pose. In the ranks of the foot cavalry that followed Lee and his lieutenants, it was pride and comradeship that bound the soldiers to their leaders and drove them on to face the crucial days ahead.

Lee understood that men fight because of their nature, finding release in the danger and excitement of combat. That ability to fight must be strengthened by comradeship and pride and liberally seasoned with strong leadership, which supplies the catalyst for successful performance on the battlefield. Lee understood that patriotism and idealism grew from these factors, not the other way around, as Mr. Noyes maintains.

The question that follows from all this then is not why men fight but how we can improve upon their battlefield performance. The answers lie, as always, in the development of pride and comradeship in the individual and the unit, overarched by a strong dose of leadership.

Concerning his Army of Northern Virginia in 1864, Lee wrote to a subordinate, "Never has there been such men. Properly led, they will go anywhere. But proper commanders," he lamented, "where to obtain them?" Similarly, a U.S. regimental commander in the Korean War who had grasped the value of leadership told an observer, "The boys up there aren't fighting for democracy now," pointing to a firefight in progress, "they're fighting because the platoon leader is leading them."

Leadership is still essential to performance on any battlefield, and neither patriotism nor idealism will ever replace it.

Mike Fisher was a platoon sergeant in a rifle company in the 1st Marine Regiment in Vietnam. He has written numerous articles and book reviews for INFANTRY and other military publications. He holds a doctorate from the University of Kansas and was Director of Academic Advisement at Pratt Community College in Kansas when he wrote this article.

System Safety

PRECY D. AGUAS

A newly developed system (a piece of equipment or a facility) sometimes presents risks in a unit that the leaders have failed to consider. A system safety program, as required by Army Regulation 385-10, The Army Safety Program, will help a commander identify and eliminate safety risks, or at least to reduce them to an acceptable level.

System safety is the application of engineering and management principles, criteria, and techniques for making a system as safe as possible, given the constraints of operational effectiveness, time, and cost throughout all phases of the system's life cycle.

In this context, a system is a composite of elements that are used together in the intended operational or support environment to perform a given task or to achieve a specific production, support, or mission requirement. A typical ground vehicle system, for example, would include the vehicle, maintenance equipment, training equipment, personnel (both crew and support), facilities, and training and procedural manuals.

Army Regulation 385-16, System Safety Engineering and Management, dictates the requirements for developing and implementing a system safety program. It emphasizes that contractors, combat developers, materiel developers, and others who design and develop hazard control measures for various systems should influence the system early in its life cycle. But it also emphasizes the need for input from the leaders and soldiers who use the system in the field, and it appears that this need is not being fully achieved.

The Infantry Branch Safety Office at Fort Benning is in the process of developing a comprehensive system safety program that should improve system safety management for all infantry products. Two safety professionals are assigned to the Infantry School to perform system safety tasks in the development and fielding of systems for which the School has proponency.

A system safety engineer permanently attached to the Directorate of Combat Developments is responsible for providing design information for requirement documents in order to develop and field systems that will be safe for soldiers to operate and maintain. This engineer ensures that safety is considered throughout the development phase of a system's life cycle and also serves as the central point of contact on system safety at Fort Benning.

In addition, a safety specialist assigned to the Directorate of Evaluation and Standardization is responsible for seeing that safety is integrated into all programs of instructions, technical manuals, and other related publications for infantry proponent systems before their deployment. This specialist also manages a safety lessons learned data base that may provide information that can be incorporated into

requirement documents for similar systems that may be developed in the future.

A few infantry leaders and soldiers are introduced to a new system during its operational testing and are given an opportunity at that time to identify hazards or unsafe equipment. Problems can then be eliminated, or reduced to a level that is acceptable to the designated decision authority, before the system is deployed.

Most users, however, do not see a newly developed system until their units receive it. Although any corrective action at this point will be expensive and more difficult to implement, these users, too, have a responsibility for promptly reporting failures or accidents in the field.

During the deployment phase, the personnel in the units' local installation safety offices play an important role. They evaluate hardware or procedural changes that have been made; review operational activities to ensure that maintenance procedures are not hazardous and do not cause other hazards; and evaluate emergency procedures and training programs to ensure that proper safety measures have been included. They also investigate any problem, incident, or accident that occurs after a system is fielded to determine the cause, the interim procedures for preventing a similar problem in the future, and the appropriate design modifications (if any) that can permanently eliminate or control the hazard.

Anytime an accident investigation reveals that a materiel failure, malfunction, or design contributed to the accident, the proponent activity responsible for the equipment must be notified. This report should be submitted without delay even if the item has been repaired or replaced locally. A report of a failure is important because it could signal the existence of a more widespread problem.

Similarly, anyone who has a recommendation that may improve a piece of equipment should submit a report to the sponsoring agency.

To notify the proponent activity, a user must prepare a Standard Form (SF) 368, Quality Deficiency Report (QDR)/Equipment Improvement Report (EIR). A QDR is used to report conditions that result from substandard workmanship (such as materiel that does not conform to design specifications). An EIR is used to report faults in materiel design, operation, or manufacture with the purpose of initiating early and effective corrective action or of recommending improvements. These reports provide a basis for corrective deficiencies and preventing the same problems from being repeated in the development or acquisition of similar systems or replacements for the same system.

A properly completed SF 368 should be sent to the responsible command within five work days after the discovery of the defect. The command should acknowledge its receipt within seven days and must then investigate the report and, if necessary, ensure that the disclosed deficiencies are corrected.

Even though the user is responsible for reporting equipment deficiencies, his local installation safety office should also be actively involved in monitoring the submission of all QDRs and EIRs. AR 385-16 requires that installation commanders review (through their safety offices) all locally initiated equipment improvement recommendations for their effects on safety and for their proper classification.

In addition to reporting equipment defects and deficiencies to their local installation safety offices, all users of infantry systems are also encouraged to provide a copy of each report to the Infantry Branch Safety Office, ATTN: ATZB-SO (Ms. Precy Aguas), Fort Benning, GA 31905-5000, or to report by telephone to AUTOVON 835-3914/3898 or commercial (404) 545-3914/3898.

Precy D. Aguas is the System Safety Engineer assigned to the Directorate of Combat Developments at the Infantry School. A graduate of Mapua Institute of Technology in the Philippines, she also attended the U.S. Army Materiel Command School of Engineering and Logistics.