

RESUME OF SERVICE CAREER

OF

FRED ELDON ELAM, Major General

DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH: 10 July 1937, Seminole, Oklahoma

YEAR OF ACTIVE COMMISSIONED SERVICE Over 26

PRESENT ASSIGNMENT: Commanding General, United States Army Transportation Center and Fort Eustis/Commandant, United States Army Transportation And Aviation Schools, Fort Eustis, Virginia, 23604, since August 1985

MILITARY SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

The Infantry School – Basic Course
The Transportation School – Advanced Course
United States Army Command and General Staff College
The Naval War College

EDUCATIONAL DEGREES:

University of Arkansas – BS Degree – Geological Engineering
Michigan State University – MBA Degree – Transportation

MAJOR DUTY ASSIGNMENTS:

<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>ASSIGNMENT</u>
Jul 60	Sep 61	Rifle Company Platoon Leader, Weapons Platoon Leader, Executive Officer, Company A, 2d Battle Group, 39 th Infantry, 4 th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington
61	Feb 62	S3 Operations Officer, 1 st Battle Group, 8 th Infantry, 4 th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington
62	Jul 62	Assistant S3, Adkutan, Headquarters, 14 th Transportation Battalion, 4 th Infantry Division
64	Sep 65	Movements Control Officer, 173d Airborne Brigade (Support) Okinawa and Republic of Vietnam
65	Jun 66	Company Commander, 173d Airborne Brigade (Support), Republic of Vietnam
66	Sep 66	Staff and Faculty, U. S. Army Transportation School, Fort Eustis, Virginia

	67	Jan	68	Division Transportation Officer, 3d Infantry Division, Wurzburg, Federal Republic of Germany
	68	Jul	68	Secretary of the General Staff, Headquarters, 3d Infantry Division, Wurzburg, Federal Republic of Germany
Jul	69	Jan	70	Division Transportation Officer, Americal Division, Republic of Vietnam
	70	Jul	70	Chief Movements Division, Headquarters, 1 st Logistical Command, Republic of Vietnam
Jul	70	Jun	72	Instructor, Course Director, Department Chairman, Defense Depot Operations Management Course, Army Logistics Management Center, Fort Lee, Virginia
Jun	72	Jun	74	Operations Research Analyst, Office of the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, Washington, D.C.
	74	Jan	76	Commander, 29 th Transportation Battalion, Fort Campbell, Kentucky
Jan	76	Jul	76	Assistant Chief of Staff, G4, 101 st Airborne Division (Air Assault), Fort Campbell, Kentucky
	76	Jul	77	Student, Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island
	77	Aug	79	Commander, United States Army Materiel Support Center, Korea
	79	Oct	81	Director for Plans, Doctrine, and Systems, United States Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, Alexandria, Virginia
	81	Jun	82	Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation, United States Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, Alexandria, Virginia
	82	May	84	Commanding General, 19 th Support Command, Eighth United States Army
	84	Aug	85	Director of Management, Office of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, Washington, D.C.

PROMOTIONS

DATES OF APPOINTMENT

	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>
2LT	30 Jan 60	15 Feb 60
1LT	15 Aug 61	15 Feb 63
CPT	29 Nov 63	15 Feb 67
MAJ	7 Apr 67	15 Feb 74
LTC	8 May 72	15 Feb 81
COL	1 Sep 76	
BG		1 Aug 82
MG		1 Jul 86

US DECORATIONS AND BADGES:

Legion of Merit

Bronze Star (with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters)

Meritorious Service Medal (with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters)

Air Medals

Army Commendation Medal (with 3 Oak Leaf Clusters)

Parachutist Badge

SOURCE OF COMMISSION: ROTC

SUMMARY OF JOINT ASSIGNMENTS: None

As of 15 December 1986



This is the End-of-Tour Oral History Interview with Major General Fred E. Elam of the U.S. Transportation Center, Fort Eustis, Virginia, on 6 April 1988, by the Command Historian, Carl F. Cannon, Jr. General Elam is Commanding General, Commandant of the U.S. Army Transportation and Aviation Schools, Chief of Transportation, and Regimental Commander.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, I should like to start by setting the context for your tenure. When was your assignment? What was your assignment prior to coming to Fort Eustis? And what is your next assignment, sir?

MG Elam: Prior to coming to Fort Eustis, I was the Director for Management in the Office of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I had been in that position for approximately one year. And then, of course, coming here to assume command on 9 August 1985. My next assignment is as the Chief of the Joint United States Military Mission for Aid to Turkey, with my headquarters being in Ankara, Turkey.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, in your position here, you wear a number of hats. Taking each responsibility separately, what have been the major accomplishments and major problems during your tenure as Commandant of the Transportation and Aviation Logistics Schools? You might tell us about the "why" of what you did, focusing on four of these topics: (a) the education of Transportation officers and NCOs [Noncommissioned Officers], (b) the doctrine and doctrinal literature developments, (c) weapons and equipment development, (d) and organizational development, sir.

