

'New Militarism'

establishment enjoyed small prestige and limited influence upon national affairs. The public knew little about the armed forces, and only a few thousand men were attracted to military service and careers. In 1940 there were but 428,000 officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy.

The scale of the war, and the world's power relationships which resulted, created the American military giant. Today the active armed forces contain over 3.4 million men and women, with an additional 1.6 million ready reserves and National Guardsmen.

America's vastly expanded world role after World War II hinged upon military power. The voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent. During the postwar period, distinguished military leaders from the war years filled many top positions in government. Gens. Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Taylor, Ridgway, LeMay and others were not only popular heroes but respected opinion-makers.

It was a time of international readjustment; military minds offered the benefits of firm views and problem-solving experience to the management of the Nation's affairs. Military procedures—including the general staff system, briefings, estimates of the situation and the organizational and operational techniques of the highly schooled, confident military profes-

sionals—spread throughout American culture.

World War II had been a long war. Millions of young American men had matured, been educated and gained rank and stature during their years in uniform. In spite of themselves, many returned to civilian life as indoctrinated, combat-experienced military professionals.

They were veterans, and, for better or worse, would never be the same again. America will never be the same either. We are now a nation of veterans.

To the 14.9 million veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968, the total living veterans of U.S. military service numbered over 23 million, or about 20 per cent of the adult population.

Today most middle-aged men, most business, government, civic and professional leaders, have served some time in uniform. Whether they liked it or not, their military training and experience have affected them, for the creeds and attitudes of the armed forces are powerful medicine, and can become habit-forming.

See SHOUP, Page B2, Column 1



Associated Press

Gen. David M. Shoup telling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month that the Vietnam war cannot be won in the South because "their big army is not there."

A Marine Attacks

By David M. Shoup

Winner of the Medal of Honor in the Battle of Tarawa in 1943, Gen. Shoup served as commandant of the Marine Corps for four years until his retirement in 1963. This article, written in collaboration with Col. James A. Donovan (USMC-Ret.), is reprinted by permission of the Atlantic.

AMERICA HAS BECOME a militaristic and aggressive Nation. Our massive and swift invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, concurrent with the rapid buildup of U.S. military power in Vietnam, constituted an impressive demonstration of American readiness to execute military contingency plans and to seek military solutions to problems of political disorder and potential Communist threats in the areas of our interest.

This "military task force" type of diplomacy is in the tradition of our more primitive, pre-World War II "gunboat diplomacy," in which we landed small forces of Marines to protect American lives and property from the perils of native bandits and revolutionaries.

In those days, the U.S. Navy and its Marine landing forces were our chief means, short of war, for showing the flag, exercising American power and protecting U.S. interests abroad. The Navy, enjoying the freedom of the seas, was a visible and effective representative of the Nation's sovereign

power. The Marines could be employed ashore "on such other duties as the President might direct" without congressional approval or a declaration of war.

The U.S. Army was not then used so freely because it was rarely ready for expeditionary service without some degree of mobilization, and its use overseas normally required a declaration of emergency or war.

Now, however, we have numerous contingency plans involving large joint Air Force - Army - Navy - Marine task forces to defend U.S. interests and to safeguard our allies wherever and whenever we suspect Communist aggression. We maintain more than 1,517,000 Americans in uniform overseas in 119 countries. We have eight treaties to help defend 48 nations if they ask us to—or if we choose to intervene in their affairs.

We have an immense and expensive military establishment, fueled by a gigantic defense industry, and millions of proud, patriotic and frequently bellicose and militaristic citizens. How did this militarist culture evolve? How did this militarism steer us into the tragic military and political morass of Vietnam?

Prior to World War II, American attitudes were typically isolationist, pacifist and generally antimilitary. The regular peacetime military es-

SHOUP, From Page B1

The military codes include all the virtues and beliefs used to motivate men of high principle: patriotism, duty and service to country, honor among fellow men, courage in the face of danger, loyalty to organization and leaders, self-sacrifice for comrades, leadership, discipline and physical fitness. For many veterans, the military's efforts to train and indoctrinate them may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had—especially so for the young and less educated.

In addition, each of the armed forces has its own special doctrinal beliefs and well-catalogued customs, traditions, rituals and folklore upon which it strives to build a fiercely loyal military character and esprit de corps.

All ranks are taught that their unit and their branch of the military service are the most elite, important, efficient or effective in the military establishment. By believing in the superiority and importance of their own service, they also provide themselves a degree of personal status, pride and self-confidence.

As they get older, many veterans seem to romanticize and exaggerate their own military experience and loyalties. The policies, attitudes and positions of the powerful veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AM-VETS, totaling over four million men, frequently reflect this pugnacious and chauvinistic tendency.

Their memberships generally favor military solutions to world problems in the pattern of their own earlier experience, and often assert that their military service and sacrifice should be repeated by the younger generations.

Complex of Industries

CLOSELY RELATED to the attitudes and influence of America's millions of veterans is the vast and powerful complex of the defense industries, which have been described in detail many times in the eight years since Gen. Eisenhower first warned of the military-industrial power complex in his farewell address as President.

