

Dear Commissioner, General Ham,

I recently read our local news paper's article on DOD's proposed plans to reduce Defense Forces - through select troop reductions. Your Commission's works came immediately to mind. (On the AM of Dec 7, '41, I, a 9 year old then and eight other boys, all about the same age, we were Orphans then, sneaked a look down at Pearl Harbor from quite a distance away from the mountain tops which are like natures backdrop up above Pearl City area. Looking down at Pearl Harbor area from where we were, everything seemed covered by dark smoke making it difficult from that distance for us to see much. But, at where we were as kids, we had our first lesson in dodging loud whistling bullet sounds that seemed to be all around us. Natures large rock boulders were our shields (Thank God).

The moral of all this, which started WWII, is that the 'enemy' knew of our armed forces and equipment strengths and what military installations they needed to cripple to handicap themselves for a larger mission elsewhere. I read later in life, that a young signal corps Lt had missjudged an incoming radar reading about "inbound aircrafts approaching" etc, etc, which would have alerted all concerned at the time. Much later in life, I read, that Admiral Nimitz, after he was put in charge of the Pacific Armed Forces by President Roosevelt, found out, that Japan would have had a much higher casualty count had they came at us in "deep water"; further, they did not destroy all the fuel storage sites during the attack at Pearl Harbor, another major mistake, he wrote, leaving us with 450,000 gallons of fuel in place for future use, a great savings in shipping distance, time and movement costs. Our casualty counts from this war will always be more because back in those days, they fought a war with the best equipment and funding support our country could afford.

Today's methods in use of the so called, high tech intelligenge gathering or detection; followed with development of matching high tech equipment for armed forces use are what world countries are doing against each other, except with specialized higher trained forces. I've always favored highly trained, well equipped contingency select forces. But, here again: structure, mission, qualifying, equipment and supplies, mobility, etc., are high in costs to defense budgets that it's now become a first consideration. Today, our future depends on what's needed in terms of costs to perform a mission, on hand inventory and system controls over its assets. I think that future combat missions and its select organization may depend much on having sound logistics systems in house. Basic tables of organization and equipment and tables of supply allowances of its 10 classes of supplies are in need of review to standardize much of the modern equipments used for special purposes. Non-standard items are costly on the bidding market whereas standard items have fixed contracts with fixed pricing at less costs to our Defense Budget. Prevention of waste in a combat zone is a challenge also which drives our supply system "batty" to replace calculated levels of combat consumption supplies rates. Fixing our Army's future from lessons learned in past wars at todays expense is a hugh challenge.

Thank You for reading my opinions. Wish you and staff "success 1 rating" with your misson.

Sam Atcherley
CW4(R) 82d Abn Div '78
Woodlake Country Club
Vass NC
satchrly@yahoo.com