

THE CONTEMPORARY ROLE OF THE MILITARY
ATTACHÉ AND PROBLEMS RELATING
TO THE ATTAINMENT OF A
QUALITY CORPS

by

GEORGE ANTHONY D'ANGELO, B.A.

A THESIS

IN

GOVERNMENT

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

Accepted

August, 1972

805
T3
1972
No. 76
Cop. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to offer my sincere gratitude for the continual assistance and enthusiasm of my Committee Chairman, Dr. Martin T. Kyre. I also wish to thank the members of my committee for their many helpful comments and suggestions, Dr. Lawrence C. Mayer, Dr. John H. Burnett, and Dr. James W. Harper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Organization of the Study	5
Research Methods and Data Sources	7
II. THE EVOLUTION OF THE DEFENSE ATTACHÉ SYSTEM	9
The Historical Consequence of Attaché	
Type Functions	9
Consolidation of the Service Attachés	12
The Assistant Attaché	15
Effects of Consolidating Service Attachés	
into the Defense Attaché System	16
III. FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY ATTACHÉ	19
Intelligence Gathering	20
The Attaché's Representative Role	24
Supplemental Representative Activities	25
Relationship With the Country Team	28
IV. THE ATTACHÉ SELECTION PROCESS	35
Application Requirements for Attaché Duty	35
Air Force Selection Procedures	46

Chapter	Page
Inadequacies in the Selection Process	49
The Advisability of a Volunteer Force	50
Value of a Personal Interview	53
Necessity for Language Proficiency	58
V. PREPARATION OF AN AIR ATTACHÉ	63
Education of An Air Force Officer in	
International Relations	64
Formal Attaché Training	69
VI. CAPACITY OF ATTACHÉS TO PROMOTE NATIONAL	
GOALS	73
Congressional Evaluation of the Attaché	
System	73
Detrimental Performance of Air Attachés	74
Beneficial Derivatives of Meritorious	
Attaché Service	77
Promotion Potential of Attachés	79
VII. CONCLUSIONS	83
APPENDIX	88
SOURCES CONSULTED	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4-1. Bachelor's and Master's Degrees Held by Air Attachés (Colonels) on Station as of June 1971 Compared to all Other Air Force Colonels	41
4-2. Education Level for Air Attachés (Colonels) and Assistant Air Attachés Selected by the Fall 1970 and 1971 Selection Panel For Entry Dates in 1971 and 1972	41
4-3. Attendance at Service School of Air Attachés (Colonels) on Station as of June 1971 Compared to Sampling of Other Air Force Colonels	43
5-1. Attendance at Service Schools of Air Attachés (Colonels) on Station as of June 1971	69
6-1. Promotion Selection Criteria	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The military and political professions have become inevitably entwined in the conduct of international affairs. Today's professional military man must not only be expert at waging war; he must also possess expertise at maintaining peace. His knowledge must be a synthesis of the total assessment of international affairs and his particular service's relationship to the current international situation.

President John F. Kennedy effectively described the goals of professional military men in his graduation address to the United States Air Force Academy in June, 1963.

We live in a world, in short, where the principal problems that we face are not susceptible to military solutions alone. The role of our military power in essence, is, therefore, to free ourselves and our allies, to pursue the goals of freedom without the danger of enemy attack. But we do not have a separate military policy, and a separate diplomatic policy, and a separate disarmament policy, and a separate foreign aid policy--all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together in the policy of the United States.¹

Perhaps the most encompassing of military assignments

¹U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Administration of National Security, Staff Reports and Hearings, Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operation, 88th Cong., 1965, p. 21.

relative to United States' foreign policy goals is that of the military attaché. The attaché's position is so seemingly intermeshed in current political and military situations that his professional capability must be considered in light of the United States' international responsibilities. As a collector of intelligence and a diplomatic representative of the United States, the contemporary attaché's role is gaining complexity. Declining resources and the resultant curtailment of overseas military commitments have diminished our nation's ability to acquire information while the need has not decreased. Further impediments to gaining intelligence are sometimes caused by increased expressions of independence and suspicions of new nations. Since the United States does not seem willing to accept a lower profile abroad, it seems necessary that a balance be achieved through a better quality representative force. This thesis will address one aspect of United States representation abroad--the military attaché.

Statement of the Problem

Nations have perennially tried to gain military information about their rivals. The military attaché is a prime resource of this objective. Reciprocity allows attachés to make similar observations; however, the more

effective the attaché, the better his observations and resultant information. While this thesis does not purport to establish the military attaché as the most important delegate in the international intelligence community, enough evidence does exist to substantiate a significant role. His importance depends, of course, on the times and the particular role national leaders wish for him to play. This implies a constantly changing attaché policy.

Whether the attaché is to be a mere figurehead instead of a vital component in international policy making can only be determined by the policy makers. This question, however, is vital when attempting to determine the adequacy of selection procedures. The relative importance of his role should be known before deciding on the caliber of individual needed to fill the position. While prior studies have assumed the importance of the attaché, this thesis attempts to determine if a present attaché policy actually exists which would indicate this importance. While there is no specific source positively identifying United States' attaché policy, its determination can possibly be found by reviewing its historic significance and examining the attachés' current functions. Only after a policy is determined can present attaché selection methods be questioned.

Current Air Force policy indicates a meaningful role

for the attaché. Expectations of attachés are conveyed in part by the duty descriptions given in various manuals and regulations. Only officers who have demonstrated superior performance are desired. In reality, however, these assignments are often filled by officers lacking in many of the desired qualifications. One indicator of an officer's superior performance is his promotion to general officer rank. The infrequent promotions of attachés to general officer raises the question of whether non-promotion is due to the quality of individuals selected, or due to the effects of being an attaché. In either event, the dearth of promotions has helped substantiate the oft heard accusation that an attaché assignment is detrimental to an officer's career. While an attaché assignment does have some inherent disadvantages for promotion, such as keeping an officer out of the mainstream of his service, there is still enough evidence to indicate that attaché selectees are not normally of general officer caliber. This is extremely significant since policy seems to require the assignment of only outstanding personnel for air attaché positions.

Purpose of the Study

Within the scope of the available data, this thesis attempts to determine if the United States' policy concerning the stated expectations of the attaché and his

position as an official representative of the United States government warrants the assignment of individuals of superior quality.

Additionally, it will attempt to adjudge if the actual Air Force selection procedures are congruent with assigning the caliber of individuals expected.

Organization of the Study

The historical perspective presented in Chapter II is important in determining present attaché policy. Military intelligence has been a prime concern for nations throughout history. Military men were naturally expected to be more capable of producing accurate intelligence; thus their assignment to foreign nations was inevitable. Their diplomatic status, however, makes attachés much more than intelligence gatherers. Much like an ambassador symbolizes diplomatic recognition of a country, the military attaché represents military recognition. A grasp of the historical consequence of the attaché aids the reader in determining present policy.

It is reasonable to infer from a study of the various regulations governing present day attaché duties, the desire to recruit individuals possessing the ability to perform broad-based functions. Chapter III looks at the attaché's three principal functions of intelligence gathering, official representation, and membership on the

country team. Appreciation of his duties helps one to understand the rationale behind the stringent selection criteria. It also shows that quality performance in these functions is required if an attaché is to successfully fulfill his role expectations.

The selection process of the air attaché is reviewed in Chapter IV. The manuals governing application and selection procedures make it apparent that the Air Force desires their attachés meet very stringent selection criteria. However, upon examining the selection process, one finds that many desired qualifications are often ignored. A primary cause of this is lack of a sufficient number of volunteers. Attaché selectees are, in many cases, ill prepared and incapable of adequately fulfilling their stated functions.

Preparation for attaché duty comprises Chapter V. We see that an officer who has gone to the various service schools should be well attuned to global matters. Air Force professional schools stress knowledge of international affairs in senior officers, yet for undefined reasons, it permits the assignment of inadequate personnel to positions deeply involved in international relations.

Finally, the consequences of Air Force attaché selection practices are explored. Case studies of attachés are viewed in an attempt to determine whether an attaché's eventual contribution could be related to the manner of

selection. Conclusions are given in Chapter VI.

Research Methods and Data Sources

Methodology employed in the study ranges from historical research to the comparative analysis of recent personnel files. Compilation of historic and functional data was derived primarily from academic sources. Existing Air Force regulations provided a necessary listing of selection requirements; however, interpretation of the actual application of these directives was gained primarily through the use of personal interviews. Numerous conferences were held with officials directly and indirectly related to the Defense Attaché System. Verification of suspected deficiencies of personnel selected for attaché duty was accomplished by a comparative study of personnel records and supplemented by data received from questionnaires.

Reviews of professional studies (including staff studies, and Air University research reports) were made available by the Air University Library and a personal visitation to the National War College. Extensive interviewing was conducted on four separate research trips to Washington, D. C. While in Washington, this author was fortunate to gain access to many of the agencies relating to air attaché selection and administration including Defense Intelligence School, Defense Intelligence Agency,

and the Department of State. Facilities and resources within each agency, excluding classified information, were made fully available. Additional information and accuracy of thesis content was a continuing process made possible by frequent written and telephone communications with various sources.

CHAPTER II

THE EVOLUTION OF THE DEFENSE ATTACHÉ SYSTEM

The Historical Consequence of Attaché Type Functions

The military's expectations of a contemporary attaché's role is better understood by tracing historic attaché-type activities. Predecessors of the modern day military attaché can be found in the Pre-Judean era. The Book of Numbers tells of the Lord directing Moses to search the land of Canaan.

. . . See the land what it is: and the people that dwelleth therein, whether they be strong or weak, few or many.¹

Even in those early days, determination of an enemy's strength was paramount in achieving military advantage.

The utilization of military personnel for the exclusive purpose of spying is recorded in Roman history. In his instructions to the Roman officer, Frontinus (A. D. 40-103), includes spy services as an officer's function. He also relates that when Scipio sent Caius Lelius into the camp of Syphax under the pretense of an embassy, he took along several army officers disguised as his domestics to gather expert military information.² When the

¹Bible, Book of Numbers, ch. 13.

²Alfred Vagts, The Military Attaché (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1907), pp. 3-4.

war-makers of seventeenth century Prussia found ambassadorial reports neither sufficiently complete nor current, they began to employ generals in diplomatic posts.³

As a supplement to his continual war schemes, Napoleon frequently used generals as ambassadors.⁴ By mid-nineteenth century, most European powers were assigning military officers to foreign legations. They were officially designated as military attachés and given diplomatic status in 1857.⁵ Qualified by an intimate knowledge of at least one foreign country, attachés were originally intended for a versatility that might prepare them for posts such as Commander or Chief of Staff.⁶

The United States had sufficiently emerged from her isolationist era and officially authorized military

³ Alfred Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy (New York: King's Crown Press, 1956), pp. 61-63. This work gives an exhaustive account of the positions of military men in diplomatic posts. Vagts traces back to the beginning of the practice and provides excellent insight into the consensus of its importance.

⁴ Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., p. 9.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 15-28. The Military Attaché is a most comprehensive work dealing exclusively with the history of the military attaché. Vagts places much emphasis on European attachés and analyzes their contributions to military and diplomatic functions.

⁶ Ibid., p. xi.

attachés in 1888.⁷ Although a late entry into the field, the United States' attaché force numerically surpassed most European powers by the eve of World War I.⁸ By this time the attaché was considered an essential addition to the foreign delegation, and had become an institution firmly entrenched in the diplomatic community and unlikely to soon be abolished. Even in those days, however, the attaché was more than a military spy. He represented official military recognition between military powers and, as such, assumed a significant representative role. Recent developments have augmented the continual need for professional military observers and representatives. It is widely felt that powers which give up stationing attachés abroad, in this era of the cold war, will lose an important resource in assessing the international arms' competition.⁹ Today's

⁷U. S. Congress, House, Act of September 22, 1888, ch. 1026, 25 Stat. In this appropriations bill, Congress established the financial support for attachés. Congress allotted for " . . . the pay of a clerk attendant for the collection and classification of military information from abroad . . . and the officers detailed to obtain the same." This allowed for the establishment of attaché posts in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, London, and St. Petersburg.

⁸Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., p. 34. The number of attaché posts rose to sixteen during the Spanish-American War of 1898 after which the posts were reduced to ten. By 1914 the United States and Russia had twenty-three operative attaché posts--no European power had more.

⁹Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., p. 393.

specialized technology and methods of modern warfare have necessitated the establishment of attaché branches in each of the armed services. Adequate determination of a nation's army, naval, and air potential can no longer be competently estimated by a single service attaché. It is hardly possible for an army officer to accurately appraise foreign air force's tactics and machinery. Therefore, the United States has considered it essential to utilize attaché expertise from all three services.

Consolidation of the Service Attachés

Employment of tri-service attachés became a reality soon after the National Security Act of 1947 created the Department of the Air Force as a separate military branch.¹⁰ Each service would station attaché personnel at those posts most conducive to producing vital information relevant to that particular service's intelligence efforts. Attachés from the three services were of equal rank in the embassy. Consequently, there often existed an unnecessary amount of duplication and inadequate coordination between the attachés and the ambassador. In 1963, a special Senate Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operation recognized this untenable situation and concluded that the number of military representatives at diplomatic posts was unnecessarily large and tended to reduce rather than in-

¹⁰National Security Act of 1947, sec. 758, 61 Stat.

crease their influence within the mission.¹¹ Soon after these findings were published, the Secretary of Defense ordered a detailed examination of the attaché structure which resulted in the recommendation for a consolidated military attaché system.

A unified organizational element known as the Defense Attaché System was established on July 1, 1965, to replace the tri-service system. Consolidation of the attaché system under a Department of Defense agency can be construed as an attempt to upgrade the system since operational control was transferred from the individual services to a higher level of policy making. The distinguishing feature of the new system was establishing the position of Defense Attaché. Presumably, the Defense Attaché would be a member of that service having the highest degree of interest within a particular country. As the senior attaché, he is the primary advisor to the ambassador on all military matters and serves as a single point of contact on military attaché matters for the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.¹² The supervisory organization for the Defense Attaché System became the Defense

¹¹U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Administration of National Security, Staff Report and Hearings, Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operation, 88th Cong., 1965, p. 21.

¹²Solis Horwitz, "Military Members of the Country Team," The Department of State Bulletin, LII (August 16, 1965), p. 271.

Intelligence Agency, also known as DIA.¹³

Budget economy within the Defense Intelligence Agency has resulted in a considerable decline of personnel within the Defense Attaché System.¹⁴ Reducing the attaché force imposed greater responsibilities on the individual attachés remaining. Correspondingly, it is reasonable to assume that performance of remaining attachés was expected to be of such improved quality as to offset the personnel losses. Even after this reduction, many attaché posts still have representatives from the three services. In addition to personnel cuts, fifteen of thirty-one aircraft previously assigned were deleted from the system.¹⁵

¹³U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1966, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 9221, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Pt. II, p. 617. The Defense Intelligence Agency was created in October 1961 with the expressed purpose of providing intelligence in support of the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all intelligence of a military value for use at the national level.

¹⁴U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1971, Hearings before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 2d sess., Pt. III, p. 983. From a total personnel strength of 1,880 in 1965, the number was reduced to 1,111 at the end of fiscal year 1970. Of this latter number, approximately 3000 are military attachés and assistant attachés.

¹⁵Ibid., In January 1970, eleven U. S. Air Force and four U. S. Navy aircraft were withdrawn from the following countries: Burma, Morocco, Congo, Ethiopia, Spain, France, Afghanistan, Finland, Iran, Sweden, Turkey, Australia, Greece, Norway, and Senegal. The sixteen remaining aircraft as of March 1970, were assigned in Brazil, Malagasy, South Africa, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, Honduras, Chad, India, Pakistan, Argentina, Venezuela, Congo, Liberia, and Indonesia.

In defense of multiple representation at many posts, Lt. General Joseph F. Carroll, then director of D.I.A., explained before a 1967 Congressional hearing that the services maintain representation only at those posts where specialized expertise is necessary and where it is in the best national interests.¹⁶ The Department of Defense apparently considers it essential to station attachés in a majority of the nations of the world. Appendix A depicts those countries participating in the Defense Attaché System. Its extensiveness is indicative of the importance the Defense Department places in the Defense Attaché System. The reader can gain some idea of the relative significance of each nation to our national security by noting the numerical representation of attachés in each country. Nations considered essential to Air Force intelligence needs are also shown.

