UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Develops and inspires air and space leaders with vision for tomorrow.

The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States Today

Richard H. Kohn
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Harmon Memorial Lectures
in Military History

Number Forty-Two

United States Air Force Academy
Colorado
1999

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

Lieutenant General Hubert Reilly Harmon

Lieutenant General Hubert R. Harmon was one of several distinguished Army officers to come from the Harmon family. His father graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1880 and later served as Commandant of Cadets at the Pennsylvania Military Academy. Two older brothers, Kenneth and Millard, were members of the West Point class of 1910 and 1912, respectively. The former served as Chief of the San Francisco Ordnance District during World War II; the latter reached flag rank and was lost over the Pacific during World War II while serving as Commander of the Pacific Area Army Air Forces. Hubert Harmon, born on April 3, 1882, in Chester, Pennsylvania, followed in their footsteps and graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1915. Dwight D. Eisenhower also graduated in this class, and nearly forty years later the two worked together to create the new United States Air Force Academy.

Harmon left West Point with a commission in the Coast Artillery Corps, but he was able to enter the new Army air branch the following year. He won his pilot's wings in 1917 at the Army flying school in San Diego. After several training assignments, he went to France in September 1918 as a pursuit pilot. Between World Wars I and II, Harmon, who was a Major during most of this time, was among that small group of Army air officers who urged Americans to develop a modern, strong air arm.

At the outbreak of World War II, Brigadier General Hubert Harmon was commanding the Gulf Coast Training Center at Randolph Field, Texas. In late 1942 he became a Major General and head of the 6th Air Force in the Caribbean. The following year General Harmon was appointed Deputy Commander for Air in the Southwest Pacific under General Douglas MacArthur, and in January 1944 he assumed command of the 13th Air Force fighting in that theater. After the war General Harmon held a several top positions with the Air Force and was promoted to Lieutenant General in 1948.

In December 1949 the Air Force established the Office of Special Assistant for Air Force Academy Matters and appointed General Harmon its head. For more than four years Harmon directed all efforts at securing legislative approval for a U.S. Air Force Academy, planned its building and operation, and served on two commissions that finally selected Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the site for the new institution. On August 14, 1954, he was appointed first Superintendent of the Air Force Academy. Upon General Harmon's retirement on July 31, 1956, the Secretary of the Air Force presented him with his third Distinguished Service Medal for his work in planning and launching the new service academy and setting its high standards. In a moving, informal talk to the cadets before leaving the Academy, General Harmon told the young airmen that the most important requirements for success in their military careers are integrity and loyalty to subordinates and superiors. "Take your duties seriously, but not yourself," he told the cadets.

General Harmon passed away on February 22, 1957, just a few months before his son Kendrick graduated from West Point. The general's ashes were interred at the Air Force Academy's cemetery on September 2, 1958. On May 31, 1959, the Academy's new administration building was named Harmon Hall in his memory.

The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States Today

*Richard H. Kohn**
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Officers and cadets of the Air Force Academy, ladies and gentlemen: I feel honored to present the Harmon Memorial Lecture this year. Twenty-five years ago I first visited the Academy to present a paper at your history department's tenth Military History Symposium, and of course have returned frequently since, with many rich and happy memories. It is particularly meaningful to me to give this lecture during Lieutenant General Tad Oelstrom's tenure as Superintendent. His exceptional ability and imperturbable temperament first struck me at the Army War College in the fall of 1980 when he corrected me in my own classroom. I had made some remark about "driving" an F-4 out over the Florida Straits during the Cuban Missile Crisis, holding up my hands to simulate piloting as if it were the same as driving a car. After questioning my interpretation of the event, he noted in his laconic but authoritative voice, "and oh, by the way, you 'drive' an F-4 *this* way (gesturing with his fist, as though holding the 'stick' of a fighter plane)!" Two years later I observed his skill as a leader when I visited his squadron and flew in the backseat of his Phantom. Many times after that I have had the pleasure of enjoying his company and observing his extraordinary professional ability in all sorts of situations, official and informal. It is unwise to embarrass one's host. But my duty as a scholar to the truth prompts me to share this judgment: in over thirty-five years as a military historian, nearly twenty in close association with the Air Force, I have not known a military officer or a commander I respect or trust more than Tad Oelstrom. Our republic is truly blessed to have men of his judgment and character leading our youth, and safeguarding our security.

* * * * *

On a more somber note, it is "duty to the truth" that leads to my subject this evening, a troubling subject, an unpleasing one, one that will make us uncomfortable–me by talking about it and you in listening to it, particularly on such a gala occasion. The subject is significant, however, because it is crucial to our national security and to our survival as a republic.

The subject involves the civil-military relationship at the pinnacle of our government, and thus the very nature of our political system. My fear, baldly stated, is that civilian control of the military has weakened in the United States in the last generation, and is threatened today. I ask you to listen to my thinking with an open mind so that we can consider the problem together. It needs our attention. Merely bringing this issue to a military audience may introduce a remedy; a frank, open discussion could, by raising the awareness of the American public and alerting the armed forces, set in motion a healing of this tear in our civic and political fabric. My thinking is not the product of some nightmare about a possible *coup d'etat*, but rather a concern that the military has grown in influence to the point of being able to impose its own viewpoint or perspective on many policies and decisions. What I have detected is no conspiracy, but repeated efforts on the part of the armed forces to evade or frustrate civilian authority when it promises to produce outcomes the military opposes or dislikes. While I do not foresee any crisis, I am convinced that civilian control has diminished to the point where it could alter the character of American government and undermine national defense. My views result from nearly four decades of reading and reflection about civilian control in this country, half of which includes personal observation from inside the Pentagon

during the 1980s, and since then, watching the Clinton and two Bush administrations struggle to balance national security with domestic political realities.

*****

Understanding the problem begins with a review of the state of civil military relations during the last nine years, which in my judgment has been extraordinarily poor, and in many respects as low as any period in American peacetime history. No president was ever as reviled by the American professional military–treated with such disrespect, or viewed with such contempt–as Bill Clinton. And on the other side, no administration ever treated the military with more fear and deference on the one hand, and indifference and neglect on the other, as the Clinton Administration.

The relationship began on a sour note during the 1992 campaign. As a youth, Clinton had avoided the draft, written a letter expressing "loathing" for the military, and demonstrated against the Vietnam War while in Britain on a Rhodes Scholarship. (It wasn't the protesting so much as organizing public demonstrations on foreign soil.) Relations turned venomous with the awful controversy over gays in the military, when the administration–in ignorance and arrogance–announced its intention to abolish the ban on open homosexual service immediately, without study or consultation. The Joint Chiefs responded by resisting, floating rumors of their own and dozens of other resignations, maneuvering with their retired brethren to arouse congressional and public opposition, and then negotiating a compromise more or less openly with their commander in chief.[1] The President was publicly insulted by the troops in person, in print, and in speeches, including one by a two-star general. So ugly was the behavior that commanders had to remind their subordinates of their constitutional and legal obligations not to speak derogatorily of the civilian leadership, and the Air Force Chief of Staff warned his senior commanders in a message "about core values, including the principle of a chain of command that runs from the president right down to our newest airman."[2] Nothing like this had ever occurred in our history. This was the most open manifestation of defiance and resistance by the American military since the publication of the Newburgh addresses over two centuries earlier at the close of the American War for Independence. Then the officers of the Army openly contemplated revolt or resignation *en masse* over the failure of Congress to pay them or fund the pensions they had been promised over the course of a long and debilitating war. All of this led me, as a student of civilian control of the military, to ask why a military as loyal, subordinate, successful, and professional as any in the world could so suddenly violate one of its most sacred traditions.

While open conflict soon dropped from public sight, bitterness hardened into a visceral hatred that became part of the culture in many parts of the military establishment, kept alive by a continuous stream of incidents and controversies.[3] To cite but a few: the undermining and driving from office of Secretary of Defense Les Aspin in 1993; the humiliation of finding a replacement who then withdrew; and controversies over the retirement of at least six four-star flag officers, including the tragic suicide of a Chief of Naval Operations and the early retirement of an Air Force Chief of Staff, both of which were unprecedented occurrences. There were ceaseless arguments over gender, perhaps the single most continuous running sore between the Clinton administration and its national security critics.[4] These ranged from the botched investigations of the 1991 Tailhook scandal to the 1997 uproar over Air Force First Lieutenant Kelly Flinn, the first female B-52 line pilot, who despite admitting to adultery, lying to an investigating officer, and disobeying orders, was allowed to leave the service without court martial. Other incidents included the outrages at Aberdeen Proving Ground where Army sergeants had sex with recruits under their command, and the 1999 retirement of the highest ranking women army general in history amid accusations that she had been sexually harassed by a fellow general officer some years previously. There were bitter arguments over readiness, over budgets, over whether and how to intervene with American forces abroad from Somalia to Haiti to Bosnia to Kosovo, and over national strategy more generally.[5] So poisonous became the relationship that two Marine officers in 1998 had to be reprimanded for violating Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the provision about contemptuous words against the highest civilian officials, and the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps felt constrained to warn all Marine generals about officers publicly criticizing or disparaging the Commander in Chief.[6] The next year at the Military Ball at the Plaza Hotel in New York City, a local television news anchor, playing on the evening's theme "A Return to Integrity," remarked that he "didn't recognize any dearth of integrity here" until he "realized that President Clinton was in town"–and the crowd, largely of officers "which included 20 generals," went wild.[7] During the election of 2000 the chief legal officers of two of the largest commands in the Army and Air Force issued a similar warning lest resentment over Gore Campaign challenges to absentee ballots in Florida boil over into outspoken contempt.[8]

These illustrations emphasize the negative. By all accounts people in uniform respected and worked well with Secretary of Defense William Perry, and certainly Generals John Shalikashvili and Hugh Shelton, chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff since 1993, appeared to have been liked and respected by civilians in the Clinton administration. But these men, and other senior officers and officials who bridged the two cultures at the top levels of government, seemed to understand that theirs was a delicate role: to mediate between two hostile relatives who fear and distrust each other but realize that for better or for worse, they must work together if both are to survive.

*****

Now to discount all this as atmospherics–essentially insignificant–would be mistaken, for the toxicity of the civil-military relationship damaged national security in at least three ways: first, by paralyzing national security policy; second by obstructing and in some cases sabotaging American ability to intervene in foreign crises or to exercise leadership internationally, and third by undermining the confidence of the armed forces in their own uniformed leadership.

In response to that first, searing controversy over open homosexual service, the administration concluded that this president, with his Democratic affiliation, liberal leanings, history of draft evasion and opposition to the Vietnam War, and his admission of marital infidelity and experimentation with marijuana, would never be acceptable to the military.[9] Knowing little or nothing about military affairs and national security, and not caring to develop a deep or sympathetic understanding (one knowledgeable insider characterized the White House as reflecting the demography of the post-Vietnam Democratic Party: people who had never served in uniform and who had a "tin ear" for things military),[10] the administration decided that for this president and this administration, military affairs was a "third rail." No issue with the military was worth exposing this vulnerability–nothing was worth the cost. All controversy with the military was to be avoided. In fact from the beginning, the Clintonites tried to "give away" the military establishment: first to the congressional Democrats by making Les Aspin Secretary of Defense; then, when Aspin was driven from office, to the military itself by nominating Admiral Bobby Inman; then, when he withdrew, to the military-industrial complex in Bill Perry and John Deutsch, which lasted until 1997; and finally to the Republicans in the person of Maine Senator Bill Cohen. From the outset, the focus of the administration in foreign affairs was almost wholly economic in nature, and while that may have been genius, one result of the Clintonites' inattention and inconstancy was the disgust and disrespect of the national security community, particularly those in uniform.[11] By the time he left office, some officials admitted that he had been "unwilling to exercise full authority over military commanders."[12] "Those who monitored Clinton closely during his eight years as president believed . . . that he was intimidated more by the military than by any other political force he dealt with," reported David Halberstam. Said "a former senior N.S.C. official who studied [Clinton] closely, . . . 'he was out-and out-afraid of them.'"[13]

Forging a reasonable and economical national security policy was crucial to the health and well being of the country, particularly at a time of epochal transition brought on by the end of the Cold War. But the administration's indifference to military affairs, and the decision to take no risks and expend no political capital, resulted in paralysis. Rethinking strategy, force structure, roles and missions of the armed services, organization, personnel, weapons, and other choices indispensable for the near and long term, was rendered futile. Now, over a decade since the end of the Cold War, there is still no common understanding about the fundamental purposes of the American military establishment or on what principles the United States will use military power in pursuit of the national interest. In fact the first Bush administration, and Clinton's initially, studiously avoided any public discussion of what role the United States should play in the world, unless one believes that asserting the existence of a "new world order" or labeling the United States "the indispensable nation" constitutes discussion.[14]

The Clinton administration held itself hostage to the organization and force structure of the Cold War.[15] At the beginning of the administration, Secretary Aspin attempted to modify the basis of American strategy–the ability to fight two "Major Regional Contingencies" (changed later to Major Theater Wars) almost simultaneously. But Aspin caved in to the opposition amid charges that such a change would embolden America's adversaries and weaken security arrangements with allies in the Middle East and Asia.[16] The result was a defense budget known to be incapable of fully supporting the size and configuration of the military establishment even without the intervention contingencies which constantly threw military accounts into deficit.[17] Budgets became prisoners of readiness. Forces could not be reduced because of the many military commitments around the world, but if the readiness to wage high intensity combat fell or seemed to diminish, Republican critics would jump all over the President. Thus the uniformed leadership–each service chief, regional or

functional commander in chief, sometimes even a division, task force, or wing commander–gained the political weight to veto any significant change in nation's fundamental security structure.

As a result, the Clinton administration never could match resources with commitments, balance readiness with modernization, or consider organizational changes that would relieve the stresses on personnel and equipment.[18] All of this occurred when the services verged on the brink, or were actually undergoing, what many believed to be such major changes in weaponry and tactics as to constitute a "revolution in military affairs."[19] One result of the disjunction between the frequency of operations and the resources of people and money was the increased loss from the services of large numbers of their best officers and NCOs, at the very same time that economic prosperity and other factors produced shortfalls in the numbers of men and women willing to sign up for military service in the first place. The paralysis in military policy provoked the Congress in the 1990s to attempt by legislation at least four different times to force the Pentagon to re-evaluate national security policy, strategy, and force structure, with as yet no significant result.[20] Perhaps the last of these efforts, the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century (also called the Hart-Rudman Commission), which undertook a comprehensive review of national security and the military establishment, will have some effect. If so, it will be because the Bush Administration possessed the political courage to brave the civil-military friction required to reorganize an essentially Cold War military establishment into a force capable of meeting the security challenges of the 21st century.[21] But the evidence has indicated otherwise: Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's secrecy and lack of consultation with the uniformed military and Congress; the forces gathering to resist change; the priority of the Bush tax cut and national missile defense, which threatened to limit severely the money available and force excruciating choices; and Rumsfeld's fudging and distancing himself rhetorically from "transformation." Even the September 11 terrorist attacks have not broken the logjam, except perhaps monetarily. The administration has committed to slow, incremental change so as not to confront the inherent conservatism of the armed services or imperil the weapons purchases pushed so powerfully by the defense contractors and their congressional champions.[22] This despite the belief that the failure to exert civilian control over the 1990s left a military establishment declining in quality and effectiveness.

Second, the Clinton administration–despite far more frequent foreign interventions with military forces–was often immobilized over when, where, how, and under what circumstances to use military force in the world. The long, agonizing debates and vacillation over interventions in Haiti, Africa, and the former Yugoslavia reflected in part the weakness of the administration compared to the political power of the uniformed military.[23] The lack of trust between the two sides distorted decision-making to an extreme. Sometimes the military exercised a veto over the use of American force, or if not a veto, the ability to so shape the character of American intervention to the point where means determined ends–a roundabout way of exercising a veto. At other times, civilians ignored or even avoided advice from the military. By the time of the 1999 Kosovo air campaign, the consultative relationship had so broken down that the President was virtually divorced from his theater commander and that commander's communications with the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs corrupted by misunderstanding and distrust. The result was a campaign misconceived at the outset and badly coordinated not only between civilian and military, but between the various levels of command. The consequences could have undone the NATO alliance, but at a minimum stiffened Serbian will, exacerbated divisions within NATO councils and criticism at home in the United States, and prolonged the campaign beyond what most everyone involved predicted.[24]

Last, the incessant acrimony–the venomous atmosphere in Washington–shook the confidence of the armed forces in their own leadership. Different groups accused the generals and admirals at one extreme of caving in to political correctness, and at the other of being rigid and hidebound about gender integration, war-fighting strategy, and organizational change. The impact on morale contributed to the hemorrhage of able young and mid-rank officers from the profession of arms. The loss of so many fine officers, combined with declines in recruiting (which probably included a diminution in the quality of officer and enlisted recruits), may weaken our military leadership in the next generation and beyond, posing greater danger to national security than any defective policy or blundering decision. Certainly many complex factors have driven people out of uniform and impaired recruiting, but the loss of confidence in the senior uniformed leadership has been cited by many as a reason to leave the service.[25]

*****

Now to attribute all of these difficulties to the idiosyncrasies of the Clinton administration alone would be a mistake. The unwillingness to exert civilian control and the friction in civil-military relations has followed a larger trend that has roots

stretching all the way back to World War II. Unquestionably Mr. Clinton and his appointees bungled civil-military relations badly, from the beginning. But other administrations have also, and others will again in the future.

If one measures civilian control not by the superficial standard of who signs the papers and who passes the laws, but by the reality of the weight of influence between the uniformed military and civilian policy makers in the two great areas of concern in military affairs outlined here (national security policy and the use of force internationally), then civilian control has deteriorated significantly in the last generation. In theory civilians have the authority to issue virtually any orders and organize the military forces in any fashion they choose. But in practice, the relationship is far more complex. Both sides frequently disagree among themselves. The military has the ability to evade or circumscribe civilian authority by framing the alternatives or tailoring their advice, by leaking information or appealing to public opinion through various indirect means like lobbying groups or retired generals and admirals, by going to friends in the Congress or, on the basis of professional expertise, predicting all sorts of nasty consequences. They can even fail to implement decisions or carry out directives in such a way as to stymie the intent. The reality is that civilian control is not a fact but a process, measured across a spectrum–something that is *situational*, dependent on the people, issues, and political and military forces involved. We are not talking about a *coup* here, or anything demonstrably illegal; what we are talking about is who is calling the tune in military affairs in the United States today.[26]

Contrast the weakness of the civilians with the strength of the military, not only in the policy process, but in defining American purpose, consistency of voice, and the willingness to exert influence both in public and behind the scene in national security affairs.

