

The views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US Air Force, Department of Defense or the US Government."

USAFA Harmon Memorial Lecture #15

"The End of Militarism"

Russell E. Weigley, 1972

General Clark and Col. Hurley, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. When this past August Muhammad Ali went to West Point to be an analyst for the American Broadcasting Company's Telecast of the Olympic boxing trials held at the Military Academy, sportswriter Dave Anderson wrote in the New York Times about the ironies that placed Ali, "Once a symbol of antiwar sentiment, . . . on a campus dedicated to a militaristic philosophy. " By implication, presumably we are meeting today on another "campus dedicated to a militaristic philosophy." If that be true, however, then apparently one of the features of a militaristic philosophy is that it permits and encourages a critical examination of the nature of militarism. Also of the relations between the military and society, for such is the purpose for which the Fifteenth Military History Symposium of the United States Air Force Academy has assembled.

We can no doubt assume that Dave Anderson wrote with no clear idea of what he meant by "a militaristic philosophy." But more serious writers have not always been clear either about what they intend when they write about militarism and things militaristic. Even among the most careful analysts of American military problems, those words carry with them a train of historical associations and connotations that may obscure our understanding of the principal problems of the military and society today.

Popular and also serious usage of the words "militarism" and "militaristic" seems to have been stretched a long distance away from the precision with which Alfred Vagts tried to endow the terms in his now classic *History of Militarism*, first published in 1937. In that book Dr. Vagts drew a careful distinction between the legitimate "military way" and the "militaristic way." "The distinction is fundamental and fateful," said Vagts. In Vagts's view, it is a distortion that overlooks the needs for and legitimate uses of armed forces to regard everything military as militaristic. In Vagts's terms, the military way exists when armed forces seek to win the objectives of national power with the utmost efficiency. The militaristic way appears when armed forces glorify the incidental but romantic trappings of war for their own sake, often to the detriment of efficient pursuit of legitimate military purpose's. ² "An army so built that it serves military men, are not, is militaristic," in Vagts's definition; "so is everything in an army which is not preparation for fighting, but merely exists for diversion or to satisfy peacetime whims like the long-anachronistic cavalry. "³ But in Vagts's analysis, the appropriate military activities of armed forces are not militaristic, and "militarism is thus not the opposite of pacifism. . . "⁴

In American usage today, such distinctions have virtually disappeared. Even in such a relatively serious, albeit polemical, book as *Militarism, U.S.A.*, by Col. James A. Donovan (USMC Retired), almost everything connected with the American defense establishment is not simply military but militaristic, and 'America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation embodied in a vast, expensive, and burgeoning military-industrial scientific-political combine which dominates the country and affects much of our daily life, our economy, our international status, and our Foreign policies.

Perhaps so; but here the word militarism is intended to encompass so wide a range of problems, and the emotion-stirring connotations of the word have so much dissolved its specific denotations, that with usage such as Dave Anderson's and Colonel Donovan's we might well argue for the end of militarism as a term to be employed in discourse and debate, simply on the ground that it has been stretched so far that it no longer means anything in particular.

But indiscriminate tarring of the American military system with the brush of militarism hinders understanding of the present military policy and problems of the United States in a deeper way. It confuses thought about the various predicaments facing us in military and foreign policy by confusing us about the sources of our problems. It implies that the blame for our predicaments lies with a kind of institution that no longer exists anywhere in the world and never existed in the United States. It sets up a scapegoat for blunders shared by the whole American nation, and it suggests that there is a relatively easy way out of the difficulties imposed on us by the burden of arms that we carry, when unfortunately no such easy way out exists.

When the word retained enough specificity of meaning to foster understanding, "militarism" described the phenomenon of a professional military officer corps not only controlling the armed forces of a state but existing as a state within the state, an officer corps existing as an autonomous sovereignty separate from the other institutions of the state and likely in a difference of opinion with those other institutions to have its own way, because the officer corps possessed a monopoly of the armed force on which the state depended.

