

1981

## Babes in Arms: Youth in the Army

J.Eric Fredland

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Fredland, J.Eric (1981) "Babes in Arms: Youth in the Army," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 34 : No. 2 , Article 13.  
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol34/iss2/13>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

## 114 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

industrial" societies of the West. But an important question is whether or not because it is more sophisticated, or more "post-industrial," a state fights better. Mao, Ho Chi Minh and Stalin thought not, and proved it.

Gabriel has tackled this vast, intractable subject with courage and daring. We must be grateful to him for doing it at all, and apparently with little assistance. He deserved better support from his respondents and greater access to the émigré community. As all ex-Soviet citizens whom I have met bitterly criticize the naiveté of Americans in the face of the Soviet threat—"You are acting like fools and you will die a fool's death," said one ominously—it is surprising that more of them did not step forward to help in a study that would document their cause. We are reminded of even Lenin's complaint that it was the Russian nature to talk endlessly and not to act.

ROBERT B. BATHURST  
Harvard University

Gottlieb, David, *Babes in Arms: Youth in the Army*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980. 173pp.

*Babes in Arms* presents results of individual interviews with 115 first-term Army enlistees conducted at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, in June 1978. David Gottlieb and four associates questioned members of the group regarding why they enlisted, whether they would reenlist, how they felt about their own combat readiness and that of their peers, their attitude toward their Army job assignment and whether that assignment measured up to their prior expectations, their assessments of their social life in the Army, and their attitudes and opinions on a variety of other aspects of their military experience. The sample included 103 men and 12 women. Forty five of the respondents were nonwhite. While all were in their first term of enlistment, some interviewees had

been in the service for only a few days, while others had served for several years. The author specifically disclaims that his sample is representative of all first termers, although he does state the belief that "these young enlistees are not dissimilar to their counterparts in other Army units."

In large part, the author lets the interviews speak for themselves. All the interviews were tape recorded, and quotations are verbatim, with each speaker identified by age, sex, and race. There is relatively little text apart from the quotations. Chapter 1 provides a brief description of the sample. Chapter 9 presents some conclusions and policy recommendations. The intervening chapters typically contain a short introduction and a short summary section. Otherwise, they present as many as 70 quotations, with text intruding only to introduce a series of quotations concerning a particular topic.

Gottlieb's interviews lead him to conclude that there is considerable job dissatisfaction among enlistees and a widespread feeling among them that they have been misled by recruiters. He also finds that many believe that their Army experience has resulted in personal growth and maturity. Many expressed the view that they are better off than friends who did not join. Accordingly, he recommends that the military should place less emphasis on advertising specific vocational training in its recruiting and, conversely, more emphasis on the maturity that enlistees are likely to gain. He also suggests 2-year enlistments, a restructuring of recruiter incentives, a "cooling off period" before induction in which enlistees have an opportunity to change their mind about their enlistment decision, expansion in the availability of education and training opportunities, and other policies that he believes will reduce the extent of job dissatisfaction.

*Babes in Arms* is an interesting, indeed entertaining, volume. Unless

one can generalize the impressions one gets from reading it, however, the work is of little value except as entertainment. The author cautions that his sample may not be representative, yet he does generalize, and in my view, rightly so, in drawing conclusions and making policy recommendations. Still, I would be more comfortable with the generalizations and with the validity of my impressions about first-term enlistees if the author had provided more information.

First, it would have been helpful to provide the reader with the interview protocol. This was promised (p. 16) as an appendix, but unfortunately it was omitted.

Second, one would like more information about the sample as a whole and about the speakers of individual quotations. For example, one knows that the sample includes people at various stages of their enlistments but one is not told the mix. More important, one does not know if a particular statement is that of a person viewing the Army after 2 weeks of experience or after 3 years, unless that information happens to be revealed in the quoted passage. Knowing the duration of Army experience is important in evaluating a quotation on such matters as attitude toward combat or on the probability of reenlistment.

Third, one would like to know more specifically how many interviewees expressed certain opinions. Instead the reader is told that a "significant number" do not feel that racial conflict is a major problem, that "most" tend in retrospect to perceive their recruiters as having been hustlers and con artists, that there is a "substantial consensus" that training is inadequate for combat, that "the majority" experience serious dissatisfaction with work training and job assignments. The reader is left to speculate whether the "significant number" who note the absence of racial tension is, say, 35 of the 115

respondents, or perhaps 100 of them. Only at the end of Chapter 4, which concerns reactions to basic training, did the author provide a frequency distribution of any of the responses. I wish he had done this more often. Such information could have been included in appendices to avoid interrupting the flow of the book.

