



The Joint Challenge to Interservice Training

By HENRY VICCELLIO, JR.

MH-60/MH-47E air refueling simulation.

U.S. Army

Few deny that the last several years have been a dynamic period for the military, possibly only matched by the period immediately after World War II. It has been a time of downsizing, budget cuts, policy debates, program cancellations, base closures, and an elusive peace dividend. As the Armed Forces grapple with change, the emphasis has been on improving

management and efficiency. Change also offers opportunities to train as a team. Many are working to expand and consolidate interservice training, including members of Congress, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the services. We can no longer afford four independent training overheads.

Initiatives such as the Goldwater-Nichols DOD Reorganization Act and other actions have genuinely improved Joint Professional Military Education. The new mission of the Armed Forces Staff College—which prepares officers for joint duty at the appropriate

*We train as a team . . .
fight as a team . . .
and win as a team.*

—General Colin L. Powell, USA

Summary

Throughout our history—in World War II, Grenada, Libya, Panama, Operation Desert Storm, and other conflicts—the Armed Forces have proven they can effectively come together in a theater of operation and achieve victory. That is not to say there have not been problems of coordination and communication that have detracted from our past successes. One of the best ways of eliminating these problems is to focus on fundamentals by revamping and expanding interservice initial skills training programs. One example of a highly successful effort is the Joint Primary Aircraft Training System. There is a good deal of consolidated training taking place today and even more planned. Our objective is to teach every soldier, sailor, marine, airman, and coastguardsman the same basic skills. Through joint education and training the Armed Forces will be ready to meet the challenge of future conflicts and protect our national interests.

point in their careers—is one example. Both the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College have long graduated joint-qualified officers. Other educational programs track with this direction, but in the realm of training the services have emphasized organic training since the 1960s. As the services assumed greater autonomy they withdrew from collocated, multiservice, and joint arrangements for training activities. It is time to reverse that trend.

Interservice Review

Over two decades ago as the Vietnam war came to a close the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO) was established. Though voluntary, ITRO has facilitated service discussions on course criteria, costs, and shortfalls. Today ITRO members range from action officers to the leaders of education and training commands (the latter constituting the organization's executive board). It gained momentum through a concept of reviewing interservice training arrangements that appears convenient but takes time to implement. Due to a burst of energy in the Senate as well as the Chairman's report on roles and missions, and in the face of budget realities, ITRO activity has accelerated over the last two years. To quicken the review process, the organization looks at broad functional areas and critiques them establishing and examining common links that promote efficient interservice training. This type of review has benefits for the services since the potential for infrastructure divestiture—getting rid of what is unneeded—increases as we train together.

The reviews look at three basic ways to make single-service courses multiservice. The first involves establishing quotas for courses managed and operated by one service by providing spaces for students from other services. The second is collocation where courses which are managed by two or more services make use of facilities and equipment of a principal host; the training remains separate but resources are shared. The final is consolidation which implies total integration; two or more services combine efforts to

offer courses with instructors and students drawn from more than one service. Today we are going one step further, rotating unit commanders at the squadron level to achieve full consolidation of training activities and to capitalize on the strengths of each service.

Two criteria are key to interservice courses. One is protecting service equities—to ensure that the interests of each service are met under the arrangement. If this criterion is observed service parochialism is usually checked and progress can be remarkable. The other criterion is upholding the standards of each service which shifts the emphasis from the least common denominator to the best solution. By taking such an approach, we can move toward accepting the challenge issued in 1992 by Senator Sam Nunn in his address on roles and missions for the Armed Services on the Senate floor: “The fundamental question is not what is best for the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force . . . the question is, ‘What is best for America?’” That challenge has become the bedrock of efforts to provide what is best for the Nation by providing the best standards for students of all services.

By proceeding in this manner, we avoid establishing interservice training schools that fail to increase efficiency. For example, the Air Force would be out of its element teaching the Navy sonar or underwater welding just as the Army would have scant interest in instructing the Marines about F/A-18 aircraft radar maintenance.

Initial Training

Reviews indicate that the greatest potential for integration is found in common initial training where individual service requirements are similar. This is foundation training which leads to particular career fields or specialties. The services have taken advantage of such opportunities resulting in a total of nearly 400 joint courses today. Nearly half of all multiservice training occurs on Air Force bases—predominantly because of the quality and availability of facilities, and because as the Air Force downsized it gained excess capacity which benefits all the services. And although the chart shows only 10 percent of training courses, those courses have very high student loads.

