THE GENERAL BOARD

United States Forces, European Theater

FUNCTIONAL OPERATIONS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL IN GROUND FORCE UNITS

MISSION: Prepare Report and Recommendations Pertaining to Functional Operations of Inspectors General in Ground Force Units.

The General Board was established by General Orders 128, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, US Army, dated 17 June 1945, as amended by General Orders 182, dated 7 August 1945 and General Orders 312 dated 20 November 1945, Headquarters United States Forces, European Theater, to prepare a factual analysis of the strategy, tactics, and administration employed by the United States forces in the European Theater.

File 333/2

Study Number 79

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
Part One: Mission, Duties and Organization	1
Chapter 1: Mission and Duties	1
Section 1: Mission	1
Section 2: Duties	2
Chapter 2: Organization	2
Part Two: Operations	4
Chapter 1: General	4
Section 1: General Scope and Type of Operations	4
Section 2: General Method of Operation	4
Chapter 2: Inspections	5
Section 1: Application of Army Regulations 20-10, Inspections	5
Section 2: Inspections during the period prior to combat	6
Section 3: Inspections during combat	7
Section 4: Inspections during rest periods	9
Section 5: Use of check lists	9
Section 6: Establishment of standards	11
Chapter 3: Investigations	12
Section 1: General	12
Section 2: Formal Investigations	12
Section 3: Informal Investigations	13
Section 4: Surveys, Studies and Inquiries	14
Chapter 4: Information and Advisory Services	14
Chapter 5: Non-functional Operations	15
Part Three: Conclusions and Recommendations	16
Chapter 1: Conclusions and Recommendations	16
Section 1: Conclusions	16
Section 2: Recommendations	17
Appendix	
Bibliography	

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

FUNCTIONAL OPERATIONS OF INSPECTORS GENERAL IN GROUND FORCE UNITS

Prepared by:

Colonel Nyal L. Adams, 0-7471, Chief, section in charge.

Lieutenant Colonel Richard A. Nott, 0-292244, Inspector General's Section.

Principal Consultants:

Lieutenant General L.R. Truscott, Jr., 0-7096, Commanding General, Fifth U.S. Army (Mediterranean Theater of Operations); Commanding General, VI Corps (European Theater of Operations).

Major General Walter M. Robertson, 0-3378, Commanding General, 2d Infantry Division.

Brigadier General Don E. Carleton, 0-15415, Chief of Staff, Fifth U.S. Army (Mediterranean Theater of Operations); Chief of Staff, VI Corps (European Theater of Operations).

Colonel Frank R. Ringland, 0-4572, Inspector General, 12th Army Group.

Colonel Robert H. Barrett, 0-3505, Inspector General, XV Corps.

Colonel Clarence C. Park, 0-7176, Inspector General, Third U.S. Army.

Colonel Cyril B. Spicer, 0-6202, Inspector General, XX Corps.

Lieutenant Colonel Leland F. Adair, 0-343952, Inspector General, XIX Corps.

Lieutenant Colonel Joseph W. Banton, 0-246385, Inspector General, 1st Infantry Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas A. Beaudry, 0-270008, Inspector General, 16th Armored Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Jesse E. Bishop, 0-222952, Inspector General, 106th Infantry Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Clarence O. Brunner, 0-236035, Inspector General, 4th Armored Division also 101st Airborne Division.

Lieutenant Colonel George M. Davis, 0-193961, Inspector General, 102d Infantry Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Cecil R. Hill, 0-243924, Inspector General, 12th Armored Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Clarence E. Johnson, 0-303693, Inspector General, 84th Infantry Division, Assistant Inspector General Ninth U.S. Army.

Lieutenant Colonel Harold G. McAdams, 0-147114, Inspector General, 8th Armored Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Louis L. Morse, 0-174546, Inspector General, 100th Infantry Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Lafayette J. Shurtleff, 0-193666, Inspector General, 9th Armored Division.

Lieutenant Colonel Duane M. Witt, 0-1283181, Inspector General, 70th Infantry Division.

Major Frank DiPietra, 0-1030235, Assistant Inspector General, 29th Infantry Division.

Major Miles G. Duwe, 0-367081, Assistant Inspector General, 5th Armored Division.

Principal Consultants (continued)

Major Herbert C. Hershey, Jr., 0-343406, Inspector General, 63d Infantry Division.
Major James R. Moss, 0-304558, Assistant Inspector General, 4th Armored Division, Inspector General, 4th Infantry Division.
Captain Frank H. Balfour, Jr., 0-422360, Assistant Inspector General, 84th Infantry Division.
Captain Robert J. McBain, 0-315745, Assistant Inspector General, 9th Armored Division.
Captain Clarence R. Pearson, 0-358775, Assistant Inspector General, 102d Infantry Division.
Captain William Allen Williams, 0-403292, Assistant Inspector General, 79th Infantry Division.
Chief Warrant Officer Fred H. Oeschger, W-2119804, Administrative Assistant, Inspector General's Section, 7th Armored Division.

