

mand prerogative in the theater, so that the commander has the disposition of supplies as well as other matters under his command. Your statement, then, is that there could be some inroad on that prerogative without necessarily completely overcoming it?

Mr. FASICK. Not at all. It would not. I think it goes back, Mr. Roback, probably to confidence in a system. I suspect that command prerogative in the sense that it is defended in the Army, is, in my opinion, a reflection of lack of confidence in the supply system—a feeling that the commander must have the supplies himself.

Mr. ROBACK. Do you think that psychologically and perhaps historically, it has been due to dispersal geographically, lack of communications, and a feeling of "let's get what we can and get hold of it, so we will have it when we need it," whereas technically if you had a worldwide communications network for logistics and reasonably accurate reporting, those fears ought to be dispelled? Is that the sense of what you are saying?

Mr. FASICK. Very much so.

Mr. LUMAN. Do you feel at this time that the Army has the wherewithal to implement such a system of visibility? Do they have the computer compatability? Do they have the communications? Is the inventory control point in the States so set up that it can take over the function of visibility of these items at overseas depots?

Mr. FASICK. I think to a limited extent. The Army is now working on taking about 1,500 or 1,700 items and bringing it under this visibility and control concept, as we understand it, as it has been described to us. It is still in its implementing or planning stages. This is a start. But I think that they have a limited capability, and they will have to develop an improved capability which will come about through this standardization of systems which they are working on. I would like to think they could move faster than possibly they might have in mind.

Mr. ROBACK. You say they really couldn't put into effect the plan you seem to espouse in your statement until they get this compatibility of computers?

Mr. FASICK. Very much so. As a matter of fact, the Army system, as we see it today, is wrought with a great deal of unreliability in its system. I would be the last one to suggest that we go on the system at once because I think you would probably create more chaotic conditions than now exist. But I think a plan should be devised and it should be recognized from conception that this is the long-range objective, to accept the concept of visibility and AMC control down to the major stockage levels worldwide.

Mr. HORTON. When you are talking about visibility, you are talking about reporting in a sense, aren't you?

Mr. FASICK. That is one facet of it.

Mr. HORTON. That is the most important facet?

Mr. FASICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HORTON. Is there any reason why you can't have the reporting system and still have the command system that the Army has?

Mr. FASICK. No, there is no reason why you couldn't have it except it brings another element that usually has to be brought to bear in order to effect efficiency in a supply system. For example, redistribution actions, if AMC were to decide that it is more important to have