The power of the military within the policy process has been growing steadily since a low point under Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in the 1960s. Under the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols law, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has influence within the Pentagon that rivals everyone's except that of the Secretary of Defense, but the Chairman possesses a more competent, focused, and effective staff, often a clearer set of goals, less political constraints, and under some circumstances greater credibility with the public. In the glow of the Gulf War success, the efforts to exorcise Vietnam, the high public esteem enjoyed by the armed forces, and the disgust Americans felt for politics in general and the partisanship in the Washington in particular, the Chairman has grown in status quite beyond his legal or institutional position. The Joint Staff is the most powerful agency in the Department of Defense; frequently, by dint of its speed, agility, knowledge, and expertise, the Joint Staff frames the choices.[27] The Joint Requirements Oversight Council has gathered influence and authority over the most basic issues of weapons and force structure.[28] Within the bureaucracy, JCS has a representative in the interagency decision process that permits the uniformed military a voice separate from that of the Department of Defense. The armed services, moreover, maintain their own congressional liaison and public affairs bureaucracies that are so large that they are impossible to monitor fully. (One officer admitted to me privately that his duty on Capitol Hill was to encourage Congress to restore a billion dollars that the Pentagon's civilian leadership had cut out of his service's budget request.)[29] The regional commanders-in-chief have come to assume such importance in their areas–particularly in the Pacific and in the Middle East and Central Asia–that they have effectively displaced American ambassadors and the State Department as the primary instruments of American foreign policy.[30]

In recent reorganizations, these CINCs have so increased in stature and influence within the defense establishment that their testimony can sway Congress and embarrass and impede the administration, especially when the civilians in the executive branch are weak and the Congress is dominated by an aggressive leadership of the opposition political party. In fact, so powerful have institutional forces become, and so intractable the problem of altering the military establishment, that the new Rumsfeld regime in the Pentagon decided to run the comprehensive review of national defense in strict secrecy, effectively cutting the CINCs, the Chiefs, and Congress out of the process so that opposition could not organize in advance of the effort at transformation.[31] One knowledgeable commentator put it this way in early 1999: "The dirty little secret of American civil-military relations, by no means unique to this [the Clinton] administration, is that the commander in chief does not command the military establishment; he cajoles it, negotiates with it, and, as necessary, appeases it."[32] A high Pentagon civilian privately substantiated the interpretation: what "weighs heavily . . . every day" is "the reluctance, indeed refusal, of the political appointees to disagree with the military on any matter, not just operational matters." Why? This observer cited "three reasons, only one of which is peculiar to this administration. Lack of military experience . . . widely noted but worse than most people realize. . . . Low priority of national security issues" in the White House. And of course the Clinton administration's "[p]olitical vulnerability on national security issues. . . . They were burned so badly on gays in

the military (and deservedly so) that they have instructed their appointees in the Pentagon to maintain political peace above all."[33]

Furthermore, senior military leaders have been able to use their leverage for a variety of purposes, either because of civilian indifference, or deference, or ignorance, or because they have felt it necessary to fill voids of policy and decision-making. But sometimes the influence is exercised intentionally and purposefully, even aggressively. After fifty years of World and Cold War struggle, the leak, the bureaucratic maneuver, the alliance with partisans in Congress–the *ménage* a trois between the administration, Congress, and the military–have become a way of life.[34] In the 1970s, responding to the widely held uniformed view that a reserve call up would have galvanized public support for Vietnam, allowed an intensified prosecution of the war, and prevented the divorce between the Army and the American people, the Army Chief of Staff deliberately redesigned army divisions to contain "roundout" units of reserve or National Guard troops, making it impossible for the President to commit the Army to battle without mobilizing the reserves.[35] In the 1980s, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral William Crowe worked "behind the scenes" to encourage Congress to strengthen his own office even though the Secretary of Defense opposed such a move. Crowe pushed for American escort of Kuwaiti tankers in the Persian Gulf because he believed it important for American foreign policy. He and the Chiefs strived to slow the Reagan administration's strategic missile defense program. Crowe even went so far as to create a personal communications channel with his Soviet military counterpart, apparently unknown to his civilian superiors, to avert any possibility of a misunderstanding leading to war. "It was in the nature of the Chairman's job," Crowe remembered, "that I occasionally found myself fighting against Defense Department positions as well as for them."[36]

In the 1990s, military leaks led directly to the weakening and ultimate dismissal of the Clinton administration's first Secretary of Defense.[37] In 1994 the Chief of Naval Operations openly discussed with senior commanders his plans to manipulate the Navy budget and operations tempo to force different priorities on the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and Congress. When a memo recounting the conversation surfaced in the press, no civilian in authority called the CNO to account.[38] The 1995 Commission on the Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces recommended consolidating the staffs of the service chiefs and the service secretaries, further weakening civilian power at the service secretary level, but no one mentioned the diminution of civilian control that would take place.[39] During the 1990s, even when the administration appeared to be forceful, insisting upon the use of American forces over military objections or resistance, the military leadership often arbitrated events. The 1995 Bosnia intervention was something of a paradigm. American priorities seemed to have been: 1) overwhelming numbers in order to suffer few if any casualties, 2) a deadline for exit, 3) robust rules of engagement, again to forestall casualties, 4) narrowing the definition of the mission to be incontrovertibly "do-able," and 5) *–fifth–*reconstructing Bosnia as a viable independent country.[40]

In recent years the senior uniformed leadership has spoken out on issues of policy–undoubtedly with the encouragement or at least the acquiescence of civilian officials, but sometimes not. Sometimes these pronouncements endeavor to sell policies and decisions to the public or within the government before a presidential decision, even though such public advocacy politicizes the Chairman, a Chief, or a CINC and inflates their influence in the public discussions of policy. A four-star general publishes a long article in our most respected foreign affairs journal, preceded by a *New York Times* op-ed article a scant ten days after retiring. In it, he criticizes the administration's most sensitive (and vulnerable) policy–with virtually no comment in the press or elsewhere as to whether his action was professionally appropriate.[41] The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff gives "an impassioned interview" to the *New York Times* "on the folly of intervention" in Bosnia while "the first Bush administration" ponders "the question of whether to intervene."[42] Another Chairman coins the so-called "Dover Principle," cautioning the civilian leadership about the human and political costs of casualties when American forces are sent to intervene in some crisis or conflict. This public lecture clearly aimed to establish boundaries in the public's mind and constrain civilian freedom of action in intervening overseas.

Certainly Generals Shalikashvili and Shelton have been more circumspect about speaking out on issues of policy, but their predecessor, Colin Powell, possessed and used extraordinary power throughout his tenure as chairman of the JCS. He conceived and then sold to a skeptical Secretary of Defense and a divided Congress the "Base Force" reorganization and reduction in 1990-1991. He shaped the Gulf War to limited objectives, the use of overwhelming force, and a speedy end to the combat and the immediate exit of American forces. He spoke frequently on matters of policy during and after the election of 1992 (an op-ed in the *New York Times* and more comprehensive statements of foreign policy in *Foreign Affairs*). Powell virtually vetoed intervention in Somalia and Bosnia, ignored or circumvented the other chiefs and the services on a regular basis, and managed the advisory process so as to present only single alternatives to civilian policy makers. All of this antedated his forcing President Clinton to back down on the open service of homosexuals in 1993.[43] In fact, General Powell became so powerful and so adept in the bureaucratic manipulations that often decide crucial questions before the final decision-maker affixes a signature, that in 2001 the Bush administration purposely installed an experienced,

powerful, highly-respected figure at the Defense Department lest Powell control the entire foreign and national security apparatus in the new administration.[44]

All of these are examples–and only public manifestations–of a policy and decision-making process that has tilted far more toward the military than ever before in American history in peacetime.

*****

Now an essential question arises: do these developments differ from previous practice or experience in American history? At first glance, the answer might seem to be "no." Military and civilian have often been at odds, and on occasion the military has acted beyond what might be thought proper in a republican system of government which defines civilian control, or military subordination to civil authority, as obligatory.

Historical examples abound. Commanding Generals and Chiefs of Staff of the Army from James Wilkinson in the 1790s through Maxwell Taylor in the 1950s have fought with presidents and Secretaries of War or Defense in the open and in private over all sorts of issues–up to and including key military policies in times of crisis. Officers openly disparaged President Lincoln during the Civil War and the President's problems with his generals were legendary.[45] Two Commanding Generals of the Army were so antagonistic toward the War Department that they moved their headquarters out of Washington: Winfield Scott to New York in the 1850s and William Tecumseh Sherman to St. Louis in the 1870s.[46] In the 1880s, reform-minded naval officers connived to modernize the Navy from wood and sail to steel and steam. They captured the civilian leadership in the process, forged an alliance with the steel industry, and for the first time in American history, in coordination with political and economic elites, sold naval reform and a peacetime buildup of standing forces to the public through publications, promotions, displays, reviews, and other precursors of the promotional public relations that would be used so frequently–and effectively–in the 20th century.[47] In the 1920s and 1930s, the youthful Army Air Corps became so adept at public relations, and at generating controversy over air power, that three different presidential administrations were forced into appointing high-level boards of outsiders to study how the Army could (or could not) properly incorporate aviation.[48]

Both Presidents Roosevelt complained bitterly about the resistance of the armed services to change. "You should go through the experience of trying to get any changes in the thinking . . . and action of the career diplomats and then you'd know what a real problem was," FDR complained in 1940. "But the Treasury and the State Department put together are nothing as compared with the Na-a-vy. . . . To change anything in the Na-a-vy is like punching a feather bed. You punch it with your right and you punch it with your left until you are finally exhausted, and then you find the damn bed just as it was before you started punching."[49]

The interservice battles of the 1940s and 1950s were so fierce that neither Congress or President could contain them. The internecine warfare blocked President Harry Truman's effort to unify the armed forces in the 1940s ("unification" resulted in loose confederation) and angered President Dwight D. Eisenhower through the 1950s. Neither administration fully controlled strategy, force structure, or weapons procurement; both had to fight service parochialism and interests, and ruled largely by imposing top-line budget limits and forcing the services to struggle over a limited pie. Eisenhower replaced or threatened to fire several of his Chiefs. Only through byzantine maneuvers, managerial wizardry, and draconian measures did Robert McNamara install a modicum of coherence and integration to the overall administration of the Defense Department in the 1960s. The price, however, was a ruthless, relentless bureaucratic war that not only contributed to the disaster of Vietnam, but a left a legacy of suspicion and deceit that still infects American civil-military relations to this day.[50] The point of this history is that civil-military relations *are* messy and frequently antagonistic; military people *do* on occasion defy civilians; civilian control *is* situational.[51]

But the past differs from the present in four crucial ways.

First, the military has *united* to oppose, evade, or thwart civilian choices, whereas in the past, the armed services were usually divided internally or amongst themselves. Indeed most civil-military conflict during the Cold War arose from rivalry between the services over roles, missions, budgets, or new weapons systems, rather than over the use of American armed forces or general military policies.

Second, the issues today reach far beyond the narrowly military, not only to the wider realm of national security, but often to foreign relations more broadly. In certain cases military affairs even affects the character and values of American society itself.

Third, military leaders have drifted over the last generation from the civil-military role primarily of advisors and advocates within the private confines of the executive branch, to a much more public function. They champion not just their services but policies and decisions in and beyond the military realm. Sometimes they mobilize public or congressional

opinion either directly or indirectly (whether in Congress or the Executive Branch) prior to civilian officials reaching a decision. To give but three examples: on whether to sign a treaty banning the use of land mines, or whether to put American forces into the Balkans to stop ethnic cleansing, or whether to join the International Court of Criminal Justice. While these actions are not unprecedented, they have occurred with increased frequency, and represent a significant encroachment on civilian control of the military.[52]

Fourth, senior officers now lead a permanent peacetime military establishment that differs fundamentally from any of its predecessors. Unlike the large citizen forces raised in wartime and during the Cold War, today's armed services are professional and increasingly disconnected, even in some ways estranged, from civilian society. Unlike previous peacetime professional forces which were also isolated from civilian culture, today's are far larger, far more involved worldwide, far more capable, and often indispensable (even on a daily basis) to American foreign policy and world politics. Five decades of world and cold war, moreover, have created something entirely new in American history: a separate military community, led by the regular forces but including also the National Guard and reserves, veterans organizations, and the communities, labor forces, industries, and pressure groups active in military affairs. More diverse than the "Military-Industrial Complex" of President Eisenhower's farewell address forty years ago, this "military" has become a recognizable interest group. And it is larger, more political, more politically active, more partisan, more purposeful, and more influential than anything similar in American history.[53]

* * * * *

Now one might argue that this is all temporary, the unique overhang of fifty years of world and cold wars, and that it will dissipate and balance will return now that the Clinton Administration is history. Perhaps. But civil-military conflict is not very likely to diminish. In "Rumsfeld's Rules," Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld states that his primary function is "to exercise civilian control over the Department for the Commander-in-Chief and the country." He understands that he possesses "the right to get into anything and exercise it [civilian control]." He recognizes that "when cutting staff at the Pentagon, don't eliminate the thin layer that assures civilian control."[54] His effort to recast the military establishment for the post-Cold War era–promised during the 2000 presidential campaign–provoked such immediate and powerful resistance (and not just by the armed forces) that he has abandoned any plans to force reorganization or cut so-called "legacy" weapons systems.[55] In the Afghanistan campaign, Rumsfeld and other civilian leaders have been reported to be frustrated by a supposed lack of imagination on the part of the military, and at least one four-star in return accused Rumsfeld of "micromanagement."[56] There is also other evidence of conflict to come: traditional conceptions of military professionalism–particularly the ethical and professional norms of the officer corps–have been evolving away from concepts and behaviors that facilitate civil-military cooperation.

If the manifestations of diminished civilian control were simply a sine curve, that is, a low period in an alternating pattern, or the product of a strong Joint Chiefs and a weak president during the coincidence of a critical transitional period in American history and national defense (the end of the Cold War), there would be little cause for concern. Civilian control is situational and to a degree cyclical. But the decline extends back before the Clinton administration. And there are indications that the long trend that began during the Vietnam war has coincided with a weakening of the structures in our social, political, and institutional life that have assured civilian control over the course of American history.

For over three centuries, civilian control has rested on four foundations which individually and in combination not only prevented any direct military threat to civilian government, but kept military influence, even in wartime, largely contained within the boundaries of professional expertise and focus. First has been the rule of law and with it, reverence for a constitution that provided explicitly for civilian control of the military. Any violation of the Constitution or its process was sure to bring retribution from one or all three of the branches of government, with public support. Second, Americans kept their regular forces small. The United States relied in peacetime on ocean boundaries to provide sufficient warning of attack and depended on a policy of mobilization to repel invasion or wage war. Thus the regular military could never endanger civilian government–in peacetime because of size and in wartime because the ranks were filled with citizens unlikely to cooperate or acquiesce in anything illegal or unconstitutional. The very reliance on citizen-soldiers–militia, volunteers, and conscripts temporarily in service to meet the emergency–was a third safeguard of civilian control. And finally, the armed forces themselves internalized military subordination to civil authority: accepted it willingly as an axiom of American government and the foundation of military professionalism. "When we enter the army we do so with full knowledge that our first duty is toward the government, entirely regardless of our own views under any given circumstances," Major

General John J. Pershing instructed First Lieutenant George S. Patton, Jr. in 1916. "We are at liberty to express our personal views only when called upon to do so or else confidentially to our friends, but always confidentially and with the complete understanding that they are in no sense to govern our actions."[57] Or, as Omar Bradley, the first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, put it: "thirty two years in the peacetime army had taught me to do my job, hold my tongue, and keep my name out of the papers."[58]

Much about these four factors has changed. More than sixty years of hot and cold war, a large military establishment, world responsibilities, a searing failure in Vietnam, changes in American society–among other factors–have weakened the foundations upon which civilian control have rested in the United States.

First, and most troubling, is the skepticism, even cynicism, expressed about government, lawyers, and justice, part of a general and generation-long diminution of respect for people and institutions that has eroded American civic culture and American faith in law. Polling data show that Americans have more confidence in their least democratic institutions: the military, small business, the police, and the Supreme Court. Americans express the least confidence in the most democratic: Congress.[59] So dangerous is this trend that Harvard's Kennedy School of Government established a "Visions of Governance for the Twenty-first Century" project to explore the phenomenon, study its implications, and attempt to counteract some of the more deleterious effects.[60] American leaders cannot continue to vilify government, the U.S. government in particular, and expect patriotism to prosper or even survive as a fundamental civic value.