(Note: The assignments shown are those held during the combat period).

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

FUNCTIONAL OPERATIONS OF INSPECTORS GENERAL IN GROUND FORCE UNITS

PART ONE

MISSION, DUTIES AND ORGANIZATION

CHAPTER 1

MISSION AND DUTIES

SECTION 1

MISSION

1. The mission of the Inspector General's Department as prescribed in paragraphs 1b (2) and (3) of Army Regulations 20-5, dated 27 May 1942 is:

> "to inquire into and report upon all matters which affect the efficiency and economy of the Army of the United States and to make such inspections, investigations, and reports as may be prescribed by law or directed by the Secretary of War, and by the Chief of Staff, or requested by the Commanding Generals of the Army Ground Forces, Army Air Forces and Services of Supply."

> "The Inspector General's Department assists commanders and other members and employees of the Military Establishment in the performance of their duties by supplying information when appropriate, recognizing and reporting meritorious conduct and performance of duty, and by suggesting ways and means to improve conditions."

2. The Sphere of Inquiry of the Inspector General's Department as outlined in paragraph 1c (1) of Army Regulations 20-5, dated 27 May 1942, includes:

> "* * * every branch of military affairs, except where specifically limited in Army Regulations or in orders. Inspectors General will exercise comprehensive and general observation over all that pertains to the efficiency and economy of the Army; the preparedness of the Army as an agency of National defense; the conduct, discipline, efficiency, living conditions, and morale of units and individuals; the condition and state of commands, posts, services, and installations, and of their arms, equipment, and other supplies; the economical, and efficient, and lawful expenditure of funds and property, including the purchase, receipt, storage and issue of property and the condition of accounts pertaining to funds and property. Inspectors

general will report their findings with strict impartiality, note specially meritorious performance of duty, and make recommendations for the correction of deficiencies and irregularities."

SECTION 2

DUTIES

3. The duties of unit inspectors general, as prescribed in paragraph 3b, Army Regulations 20-5, dated 27 May 1942, are as follows:

> "Inspectors General assigned to military commands are under the immediate direction and control of their respective commanders. In addition to the general duties prescribed in regulations they will make such inspections and investigations as their commanders may direct."

4. Inspectors General are designated as special staff officers by paragraph 20, FM 101-5, dated 19 August 1940, subject: "Staff Officers' Field Manual, The Staff and Combat Orders." Paragraph 21 of the cited Field Manual states, in part that:

> "The duties of the several special staff officers as listed in paragraphs 22 to 40, inclusive, are intended as a guide. The commander may and should adjust duties to meet operating conditions. In the performance of their duties, special staff sections are ordinarily subject to supervision and coordination by appropriate general staff sections. * * *"

5. The duties of inspectors general as listed in paragraph 36 of the cited Field Manual are:

> "a. Inspections and investigations as the commander may direct. For sphere of inquiry see Army Regulations 20-5, 20-10, 20-30, and 20-35.
>
> b. Inspection of all commands, units, systems, transportation, installations, accounts, and non-military agencies as required by the commander."

CHAPTER 2

ORGANIZATION

6. General supervision over all inspectors general in the ground forces was exercised by the Theater Inspector General. There being no Headquarters Army Ground Forces in the European Theater, the Theater Inspector General dealt primarily through the two Army Group Inspectors General (6th and 12th Army Group). Coming under this general supervision of the Army Group Inspectors General were the Army Inspectors General who, in turn, exercised general supervision over the Corps and Division Inspectors

General within their respective organizations.

7. Inspector General's Sections in armies, corps and divisions were organized in accordance with then current pertinent Tables of Organization and Equipment. The Army Group inspector general's sections were organized in accordance with an authorized allowance.

PART TWO

OPERATIONS

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL

SECTION 1

GENERAL SCOPE AND TYPE OF OPERATIONS

8. The operations of inspectors general of ground force units in the European Theater of Operations comprised (1) special inspections, either general or limited in scope including "spot" inspections, "checks" and "visits of observation", (2) investigations, including special studies, inquiries and surveys, (3) information and advisory service, and (4) non-functional operations, including membership on courts-martial and boards of officers, acting as commanding officer of the rear echelon, reviewing reports of survey, acting as unit claims officers, etc. Wide variation existed between units in the relative emphasis placed upon and the amount of time devoted to each of these four main categories of operations. While in a few units seventy-five percent or more of the time of the inspector general's section was spent on non-functional operations, on the average over the whole period covered by this report, the operations of the sections were about equally divided between inspections, investigations, information and advisory services, and non-functional operations.

