STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

EDUCATING THE 21ST CENTURY LEADER: A CRITICAL VIEW OF THE MILITARY SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGES WITH AN EYE TOWARD JOINTNESS

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL BARBARA L. PASIERB
United States Air Force Reserve

19980604 013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1998

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Educating the 21st Century Leader:

A Critical View of the Military Senior Service Colleges

with an Eye Toward Jointness

by

Lieutenant Colonel Barbara L. Pasierb
United States Air Force Reserve

Colonel Stephen J. Pryplesh
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Barbara L. Pasierb, Lt Col, USAFR

TITLE: Educating the 21st Century Leader: A Critical View of the Military Service Colleges with an Eye Toward Jointness

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 17 April 1998 PAGES: 27 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 established certain requirements for creating a cadre of Joint Specialty Officers. A number of studies and assessments were undertaken to review the military education system. The Skelton Committee recommended a two-phase joint education process with the first phase taught by the service colleges and the second phase taught at the Armed Forces Staff College. Currently students attending National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces receive credit for both phases, while students attending other senior service colleges receive only phase I credit and must attend a twelve week follow-on course at Armed Forces Staff College to receive phase II credit. It is time to reevaluate the two-phased approach to joint education. Graduates of resident programs at all senior service colleges should be awarded full credit as Joint Specialty Officers without needing additional training. This paper will examine the similarities and differences in the curricula of the various senior service colleges and address the issues of why only some colleges produce Joint Specialty Officers and how we might better prepare senior field grade officers to lead the military of the 21st century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

INTRODUCTION 1

SENIOR JOINT MILITARY EDUCATION 4

AIR WAR COLLEGE 6

ARMY WAR COLLEGE 8

COLLEGE OF NAVAL WARFARE 11

MARINE CORPS WAR COLLEGE 13

NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE 13

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES 16

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS 19

RECOMMENDATIONS 23

ENDNOTES 29

BIBLIOGRAPHY 33

INTRODUCTION

"The nature of modern warfare demands that we fight as a joint team. This was important yesterday, it is essential today, and it will be even more imperative tomorrow."[1] General Shalikashvili, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made this comment in his introduction to Joint Vision 2010.

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act became law in 1986. It was the first major legislation affecting the Department of Defense in nearly forty years. One of the more significant aspects of Goldwater-Nichols was the establishment of the Joint Specialty Officer. This led to an extensive review and reassessment of the military education system. During the first few years following the enactment of the law, a number of studies were undertaken to examine the existing military education programs. Two of the best known are the Dougherty Board and the Skelton Committee reports.

In May 1987, the Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board, chaired by General Dougherty, made eleven recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Key among them were that the Chairman should establish a standard for joint education and should adopt an accreditation process for all

intermediate and senior service schools.[2] The Board also proposed an expanded definition for joint matters: "Joint matters are those command and staff actions relating to the integrated employment of land, sea, and air forces of two or more of the Armed Services. This includes national security policy and military strategy, strategic and contingency planning, joint and combined operations, joint doctrine, and the command and control of combat forces under unified command. It also includes actions related to mobilization of forces/resources, joint logistics, communications, and intelligence, and the joint aspects of the planning, programming and budgeting process.[3]

A few months after the Dougherty Board released its report, the House Armed Services Committee appointed a Panel on Military Education chaired by Representative Ike Skelton.[4] The Skelton Panel's report was published in April, 1989, and also made numerous recommendations concerning curricula, faculty and student requirements. One of the Panel's recommendations formalized the two-phased approach for joint education. The report stated: "The most fundamental conclusion of the panel is that joint specialist education should take place in joint schools. Joint schools have equal mixes by military department of faculty and student bodies. They are under the control of the Chairman, [Joint Chiefs of Staff], so that joint matters dominate

the curriculum and joint viewpoints prevail. This conclusion of the panel coincides with that of our World War II military leaders who determined that joint schools were essential."[5]