Second, the media, traditionally the herald of liberty in this society, has become less substantial, more superficial, less knowledgeable, more focused on profit, less professional, and more trivial. About the only liberty the media seems to champion vocally is the freedom of the press. Issues of civilian control seem to escape the press; time after time, events or issues that in past years would have been framed or interpreted as issues of civilian control, go unnoticed and unreported as such.[61]

Third, the nation's core civic culture has deteriorated. Basic social institutions such as marriage and the family, and indicators of society's health such as crime rates and out-of-wedlock births, while stabilizing or improving in the 1990s, have weakened over time. Our communities, neighborhoods, civic organizations, fraternal groups, and social gatherings have diminished in favor of individual entertainment, staying at home with the video and the Internet, and avoiding crime, crowds, traffic, or dealing with the crumbling physical and social infrastructure of our society. American society has become more splintered and people more isolated into small groups "clustered" geographically and demographically, with similar values, culture, and lifestyles. With this deterioration of civic cohesion–gated communities being perhaps emblematic–has been a weakening of shared values: less truthfulness, less generosity, less sacrifice, less social consciousness, less faith, less common agreement on ethical behavior, and more advocacy, acrimony, individualism, relativism, materialism, cynicism, and self-gratification. The September 11 attacks and the war on terrorism are unlikely to reverse these trends as long as the national leadership exhorts the American people to go back to "normal."[62]

Civilian control is one common understanding that seems to have faded in American civic consciousness. The American people–whose study and understanding of civics and government generally has declined–have lost their traditional skepticism about the professional military that made civilian control a core political assumption that was widely understood and periodically voiced. Simply put, the public no longer thinks about civilian control–doesn't understand it, doesn't discuss it, and doesn't grasp how it can and should operate.[63] An occasional popular movie like *The Siege* and *Thirteen Days* raises the issue, but most recent films caricature the military and frequently, like *GI Jane* and *Rules of Engagement*, lionize an honest, brave, faithful military and demonize lying, avaricious politicians.[64]

Fourth, in the last generation the United States has abandoned the *first* principle of civilian control, the bedrock practiced throughout American history extending back into pre-modern England: the reliance on the citizen soldier for national defense.65 National security policy no longer seriously includes mobilizing industry and the population for large-scale war. Americans in uniform, whether they serve for one hitch or an entire career, are taught to view themselves (and do) as professionals. To be the apotheosis of citizen soldiers, some members hold civilian government jobs in their reserve units or elsewhere in the government in national security, and others serve on active duty considerably more than the one weekend a month and two weeks a year of traditional reserves.[66] Furthermore, while Guards and reserves pride themselves on their "professionalism" and both voice and believe the traditional rhetoric about citizen soldiering, the views of their up-and-coming officers mirror almost exactly those of their regular counterparts.[67] Reserve forces are spending more and more time on active duty, not simply for temporary duty for the crisis over homeland defense. Increasingly, the National Guard and reserves are being used interchangeably with the regulars, even in overseas deployments on constabulary missions,

something wholly unprecedented.[68] Even if they call themselves citizen soldiers, the fundamental distinction between citizens and soldiers has so blurred that in 1998, at two of the most respected of our professional military educational institutions, Marine majors who spent their adult lives in uniform and National Guard adjutant generals who have done the same, could both insist that they were "citizen soldiers."[69] Americans have lost the high regard they once possessed for temporary military service as an obligation of citizenship, along with an understanding of its underlying function for civic cohesion and civilian control of the military.[70] Today, fewer Americans serve or know service, and the numbers will decline as a smaller percentage of the population serve in the uniform.[71] Their sense of ownership or interest in the military, and their understanding of the distinctiveness of military culture–its ethos and needs–has declined. In recent years the number of veterans serving in the U.S. Congress has fallen fifty percent, and those veterans are fewer now as a percentage than in the population as a whole, reversing (in 1995) a trend of the entire 20th century.[72] And the recent change is dramatic; less than ten years ago, 62 percent of the Senate and 41 percent of the House were veterans. Today in the 107th Congress, the Senate is 38 percent and the House 29.[73]

Finally, at the same time that civilian control has weakened in public awareness, so too has the principle declined in the consciousness and professional understanding of the American armed forces. Historically, one of the chief bulwarks of civilian control has been the American military establishment itself. Its small size in peacetime, the professionalism of the officers, their political neutrality, their willing subordination, and their acceptance of a set of unwritten but largely understood rules of behavior in the civil-military relationship, has made civilian control succeed–messy as it has been, and situational as it may always be. In the last half century, however, while everyone in armed forces continues to support the concept, the ethos and *mentalité* of the officer corps has changed in ways that damage civil-military cooperation and undermine civilian control.

Reversing a century and a half of practice, the American officer corps has become partisan in political affiliation, and overwhelmingly Republican. Beginning with President Richard Nixon's politics of polarization–the southern strategy and reaching out to the "hard-hats"–Republicans embraced old-fashioned patriotism and strong national defense as a central part of their national agenda. During the late 1970s, when the armed services suffered lean budgets and the "hollow force," and in the 1980s when Ronald Reagan made rebuilding the military establishment and taking the offensive in the Cold War centerpieces for his presidency, Republicans reached out to the military as a core constituency. They succeeded in part because in the wake of Vietnam, the Democratic Party virtually abandoned the military, espousing anti-military rhetoric and reduced defense spending. During the same period, voting started to become a habit in the officer corps. In the 1950s, the Federal Voting Assistance Program came into existence in order to help enlisted men, most of whom were draftees or draft-induced volunteers, to vote. In every unit an officer was designated to connect the program to the men, and undoubtedly the duty began slowly to break down the old taboo against officers exercising their franchise. How credibly could officers assist their soldiers if they themselves abstained from voting?[74]

Today the vast majority of the officer corps votes and identifies with a political philosophy and party: comparing the TISS sample of active duty officers with earlier data, from over 54% independent, no preference, or other in the 1976 to 28% in 1998-1999, and from 33% to 64% Republican.[75] In the presidential election of 2000, Republicans targeted military voters by organizing endorsements from senior retired flag officers, advertising in military publications, using Gulf War heroes Colin Powell and H. Norman Schwartzkopf on the campaign trail, urging soldiers to register and to vote, and focusing special effort on absentee military voters, which proved critical–and perhaps the margin of victory–in Florida where thousands of the officers were legal residents.[76]

Every generation of American professional officers since before the Civil War abstained as a group from partisan politics, studiously avoiding any partisanship of word or deed, activity or affiliation, to the point where by George C. Marshall's generation the practice was not even to vote.[77] Historically a handful of the most senior pursued their own personal political ambitions, usually trying to parlay wartime success into the presidency. In a very few instances, some even ran for office while on active duty. But these were exceptions. The belief was that the military, as the neutral servant of the state, stood above the dirty business of politics. Professional norms dictated faith and loyalty not just in deed but in spirit to whomever held the reins of power under the constitutional system. To Marshall's generation, partisan affiliation and voting conflicted with military professionalism.[78]

Marshall and his generation must have sensed that the habit of voting leads to partisan thinking, inclining officers to become invested in policy choices or decisions that relate directly to their professional responsibilities.[79] Officers at every level have to bring difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions to their troops and motivate them to accomplish the task. Likewise senior officers must advocate the needs and perspectives of the troops to political leaders even when that advice is unsolicited and unwanted. How effective can that advice be if the civilians know the officers are opposed to the policy?

What are the effects on morale when the troops know their officers dislike, disrespect, or disagree with the politicians, or think the mission is unwise, ill-conceived, or unnecessary?

The consequences of partisanship can also be more subtle and indirect, but equally far-reaching, even to the point of producing contempt for civilian policy and politicians, or unprofessional, disruptive behavior, as in 1993. There is a belief current today among officers that the core of the Democratic party is "hostile to military culture" and engaged in a "culture war" against the armed forces, mostly because of pressure for further gender integration and open homosexual service.[80] During the 2000 election campaign, when Al Gore stumbled briefly supporting a "litmus test" on gays in the military for selecting members of the Joint Chiefs, he confirmed for many in uniform that Democrats do not understand the military profession or care about its effectiveness. His campaign's effort to minimize absentee votes in Florida and elsewhere through technical challenges outraged the armed forces, raising worries that a Gore victory might spark an exodus from the ranks, or that attitudes toward him were so soured that a Gore administration would have even more troubled relations with the military than Clinton's.[81]

Partisan politicization loosens the connection of the military to the American people. If the public begins to perceive the military as an interest group driven by its own needs and ethos, support–and trust–will diminish. Already there are hints. When a random survey asked a thousand Americans in the fall of 1998 how often military leaders would try to avoid carrying out orders they opposed, over two-thirds answered at least "some of the time."[82]

Partisanship also poisons the relationship between the president and the military leadership. When a group of retired flag officers, including former CINCs and Chiefs, endorsed presidential candidates in 1992 and again in 2000, they broadcast their politicization to the public and further legitimated partisanship in the ranks, for everyone knows four-stars never really retire. Like princes of the church, they represent the culture and the profession just as authoritatively as their counterparts on active duty. If senior retired officers make a practice of endorsing presidential contenders, will the politicians trust the loyalty and discretion of the generals and admirals on active duty, in particular those who serve at the top, not to retire and use their inside knowledge to try to overturn policy or elect opponents? Will not presidents begin to vet candidates for the top jobs for pliability, or equally deleterious, party or political views, rather than for excellence, achievement, character, and candor? Over time, the result will be weak military advice, declining military effectiveness, and accelerating politicization. The investment of officers in one policy or another will lead civilians to question whether military recommendations are the best professional advice of the nation's professional military experts. Perhaps one reason Bill Clinton and his people dealt with the military at such arm's length is that he and they knew that officers were the most solidly Republican group inside the government.[83] One need only read Richard Holbrooke's memoir about negotiating the Dayton accords to plumb the depth of suspicion between military and civilian at the highest levels. In 1995, convinced that the military opposed the limited bombing campaign against the Bosnian Serbs, Holbrooke and Secretary of State Warren Christopher believed that the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was lying to them when he asserted that the Air Force was running out of targets.[84]

Certainly officers have the right to vote and to participate privately in our nation's political life. No one questions the prerogative of retired officers to run for office or endorse candidates. But they must recognize its corrosive effect on military professionalism and the threat to the military establishments relationship with Congress, the President, and the American people. Having a right and exercising it are two very different things.

A second example of changing military professionalism has been the widespread attitude among officers that civilian society has become corrupt and perhaps degenerate, while the military has remained a repository for virtue and perhaps is the one remaining bastion of the traditional values that make the country strong in an increasing unraveling social fabric. Historically officers have often decried the selfishness, commercialism, and disorder that seems to characterize much of American society.[85] But opinion today has a harder, more critical, more moralistic edge, less leavened by that sense of acceptance that enabled officers in the past to tolerate the clash between their values and those of a democratic, individualistic civilian culture–and reconcile the conflict with their own continued service. Nearly 90 per cent of the elite military officers (regular and reserves) surveyed in 1998-1999 by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies agreed that "the decline of traditional values is contributing to the breakdown of our society." Some 70 per cent thought "through leading by example, the military could help American society become more moral" and 75 per cent that "civilian society would be better off if it adopted more of the military's values and customs."[86] Is it healthy for civilian control when the American armed forces believe that they are morally, organizationally, institutionally, and personally superior to the rest of society–and contemptuous of that society? Do we wish civic society in a democratic country to adopt military norms, values, outlooks,

and behaviors? In my judgment that is an utter misreading of the role and function of our armed forces. Their purpose is to defend society, not to define it. The latter is militarism, in the classic definition: the same thinking that in part inclined the French and German armies to intervene in the politics of their nations in the 20th century.

Third, and the most disturbing change in military sentiment, is the belief that officers should confront and resist civilians when their policies or decisions threaten to weaken national defense or lead the country into disaster. Many think that officers should speak out publicly, or work behind the scenes, to stop or modify a policy, or even resign in protest. Some senior leaders have been willing to speak publicly on issues of national security policy and foreign and military policy before policy is formulated, and afterwards as spokespersons for what are often highly controversial and partisan initiatives or programs. In 1998 and 1999, the respected retired Army colonel and political scientist Sam Sarkesian, and the much-decorated Marine veteran, novelist, and former Secretary of the Navy James Webb, called publicly for military leaders to participate in national security policy debates, not merely as advisers to the civilian leadership, but as public advocates, an idea that seems to resonate with many in the armed forces today.[87] "Military subservience to political control applies to existing policy, not to policy debates," admonished Webb, as if officers can subscribe to policy and debate it honestly at the same time.[88] Such behavior politicizes military issues and professional officers directly, for rare is the military issue that remains insulated from politics and broader national life.

This willingness, indeed in some cases eagerness, to engage in forming public opinion and striving publicly to affect decision-making and policy outcomes is a dangerous role for our military, and extraordinarily corrosive of civilian control. Is it proper for military officers to leak information to the press "to discredit specific policies–procurement decisions, prioritization plans, operations that the leaker opposes," as Admiral Crowe in his memoirs admits happens "sometimes" and "copiously?"[89] Is it proper every year for the four services, the CINCs, or the Joint Chiefs to advocate to the public directly their need for ships, airplanes, divisions, number of troops, and other resources? Or what percentage of the nation's economy should go to defense as opposed to other needs?[90] This advocacy reached such a cacophony in the fall of 2000 that the Secretary of Defense warned the military leadership not "to beat the drum with a tin cup" for their budgets during a presidential campaign and a transition to a new administration.[91] Do we wish the military leadership to argue their views on the merits or demerits of intervention in the Balkans or elsewhere in order to mobilize public opinion one way or the other, before the President decides? Or debate whether or not the United States should sign a land mine treaty or international court of criminal justice treaty? Imagine 1941: should the Army and the Navy have pronounced publicly on the merits or demerits of Lend Lease, or convoy escort, or occupying Iceland, or the Europe first strategy? Or 1861: on whether the Lincoln administration should reinforce Fort Sumter, or fight to restore the Union after the conflict began? Should senior military officers question the President's strategy in the midst of a military operation, as happened publicly in leaks within the first week of the bombing campaign over Kosovo in 1999?[92] In such instances, what happens to the President's, and Congress's, authority and credibility with the public, or ability to lead the nation? And how would such advocacy affect the trust and confidence between the President, his cabinet officers, and the most senior generals and admirals, which is so necessary for effective policies and decisions?[93]

The way in which military officers have interpreted a study of the Joint Chiefs of Staff role in the decision on intervention and in the formulation of strategy in Southeast Asia in the 1963-1965 period exemplifies the erosion of professional norms and values. H. R. McMaster's book *Dereliction of Duty: Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Lies that Led to Vietnam* is by all accounts the most widely read and discussed history book in the military in the last several years.[94] Officers believe that McMaster validates longstanding military convictions about Vietnam: that the Joint Chiefs, lacking a proper understanding of their role and the requisite courage to oppose the strategy of gradualism that they knew would fail, should have voiced their opposition–publicly if necessary–and resigned rather than carrying out the strategy. Had they done so, goes this credo, they would have saved the country a tragic, costly, humiliating–and above all, unnecessary–defeat.[95]

McMaster's book neither says nor implies that the Chiefs should have obstructed U.S. Vietnam policy in any other way than by insisting on presenting their views frankly and forcefully to their civilian superiors, and speaking honestly to the Congress when asked for their views: no leaks, no public statements, and no resignations unless they personally and professionally could not stand, morally and ethically, to carry out the policy. There is in fact no tradition of resignation in the American military. In 1783 at Newburgh, New York, as the War for Independence was ending, the American officer corps rejected individual or mass resignation–which can be indistinguishable from mutiny. George Washington dissuaded them not to march on Congress or to refuse orders over Congress's unwillingness to pay them or guarantee their hard-earned

pensions. The precedent has survived for over two centuries. No American army ever again considered open insubordination. Proper professional behavior cannot include walking away from a policy, an operation, or a war an officer believes is wrong or will fail. That is what the left advocated during the Vietnam War and the American military rightly rejected it. Imagine the consequences if the Union Army had decided in late 1862 that it had signed on to save the Union but not free the slaves, and had resigned *en masse* because it disagreed with the Emancipation Proclamation, as many did? Air Force Chief of Staff Ronald Fogleman did not resign in protest in 1997, as many officers wish to believe; he requested early retirement and left in such a manner–quietly, without a full explanation–so as *not* to confront his civilian superior over a decision with which he deeply disagreed.[96] All McMaster says (and believes), and all that is proper in the American system, is for the military to advise, honestly and forthrightly, or to advocate in their confidential advisory capacity, a course of action. If their advice goes unheeded, and the policy or decision is legal, carry it out.

Resignation in protest directly assails civilian control. Resigning with a public explanation, however softly couched, would constitute an effort to marshal all of an officer's military knowledge, expertise, and experience–and the profession's standing with the public and reputation for disinterested patriotism–to undercut something that the officer opposed. The fact that officers today either ignore, or are oblivious to this basic aspect for their professional ethics, and would countenance, even admire, such truculent behavior, illustrates both a fundamental misunderstanding of civilian control and its weakening as a primary professional value.[97]

Our military leadership has already traveled far in the direction of self-interested bureaucratic behavior in the last half century, to become advocates for policy outcomes, as opposed to advisors–to advocate not only the military perspective on a problem, or the needs of the military establishment and national defense, or the interests of their service or branch, but their own views of foreign and military policy, even to the point of pressing for a specific policy outcomes outside the normal advisory channels. Some of this is unthinking, some the product of civilian abrogation of responsibility. Some originates in the unintended consequences of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 which so strengthened the Chairman and the CINCs. But some is quite conscious. In his memoirs, Colin Powell, the most publicly celebrated soldier of the era, wrote that he learned as a White House Fellow from his most important mentor that in the government "you never know what you can get away with until you try."[98] Is that a proper standard of professional behavior for a uniformed officer? He also declared that his generation of officers "vowed that when our turn came to call the shots, we would not quietly acquiesce in halfhearted warfare for half-baked reasons that the American people could not understand or support."[99] Is that a proper view of military subordination to civilian authority?

Unfortunately, General Powell's views mirror attitudes that have developed over the last generation. The survey of officer and civilian attitudes and opinions undertaken by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies in 1998-1999 discovered that many officers now believe that they have the duty to force their own views on the civilians when the United States is contemplating committing American forces abroad. When "asked whether . . . military leaders should be neutral, advise, advocate, or insist on having their way in . . . the decision process" to use military force, fifty percent or more of the up-and-coming active duty officers answered "insist" on the following issues: "setting rules of engagement, ensuring that clear political and military goals exist . . . , developing an 'exit strategy,'" and "deciding what kinds of military units . . . will be used to accomplish all tasks."[100] In the context of the questionnaire, "insist" definitely implied that officers should try to compel the civilians to accept the military's recommendations.

In 2000, a three-star general casually referred to a uniformed culture in the Pentagon that labels the Office of the Secretary of Defense as "the enemy" because it exercises civilian control.[101] In 1999 staff officers on the National Security Council attempted to promulgate a new version of the National Security Strategy in haste to prevent the President from enunciating his own principles.[102] In 1997 the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs purposely coaxed the other chiefs to block Congress's effort to reform the military establishment through the Quadrennial Defense Review.[103] In the early 1990s senior officers presented alternatives for the use of American forces abroad designed purposefully to discourage the civilian leadership from intervening in the first place.[104] Twice in the last five years members of the Joint Chiefs threatened to resign as a means of blocking a policy or decision.[105]

Thus, in the last generation, the American military has slipped from conceiving of its primary role as advice to civilians, and then executing their orders, to believing that it is also proper–even essential in some situations–to try to impose the military's viewpoint on policies or decisions. In other words, American officers have, over the course of the Cold War and in reaction to certain aspects of it, forgotten or abandoned their historic stewardship for civilian control, their awareness of the requirements to maintain it, and an understanding of the proper boundaries and behaviors that made it work properly

and effectively. That so many voices applaud this behavior, or sanction it by their silence, suggests that a new definition of military professionalism may be forming, at least in civil-military relations. If so, the consequences are not likely to benefit national security, and could even alter the character of American government itself.