MG Elam: Okay, thank you. Let me, Carl, first begin by saying that fortunately during my tenure, we've created two more schools here at Fort Eustis. We've created the Noncommissioned Officers Academy. And we have created the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center. So I'm really now the Commandant of three schools: (a) The Transportation School, (b) The Aviation Logistics School, (c) and the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center. I am not the Commandant of the Noncommissioned Officers Academy. We have a command sergeant major who is the Commandant for that Academy. Now, then focusing in on, if you will, the "why," Carl, of what we did. I would say the major emphasis was to take training out of the classroom and put it in a tactical or field training environment. The purpose was to permit students to demonstrate their technical knowledge in a tactical environment. Now that was quite an enriching experience for Fort Eustis and the Transportation and Aviation Logistics Schools who had, when I arrived here in 1985, what I considered it to be sort of a white collar approach to training students. We then set about moving that instruction into a more tactical environment. It's important, I think, that you understand the "why" of that. If you look at aviation logisticians and transportation officers and NCOs in terms of where do they serve on the battlefield, you will find that they are everywhere. Transporters are involved and Aviation Logisticians are involved in deep operations, close operations, and rear operations. This means that they are where the enemy is. And so they must be prepared to do their mission while at the same time defending themselves against lightly-armed enemy forces. So it became very necessary, in my view, if our students were to understand Airland Battle doctrine, and to be able to operate units in an Airland Battle scenario, that they be able to do their mission in a very tactical environment. Not in a classroom sterile environment. And that's what we began. That was the "why." That was to stress the students in the academic

environment, if you will, so that they could begin to understand their capabilities and their limitations. So with the Transportation officers and NCOs as well as the aviation logistics soldiers, I'm happy to report that we [the Transportation Officers Advanced Course] now have a week long field training exercise. That field training exercise began in November 1986. For the first time in the 44 year history of the Transportation Corps, the Advanced Course has a field training exercise.

Mr. Cannon: Where is that, sir?

MG Elam: That field training exercise is conducted at one of two places: either Camp A.P. Hill here in Virginia or at Fort Eustis, depending on the availability of training sites and other factors. But it is a week long field training exercise. With respects to the doctrine and doctrinal literature developments, the thrust was clearly on moving our doctrine to support Airland Battle. I will tell you that our biggest doctrinal gap in the Transportation Corps has to do with movements control on the Airland battlefield. That is the piece that is broken the most, if you will, and has required the most of our work in really doing some innovative thinking about how do you organize that function in that task for Airland Battle. With respect to equipment development, I'm very happy to report that the Transportation School has been the most successful TRADOC [Training and Doctrine Command] school in the last three years in terms of getting equipment under contract. Some examples: in the Marine field, 4 LSVs [Landing Ship, Vehicle], 29 LCU [Landing Craft, Utility] 2,000s, and 2 large tugs. The largest modernization of the Army's marine fleet since the Korean War. In the common-use tactical wheeled vehicle arenas, the new series of 5-ton trucks, the 939A2s. The first time we've had a tactical truck with central tire inflation. Those trucks started rolling off the production line in March 1988. We have put requests for proposals to the trucking industry out recently. For example, the Heavy Equipment Transporter, the HET. The RFP [Request for Proposal] went out on the street on the 12th of February. The RFPs for the family of medium tactical vehicles, a new 2-1/2-ton and 5-ton class of vehicles. Those RFPs went on the street in April of 1988. So we've had some great success in modernizing the ground and water transportation portions of the Transportation Corps and the Army.

Mr. Cannon: I remember your requirement for us in the School to be number one in getting the first truck.

MG Elam: Yes!

Mr. Cannon: Did you succeed in doing that, sir?

MG Elam: Yes, we have. It's called the Basis of Issue Plans. And, Carl, you may recall that in 1985 when I asked to see the trucks for which I was the proponent, they were not at Fort Eustis. I found that out much to my chagrin. But we've turned that around. And so we have HEMTT [Heavy-Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck] trucks here. We have HMMWV [High Mobility Multi-Purpose Wheeled Vehicle]. We've got CUCV [Commercial Utility Cargo Vehicles] here. And just as importantly, our students are exposed to those vehicles so that when they go out into Army units, they see them. They know what their operating characteristics are. Our students drive those trucks. Now that was sort of a catch-up thing. Focusing on the future was to make sure that for each new type of truck, the Transportation School was in the Basis of Issue

Plan. So we got the first trucks off the assembly line.

Mr. Cannon: Excellent, sir. What about organizational developments?

MG Elam: With respect to the Transportation Corps and its units, the biggest change we've made is to authorize tactical design trucks in transportation truck units that operate forward in the Corps. Today's are. The former organizations called for commercial design trucks called 915s. They simply would not perform the cross-country Airland Battle mission that our new doctrine requires. So they were being replaced by a tactical design truck called the 939s.

Mr. Cannon: They wouldn't perform off the road?

MG Elam: They would not perform off the road

Mr. Cannon: Is there anything else in the organizational development that you can think of?

MG Elam: Let me just say that the creation of another school, the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center, has been a major organizational change, breaking that training out from the Transportation School in order to give it better focus and improve visibility and also to make it a jointly-manned staff school.

Mr. Cannon: Yes, sir. Later during the training portion, I should like to have you comment about the NCO Academy and the warrant officers. Sir, what is your view as your role as Branch Chief, Chief of Transportation, and what have you accomplished during your tenure? What remains to be done? You might again tell us about the "why's" of those.

MG Elam: First of all, from a historical point-of-view, it's important to note that I am the first Chief of Transportation since about 1962 [Sic]. Secondly, I am the first Chief of Transportation to reside at Fort Eustis. The previous chiefs always were in the Pentagon as part of the DA [Department of the Army] staff. And having set that piece of the records straight, historically, I would say that its been a bulley pulpit. I have thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to be the Branch Chief, to be the Chief of Transportation. Outside the confines of Fort Eustis, I will tell you that in the total Army, as I go out and represent the Corps in front of civic groups, as I go out to National Guard and Reserve units, that the title Chief of Transportation is the one that carries the most meaning and the most import to people, particularly in the civilian communities. You know, Commandant of Schools, and Center Commander and all that, do not have to the civilian community the same degree of importance as Chief of Transportation.

