



# SPEECH FILE SERVICE

FILE

U. S. ARMY COMMAND INFORMATION UNIT

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20315

No. 11-1-64

PUBLISHED FOR THE USE OF INFORMATION PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING SPEAKER'S BUREAUS FOR MAJOR COMMAND HEADQUARTERS AND ARMY INSTALLATIONS. THIS SERVICE AUGMENTS THE SPEECHMAKER SERIES AND COMMAND COMMENT BY PROVIDING COMPLETE TEXTS OF TIMELY SPEECH MATERIALS ON A WIDE VARIETY OF SUBJECTS AS THEY BECOME AVAILABLE. THEY ARE NUMBERED AND TITLED TO FACILITATE INDEXING AND FILING.

*This speech by Lieutenant General Edwin J. Messinger, Deputy Commanding General, United States Continental Army Command before the Army Affairs Committee, Reserve Officers Association, Omaha, Nebraska, 24 October 1964, had as its subject:*

ONE ARMY

● IN WAR

● IN PEACE

It is a genuine pleasure to come to Omaha and to have this opportunity to meet with the members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. Since its establishment in 1922, the ROA has been a stalwart and influential advocate of a sound military position for this country. It has been constantly attentive to all essential aspects of national defense and has worked energetically toward the development of strong Reserve forces. The ROA represents the leadership upon which the success of our Reserve program depends.

This is especially significant when we recall the words of General Pershing: "There was, throughout the country, an almost total lack of concern of appreciation of the value of a Reserve force of any sort. But the war has brought home to us in a very striking manner the advisability of reasonable precaution -- completely vindicating the advocates of military training."

When he made those remarks to a dedicated group of men gathered for the purpose of forming this association some 42 years ago, I am certain he was convinced beyond any doubt that the Nation would never again allow its military structure to ripen on the vine of public indifference. He had just witnessed on the battlefields of France the fallacy of untrained youth, led by untried officers who, as he put it, "Had no conception of their duties and responsibilities."

I will not bore you with a recitation of what happened during the next fifteen years to the vast American military machine that had swept to victory in World War I. Let it suffice to say that we entered the second great war only slightly better off than we were the first time. And again during the late Forties we were well on our way to a return to a similiar idyllic era.

But just ahead for the United States was a new way of life that literally shook the foundations of our traditions and history. Korea -- the truce -- and events of the Fifties found us thrust into the era of the so-called "Cold War" where military might -- or the threat of it -- was the only thing protecting the hopes and goals of free peoples everywhere. The mantle of free world leadership was an unfamiliar mode of dress of a Nation that had long prided itself in minding its own business and avoiding entangling foreign alliances.

The rapidly expanding commitments placed on the United States Armed Forces during the latter part of the Fifties required a sober re-examination of our world position. First, it was obvious that this was no fleeting crisis that would dissolve in the immediate future. This was going to require major national effort for an undetermined number of years ahead. Secondly, we had to sustain ourselves economically and industrially as well as militarily. The maintenance of large active military forces on a wartime footing was not only economically unsound but was repugnant to this country as a free democracy.

The answer was to rely on our Reserve Forces to share the Nation's military commitments with the active forces. But this meant Reserve Forces of a type we had never had before -- forces that could be called upon and could react in a time frame compatible with the modern arts of war.

For the United States Army the concept was called "One Army."

Nothing about "One Army" is new -- neither the concept nor the phrase. As a concept it has a long lineage, having been used many times in the history of the United States Army. And as a phrase, "One Army" is even older than the Army. "One Army" was a fact before we had an Army to which to ascribe it. Historically, we first saw it in the early days of the Revolutionary War, when the whole entity of volunteers, militia and conscripts was called the Continental Army. The United States Army, as such, was not created until 1784. The story of our first Army and our first major armed conflict is well known from our school days.

Short-term enlistments, desertions, ignorance, indifference, shortages -- these were only part of George Washington's problems. With his Army disintegrating before his eyes, he had to imbue the remnants with a kinship and a team spirit that

made it possible to go out against terrible odds and win. However, in this day and time we cannot put all our hopes on the determination and dedication of one man like George Washington.

