

quire training and logistical support, and a deployment that works out of a *cantonment area requires administrative and off-duty programs as well.* In either case, the UREPs will need to find out and retain a lot of varied information.

One technique for collecting this information is to use deployment worksheets. These worksheets, one for the S-2/S-3 and one for the S-1/S-4, contain words or phrases that are used to request key information. (An S-1/S-4 worksheet is shown here as an example.) This facilitates accurate and helpful note taking. Units with special capabilities or equipment (such as parachutes, for example) can include additional categories (packing facilities, rigger availability, storage areas, drop zone set-up assistance, or whatever else needs to be covered).

In all areas, UREPs must ensure that the names and phone numbers of points of contact, as well as their mail and electronic addresses, are noted so that follow-up questions can be answered or clarifications can be made.

These worksheets can be prepared on a trip-by-trip basis, or the battalion can establish them as its SOP for coordinating trips. In most cases, the S-1/S-4 worksheet can become the coordination trip SOP, because the same information on services and classes of supply will probably be required for every trip. The S-2/S-3 worksheet, however, should

probably be developed for each separate deployment, because what the commander plans to get out of one deployment may differ entirely from what he plans to get out of the next. A worksheet can be set up on a day-to-day or mission-to-mission basis, depending upon which seems to work best for tracking the requested and coordinated resources.

When the UREPs arrive at the deployment site, or wherever coordination needs to be made, they should link up with the people the battalion's project officer has been working with. Ideally, these people are expecting the UREPs and are prepared to take them around. This is the time to verify deployment dates; known transportation data; number of soldiers; advance party, main body, and trail party information; and the commander's intent. While these individuals can probably answer most of the UREPs' questions, the UREPs also need to get in touch with other sections to get all the answers they need.

The UREPs should talk to every possible point of contact for their listed areas of responsibility and should get range regulations, wire diagrams, unit or school SOPs, Self-Service Supply Center catalogs, or anything else that may help the battalion's deployment planners do their jobs better.

UREPs should make sure all the notes they take are clear and complete. Too,

while working with their points of contact at the deployment location, they should come to an understanding about requirements for fund cites or memorandums of understanding. Getting these things clear on this coordination trip may smooth out potential problems later.

Upon their return from the coordination trip, UREPs should finish memorandums of understanding that were not or could not be prepared earlier and back-brief the staff principals and the commander or executive officer. Unless their guidance changes, the next step is for them to write, or help write, the most complete and accurate order, letter of instruction, or annex possible. In short, they should translate all the knowledge they gained on the trip into something the unit can really use.

The last step should be to note any weak or unclear areas on the order. This may mean an addition to or a modification of the deployment worksheet. Once any necessary changes are made, the UREPs can feel confident that the battalion is well on its way to making the most of its off-post training opportunities.

Captain Steven D. Cage formerly commanded HHC, 2d Brigade, 10th Mountain Division at Fort Benning. He is now an ROTC instructor at Western New England College. A 1978 graduate of the United States Military Academy, he also holds a master's degree from Central Michigan University.

Leadership

The Human Dimension

CAPTAIN THOMAS P. WEIKERT

Today, more than ever, junior leaders have an obligation to rely less on management skills and more on the basic elements of leadership. Never in the Army's history has there been a greater need for the junior leader to embody the human

element of leadership. Compassion, as a fundamental quality of our leadership style, takes on a greater significance as we find ourselves responsible for ever brighter, more responsive, and more highly motivated young soldiers.

For a new lieutenant to be truly effective in what has become a technologically advanced (but still soldier-dependent) infantry, he must focus the development of his leadership style on a commitment to the human dimension of leading



soldiers. The new lieutenant's success as a leader results as much from the development of a sound leadership style as it does from the achievement of tactical and technical proficiency. The human component, an integral part of that leadership style, requires that he identify the needs of his subordinates, demonstrate compassion and loyalty toward them and, finally, simply get along with them.

In the hope that new lieutenants can benefit from my own past experience, I would like to offer a prescription for ensuring a commitment to the human element and also to present some specific situations in which that commitment becomes essential.

Although the thoughts offered here may not be especially illuminating to an officer with a great deal of experience in the infantry, they should provide some useful guidance to a new infantry lieutenant embarking on his first assignment.

As the Army's leadership manual (FM 22-100) indicates quite clearly, a leader must know "how to motivate people in general and [his] subordinates in particular." A successful "motivator" is, by my definition, a leader who is capable of working side-by-side with his charges. He is then, also by my definition, able to "get along" with them. Although this is only one of the factors that contribute to good leadership, it is a critical one.

Those who would disagree could point, of course, to successful battlefield commanders who have relied heavily upon a form of coercive power. It is true that, because of extraordinary personalities or unusual circumstances, such leaders have emerged in combat and even in peacetime and have succeeded. But I believe these are rare exceptions.