The Assistant Attaché

It should be noted at this juncture that manning requirements at most stations call for attachés and assistant attachés. The assistant aids and supplements his service's attaché and is directly responsible to him. While this thesis is concerned primarily with the attaché,

¹⁶U. S. Congress, Senate, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1968, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 10738, 90th Cong., 1st sess., Pt. II, p. 940.

his assistant also has a vital role in the Defense Attaché structure in that his functions are identical to the attaché's, although in a lesser measure. The advice given to the ambassador is a synthesis of the information gathered by all members of the attaché system.

Effects of Consolidating Service Attachés into
the Defense Attaché System

Although the Defense Attaché System eased communication between the chief of mission and the attachés and prompted coordination and administrative homogeneity among the attachés, it was strongly opposed by the services.¹⁷ The service representatives contended that while there would be some advantageous derivatives from the new system; it would not be as effective as the quasi-independent tri-service system. It was felt that communications between the attaché and his host service would deteriorate if the Defense Attaché served as an intermediary, speaking for all services. Additional objections were the possibilities of rivalry among the attachés, and disregard by the Defense Attaché of the advice of the other service attachés. While these allegations occasionally occur, it is expected that professional military men can maintain harmonious

¹⁷Robert L. Rizon, Colonel, USAF, Retired, personal interview, August, 1971. Colonel Rizon was the Air Force representative on the committee to examine the proposed Defense Attaché System. Many of the following comments were derived from this interview.

relations.

Another deficiency, which is inherent in the system itself, is that the Defense Attaché, or DATT, must be the highest ranking of the service attachés. When an individual service attempts to maintain the DATT position at a dual-service or tri-service post, it must necessarily fill the position with a colonel having an earlier date of rank than the other attachés. This instance gives rise to at least three related problems:

1. Because of the date of rank requirement, over half of a service's colonels are eliminated from serving as the Defense Attaché.¹⁸

2. Exceptionally able young colonels often serve for officers who have already achieved the height of their careers, thus depriving the lesser ranking colonel of the command experience and responsibility needed for advancement.

3. The overall mission can be adversely affected since the ambassador is sometimes deprived of the best available chief advisor.

¹⁸The average time-in-grade of Air Force colonels filling DATT positions as of 1 June 1971 was 7.3 years, while the average colonel throughout the Air Force has about 5 years time-in-grade. Information compiled from the Defense Attaché Roster, June 1971, and statistics supplied by the Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel, Colonel's Group, the Pentagon.

While the Defense Attaché System solves some intra-embassy communication deficiencies, it severely limits the choice of best qualified personnel. At a time when Defense Department policy is designed to make attachés more relevant to the embassy mission, limitations are placed on the choice of individuals able to serve as the chief attaché advisor.

Historically, the use of military intelligence played a vital part in the security of states. When military observers achieved diplomatic status, they were no longer merely spies but representatives of their military and their country. Attaché representation was sought after much the same as diplomatic recognition. The position became somewhat hallowed and firmly entrenched in the diplomatic inter-actions of nations. It can be interpreted that the establishment of the Defense Attaché System was an attempt by the Department of Defense to improve the status and productivity of attachés.

While the role of the attaché has varied throughout the years, his functions today are easily recognizable. Viewing these functions, one might better determine present day attaché policy.

CHAPTER III

FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY ATTACHÉ

According to the manuals which govern the responsibilities of the attaché, it is possible to determine that he has one of the more unique duties within the services. His proficiency at extracting valuable military information from routine situations must be balanced by the ability to work effectively with his civilian diplomatic counterparts. Functional emphasis also differs between countries. While ceremonial duties may be paramount in one country, observation and reporting are prominent in other countries.

Accountability of the Air Attaché is amply compiled in Air Force Manual 36-1, Air Attaché Special Duty Summary:

Collects, evaluates and reports information in response to military intelligence requirements as primary mission, and as secondary mission represents the Chief of Staff and/or the Department of Defense, and maintains good relations and effective liaison between the U. S. Air Force and the Armed Forces of the country or countries for which responsible; provides military advice to the Chief of the diplomatic mission; and plans and directs operational and administrative attaché functions.¹

Attaché responsibilities can be broadly categorized into intelligence, representation, and membership on the

¹Air Force Manual 36-1, Officer's Classification Manual (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Air Force, 28 May 1969), p. A4-5.

country team. Each category will be treated separately.

Intelligence Gathering

The collection and evaluation of militarily significant information continues to be the primary consideration of attachés. However, it should be recognized that attachés must discharge their intelligence gathering function in an overt manner.² Covert attempts to satisfy the assemblage of information are not sanctioned since an accusation of espionage can result in the attaché's status of persona non grata and expulsion by the host government.³

Although openly accumulated, methods of collecting intelligence data varies depending on the host country's disposition toward the United States.⁴ In countries where the United States is considered antagonistic, the attaché may find it extremely difficult to collect significant military data. Communist countries are particularly notorious in denying American attachés authorization to observe military maneuvers, visit military bases, or to travel in

²Horwitz, op. cit., p. 268.

³Wendell W. Blancke, The Foreign Service of the United States (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 150.

⁴Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., ed., The Representation of the United States Abroad (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 158.

large areas of the countryside.⁵ Since information of a military nature is seldom available in the press, the attaché must laboriously gather data by accumulating shreds of related knowledge. Information is often obtained by pooling resources with attachés of other free world countries and acquiring data from other United States' agencies which overlap into military intelligence.⁶

The need likewise exists for gauging the strength of one's allies.⁷ The Acting Director for DIA in 1969, Rear Admiral Donald M. Showers, acknowledged to congressional inquiries that while there may not be an immediate need for information collected in any given country, a comprehensive knowledge base concerning foreign military capabilities is necessary for futurity. After all, ". . . a country which is friendly to us today may not be a year from now."⁸ Here an attaché's intelligence functions may be somewhat subservient to his official representative role and, therefore, justified as a necessary diplomatic expense. As could be expected, friendly countries are far

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Blancké, op. cit., p. 151.

⁸U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F. Y. 1970, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 15090, 91st Cong., 1st sess., Pt. 1, p. 830.

less restrictive in permitting American attachés access to military facilities. Among allied nations, the exchange of information is often formalized and relatively comprehensive.⁹

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, then Inspector General for the Central Intelligence Agency, and a vigorous proponent of up-to-date intelligence, says:

Intelligence is absolutely essential to national defense. Incorrect or inaccurate intelligence of the future direction of the army of those powers which have hostile intentions for this country, could be such an important and decisive factor in our defense structure that we might be arming for the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.¹⁰

The accuracy of intelligence reports can have significant consequences on diplomacy; a point graphically illustrated by the blunder at the Bay of Pigs. Apparently presuming that the Cuban people would support an invasion, President Kennedy permitted an assault of the island. The resultant rebuff caused worldwide diplomatic embarrassment for the Kennedy administration and is believed by some to be one of the reasons why Kennedy became so resolute about

⁹Barnett, op. cit., p. 158.

¹⁰Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, "Is United States Intelligence Answering the Red Challenge?" Vital Speeches, XXVII, (January 15, 1961), p. 209.

Vietnam.¹¹ Conversely, accurate and auspicious intelligence during the Cuban missile crisis resulted in what was widely hailed as a brilliant diplomatic triumph.¹²

The extent of the military attaché's role in securing intelligence could only be measured by examining specific cases which obviously is not possible. However, an authoritative gauge of the expected role of the attaché in the intelligence gathering effort is given in the following breakdown of intelligence sources suggested by academician and authority on intelligence, Harry Howe Ransom.

Activity	Value
Military attachés, accredited by foreign governments and from routine military operations	30%
Press, radio, tourists, published documents and other standard sources	25%
Routine reports, Department of State and other government agencies abroad	25%
Clandestine operations, secret sources, and secret agents ¹³	20%

¹¹Walter LaFeber, America, Russia, and the Cold War (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 222-224.

¹²Ibid., pp. 231-234. The United States' naval attaché stationed in Cuba when Fidel Castro rose to power, Captain C. R. Clark, was decorated in March 1965 for first suggesting the presence of hidden Russian missiles on the island. Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., pp. 108-109.

¹³Harry Howe Ransom, Central Intelligence and National Security (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 18. The basis of these estimates are not given by Ransom. However, they are his ideas of the probable percentages based on years of study and familiarity with the intelligence community.

Sufficient intelligence is not only essential to defense posture, but also vital in diplomacy.¹⁴ The military attaché's participation in providing accurate intelligence has been well demonstrated. Intelligence gathering, however, is not the sole function of the attaché. He must also be capable of fulfilling his representative duties. Frequently an attaché's propensity as an official representative determines his success at gathering intelligence.

The Attaché's Representative Role

Air Force Manual 36-1 interprets the Air Attaché's representative responsibilities as:

Represents the Department of Defense and/or Chief of Staff; Speaks and acts for the Chief of Staff (and other Services if not a tri-service post) or Defense agencies in matters of official interest. Attends official State and military functions as observer or participant as may be required in the performance of official duties. Acts as liaison officer for visiting U. S. Fleet commands and military units.¹⁵

Likewise, the Army attaché is to

. . . maintain good relations between the United States Army and army officials of the country to which assigned, to further the interests of the Department of the Army in the country concerned.¹⁶

¹⁴Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 207.

¹⁵Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-5.

¹⁶Army Regulation 611-10, Personnel Selection and Classification, Assignment to Army Attaché Duty (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, 16 March 1970), p. 1. While the Navy also has definite criteria for attaché functions and selection, there is not an available regulation that covers these criteria.

Each service accentuates the representative function; recognizing that through his emissary skills, the attaché can often facilitate his reportorial duties.

The attaché's most obvious representative duties are conducted with the host country's military and other third country attachés.¹⁷ To imbue credibility among the host military, it is advantageous for the attaché to possess inimitable knowledge of the United States' defense structure and that of his own service. In addition, an attaché is more likely to be effective if he is capable of adapting himself to his foreign environment by developing a cultural empathy and understanding of the assigned country. Ignorance of one's host country can adversely affect the United States' national objectives by creating hostile and contemptuous emotions.¹⁸ If an attaché has the competency to form close personal relationships with members of the host military establishment, his effectiveness can be greatly enhanced.¹⁹

Supplemental Representative Activities

An attaché's representative duties are manifested in

¹⁷Blancké, op. cit., p. 52.

¹⁸Handbook for the Air Force Attaché, Headquarters 1127th U. S. A. F. Field Activities Group (Fort Belvoir, Virginia, Department of the Air Force, 22 April 1965), pp. 54-55.

¹⁹Raymond J. Barrett, "The Role of the Military Attaché," Military Review, LI (May 1971), p. 51.

numerous ways. He is expected to attend all military ceremonies and observations.²⁰ His obligations also extend to embassy social affairs where unique opportunities exist to gather information not readily available in other situations. On these social occasions, a gracious and adaptable wife can considerably enhance an attaché's effectiveness.

Greeting and escorting visiting United States' dignitaries, and members of his host service is another representative duty of the attaché. He is usually charged with the arrangement of their accommodations, transportation, and appointments with local service representatives. In addition, he is a natural point of contact for those retired service personnel either living in his area or passing through.²¹ When a flying squadron is deployed to a foreign air base or a ship arrives in port, it is usually the military attaché who accomplishes the necessary customs and social arrangements.²²

Although not officially an attaché function, many United States attachés in allied countries participate in the Military Assistance Program. On a limited scale, it

²⁰Horwitz, op. cit., p. 269.

²¹W. H. Packard, "The Naval Attaché," U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, April 1965, p. 131.

²²Ibid.

is not unusual for the military attaché to be charged with the entire responsibility of administering his service's Military Assistance Program.²³ While performance of these many different facets of the representative function are essential, the attaché's primary representative duty is that of envoy to the host government's military.

It must be remembered that in some countries the military man has far greater influence in national affairs than is true in the United States. In these cases especially, much value can be obtained from an attaché sufficiently skilled at influencing foreign groups and individuals to perform certain measures.²⁴ A special governmental report on Foreign Affairs stressed that United States' foreign policy goals cannot be pursued by passively observing and reporting. Instead, foreign emissaries should engage in,

. . . not only watching things happen and reporting them, but also helping them happen or at least influencing their happening. Our personnel systems must be adapted to recruiting and developing officers oriented to and capable of this kind of performance.²⁵

Policy clearly indicates an active role for our offi-

²³Horwitz, op. cit., p. 271.

²⁴Handbook for the Air Force Attaché, op. cit., p. 55.

²⁵Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel, Personnel for the New Diplomacy (Washington, D. C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1962), p. 6.

cial representatives abroad. As the chief military advisor to the ambassador, the attaché's influence on United States' policy towards a foreign country may be far-reaching.

Relationship with the Country Team

An attache is subordinate to the head of the embassy or legation in which he serves. The attaché:

Advises chief of diplomatic mission on matters of military import such as military capabilities of host government from a military point of view. Makes recommendations on treaties, international agreements, and politico-military plans, policies, and procedures.²⁶

Possibilities of dissonance between embassy chief and service attaché was perceived as early as 1897 when the American Secretary of State reminded those ambassadors concerned that:

. . . Each military attaché is, in a sense, an aide-de-camp to the ambassador or minister to whose embassy or legation he is appointed. The orders of the ambassador or minister will be obeyed, unless they manifestly conflict with orders or instructions given by the Secretary of War.²⁷

²⁶Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-5.

²⁷Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., pp. 329-330, quoted from Secretary Sherman to Ambassador John Hay, London, October 14, 1897. John Bassett Moore, A Digest of International Law (Washington, 1906), IV, p. 437. The continuation of the passage is as applicable to relationship now as it was then: "In the latter case, the military attaché will respectfully notify the ambassador or minister of the circumstances which prevent a compliance with his orders, in which event the full particulars of the case must be at once forwarded to the Adjutant General. It is the earnest wish of the War Department that the most harmonious relations should exist between the military

The many different United States' agencies within the host countries have often resulted in problems of their coordination with the mission chief. In an effort to consolidate the various agencies under the ambassador's jurisdiction, President Truman initiated the concept of the 'country team' in 1951.²⁸ President Kennedy reaffirmed the ambassadors' primacy over the country team in 1961.

You are in charge of the entire United States Diplomatic Mission, and I shall expect you to supervise all of its operations. The Mission includes not only the personnel of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, but also the representatives of all other United States' agencies which have programs or activities . . .²⁹

A depiction of a typical United States Mission is given in Chart 1. The multiplicity of embassy agencies is clearly seen. While respecting the precedence of the mission chief, there is still a wide spectrum of ambassadorial influence among team members.

attachés and their chiefs in the Diplomatic Service. Any military attaché whose relations with the Chief of Embassy or Legation to which he is assigned are not most cordial will request a recall. A dignified appreciation of his own position and courteous respect for his diplomatic chief will be expected of each attaché."

²⁸U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Administration of National Security, Staff Reports and Hearings, op. cit., p. 21.

²⁹President John F. Kennedy, letter to American Ambassadors, May 29, 1961, as quoted, Ibid., p. 15. It should be noted that the Diplomatic Mission does not include military forces operating in the field where such forces are under the command of a U. S. area military commander.

CHART 1

COMPOSITION OF A U. S. MISSION

The personnel of an American Diplomatic Mission may range in number from six as in Rwanda, to several hundred as in Viet-Nam. The example used below is Venezuela, an important South American country where there is a broad range of official U. S. activities. In addition to the Embassy with its executive, political, economic, consular, and administrative sections, the U. S. mission in Venezuela includes military attachés, agricultural attachés from the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) of the Department of Agriculture, Peace Corps representatives, United States Information Service officers, Agency for International Development staff, and two consular posts outside the capital city.

In the two consular posts at Maracaibo and Puerto La Cruz, there are seven consuls and vice consuls. Also at Maracaibo is a public affairs officer directing a branch USIS office. In addition, there are American and local secretarial and clerical employees, translators, maintenance men, security personnel, librarians, and other support staff.

Executive Section

Ambassador
Deputy Chief of Mission
Executive Assistant

Political Section

Counselor for Political
Affairs
Two Political Officers
Labor Attaché

Military Attachés

Army Attaché
Assistant Army Attaché
Naval Attaché
Assistant Naval Attaché
Air Attaché
Assistant Air Attaché

Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS)

Agricultural Attaché
Assistant Agricultural
Attaché

Source: U. S. Department of State, The Country Team, An Illustrative Profile of Our American Missions Abroad, a Department and Foreign Service Series 136 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April 1967), p. 9.