SECTION 2

GENERAL METHOD OF OPERATION

9. Formal channels of operation: When inspectors general first arrived in the theater, many operated under the direct supervision of the assistant chief of staff, G-1 of their headquarters. As time went on many of these inspectors general found that they were more and more frequently making their reports directly to the commanding general. Because of this, in many units the channels of report were accordingly changed by specific direction of the commanding general and as of the close of the campaign, while a few inspectors general continued to report to the assistant chief of staff, G-1, a great majority of them were reporting directly to the chief of staff. The latter practice conforms to that followed in the War Department and in the Headquarters, European Theater of Operations.

10. Informal channels of operation: In all units, particularly during combat periods, inspectors general, while reporting to the chief of staff, worked informally very closely with the assistant chiefs of staff, G-1, and G-4, with other special staff officers, particularly the Adjutant General, Quartermaster, Surgeon and Ordnance officer, and with the regimental and separate battalion commanders. In many cases, based upon informal discussions with one or the other of these officers, the inspector general would make informal inquiries or checks into matters of supply, ration and clothing distribution, and other administrative matters, the results of which might or might not be reported to the

chief of staff.

11. Location of Inspector General's Section: In corps and higher headquarters, the inspector general's section was usually located with and operated from the rear echelon of the headquarters. In divisions, the headquarters was often divided into three echelons, (1) forward echelon, (2) rear echelon and (3) an administrative center (located in the rear of the "rear" echelon.) In divisions with three echelons, the inspector general's section was usually located with and operated from the "rear" or intermediate echelon. In a few divisions, it operated from the administrative center. In a number of divisions, particularly while involved in fast moving situations, the inspector general's section was divided, the inspector general and a stenographer remaining either with the forward or rear echelon and the assistant inspector general, the warrant officer and remaining two clerks staying with the administrative center. In those divisions which operated only two echelons of their headquarters, a forward and a rear, the inspector general's section usually remained with the rear echelon. However, in these divisions, also, it was often the practice to divide the inspector general's section between the two echelons when they were widely separated. In the campaign through Southern France, for example, division forward and rear echelons were frequently fifty to one hundred miles and occasionally during the early phases, two or three hundred miles apart. Other solutions to this problem were made. In some divisions, for example, the inspector general's section was located with the quartermaster or ordnance company, which was usually located between the forward and rear echelons. In still other divisions, the section was divided between the forward and the quartermaster or ordnance company, or three ways, between the forward, the quartermaster or ordnance company, and the rear or administrative center.

CHAPTER 2

INSPECTIONS

SECTION 1

APPLICATION OF ARMY REGULATIONS 20-10, INSPECTIONS

12. In May 1942 the Inspector General, Headquarters United States Forces in the British Isles, who later became Inspector General, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, had concluded, after a study of the situation in the theater, that it would be "practically out of the question and also highly undesirable to attempt to continue formal annual general inspections" prescribed by paragraph 1, Army Regulations 20-10, and recommended that they be discontinued. He further recommended that inspections be confined to the special inspections envisaged by paragraph 6, Army Regulations 20-10, contemplating that such special inspections might be either general or limited in scope as directed by the commander concerned but would include the inspection of the records of accounts of accountable disbursing officers twice annually at irregular intervals as required by paragraph 9, Army Regulations 20-10. These recommendations were concurred in by the Chief of Staff, United

States Forces in the British Isles, and by The Inspector General, Washington, D.C., and later approved by the Commanding General, European Theater of Operations and continued in effect in the theater throughout the period of combat operations.

SECTION 2

INSPECTIONS DURING THE PERIOD PRIOR TO COMBAT

13. Units in the theater (United Kingdom) six months or more before entering combat: These units were given complete general inspections before entering combat. Army and corps inspectors general confined their inspections to army and corps units and did not inspect divisions, the latter being inspected by their own staff inspectors general. Emphasis was placed upon preparation for the coming invasion.

14. Units in the theater less than six months before entering combat: These units had undergone extensive and intensive "preparation for overseas movement" ("POM") inspections immediately before departure from the United States for overseas, therefore, inspections overseas before entering combat were generally limited in scope and informal. When time was available, spot inspections of clothing and equipment were made. Show down inspections were not generally held. In a few instances, however, general inspections of minor commands were made. In one corps, for example, the corps inspector general made a general inspection of each corps unit in which command and technical inspections had disclosed generally unsatisfactory conditions. These were formal inspections and formal reports were made to the corps commander. In the units which came directly from the United States to France, or merely passed through the United Kingdom on the way to France, inspections were generally limited to informal inspections of bivouac areas for police and sanitation and the prevention of damage or looting. In many of these units, inspectors general were employed in checking the unloading of ships and the assemblage of equipment and supplies, and their distribution from the assembly areas to the units. In many cases this work amounted to more than checking or inspection and developed into general supervision of the work. Inspectors general were also employed during this period in checking motor convoys moving from the port to the assembly areas and later to the combat areas.

15. Type and Routing of Reports. In those units which were in the theater six months or more before combat, formal reports of inspection were made, routed through the commanding officer of the unit inspected to the commanding general. In the units which spent less than six months in the theater, reports, with few exceptions, were made verbally or by informal memorandum to the unit commander. Only major deficiencies and irregularities were reported to the chief of staff and this was done informally either verbally or by memorandum.