The panel also recommended that the first phase be provided to all students attending an intermediate (or senior, as required) service school.[6] "The Phase I curriculum should include: capabilities and limitations, doctrine, organizational concepts, and command and control of forces of all services; joint planning processes and systems; and the role of service commands as part of a unified command."[7] The second phase, according to the Panel, should be given to graduates en route to assignment as joint specialists, should build on the first phase, and should be about three months in length.[8] "Phase II should concentrate on the integrated deployment and employment of multi-service forces. The course...should provide time for: (1) studying joint doctrine; (2) using case studies in both developed theaters and undeveloped contingency theaters; (3) increasing the understanding of the four separate service cultures: and (4) developing joint attitudes and perspectives."[9]

Another recommendation of the Skelton panel, which will be discussed later in this paper, was to review the Navy education system to see if Navy officers could attend both intermediate and

senior colleges and whether each school should have a more distinct curriculum.[10]

More than ten years have passed since Goldwater-Nichols became law. The majority of recommendations in the Dougherty and Skelton reports have been implemented. The remainder of this paper will examine the current curricula at the senior level service colleges, with an eye toward jointness. The questions this paper will address are: (1) Should graduates of **all** resident senior service college programs receive Joint Professional Military Education, Phase II, credit? and (2) What changes, if any, should be made in the current senior military college curricula to better educate the future military leaders of the 21st century?

SENIOR JOINT MILITARY EDUCATION

The current governing directive for joint professional military education is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 1800.01, Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP), 1 Mar 96. This is the third directive published by the joint staff regarding joint education since enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. The major revisions in

the current instruction include: identifying joint education as a career-long effort, establishing joint learning areas for precommissioning, primary, intermediate, senior and general/flag officer levels, and placing more emphasis on use of joint doctrine, multinational warfighting and systems integration.[11]

One portion of the document is the Officer Professional Military Education Framework which identifies five levels of military education and the primary focus of each in terms of the major levels of war. The five levels are supposed to be linked so that each builds on knowledge gained at the previous level. According to the OPMEP, the total professional military education system produces: "(1) Officers educated in the profession of arms. (2) Strategic thinkers who view events in a historical, political, social, economic, informational, technological, and military context and are capable of identifying and evaluating likely changes and associated responses affecting US military strategy, theater strategy and campaigning. (3) Senior officers who can integrate national military strategy with national security strategy and policy to ensure effective employment of the Armed Forces in implementing national security policy."[12]

The senior level of professional military education is typically done at grades O-5 or O-6, and emphasizes the strategic level of war. According to the OPMEP, the primary emphasis of

the service schools is national military strategy, theater strategy and campaigning, while the focus of the joint schools is national security strategy. However, each of the senior level service colleges must also include learning areas on national security strategy and national planning systems and processes as part of their joint military education requirements.[13] In the following chapters we will briefly examine the curricula of each of the senior level colleges.

AIR WAR COLLEGE

The Air War College is part of Air University, located at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Its mission is to educate senior officers to lead at the strategic level in the employment of air and space forces, including joint operations, in support of national security.[14] It conducts one 10-month resident course for approximately 250 students per year. The resident class includes members of each military service and employees of selected civilian agencies of the federal government, as well as officers from selected foreign countries. The core seminar program consists of five major areas of study: conflict and change; leadership and ethics; international security; strategy, doctrine, and air and space power; and joint force employment.[15]

The current curriculum reflects a refocusing of senior level professional military education since the end of the cold war, which has caused shifts in national priorities. The Air War College redesigned its curriculum to better prepare senior officers to alter the way they think about, attempt to deter, and conduct war in the future.[16]

In addition to the core seminar program, all students take from six to eight course from the core electives program and participate in the regional studies program. The core electives provide opportunities for more intensive study in specific areas of the core curriculum. The regional studies program provides each student the opportunity to evaluate one area of the world where a regional unified commander in chief must implement national military strategy in support of US security policy. Class members also visit the studied region during a 10-12 day long field travel. The capstone event is the National Security Forum, hosted by the Secretary of the Air Force and conducted just prior to graduation. During this time approximately 100 civilian leaders join the class member to focus on national security issues.[17]

The Air War College resident course consists of more than 600 hours of academic study and is designed to enhance its graduates' ability to analyze current and future threats to the United

States and its allies, to understand the process of formulating and implementing US national security policy, to analyze national and international security environments and their influence on US security interests and policy, and to recognize the roles and unique characteristics of airpower in supporting US national security objectives.[18]