CHART 1--ContinuedEconomic Section

Counselor for Economic
Affairs
Three Economic Officers
Four Commercial Officers
Transportation and Communi-
cations Attaché
Petroleum Attaché

Consular Section

Consul General
Four Consular Officers
Visa Assistant

Administrative Section

Counselor for Administration
Administrative Officer
Two Security Officers
Budget Management Officer
General Services Officer
Disbursing Specialist
Communications and Records
Supervisor
Personnel Services Assistant

General Assignment

Foreign Service Officer
(a junior officer on first
tour of duty abroad)

Agency for International
Development (AID)

AID Representative
Controller
Training Officer
Programs Analysis Officer
Public Safety Adviser
Manpower Adviser
Agriculture Credit
Adviser
Industrial Officer
Resources Development
Officer
Sociologist
Education Adviser
Reports Officer

Peace Corps

Peace Corps Representative
Deputy Representative
Physician

United States Information
Service (USIS)

Counselor for Public Affairs
Information Officer
Cultural Affairs Officer
Executive Officer

State Department personnel report directly to and through the mission chief and are most dependent on him. The Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG), however, is highly operational and more dependent on the Pentagon on budgetary, programming, and operational decisions; hence does little more than inform the ambassador of its actions.³⁰ Whereas, the attaché's degree of ambassadorial dependence is interjacent to these extremes. His advisory and representative faculties necessarily result in a close working relationship with the mission chief; however, he receives functional directions, and is employed by the Department of Defense.

As a member of the embassy staff, the attaché is placed on the protocol list and automatically actively engages in diplomatic social activity. His protocol position in an embassy is illustrated by the following listing:

Ambassador
Minister
Counselor
Military Attaché
First Secretary
Second Secretary
Assistant Military Attaché
Third Secretary³¹

³⁰U. S. Congress, Senate, Administration of National Security, Staff Reports and Hearings, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

³¹William Barnes and John Heath Morgan, The Foreign Service of the United States (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961), p. 308, and Blancke, op. cit., pp. 152-153. The listing is an interpolation of data taken from both sources.

Since the interests of the Department of Defense and the ambassador are not always identical, most of the military communication is routed directly to Washington without going through the Chief of Mission. However, data of interest to both parties is dispensed to the proper mission office.³² Although generally esteemed by most mission chiefs, an attaché's influence in embassy policy is often dependent upon the mission chief's disposition toward him. Thus, it appears advantageous to assign individuals capable of gaining the confidence of the ambassador.³³

This chapter has attempted to show the multiplicity of attaché functions. Clearly, the Department of Defense expects much more than spy activity from the attaché. As an official diplomatic representative, he is expected to actively influence the actions of foreign military men. His success at achieving this is dependent in large measure

³²Horwitz, op. cit., p. 269. Horwitz points out that Ambassador David K. E. Bruce testified before a Congressional Committee in December 1963 and said that separate channels of communication are not opposed by the Chief of Diplomatic Missions and that they do not constitute a problem of any kind.

³³Donald Crowley, Lt. Colonel, USAF, Former Air Attaché to the Dominican Republic, personal interview, August 1971. During his three year tour as an attaché, Lt Colonel Crowley noted instances where ambassadors used the attaché as his main confidant while others used attachés only for purposes of military advice. When the attaché possessed language fluency, good relationships with the host government, and good working relations with the embassy staff, his influence was invariably greater.

on his ability to establish rapport among his foreign contemporaries. Additionally, his influence within the embassy is directly related to capabilities of gaining the ambassador's confidence. Successful accomplishment of these tasks requires individuals of exceptional skills.

Since policy apparently places the attaché in a very significant role, it would seem imperative that individuals assigned be commensurate to that role. Chapter IV will review the present method of air attaché selection in an attempt to determine its adequacy at supplying individuals capable of fulfilling policy goals.

CHAPTER IV
THE ATTACHÉ SELECTION PROCESS

This chapter will attempt to determine if the present Air Force attaché selection process is adequate. Before examining the mechanics of selection, an elaboration of the requirements for attaché duty is in order. Attaché qualifications are a reflection of attaché policy in that the quality of individual desired is indicative of job significance. As the desired selectee is compared to the actual selectee, it becomes apparent that personnel selection procedures are not consistent with attaché policy.

Application Requirements for Attaché Duty

The Air Force categorizes attaché duty as a Special Duty Assignment allowing

. . . qualified officers the opportunity of serving in unique and challenging positions not normally available to most individuals in the course of their Air Force careers.¹

Specific requirements for application to a Special Duty Assignment are set forth in Air Force Manual 36-11² (Appendix B). Air Force requires that applicants for special duty assignments be volunteers, not have been

¹Air Force Manual 36-11, Officer Assignment Manual (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Air Force, 31 July 1970), p. 8-1. There are a total of twenty-two Special Duty Assignments.

²Ibid.

"passed over" in the promotion cycle,³ and have intentions of making the Air Force a career. Although all the Special Duty Assignments require certain individual attributes, the identifier for attaché duty found in Air Force Manual 36-11 seems to have more demanding personal qualifications than the other Special Duty Assignments. Air Force Manual 36-11 states:

It is imperative that officers assigned to the Defense Attaché System reflect the highest credit upon the U. S. Air Force and the U. S. Government. Officers of mature judgment who are temperamentally suited to work within a diplomatic environment and understand foreign nations, cultures, and their people are desired.⁴

Inquiry into the qualifications of the air attaché and the actual determination of these qualifications should either uphold the selection criteria as realistic or expose them as mere platitudes. Each of the "mandatory" and "desirable" qualifications listed in the assignment manuals will be looked at separately in an attempt to determine if they are complied with.

Mandatory Qualifications

1. Knowledge of geopolitics, international

³The exact nomenclature is "failed selection," meaning that an officer must have made all temporary and permanent promotions in the allotted time. Since there is no allotted time for promotion to colonel, this requirement is only for those ranks below colonel.

⁴Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., p. 8-7.

relations; U. S. foreign policy; international power relationships; and U. S. military organization and operation.⁵

Since the attaché training school is necessarily limited in its duration, a prior appreciation of foreign affairs is important. However, this appears to be an unsubstantial prerequisite since the selection panel has very limited means of measuring an applicant's knowledge of international relations. Determination of one's exposure to international affairs is achieved primarily by reviewing his past assignments and education.⁶ However, without a written or oral examination, his knowledge of international affairs is difficult to measure.

2. Foreign language comprehension and speak-proficiency.⁷

Although the manual lists this as a mandatory requirement for selection, it is not rigidly adhered to. Language proficiency aids an individual's chances for selection, but lack of language skills does not preclude being chosen. However, it is necessary for the applicant to achieve a minimum qualifying score on the Air Force Language Aptitude

⁵Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-5.

⁶Willard Hammons, Captain, USAF, Air Attaché Assignments Officer, Personnel/Attaché Activities Group, Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence, personal interview, November, 1971.

⁷Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

Test.⁸ The attaché's need for language proficiency will be further discussed in the latter part of this chapter.

3. The selected applicant must possess an impeccable personal character, a trouble-free family environment, and a demonstrated high degree of tact and diplomacy.⁹

The selection panel's principal resource in determining these qualifications is a questionnaire sent to five or six of the applicant's former supervisors (Appendix C). These questionnaires have proven to be especially useful.¹⁰ Performance reports provide another determinant of character traits. Although a fairly accurate estimation of an individual's tact can be gained from these reports, it is highly unlikely that a portrayal of his character or family life would be given unless it resulted in the degradation of his duties.

⁸ Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., pp. 8-7 to 8-9. The minimum score required by Air Force Manual 50-5 for entrance into Air Force language training is 18. The wife is also expected to take the test but is not required to obtain a minimum score. The Army has a similar aptitude test and requires a score of 25 with provisions for a special waiver to 18. From Army Regulation 611-60, op. cit., p. 2

⁹ Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

¹⁰ Hammons, op. cit., Questionnaires are the dominant factor in determining an individual's character suitability. Approximately one of ten contains some derogatory information. In cases where discredit occurs, a cross-check is made with the supervisor's performance report of the individual in an attempt to determine if a personality conflict exists. Normally, if an individual receives more than one derogatory questionnaire, he is eliminated.

4. It is mandatory that the attaché possess an excellent/superior record of performance of duty.¹¹

An officer's efficiency report (OER) is the primary means of determining his performance of duty. While these reports are unavailable for analysis, it is the author's opinion that their disclosure would not show that the attaché's performance is superior to other Air Force colonels'. This assumption is based on the fact that most attachés have volunteered on their own initiative, thus negating an initial selecting of superior personnel.¹² Additionally, numerous former attachés have suggested that the performance of many attachés known to them was far less than superior. Often, individuals volunteer for their own gratification rather than the positive contributions they could make to national goals. The conspicuous lack of promotions of attachés to general officer rank might also be indicative of low performance reports.

The above four qualifications are categorized as man-

¹¹Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

¹²It should be noted at this point that all attachés are "volunteers" insofar as they voluntarily accept the assignment. Most attachés have volunteered on their own initiative, sending in advanced applications and following all the formal procedures of applying for the assignment. Other attachés are specifically asked or persuaded to take the assignment. This author prefers to classify the two as "initiative volunteers" and "persuaded volunteers."

datory for selection to attaché duty yet are difficult, if not impossible, to determine under the present system of selection. "Desired" qualifications for attaché duty are tangible and, thus, more easily measured.

Desirable Qualifications

1. Bachelor's Degree in engineering, arts, social sciences, physical science, or business/management and a Master's Degree in area studies or international relations.¹³

With the Air Force's accent on education and its vast base of college educated personnel, a mandatory qualification of a Bachelor's Degree, with few exceptions, could easily be supported. Since most people in diplomatic circles are college graduates, the attaché's position would be enhanced if he, too, had a college education.¹⁴ Although listed as a qualification, available data indicates that attachés are no more likely to possess college degrees than other Air Force colonels. Table 4-1 depicts the education level of colonels on station as of June 1971.

¹³Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6

¹⁴A poll of twenty-six Army attachés and former attachés revealed that eighteen felt that a Bachelor's Degree was sufficient while eight recommended a Master's Degree. Results of an extensive questionnaire was furnished to this author by Major Jack Peters, U. S. Army. Major Peters is currently writing his Master's Thesis on a similar topic for Kansas State University. Major Peters received completed questionnaires from sixteen current attachés and ten former attachés. Future reference to this questionnaire will be listed as Major Peters' Survey.

TABLE 4-1

BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S DEGREES HELD BY AIR
ATTACHÉS (COLONELS) ON STATION AS OF
JUNE 1971 COMPARED TO ALL OTHER
AIR FORCE COLONELS

	Attachés	Other Colonels
Number Considered	13	6,307
Bachelor's Degree	9 (69%)	70%
Master's Degree	3 (23%)	40%

Source: Compiled from data received from the Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel, Colonels Group, and the Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence, Attaché Selection Section.

Since the education level of attachés actually lags behind their peers, it is very doubtful if education was a significant consideration in the selection process. This situation seems to be improving as indicated below.

TABLE 4-2

EDUCATION LEVEL FOR AIR ATTACHÉS (COLONELS)
AND ASSISTANT AIR ATTACHÉS SELECTED BY
THE FALL 1970 AND 1971 SELECTION
PANEL FOR ENTRY DATES IN
1971 AND 1972

	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Total Considered
Attaché	9	a	11 (82%)
Assistant Attaché	31	8	33 (94%)

^aUnable to determine from available information. Within the past two years, education has evidently become a prime consideration for an officer's selection to duty.

Source: Compiled from data received from the Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence, Attaché Selection Section.

A special graduate education program called the Area Specialist Program has recently been implemented by the Air Force which will provide area experts for use in the Defense Attaché System. The program leads to a Master's Degree in area studies, and includes studies in the selected area's history, economics, geography, politics, and language. While these students will not be exclusively schooled for attaché duty, this education can be a major step in attaining more qualified and specially trained individuals.

2. Completion of a professional military school appropriate to grade and seniority is desirable.¹⁵

Desirability for the completion of service schools as a principal qualification for selection to attaché duty is logical since an individual's general military education and knowledge of international politics can be greatly enhanced by his attendance at these schools. Once again, attachés are no more likely to have attended these schools than their counterparts. Table 4-3 compares service schools attended by attachés to other Air Force colonels.¹⁶

¹⁵Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

¹⁶Major Peters' Survey shows that Army attachés' attendance at service schools is similar to the Air Force. Of the twenty-six questionnaires in the survey, nineteen indicated that Staff College was sufficient military education for attaché duty. The other seven recommended attendance at War College. Of the twenty-six polled, only six had actually attended the War College.

TABLE 4-3

ATTENDANCE AT SERVICE SCHOOL OF AIR ATTACHÉS
(COLONELS) ON STATION AS OF JUNE 1971
COMPARED TO SAMPLING OF OTHER
AIR FORCE COLONELS

	Attaché	Other Colonels
Number Considered	13	6,307
Air Command and Staff College	8 (61%)	55%
Senior Service Schools	5 (39%)	40%

Source: Compiled from information received from the Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel, Colonels Group.

The last significant qualification listed as desirable, previous attaché duty, is actually at variance with official Air Force policy.

3. Previous attaché, joint duty, or intelligence experience is desirable.¹⁷

The value of previous attaché duty is a topic of continual concern to the services. Some of the advantages of repeat tours are readily apparent. By the end of an initial attaché tour, an individual should be reasonably proficient in both language and intelligence collection through on-the-job training. Moreover, the services could be very selective in choosing individuals for repeat tours by re-employing only those of proven caliber.¹⁸ As in other

¹⁷Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

¹⁸Joseph D. Cooper, Lt Colonel, USAF, "Some Recommendations for the Improvement in Training and Utilization of Air Attachés" (unpublished research report, Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, January 1966), p. 24. Lt Colonel Cooper presents a strong case for the establishment of a career attaché corps.

fields, performance improves with experience. Addressing this subject, Lt General Donald V. Bennett, DIA Director since September 1969, estimated that approximately 50 per cent of the attachés were serving repeat tours and it depended, " . . . entirely on the individual . . . and the very tangible contributions he can make."¹⁹ Although explicitly stated as a desirable qualification in Air Force Manual 36-1, official Air Force policy is opposed to repeat tours.

In a letter dated April 30, 1970, the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff expressed a desire to be knowledgeable of all repeat tours and said, "For a start let's say, 'no second tours' without personal approval of the Office of Vice Chief of Staff."²⁰ This decision is based partially on basic Air Force personnel doctrine of refraining from specialization within the officer corps. Presumably, the desired flexibility and mobility necessary for the Air Force mission is better maintained through generalists, or the "Whole Man" concept.²¹ The Vice Chief of Staff

¹⁹U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1971, Hearings, op. cit., p. 984.

²⁰Letter, Office of Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel, to Air Force Intelligence, April 30, 1970.

²¹John P. Richmond, Jr., Major, USAF, "Functional Planning: Does the Air Force Policy on Reassignment of Experienced Diplomatic Personnel Reflect Efficiency in the Management of Trained Resources?" (unpublished thesis, Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, June 1967), p. 25.

appreciated that second tours would have certain value to the Defense Attaché System but commented,

In the context of attache requirements, this, the selection process, looks like a good system. In the context of Air Force-wide personnel policy, it does not. The system as outlined, excessive repeat tours, tends toward a professional attaché corps.²²

At the time the Vice Chief of Staff made this decision, fifteen of thirty-nine Air Force colonels were serving repeat tours as attachés.²³

Augmenting the Air Force's desire for a generalized officer corps, assailants of repeat tours present two predominant inadequacies of a professional attaché corps.

1. From a purely operational perspective, officers who have not had recent exposure to new developments in military technology and doctrine are perhaps less capable of evaluating the host country's military capacity.

2. It is also unlikely that a career specialist in diplomacy or intelligence would succeed in winning the confidence of the host country's professional military men. The establishment of rapport is often dependent on the attaché's military deportment and adroitness. It is concluded, therefore, that a heterogeneous military career

²²Letter, Office of Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel, April 30, 1970, op. cit., italics are author's.

²³Letter, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel to Vice Chief of Staff, Air Force, April 20, 1970.

is more probable to produce a thoroughly professional soldier than a career served principally in the diplomatic or intelligence area.²⁴

Admittedly, drawbacks do exist; however, using attachés for repeated tours can serve useful purposes. An individual who serves two tours in the attaché system, over a thirty-year period separated by intervening operational tours, can scarcely be called a professional attaché. Those individuals who performed in an outstanding manner could be placed on a preferred attaché list and be eligible for selection after an intervening Air Force tour. This would allow the Defense Intelligence Agency an opportunity to pick a known quantity, and, additionally, reduce the time in training.