16. Use of Technical Specialists. Teams composed of officers from the ordnance, signal, medical services, and the Adjutant General's Section were used to a limited extent by inspectors general in those units which were in the theater for several months prior to entering combat. When

so used the teams were under the direction of an officer of the inspector general's section. In most other units inspectors general used the personnel of their own sections, only.

SECTION 3

INSPECTIONS DURING COMBAT

17. General: During the periods in which units were in combat, inspections of ground force units were generally informal, limited in scope and planned to be carried out in a manner to cause the least interference possible with the normal functioning of the units.

18. On the corps and higher levels, the inspections could be and were more comprehensive. In the case of service units, the inspections frequently approached the type of general inspections except that the troops were seldom if ever inspected in ranks or required to be present, away from their duties. These inspections, although generally informal in character, were often scheduled periodically and announced beforehand to the unit commanders, and usually included thorough inspection of records and reports, welfare and sundry funds, sanitary conditions, security measures, and messes. Spot inspections of clothing and equipment, supply and storage, ration breakdown and distribution, enlisted men's quarters and welfare were usually included. In the case of combat units on corps and higher levels, such as corps and army artillery and combat engineer units, the inspections were usually somewhat less comprehensive although in some units the inspection of the combat units followed the same general procedure as that of service units. More frequently, however, except for thorough spot inspections of personnel records and reports, the inspection of combat units assumed more the nature of visits of observation or checks designed particularly to check on the welfare of the enlisted men, and the distribution of supplies. In general, welfare and sundry funds of combat units were held in the custody of the adjutant during combat periods and were for the most part inactive. However, periodic checks were usually made to determine their status and where expenditures had been made inspections of the council books and vouchers were made. Divisions were usually held responsible for inspection of the corps troops normally attached to them, such as the tank, tank destroyer and anti-aircraft artillery battalions. In some cases, however, corps inspectors general made periodic checks of these units, more particularly to determine whether or not they were being adequately serviced by the divisions and the enlisted men were being properly cared for. In a few cases, corps inspectors general conducted inspections of these units down to and including platoons.

19. In divisions, inspections during combat periods were invariably informal, and limited in scope. The frequency of inspections and the number and variety of the installations and activities inspected depended largely upon the time available to the inspector general for this phase of work (which in turn depended to a considerable degree upon the policy of the commanding general with respect to his employment of the inspector general) and to a less extent upon the initiative and aggressiveness of the inspector

general concerned. In divisions, particular emphasis was placed upon non-interference with the normal functioning of the troops, either of the services or arms.

a. Inspections of personnel records (service records and qualification cards, in particular) were made in almost all divisions. In some divisions this inspection was very complete and was accomplished by having a certain percentage of the records of each unit, in turn, sent to the inspector general's section each week until all of the records in the division had been inspected. In other divisions, periodic spot inspections of a sample number of records varying from ten to twenty percent were made. In some cases the records were sent to the inspector general's section, in other cases teams composed of the warrant officer and one or two enlisted men visited the personnel sections in turn. In a number of divisions it was a standing operating procedure to send all of the records of men leaving the division to the inspector general's section for final check, and, if necessary, completion and correction before forwarding them to other headquarters. When the men were present, often they were also sent to the inspector general's section with their records so that entries in the record might be checked with the men.

b. Other inspections made by division inspectors general during combat periods included welfare and sundry funds, army postal units, army exchange records, property records, ration breakdown and distribution, casualty reporting, messes, reinforcements, recovery of equipment, traffic control, and distribution of clothing and equipment. Not all inspectors general covered all of these subjects; a few made no inspections except the required inspections of disbursing officers' accounts and inspection of personnel records, but in a majority of the divisions the inspectors general covered two or more of the above items. In addition, many division inspectors general made more or less frequent visits of observation to regimental and battalion headquarters and supply points. Usually these visits were not so much for the purpose of inspecting the particular installations as they were for determining their needs and problems and checking on the functioning of services and administration on division level. In some divisions the inspector general would spend two or three days at a time at a regimental headquarters. Inspections of welfare and sundry funds and army exchange records were usually made by the warrant officer with one of the enlisted clerks. Other inspections such as those of postal units, property records, ration breakdown and distribution, etc., were made by the inspector general himself or by his captain assistant, and one or more of the enlisted personnel. Bank accounts were not maintained by disbursing officers on the continent of Europe, with the result that very substantial sums of cash were kept on hand. Inspection of disbursing officers' accounts and records, as a consequence, usually required one of the officers, the warrant officer, and two of the clerks.

