

Letters

Dear Editor,

The decades-long debate regarding how to best employ mechanized-cavalry scout assets seems to have a fundamental flaw that is significantly impeding the establishment of doctrine and implementation for cavalry scouts and cavalry in general. This flaw is a result of trying to force cavalry functionality onto units that do not have a large speed and range advantage over the main body to which they are attached.

In the instance of the Bradley Cavalry Fighting Vehicle, current ground cavalry does not have a large speed and range superiority over the Abrams and Infantry Fighting Vehicle of typical main-body elements. Without a great mobility advantage, modern cavalry cannot perform traditional cavalry tasks.

Aviation assets do have the speed and mobility advantages. Aviation is the modern equivalent of historical cavalry.

Modern ground cavalry needs a faster “horse” before it can reach its potential. Maybe the Stryker vehicle, instead of being “upgunned,” should be lightened by reducing protection to small-arms-fire level and down-gunned even to the point of removing the turret entirely. Then this lighter vehicle could be given more fuel and more engine power. A six-vehicle platoon consisting of fast-moving scouts, mortar and command vehicles might be able to fill the role of modern ground cavalry. This might be greatly augmented by the new 155mm artillery now in development.

RETIRED 1LT JOHN HAZEL

Dear Editor,

As a unit trainer and post Army career trainer and training developer, I consider COL Stuart Smith’s article in the Winter 2019 issue of **ARMOR** an outstanding read. He got the business of unit training now and going forward exactly right. His discussion is accurate and to the point on planning and conducting effective mission to standard unit training that will produce deployment-ready units.

COL Smith’s comments on the use of vital resources the Army has developed and made available to support the training effort echoes work the Army team has been doing over the years to make mission-effective training possible. His comment on the Combined-Arms Training Strategy (CATS) was especially apropos and an echo of much hard work that occurred to create the resource for exactly the reasons emphasized in the article.

The essentially universal thought that underpinned the initial development of CATS by U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), the integration centers and the schools with real-time line-Army input at the time echoed in COL Smith’s words. As the lead at TRADOC headquarters for the Army team’s CATS effort, I can say that COL Smith is on target. The intent of CATS was to allow the commander and unit to flexibly, under almost any conditions, train to mission standard and critical readiness.

RETIRED LTC TOM ROZMAN

Past director, Collective Training Directorate
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Training, TRADOC

Acronym Quick-Scan

CATS – Combined-Arms Training Strategy

TRADOC – (U.S. Army) Training and Doctrine Command