Thus far, this chapter has concentrated on those qualifications the Air Force considers essential for selection for attaché duty. An individual desiring the job and feeling he has met the criteria must then submit a formal application. What happens after the submission of the application until the final acceptance of the candidate by the Defense Intelligence Agency is the subject of the next section.

Air Force Selection Procedures

Once the officer's formal application has been screened

²⁴Barnett, op. cit., p. 160.

for the acceptable eligibility criteria and suitability qualifications, it is kept on file for three years. During this time, the officer's application is liable for selection through the following process.²⁵

1. The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) sends a requisition (DIA Form 572) to the appropriate service specifying requirements for a certain station. This requisition (Appendix D) gives the qualifications considered essential for a particular post. Most of the requirements are satisfied by the formal application; however, some applicants must be eliminated because of housing requirements, school inadequacies, etc. For instance, an officer having school age children will not be considered for a station without English speaking school facilities.

2. Using the DIA requisition, the Air Attaché Assignment Officer identifies qualified applicants for the vacancies. Individuals unavailable because of higher priority requirements are not considered by the selection panel.

²⁵Information concerning the selection of personnel is taken from an unpublished mimeographed booklet distributed by the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence, Attaché Activities Group entitled, "The Defense Attaché System and Selection of Personnel." ca., 1967, and Hammons, op. cit.

3. The Air Attaché Assignment Officer prepares a roster indicating the positions for which each applicant is qualified. He also furnishes the panel with the candidate's formal application, promotion board records, supervisor's evaluation forms, and any other related papers.²⁶

Panel members then:

(a) Individually review the records of each member without particular reference to an applicant's preference or to existing vacancies. This review is to determine overall qualifications for duty in the Attaché System. Each member is then given the opportunity to identify those he does not consider qualified for attaché duty and votes on their elimination.

(b) Nominate and vote on qualified applicants for the existing vacancies.²⁷

4. Nominations of the Air Force Selection Panel are given to the Defense Intelligence Agency for final approval.²⁸

²⁶Hammons, op. cit. The formal selection panel consists of four voting members, including the Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence who is the Chairman, and a Recorder. The Recorder is normally the Air Attaché Assignment Officer. Formal meeting of the selection panel usually occurs in the Fall of each year and endeavors to make yearly selections. For example, the panel met in October 1971 to fill requirements to enter training from January 1972 through November 1972, making twenty-two selections for this period. The individuals serving on the 1971 board were all Intelligence personnel, including one former attaché. All are knowledgeable of the Defense Attaché System.

²⁷Unpublished information booklet, "The Defense Attaché System and Selection of Personnel, op. cit., p. 4.

²⁸Robert L. Ventres, Colonel, USAF, Acting Assistant Director of Attaché Affairs/DIA, personal interview, November 1971. While DIA has final approval authority, they are not given a choice in the actual selection process. If a nominee is rejected, the Air Force repeats the selection process. Candidates are normally declined by DIA because of obvious deficiencies resulting from an oversight of the selection board or failure of the nominee to meet the security clearance requirement.

If the candidate is accepted, requests for final assignment orders are forwarded to the Military Personnel Center.

Not all selections are made according to the above process. Unusual circumstances sometimes demand selection without formal board action.²⁹ Unexpected vacancies requiring immediate replacements often result in the solicitation of individuals already possessing language proficiency and/or attaché experience. These cases are usually exceptions and Air Force attempts to fill most vacancies through board action.

One is likely to conclude that the demanding selection procedure guarantees an input of superior personnel to the Defense Attaché System. However, upon closer scrutiny, several inherent deficiencies are manifested.

Inadequacies in the Selection Process

Deficiencies in the selection process are perhaps the most significant vexation of those concerned about the attaché system. One need only speak to former attachés or review the recall files of the Defense Intelligence Agency to realize the frequent placement of subordinate

²⁹Hammons, op. cit. Captain Hammons estimated that about twenty special actions occurred between the 1970 and 1971 panel meetings. Instead of meeting as a formal panel, the Air Attaché Assignment Officer usually suggests a best qualified individual for a position and then seeks concurrence of the board members.

attachés.³⁰ A study of three prominent areas in the selection process reveals the possibility of remedying much of this situation. This section will examine the volunteer status of applicants, the essentiality of an interview, and the necessity of language proficiency.

The Advisability of a Volunteer Force

A basic criterion of the attaché system is that it must be an entirely volunteer force. Truly, the very ethos of attaché duty requires individuals who are willing and anxious for such an assignment. An officer who is not favorably disposed toward his duty in a foreign country in a quasi-diplomatic role may become malevolent over his forced assignment and, thus, injurious to the mission. Likewise, a wife having an aversion towards her numerous duties or many inconveniences resulting from her necessary participation in her husband's position can be an enormous detriment to his job performance. Indiscriminate assigning of non-volunteers as attachés can have far-reaching adverse effects on the overall attaché mission. However, it is the interpretation of 'volunteer' that requires

³⁰ For documented firsthand accounts of individuals totally lacking in attache qualities refer to: Duane L. Kime, Colonel, USAF, "The Value of Our Air Attaché System and Proposed Future Program." (unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, April, 1954), and Donald M. Marks, Lt Colonel, USAF, "Air Attaché; Realistic Selection and Meaningful Training." (unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, April, 1968).

close scrutiny.

Air attachés are selected principally from those officers who have submitted formal applications.³¹ This practice severely limits the choice of the selection panel since the actual number of eligibles remaining after the initial screening is rather low.³² Because of this limited resource, it can be accurately inferred that the quality of selected personnel is not commensurate with the euphoric set of standards set forth.³³ Rejuvenation from this predicament is plausible by either adequately publicizing the attaché mission in the hope that enough highly qualified personnel would volunteer, and thus make

³¹Occasionally situations arise where an individual is requested to fill a vacancy because of his language proficiency or past experience; this is usually done because of an immediate need as described above. On rare instances, eminently qualified personnel may be requested to serve at a high-priority station. An example of this was the acceptance of Colonel Lyle E. Mann to serve as Defense Attaché to Israel. Colonel Mann was subsequently precluded from serving his tour due to his selection for brigadier general in February 1972. This method of selection is the exception.

³²Hammons, op. cit. Captain Hammons estimates that after the initial screening process there is usually an average of one applicant available for each air attaché position. The more attractive stations may have several applicants, while undesirous ones often have none. The ratio of applicants to fill the Assistant Air Attaché position is somewhat better, usually running about four to one.

³³Donald M. Marks, Lt Colonel, USAF, "Air Attaché: Realistic Selection and Meaningful Training" (unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, April, 1968), p. 65.

selection competitive and meaningful, or by actively investigating and encouraging the volunteer status of eminently qualified personnel. This latter suggestion warrants further attention.

By reviewing an officer's personnel records one can likely determine his propensity for an attaché assignment. Items such as previous intelligence experience, military and civilian educational background, language proficiency or aptitude, and other desirable qualifications can be readily evaluated. Additional screening could reduce the number to manageable size where supplemental individual scrutiny would be possible. The idea here is to develop a 'prime attaché candidate pool.' If these individuals were kept acutely aware of attaché system operations, advantages, openings, etc., on a continuing basis, it is most likely that many would volunteer or at least be persuaded to accept an assignment within the system. Once applicable criteria are identified, the mechanics of such a system could be adequately implemented by the Personnel Division of the Attaché Group, Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence.³⁴ This resource pool could supplement the already

³⁴ While it is realized that the present staffing of this office is insufficient to accomplish this task, it can be safely assumed that an additional non-commissioned officer could adequately assist the Air Attaché Assignment Officer in the initial screening process and the ensuing publicity campaign.

existing volunteer procedures.

The above proposal might germinate two very advantageous conditions: (1) upgrading the prestige of the attaché merely because he is chosen from a careful screening of all Air Force colonels, (2) elimination of suspicion that an individual volunteered in order to serve a plush tour of duty, or because he wanted a nice career termination tour. It would also quell criticism such as Lt General Donald V. Bennett received at a Congressional hearing when he was accused of having some individual attachés in the system, " . . . because there was no other place to put them."³⁵

The establishment of a pre-selected resource pool would only be able to identify those officers who meet the tangible criteria determinable by personnel records. To adequately gauge character traits, inclusion of a personal interview seems imperative.

Value of a Personal Interview

The absence of established interviewing apparatus is one of the more salient inadequacies of the attaché selection process. Air Force Manual 36-11 suggests an interview by stating

³⁵U. S. Congress, House, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1971, Hearings, op. cit., p. 204.

Qualified officers interested in this duty are encouraged to visit the Resources Management Group office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Headquarters USAF, Pentagon. Wives are encouraged to accompany their husbands.³⁶

Incredibly, the ideal opportunity to assess the desired personal characteristics of attachés is virtually ignored in the actual selection process. When an applicant does submit to an interview, it is conducted by the Air Attaché Assignments Officer who has neither training nor set procedures for an interview transaction. This default appears inconsistent with the necessity of identifying, "Officers of mature judgment who are temperamentally suited to work within a diplomatic environment and understand foreign nations, cultures, and their people. . ."³⁷

Foreign Service applicants to the State Department are subjected to a thorough oral examination designed to evaluate personality traits, general qualities, and to ascertain the candidate's command of his field.³⁸

. . . the purpose of the 'oral' is to measure the candidate's personal qualities: his resourcefulness and versatility, the breadth and depth of his interests, his ability to express and defend his views, his potential for development, and, in general, his suitability as a representative of his country abroad.³⁹

³⁶Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., p. 8-7.

³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel, op. cit., p. 78.

³⁹Blancké, op. cit., p. 265.

The Foreign Service aspirant is quizzed on a variety of subjects and judged primarily on his ability to think on his feet by expressing his thoughts clearly and concisely. Orals usually consist of one and a half to two hours of intensive discourse resulting in the elimination of most applicants.⁴⁰ Considering the necessary attributes of an attaché, a similar interview design might divulge certain character traits of the applicant, the revelation of which should be known before final selection.

In his book, The Evaluation Interview, Mr. Richard A. Fear announces the value of various forms of appraisal interviews. Information derived from this type interview administered to attaché applicants and their wives could provide an adequate insight into the candidate's adaptability toward the attaché mission. While the specific content and manner of the interview should be decided after careful consultation, its effectiveness would be increased if conducted by one proficient in the technique.

The Air Force Academy solicits applicants for the Department of Political Science. Apparently, letters re-

⁴⁰ Ibid., Attrition statistics among Foreign Service applicants reveal the extremely arduous selection process of the State Department. During the five-year period covered by Blancké, twenty-three percent passed the vigorous written examination -- 5,778 of 24,335; of those successfully passing the written, twenty-seven per cent survived the oral.

questing applications are sent to individuals meeting certain predetermined criteria. Concerning an interview, the letter states:

A personal interview is usually required before the final selection of any applicant. In fact, this is often the most important phase of the application process.⁴¹

Additionally, interviews are considered mandatory for applicants to Latin American Missions.⁴² Air Force Manual 36-11 is explicit in directing qualified officers to be interviewed.

Headquarters USAF will advise Consolidated Base Personnel Offices to place tentatively selected officers on Temporary Duty (TDY) at Headquarters USAF . . . for personal interview and further language aptitude proficiency testing.⁴³

The reasons for requiring and providing funds to interview prospective Latin American Mission personnel, while ignoring this aspect in the selection process of attachés,

⁴¹Letter, Russell R. MacDonald, Jr., Major, USAF, to Captain George A. D'Angelo, January 24, 1972, page 2 of Personnel Policies. Coincidentally, many of the actions urged by this thesis are being accomplished by the recruiting techniques of the Air Force Academy. Careful review of the letter and attached Personnel Policies reveal a type of resource pool similar to that advocated here for prospective attaches. See Appendix E.

⁴²The mission of the Latin American Group is very similar to that of attaché. Selectees are assigned to Latin American countries to perform representational and technical tasks.

⁴³Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., p. 8-7.

could not be determined. One might conclude that Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence considers an interview for attachés incidental to selection. Even if government funds were not available for travel to Washington, D. C., Air Force personnel would incur little hardship by making the trip at their own expense.⁴⁴

Omission of a substantial interview can have grave consequences in causing monetary losses incurred by frequent recalls of inadequately selected personnel. More importantly, is the damage done to the prestige and integrity of the United States. Lt Colonel Donald M. Mark's summation of this subject reiterates the hazards involved in the omission of an evaluation interview in the selection process.

Of course, there are those who will oppose the efficacy of the interview but what the present system amounts to is selecting a representative of the United States abroad sight unseen and trusting only in the prejudicial appraisal of the immediate superior and the diaphanous disputation set forth in the Effectiveness Report. Even the sum of the two is inadequate.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ By using a combination of commercial standby fare and military space available transportation, this author made the round trip from Lubbock, Texas, to Washington, D. C., at a cost of \$36.00. Rated personnel can easily take proficiency flights to the Washington, D. C. area at no personal expense.

⁴⁵ Donald M. Marks, op. cit., p. 22.

Necessity for Language Proficiency

Air Force Manual 36-1 mentioned the foreign language qualification in the following statement:

Foreign language comprehension and speaking proficiency is mandatory.⁴⁶

The necessity for the attache to possess fluency in the host country's language should be readily obvious, yet this fluency is seldom achieved. A special Air Force report addressed this subject.

The End of Tour reports on file at the Air Attache Support Branch reflect a very high level of personal concern by returning attaches about the attaché language capability on station.⁴⁷

This section will discuss the significance of language proficiency and its place in the selection process.

As a collector of intelligence, it appears obvious that the attaché can be more effective if he can adapt to the foreign culture. An overheard conversation of intelligence value is rarely repeated upon request; it must be understood the first time. While one might expect English to be spoken in matters of superficiality and pleasantries, it is only reasonable to expect the more profound discussions to be pursued in the host

⁴⁶Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

⁴⁷Department of the Air Force Special Study of Air Attachés Conducted by Attache Office for ASC/Intelligence, ca., July 1971, p. 11.

country's language. The intimacy of contact with his host country peers can be sufficiently enhanced by an attaché's language fluency. These intimate relationships help develop social rapport, diplomatic intercourse, and aid in the intelligence collection function. As such, the attaché cannot abdicate this vital responsibility to an interpreter.⁴⁸

The success an individual has in attaining language fluency depends on one's prior exposure to the language, his language aptitude, and/or the amount and quality of training. Each circumstance will be considered separately.

Prior Language Proficiency

It would appear advantageous to assign personnel already proficient in the host country's language. While it is true that an applicant's language capability is a consideration in the selection process, few attempts are made to recruit these individuals.⁴⁹ Names of officers possessing various foreign language reading and writing levels can be easily obtained from the Military Personnel Center, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas. A complete read-

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 12-14.

⁴⁹Hammons, op. cit. Records for the past two years indicate that approximately 40% of personnel assigned as attachés had some language background. However, most of these volunteered on their own initiative.

out identifies both the primary and secondary language proficiency of officers who have taken Air Force language tests. This language printout would be a useful tool in identifying officers for prospective attaché assignments.

In addition to providing prime prospects for attaché candidacy, selection of applicants fluent in a language can significantly reduce the time spent in training and reduce the cost of that training. Individuals identified as having language proficiency would be prime prospects for the attaché resource pool mentioned earlier.

Language Aptitude

Studies have recently been conducted by the Defense Language Institute in an attempt to determine surer prediction patterns for language aptitude.⁵⁰ The widespread concern over language inadequacies emphasizes the fact

⁵⁰ Department of Air Force Special Study of Air Attaches Conducted by Attaché Office for ACS/Intelligence, op. cit., pp. 17-20. During the month of February 1971, a team from the Defense Language Institute located at Monterey, California, administered a battery of tests to approximately ninety personnel at Lackland Air Force Base. A crash course of sixteen hours of Mandarin Chinese was administered to these people in conjunction with the standard Language Aptitude Tests which are used by the Armed Services. Additional tests were administered, among which were: (1) The Otis-Lemmon Mental Ability Test, (2) The Pinsleur Language Battery Test, (3) The Horn Assessment of Basic Language Aptitude, and (4) The Foreign Language Auditory Aptitude Test. In addition to this series of tests, a series of tests covering personality traits and general background were administered. It is hoped that a prediction pattern will emerge from this correlation.

that present aptitude testing is not sufficient for realistic identification of language learning aptitude.

Hopefully, an identification test for certain personality types, and background most adaptable to language training and language use may be developed. Once achieved, these tests should be a useful tool for the attaché personnel branch in adequately assessing the language aptitude of candidates tentatively selected for assignment.

