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The second edition of *The Naval Aviation Guide* is an informative and comprehensive publication which contains many items of interest and value to the professional naval pilot. A glance at the table of contents will disclose a wide spectrum of subjects, most of which are arranged in a logical and interesting manner.

The serious reader of this publication could acquire the knowledge and understanding necessary to become a better pilot and naval officer as well as an ambassador of good will for naval aviation. For these reasons *The Naval Aviation Guide* should be on the bookshelf of every squadron commanding officer and department head.

The publication's weak point is chapter 4, wherein the authors and editors make the recurring mistake of equating “leadership” to the broader spectrum of “management.” In formal management training throughout the Navy, the naval officer is taught that leadership, albeit important, is only one principle of the managerial function of directing. However, in various publications in the Navy, including this one, the reader is led to believe that all that is necessary “...to accomplish the Navy’s mission through people...” is to become a leader by mastering the art of leadership. Leadership's position and value in the overall picture seems to have been overstated at the expense of the other principles of management and functions of a manager.

Admittedly, *The Naval Aviation Guide* may not be the appropriate place to present a short, informal course in management. Nonetheless, chapter 4 could be improved by avoiding the implication that mastering the art of leadership is a panacea for the managerial problems facing the Navy at the operator level. Instead, it should stress that leadership is a necessary part of management rather than vice versa. Leadership is not an end within itself, but only a means toward an end. Such phrases as “...effective leadership is based on personal example, good management and moral responsibility...” would seem to indicate the converse.

In essence, this reviewer is arguing for a more realistic and pervasive approach toward “grass roots” management training within the Navy. It is believed that there is a better way to integrate behavioral theories with traditional management concepts without emphasizing only one aspect of the problem, i.e., leadership.

E.E. HANSON
Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy


Professor Fenwick has written this volume ostensibly so that the “man in the street” will have a guide to enable him better to identify the interfaces...
between U.S. foreign policy and that body of jurisprudence that is recognized as international law. A brief historical introduction to the development of international law in the first chapter is followed by analysis of the consistencies and inconsistencies of major U.S. foreign policy decisions in relation to the points of international law then prevailing. It is clear from this analysis that in her pursuit of national objectives through her foreign policy, the United States has, for the most part, been in consonance with the accepted law, and where she has deviated she has given due notice of her intentions and reasons therefor. The book also points out the constraints on foreign policy which operate as a result of attempting to follow the law consistently and the consequences that may ensue from deviating from international standards of legality.

Professor Fenwick is the unusual writer on international law who is capable of translating the concepts of that law into prose understandable by the layman. His style is lucid, and his discussions are much to the point, with a notable absence of jargon. This book is consistent with those characteristics. It falters in only two respects. Firstly, the book presupposes a considerably greater storehouse of knowledge of the history of U.S. foreign policy than one would normally expect the man in the street to possess. Secondly, it is dangerous to isolate incidents of foreign policy out of historical context in that it necessitates oversimplifications which are not conducive to an understanding of the issues involved. Thus, to say that the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States decided to intervene in the Dominican Republic in 1965 (p. 59) would seem to be an oversimplification of a complicated series of events more political in nature than a look at the law would reveal. The questions posed at the end of each section of the book, particularly those asking for justification of certain acts, reflect this lack of historical background, since the answers in most cases may be found in the diplomatic history of the event itself. Despite these shortcomings, this book is highly recommended reading for those interested in perceiving international law in its proper perspective, i.e., in relation to the international diplomacy from which it derives many of its salient features.

J.E. WESSEL
Commander, U.S. Navy


As Professor of Philosophy and Social Science at the University of California, Berkeley, Lewis Feuer had an unusual opportunity to observe the Berkeley student uprising. These observations reinforced his belief that all student movements follow the same pattern and led to his writing The Conflict of Generations in which he analyzes past student movements to show the recurring traits. The emphasis of his analysis is on the psychological factors that determine lines of thought and action. Although students feel that their focus of attention is on society, Professor Feuer believes that human nature in the form of generational conflict is the real source of student unrest. In his view, if “exploitation” is the master term for defining class conflict, “alienation” is the term for the conflict of generations. Reviewing the characteristics of student movements during the past 150 years, and particularly those of the sixties in the United States, he presents a strong case for his thesis that every student movement is the outcome of a “de-authorization” of the elder generation, presumably through some historical failure. “They arise wherever social and historical circumstances combine to cause a crisis in loss of generational confidence, which impels the young to resentment and uprising.” The