Mr. Cannon: Ninety feathers, sir, instead of one.

MG Elam: In terms of what I have been able to accomplish, I would say with a lot of good help from lot of people, we successfully accomplished, first of all, the establishment of the Transportation Regiment in July 1986. We were able to get the Department of the Army approval for a professional branch publication called the Transportation Corps Professional Bulletin. We've been able to put together a master plan for the Transportation Corps which gives us

an azimuth for the future and at least it serves as a point around which transporters can look and see about the future in terms of equipment, organization, doctrine, and so forth. We have accomplished a functional area assessment [FAA] for the Transportation Corps using the auspices of the Office of the Chief of Transportation. We've also looked at and increased the number of graduate degree positions, AERB [Army Educational Requirements Board] positions. So there have been some positive things, I think, that we have been able to accomplish. We have changed all of the MOSs [Military Occupational Specialty] rather than Transporters being strung out as 51s, and 71s, and 64s, and 61s, and all that. Now all of our Transporters are 88s. I think the potential is to develop an even better sense of cohesion and belonging, Carl. A shorthand way of saying "I'm a Transporter" is to say "I'm an 88."

Mr. Cannon: I think that we are going to talk maybe a little more about the Regiment. Has that been successful, sir, the Regiment?

MG Elam: I'd say that it's too early to tell. I think what limited success we've enjoyed has been bigger or better in the active force than in the Reserve and National Guard, which gives me cause for concern because two-thirds of the Corps is in the Reserve and National Guard. I think that there is a tremendous potential for making people feel proud of being a part of an organization with some lineage and history about it, that is larger than them and their individual units. The rite of passage says that if you are an officer, unless you can successfully complete the basic course, you can't be a member of the Regiment. Or if you're an enlisted soldier, unless you successfully complete advanced individual training, you can't be a member of the Regiment. I think that those are some positive things. But in all candor, I would say that the School is sort of still out in terms of its success.

Mr. Cannon: All the parts are still are in place now, aren't they, sir?

MG Elam: All the parts are in place. All the redesignations, unit redesignations have been done.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, what were the chief challenges, and the accomplishments, and the problems in the training area as your being Center commander?

MG Elam: Challenges had to do with standards, making sure that we had high standards because we are getting smarter soldiers in. And making sure those standards challenge soldiers. I think that we have put many of those in place. Problems had to do with, first of all, insuring that we had the right cadre here. That we had a talented cadre here. Bringing in talented people. I'm proud to tell you that this summer, 1988, we have eight Transportation Corps lieutenant colonels leaving en route to War College.

Mr. Cannon: That's excellent, sir

MG Elam: And an additional two of them are leaving to go to command battalions. And none of them have been here longer than the summer of 1986 - two years.

Mr. Cannon: Just two years.

MG Elam: So we have found the talent, we have brought the talent in, and we've given them mission type orders. They've done very well and now they are leaving. And, of course, right behind them, we're bringing in equally talented people. So we needed talented people and we've brought them in and that was a great challenge. A great challenge because people did not perceive the service that Fort Eustis was very enhancing.

Mr. Cannon: You might comment on your development of the training areas, sir.

MG Elam: There was a perception, Carl, that Fort Eustis was a small post and we did not have enough area to go out and train. Being an old guy from Oklahoma, who also used to work for the Forest Service when I was in college, I went around and tramped in the woods. And I found out that there were plenty of areas that could be used with very little effort in terms of road construction and bridge construction. So we have doubled the amount of acreage in our outdoor training areas at Fort Eustis and that amounted to an additional 600 acres of land for training. It's being used now as people now understand better how to do that.

Mr. Cannon: What about the use of Fort Story, sir, as a training area?

MG Elam: Fort Story has really come a long way. We have invested in new classrooms. We have invested in a new outdoor training area for the rough terrain container handler. We have new permanent barracks for our students. We use Fort Story as the billeting site when we take students and train them on the fast sealift ship that is berthed at Norfolk. We have increased the training at Fort Story for AITs [Advanced Individual Training] to the extent that it became necessary to organize an AIT company at Fort Story, which we have done in the Company. And to the extent that we have assigned now permanent drill instructors at Fort Story for the first time. So we have really expanded the use of Fort Story. It's a potential there that was bound to be used.

Mr. Cannon: It really ties in with the next question, sir. As Installation Commander, what were the major accomplishments and major problems of the installation during your time here? And you might comment both on Fort Eustis and Fort Story.

MG Elam: Well, I guess the first point I'd like to make to you is that I tried very diligently to let the chief of staff at Fort Eustis be the garrison commander at Fort Eustis. And let the garrison commander at Fort Story be the garrison commander at Story. I felt that it was my mission in life to support those two colonels the best way I knew how in terms of allocation of resources. At Fort Eustis, we have continued to invest - probably well in excess of six million dollars - in new Morale Welfare Recreation facilities in the last three years. We've already mentioned the new training areas. We have also constructed an additional 75 classrooms for the Transportation and Aviation Logistics Schools. We have rail training facilities since we brought rail training back to Fort Eustis. We have invested in the purchase of central air conditioning for our AIT barracks, a major step forward. So we've made some improvements not only in the quality of life, but in the training opportunities that are here at Fort Eustis. The same thing goes for Fort Story. At Fort Story, we've opened up about 35 million dollars in new facilities. And some of those are training facilities. Others are focused on

barracks, maintenance facilities, new gym, bowling centers, and so forth. So I guess in sum, in substance, we have concentrated our efforts and focused-in on quality of life, things for soldiers and their families, and for increased training opportunities.