20. Type and Routing of Reports. Many inspectors general of corps and higher echelons made formal reports of their inspections to their commanding generals, routing them through the commanding officer of the unit inspected. In divisions, generally, and in certain of the higher headquarters, no formal reports of inspection were made during

combat periods. In these cases, the deficiencies and irregularities noted would be discussed informally with the commanding officer of the unit concerned and, if they involved service or administration on division or higher level, with the appropriate general or special staff officer. Major deficiencies and irregularities were reported either verbally or by informal memorandum to the chief of staff or in some cases directly to the commanding general. Except in the higher headquarters where a type of general inspection and formal reports were made, no ratings were given as a result of the inspections. The inspections invariably dealt with limited subjects or activities and were concerned primarily with the prompt correction of the deficiencies and irregularities disclosed. In some cases, where irregularities or deficiencies appeared to be general or were likely to affect all units, the inspector general would prepare a memorandum calling attention to them and to the remedial action necessary or to the proper procedure, and forward it through the special and general staff officers concerned to the chief of staff for publication as a directive or in a periodic bulletin, as the subject warranted.

21. Use of Technical Specialists. During combat periods very limited use was made by inspectors general of technical specialists from the services, such as ordnance, quartermaster, and medical in making inspections. In corps and higher headquarters, officers from these services were occasionally used in teams under the general supervision of an officer of the Inspector General's Department. In divisions an officer from the adjutant general's section and one or more enlisted men from the personnel sections of the subordinate units were used by some inspectors general to assist in the inspection of personnel records. A few inspectors general made it a practice to be accompanied by a medical officer when making inspections of messes or of sanitary conditions in bivouac or camp areas, or by an ordnance officer when inspecting motor vehicles. In general, however, inspectors general made use of the personnel of their own sections in making their inspections. Inspectors general, however, frequently sought the advice and opinion of the service specialists in consultations either before or after their inspections.

SECTION 4

INSPECTIONS DURING REST PERIODS

22. During the European campaign rest periods for any of the major units were so infrequent and of such relatively short duration, that no appreciable change in the activities of the inspector general's section was warranted. In the few cases where more or less protracted rest periods were possible, the inspectors general of the units utilized the time primarily for the inspection of property and property records.

SECTION 5

USE OF CHECK LISTS

23. General: Check lists of various types and degrees of detail were kept and maintained current by almost all

inspector general's sections.

24. Sources of data: The Inspection Guides which had been prepared by the Office of The Inspector General, Washington, D.C. and distributed in mimeograph form to officers of the Department, while soon out of date and in many matters not applicable to ground force activities in the European Theater, nevertheless formed the origin of many of the check lists maintained by the sections. Check lists later published in or as supplements to successive issues of the Bulletin of The Inspector General of the Army (formerly The Information Circular, Office of The Inspector General) although generally more applicable to Zone of the Interior installations and activities, were also used as guides for the preparation of special check lists by the sections. War Department Training Manuals (TM 12-230, Service Records, for example) were either themselves used as check lists or as the basis for the preparation of special check lists.

25. Limitations: The necessity for posting check lists currently with the frequent changes in War Department and Theater directives limited their use considerably, particularly in divisions where the clerical help to do this work was limited.

26. Types: In general the check lists used were of three types: (1) the outline or narrative type in which the important requirements to be met in the particular activity covered were listed in logical order with references to the pertinent directive in each case, (2) the questionnaire type, in which the requirements were stated in the form of questions usually so phrased that a "no" answer indicated an irregularity or deficiency, and (3) the tabular form, in which the requirements were listed in logical order with spaces for indicating by an "X" that a deficiency or irregularity existed or by a check mark (✓) that none existed. Space for comments or remarks was frequently included.

27. Use: The outline or narrative type was used primarily as a guide or reminder to refresh the memory of the inspectors either just before making the inspection or during the inspection. The questionnaire type was used either, like the outline type, as a guide, or as a means of recording the actual status of the activity. The tabular form was used for making a record of the status of the activity. The tabular form was generally used by inspectors general of all units for inspecting service records and qualification cards. The questionnaire was generally used in making inspections of the general type and therefore was used primarily by inspectors general in corps and higher echelons. It was, however, frequently used by division inspectors general in making their inspections of the disbursing officers' accounts and of postal units. All types of check lists were used extensively by inspectors general in the instruction of the personnel of their sections and for the guidance and instruction of personnel of other staff sections and services used as assistants on inspection teams.

28. Reference files: Many inspector general's sections maintained reference folders or files for each officer and clerk in the section containing such check lists as were maintained current by the section, copies of regulations and theater and unit directives frequently referred to, an

extract policy file and lists of current special subjects.

SECTION 6

ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

STANDARDIZATION OF PROCEDURES

29. Importance and Purpose: The standardization of administrative procedures was a matter of great interest and importance to all inspectors general from the point of view of instructing the personnel of their sections and the personnel of other staff sections or services who might be used as assistants on inspection teams. Such instruction was essential in order that the personnel might have common standards by which to assess the performance of units inspected and in order that they might recommend correct remedial action and give helpful advice and instruction.