The relationship between the defense industry and the military establishment is closer than many citizens realize. Together they form a powerful public opinion lobby.

The several military service associations provide both a forum and a meeting ground for the military and its industries. The associations also provide each of the armed services with a

means of fostering their respective roles, objectives and propaganda.

Each of the four services has its own association, and there are also additional military function associations for ordnance, management, defense industry and defense transportation, to name some of the more prominent.

The Air Force Association and the Association of the U.S. Army are the largest, best organized and most effective of the service associations. The Navy League, typical of the "silent service" traditions, is not as well coordinated in its public relations efforts, and the small Marine Corps Associa-

tion is not even in the same arena with the other contenders, the Marine Association's main activity being the publication of a semiofficial monthly magazine.

Actually, the service associations' respective magazines, with an estimated combined circulation of over 270,000, are the primary medium serving the several associations' purposes.

Air Force and Space Digest, to cite one example, is the magazine of the Air Force Association and the unofficial mouthpiece of the U.S. Air Force doctrine, "party line" and propaganda. It frequently promotes Air Force policy that has been officially frustrated or suppressed within the Department of Defense.

It beats the tub for strength through aerospace power, interprets diplomatic, strategic and tactical problems in terms of air power, stresses the requirements for quantities of every type of aircraft and frequently perpetuates the extravagant fictions about the effectiveness of bombing.

This, of course, is well coordinated with and supported by the multibillion dollar aerospace industry, which thrives upon the boundless desires of the Air Force. They reciprocate with lavish and expensive ads in every issue of Air Force and Space Digest.

Over 96,000 members of the Air Force Association receive the magazine. Members include active, reserve, retired personnel and veterans of the U.S. Air Force. Additional thousands of copies go to people engaged in the defense industry. The thick mixture of advertising, propaganda and Air Force doctrine continuously repeated in this publication provides its readers and writers with a form of intellectual hypnosis, and they are prone to believe their own propaganda because they read it in Air Force and Space Digest.

War As An Escape

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE have also become more and more accustomed to militarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun and to the violence of combat.

Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips and television programs with war or military settings.

To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use

at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth.

Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.

It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism.

There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion.

How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exerts



United Press International

It's often a race between elements of the American armed forces, says Gen. David M. Shoup. At left, 12th Regiment Marines swarm-

so much martial influence upon the Government and life of the American people?

The military will disclaim any excess of power or influence on their part. They will point to their small numbers, low pay and subordination to civilian masters as proof of their modest status

and innocence.

Nevertheless, the professional military, as a group, is probably one of the best organized and most influential of the various segments of the American scene. Three wars and six major contingencies since 1940 have forced the American people to become abnormally aware of the armed forces and their leaders. In turn, the military services have produced an unending supply of capable, articulate leaders.

The sheer skill, energy and dedication of America's military officers make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from the Federal Cabinet to the local PTA.

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter, for the rest of their careers, they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others.

Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The Sense of Duty

THE MEN who rise to the top of the military hierarchy have usually demonstrated their effectiveness as leaders, planners and organization managers. They have perhaps performed heroically in combat, but most of all they have demonstrated their loyalty as proponents of their own service's doctrine and their dedication to the defense establishment.

The paramount sense of duty to follow orders is at the root of the military professional's performance. As a result, the military often operate more efficiently and effectively in the arena of defense policy planning than do their civilian counterparts in the State Department.

The military planners have their doctrinal beliefs, their loyalties, their

discipline—and their typical desire to compete and win. The civilians in government can scarcely play the same policy-planning game. In general, the military are better organized, they work harder, they think straighter and they keep their eyes on the objective, which is to be instantly ready to solve the problem through military action while ensuring that their respective service gets its proper mission, role and recognition in the operation.

In an emergency, the military usually have a ready plan; if not, their numerous doctrinal manuals provide firm guidelines for action. Politicians, civilian appointees and diplomats do not normally have the same confidence about how to react to threats and violence as do the military.

The motivations behind these endeavors are difficult for civilians to understand. For example, military professionals cannot measure the success of their individual efforts in terms of personal financial gain. The armed forces are not profit-making organizations, and the rewards for excellence in the military profession are acquired in less tangible forms.

Thus it is that promotion and the responsibilities of higher command with the related fringe benefits of quarters, servants, privileges and prestige, motivate most career officers. Promotions and choice job opportunities are attained by constantly performing well, conforming to the expected patterns and pleasing the senior officers.

Promotions and awards also frequently result from heroic and distinguished performance in combat, and

takes a war to become a military hero. Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.

Aggression As Competition

THE PROFESSIONAL military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures.

Unlike some of the civilian policy makers, the military has not been obsessed with the threat of communism per se. Most military people know very little about communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government.

But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil.

When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the Armed Forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from communism.

In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The Armed Forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its general purpose forces in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances.

To do this, it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the unified commands and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Important features of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue



United Press International

In the massive Dominican intervention in 1965, "contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy."

to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sealift forces and the Army-Air Force team of air-mobility proponents.

At the senior command levels, parochial pride in service, personal ambitions and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe.

The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the "first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves.