Mr. Cannon: Do you have some things that have been accomplished that are coming up after you leave, sir?

MG Elam: Well, I do. There's one good example in the Haglund Crane Training Facility at Third Port which will be on-line by early fall. Another one is the training vessel McHenry which is replacing the old Sutton and will be coming here probably at the latter part of the summer. The Transportation School will get the Runnymede, which is the first LCU 2000-Class vessel. It will come here for training of LCU crews. We're continuing the expansion of the Goodman Road Rail Training Facility. So there are some things that are ongoing now that will finish up by fall, as we work to expand our opportunities for training.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, the questions so far have dealt with horizontal command and control. The next questions will focus on the vertical. What is your view of how well the present organizational structure works, that is, the Center/School to the Integrating Center at Fort Lee, to Headquarters TRADOC, to DA?

MG Elam: Well, if you're sitting in my position, you really look about three different ways. First of all, I have a command relationship with Forces Command because I'm a Forces Command commander with the 7th Transportation Group Terminal here. Then, with respect to TRADOC, my resources in terms of people and dollars come directly from the Headquarters, TRADOC. And so when I look at for resources, when I look for NWR [Nuclear Weapons Report] kinds of things, I look for logistics of personnel. In other words, sort of the post staff operations that's directly the Headquarters, TRADOC. When I'm looking toward NCO Training, officer training, looking toward doctrine, combat developments, that's the Integrating Center (called the Log Center) at Fort Lee. So, the Commander's focus here and that of his staff is really in three different directions depending on the action at the time and the question being asked.

Mr. Cannon: Are there other similar relationships, for example, in the Transportation Command or with other groups that we might like to know about?

MG Elam: I would say that there is an informal relationship developing with the United States Transportation Command, the new unified command headquartered at Scott [Air Force Base]. That is an embryonic relationship now. It's one that I have tried to foster because I would like to be the trainer for the TRANSCOM [Transportation Command] and I think that the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center is that vehicle. So, yes, there's an embryonic relationship going. We've made no secret about that and General Thurman and General Tuttle know about that. And we've been trying to work that.

Mr. Cannon: Any connection with the Joint aspect of command?

MG Elam: Well, there would be, in the sense that we have TRADOC's support in

a paper that we've sent forward saying that we should like to be the proponent for all of the Joint Strategic Deployment doctrine. So, yes, we have worked that and I'm hopeful that that joint doctrinal responsibility will soon rest at Fort Eustis.

Mr. Cannon: Specifically, sir, when talking about the organizational structure and how it works, how well has the relationship worked between this organization and the Integrating Center and this organization in TRADOC Headquarters and this organization in Headquarters, DA?

MG Elam: I'm satisfied. I'm generally pleased with the the lack of conflicting guidance in those cases where we felt that there was a conflict in guidance between the Integrating Center and Headquarters, TRADOC. Those were fairly easy to work out and I cannot recall a single instance where I had to get involved in terms of deconflicting, if you will, guidance and priorities between Headquarters, TRADOC and the Integrating Center. I would not suggest, by the way, that the Integrating Center be the single funnel of everything coming out of TRADOC Headquarters. I think the Integrating Center can stay small and lean and concentrate its efforts in the doctrine, organization, combat developments than Headquarters. Let TRADOC continue to deal directly with commandants on engineering matters and NWR matters and funding matters, that sort of thing.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, the next is a three-part question and I want to ask you about the first part, sir, about support for your combat developments responsibilities. How valuable has the TRADOC test apparatus been?

MG. Elam: For us at TRADOC, at Fort Eustis, we've had mixed results on the test apparatus. Quite frankly, it's a cumbersome thing. It takes a long time to get your test scheduled through that mechanism using Forces Command troops, generally. I would tell you that I've thought a great deal about how I would simplify it. And quite frankly, I know of no way, by its very nature in terms of trying to ensure that we can answer our congressional critics. Quite frankly, I don't know how I would correct the testing piece, in order to make it more simple or more responsive to the needs of Commandants like myself. I understand the need for the complexity given our congressional critics, people who look for any small loopholes in the test plan in order to shoot down a particular new weapons acquisition. The DIVAD [Division Air Defense] is a very good example of all that and AQUILA [RPV-remotely piloted vehicle] is coming along hard on it's heels. Just to say that, I think probably the best thing to do is to take a few selected civilians in each school and really make them experts at designing tests to answer critics. And I don't think that generally the military folks stay in that business long enough to do that. But I think that our Department of the Army civilians could do that and perhaps that's the only thing I can suggest.

Mr. Cannon: Because that's perhaps a weakness in the past? I know that we've had the structure in place and everything.

MG Elam: Well, we've become too defensive about our systems, you know, particularly at this sort of level, and we don't want to. We will not brook any criticism. Well, you are going to get the criticism, so you might as well do it among friends.

Mr. Cannon: Sir, I went through a lot of things trying to determine what you did do during your tenure from 1985 to 1988. You have seen a great many projects in DA, from TRADOC, from Fort Lee, from Fort Eustis, and from the Schools. From the transportation specialist point of view, could you give us some of your views on these following things: How do you see the School's role in the Army of Excellence?

