

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

ARMY DOCTRINE AND THE PHYSICAL
DOMAIN REQUIREMENTS OF STRATEGIC LEADERS

by

Kevin A. Comfort, COL, US Army

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: COL Dale C. Kuehl

6 April 2017

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government, the Department of Defense, or Air University. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.



Biography

COL Kevin A. Comfort is assigned to the Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL. Kevin A. Comfort is a Distinguished Military Graduate of the University of Jacksonville with a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice. He received his Masters degree graduating with Honors from Webster University in Business Security Management.

His military education includes Military Police Officer Basic Course, Joint Deployment Officer Course, Military Police Officer Advanced Course, Combined Arms Services and Staff School, Total Army Instructor Training Course, and the Command and General Staff College.

COL Comfort's assignments include Senior Advisor to the Commanding General, Afghan Anti-Crime Police, Minister of Interior, Afghanistan; Deputy Brigade Commander, 15th Military Police Brigade, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Commander, 97th Military Police Battalion, Fort Riley, Kansas; Commander, 720th Military Police Battalion Rear Provisional; 89th Military Police Brigade S4; 89th Military Police Brigade Long Range Plans Officer, Fort Hood, Texas; Executive Officer, 796th Military Police Battalion, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Provost Marshal, Doha, Qatar; Commander and Provost Marshal Base Security Detachment Eskan Village, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; Small Group Leader and Officer Basic Course Instructor, Combined Arms Training Directorate, USAMPS; Commander A Company, 795th MP BN, 14th MP BDE, Fort Leonard Wood Missouri; Commander 527th MP Company, 709th MP BN, 18th MP BDE, Giessen Germany; Provost Marshal, 221st BSB, Wiesbaden Germany; Assistant S3 Training, 89th MP BDE; Platoon Leader 410th MP CO, Fort Hood Texas.

His awards include the Bronze Star Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal four oak leaf clusters, the Army Commendation Medal three oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Meritorious Unit Citation, the Army Superior Unit Award, the Naval and Marine Corps Meritorious Unit Commendation, the National Defense Service Ribbon, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Kosovo Campaign Medal, the Iraqi Campaign Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Naval Sea Service Ribbon 2nd award, the Army Service ribbon, the Overseas service ribbon, the NATO medal, and Parachutist Badge.

Abstract

The Army's doctrine, history and culture consistently highlights and venerates the physical attributes of warrior athletes, especially those who lead the men and women of the greatest land force in history. As the Information Age over-takes the legacy of influences of the Industrial Age, technological advancements are influencing perceptions of a need to focus training and improvement efforts on cognitive capabilities while subordinating the roles of the physical and social attributes of the human dimension. The Army's 2015 strategy on the Human Dimension signals a shift in how the Army views the relationship of the three components of the Human Dimension. The Army's Human Dimension is consistently comprised of three attributes within Army leadership doctrine. Character, Presence, and Intellect are contextually used to define the three components. Presence is fitness, bearing, attitude, and resilience. Character is values and morals with Intellect being cognitive skills. The overall intent of this paper is to generate needed discussion and healthy debate on the effect of creating a triad, versus the current trinity, with the three components of the human dimension for Army leader development as individuals move through a career from direct to strategic leadership. Using a qualitative approach, the author argues the negative implications of changing the ideology of the relationship of the components of the human dimension outweigh the potential additive effect. The paper then reviews the continuity and interconnectedness of Army doctrine on the physical domain of the human dimension of leadership revealing potential for competitive friction between two goals relating to the physical and cognitive domain. Using historical vignettes, the author reveals the long-standing tradition and culture of physical presence ingrained in the Army's leadership and Soldiers. Adding to the discussion is the presentation of the potential benefits and contributions to human dimension capability development from sources outside of

the military. The author presents four possible recommendations to shape the discussion and scholarship efforts on how the Army doctrinally defines the corollary relationship of the components that create the human dimension in furthering leader development strategy, policy and programs.



Introduction

The Army's human dimension and leadership development doctrine, over the past decade, contains relatively unchanged historical continuity, as well as, interconnected supporting discourse on all three components within the human dimension. The 2006 US Army Field Manual (FM) 6-22 describes the three domains of the human dimension of leadership as character, presence, and intellectual capacity.¹ The 2008 US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7 describes the three attributes as moral, physical, and cognitive.² The 2012 US Army Doctrinal Publication (ADP) 6-22 describes them as character, presence and intellect,³ as does Army Doctrinal Reference Publication (ADRP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*. Regardless, the doctrinal rhetoric on the three attributes, or domains, which comprise the human dimension, are descriptively presented as a mutually supporting co-occurrence relationship. The 2015 Department of the Army publication, *The Army Human Dimension Strategy: Building Cohesive Teams to Win in a Complex World, Cognitive Dominance - Realistic Training – Institutional Agility*, creates a new relationship triad by placing the physical and social components of the human dimension under cognitive dominance.⁴ Nonetheless, the content of the physical domain defined as presence remains relatively the same throughout doctrine. The 2015 strategy describes systematized programmatic offices and authorities to span organizational boundaries for improving human dimension capability development. The overall intent of this paper is to create discussion on how the Army will discern the prioritization of cognitive dominance over physical components of the human dimension in the design of strategic leadership and human performance optimization by resolving how the Army ideally views the correlation between the physical and cognitive domains of the human dimension of leadership.

Reflecting on the leadership examples of a few great Army Generals reveals the cultural reasoning about the physical components of strategic leaders within the Army. The Army's self image is grounded in its history. The value and reverence the Army places on the physical presence of leaders serving in direct through strategic leadership roles dominates its lead from the front ideology. Generals, like John J. Pershing, Chief of Staff of the Army, Matthew "Bunker" Ridgeway, as well as, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Lyman Lemnitzer exemplify the leadership culture of the Army. Their careers epitomize the Army's ideology of physical presence. The vignettes of some of their accomplishments help broaden the understanding of how and why the Army culturally places significance on leadership presence and why the physical domain remains important to strategic leadership development and doctrine.

