

# Jackson Journal

## **Brigadier General**

**Bradley A. Becker**

*Commander, USATC  
and Fort Jackson*

## **Command**

**Sergeant Major**

**William D. Hain**

*Post Command  
Sergeant Major*

## **Editorial Staff**

*Editor in Chief*

**Michael Ryan**

*Executive Editor*

**John Philibert**

## Featured Articles

### 6 Instilling Combat Skills, but at What Cost?

*CPT Martin P. Vanderhoek and 1SG Tyrone Antley  
Should live training on the M67 Hand Grenade be conducted during Basic Combat Training?*

### 12 BRM Training with the M68 “A Better Way-More Effective and Efficient”

*CPT Kenneth L. Johnson  
Today BCT companies use traditional iron sights throughout Basic Rifle Marksmanship, but they should no longer; instead they should use the M68, a more efficient, more cost effective, and more true to the modern day battlefield sight.*

### 16 Origins of the Drill Sergeant School

*Stephanie Sapp  
The Drill Sergeant, the epitome of the Army as a profession, was introduced to Basic Combat Training in 1964.*

### 22 Fort Jackson’s Four Legged Military Police Detachment

*SFC Ted Perry Jr  
The Soldiers and Working Dogs of the 208th Military Police Detachment work diligently providing Force Protection to Fort Jackson on a daily basis.*

### 24 CBRN

*SSG Matthew Stahl  
Is there a better way to conduct CBRN training in BCT? The author says yes!*

### 28 “The Soldier Selects...” Creating Soldiers for the Next Conflict

*COL Joseph McLamb  
The Army’s need for thinking, innovative, and confident leaders and Soldiers is not unique to our current historical era.*

### 32 Inter-Service Postal Training Activity (IPTA)

*CWO3 (USMC) I.G. Rodriguez and Mr. Michael W. Gasque*

### 34 COG Analysis and Associated Targeting for SHARP

*LTC J.C. Glick and MAJ Jay K. Smith  
If we target the predator with the mindset that the predator is an enemy to our unit, we can develop a coordinated attack strategy that does not waste time and resources.*

## **United States Army Training Center and Fort Jackson**

### **Volume II, April - July 2014, NO. 4**

The Jackson Journal is a professional journal that provides a forum for original thought and discussion on all aspects of training and leadership as they pertain to Initial Military Training. The views expressed in the Jackson Journal are those of the Authors, not necessarily those of the Department of Defense or any element of it. The content does not necessarily reflect U.S. Army position and does not change or supersede any information in other official U.S. Army publications. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the articles they provide. The Jackson Journal reserves the right to edit material.

The Jackson Journal is available online at:

<http://www.jackson.army.mil/sites/jacksonjournal/pages/745>

#### 40 Adaptive Leaders

1SG Victoria Reeves and SFC (DS) Maria T. Taylor

*Effective leaders today must present a multi-dimensional approach to learning and training to be deemed successful. This could be no truer than for today's modern Drill Sergeant.*

#### 44 FRG: One Company's Approach

CPT Nicholas Milano

Drill Sergeants and their Families keep Fort Jackson running. We should do everything possible to take care of them and show them how important they are.

#### 46 Discipline and Order in the U.S. Armed Forces: The Role of Military Instructors in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps

Ssg Jessica Brooks

#### 52 Biblical Response to Killing in Combat

CH (CPT) Colt Randles

How should a Christian feel about the prospect of having to take another's life in combat?

#### 54 Newstarts: Pace vs. Potential

CPT Doniel D. McPhail and 1SG James L. Powell

Does every trainee deserve a second chance to become a Soldier? We must carefully weigh every aspect of the trainee's time spent in BCT when determining if they deserve a newstart.

#### 56 Negotiating with New Soldiers

1LT Daniel Webb

Baron von Steuben quickly found that the Americans were a different type of Soldier, and remarked that "You say to your soldier, 'Do this' and he does it. But I am obliged to say to the American, 'This is why you ought to do this' and then he does it."

#### 60 The Best Kept Secret

CPT Sindie L. Hicks

Student Detachment is a vast, unique organization, with a manpower authorization of 7 Soldiers and 6 civilian workers to support over 2,200 Soldiers assigned to the Detachment with duty in over 310 diverse locations worldwide.

#### 62 The AG School Advanced Officer Training Division (AOTD)

CPT Brian Hollandsworth

#### 64 The Humble Leader: The role of Humility in Leadership

COL Bryan Hernandez

No person can be a great leader without a touch of humility.

## **Team Jackson – Training the Best Soldiers in the World!**

Bradley A. Becker

BG, USA

### **Commanding**

Welcome to the Jackson Journal, our professional journal focused on leading and training Soldiers. My intent behind the publication of the Jackson Journal is to improve Fort Jackson's organizational learning through the sharing of ideas, best practices, and lessons learned among all leaders. The Jackson Journal serves as a platform for professionals to express their thoughts and ideas, start a dialogue or simply gain a better understanding on a specific topic to improve their own professional development.

The articles in this issue truly highlight the diverse and wide spectrum of topics that all leaders within the Army Training Center and Fort Jackson must become familiar with to successfully lead and train the future Soldiers of our great Army.

Two articles of note in this issue challenge the status quo and look at finding

better

ways for us to conduct training.

The first article is titled, “Instilling Combat Skills, but at What Cost?” and is written by CPT Martin Vanderhoek and 1SG Tyrone Antley from 4-10 IN. The authors propose that cutting only the live portion of M67 Hand Grenade training from the BCT POI meets the intent of training Soldiers on a crucial skill, while saving money that could be better utilized to improve training facilities and equipment while also saving the Army an untold amount of money in pay, medical expenses, and the cost of Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA+E).

The second article is titled “BRM Training with the M68” and is written by CPT Kenneth Johnson from 1-34 IN. His company recently participated in a study that compared the effectiveness and efficiency of the M68 Close Combat Optic (CCO)

versus the traditional iron sight during BRM training. Based on the findings of this study he recommends that all Soldiers should use the M68, a more efficient, more

cost effective, and more true to the modern day battlefield sight. I am interested in your thoughts and ideas on these two articles. The next time you see me at your training please let me know what you think.

I encourage leaders at all levels to read the Jackson Journal and submit articles for future publications. One of the best ways to become an expert in our profession is to turn your thoughts and ideas into the written word. We must continue to emphasize the importance and value of writing for all of our leaders.

## *From the Commanding General*

### **Victory Starts Here!**

William D. Hain

CSM, USA

Post Command Sergeant Major

## *Post Command Sergeant Major*

As I assume duties as the Post CSM, I want to take the opportunity to share my experience and philosophy on our top priority—Training. I have had the opportunity to attend quite a few training events and venues since arrival. I continue to be impressed with what I see daily, but suggest in some cases, we can achieve more with less.

I remain convinced that the key to success both in training here at the IMT level and all the way to prepare- for- war training is mastery of basic skills, doing the fundamental individual tasks to the required standard each and every time, regardless of the conditions.

In our environment where we have a captive training audience, there always exists a temptation to push the envelope to make training more relevant to the collective level we all experienced in our operational assignments. We all naturally want to expose our newest Soldiers or Leaders to complex problem solving, therefore producing more agile and adaptive Soldiers. It can really make sense to put training in context with higher level missions. I advocate all of this, within a clear set of boundaries—NOT at the expense of what is truly important—executing individual tasks correctly, every time, under every condition.

It simply makes no sense to teach a Soldier how to do a task correctly, explain why it is important and then teach him (through lack of enforcement or a shift in focus) that it is okay to not do it that way because we've moved on to a "tactical" scenario. Some examples: aim during RM but okay not to aim during a squad attack; load weapon properly during PMI to prevent malfunctions but okay to skip a step or two before going through HG assault course; low crawl correctly today because we're teaching individual movement techniques, but okay to adjust on the range because it's not "safe".

When we attempt to go big on training events early (career, training cycles, NCOES, OES), inevitably the standards on basic skills are overlooked, marginalized, or not enforced at the cost of higher level training objectives. So, in spite of our best intentions, we un-train the skills we are charged with training. When we make first contact, training or war, the plan will not survive. What will survive is a Soldier's training and confidence in their equipment and leaders, or not.

As we continue to train the best Soldiers in our Army, know that our Soldiers' lives will one day count on one or two very basic skills we taught them. We can't afford to not get that right!

6 Jackson Journal April - July 2014

## **Instilling combat skills, but at what cost?**

CPT Martin P. Vanderhoek 1SG Tyrone Antley

**H**ere at the United States Army's largest Basic Combat Training

**(BCT) post, our collective goal is to transform civilians into Soldiers in the most professional Army in the world, capable of carrying out national policy swiftly, decisively, and as ordered. While there are hundreds if not thousands of different skill sets, multiple echelons of command structure, and several ranks, every service member has this in common: they started at some sort of initial training, and they were trained on combat skills to allow every Soldier to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemy at an individual level if necessary. We believe that live**

**training on the M67 Hand Grenade in the BCT Program of Instruction (POI) could be altered to better utilize training funds, drastically reduce the potential for injury to both trainees and cadre, and open up a dialogue on training techniques that better benefit the Soldier and the Army.**

*April - July 2014 Jackson Journal 7*

*Spending money does not a trained Soldier make*

**It is no surprise to anyone that the Army is operating in a fiscal climate that is rapidly changing from that of the past decade. Our budget is being reduced exponentially, we are downsizing our Army, and both our civilian and military leadership is strongly considering cutting pay, salary, and other benefits as we seek to create an Army that is lean, agile, and still well trained. To that end, I propose that cutting only the live portion of M67 training from the BCT POI meets the intent of training Soldiers on a crucial skill, while saving money that could be better utilized to improve training facilities and equipment while also saving the Army an untold amount of money in pay, medical expenses, and the cost of Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA+E).**

**Currently, a M67 costs \$59.71 per grenade. While this does not seem like a costly expense, consider that between 01 January 2013 and 01 January 2014, Fort Jackson trained 41,675 personnel on live M67s. Since every trainee throws two M67 grenades during live training we spent \$4,976,829 in costs of AA+E alone, not including the cost of extra grenades thrown to account for duds. Additionally, we have approximately 15 Infantryman working as cadre, under B/4-10 IN, at Remagen live range. Each one of those Soldiers rightfully receives Demolition Pay of \$250 dollars per month as well their base pay, BAH, TRICARE coverage, etc. Given that our Army is reducing in size, it makes much more sense to reduce our personnel needs and allow those 11Bs to be utilized somewhere else in FORSCOM or TRADOC. Furthermore, several of those cadre members have received the Soldiers Medal (SM) for their actions in saving lives in the performance of their duties at Remagen. Without taking away from the absolute selflessness and courage of their actions, being awarded the SM rightfully carries with it a 10% increase in retirement pay – another cost that we must consider if we are to honestly and objectively conduct an analysis of the cost of this training.**

*8 Jackson Journal April - July 2014*

The Army could save tens of millions of dollars if we retain only the practice / qualification portion of hand grenade training. A M228 practice fuze costs only \$9.97 per fuze. Since trainees already utilize this training aid during their qualification training the day prior to throwing live M67s and all training facilities / infrastructure already exist, this would not count as a monetary trade off. Since the cost of training with simulations is \$831,000, the Army would experience a reduction of 85% of training costs in AA+E alone. Drill Sergeants can continue to train on the skills required to properly employ a hand grenade, commanders can use that money for other purposes and the Army can use its personnel more efficiently.

*An injured Soldier is never a good thing; a needlessly injured Soldier is a tragedy*

Anyone can tell you that handling grenades is an inherently risky and dangerous thing to do. The explosives can become unstable, fuzes can be shorter than anticipated, and shrapnel can seriously injure bystanders. All of the above risks exist regardless of the level of training the thrower may have, but it becomes even more hazardous when you consider that 100% of the throwers here at Fort Jackson have never handled grenades before, are not yet considered to be fully disciplined Soldiers, and have been immersed for an extended time in an environment that induces high levels of stress. These factors combine to create a veritable recipe for disaster. If you were to interview the cadre at Remagen Range, every one of them would have a 'near-miss' story to tell. When you are dealing with hand grenades, even a close call has a very real potential for severe injuries. Within the past year, cadre have saved the lives of trainees on three separate occasions, and taken direct action to mitigate training incidents (errant throws, cook offs, and danger-close detonations) at least 15 times. Each one of these incidents did not take a turn for the worst because of our cadre members' dedication to their duties, their discipline, and their attention to detail. Still, just because no one has been severely injured yet does not mean it will not happen. With over 50% of the Army's trainees coming through Fort Jackson annually, it is only a matter of time before our cadre are not quick enough to prevent an accident. Not only does the immediate blast of a hand grenade have a potential for injury, the shockwaves can cause considerable damage as well. Looking at the photo of Bay 03 of Remagen, a considerable 'bowed' effect to the wooden slating on the berm walls is noticeable. Furthermore, the dirt berms are packed extremely tight. This is not by design. As time goes on, the repeated concussive force of the detonations cause the wood to permanently warp and the dirt to be packed down to a density that resembles concrete. If the concussive forces of repeated detonation can cause that kind of change in regular materials, what is happening to the bodies of the cadre who repeatedly, day in and day out, stand inside that pit with trainees to supervise the throwing of a live grenade? Many of the injuries

we see in our cadre who facilitate this training are in line with ailments the Army just began to learn about as we faced the dangers of IEDs and EFPs. Non-visual injuries that can take months to surface and are difficult to diagnose - Mild Traumatic Brain Injuries (mTBI), memory loss, and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder caused by repeatedly witnessing or taking part in action drills to prevent explosives from injuring or killing others. Those are all injuries from a singular incident, but we also need to consider the long term damage that can be caused by repeated exposure to blasts. Medical research

## **Instilling Combat Skills**

consistently shows a link between individuals who sustain consistent and continuing sub-concussive brain trauma and degenerative diseases such as Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy (CTE). There can be a danger in being so risk-adverse that you overlook the need for or are unwilling to accept the inherent risks of a training program that ultimately carries a benefit higher than that of the cost of training. I don't believe this is the case with live hand grenade training. Again, if we continued the training utilizing only practice fuzes, we could continue to meet the intent of training with minimal risks and much less of a window for injuries both short term and long term with regards to both trainees and cadre.

### ***Why here, why now***

Hand grenades have existed since the 10th century when the Eastern Roman empires used fire filled pots that would be thrown at enemies. The Union and Confederate Armies of the Civil War used forms of the Ketchum grenade in combat, and the US Army has utilized grenades during every War and in various forms from antipersonnel to incendiary since. The hand grenade is an invaluable tool in close combat, and every Soldier should be capable of employing grenades to kill an enemy (fragmentation, antitank), provide concealment (smoke), or destroy enemy equipment or friendly equipment for the purposes of safeguarding technological secrets or to prevent the enemy from using equipment against us (phosphorous). But BCT does not include hands on training for any of the grenades other than fragmentation. Commanders of the graduating Soldiers follow on duty station decide whether to conduct that training. This is because the leadership

of the unit to which that Soldier is going knows better than we do the necessity for this type of training based on their Mission Essential Task List (METL) and can better tailor their training to match the individual skills

10 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

required to be proficient in the units METL. Only an incredibly small percentage of the Soldiers who go through BCT end up utilizing grenades in combat, and those that do are generally combat arms Soldiers, who make up a small percentage of the Army compared to combat support and combat service support branches.

The intention is not to suggest that non combat arms Soldiers require no training on hand grenades. Everyone should know how to employ a hand grenade, but the decision to train on employment of grenades utilizing LIVE explosives should be a decision made by the unit to which the Soldier is permanently assigned. That command knows their assigned mission and can more effectively perform the Military Decision Making Process and Army Training Management to determine whether further training on hand grenades is needed to ensure mission success.

Leaders on ranges occasionally voice the argument that training on live explosives is historically based, and that BCT has always trained on it. While there is some validity to continuing to train on a specific task at times, it does not hurt to regularly assess the need for said training. Because it's been done before does not mean that it must continue in the face of obsolescence. A good example of this can be found in the M72 LAW, which saw heavy use in Vietnam and was incorporated into BCT, but sees little use now. While the LAW has seen action in a few battles in Iraq and Afghanistan, its use has been very limited and so has not been included in BCT since the 1980's. It is also believed that the training increases attention to detail, discipline, and confidence in the task. Certainly we desire these qualities during the training, but the training does not instill these qualities. In fact, from a historical standpoint the Army did not use grenades as a training tool until relatively recently, and the focus has never been on discipline and attention to detail. When Baron von Steuben was charged with assisting in the creation of a disciplined Army, he developed drill movements and regulations for Washington's Army in 1778. He did not focus on hand grenade training, and yet still created the foundations that we use today to create a professional, disciplined Soldier. Discipline is instilled through constantly training troops the proper way to carry out a task,

encouraging them to better their ability at carrying the task out, and providing feedback in a consistent manner. What it is not is a singular training event. If a trainee is not displaying an appropriate degree of discipline prior to throwing a live hand grenade, performing that act will not magically change the level of discipline displayed by that Soldier.

A valid argument can be made by stating that this event is the singular point during the Soldier's entire training in which they face imminent danger and must face it head on. There is undoubtedly an intangible training benefit to this event that merits a dialogue, but we must consider the worth of the risk. Throwing a live grenade does not guarantee an increase in confidence in self or equipment, and it may even instill false confidence. Confidence can be built by facing fears and overcoming them (case in point Victory Tower), but does the benefit of possibly boosting confidence outweigh the risks that are associated with live hand grenades? A Soldier may walk in, employ the hand grenade poorly but in a manner that does not injure anyone within the protective confines of the live bay, and now falsely believe they are proficient in the employment of that weapon, which is extremely dangerous. A change in the Training Support Package (TSP) to allow for more practice fuzes and Drill Sergeant driven instruction in throwing a grenade would meet the intent of the training with substantially less risk to the trainee and the trainer. An additional option to consider would be allowing 1-2 of the top trainees to throw live grenades with the rest of the company watching – this would still allow everyone to familiarize themselves with the 'impact' of the weapon, while reducing AA+E costs. Similar familiarization training is already conducted with both the M203 and AT-4 weapons systems during US Weapons Familiarization.