ARMY WAR COLLEGE

The U.S. Army War College is located at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania. Its mission is: "to prepare selected military, civilian, and international leaders to assume strategic responsibilities in military and national security organizations; to educate students about the employment of the U.S. Army as part of a unified, joint, or multinational force in support of the national military strategy; to research operational and strategic issues; and to conduct outreach programs that benefit the U.S. Army War College, the U.S. Army and the nation."[19]

To accomplish this mission, the Army War College offers a curriculum which addresses national defense, military science, and responsible command that prepares graduates to analyze threats and other factors affecting U.S. interests, to apply

strategic thought to US national security decisionmaking processes, to develop theater strategies, estimates and campaign plans which employ unified, joint, and multinational forces, and to manage change by applying resources to those processes which translate strategy into force requirements.[20]

Each year the Army War College hosts more than 300 resident students from all the military services, selected foreign nations, and several civilian government agencies. The academic year is approximately ten months long and is divided into three terms. The first term consists of four core courses: 1) Strategic Leadership; 2) War, National Policy, and Strategy; 3) Joint Systems and Processes; and 4) Implementing National Military Strategy. The second term consists of three advanced courses (electives) and the regional strategic appraisals. It also includes a 10-day Strategic Crisis Exercise, which is an interactive war game involving students, faculty and many distinguished guests. The exercise requires students to use previous knowledge to deal with multiple crises at the strategic and operational levels. The third term includes four additional advanced course electives and the National Security Seminar Week. During the academic year students are required to conduct an individual strategy research project and present their results in

a written report. Many additional complementary programs are offered throughout the year to enhance the resident curriculum.[21]

Virtually all activities in the Army War College curriculum focus on the unified and joint aspects of problems to include the mobilization, deployment, organization, and employment of unified, joint, and multinational forces. Joint awareness and perspective underlie everything the college does, beginning with the presence of students from each Service in each seminar. The all-Service faculty reflects the commitment to a joint approach, as do specific lessons which teach capabilities, doctrine, and employment of each Service. Other lessons, as well as the design of the core curriculum itself, emphasize joint support to the Commanders in Chief and joint planning for the employment of national military capabilities. Exercises and case studies require the application of joint doctrine, planning, and warfighting capabilities.[22]

Of the twenty-five learning objectives specified in the 1996 OPMEP, all are covered in multiple lessons in the core courses. The joint perspective goes beyond the core curriculum, however, and is seen in the Strategic Crisis Exercise and the Regional Strategic Appraisals in which all students must participate. Additionally the advanced course electives allow students to explore a wide variety of subjects in depth, more than half of

which are oriented toward joint matters. Out of a total of approximately 120 advanced courses available for students to choose from, over 70 are directly related to joint matters.[23]

COLLEGE OF NAVAL WARFARE

The Naval War College, located at Newport, Rhode Island, encompasses five different colleges. The College of Naval Warfare is the senior level resident school attended by senior grade officers from all five US military services and civilians from a number of US government agencies. A typical class consists of 200-225 resident students. The 10-month course is divided into three trimesters of approximately three months each. While the majority of students begin classes in August, nearly half of the US Navy students and several students from other Services begin during the winter or spring trimester.[24] During the first two trimesters, approximately 35 international students from the Naval Command College sit side-by-side in seminars with their US counterparts from the College of Naval Warfare. During the last trimester the international officers pursue a separate course of study from the US students.[25]

The curriculum is based on three core courses of study: Strategy and Policy, National Security Decision Making, and Joint Military Operations, as well as a fourth multidisciplinary electives program. The core courses are designed to teach students how to think strategically, how to plan and conduct joint and combined military operations, and how to develop personal frameworks for integrating the many competing demands involved in planning, choosing and obtaining future military forces. The electives program offers a wide range of courses which allow students to explore subjects of professional significance not included in the core curriculum or to investigate specific aspects of the core curriculum in greater detail. Electives cover subjects ranging from military theory to area studies, from international relations to professional ethics, and from international law to media relations. Courses in each of these four areas are designed to provide depth and perspective to the study of conflict, its causes and resolutions.[26]

MARINE CORPS WAR COLLEGE

The US Marine Corps, which is part of the Department of the Navy, also has its own War College, located at Quantico, Virginia. The Marine Corps War College was only recently established and it currently enrolls thirteen resident students, nine Marines and four students from other services. For these reasons it was not included in this report. As the program matures, however, it should be considered for the same recommendations that apply to the other senior service colleges which are presented later in this paper.

NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

The National War College, part of the National Defense University, is one of two joint senior military colleges located at Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC. It conducts a senior level course in national security strategy to prepare selected military officers and federal officials for high-level policy, command and staff responsibilities. The College emphasizes the joint and interagency perspective. In reflecting this emphasis, 75 percent of the student body is composed of equal

representation from the land, sea and air Services, while the remaining 25 percent is drawn from the State Department and other federal departments and agencies. In addition, international fellows from a number of countries join the student body each year.[27]

The academic program is designed for a student body already highly experienced in military and civilian professions devoted to different facets of national security. The focus is on broadening their understanding of national security policy and strategy, including national military strategy and operations, and particularly on principles and concepts that can be applied as they progress in their chosen fields.[28]

The curriculum is composed of a series of interconnected core courses complemented by elective regional and advanced studies which provide more comprehensive understanding of issues and areas of special concern in national security, military strategy and operations. The core courses include: Foundations of National Security Strategy; Economics Review for Strategists; Foundations of Military Thought and Strategy; Joint Forces Capabilities; The National Security Policy Process; The Geostrategic Context; Military Strategy and Operations; and the regional studies program. Regional studies seminars culminate with two weeks of travel abroad, where students meet with

military and civilian officials in the region of their concentrated study to determine their perceptions of US security policy. Advanced studies provide a selection of courses ranging from military history, the influence of technology on warfare, proliferation and counter-proliferation, to revolutionary warfare, American politics, and statecraft. Students at the National War College take a minimum of four advanced studies courses, two in the fall term and two in the spring. They may also take courses offered by the other colleges at National Defense University.

At the conclusion of the academic year students participate in a crisis decision exercise to resolve a national level conflict crisis scenario set in the future. They must analyze the crisis, assess the international and domestic situations, determine US interests and objectives, evaluate threats, devise strategies to orchestrate appropriate instruments of national power, mobilize the needed resources, weigh risks, and react to the unfolding crisis. After successful completion of the academic program, military students have fulfilled the educational requirement for designation as a Joint Specialty Officer.[29]

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF) is the other joint senior level college located at Ft McNair in Washington, and it is also part of the National Defense University. Its mission is to prepare selected military officers and civilians for senior leadership and staff positions by conducting postgraduate, executive-level courses of study and associated research dealing with the resource component of national power, with special emphasis on materiel acquisition and joint logistics, and their integration into national security strategy for peace and war.[30]

The College's approach to education focuses on broad-based national security decisionmaking for senior policy makers in a dynamic world environment. The curriculum consists of interrelated courses presented in a mix of seminars and lectures, using the case-study method, student readings, written and oral presentations, and a field study program. The student body is a balanced mix of military operators, military resource managers and technicians, and civilian personnel. Graduates are unique among senior officials in that they are knowledgeable in both strategic planning and resource management. They receive full

coverage of joint professional military education and satisfy the requirements for Joint Specialty Officers.[31]

The fall semester focuses on national security strategy and lays the theoretical, historical, and conceptual groundwork for examining the use of national resources during the second semester. Through an integrated interdisciplinary approach, using the academic disciplines of history, economics, political science, strategic decisionmaking, and military strategy, students gain an understanding of the relationship between military objectives designed to support national political objectives, the economic considerations that influence national strategy, and the means and uses of national power. Issues are presented in three phases: the strategic decisionmaking process, the international system and grand strategy, and grand strategy in transition. A regional security studies program that provides in-depth study of US national security interests in selected regions of the world is also part of the first semester. The semester culminates with an exercise in which students develop a new US national security strategy for the future.[32]

The spring semester concentrates on matters related to national resource management. The curriculum emphasizes issues associated with the capability of a nation to support its aims with a proper balance among the social, economic, and political

needs of its people. The second semester is also organized in three phases: the generation of resources, their acquisition and allocation, and their application. Courses are taken from the areas of acquisition, economics, elements of national power, mobilization and joint military logistics and industry studies. A major element in the curriculum is the Industry Studies Program which organizes students into 18 study committees to examine industrial sectors vital to US national security. The field study portion of the Industries Program allows students to visit domestic and foreign industries and provides a laboratory for testing concepts learned in earlier courses.