The classic instance of militarism is of course Prussia and then the Prussian-dominated German Empire, from the Napoleonic period through the First World War. The classic Prussian type of militarism did not appear until the time of the military reforms that followed Napoleon's defeat of Prussia in the twin battles of Jena and Auerstadt in 1806, because only then did the first truly professional officer corps begin to develop, as Samuel P. Huntington has made well known in his book *The Soldier and the State*.⁶ Before the Prussians invented the professional officer corps, no distinctively military interest existed in the European states. Previously, military officership was an appurtenance of aristocracy. Previously, the officer did not possess a military education that in any way can be called professional, he was typically an aristocrat first and then an officer, and his political interests were not distinctively military ones but primarily the class interests of the aristocracy. Without a distinctively military interest and influence to work upon the policies of the state, there could be no militarism.

By creating the first professional officer corps as a means of offsetting the individual genius of Napoleon with an educated collective intelligence, the Prussians took the first essential step toward nourishing a distinctively military interest within the state and thus militarism. Because Prussia was a state uniquely dependent upon its military, it soon moved into the other essential step as well, that of allowing the professional military interest to become an autonomous sovereignty within the state. Modern Prussia had always been uniquely dependent on military power to maintain its claim to great-power status and its very existence. Though the Prussian reformers of the Napoleonic era hoped to bring the army closer to the people at large than it had been in the time of Frederick the Great, in fact the newly professional officer corps was able to exploit Prussia's extreme dependence on the army to make the army more separate from the rest of the state and the nation than before, and more autonomous. The professionalization of the officer corps gave the army leadership a special expertise to enhance its claims to freedom from control by the civil state. The conservative stance of the army against the middle-class liberals who in the mid-nineteenth century hoped to transform Prussia into a parliamentary state widened the gulf of suspicion and misunderstanding between the army and the nation at large. Yet, because the Prussian liberals were also nationalists, the decisive role of the army in placing Prussia at the head of the German Empire in the wars of 1864-1871 also left even the middle-class liberals reluctant to challenge the increasingly autonomous and privileged position of the army.

In the midst of the wars for Prussian hegemony over Germany, the officer corps quarrelled with the great Chancellor Otto von Bismarck himself, asserting the independence of the army from all direction by the civil government and the independence of military strategy in wartime from the Chancellor's efforts to bend it to national policy. On January 29, 1871, the Chief of the General Staff, Helmuth von Moltke, responded to Bismarck's charges that the army was both indulging in political activity of

its own and denying the Chancellor information about operations, in writing to the only superior authority he acknowledged, the Emperor:

I believe that it would be a good thing to settle my relationship with the Federal Chancellor definitively. Up till now I have considered that the Chief of the General Staff (especially in war) and the Federal Chancellor are two equally warranted and mutually independent agencies under the direct command of Your Royal Majesty, which have the duty of keeping each other reciprocally informed.⁷

This declaration of the independence of the German army from the rest of the state except for the Emperor had already been preceded by a number of specific efforts by the army to override Bismarck's policies in the name of the autonomy of military strategy, as for example when the army had wished to complete the military humiliation of Austria in 1866 at the expense of the Chancellor's efforts to lay the foundation of future friendship and alliance, and as when the army obstructed Bismarck's efforts to negotiate an early peace with France to head off possible foreign intervention in the Franco Prussian War. It required all Bismarck's political astuteness and power, and all the Chancellor's persuasive influence with the Emperor William I, to keep the army in harness with national policy through the wars of 1864-1871, and at that Bismarck did not succeed in every detail.

When Bismarck was succeeded by lesser German Chancellors, the officer corps and especially the General Staff emerged not only as a state within the state but able to challenge with frequent success the independence of the civil state from army dictation in behalf of army interests. Because Chancellor Leo von Caprivi sponsored a Reichstag bill to reduce compulsory military service from three to two years- albeit increasing the peacetime strength of the army in the process- the army undermined Caprivi's standing with Emperor William II so badly that the Chancellor concluded he must resign. Under the next Chancellor, the army at various times forced the removal of a War Minister, a Foreign Minister, and a Minister of the Interior who displeased the officer corps.

