

It is not contemplated that all joint positions would be filled by officers with a joint specialty. Instead, we believe that there should be a mix of officers with varied backgrounds and specialties in joint positions to ensure that these staffs do not become isolated or in any sense a general staff. Finally, to ensure that officers with joint specialties have adequate promotion opportunities, an officer with a joint specialty should be included on service promotion boards for colonels/captains and flag and general officers.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION

Each military department headquarters contains a staff for the Secretary and an additional staff for each service chief.

The secretariat, nominally civilian but containing a significant number of military personnel, consists of the under, assistant, and deputy assistant secretaries and their associated staffs. Secretariat officials are assigned such functional responsibilities as installations, logistics, financial management, manpower, reserve affairs, research and development, shipbuilding, and acquisition. Secretariats vary in size from 300 to 800 personnel. At the end of fiscal year 1985 the Army Secretariat numbered 368 individuals; the Navy, 806; the Air Force, 304.

The military headquarters staffs, headed by the service chiefs, number in the thousands. In addition to a vice chief of service, the military headquarters contain a number of deputy and assistant chiefs of service with such functional responsibilities as personnel, logistics, research and development, acquisition, program analysis, reserves, National Guard, comptroller, military medicine, chaplain, military operations, military plans, and military intelligence. The military headquarters, though predominately staffed with military personnel, contain a significant number of civilians. At the end of fiscal year 1985 the Army staff numbered 3211 personnel; the Navy, 2029; the Marine Corps, 503; and the Air Force, 2769.

Why is it necessary to have separate service secretariats and military headquarters staffs containing many duplicative offices responsible for performing the same functions? Why not move away from a military department headquarters structure that is obviously a holdover from the era preceeding the creation of the Department of Defense and thus reduce the bureaucratic layering in the top management of the Pentagon? Questions such as these have been raised repeatedly for decades.

The *Report on Reorganization of the Department of Defense* prepared by Senator Stuart Symington in 1961 for President-elect Kennedy, called for a change in organization "to minimize the duplication and delay growing out of the present multiple layers of control. * * *" Although separate military services would be retained, the Symington report recommended "the elimination of the present departmental structure of the Army, Navy and Air Force."

In 1970 the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel *Report to the President and the Secretary of Defense on the Department of Defense* pointed out the "substantial duplication in all military departments between the secretariat staffs and the military staffs." The report