

The Army is in the first line of defense of the United States. By its overseas deployment it presents to the enemy the United States soldier as an initial obstacle to his aggression, covering the forward bases of the other Services.

When the United States was a small nation with little influence in world affairs, the Army alternated as its first line of defense. Now that the United States is the leading power of the Free World, the Army is again in our first line of defense. The only difference is that the line is no longer on our national frontier.

Instead, the line has shifted to the frontier that divides the Free World from the Communist World. Aggression directed at key areas of the Free World will first have to meet the American soldier who is patrolling that frontier. In strength ranging from small missions to field armies, the Army is presently on duty in more than 40 foreign countries; if we include our military attaches, the total is 73 countries.

We are deployed in these overseas areas primarily to defend the security of the United States. We are there because it is no longer possible to defend the United States solely from positions along our own borders, and because we recognize that aggression against any free nation would constitute an immediate or long-run threat to our own security.

At the same time we are defending our own freedom, we are helping to maintain the freedom of our allies. The Free World hopes, of course, that these defenses will prevent aggression - that resolute strength will lead to lasting peace.

Only by being combat ready, with strategically deployed or deployable Army forces, in strength sufficient to stop or significantly delay the aggressor's attack when it comes, can the Army perform its maximum role as a deterrent to aggression and war.

The Army is the versatile member of the defense team with a flexible system of weapons at its command. While possessing atomic weapons of great power, it retains the ability to vary the application of military force to the needs of the moment, to make "measured" rather than "mass" retaliation.

No one can foresee precisely the form a future war would take; consequently, we must build forces that can cope with any single type of warfare or any combination of the several possible forms. The Army can apply degrees of force to fit each situation, from light restraint to extreme destruction, no matter how small or large the degree of force needed.

The Army is particularly concerned with this problem because of the many kinds of tasks it performs, both in peace and war. Because the full range of human activities is possible only on land, it has had to emphasize the characteristics of versatility and flexibility which in modern war are essential to all the Services.

The changes that we are making (and will continue making) in organization, in weapons, in tactics and techniques, are all directed toward making the Army responsive to any combat situation. We are determined to retain and improve the Army's traditional ability to apply military force in whatever measure, and of whatever kind, a particular situation requires.

The Army is a progressive Service, looking steadily ahead to the future. While respecting experience and avoiding fads, the Army concerns itself with the next war, not the last one.

The Army has developed to its present state as a result of the many and varied tasks the Nation has entrusted to it through the years. The Army respects its own experience, gained in fighting major wars successfully for almost two hundred years. It has never had a very high regard for change merely for the sake of change. At the same time, the Army never has hesitated to depart from old ways when the national interest clearly called for new ways. For example, it was the Army that developed land-based military aviation and used it in two world wars; it was the Army that administered the development of the first atomic weapon.

Ten years ago, with the first reverberations of the atomic age still fresh in memory, there was a tendency in some quarters to repeat the historical tendency of reaching some very hasty conclusions about future military forces. "Armies are obsolete!" was one cry. Had this conclusion been acted on at the time, we would have had no ground forces to oppose the communist ground assault against the Republic of Korea in 1950, an assault which because of its locale and character could not be stopped by the massive new weapons which were supposed to have made our Army "obsolete." If the Korean crisis found our Army less than fully ready, it certainly was not because of any feeling within the Army that its fighting days had ended in 1945. The Army has always believed, and believes now, that in war victory goes to the side that is able to seize and control the enemy's land, and that the Army is the only Service trained and equipped to perform this ultimately decisive act of war.

The Army respects its civilian leadership and traditionally abstains from any suggestion of involvement in politics. It respects the role of Congress and responds quickly and accurately to the legitimate requests of its members.

One of the bed-rock principles of the American system of government is that its military power exists to serve the national interests, which means the interests of the American people. This principle is made concrete in the two provisions of the Constitution which give Congress power to "raise and support armies," and designate the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

The whole history of civil-military relationships in the United States stems from these two provisions of our basic law. The Army has just cause for pride in the fact that it has always tried to observe the spirit as well as the letter of the law in these matters.

The Army, by the nature of its requirements, attaches the greatest importance to human values. It recognizes man as the basic element of military strength. Hence, it works constantly to improve the moral, physical, and intellectual capacity of its men. It creates for them an environment of decent clean living and of intolerance of vice, dissipation, or flabbiness.

The nature of land warfare demands continuous personal contact between large numbers of men, each of whom is an individual performing a special task, but all of whom are directly involved with each other at all times. The Army, like its sister Services, always needs high quality people; anything less means lower military efficiency. Without good men we would not merely be without a good Army--in the truest sense we would have no Army at all. That is why the Army pays a great deal of attention to improvement of the moral, physical, and intellectual capacity of every soldier.

