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έκαλύφθη κυρίως άπό έθνογραφικά και την μείωση του άριθμού των κοινωνικών συστημάτων είς την ρουμανικήν άνθρωπολογικάς έρευνας.

τής Κοινωνιολογία άπό τό ρουμανικόν λειαν έπειδή έχει κακώς ταυτισθή μέ τάς Κοινωνιολογία δεν έχει κατορθώσει άκοτό Πανεπιστήμιον έπειδή αϋτη έθεωρήθη τήν διδασκαλίαν τής Κοινωνιολογίας είς μη να άποκτήση άκαδημαϊκήν αυτοτέλεστος, είς τήν Ελλάδα ή καθεστώς κατήργησεν είς σειράν έτών είς τήν Ρουμανίαν τό κομμουνιστικόν οποία έπαυσε να διδάσκεται ώς αυτόνομο Πολέμου, φθάνει μέχρι τής σήμερον. Ή μετά τό πέρας τού δευτέρου Παγκοσμίου πολέμου, οπότε έπεσε να διδάσκεται ώς αυτόνομο 

άλλα, καί έπετρεψε τήν εύχερεστέραν χρησιμολέτης ένός συγκεκριμένου λαογραφικού χαρακτήρα τής είκή καί ώς έτυχε συλπροβλήματος. 'Ακόμη καί ή λαογραφική έρευνα μιας κοινότητος δέν είχε τόν νότητον έν τφ συνόλφ της, εμφασις έδόκτηρίζεται άπό μίαν ποιοτικήν διαφορετικά τών έπει ΜΕΡΩΝ έρευνών. Είναι γνωστόν αί άγροτικαί περιοχαί, ή όποια χαρακτηρίζεται άπό τήν λέτη ή τήν έθνογραφικήν έξέτασιν τού πλήρωσις τής κοινωνικο-οικονομικής μείωσης συνέπειαν άφ' ένός μέν τήν άλλαγήν τού ρουμανικού χωρίου, ή όποια είχεν μεταβολήν της δομής τού χωρίου, ή όποια είχεν έξυπνηκή και αί έμπνευσης. Τό πέμπτον στάδιον, τό όποιον ήρχισε έτ' άλλοι, άφ' ένός μέν τήν άλλαγήν τού ρουμανικού χωρίου, ή όποια είχεν έξυπνηκή και αί έμπνευσης. Τέλος θα άποκτήση μέ τήν όποιαν είς τήν Ρουμανίαν 

καταστάσιμας της γειαρίας και τού ρουμανικού πληθυσμού, είς φροντική περιοχή. Το δευτέρον στάδιον, τό άλλοι, άφ' ένός μέν τήν άλλαγήν τού ρουμανικού χωρίου, ή όποια είχεν έξυπνηκή και αί έμπνευσης. Τέλος θα άποκτήση μέ τήν όποιαν είς τήν Ρουμανίαν κοινωνικολογικάς μείωσης μέ τήν έθνογραφικήν έξέτασιν τού χωρίου. Τέλος θα άποκτήση μέ τήν όποιαν είς τήν Ρουμανίαν κοινωνικολογικάς μείωσης μέ τήν έθνογραφικήν έξέτασιν τού χωρίου.
problems facing the US army. In his last part, however, the author in an unprecedented manner takes a stand on the issues he raised previously. In his last chapter, for example, «What to do and how to do it», the author shows that there is no time for a «change»; and «reform». One would think that the basic mission of the US army and indeed of the nation is maintained in a world of international discord and blackmail. And the army's basic mission as spelled out by the political authority is to maintain the national security and be prepared to fight all types of war.

In view of the contradictions of American society and the armed forces internal cleavages, the author offers something for everybody by elaborating on what Moskos refers to as «The Emergent Military: Civil, Traditional or Plural?». In fact, the author accepts in principle Moskos' pluralistic model but does not support the splitting of the army into two parts: a «fighting» army and a «supporting» army.

This book has some unique aspects not ordinarily found in recent books on armed forces and society. First, most books on civil-military relations are written by academic social scientists. Second, most examine the impact of military on society rather than the reverse. Third, while the author is selective in his sources, he nevertheless succeeds in blending civilian and military scholarship in his analysis. This is something that academics who write about civil-military issues rarely do.

This analysis is not an «apostasy» of the military profession nor an «apology» for anti-military critics. It is rather a sympathetic and constructive critical analysis of some of the major issues confronting the US army. Indeed these problems may be observed in other western and non-western armies in industrial and post-industrial societies. Further this book may be seen as a glowing tribute to the US army for its capacity and willingness to re-examine itself and adapt to the changing environment without losing its basic mission and role in a free and democratic society.

While the author earns his brownie points, his analysis, inferences, conclusions, and policy recommendations may be challenged by a number of military personnel and civilians alike. The book for its part reads like «A Facts on File type publication». It is episodic and anecdotal. It has a journalistic flavor while his analysis, inferences, conclusions, and recommendations may be valid, one wonders if his «America's Army in Crisis» is indeed in crisis. We are told that there is a political crisis, a sociology crisis, a health crisis, a food crisis, an ecology crisis, a moral crisis, a family crisis, a legitimacy crisis, and more recently an energy crisis and ad infinitum. There is an incipient tendency of the author to hastily over-react to the army's present difficulties. In addition, the author tells nothing about how the other branches of the US armed forces view these problems.

Furthermore, the author concentrates on the year 1971 for his in depth analysis of the army's problems. How representative is this year for the over-all US army's performance and morale in the context of post Vietnam and its Watergate sequel? His proposal of bifurcation of the US army along heroic/fighting vs. managerial/supporting dimensions is a rather simplistic formula for an other-wise complex social organization. Even the author himself is sceptical of its implementation. Questions as: Who is going to do the fighting? How does one evaluate a «heroic officer» or a «fighting army» in a period of détente? or conversely who is going to be accountable to whom during possible wartime? are not adequately answered. By suggesting that the «fighting/heroic» type should be an «elite» (like the air-borne paratrooper), authoritarian, isolated from society, tough and rugged, the author in fact advocates as primordial «spartan-warrior» types as opposed to the «Athenian citizen-soldier types». It may be that Athens lost the Peloponnesian War, yet she defeated the Persians at Marathon and Salamis and the Athenian model provided the foundation upon which Western civilization was built.

Signed articles express only the views of the author

Perhaps the author reflects a new way of thinking among some of the younger generation of officers and his civilian contemporaries. He is concerned with status, images, attitudes, and morale of the post Vietnam US army. He writes with sensitivity and acumen and reflects a profound affection and concern for his country and his calling. Viewed in this light the book over-all is a thoughtful analysis of some of the major issues confronting the US army today. It should be read not only by the professional soldier but by the policy makers, students of civil-military relations and all those who are concerned with the future of the US army and its mission.
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