[W]e must look at how we are teaching these skills and why – if we are not making the absolute best training available with the resources that we are given, and if we are not conducting this training in a manner that preserves the safety and welfare of the trainee and the trainer, we are failing

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 11  
**CPT Martin P. Vanderhoek and 1SG Tyrone Antley are the Commander and First Sergeant for Bravo Company, 4th Battalion, 10th Infantry Regiment, 171st**

### ***Infantry Brigade.***

#### ***Closing thoughts***

A Chinese proverb states “When planning for a year, plant corn. When planning for a decade, plant trees. When planning for life, train and educate people.” As it stands now we are executing what one could say is the equivalent of planting corn. There is a short pay out, that of the Soldier experiencing a sensory overload of sorts, but it does not provide long term value. It could even be argued that we are planting trees, as the experience will no doubt be engrained in an individual for many years. But in order for us to truly impact a Soldier for their life, we must focus on identifying the training that could *save* their life. To take it a step further, we must educate them through immersion on training methodology that is effective and can be carried out efficiently and simply. I believe that a Trainee will remember a well taught, tough, standards based training module much longer in the span of their career than a one-time ‘shock’. As an added bonus, that training model has the potential to show that Soldier how to carry out effective training in a manner that they can remember and take to their follow on unit, draw on during their career, and pass on to others.

An organization which does not continuously search for methods to improve itself will surely stagnate. Organizations often fail because they do not look internally at their methods and programs to determine what does not work, what works but is not necessary and what is a critical task that is needed to keep the organization moving. The Army is no different, and it is absolutely critical that we take a focused, objective look at every training event to determine how best to allocate our resources, which in this case is a disciplined and competent Soldier capable of deploying, engaging, and destroying the enemy from the first day of graduation.

### **Instilling Combat Skills**

The ability for a Soldier to fight and win through knowledge of tactics and the proper employment of individual or crew served weapons systems is invaluable, and our ability as an Army to teach these skills professionally is a primary reason we are the best Army on earth. But we must look at how we are teaching these skills and why – if we are not making the absolute best training available with the resources that we are given, and if we are not conducting this training in a manner that preserves the safety and welfare of the trainee and the trainer, we are failing. And we would be failing not just the United States Army as an institution, but the citizens to which we are responsible to and most importantly, the Soldiers that make up the greatest

**W**e all have heard these sayings before and

all of us as leaders try to live by these axioms when leading our Soldiers. As leaders we should strive relentlessly to not only make these axioms a reality but we should also seek ways to make training better. As a Company Commander I have spent countless hours with my Drill Sergeants at ranges with newly arrived Trainees during Basic Rifle Marksmanship (BRM) periods 4-10. BRM period 4 is typically the most frustrating time for Drill Sergeants, as we have learned from a previous article entitled, "Zeroing the Unzeroable" by SSG Chad A. Sage. Days at BRM period 4 are long and arduous, and sometimes with little reward or little gratification at days end. I have watched many Drill Sergeants walk from the firing point to the target and back numerous times to analyze and assess the Warriors firing. What causes this frustration or feeling of little reward? Teaching correct sight alignment and sight picture is the cause. To achieve a correct sight picture the Trainee must align the rear sight post, the front sight post, and the target. Sight alignment is centering the tip of the front sight post in the center of the rear sight aperture. Any alignment errors will cause the target to be missed. "Right 8 down 6 or left 3 up 3" are familiar sounds coming from Drill Sergeants. These are the corrections that are being given to adjust the point of impact of the round on the target to achieve a hit or a score. These are the same standards and methods I was taught as a Trainee nearly 22 years ago. *Has nothing changed in our weaponry, in our systems, in our technologies, or in our tactics?* To answer the above question, no, our Army has changed and is constantly changing. The Army continues to introduce new weapons systems to enhance our overall readiness by providing our Soldiers with the most advance weaponry, giving us a distinct advantage on the battlefield. In 2000, the Army introduced the M68 Sight Reflex and was designated a Close Combat Optic (CCO). The M68 can be used on both the M16 and M4 rifles and since its introduction the Army has fielded over 1,000,000 M68's. Today BCT companies use traditional iron sights throughout Basic Rifle Marksmanship, but they should no longer; instead they should use the M68, a more efficient, more cost effective, and more true to the modern day battlefield sight. Recently my company participated in a study that compared the effectiveness and efficiency

of the M68 CCO versus the Iron sight, and so began the study of “Legacy Companies vs. Contemporary Companies”.

The three contemporary companies were equipped from the beginning of the cycle with the M68 and the three legacy companies were equipped with standard aperture sights. At the start of BRM 4 I was very nervous with the usage of the M68 for reasons such as equipment malfunctions and Trainees just not grasping the optic as quickly. I utilized three days of BRM 4, two days consisting of two platoons at the zero range and two platoons in the company area conducting BRM reinforcement training. The third day was utilized for our hard cores, which is usually an estimated 30 to 35 Trainees. *Train to standard. Train as you fight. Training must be tough, realistic, and challenging.*

## **BRM Training with the M68**

### **“ A Better Way-More Effective and Efficient”**

CPT Kenneth L. Johnson

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 13

ees. We began BRM 4 by opening the range at 0815 and closed the range at 1745. By lunch time (1200) 47 of the 107 Trainees present at the range had grouped and zeroed with their assigned weapon (M16/M4). I sent 38 of the 47 zeroed Trainees back to the company area and brought 38 of the trainees conducting BRM reinforcement training out to the range. At the end of day 1 for BRM 4 we trained a total of 145 trainees with 32 Trainees failing to group and zero. Day 1 we received 5040 rounds from the Ammunition Supply Point (ASP) and fired 3840 rounds. We also spent a total of 9 ½ hours training Trainees. By bringing Soldiers forward and utilizing the optics our company was now far ahead of the training schedule. On day 2 we brought the remainder of the company to include the 32 that failed to zero the day prior, for a total of 101 Trainees. Day 2 began as day 1 except that we opened the range at 0745 and closed the range at 1700, spending 9 hours and 15 minutes at the range.

We received 6720 rounds and fired 4913. By lunch time again we were approaching 50 firers grouped and zeroed. At 1700 we were 100% grouped and zeroed. This was very instrumental and

set the tone for our best training cycle yet. Drill Sergeants moral was very high at the end of day 2. Now instead of using Day 3 for hard cores, we took out our Trainees that we thought could use more trigger time behind the weapon and optic itself. Now let's take a look at one of our legacy companies who followed the same concept as my company. They also scheduled three days of BRM 4, taking two platoons at a time and saving day 3 for their hard cores. Day 1 they opened the range at 0715 and closed the range at 1730, spending a total of 10 hours and 15 minutes on the range. They received 6720 rounds and fired 6531. They trained 118 Trainees and at the end of the day they had 14 Trainees that did not meet the standard. Day 2 they received 6720 rounds from the ASP and they

### ***Training with the M68***

fired 5880. They opened the range at 0715 and closed the range at 1650, spending 9 hours and 35 minutes at the range. They trained 100 Trainees and at the end of the day they 10 Trainees that did not meet the standard. After Day 2, they were left with 24 Trainees as hard cores. I would like to point out that this company did not bring any Trainees forward as my company did. This is likely because time was spent on the range with a Drill Sergeant or two running remedial training. It could also be that at midday they were in the high teens or low twenties for Trainees being grouped and zeroed. Now let's move to day three with the hard cores. They received 3360 rounds from the ASP and fired 1942. They opened the range at 0830 and closed the range at 1530, spending 7 hours at the range. They trained their 24 remaining Trainees and all 24 were grouped and zeroed bring their company to 100% grouped and zeroed. The difference in time spent at the range, the amount of rounds fired and the higher results of first time go's was very noticeable. This trend continued during BRM 5 which is Location of Hits and Misses (LOMAH). We schedule two days for LOMAH and again split the company into two platoons. Usually this is an all day event at the range because LOMAH is used to verify what we accomplished during BRM 4. During LOMAH my Drill Sergeants spent less time making adjustments

and reconfirming zeros. Again we used less ammunition and spent less time at the range.

The upward trend continued to BRM periods 9 and 10, and the optics proved their worth during qualification. The M68 has a red dot aiming device that can be adjusted to the individual soldier allowing for faster or quicker target acquisition and because Soldiers can engage targets up to 300 meters with both eyes open it allows for better situational awareness. The M68 uses a collimator reflex system. Since the reticle is at infinity it stays in alignment with the device the sight is attached to

14 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

regardless of the viewer's eye position, removing the parallax and other sighting errors found in simple sighting devices (iron sights). On the day of BRM 9, I sensed for the first time in my time as a commander that the Trainees were anticipating firing that day. Previous cycles there were always mumblings and a nervous angst amongst the Trainees. I could also see calm in my Drill Sergeants because they were confident that the Trainees would perform very well. As all company commanders, ISG's and Drill Sergeants know that during BRM 9, if a Trainee achieves a qualifying score that score can count as the Trainee being qualified. At the completion of BRM 9 all but one trainee had achieved a qualifying score. We achieved over 30 experts, with three trainees scored 39 out of 40 hits, over 90 sharpshooters, and over 50 Marksman. For BRM 10 I was able to give every trainee the opportunity to shoot for a higher score. At the end of the day we achieved 41 experts, to include one Hawkeye. We reached 104 sharpshooters and 58 total marksmen. At the completion of BRM 9, the legacy company qualified all but 12 Trainees which is still a very positive turn out. For BRM 10 the legacy company final numbers 20 experts, 73 sharpshooters, 115 marksman, and 1 Trainee not qualifying on their assigned weapon.

***CPT Kenneth L. Johnson is the Commander of Delta Company, 1st Battalion, 34th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.***

ISG Shannon Allen and SFC (DS) Joseph Brown from Delta Co 1-34<sup>th</sup> Infantry Battalion contributed to this article.

Using the M68 CCO proved to more effective and efficient, and yielded a higher success rate among the contemporary companies. As stated above over 1,000,000 M68's have been fielded throughout the Army. Trainees will arrive to the force trained as they will be expected to fight and be knowledgeable of the equipment that will be used to eliminate the enemy. A single 5.56 mm round purchased by the Army cost on average .25 cents per round. The contemporary company based on these numbers have the capacity to fire 5600 less rounds than

the legacy company. That equates to a saving of \$1400.00 for a training cycle. With a possible four to five cycles per year and 5 to 6 companies per battalion this could equate to a savings of \$19,320-\$33,600 per battalion for a fiscal year. Using the CCO during BRM 4 could also potentially eliminate need for training Advance Rifle Marksmanship (ARM) period 3. Requirements for ARM period 3 are exactly the same if units use CCO's from the beginning of BRM. This will not only eliminate the need for ARM 3 but it would save \$20,000-\$22,000 per battalion for a fiscal year. With today's downsizing, military spending and budget cuts are at the forefront of our military future. We as leaders can use the resources we already possess along with some critical thinking and find ways to make training more effective, more efficient, and more relative to how these young Trainees will fight in the force and save government spending in the process.

58  
104  
41  
93  
56  
13

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 15

## **SHELL SHOCK**

The revolutionary weapon that changed warfare forever.

At the start of the 1800's, a new weapon appeared on the battlefields of Europe. It was the brain child of an English officer who had spent thirty years perfecting it. A hollow artillery shell was filled with smaller musket balls, along with a charge of gunpowder ignited by a fuse. The shell could be launched long-distance at the enemy's lines. When it exploded in midair, it spread a deadly carpet of metal shards over a wide area.

The inventor of the shell devoted all his free time to perfecting it, pouring his life savings into the project. The British army finally adopted the shell in 1803, and first used it in the Napoleonic Wars. It proved frighteningly lethal on massed troops and so terrified French soldiers that they believed the British had poisoned their cannonballs.

Sir George Wood, commander of the British artillery, credited the new shell with playing a critical role in the defeat of Napoleon at the Battle Waterloo. "On this simple circumstance hinged entirely the turn of the battle," he later wrote in a letter to the shell's inventor.

Artillery become infinitely more terrifying and the name of the officer who invented the shell became known around the world:

Henry Shrapnel.

Rick Beyer, *The Greatest War Stories Never Told*, (HarperCollins) New York, 2005

16 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**T**he Drill Sergeant, the epitome of the Army

as a profession,<sup>1</sup> was introduced to basic combat training in 1964. Prior to 1964, basic training was conducted, for the most part, by inexperienced and unmotivated Soldiers.<sup>2</sup> With the introduction of the Drill Sergeant concept, the Army adopted the strategy already employed by the other branches of the military of filling the basic combat trainer role with specially trained and highly qualified instructors. The Army developed a strict selection process and a five-week training program to pick and prepare the Soldiers responsible for conducting basic combat training. The pilot program of the Drill Sergeant School, started in May 1964 at Fort Jackson, and the subsequent field tests of drill-sergeant-led basic training were so successful, that by the end of the year the Department of the Army had established Drill Sergeant Schools at six of the Army's training centers and, by October 1965, had directed the use of Drill Sergeants at all of the training centers. The origin of the Drill Sergeant program actually started in 1962, two years prior to the organization of the first Drill Sergeant School. In July 1962, the Department of the Army organized the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Individual Training (DCSIT), Continental Army Command (CONARC), to examine the Army's process of individual training. This reorganization centralized responsibility for basic combat training under one headquarters, CONARC.<sup>3</sup> Once this centralization was accomplished, the DCSIT discovered that the standards of performance at the Army's eight training centers were radically different. To create a more uniform training program, the DCSIT started standardizing the expectations of all the Army training centers, making a comparison of performance between the centers possible.<sup>4</sup> Once the standardization was complete and a comparison of the training centers was possible, leaders from all of the Army training centers met in March 1963 to evaluate their individual training programs. As a result of the conference, an 8-week Basic Combat Training program was developed that went into effect in August 1963. The new curriculum presented a clear statement of objectives and defined goals for each aspect of the training program. The revised program reduced lecture time, removed purely infantry subjects (45 hours of land navigation, land mine warfare, techniques of fire and rifle squad tactics) and substantially increased the time devoted to drills

and ceremonies, physical training, and marches and bivouacs.

Concurrent with the development of the new basic training curriculum, the Secretary of the Army ordered a comparison of the Army training program against the training programs of the Marines, Air Force, and Navy. In 1963, the Under Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes examined

<sup>1</sup> Department of the Army. "U.S. Army Drill Sergeant", <http://www.army.mil/drillsergeant/?from=features>

<sup>2</sup> Department of the Army. "History of the Drill Sergeant", <http://www.army.mil/drillsergeant/history.html>; Memo, Stephen Ailes, Under Secretary of the Army, for Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army, 21 December 1963, sub: Recruit Training, NARA, Paragraph III, C.

<sup>3</sup> CONARC was disestablished in 1973. It was replaced by the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), headquartered at Fort Monroe, VA; and Forces Command (FORSCOM), headquartered at Fort McPherson, GA.

<sup>4</sup> Recruit Training Memo, Paragraph III, A, 1

<sup>5</sup> Recruit Training Memo, Paragraph III, A, 2

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 17

male recruit training in the four branches. In his survey published in December 1963, Ailes recognized the differences in terms of size, Soldier demographics,<sup>6</sup> and objectives of the four programs; however, he believed that common strategies could be employed by all of the programs:

"[I]deas developed in one service to meet specific problems can be useful in another service...the Army can benefit greatly from some of the methods which have been developed in the other BCT programs."<sup>7</sup>

The report identified many deficiencies in the Army training program, primarily concerning the personnel at the training centers.<sup>8</sup> Ailes found that while other branches of the military placed an emphasis on providing a high quality trainer, the Army training centers were "woefully" understaffed, and the Soldiers assigned to the training centers were under qualified, inexperienced, unmotivated, and overworked.<sup>9</sup> The report recognized that the training centers were placed at a low priority in regards to filling positions, which meant that most of the training centers only had their minimum staffing needs fulfilled. Additionally, of the men assigned to the training centers, most were under qualified. While the Staffing Guide for the centers recommended a captain in charge of each training company and a first lieutenant in charge of each platoon, in reality most company commanders were second lieutenants, a majority of whom were Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) graduates freshly reporting from branch school. These officers

### ***Drill Sergeant School***

lacked the experience and leadership skills to effectively govern their subordinates. Sadly, the enlisted personnel faced a similar situation, with drastic shortages of staff

sergeants and sergeants first class but substantial overages in the grades of sergeant and below. Because of these staffing inadequacies, qualified Soldiers at the training centers were overworked. Longer working hours meant disrupted family lives, and the lack of support bred negative attitudes among the trainers.<sup>10</sup>

Among other suggestions to improve the Army basic training program,<sup>11</sup> the Ailes Report recommended an overhaul of the staffing procedures for the training centers. Specifically, the report requested improvements in the selection process for trainers, a formalized training program for the selected trainers, and rewards available for the trainers to attract more Soldiers to the position. The first of these suggestions to gain traction was the implementation of a training program for the trainers.

As a result of the Ailes Report on recruit training, a Trainer Preparation Project Staff, consisting of representatives from the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO),<sup>12</sup> Soldiers from the Army's training centers, staff from the 3rd US Army NCO Academy at Fort Jackson, and a project officer from HQ, CONARC<sup>13</sup> met at Fort Jackson. From February 1 to April 17, 1964, this group worked together to develop a training program that would produce a highly skilled,

<sup>6</sup> Half of the Soldiers going through Army training at the time of the report were draftees, whereas the other services were filled with volunteers. Therefore, Army trainees were, on average, older and better educated.

<sup>7</sup> Recruit Training Memo, Paragraph II

<sup>8</sup> Ailes broke down the deficiencies of the Army training program into three categories: staffing, recognition of trainers, and incentives for brighter trainees. One, staffing at the training centers was inadequate, for the reasons discussed here. Two, the Army did not have a program for selecting, training, and encouraging the training center staff, or in according well merited recognition. And three, "basic combat training...lack[ed] meaningful challenge, especially for those men who have the greatest potential for effective service."

