

### *National security deliberations*

Possibly as a result of the deterioration in the quality of joint military advice, the influence of the military in deliberations at the highest levels, concerning issues of the utmost concern to the survival of the Nation has diminished. Testimony noted the limited role played by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in a number of major national security decisions involving the structure and employment of the military forces of the nation.

The committee believes that political leaders should avail themselves of the advice of the chairman and, when they deem it necessary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders, on all issues in which the military component is significant. Moreover the committee believes that advice rendered by these most senior military officers should receive careful consideration when decisions are made.

Consequently, the committee has included a provision in the bill that would require the JCS chairman or his deputy to attend meetings of the National Security Council and to participate in its deliberations. This measure is intended to ensure that joint military advice receives a hearing before national security issues that involve military considerations are decided.

### *Improving Staff Support*

#### *Personnel*

Testimony revealed a number of disincentives that at times have had the effect of discouraging officers from seeking Joint Staff assignments. Promotions of Joint Staff members have lagged. The services disagreed on the caliber of officers who should be assigned. Joint Staff influence is perceived as limited. As a result, officers who seek challenge may avoid Joint Staff service.

The committee considers the Joint Staff the preeminent U.S. military staff. The Joint Staff personnel provisions enacted in 1984 were designed to ensure that the committee's conviction concerning the importance of the Joint Staff becomes manifest in the structure of the Department of Defense.

The Committee is concerned with how the Joint Staff personnel provisions enacted in 1984 have been implemented. One of the provisions requires the assignment of the most outstanding officers to the Joint Staff. The committee is aware of some evidence that implies that this provision is not being implemented as intended.

Another provision enacted in 1984 was intended to improve the career prospect of officers who serve on the Joint Staff. It made the Secretary of Defense responsible for ensuring that military department officer personnel policies concerning promotion, retention and assignment give appropriate consideration to the performance of an officer as a member of the Joint Staff. Because the demands and complexity of Joint Staff work require talented and dedicated officers, the committee is convinced that performance at the Joint Staff level should be considered a mark of distinction deserving special attention by promotion boards. Though no individual should be guaranteed advancement as a result of Joint Staff service, statistical analyses of serving and former Joint Staff officers should be