



MOBILIZATION LESSONS: LET'S START
APPLYING THEM NOW!

LAST Fall's mobilization is generally conceded to have been the smoothest in the Nation's history—meaning that units and individuals were selected, alerted, mobilized, and brought to battlefield readiness with fewer snafus and greater speed than we'd ever managed before.

Even so, imperfections appeared. Men were ordered-up who shouldn't have been, a few units wound-up with little to do—militarily, at least—and little to do it with, procedures were permitted to take precedence over results.

It's still a bit early to make a well-rounded appraisal of the machinery of mobilization, or to correct all the weaknesses the recent mobilization turned up. But it's not too early to start. In some areas, a start *has* been made; in others, the evidence is so clear that it is pointless to delay the required corrective steps—and perhaps even dangerous in today's threatening atmosphere.

Topping everyone's list of things that went wrong, of course, is the "filler problem." Mistakes were made and injustices committed, but the problem was magnified out of all proportion by the bellyaching, letters to editors and mass meetings of a handful of malcontents. They behaved like spoiled kids; they shamed their fellow Guardsmen and Reservists; they deserve nothing but our scorn.

There was a legitimate need for improvement in the handling of M-Day reinforcements, though, and progress already has been made. Department of Defense has directed all the Services to earmark fillers for specific slots in specific units; to continuously screen personnel records to insure that individual Ready Reservists are in truth ready, and available, and to keep those individuals informed as to their assignment and relative M-Day priority. Even before that, the Army National Guard advanced a plan (now awaiting final approval) to permit each unit to create its own pool of fillers in the Inactive National Guard from men who no longer could attend drill regularly. The Army Reserve is giving serious study to a similar plan. The Air Guard has sent a proposal "upstairs" for 100% manning of all or many of its units, thus eliminating the need for more than a handful of fillers.

If accepted and given the financial support they'll require, these plans alone will go a long way toward alleviating the worst ills of the recent callup. Thousands of previously unassigned reservists will acquire a military "home." They'll be able to identify themselves with a unit through periodic muster days and refresher field training, and the unit will provide an improved channel of communication. It's no cure-all, but it will help.

There are other steps, though, that can be taken now, or soon, to improve the mobilization responsiveness of the Reserve Forces. For the few we'll enumerate here, the Guard appropriately can take the lead in suggesting, or initiating, necessary changes. To name but four—

- Shortening and simplifying the processing—the paperwork—of mobilization.
- Intensifying leadership training for junior commissioned officers and non-commissioned officers.

- Overhauling the process of supply, to bring it into greater conformity with Army practices.

- Revising the requirements for ARs, AFRs, Supply Manuals, Training Manuals and above all, blank forms, to be stocked for ready availability in case of mobilization.

Nearly every Commander of Guard units now on active duty—particularly on the Army side—has told the same story. Guard units wrestled for weeks with the administrative and procedural requirements of mobilization before they could turn their full energies to the serious business of training. There were physical exams, dental exams, dogtags, ID cards and photos, allotment forms, dependency certificates, clothing issues (and shortages), security clearances—to select only a few from a list that goes on and on. Long after they were supposed to be driving full-scale through their intensified training programs, men (and whole units) were being siphoned-off to draw the latest shipment of shirts, or to take dental X-rays, or some such thing connected with the *administrative* phase of mobilization. This made training programs meaningless. It's useless to offer a once-only class in some vital subject when a whole Platoon is away getting anti-tetanus shots or posing for photos. Most Commanders believe many of these requirements can be dispensed with entirely, others can be met long before M-Day rolls around. Lt Gen Lewis B Hershey, wise old patriarch of Selective Service, has put his finger on one bit of needless duplication when he says we require too many physical exams. Once a man has been examined and found fit, at enlistment, it shouldn't be necessary to re-examine him at M-Day unless there's concrete evidence it's needed. Likewise, hours of valuable training time could be salvaged by making ID photos, and dogtags, and gathering data for such forms as "next of kin" and allotments, and keeping them on file against the day of mobilization.

Commanders likewise agree that many young officers and NCOs lacked leadership training and experience. Their suggestions: use Guard and Army Area NCO Academies to a greater extent, seek continuously for new ways to draw young leaders into every phase of unit operations, at armory drills and at field training.

Next, goes the story heard over and over, officers and men in supply jobs were seriously handicapped by their vague understanding of Army supply procedures, because supply matters in the Guard revolve around the USP&FO and a few fulltime Technicians. Part-time men actually assigned to supply jobs tend to get shunted aside.

And over all the rest, in last Fall's callup, hung the universal, all-influencing shortage of vital publications and blank forms. It was a classic case of nearly losing the battle for want of a nail. Whatever units tried to do during their pre-M Day alert, they found themselves stymied because the required manuals or blank forms weren't in stock and couldn't be obtained for days or weeks.