<sup>9</sup> Recruit Training Memo, Paragraph III, C.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> The other suggestions, which addressed the third training deficiency of challenging recruit, included incorporating basic combat training learning comprehension tests and developing a basic training manual to challenge brighter trainees.

<sup>12</sup> HumRRO is an independent, non-profit organization. Their mission is "to develop and apply state-of-the-art science and technology to improve the performance of individuals and teams within public and private sector organizations and educational institutions." (Online, <http://www.humrro.org/corpsite/category/about-humrro>)

<sup>13</sup> Specifically, 4 scientists from the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), 13 officers and 28 enlisted men from five training centers, staff from the 3rd US Army NCO Academy, and a project officer from HQ, CONARC

18 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

competent, dedicated trainer desired in the recruit training centers.<sup>14</sup> From May 25- June 26, 1964, permanent party personnel of Fort Jackson's NCO Academy<sup>15</sup>, supervised by HQ, CONARC and by HumRRO, conducted the Pilot Trainer Preparation Course, a 5-week pilot training course developed by the Trainer Preparation Project Staff, as an adjunct to the existing noncommissioned officers academy.

The Pilot Trainer Preparation Course developed by the Trainer

Preparation Project Staff was divided into two phases: an NCO phase and an Officer Phase.

The NCO Phase, also known as the Drill Sergeant Course, taught leadership, training management, recruit handling, and inspections. The course emphasized training at the company level during basic training and encouraged a closer relationship between the instructors and the trainees than had previously been observed. The Officer Phase, also known as the Pre Command Course, was a two-week course designed to familiarize officers in the grade of major and below in the duties expected of them in a training brigade.

71 Noncommissioned officers volunteered to participate in the NCO Phase, and 15 officers attended the Officer Phase of the Pilot Course. Participants, selected from the 2nd Division at Fort Benning, the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, and the training centers at Fort Gordon and Fort Jackson, could not be over 39 years old, averaged 70 percent or better on academic examinations, scored at least 300 points on the physical fitness test, and had at least 15 months left of service.<sup>16</sup> Upon the candidates' arrival, they were tested on their knowledge – or lack thereof – of training procedures. At the end of the course, the candidates were again tested, with much better results.<sup>17</sup>

Following completion of the Pilot Trainer Preparation Course, the 57 graduating NCOs and 15 graduating officers were placed in basic combat training units to see if their training improved performance. 45 of the graduating NCOs formed the 8th Training Battalion, 2nd Brigade at Fort Jackson, and 12 Drill Sergeants were sent to Fort Gordon to form a single training company.<sup>18</sup> Two test cycles were completed at each location with a representative from CONARC monitoring the results. The tests revealed that the trainees who graduated from these test cycles were

not only better trained  
but had a better attitude  
towards the Army at  
the completion of their  
training.

On September 10,  
1964, following the  
graduation of the drillsergeant-  
trained basic  
combat training units,  
representatives from  
CONARC and from the  
Fort Dix, Fort Leonard  
Wood, Fort Gordon, Fort  
Ord, and Fort Polk training centers met at Fort  
Jackson to discuss the success of the training units  
and the effect of the Drill Sergeant School Program.  
The 8th Battalion test of the Drill Sergeant concept  
of Basic Combat Training was declared a success.

Major General Gines Perez, Commanding General,

<sup>14</sup> "Implementation of Ailes Report," 50th Anniversary History, 1917-1967: Fort Jackson, South Carolina. United States Army Training Center, Infantry, Columbia, South Carolina, November 11, 1967, pp. 155.

<sup>15</sup> Original instructors include: SSG Ernest Jones Jr, Kenneth Miller, Joe Rush, Karl Baccene, and James Ross.

<sup>16</sup> Simpson, Gerald. "The United States Army Drill Sergeant Program History." Staff article, Proponent Development Integration Division of the U.S. Army Drill Sergeant Program, 2013, pp. 14-16.

<sup>17</sup> "Army Drill Sergeant is Breed Apart," Daily Press, Newport News, VA, 3 Aug 1964; Jantzen, Angela. "The U.S. Army Drill Sergeant School," The Leader, 29 June 1989.

<sup>18</sup> Semiannual Historical Report, Advanced Individual Training Division, Individual Training Division, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Individual Training (ODCSIT), Jan-Jun 64, Item 8; "History of the Drill Sergeant", <http://www.army.mil/drillsergeant/history.html>.

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 19

### ***Drill Sergeant School***

Fort Jackson stated that "the Drill Sergeant is a specially trained noncommissioned officer and dedicated Soldier determined to train young recruits in military fundamentals.... His job is a hard one! High moral and professional standards are required of him."<sup>19</sup> Following the success of the test cycles, Drill Sergeant Schools were set up at six of the eight major basic training centers. By October 5, 1964, Drill Sergeant Schools had opened at Fort Dix, Fort Knox, Fort Ord, Fort Leonard Wood, and Fort Polk, in addition to the school already in place at Fort Jackson.<sup>20</sup>

Over the next year, the Army continued to define the Drill Sergeant program and the curriculum taught at the Drill Sergeant Schools.

In September 1964,  
the Department  
of the Army  
authorized Drill  
Sergeants to wear  
the Montana Peak  
campaign hat and  
the "pumpkin  
patch" Drill  
Sergeant insignia.  
The hat, retired

from Army use in

1939, and the patch, previously worn by all training center personnel, were reclaimed as distinguishing Drill Sergeant markers, to serve as well-recognized symbols of the Drill Sergeant tradition.<sup>21</sup>

Additionally, in February 1965, the Army redefined the criteria used to select Drill Sergeants, limiting qualifying Soldiers to sergeants returning from overseas for reassignment, rank E4 or higher, who were younger than 39 years old, physically fit, and qualified in a combat arms MOS; who had good military bearing and no record of emotional instability; and who demonstrated leadership and Soldierly qualities with no record of disciplinary action.<sup>22</sup> These changes were made in an attempt to attract Soldiers with more experience and with more qualifications into the Drill Sergeant roles. To further sweeten the pot, the Army began to offer extra uniforms and a standard 2-year tour for those Soldiers who served as Drill Sergeants.<sup>23</sup>

Regarding development of the Drill Sergeant curriculum, the Army looked at the Marine Drill Instructor program that was already in place for guidance. From January 13 to March 12, 1965, the Army sent 10 noncommissioned officers from 6 different training centers to the Marine Drill Instructor School at Parris Island to study first-hand the methods used by the Marines to instruct their Drill Instructors.<sup>24</sup> A second class of NCOs attended the course from March 26 to May 21, 1965, for the same purpose. From the experience, the sergeants gained insight on the Marine techniques of drill discipline, physical training, and basic marksmanship, with the intention of improving the Army's training methods.<sup>25</sup> Following the graduation of the first

<sup>19</sup> "Drill Sergeant Concept of Basic Combat Training," 50th Anniversary History, 1917-1967: Fort Jackson, South Carolina. United States Army Training Center, Infantry, Columbia, South Carolina, November 11, 1967, pp. 162

<sup>20</sup> Simpson, Gerald. "The United States Army Drill Sergeant Program History." Staff article, Proponent Development Integration Division of the U.S. Army Drill Sergeant Program, 2013, pp. 20.

<sup>21</sup> Fort Jackson Historical Report, Annual Supplement, 1 Jul 63- 31 Dec 64, pg. 10; United States Army Drill Sergeant School Historical Information Pamphlet, 1989; Memo, Status of Actions, 15 Oct 64.

<sup>22</sup> Simpson, Gerald. "The United States Army Drill Sergeant Program History." Staff article, Proponent Development Integration Division of the U.S. Army Drill Sergeant Program, 2013, pp. 21; CONARC letter, 9 Mar 64, re: Ailes Survey, Incl 2, p. 6.

<sup>23</sup> Facsimile, Dr. Chapman, TRADOC Command Historian to Judy Madison, Ft Jackson Museum, 24 July 1992. Historian Files, Drill Sergeant Photos/ Primary Documents folder, BCT Museum.

<sup>24</sup> SSG Ernest M. Jones, Jr., SFC Edwin L. Moody; SFC Argil L. Kirk, Fort Ord, CA; P/Sgt. Billy Wittington and S/Sgt. Ernest L. Leonard, Ft Leonard Wood, MO; SFC David F. Butters and SFC Walter W. Bryant, Ft Dix, NJ; SFC George C. Cruz, Ft Polk, LA; and SFC James L. Hood, Ft Know, KY attended the Marine Drill Instructor School at Parris Island from January 13-March 12, 1965. M/Sgt. Leonel A. Martinez, Ft Polk, was senior NCO of the group and collected notes and observations on the training received by the class ("Drill Sergeants Back to Army" The Leader, 19 March 1965).

<sup>25</sup> "Drill Sergeant Back to Army," The Leader, March 19, 1965.

20 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

group of Drill Sergeants from the Marine program, on March 16-18, 1965, commandants from each of the Drill Sergeant Schools, representatives from each Army headquarters, and HumRRO representatives met at Headquarters, CONARC to discuss further modifications to the Drill Sergeant program. As a result of the conference, the Drill Sergeant Course was expanded from 5

weeks to 6 weeks in order to add instruction on marksmanship, drill, and methods of instruction, and the Drill Sergeant Course Orientation was shortened from 2 weeks to 1 week. Also, the commandants were able to formalize a plan for the development of Drill Sergeant School training materials, lesson plans, and a standardized POI.<sup>26</sup> With all of these developments in place, CONARC issued instructions implementing the Drill Sergeant program in basic combat training at all training centers on October 4, 1965.

**Stephanie Sapp is a museum technician at the U.S. Army Basic Combat Training Museum, Fort Jackson, SC. She earned her degree in History from the College of William and Mary and her Masters in Archaeology from the University of South Carolina.**

<sup>26</sup> Simpson, Gerald. "The United States Army Drill Sergeant Program History." Staff article, Proponent Development Integration Division of the U.S. Army Drill Sergeant Program, 2013, pp. 26.

<sup>27</sup> Recruit Training Memo, Paragraph V.

<sup>28</sup> "Drill Sergeant Creed." U.S. Army Drill Sergeant School Drill Sergeant Candidate Guide, U.S. Army Drill Sergeant School, Fort Jackson, SC, 1 June 2012.

In December 1963, Stephen Ailes warned, "[T]he Army can only gain as more effort is devoted to the BCT program, to staffing it with the right number and kind of trainers and to giving it the participants in it the recognition which it deserves."<sup>27</sup> The Department of the Army responded quickly to Ailes' portent of deficiency, and within two years, had developed, tested, revised, and implemented a Drill Sergeant program. The program was an immediate success, and ever since, the Drill Sergeant School has trained Soldiers to lead by example, to instill pride into those they train, and to bring basic combat training Soldiers up to the Army standards of military bearing and courtesy.<sup>28</sup>

## There are no traffic jams along the extra mile.

Roger Staubach

22 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**O**n 16 October 2012, a new unit was

activated on Fort Jackson comprised of Soldiers who were already here. The 208th Military Police Detachment (MWD) was created as a subordinate of the 17th Military Police Detachment. This new detachment consists solely of Military Working Dogs and Working Dog Handlers whose mission is to provide trained and certified Military Working Dog teams to the Fort Jackson Community and in support of TRADOC and the Department of Defense operations worldwide.

The Soldiers and Working Dogs of the 208th

Military Police Detachment work diligently providing Force Protection to Fort Jackson on a daily basis by conducting Random Anti-Terrorism Measures around the installation. The 208th also provides support to every unit Commander on the installation with the use of narcotics detection dogs for health and welfare searches. Any unit Commander can request Military Working Dog support for health and welfare inspections by contacting the Fort Jackson Kennel Master at 751-1529.

The scope of the Military Working Dog teams on the installation reaches farther than the gates. The 208th also provides Explosive Detector Dog support to local agencies when requested as well as federal support to the Department of State and the U.S. Secret Service worldwide. These MWD teams also deploy worldwide in support of operations. The 208th is the highest deployed organization on Fort Jackson due to the fact that they continually have MWD teams deployed at all times.

## **Fort Jackson's Four Legged Military Police Detachment**

### **SFC Ted Perry Jr.**

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 23

The Soldiers that handle these working dogs are 31B Military Policemen with an additional skill identifier of Z6. In October of 2014, Military Working Dog Handlers will become its own MOS of 31K.

The Soldiers that become Military Working Dog Handlers undergo an extensive period of training that begins with Basic Training at Fort Leonard Wood. After completing the 16 week Basic Combat Training and Military

Police One Station Unit Training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO they then conduct 11 weeks of training at the Military Working Dog Handler's Course at Lackland AFB, TX. After the completion of the MWD Handler's course, these new handlers face a whole new challenge, being introduced to their first working dog at their duty station. Typically, a new MWD handler will be assigned to a narcotics dog for at least one year in an effort to hone their skills before moving to an explosives detection dog where they will work to save lives.

The transition of the Military Working Dog section becoming its own MOS of 31K marks a new chapter in the transition of the Army. Up until now, all of the Military Working Dog handlers have been seasoned Military Policemen prior to going to K9 School. The previous standards were for personnel wishing to become MWD handlers to be a Specialist or above and possess a minimum of three years of

## **Four Legged Military Police Detachment**

***SFC Ted Perry Jr. is the Kennel Master for the 208th Military Police Detachment.***

service. With the implementation of the new MOS of 31K this October, personnel are able to enlist in the Army for the sole purpose of being a MWD Handler. Although the times are changing, the standards are not. Regardless of whether it is a Sergeant reclassifying their MOS to become 31K, or a new basic entry Private enlisting in the Army to work dogs, the job will remain just as challenging as it has ever been. Although the 31K MOS will remain small in numbers, there will still be plenty of room to excel.

The 31K MOS of Military Working Dog Handler goes active in October of 2014. If anyone is interested in the possibility of changing their MOS or enlisting in the Army as a Dog Handler, they can contact the Fort Jackson Military Working Dog Kennel Master for information. ***It takes a special breed to work with MWD's and if you fit the mold then this just might be the job for you.***

24 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

# CBRN

**E**veryone remembers their first or only

experience in the gas chamber. For some it was a terrifying experience that they will never forget, and for others it was an adventure. Here lately though it has been a big disappointment. I've been asked things like "was that just a practice run? Drill Sergeant" or "Can I try it again, without my mask?" The point is over the generations there has been a lot of hype that has built up surrounding the day you go to the gas chamber in BCT, and the bottom line is the majority of Soldiers want the gas. I say let's give it to them, not in the traditional way though, I say why not send them inside, just carrying the mask, MOPP level 1.

We all remember how it worked- we lined up, some guy said "Gas, gas, gas!", while giving the appropriate hand and arm signal then we all held our breath, closed our eyes and attempted to don our pro-mask in nine seconds or less. Once our mask was properly sealed we were then inspected by the same guy and walked into the chamber. We lined up on both sides of the chamber, backs against the wall, then looked left and right and up and down, showing us that our equipment does in fact work. We were then instructed to break the seal and clear the mask just as we were taught, once again instilling confidence in our equipment. Once all that ridiculousness was over with we could get on to the fun part, the fun part being breathing in that volatile supposedly nonlethal substance until you swore you were going to die.

At first you think something like "Well, this isn't that bad, it doesn't taste very good, but it's not all that bad." That lasts for all of about 3 to 5 seconds (coincidentally the same amount of time as the delay of the M67 hand grenade), then your eyes begin to water uncontrollably, you begin to cough up what you believe is your own lungs, mucus begins to flow from your nostrils, and you of course cannot breathe, not that you really want to anyway. While all of this is going on some inconsiderate Drill Sergeant, who is wearing a mask, is telling you to state your name and the last four digits of your social security number, or

**Chemical, Biological, Radiological  
and Nuclear**

SSG Matthew Stahl

## **CBRN**

your roster number, or the seven Army Values. You try to spit out this information, but the only thing you can think of is “I need to get out of here, but I can’t even see the door. I can’t really see anything for that matter.” Once you do finally make it out the door you are told to flap your arms up and down as if you are absurdly reenacting the Greek mythological tale of Icarus.

What is the purpose of this? The widely used answer to this question is to gain confidence in your equipment. The true purpose of the gas chamber is to ensure that you can properly don, clear and seal your mask. Do you need to expose yourself to a contaminated environment to do this? Probably not, definitely not to know you have a proper seal. But to know you have properly cleared your mask, there definitely needs to be some proof that you did it correctly. Do you need CS gas to prove this? No, all you really need is an enclosed space and a stink bomb or two picked up from your closest fireworks dealer. So what is the point of all of it?

The only reason I can give for doing it this way, is that years ago we started doing it this way, and now it is more or less a tradition, or rite of passage. In all actuality the Soldiers want it this way. Maybe not herded in the chamber like cattle, but they definitely want some gas. In recent cycles our battalion has stopped conducting the gas chamber in this manner. We have now turned this day into a mission. It starts off the night before when they are briefed the Operations Order. This sets the precedence for the next day; it gets them excited, and motivated to do the training. We try to instill in them that this is not just another day, this is a mission, and the local nationals of Tbilisi depend on your success.

The following is the OPORD that we currently use:

**SITUATION:** B/2-39IN has been assigned to assist and advise the local police agency in the Gorgas capital of Tbilisi. Our assigned police agency has a storage facility containing riot gear that includes, but is not limited to weapons, CS gas, and a riot control agent. The LN police agency to which we have been assigned have requested our assistance to secure the site. The police agency has reported that a team-sized enemy element attacked the storage facility IOT secure the riot control agent and in doing so, have dispersed the chemical agent in both the concentrated space of the storage facility and in the area surrounding the site. The report further

indicates that multiple friendly personnel have sustained small arms fire related wounds inside of the compound and that they will require medical assistance when site security has been established. PPE has been used by the enemy operating in the area; however, the team-sized enemy element has been reported as having exfiltrated from the site when the gas was released. MISSION: B/2-39IN secures the LN police munitions depot IVO Grid NT 0794 6445 NLT \_\_\_\_\_ IOT prevent the chemical threat in the area.

