

Naval War College Review

Volume 30
Number 2 *Spring*

Article 16

1977

The System for Educating Military Officers in the U.S.

Thomas W. Carr

Lawrence J. Korb

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Carr, Thomas W. and Korb, Lawrence J. (1977) "The System for Educating Military Officers in the U.S.," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 30 : No. 2 , Article 16.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol30/iss2/16>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

108 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

Yangtze River. Then, "one dark night [she] stealthily slipped her cables and got away down the river to the sea . . . China was closed again."

The Opium War is an excellent work. Fay provides an extensive index, a helpful "list of characters," and useful maps. This carefully documented work does not displace John King Fairbank's classic work on early Sino-Western relations but supplements it in an outstanding fashion.

BERNARD D. COLE
Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy

Kelleher, Catherine McArdle. *Germany and the Politics of Nuclear Weapons*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1975. 372pp.

Professor Kelleher has set herself the task of examining nuclear weapons developments in relation to German politics during the years 1954 to 1966. Her volume, as Professor William T.R. Fox brings out in the Foreword, is one of three country studies on the same general topic, of which the French and British volumes are already in print. All three are part of a series sponsored by the Institute of War and Peace Studies of Columbia University.

Professor Kelleher's book begins with a prologue for the years 1945-1954, and then in Chapters 2 through 10 proceeds essentially chronologically through the period 1954-1966. Chapter 11 is a "Commentary" on those 12 years, and Chapter 12 is "A Look Forward" at the present-day situation.

The book is based upon personal residence in Germany and a number of interviews, mostly with Germans, but also with American, British, and French subjects. (The number of interviews conducted in 1964 to 1966 exceeded 125.) Professor Kelleher notes that she did not aim at replicating "the usual American or German secondary analyses," that she wanted to focus on primary sources. As a result the notes

make only very restricted reference to books in the category of "secondary analyses." One inescapable problem with this kind of approach is that it necessarily drives a book toward a focus on such primary material as does turn out to be available.

Professor Kelleher's book is a competent account which does justice to her chosen focus. As she herself realizes and stipulates, many of the issues of German control of and access to nuclear power appear today rather remote and secondary. It is for this reason that she added the chapter at the end to provide a contemporary focus.

FREDERICK H. HARTMANN
Naval War College

Korb, Lawrence J., ed. *The System for Educating Military Officers in the U.S.* Pittsburgh: International Studies Association, 1976. 172pp.

Before he left the Department of Defense in January, Deputy Secretary of Defense William P. Clements, Jr., in a memorandum on senior service colleges, reaffirmed his commitment to improving officer education:

These institutions represent the capstone of the DoD educational system. They must be centers of excellence—marked by scholarship, innovative thought, and research. They should attract the best students, teachers, researchers, and visiting faculty . . .

For 3 years Mr. Clements had led the DoD Committee on Excellence in Education, made up of the Service Secretaries and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)—"a group that'll get your attention," one wag noted—in a searching review of officer education: the service academies, the senior service colleges, the intermediate-level (staff) colleges, and the graduate education system. And for 3 years Clements and the Committee ran into the kinds of strains and

PROFESSIONAL READING 109

paradoxes discussed by the authors in Professor Korb's compilation of essays.

There is, first, the classic question of whether courses in military schools are training or education. The simplistic and rather silly notion: "Training is for enlisted men—education is for officers" is heard only rarely now. In his chapter, Adam Yarmolinsky notes that "... innovation is the essential business of education, as replication is the essential business of training. ..." Although neat, even that phrase begs many questions; for some portions of what the military calls "education" allow little room for innovation.

Second, there is the vexing question of curriculum focus in officer education: should it be concerned with general broadening or with the *employment of military force*. Donald F. Bletz, noting that the military needs few sociologists but many officers who understand society, argues for broader education. John E. Ralph, on the other hand, alone among the authors, makes a strong case that military education has yielded wrongly to such ideas and moved away from its primary purpose: training in the use of military force.

Third, there is the obvious strain faced by any military educational institution which, by definition, has two sets of loyalties. One to the established procedures and hierarchy of the military. The other to education's insistence on freedom in the pursuit of knowledge.

