

It would appear that, for the future, there will be available a certain number of military personnel who are entirely competent to direct in-house laboratories. In addition to their military training, they must have technical education and training, as well as direct experience in research and development.³ Also, as has already been noted, civilian personnel can most certainly be trained to direct programs in military operations. It might be said that both classes of individuals have similar training and backgrounds, but the military personnel are more heavily indoctrinated in combat matters, while the balance of training in the case of civilians is heavier on the technical and theoretical side.

It appears that every director of an in-house laboratory should be chosen on the basis of capability, especially his ability to challenge and stimulate his staff, and regardless of military or civilian status. Only in this way can both civilians and military personnel be afforded the same opportunity for professional advancement. The idea has often been suggested that, if a laboratory director is military, his deputy should be civilian, and vice-versa. This is a satisfactory management approach in view of the increasingly technological complexion of modern weapon systems. It has also been suggested that, if the emphasis is on in-house development, the director should be a civilian engineering manager. On the other hand, if the emphasis is on contractual activities, the director should be a technical military officer.

These remarks are directed toward research and development. As military systems move into test and evaluation, there is little difference of opinion on the conclusion that military management should prevail.

One final point regarding the selection of individual laboratory directors: A deliberate attempt should be made to avoid appointing to key laboratory management positions military officers who are preparing to retire. Similarly, under no circumstances should a civil servant be allowed to assume the leadership of a laboratory primarily because of longevity of service. Above all, the tenure of office should be of sufficient duration to indicate clearly that the director himself has had a real impact on laboratory operations.

³Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Technical Military Personnel, Report of the Defense Science Board Subcommittee, 9 September 1965.