MG Elam: The School is the developer of the doctrine which then drives organization and equipment and which then drives training in the manning of the force. With respect to the Army of Excellence [AOE], we are able to increase the productivity of our units, hence scaling them down in accordance with AOE objectives. If we are able to be imaginative enough in the equipment that we design, the organizational procedures would follow. Therefore, the Schools in my view, play the pivotal role. They ultimately train the people who must operate the equipment and form the organizations that are the Army of Excellence. When you consider the fact that we have cut out a lot of the supervisory structure in AOE, it means that at the lower ranks we are hunting a much greater dependence on their technical and tactical skills than we ever had before. That is because there may not be a sergeant around to supervise. Therefore, the Schools' role is magnified in importance.

Mr. Cannon: It is very supportive. In the same way, how do you see the School's role in the Army 21?

MG Elam: It is part of our mission to prepare for the Army of the future. We must try to be smart enough to discern through our somewhat cloudy crystal ball what the 21st century will bring in terms of: (1) national commitments, and (2) technology, war fighting, to support those national objectives. The School is very important in that because being a field commander for many years, you do not have the time nor the academic resources to think about the future. Therefore, I have been pleased to see some innovative thinking within the School, particularly, the role of the Transportation Corps in space and the Transporters on earth stations that send rockets up to space stations, Transporters in space, on space, and orbiting space stations. That has been a good piece of thought.

Mr. Cannon: In the same way, you have already commented on the Airland Battle. How do you use it to teach the Transportation Corps role in that?

MG Elam: I find it very interesting. If you go to the basic tenant of Airland Battle, that tenant is mobility. Transportation is mobility and mobility is what all the transportation is about. In particular, it is about movements control. As we have sorted our way through that, we have discovered that we did not have the right kind of cross-country mobility in our trucks. With that discovery, we have gone to the M939A2 series with a central tire inflation system. In April of 1988, the first of those new trucks is rolling off the production line. As I may have mentioned earlier, the family of Medium Tactical Vehicles will have significantly increased cross-country capability along with the Palletized Load System. That lets us provide the mobility piece in Airland Battle.

Mr. Cannon: That really ties in with what you are talking about in one of your articles that mentioned something to the effect that probably Transporters will not be fighting but you were training them to be doing that

so the Airland Battle can be fought. Locally, sir, there have been a great many new and innovative organizations both at Fort Eustis and Fort Story, and projects. I went through and listed a group of them and I thought perhaps you might comment on them. For example, is the Noncommissioned Officers Academy on track? How do you see it? How do you see it's future?

MG Elam: The Noncommissioned Officers Academy teaches BNCOC [Basic Noncommissioned Officers Course] and ANCOG [Advanced noncommissioned Officers course] in both transportation and aviation logistics skills, commencing with the creation of the Academy in January 1987. For the first time in the history of the Corps, the noncommissioned officers at the BNCOC level were all trained at the same place, at Fort Eustis. At both the BNCOC and ANCOG level, we have set aside barracks so that the noncommissioned officers live in the barracks. They are rotated through leadership positions while they are learning their technical skills. It is no longer a college atmosphere. It is an atmosphere filled full of stress in order to make sure we have the right kind of noncommissioned officer/leaders on the Airland battlefield in both transportation as well as aviation logistics. In the future, I have insured that the Noncommissioned Officers Academy was fully funded even in the face of the funding cuts that we have had. I will commend to my successor that he continue that commitment. I believe that it is essential that the noncommissioned officer education system, expressed as BNCOC and ANCOG in the NCO Academy, be supported by the officer chain-of-command in the funding arena. It's future I think, therefore, is bright. We will, ultimately and hopefully, secure through Congress the monies we need to build a brand new campus for the NCO Academy here. It will have the classrooms, the associated dining facilities, and barracks all in one independent complex.

Mr. Cannon: The Center for Strategic Deployment was created during your time on watch.

MG Elam: Yes, it was.

Mr. Cannon: How do you see its role and its future?

MG Elam: I see that its role is becoming increasingly important. As you look at the importance of conventional forces, particularly if the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty [INF Treaty] is supported by the U.S. Senate, its importance will improve or increase. Therefore, getting them there is that more important. I believe that the Transportation Center here is unique among all the services in that it offers a center for expertise in strategic deployment. It fulfills, in my view, a void that was there. Therefore, I see its future in both the Army as well as the joint community as being very healthy. I predict if one were to visit here in 1990, you will see a bigger, and stronger school in the joint arena. There will be lots of students doing important things for national defense.

Mr. Cannon: Another thing that fell during your tenure was the creation of the Regiment. You've already talked about that but has the Regiment accomplished what the Army and the Corps expected, and what do you see down the road for the Regiment?

MG Elam: No. The Regiment has not yet accomplished what I believe that its promise was. Its promise was to improve the cohesion of the Corps, and to

improve people's pride in belonging to the Corps. In that regard, I think that there is a piece of work still to be done. I would tell you that the piece of work still to be done is in the Reserve Components. I think, in the active force, since 1986, that a sense of belonging, the wearing of the Regimental crest, as I say, the redesignation of all the TRADOC units so that when a soldier comes in the Army as a Transporter, he is part of the Transportation Battalion, I think those have been very positive. I will tell you that in the Reserve Components, we still have some opportunities to improve the meaning of the Regiment and its usefulness as in building a team. Has it fulfilled its promise? No. The promise is still there to be fulfilled.

