tion and force structure, in the view of many analysts. Perhaps even more seriously, they have little influence over training and they do not have the ability to modify service doctrines to fit the unique requirements of their combatant commands.

Opponents of JCS reorganization, including Navy Secretary John Lehman, argue that the JCS must remain the principal military advisors to the President, the NSC and the Secretary of Defense, because of what they claim is the well-known principle that those who will be charged with carrying out a decision will provide the most responsible advice before the decision is made.

The people responsible for carrying out the most significant military decisions are the unified and specified commanders, the CINCs, who are responsible for employing U.S. forces. The CINCs command U.S. military forces and are responsible for fighting wars and responding to crises when the use of force is required. The service chiefs, by law, *supervise, (vice command)* their services.

General P.X. Kelley clarified the advice-responsibility linkage in 1983 in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee after the Beirut bombing. He correctly pointed out that as Marine Commandant he was not in the chain of command to Lebanon. Both the Long report and the House Armed Services Committee report on the Beirut tragedy confirmed General Kelley: *They held the unified commander and his subordinates in the chain of command responsible—not the service chiefs or the JCS—for any oversights that contributed to the tragedy.*

As the Congress comes to grips with Gramm-Rudman, it is important to consider its impact upon the CINCs. Press reports in September, 1985 indicated that the Pentagon, responding to congressional belt-tightening, was planning a $300 billion cutback in previously projected defense expenditures over the next five years. No major weapon system, beyond the politically doomed DIVAD, was to be cut, according to the articles. Ammunition and spare parts cutbacks that undermine readiness are the likely alternative.

The underlying reason for this distortion is that the interests of the combat commanders, who would be responsible for employing U.S. forces in a war or crisis and who, therefore, would live or die by the readiness of their forces, is not adequately reflected in a JCS dominated by four service chiefs whose top priorities have been described by many as 600 ships, 40 wings and 18 divisions.

Improving Joint Officer Capabilities

Retired Air Force Lieutenant General John Pustay, formerly an assistant to the Chairman of the JCS, makes an interesting point in linking the organization of the JCS to our military performance.

> We tend to press forces designed and trained for [the most likely forms of conflict] into service in situations where they simply can't cope with the confronting lower-intensity, unorthodox threat.
>
> It is fair to ask why is this so. It is clear to me that the answer lies in the lack of a joint perspective and the lack of a strong JCS system to make that perspective a reality permeating all the Services. Such a perspective can provide this nation with viable fighting forces tailored for all parts of the conflict