In the past, all components have lost their identity in combat and become part of a one Army. This has happened to us many times. We could never have won a war without this one Army unity. So you may justly ask, "Why all this concern over implementing a concept now that will take care of itself in the normal course of events on the battlefield?"

Because we're attempting to do it in peacetime!

Because we're trying to create a decisive, effective One Army before we get onto the battlefield.

Because we can no longer take the time and the casualties required to perfect the team; and -

Because the enemy may give us barely enough time to commit the team in whatever condition it's in.

The job today is too complex and the odds too deadly. Actually, many of the problems today are no different than those of George Washington's.

Although we have had passed down to us many traditions of fighting spirit and valor in wartime, we have also inherited the tradition of economy in peacetime. This is not critical of American society; it is merely a by-product -- a trait -- of a free democracy. In a freely determined form of government such as ours designed to flourish in peace, military security is not based on a huge standing Army but on ready and willing Reserve Forces.

For many generations various nations have based their aggressive strategy not on the strength of our country but on our anticipated weaknesses. They expected us to lose by default. Yet each time we got there, not only in time to participate, but with enough force to call the key plays and win. Because we had the time -- time to prepare gracefully behind protective oceans while our allies kept the enemy contained.

Those were the good old days. Modern war has accelerated, and we can no longer expect that period of grace. Accordingly, our reaction time must be likewise accelerated if we are to survive. We intend to do this job today by continuing to develop the One Army -- in advance of any emergency.

To understand this One Army and its potential as regards our national security mission, it is essential if first understand the role of the Reserve Forces -- two-thirds of the One Army team. Let me give you this quotation from Paragraph 1, Chapter 1, of the USAR Advisor Orientation Handbook, published by Headquarters, United States Continental Army Command: (I quote)

"One Army Concept. The Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the US Army Reserve comprise One Army -- the United States Army. Each of these components is an indispensable element of our military defense. Your goal (the advisor's) is to advance the Army as a whole and to weld all components into a One Army team in order to provide a readiness posture which will meet any threat to our national existence. There is no intent that components, and units within components, be identical in strength, equipment, or training. The goal is mutual understanding, cooperation and team work to the degree that the three components present the same united front in peacetime that in the past has been presented in war." (End Quote).

Accordingly, the Reserve Components have but one mission: mobilization readiness. Some call it deployment readiness. This is not a separate mission but one they share with the Active Army. The Reserve Forces portion of the team must be prepared to meet certain pre-set mobilization schedules. In this way the Reserve Components can reinforce and augment that portion of the One Army team already on active status. They are not on the second -- nor third team -- they are on the first team!

Since we are allowed only one mobilization in an all-out war, the only reinforcements we will have are those forces in being, trained and equipped to fight now -- the Army National Guard, the Army Reserve and the Active Army. This mobilization may well be without the assistance and facilities we've known in the past and may be for any type of conflict. M-Day demands that we field a whole team, composed of elements which are not identical but interchangeable. There may be differences in training among elements of the One Army team but only in degree. The mobilization status of the Army National Guard, Army Reserve and the Active Army differs in duty status only -- and that can be changed with a simple set of orders. Such action is facilitated by the fact that all of our Reserve Combat Divisions are basically organized along the same lines as Active Army Combat Divisions for either nuclear or conventional warfare.

Instead of paper units, the Reserve Components are manned at the maximum strength authorized by law. Instead of untrained recruits, the ranks are now being filled with young soldiers who have recently completed a minimum of four months' active duty training.

Let us turn to current implementation. I would like to discuss the present status of projects underway to further the One Army concept.

1. One of the most important of these projects is to obtain public acceptance. The original program was implemented by the Information Staff of all three components, coordinated initially by Headquarters, United States Continental Army Command and later by Department of the Army itself. In this regard, we cannot say enough for the continued assistance that can be given by your local chapters of the Reserve Officers Association.

I ask your local chapters to assist us by adopting chapter projects in this area. I am confident that with such assistance, public acceptance of this concept will continue to spread and contribute to our national defense efforts.