EXECUTION: Weapons squad, the shaping operation, establish support by fire in order to allow 1st Squad to attack. On order, 1st Squad will attack Objective 1, in vicinity of grid NT 0794

*26 Jackson Journal April - July 2014*

6445, in order to secure the objective. Once OBJ 1 is secure, and cleared of all enemy forces, SSE will be conducted as well as aid and litter to tend to any casualties. At PL Red, all elements will prepare PPE (MOPP1), and begin maneuver as they enter the most likely area of contamination, or the "hot zone." PL White; all elements are in place and ready to assault/SBF. Refer to Ex-check for reporting criteria.

The best way to execute the training and make it more realistic is to take out the CBRN briefing, the mask inspection, and the nonsense that typically goes on inside and while exiting the chamber. So how do we do that? We have to ensure they get a safety brief, and we have to ensure the masks are all in proper working order. The best way to do this is to have the cadre from CBRN come to your Company the day before to do all this. As long as you coordinate and plan it in advance they typically do not have any issues with doing this. If you do it this way you can actually SP from the company area and stay tactical throughout the entire training exercise. Our unit has completely stopped doing it the old way. Once inside the chamber the Soldiers never actually take their masks off. All they do is break the seal and re-seal and clear their mask. They never actually get the experience of a riot control agent and how it affects your body, and mind. The Soldiers then leave the chamber disappointed. The reason we stopped doing it the old way, the old way being making them say something to ensure they inhale the gas, is because it could be looked at as hazing. And I'm sure that it was or is border line hazing in some instances. But is it hazing to make someone do something that they actually want to do or have looked forward to doing for some time? Every year thousands of Soldiers in Basic

Combat Training all over the country repel down the confidence tower, some very much terrified. Since being a Drill Sergeant I have seen plenty of Soldiers cry before, during, and after repelling down the tower. Is this not hazing, forcing a Soldier to do something that is going to cause them to cry in front of all their battle buddies and maybe make them a little ashamed of themselves? Of course not, because it's forcing them to overcome a challenge, a fear and show some personal courage. And it's a graduation requirement.

There is a way for the Soldiers to get the experience but at the same time keeping it realistic. Let's face the facts; you will never remove your pro-mask in a contaminated environment. You will also never enter a contaminated environment, stop what you are doing, and break the seal of your mask only to re-seal it. So, how do we do this?

It all starts the night or day before with the OPORD. Once they receive the mission they automatically go into PCCs and PCIs. This would be a good time to have the CBRN cadre there to inspect the masks. The next morning you SP enroute to CBRN, remaining tactical the whole way. Establish the ORP, and then kick out the first squad to support by fire. Once SBF is established it is now time for the decisive operation. The assault squad then moves to the OBJ (chamber) and then enters and clears. Once inside they realize that there is some sort of chemical/biological agent in the air and they immediately don their pro-mask, seal and clear. Once this is done they can go back to securing the objective. Once secured they exit move to a safe location, preferably in the wood-line and decontaminate. What are the challenges? First, once the first person enters the building they should know that there is some sort of toxic agent in the air, so shouldn't they immediately pull back? I know I would. The only way I can think to overcome this challenge would be to brief them just like we do at MSTF. What I mean by this is we do not go into the MSTF building conducting Battle Drill 6, we tell the Soldiers before to pretend they are still outside. We could do the same thing here. Think of it like you are seizing an objective and

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 27

*SSG Mathew Stahl is a Drill Sergeant in Bravo Company, 2nd Battalion, 39th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.*

## **CBRN**

the enemy attacked you with a chemical agent. Second, keeping pieces in motion, what I've found easiest is to keep two squads on support

by fire. This way once one squad enters the chamber the next squad from support by fire begins their movement to the chamber. While this is happening you are already bringing the next squad up to the support by fire location. This allows all the Soldiers to participate on both the shaping operation as well as the decisive operation, and it keeps the flow of things moving. Third, what do you do if a Soldier cannot get their mask on? Well Noncommissioned Officer, use good judgment and remove the Soldier from the chamber if this happens. The RSO is in there, two other Drill Sergeants and one of the range cadres are all inside, between the four of them it should be easy to figure out.

The point is these Soldiers want to get gassed. They want the excitement and adventure. They want to be able to tell the story of how awful their experience in the gas chamber was, in a good way of course. So how do we change it to make it realistic and give them the experience they are looking for? I like the way our battalion does it, mission oriented, and so do the Soldiers. Instead of doing it the traditional way of having their mask on before they enter a contaminated area why not have them go inside without the mask on. This not only makes it more realistic, but it will give them the opportunity to get what they came for. It alleviates the opportunity for what might be perceived as hazing. It might also give them the motivation they need to actually get that mask on in less than nine seconds.

28 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**T**he Army's need for thinking, innovative, and confident leaders and Soldiers is not unique to our current historical era. Long before computers, networks, or smart munitions, the Army found, under the stress of combat, that only self-guiding and self-correcting Soldiers are fit for service in the army of a republic. Indeed, an unbiased reading of American military history reveals that the Army relearns this lesson with monotonous regularity, and our ability to treat this lesson as a surprise is perhaps the biggest surprise of all. As the excerpts from the *Army Learning Concept* of 2011 and the famous *Infantry in Battle* of 1939 reveal, the Soldier that we need for tomorrow is not so radically different from the one we needed yesterday – but both are far from the mindless, unthinking automaton that serves as the stereotype. But how to produce that Soldier? This seems to be the real issue around which our recurring

discussions of leader and Soldier development center. We know what we need in a Soldier, but

COL Joseph McLamb

“The Soldier Selects...”

## *Creating Soldiers for the Next Conflict*

The Army learning model must develop adaptable Soldiers and leaders who have the cognitive, interpersonal, and cultural skills necessary to make sound judgments in complex environments, from the tactical to strategic level.

TRADOC Pamphlet 525-8-2

*The U.S. Army Learning Concept for 2015*

20 Jan 11

To master his difficult art he must learn to cut to the heart of a situation, recognize its decisive elements and base his course of action on these. The ability to do this is not God-given, nor can it be acquired overnight; it is a process of years. He must realize that training in solving problems of all types, long practice in making clear, unequivocal decisions, the habit of concentrating on the question at hand, and an elasticity of the mind, are indispensable requisites for the successful practice of the art of war.

*Infantry in Battle*<sup>1</sup>

1939

<sup>1</sup> Author unidentified, *Infantry in Battle* (Washington, D.C.: The Infantry Journal, 1939). This text, originally authored by officers at Fort Benning, Georgia, reflected the Army's lessons learned from its experience in the First World War. It was republished on the eve of the Second.

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 29

frequently find ourselves at a loss for techniques that produce that Soldier. Indeed, my contention is that we all too frequently adopt training techniques that actively work against our stated desires. Perhaps a single example will illustrate the point. Soldiers in Basic Combat Training typically execute the Buddy Team Live Fire Exercise (BTLFX) during their seventh week of training.<sup>2</sup> The Army's expectations of the Soldier at that point are high. Without cadre assistance, the Soldier is required to select temporary fighting positions with cover and concealment, use proper movement techniques as required by terrain and enemy fire, and engage enemy personnel to enable continued movement toward the objective.<sup>3</sup> He is, in other words, expected to solve the tactical problem he faces on his own, aided only by his battle buddy. Clearly, the Army had the Soldier of the future in mind when we drafted these standards – to be successful the Soldier must think for himself, take the initiative, and adapt to changing battlefield conditions. But twenty minutes spent on this range will lead an observer to note that very few Soldiers achieve this standard, and – more alarmingly – few cadre members even see this standard as achievable. Instead, most Soldiers aim for and achieve a much lower standard for the BTLFX, a standard that might be summarized as “the Soldier obeys the commands of his Drill Sergeant and does not violate the safety requirements of the range.” This

standard makes obedience, not initiative, the prized commodity in a Soldier, and seems to be designed to produce the stereotypical mindless automaton rather than the self-guiding and self-correcting

### ***the Next Conflict***

Soldier that we will need in the future...and depended upon in the past.

If we really want to produce competent Soldiers who are assets to their units, we have to let go of a number of wrong practices that currently dominate our training methodology. We are guilty of valuing obedience above initiative, of relying on authority rather than influence, and of focusing on motivation at the expense of inspiration. Note that I call these practices “wrong,” not “old.” These practices are not tried and true techniques that have suddenly been rendered inappropriate by a change in our environment; these were bad ideas yesterday as well as today. They retain their attractiveness not because they are successful, but because they place a lesser demand on us as leaders than their better, more effective alternatives. To produce the best possible Soldier, however, we must accept these better alternatives and the cost of implementing them.

### **Initiative is more powerful than obedience**

Obedience is absolutely necessary in a Soldier, especially in a Soldier of a republic. The American people will and should tolerate an Army only so long as they can be completely confident that the Army will be obedient to orders. From that requirement naturally and directly flows the requirement for all Soldiers to obey all lawful orders.

The opposite of obedience is not initiative, however, but disobedience. Initiative, at least as envisioned within our doctrine, is a powerful form of obedience. Exercising initiative does not mean ignoring orders, but interpreting them and applying them to the situation at hand in a manner that produces the desired outcome of the order. “Disciplined initiative” as described in ADP 3-0 requires leaders and Soldiers to operate within the commander’s intent.<sup>4</sup> This is much more difficult than simply obeying orders. *It is “the Soldier selects” rather than “the Soldier obeys.”*

The importance of initiative in combat is difficult to overstate. Armies that build Soldiers and leaders who take the initiative have an almost unbeatable

<sup>2</sup>Fort Jackson Standardized Basic Combat Training Core 2014.

<sup>3</sup>Buddy Team Live Fire Exercise, BT071002, Version 2.0, 1 Mar 10, page 5.

**If we really want to produce competent Soldiers who are assets to their units, we have to let go of**

## a number of wrong practices that currently dominate our training methodology.

30 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

advantage over armies that do not, and much of the US Army's success has rested squarely on this advantage much more than advanced technology. If not trained correctly however, the idea of initiative can be disastrous. The German invasion of France in 1940 is often held out as one of the most clear examples of an army led by empowered leaders using their initiative fighting an opponent whose leaders do nothing more than follow orders. The reality, however, is a bit more complicated. When the Germans first established a bridgehead over the Meuse River, the French commander in the sector correctly assessed the situation and determined that a major counter-attack coming at dawn on the next morning would almost certainly eliminate the bridge-head and end German visions of a rapid victory. His German counterparts apparently came to the same conclusion, and spent the evening frantically trying to get tanks and anti-tank guns across the river before dawn. They failed, but their bridgehead remained intact because the French counter-attack never materialized, despite repeated orders from the senior French commanders. When asked to explain the failure to counter-attack during what both sides recognized as a period of extreme German vulnerability, the French commander blamed his subordinate commanders' tendency to "interpret an order [rather] than to execute it as received; too great a facility to modify under the pretext of initiative." Initiative is not freedom to do what the individual wants, but the power to adjust individual actions to match rapidly changing conditions in order to achieve the intent. To be successful on the future battlefield, we need both leaders and Soldiers who use their initiative in order to accomplish their assigned mission. The degree of latitude will increase as a leader's responsibilities increase, but even at the individual Soldier level, we must train them in Basic Combat Training to exercise the initiative appropriate to their level of responsibility. The standards for the BTLFX clearly point us in that direction.

### **Influence is more powerful than authority**

In the same way that initiative is really an expanded version of obedience, influence is an expanded version of authority. Leaders have authority because the organization delegates it to them; for example, the authority of a commander is delegated by the Army in AR 600-20. Authority

is important; the Army could not function without it, and Basic Combat Training would be impossible if leaders at every echelon did not have clear authority.

As important as it is, however, it is not sufficient in and of itself. Going back to our BTLFX example, a Drill Sergeant who relies solely on authority can get the Soldier through the event only by dictating his every move, a course of action that falls short of the standard. Instead, the effective leader exerts an influence on his subordinates that exceeds his authority by a significant degree. The best Drill Sergeants continue to exert an influence on Soldiers long after they have graduated from Basic Combat Training and moved to their first unit of assignment.

Sadly, influence cannot be delegated by an Army regulation or any other device. It must be earned. Leaders gain influence through demonstrated competence, clear commitment to the mission, and genuine concern for their subordinates. It takes time to build influence, and even relatively minor lapses in judgment can quickly reduce influence. On the day that a Soldier reports to Basic Combat Training, we are completely reliant on authority to direct his actions. We have no inherent influence; he doesn't even know us. But we know something on that first day that he doesn't know – in just seven weeks he will have to execute the BTLFX without the benefit of our authoritative instructions. If he is to be successful, we must start building influence that very first day.

<sup>4</sup> Army Doctrinal Publication 3-0, Unified Land Operations, Oct 11, page 6.

<sup>5</sup> Alistair Horne, *To Lose a Battle: France 1940* (New York: Penguin, 2007), page 365.

<sup>6</sup> TRADOC Regulation 350-6, Enlisted Initial Entry Training policies and Administration, 7 Nov 13, page 16.

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 31

**COL Joseph McLamb is the Commander of the 193rd Infantry Brigade (Basic Combat Training) at Fort Jackson.**

### **Inspiration is more powerful than motivation**

We *can* build that influence, and the secret to doing so is no secret at all. We simply must move past “motivation” to inspiration. Motivation can come from a variety of sources, to include fear of punishment, desire to gain some reward, or simple peer pressure. None of these motivators is poor in their own right, and leaders have used them for generations. They simply are insufficient to produce Soldiers who use their initiative to accomplish their assigned mission. To do that, we need to inspire.

Inspiration is the central foundation of both the Army's model for future Soldiers and its stated method for producing those Soldiers – transformation. “The primary behavioral learning method in IET is through observation, requiring consistent leadership by example. The IET

environment fosters learning through observation, making it critical for leaders and trainers to embrace the ‘do as I do’ mentality.”<sup>6</sup>From wearing the uniform to moving under direct fire to living in accordance with Army Values, the primary way that a Soldier is transformed is through watching his leader do these things. The leader’s authority compels compliance when under observation, but the leader’s influence generates initiative even in the absence of definitive orders.

### ***the Next Conflict***

Leaders gain influence through demonstrated competence, clear commitment to the mission, and genuine concern for their subordinates.

<sup>6</sup>TRADOC Regulation 350-6, Enlisted Initial Entry Training policies and Administration, 7 Nov 13, page 16.

### **The Soldier Selects...Correctly**

The standards for the BTLFX fall short in only one regard; they require the Soldier to select his temporary position and his movement technique, but do not explicitly require that he choose correctly. Clearly, however, that is the intent. We want Soldiers who not only make decisions, but make them correctly. And we want them to do be able to do so, at least for simple situations such as that reflected in the BTLFX, only seven weeks after they begin their journey in the Army.

We cannot attain this standard if we focus exclusively on obedience and discard initiative, rely solely on authority and never build influence, or ignore inspiration in favor of motivation.

Obedience, authority, and motivation can get us through a simplified and unrealistic version of the BTLFX, but they will not produce the self-guiding and self-correcting Soldiers that our Army needs – and that we have the duty to produce.

32 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**I**n 1980 the Department of Defense (DoD),

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics, designated the Secretary of the Army as the single manager for the Military Postal Service (MPS). Under this authority the Inter-Service Postal Training Activity (IPTA) was established in 1982 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, as part of the Adjutant General’s Corps, and serves as the DoD single Inter-Service Training Review Organization (ITRO) course for postal training. In 1995 IPTA was moved to its current location at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. The IPTA multi-service team of Army, Air Force, Marine and civilians account for the effective postal training of an estimated 800 students annually.

The ITRO Postal Course is designed to

provide a postal foundation to service members without previous experience in postal related tasks. Students receive training in both the basic and advanced areas of military postal operations. Three courses are provided: (F5) Postal Operations Course, (F5)

Postal

Operations Phase I Course, and the (F4) Postal Supervisor Course. Each course curriculum is designed to adequately train and prepare student for postal duties. Student populations consist of civilian, Active and Reserve personnel that range from E1 through O4. Postal Course graduates can be expected to be proficient in postal finance and mail processing within a Military Post Office (MPO).

The IPTA provides a resident (F5) Postal Operations Course that includes twelve lesson plans that are required to be completed within a 5 week (187 academic hours) training schedule. This resident course includes a Mock MPO CPX that allows students to demonstrate their technical competence in the following areas: Stamp Stock, Domestic Mail I & II, Money Orders, International Mail, Postal Claims, Postal Service Centers, Postal Supplies, Mail Transportation, Mail Directory, Mail Processing, and Registered Mail.

Mobilized units receive a 4 week (187 academic hours) nonresident (F5) Postal Operations Course that is supported via an IPTA instructor led Mobile Training Team (MTT). The Army Reserve and National Guard receive a tailored 2 week (77.5 academic hours) resident (F5) Postal Operations Phase I Course. The (F5) Postal Operations Phase I Course is designed to effectively provide technical instruction in postal financial operations. A (F5) Postal Operations Phase II Course is offered at Ft. Deven's by the U.S. Army Reserve for an additional 2 weeks. The (F5) Postal Operations Phase I and Phase II Courses are only available to the Army Reserve and National Guard.

## **Inter-Service Postal Training Activity (IPTA) CWO3 (USMC) I.G. Rodriguez and Mr. Michael W. Gasque**

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 33

Additionally, the IPTA provides a resident (F4) Postal Supervisor Course that includes five lesson plans that are required to be completed within a 2 1/2 week (103 academic hours)

training schedule. This resident course also includes a Mock MPO CPX that allows students to demonstrate their technical competence in the following areas: MPS Overview, Custodian of Postal, Effect / Meter Operations, Point of Sale (POS), Automated Military Postal System, and Inspect MPO.

The (F5) Postal Operations Course, (F5) Postal Operations Phase I Course and (F4) Postal Supervisor Course have been structured to facilitate individual learning and are task-oriented. Soldiers are taught as they fight. Critical tasks supported by basic skills and knowledge are performed by most military postal personnel regardless of their duty positions. Therefore, the courses are designed to provide training in those “critical” areas.