Language Training

Adequate language training is the final means of insuring proficiency. Length of time in a language course varies between six and twelve months, depending on the difficulty of the language. Training is accomplished at one of the Defense Language Institute schools at Anacostia Naval Air Station, Washington, D. C.; Monterey, California; and Biggs Field, El Paso, Texas. Although high professional quality is claimed, it is significant that the Institute has eliminated very few service attachés from a course, yet many have subsequent difficulty in actual use of the language. In order to reduce ineffectiveness caused by inadequate language proficiency, the Defense Intelligence Agency must carefully examine all aspects of the problem from selecting better prospects, to the quality of training itself.

While the personal requirements for attaché assignment

are apparently consistent with policy, the actual selection of personnel falls below the required standards. The present selection process seems inadequate in determining those desired personal characteristics so necessary for competent attaché performance. Without a personal interview, it is difficult to assess an individual's personality traits or his adaptability for an assignment.

Of greater significance is the inability of volunteers to meet the stringent qualifications set forth. A positive means of identifying officers with the desired qualifications of education, prior experience, and language proficiency, and then actively recruiting these individuals, seems to be a solution to the inadequate quantity of volunteers. Perhaps if selection procedures adhered to the given requirements, the status of the attaché would become commensurate to its policy position.

What is lacking in the selection of adequate personnel must be compensated for in attaché training. The next chapter reviews the attaché's preparation for his assignment. Additionally, it attempts to show, through the examination of professional military schools, that Air Force policy considers the knowledge of international relations an important ingredient in the education of its senior officers. This is significant since the actual assigning of officers to positions dealing with international relations appears to be deficient.

CHAPTER V

PREPARATION OF AN AIR ATTACHÉ

The essential education of an attaché is started long before his entry into the Defense Attaché System. A professional military man's broad purview of responsibilities was amply stated by President John F. Kennedy in his June 1962 address to the United States Military Academy graduating class.

Whatever your position, the scope of your decisions will not be confined to the traditional tenets of military competence and training. You will need to know and understand not only the foreign policy of the United States, but the foreign policy of all countries scattered around the world who only twenty years ago were the most distant names to us. You will need to give orders in different tongues and read maps by different systems.¹

The intent of President Kennedy's message is satisfactorily complied with through the curriculum time given to international affairs at Air Force professional schools. The amount of time allotted to international relations, especially at the senior service schools, indicates that the Air Force recognizes the impact its officers can make in international affairs. This is significant because it is further indicative of policy. Since the study of global matters consumes such a significant portion of an officer's

¹Allan Nevins, ed., The Burden and the Glory, Public Statements and Addresses (New York: Harpers and Row, 1964), p. 241.

professional education, it seems safe to conclude that the Air Force actually desires the placement of superior performing officers in positions relating to international relations. This chapter will consider both the international relations training given at Air Force service schools and the formal training given to an attaché selectee.

Education of an Air Force Officer
in International Relations

Having committed himself to an Air Force career, an officer's career potential is enhanced by his attendance at professional military schools. Senior officers are expected to be, ". . . experts in the ordered application of military resources to obtain national goals and objectives."² Professional schools offer one means of accomplishing these goals by accentuating the various factors which govern and influence the relations among the nations of the world. Therefore it is reasonable to expect that attachés should have ". . . completion of a professional military school appropriate to grade and seniority . . ."³

²Thomas S. McFarland, Colonel, USAF, "Power and Conflict: an Assessment," lecture to the Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 29 September 1965, quoted in Kenneth L. Dyer, Lt Colonel, USAF, et al., "Qualifications in International Relations Essential to the Future Leadership Role of Senior Air Force Officers," (unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1966), p. 23.

³Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

The curriculums of the three major Air Force professional schools; Squadron Officer School, Air Command and Staff College, and Air War College, emphasize the importance the Air Force places on knowledge of international affairs.

Squadron Officer School

The Squadron Officer School's mission is:

To prepare selected captains and lieutenants to execute those command and staff tasks required of junior officers of the United States Air Force. To strengthen those professional values necessary for a full career of dedication and service to their country, and to provide these officers with a foundation for further professional development.⁴

Although having a narrowly defined mission, the school devotes considerable attention to the, "Knowledge of national power with emphasis on international relations and the current basis of international conflict."⁵

Of its total 476 academic hours, subjects relating to international relations consume approximately fifty-eight hours.⁶ This amount seems quite adequate considering the

⁴Squadron Officer School, Curriculum Catalog, Class 71-C (Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, September, 1971), p. 1.

⁵Ibid. This is one of the five stated objectives of the school.

⁶Ibid., pp. 10-98. This figure was arrived at by reviewing each of the course hours in the curriculum catalogue. The additional time an individual student spends on international relations varies depending on speech topics and subjects researched during the fifty-six hours of independent study and research.

limited exposure of junior officers to global problems. As could be anticipated, this proportion increases with higher level schools.

Air Command and Staff College

Continuation of an officer's professional military training is achieved through completion of Air Command and Staff College.

The mission of Air Command and Staff College is to improve and broaden the professional competence of selected field grade officers to prepare them for command and staff positions of greater responsibility, and to provide them a firm foundation for continued professional growth.⁷

The college accomplishes this mission by achieving four primary objectives; one of which is to

Increase the student's understanding of the international environment, the institutions and the instruments of national policy--political, economic, psychological, and military--which have an effect on national security and his role as a military officer.⁸

Approximately 209 of the college's 774 lecture and seminar hours deal with problems of the international environment.⁹ In addition to classroom hours, officers are required to submit an extensive research report. If one is inclined to research an international relations topic, he

⁷Air Command and Staff College, Curriculum Catalog, Class ASCS-72 (Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama), p. 1.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 13-80.

may devote another 600 hours of allotted curriculum time to his subject.¹⁰

Once an officer has completed the Air Command and Staff College, he should possess a solid foundation in international studies and its relation to the Air Force. This exposure is ample preparation for Air War College and the extensive attention given to global matters.

Air War College

The senior professional school in the Air Force educational system is the Air War College.

Its student body is composed of a highly selected group of mature, and successful men of widely diverse backgrounds who are brought together for ten months of graduate level study of military strategy, national security, and international affairs.¹¹

Of the 955 scheduled classroom academic hours, approximately 423 are spent studying topics dealing with international relations.¹² Additionally, a graduate level treatise is

¹⁰Dr. Joseph H. Mahaffey, Educational Advisor, Air Command and Staff College, personal interview, March, 1972. Dr. Mahaffey reported that a recent Air University Study revealed that 18.5 per cent of the research reports are on topics relating to international affairs.

¹¹Air War College, Curriculum Catalog 1971-1972 (Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama), p. 3. The school's high selectivity is shown in that only 221 lt colonels and colonels, from an eligibility list of approximately 4,200, were chosen to attend the 1972 class.

¹²Ibid., pp. 19-76. An additional 162 hours are devoted to an elective and professional studies program. Those interested have a wide spectrum of internationally oriented subjects to choose from.

required on a subject of significance in the area of military concepts, doctrine, and strategy.¹³ Students often select subjects directly related to international relations.¹⁴

An Air Force professional education can be considered more than adequate in providing a background in international affairs. Apparently then, the Air Force judges a current knowledge of international relations to be a fundamental responsibility of its officers which increases with advanced rank and position.¹⁵ Herein lies one of the more prominent paradoxes of the attaché selection system.

While the Air Force is emphasizing knowledge of international affairs as a fundamental ingredient of its future leaders, it is countervailing its educational system by placing inadequately chosen personnel in a most important international position. Attaché duty is recognized as an assignment where officers possessing the high qualities of judgment, diplomacy, integrity, and self-discipline can make the most beneficial contributions to good foreign relations.¹⁶ The requirement for the "Completion of

¹³Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁴Mahaffey, op. cit., The Air University study also indicated that 12.1 per cent of Air War College papers are written on topics of international relations.

¹⁵Dyer, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 61.

professional military school appropriate to grade and seniority. . . ."17 is meaningless unless strictly adhered to.

The following table indicates the likelihood of attachés attending such schools.

TABLE 5-1

ATTENDANCE AT SERVICE SCHOOLS OF
AIR ATTACHÉS (COLONELS) ON
STATION AS OF JUNE 1971

Number Considered	13	Percentage
Squadron Officer School	5	38%
Air Command and Staff College	8	62%
War College	5	38%

Source: Deputy Chief of Staff/Personnel,
Colonels Group.

Attendance at the service schools can certainly enhance one's knowledge of international relations, yet available data indicates that air attachés are not very likely to have attended these schools. Therefore, it is necessary for attachés to gain an international relations background during the formal training program.

Formal Training of Attachés

Defense Intelligence School, located at the Anacostia Naval Station in Washington, D. C., provides professional training for attaché selectees. The school offers a basic

¹⁷Air Force Manual 36-1, op. cit., p. A4-6.

thirteen-week attaché course; foreign languages and other specialized training are programmed according to the particular position to be filled.¹⁸ Major spheres of interest are intelligence, foreign relations and area studies, and operation of the attaché system. While relatively short in duration, most attachés agree that the training is adequate for properly selected personnel.¹⁹

Attaché classes have a maximum of forty-five students who are taught by a faculty of seven full time instructors. All instructors are former attachés or assistant attachés and, hopefully, from different areas of the world.²⁰ Each instructor monitors an area study group comprising five to twelve students.²¹ Since instructors are former attachés, students greatly benefit from the firsthand knowledge of the instructors' experiences.

Wives are also included in an orientation.

¹⁸Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., p. 8-9.

¹⁹Major Peters' Survey. Of the sixteen army attachés currently on station, twelve made specific comments about the necessity and adequacy of the Defense Intelligence School. One individual (Code Number L-11) made the following comment concerning the training. "No amount of education or training can provide the character requirements of attaché duty. Personality traits of the attaché and spouse can contribute significantly to the success or failure of U. S. foreign relations."

²⁰Letter, Commander Timothy O'Keefe to Captain George A. D'Angelo, 9 December 1971.

²¹Ibid.

Within the limits of legal authority and availability of funds, wives will be trained as far as practicable in the customs, background, culture, and language of the country to which husbands are accredited.²²

Since the wife plays such a significant role in her husband's assignment, every effort should be made to induce her attendance at applicable classes.

Final Evaluation of Attaché Selectees

The primary purpose of the Defense Intelligence School is naturally to train attachés in their appropriate skills. However, the school might also perform a supplementary function of closely scrutinizing and eliminating deficient students. While one can easily expect that marginally qualified personnel will occasionally be unsuspectingly admitted to the attaché program; regardless of the selection process; it is only logical to assume that these individuals be eliminated when their incompetency is recognized. However, elimination of attaché selectees seldom occurs at the school.²³

The Defense Intelligence School presents an ideal opportunity to intently scrutinize its students. As former attachés, instructors are intimately familiar with

²²Air Force Manual 36-11, op. cit., p. 8-9.

²³Bill G. Rippey, Captain, USAF, "A Study of the Air Attaché" (unpublished thesis, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, June 1966), p. 33.

the necessary attributes of an attaché. A conscious endeavor by the school's staff to evaluate the qualifications of each student and his wife and recommend their retention or elimination from the program could easily be accomplished. While removal of applicants at such a belated date would cause inconvenience to the involved agencies and individuals, it might result in a significant decrease of attaché recalls from station. Additionally, elimination during training would perhaps cause selection boards greater consternation in choosing personnel.

The curriculums of the service schools adequately confirm that the Air Force is indeed cognizant of its responsibility of making senior officers knowledgeable in international affairs. Why then is inadequate selection allowed to persist? Perhaps because it is felt that the individual performing the duty has little impact on the job itself. The following chapter will attempt to show that an individual's ability is often the determining factor in the successful completion of attaché functions.

CHAPTER VI

CAPACITY OF ATTACHÉS TO PROMOTE NATIONAL GOALS

Thus far, this thesis has attempted to determine United States' policy toward the attaché. His position is one in which expectations are great, yet actual selection procedures often preclude choosing personnel to meet these expectations. By reviewing a few cases of positive and detrimental consequences of attachés on United States foreign relations, one might better recognize the need for corrective action.

Congressional Evaluation of the Attaché System

As is true of most government programs, the attaché system receives close financial scrutiny. Congressional appropriation subcommittee meetings manifest concern over the value of the system. Questioning the substance of the system, Senator John O. Pastore remarked, "I am wondering whether or not we have developed a custom here, and we are reluctant to relax that custom."¹ Many congressmen seemingly have the attitude that military attachés are on luxurious vacations and provide little return to the

¹U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1970, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 15090, 91st Cong., 1st sess., p. 830.

taxpayer.² Opposing this view, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman, Richard B. Russell, commented,

. . . we do get a great deal of information of this nature (by personal associations) that is extremely valuable to this country. I don't think the attaché program costs more than \$24 or \$25 million. I really think we get more information for a dollar from this source than we do from any part of the intelligence community.³

Admittedly, the value of the attaché system is difficult to assess, especially in a dollar and cents context. Realizing that the worth of the system is dependent upon the quality of the particular attaché, Senator Russell added congressional wisdom by saying, "The capabilities of an individual has a great deal to do with it. Some are good and some aren't worth a tinker's hoot."⁴

Detrimental Performance of Air Attachés

Aberrations of quality selection is a common occurrence in the attaché system. Conversations with former attachés regularly disclosed close personal knowledge of individuals who were reprehensible in the performance of their attaché duties. Invariably, one will find that the injurious char-

²Harry Howe Ranson, Central Intelligence and National Security (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 51.

³U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for F.Y. 1970, Hearings, op. cit., p. 832. Italics are authors.

⁴Ibid.

acteristics of the attaché stems from the absence of those very traits necessary to qualify for the position. A few case histories should factually substantiate the inability of the present selection process to adequately assess desirable attaché qualifications.

Case 1

This example involves a field grade officer whose former intelligence experience and language fluency indicated possible suitability for attaché duty. The first few months on station, he indicated his ineptitude at the job, but his exceptional interest and diligent application led his superiors to believe that more experience would make him an asset to the operation. However, added experience only exposed his tactlessness and gross espionage activity. He was then placed in a position which would preclude his contact with the foreign military. Still the individual did not relinquish his unacceptable practices in collecting intelligence. This resulted in the foreign Air Force officials informing his superior that he was no longer welcome in their circles.

The individual's effectiveness as an attaché was irreparably destroyed and he returned to the United States with two years of his tour remaining. Subsequent inquiry revealed that this individual was far from above average, and had previously been relieved from a foreign duty assignment

for personal misconduct.⁵ Obviously, this officer met few of the qualifications considered in Chapter IV. Had his background been carefully investigated, and his character traits attentively evaluated; his selection might not have occurred.

Case 2

Another example of the inadequacies of the selection apparatus likewise involved a field grade officer whose service background appeared to make him well suited for an attaché position. However, during his first year on station, he displayed a definite affinity for alcohol. This weakness soon progressed to an unacceptable level and was further complicated by acts of marital infidelity. Repeated warnings and an official reprimand had no effect, and he eventually reached a point that his presence in a foreign country as a representative of the United States Air Force could not be tolerated. It was necessary to return him to the United States with more than a year remaining on his tour of duty. It was later learned that his overindulgence in drinking and his propensity for women existed long before his attaché assignment.⁶

Presumably, a more thorough determination of the

⁵Rippy, op. cit., p. 30.

⁶Ibid., p. 29.

qualities required for attaché duty, coupled with a properly conducted interview and close scrutiny during training, might have precluded his assignment.

Beneficial Derivatives of Meritorious
Attaché Service

While there are ample cases, other than ones given here, of inadequate personnel representing the United States, many attachés' actions have been advantageous to foreign policy goals. Theodore Draper, an authority on the Dominican Republic, attributes many of the United States' actions during the 1965 revolt to the military attachés in Santo Domingo. Their early urgings to the Dominican military to suppress the suspected communist revolution facilitated the position of the loyalists.⁷ If the intervention of the United States' attachés was a major factor in the Dominican Republic's Air Force and Navy decisions to launch attacks during the early part of the uprising, as indicated by Draper; then the attachés had unprecedented influence on the future course of Dominican politics.

⁷Theodore Draper, The Dominican Revolt (New York: Commentary Press, 1968), pp. 72-79. While there was much confusion during the first two days of the revolt, Draper indicates that the attachés were making extempore decisions. On the second day, the embassy military attachés had given loyalist leaders permission to do everything possible to prevent what they described as a communist take over.

