

In the Air Force there is a line of logistics control from the Air Force Logistics Command through the various inventory control points and weapons systems managers, to Air Force bases both in the United States and overseas. Worldwide asset data on many items is provided to inventory control points through periodic reporting.

The Navy, with a different mission and resultant different supply concepts, has multiple stockage points. However, the Navy's logistics philosophy is somewhat similar to that of the Air Force wherein there is recognition of the line of logistics control from the Chief of Naval Material to the various major supply centers and the depots both in the United States and overseas. Central supply control is maintained on a worldwide basis through periodic report procedures.

The Army also has multiple stockage points both in the United States and overseas. However, the Army philosophy differs from the other services in that there is no single line of logistics control extending from the Chief of Staff, through the Army Materiel Command, to overseas stockage points, and to the stock stored at posts in the United States under the control of the Continental Army Command.

The Army Materiel Command, counterpart of the Air Force Logistics Command and the Naval Materiel Command, now has control of stocks only to the level of depots in the United States. When supplies are issued to posts in the United States, the Continental Army Command (CONARC) assumes responsibility. Under CONARC, the various U.S. Armies "own" stock at the posts in their area of responsibility.

When supplies are issued to the overseas commands, such as the U.S. Army, Pacific, and the U.S. Army, Europe, they assume responsibility and "ownership." The overseas commands all have separate depots complexes and supply control points.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will you stop at this point and explain what you mean by "own" and "ownership?"

Mr. FASICK. We explain this a little further on, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. FASICK. Basically then, the differences in the physical aspects of the three services' supply systems are dictated in part by differences in missions and access to rapid transport facilities. The more subtle difference in organizational philosophy is much more difficult to define and involves relationships between "staff" and "line" functions, where logistics is a staff function as distinguished from operations, or line functions.

In the Air Force the base supply officer has a "staff" responsibility through organization channels to the Air Force Logistics Command. At the same time, he is under the "line" command of the commanding officer of the base.

This philosophy of dual responsibility is recognized and accepted at all levels, in both the Air Force and Navy. In the Army, however, much more emphasis is placed upon a philosophy of "command prerogative," wherein an Army commander retains complete control and responsibility with respect to all facets of logistics, personnel and military operations related to his mission. For example, the 2d Logistical Command in Okinawa is under the command of the U.S. Army, Ryukyu Islands. Therefore, little, if any, command relationship