All students must also complete four advanced studies courses, selected from ICAF, National War College or the Information Resources Management College (another school of the National Defense University) advanced courses. At the end of the year, students from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces join together with students from National War College in the crisis decision exercise, using the full range of knowledge and skills learned to develop solutions to fundamental questions of national interests and objectives presented in the exercise scenario.[33]

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

As stated in the introduction, the professional military education for Joint Specialty Officers (JSO) was established as a two-phase system after the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, with phase one provided by the service schools and phase two provided by the joint schools. As of today, Academic Year 1997-98, only students at National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, both part of the National Defense University, receive full credit as Joint Specialty Officers upon graduation. Resident students at the service oriented colleges, Air War College, Army War College, and the College of Naval Warfare, still receive credit for only Phase I of Joint Professional Military Education (JPME I). Those graduates of the these institutions who will serve as JSOs must attend twelve additional weeks of school at the Joint and Combined Warfighting School of the Armed Forces Staff College, located in Norfolk, Virginia. The Armed Forces Staff College, which was incorporated into the National Defense University in 1981, also conducts intermediate level phase two joint education at its Joint and Combined Staff Officer School.

At the Joint and Combined Warfighting School, senior level students emphasize the application of knowledge and skills developed through their respective Service colleges. The 12-week program begins with a fast-paced crisis exercise intended to give an appreciation for the complexities of joint force operations. The exercise is followed by an overview of strategic decisionmaking, with particular focus on the interagency process. Using the historical case study method, operational planning for Operations Other Than War is covered. This part of the program includes the study of joint warfighting and the integration of multi-Service forces. Other key aspects of the course include field trips to the Joint Staff, CIA, Department of State and National Security Council, as well as visits to selected unified commands, participation in an interagency war game, and a final campaign planning exercise.[34]

After reviewing the current curricula of the senior level military colleges, there appear to be a few disconnects. First of all, in examining the curricula of the senior level colleges, it is difficult to discern any significant differences in what is being taught. Indeed some of the Service schools appear to be more joint in their philosophy than the "joint" schools.

The differences are even somewhat unclear in the OPMEP which list specific objectives and learning areas for both service and

joint schools. For example, the OPMEP lists the following learning areas for the service colleges: National Security Strategy, National Planning Systems and Processes, National Military Strategy and Organization, Theater Strategy and Campaigning, and Systems Integration in 21st Century Battlespace.[35] The identical five areas are also listed for National War College and ICAF. While it is true that specific objectives under these areas do vary somewhat between the schools, one must question where the true differences lie.

It is also unclear what the difference is between Phase I joint education at the Service colleges and Phase II at the joint schools. In fact, the OPMEP states that the primary objective of the Phase II program taught at Armed Forces Staff College is to build on the foundation established at the Phase I schools, and that the intense interaction in the fully joint environment cements professional joint attitudes and perspectives. However, the specific learning objectives are very similar to those found at the senior service colleges.

Again, when looking at the academic programs offered, Air War College, Army War College and National War College are very similar, yet, of these three schools, only graduates of National War College are fully accredited as JSOs. One also notices that National War College graduates receive a Master's Degree, while

graduates of Air and Army War Colleges do not, but that is a topic which this paper will not address.

So what is the real difference between the Service and joint senior level colleges? The only differences now appear to be in the percentages of students and faculty from the various services. The joint colleges have approximately equal percentages of students and faculty from land, air and sea services, while the Service colleges have a greater percentage of students and faculty from the host Service. However, even at the Service unique colleges a great deal of effort is made to ensure that all seminars and courses are a mix of all military Services and civilian agencies and whenever possible also include international students. The OPMEP requires the Service colleges to have a minimum of 20% of their US military students to be from the nonhost Services, with at least one student from each of the nonhost Services in each seminar group.[36] Again one wonders if a 25% mix of sister Services at joint schools is really a significant difference from a 10% mix of sister Services at the Service colleges when it comes to interacting with members of other Services and presenting an overall joint perspective.

