

Memo of the Month

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE DATA SYSTEMS DESIGN CENTER
BOX 421, BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, D.C. 20332

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: HCA (Major Kauppila/32400)

21 Apr 1969

SUBJECT: Optional Wear of Civilian Attire for Enlisted Personnel

1. There is a growing concern throughout the Center that the mandatory requirement for our enlisted personnel to wear the military uniform at The Forrestal [Defense Department office building in Southwest Washington] is undesirable. Besides having a deleterious effect on the morale of the personnel, there are other points which we should carefully consider:

a. Military personnel in uniform in Washington, DC are vulnerable targets for the criminal elements of our society. Common thieves, drunks, prostitutes, and other unsavory elements will presume that our personnel are on leave status and probably carrying ample personal monies. They, therefore, could become potential targets for crimes of violence, robbery, pandering, etc.

b. There is a growing concern throughout the nation at the present time about the military influence in all departments of the government. Many of our national leaders feel

that the influence of the military establishment is getting out of hand. We would be aggravating this national concern when several thousands of people in military uniform start working out of The Forrestal. Because of its close proximity to the House and Senate Office Buildings, I feel that it may have a bad effect on the congressmen on The Hill to suddenly see us as trying to take over more and more of the Nation's Capital.

2. In spite of the fact that AFM 35-10 would not normally allow our enlisted personnel to wear civilian attire, I believe that The Forrestal situation merits special consideration. Recommend that the Department of Defense be contacted to determine whether or not these points have been considered, to see if a standard policy of optional wear can be adopted for all the occupants of The Forrestal. If this is not feasible, recommend we write a special letter to MPC pointing out these factors and requesting their approval for the Air Force enlisted people assigned to the DSDC.

/s/

JOHN W. FIPPEN, Lt Col, USAF
Headquarters Commandant

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

27 MAY 1969

REPLY TO USAFMPC (AFPMSAU)
ATTN OF: RANDOLPH AFB TEXAS 78148

SUBJECT: Wear of Civilian Clothing (Your ltr, 21 Apr 1969)

TO: AFSDC (HCA)

Your request for authority to permit officer personnel assigned to the Air Force Data Systems Design Center to wear civilian clothing in lieu of the military uniform while performing duty in the Forrestal Building is approved.

/s/

FREDERICK W. JOY, JR., Colonel, USAF
Executive
Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel

The Culture of Bureaucracy:

by Albert O. Hirschman

Exit, Voice,

If you don't like the way things are going wherever you are, the chances are that you have two options open to you. You can either use "exit" or "voice."

Exit means: leaving under your own steam, quitting, switching, resigning, deserting, escaping from. It is comparatively neat and impersonal. It implies the end of your loyalty to whatever you are leaving.

Voice means: an attempt to change things through articulation—whether by addressing your dissatisfaction to those in a position to make the changes, or by grouching to anyone who will listen. It is far messier than exit, since it can range from faint grumbling to violent protest. And while exit is an either-or proposition—you either exit or you don't—voice is essentially an art, constantly evolving in creative new directions. In contrast to exit, voice implies a continu-

ing (if strained) loyalty to the entity that is causing stress.

In some situations, of course, voice and exit can be successfully joined. Take the hippies. Their dissatisfaction with the surrounding social order led them to combine their exit from it with a demonstrative "otherness." By making their cop-out so spectacular—that is, by mixing deviance with defiance—they have made their exit brim with voice.

In other situations, either voice or exit can become so unthinkable (or so attractive) that only one option is really open. Exit has often been unavailable to members of primordial human groups such as the tribe, the family, the church, and the state. Sometimes, again, exit is consciously rejected. Black Power, for example, refuses the traditional pattern of individual upward social mobility. Its open and exclusive re-

Albert O. Hirschman is Littauer Professor of Political Economy at Harvard. This article has been adapted by the editors from various chapters of his forthcoming book, Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. It will be published in February by Harvard University Press.