Mr. Cannon: I know that this is down the road, but one of the great changes at Fort Eustis and Fort Story has been in the area of your automation initiatives: computer labs, the inclusion of POIs [Program of Instruction], and other things. Would you please tell us about these and what the future changes you see in the Transportation Corps in the automation/information area?

MG Elam: I believe that the future of the Corps hinges solidly in the movements arena on the exploitation of automation. I believe that given the current and projected shortages of strategic sealift, strategic air, the current projected shortages of intra theater air, once you get to an operational area, [we must] demand that we do an even better job of allocating transportation resources than we have in the past. I think that only can come through as a result of automation. The rapidness with which one moves about the Airland battlefield also argues for Transporters with lap-top computers linked with good communications to make quick decisions.

Mr. Cannon: Another area that we talked about already has been training. Would you like to comment on the two major changes that you have accomplished since you been here: (1) the beefing up of the TC field training exercises and (2) the upgrading of the training areas?

MG Elam: Let me just say that when I came here in 1985, I believed that one of the training shortfalls for the Transportation and Aviation Logistics was that soldiers were not exposed to realistic field conditions as they trained here in AIT, in the Basic Officers Course, and in the Advanced Officers Course. I set about a procedure to move, as much as possible, the training into the field. I was immediately confronted by those who said that we do not have any training areas here. At the risk of sounding pedantic, I got out and walked the terrain at Fort Eustis. I discovered, literally, hundreds of acres.

Mr. Cannon: It was six hundred I think somebody said.

MG Elam: Yes. There were over six hundred acres of training area that were not being used. They could be used with a minimal investment of some road grading, and in one instance, rebuilding the bridge in the training area 1490. We built a bridge across Bailey's Creek out here in order to shorten the walking distance from one training area to 3d Port. We did all that and we created those opportunities for training which we can now exploit in the School. There was another thing that we did which probably is important in terms of the why. For the Transportation School, the Aviation Logistics School, and the NCO Academy, we have designated training areas for their exclusive use. Now what that has done, it has given them a pride in ownership. If you go to those training areas, you see the noncommissioned

officer instructors and the Department of the Army civilian instructors. Each time they have a class come out, we will do a little bit of improvement here. Maybe they would fill ten sandbags this time, spread some gravel this time, or trim a tree limb this time. They are improving the primitive training areas so that we are getting even better training because of that sense of ownership.

Mr. Cannon: One of the questions that DA asked was about the problems and challenges. They asked what do you see as systemic, that is, resulting from the way that the Army as a whole runs. What are your problems and your challenges? Do you have any idea about how these problems and challenges could be addressed?

MG Elam: I will go back to my days as Director of Management. I was given a mission by the current TRADOC commander when he was the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army to develop a course of instruction for generals and SESers called "How the Army Runs." I would tell you simply that we need to teach more people in the Army how it runs. We have a lot of people who understand maybe the personnel piece of the system, the training piece, and perhaps even the logistics piece. But they do not understand how all these systems interrelate and how a decision made in one system can have sometimes very adverse effects in another. As you become, in my role, as the Chief of Transportation and as the Commandant of a couple of schools charged with fighting unit organizations together, you have to, in doing that, deal with what I call the system of systems in the Army. Putting together a TO&E [Table of Organization and Equipment] involves logistics. It involves recruiting and training to get the right people to fill the units in personnel policies. You find that even the best of your officers who are working in combat development, working on TO&Es, or whatever, do not know how the Army runs. I have spent a considerable amount of time in mentioning and teaching people how the Army runs so they can do their job better because they would brief me and they would be very frustrated. They had been stopped by the bureaucracy and they didn't know enough about how the Army ran to overcome that. If I had to say anything about that, I would say that the Army's complexity lends itself to narrow-minded bureaucrats who can very effectively stop progress because no one knows how to go around it.

Mr. Cannon: Probably the same thing is in industry as well, sir.

MG Elam: I wouldn't quarrel with that

Mr. Cannon: Sir, the Center of Military History and TRADOC Headquarters poses eleven core questions and they are really short answers for many of them. For example, do you feel that you were properly prepared for your position when you came? How might you have been better prepared?

MG Elam: I feel that my background in command, both in peace and in war, and my staff experiences, Headquarters DA, and AMC [Army Materiel Command], properly prepared me to come here. How might I have been better prepared? I would suggest maybe a previous assignment in TRADOC somewhere to learn the language. But I don't think that it is essential.

Mr. Cannon: That really ties in the second question, which is, what guidance did you receive at the beginning of your tour and were you charged with

accomplishing specific objective?

MG Elam: The guidance I had was to prepare the Transportation Corps to go to war now and in the future. That guidance came from General [John A.] Wickham, Jr. There was another subordinate set of objectives having to do with the quality of life at Fort Eustis and Fort Story, to change attitudes about an assignment here, how people felt about an assignment here, and how they felt - let me call it instinctively - to change the command climate. It was one of the challenges that I was given by the leadership of the Army.

Mr. Cannon: That really ties in with your personal philosophy of leadership, command, and management. Could you describe those three things?

MG Elam: I would say maximum decentralization. I have decentralized everything that I could by law to the garrison commanders, to the commander of Story and here, as well as the colonel-level commanders of units. The second piece of that, in terms of command, is to try to create an environment where people enjoy being in command or being in charge, and give people the authority commensurate with their responsibilities. I would say, lastly, and this is not frivolous, is to create a command climate where I am not the only one having fun.