Most prominent figures in the Army's history, and especially in the infantry's history, have had the ability to get along

with their subordinates and have therefore been able to motivate them. The controversial General George S. Patton, Jr., for example, whom General Omar N. Bradley described as "excessively harsh," clearly relied upon coercion to achieve results. But one of the principles by which he operated was that as soldiers "we can always learn from each other." Patton reportedly believed in doing everything that was expected of the men he commanded, including personally testing his tanks in river crossing operations. Although Patton demanded much of his men, and although many undoubtedly feared him, he was able to work side-by-side with them, and this, I am convinced, contributed to his effectiveness as a leader.

Like Patton, a junior infantry officer in the Army today has to be able to get along with his subordinates. He must not, however, under any circumstances, allow the senior-subordinate relationship to become obscured. In other words, he must recognize the fine line that exists between fraternizing with his soldiers and working among them to accomplish a mission. To ensure that he stays on the right side of that line, he should demand respect and remain in charge. This relationship is critical to his legitimacy as a leader and, when coupled with a willingness to work alongside his men, it should guarantee his success.

To get along with his subordinates, a new lieutenant must also identify their needs. He cannot casually lump together the needs of a group of soldiers; he must get to know them individually. By so doing, he learns something about each one and should eventually be able to recognize what makes each one tick. A little attention to a soldier in the form of care and concern, provided it is genuine, will earn great dividends for a lieutenant.

Identifying a soldier's beliefs and values, as FM 22-100 points out, is critical to the understanding of his personality and the things that motivate him. The indisputable fact is that understanding the diverse personalities found in a platoon requires tremendous effort, patience, and more than a basic understanding of human nature. Because conducting such an analysis is usually less conscious than subconscious, it requires that a platoon leader

have a sincere regard for his subordinates.

At the same time, he must be determined to create an inspired and cohesive small unit that is as capable of performing its peacetime mission as it is prepared to fight a war.

One situation in which it is particularly important for a company grade officer to recognize a subordinate's character make-up and to understand his personality is in considering that subordinate for a job of greater responsibility. Surprisingly enough, sometimes a soldier who has demonstrated either lassitude or an obvious dissatisfaction with his current job will make the best candidate for the new job. Although these are clearly undesirable traits in a subordinate, a soldier who demonstrates this sort of attitude often has reached a point in his development where he feels unfulfilled. If so, giving him a job with more responsibility can serve to rejuvenate him and improve his performance. On the other hand, this kind of attitude may reflect a soldier's feelings about a job that is beyond his capabilities.

The point is that the leader must be able to identify what is causing the poor performance. Only a complete familiarity with a soldier's motives, values, and perhaps goals, coupled with a thorough understanding of human nature, will enable the leader to do this. An analysis

of this sort may even help the junior leader at some future time make a responsible decision in a critical situation.

If this kind of compassion and understanding toward subordinates is to be effective, however, it must be genuine. All too often, I have seen junior leaders engage in what amounts to mere cheer-leading. Encouragement is important to soldiers but not if they perceive it as phony. In other situations, I have seen junior leaders encourage good performance chiefly to impress their superiors, and there is nothing more damaging to a leader's credibility among his subordinates. A junior leader succeeds only to the extent that his actions are perceived to be in the interest of his subordinates and not self-serving.

Loyalty to subordinates is a powerful tool for the young leader to use in his efforts to gain their respect. Soldiers understand and probably appreciate more than anything else their leader's support in a wide variety of situations. A common one, and one that often proves troubling for a lieutenant, involves disciplinary action.

When called upon to comment on a soldier's poor duty performance or to make a recommendation as to his redemptive value, an officer must consider a number of interests, including that of the unit, the Army, and the individual. A

soldier who has committed an indiscretion but has shown a genuinely penitent attitude and no potential for further indiscretions deserves his leader's support.

To make a judgement as to his soldier's potential for slipping further, the leader must again be able to read his character. In many cases, the disciplinary infraction may be just an aberration. The leader must also know his subordinate well enough to determine whether his penitent attitude is sincere. If it is, he can justifiably be compassionate in dealing with an outstanding soldier who has erred and whose career hangs in the balance. And supporting a soldier like this also contributes enormously to a lieutenant's credibility among his other subordinates.

Developing the human dimension in his leadership style should be one of a new lieutenant's most important goals. Being compassionate and trying to understand every soldier's character should guarantee that development. In addition, if he is able to get along with his subordinates, his efforts to lead them will meet with success.

Captain Thomas P. Weikert is assigned to the 1st Battalion, 503d Infantry, in Korea. He previously served as a platoon leader and a company executive officer with the 5th Battalion, 8th Infantry in Germany.