*****

Now I am sure that to many of you these concerns seem overblown. Certainly there is no crisis. The American military conceives of itself as loyal and patriotic, universally expressing support for civilian control as a fundamental principle of government and of military professionalism. Yet at the same time, the evidence is overwhelming that civil-military relationships have deteriorated in our government. The underlying structures in civilian society and in the military profession that have traditionally supported the system of civilian control have also weakened. Over the course of the last generation, much influence and actual power has migrated to the military, who have either been allowed to define, or have themselves claimed, an expanded role in policy and decision making.[106] The reasons are complex: partly circumstance, partly civilian inattention or politically-motivated timidity, and partly because military leaders have either forgotten, or chosen to ignore, the basic behaviors that make civil-military relations function in such a way as to support military effectiveness and civilian control at the same time. But whatever the causes, the consequences are dangerous. The shift to greater military influence, combined with the ignorance or indifference of the American people to civilian control, and the misreading of the limits on behavior on the part of senior military officers, could at some future time produce a civil-military clash that damages American government or compromises the nation's defense.

That civilians in the executive and legislative branches of government over the last generation bear ultimate responsibility for these developments is beyond doubt. Some on both sides seem to sense it. Secretaries of defense came into office in 1989, 1993, and 2001 concerned about military subordination and determined to exert their authority. Civilian officials have the obligation to make the system work, not to abdicate for any reason. But to rely on the politicians to restore the proper balance is to ignore the conditions and processes that can frustrate civilian control. The historical record is not encouraging. Over two centuries, the officials elected and appointed to rule the military have varied enormously in knowledge, experience, understanding, and motive. Their propensity to exercise civilian control, and to provide sound, forceful leadership, has been largely situational–and unpredictable.[107]

Nor can the changes in American society and political understanding that have weakened civilian control be easily reversed. National defense will capture at best superficial public attention even during a war on terrorism, unless military operations are ongoing or the government asks for special sacrifice. And in wartime, Americans want to rely more on military advice and authority, not less. Fewer and fewer Americans will experience uniformed service, and without a conscious effort by our media to avoid caricaturing military culture, and by our colleges and universities to expand military history and security studies, a rising generation of civilian leaders will lack not only the experience, but also the comprehension of military affairs needed to make civilian control work effectively.

A better way to alter the equation is for officers to recall the attitudes, and rejuvenate the behaviors, that civilian control requires. Certainly every officer supports the concept. Every officer swears at commissioning "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States," and "bear true faith and allegiance" to the same.[108] Because civilian control pervades the Constitution, the oath is a personal promise to preserve, protect, defend, and support civilian control, in actual practice as well as in theory. The requirement for such an oath was written into the Constitution for precisely that purpose.[109] The oath is not to maximize one service's budget, or try to achieve a certain policy outcome, or to try to reshape civilian life toward a military vision of the good society.

Examine your own personal views of civilians, particularly of your clients: the American people, their elected officials, and those appointed to exercise responsibility in national security affairs. I must admit that for the ten-plus years I worked in the Department of Defense, I measured every senior officer and official I worked with and for, and occasionally I experienced feelings of dislike, distrust, and even contempt. Now a certain amount of caution, skepticism, and perhaps distrust is healthy. But contempt? I was wrong. Contempt for clients destroys the professional relationship. Lawyers cannot provide sound legal representation, doctors effective treatment, writers useful prose, ministers worthwhile support, teachers successful learning when they do not understand and respect their clients. Military officers and civil servants who feel contempt for their bosses are not likely to advise them wisely or carry out their policies effectively.

Investigate your own professional view of civilian control. On what do you base your thinking? Much of the problem may stem from the Cold War and from one particular campaign of it: Vietnam, which continues to cast a long, sometimes

unseen shadow. Are you positive that your thinking about civil-military relations does not rest on the mistaken beliefs–and they are mistaken–that the war was lost because of too much civilian control? Or that we succeeded so magnificently in the Gulf War because the civilians got out of the way and let the military run the war? Both of those interpretations do not fit the facts of what happened in either war.[110]

Ponder whether you are prepared to accept, as a principle of civilian control, that it includes the right of civilians to be wrong.[111] And to make mistakes–indeed to insist on making mistakes. These are very hard things to accept, given that peoples' lives hang in the balance, or the security of the nation. But remember that the military can be wrong–dead wrong–about military affairs, for after all, you are not politicians, and as Carl von Clausewitz wrote long ago, war is an extension of politics.[112] Were you prepared to work for and with, and to accept, a Gore administration had he won the 2000 election? And if there is doubt on your part, ponder the implications for civil-military relations and civilian control. It is likely that within the next dozen years, there will be another Democratic administration. If the trend toward increasing friction and hostility in civil-military relations during the last three–the Johnson, Carter, and Clinton administrations–continues into the future, the national security of the United States will not be served.

Last of all, consider that for civilian control to function effectively, the uniformed military will not only have to forswear or abstain from certain behavior, but to actively encourage the civilians to exercise their authority and perform their legal and constitutional duty to make policy and decide. You cannot–and will not–solve these problems yourselves, nor is it your responsibility alone. Civilian behavior and historical circumstances are just as much the causes of the present problems in civil-military relations as any diminishing of military professionalism. But you can help educate and develop civilian leaders on their role and on the processes of policy-making, just as your predecessors did, by working with them, and helping them–without taking advantage of them even when the opportunity arises. Proper professional behavior calls for a certain amount of abstinence. We hear much about the need for abstinence in so many areas of our national life. We ask children to "just say no" to drugs and pre-marital sex; we ask our media to exercise restraint in their programming; we ask our politicians to abstain from the most despicable acts of self-interest. In this, you are being asked to do no more or less than other professionals who are asked to restrain their own self-interest in dealing with their clients and customers: lawyers to act against their self interest and advise clients not to go to trial when not called for; doctors not to prescribe drugs or surgery that is not needed; teachers to help their students learn; clergy to encourage their parishioners or congregants not to commit sin.[113] It will be up to you, as it is to every professional, to shape the relationship with your client, just as these others do. And at its heart, that relationship involves civilian control in fact as well as in form.

* * * * *

Let me close with some distinctions that bear remembrance. In the long history of human civilization, there have been military establishments that have focused on external defense–on protecting their societies–and those have preyed upon their own populations.[114] The American military has never preyed on this society. Yet democracy, as a widespread form of governance, is rather a recent phenomenon, and our country has been fortunate to be the chief messenger of that democratization. For us, civilian control has been more a problem of making certain the civilians control military affairs than it has been keeping the military out of civilian politics. But if the United States is to teach civilian control–professional military behavior–to the rest of the world, our officers must look hard at our own system and our own behavior at the same time.[115] "No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise," Winston Churchill observed in 1947. "Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government except all those other forms that have been tried. . . ."[116] Churchill certainly knew the tensions involved in civil-military relations as well as any democratic head of government in modern history. My purpose this evening has been to remind us to be conscious of these problems, on each side–civilian and military–and to work to ameliorate them.

Notes

1.Defenders of the Chief's behavior in the first months of the Clinton Administration's intention to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military argued that the Commander in Chief should not be challenged by the military but by Congress. However, military leaders very early encouraged the initiative to be taken out of the hands of the Congress against Clinton's intentions. "The word went out to the senior ranks," a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff acknowledged later, "we've got to be as courteous as you can be and create enough pressure on Congress to block this." Thomas E. Ricks, "Military Chief Says Gays Would Harm Force," *Washington Post*, Oct. 24, 1999. See also Thomas C. Metas, "Discipline, Morale Require Ban On Homosexuals," *Fayetteville* (NC) *Observer-Times*, Jan. 28, 1993, p. 15A, especially the closing two paragraphs in which Metas calls on the public to "Let the president and Congress know how you feel" and then to "put on your civilian hat, the one you wear when you vote. Write your friends and relatives and let them know how you feel, and ask them to write to Washington. Then sit down and write to the president and Congress–let them know how you personally feel. For the officers and NCOs, tell them how your responsibility to command will be eroded. For those days living in barracks, since

the Clinton administration just doesn't get it," called to tell them explaining what the effect would be on your ability to conduct action, the retention of Republicans from the homosexuality by many carry the day." See also Eric Schmitt, "The Top Soldier's Tom Between 2 Loyalties," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1993, p. 1; "Aspin Seeks a Deal on Gays That the Brass Will Bless," *Congressional Quarterly*, June 26, 1993, p. 1670; Eric Schmitt and Thomas L. Friedman, "Clinton and Powell Forge Bond for Mutual Survival," *New York Times*, June 4, 1993, p. 1; Richard Lacayo, "The Rebellious Soldier," *Time*, Feb. 15, 1993, p. 32; and E. Haley, *Don't: A Reader's Guide to the Military's Anti-Gay Policy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 20–25. The extent of the President's defiance is evaluated in George Stephanopoulos, *All Too Human: A Political Education* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1999), 155–163; Elizabeth Drew, *On the Edge: The Clinton Presidency*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 242–48, 248–251.

2. Quoted in John Lancaster, "Air Force General Demands Tight Formation for Commander in Chief"; "Accused of Ridicule, Clinton General Faces Air Force Probe," *Washington Post*, Apr. 22, June 8, 1993, p. 21, p. 1. See also "The President and the General," June 11, 1993; ibid., p. 20; "Transcript of President Clinton's News Conference," ibid., June 16, 1993, p. 14; "A Military Breach?" *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, June 11, 1993, p. 10; David H. Hackworth, "Rancor in the Ranks: The Troops vs. the President," *Newsweek*, June 28, 1993, p. 24; Associated Press, "General's Impression of Clinton mistaken," *Washington Times*, July 8, 1993, p. 5.

3. The events and incidents described below were recovered extensively in the daily press, journals of opinion, and other academic and national media, 1993–2001.

4. The widening gender and sexual orientation issue was evaded by Stephanie Gutmann, *The Kinder, Gentler Military: Can America's Gender-Neutral Fighting Force Still Win Wars?* (New York: Scribner, 2000).

5. The arguments over readiness became so ugly by 1998 that the Joint Chiefs and U.S. Senators engaged in public accusations of dishonest testimony and lack of support. See Eric Schmitt, "Joint Chiefs Accuse Congress of Weakening U.S. Defense," *New York Times*, Sept. 30, 1998, p. 1. The military opposition to Clinton's interventions was almost immediate; see Richard A. Serrano and Art Pine, "Many in Military Angry Over Clinton's Policies," *Los Angeles Times* (Washington ed.), Oct. 19, 1993, p. 1. The arguments over readiness continued. See Elaine M. Grossman, "Congressional Aide Finds Spending On 'Core Readiness' in Decline," *Inside the Pentagon*, June 28, 2001, p. 1.

6. Rowan Scarborough, "Marine Officer Probed For Blasting Clinton," "Major Gets Punished For Criticizing President," *Washington Times*, Nov. 11, Dec. 7, 1998, p. 1, p. 1; C. I. Chives, "Troops Obey Clinton Despite Disdain," USA Today, Nov. 18, 1998, p. 27A; Pat Towell, "Keeping Civil Tongue," *CQ Weekly*, 57 (Jan. 2, 1999) 26. Article 88, "Contempt toward officials," reads: "Any commissioned officer who uses contemptuous words against the President, the Vice President, Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department, the Secretary of Transportation, or the Governor or legislature of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession in which he is on active duty or present shall be punished as a court-martial may direct." *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (1995 ed.), A23-23. The history of this provision and its enforcements is covered in John G. Kester, "Soldiers Who Insult the President: An Uneasy Look at Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice," *Harvard Law Review*, 81 (1967–1968) 1697–1769; Daniel Blumenthal, "A Brief Overview of Article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice," Seminar Paper, Strategy and Policy Seminar, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Study, Dec. 4, 1998.

7. PAGE SIX, "Wicked Wit," *New York Post*, Oct. 11, 1999.

8. Thomas E. Ricks, "Military Personnel Warned On Politics," *Washington Post*, Nov. 30, 2000, p. 35. An army officer, after receiving the reminder by mass distribution in his command, remembered that "This was perhaps the fourth or fifth time in the past 8 years (during the Clinton administration) that I have received some official reminder of Article 88..." E-mail to the author, Nov. 27, 2000. See also Capt. Robert G. Bracknell, "The Marine Officer's Moral and Legal Imperative of Political Abstinence," *Marine Corps Gazette*, 84 (Sept. 2000) 102–107.

9. And the major embarrassment came to Clinton administration soon thereafter when a woman staff member, Lt. Gen. Barry McCaffrey, a much decorated and three-wounded veteran of Vietnam and commander of the 24th Infantry Division in the Gulf War, McCaffrey was then serving as assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His response to a casual "good morning" in the White House, he stated, "we (or I) don't take to people in uniform." Within such a short incident touched a lot over Washington and to the press, the notification of the administration. The impact of this insult was felt most acutely inside the Beltway and especially in the officer corps. Kenneth T. Walsh, Bruce B. Auster, and Tim Zimmerman, "Clinton's Warrior Woes," *US News & World Report*, 114 (Mar. 15, 1993) 22ff; Carl M. Cannon, "Military Feeling Resentful toward the White House," *Buffalo* (NY) *News*, Mar. 23, 1993, p. 5. McCaffrey was one of the officers featured in James Kitfield, *Prodigal Soldiers* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995); see also Jay Nordlinger, "Clinton's Good Soldier," *National Review*, May 3, 1999, pp. 20–23.

10. Conversation who is now official (Office of the Secretary of Defense, Apr. 1993.

11. President Clinton undated of from the beginning to work the military to overcome the hostility. Walsh et al., "Clinton's Warrior Woes," 22; Carl M. Cannon, "Clinton reaches for military ties," *Baltimore Sun*, May 30, 1992, p. 22. But five years later, the relationship was hardly better than "a way to truce." "I can't think of anything the president has put more personal attention and caring into than his relationship with the military at all levels," White House press secretary Michael McCurry was quoted as saying. "He did it because he understood that he began with a significant deficit. He has tried to make personal and human connection with his commanders and all the way down the chain." Brian McGrory, "U.S. military, Clinton achieve a way to truce," *Boston Globe*, Feb. 22, 1998, p. 1. Two of senators officers who mentioned their professional relationship with Clinton praised his discharge of his commander-in-chief duties. Richard H. Kohn, ed., "The Early Retirement of General Ronald R. Fogleman, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force," *Aerospace Power Journal*, 15 (Spring 2001) 16; General Wesley K. Clark, *Waging Modern War: Bosnia, Kosovo, and the Future of Combat* (New York: Public Affairs, 2001), 290. However, the "personal and human connection" apparently never eased the Clinton hair in the officer corps generally, which stated his return. See David Halberstam, *War in a Time of Peace: Bush, Clinton, and the Generals* (New York: Scribner, 2001), 415–419; Joseph Curl, "Military Finds Refreshing Change With New Commander in Chief," *Washington Times*, Feb. 13, 2001, p. 1. For the economic data emphasis of the administration's foreign policy, see Halberstam, *War in a Time of Peace*, 242; David E. Sanger, "Economic Engine for Foreign Policy," *New York Times*, Dec. 28, 2000, p. A1. Scholarly analyses of the Clinton foreign policy are William C. Berman, *From the Center to the Edge: The Politics and Policies of the Clinton Presidency*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001), 35–38; Andrew J. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002) in press.

12. Jane Perlez, "For 8 Years, Strained Relationship With the Military," *New York Times*, Dec. 28, 2000, p. A13.

13. "Clinton And The Generals," *Vanity Fair*, Sept. 2001, p. 230.

14. In 1996, former congressman and secretary of defense Dick Cheney observed: "If you look at the '92 election, the '94 congressional election, and I think even the 1996 presidential election, there has been almost no discussion—his will be the first election I can ever do without—of the U.S. role in the world from a security standpoint, strategic requirements, what our military ought to be doing, or how big the defense budget ought to be." Quoted in Stephen M. Duncan, *Citizen Warriors: America's National Guard and Reserve Forces & the Politics of National Security* (Novato, CA: Presidio, 1997), 225.

15. The most insightful brief analysis of the overall character of the military establishment is Eliot A. Cohen, "Defending America in the Twenty-first Century," *Foreign Affairs*, 79 (Nov.–Dec. 2000) 40–56. For another persuasive argument for continuity with the Cold War establishment, see William Greider, *Fortress America: The American Military and the Consequences of Peace* (New York: Public Affairs, 1998).

16. Michael R. Gordon, "Cuts Force Review of War Strategies," *New York Times*, May 30, 1993, p. 16; Barton Gellman, "Rumbling of Discord Heard in Pentagon; Aspin's Civilian Leadership, Management Style and Agenda Irk Some Officers," John Lancaster, "Aspin Opts for Winning 2 Wars—Not 1—at Once; Practical Effect of Notion Is Uncertain Amid Huge Military Budget Cuts," *Washington Post*, June 20, 25,

1993, p. 1, p. A6. For a broad analysis of the Bottom Up Review, see Donald Kagan and Frederick W. Kagan, *While America Sleeps: Self-Delusion, Military Weakness, and the Threat to Peace Today* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), ch. 14.

17. The disjunction between resources and requirements, which became the subject of much debate and recrimination in the late 1990s, was clear by 1995. See Daniel Goure and Jeffrey M. Ranney, *Averting the Defense Train Wreck in the New Millennium* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1999), 1; Don M. Snider, "The Coming Defense Train Wreck," *Washington Quarterly*, 19 (Winter 1996): 89-101, which comments on "what to do about it," pp. 103-124. According to then Lt. Gen. Wesley Clark, the head of plans (J-5) on the Joint Staff beginning in 1994, "we had constructed a bottom-up, bureaucratic instrument that would focus the U.S. Armed Forces' thinking on only two primary conflicts and then drive marginal investments of scarce resources to enhance these capabilities at the expense of other possible employments." This "was intended to be a strategy for employing armed forces—it was meant to defend the size of the military." Clark, *Waging Modern War*, 47, 36.

18. A brief analysis of these dilemmas is in F. Lehman and Harvey Sicherman, "Demilitarizing the Military," Foreign Policy Research Institute Wire, 5 (July 1997). More extended analyses are Goure and Ranney, *Averting the Defense Train Wreck*, ch. 1-2; Gordon, *Forces for a New America*, esp. 28-29, 36-39, 42-45.