In 2012 the DoD required the replacement of the antiquated Integrated Retail Terminals with the Pitney Bowes Meter / Scale and Point of Sale system. Many military postal facilities have already transitioned to the new systems with remaining locations making the transition later in 2013. This

## **IPTA**

DoD initiative required a near complete change to the course curriculum. The IPTA staff has aggressively initiated training on these new systems with initial feedback from instructors and students to be very positive.

The IPTA continues to align training in compliance with the Army Learning Model 2015, and we are very excited with the progress made on our Mock MPO CPX. The Mock MPO CPX adds a special degree of realistic training that enhances the IPTA structured training requirements. The IPTA is committed to obtaining a continued standard of excellence by providing relevant and current postal training to the DoD.

**CWO3 (USMC) I.G. Rodriguez is the Director and Mr. Michael W. Gasque is the Deputy Director of the Inter-Service Postal Training Activity, Soldier Support Institute, Fort Jackson, SC.**

There are three types of possible offenders in the BCT environment: Predators, Outliers, and Norms. The Predator is self-explanatory. This individual is purely motivated by self-esteem, either high or low. Either they want to dominate others, or they want to feel better about themselves. The Outliers are those individuals that you would never anticipate committing a Sexual Assault or Sexual Harassment violation, however, some significant or traumatic event has occurred in their lives and they step over the line in order to feel that they control their lives again. The Norms are those individuals that, again, would normally never commit a violation, but influencers, such as command climate, environment, or Soldier vulnerability creates a “perfect storm” that the individual sees as an unavoidable opportunity. With all three types of possible offenders, there are the following influencers:

For the sake of simplicity, we will discuss Center of Gravity Analysis starting with identifying the Center of Gravity, moving to Critical Capabilities and then identifying Critical Requirements, Critical Vulnerabilities and Critical Requirements that are Critical Vulnerabilities. When examining the possible Center of Gravity (CoG) of the three types

**A**s an Army trained to fight and win wars, we have spent countless hours training leaders, analysts, and even Soldiers on how to analyze enemy based data in foreign countries in order to be able to attack those enemies. Recently, there has been a concerted effort to try and “fix” the Army’s sexual assault trends. That being said, we often look at foreign insurgents and sexual predators inside our ranks through a disconnected and myopic view. However, just because the sexual predator wears the same uniform, they are still an enemy that is consciously planning and executing actions that destroy our force, just like an enemy insurgent in Iraq or Afghanistan. While their goals may be different, their actions are strikingly similar. Conversely, we currently think of sexual predators as criminals, and therefore analyze the problem in that vein. The deepest analysis tends to look more like profiling right now, which is limited at best in determining not only who the predator is, but what actions should be taken to defeat him. Yet, if we look at analyzing sexual predators the same way we look at Al Qaeda-Iraq insurgents, we can not only find that it is probably “a young male between 25-30 years ...” or whatever unactionable data points that profiling gives us, but

we can also find proactive measures that we can do. At this point, because we are only profiling the enemy instead of targeting them. Thus, we are left with unsynchronized strategies that only touch the surface of the problem, and most simply serve as a talking point to say we are trying. On the other hand, if we target the predator with the mindset that the predator is an enemy to our unit, we can develop a coordinated attack strategy that does not waste time and resources hanging random signs and giving ill-timed briefings that do not have impact as standalone products. This is the process as applied to a Basic Combat Training battalion that includes fully gender integrated platoons of trainees.

## COG Analysis and Associated Targeting for SHARP

LTC J.C. Glick and MAJ Jay K. Smith

Command Climate

Wartime Service/Experience

Position/Job (being a Drill

Sergeant/Cadre member)

Soldier Vulnerabilities/

Attitudes

Opportunity

Motive

Family

Environment

Culture

Financial Issues

“It is time we take on the fight against sexual assault and sexual harassment as our primary mission.”

GEN Ray Odinero

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 35

of predators there were two influencers that all three required, and where all three derived their power: Motive and Opportunity. As shown in the Venn diagram below, where these two influencers intersect is the CoG.

From that CoG we identified the following Critical Capabilities (CC):

These Critical Capabilities show us why we are afraid of this threat – the threat itself may seem to be enough, however, without understanding the true capabilities of what that threat brings, we run the risk of attacking the symptoms of the threat, or even unrelated issues, instead of having effects on the threat itself. The threat’s effects are far greater than the SHARP act itself – as you can see above, the Critical Capabilities erode the BCT environment to the point it is no longer a learning/building environment, but more an environment to “survive”, and directly contradictory to our values. Examining it from this direction allows us to identify what the threat can do to prevent us from accomplishing our mission – and as seen – these capabilities seriously degrade our ability to accomplish our mission in BCT.

As we move to identify what Critical Requirements and Critical Vulnerabilities, we begin to identify areas where we can “target” the threat. As we identified the threat capabilities we identified the following Critical Requirements and Critical Vulnerabilities:

### SHARP

Opportunity CoG Motive

Misguided loyalty

Disdain and Arrogance

Perception of Being Untouchable

Create Environment of Fear  
Potential for Personal Gratification  
Dominates Environment  
Intelligence/Insight unknown to others

Misguided  
loyalty  
CC  
Opportunity CoG Motive  
Disdain and  
Arrogance  
CC  
Potential for  
Personal  
Gratification  
CC  
Intelligence/  
Insight  
unknown to  
others  
CC  
Dominates  
Environment  
CC  
Perception of  
Being  
Untouchable  
CC  
Create Fear  
CC

36 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

We then looked at possible linkages to each requirement and vulnerability to determine what vulnerabilities were most linked to other vulnerabilities and requirements, and therefore would have the greatest targeting impact.

From the analysis, we determined that the “best” vulnerabilities to target were:

All of these components had multiple targets. For example, with Command Climate, we can target Peers, other Trainees, Loyalty of Trainees, and Trust of the Chain of Command. This applies to each of the others

Critical Requirements

POI/TSP/Regulations

Position

Time/Energy

Other Trainees

Distorted Self-ID

Peers

Loyalty of Trainee

Trust of Chain of Command

Time

Command Climate

Lack of Fear of Consequences

Access

Need/Desire

Critical Vulnerabilities

POI/TSP/Regulations

Time/Energy

Other Trainees (Complicit or not)

Distorted Self-ID (high or low)

Peers (Complicit or not)

Loyalty of Trainee (to individual)

Trust of Chain of Command

Time

Command Climate

Lack of Fear of Consequences

Access

Need/Desire

Misguided  
loyalty  
CC  
Opportunity CoG Motive  
Disdain and  
Arrogance  
CC  
Potential for  
Personal  
Gratification  
CC  
Intelligence/  
Insight  
unknown to  
others  
CC  
Dominates  
Environment  
CC  
Perception of  
Being  
Untouchable  
CC  
Create Fear  
CC

POI/TSP/Regulations

Distorted Self-ID

Command Climate

Lack of Fear of Consequences

Access

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 37

as well. From there – using top down planning and bottom up refinement, we allowed our Command Teams to develop their specific “munitions” and “delivery methods” for each target set and sub-set. One company checked the fit of female uniforms, and ensured that items that were deemed “too tight” by female Drill Sergeants were exchanged for looser fitting uniform items. Another company used female Drill Sergeants to deliberately message the male Drill Sergeants on the abhorrence of any act with a Trainee. This “de-sexualization” of potential victims becomes a coordinated messaging strategy that spreads throughout the formation, including other trainees. Also, because the message is synchronized with other “munitions,”

gender specifics such as masculinity and femininity are not the focal point. In other words, there is no whitewashing of a “Soldier is a Soldier is a Soldier” that causes a lack understanding of gender issues that in reality creates further separation. At the battalion level, the decision was made to raise the TRADOC 350-6 standard, which allows two male Trainees to Battle Buddy a single female Trainee, and insist upon same gender Battle Buddy Teams. Additionally, there was a deliberate effort for non-Drill Sergeant Cadre not to refer to Drill Sergeants as “Drill Sergeant Smith”, but instead, referred to them as “Sergeant Smith” (though Trainees still refer to them as Drill Sergeant Smith). This is a deliberate message that not only teaches the trainees proper customs and courtesies, but also signifies that no one is untouchable when it comes to misconduct. Companies also identify “high risk” Drill Sergeants, and ensure that they do not have the opportunity to make a mistake, which is really just seen as taking care of each other.

However, we cannot just attack the threat – we must protect our friendly CoG, and luckily, our protection methods are directly tied to what we are trying to do at BCT, which is create the best Soldiers in the world. That said, we identified the victim CoG, and determined it to be the Army Value of Loyalty. Loyalty to your Battle Buddy, your team, your platoon, your company, the Army, will ensure that we gain the Critical Capabilities we need from a Trainee. Our one goal in regard to character at IET should be to ingrain a sense of loyalty. And though we must be careful about who they decide to give loyalty to, we really just need them to have a commitment to something beyond themselves. This may be the Nation, the flag, the Constitution, the Army, their unit. We just need them to understand they are part of something larger.

The following Critical Capabilities are derived from our CoG:

## **SHARP**

Acceptance of

Learning

Resilience

Warrior Ethos

Confidence

Mission Focus

LOYALTY to

Team/ Unit/

Army

CoG

Acceptance

of Learning

CC

Mission

Focused

CC

Confidence

CC

Warrior

Ethos

CC

Resilience

CC

38 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

These Critical Capabilities are exactly what we want from our Trainees, and future Soldiers. They hold the key to ensuring that, when faced with a potential threat, an individual Trainee, or their Battle Buddy, have the tools to stop, or even stall the event. We create a Trainee that can adapt to any environmental situation, and has more than a knowledge of what is going on around them (situational awareness), but takes that knowledge and can develop an appropriate course of action for their level (situational understanding).

We then identified the Critical Requirements and Critical Vulnerabilities associated with our capabilities:

What we found unique in this analysis is that every Critical Requirement was also a Critical Vulnerability.

This is attributed to the nature of BCT where the Trainee is far removed from their comfort zone (a necessary requirement for the development of a Soldier). We believe that if other units conducted similar CoG analysis they would identify other CoGs, capabilities, requirements and vulnerabilities. However, because of the BCT distinction, it was very important that the analysis on the linkage was done correctly, as we knew that targeting everything would have no effects.

Critical Requirements

POI/TSP/Regulations

Lack Need/Desire

Value Team over Self  
Other Trainees  
Self-ID  
Appropriate Access  
Trust in Chain of Command  
Understand of Consequences  
Sense of Selfless Service  
Mission above Self  
Critical Vulnerabilities  
POI/TSP/Regulations  
Lack Need/Desire  
Value Team over Self  
Other Trainees (Complicit or not)  
Self-ID (high or low)  
Appropriate Access  
Trust of Chain of Command  
Understand of Consequences  
Sense of Selfless Service  
Mission above Self  
Value  
Team  
over Self  
CC/CV  
POI/TSP/  
REG  
CR/CV  
Mission  
above  
Self  
CR/CV  
Selfless  
Service  
CR/CV  
Other  
Students  
(Complicit  
or not)  
CR/CV  
Self ID  
(high or  
Low)  
CR/CV  
Lack  
Need/  
Desire  
CR/CV  
Trust in  
CofC  
CR/CV  
Appropriate  
Access  
CR/CV  
Understanding  
of  
Consequences  
CR/CV  
Acceptance  
of Learning  
CC  
Mission  
Focused  
CC  
Confidence  
CC  
Warrior  
Ethos  
CC  
Resilience  
CC  
LOYALTY to  
Team/ Unit/  
Army  
CoG

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 39

From the analysis, we determined that the “best” vulnerabilities to target were:

Like our predator CoG, all of these components had multiple targets. For example, with Appropriate Access, we can target POI/TSP/Regulations, other Trainees, Self-ID, and Trust of the Chain of Command. Again, using top down planning and bottom up refinement units took the following measures: Signs we created to put on the inside of female bays stating that male Drill Sergeants could not enter female bay after lights out without female Drill Sergeant accompaniment; thereby empowering the female Trainee with a reminder of command policy (as opposed to the generic signs that are often not part of a synchronized plan, such as targeting “opportunity”); TRADOC 350-6 standards were again raised, requiring only female interior guards, with direct communication to female Staff Duty in the event Separate and Secure Alarm System malfunctioned; Units focused values training to illustrate that loyalty equals action, and reinforced team concepts during all events; Use of the term “gender integrated” was replaced by “whole Soldier concept”, attempting to reduce the self-segregation of Trainees; Finally, teaching concepts were changed to create a Leader/Led relationship versus a Guard/Prisoner relationship.

There are numerous other munitions and delivery methods that were successful, however, what is important is not the list of these methods, but that they are not reactive in nature, but pre-active – this allows units to “get to the left of the bang” and pre-act to contact versus react to contact. The reactive systems and process are already in place, but we needed to attack the threat before it had effects on our mission. We have been successful with our targeting methodology in combat operations, and have demonstrated that it is an excellent problem solving model. If it works for our life and death missions, why would we not use this technique for our most important mission – developing American Soldiers? Understand that this is an example of the process applied to a very unique role and composition in today’s Army. However, this same process can be applied to every unit whether that unit is gender integrated or not. Arguably, it is just as important for units that are currently gender segregated to conduct as it is for other units that are composed of male and female Soldiers. There is far too much interaction between different types of units, both professionally and socially, that restrict this to gender integrated units only.

Lack Need/Desire

Value Team over Self

Appropriate Access

Understanding of Consequences

**LTC J.C. Glick is the Commander and MAJ Jay K. Smith is the Executive Officer of 2nd Battalion, 39th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.**

## **SHARP**

40 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**M**any leaders in today’s Army can relate to

hearing this famous phrase, “Be flexible” on various occasions throughout their careers. For the most part, many of us chalk it up as meaning to just accept what cannot be changed and to roll with the punches. The United States Army like many other diverse organizations is not unique or exempt from challenges and the many obstacles that arise during training, development and implementation phases. Drill Sergeants help inspire future Soldiers to reach their potential, challenge their mind and body to overcome fears and how to embrace the Army life and traditions. However, in this expectation to accept the uncontrollable, a certain attitude ingrains itself in many leaders that promote stagnation in the ability to think creatively and to effectively problem solve.

The mindset that should be embraced is “how do I as a leader adapt to this change, rather than accept it?”

Drill Sergeants face a multitude of issues and challenges while training America’s future Army. The newest generation of Soldiers that are beginning to fill the ranks are unlike their predecessors. This new generation is independent, technologically savvy, and responsive to challenging and ongoing learning environments. They have high expectations of themselves and of others, and are not afraid to question authority. The shape of American society has begun to shift in a new direction, and for many who still adopt a direct and authoritative leadership style in training are experiencing difficulties in influencing this new generation of Soldiers.

## **Adaptive Leaders**

1SG Victoria Reeves and SFC (DS) Maria T. Taylor

What used to be considered effective learning tools ten years ago is not the case today, especially in Basic Combat Training. The advancements in technology have revamped education in classrooms across America, and have highlighted the importance of interactive learning environments. Drill Sergeants who want to impact this new generation of Soldiers have to scrap “old school” methods of learning and instead, embrace adding a little creativity into training. Not only are creative thinking skills among leaders encouraged, but also a need for leaders to seek adapting their leadership styles and their behavior. Effective leaders today must present a multi-dimensional approach to learning and training to be deemed successful. This could be no truer than for today’s modern Drill Sergeant.

For Drill Sergeants, it is very easy to succumb to the same monotonous teaching tools, such as “death by PowerPoint slides” and one dimensional classroom instruction. It is in our human nature to want to stick with what feels comfortable, and to replicate tasks in the same manner that they were taught to us. This is not to argue that these types of teaching tools are ineffective. The important takeaway when it comes to training, is that we should always ask the following question, *how can we as leaders enhance training to match the expectations we have for our future Soldiers?*

The premier trainer of Basic Combat skills (Drill Sergeants) must adopt adaptive leadership skills that promote facilitation of learning and challenging training opportunities that can

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 41

adequately measure the competency level of young Soldiers. ***Put the training and responsibility for***

***learning into the Soldiers' hands by taking a teach/facilitate/mentor approach to education.***

This requires thinking outside the box, incorporating lessons learned and seeking feedback from peers and Soldiers alike to advance training. Training needs to be multi-dimensional, demanding and stimulate the eagerness to advance an individual's knowledge base. By providing realistic, innovative and tough training, leaders can expect benchmarks and expectations of Soldiers to far exceed what was originally anticipated.

In the last few cycles we have begun to try a few new teaching techniques, and different approaches on learning. One training block that we identified as an opportunity to create a dynamic learning environment, was the medical training block. First, we gave the Soldiers the supplies without teaching them how to apply the bandage or tourniquet. Not using the power point slides, and only using the CLS book and YouTube to show a few videos, we accepted the challenge of reaching our trainees more thoroughly, and in only one week. We developed a training plan for each of the five days of CLS, and during that week there was other training scheduled, such as weapons emersion, tactics, and ranges. The days were broken up so that we could conduct two training events after the first day of CLS. Over many cycles of testing different ways of presenting CLS and the Soldiers retaining that information our five day plan is as follows:

**Homework** prior to day one- Have the Soldiers read Lesson 1-3 and complete the questions in the back of each lesson. This will give them an idea of what to expect.

Day 1- Put out all of the CLS supplies, break up the Soldiers into teams of four and make someone the casualty. We would assign extremity fractures, head wounds, abdominal wounds and amputations.

### **Adaptive Leaders**

The other three had to figure out what supplies they needed in order to treat the casualty. A great teaching and learning moment occurs as the different groups explain what the injury was, what they could have done and what other supplies that they could have used to the entire platoon. Talk about the history of the CLS, the progression of TCCC, and assign homework, specifically

completing the questions at the end of Chapter.  
Emphasize completing the questions alone because of the test.

**Homework-** Lesson 4-6, make sure that there are supplies in the bays for the Soldiers to use. Emergency bandages, abdominal bandages, splints, cravats and CAT tourniquets.

Day 2- Explain how to use the different CLS supplies to control bleeding, breathing, fractures, burns and treat for shock. Have the Soldiers break into groups of two and work with each other. Focus on Tactical Field Care and conducting a head to toe assessment on the casualty.