The soldier's moral development is not left to chance. Character guidance is a specific program in the Army. Consistent with each individual's personal freedom, religious development is encouraged. Army chaplains and unit commanders are assiduous in discouraging unseemly activities and in encouraging participation in wholesome pursuits. The Army's rate of church attendance is estimated to exceed the rate for the public as a whole.

The Army is not content merely to maintain each soldier's health as it was when he entered service; it takes his basic good health as the starting point and seeks to increase his vigor and stamina through well planned programs of physical training, augmented by an extensive and varied program of leisure time athletics.

The Army's interest in the intellectual capacity of its members is abundantly evident. Assignments vary from routine duties in a limited field to the extremely comprehensive duties of a supreme international commander. Its schools system provides an exceptionally broad variety of professional studies. In addition, the Army offers its members countless opportunities for leisure-time educational advancement. Human intelligence and skill are precious ingredients of military proficiency; the qualitative improvement of the individual soldier is as important to the Army as having enough soldiers.

In the Army, authority impresses its weight by the professional competence of leaders rather than by the arbitrary or despotic methods of martinets. Second only to accomplishing his military mission, the officer's duty is to the welfare of his men. Rank is a badge of responsibility, not of privilege.

To become an officer, besides meeting specified educational and physical standards, it is indispensable that one have good character. Once commissioned, an officer has a never-relaxed demand placed upon him: the all-embracing demand of maintaining professional competence. American soldiers always recognize competent leadership, and will give their best only when they receive it.

Any system which undertakes the direction of large numbers of men must be based on an authoritative framework. In addition, the extreme stresses of combat require a source of authority capable of causing a man to stand and fight when his natural instinct urges him to run away. When the life of the nation is at stake, the outcome of the battle cannot be left to individual decisions. Therefore, the basis of military discipline is authoritative. Nevertheless, we must take advantage of increasing knowledge of human motivation. If possible we leave the authoritative extremes for direct application in emergency, and attempt to use all the resources of the best leadership methods to persuade men to do willingly what we want them to do. Remember the words of General Schafeld engraved on the walls of West Point: "The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army." It is

possible to impart instruction and to give commands in such manner and such a tone of voice to inspire in the soldier no feeling but an intense desire to obey, while the opposite manner and tone of voice cannot fail to excite strong resentment and a desire to disobey. The one mode or the other of dealing with subordinates springs from a corresponding spirit in the breast of the commander. He who feels the respect which is due to others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself, while he who feels, and hence manifests, disrespect toward others, especially his inferiors, cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself."

What the genuine military leader always has in abundance, and the martinet is largely without, is an innate and overriding concern for the welfare of the men he commands. Given this one essential quality, an officer need never hesitate to impose whatever disciplinary measures may be required in a given situation, for they will be imposed justly and equitably, and for sound reasons. His men will tolerate almost any of the minor personal shortcomings common to the human species if they are convinced that he knows his business and that his two primary interests are for his mission and their welfare. They will endure all manner of hardship when they know it is caused by the enemy or some other outside agency and not by a failure of their own leadership. This, in brief, is the concept of leadership in our Army.

Because of the essentiality of its mission and the complexities of its tasks the Army must have its share of the best manpower. It offers a worthwhile career for every talent.

An increasingly large number of tasks in the Army require the attention of soldiers who possess greater than average education, skill and experience in various scientific and technical fields. From the total manpower available to the Armed Forces, the Army must be able to draw adequate numbers of people who have these attributes or will be able to absorb Army training to develop them.

The Army's constant need for good leaders at every level is an even more pressing reason why it must have an adequate share of the best men available. The responsibility of leading soldiers in ground combat can be safely entrusted only to the best men our Country can produce. We must have an increasing proportion of high quality soldiers who are in the Army because they want to be; who have chosen the Army because they see it as a worthwhile career in which their talents and aptitudes are put to use and their achievements appropriately recognized and rewarded.

The Army strives to get the most defense for the money from the resources provided to it. It spends its money prudently for the essentials of defense in accord with good business practices. It is constantly self-critical, trying on its own initiative to uncover inefficiency and malpractice.

Everyone in the Army must demonstrate in action that the Army is spending its portion of the defense outlay wisely and economically. We must make sure that we, as individuals, do not increase the Army's costs by negligence or wastefulness in the use of equipment and supplies. We can do a great deal by insuring that the importance of proper care and maintenance is appreciated by those in our commands.

