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έκαλύφθη κυρίως άπό έθνογραφικά και την μείωσιν τού άριθμού τών κοινωνικών πανεπιστημίων έχει ως αποτέλεσμα και της Κοινωνιολογίας άπό τό ρουμανικόν λειαν έπειδή έχει κακώς ταυτισθή μέ τάς μαρξιστικός θεωρίας.

Κοινωνιολογία δέν έχει κατορθώσει τό Πανεπιστήμιον έπειδή αϋτη έθεωρήθη τήν διδασκαλίαν τής Κοινωνιολογίας είς μη να άποκτήση αυτοτέ­

ότι έξυπηρέτει τά συμφέροντα τού βασικαθεστώτος έπί σειράν έτών ένφ είς τήν Ρουμανίαν τό κομμουνιστικόν μος έπιστήμη εις τό Πανεπιστήμιον μέχρι έπί τής ρουμανικής Κοινωνιολογίας, ή μετά τό πέρας τού δευτέρου Παγκοσμίου ποίηση τής συγκριτικής μεθόδου. Μία αλλάγη τού καθεστώτος έπέδρασε καί προβλήματος. Ό νέος τρόπος έρεύνης λογής οίδοτής ύλικού, άλλα τής με­

προβλήματος. 'Ακόμη καί η λαογραφική έρευνα μιας κοινότητος δέν είχε τόν θότητον εν τφ συνόλφ της, εμφασις έδό­

προηγουμένης περιόδου. 'Αντί τής πλη­

ποίηση1 τής μονογραφικής έρεύνης τής λής. Ό κύριος έκπρόσωπος τής σχολής κτηρίζεται από μίαν ποιοτικήν διαφορο­

δημιουργίαν ρουμανικής Κοινωνιολογίας, Ιδέας ότι ή κοινωνιολογική ερευνά έπρε­

ρους καί λεπτομερούς έρεύνης μιας κοι­

τό διάστημα 1925-1935, είναι γνωστή εις λεπτομερή περιγραφήν τού λαογραφικού χωρίου, ή όποια χαρακτηρίζεται από τήν λέτης μέ τήν έθνογραφικήν έξέτασιν τού πλήρωσις τής κοινωνικο-οικονομικής με­

χεϊον τής περιόδου έπίσης είναι ή συμ­

εις τον χώρον τού χωρίου. Βασικόν στοι­

από τήν μεγάλην διοικητικήν περιο­

μεθόδων, όπως τά έρωτηματολόγια, sur­

ρουν τάς πολιτιστικός, ένφ οί κοινωνιο­

δρομον. Άλλο άριθμο πανεπιστημίων όπως τα πολιτικά, όπως τα ιατρικά, ένφ κοινω­

ποικίλα τού συνολφ, εμφασις έδό­

προηγουμένης περιόδου. 'Αντί τής πλη­

ποίηση1 τής μονογραφικής έρεύνης τής λής. Ό κύριος έκπρόσωπος τής σχολής κτηρίζεται από μίαν ποιοτικήν διαφορο­

δημιουργίαν ρουμανής Κοινωνιολογίας, Ιδέας ότι ή κοινωνιολογική ερευνά έπρε­

ρους καί λεπτομερούς έρεύνης μιας κοι­

τό διάστημα 1925-1935, είναι γνωστή εις λεπτομερή περιγραφήν τού λαογραφικού χωρίου, ή όποια χαρακτηρίζεται από τήν λέτης μέ τήν έθνογραφικήν έξέ­
problems facing the US army. In his last part, however, the author shows that there is a time for compromise; and one would see it to be the 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 the maintenance of national security and be prepared to fight all types of war.

In view of the contradictions of American social order and the armed forces as a national cleavage, the author offers something for everybody by elaborating on what Moskos refers to, "The Emergent Military: Civil, Traditional or Plural?" In fact, the author accepts in principle Moskos’ pluralistic model by suggesting 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 begin to 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 publications. It is episodic and anecdotal. It has a journalistic flavor coupled with an assortment of carefully selected quotations from the professional literature of armed forces and society. It fails to offer an over-all coherent conceptual framework of armed forces and society beyond the three concepts / issues mentioned above. With the exception of "recruitment," the other two concepts of "isolation" and "professionalism" are difficult to evaluate and operationalize. The concept of "isolation" for example to which he devotes three chapters of 1/4 of his book is somewhat vague. Using Isolation I,II,III, he discusses problems of race and dissent, discipline and drugs. One would think that these social problems generate "social conflict" rather than "isolation" between the army sub和社会 and the larger society.

The book is an issue oriented analysis par excellence. The author wrestles with the three major concepts of isolation, recruitment, and professionalism which he perceives to be the common issues underlying the crisis in the US army and its major counterparts in Western Europe on the year 1940's and 1950's. In doing so, the author relies heavily on popular reporting, the mass media perceptions, qualitative material, and his own perceptiveness as a professional soldier. In other words, 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 insipient 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 otherwise complex social organization. Even the author himself is skeptical of its implementation. Questions arise: Who is going to do the fighting? How does one evaluate a "heroic officer" or a "fighting army" in a period of detente? 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.

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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