**Homework-** Lesson 7-10, explaining that the 9-line MEDEVAC uses brevity codes and radio communication procedures.

Day 3- Starts with drags and carries. Explain what phase of care and what type of drag or carry would be best suited for the situation. Go into Tactical Evacuation Care and how to call up a nine line medical evacuation request. Have the Soldiers fill out TCCC cards on their casualty and continue to reassess the casualty every five minutes.

**Homework-** Have the Soldiers revisit Lesson 2, 3, 8 and the three phases of TCCC.

Day 4- This is the walk phase. Have the casualty go to another location and coach the Soldiers on patrolling in a squad formation and what they are doing during the different phases. Revisit the book in preparation for the exam.

#### 9-LINE MEDEVAC Request

Line 1:  
Line 2:  
Line 3:  
Line 4:  
Line 5:  
Line 6:  
Line 7:  
Line 8:  
Line 9:  
6-digit UTM grid location of pick-up site.  
Radio frequency, call sign, and suffix of requesting personnel; encrypt the frequency.  
Number of patients by precedence (Urgent=loss of life or limb within 2 hours. Priority=loss of life or limb within 4 hours. Routine=evacuate within 24 hours).  
Special equipment required, as applicable (none, hoist, stokes litter [litter basket], jungle penetrator).  
Number of patients by type (litter, ambulatory).  
Security of pick-up site (no enemy or artillery in the area; possibly enemy troops or artillery in the area [approach with caution]).  
Method of marking pick-up site (Branches, wood, stones, panels, signal lamp, flashlight, pyrotechnic signal, vehicle lights; smoke, open flame; signal person; fabric strips).  
Patient nationality and status (US military, US civilian, non-US military, non-US civilian, enemy prisoners of war).  
Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) contamination.

42 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**Homework-** Study for the test.

Day 5- Testing- Take the written exam. After the written exam is complete it is time for the hands on portion of the testing. Place mannequins with

mouflage kits along a path with four different injuries: head wound, amputation, chest wound and abdominal wound. Place Soldiers in fire team wedges and have them conduct a patrol. OPFOR will be in place waiting to ambush the squad. The squads will then perform care under fire, eliminate the threat and drag the casualty to safety. While the casualty is being treated QRF arrives and everyone in the squad will treat the casualty. Once the bandages are in place and the assessment is complete the RTO calls in a 9-line MEDEVAC request and the TCCC cards are completed. The squad places the casualty on a litter, conducts a two person carry and moves out in preparation of the MEDEVAC.

This style of teaching requires little to no classroom training. This generation does not respond to PowerPoint, they learn by hands on and by being challenged. We created a CLS book that is small enough to fit into the cargo pocket. The book is a condensed version of **IS0871** but still has all the important information of the course. This book is more convenient to carry around and the Soldiers take notes and have all the pictures they need in order to perform all of the hands on task. Note the high level of peer to peer training **1SG Victoria Reeves and SFC (DS) Maria T. Taylor are assigned to Echo Company, 2nd Battalion, 39th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.**

your ability:  
casualty  
AC):  
dead.  
casualty  
control.  
general casualty you approach  
responsiveness.  
casualty airway  
(ated.  
the  
casualty's airway breathing, bleeding.  
**divided**  
**care,**  
**care.**

## Tactical Combat Casualty Care

**Tactical combat casualty care (TCCC) can be into three phases: care under fire, tactical field and combat casualty evacuation** Care under fire limits the care you can provide:

Tactical field care occurs when you and the casualty are relatively safe and no longer under effective hostile fire. Provide casualty care to the best of Combat casualty evacuation care is rendered during evacuation (CASEVAC):

- Return fire as directed or required before providing medical treatment.
- Determine if the casualty is alive or • Provide tactical care to the live casualty.
- Administer life-saving hemorrhage • Transport the casualty, his/her weapon, and missionessential equipment when the tactical situation permits.
- Recheck bleeding control measures as the tactical situation permits.
- Form a impression of the as (extent of injuries, chance of survival).
- Check for • Position the and open the airway.
- Assess for breathing and chest injuries.
- Identify and control bleeding.
- Check for fractures.
- Check for burns.
- Administer pain medications and antibiotics the casualty's combat pill pack) to any Soldier wounded in combat.
- Transport the casualty to the site where evacuation is anticipated.
- CASEVAC refers to the movement of casualties aboard nonmedical vehicles or aircraft.
- Care is rendered while the casualty is awaiting pickup or is being transported.

• A Soldier accompanying an unconscious casualty should monitor airway, and through homework and scenario based training in

which the Trainees are to required work through the problem with the instructor simply supervising and facilitating the action and AAR afterwards. The Instructor can then see if the trainees truly understand the task, and can make the adjustments to the schedule. The Trainees, on the other hand, now bear the responsibility of learning.

CLS is important and should be taught in accordance with the TSP and POI. However, it can

be done as concurrent training throughout the cycle. It's time to change from a sub-course of an Army Correspondence Course Program that is not longer relevant, and teach to the new generation, Generation Y. Tactical Combat Casualty Care can be taught in a tactical environment without the need for media and in a way Soldiers will retain the information and feel confident in their ability to perform first aid.

**Drill Sergeants' roles must expand beyond "teachers", and evolve into "facilitators".** Drill Sergeants who truly mirror the definition of adaptability understand the requirement to always look for improvements to training. Critical thinking and creativity in learning is emphasized and encouraged. Great leaders seek growth within them and inspire change within others. *There is one difference that separates a good leader from a great leader and it is simply this, one dictates what to think while the other, teaches how to think. Which one are you?*

**In any moment of decision, the best thing you can do is the right thing, the next best thing is the wrong thing, and the worst thing you can do is nothing.**

Theodore Roosevelt

44 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**I**n General Odierno's initial thoughts when he became Chief of Staff of the United States Army he wrote *"The Strength of our Nation is our Army; the Strength of our Army is our Soldiers; the Strength of our Soldiers is our Families. This is what makes us Army Strong"*. These are very powerful and truthful words that cannot be taken for granted. Here in the Basic Combat Training (BCT) environment it is very easy to overlook the Families as we remain focused on transforming civilian volunteers into Soldiers. A common misconception with new cadre members and their Families is that Family Readiness Groups (FRG's) are only for deploying units. Although I would not compare working in the BCT environment and deploying to a combat zone, I would argue that the strain on Families is just as great and often lasts for two years. A typical Drill Sergeant is on their way to work well before their Family awakes and often comes home after they are sound asleep. I am sure in every battalion across Fort Jackson there are some amazing company FRG's. I wanted to share what has worked well for us in the hope that someone out there will be able to use this information to improve their FRG or get it started.

When I first took command of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 61st Infantry Regiment we did not have a functioning Family Readiness Group (FRG). During my initial counseling with my First Sergeant I said I wanted to take care of our Families, get together at least once a month, and maximize the cadre's time at home with the Families. 1SG Flippo agreed with me, and had lots of great ideas to make this happen. In AR 608-1, Army Community Service it states "An FRG is a commander's program formed in accordance with AR 600-20 and appendix J to provide activities and support that encourage self-sufficiency among its members by providing information, referral assistance, and mutual support". We follow that format by keeping the Families informed about the activities of their Soldiers, and opportunities for them to take advantage of (MWR Activities, Trips, Concerts, FRG Events and local community events). We strive to arm the Families with information and experience to enable them to take care of themselves when their Soldier is away and they have just arrived to the unit. Finally we make the Families feel like they are a part of something larger than themselves.

In the 1st Battalion, 61st Infantry Regiment we have been very fortunate to have a battalion that fully supports our FRG endeavors. Every month each company is allocated \$75.00 to use for FRG Events, and if something large is planned additional funds maybe requested during the monthly Battalion FRG meetings. My first event was during a cycle reset where we invited all of the Families to include husbands, wives, and children to a Saturday luncheon. We had it catered by Chic-Fil-A, and my wife made dessert. All in all we spent two hours together getting to know one another, reviewing the upcoming cycle, and talking about what type of events we wanted to do in the future. This was also a great time for us to update our social roster and try to get buy in from everyone. This initial event really set things up and got everyone on the same page.

## **FRG: One Company's Approach**

### **Captain Nicholas Milano**

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 45

Since the initial event we have gotten together every month, typically on a Saturday and on Phase Change days. Normally the First Sergeant and I will talk to the spouses and get a pulse for what type of lunch everyone would want and it varies each time. We have done pizza, Mexican, gyros, fried chicken, BBQ, cake and ice cream, etc. Typically we begin the FRG get together at noon while the Soldiers are at the DFAC. This lets us setup the

day room, bring all the Families in and avoid the Privates seeing all the food and drinks. Once the trainees return they head up to their classroom for phase exams, and peer evaluations. This normally takes two hours which is the length of our event. Drill Sergeants will rotate supervising their Soldiers and spending time with their Families. This works out well because Families often do not want to come to the company if their spouse is not there and they cannot see them.

**I believe that the hardest working Soldier on Fort Jackson is the Drill Sergeant.** They work extremely long hours; sacrifice their Family and personal time training Soldiers. The majority of the time they miss out on all of the three and four day weekends that their battle buddies get at other installations. For this reason we try to do one large event each quarter that somewhat represents the holidays or season of that time that they may miss. We had an Easter Egg Hunt at Red Diamond Field, a Beach Bash at Weston Lake, a Secret Santa Christmas party, and a chili and cake cook-off contest. John Keegan and Mike Elkins of the Fort Jackson FMWR have been great in supporting us with equipment, bounce houses, or anything else we need for our events. Just about every agency on Fort Jackson has offered to support our FRG when we called or asked for help.

When we do our events I want everyone to have a good time, see their spouse and become friends with other Family members. I further want the new Families welcomed and taken care of as they navigate the life of a BCT Family. Since my FRG has taken off, the spouses get together on their own, communicate through our Roughneck FRG Facebook page, and support each other. It is great to overhear Drill Sergeants talking how their wives took the kids to the gym together, went to the movies, or got together for a baby shower. I also make it important to review our core calendar and

### **FRG**

explain events where the cadre will be working late, or spending the night in the field. We also discuss battalion, brigade, and post level events. The most important thing I want to know is important dates and events for each Family. Things I want to know are medical appointments, anniversaries, birthdays, vacations, or other significant events. As long as ISG and I have some type of notice we can accommodate for any important Family event. We have also been fortunate to have a great cadre chow rotation. The spouses have taken it upon themselves to provide dinners and drinks during our FTX's, and Advanced Rifle Marksmanship periods. Once we are out of Red Phase I invite the Families to come out to training and observe from afar. They all

know they can bring a meal to their Drill Sergeant and spend some time with them at any range. It is great to see a reenergized Drill Sergeant who just got to spend 15 minutes with his wife and kids while eating a quick meal with them.

Drill Sergeants and their Families keep Fort Jackson running. We should do everything possible to take care of them and show them how important they are. I do not claim that we have the perfect FRG or that we have somehow cracked the code.

We have something that works great for our Families. It is hard to measure the effectiveness of an FRG. We get together regularly, share information, take care of each other and have lots of fun together. I hope this article provides you some information and ideas to assist you in improving the lives of your Cadre and Families.

***CPT Nicholas Milano is the Commander of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 61st Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.***

46 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

The history of the United States is filled with stories of military battles, conflicts, and all-out war. The nation was, in fact, founded as a result of the Revolutionary War, where the original colonies that had been established by Great Britain decided that they no longer wanted to be under British rule, and chose to form their own new nation. In the earliest days of the U.S. the military was a haphazard and poorly organized system. The members of the first U.S. military forces were farmers, laborers, and other colonists who chose to come together to fight the British and claim this land as their own. Letters from George Washington written in this period show that he believed the U.S. should have its own Armed Forces (Wood, 1917); though it was some time before the original states agreed that having their own individual militia forces was not the best way to defend the nation. Much has changed since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and the U.S. now has the most powerful military force on the planet. One of the most important functions in the Armed Forces is the training of new recruits, and the Drill Instructors, Drill Sergeants, and other military members who are responsible for training these recruits must meet the highest standards of professionalism in order to ensure that the U.S. Armed Forces remain prepared to meet the demands and challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Training recruits for their roles in the Armed Forces has been a primary concern for military commanders throughout history. In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, as the U.S. was growing into the

***SSG Jessica Brooks***

## Discipline and Order in the U.S. Armed Forces:

powerful nation it would become, the nation developed a multi-pronged military system which would eventually become the five branches we have today: the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. Before these five branches of the military were established, however, the primary means by which the U.S. prepared for and fought military conflicts was with a militia system (Chambers & Anderson, 1999). The original states each had their own militias, as the leaders of these states were concerned that a national Armed Forces could grow to be too powerful, and could threaten the sovereignty and freedom of the individual states. Membership in these militias was sometimes voluntary, while at other times militia forces were conscripted (drafted) into service (Chambers & Anderson).

By the 20<sup>th</sup> century the national Armed Forces were transforming into the five branches we know today, and the roles of the state militias had been largely taken over by the national Armed Forces. Training of recruits was more formal and regimented than it had been in the days of George Washington, when recruits were handed guns if they did not have their own, and told to prepare to fight (Chambers & Anderson). The U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps, in particular, had developed standardized training programs to prepare recruits for combat and their other roles in the Armed Forces. It was during this period that the positions of Drill Instructor and Drill Sergeant as we know them today were beginning to take shape, and

## The Role of Military Instructors in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 47

### **Discipline and Order**

new recruits all went through the same forms of basic training and boot camp to ensure that each were prepared and educated in the same manner. Conditions in boot camps and basic training systems were difficult and challenging, and it was the role of the Drill Instructors to ensure that each recruit was mentally and physically prepared for combat should the need arise.

When the U.S. entered World War II in the 1940s the U.S. military did not have enough Soldiers to adequately maintain a dominant position in the various combat theaters of Europe and the Pacific Islands (Chambers & Anderson). It became necessary to establish a draft in order to grow the ranks of the Armed Forces, and with the tens of thousands of new members of the military it was also necessary to ensure that they were adequately trained and prepared for war. While the various

branches of the Armed Forces have always had training programs and members who were responsible for administering training to recruits, it was during this period that the roles of Drill Instructor and Drill Sergeant that we think of today were initially established. The task of training new recruits is one of the most important responsibilities that the military can bestow upon its members, as it is often this training that will determine whether a Soldier will live or die, and whether he or she will be prepared for and capable of defending the nation. With this great responsibility to recruits also comes the responsibility to maintain the highest standards of professionalism. This responsibility to maintain the highest standards has become even more significant in recent decades, as women have been allowed to enter the Armed Forces.

The U.S. Secretary of Defense recently announced that women will now be allowed to assume combat positions in the Armed Forces. This is a notable change in the U.S. military's position, but many of the considerations related to having women in the Armed Forces have already been a factor for decades. One of the primary concerns for military leaders where this is concerned has been, of course, the possibility of problems arising related to interactions between male and female members of the military (Nelson, 2002). Concerns about fraternization, sexual harassment, and even sexual assault have all been important considerations where it comes to establishing military policy. Every aspect of military life, such as the training of new recruits, the housing of Soldiers and other members of the Armed Forces, the decisions related to assigning tasks and responsibilities to males and females, and every other decision that military leaders must make are affected by the inclusion of females in the Armed Forces (Sieg, 1997). Now, more than ever, it is incumbent upon military leaders and those responsible for training recruits to establish and adhere to the highest standards of professionalism at all levels and at all times.

It is not an exaggeration to say that Drill Instructors hold the lives of new recruits in their hands. A Soldier or Marine who is not adequately prepared for military life may endanger him or herself, and may also put the lives of others at risk. Even during training, Drill Sergeants must assume the utmost care for their recruits, as training can be very

difficult and even dangerous. Drill Sergeants must push their recruits to their limits to ensure that they are prepared for real-life combat situations that will test these limits, but at the same time it is necessary for Drill Sergeants to ensure that their recruits are safe and that the conditions of their training are challenging without being actually harmful and dangerous. In most instances this is exactly what happens during training, as recruits are challenged to push themselves as far as they can. In some instances, however, things can go very wrong, and when they do, the lives of recruits can be at risk.

In April of 1956 an incident occurred at the Marine Corps training camp at Parris Island, South Carolina, that cost the lives of a number of young recruits. This incident was classified as a “training accident,” though it was clearly the responsibility of the Drill Instructor to avoid such accidents, and the aftermath of the incident had significant consequences for the Marine Corps and for those who knew and loved the recruits who died during

48 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

training. Drill Instructor Matthew McKeon was in charge of training the new recruits in Platoon 71, and he was having some difficulty getting some members of the platoon to maintain the proper discipline and behavior that was expected of recruits (Stevens, 1999). McKeon was a young man at the time, and had only completed his Drill Instructor training a few months earlier. Platoon 71 was his first batch of recruits since completing his training, and he wanted to demonstrate to his superior officers that he was up to the task of being a Drill Instructor. It was apparent not just to McKeon, but also to many of his fellow instructors, that some of his recruits were not properly disciplined, and McKeon decided to push them to their limits to make it clear that he was in charge and that he expected them to fall in line (Stevens). On the night of April 8, 1956, McKeon assembled his platoon and told them that they were going on a march into the swamps that bordered part of the Parris Island base. He joked with the recruits that they had better be prepared to swim, and that those who could not swim would probably drown, while those who could swim would probably be eaten by sharks (Stevens). The swamps around Parris Island were primarily freshwater and brackish water, but they did feed into the Atlantic Ocean, and it was true that sharks and other sea life occasionally made their way into the deepest parts of the swamp. Although it was highly unlikely that the marching

recruits would encounter any sharks during their march into the swamp, McKeon's warning did help to reinforce the point that the conditions they would face on their excursion were potentially dangerous. There were, in fact, several members of the platoon that were unable to swim, though the records and investigative reports conducted after the incident seemed to demonstrate that McKeon was unaware of this when he set out on the march (Stevens). It is difficult to say for sure whether McKeon would not have sent the recruits on the march had he known that some of them could not swim, but the investigation did, at least, seem to prove that he had not purposefully sent those who could not swim into the deep, chilly waters of the swamp.

