

later assignments to Joint-duty positions. The officers would be educated at Joint schools (AFSC, NWC, ICAF). They would serve primarily in Joint-duty positions, but would return periodically to their parent Services for field assignments to maintain currency. Perhaps half of the positions on the Joint Staff and in other Joint headquarters would be filled by such officers, thus retaining an essential mix of officers with varied backgrounds (including command experience) on the staffs, and assuring that the Joint Staff particularly would not become isolated or in any sense a "general staff." The provisions of the U.S. Code that now restrict the length of and interval between officer assignments to the Joint Staff, as well as the size of the Joint Staff, should be eliminated through legislative action. To assure that officers in the Joint-duty career specialty have adequate promotion opportunities, 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 each promotion board 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 and accomplishments. In another step designed to reflect greater awareness of Joint needs, a program should be established for increasing the frequency of cross-Service assignments aimed at improving the awareness within each Service of the characteristics, traditions, capabilities, and problems of the other Services. Finally, the appointment of a limited number of civilian specialists to Joint positions should be considered as a way to strengthen continuity and to provide expertise that may not be readily available within the career officer corps.

The joint specialty idea was later recommended in *Toward a More Effective Defense*, the final report of the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies Defense Organization Project, published in 1985, that was endorsed by six former secretaries of defense:

Giving the chairman greater authority over the Joint Staff would only improve cross-service military advice if the military personnel system were also modified so that officers were attracted to, trained for, and rewarded for service in joint positions. Toward this end, we recommend that each service establish a "joint specialty" that selected officers could enter in addition to their normal service specialties. These officers would be trained at existing joint schools and could spend up to half of their subsequent assignments in joint positions—the staffs of the unified and specified commanders, OSD offices and other civilian agencies, as well as the Joint Staff. In this context it would be necessary to remove the remaining statutory restrictions on Joint Staff tenure and reassignments.