Here indeed, in Germany after the Franco-Prussian War, the phenomenon of militarism existed: the professional officer corps, a distinctively military interest, had become virtually a sovereignty unto itself independent of the civil state, and it exploited its sovereignty to bend the whole policy of the civil state to the interests of the military whatever might have been the interests of the nation at large. Here in fact was a militarism whose power exceeded the implications of Alfred Vagts's definitions in his *History of Militarism*. Here was a German officer corps whose abuse of its power to reshape national policy to its will far belied Samuel Huntington's idealized depiction of the German officer corps, in *The Soldier and the State*, as practically the embodiment of the model type of the professional Officer corps bound by "objective civilian control." Here already was plainly foreshadowed the dictatorship of the army over the civil state that led Germany to disaster in World War I.

But in 1871 Germany's disasters of 1914-1918 were far in the future, and for the present the most conspicuous feature of the German military system was that the skills of a professional and autonomous officer corps had transformed Prussia from the least of the great powers into the center of a unified German Empire whose strength approached military hegemony in Europe. If the Prussian officer corps, headed by its General Staff, could accomplish so much beginning from a base that afforded them limited resources, what could they not accomplish now that they could draw on the most populous state in Europe outside Russia and upon an industrial system rapidly moving toward European preeminence? All the rival powers concluded that in self-defense they must emulate the Prussian-German military system, including the professionalization of the officer corps and the granting to it of a considerable measure of autonomy.

In victorious Germany in the 1870s, the army was the darling of the nation because it had won; even most of the previously disgruntled liberals joined in the national love affair with the army. In defeated France in the 1870s, the army was almost equally the darling of the nation because it had lost: the army must be pampered and cultivated so that it would not lose again. The French Third Republic was considerably quicker to pass the basic laws creating a military system remodeled after the Prussian

example than to adopt the basic constitutional laws settling the decision between republicanism and a restoration of the Bourbons or the Bonapartes. By the turn of the century, the Dreyfus affair revealed to France some of the dangers inherent in cultivating a military interest powerful and arrogant enough to set itself up as a judge not only of the policies but of the moral fiber of the nation at large; yet for all the acrimony of the Dreyfus case, as soon as the affair seemed to endanger the efficiency of the army—when the public learned of anticlerical spying against Catholic and conservative officers and the keeping of files concerning such officers in the headquarters of French Freemasonry—the voters and government once again rallied behind the army. The last ten years before 1914 saw any intention to curb the autonomy and pride of the French officer corps dissolved in the effort to strengthen the army against the increasingly restless rival across the Rhine.

Great Britain and the United States did not feel obliged to follow the Prussian military example so thoroughly as the continental powers. In the wake of 1870, neither of the Anglo-Saxon powers abandoned its traditional volunteer armed forces to adopt the Prussian system of recruitment and training, the cadre-conscript system. Neither created an army large enough or became dependent enough on its army to foster the continental pattern of militarism. But even in the Anglo-Saxon powers, the officer corps had to be remade into a body of professionals where previously there had been a relatively easy interchange of military and civilian roles. The consequent creation of a distinctively military interest created unprecedented tensions between the military and the rest of the society even in Great Britain and the United States.