The rest of the answer lies in the past. When Goldwater-Nichols was enacted in 1986, there was much less emphasis on jointness at all levels of professional military education. Thus

the two-level system of joint education was put in place to immediately address the issue of joint education, particularly at the intermediate and senior levels. The system has worked very well, but now nearly twelve years later, perhaps it is time to rethink this two-phase system. In the late 1980s or early 1990s, there may have been many officers who had not been exposed to a joint perspective prior to attending a senior level military college. This is hardly the case today. It is time to move the system of joint professional military education forward into the 21st century.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After several months of reviewing the literature and talking with students, faculty, and graduates of many of the senior level colleges, I believe that it is past time to change the current two-phase joint education system. Specifically, graduates of all resident programs of senior level colleges, whether Service-unique or joint institutions, should be fully qualified to serve as Joint Specialty Officers without additional education or training requirements. This change should be implemented as soon

as possible, but will require an amendment to the wording in the original Goldwater-Nichols Act.

The twelve-week course at the Joint and Combined Warfighting School may be required for those officers who are unable to complete a senior level college in residence. However, the curriculum may need to be revised to place a greater emphasis at the strategic, rather than operational, level of war. It may also be possible to waive senior level JPME requirements for those officers who previously attended a resident intermediate level college. Since this paper did not look at intermediate level programs, this recommendation may require further study by the Joint Staff, J-7, which has the responsibility of overseeing and accrediting all joint education programs.

Lastly, all Services should ensure that the maximum possible number of qualified senior officers be afforded the opportunity to attend senior service colleges in residence. In these days of downsizing, it is critical that those officers reaching the most senior levels of command and leadership be the best trained and educated that the military has to offer. Former Secretary of Defense Cheney noted in his preface to a report that "...as the military is being downsized, it is more important than ever that the PME system from the service academies to the war colleges be upgraded. This is what happened in the 1920s and 1930s, giving

us the Eisenhowers, Marshalls, Pattons, Vandenbergs, Arnolds, and others who led us to victory in World War II."[37]

This has been identified as a particular problem for the Navy, which seems extremely troubling in light of the fact that the Naval War College is the oldest of all senior service schools. Another cause for concern is the apparent lack of distinction between the intermediate and senior levels of education at the Naval War College. This problem was identified in the Skelton report nearly ten years ago and still persists today. One Air Force officer I know felt he could have completed the senior level Naval War College curriculum when he graduated from the intermediate level course. Clearly, the Navy should reexamine the close ties between the College of Naval Warfare and the College of Naval Command and Staff, both located at the Naval War College, if there is so little difference in curriculum requirements that even the students have difficulty identifying them. Otherwise a disservice is being done to students of all Services who attend either the intermediate or senior level colleges.

Another aspect of the problem for the Navy is that many of its senior officers do not attend a senior service college in residence. One Navy officer I spoke with indicated that graduating from a senior service college was not even a

requirement for becoming Chief of Naval Operations. The Navy is aware of the situation and appears to be making an effort to change. In a letter written to the Cheney Panel, the President of the Naval War College stated: "...most senior Navy officers do not have even a single staff or war college background, let alone two. I am working actively to correct this, and am convinced that it is a cultural issue which will only be solved by a major policy change..."[38]

The Navy should consider a program more like that offered by both the Army and the Air Force to ensure there is a distinction between intermediate and senior level professional military education. This does not mean that the Service and joint colleges should all look alike. Certainly each Service and each college has its unique requirements and unique capabilities. This is particularly true in the unique mission of ICAF. However, just as a bachelor's degree is not equivalent to a master's degree, even in the same field of study, neither should an intermediate level professional military education program be equal to a senior level program. But as a master's degree in math from one accredited university is equal to a master's degree in math from another accredited university, so should a senior level professional military education from one accredited

military college be equivalent to a senior level program from another military college.