19. Forecasts of how electronics and miniaturization, leading to greater accuracy of weapons, acquisition of targets, networking of computer systems, and the like, might be affecting warfare and the armed services, see James Kitfield, "The Permanent Frontier," *National Journal*, Mar. 17, 2001, p. 780; Joseph Fitchett, "Spying From Space: U.S. To Sharpen The Focus," *International Herald Tribune*, Apr. 10, 2001, p. 1; Glenn W. Goodman, Jr., "Futuristic Army Vision: The Service's Future Combat System is A True Leap-Ahead Program," *Armed Forces Journal International*, 138 (May 2001): 26; James Ware, "Virtual Defense," *Foreign Affairs*, 80 (May-June 2001): 98-112; Nicholas Lemann, "Dreaming About War," *The New Yorker*, July 16, 2001, pp. 32-38; Admiral Bill Owens with Ed Offley, *Lifting the Fog of War* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2000). An argument from continuity that forces on ground warfare is Stephen Biddle, "Assessing Theories of Future Warfare," in H.W. Brands, ed., *The Use of Force after the Cold War* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001), 217-288. For a more review, see Lawrence Freedman, *The Revolution in Strategic Affairs* [International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 318] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

20. Congress began pressing the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Department of Defense to consider overlapping roles and missions among the armed services as early as 1992, when a commission tasked to do so issued its 1995 "bottom-up update." A broader Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) in 1997 (with a National Defense Panel to review and critique the effort immediately after), another QDR in 2001, and in 1998 the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century took an "end-to-end," or more comprehensive, look at national security and reported in 2001. See *Report on the BOTTOM-UP REVIEW*, Les Aspin, Secretary of Defense, October 1993, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/bur/index.html> (Oct. 5, 2000); *Directions for Defense: Roles and Missions Commission of the Armed Forces, Report to Congress, the secretary of defense, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff*, May 24, 1995, Executive Summary, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/com95/dl062.html> (Nov. 26, 2000); William S. Cohen, *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review*, May 1997, <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr/index.html> (Nov. 26, 2000); *Report of the National Defense Panel*, December 1997, *Transforming Defense: National Security in the 21st Century*, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/ndp/toc.htm> [links from inside table of contents] (Aug. 2, 2001); *Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change: The Phase III Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, March 15, 2001* (np: [Washington: np, [U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century], 2001). Background on the Quadrennial Defense Review: May 1997, HR 3230 (National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, Title IX, Subtitle B, Sec. 923, Quadrennial Defense Review--Force Structure Review, <http://www.comwar.gpl.hq.gc.ca.htm> (Nov. 26, 2000). For background, see Lorna S. Jaffe, *The Development of the Base Force* (Washington: Joint History Office, Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, July 1993); *National Security Strategy of the United States* (Washington: White House, Aug. 1991); Gen. Colin Powell, Les Aspin, Defense Department Briefing; "DOD Bottom-Up Review, September 1, 1993," Federal Information Systems Corporation, Federal News Service, access through Academic Universe; "bottom up review" Search Terms (Dec. 13, 2000). For an insider's admission of paralysis on change within the Pentagon and the failure of outside reform efforts, see Owens, *Lifting the Fog of War*, 32-42, 166-177, 207-219. Revealing reportage about the 1997 QDR is in George Wilson, *This War Really Matters: Inside the Fight for Defense Dollars* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press, 2000), ch. 1-3.

21. As of June 26, 2001, some two-thirds of the fifty major recommendations of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century "were being adopted in some fashion by the Administration or Congress." "Recommendations' Status," June 26, 2001, enclosed in Charles G. Boyd to the author, June 27, 2001. The author was a member of the National Security Study Group supporting the Commission. The Bush Administration also rhetorically committed to change, see James Gerstenzang, "Bush Offers New Vision of Military," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 12 2000, p. 1.

22. The debate over transforming defense policy during the first months of the Bush administration in 2001 has been covered extensively in the press. See, for example, reports by Thomas E. Ricks, *Washington Post*, May 20, 25, June 22, July 14, 19, 25, Aug. 3, 7, 18, 31, Dec. 9, and by Al Kamen, May 16, by Elaine Grossman, *Inside the Pentagon*, May 31, June 14, July 5, 19, 26, Aug. 17, by Stan Crock, *Business Week*, July 2, Aug. 6, by James Dao, Thom Shanker, Thomas L. Friedman, *New York Times*, June 3, July 11, 13, 14, 19, 26, 30, Aug. 18, Sept. 2, by James Kitfield, Sydney J. Freedberg, and George C. Wilson, *National Journal*, Mar. 3, June 9, July 14, Nov. 3, by Bill Gertz, Rowan Scarborough, *Washington Times*, Apr. 24, May 25, June 11, 29, July 13, Aug. 30, by Robert Holder, *Defense News*, June 4-10, July 23-29, by Morton M. Kondracke, Roll Call, July 26, by Andrea Stone, *USA Today*, July 27, by William M. Arkin, *washingtonpost.com*, June 4, July 16, by Pat Towell, *Congressional Quarterly Weekly*, May 12, July 21, by Eun-Kyung Kim, Lisa Burgess, *European Stars and Stripes*, May 24, June 2, by Vago Muradian, Hunter Keeter, *Defense Daily International*, May 4, *Defense Daily*, May 11, 25, by Michael Duffy, *Time*, Aug. 27, and editorials and opinion pieces in the *Washington Post*, Feb. 7, Aug. 27, *Weekly Standard*, May 14, July 23, *Los Angeles Times*, May 24, *New York Times*, May 25, July 13, Aug. 20, *Washington Times*, May 25, June 10, *London Financial Times*, June 27, July 31, *Wall Street Journal*, July 13, Aug. 1, 27, *USA Today*, July 18, *Boston Globe*, July 22, *US News and World Report*, Aug. 13, *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, Aug. 27, 28, and *Newsweek*, Sept. 3. The first public attacks on Rumsfeld's efforts by the services came in a widely disseminated memo from former Army Chief of Staff Gordon Sullivan, head of the Association of the U.S. Army, on May 5, and from active duty and retired naval officers defending carriers (Capt. William Toti in the *Washington Times*, Apr. 23; Chief of Naval Operations Vernon Clark quoted in *Inside the Navy*, June 4; Admiral (retired) Leighton W. Smith, Jr. in *National Defense*, June). "If we could achieve a 15 percent transformation in 10 years, I would consider that remarkable," Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz admitted in August 2001. "I don't think he is going to be issuing decisions that will not be opposed by someone," Tom Carhart, "Total U.S. Military Transformation in 10 Years Not Realistic, Says Wolfowitz," *Defense News.com*, Aug. 16, 2001. For the current definition of "transformation," see Wolfowitz, Keynote Address, Fletcher Conference on "Focusing National Power," Nov. 14, 2001, <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2001/s20011114-depsecdef.html> (Dec. 1, 2001).

23. See, for example, Paul Quinn-Judge, "Doubts of Top Brass on the Use of Power Carry Great Weight," *Boston Globe*, Apr. 20, 1994, p. 12.

24. My understanding of the Kosovo air campaign comes from Clark, *Waging Modern War*; Andrew J. Bacevich and Eliot A. Cohen, eds., *War Over Kosovo: Politics and Strategy in a Global Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); Haberstam, *War in a Time of Peace*, 364ff; Benjamin S. Lambeth, *NATO's Air War for Kosovo: A Strategic and Operational Assessment* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2001); Michael Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure," *Foreign Affairs*, 78 (Oct. 1999): 2-8; and David L. Byman and Matthew C. Waxman, "Kosovo and the Great Air Power Debate," Barry R. Posen, "The War for Kosovo," *International Security*, 24 (2000): 5-84.

25. In 1998-1999, the Triangle Institute for Security Studies' "Project on the Gap between the Military and Civilian Society" compared the attitudes, opinions, values, and perspectives of the officers in the military on active duty and in the reserves who are the officer corps in the United States, and the general public. The officers sample came from senior-year cadets and midshipmen at the service academies and in ROTC, and from

officers selected for in residence attendance at staff and war colleges and the Capstone course at National Defense University for new flag officers. Comparable samples of reserve and National Guard officers were also surveyed. The active-duty sample was a random selection from *Who's Who in America* and other similar biographical compilations. The general public sample came from a telephone poll using a portion of the survey's questions, conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates. Information on the project and its methods can be found at <http://www.poli.duke.edu/ml> and in the introduction and conclusion in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001). The figures for military officers cited in this essay do not include students in pre-commissioning programs. In the survey, 49 percent of the active-duty military officers said they "would leave military service the soonest I can from a career standpoint, no matter what is right in military policy." This was the second most-selected choice of nine offered, exceeded only by "the challenge and sense of fulfillment I derive from my service work" (68 percent). (All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.) For a sense of the blame in the officer corps, particularly toward the senior uniformed leadership, see Chief of Staff of the Army's Leadership Survey, Command and General Staff College Survey of 760 mid-career Students (Majors with a Few LTCs)," n.d. [Spring 2000], <http://www.dennisfrost_Folder/leadership_comments.htm> (Nov. 30, 2001); Eric Offley, "Young Officers' Anger, Frustration Stun Navy's Top Brass," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Jan. 29, 2000, <http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/navy29.shtml> (Nov. 30, 2001); Rowan Scarborough, "Army, cohesion subject of choice assignments," *Washington Times*, Nov. 1, 2000, p. A1; Paul Richter, "Glamour Of America's Military Schools Fading For Youth," *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 15, 2000, p. 16; Capt. Justin P. D. Wilcox, "Military Experience Exposes 'Readiness Lie,'" *USA Today*, Sept. 5, 2000, p. 26. Wilcox, a West Pointer, was leaving the service after five years because of underfunding, "more attention placed on landscaping and details...than on training," because "pursuit of mediocrity has become the norm," and other reasons. "When was the last time you had to look up to the current administration for inspiration?" One of the harsh critics of the senior leadership was David H. Hackworth, "Too much brass, too little cloth," *Atlanta Constitution*, Mar. 2, 1994, p. 11. For survey data and analysis, see *American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century: A Report of the CSIS International Security Program* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2000), pp. xix-xx, 17-18, 23-24, 45, 71-72. For an indication of shipping in quality, see David S. C. Chu and John Brown, "Ensuring Quality People in Defense," in Ashton B. Carter and John P. White, eds., *Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), 206. These events follow the downsizing of the armed services, which in the army officer corps damaged morale, loosened organizational commitment, and undermined professionalism. See David M. Kennedy, *The Dowsized Warrior: America's Army in Transition* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), ch. 4, esp. 127-129.

26 Iam indebted to Alfred Goldberg, Historian in the Office of the Secretary of Defense since 1973, for the insight that civilian control being situational used this definition first: "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," *The National Interest*, Spring 1994, pp. 16-17. As I made this point, emphasizing the relative weight of military and civilian inclinations and decision-making, Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), esp. ch. 1-3 and Appendix. See also the discussion in Yehuda Ben Meir, *Civil-Military Relations in Israel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), ch. 2 ("Civilian Control"). In an important forthcoming work on civil-military relations, Peter Feaver distinguishes between trying to overthrow civilian authority (a *coup*) and simply shirking, carrying out the orders or wishes of the civilians. He explores the interdependent interplay of military shirking and civilian authority as a variable rather than a given. See his *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002 in press).

27 Pentagon reporter David Martin, "Landing the Eagle," *Vanity Fair*, Nov. 1993, p. 153, described the Joint Staff this way: "Made up of 1,400 men and women, mostly in uniform, the Joint Staff analyzes the military consequences of the various options proposed by the administration. The answers they come up with can stop a fledgling policy dead in its tracks. You want to put the hood in Bosnia? Sure, we can do it. But it will take 500,000 troops and the second you pull them out the fighting will resume." For an indication of the Joint Staff's analytical (and political) advantages over OSD in the 2001 QDR, see Elaine Grossman, "Shelton Molds Holding Key, Civilian-Led Review to Exacting Standards," *Inside the Pentagon*, Aug. 2, 2001, p. 1. See also James Kitfield, "Pentagon Power Shift," *Government Executive*, Apr. 1994, p. 72.

28 Owens, *Lifting the Fog of War*, 172-174, John M. Shalikashvili, "Keeping the Edge in Joint Operations," in Carter and White, eds., *Keeping the Edge*, 39-42, 44-45; Richard Haass and Stephen C. Lee Suer, "JCS Quietly Gathers Up Reins of Power," *Defense News*, June 13-19, 1994.

29 Conversation with an officer at a war college, June 1999. In late 2001, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld asked Congress's permission to reduce the various legislative liaison staffs in the Pentagon by almost half, to 250, because he reportedly believed that "some congressional liaison officers may be working across purposes with the Bush administration's plan by pushing their own agency or command instead of the Pentagon's top priorities." Rick Maze, "Senate Wants To Reduce Number Of Military Liaisons," *Army Times.com*, Dec. 4, 2001.

30 Dana Priest, "The Proconsuls Patrolling The World," in her four-part series entitled "A Four-Star Foreign Policy?" "An Engagement 10 Time Zones," and "CINCs Don't Swim with State," *Washington Post*, Sept. 28, 29, 30, 2000. See also the remarks of Dana Priest and Robert B. Oakley in the State Department Open Forum, Mar. 23, 2001, "Civil-Military Affairs and U.S. Diplomacy: The Changing Roles of the Regional Commanders-in-Chief," cable message, Secretary of State to all diplomatic and consular posts, July 1, 2001. Writing from Paris, he journalist William Pfaff highlighted the change a year earlier: "It is not too much to say that there is a distinct foreign policy of military inspiration, conducted from the Pentagon," he wrote, citing the conflicting messages sent by the American military to its hosts in seven countries during the East Timor crisis. See "Beware Of A Military Pendant For A Parallel Foreign Policy," *International Herald Tribune*, Sept. 22, 1999, <http://www.iht.com/IHT/WP99/wp092299.html> (Dec. 5, 2001). For an indication of how one CINC actively sought to determine policy and influence diplomacy, in his case in intervention to prevent ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, see Clark, *Waging War*, ch. 56. Another CINC, USMC Gen. Anthony Zinni of US Central Command, described himself as "proconsul," hinting at an analogy with a position in the ancient Roman Republic and Empire that involved enormous political, military, and judicial powers over the population in provinces. The author may have been the first to suggest that both Gen. Zinni in exchange at US Central Command Headquarters, Tampa, FL, Apr. 1998.

31 See the sources in note 22 above. An insightful summation is Michael Duffy, "Rumsfeld Order But Wise?" *Time*, Aug. 27, 2001, pp. 22-27.

32 Andrew J. Bacevich, "Discord Still Clinton and the Military," *Washington Post*, Jan. 3, 1999, p. C01.

33 E-mail communication to author, Feb. 2, 1999.

34 Wilson, *This War Really Matters*, takes as data, and particularly evaluating how the "decision-making process for national defense" (p. 3) for the 1997-1999 period, especially the interactions between the civilians in the executive branch, the Congress, and the Joint Chiefs. To understand the extent to which the armed services are expected to possess their own institutional interests with Congress, see Stephen K. Scroggs, *Army Relations with Congress: Thick Armor, Dull Sword, Slow Horse* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000).

35 Lewis Sorley, *Thunderbolt: General Creighton Abrams and the Army of His Times* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 361-364; Hebert Y. Schandler, *The Unmaking of a President: Lyndon Johnson and Vietnam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 39, 56, 103, 305; Eric Q. Wingard, "Officials Hone and Defense Mission While Mean Changes For The Guard," *Inside the Army*, Nov. 19, 2001, p. 1. James Schlesinger, the Secretary of Defense who had to have approved this change in force structure, confirmed his interpretation in the process of questioning it: "This would really be Abe Lincoln at the view that the military must defer to the civilians, even to a extraordinary degree. I speculate that the military ought to fight to the limit to resist what the civilians would ultimately do." Quoted in Duncan, Citizen Warriors, 271-272.

36 Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., *The Line of Fire: From Washington to the Gulf, the Politics and Battles of the New Military* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 41, 127, 152-159, 161, 177, 180-185, 189-190, 212-241, 304-305, 309, 312-319, 341-345; Bob Woodward, *The Commanders* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 40.

37 See, for example, Barton Gellman, "Rumblings of Discord Heard in Pentagon," *Washington Post*, June 20, 1993, p. A1.

38. J. G. Prout, III, *Memorandum for the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet*, Sept. 23, 1994, "SUBJ: CNO COMMENTS AT SURFACE WARFARE FLAG OFFICER CONFERENCE (SWFOC)," copy in possession of the author.

39. *Directions for Defense, Roles and Missions Commission of the Armed Forces, Report to Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff*, May 24, 1995, Executive Summary, <http://www.fas.org/man/docs/com95dl/062nm1-1.htm> (Nov. 26, 2000); Robert Holzer, "Experts Slam Inept Staff At OSD, Could Save Billions," *Defense News*, Dec. 2-8, 1996, p. 28.

40. For insight into the military's influence over the character of the intervention in Bosnia, see Ivo H. Daalder, *Getting to Dayton: The Making of America's Bosnia Policy* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2000), 140-153, 173-178; Dan Blumenthal, "Clinton, the Military, and Bosnia, 1993-1995: A Study in Dysfunctional Civil-Military Relations," Seminar Paper, Soldiers, Statesmen, and the Use of Force Seminar, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, June 7, 1999; and Clark, *Waging War*, 55-66, 73, 79-80. Clark, who was the senior U.S. military advisor at the Dayton negotiations, put this way (p. 59): "Under our agreement, we are seeking to limit the obligations of the military ... but give the commander unlimited authority to accomplish these limited obligations." A background analysis is Susan L. Woodward, "Upside-Down Policy: The U.S. Debate on the Use of Force and the Case of Bosnia," in Brands, ed., *Use of Force*, 111-134. In an analysis of civil-military conflicts between 1988 and 1997, Michael C. Desch believes that civilian control has weakened in the United States during the 1990s. He found that civilians prevailed in 59 of 62 instances of civil-military conflict before the 1990s, but in only 5 of 12 in that decade. See his *Civilian Control of the Military*, ch. 3 and appendix.

41. Charles G. Boyd, "America Prolongs The War in Bosnia," *New York Times*, Aug. 9, 1995, p. 19; Charles G. Boyd, "Making Peace with the Guilty: The Truth about Bosnia," *Foreign Affairs*, 74 (Oct. 1995) 22-38. The op-ed began, "Having spent the last two years as deputy commander of the U.S. European Command, I have found that my views on the frustrating events in Bosnia differ from much of the conventional wisdom in Washington."

42. Bill Keller, "The World According to Powell," *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 25, 2001, p. 65.

