

ice rivalry dimension blown all out of proportion to what is really going on."

The European reception of the Marine casualties raises questions about this interpretation, however. An Army doctor told the Air Force that he did not believe the distribution of casualties "could be defended, medically, morally or ethically."

Given these problems, what might be done about the Joint Staff? General Jones had this suggestion in 1982:

*5. The Joint Staff should be made responsible directly to the Chairman rather than the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a body. In addition, we must improve the experience and military education levels of officers serving in joint assignments and provide greater incentives and rewards for distinguished joint duty. This will require removing the legislative restrictions on the Joint Staff and establishing joint procedures for selecting, schooling, insuring enhanced promotion and assignment opportunities, and managing the careers of those officers best qualified for joint duty. Actions are already being addressed by the Joint Chiefs to properly manage well qualified joint officers as a valuable national asset; repealing the legislative constraints on Joint Staff duty will allow sufficient flexibility to do this job properly.*

His recommendations closely parallel those of the Brehm Study, which advocated the creation of a "joint sub-specialty"—a joint career duty track which selected officers would follow in conjunction with assignments in their own Services. The Brehm report recommended:

*1. Improve the preparation and experience levels of Service officers assigned to the Joint Staff and other Joint activities such as the Unified Command headquarters. Establish in each Service a Joint duty career specialty open to selected officers in grade of O-4 and above. Such officers should be nominated by the Service Chief and approved by the Chairman, both for selection in the specialty and for assignment to Joint duty positions. The officers should be educated at Joint schools and should serve primarily in Joint duty positions, but should also return periodically to their parent Services for field assignments to maintain currency. Perhaps half of the 4,600 positions on the Joint Staff and in other Joint headquarters should be filled by such officers, thus retaining an essential mix of officers with varied backgrounds (including command experience) on these staffs, and also assuring that the Joint headquarters do not become isolated.*

Service promotion boards selecting officers for promotion to O-5 and above should have appropriate representation from the Joint Staff or other major Joint headquarters. Written guidance should be furnished to the promotion boards that states explicitly that the selection process should: (1) emphasize the advancement of the best officers in all specialties including those in the Joint specialty; and (2) recognize the importance and value of Joint duty experience.

### MODERNIZING THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

One source of the problems encountered in achieving jointness in operation, effective readiness, and clarity in the chain of command can be found in the current structures of our Military Departments—the separate Army, Navy, and Air Force. Many critics contend that, particularly in the Services, the desire to acquire new weapons and hardware tends to drive and dominate policy, since the Service chiefs primary motivation is to make their individual services the best-equipped and most capable. Yet this desire can govern defense policy, in part because of the current approach of placing organizationally weak civilian Secretaries in temporary and nominal charge of tightly-knit and clearly-structured Military staffs.

One often hears in debates on these issues the principle of "civilian control." Nowhere is this issue more pertinent than in the current structure of the Military Departments. To many analysts, the