

Subject: Draft of Chapter 10, Dartmouth Policy Study
To: Colonel Lincoln

We would like to comment on two aspects of this chapter which fall within our area of competence.

1. We object to the notion that there is some sort of special relationship among combat experienced officers which establishes a dichotomy between them and officers who have survived only the normal hazards of existence. To the contrary, we would hold that combat experienced officers, perhaps better than their ribbonless colleagues, recognize that "combat experience", like all other experiences, is a function of personality, and that while in some individual cases combat improves an officer professionally, in others it merely serves to confirm him in misconception and bad-habit. No one knows better than those who have experienced ultimate dependency upon their fellow men that medals and experience are absolutely no index of the true worth of an officer. We feel that to suggest, that there exists any genuine, widespread awareness of difference among the officers of this post based on combat time is to distort, and that this distortion in a book about training for policy-making introduces a serious misconception. If the contention were true, for example, would not this awareness be communicated to cadets, and would not this notion adversely affect their professional relationships even when they reached the policy making level?

2. We object to the notion that there is a division of function among the officers of the post with regard to teaching to the cadet professional attributes. The statement that the Tactical Officer enjoys a special fatherly relationship with the cadet which is the sole or principal source of soldierly advice, information, or guidance is again a serious distortion. To be sure, the Tactical Officer's relationship with the cadet makes him peculiarly well suited to teach the external attributes of the soldier -- the postures, the manner of address, the courtesy, etc., and beyond a doubt this same relationship is a real source of professional

attitudes among cadets. But, this is not to say that we in the section room, acting in our capacity of "only a teacher", do not likewise teach him those same lessons. We would go so far to suggest that it is the instructor in the section room who teaches some cadets their major lessons in attention to detail, precision of thought and expression, self-discipline, courtesy, etc., and we are certain that much -- if not most -- of the remunerative sort of informal, give-and-take discussion on professional topics takes place -- and indeed can only take place -- in the section room. We work with minds. We are all professional soldiers. We would be less than human were we not to inject into our discussion our attitudes; from them the cadet acquires some of his. But most important of all, we would be derelict were we to ignore the opportunities which are afforded us daily to develop that most important of all the "attributes essential to ... a lifetime career as an officer in the Regular Army": professional mindedness. In summary, we, no less and no more than the tactical officer, are responsible for developing our cadets as soldiers. Our particular function is the management of an academic discipline, but it is no less important to the professionalism of the cadet than the more specifically military discipline managed by the Department of Tactics.

SIDNEY B. BERRY
Major, Infantry

PAUL F. GORMAN
Captain, Infantry