Mr. Cannon: I thought that you were going to say that, sir. That's the very thing I remembered in the beginning about you. What was the greatest challenge you faced during your tenure here?

MG Elam: The morale of the Transportation Corps, as a whole, was low when I got here. That was created because the aviation logisticians, so long a part of the Corps, had been removed from the Corps in 1983, and made a part of the Aviation Branch. The Transporters (enlisted, warrant, and commissioned) were questioning whether or not the Corps would be around much longer, and what was the role of the Corps. I would say the morale of the Corps was the greatest challenge that I faced in restoring confidence in the Corps, the Corps that has a future in all of those things.

Mr. Cannon: Another question that was asked, sir, was what is your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of your subordinates? What measures did you take to correct any deficiencies that you might observe? I am talking about people such as senior officers and junior officers and civilians.

MG Elam: I would say that the majority of the shortcomings that I noted were situational. People were scared to death to make a decision. They lost their initiative. They lost their self-confidence. To be brutally honest with you, in some cases, those same people just could not respond and I moved them out. Some of them retired and some of them left. Others who could respond to a more open kind of leadership did so and did it very well. My greatest challenge was to demonstrate by my actions what I really meant. Words are cheap but I tried to demonstrate by my actions that I meant what I said that I wanted to decentralize authority and responsibility.

Mr. Cannon: You feel, then, that you have been successful in raising the level?

MG Elam: No question about it

Mr. Cannon: One of the questions the Army was interested in is to what degree did you involve yourself directly with the civilian community and what was the nature of your contact?

MG Elam: The involvement has to do with everything from an annual community reception we had at our quarters, to periodic meetings with the mayors of both Newport News and Virginia Beach, as well as elected Representatives like Bateman, Tribble, at that level. We had informal contacts with businessmen through the Association of the United States Army, and AAAA [Army Aviation Association of America]. The nature of the contacts was both of a official nature as well as just a personal or social nature. We would see each other at various assorted functions.

Mr. Cannon: I think the question probably was posed as a general question because in a place like you are, you are surrounded by the community and cannot avoid it. Did you make any major changes in the organizational structure of the organization and if so, why?

MG Elam: We have already talked about the creation of two new schools since I have been here which I considered to be major organizational structural changes: the Noncommissioned Officers Academy and the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center. The other major change that I made was that I changed the rating schemes so that I rated the 8th Transportation Brigade commander directly rather than his being rated by the deputy commandant. That was an organizational change derived through a rating change. Another change that we made in the 8th Transportation Brigade was to organize new AIT companies. We have organized three new AIT companies, to include, for the first time, an AIT training company at Fort Story to take care of that important piece. As an aside, I might mention that we are organizing a new battalion headquarters for the 8th Transportation Brigade. That will come on line, the 765th, in July of this year. The post or garrison activities have left the organization pretty well alone.

Mr. Cannon: I only have four more questions. Could you describe the efforts undertaken to promote the Total Army Concept that was good for you?

MG Elam: First of all, two-thirds of the Transportation Corps is in Reserve Components. I made it a point to visit, quite frequently, the Transportation Corps units in Reserve, and the National Guards scattered throughout the Continental United States. Secondly, we sat up a special update message that once a month goes to all the Transportation Reserve and National Guard units in the total Army telling them what is going on in the Corps. Thirdly, at the Worldwide Transportation Corps Conference, invitees are brought in from the Reserve and National Guard units and we, at all levels, look at their problems and work them. We have done a great deal of work through the Office of the Chief of Transportation which is sort of the focal point for that to involve the Total Army.

Mr. Cannon: The next question I find very humorous because DA would like for you to describe your typical day's activities as the Commander/Commandant/Chief of Transportation. I have read your personal calendar. I find the answer difficult. Every day is different, is it not, sir?

MG Elam: Every day is different in terms of my own personal calendar. I

would say that I start out my morning at 0600 with a run either with my aide or with the unit and my calendar often goes to 10 or 11 at night depending on some social function, unit function that I go to. Now how do I allocate my time? I try to allocate my office time to those instances where I need to have briefings and face-to-face contact with individuals. What I have found through many years of command to be most productive for me is to do my paperwork at home at night away from the office so that those vital person-to-person communications, links to briefings, one-on-ones, whatever, I can do in the office during normal work hours. Then the paperwork, which requires some thought, some time, I can do it at night at home. That works best for me.

Mr. Cannon: Do you find time at home with the phone not ringing and nobody coming in?

MG Elam: I do.

Mr. Cannon: Was there one area, and you have described several, in which you didn't make the progress that you had hoped for, and if so, to what did you attribute this? I do not want to call it a failure, but a lack of progress?

MG Elam: Yes. Let me give you two. Number one is that I spent a great deal of personal effort and time trying to get agreement with the city of Newport News to get a second entrance for Fort Eustis. I utterly failed in that effort. I utterly failed because I could not get agreement with them to give us the necessary land easements through the Oakland Plantation. That is a serious matter of concern and that's why I say I spent a lot of time on it and failed. Looking at the broader, beyond Fort Eustis and Fort Story, contact in terms of the Corps, I would say that I have not been successful in bringing the intuition, the movements control, the doctrine, the organization, the training, and the structure that's needed for the Airland battlefield. Why did we not get that done? Quite frankly, there were other, more pressing things that needed fixing and I've alluded to the field training, the NCO Academy, the Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center, the combat developments piece for the PLS [Palletized Loading System], the FMTV [family of Medium Tactical Vehicles], and the Marine fleet. You spend a lot of time on all of those and we are just now really getting in the movements control, but that's something I wish I could have done, finished.