While the diplomats may have been trying to make up their minds, the military attachés apparently acted.⁸

While opportunities to determine actions are normally not of this magnitude, a well thought of attaché may control significant influence among his contemporaries. When the United States broke diplomatic relations with Peru after the 1962 military coup, the military attachés were the first to make contact with the new government. These mediations eventually resulted in recognition of the new Peruvian regime.⁹

The following two attachés, in particular, have been especially instrumental in influencing their host governments toward favorable United States relations. A review of their actions and qualifications may provide some insight into those attributes necessary for the successful fulfillment of attaché functions.

Both instances reflect a high degree of selectivity. In these particular cases, each individual had distinguishable service records, prior language knowledge, and previous personal association with government officials. One attaché had attended a professional service school with the president of his host country which resulted in

⁸Ibid., p. 73.

⁹New York Times, July 29, 1962, p. 24.

close rapport between them. Throughout the tenure of these attachés' tours, relations with the United States were decidedly improved.

The selection of both these individuals was due, in part, to extensive searching by the selection board. A definite attempt was made to seek out prospective attachés who had prior knowledge of the country and contact with ranking government officials. These illustrations indicate that extensive efforts to satisfy particular attaché requirements can be immensely valuable to United States' foreign relations.¹⁰

Promotion Potential of Attachés

While attaché duty was originally intended to sufficiently broaden an officer's international perspective to prepare him for high level command,¹¹ the reverse has been true. The infrequent promotions of attachés to general officer has caused many to suspect that attaché duty is a "dead end" assignment in that subsequent promotion is unlikely.¹² Appendix F lists generals who once

¹⁰Rizon, op. cit.

¹¹Vagts, The Military Attaché, op. cit., pp. xi.

¹²This precept holds true only for general officer promotions. The field grade promotion potential is comparable or better than the overall Air Force rate. In a staff study resulting from an ambassadorial inquiry to the Deputy Secretary of Defense regarding promotions of attachés, the Air Force supplied the following statistics for the 1968

served tours as attachés. While the list seems extensive, it is also misleading. Only eight were promoted to general after serving an attaché tour as a colonel, and it has been approximately twelve years since any of these served as an attaché.¹³

This dearth in attaché promotions is paradoxical considering that attachés are supposedly selected from above average personnel. If the selection board actually chooses only those possessing the desired qualifications to serve as attachés, former attachés would swell the general officers' ranks. Clearly, this is not the case. By comparing statistical information on attachés with general officer selectees, one can determine that attachés do not fare as well as the selectees in some of the vital promotion criteria. Table 6-1 lists four of the tangible

and 1969 promotion cycles.

To Grade	Considered	Selected	Attaché Rate	Overall USAF
Major	4	3	75%	56%
Lt Colonel	22	16	72%	45%
Colonel	47	5	10.6%	12.8%

Source: Compiled from staff study: Memorandum for Deputy Assistant Secretary (Reserve Affairs), Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) from James P. Goode, Acting Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs dated 1 April 1969.

¹³Since 1946, approximately 376 colonels have served tours as attachés. Of this number, eight were promoted to general officer for a 2.1 per cent promotion rate. The overall Air Force rate for promotion of colonels to general is about 5.0 per cent. Data compiled from attaché listing supplied by 1127th USAF Field Activities Group, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

considerations for promotion to general officer.

TABLE 6-1

PROMOTION SELECTION CRITERIA

Promotion Criteria	Attachés	Generals
Number Considered	13	210
War College	5 (39%)	59%
Master's Degree	3 (23%)	56%
Bachelor's Degree	9 (69%)	80%
Time in Grade	5.9 years	5.5 years

Source: Data for attachés compiled from information received from DCS/Personnel, Colonel's Group. Statistics for general officers were compiled from: Air Force Times, February 5, 1969, pp. 1-3; January 14, 1970, p. 5; February 16, 1972, p. 6.

Air Force colonels anticipating promotion to general are reluctant to volunteer for an assignment with low promotion potential such as attaché duty. Instead, they find it advantageous to seek assignments offering high visual exposure.¹⁴ If general officer caliber individuals do not normally apply for attaché duty, it is to be expected that fewer attachés will be promoted to general officer. Hence, many individuals assume that the attaché assignment is the cause for non-promotion. This assumption presents one of the basic problems and perhaps the

¹⁴Air Force Times, February 16, 1972, p. 6. An operational command has inherently provided desirable promotion opportunities. Twenty-eight of the seventy-six selectees in the 1971 colonel's promotion cycle were operational commanders at the time of selection.

most difficult obstacle to overcome in attaining a quality attaché corps.

This chapter has shown that individual performance is often the determining factor in the successful completion of attaché functions, yet the low promotion rate of attachés has discouraged many superior performing officers from applying for attaché duty. The following chapter will offer some conclusions as to how attaché policy and personnel selection might become more commensurate with each other.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

At no other period in the history of civilization has man's capabilities of destroying his fellow man been so exorbitant as it is today. Great power friction has resulted in making the role of strategic intelligence one of paramount importance. By an adequate assessment of a foreign government's war potential, the United States can take appropriate measures of deterrence. As vital as assessing a nation's potential, is the determination of the intentions of that potential. In the attainment of these objectives, the military attaché is intricately involved.

This thesis has attempted to determine the United States' policy toward the attaché, and the adequacy of selecting individuals capable of fulfilling policy objectives. Present policy is deeply rooted in history. Military observers were used in foreign countries to provide the best possible intelligence of a nation's military potential and intentions. Eventually these individuals assumed diplomatic status and became important official representatives between military establishments. The extensiveness of the current Defense Attaché System indicates a far-reaching role in determining foreign policy. The attaché's functions re-emphasize this role.

As an intelligence expert, he is expected to make valuable assessments of a nation's military capacity. His representative duties charge him with the vital responsibility of effective liaison between the United States and the host country's military. He is expected to pursue these responsibilities by actively influencing the actions of his host government. As an advisor to the ambassador, he is also expected to render expert military advice. Often his suggestions provide the necessary input in determining United States' foreign policy.

The Air Force's perception of his importance may be inferred from the rigor of the formally, explicated selection criteria. College degrees, professional service schools, language proficiency, and superior performance records are all given as criteria for selection. One can reasonably conclude that the attaché is expected to perform a significant role in the attainment of national goals. However, it is also demonstrated that the actual selection of personnel to fulfill these vital goals is inconsistent with the formally stated policy objectives.

In examining the selection process, we find that attachés seldom fulfill the stated qualifications. In every category, attachés are either less likely, or just as likely, to meet the desired qualifications for attaché duty as are their colonel counterparts in other fields.

While knowledge of international relations and impeccable character traits are considered essential, we find that there is no positive means of measurement. Superior performance is a prerequisite for selection, yet few attachés have been considered superior enough to rise beyond the rank of colonel. Examination of some of the selection criteria for general officer indicates that attachés are actually lacking in areas essential for the attainment of that rank.

That the Air Force actually believes in the value of international relations is reflected in the curricula of the service schools. The stress given to international affairs is indicative of Air Force's desire to have its officers knowledgeable on global matters. Yet when looking at some case studies of attachés we find, at best, uneven performance.

An obvious question must be asked. If the attaché is expected to play such a significant role in international relations, why are inadequately selected personnel chosen for these assignments? Perhaps the most logical explanation is the inadequate number of volunteers for these positions.

The present selection system relies almost entirely on choosing individuals who have submitted formal applications. As such, a definite limitation is imposed on

the selection committee. Many officers possessing the desired qualifications are reluctant to volunteer for an assignment which would place them outside the mainstream of the Air Force. Additionally, many colonels who think they can make general officer feel that attaché duty may impair them from doing so. This assumption is based largely on the fact that few attachés have advanced to that rank. Perhaps if individuals possessing the necessary qualifications were actively encouraged to submit an application, this deficiency might be remedied. Making attaché assignments attractive for ambitious colonels appears to be a prerequisite for increasing the quantity and quality of attaché aspirants. Definite policy objectives might aid this task.

As stated, the present day expectations of the attaché are drawn from duty descriptions and formal application requirements. Nowhere is there positively stated the degree of importance an attaché is expected to have on foreign relations. Exact determination of this question seems imperative before an adequate assessment concerning the caliber of individuals required can be made. Thus, a clarification of the specific nature of the attaché's role seems necessary. An interagency committee composed of representatives from the three services, Defense Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, and the Department

of State would be well qualified to determine his expected role. Once decided, it then becomes the responsibility of the services to insure the selection of individuals who are commensurate to this role.

A possible finding might be that his function is essentially that of gathering intelligence. If so, consideration for the establishment of an intelligence career pattern for attachés might be in order. On the other hand, if he is expected to make positive inputs to the formulation of foreign policy, and given authority to make high level decisions, the necessity of assigning well rounded individuals is apparent. In either event, the services are obliged to make these type individuals available by realizing that

. . . we do not have a separate military policy, and a separate diplomatic policy, and a separate foreign policy, all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together in the policy of the United States.¹

¹President John F. Kennedy, graduation address to the United States Air Force Academy, June 1963. Quoted from U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Administration of National Security, Staff Reports and Hearings, op. cit., p. 21.

APPENDIX

Appendix	Page
A. Defense Attaché System as of June 1971	89
B. Air Force Manual 36-11	94
C. Letter of Evaluation to Former Supervisors	100
D. Defense Intelligence Agency Form 572	103
E. Letter From Air Force Academy: Department of Political Science	107
F. Former Attachés of General Officer Rank	112

APPENDIX A
DEFENSE ATTACHÉ SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 1971

DEFENSE ATTACHÉ SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 1, 1971

Country	<u>Total</u>		Country	<u>Total</u>	
	Offi- cers	Colo- nels		Offi- cers	Colo- nels
Afghanistan	2	1	Jamaica	1	..
Argentina ^a	5	3	Japan	5	3
Australia	5	3	Jordan	2	1
Austria	3	2	Korea	3	1
Belgium ^b	4	1	Laos	8	2
Bolivia	3	1	Lebanon ^e	4	3
Brazil	6	2	Liberia	2	..
Bulgaria	2	1	Malagasy Rep.	2	..
Burma	3	1	Malawi	1	..
Cambodia	9	1	Malaysia	3	2
Canada	4	3	Malta	1	1
Ceylon	1	..	Mexico	5	3
Chad ^c	2	..	Morocco	4	2
Chile	4	2	Nepal	1	1
Columbia	1	1	Netherlands	4	2
Dem. Rep. Congo ^d	4	1	New Zealand	2	1
Costa Rica	1	1	Nicaragua	1	1
Cyprus	1	1	Nigeria	2	1
Czechoslovakia	2	2	Norway	7	3
Denmark	5	3	Pakistan	5	3
Dominican Rep.	2	..	Paraguay	1	..
Ecuador	1	1	Peru	3	2
El Salvador	1	..	Philippines	4	2
Ethiopia	2	2	Poland	1	..
Finland	5	2	Portugal	5	3

^aAlso assigned to Paraguay.

^bAlso assigned to Luxembourg.

^cAlso assigned to Cameroon and Gabon.

^dAlso assigned to Burundi.

^eAlso assigned to Cyprus and Jordan.

Source: Foreign Service List as of June 1, 1961,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEFENSE ATTACHÉ SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 1, 1971--Continued

Country	<u>Total</u>		Country	<u>Total</u>	
	Offi- cers	Colo- nels		Offi- cers	Colo- nels
France	11	3	Romania	3	2
Germany	7	3	Saudi Arabia		..
Ghana	1	..	Senegal ^h	1	..
Greece	7	3	Singapore	3	2
Guatemala	1	1	South Africa ⁱ	5	2
Haiti	1	..	Soviet Union	14	3
Honduras ^f	2	..	Spain	6	2
Hungary	2	1	Sweden	6	3
India	8	3	Switzerland	2	2
Indonesia	10	3	Thailand	7	3
Iran	3	2	Tunisia	1	1
Ireland	1	1	Turkey	6	1
Israel	7	2	United Kingdom	12	5
Italy	7	3	Uruguay	3	2
Ivory Coast ^g	2	1	Venezuela	6	2
			Yugoslavia	3	1

^fAlso assigned to Guatemala and El Salvador.

^gAlso assigned to Dahomey, Upper Volta, and Togo.

^hAlso assigned to Sierra Leone.

ⁱAlso assigned to Lestho and Swaziland.

AIR ATTACHÉ SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 1, 1971

Country	Total		Country	Total	
	Offi- cers	Colo- nels		Offi- cers	Colo- nels
Argentina ^a	2	1	Japan	1	1
Australia	2	1	Korea	1	..
Austria	1	1	Laos	4	1
Belgium ^b	1	..	Lebanon ^g	1	1
Bolivia	1	1	Malagasy	2	..
Brazil	1	..	Malaysia	1	1
Bulgaria	1	..	Mexico	1	1
Burma	1	..	Morocco	1	..
Cambodia	3	..	Netherlands	1	1
Canada	2	1	New Zealand	1	..
Chad ^c	2	..	Norway	3	1
Chile	1	..	Pakistan	2	1
China (Nat.)	2	1	Peru	1	..
Dem. Rep. Congo ^d	1	..	Philippines	2	1
Czechoslovakia	1	1	Poland	1	..
Denmark	2	1	Portugal	2	1
Ethiopia	1	1	Romania	1	1
Finland	1	1	Singapore	1	..
France	4	1	South Africa ^h	2	1
Germany	3	1	Soviet Union	6	1
Greece	2	1	Spain	2	1
Honduras ^e	2	..	Sweden	2	1
Hungary	1	..	Switzerland	1	1
India ^f	3	1	Thailand	3	1
Indonesia	2	1	Turkey	2	1

^aAlso assigned to Paraguay.

^bAlso assigned to Luxembourg.

^cAlso assigned to Cameroon and Gabon.

^dAlso assigned to Burundi.

^eAlso assigned to Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Nicaragua.

^fAlso assigned to Nepal.

^gAlso assigned to Cyprus and Jordan.

^hAlso assigned to Lesotho and Swaziland.

Source: Foreign Service List as of June 1, 1961,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

AIR ATTACHÉ SYSTEM AS OF JUNE 1, 1971--Continued

Country	<u>Total</u>		Country	<u>Total</u>	
	Offi- cers	Colo- nels		Offi- cers	Colo- nels
Iran	1	1	United Kingdom	4	1
Israel	3	1	Uruguay	1	..
Italy	2	1	Venezuela ^j	2	1
Ivory Coast ⁱ	1	..	Yugoslavia	1	..

ⁱAlso assigned to Dahomey, Ghana, Niger, and Togo.
^jAlso assigned to Haiti and Jamaica.

APPENDIX B
AIR FORCE MANUAL 36-11

8-1. General. The SDAs contained in this chapter offer qualified officers the opportunity of serving in unique and challenging positions not normally available to most individuals in the course of their Air Force careers. An SDA is a specific type of duty for which an officer may volunteer and which may entail assignment to a stabilized tour. Not all SDAs have a stabilized tour of duty. However an officer receiving an SDA which does not have a stabilized tour can expect to remain in that duty until the needs of the Air Force require his movement elsewhere. Although the number of positions are limited within special duty activities, there is always a continuing need to fill recurring vacancies and additional requirements. To enhance their opportunities for selection, officers are encouraged to apply for their choice of SDA at the earliest convenient date. Volunteers ordinarily have priority in being selected for SDAs; however, other qualified officers who have not applied for the assignment may be selected on the basis of their possession of the desired skills or experience. The policy is to assign applicants to the SDAs of their choice, as well as location; however, there are many variable factors involving the selection of an officer for a particular assignment which may result in a location other than that requested by the officer. In such instances, USAFMPC (para 1-5) will attempt to place the applicant in an SDA acceptable to him. Tours of duty are as prescribed in table 8-1 and chapter 9. Extensions and curtailments of tours will be accomplished according to chapter 9. MAJCOMs and activities listed in table 1-1 will submit requisitions or special officer personnel requirements for officers to fill SDAs according to paragraphs 2-21 or 9-2, when authorized to do so according to table 8-1.

8-2. Basic Criteria. The criteria listed in this paragraph is precedent to the eligibility cri-

teria outlined for the SDAs in paragraph 8-5 through 8-24. Exceptions to this criteria are permitted only when specifically indicated in paragraphs 8-5 through 8-24. Requests for waivers must be approved/disapproved by USAFMPC (para 1-5).

a. Applicant must:

- (1) Be career-motivated.
- (2) Have sufficient service retainability to complete the tour prescribed for the SDA.
- (3) Not be vulnerable for overseas duty when applying for a CONUS SDA. See paragraph 3-9.
- (4) If serving on DDA, apply for an assignment in which he will be utilized in the same designated AFS or utilization field.
- (5) Be fully qualified in the AFS required for the assignment.
- (6) Be within 12 months of tour completion date if serving on a CONUS stabilized tour prescribed in chapter 9.

b. Applicant MUST NOT:

- (1) Have an assignment selection date.
- (2) Have an application pending for any other SDA.
- (3) Be serving in the status of "failed selection, deferred, removed, or withheld" as prescribed in paragraph 3-7.

