

that this issue requires careful consideration in the study of the central issue we have recommended. These problems include the following:

The authority of some agencies to levy requirements on the U&S Commands and the Services without commensurate responsibility for the operating missions.

The authority of the Services to levy various requirements on certain Agencies without commensurate fiscal responsibility.

The authority an Agency for quality inspection and acceptance of materiel whose utilization is the responsibility of the services.

Less than optimum efficiency resulting from inadequate coordination.

A need for greater participation by the U&S Commanders in the review of major issues in the programs and budgets of the Defense Agencies.

Secretary of the Navy Lehman is a consistent, outspoken critic of defense agencies:

Is the Defense establishment overgrown? Yes. To cope with this avalanche of legislation and regulation, each military department headquarters numbers 2,000, as does the Joint Staff and its appendages and the Office of the Secretary of Defense staff. There are 10 Defense agencies numbering 85,000, and nine joint and specified commands that each average nearly a thousand. No intelligent human being would pay \$700 for a toilet cover. It took a unified buying agency of 50,000 billets to do that.

That vast bloat in Congress and the executive branch has all been done over the past 30 years in the name of reformation at the altar of the false idols of centralization and unification.

CONCLUSION

The strength of any complex organization—and the national military command structure is more complex than most—depends in equal measure on three things: people, leadership and structure. We are indeed fortunate that the Armed Forces today are attracting and retaining some of the best trained and most highly qualified soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines in our history.

The leadership of these forces, the officers and non-commissioned officers, should also be singled out for praise. Our top leadership has also shown great initiative and brilliance in solving some of our most troubling Service and inter-Service problems. An example is the Army-Air Force agreement on 31 of the most important issues affecting those Services in their joint responsibilities.

However, the third component—structure—is important as well because it determines the pace at which those changes and improvements take place. Structural changes cannot by themselves solve any problem. However, the process of evolutionary change can be facilitated by a structure that promotes initiative as well as organizational excellence.