

Naval War College Review

Volume 19
Number 2 February

Article 9

1966

Schools for Strategy

W. D. Clark
U.S. Air Force

Gene M. Lyons

Louis Morton

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

Recommended Citation

Clark, W. D.; Lyons, Gene M.; and Morton, Louis (1966) "Schools for Strategy," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 19 : No. 2 , Article 9.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol19/iss2/9>

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.

economic and moral viewpoints, finding it a factor vital to the ultimate rupture of Germany's borders by Allied military and naval forces. The author's subject is historical in nature, but the conclusions reached are pertinent now. Therefore, this short, interesting, easy-to-read work is recommended to all students of warfare.

K.C. HOLM
Commander, U.S. Navy

Lyons, Gene M. and Morton, Louis. *Schools for Strategy*.
New York: Praeger, 1965. 356 p.

This book is primarily a compilation of empirical data on schools conducting studies in national security affairs. The authors examine the programs of private universities, state universities, military war colleges, State Department schools, and private and government-operated research organizations, with a brief look at the London Institute for Strategic Studies. The approach taken by Princeton, Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Duke, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio State, the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Rand, Operations Evaluation Group, Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, Institute for Defense Analysis, and the Council on Foreign Relations in their treatment of national security studies is covered in some detail. Most of the effort is devoted to strictly background information which has been developed since early in the 1940's. This includes, *inter alia*, the organizers of the national security programs, the existing experts—both military and civilian—now participating, and the numerous disciplines within which the subject is entwined. These are almost exclusively the humanities, economics, public administration, and military studies. Selected information is provided on undergraduate, graduate, and advanced research programs.

The need for formal training in national security affairs for government officials who may occupy policy-making positions is discussed. Mention is made of the world events which brought about this need, such as post-World War II realignment, the Soviet A-bomb explosion in 1949, and the initial Soviet sputnik. The difficulties experienced in the recruitment of highly qualified scholars to fill government positions is pointed out. The main theme of the book centers on the piecemeal approach to formal schooling in national security affairs, with a recommendation that the entire program should be given a new sense of direction.

The authors indicate the old dilemma that most institutes of higher learning consider military affairs as too narrow a field to be presented as a separate discipline. While existing schools and programs are useful, a planned formal training program is considered the most desirable. Professors Lyons and Morton suggest full incorporation of national security affairs in the history and social science disciplines of our universities and colleges.

W.D. CLARK
Colonel, U.S. Air Force

Mark, Max. *Beyond Sovereignty*. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1965. 178 p.

The student of political science will find the first four chapters repetitious of much he has already studied. Others will find them easy to read and an orientation for what is to follow. The meat of the book begins with an insight into the split between East and West. This chapter sets forth Mr. Mark's thesis, that there is something for Americans beyond sovereignty. The idea is expertly developed as the reader is drawn through the anti-colonial revolution, the revolution of warfare, and the revolution of rising expectations. This is followed by an analysis of the Communist world and a comparison of this world with the West. The chapter on contemporary international politics is impressive and incisive. In readable language and without tortuous exercises in terminology, the author lays down his thoughts on the decline of the nation-state, transitional ideologies, and the fusion of domestic and international politics. He puts the new diplomacy in its proper place and points out the ambiguous position of physical power reflecting the unsettled character of military doctrine. The United Nations is described as a child of the age of total war; and the philosophical basis for international law is doomed to failure since the rise of the sovereign state. Although the nation-state has become obsolete, world community is still in the distance. Mr. Mark thinks the chances for disarmament should become more promising since wars have become suicidal. But one is forced to the conclusion that in actuality the abstract proposition of disarmament finds itself in a vicious circle. At this point the author offers his perspective of the world scene. This alone could fuel a long debate, but he does not dwell upon it. Instead there follows an excellent appraisal of the American approach to foreign policy—that it lacks the correct understanding of our historical period, that our outlook is narrowly pragmatic. From these corollaries we