In the United States, the military scholar and writer Emory Upton both contributed greatly to the professionalization of the officers and nourished within the officer corps a distrust of American civilian values and of democratic government. In Great Britain, where for all its abuses the system of purchasing commissions had kept the interests of the officer corps in harmony with those of the civil leadership, the abolition of purchase as one of the responses to the rise of Prussia opened the way to that military contempt for civilian leaders exemplified by the young Douglas Haig when he said: "I would disband the politicians for ten years. We would all be better without them."⁸ Until the professionalization of the officer corps, British soldiers habitually had been politicians themselves, the leading soldiers frequently sitting in Parliament; there had been no clear separation of military and civil interests. When the Great War of 1914-1918 at last compelled Britain to build a mass conscript army, military professionalism's creation of a distinct military interest separate from and hostile to the politicians brought militarism even to Britain, as the soldiers sought and through much of the war won a quasi-sovereignty, and in the crises of the war an ascendancy, over the civil government.

By that time, militarism on the European continent had reached the climax of its history, as a decisive influence among the forces that plunged Europe into the Great War. In Austria, Russia, and Germany, the quasi-sovereignty of the military, their ability in a crisis to bend the policies of the civil governments of their countries, and the insistence of the general staffs that diplomacy and national policy must be sacrificed to the expediencies of military strategy and the military mobilization plans ensured that there would be no escape from the Sarajevo crisis without material collision.

Militarism contributed decisively to the coming of the First World War; but historical militarism, the militarism of the quasi-sovereign professional officer corps, was also among the casualties of the war. Each of the European states had favored its officer corps with the power and privileges of a state within the state because after the wars of 1864-1871, each state believed it needed to do so in order to protect itself against the fate of Austria in 1866 and of France in 1870-1871; and each state at the same time hoped that by doing so it might win from its military a repayment in the form of swift, decisive victories comparable to those of Prussia. But despite the sacrifice of diplomacy to the mobilization timetables, none of the armies, including Germany's, was able to reproduce the quick triumphs of 1866 and 1870 in 1914. None of the armies was able to win a better result than bloody stalemate as recompense for the privileges it had enjoyed. The diffusion of military professionalism among all the great powers contributed to the stalemate by tending to give all the armies a command system

competent enough at least to avoid the most egregious blunders of the kind by which France had played into Prussia's hands in 1870. The lavishness with which all the powers had offered their resources to the military similarly assured a stand off in men and materiel.

In the outcome, failure to redeem their implied promises of swift and decisive victory in the Great War of 1914-1918 cost all the armies of the European great powers the special privileges that had made them virtual sovereignties. In all the powers, a disillusioned citizenry moved to restore the military to civil control. In France, Gen. Joseph Joffre began the war by almost sealing off the Zone of the Armies from the rest of the country and from the scrutiny of the Ministry and the Deputies, while he exercised wide military powers under a state-of-siege decree in the Zone of the Interior as well; but Joffre's failure to follow up the miracle of the Marne with additional and more positive miracles that would have released northeastern France from the grip of the invader emboldened the Chambers to revoke the state of siege in the Zone of the Interior in September 1915 and the Ministry at length to badger Joffre into retirement at the end of 1916. The removal of Joffre opened a gradual process of restoration of parliamentary control over the French army. Hastened by the army mutinies of 1917, the process culminated in the thorough subjection of the army along with all the rest of the apparatus of the state in 1918 to Premier Georges Clemenceau, who put vigorously into practice his famous principle that war is too important a business to be left to the generals. Less forthrightly than Clemenceau, David Lloyd George in Great Britain similarly terminated the independence that the military had enjoyed at the opening of the Great War: first whittling away the powers of the War Minister, Field Marshal Lord Kitchener, then breaking the alliance between the Chief of the Imperial General Staff in London and Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig at the head of the B.E.F. in France, and finally leaving Haig still powerful but much hedged about by the Prime Minister's recapture of control over the machinery of military administration and command in the capital.