Mr. Cannon: That is pretty good. This is the last question. What do you see as the greatest challenge facing your successor? Do you have any recommendations as to how that challenge might be addressed?

MG Elam: Yes. His greatest challenge in my view will be to maintain the important initiatives of training Airland Battle leaders which I shall define as BNCOC, ANCO, the Basic Officer Course for Transportation, the Advanced Officers Course, and the Aviation Maintenance Officers Course here. To maintain those training initiatives in an era of reduced resources, in my view, the way my successor can best meet that challenge is by taking resources away from functional courses and from AIT in order that the Airland Battle leaders are trained. To do otherwise, I think, sacrifices that very necessary combat leadership that is needed by both transportation and aviation logistics units.

Mr. Cannon: Do you have anything else you want to comment about? General [Maxwell D.] Thurmond is interested in the future for us in our annual historical reviews to talk about training, combat developments, doctrine and leadership. As a matter of fact, he has asked us to streamline our reports to cover those and then in your last end-of-the-year report, you covered precisely those topics. Do you have anything that you would have added to your last end-of-the-year report in those areas that not already covered? This is not really for the interim. This is for the historian.

MG Elam: I would say that in our training, we need to do a better job of emphasizing to our officers that when you are given command of anything, that is stewardship, not ownership. And that you really only leave two long-term legacies when you are commander. You leave a legacy in people. I tell Company commanders [that] and I always ask them: "Do you remember your first Company commander?" Everybody raises their hand. They do. And I remind those Company commanders that they are going to leave a thirty-year legacy or more in the Army or somewhere with the young privates. And not only that, but with the second lieutenants. And they have to choose what kind of legacy they want to leave.

Mr. Cannon: Jim Shepard speaks to that when he talks to the TOAC classes about what is the record that you are going to leave and the sorts of material the you will leave behind?

MG Elam: And you leave it behind in people in the sense of you sort of help them develop a set of values or you turn them on or turn them off to service to the nation, whatever. I think this. So, the first legacy is people. The second legacy has to do with facilities. Most Army officers don't spend enough time learning how to acquire new or improved facilities. I found in the last decade as I have been a colonel-level commander, brigadier general-level, now major general, that officers are just really deficient when it comes to understanding how to get MCA [Movement Control Agency] projects, NWR projects, OMA [Operations and Maintenance, Army] upgrades, and so forth. And so as a result, they don't leave a very good legacy of facilities.

Mr. Cannon: Do you think the better commanders, the best commanders are fully aware of those sorts of things?

MG Elam: I do. I really do. Lot of people opted out in saying, "Gee whiz, not under my watch. I'm not going to do it." They're not very good commanders. So that's the couple of points on leadership.

Mr. Cannon: Do you have anything else that you would talk about? You talked lightly about doctrine. I'm not sure what General Thurman's interest is in the doctrine area.

MG Elam: Well, I think that his challenge to us is to constantly ask the question, "Is the doctrine current? Does the doctrine properly address the threat, and our capabilities with weapons systems, and our capabilities with people?" We might have had a two-and-a-half mile per hour doctrine a few years ago. Now it's about a hundred clicks-per-hour doctrine. Our soldiers are in better shape physically, and intellectually they're better. The threat keeps changing. So I think it's good that we constantly say, "Is the doctrine working?" For example, you know Airland Battle doctrine may not be correct

five years from now. You know as we get smarter about what and how we ought to react to something, I think that's especially disasterous.

Mr. Cannon: You mentioned earlier in one part of your interview about our Transporters not only being transporters, but also being part of the battle.

MG Elam: Yes. I think we're doing that. We have secured approval for the first time in the history of the Corps to have radios down to truck squad leader level. We've only had radios down to platoon level. That as we have seen this new thing, we have increased the number of automatic weapons and increased communications. We're trying to meet that more sophisticated threat. I have asked industry to develop for me an armored truck. And I asked them to give me a truck where I could maybe have slots in doors and things like that and I can slip the armor in and out. So if the truck were in a situation where it might not be within the firing range of Russian artillery or whatever, I wouldn't have to haul around all that weight. You know I would leave that at the trailer transfer point or whatever.

Mr. Cannon: Multipurpose.

MG Elam: Multipurpose. But then if the threat is there or we're going into deep operations or whatever, I would slip the armor in.

Mr. Cannon: You could have used those in Vietnam.

MG Elam: Yes.

Mr. Cannon: How valuable has the TRADOC analysis apparatus been?

MG Elam: The TRADOC analysis apparatus is running a bit wild, in my opinion now, particularly with respect to a new innovation called an abbreviated analysis. This so-called abbreviated analysis is, in one case, for an item that we have in the Aviation Logistics School called a Unit Material Aircraft Recovery System [UMARS]. This abbreviated analysis is running over one hundred pages. It is not being useful to us and I think that needs to be fixed.

Mr. Cannon: Could you suggest how these support functions might be improved?

MG Elam: Yes. I think we should give the analyst different performance objectives. We ought to give the analyst credit for brevity and speed rather than how many I's you dot or T's you cross and defining the problem to the 14th decimal place. It serves no one any useful purpose.

Mr. Cannon: I want to thank you for participating in the interview, sir, and your comments have been most helpful.

MG Elam: Thank you, Carl.

Mr. Cannon: Thank you, Sir.

MG Elam: I appreciate your coming over here.