And surely, as each change in procedure is weighed, one question should dominate: Will it reduce the time required to put battleworthy units in the field, or won't it? ♦

THE NATIONAL GUARDSMAN



MAY, 1962 16-5

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF
THE NATIONAL GUARD
ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES

1 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON 1, D.C.

Officers

- Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., President
- Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, Past President
- Maj. Gen. Carl L. Phinney, Vice-President
- Maj. Gen. Leo M. Boyle, Treasurer
- Brig. Gen. Allison Maxwell, Secretary

Committee On Publication

- Maj. Gen. Frederick G. Reincke, Chairman
- Brig. Gen. Howard S. Wilcox, Vice-Chairman
- Maj. Gen. E. J. Stackpole, Retired
- Col. Richard Snyder, Second Army
- Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Cooper, Jr., Third Army
- Col. Karl N. Smith, Fourth Army
- Maj. Gen. Charles H. Browne, Jr., Fifth Army
- Maj. Frank M. Coley, Jr., Fifth Army
- Brig. Gen. Carl H. Aulick, Sixth Army
- Maj. Frank W. Davidson, First Air Force
- Brig. Gen. Jack LaGrange, Jr., Fourth Air Force
- Maj. Lloyd L. Johnson, Tenth Air Force
- Brig. Gen. John P. Gifford, Fourteenth Air Force

Executive Staff

- THE NATIONAL GUARDSMAN
- Col. Allan G. Crist, Editor
- Maj. W. D. McGlasson, Associate Editor
- Capt. John Bibb, Office Manager

Publication Office

* Telegraph Press Bldg.,
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

General offices: 1 Massachusetts Ave., N. W. Washington 1, D. C. Second class postage paid at Harrisburg, Pa., and at additional mailing offices.
Domestic subscriptions for home delivery: \$2 per year. A year's subscription is included within the annual dues, paid by members of the National Guard Association of the United States. Subscriptions to foreign countries \$2.50 per year.

SPECIAL RATES TO NATIONAL GUARD UNITS FOR BULK SUBSCRIPTIONS TO ONE ADDRESS: 20 to 200 subscriptions, \$1.75 per subscription; 201 or more subscriptions, \$1.50 per subscription; SINGLE COPIES, 25c.

ALL MATERIAL INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION, AND SUBSCRIPTIONS, SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON 1, D. C.

Prompt notice is requested of change of address. PLEASE INCLUDE YOUR OLD AS WELL AS YOUR NEW ADDRESS.

THE NATIONAL GUARDSMAN welcomes original articles bearing on matters of National defense with special emphasis on Army National Guard and Air National Guard aspects. Payment is made upon publication at a minimum rate of three cents per published word. Manuscripts must be accompanied by return postage, and no responsibility is assumed for their safe handling.

Copyright, 1962, The National Guard Association of the United States. All rights reserved.

MAY, 1962

CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

OVERSEAS DUTY "NO SWEAT" FOR AIR GUARDSMEN ... 2
A report from an ANG flying unit in Spain

THE BIG SLICE 6
24 different plans led to the final huge whack at the Guard

FROM QUINHAGAK TO SKAKTOOLIK 15

IT'S THAT TIME AGAIN 16
A veteran's thoughts on how to turn hits into misses

RESCUE . . . RELIEF . . . SECURITY . . . a sequel 18

FEATURES:

Washington Report 8 Pentagon Paragraphs 21

You Ought to Know 14 On Guard 22

Technical & Tactical 20 Posting the Guard 28

EDITORIAL Inside Front Cover
Mobilization Lessons: Let's Start Applying Them Now

DEAR GUARDSMEN: It seems that the same fed-upness with pompous military jargon struck home at just about the same moment recently for the Editors of "Infantry" at Ft Benning, Ga, and "The National Guardsman" at Washington, DC.

Flipping through the March issue of our magazine, the Editor of "Infantry" did a double-take of "Dear Guardsmen" and its ribbing of "profound" phraseology vs. simplicity." For here's what he had written in the March-April issue of "Infantry":

"This concerns the verbization of nouns, whatever that means. For unfathomable reasons, there are military folks who create and perpetuate this verbization process. Maybe it masks inadequacy. Maybe it is done to murkize an otherwise clear answer to some knotty problems. Or maybe people are just a bunch of parrots.

"Take the word 'utilize' (and you're welcome to it!). For the moment this one seems to be the fad. There's a fine word which is both easier to write and 99% of the time more accurate. But *utilize* is a lot more pompous and knowing, isn't it? I utilized eggs this morning in an omelet, and I know.

"The thought has occurred to us—because we would like to ride the fashionable bandwagon also and not be labeled fuds—that we could eliminate all verbs from the English language by this clever device. Think of the savings in postal charges for mailing an unabridged dictionary which is only half as large as today's out-of-step version! Want proof? Try this (and when you have it figured out please let us know what we said):

"Meticulous, formalized conceptionization in the field of dieselization maximizes the minimization of adverse effect upon the Army's transition to vehicularization of ground forces."

"We staffed this."

—AGC