In Russia the end of military autonomy came dramatically, with the Bolshevik Revolution, the dissolution of the old army, and the careful binding of the new Red Army to the political control of the Communist Party. In Germany the end of military autonomy came gradually; in the birthplace of modern militarism the army seemed to be able to ride out its failure to repeat the victories of 1864-1871. The war years brought not a recapture of parliamentary power over the military in Germany as in France and Great Britain but the military dictatorship of Ludendorff and Hindenburg; and after the Armistice the old army was able to remain a state within the state by holding at arm's length the Weimar Republic. Nevertheless, even in Germany the inability of the army to rescue the nation from the terrible strains of four years of indecisive war could not but undermine confidence in the wisdom of the military and in the necessity to go on granting the army immunity from civil interference. Nor could the stab-in-the-back legend altogether save the army from the consequences of finally losing the war. The German army of the Weimar Republic was still powerful enough to assist in Adolf Hitler's rise to the chancellorship; but when Hitler chose to reduce the army to the same uniform subserviency to his will and the same nazification that he decreed for all the institutions of Germany, the army proved no longer powerful enough to resist. By the time World War II had developed far enough that much of the German military command would have liked to get rid of Hitler because they could now recognize he would bring them not endless victories and more and more marshals' batons but ruinous defeat, they could no longer do anything effective against him. They no longer had their own autonomous network of command; against the Waffen SS and the nazified Luftwaffe with its own ground troops, the army no longer possessed a monopoly of armed force; the army itself was too permeated with Nazism. By the time the military command became disillusioned with Hitler, the Fuhrer had so reduced the professional soldiers to his will that he was not only in possession of political mastery but himself giving operational and even tactical orders to the troops.

In none of the great powers in the Second World War did there exist a quasi-sovereign military influence upon the policies of the state comparable to the militarism with which all the European great powers had entered the First World War. In Germany, the army was the pliant tool of Hitler. In Japan,

a professional officer corps in the Western sense had never existed; there were always plenty of military officers in the civil government of modern Japan, but they habitually flitted back and forth between military and civil capacities, the role of the soldier had never been clearly differentiated from that of the politician or statesman, and thus the soldiers in the Japanese government represented not the distinctive military interest characteristic of militarism but a jingoist nationalism that they shared with other government figures who rarely or never wore a uniform. In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin had assured the docility of the military just before the Second World War by purging the principal leadership of the army. While Stalin felt obliged to grant some concessions to military professionalization during the crisis of the war, he demonstrated his continuing ascendancy over the soldiers by appropriating to himself the public glory of being Russia's principal strategist of victory, while significantly pushing his most successful soldier, Marshal G. K. Zhukov, into the obscurity of a provincial garrison command as soon as the war was over.

In Great Britain, Winston Churchill never had to maneuver deviously as Lloyd George had done to assure the compliancy of the military to the civil power; instead, any suggestion of military autonomy was so discredited by the memories of the Somme and Passchendaele that from the moment he combined within himself the offices of Prime Minister and War Minister, Churchill commanded outright, even to the point of carrying the British armed forces into essaying the application of some of his most quixotic flights of strategic fancy.

In the United States, whose remoteness from the center of world politics had previously denied militarism even so much of a foothold as it had gained in Britain in the early years of World War I, there was no belated surrender in 1941-1945 to an autonomous military able to shape the decisions of the state. President Franklin D. Roosevelt to be sure kept his military advisers close to his side during his war years as Commander in Chief, but the President remained very much the Commander in Chief- witness Kent Roberts Greenfield's now familiar refutation of the old canard that only twice did Roosevelt overrule his military advisers; Roosevelt's overruling of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was relatively frequent.⁹ And Roosevelt remained very much the President as well as the Commander in Chief; that is, he kept his attention fixed on the pursuit of the political goals which in his judgment should be the objects of American military strategy in the war. The idea that President Roosevelt and the United States habitually sacrificed political aims for military expediency in World War II is another canard.

All of which is hardly to deny that in the United States, the military factor in decision making during World War II weighed heavily enough to be a reasonable cause of discomfort among men anxious about the preservation of America's generally unmilitary traditions. And in the Cold War and Indochina War years the military factor in American policy has often weighed more heavily still. But it is not militarism of the historical type with which we are dealing in the contemporary United States or in any of the great powers since World War II; an essential ingredient of historical militarism, that of the military as an autonomous state within the state virtually immune from the ordinary processes of civil power, is missing.