30. Methods of Attaining Standardization: The War Department and Theater publications (regulations, manuals, circulars, and directives) were, of course, the basic source of instruction. The various types of check lists were of great assistance in codifying the material in these publications by subject. War Department Training Manuals of the type of TM 12-230, Service Record, which outlined the procedure to be followed in the preparation and posting of service records step by step and item by item, in great detail, were especially helpful in the establishment of standardized procedures.

31. Difficulties encountered: Considerable variation existed in the interpretation and application of certain theater directives, resulting in non-standardization. Examples of these were Circular 2, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, United States Army, subject: "Simplified Property Accounting" dated 8 January 1945, certain requirements of which could not as a practical matter be met by infantry units in combat, and Circular 122, same headquarters, subject:"Self-Inflicted Wounds" dated 18 December 1944, which could be and was subject to different interpretations by different headquarters. Inspectors general in the field were frequently called upon to interpret these and other directives and to recommend the procedures to be followed in their organizations. In this they endeavored to reach a practical solution of the problem but in many cases it might differ considerably from that arrived at in other units. With frequent transfers of officers between units, this led to confusion and misunderstandings.

STANDARDS FOR RATING

32. It is customary in making general inspections to rate the various activities of a unit and to give an overall general rating to the unit. For the sake of uniformity and fairness, it is necessary to establish a uniform system of rating. In corps and higher echelons, where general inspections were made and ratings given, this was done, in so far as possible, by the use of the questionnaire and tabular forms of check lists which made possible a numerical evaluation of an activity by tabulating the number of deficiencies and irregularities. There still remained, however, certain intangible phases of activity, the evaluation

of which depended to a large degree upon the experience and good judgment of the inspector general. In divisions the general type of inspection with ratings was very seldom made and the problem of standards, for rating purposes only, was not important.

CHAPTER 3

INVESTIGATIONS

SECTION 1

GENERAL

33. Definitions: Investigations were generally classified as "formal" or "informal". This distinction was based upon the type of report made. If the report rendered was written and substantially in the form outlined in paragraph 9, Army Regulations 20-30, dated 23 May 1942, the investigation was generally referred to as a "formal investigation." If the report rendered was either verbal or in the form of a memorandum or routing slip, the investigation was generally referred to as an "informal investigation."

34. Relative frequency: The proportion of formal to informal reports (investigations) made varied considerably between units. In a few units formal reports were made for 90 or more percent of the investigations conducted by the inspector general although many of these investigations concerned relatively less serious matters. In other units formal reports were required only in cases where report had to be made to a higher headquarters. In a majority of units formal reports were required in all cases when report had to be made to higher headquarters, regardless of subject matter, and, in other cases, when court martial proceedings or reclassification of officers appeared likely to result or when possible violation of the Geneva Convention either by our own troops or by the enemy was involved. In these units, informal report was made in all other investigations conducted by the inspectors general.

SECTION 2

FORMAL INVESTIGATIONS

35. Authority: Invariably the authority of the commanding general was required for making investigations for which formal reports were rendered.

36. Procedure: The form of report generally followed that outlined in paragraph 9, Army Regulations 20-30, 23 May 1942. Sworn verbatim transcript of testimony, in question and answer form, was usually included as an exhibit to the report although occasionally, sworn statements were used. Foreign civilians or soldiers appearing as witnesses were not required to take oath if they objected to doing so. The rights of witnesses and the person being investigated were invariably safeguarded in accordance with the provisions of Army Regulations 20-30 dated 23 May 1942. Formal investigations were always conducted by one of the commissioned officers of the section.

37. Subjects covered by formal investigations made by inspectors general included misbehavior of officers (including misbehaviors before the enemy), murders, rape, looting and pilfering, serious accidents, unauthorized transmission of money from the theater, violations of censorship or postal regulations, loss of funds, cases of racial discrimination, violations of the Geneva Convention either by our own troops or by the enemy, and loss or surrender in combat of platoons, companies or larger units or the tactical employment of a command resulting in such loss or surrender.

38. Frequency: The number of formal investigations made by inspectors general averaged between two and three a month although in a few units where the formal type of report was used extensively, the number was, of course, much higher.

SECTION 3

INFORMAL INVESTIGATIONS

39. Authority: The prior authority of the commanding general was usually required but in rare instances when immediate action appeared desirable, the inspector general might initiate preliminary investigation reporting the matter as soon as possible to the chief of staff or commanding general and obtain the latter's authority before completing the investigation.

40. Procedure: Except for the type of report prepared, the procedure in informal investigations frequently was similar to that employed in formal investigations. Formal sworn testimony was often taken. On the other hand, in conducting informal investigations, the inspector general very frequently summarized the substance of the testimony without taking verbatim notes. Regardless of the form of testimony taken, the rights of witnesses and the person being investigated, were explained to them.