During the past few years several important changes in the Department of the Army organization have had the specific purpose of improving its machinery for business management. For example, we now have an Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management, and another for Logistics. Establishment of the Office of the Comptroller of the Army, and the re-organization of G-4 and its redesignation to a higher staff level as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics are other recent changes aimed at greater efficiency and economy in conducting the Army's business. These organizational changes have been accompanied by the development of management practices comparable to those that have proven most effective in America's great business institutions. We have adapted these practices to the special needs of the Army. At the same time, many of the best organizational and management practices used in large civilian agencies were originated by the Army. In the service schools (including several whose instruction is entirely in the management field) and in selected civilian universities, Army officers are constantly undergoing training to handle the complex business of a modern Army. There is no agency more critical of the Army's operations than the Army itself.

The active Army is aware of the importance of the civilian components and supports wholeheartedly the program to strengthen and improve them. It insists, however, on getting a fair return in efficiency and combat readiness.

The concept of the civilian citizen rushing to arms in times of emergency is one of our Country's oldest traditions. The Colonies maintained militia forces long before 1775, when the Continental Army came into being. In all our wars since then, the comparatively small active Army which we customarily maintain in peacetime has had to be speedily expanded to wartime strength. We have never been more than partially prepared, and have had to depend on Allies to give us time to mobilize. It is evident that we will never have such preparatory time if another general war begins. In addition, the complexity of war has increased enormously; much training must be accomplished before the civilian volunteer can become a competent soldier.

Some of these past mobilizations, while they attested to the deep patriotism of our people, also showed the folly of reliance upon mere quantity as a measure of our reserve strength. That is why today's active Army puts so much stress on the importance of quality in our Reserve components. The Army's support of the recently enacted Reserve legislation and its current activities under that law, reflect this emphasis.

The active Army trains most of the officers and enlisted men who later enter the Reserve forces; thereafter, it shares the responsibility for maintaining their readiness for mobilization. We of the active Army have an obligation to explain to members of our commands how the Reserve is a vital part of the national defense, and to emphasize the obligations of Reservists under the law.

In its inter-service relationships, the ARMY is a loyal member of the national defense team, resisting encroachments on its own legitimate responsibilities, but scrupulously avoiding trespass on those of the other Services. It is open-minded, and will listen to reason on any subject.

The Army's primary policy governing its relations with the other Services can be stated quite simply. Higher authority has assigned specific functions and responsibilities to the Army. In order to perform these functions and meet these responsibilities, the Army must be suitably organized, manned, and equipped. It does not want to assume any functions that have been assigned to the other Services. It recognizes that certain of its functions tend in practice to overlap certain functions of other Services, as some of theirs overlap Army functions, and that because the possibilities of dispute regarding them are particularly strong, there must be the maximum of forbearance, objectivity, understanding, and good judgment on all sides.

This policy is rooted in the principle that the functions of all the Services have meaning only in terms of their contribution to the security of the United States. If in some future emergency the Army found itself lacking in the means to perform one of its functions, the adverse effects could not be confined to the Army alone.

It is particularly important to remember that the Services, in the great majority of their working relationships, display the finest kind of team effort. Moreover, considering the complexities of our national defense problems, the remarkable thing is not that there are conflicting viewpoints, but that there are so few of real importance. The Army is determined to avoid all unnecessary dispute on these matters, but will vigorously present its viewpoints when decisions affecting the Army's ability to perform its functions are at issue.

The Army does not forget its old soldiers after they retire. It remains interested in their welfare, and wants them to serve in their civilian communities as loyal, informed, representatives of the Army.

By tradition and by law, retired Army personnel are considered to be in a sense still members of the Army. The Retired List is not a roster of former soldiers; it is a designation of personnel who by age, length of service, or disability may be largely regarded as having been transferred from one Army category to another.

The Army's legislative program each year includes items of specific interest to retired personnel. They retain certain of familiar privileges such as the use of Army commissaries and medical facilities.

In the civilian community the retired member of the Army can be a particularly valuable link between the active Army and the general public. His acquaintances are likely to give special weight to his views on military affairs and his explanations of Army developments and activities. He is consequently under strong obligation to them and to the Army to keep himself informed and up-to-date on such matters. Few means of telling the Army's story and demonstrating its true worth are more effective than word-of-mouth explanation by a well-informed retired officer or enlisted man who is known and respected in his community.

---

In his letter to senior commanders and staff officers, the Chief of Staff asked them "to verify that the segment of the Army under your command lives true to these principles which should be reflected in day-to-day leadership, training and routine. Concurrently, I want you to exert continuing efforts to have the Army recognized as a military society with a personality and ethos in consonance with these principles."

This instruction applies in appropriate measure to every officer in the Army.

---