Thus it would seem advisable to focus our studies of the military and society increasingly upon the combinations of ingredients that actually prevail in the great powers today. Historians and political scientists have been diligent in investigating the pathology of the traditional militarism of the Prussian Kingdom and German Empire and of all the European states in the First World War. No historian would deny the general value of the past toward illuminating the present. But recurring investigation of traditional militarism is likely to yield diminishing returns toward illuminating the place of the military today in the United States and in the other contemporary military powers. Whether the role of the Great General Staff in Germany and thus European history is to be regarded as primarily that of a sinister influence, as it is in the most prevalent democratic view, or as a model of military professionalism under "objective civilian control," as it is in Samuel P. Huntington's view, the circumstances of civil-military relationships in all the powers today are so different from those of 1914

that using the Great General Staff as a model for studying the soldier and the state is not likely to have much more to tell us, either as warning or encouragement, about our own situation.

Having witnessed the end of traditional militarism, we need to begin studying more carefully the military systems in which a professional officer corps akin to that of the old Prussian model in its professionalism remains, but in which the autonomous separation of the military from the Civilian state is gone. Clearly, this different combination of ingredients is likely to produce consequences different from those of traditional militarism.

We can suggest at least one possible tendency. When Hitler destroyed the historic privileges of the German army as a state within the state in the birthplace of traditional militarism and put the army in thrall to the civil power embodied in himself and his party, one striking effect was to politicize the members of the officer corps. It was implicit in the quasi-sovereign status of the old German army that the officers remained aloof from the politics of the civil state and the civilian parties, except when they intervened institutionally in behalf of the interests of the army. Hitler, however, so closely identified the army with Nazism that it became almost impossible for an officer to continue being politically uninvolved. Either the officer had to embrace Nazism, or he had to become a political opponent of Nazism, as did those officers who, deprived of the German army's earlier means of asserting itself, resorted to assassination attempts against the Fuhrer.

The effects of the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to assure the subordination of the Soviet Army to doctrine and party have been similar. Merely for the officers to retain the measure of military professionalism they believed essential to military efficiency, Soviet officers have had to become politicized. They have had to participate actively in the internal politics of the Soviet state, not in the manner of traditional militarism as a quasi-sovereign power operating outside the arena of civilian politics, but as one of a congeries of interest groups vying within the Soviet political arena.

While Stalin lived after World War II, the Soviet military saw their advancement in professional doctrine and even in military technology impeded by the official myth that Stalin was the great military genius of the war and that the generalissimo's methods- the methods of World War II- were sacrosanct. To regain enough influence in the state so that professional judgment could again control professional decisions, the military plunged into political activism following Stalin's death. They aligned themselves with the party apparatus led by N. S. Khrushchev and the state bureaucracy led by G.M. Malenkov to destroy the effort of L. P. Beria and the secret police to win supremacy in the regime; the armed secret police represented a special threat to the ability of the military to control their own professional destiny. After the fall of Beria, the army remained in partnership with Khrushchev against Malenkov. Khrushchev rewarded the army and the rehabilitated Marshal Zhukov by arranging for Zhukov to become the first professional soldier to receive candidate membership in the Party Presidium. In 1956 the Central Committee of the Communist Party elected six professional soldiers to its full membership and twelve others to candidate membership. The military in turn rewarded Khrushchev by saving him from the attempted coup d'etat of June 1957; but Khrushchev's consequent dependence on the army made him uncomfortable, and in his latter years in power he attempted gradually to restore the military to the discipline of the party. Khrushchev's humiliation in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 weakened his hand enough to cut short this effort, and the disgruntlement of the military over both the Cuban fiasco and Khrushchev's efforts to restore party predominance even in matters of military doctrine probably contributed to Khrushchev's downfall in 1964. Since then the new party leadership and the military have remained in a condition of somewhat uneasy, but for the time being relatively stable, compromise of party and military claims and aspirations.