And finally, as General Ralph points out in his article, there is tension inherent in the very phrase "military education." Education is aimed at providing a means of human betterment, of societal improvement. The military, in its role as guardian of the society, frequently must destroy in order to protect. There are, in fact, some who feel "military education" is a two-word *non sequitur*.

Dr. Korb, a Professor of Management at the Naval War College (formerly on the faculty of the Coast Guard

Academy), has pulled together 14 thoughtful but disjointed essays on officer education which, with the help of a skillful introduction and careful editing, add up to a useful and readable book. It is not a definitive study and does not purport to be one. This short volume is divided into an overview, a section on precommissioning education, one on professional education, and a final and more theoretical part which discusses issues (e.g., education vs. training) and unabashedly promotes a graduate education in civilian universities.

Officer education is on trial, Professor Korb notes in his introduction. One is tempted to respond: "It has ever been thus." For in times of budget crunch, travel and training are the first to go, the old canard alleges. Furthermore, issues involving military education and training, their form, content, and cost—are not new to the Congress, only cyclical. After each war there is a reevaluation of how money should be spent during periods of no military conflict, and for the last several years we have been in the midst of such an examination.

But this period does seem extraordinary—at least in terms of the scope and intensity of the investigations. In addition to congressional interest, exemplified by House Appropriations Committee studies of professional military education, graduate education, and the service academies, the General Accounting Office has, during the past several years, looked into ROTC, graduate education, language training, and dependents schools overseas, and has made a series of studies of the service academies alleged to be the largest single investigation ever conducted by that Office.

In the meantime, the formation of the DoD Committee on Excellence in Education, in late 1973, led to a sweeping review of the officer education system by top DoD policymakers themselves. The Committee was concerned

110 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

that officer education programs were not always administered effectively, with an efficient use of resources.

This state of affairs was not blamed entirely on the services or on individual educational institutions. Rather, it was felt the problem stemmed from the fact that lack of senior-level guidance and review had allowed the schools to pursue their respective programs without any rigorous attention to the specific needs of their services or of the Defense Establishment as a whole. This lack of attention had resulted in a variety of anomalies noted in this volume.

For example, the various senior service colleges in many respects duplicated each other's courses. Graduates of particular intermediate service schools were not assigned to positions for which their studies ostensibly had prepared them. And, both the senior and intermediate schools provided some courses within their curricula which had little, if any, relevance to the stated purpose of those schools.

Similar problems were found at the service academies and within the graduate education systems, and a series of corrective initiatives ordered by the Committee will continue to be reviewed by the new Administration.

In addition to all this outside interest in education, the services themselves have in recent years conducted intensive internal reviews of various sorts. Between 1972 and 1976, an officer in a position to know alleges there were no fewer than 42 studies of education and training affecting the Department of the Navy alone!

In short, it seems that officer education is on trial. One hopes it will continue to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. For despite obvious weaknesses, it is a highly respected system, and one that has served us well.

Perhaps one should be reassured that this book came to be written at all. It is comforting to note that gifted academicians, within and without the

military, believe the officer education system is of sufficient importance to the health of the nation to deserve their serious attention. In a strange way it is even more comforting to note they almost never agree on what specific changes are needed to make the system most effective.

Former Deputy Secretary Clements highlighted the role of officer education when he said: "Excellence in Education' is more than the name of our committee: it is an essential element in improving the management of this Nation's national security affairs."

THOMAS W. CARR

[Mr. Carr is Director of Defense Education]

The Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service. *United States/Soviet Military Balance*. Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1976. 86pp.

Of the myriad reports, studies, documents, and articles prepared under the cognizance of the U.S. Government, few could be recommended for general readership. Fewer still provide more than specific or isolated facts concerning the salient issues of the times: either they are too technical, too general, or they lack completeness and continuity. This limited study prepared as "A Frame of Reference for Congress" and published as a Committee Print is exceptional in its breadth, its detail, and its brevity. Prompted by a request from a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Congressional Research Service has authored a short, current, very readable unclassified study of the military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The study gives a quick overview of the policies, programs, and problems of the armed forces of both countries and initially sets the purpose as twofold:

-First, to furnish the Congress with an objective analysis of U.S./Soviet military balance.

-Second, to provide a starting point for congressional debate on the subject.