8-3. Application Procedures. When an officer desires to apply for an SDA, the CBPO will determine his eligibility according to the criteria in paragraph 8-2 and the paragraph (8-5 through 8-26) appropriate to the assignment. If eligible, the officer will submit AF Form 90, Officer Career Objective Statement, according to AFM 36-23 and a *below*. Officers serving overseas and in stabilized tours must apply no earlier than 12 months before their tour completion date and no later than the day before their assignment selection date. (EXCEPTION: Applicants for an SDA listed in paragraph 8-12 or 8-13 must apply in the time periods specified.) Required documents listed in the applicable paragraph will not be submitted until US-

AFMPC (Para 1-5) directs their submission. SDAs will be considered no longer valid on the third anniversary of the application date.

a. The officer must include the following information in the AF Form 90:

- (1) Item 39—SDA desired.
- (2) Item 41—Date assignment desired.
- (3) Item 40—DAFSC desired.
- (4) Item 43—Date of application.
- (5) Item 56—Three geographical preferences.

b. The CBPO will input format D4, PTI 080, including in card columns 25-26 the ADE SP-159 code as listed in the appropriate SDA paragraph and AFM 300-4. Card columns 31-65 (narrative remarks) will indicate the three geographical preferences (station, city, state, or country) and other information required in paragraphs 8-5 through 8-24. Preferences are not required when the SDA desired is at one location only, such as OTS Instructor—Lackland AFB. Also, officers may include any information which they consider will enhance their chance for selection in trailer cards, and information as specified in *d below*.

c. The MAJCOM will review the format D4 and determine the applicant's eligibility for the SDA. It will reenter the format D4, PTI 081, indicating approval, or input format D5, PTI M82, indicating disapproval to the CBPO. The MAJCOM may disapprove the application only when the officer does not meet the eligibility criteria. MAJCOMs may add specific recommendations in trailer cards to the format D4, PTI 081.

d. Requests for waiver of the eligibility criteria may be submitted in trailer cards to the D4 format, or if space is not sufficient, by separate letter through command channels at the same time the format D4 is entered into PDS-O. In cases where correspondence is forwarded separately, include in the remarks sections of the trailer card "waiver of para submitted on (date)."

8-4. Assignment and Selection Procedures. Unless otherwise provided in paragraphs 8-5 through 8-24, the assignment and selection

of applicants will be accomplishing according to the following procedures:

a. USAFMPC (para 1-5) will:

(1) Review career brief generated by format D4, verify the applicant's eligibility and determine his availability for the SDA. Applications will remain valid for up to 3 years from the date of application unless sooner withdrawn or disapproved. USAFMPC (para 1-5) will determine when to refer the request to a selecting activity. Format D5 PTI 082 will be input to MAJCOM and CBPO indicating: (a) applicant is eligible and available for the SDA, or (b) disapproval with DELT in card columns 17-20 which will delete SDA code and date of application from the UOR.

(2) Forward career or assignment brief, as appropriate, to the selection authority designated in column, D, table 8-1, upon determining that applicant is eligible and available for the SDA.

(3) Issue assignment instructions by C format according to chapter 2 upon receipt of notice from the selecting activity that applicant has been selected for an assignment. Format D5 PTI 082 with DELT in card columns 17-20 will be input by USAFMPC (para 1-5) at the same time the C format is input.

(4) If selection authority determines that the applicant is not acceptable, or he subsequently becomes ineligible, USAFMPC (para 1-5) inputs format D5 PTI 082 with DELT in card columns 17-20 which deletes the SDA code and date of application from the UOR and serves to notify the MAJCOM and CBPO that the application is no longer valid. On the third anniversary of the application date, the USAFMPC computer will automatically generate format D5 PTI 082 with DELT in columns 17-20 deleting the SDA code and the application date from the UOR. Officer will be advised by the CBPO that his application is no longer valid.

b. Selecting authority will:

(1) Submit requirements for officers, if authorized to do so, according to column E, table 8-1.

(2) Review career/assignment brief

and documents, determine acceptability of applicant and advise USAFMPC (para 1-5) of its decision within 120 days, unless other separate arrangements are made with USAFMPC (para 1-5).

(3) Furnish assignment instructions for accepted individuals, with desired reporting date.

c. CBPO will:

(1) Notify applicant of decision and, when directed by USAFMPC (para 1-5), instruct him to submit required documents within 5 working days after notification. CBPO will review documents for administrative sufficiency and, within 10 working days of receipt of PTI 082, forward them by letter of transmittal to the selection authority listed in column, D, table 8-1, with an information copy of the transmittal letter to USAFMPC (para 1-5).

(2) When the applicant becomes ineligible for the SDA, or withdraws his application by submission of a new AF Form 90, input format D4, PTI 080, indicating "00" in card columns 21-24 and 25-26. CBPO will not input format D4, PTI 080, when officer only wants to update AF Form 90 but does not want to change or withdraw an existing SDA application. Date of original submission of SDA application will be retained.

(3) If officer reassigned intercommand during the three-year period that application is valid, format D will be received by the gaining CBPO with "9999" in date desired assignment to duty. Gaining CBPO must resubmit format D4, PTI 080, indicating new date desired assignment to SDA taking into account new assignment eligibility.

8-5. Military Aides for General Officers. Military Aides are considered as an activity within the function of command, and are assigned to a general officer to assist him in his duties, transmit orders, and collect information. General officers of the Air Force are authorized military aides in the number and grade shown in AFM 26-1. General officers should select aides from personnel assigned

to their command using the normal assignment procedures. If a suitable officer cannot be identified and an intercommand reassignment is involved, requests will be forwarded to USAFMPC (see para 1-5). Subject to the criteria in a *below*, aides may be reassigned concurrently with general officers. Promotion of aides will not be cause for reassignment prior to completion of tour of duty. Officer aides will be reassigned, PCS or PCA as appropriate, to other duties upon completion of 3 years continuous duty or upon completion of 4 years cumulative duties as aides.

a. Eligibility Criteria:

(1) Have completed a minimum of 1 year of active commissioned service.

(2) Have not served as an aide for 3 continuous years.

(3) Have not served as an aide for a cumulative period of 4 years.

(4) Not be related to the general officer concerned.

(5) Rated officers in flying category 1 will not be assigned primary duties as aides unless the authorized position is rated.

b. Report of Officers Assigned to Aide Duties (RCS: HAF-P195). All MAJCOMs including ACIC, AFAFC, and USAFA will submit this report by mail on AF Form 320 as of 30 June and 31 December each year to arrive at USAFMPC (DPMRES) by 31 July and 31 January. AF Form 320 (atch 4) will be reproduced locally on 13x8" paper. The servicing CBPO will forward the report to the MAJCOM of assignment NLT 15 January and 15 July for consolidation. HQ COMD, USAF will report for special activities and field extensions, and HQ USAF (DAB) will report for HQ USAF and Central Control Group. This report will reflect officers assigned to primary or additional duties as military aides. It will be used to monitor assignment actions.

c. AFM 300-4, ADE SP-159-II code for this SDA:

Military Aide AA

8-6. Air National Guard (ANG) and USAF Reserve Program Advisors. The primary objective

side with mandatory retirement or separation.

(4) Minimum AFLAT qualifying score required by AFM 50-5 for entrance into USAF Language Training, unless currently qualified in language at S-3/R-3 level of proficiency.

(5) No more than five dependents will accompany officer without waiver by HQ USAF (XOXXWW).

b. Required Documents:

(1) Statement from immediate commander including recommendation for this type of duty, comments on applicant's general qualifications, as explained in a *above* to (exceptional) (satisfactory) (unsatisfactory) degree. Also, specific comments regarding social behavior of officer and his dependents who normally reside with him. If the immediate commander has not had the opportunity to observe the applicant and wife in social atmosphere, he will obtain a statement from an officer senior to the applicant who is qualified to comment. Additional remarks which may be of value in determining the acceptability of the officer and family for USMILGP duty should be included.

(2) CBPO certification of AFLAT and LPT, dates and raw scores.

(3) Brief biographical sketch of wife including place of birth, if not in US, religious preference, education level, occupation and number of years experience, hobbies, civic or club activities, foreign language capability, an other pertinent information.

(4) List of relatives of officer or spouse living in Latin American countries (name, relationship, occupation, location).

(5) Dependent Medical Certificates (figure 8-2).

(6) Family group photograph (officer in Class A uniform).

c. Specialized Training:

(1) Foreign language training is required for all selectees not possessing language proficiency at S-3/R-3 levels. The full language training course is 24 weeks in length. Refresher language courses are available for selectees with language ability

at levels below S-3/R-3. When the trainee fails to maintain an acceptable level of progress. HQ USAF (XOXXWW) will determine if further training is appropriate or if the officer is to be withdrawn.

(2) Other specialized training (AFM 50-5) may be programmed to meet specific position requirements.

(3) Within the limits of legal authority and availability of funds, wives of selected officers will be trained insofar as practicable in the language of the country to which their husbands will be assigned.

d. Personal Interview and Additional Testing. HQ USAF will advise CBPOs to place tentatively selected officers on TDY at HQ USAF (XOXXWW) for personal interview and further language aptitude/proficiency testing. This does not apply to officers stationed overseas.

e. AFM 300-4, SP-159-II code for this SDA: USMILGP, Latin America CA 8-8. Defense Attache System. It is imperative that officers assigned to the Defense Attache System reflect the highest credit upon the US Air Force and the US Government. Officers of mature judgment who are temperamentally suited to work within a diplomatic environment and understand foreign nations, cultures and their people are desired. Important consideration is given to the suitability of the wives of applicants. Qualified officers interested in this duty are encouraged to visit the Resources Management Group, office of the Asst. Chief of Staff, Intelligence (AFNIND), HQ USAF, Pentagon. Wives are encouraged to accompany their husbands.

a. Eligibility Criteria. The criteria for Defense Attache and Assistant Defense Attache is as follows:

(1) Captain through colonel with a minimum of 7 years total active commissioned service.

(2) Regular officer with at least 6 years retainability, or a Reserve officer with not more than 14 years TAFMS.

(3) Minimum AFLAT qualifying score required by AFM 50-5 for entrance into

USAF Language Training. The wife is expected to take the AFLAT, but is not required to obtain a minimum score.

(4) US citizen. The wife must be a US citizen at time application is submitted.

b. Required Documents:

(1) Statement from immediate commander including recommendation for this type of duty, comments on officer's general qualifications, as explained above to (exceptional) (satisfactory) (unsatisfactory) degree. Also, specific comments concerning: traits of character and habits, military bearing, exhibited enthusiasm to do the very best on any assignment, estimated ability to work and cooperate with members of the other Armed Forces and governmental departments, estimated effectiveness as an Air Force representative in a diplomatic community in a foreign nation, and social behavior of officer and his dependents who normally reside with him and an estimate of their social fitness for such duty. If the immediate commander has not had the opportunity to observe the officer and wife in a social atmosphere, he will obtain a statement from an officer senior to the applicant who is qualified to comment. Additional remarks which may be of value in determining the acceptability of the officer and family for this duty should be included.

(2) CBPO certification of AFLAT and LPT, dates and raw scores.

(3) Statement from applicant indicating education in addition to that shown in his records regarding honors or scholarships awarded, total postgraduate credits and field of study, civilian education courses completed and military courses completed.

(4) AF Form 11, "Officer Military Record" (reproduced copy), or a copy of the Uniform Military Personnel Record (abbreviated).

(5) DD Form 398, "Statement of Personal History" (original and five copies for officer—only one copy for wife).

(6) DD Form 98, "Armed Forces Security Questionnaire" (original and one copy, officer and wife).

(7) FD Form 285, "FBI Fingerprint Card" (two sets, officer and wife).

(8) Dependent Medical Certificate (figure 8-2).

(9) Family Group Photograph (Officer in Class A uniform).

(10) Brief biographical sketch of spouse. Include level of education, hobbies, civic or club activities, foreign language capability, etc.

c. HQ USAF (INVEP) Action. INVEP will review application documents to verify special qualifications, duty performance, outstanding professional competence, demonstrated tact and diplomacy and impeccable personal character. If officer is not acceptable for attache duty, INVEP will return application file to CBPO with information copy of reasons for non-acceptance to USAFMPC (para 1-5). USAFMPC (para 1-5) will advise MAJCOM and CBPO of non-acceptance in accordance with the procedures outlined in paragraph 8-4a(4). INVEP will maintain active case files for 3 years and consider applicants against Defense Attache requirements as they occur.

d. Specialized Training:

(1) Four months preparatory course at the Defense Intelligence School, Washington, DC.

(2) Foreign language and other specialized training is programmed according to the position to be filled. When a selectee requires foreign language training, he will be sent to a language school of 6 months or more duration, depending upon the language (see AFM 50-5). Refresher courses are available for selectees previously qualified in a language. Ability to become proficient in the language of the country for which selected is important. Trainees are expected to attain minimum reading and speaking professional proficiency upon completion of language training.

(3) Within the limits of legal authority and availability of funds, wives will be trained as far as practicable in the customs, background, culture, and language of the country to which husbands are accredited.

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF EVALUATION TO FORMER SUPERVISORS

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.



Dear

is under consideration for nomination to duty in the Air Attache System. As a former supervisor, your comments concerning the suitability of subject officer and his wife for Attache duty are important to our evaluation processes.

In addition to professional qualifications and a record of sustained high effectiveness, it is necessary that officers selected for nomination be tactful, diplomatic, and of impeccable personal character.

The suitability of an officer's wife is of equal importance. Within the limits of legal authority and availability of funds, wives of Attache designates are trained in the customs, culture, and language of the country to which their husbands are to be accredited. This training is accomplished in order that the wife may be better qualified to assume her place in a diplomatic community and complement her husband's position.

To assist in your evaluation, please reference attached guidance. It is not intended that this guidance limit your comments in any way. All comments and information resulting from this request will be treated in confidence and used only for evaluating suitability for Attache duty.

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely

PAUL D. ALLEN
Chief, Personnel & Manpower Branch
ACS/Intelligence

2 Atch
1. Guide Questions
2. Self-Addressed
Envelope

OFFICER AND WIFE

1. Do they appear to be happily married? Do they complement each other?
2. How do they mix with others at social affairs?
3. Describe their drinking habits.
4. Is there any indication of emotional stresses, neurosis, or moral laxity?
5. Do they have an ability to converse on various subjects? Comment on their command of the English language.
6. Are they athletically inclined? Any special hobbies?
7. Is there any reason to suspect prejudices or fanaticisms - especially concerning religious, racial, or political considerations?

OFFICER

1. How discreet is he in discussing business outside of normal working arrangements? Are there any known circumstances that might prohibit his access to highly sensitive classified information?
2. Describe his physical appearance. Is there any indication of physical impairments? Is his personality retiring, aggressive, etc?
3. Do you feel he has the qualities to represent the USAF at the highest military, diplomatic, and civilian community levels?
4. In your opinion, what is his future in the Air Force - promising, average, limited?

WIFE

1. Describe her physical appearance. Is there any indication of physical impairments? Is her personality retiring, aggressive, etc?
2. Does she appear to get along with other women?
3. What kind of hostess is she in her home?
4. Do you believe she is prepared to accept the status and duties demanded by protocol customs within an embassy community as an attache wife?

APPENDIX D

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY FORM 572



DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

U-

SUBJECT: Nomination of Officer Attache Personnel

TO:

1. It is requested that an officer in the grade of _____ (alternate rank _____) with a designator of _____ and date of rank senior/junior to _____ be nominated for assignment to the Defense Attache Office, _____ for duty as _____, as a replacement for _____, whose ETD from station is _____. The following apply for this station:

a. Tour length is _____ years.

b. Housing is adequate for an officer with _____ dependents.

c. School facilities are available through the _____ grade.

2. When a decision to nominate an individual is reached, it is requested that this Agency, ATTN: DS-6, be provided the full name, rank, service number, social security number, date and place of birth of the nominee. The actual nomination should be forwarded in time to reach this Agency, ATTN: AA-5, not later than 90 days prior to the reporting date shown below. Tentative training schedule for the nominee is attached.