Sergeant McKeon had only been stationed at Parris Island for a short while; he had completed his Drill Instructor training at a different Marine Corps facility, and had been transferred to Parris Island only a few weeks before he was given his first platoon of new recruits. McKeon had grown up in New Hampshire, and he was unfamiliar with many of the geographical and climate conditions of South Carolina. McKeon was a capable swimmer, and he was confident that he could lead his recruits into the swamp safely. It was his intention to march them into the water until they were about waistdeep, and keep them in the water just long enough to ensure that they were cold and miserable before leading them back out again (Stevens). What McKeon did not know, because he was unfamiliar with the conditions in the region, was that the bottom of the swamp was covered with oozing, sticky mud that was sometimes quite deep. It was entirely possible to get stuck in this mud, and to then sink down into it. Because it was so dark by the time the men were led into the swamp, McKeon could not see most of the recruits as they marched. The only way in which he could communicate with them, and the only way they could communicate with him, was by yelling back and forth to each other. Because it was clear to the recruits that McKeon was unhappy with the performance of several members of the platoon, most of them chose to remain silent as they marched. It was later reported by those who survived the event that many of them were quite scared by the circumstances, but they were also scared of McKeon, and most chose not to speak up even as conditions around them began to get uncomfortable (Stevens). After all, if McKeon was angry enough to punish them with this march, what would he do to those who complained about it?

Much of what is known about the events of April 8, 1956 has come from the interviews and

investigations that were conducted afterwards. Most of the evidence contained in the investigative reports seems to support the idea that McKeon did not purposefully endanger the lives of his recruits, and it was simply a matter of unfortunate and unknown circumstances that led to the tragedy (Stevens). Among those who survived were several members of the platoon who were unable to swim, and in their interviews after the incident, they all described a similar sequence of events. According to the bulk of the testimony, McKeon was at the front of the platoon, leading the march. As some of the recruits near the end of the group began to experience trouble, such as getting stuck in and sinking into the deep mud in the swamp, McKeon was unaware that they were having difficulty. It was so dark that some of the recruits were able to sneak away from the main pack and maneuver closer to the edge of the swamp closest to dry land. Others, it seems, became disoriented in the dark

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 49

## **Discipline and Order**

conditions and also split from the main group, but headed away from land. Because the water was deeper in some parts and shallower in others, it was impossible for the recruits to determine if they were moving closer to shore simply by judging the depth of the water. Some members of the platoon reported later that they thought they were moving closer to land because the water was growing shallower, while they were in fact heading deeper into the swamp (Stevens).

Compounding the problems that some of the recruits were experiencing was the fact that the tide shifted while they were in the swamp. Although they were surrounded by grasses, reeds, mud, and the other conditions normally found in swampland, they were actually quite close to the ocean. As the tide began to go out, the water began to rush from the swamp back to the ocean, creating hazardous undertows that were worse in the deeper parts of the swamp. As the undertow began to pull at some of the recruits, those on the outer edge of the marching column found themselves slipping into much deeper water. These men had come to a point where the bottom of the swamp dropped from a few feet to over ten feet deep. Those to the other side of the column and those at the front who had already changed direction as they followed McKeon had no idea that these depth changes

existed, and in the darkness it was impossible for McKeon to see what was happening at the rear of the column. McKeon and the recruits that were directly behind him were already marching back towards dry land while at the same time some of those recruits at the rear of the column were becoming stuck in the mud or being swept under by the rushing current of the shifting tide.

As the conditions in the swamp suddenly grew very dangerous, several of the men began to cry out in panic and fear. For a moment McKeon and some of the recruits near the front of the column thought the yelling was just the sound of horseplay, but they quickly realized that there was a serious problem. Those near the front of the column, including McKeon, turned back to assist the recruits who were struggling in the mud and water. Those who could swim waded into the deeper water to try to pull those who were struggling to safety, and a few found themselves being pulled under by others who were incapable of swimming or were being swept out by the undertow. The worst of the circumstances were over in just minutes, but that was enough time for several of the recruits to drown. When McKeon first led the recruits out into the swamp there were seventy-four men in Platoon 71. ***When they returned there were only sixty-eight men; six of them drowned in the chilly, muddy waters.*** Sergeant McKeon was court-martialed for the incident, charged for manslaughter. Many of his fellow officers testified on behalf of McKeon during his court-martial, insisting that he was right for trying to discipline his troublesome recruits and also asserting that training at night and training in swamps was necessary and proper (Stevens). Even some of the recruits who were members of Platoon 71 testified on behalf of McKeon, telling the court that they admired and respected McKeon and that he had, in their view, done nothing wrong. In the end McKeon was convicted of lesser charges; although he spent time in custody and had his rank reduced to Private, McKeon remained in the Marine Corps for several more years before receiving a medical discharge.

While Marine Corps training, and training in all branches of the military, is supposed to be challenging and difficult, incidents such as the Ribbon Creek tragedy are not common. For every story about something dangerous or even tragic happening

in basic training, there are many more that describe training as extraordinarily challenging but ultimately rewarding. In the book "Once a Marine: Collected Stories by Enlisted Marine Corps Vietnam Veterans," the editors compile a number of tales recounting the experiences that Marines had while undergoing training and later serving in combat. According to one Marine, "none of the other Armed Services does recruit training better than the Marine Corps" (Latting, 2005).

50 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

This former Marine explains that it is the job of the Drill Instructor to "transform" raw recruits into Marines, and to drill recruits "to an exacting standard" (Latting). Drill Instructors have both a "personal and professional stake" in ensuring that their recruits are properly trained and that they meet these exacting standards. Drill Instructors take great pride in their ability to take recruits from varied backgrounds and with different levels of experience and ability and bring them up to the standards set for all Marines. It is this adherence to, and respect for, the traditions and standards of the Marine Corps that exemplify what makes a good Drill Instructor. This is holds true for Drill Sergeants in the Army, of course, as well as the instructors in all branches of the Armed Forces. As noted earlier, Drill Sergeants in the 21<sup>st</sup> century not only have to contend with the sorts of issues and concerns that all instructors have had to face throughout history, they also must now contend with the fact that both men and women can now serve in the military in all of the same positions and roles that were historically limited only to men. With these changes come new responsibilities and concerns that many instructors never had to face before. Instructors must ensure that the temptations faced by men and women serving in close quarters do not lead to inappropriate behavior, and instructors must also maintain strict control over their own behavior, and not use their power and influence to demand inappropriate behavior from their subordinates (Nelson). Since the times where women have been allowed to serve in the military in roles that were historically limited to men only, conditions and circumstances in the various branches of the Armed Forces have often brought men and women into close contact with each other. There have been a significant number of reports of sexual harassment and even sexual assault made by female members of the military; along with these reports come a significant number of complaints that military leadership has not always responded swiftly or adequately to such complaints (Sieg; Nelson). Along with complaints of sexual harassment or misconduct between recruits

of similar rank, there have been a number of complaints by female Soldiers, Marines, and other members of the Armed Forces that their superior officers have behaved inappropriately; this behavior runs the gamut from allegations of harassment all the way up to accusations of assault and rape (Sieg; Nelson).

With such concerns in mind, it is clear that the rules that establish the conduct of Drill Instructors, Drill Sergeants, and other training instructors must be met and followed according to the most exacting standards. It is the responsibility of these instructors to ensure that the recruits they train are properly educated about the rules and regulations of the various branches of service, and that the recruits do not just learn these rules and regulations, but they adhere to them without fail. *In a time where both men and women can serve together at all levels of military service, including combat, the ability of Drill Sergeants to establish discipline and order have never been more important.* It is imperative that the men and women who are given the responsibility to transform new recruits into members of the Armed Forces meet the most exacting standards of their profession, and pass along these standards from one generation to the next. It is in this way that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines of the United States of America will remain the most disciplined, powerful, and professional military force in the world.

1 Alvarez, E. (2007). Parris Island: Once a recruit, always a marine. Charleston, SC: History Press.

2 Chambers, J. W., & Anderson, F. (1999). The Oxford companion to American military history. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

3 Latting, C. (2005). Once a marine: Collected stories by enlisted Marine Corps Vietnam veterans - their lives 35 years later. Bloomington, Ind: AuthorHouse.

4 Nelson, T. S. (2002). For love of country: Confronting rape and sexual harassment in the U.S. military. New York, NY: Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press.

5 Sieg, R. S. (1997). Secretary of the army's senior review panel report on sexual harassment. Washington, D.C.: Diane Pub Co.

6 Stevens, J. C. (1999). Court-martial at Parris Island: The Ribbon Creek incident. Annapolis, Md: Naval Institute Press.

7 Taylor, B. (2001). A Few Good Memories: Tales from Usmc Boot Camp.

8 Wood, L. (1917). Universal military training. New York, NY: P.F. Collier & Son.

***SSG Jessica Brook is assigned to Charlie Company, 3rd Battalion, 13th Infantry Regiment, 193rd Infantry Brigade.***

**If not *you*, then *who*?**

**If not *now*, then *when*?**

Hillel the Elder

52 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**F** or this chaplain there is something uniquely

special about counseling Soldiers. It is both humbling and challenging to be approached with any and every issue that may weigh on the mind and heart of the individual. Difficulties or

struggles within relationships tend to top the list of topics for discussion. Overtly biblical questions come very infrequently. Sometimes looking back one might have wished for more than two courses out of eight years of college and seminary on the subject of counseling. Nevertheless an average of 20-25 individuals will approach on a weekly basis to request advice on untangling their situations or managing their burdens. What a blessing it is to be present in the moment and give them from some of what God has given you. It is all the more exciting to be able to use theological studies in the dialogue. One question that has come recently is a personal favorite to attempt to answer. How should a Christian feel about the prospect of having to take another's life in combat? Could that person maintain a clear conscience before God after taking a life in the line of duty that they cannot replace? The answer comes in the form of a few key passages and a number of important principles.

#### **Human Life is Inherently Valuable and Must Be Protected**

*“Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image.”*  
(Genesis 9:6)

In the context the type of killing is of the premeditated and wicked sort. The bible recognizes various types of killing (accidental, Deut. 19:5; murder, Gen. 4:5-8; commanded, Num. 31:7) which have varying ramifications. There is an intrinsic value and dignity in human life such that the wrongful taking of that life, pre-meditatively, should be met with death to uphold the value of what was taken. If one entered an art gallery during a traveling exhibit of the works of Leonardo da Vinci one would expect to see a heightened level of security around those works compared with those of lesser known or local artists. Why, because da Vinci is recognized the world over as a master of the highest level. The rationale given in this passage is that mankind bears the mark of the Master of the Universe! And lest we get hung up in the fact that this is an Old Testament passage, the logic of the conditional statement requires the justice so long as mankind continue to be created in the image of God, a timeless principle. This forms the basis for capital punishment.

#### **Governments Are Tasked with the Defense of Life at the Cost of Life When Necessary**

*“Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore whoever resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of the*

*one who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God's wrath on the wrongdoer." (Romans 13:1-4)*

The institution of Government is God-ordained to constrain evil and uphold the dignity and value of human life. The avenger does not bear the sword for nothing and swords are not for tickling. He has a license to kill in order to maintain the peace. As our bumper stickers remind us, "freedom is not free." There is a cost that must be paid.

**CH (CPT) Colt Randles is the Chaplain for 3rd Battalion, 34th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.**

## *Biblical Response to Killing in Combat*

**CH (CPT) Colt Randles**

Fort Jackson has had a vital role in preparing Americans to serve their country for over 96 years. When the installation was built in 1917, just like today, our nation was at war. Since then, numerous units have prepared for battle here-the 4th Infantry Division, the 101st Airborne Division, and the 81st Infantry Division. More than 500,000 Soldiers trained here before fighting in World War II. The Soldiers who trained here before us leave us with a proud legacy and have inspired many to follow in their footsteps. Although the Army has changed tremendously over the years, we are all part of that lineage of brave Americans. All of us should be proud to be part of the tradition that defines this great installation.

Training is our hallmark. With two Brigades, nine Battalions and 52 Companies focused solely on training Soldiers in Basic Combat Training (BCT), Fort Jackson, is the largest Initial Military Training Center in the U.S. Army. Roughly half of all Soldiers who complete Basic Combat Training in the United States Army do so at Fort Jackson, SC. We are also home to Advanced Individual Training units, the Soldier Support Institute, the Drill Sergeant School, Armed Forces Chaplain Center and School, Victory College, and the National Center for Credibility Assessment.

Although we have a proud tradition on which to rely and inspire us, we must never lose sight of the future. To be effective, we must be willing and ready to accept

**change. Transformation means more than just modernizing our infrastructure. This means constantly challenging ourselves, our methods, and our means. Transformation is not a new concept here. Our responsibility as leaders hinges on our ability to continually evaluate and improve training. It is only by providing the best training that effective transformation from civilian into Soldier can occur.**

## ***Tradition, Training, Transformation***

54 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

Company full of newly arrived trainees have come and gone, and as the rigors of stress and training begins to wear on them, some begin to fall behind their peers due to missed training, substandard performance, and/or just not grasping the concepts of Army Values and it's way of life. At this point, you have to make the decision on whether the trainee is deserving of another chance to graduate and become a productive Soldier in the United States Army or chapter them and send them home. For those who believe in second chances, the concept of newstarting trainees allows additional time for those who may not have grasped the training during the normal scheduled training periods. The Basic Combat Training (BCT) schedule is rigid and does not always allow for makeup training within that company or battalion. When allotted, Drill Sergeants do their best to identify and retrain those who might fall behind. Makeup training can be conducted one or two ways. Either by making up the training with a sister company within that battalion or going outside the battalion and conducting missed training with another unit. It sometimes becomes more difficult to slow down or shift training to benefit one or two who miss numerous training events; especially when a BCT Company often fills to capacity, which can be as many as 240 trainees.

### ***How are Newstarts Chosen?***

Once a trainee is identified as a candidate for a newstart, the Company Command Team along with the trainee's Drill Sergeants, weigh in on the training missed and the whole Soldier concept of the trainee. They should discuss the trainee's potential to achieve the Army standards that are set forth in BCT. There also should be benchmarks for evaluating the trainee's pace versus their potential for a successful completion of BCT. For example, let's use BRM Qualification and APFT 2 as benchmarks to decide on newstarting a trainee. If a trainee fails to qualify on their assigned weapon but is doing well in all other areas of training, they should be newstarted due to potential. If the

trainee qualifies on their assigned weapon but fails to keep pace with peers in physical training by failing APTF 1, and APFT 2, the Command Team and Drill Sergeants must look at their scores and decide if they can get them to the 30% standard for the Fitness Training Unit (FTU) or the 50% standard to graduate BCT. Those benchmarks along with evaluating their potential, are important because the longer you hold them in the company and newstart them later in the cycle (See Figure 1), the more likely they are to lose motivation to graduate.

***Not Everyone is Worthy of a New Start:***

Any trainees pending UCMJ, who are undisciplined and unmotivated to train, are not good candidates for a newstart. *Being a newstart is a privilege and not a right.* The goal is to give second chances for those who display the potential to become a productive and professional Soldier.

## ***Newstarts: Pace vs. Potential***

***CPT Doniel D. McPhail and***

***1SG James L. Powell***

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 55

A Professional Soldier, as defined in TRADOC Regulation 350-6, is an expert, a volunteer certified in the Profession of Arms, bonded with comrades in a shared identity and culture of sacrifice and service to the Nation and the Constitution, who adheres to the highest ethical standards and is a steward of the future of the Profession. The question that should be asked is, "Would I want this trainee in my formation out in the force? Do they embrace our Army values, demonstrate teamwork and discipline, motivation and willingness to become proficient in the essential skills needed to graduate and deploy with their first unit?"

The Army is depending on us to produce quality Soldiers." If your answer is anything less than yes, the trainee should be separated from the Army.

***Cost to New Start:***

In the Army, almost everything we do and have is resourced by American citizen's tax dollars. As Soldiers, we are the stewards of those tax dollars and must ensure they are spent wisely. It pertains to equipment and also personnel. Therefore, we have to take into account the cost it took to recruit and send the trainee to BCT. The Army loses countless amounts of man hours and money invested in trainees who are chaptered, due to

their inability to complete BCT. Since the Army has already invested thousands of dollars in each recruit, \$22,300 according to the USAREC website, it only makes sense to give a second chance” to

### **Newstarts**

***CPT Doniel D. McPhail and 1SG James L. Powell are the Commander and First Sergeant for Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 34th Infantry Regiment, 165th Infantry Brigade.***

Benchmarks to Assess trainee's Performance and Potential for **Graduation** decision of Newstart

Red Phase

White Phase

Blue Phase

Weeks 1-3 Weeks 4-6 Weeks 7-10

APFT 1 BRM 10 APFT 2

Figure 1

All Newstarts / Chapter Candidates

identified and packets initiated

Process Newstarts / Chapter packets

Assess Trainees

(Take note of possible Newstart / chapters)

those trainees with the potential to meet the set standards of BCT in order to recoup the cost invested in them.

Does every trainee deserve a second chance to become a Soldier? We must carefully weigh every aspect of the trainee's time spent in BCT when determining if they deserve a newstart. From analyzing where they are in reaching the standard; to the trainee's discipline, motivation, potential, and performance in comparison with their peers, must all be important factors in determining if they are worthy of a newstart. In evaluating those factors, IAW TRADOC Regulation 350-6, Chapter 4-10, a judgment call will be made to newstart or separate the trainee from the Army. In the end, the overall benefit is to everyone involved. Most Soldiers who get newstarted go on to complete basic training. In turn, the units out in the force will receive Soldiers that are ready to deploy at a moment's notice.