This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small, turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the



Associated Press

ing ashore to reinforce the Danang air base July 7, 1965. Right, the 101st Airborne Division reaches Camranh Bay July 29, 1965.

Marines and to attain overall command of "U.S. Forces Dom. Rep."

Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82d Airborne Division to the scene, included a lieutenant general, and took

charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965, the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Vietcong and North Vietnamese aggressions. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!)

So by early 1965, the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause.

Bombing a 'Hoax'

MUCH OF THE reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes.

In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in both North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people.

Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots and opportunity for career officers.

The highly trained professional and aggressive career officers of the Army and Marine Corps played a similar game. Prior to the decision to send combat units to South Vietnam in early 1965, both services were striving to increase their involvement.

The Army already had over 16,000

military aid personnel serving in South Vietnam in the military adviser role, in training missions, logistic services, supporting helicopter companies and in Special Forces teams. This investment of men and materiel justified a requirement for additional U.S. combat units to provide local security and to help protect our growing commitment of aid to the South Vietnam regime.

There were also top-ranking Army officers who wanted to project Army ground combat units into the Vietnam struggle for a variety of other reasons; to test plans and new equipment, to test the new air-mobile theories and tactics, to try the tactics and techniques of counterinsurgency and to gain combat experience for young officers and noncommissioned officers. It also appeared to be a case of the military's duty to stop "Communist aggression" in Vietnam.

Marines vs. Airborne

THE MARINES had somewhat similar motivations, the least of which was any real concern about the political or social problems of the Vietnamese people.

In early 1965, there was a shooting war going on and the Marines were being left out of it, contrary to all their traditions. The Army's military advisory people were hogging American participation—except for a Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron at Danang which was helping the Army of the Republic of Vietnam.

For several years, young Marine officers had been going to South Vietnam from the 3d Marine Division on Okinawa for short tours of "on-the-job training" with the small South Vietnam Marine Corps. There was a growing concern, however, among some senior Marines that the Corps should get involved on a larger scale and be the "first to fight" in keeping with the Corps's traditions. This would help justify the Corps's continued existence, which many Marines seem to consider to be in constant jeopardy.

The Corps had also spent several years exploring the theories of counterinsurgency and as early as 1961 had developed an elaborate lecture-demonstration called Operation Cormorant, for school and Marine Corps promotion purposes, which depicted the Marines conducting a large-scale amphibious operation on the coast of Vietnam and thereby helping resolve a hypothetical aggressor-insurgency problem.

As always, it was important to Marine planners and doctrinaires to apply an amphibious operation to the Vietnam situation and provide justification

for this special Marine functional responsibility. So Marine planners were seeking an acceptable excuse to thrust a landing force over the beaches of Vietnam when the Vietcong attacked the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at Pleiku in February, 1965. It was considered unacceptable aggression, and the President was thereby prompted to put U.S. ground combat units into the war.

Elements of the 3d Marine Division at Okinawa were already aboard ship and eager to go, for the Marines also intended to get to Vietnam before their neighbor on Okinawa, the Army's 173d Airborne Brigade, arrived. (Actually, the initial Marine unit to deploy was an airlifted antiaircraft missile battalion which arrived to protect the Danang air base.) With these initial deployments, the Army-Marine race to build forces in Vietnam began in earnest and did not slow down until both became overextended, overcommitted and depleted at home.

Military Role in Vietnam

FOR YEARS up to 1964, the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was then one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia.

In 1964, there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what has become the quagmire of Vietnam.

The intention at the time was that the war effort be kept small and "limited." But as the momentum and involvement built up, the military leaders rationalized a case that this was not a limited objective exercise but was a proper war in defense of the United States against "Communist aggression" and in honor of our area commitments.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting

men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders.

Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam; they have managed the details of its conduct, and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian Administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to ques-

tion the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Some of the credibility difficulties experienced by the Johnson Administration over its war situation reports and Vietnam policy can also be blamed in part upon the military advisers.

By its very nature, most military activity falls under various degrees of security classification. Much that the military plans or does must be kept from the enemy. Thus the military is indoctrinated to be secretive, devious and misleading in its plans and operations. It does not, however, always confine its security restrictions to purely military operations.

Each of the services and all of the major commands practice techniques of controlling the news and the release of self-serving propaganda: in "the interests of national defense," to make the service look good, to cover up mistakes, to build and publicize a distinguished military personality or to win a round in the continuous gamesmanship of the interservice contest.

If the Johnson Administration suffered from lack of credibility in its reporting of the war, the truth would reveal that much of the hocus-pocus stemmed from schemers in the military services, both at home and abroad.

Self-Pollinating Militarism

OUR MILITARISTIC CULTURE was born of the necessities of World War II, was nurtured by the Korean war and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc.

Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives.

The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and materiel development and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single-service doctrinaires, to

create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anticommunism, national defense and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines and to self-maintenance and management.

Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field tests. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals.

Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action.

Being recognized public figures in a Nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician. Flag officers are considered "experts," and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obliged not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems.

Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them, are the rich and powerful defense industries.

Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons and lapel emblems, is a Nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic and well-intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture.

Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.