2. The indoctrination phase, of course, is carried out concurrently with the public acceptance program. This first gained command recognition and support when the philosophy of the One Army concept was disseminated through the entire structure of the Army establishment down to the training centers to reach the young soldier during his first day of duty. In planning and laying out the informational activities, the indoctrination committee uncovered some of the symbols that retarded the One Army from becoming a peacetime reality years ago. For example, the first action of the indoctrination committee was highly significant and progressive.

It resulted in a Circular (135-15) that eliminated the requirement to include the component along with unit designations in official nomenclature. Now, the indoctrination committee is not the first group which ever thought of wiping out the component designations parenthetically attached to our units. Many other accomplishments are not new. Staff officers, commanders and individual soldiers have seen the need for some of them throughout the years. The significant point here is: The climate for One Army is such that these things have not only been noticed, they are being corrected, revised or completed.

3. In the personnel utilization phase of One Army, I would like to cite a simple example of cross-utilization of personnel. A young man joins the Army National Guard and is ordered to report for his required period of active duty for training with the Active Army. Upon completion of such training he returns to his home area and Army National Guard unit of assignment. Shortly thereafter, he may take a better job in another State where there is no nearby Guard unit, so he joins the local unit of the USAR. This is the ultimate in Army training. This is the One Army.

4. In the field of Military Personnel Management, the objective is "to develop policies and procedures for obtaining and using soldiers to best accomplish the missions

assigned." To this end, the enlisted management program, which combined all personnel policies and procedures for enlisted men into a single integrated package, was adopted in the Active Army. An important element of this program, the pay grades E-8 and E-9, has been extended to the Reserve Components. This provides additional recognition for senior Reserve enlisted personnel who carry heavy responsibilities.

Essentially, promotion criteria are the same for all components. And of equal importance is the extension of the enlisted evaluation system to the Reserve Components -- a comprehensive testing, review and analysis of the whole MOS structure. This is indeed One Army in action.

5. In mobilization training we have made our greatest strides. We have authorized and encouraged progression to higher levels of training for units of the Reserve Components, consistent with assigned priorities and training objectives. This includes participation in Active Army exercises, the Reserve Components' Airlift Program, the conduct of CPX's by combat divisions or elements thereof, and the use of squad and platoon live fire attack courses.

Equal in importance here is the requirement which these innovations impose on Reserve Component officers to raise their professional standards and levels of education. You may rest assured that we will continue in our efforts to develop new training projects and programs and extend active Army training programs to the betterment of the Reserve Components and the Active Army to form One Army in the field.

The question naturally arises, "How well are the Reserve Components carrying their two-thirds share of the One Army?"

Two distinguished Army officers who are in a position to know, Lieutenant General Wright, Chief of the Office of Reserve Components, and Major General Sutton, Chief of Army Reserve, who is in the audience, have expressed their views on this.

In the October issue of the ARMY INFORMATION DIGEST, General Wright is quoted as saying, "The Active Army of nearly one million men and women is supported in depth by the most responsive Army Reserve Component structure this country has ever known."

In the same publication General Sutton writes, "Today, units of the Army Reserve are prepared for extended operations in areas of special operations. They have participated side-by-side with Active Army units in maneuvers, tactical exercises, and special airlift maneuvers."

Nor are these officers alone in their praise of the Reserves. General Paul D. Adams, Commander-in-Chief, US STRIKE Command, also commented on his recent experiences with Reserve Components in the combined Exercise DESERT STRIKE, saying, "I am gratified by the results achieved by the Reserve Component units participating in this exercise -- We have seen a potential demonstrated here that justifies in every respect higher manning levels and increased equipment and general operating support."

For General Harris, myself, and the staff at CONARC, I can only say we concur completely with these expressed sentiments. The Reserve Components have been challenged; they have met that challenge, and I am confident they will continue to do so.

The One Army can accept nothing less than 100 per cent unity and cohesion of all Army components, sharing their equipment and facilities in peacetime just as they will have to share them in combat.

One Army training criteria today are designed to improve our capabilities to succeed as a team. We must be prepared in advance -- now -- not during combat.

I close these remarks by saying that One Army is no longer a traditional but unexpressed philosophy. It's a working fact!

Thank you.