

Mr. STRATTON. I have always been a little bit hesitant about this business of having the Secretary of Defense in the chain of command in time of war.

Admiral MOORER. Well, that creates difficulties, as I said earlier. If the Secretary of Defense, for personal or political reasons, opposes what the Commander in Chief, the President, wants to do the problem is serious. I would like to point out to you there is a big difference in the way a civilian looks at the President of the United States and the way a military man looks at the President of the United States.

The people in the executive branch who have appointments here and there in the White House and around about in the overall executive branch look upon the President as the leader of their political party. They are always kind of maneuvering around as to what is going to happen in the next election and so on, and looking at it from that point of view.

Whereas a military man, a career military man, looks on the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief, period. He is the man that gives them that directive. They do not have a political overtone. And for that reason I think it is quite different. There is quite a different attitude and outlook.

Mr. STRATTON. The other bill, Mr. Skelton's, according to the heading here, would establish a single Chief of Staff. This is some-