

Is this to try to overcome all these special adaptations?

Mr. FASICK. Yes. In effect, it should improve efficiency and also reduce cost if it is properly implemented.

Mr. ROBACK. But any supply system probably is going to have special adaptations. For example, you attribute them to the present Army organization. You say such systems are required to provide effective supply service for critical items. You are talking about "Red Ball." The Air Force has a "Red Ball" too, does it not?

Mr. FASICK. Yes, it has something comparable.

Mr. ROBACK. It isn't necessarily the fact that it is the Army's system. Every system in a war, and in a war like Vietnam, which in many ways is very unusual, experiences special adaptations. Many of the terrain and environmental features which have made special supply demands were either not anticipated or couldn't be foreseen until they were experienced in the field.

So, you are inevitably going to have special adaptations in any system, isn't that so?

Mr. FASICK. I agree.

Mr. ROBACK. You are trying to minimize the special adaptations, or trying to get away from having to say that the whole system doesn't work when it should be working for combat and not be just a peacetime relatively leisurely system; is that the general philosophy you are propounding?

Mr. FASICK. That was very well expressed.

Mr. ROBACK. You mentioned the possibility of wrapping up certain depots in Europe and supplying units from the United States?

Mr. FASICK. I was suggesting they could eliminate some layers of supply ownership and should give consideration to it.

Mr. ROBACK. You said the Army was planning or proposing to eliminate certain depot complexes; did I understand that correctly?

Mr. FASICK. I don't know about the depots themselves, but organizationally they are giving consideration to eliminating the 7th Army Inventory Control Center.

Mr. ROBACK. In other words, the inventory control would be in the United States?

Mr. FASICK. No, it would be in the Communications Zone's Supply and Maintenance Agency, which is the next highest level. This is the U.S. Army, Europe's logistics organization.

Mr. ROBACK. Looking at the Air Force concept, where you have worldwide control from inventory control points in the United States which are in proximity with the supply depots, the air materiel areas, is there an evolution toward U.S. centralized control over all these field logistics systems?

Mr. FASICK. There is. There is visibility and a degree of control.

Mr. ROBACK. I mean, is the Army sort of gradually evolving along that line, which the Air Force has instituted?

Mr. FASICK. I think so.

Mr. ROBACK. Are you recommending, or do you believe, that the Army could control the inventory from the United States now?

Mr. FASICK. If they overcome some of their other basic problems in the supply systems, conceptually they could do it now, yes.

Mr. ROBACK. This would be standardization of data processing equipment and communications, is that right?