Finally, a major purpose of collecting and presenting in-depth interview data is to complement studies using larger data samples containing narrower ranges in information. The book would have been improved with references to relevant theoretical and empirical literature. There is no bibliography, nor any footnotes. Reference to at least a few key statistics would also have helped. For example, about half of Gottlieb's respondents say they might reenlist. It would have been useful to point out that in fact the first-term Army reenlistment rate for fiscal 1978 was 36 percent. (Department of Defense, *Defense/80*, p. 21)

One other point that relates to the validity of the impressions the reader gets from the quotations should be mentioned. Although it is somewhat difficult to be sure inasmuch as speakers are identified only by age, sex, and race, it appears that some respondents are quoted far more often than are others. This is certainly true of the 12 women, who are quoted more often than their proportion of the total sample in all chapters except Chapter 6 on combat readiness, in which no women are quoted at all. One woman, a chaplain's assistant, is quoted at least once in every chapter except Chapter 6. The reader knows her story quite well by the end of the book. It is not necessarily invalid to quote the women disproportionately often, of course. The differences in attitudes between the women and the men are certainly of interest. However, when 60 percent of the quotations in the chapter on recruiters and the recruiting process are from the female respondents,

## 116 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

one wonders whether the impression one gets regarding feelings about recruiters is really the way most first termers feel. One might also wonder whether 12 women is a large enough sample from which to generalize about women's attitudes.

In sum, *Babes in Arms* provides some interesting anecdotal evidence on the attitudes of first term enlistees. The conclusions drawn, while perhaps valid for first term enlistees in general, need further confirmation from other sources.

J. ERIC FREDLAND  
U.S. Naval Academy

International Institute for Strategic Studies. *The Military Balance 1980-1981* and *Strategic Survey 1979*. London 1980. 119pp. and 139pp.

*Military Balance* presents, in easily usable form, survey statistics of military forces around the world. Figures are provided for armaments, manpower and defense expenditures for U.S., Soviet Union, NATO and Warsaw Pact States, as well as for some 100 others with standing defense forces. The types and quantities of specific weapons systems and the organization and strength of defense elements are listed. This year there is also a map of Soviet military districts and groups of forces, and charts showing French and Chinese divisional organization. Treaties, agreements and other regional arrangements are described succinctly for each major geographic region of the world, and some activities resulting from these alignments are reported. Additionally, for countries that have forces operating or stationed out-of-country, the location and size of deployed forces are indicated.

In the tables published in Section Two of this edition are data showing comparative strengths and characteristics of nuclear delivery vehicles; also, defense expenditures and military manpower statistics for the 1975-1980 period for some 65 countries are

tabulated, and a summary of major arms agreements made between July 1979 and June 1980 is provided. Particularly topical for the American reader is the table of NATO defense expenditures, by NATO country, for the past 20 years, and the two analytical essays in Section Three on the East-West conventional and theater nuclear balance in Europe. An assessment of the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union introduces the force level statistics sections for the two super-powers.

In sum, *Military Balance* very nicely fills the need for a concise, unclassified ready-reference source of information on military forces around the world.

*Strategic Survey 1979* recapitulates that year's security-related events in an analytical style that gives new insight to the significance of the events themselves. A chronology of events is presented by geographic area, but most information is provided in a concise but comprehensive and highly readable text. The world's security-related actions and interactions are analyzed and brought into perspective in terms of their objectives, political and economic factors and repercussions, and results. Prospects or possible outcomes are offered for issues that were unresolved at year's end.

The 1979 edition, published in mid-1980, includes elucidations of new factors in security, such as the challenges to nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia, the expanding Soviet naval forward deployment policy, and uncertainty and insecurity of international oil supplies. The phenomenon of détente is examined in light of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, normalization of U.S./Chinese relations, and conflicts occurring outside of Europe.

Arms-control issues are discussed in several of the articles; in addition, an 11-page section treats SALT and other arms-control negotiations exclusively. An arms-control chronology lists the