In sum, however, the post-Stalin Soviet military have emerged as active politicians, following the same path the German generals were beginning to take after Hitler deprived them of their old-fashioned kinds of power. In both these instances, the professionalism of the officer corps has been no guarantee against political involvement; on the contrary, with the loss of old-fashioned military

autonomy, the very need for protection of military professionalism has offered a motive for officers to politicize themselves.

In all the great powers, the politicization of the military is likely to prove an outstanding tendency of the new combination of a professional officer corps, with its distinctive military interests, but without the kind of autonomy that pre-World War I soldiers enjoyed to protect their interests. It is not only the armies of totalitarian states that have displayed the growing tendency toward a politically active military. After the French army lost its privileged status of 1871-1916, it became by the 1940s and 1950s perhaps the most politically active of all major armies save the Chinese Communist army. In the United States, it distorts matters to regard the post-World War II armed forces as "militaristic" in the historic, Prussian sense; but it is a critical element in our current military-civil relations that the Defense Department as a whole and the armed forces severally have become centers of actively mobilized and manipulated political influence and power on a scale altogether without precedent in our history. The theme of the politicization of the American military, the transformation of the military into an active contender for spoils within the arena of American politics and of soldiers into active political figures, may suggest the shared roots from which spring both so obvious a phenomenon of the current military scene as "the selling of the Pentagon" and events more puzzling in the light of older American military traditions, such as the apparently independent policy-making of Gen. John D. Lavelle.

It would no doubt be going too far to suggest that in the future the model to which we should look for guidance toward an understanding of dominant tendencies in military-civil relations should be not the old Prussian army but the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Nevertheless, the immensely politicized PLA, in which military and political roles blur indistinguishably together, may represent in an extreme form the tendencies developing in all major contemporary armies. On the one hand, the "civilian militarism" about which Alfred Vagts wrote in the two chapters appended to the 1959 edition of his *History of Militarism* points toward a blending of civilian and military attitudes and values; much might be said about civilian militarism in recent American administrations as a primary cause of the expanding war in Indochina. Meanwhile, the politicization of the military which I have suggested as a likely sequel to the end of traditional militarism points toward another blending of the civil and military elements in the contemporary powers. The future development of the military in society may witness the blurring of all the boundaries that symposia such as this one have hitherto marked. The increasing concern of future symposia may be with a politicized military in a militarized politics and society.

1. New York Times, August 6, 1972, Section 5, p.4.
2. Alfred Vagts, *A History of Militarism: Civilian and Military* (Revised Edition, New York: Meridian Books, 1959), p.13.
3. *Ibid.*, p.15.
4. *Ibid.*, p.17.
5. James A. Donovan, *Militarism, U.S.A.* (paperback edition, New York: Scribner, 1970), p.1.
6. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957).
7. Gordon A. Craig, *The Politics of the Prussian Army, 1640-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p.214.
8. John Terraine, *Ordeal of Victory* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1963), pp.31-32.
9. Kent Roberts Greenfield, *American Strategy in World War II: A Reconsideration* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963), Chapter III. For an expression of the idea that President Roosevelt rejected the advice of the Joint Chiefs only twice in the course of World War II, see Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, p.322.

Professor Russell F. Weigley has taught at Temple University since 1962. He taught previously at the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel University. He served as Visiting Professor of History at Dartmouth College during 1967 and 1968 and held a Guggenheim Fellowship during 1969 and 1970. Professor Weigley's best known works include: *History of the United States Army* (1967), *Towards an American Army: Military Thought from Washington to Marshall* (1962), *Quartermaster General of the Union Army: A Biography of M.C. Meigs* (1959), *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaigns of 1780-1782* (1970), and *The American Military: Readings in the History of the Military in American Society* (1969).

"The views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US Air Force, Department of Defense or the US Government."