43. For a fuller discussion of Gen. Powell's first encounter with civilian control, see Koch, "Out of Control," 8-13, with Powell's reply, comments by John Lehman, William Odom, and Samuel P. Huntington, and my response in *The National Interest*, Summer 1994, pp. 23-31. Other profiles and supporting material are in Jon Meacham, "How Colin Powell Plays the Game," *Washington Monthly*, 26 (Dec. 1994) 33-42; Charles Lane, "The Legend of Colin Powell," *New Republic*, Apr. 17, 1995, pp. 20-32; Michael R. Gordon and Bernard E. Trainor, "Bell-way Warrior," Keller, "World According to Powell," *New York Times Magazine*, Aug. 27, 1995, pp. 40-43, Nov. 25, 2001, 61ff; Michael C. Desch and Sharon K. Weiner, eds., Colin Powell as JCS Chairman: A Panel Discussion on American Civil-Military Relations, October 23, 1995 [Project on U.S. Post-Cold War Civil-Military Relations, Working Paper No. 1] (Cambridge: Harvard University, John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Dec. 1995); Lawrence F. Kaplan, "Yesterday's Man: Colin Powell Is Out Of Date Foreign Policy," *New Republic*, Jan. 1, 2001, pp. 17-21.

44. Eric Schmitt and Elaine Sciolino, "To Run Pentagon, Bush Sought Proven Manager With Muscle," New York Times, Jan. 1, 2001, p. 1; Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough, "Inside the Ring," *Washington Times*, Jan. 26, 2001, p. A9. Significantly, Powell's close friend Richard Armitage, who had been mentioned frequently for the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense, was not offered that position and instead became Deputy Secretary of State.

45. T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and His Generals* (New York: Random House, 1952; remains indispensable. See also Richard N. Current, *The Lincoln Nobody Knows* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958), 169; David Herbert Donald, *Lincoln* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 386-388; Bruce Tap, *Over Lincoln's Shoulder: The Committee on the Conduct of the War* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 151-154.

46. Timothy D. Johnson, *Winfield Scott: The Quest for Military Glory* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 217-219; John E. Masland, *Sherman: A Soldier's Passion for Order* (New York: The Free Press, 1993), 386-389.

47. Mark Russell Shulman, *Navalism and the Emergence of American Sea Power, 1882-1893* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1995), 46-57, 152-153; Paul A. C. Koistinen, *Mobilizing for Modern War: the Political Economy of American Warfare, 1865-1919* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 48-57; Benjamin Franklin Cooling, *Gray Steel and Blue Water Navy: The Formative Years of America's Military-Industrial Complex, 1881-1917* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1979), ch. 3-4, postscript. See also Kurt Hackemer, *The U.S. Navy and the Origins of the Military-Industrial Complex, 1847-1883* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2001).

48. De Witt S. Copp, *A Few Great Captains: The Men and Events That Shaped The Development of U.S. Air Power* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1980); David E. Johnson, *Fast Tanks and Heavy Bombers: Innovation in the U.S. Army, 1917-1945* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 66-69, 81-84, 86-90, 102-103, 158-160, 220-222, 227-228.

49. Quote in Marine Eccles, *Reckoning: Fronties: Public and Personal Recollections*, ed. Sidney Hyman (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), 336. For a sense of Theodore Roosevelt's studies with the services, see his letters to Elihu Root, Mar. 7, 1902, to Oswald Garrison Villard, Mar. 22, 1902, to Leonard Wood, June 4, 1904, and to Truman H. Newberry, Aug. 28, 1908; Elting E. Morison, ed., *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*, 8 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951-1954), III, 241, 247; IV, 820; VI, 1199; the forthcoming study of Roosevelt as commander-in-chief by Mathew Moyo, who supplied excerpts from the above documents; and Moyo, "Theodore Roosevelt, Congress, and the Military: U.S. Civil-Military Relations in the Early Twentieth Century," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 30 (2000) 312-330.

50. The civil-military battles of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s are covered in a number of works; among them are Demetrios Caraley, *The Politics of Military Unification: A Study of Conflict and the Policy Process* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966); Herman S. Wolk, *The Struggle for Air Force Independence, 1943-1947* (Washington: Air Force History and Museums Program, 1997); Jeffrey G. Barlow, *Revolt of the Admirals: The Fight for Naval Aviation, 1945-1950* (Washington: Naval Historical Center, 1994); Steven L. Rearden, *The Formative Years, 1947-1950 [History of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Vol. I]* (Washington: Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1984); Robert L. Watson, *Into the Missile Age, 1956-1960 [History of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Vol. IV]* (Washington: Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1997); and Deborah Shapley, *Promise and Power: The Life and Times of Robert McNamara* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1993).

51. For a brief history of civilian control, see Richard H. Kohn, "Civil-Military Relations: Civilian Control of the Military," in John Whiteclay Chambers II, ed., *The Oxford Companion to American Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 122-125. Similar interpretations of the conflict-ridden relationship are Russell F. Weigley, "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell," *The Journal of Military History*, Special Issue, 57 (1993) 27-59; Russell F. Weigley, "The American Civil-Military Cultural Gap: A Historical Perspective, Colonial Times to the Present," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, ch. 5; Ronald H. Spector, "Operation Who Stays: Tension Between Civilian and Military Leaders is Inevitable," *Washington Post*, Aug. 22, 1999, p. B1; and Peter D. Feaver, "Discord and Division of Labor: The Evolution of Civil-Military Conflict in the United States," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, 1993. A particularly cogent analysis from a generation ago by a scholar who both studied the issues and participated as a senior civilian official in the Pentagon is Adam Yarmolinsky, "Civilian Control: New Perspectives on New Problems," *Indiana Law Journal*, 49 (1974) 654-671.

52. See, for example, Dana Priest, "Mine Decision Boosts Clinton-Military Relations," *Washington Post*, Sept. 21, 1997, p. A22; Ernest Blazar, "Inside the Ring," *Washington Times*, June 8, 1998, p. 11; Jonathan S. Landay, "U.S. Losing Hands Onlis Diplomacy In A Kosovo 'At War'," *Christian Science Monitor*, June 5, 1998, p. 7; Daniel Reardick, An Unfortunate Opposition: U.S. Policy Toward the Establishment of the International Criminal Court (Honors Thesis, Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2000).

53 In *The Closed World: How We Live, What We Buy, and What All Means About Who We Are* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2000), a study of consumerism and lifestyles, Michael J. Weiss identifies the military as one of "sixty-two distinct population groups each with its own set of values, culture and means of coping with today's problems" (p. 11). His thesis is that the country has become splintered and fragmented (see pp. 258-259) and (chapter 1). For the military's "presence" in American society, see the late Adam Yarmolinsky's comprehensive *The Military Establishment: Its Impacts on American Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) and James Burk, "The Military's Presence in American Society," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, ch. 6. In 1985, "a group of 31 military and veterans organizations that lobby for the uniformed services on personnel and pay issues" (representing some "6 million veterans and their families") banded together to form the "Military Coalition," a force that in the opinion of one thoroughly informed general is "potentially far more numerous & powerful than the NRA!!!" Stephen Barr, "Military Pay Expert Retires," *Washington Post*, Mar. 12, 2001, p. B2; Ted Marcinkowski, author to author, Oct. 24, 1999.

54 "Rumsfeld's Rules," cDonald Rumsfeld memo dated Jan. 17, 2001, <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/jan2001/rumsfeldrules.pdf> (Jan. 29, 2001).

55 Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, Sept. 30, 2001, <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr2001.pdf> (Oct. 6, 2001); Anne Plummer, "Pentagon Launches Some 50 Reviews in Major Defense Planning Effort," *Inside the Pentagon*, Nov. 15, 2001, p. 1; John Liang, "Rumsfeld Supports Switching Future QDRs To Administration's Second Year," *Inside Defense.com*, Dec. 6, 2001.

56 Thomas E. Ricks, "Target Approval Delays Cost Air Force Key Hits," "Rumsfeld's Hands-On War: Afghan Campaign Shaped by Secretary's Views, Personality," *Washington Post*, Nov. 18, Dec. 9, 2001, p. 1, p. 1; Esther Schrader, "Action Role A Better Fit For Rumsfeld," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 11, 2001, p. 22; Lawrence F. Kaplan, "Ours to Lose: Why is Bush Repeating Clinton's Mistakes?" *New Republic*, Nov. 12, 2001, pp. 25-26; Robert Kagan and William Kristol, "Getting Serious," *Weekly Standard*, Nov. 19, 2001, pp. 7-8; Michael Wade, "Rumsfeld Plagues Bin Laden," *Insight Magazine*, Dec. 10, 2001; Damian Whitworth and Roland Watson, "Rumsfeld At Odds With His Generals," *London Times*, Oct. 16, 2001, p. 5; Toby Harnden, "Rumsfeld Calls For End to Old Tactics Of War," *London Daily Telegraph*, Oct. 16, 2001, p. 8.

57 Quotation in Donald Smythe, *Guerrilla Warrior: The Early Life of John J. Pershing* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973), 278.

58 Omar N. Bradley, *A Soldier's Story* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1951), 147. For an outline of the various factors underlying civilian control in the United States historically, see my "Civilian Control of the Military," in Chambers, ed., *Oxford Companion*, 122-125.

59 The Gallup polling organization has surveyed American samples on their confidence in major institutions since the early 1970s, and the military has topped the list since 1987, with over 60% expressing "great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence. See Frank Newport, "Military Retains Top Position in Americans' Confidence Ratings," June 25, 2001, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr010625.asp> (Dec. 2, 2001); Newport, "Small Business And Military Generate Most Confidence in Americans," Aug. 15, 1997, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr970815.asp> (Dec. 2, 2001); "GALLUP POLL TOPICS: A-Z: Confidence in Institutions," June 8-10, 2001, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/indicators/indconfidence.asp> (Dec. 2, 2001). Excellent analyses of the change in public attitudes toward the military since the late 1960s are David C. King and Zachary Karabell, "The Generation of Trust: Public Confidence in the U.S. Military since Vietnam," revision of a paper presented to the Duke University Political Science Department, Jan. 29, 1999, to be published in 2002 by the American Enterprise Institute; Richard Sobel, "The Authoritarian Reflex and Public Support for the U.S. Military: An Anomaly?" paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Apr. 16, 1999. Respect for lawyers is low and has been declining in recent years. See Darren K. Carlson, "Nurses Remain Top of Honesty and Ethics Poll," Nov. 27, 2000, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr001127.asp> (Dec. 2, 2001).

60 Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Philip D. Zelikow, and David C. King, eds., *Why People Don't Trust Government* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997); Albert H. Cantril and Susan Davis Cantril, *Reading Mixed Signals: Ambivalence in American Public Opinion about Government* (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1999). The decline in trust of government and confidence in public institutions has not been limited to the United States. See Susan J. Pharr and Robert D. Putnam, eds., *Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). Trusting government in the U.S. after the September 11 attacks jumped dramatically to the highest levels since 1968. Frank Newport, "Trust in Government Increases Sharply In Wake of Terrorist Attacks," Oct. 12, 2001, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr011012.asp> (Dec. 2, 2001); Alexandra Starr, "Suddenly, Americans Trust Uncle Sam," John D. Donahue, "Is Government the Good Guy?" *New York Times*, Nov. 3, Dec. 13, 2001, p. A11, p. A31. Whether attacks will have severe long-term deterrent effects remains to be seen.

61 For critiques of journalism in general and coverage of the military in particular, see Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, *Warp Speed: America in the Age of Mixed Media* (New York: The Century Foundation Press, 1999); Scott Shuger, "First the Bad News: The Big Daily Newspapers Get Something Right. National Defense Isn't One Of Them," *Mother Jones*, Sept.-Oct. 1998, 72-76. My views on media decade of observing reporting on military security issues. An example of lack of interest in civil-military relations is the lack of reaction to, or interpretation in the media of, the detailed and persuasive reports of Dana Priest (see note 30 above) about the growth in power of the regional CINCs, discussed previously. Typical of press misunderstanding is the editorial "Unifying Armed Forces Requires Radical Change" in the June 18, 2001 *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, calling for abolition of the separate military departments, abolition of the JCS to be replaced by a "single Chief of Military Staff who would command the armed forces," and the further empowering of the CINCs. The editorial purports to "Make the Secretary of Defense a genuine master of the Pentagon rather than a referee among warring factions," but the recommendations would destroy a Secretary's ability to monitor and supervise one of the world's largest and most complex bureaucratic structures.

62 See William J. Bennett, *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: American Society at the End of the Twentieth Century*, updated and expanded ed. (New York: Broadway Books, 1999); Marc Miringoff and Marque-Luisa Miringoff, *The Social Health of the Nation: How America is Really Doing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); James H. Billington, "The Human Consequences of the Information Revolution," Dudley Foundation Lecture XXXVII, Chipping Norton, England: Dudley Foundation, 2000); Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000); Everett Carll Ladd, *The Ladd Report* (New York: The Free Press, 1999); Weiss, *The Closed World*, pp. 10-11, 14-15, 192-5, 343-44; Theda Skocpol and Morris P. Fiorina, eds., *Civic Engagement in American Democracy* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 1999); essays 1, 12, 13; Derek Bok, *The Trouble with Government* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 386-398; William Chafe, *Everybody Knows: Cynicism in America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Robert D. Kaplan, *An Empire Wilderness: Travels into America's Future* (New York: Random House, 1998); and Adam B. Seligman, *The Problem of Trust* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997). More hopeful though skeptical outlook is reflected in William Fogel, *The Fourth Great Awakening & The Future of Egalitarianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Francis Fukuyama, *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order* (New York: The Free Press, 1999).

63 In the TISS survey, a number of the 250 some questions examined attitudes about the proper role of the military in society. For example, 49% of civilians and 68% of the mass public agreed ("strongly" or "somewhat") that "In wartime, civilian government should let the military take over running the war," a position which was elevated by asking it side-by-side with a draconian provision ("How Not to Win The War," *USA Today*, Nov. 7, 2001, p. 15). On the question "Members of the military should be allowed to publicly express their political views just like anyone else," 59% of the civilians and 84% of the general public agreed. Civilians were much more likely than the military to condone leaking documents to the press in various situations. The distinguished sociologist James A. Davis found the results disturbing enough to "make one's hair stand on end," but suggested the "simple explanation" of civilian control being "a fairly sophisticated doctrine, which common sense suggests that important decisions should be made by people who are informed," "cynicism about civilian politics," and Americans' high regard for "their military." See his "Attitudes and Opinions Among Senior Military Officers and U.S. Cross-Section, 1998-1999," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, 120 and especially 210. My point is that whatever the explanation, these views—the very positive image of the military held by Americans in the last decade or so years—vary considerably from what is

known of them historically. See C. Robert Kemble, *The Image of the Army Officer in America: Background for Current Views* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973); Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957) particularly Part II. At the same time, 47% of the general public do not think "Civilians outside the military is [sic] do a fair job of educating the United States" and 68% thought that "Civilian leaders order the military to do something that puts military leaders in a position where it is hard to stay true to our country's values" at least "some of the time." Thirty percent answered "all" or "most of the time." For the decline in civics education and understanding see Chris Hedges, "35% of High School Seniors Fail National Civics Test," *New York Times*, Nov. 21, 1999, p. 17; Bok, *Trouble with Government*, 403-406.

64. For the caricatures in popular literature and films, see Howard Harper, "The Military and Society: Reaching and Reflecting Audiences in Fiction and Film," *Armed Forces & Society*, 27 (2001) 231-248; Charles C. Moskos, "Toward a Post-modern Military: The United States as a Paradigm," in Charles C. Moskos, John Allen Williams, and David R. Segal, eds., *The Post-modern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 20; Moskos, "What Makes the All-Volunteer Force: An Institutional Perspective," *Parameters*, 31 (2001) 34-35; and, "Interview: James Webb," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, 126 (Apr. 2000) 78-79. I believe that the military is pictured negatively in film. But King and Karabell, "Generation of Trust," 6-7, judge that current portrayals are the most positive... since World War II."

65. Gary Hart, *The Minuteman: Restoring an Army of the People* (New York: The Free Press, 1998), particularly ch. 1, 3.

66. In the TISS survey of "elite" officers, some 40 percent of the National Guard and 25 percent of the reserve respondents identified their occupations as "military," which suggests that they are full-time in their uniformed activity or works somewhere in national defense rather than for government or industry. See David Paul Fehr, "Military Reserves: Bridging the Culture Gap Between Civilian Society and the United States Military" (MA Thesis, Duke University, 2001), 46-47. In the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Authorization Act, 66 percent of the Army National Guard and 20.6 percent of the Air National Guard could be "dual-status" civilian technicians and uniformed members. Charles Pope (National Guard Bureau Public Affairs) e-mail to author, Feb. 12, 2001.

67. The similarity "attitudinally" between active duty officers and National Guard and Reserves on some of the questions in the TISS survey is evident in Fehr, "Military Reserves." Other congruencies evident in the data.

68. See, for example, Jack Kelly, "U.S. Reliance On Guards, Reservists Escalating," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, Oct. 28, 2000, p. 9; Steven Lee Myers, "Army Will Give National Guard The Entire U.S. Role in Bosnia," *New York Times*, Dec. 5, 2000, p. A8; Wingard, "Officials Hope and Defense Mission Will Mean Changes For The Guard," p. 1; David T. Fautua, "Army Citizen-Soldiers: Active, Guard, And Reserve Leaders Remain Silent About Overuse Of Reserve Components," *Armed Forces Journal International*, 138 (Sept. 2000) 72-74; John J. Miller, "Unreserved: The Misuse of America's Reserve Forces," *National Review*, July 23, 2001, pp. 26ff; and Duncan, Citizen Warriors, 214-217 and n. 25. Duncan calls the 1995 deployment of Guard and reserves to the Sinai for six months of peacekeeping duty "unprecedented." See also Peter Baculis, "Guard troops will head for Sinai in '95," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Jan. 28, 1994, p. B6. Reserve component service on active duty missions has risen from about one million man-days in 1986 to approximately nine million in each of 1996, 1997, and 1998. CSIS, *American Military Culture*, 19. See also Conrad C. Crane, *Landpower and Crises: Army Roles and Missions in Small-Scale Contingencies During the 1990s* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute, Jan. 2001), 29-30.

69. Personal exchange; panel discussion on civil-military relations, Marine Corps Staff College, Quantico, VA, Sept. 1998; personal exchange; lecture/discussion with twenty-six state adjutant generals, Army War College, Carlisle, PA, Oct. 1998.