41. The form of report used in informal investigations varied all the way from brief verbal reports to the chief of staff to written memoranda to the commanding general, substantially in the form of a formal report but omitting the exhibits of testimony and other evidence. In general, however, the facts were very briefly summarized, followed by conclusions and recommendations.

42. The subjects covered by informal investigations were, in general, the less serious matters concerning which report did not have to be made to higher headquarters.

43. The number of informal investigations conducted by inspectors general varied greatly depending in a large degree upon the policy of the commanding general. In units in which very few informal investigations were made it might be due either to the fact that formal reports were required in most of the cases referred to the inspector general for investigation, including relatively minor matters, or to the fact that only the more serious matters requiring formal report were referred to the inspector general, other matters being investigated in the subordinate units. In units where individual cases of suspected self-inflicted wounds or of alleged battle exhaustion were investigated by inspectors

general, the average number of investigations might be 30 or 40 a month, or during very active combat periods, considerably more.

SECTION 4

SURVEYS, STUDIES AND INQUIRIES

44. In addition to making investigations of particular incidents, some inspectors general were called upon to make surveys or studies of overall conditions. Occasionally such surveys were directed to be made by higher headquarters and in such cases formal reports were made. Usually, however, they were either initiated by the inspector general or directed by his commanding general and the reports were made verbally or by informal memoranda to the commanding general. Subjects included were the general problems of self-inflicted wounds and exhaustion cases, prevalence of trench foot, frequency of court-martial cases (particularly for misbehavior before the enemy, desertion or absence without leave), the distribution of clean clothing to troops in combat, the serving of hot meals in combat, battlefield recovery of equipment, etc. within the particular command. These surveys were usually conducted through personal interviews with officers and enlisted men, supplemented in some cases by the use of questionnaires. Experienced noncommissioned officers in the inspector general's section were often of great assistance in conducting interviews with enlisted men.

CHAPTER 4

INFORMATION AND ADVISORY SERVICES

45. Scope: Although frequently not taken into consideration in enumerating the operations of inspector general's sections, the time spent by many of them in giving information and advice concerning the interpretation of regulations and directives and the establishment and carrying out of administrative procedures, was very appreciable. Taking into account the time spent on this kind of work during the course of inspections and visits of observation, it amounted on the average to an estimated twenty-five percent of the section's time.

46. Type: In all echelons, the inspectors general were frequently called upon to review and comment upon proposed directives. Occasionally the inspector general prepared directives. In addition to this, all inspectors general were frequently consulted on questions pertaining to welfare and sundry funds, property accounting, mess accounting, and disciplinary problems. Corps and, particularly, army inspectors general were frequently consulted by division inspectors general. In divisions there was a rapid turnover in line officers and many of them were relatively inexperienced in administrative matters and, especially during combat, had little time to read and digest the various pertinent directives. It was generally understood that because of the nature of its work, the inspector general's section was reasonably familiar with the current directives on many subjects. Representatives of the inspector general's section were in frequent contact with all echelons of the division on inspections, visits of observation, or making investigations

or studies. As a result, the inspector general's section was very frequently being asked for advice regarding many matters of administration. In the interest of "getting the job done", it generally was the practice in divisions for the inspector general's section to give the answer to these questions, if it was known, or to get the answer as promptly as possible. The objective was to help the unit.

CHAPTER 5

NON-FUNCTIONAL OPERATIONS

47. In corps and higher echelons, the work of inspector general's sections was generally confined to functional operations such as inspections and investigations. In a few instances, officers of the section were members of special and general courts martial, and, in two corps at least, the inspector general was placed in command of the rear echelon of the headquarters. Inspectors general and their senior assistants occasionally served on boards of officers.

48. In divisions, there was much more frequent use of officers of the inspector general's section on non-functional duties. Such duties included membership on courts-martial, acting as trial judge advocate or defense council, membership on army exchange council, awards and decorations board, promotion boards, investigating boards, officer candidate boards, acting as claims officer or assistant claims officer, commander of the rear echelon of the headquarters, commander of the division rest center, acting as assistant G-3 or G-4, reviewing all reports of survey, certificates of expenditure, claims reports, and investigations made by lower echelons. In many divisions, officers of the Inspector General's Department performed none of these non-functional duties. In a few divisions, they performed nearly all of them to the extent that seventy-five percent or more of their time was so occupied. In a majority of the divisions, about twenty-five percent of the time of the officers of the Inspector General's Department was employed on non-functional operations.

PART THREE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1

SECTION 1

CONCLUSIONS

49. That the inspector general's sections of the army ground force units in the European Theater of Operations fulfilled the duties of their sections to the extent of making such "Inspections and investigations as the commander may direct," as set forth in paragraph 36a, Field Manual 101-5, dated 19 August 1940. (Quoted in paragraph 5, of this report)

50. That the operations of inspector general's sections did not, in general, cover the whole sphere of inquiry envisaged by paragraph 1c(1) Army Regulations 20-5, dated 27 May 1942, and paragraph 36b, Field Manual 101-5, dated 19 August 1940. (Quoted in paragraphs 2 and 5, respectively, of this report)

51. That there was a tendency to restrict the sphere of operations of unit inspectors general to formal investigations and the inspection of personnel records, welfare and sundry funds.