3. In addition to the qualifications required by DIA directives, the nominee must:

a. Possess an S /R proficiency in the required language or have attained a qualifying language aptitude test score (DLAT 25) necessary to acquire the minimum proficiency of S /R in the _____ language. As of this date it is projected by the Defense Language Institute that training in this language will normally be conducted in the _____ area.

b. Have a background investigation for TS access, current within the last five years, and be clearable for Special Intelligence by DIA.

4. Request your nomination be submitted to this office with the following:

a. A resume including the following:

- (1) Assignments and duties.
- (2) Security clearability.
- (3) Retainability after completion of tour.
- (4) Intelligence experience.

b. Statement of Personal History (DD Form 398) in six copies.

c. Fingerprint Card (FD Form 258) in two copies.

d. Certificate of non-affiliation with Certain Organizations (DD Form 98) in two copies.

e. Latest copy of Officer Data Card ().

f. If paragraph 3.a. above applies, submit a copy of current (within 1 year) language proficiency or aptitude (as appropriate) test scores.

g. Full length/full face photographs of nominee and spouse.

h. Certifications:

(1) By a physician, that nothing is contained in nominee's medical file which reflects adversely on his judgment or reliability.

(2) By nominee's commander, that nothing is contained in nominee's personnel file of an unfavorable nature.

(3) By a physician, that nominee and accompanying dependents have been examined and are physically qualified for this assignment.

i. Assurance that nominee and his family are suited for attache duty.

j. The following forms pertaining to spouse (non-submission will preclude her attending classified phases of instruction of Defense Intelligence School):

(1) Statement of Personal History (DD Form 398) in one copy.

(2) Fingerprint Card (FD Form 258) in two copies.

(3) Certificate of non-affiliation with Certain Organizations (DD Form 98) in one copy.

FOR THE DIRECTOR:

APPENDIX E

LETTER FROM AIR FORCE ACADEMY: DEPARTMENT
OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
USAF ACADEMY, COLORADO 80840



DFPO

24 January 1972

Captain George A. Dangelo
181-34-5250FR

Dear Captain Dangelo

I am writing to inform you of a career broadening assignment of which you may not be aware. The enclosed copy of our personnel policies describes both the opportunities in and selection procedures for the Department of Political Science.

While we have a large number of applicants, we are constantly looking for new talent. You have been identified as a distinguished ROTC graduate with a political science background who has done well in the Air Force to date. It is an easy task to locate desirable Academy graduates since we have their undergraduate records, and they are aware of the opportunities which exist here on the faculty. This is not the case with many ROTC and OTS graduates, so we are actively trying to contact selected individuals such as you.

I would like to emphasize the educational opportunities afforded by this assignment. It is presently the only way to obtain an AFIT sponsored masters degree in international relations or political science. Also, two to three officers are returned to graduate school for Ph.D. training each year. These officers are selected after evaluation in the department for one or two years.

As mentioned in the policy statement, the competition is relatively stiff. However, you are presently at the optimum career point for selection, and we are short of applicants with ROTC commissions. If you feel that you have something to offer and are interested in such an assignment, do not hesitate to make formal application. Also direct communication with the department by phone or mail is encouraged.

Sincerely,

Russell R. MacDonald, Jr.
RUSSELL R. MacDONALD, JR., Major, USAF
Assistant Professor and Personnel Officer

1 Atch
DFPO Personnel Policies

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

PERSONNEL POLICIES

1. General

a. The Department of Political Science consists of one permanent professor, twenty-nine USAF line officers, and four exchange officers representing the U. S. Army, U. S. Navy, the Royal Air Force, and the State Department. The faculty of the department is equal in quality to that of any undergraduate university in the country, and competition for assignment is naturally stiff. The department presently has 300 active personnel files. Of these, roughly 100 are candidates who now fulfill the minimum selection criteria, and approximately 25 could be considered prime candidates. Normal rotation provides five to seven vacancies per year, so a career officer with high academic and military qualifications has a good chance of selection.

b. The department includes both rated and nonrated officers. The department desires approximately forty percent of its instructors to be service academy graduates, and a deliberate attempt is made to include graduates from all commissioning sources. The normal tour at the Air Force Academy is four years; in some cases it may either be reduced to three years or extended to five years.

c. Applicants may possess either a bachelors or advanced degree in political science, international affairs, area studies or related disciplines. If selected, those candidates with bachelors degrees will be placed in graduate school for one to two years under the sponsorship of the Department of Political Science prior to assignment. Holders of masters degrees will be requisitioned for direct assignment to the department.

2. Application Procedures

a. Formal application procedures are outlined in AFM 36-11. Both the Director of Military Personnel, USAF Academy, and the Department of Political Science maintain active files on prospective instructors.

b. Although not required by AFM 36-11, letters of recommendation from at least two graduate school professors are an important part of an application for those applicants possessing graduate degrees. These letters should be addressed to:

Colonel Richard F. Rosser
Professor and Head
Department of Political Science
USAF Academy, Colorado 80840

c. A personal interview is usually required before the final selection of any applicant. In fact, this is often the most important phase of the application process. Unfortunately, no TDY funds are available for this purpose, but the department will render any help it can in arranging a visit. June and July are not recommended because most of the department personnel are away on leave and summer TDY assignments.

3. Selection Criteria

a. Applicants normally should have four to ten years of service at the time of selection. The Dean may waive this requirement in exceptional cases. Supervisory positions are held by field grade officers with prior teaching experience at the Academy or other universities. An applicant over 35 years of age must have outstanding qualifications to be selected.

b. The military record of the applicant, including his effectiveness reports for the past five years, is examined. Every instructor has a dual obligation--he must be a truly outstanding professional officer who motivates the cadets toward military careers as well as thoroughly competent in his academic discipline.

c. Academically, an applicant should normally possess at least a "B" average in his undergraduate and graduate work.

d. Continued interest in political science as evidenced by off-duty education, teaching experience, etc. strengthens an applicant's selection chances.

e. For all practical purposes, an officer cannot be assigned for a full tour at the Academy without having completed a SEA tour. Exceptions may be made for some officers with special AFSCs or with other remote tour credit. However, this decision can be made only on an individual basis by the Military Personnel Center.

4. Selection Process

a. Records are screened annually during the months of August and September. Candidates compete in either a masters degree or bachelors degree group. Selections are made one year in advance of the assignment date for those with masters and two years in advance for those with bachelors degrees.

b. An initial screening of all records eliminates those officers who would not be eligible because of age, rank, or availability (e.g., a DEROS or stabilized tour lasting beyond the assignment or school entry date).

c. Remaining candidates are reviewed by the most senior and experienced officers in the department and a composite order of preference is constructed. The Professor and Head of the department makes the final determination in all cases. Along with weighing and balancing the

factors mentioned above, he also must determine the ratio between masters degree and bachelors degree candidates. This is a variable factor and no specific numbers are predetermined.

d. After selections have been made, the department Personnel Officer takes the necessary requisition or AFIT entry actions. Those officers who have been selected will be notified, and candidates who hear nothing from the department by November can assume that they were not successful and that they will remain in competition for the following year.

5. Candidates are expected to keep the department informed of changes in their address and status such as advanced degrees, teaching experience, new assignments, etc. Direct contact either by phone or mail with the department Personnel Officer regarding selection status is encouraged.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Richard F. Rosser". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

RICHARD F. ROSSER, Colonel, USAF
Professor and Head

APPENDIX F
FORMER ATTACHÉS OF GENERAL OFFICER RANK

FORMER ATTACHÉS OF GENERAL OFFICER RANK
Colonels Promoted to General Subsequent
to a Tour as Air Attaché

Name	Position	Country	Period
Brig Gen J. W. Baska ^a	AIR ^b	Iran	1957-1959
Maj Gen Emmett B. Cassady	AIRA	Italy	1953-1956
Brig Gen Richard A. Knobloch	AIRA	Italy	1956-1960
Brig Gen Wright J. Sherrard ^a	AIRA	Russia	1953-1954
Brig Gen William K. Skaer	AIRA	Mexico	1951-1955
	AIRA	England	1962-1964
Maj Gen Carl W. Stapleton ^a	AIRA	Thailand	1952-1955
Maj Gen Leigh Wade	AIRA	Greece	1949-1951
	AIRA	Brazil	1951-1952
Brig Gen J. M. Vande Hey	. .	Philippines	1953-1956
Maj Gen John B. Ackerman	AIRA	England	1949-1950

Served on Station as General Officer

Maj Gen Grover C. Brown	AIRA	England	1959-1962
Brig Gen L. P. Geary	AIRA	Pakistan	1967-1968
Brig Gen Hollingsworth F. Gregory	AIRA	France	1952-1956

^aOn active duty as of October 1971.

^bAIRA: Official Defense Intelligence Agency designation for Air Attaché.

^cA/AIRA: Official Defense Intelligence Agency designation for Assistant Air Attaché.

Source: Compiled from listing supplied by the Defense Intelligence School and author's research.

FORMER ATTACHÉS OF GENERAL OFFICER RANK--Continued

Name	Position	Country	Period
Maj Gen Reuben C. Hood	AIRA	Brazil	1948-1951
Maj Gen Burton M. Hovey	AIRA	Argentina	1949-1952
Brig Gen Brank B. James	AIRA	England USSR	1956-1959 1951-1952
Brig Gen Monroe MacCloskey	AIRA	France	1949-1952
Brig Gen John M. Sterling	AIRA	France- Belgium	1938-1940
	AIRA	England	1953-1956
Maj Gen Robert W. Strong	A/AIRA	Canada	1949-1952
General Thomas D. White	A/AIRA	Russia	1934-1935
	A/AIRA	Italy- Greece	1935-1937
	AIRA	Brazil	1940-1942
Maj Gen Jack W. Wood	AIRA	England	1950-1953
General Thomas S. Power	AIRA	England	. .

Assistant Air Attachés Subsequently
Promoted to General

Lt Gen Kenneth E. Pletcher	A/AIRA	England	1950-1954
Maj Gen Charles H. Roadman	A/AIRA	Argentina	1951-1954
Maj Gen Felix M. Rogers	A/AIRA	Spain	1953-1957

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books

- Appleton, Sheldon. United States Foreign Policy. Boston, Mass.: Little Brown and Company, 1968.
- Barnes, William, and Morgan, John Heath. The Foreign Service of the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Barnett, Vincent M., Jr. The Representation of the United States Abroad. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.
- Blancké, Wendell W. The Foreign Service of the United States. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Briggs, Ellis. Anatomy of Diplomacy. New York: David McKay Company Inc, 1968.
- Draper, Theodore. The Dominican Revolt. New York: Commentary Press, 1968.
- Fear, Richard A. The Evaluation Interview. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.
- Fuller, C. Dale. Training of Specialists in International Relations. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.
- Harr, John E. The Anatomy of the Foreign Service-A Statistical Profile. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1958.
- _____. The Professional Diplomat. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Johnson, Richard A. The Administration of United States Foreign Policy. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1971.
- LaFeber, Walter. America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1966. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- MacCloskey, Monro. The American Intelligence Community. New York: Richards Rosen Press, Inc., 1967.

- Nevins, Allan, ed. The Burden and the Glory, Public Statements and Addresses. New York: Harpers and Row, 1964.
- Ransom, Harry Howe. Central Intelligence and National Security. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel. Personnel for the New Diplomacy. Washington, D. C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1962.
- Sapin, Burton M. The Making of United States Foreign Policy. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1966.
- Vagts, Alfred. A History of Militarism. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1959.
- _____. Defense and Diplomacy. New York: Kings Crown Press, 1956.
- _____. The Military Attaché. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Articles

- Air Force Times, February 5, 1969, January 14, 1970, February 16, 1972.
- Barrett, Raymond J. "Politico-Military Experts." Military Review, XLVI (November, 1966), 44-52.
- _____. "The Role of the Military Attache." Military Review, LI (May, 1971), 50-55.
- Caldwell, Oliver J. "Education for World Service." School and Society, LXXVIII (December 26, 1953), 191-96.
- Everett, Robert P., Capt. "Airman on the Dip List." The Airman. May, 1969, pp. 16-19.
- Horwitz, Solis. "Military Members of the Country Team." The Department of State Bulletin, LIII (August 16, 1965), 268-71.

Kirkpatrick, Lyman B. "Is United States Intelligence Answering the Red Challenge?" Vital Speeches, XXVII (January 15, 1961), 206-10.

New York Times. July 29, 1962.

Packard, W. H. "The Naval Attaché." U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, April, 1965, pp. 130-33.

Pinkerton, Roy H. "The Role of Intelligence in Policy Making." Military Review, XLVI (July 1966), 40-51.

"Service Academies." Time Magazine, December 23, 1966, p. 72.

Sheehan, Brian, Capt. "The Air Attaché-Military Statesman." The Airman, August, 1965, pp. 4-8.

Congressional Documents

Army Appropriations Act. Statutes at Large, Vol. XXV (1888).

National Security Act of 1947. Statutes at Large, Vol. LXI (1947).

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for F.Y. 1966, Senate, on H.R. 9221, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Pt. II.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for F.Y. 1967, Senate, on H.R. 15941, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., Pt. II.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for F.Y. 1968, Senate, on H.R. 10738, 90th Cong., 1st sess., Pt. II.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for F.Y. 1969, Senate, on H.R. 18707, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., Pt. IV.

- U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations, Hearings before a Subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations for F.Y. 1970, Senate, on H.R. 15090, 91st Cong., 1st sess., Pt. I.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Administration of National Security. Staff Reports and Hearings by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, 88th Cong., 1965.

Governmental Documents

- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Air Force Manual 36-1, Officer Classification Manual. Washington, D. C.: Department of the Air Force, 28 May, 1969.
- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Air Force Manual 36-11, Officer Assignment Manual. Washington, D. C.: Department of the Air Force, 31 July, 1970.
- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Air Command and Staff College, Curriculum Catalog, Class ACSC-72. Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.
- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Air War College Curriculum Catalog 1971-1972. Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.
- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Squadron Officer School Curriculum Catalog, Class 71-C. Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, September, 1971.
- U. S. Department of the Air Force. Handbook for the Air Force Attache. Headquarters, 1127th USAF Field Activities Group, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, April 22, 1965.
- U. S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 611-60, Personnel Selection and Classification. Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., March 16, 1970.
- U. S. Department of State. Foreign Service List as of June 1, 1971. Washington, D. C.: Department of State, June, 1971.

U. S. Department of State. The Country Team: An Illustrative Profile of Our American Missions Abroad. Department and Foreign Service Series 136, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April, 1967.

Unpublished Material

- Champion, George P., Colonel. "We Can Improve Our Attaché System." Unpublished research paper, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 1952.
- Cooper, Joseph D., Lt. Colonel. "Some Recommendations for the Improvement in Training and Utilization of Air Attachés." Unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, January, 1966.
- Dyer, Kenneth L., Jr., Lt. Colonel, et al. "Qualifications in International Relations Essential to the Future Leadership Role of Senior Air Force Officers." Unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, May, 1966.
- Harris, Richard C., Colonel, et al. "To Develop a USAF School for Attaché Designees." Unpublished research report, Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, March, 1957.
- Kime, Duane L., Colonel. "The Value of Our Air Attaché System and Proposed Future Program." Unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, April, 1954.
- Marks, Donald M., Lt Colonel. "Air Attaché: Realistic Selection and Meaningful Training." Unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, April, 1968.
- Michaelis, Ralph L., Colonel. "Guide Lines for the Air Attaché System." Unpublished research thesis, Air University, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 1956.

- Rippy, Bill G., Captain. "A Study of the Air Attaché." Unpublished thesis, Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, June, 1966.
- Richmond, John P., Jr., Major. "Does the Air Force Policy of Reassignment of Experienced Diplomatic Personnel Reflect Efficiency in the Management of Trained Resources?" Unpublished thesis, Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, June, 1967.
- Smith, Weldon H., Colonel. "Diplomacy, A Function of the United States Air Force." Unpublished research report, Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, March, 1952.
- "The Defense Attaché System and Selection of Personnel." Mimeographed information booklet distributed by office of Personnel-Attache Activities Group. ca., 1967.

Personal Interviews

- Crowley, Donald, Lt. Colonel, USAF, Former Air Attaché to the Dominican Republic, August, 1971.
- Hammons, Willard, Captain, USAF, Air Attaché Assignments Officer, Personnel/Attaché Activities Group, Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence, November, 1971.
- Mahaffey, Joseph H., Dr., Educational Advisor, Air Command and Staff College, March, 1972.
- Rizon, Robert L., Colonel, USAF, Retired, Former attaché, November 1971.
- Ventres, Robert L., Colonel, USAF, Acting Assistant Director of Attaché Affairs/Defense Intelligence Agency, November, 1971.