70. The decline in views during and some of the implications are in Andrew J. Bacevich, "Losing Private Ryan: Why the Citizen-Soldier is MIA," *National Review*, Aug. 9, 1999, pp. 32-34; Eliot Abrams and Andrew J. Bacevich, "A Symposium on Citizenship and Military Service," Eliot A. Cohen, "Twilight of the Citizen-Soldier," James Burk, "The Military Obligation of Citizens Since Vietnam," *Parameters*, 31 (Summer 2001) 18-20, 23-28, 48-60; Hart, *Minuteman*, esp. 16-17, 21-25. For a recent review of the end of conscription, see David R. Sands, "Military Draft Now Part of Past, Spain and Italy are the Latest European Nations to Abandon Compulsory Service" and "U.S. Takes a Draft Probably Not Air," *Washington Times*, Dec. 31, 2000, pp. 1, 4.

71. In the TISS survey, we love 90 percent of the civilians say that the people they come into contact with "in the social community groups to which [they] belong" are either "also civilians" or "mostly civilians with some military." The same issue (over 90 percent of respondents) in the workplace. Americans (both the larger general public) who have not served in the military also have few advocates or friends who serve or are veterans. The prospects for diminished civilian contact with, understanding of, and support for the military are analyzed in Paul Gronke and Peter D. Feaver, "Uncertain Confidence: Civilian and Military Attitudes about Civil-Military Relations," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, ch. 3. Congressman Ike Skelton, ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, does not understand this implications for support of the military either. See Rasheda Clayton, "Skelton Calls for More Military Support," *Kansas City Star*, Nov. 12, 1997, p. 15. A more general comment came from Brent Scowcroft, national security advisor to Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush: "with the lessened contact between the American people and the military... there results with the healthy," Scowcroft, "Judgment and Experience: George Bush's Foreign Policy," Aaron Lobel, ed., *Presidential Judgment: Foreign Policy Decision Making in the White House* (Hollis, NH: Hollis Publishing Company, 2001), 115. The declining propensity of youth to serve is noted in Thomas W. Lippman, "What a Draft Cut Of: Nation's Society Climate Changed Sharply," *Washington Post*, Sept. 8, 1998, p. 13. Lippman notes does Pentagon "Youth Attitude Tracking Survey" figures that show a some 32 percent of youth "express a moderate interest to join the military" in 1973, the last year of the Cold War draft. By 1993, the figure had dropped to 25 percent and by 1997, 12 percent. See also Moskos, "What Makes the All-Volunteer Force," 394-1.

72. William T. Bianco and Jamie Markham, "Vanishing Veterans: The Decline of Military Experience in the U.S. Congress," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, ch. 7.

73. Norman Ornstein, "The Legacy of Campaign 2000," *The Washington Quarterly*, 24 (Spring 2001), 102; William M. Welch, "Most U.S. Lawmakers Lack Combat Experience," *USA Today*, Nov. 12, 2001, p. 12. Writing before September 11, Ornstein calculated "present Congress... clearly a drive-out by a post-Cold War Congress. Eighty-three percent (363 members) of the House were first elected in the 1990s, since the Berlin Wall fell, along with 57 members of the Senate. Few of these lawmakers, in either party, have a abiding interest in the U.S. role in the world. International issues are simply not high on their priority list." He notes that a typical post-World War II Congress, some three-quarters of the Senators and more than half the Representatives were veterans. Importantly, the new veteran Congressmen are much more likely to be Republicans, whereas in the past veterans were more closely split. Donald N. Zillman, "Maintaining the Political Neutrality of the Military," [U.S. Air Force Academy, Seminar on Armed Forces and Society] *Newsletter*, Spring 2001, p. 17. In 2000, a retired admiral "started a National Defense Political Action Committee" to support congressional candidates who have served in the armed forces." "Inside Washington Gloves and Gloves Ready Their PAC," *National Journal*, Sept. 9, 2000, p. 2759.

74. According to *Voting Information News*, the newsletter of the Federal Voting Assistance Program, the military began voting a greater percentage share than public in 1984, and in 1996 "at an overall rate of 64%, compared to the 49% rate generated by the general public. The Uniformed Services' high participation rate can be credited to the active voter assistance programs conducted by Service Commanders and to assistance from the state and local election officials in simplifying the absentee voting process and accommodating the special needs of the Uniformed Services..." See "Military Retains High Participation Rates," 7 (July 1997) 1. In the 1980 election, military voting was below civilian (49.7 to 52.6 percent). In the 1992 election, the Defense Department expanded the program, according to a report, "to register and turn out military voters," changing the "emphasis... from ensuring availability of voting forms to mustering ballots at the polls." Stating "for the first time... a targeted participation." This "new focus on return out-reach seems to Democrat and some independent analysts to suggest the Bush administration is trying to energize a predictably sympathetic voter base." Barton Gellman, "Pentagon Intensifies Effort To Muster Military Votes," *Washington Post*, Sept. 17, 1992, p. A1. See also Daniel A. Gahan, *Absentee Voting: A Brief History of Suffrage Expansion in the United States* (Washington: Federal Voting Assistance Program, Aug. 2001).

75. Ole R. Holsti, "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society? Some Evidence, 1976-1996," *International Security*, 23 (Winter 1998/1999) 11; TISS survey data. Some observe think the actual Republican figure is much higher, many officers being reluctant to reveal a preference, "knowing full well what the reaction would be if the percentage of Republicans in the Army ranks was seen to approach 85 to 90 percent, which I am told is a reasonable figure." This thought I am told welcomed West Point graduate continued "We're in danger of developing our own in-house Soviet style military, one in which if you're not in the party, you don't get ahead. I have spoken with several... who were recruited to the Army near the beginning of their careers when commanders became aware that they had voted for Clinton 1992. I have no doubt they are telling me the truth and... I've spoken with some... who confirm their stories." E-mail queries to Tom Ricks to the author, Nov. 20, 2000. General and admirals, who as duty messengers and

more experienced officers could be expected to be imbued with the more traditional ethic of nonaffiliation, have a slightly higher independent or nonpartisan self-identification. In 1984, Newsweek (July 9, p. 37) surveyed 257 flag officers, about a quarter of those on active duty: Republican 52%; Democrat 4%; Independent 43%; Don't Know 1%. Holsti's 1984 officer sample contained 29% independent. The TISS survey included 74 one and two star officers: Republican 57%; Democrat 9%; Independent, No Preference, Other 34%. The TISS active duty sample was 28% Independent/No Preference/Other.

76. Pat Towell, "GOP Advertises Differences With Commander In Chief in Military-Oriented Papers," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly*, Dec. 11, 1999, p. 2984; Republican National Committee advertisement, "Keeping the Commitment: Republicans Reverse Years of Military Neglect," *Air Force Times*, Dec. 13, 1999, p. 57; Republican National Committee postcard to Univ. of NC Army ROTC cadet members, n.d. [fall 2000], in possession of author; Frank Abbott to author, Oct. 11, 2000; David Wood, "Military Breaks Ranks with Non-Partisan Tradition," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Oct. 22, 2000, p. 16. Just prior to the election, the Republican National Committee paid for e-mail messages from Colin Powell urging recipients to vote for "our Republican team." Powell to Alvin Bernstein, subject "A Message From Colin L. Powell," Nov. 6, 2000, in possession of author. In the 2000 election, about 72 percent of *overseas* military personnel, targeted particularly by Republicans, voted. The overall voting rate for the civilian population was 50 percent. Robert Suro, "Pentagon Will Revise Military Voting Procedures," *Washington Post*, June 23, 2001, p. 2. The Bush campaign pushed to count overseas military ballots, even questionable ones, in counties where Bush was strong and to disqualify those in counties where Gore was strong, resulting in a large enough net gain almost to swing the outcome. David Barstow and Don Van Natta Jr., "How Bush Took Florida: Mining the Overseas Absentee Vote," *New York Times*, July 15, 2001, p. 1.

77. Christopher McKee, *A Gentlemanly and Honorable Profession: The Creation of the U.S. Naval Officer Corps, 1794-1815* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1991), 107-108; William B. Skelton, *An American Profession of Arms: The Army Officer Corps, 1784-1861* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992), ch. 15; Edward M. Coffman, *The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 87-96, 242-243, 266-269; Peter Karsten, *The Naval Aristocracy: The Golden Age of Annapolis and the Emergence of Modern American Navalism* (New York: The Free Press, 1972), 203-213.

78. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, Jr., *The Twilight of the U.S. Cavalry: Life in the Old Army, 1917-1942* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989), 130. He remembered that "The view [illegible] [ ] [illegible] Regular Army officers [illegible] sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution [illegible] Edward M. Coffman [illegible] Army [illegible] Army, 1898-1941, follows *The Old Army* [illegible] 1900-1940 [illegible] Coffman [illegible] 1999 [illegible] Customs [illegible] Traditions [illegible] The Political Attitudes of American Officer [illegible] Leading Up to World War I, Seminar Paper, National Security Law Course, Duke University Law School, April 1998.

79. I agree with Lance Betros, "Political Partisanship and the Military Ethic in America," *Armed Forces & Society*, 27 (2001), 501-523, that the mere act of voting is not partisan, but I think that continual voting over time for the same party can lead to partisanship that does harm military professionalism. In a March 1999 discussion at the Naval War College, Adm. Stanley Arthur suggested that officers who are sincere about their vote "take ownership" of it and that can undermine being the neutral, apolitical instrument of the state. I do not find that promoting one's armed service, writing about national defense issues to affect policy, and making alliances with politicians to advance one's own personal and service interests are the same as the partisanship of identifying personally with the ideology, and political and cultural agenda, of a political party, which is the partisanship that has emerged in the last two decades. For a different view, see Betros, "Officer Professionalism in the Late Progressive Era," in Don Snider and Gayle Watkins, eds., *The Future of Army Professionalism* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2002), in press.

80. Mackubin Thomas Owens, "The Democratic Party's War On the Military," *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 22, 2000, p. 22. See also Tom Donnelly, "Why Soldiers Dislike Democrats," *Weekly Standard*, Dec. 4, 2000, p. 14.

81. Ed Offley, "Rejected Military Votes Spark New Furor In Florida Election Count," *Stars and Stripes Omnimedia*, Nov. 20, 2000; Thomas E. Ricks, "Democratic Ballot Challenges Anger Military," *Washington Post*, Nov. 21, 2000, p. A18; Kenneth Allard, "Military Ballot Mischief," *Washington Times*, Nov. 27, 2000; Elaine M. Grossman, "Rift Over Florida Military Ballots Might Affect A Gore Administration," *Inside the Pentagon*, Nov. 30, 2000, p. 1.

82. Triangle Institute for Security Studies, "Survey on the Military in the Post Cold War Era," 1999. The question read: "If civilian leaders order the military to do something that it opposes, military leaders will seek ways to avoid carrying out the order: 1) all of the time [9% chose this answer]; most of the time [21%]; some of the time [38%]; rarely [20%]; never [8%]; no opinion [4%]." The telephone survey of over 1,000 people was administered by Princeton Survey Research Associates in September 1998.

83. I made this argument more fully in "The Political Trap for the Military," *Raleigh* (NC) *News & Observer*, Sept. 22, 2000, p. A19, orig. pub. *Washington Post*, Sept. 19, 2000, p. A23. See also Charles A. Stevenson, "Bridging the Gap Between Warriors and Politicians," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA, Sept. 2-5, 1999.

84. Richard Holbrooke, *To End a War* (New York: Random House, 1998), 144-146, 361-362. An indication of the bitterness that developed between Holbrooke and Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Commander in Chief Allied Forces Southern Europe, who carried out the bombing for NATO's governing body, is in "Frontline: Give War a Chance," (WGBH Educational Foundation, 2000), aired May 11, 1999, Public Broadcasting System. For a dispassionate view of the misunderstanding between political and military officials, see Col. Robert C. Owen, "Summary," in Col. Robert C. Owen, USAF, ed., *Deliberate Force: A Case Study in Effective Bombing* (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Press, 2000), 500-505.

85. Huntington, *Soldier and the State*, ch. 2, 8-11, pp. 361-367; James L. Abrahamson, *America Arms for a New Century: The Making of a Great Military Power* (New York: The Free Press, 1981), 138-147; Karsten, Naval Aristocracy, 187-193.

86. In the TISS survey, the answer "agree strongly" or "agree somewhat" to the question, "The decline of traditional values is contributing to the breakdown of our society," was distributed as follows ("Military" being active duty and active reserve and National Guard up-and-coming officers): Military: 89%; Civilian Elite: 70%; Mass Public: 82%. Question, "Through leading by example, the military could help American society become more moral." Military: 70%; Civilian Elite: 42%; Mass Public: not surveyed on this question. Question, "Civilian society would be better off if it adopted more of the military's values and customs." Military: 75%; Civilian Elite: 29%; Mass Public: 37%. See also Davis, "Attitudes and Opinions," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, 116-119. For more analysis of the military view of civilian society, see Paul Gronke and Peter D. Feaver, "Uncertain Confidence: Civilian and Military Attitudes about Civil-Military Relations," in ibid., 147 ff. On p. 149, they wrote: "elite military officers evaluate civilian society far more negatively than do elite civilians..." The use of the military as a role model for society has a long history in American thinking. In the 1980s, Chief of Naval Operations James D. Watkins was a leading proponent. Peter Grier, "Navy as National Role Model?" Christian Science Monitor, June 4, 1986, p. 1.

87. Sam C. Sarkesian, "The U.S. Military Must Find Its Voice," Orbis, 42 (Summer 1998), 423-437; James H. Webb, Jr., "The Silence of the Admirals," *US Naval Institute Proceedings*, 125 (Jan. 1999), 29-34. Sarkesian expanded the argument in Sam C. Sarkesian and Robert E. Connor, Jr., *The US Military Profession into the Twenty-First Century: War, Peace and Politics* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), esp. ch. 11, 12. Even as respected and experienced a defense reporter as George C. Wilson implied that the senior military leadership should speak out publicly in disagreement with their civilian superiors. This sentiment became something of a mantra in the mid and late 1990s as senior officers were accused of caving in to political correctness. See Wilson, "Joint Chiefs Need to Be More Gutsy," *National Journal*, Nov. 20, 1999, p. 3418.

88. Webb, "Silence of the Admirals," 34.

89. *The Line of Fire*, 214. The 1998-1999 TISS survey asked under what circumstances "it is acceptable for a military member to leak unclassified information or documents to the press." The figures for active duty officers were:

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
"A crime has been committed			

and the chain of command is not acting on it"	26%	70%	4%
"Backing down may prevent a policy that will lead to unnecessary casualties"	30%	65%	6%
"Backing down does not accuse of action that is morally or ethically wrong"	28%	65%	7%
"Disobedience is rebuked by a superior"	17%	76%	7%
"Ending service brings to light a military policy or course of action that may lead to a disaster for the country"	39%	55%	6%
"Forever"	41%	49%	10%

Reserve and National Guard officers were slightly more willing to agree to back, but these remained a high percentage (46%) answered "forever."

90 Peter J. Skerkis, "New Commandant Intends to Push for More Resources for Pentagon," *Inside the Navy*, Nov. 15, 1999, p. 1; Hunter Keeter, "Marine Commandant Calls For Defense Spending Increase," John Robinson, "Outgoing Chief Commander Warns Fleet Size Is Too Small," *Defense Daily*, Aug. 16, Sept. 22, 2000, p. 6, p. 1; Elaine M. Grossman, "Defense Budget Boosts 4 Percent of GDP Would Pose Dramatic Shift," *Inside the Pentagon*, Aug. 31, 2000, p. 3; Steven Lee Myers, "A Call To Put The Budget Surplus To Use For The Military," *New York Times*, Sept. 28, 2000, p. A24; Cindy Rupert, "Admiral Navy Plans to Past One," *Tampa Tribune*, Oct. 21, 2000, p. 2; Linda de France, "Senior Navy Officers: 'We Need More Ships, Planes, Subs,'" "In Next QDR, Budgets Need to Support Our Tasking' General Says," *Aerospace Daily*, Oct. 30, Dec. 4, 2000; Vicki Howell, "Admiral Tells Civic Clubs Navy Needs More Ships, Subs," *Birmingham (AL) News*, Nov. 16, 2000, p. 6B; Robert Natter, "Help Keep This the Greatest Navy," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, 126 (Dec. 2000) 2; Rowan Scarborough, "Military Expects Bush to Perform," *Washington Times*, Dec. 26, 2000, p. 1.

91 Rowan Scarborough, "Cohen Tells Military Leaders 'Not To Beat Drum With Tin Cup,'" *Washington Times*, Sept. 8, 2000, p. 4; Secretary Cohen told them, according to his spokesman, "to be more strategic." According to Thomas E. Ricks and Robert Suro, "Military Budget Maneuvers Target Next President," *Washington Post*, June 5, 2000, p. 1, the armed services began ringing up new demands on the budget as early as June 2000 to "target" the next administration. "We're going for the big money," another member of the Joint Staff was quoted as saying. "Pentagon insiders say the Clinton administration, which long has fewer hawkish military issues, doesn't have a mandate to push hard with the chiefs - especially in the midst of Gore's campaign. So these officials say, it's up to Defense Secretary William S. Cohen to use his access to the president to turn up the pressure." One career bureaucrat in the Office of the Secretary of Defense said privately that he was offended by the arrogant tone service officials have used in recent discussions. "By contrast, a senior military official said the chiefs' budget demands represent a 'regurgitation of bare-knuckle thinking' in both the White House and Congress, which have asked the military to conduct a growing number of missions around the world in recent years while paying the full bill."

92 Bradley Graham, "Joint Chiefs Doubted Air Strategy," *Washington Post*, Apr. 5 1999, p. A1. See also Kenneth R. Rizer, Major, USAF, *Military Resistance to Humanitarian Warin Kosovo and Beyond: An Ideological Explanation* [Air University Library, Faichild Paper] [Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Press, 2000), 1-2, 7, 41-42.

93 The regular public promotion of service interests by officers began when the Navy and Army in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries formed elaborate understandings of their own domain of defense and formal doctrines for warfighting in their respective domains of sea and land (and later air). The institutionalization of service advocacy in military subjects and public pronouncements on national security affairs is a much debated domain of contemporary civil-military relations. Efforts to limit the military's public voice began perhaps in the first Wilson administration (1913-1917) have been episodic, and often ineffective. See Alan R. Millett, *The American Political System and Civilian Control of the Military: A Historical Perspective* (Columbus, OH: The Mershon Center of The Ohio State University, 1979), 19, 27-30; Karsten, Naval Aristocracy, 301-313, 362-371; Abrahamson, America Arms for a New Century, 147-150; Bacevich, "Officer Professionalism," Impress, Johnson, *Fast Tanks and Heavy Bombers*, 68-69 (New York: Harper Collins, 1997).