From an Air Force perspective, 29 percent of enlisted personnel coming out of boot camp each year at Lackland Air Force

the greatest potential for integration is found in common initial training

General Henry Viccellio, Jr., USAF, is Commander of Air Education and Training Command and formerly served as Director of the Joint Staff.

Base will go into a multiservice environment for initial tech school. Ten years ago, less than 20 percent of Air Force enlisted personnel trained in such an environment. Based on a growing trend in interservice initial skills programs, over half of new Air Force enlisted personnel will soon be trained in a multiservice environment.

A few examples illustrate how interservice training works. As the DOD executive agent the Air Force teaches intelligence at Goodfellow Air Force Base, predominantly in imagery and signals intelligence. The dog handler school at Lackland Air Force Base

trains DOD personnel as well as students from other Federal agencies which use canines. The Air Force also operates a law enforcement school at Lackland for Navy and Air Force "cops." In addition, English—the official language of aviation—is taught at Lackland to more than 4,500 foreign students from nearly 110 countries annually while the Foreign Language School is admin-

istered by the Army at the Presidio of Monterey. Though not the executive agent, the Air Force has a multiservice weather school at Keesler Air Force Base attended by officer and enlisted students from all services. The Army teaches welding at Aberdeen Proving Ground and the Navy teaches metal working in Memphis, and so on. More interservice training goes on today than many realize.

The advantages of interservice initial skills training include lowering costs as redundancies are reduced, downsizing the overall infrastructure, fostering teamwork, and nurturing jointness by exposing students to interservice dialogue early in their careers. Once servicemembers have passed through that window into advanced training and begin working with operational equipment unique to their services, or once they learn to employ equipment as required by their service doctrine and tactics, this potential is diminished.

Specific training is essential to ensure that trainees assume operational assignments with the right skills, attitude, and foundation to do the job. Some think that this training



Maintaining AH-1
Cobra.

U.S. Army (Gary Bryant)

Interservice Training Status

Approved/Implemented

Army

- Metals Technology
- Welding
- Helicopter Maintenance
- Vehicle Operator
- CE—Equipment Operators, Engineer Technicians
- Construction Mechanics (Army/Marine Corps)
- HVAC, Refrigeration (Army/Marine Corps)

Navy

- Explosive Ordnance
- Non-Morse Operations Analyst
- Water Survival
- Carpenters, Buildings
- Construction Mechanics (Navy/Air Force)
- Vehicle Mechanics (Navy/Air Force)

Marine Corps

- IBM Computer Training

Air Force

- Law Enforcement/Corrections
- Cryptology
- Weather
- Calibration
- Food Service
- Undergraduate Space Training
- Power Line Specialist
- Utilities Plumbers
- Electricians, HVAC, Refrigeration (Air Force/Navy)
- Fire Protection (Air Force/Army/Marine Corps)
- Survival/Evasion

Nearing Decision

- Aircraft Maintenance
- Intelligence
- Air Traffic Control
- Communications Training
- Information Technology
- Environmental

Under Review

- Transportation
- Medical Specialties
- Supply Logistics
- Petroleum

would be enhanced by creating either a Defense Training Agency or appointing a CINC-TRAINING, but the services do not currently support the idea. As one moves beyond initial skills training, it is vital to retain service identities. This is where applications among the services become more distinct and training must build on the cultures and missions of each service. By bringing their unique capabilities together the individual services make joint warfare successful.

as in technical training the services have large flight training infrastructures

Administration and command are also issues. In the past when there were few interservice initial training opportunities, each service could easily afford what might be called an “overseer” organization. These were small bodies of between seven and forty people at the bases of other services where training took place. As we move toward more interservice programs, such organizations increase manpower costs. A solution might be to create a student squadron which is interservice or joint in nature. Under that system service-specific support organizations may prove unnecessary. The net result would be lower manpower costs for each service involved.

Flight Training

Climbing skyward from ground training, one increasingly observes a commitment to joint ventures in flight training. General Colin Powell noted that, “The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps each have aviation arms essential to their assigned warfighting roles. Each air arm provides unique but complementary capabilities. They work jointly to protect America’s airpower.” Projecting power demands joint training to build complementary capabilities which is just what we do in navigator as well as pilot training.

