

developed and monitored to ensure that Joint Staff performance is given appropriate consideration.

H.R. 3622 contains an additional personnel provision intended to focus the attention of the most outstanding military officers on joint assignments. It would require the JCS chairman to submit an evaluation to the President of the performance and joint military assignments of any officer recommended for promotion to the grade above Major General or Rear Admiral.

Continuity and experience

The Joint Staff changes enacted in 1984 relaxed the legislative restrictions on Joint Staff assignments. The limitation on Joint Staff assignments was increased to four and the interval between Joint Staff assignments was reduced from three years to two years. In addition, the Secretary of Defense was given authority to waive the two year limitation. To provide the Secretary even more flexibility, H.R. 3622 would allow him to waive the four year limitation.

These less restrictive provisions should afford the flexibility needed to overcome the deficiencies in Joint Staff continuity. At the same time, retaining legislative constraints on the tenure of Joint Staff assignments continues safeguards against the possibility, however remote that the Joint Staff could evolve into a powerful, self-sustaining, elite military organization superimposed between civilian authorities and the services and combatant commands.

The bill does not address the problems of Joint Staff inexperience caused by faulty Department of Defense personnel management procedures and inattention to joint education. Based on their thoughtful comments, the committee is convinced of the seriousness of those problems and the necessity for corrective measures. But legislative relief is not required. Consequently, the committee intends to monitor Defense Department actions to resolve the problems relating to Joint Staff experience identified in the hearings.

Management, procedures, charter, and size

At present the Joint Staff is smothered by complex, voluminous operating procedures to ensure that the services control the form and content of Joint Staff work. Although the chairman manages the Joint Staff, by law, he does so on behalf of the Joint Chiefs. The JCS, over time, has developed an ironclad system that protects service interests and, as a corollary, tends to convert the Joint Staff into an executive secretariat dependent on service staffs.

The following description of the joint staffing process graphically illustrates the debilitating effects of the present system. It is excerpted from an answer for the record received from the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General JONES. A typical joint staffing action can be illustrated by outlining how a request from the Secretary of Defense for JCS views on an important defense issue would be handled.

The Joint Staff action officer is under institutional pressure to find a position with which each of the Services can agree. . . . Likewise, the Service action officers are under