94 The author was McMaster's advisor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992-1996, for the seminar papers, MA thesis, and PhD dissertation that resulted in the book.

95 McMaster insists such an interpretation only by implying that Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson might have been justified in resigning (p. 318), by implying that the Chiefs should have "confronted the president with their objections to McNamara's approach to the war" (p. 328), by stating that "The president expected the Chiefs to do" and the flag officers should not have debated it" (p. 331), and by blaming the Chiefs for going along with a strategy they believed would fail and thus sharing the culpability with their civilian superiors for losing the war "in Washington, DC, even before American soldiers took responsibility for the fighting in 1965 and before the end of the year, as the country was at war, indeed, even before the first American units were deployed." (pp. 333-334). The interpretation long standing in military thinking since the Vietnam War is that the war lacked clear objectives, was lost because a failed strategy was imposed by civilian politicians who limited American power and micromanaged military operations, and because the American people, who took the war (not the casualties as a voluntary service), were biased against the American effort by a hostile press. Rosemary Mariner, retired naval captain and pioneer naval aviator, remembers "a certain irony to the Vietnam War story" in "every ready room," a date every "happy hour" from "fighter training and throughout subsequent tactical aviation assignments" (she was commissioned in 1973). "...that belief that Robert S. McNamara was the devil incarnate, whom the Joint Chiefs obviously didn't have the balls to stand up to. Had the general admirals resigned in protest or conducted some kind of fast admiral revolt, the war would have been won or stopped." Thus Mariner's "initial reaction to McMaster's book was that is simply affirmed what had been received as common wisdom." Conversation with the author, Apr. 13, 2000, Durham, NC; e-mail to the author, May 14, 2001. Indications of the impact of Vietnam on officer thinking are in George C. Herring, "Preparing Not to Fight the Last War: The Impact of the Vietnam War on the U.S. Military," in Charles Neu, ed., *After Vietnam: Legacies of a Lost War* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 73-77; David Howell Petraeus, *The American Military and the Lessons of Vietnam: A*

Study of Military Influence and the Use of Force in the Post-Vietnam Era (PhD diss, Princeton University, 1987) and Frank Hoffman, *Decisive Force: The New American Way of War* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).

96 Fogleman explained his motives in a 1997 interview and specifically rejected the notion that he resigned in protest. Kohn and Kohn, "Early Retirement of Fogleman," 6-23, esp. 20.

97. While there is no tradition of resignation in the American armed forces, it has happened, and occasionally senior officers have considered doing so. In 1907, "Admiral William H. Brownson resigned as chief of the Bureau of Navigation after the president [Theodore Roosevelt] overruled Brownson's protests, appointed a surgeon rather than a line officer to command a hospital ship..." Coyle, "Roosevelt, Congress, and the Military," 325. George C. Marshall reflected on his attempted resignation, or was reported to have done so, at least a half dozen times when Chief of Staff, but did not take it that he had actually threatened to do it only once - and once to a select few. He characterized his actions as "impermissible." Forrest C. Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope* (New York: The Viking Press, 1966), 461 (note 33) and 197-103, 285-287; Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945* (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), 246-247, 492-493, 510-11. Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson considered resigning several times, and in August 1967 the Joint Chiefs (absent one member) considered resigning as a group over the Vietnam War. See Lewis Sorley, *Honorable Warrior: General Harold K. Johnson and the Ethics of Command* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 181-182, 223-224, 263, 268-270, 285-287, 308-304. In 1977 on a flight to Omaha from Washington, Gen F. Michael Rogers suggested to four of his colleagues that the Air Force's fourteen should resign over President Jimmy Carter's cancellation of the B-1 bomber, but nothing came of the discussion. See Erik Rikel-Coleman, "Political Pressures on the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Case of General David C. Jones," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Military History, Calgary, Alberta, May 27, 2001. The source for the discussion of mass resignation is Gen Bruce Holloway, USAF, Oral History Interview by Lt Col Vaughn H. Gallacher, Aug 16-18, 1977, pp 424-426, USAF Historical Research Agency, Maxwell AFB, AL. In a discussion about pressure to resign over the cancellation of the B-1, Gen David C. Jones (Oral History Interview by Lt Col Maurice N. Manyrow, USAF and Richard H. Kohn, Aug-Oct 1985 and Jan-Mar 1986, pp. 178, 179, 181, [ibid]) commented "I think there are cases where people should perhaps resign if they are very pressured to do something immoral, illegal, unethical, or if you possibly feel you had in the day in question - if you had in the end to express your views, or if we had been invited in the conversation to the Congress... I see no more than is very presumptuous that somebody in the military can see themselves up on a pedestal that they have the answer to the country, that the President who has just been elected on a platform of cutting the defense budget is somehow so wrong that we are in his pedestal position, that we know the answer is in this country... I'm just not there. My tone makes a case, and then salutes smartly once that case is made... The only thing I have seen while I was in the military that really would be... a condition of resignation would be somehow during the Vietnam War. But probably... it would have been for the wrong reasons. The White House... determining the targets... or whatever. There more fundamental reasons I show in the world did we get ourselves involved in a land war in Southeast Asia. [W]e are really servants of the people. The people make the decisions on the President. We are elected, the President is elected. It's only in the regard if I'm here or they are trying to corrupt you, buying you or buying your way, or doing you and by my using you and all that sort of stuff... On [s]omething is of such national importance, and I'm not sure anybody can predict." In 1980, Chief of Staff Edward N. Meyer was asked by the Secretary of the Army to resign. In a statement to Congress about "a hollow army," Meyer refused and declined to resign, but that was not accepted. Kitfield, *Prodigal Soldiers*, 201-203. Retired Marine Corps Commandant Charles C. Krulak (transcript of the question and answer session, Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics, Springfield, VA, Jan 27-28, 2000, enclosed in e-mail from macdaigue to the author, Feb 1, 2000) claimed that "if the become known within the Pentagon that 56 Marine General Officers would turn in their suits if invited, and certainly were imposed on the Marine Corps... The Marines do walk in their sand, and the opposition did."

98 Colin L. Powell with Joseph E. Persico, *My American Journey* (New York: Random House, 1995), 167.

99 Ibid, 149. In May 1983, Lt Col Wesley Clark "suggested in a fragment" to Big Gen Powell on introducing a transition plan to the incoming Army Chief of Staff "is the most important thing never to commit US troops again unless we're going into win? No more graduals and holding back like in Vietnam, but go in with overwhelming force?" According to Clark, Powell agreed. "This argument captured what so many of us felt after Vietnam." Clark, *Waging Modern War*, 7. Clark remembered that "in the Army, it had long been a maxim for officers that we would be 'no more Vietnams,' a vision which dates and the weight of the nation's decade-plus lack of public support at home." Ibid, 17.

100 Ole R. Holsti, "Of Chasms and Convergences: Attitudes and Beliefs of Civilians and Military Elites at the Start of a New Millennium," in Feaver and Kohn, eds, *Soldiers and Civilians*, 84, and tables 127, 128, TIPS survey, question 46.

101 Lt Gen Ronald T. Kadish, USAF, Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, "Remarks," Dec 6, 2000, Space and Missile Defense Symposium and Exhibition, Association of the United States Army, El Paso, TX, <http://www.ausa.org/kadish.html> (Jan 5, 2000).

102 Frank Hoffman e-mail to the author, Mar 14, 2000. Hoffman, a member of the National Security Study Group assisting the US Commission on National Security 21st Century, reported his conversation with a "Joint Staff Officer at the Joint Staff and the military offices in the NSC were coordinating a quick shot to preclude the President from announcing a Clinton Doctrine on the use of force in late Oct. It was expressed in the conversation that what push that publishing a strategy with narrow use of force criteria would dictate to the President from contacting himself later in the month in a speech that would intervene on the military's side of how to use military force."

103 Kohn and Kohn, "Early Retirement of Fogleman," 12.

104 "Why is it that whatever the question is - enforcing peace agreement in Bosnia, evacuating the UN from Bosnia, invading Haiti - the answer is always 25,000 Army troops," one Marine officer told a reporter. By mid-1995, the uniformed leadership was moved to adopt opposing interventions. See Thomas E. Ricks, "Colin Powell's Doctrine on Use of Military Force Is Now Being Questioned by Senior US Officers," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug 30, 1995, p. A12, Quinn-Judge, "Doubts of phrase," p. 12.

105 Kohn and Kohn, "Early Retirement of Fogleman," 18. There was another instance of possible resignation voiced privately in 2000. Conversation with senior military officer, Jan 2001.

106 In "The Pentagon, Not Congress, Or The President, Calls The Shots," International Herald Tribune, Aug 6, 2001, <http://www.hnt.com/articles/2842.htm> (Dec 5, 2001), journalist William Pfaff calls the military "the most powerful institution in American government in practice, largely unaccountable to the executive branch" and the Pentagon's "power in Congress" "unassailable." In "The Praetorian Guard," The National Interest, Winter 2000/2001, pp. 57-64, Pfaff asserts (p. 63) that American "military forces play a larger role in international affairs than in the counterparts in any state outside the Third World." See also Desch, Civilian Control, ch 3 and appendix; Charles Lane, "TRB from Washington," New Republic, Nov. 15, 1999, p. 8; Melvin Goodman, "Shotgun Diplomacy: The Dangers of Letting the Military Control Foreign Policy," *Washington Monthly*, 32 (Dec 2000) 46-51; Gore Vidal, "Washington, We Have A Problem," *Vanity Fair*, Dec 2000, p. 136ff.

107 For the long-term congressional failure of authority in national security, see Louis Fisher, *Congressional Abdication on War & Spending* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000), ch 1-4.

108 The oath every American military officer takes upon commissioning reads "I [name], do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." The requirement and wording is in 5 USC, §3331 (1966). Another oath supports the Constitution is required of "all executive and judicial officers," as well as senators and representatives of the national and state governments by Article VI, paragraph 3.

109. For civilian control in the Constitution, see Richard H. Kohn, "The Constitution and National Security: The Intent of the Framers," in Richard H. Kohn, ed., *The United States Military under the Constitution of the United States, 1789-1989* (New York: New York University Press, 1991), 61-94.

110. A good bibliography of the literature on the Vietnam War is George C. Herring, *America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975*, 3d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996). The most convincing explanations of the American defeat are the inability of the United States and South Vietnam to prevent communist forces from contesting the countryside and continuing combat, and the failure to establish an indigenous government that could command the loyalty or obedience of the population in the crucial period 1965-1968 before the American people's patience with the costs and inconclusiveness of the struggle and forced American disengagement. The best discussion to date of civil-military relations in the Persian Gulf War is Michael R. Gordon and General Bernard D. Trainor, *The General's War: The Inside Story of the Conflict in the Gulf* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1995). The memoirs of Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf confirm the very strong oversight and occasional intervention by the Bush Administration in strategy and operations during the fighting. The senior British Commander in the Gulf, General Sir Peter de la Billiere, *Storm Command: A Personal Account* (London: HarperCollins, 1992), 103 remembered that Schwarzkopf was under intense pressure from Washington "to consider the plans being drawn up by amateur strategists in the Pentagon," but (pp. 139-40) that as early as December 1990, he "had no intention of telling us how he should proceed ... no precise instructions as to whether he was to attack Iraq as a whole, march on Baghdad, capture Saddam, or what." See also George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Random House, 1998), 302 ff.

111. That civilian control includes the right of the civilians to be "wrong" is the insight of Peter D. Feaver. See "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society*, 23 (1996), 154.

112. The importance of mutual civilian control, even to the point of interference in technical military matters, in order to assure a strong coalition between generals and managers, is the argument of Eliot A. Cohen, "The Unequal Dialogue," in Feaver and Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*, ch. 12.

113. S.L.A. Marshall, the famous journalist-historian-reserve officer who from the 1930s through the 1970s studied and wrote so influentially about the dynamics of battle and war, was not containing the military from other professions but explaining uniformed leaders when he wrote: "...the placing of the ethic of duty above the ethic of self-interest is all that distinguishes the soldier from the civilian. And that aspect of military education is slighted from year to year in the nation that is most in doubt on security." *The Soldier's Load and the Mobility of a Nation* (1947; reprint ed. Quantico, VA: Marine Corps Association, 1980), 104.

114. I am indebted to University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill emeritus professor of political science Raymond Dawson for this distinction.

115. Since the end of Cold War, the Department of Defense has created dozens of new institutes for security studies to teach democratic defense practices, particularly civilian control of the military, to the nations. Presently these are at least four, serve uniformed officers, defense officials, and political leaders from formerly communist countries in Europe and central Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Asia-Pacific.

116. Speech to the House of Commons, Nov. 11, 1947, Robert Rhodes James, ed., *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches*, 8 vols. (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974), VII, 7566.

Richard H. Kohn

Richard H. Kohn chairs the Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he is Professor of History. He also serves as Executive Secretary of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, a consortium of faculty at Duke, Carolina, and North Carolina State interested in national and international security issues.

Educated at Harvard and the University of Wisconsin, Kohn has served on the faculties at CCNY, Rutgers University-New Brunswick, and the National and Army War Colleges. From 1981 to 1991 he was Chief of Air Force History and Chief Historian of the United States Air Force. He has lectured at numerous universities and to a variety of academic and military audiences, and has served as an advisor or consultant to various academic and government organizations and agencies, including the US Indian Claims Commission, the Presidential Materials Review Board of the National Archives and Records Administration, the Advisory Board of the US Air Force's Gulf War Air Power Survey, and the Advisory Committee on Research and Collections Management for the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum, which he chaired from 1991 to 1996. He served two terms as president of the Society for Military History, 1989-1993. Currently he serves on the USAF's Air University Board of Visitors and as a consultant to the US Commission on National Security/21st Century, the government group reviewing American national security policies and institutions. He also chairs the board of directors of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, the historical profession's lobbying organization.

His awards include the Organization of American Historian's Binkley-Stephenson Prize, the Society for Military History's Victory Gondos Memorial Service Award, the Air Force Historical Foundation's President's Award, two Department of the Army Certificates for Patriotic Civilian Service, and the Department of the Air Force's Organizational Excellence and Exceptional Civilian Service Awards.

A specialist in American military history and civil-military relations, he is the author of Eagle and Sword: The Federalists and the Creation of the Military

Establishment in America, 1783-1802 (1975). He has also edited, co-edited, or co-authored some eight other volumes on American military history, including The United States Military under the Constitution of the United States, 1789-1989 (1991) and The Exclusion of Black Soldiers from the Medal of Honor in World War II (1997), the report that resulted in the award of seven medals of honor to black soldiers of that conflict. Among his recent publications are "How Democracies Control the Military," Journal of Democracy, 8 (October 1997), 140-153 and "An Officer Corps for the Next Century," Joint Force Quarterly, No. 18 (Spring 1998), 76-80. Currently he is working on a book about presidential war leadership in American history, and co-directing a project investigating the gap between military and civilian attitudes and culture in the United States today.

The Harmon Lectures in Military History

The oldest and most prestigious lecture series at the Air Force Academy, the Harmon Memorial Lectures in Military History originated with Lieutenant General Hubert R. Harmon, the Academy's first superintendent (1954-1956) and a serious student of military history. General Harmon believed that history should play a vital role in the new Air Force Academy curriculum. Meeting with the History Department on one occasion, he described General George S. Patton, Jr.'s visit to the West Point library before departing for the North African campaign. In a flurry of activity Patton and the librarians combed the West Point holdings for historical works that might be useful to him in the coming months. Impressed by Patton's regard for history and personally convinced of history's great value, General Harmon believed that cadets should study the subject during each of their four years at the Academy.

General Harmon fell ill with cancer soon after launching the Air Force Academy at Lowry Air Force Base in Denver in 1954. He died in February 1957. He had completed a monumental task over the preceding decade as the chief planner for the new service academy and as its first superintendent. Because of his leadership and the tensions of the cold war, Congress strongly supported the development of a first-rate school and allotted generous appropriations to build and staff the institution.

The Academy's leadership felt greatly indebted to General Harmon and sought to honor his accomplishments in some way. The Department of History considered launching a lecture series to commemorate his efforts, and in 1959 the Harmon Memorial Lecture Series in Military History was born.

The Harmon Lecture series supports two goals: to encourage the interest in contemporary military history and to stimulate in cadets a lifelong interest in the study of the history of the military profession. The lectures are published and distributed to interested individuals and organizations throughout the world and many are used in courses at the Academy. In this way, we continue to honor the memory of General Harmon, who during his lifetime developed a keen interest in military history and greatly contributed to establishing the United States Air Force Academy.

Previous Harmon Memorial Lectures

I. [illegible]

II [illegible]

III [illegible]

IV. [illegible]

V. [illegible]

VI [illegible]

VI. [illegible]

VII. [illegible]

IX. [illegible]

X. [illegible]

XI. [illegible]

XII. [illegible]

XIII. [illegible]

XIV. [illegible]

XV. [illegible]

XVI. [illegible]

XVII. [illegible]

XVIII. [illegible]

XIX. [illegible]

XX. [illegible]

XXI. [illegible]

XXII. [illegible]

XXIII. [illegible]

XXIV. [illegible]

XXV. [illegible]

XXVI. [illegible]

XXVII. [illegible]

XXVIII. [illegible]

XXIX. [illegible]

XXX. [illegible]

XXXI. [illegible]

XXXII. [illegible]

XXXIII. [illegible]

XXXIV. [illegible]

XXXV. [illegible]

XXXVI. [illegible]

XXXVII. *The Structure of Military-Technical Transformation*, by William H. McNeill, 1994

XXXVIII. *The Place of World War II in History*, by Gerhard L. Weinberg, 1995

XXXIX. [illegible]

XL. *Battles Not Fought: The Creation of an Independent Air Force*, by Stephen L. McFarland, 1997

XLI. *Fighting with Allies: The hand care and feeding of the Anglo-American Special Relationship*, by Warren Kimball, 1998

The first thirty lectures in this series are compiled in one volume, *The Harmon Memorial Lectures in Military History*, 1959-1987, edited by Lt. Colonel Harry R. Borowski. Published by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.