As in technical training the services have large flight training infrastructures. The Navy has closed down Chase Field and the Air Force has shut down Williams and Mather Air Force Bases. The services are also looking at ways to deal with other parts of the infrastructure. In addition, former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin reacted to the Chairman’s *Report on the Roles, Missions, and Functions of the Armed Forces of the United States* by directing the consolidation of portions of flight training programs. Accordingly, we merged initial fixed-wing aircraft training—primary training—with that of other services and transitioned to a Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS). The Secretary of Defense also ordered the creation of a four-track follow-on training structure. Toward that end students graduating from JPATS will follow the Navy fighter attack and E-2/C-2 path designed for carrier operations, the Air Force bomber/fighter

track, the airlift/tanker/maritime track, or a helicopter track.

The Air Force has been “growing its own” pilots since 1947. Spurred by Senator Nunn’s challenge and Secretary Aspin’s subsequent guidance, we are changing as we establish interservice training and then consolidate the infrastructure. This began with instructor pilots (IPs) and already Navy IPs are flying T-37s at Reese Air Force Base while Air Force IPs are flying T-34s with the Navy at Whiting Field. These exchanges are the foundation for joint primary training.

We will put a rapidly growing number of students into interservice training annually in the coming years. After an initial adjustment phase we will ramp up quickly and operate two fully consolidated squadrons. The rest will become joint as JPATS arrives on the scene in 1997. Each primary squadron, whether training at an Air Force or Navy base, will eventually have about 200 students equally divided between the two services.

To achieve this end we are well on the way to interservice fixed wing pilot training. Even the squadron leadership will be joint as the commander and second-in-command are rotated. The first two officers involved in interservice command are an Air Force lieutenant colonel (executive officer of Training Squadron 3 at Whiting Field) and a Navy commander (operations officer for the 35th Training Squadron at Reese Air Force Base).

A new approach to training pilots of multi-engine aircraft evolved through a study of flight training in the Navy and Air Force. Naval aviators now train in T-44 twin engine turboprops while the Air Force uses new T-1 twin-engine jets for specialized undergraduate pilot training. The Navy had trained jet pilots in turboprops while the Air Force trained C-130 pilots in jets. The Navy and Air Force are developing a cross-flow system where C-130 pilots from the Air Force, Navy, and elsewhere will fly T-44s, while jet-bound personnel such as E-6 pilots going on to Take Charge and Move Out Aircraft (TACAMO) will go to Reese Air Force Base and fly T-1s. Both instructor and student exchanges began in 1994.

Navigator training has been joint for over twenty years. The student body mix has recently been half Navy/Marines and half Air Force. All Air Force navigator training is now conducted at Randolph Air Force Base



U.S. Air Force

T-1A trainer.

since Mather closed. There is a 22-week basic course and an advanced course for electronic warfare officers and weapons systems officers who are assigned to fighter aircraft or bombers after earning their wings.

The Navy has a somewhat different approach. It gives some T-34 basic flying instruction to navigators at Pensacola Naval Air Station. Two-thirds of the way through the program, those selected for larger aircraft are sent to Randolph Air Force Base for training. The remaining trainees receive more T-34 time, then some T-39 time, after which they go to either E-2s at Norfolk Naval Air Station or stay at Pensacola, where the Navy has specially modified T-39s with fighter-type radars to teach fighter navigators. The Navy also gives navigators basic fighter maneuver training in T-2s. This offers enough of an advantage that Air Force navigators

headed for fighters or B-1s will go to Pensacola for advanced training with Navy radar-intercept operators in T-39s and T-2s.

As General George Patton commented, "Wars may be fought with weapons, but they are won by people." To echo his remark, properly trained and educated soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are key to our Nation's defense. Before the Marines hit the beach to provide humanitarian relief in Somalia, before Air Force F-16s or Marine F-18s patrolled the skies over Bosnia, before relief supplies were airlifted to the Midwest during the floods of 1993, and before the first Special Forces soldiers slipped across the border into Iraq during Desert Storm, they received the best training in the world.

In moving toward greater consolidation in initial skills training we have to ensure that the warriors of tomorrow are just as well trained. Recent events, together with initiatives by Congress and DOD, have helped expand the prospect for interservice training. Once seen as a convenience, such training has become an imperative. With our counterparts in other services, the Air Education and Training Command has a full plate in providing the best possible trained and educated soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. The services must share their unique capabilities in order to foster joint culture. We are going to fight together and we are going to win together.

JFQ