**A**t an installation that sees thousands of new Soldiers pass through its gates on a weekly basis, it's

**important to continually reassess what allows trainers to accomplish Fort Jackson's mission. One of the most important, but perhaps overlooked facets of transforming civilians is emphasizing the value of negotiation in training. Undoubtedly, that statement raises a few eyebrows or makes some readers reach for torches and pitchforks, but let me preface my argument by noting that this is not negotiation in the sense that a Drill Sergeant is haggling with a new Soldier about whether he or she feels like doing physical training. Negotiation, as defined in simple terms, is getting what you want from another party. Considering that a goal of Fort Jackson is to provide our country with a Soldier ready to face its challenges, it's clear what we want to get from those whom have taken the oath. There are two main tenets of negotiation that directly apply to how we train Soldiers, and where we can fail—if not careful.**

**First, it's important that we differentiate between the Soldiers and the challenges that they face as trainees. The Army is a human organization. While it's true that we depend on technology in order to meet objectives in certain missions, the true strength of the organization lies in the Soldier. Because of this,**

human issues have significant impact in our pursuit of success. Roger Fisher and William Ury, authors of “Getting to Yes,” note that:

“A basic fact about negotiation...is that you are dealing not with abstract representatives of the “other side” but with human beings. They have emotions, deeply held values, and different backgrounds and viewpoints; and they are unpredictable. So are you.”<sup>1</sup>

# NEGOTIATING WITH NEW SOLDIERS

1LT DANIEL WEBB

Our Army has a somewhat unique strength as an organization because it truly is a cross-section of the American public. However, this distinction comes with its own set of difficulties, and how we address them can quickly become a point of failure. We understand that our country desires Soldiers that are capable of accomplishing whatever is asked of them, but this only considers one side of the negotiation. What do these new Soldiers want? Diane Spiegel—CEO of The End Result, a training and leadership development company—highlighted what many millennials want as they enter the workplace. Two of the top four results were coaching and collaboration.<sup>2</sup> In light of this, one sees why the Army places heavy emphasis on teamwork and the power of the “teach, coach, and mentor” process. Many of these new Soldiers value exactly what the trainers at Fort Jackson are supposed to provide! When trying to achieve the mutually beneficial outcomes of coaching and collaboration, we can fail by not cementing the working relationship in trust, understanding, and respect.<sup>3</sup> Arguably, the biggest point of conflict arises in the perception of the trainee versus that of the trainer. Even though a Drill Sergeant knows that adequate safety measures are in place at Victory Tower, the Soldier’s perception is that of fear. These fears, while inconsequential to the Drill Sergeant, are “even if ill-founded, [sic] real fears and need to be dealt with.”<sup>4</sup> Rather than assess blame for the fear or infer weakness, it’s necessary to separate the Soldier from the problem and continually remind them of the mutually beneficial outcome that the Army wants to achieve with them. This process doesn’t mean the leader is holding the Soldier’s hand; it’s often as simple as mentoring the Soldier as he or she thinks through the fears and arrives at the most mutually beneficial conclusion. It’s easier as a leader to just tell the Soldier to “toughen up” or some other similarly meaningless platitude. However, a leader that’s willing to listen and teach reinforces trust, understanding, and respect while simultaneously pursuing the mission.

Second, consider focusing on what the greatest intrinsic motivator is for your Soldiers. Generally speaking, basic

**human needs are the most powerful motivators. These needs include: security, economic well-being, sense of belonging, recognition, and control over one's life. They can often be conflicting. For example, a Soldier's desire to provide for his or her family may be at odds with the desire to have control over his or her life. The majority of Soldiers will zero in on one need and use that to get through Basic Combat Training (BCT) and Advanced Individual Training (AIT). They generally do not require special attention as they are able to stay focused on what motivates them or draw strength**



**W**hat do most people think of when they

hear Fort Jackson, SC? Basic Training! Instantly people associate Fort Jackson as one of four Installations's conducting *Army Basic Combat Training*. Unbeknown to many personnel and Soldiers, there are many other Companies, Units, and Detachments co-located on Fort Jackson. On the second floor of Strom Thurmond Soldier Services Center, is a small office located at the end of a long hallway housing the unknown *United States Army Student Detachment (USASD)*. USASD, better known as Student Detachment, is the best-kept secret within the United States Army. Student Detachment is a vast, unique organization, with a manpower authorization of 7 Soldiers and 6 civilian workers to support over 2,200 Soldiers assigned to the Detachment with duty in over 310 diverse locations worldwide. We have Soldiers assigned in all fifty states, over 46 countries and on six of seven continents; there were no volunteers for Antarctica. Student Detachment's primary mission is to provide Command, Control and personnel administration for all active-duty Soldiers participating in Advance Civil School (ACS), Green to Gold(G2G), and support the Soldiers who have been granted the opportunity to Train with Industry (private commercial companies)(TWI). Command entails providing for the morale, welfare, and discipline of the assigned students. The Detachment accomplishes Command for the students through the use of liaison officers and coordination with Army Advisors, Professors of Military Science, and the Defense Attaché Officials at installations near the student's school. Student Detachment was originally formed in November 1973 as a part of the Directorate of Personnel and Community Activities supporting all Officers and Noncommissioned Officers. In April 1981, functional responsibility for the Student Detachment was transferred from the Directorate of Personnel and Community Activities to Troop Brigade, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana. In October 1993, the unit was relocated to Fort Jackson, SC and aligned as a separate tenant unit on Fort Jackson, that same year it fall under the command and control of Victory Brigade, now

171<sup>st</sup> Infantry Brigade (*Blackhawks*). The Student Detachment consists of a detachment Headquarters and three subordinate support sections (Finance, Human Resources and Training) arranged to provide services similar to those of a Battalion or Brigade S-1 section. It's not unusual for Student detachment staff to e-mail and talk with several hundred Soldiers in one day with military and civilian Department of Defense support staff working to ensure pay, travel, and administrative requirements are met with the utmost level of professionalism.

***Training with Industries (TWI)*** is an opportunity of a lifetime; it allows active duty Service Members the opportunity to train with some of the world's leading *Fortune 500 Companies* in the United States while remaining on active duty status. TWI was first initiated in the 1970's in response to the Army's critical need for Soldiers to gain skills in industrial practices and procedures. In the beginning Soldiers participated only in programs that supported the development of material acquisition and logistics management. Today's Army has heard the calling

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 61  
for Soldiers to heighten their professionalism while in uniform, and better prepare our men and woman in uniform for life as civilian. TWI has vastly expanded its programs base, to include training programs that support marketing, public affairs, artificial intelligence, physical security and banking. Currently, USASD has service members working with *Microsoft, the National Football League (NFL), SCANA, Wal-Mart, Google* and other private sector companies. Once you have completed your TWI studies, you are integrated back into the Army and assigned to a utilization tours using the knowledge that you have gained to improve the Army's ability to interact and conduct business with outside industries.

***Advanced Civil Schooling (ACS)*** facilitates the professional development of regular Army officers, by providing them the opportunity to participate in a fully funded graduate degree program all while maintaining their active duty status. In today's Army many officer positions require graduate degrees as a prerequisite for advancement and different assignment. The ACS program is designed to ensure officers meet the educational requirement for their future placements into those positions. While in the program, ACS Branch (part of HRC Fort Knox, KY) will oversee all tuition payments to the university and USASD is responsible for all administrative actions to include their accountability and any Finance issues that may arise during the tour of school.

Within the Army's ACS there are three different

programs; *ACS Masters of Art/Science* (ACS- MA/MS), *ACS Intermediate-Level Education* (ACS- ILE) and *ACS Senior Service School* (ACS-SSS). The ACS-MA/MS is for students attending colleges and universities to obtain their master degree for career progression. ACS-ILE is for Soldiers attending Professional Military Education (PME) courses funded through ACS at an off-site location such as ; Fort Belvoir, Fort Lee and Monterrey, CA. Soldiers will PCS from their current unit to USASD (until completion of your program) already knowing their follow-on assignment. Our ACS-SSS is identical to the ACS-ILE; however this program is for the Army Senior leaders who have been selected to participate in the various War Colleges (Air War College, Maxwell, AFB, Naval War College, Rhode Island, etc).

## **Secret**

Regardless of the ACS program selected, the ultimate goal remains the same, “Better equip today’s Officers with the best academic education in the timeliest and most cost effective manner”.

***Green to Gold (G2G)*** is a program designed to allow qualified and inspired young enlisted Soldiers an opportunity to return to school and earn a baccalaureate or graduate degree while striving to become a commissioned Army Officer. Although this program offers several different ways to earn a commission and degree, Green to Gold Active Duty Option (ADO) Soldiers is the only program Student Detachment accounts for. Soldiers selected for ADO attend a college/ university of their choice (with an Army ROTC program) for 24 months obtaining their BA/BS degree and commissioning as an officer upon completion. While attending school, ADO’s will maintain their current military pay, entitlements and allowances. The Soldier’s family will still have access to majority of all benefits (hospital, on-post daycares) the only thing that will change is your everyday outfit; who wouldn’t want to wear jeans a few days a week.

The Student Detachment achieves success by working as a Team. Our end state is providing the highest level of customer service to assist the Soldier in maintaining focus on their pending achievement of earning a *DEGREE!!!!* Many of the Soldiers attending Basic Combat Training today just might one day be reassigned to USASD through one of our many program opportunities. So now on when you think of Fort Jackson, South Carolina, think of United States Army Student Detachment...

***Secret EXPOSED!!!***

***CPT Sindie L. Hicks is the Commander of the U.S. Army Student Detachment, 171st Infantry Brigade***

**T**he Advanced Officer Training Division

(AOTD) of the Adjutant General School (AGS) provides AG Captains and Warrant Officers with their last AG focused Professional Military Education (PME), the Captains Career Course (CCC) and the Warrant Officer Advanced Course (WOAC), respectively. How does the AOTD ensure students gain an understanding of doctrinal foundations while also developing skills essential to success during the remainder of their careers in the myriad of assignments available to the AG Corps? AOTD cadre prepare our HR professionals for the unpredictable future through the use of discussion based facilitation in order to develop competent leaders capable of critical thought and the application of HR and operational doctrine. The instructors' experiences are important training aides, however, the most valuable tool cadre leverage during instruction is the operational experience of the students. By using student experiences with guided, facilitated conversation, students are able to internalize and apply doctrinal principles while identifying best practices across the force. Drawing from these experiences allows the AOTD to provide quality HR professionals capable of serving our Army well into the future.

Facilitated discussion is key to both the CCC and the WOAC. Students bring a wealth of knowledge and experience from their operational assignments, with no two students having the same experience. By drawing learners into discussion, instructors facilitate lessons learned in the operational domain and apply these experiences to doctrinal principles in the institutional domain. Through focused discussion on doctrinal topics, students are exposed to many different experiences all while being required to engage more directly in their PME. To allow for productive discussion, slide decks and lesson plans are designed to spur discussion instead of being solely informational briefings.

Student experiences shared during discussion validate and reinforce the importance of doctrinal foundations. As stated by LTG David Perkins, Commander of the US Army Combined Arms Center, during his visit to the Soldier Support Institute in August of 2013, "doctrine teaches you not what to think, but how to think." The AGS provides relevant information to the current issues of today by incorporating current MILPERs, ALARACTs, and changes to Army regulations.

However, it is only through the development of critical thinkers that we can address the issues that will face our HR professionals tomorrow. As students share experiences, it becomes apparent that no two experiences are exactly the same and that there are multiple ways to accomplish the mission. The key is to identify the doctrinal principles that guide the different experiences so the principle can be applied in an uncertain future. As the Army transitions back to a train-ready stance, these principles become even more critical as we prepare to engage a hybrid threat in an unknown location.

By incorporating insight and knowledge from students with different experiences, the cadre can ensure they are developing the next generation of HR leaders. The use of facilitated discussion to reinforce doctrinal principles and develop best practices improves the quality of institutional learning offered students attending AOTD courses.

By drawing on the experiences of our students rotating out of operational units, AOTD ensures HR professionals are relevant not only today, but also for the Army's future challenges.

***CPT Brian Hollandsworth is assigned to the Adjutant General's School, Soldier Support Institute, Fort Jackson, SC.***

Above, From L to R: LT Mary Wilcox, LT Yildirim Isik (Turkey), LT Ben Amaya, and CPT Todd Gibson watch as CPT John Harder (Center) works out a practical exercise during a HR lesson. AG School student discussions help officers better grasp the concepts discussed in class.

## The AG School Advanced Officer Training Division (AOTD)

CPT Brian Hollandsworth

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 63

# Challenge Yourself

In 2005, Roz Savage became the first woman to compete the Atlantic Rowing Race solo. That's right – one woman, one boat, 103 days of rowing across three thousand miles of open ocean. Her cooking stove failed after twenty days and all four of her oars broke, but she made it. Roz later became the first woman to row solo across the Pacific Ocean!

Chade-Meng Tan, *Search Inside Yourself*, (HarperCollins), 2012

64 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

**H**umility is a unique quality rarely seen and quite often, misunderstood, but when found can be the difference between an average and great leader. Humility comes from the Latin

word humilis, which literally translates to mean low. According to Webster's Dictionary, humility is the quality or state of not thinking you are better than other people. In terms of leadership, humility may be defined by someone who recognizes their shortcomings without reservation and places the importance of others above their self. Further, a leader that is humble realizes they do not have all the answers - they understand that they are imperfect and, rather than acting to deceive or deny their own weakness, they embrace it and use it to lead in a more effective manner. It is a quality that enables someone in a leadership role to be simultaneously self-confident yet self-aware, assertive but openminded, knowledgeable nevertheless curious. It is a characteristic that can be learned; most often in failure but more effectively in success.

Humble leaders seek answers based on their own internal acceptance that some answers, challenges, and issues are beyond their expertise and capabilities. Instead of allowing this fault to disrupt their self confidence, they use humility to strengthen it by understanding that there are some things they do not know and reaching out to others is necessary. This void in knowledge is understandable due to the complexity of issues and enormous responsibilities leaders face in their positions. Humility teaches to seek answers to solve challenges and problems through a process that applies a style promoting input, listening to others, and teamwork.

Consequently, these types of leaders must open their mind and decision-making process to acknowledge their own limitations and those of others while encouraging learning across the organization. Because they are humble, they treat others with dignity and command a greater following unlike the selfish leader who only has an exaggerated sense of their abilities and requires no external input. Good leadership is based on humility, on an ideal that leaders are not islands unto themselves but members of a team. A humble leader must recognize that being a leader, regardless of the size of the unit, is a privilege and not an entitlement.

Many of us have served with poor leaders that fail to demonstrate humility and, in its place, display an overwhelming amount of hubris; an extreme self-confidence along with a false perception of reality. These leaders are not open to ideas nor do not they seek input from others. The leader who perceives their opinion as the most important never listens and accomplishes little to build a team or inspire people within an organization. Their lack of humility makes them very quick to respond- acting blindly rather than thinking. Humility requires an innate ability to downplay their self-importance as well as disregard their own publicity. Great leaders

demonstrate a consistent passion of curiosity in attaining knowledge through a calm and deliberate method of engagement with those they lead. They can be assertive but promote constructive dialogue with others while demonstrating a sense of selfless service that fosters a universal focus of bettering the organization over an individual's needs.

Finally, humble leaders recognize that they are human, subject to all the mistakes and errors as those they lead. They know their own strengths and weaknesses, as well as those in their formation. They do not believe they are always right and readily recognize when they are wrong. A leader with humility can equally stand in front of his/her boss, peers, and subordinates and assume responsibility for their mistakes while easily withdrawing to the rear of the unit when they are being praised so that the accolades are shared amongst those led rather than reserved solely for the leader. If we are to try and become a great leader then we must realize that it cannot be done alone, it takes humility. The best leaders are not the ones who boast of their victories or prowess, but talk of their failures and faults, and how they used them to learn important lessons and finally achieve success.

*COL Bryan Hernandez is the Commander of the 165th Infantry Brigade (Basic Comat Training) at Fort Jackson.*

## *The Humble Leader: The role of Humility in Leadership*

*COL Bryan Hernandez*

No person can be a great leader without a touch of humility.

**Life is not measured by the number of breathes we take, but by the moments that take our breath away.**

**Maya Angelou**

66 *Jackson Journal* April - July 2014

## *Jackson Journal*

### **Articles Needed**

**The Jackson Journal is always in need of articles for publication.**

**Topics for articles can include any aspect of training or leading Soldiers in Initial Military Training (IMT). If you are unsure whether a topic is suitable, please contact us.**

**Feature articles are usually between 2,000 and 4,000 words (but**

those are not rigid guidelines). We prefer clear, correct, concise, and consistent wording expressed in the active voice. Also, please spell out all acronyms and abbreviations the first time you use them. Photographs or graphics that support your article are encouraged when you submit your article, please include the original electronic file of all graphs (jpeg, power point, etc).  
Submit articles NLT 13 June 2014 for the August - November 2014 issue by email to: michael.ryan9@us.army.mil or john.d.philibert.civ@mail.mil

“A good company idea in tactics is likely to remain confined to one company indefinitely, even though it would be of benefit to the whole military establishment”.

*S.L.A. Marshall*

*Men Against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command, 1947*

April - July 2014 *Jackson Journal* 67

**Add to your**

# ***Reading List***

## ***Boundary Spanning Leadership***

Chris Ernst and Donna Chrobot-Mason / Center for Creative Leadership 2011

Through compelling stories, practical tactics, and actionable tools, you'll learn and apply the six boundary spanning practices that occur at the nexus between groups (Buffering, Reflecting, Connecting, Mobilizing, Weaving, Transforming). Together, these practices combine to create what authors Ernst and Chrobot-Mason call, "The Nexus Effect". Boundaries exist, what matters most is how you work to bridge these divides and transform your organization's wide-ranging talents and knowledge to deliver value.

## ***Common Sense Training: A Working Philosophy for Leaders***

Arthur S. Collins, Daniel P. Bolger (Foreword by), LT Gen Collins Presidio Press 1978

Written by LTG Arthur S. "Ace" Collins and first published in 1978, Common Sense Training is simply the best book ever written on how to train American Soldiers. In lucid, clever prose punctuated by

terrific anecdotes and provocative examples, the General describes the tough, realistic training techniques that our Army used to prepare for war in the Gulf and still uses today.