52. That a disproportionate amount of time was spent by a majority of the inspector general's sections on non-functional operations, to the detriment of the performance of their particular function as envisaged by Army Regulations.

53. That in a few units it was found feasible, possible and desirable to exempt the officers of the unit inspector general's section from the performance of non-functional duties such as membership on courts martial, boards of officers, etc.

54. That it has not generally been found satisfactory to have the inspector general come under the supervision of the assistant chief of staff, G-1, of the staff on which he serves but is preferable to have him report directly to the chief of staff or commanding general.

55. That it is desirable that at least one officer of the inspector general's section, preferably the inspector general, together with a stenographer, be located within at most one-half hour's traveling time by motor vehicle, of the commanding general and chief of staff.

56. That the annual general inspection was impractical and unnecessary in the theater of operations.

57. That there was a tendency on the part of many inspectors general in making inspections of administrative records, especially personnel records, to go beyond the limits of inspection and actually to perform the work which was the function of other branches.

58. That although formal reports of inspection are desirable in certain cases, the general use of informal reports is practical and satisfactory in a theater of operations.

59. That the use by inspectors general of technical specialists from the services as assistants during inspections is desirable.

60. That check lists are useful and important aids to the inspector general and his assistants.

61. That detailed instructions such as those contained in recent War Department Training Manuals are of material assistance in the standardization of administrative procedures.

62. That the requirements of certain theater directives, although they could be met by communication zone and service units, could not be fulfilled by infantry units while engaged in active combat.

63. That the necessity for modifying locally the requirements of certain theater directives to meet conditions existing in units actively engaged in combat had a tendency to bring about looseness and carelessness in following other directives, and resulted in the lack of uniformity in procedures.

64. That there was a tendency to use inspectors general for the investigation of individual criminal cases which should have been investigated by Provost Marshal personnel.

65. That, although formal reports of investigation continue to be necessary in the more serious types of investigations, the use of informal reports, either verbal or written, is practical and desirable in the case of relatively minor investigations and in certain cases where the allegations are disclosed to be unfounded.

66. That the lack in subordinate units of personnel trained and experienced in the making of investigations resulted in the use of inspectors general for making many minor investigations which should have been conducted in those units.

67. That information and advisory service by the inspector general's section is a useful and proper function of the unit inspector general.

SECTION 2

RECOMMENDATIONS

68. That greater emphasis be placed upon the use of unit inspectors general in the broad sphere of inquiry envisaged by paragraph 1c(1) Army Regulations 20-5, dated 27 May 1942. (Quoted in paragraph 2 of this report)

69. That the unit inspectors general report directly to the chief of staff or commanding general of their headquarters.

70. That unit inspectors general confine their operations to fact finding and advisory functions and not perform detailed administrative work which is the function of other branches and departments.

71. That in the preparation of directives by higher headquarters more study be given to the practical application of the requirements to units actively engaged in combat and where it is recognized that the same requirements cannot be met by communications zone units and combat units alike, a distinction be made between the two and practical requirements for each be made.

72. That provision be made in the Tables of Organization of regiments and other comparable units, for the inclusion in their headquarters of two officers, one captain and one first lieutenant, with necessary clerical help to include one stenographer, as investigating and claims officers, to conduct minor investigations, claims investigations, investigations under the 70th Article of War and to act as surveying officers.

73. That individual criminal cases be investigated by personnel of the Provost Marshal's office.

74. That more emphasis be placed upon the use of unit inspectors general in making overall surveys, studies and inquiries leading to recommendations for preventive measures as well as corrective measures.

THE GENERAL BOARD
UNITED STATES FORCES, EUROPEAN THEATER
APO 408

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Army Regulations of the 20 Series.

2. War Department Field Manuals 100-10 and 101-5.

3. "History of the Office of the Inspector General, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, United States Army," Office of the Inspector General, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, United States Army, 3 December 1944.

4. Histories and Journals of the inspector general sections of numerous units of the ground forces, European Theater of Operations.

5. Report of Board of Officers on Reorganization of the War Department, Washington, D.C., 18 October 1945.

6. Check lists and articles published in The Information Circular, The Office of The Inspector General, Washington, D.C., and in the Bulletin of The Inspector General of the Army, The Office of The Inspector General, War Department, Washington, D.C.

7. Inspection Guides, Office of The Inspector General, War Department, Washington, D.C.

8. Circular 2, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, United States Army, subject: "Simplified Property Accounting" dated 8 January 1945.

9. Circular 122, Headquarters European Theater of Operations, United States Army, subject: "Self-inflicted Wounds," dated 18 December 1944.