As Expanding Vision 2010 states: "From the beginning of their careers, future leaders mist be both educated and experienced in joint operations without sacrificing their basic Service competencies...To master the complex tasks of 2010 may require our warriors--particularly our leaders--to become perpetual students of military art and supporting technologies."[39]

As professional military officers, we must continue to hone our skills in military leadership, technical fields, our own Service perspectives, and joint matters. There is little enough time within a 20 or 30 year career to devote to education and training, but without continued growth we will be ill-prepared to face the challenges of leading those who come after us. All senior officers should strive to attend a senior service college, but not all will be able to attend a resident program. However, for those who do devote nearly a year to professional military studies, they should be able to expect the same degree of recognition for their efforts regardless of which college they have attended. Attendance at any of the senior level colleges should fulfill the requirement for Joint Specialty Officers.

Word Count: 6205

ENDNOTES

[1] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Vision 2010, (Washington, DC: Pentagon, 1996), ii.

[2] Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, USAF (ret) et al, The Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board on Recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Regarding Professional Military Education in Joint Matters, (Washington, DC: Pentagon, 1987), iii. Sometimes referred to as the Dougherty Board Report.

[3] Ibid.

[4] U.S. Congress, Report of the Panel on Military Education of the One Hundredth Congress of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives. (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1989), v. Also known as the Skelton Committee Report.

[5] Ibid., 3.

[6] Ibid., 4.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., 6.

[11] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Officer Professional Military Education Policy, (Washington DC: Pentagon, 1996), 3.

[12] Ibid., A-B-1.

[13] Ibid., A-B-1 to A-B-3.

[14] Department of the Air Force, Air University Catalog 1997, (Maxwell AFB, AL: AU Press, 1997), 7.

[15] Ibid., 9.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid., 10.

[18] Ibid., 7-8.

[19] Department of the Army, Curriculum Pamphlet, Academic Year 1998, (Carlisle Barracks, PA: USAWC, 1997), 1.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Department of the Army, Program for Joint Education (PJE), Academic Year 1998, (Carlisle Barracks, PA: USAWC, 1997), 18-19.

[22] Ibid., 11.

[23] Ibid., 39.

[24] Department of the Navy, United States Naval War College Catalog, (Newport, RI: NWC, 1994), 83-84.

[25] Ibid., 87.

[26] Ibid., 27-28.

[27] Department of Defense, National Defense University Catalog, 1996-1998, (Washington, DC: NDU, 1996), 41.

[28] Ibid., 41-42.

[29] Ibid., 42-45.

[30] Ibid., 13.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 16.

[33] Ibid., 18-19.

[34] Ibid., 67-68.

[35] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, OPMEP, C-C-1 to C-C-4.

[36] Ibid., B-2.

[37] Dick Cheney et al, Professional Military Education: An Asset for Peace and Progress, (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997), xii.

[38] Ibid., 55.

[39] Department of Defense, Concept for Future Joint Operations, Expanding Joint Vision 2010, (Fort Monroe, VA: Joint Warfighting Center, 1997), 20-21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Vision 2010. Washington, DC: Pentagon, 1996.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Officer Professional Military Education Policy, CJCSI 1800.01. Washington DC: Pentagon, 1 March 1996.

Cheney, Dick et al. Professional Military Education: An Asset for Peace and Progress. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1997.

Department of Defense. National Defense University Catalogue, 1996-1998. Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1996.

Department of Defense. Concept for Future Joint Operations, Expanding Joint Vision 2010. Fort Monroe, VA: Joint Warfighting Center, 1997.

Department of the Air Force. Air University Catalog 1997. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Press, April 1997.

Department of the Army. Curriculum Pamphlet, Academic Year 1998. Carlisle Barrack, PA: U.S. Army War College, 1997.

Department of the Army. Program for Joint Education (PJE), Academic Year 1998. Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College, 1997.

Department of the Navy. United States Naval War College Catalog. Newport, RI: Naval War College, 1994.

Dougherty, Russell E., Gen., USAF, et al. The Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board on Recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Regarding Professional Military Education in Joint Matters. Washington DC: Pentagon, 7 May 1987.

United States Congress. Report of the Panel on Military Education of the One Hundredth Congress of the Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, April 21, 1989.