Thesis

The US Army should not place more focus on the cognitive component of the human dimension while subordinating the physical and social components because the interrelationship of the three components is a part of the Army's culture and history that remains ingrained in the quality and quantity of doctrinal text applicable to the development of strategic leaders.

Reviewing the Last Decade of the Army's Physical Domain Doctrine

The Army's doctrine on the physical component requirements of leaders functioning in the complex environment of the future remains consistent. Physical domain requirements for leaders functioning in the Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational (JIIM) area of influence within the volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) environmental context has been addressed with great continuity within Army doctrine. The 2006 US Army Field Manual (FM) 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, is the preceding

foundation of a decade of doctrine on Army leadership for all military and civilian personnel. The 2006 FM 6-22 on Army Leadership describes the physical component as “Presence” that is comprised of military bearing, physical fitness, confidence, and resiliency.⁵ The manual asserts, “the values and attributes are the same for all leaders, regardless of position, only developed and improved over time and experiential learning in assignments of increased duty and authority.”⁶ The manual establishes that “Army leaders represent the institution and the government and should always maintain an appropriate level of physical fitness and professional bearing,” further quoting Julius W. Gates, Sergeant Major of the Army from 1987-1991, “Our quality soldiers should look as good as they are.”⁷ The essence of the prescribed presence is exuding composed strength with belief in one’s self that garners authority throughout a continuously stressful environment with the capability to bounce back quickly, while remaining able to focus on performing difficult cognitive analytics and decision making processes. A provided example of presence is the indirect approach of motivation and influence by sharing in the labor required in difficult tasks and serving with personnel working nonstop in arduous conditions.⁸ The 2006 manual links physical fitness, rest and recovery, to the cognitive process. The components and rhetorical theme of Leader Presence continue in other doctrine.

Following the Army field manual on leadership, publications evolved to the Human Dimension concept expounding on the physical component requirements of leaders. The 2008 US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlets (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7, *The US Army Concept for the Human Dimension in Full Spectrum Operations 2015-2024* and 525-3-7-01, *The US Army Study of the Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, provide the additive doctrinal foundation for the human dimension and the physical domain requirements of today’s Army. The documents describe the moral, physical, and cognitive components of the human dimension

shared inter-connectedness. In the Forward section of TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01, General William Wallace, Commander, US Army Training and Doctrine Command, writes that in 2006 “*The United States Army Study for the Human Dimension* commenced in order to explore the human factors of moral-ethical, intellectual and physical components that make up Soldier development” to change the conversation and discourse on the future analysis of accomplishment, agility, innovation, dependability, and fortitude of an Army comprised of Soldiers and Civilians.⁹ The complexity of the future operational environment largely shaped the problem under the likeliness of a broad range of persistent conflict. The study’s intent was to identify requisite change in order to face the tests and confrontations in the decades to come.¹⁰ The study’s concluded finding iterates a need to continue to evolve and improve the overall concentration of effort on the human dimension to sustain equality of “moral, physical, and cognitive components of the human dimension.”¹¹ Correlating to the findings, the Army needed to expand its collective partnerships with advocates and proponents of human dimension science and technology to positively influence the personnel career timeline creating a force that can succeed in the complex future operational environment.¹² Both TRADOC PAMs describe the linkage of the physical requirements with the moral-ethical and intellectual components, while thoroughly discussing Leader Development focusing on Knowledge Management and the social and intellectual aspects of influence. The discussion on the physical requirements of leaders applies to every Soldier at all levels to build resiliency in coping with combat and operational stress through progressive developmental stages of physical competency. A few years later, the Army would again expound on the physical domain requirements of its leaders.

The 2012 US Army Doctrinal Publication (ADP) 6-22, and Army Doctrinal Reference Publication (ADRP) 6-22, *Army Leadership* from Headquarters, Department of the Army

synthesizes the moral, physical and cognitive foundations articulated in the previous study into the attributes and characteristics required of all Army military and civilian leaders. The ADP and ADRP 6-22 provide continuity on the term presence. The documents continue the same description of the moral, physical, and cognitive components of the human dimension shared inter-connectedness. Mirroring the components of presence as described in the 2006 FM 6-22, ADP 6-22 *Army Leadership*, again defines the components and the attribute of presence. The attribute of presence consistently remains comprised of military and professional bearing, fitness, confidence, and resilience throughout the levels of leadership defined within the “Leadership Requirements Model” as direct, organizational, and strategic.¹³ The content of the ADP on presence describing the physical domain requirements provides continuity while expanding the holistic discussion on presence in detail. ADP 6-22 does not differentiate a requisite variance in the attributes when describing the special conditions of leadership of formal, informal, collective and situational when applied in any specific level of leadership.¹⁴ It further goes on to describe presence as the external conveyance of positive visual behavior, activity, and message as “attributes affect the actions that leaders perform. Good character, solid presence, and keen intellect enable the core leader competencies to be performed with the greater effect.”¹⁵ The Army Doctrinal Reference Publication of the same publication number extends the discussion on presence and the physical domain requirements of Army leaders.

ADRP 6-22 *Army Leadership* articulates in depth and great detail the requirements of Army leaders. ADRP 6-22 provides descriptions of Operational and Strategic leadership Presence. The ADRP is similar to the complimentary doctrinal affect of the 2008 TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01 *Study for the Human Dimension* by providing broader descriptive analysis into the leadership framework established from its parent doctrine. The 6-22 doctrinal reference

provides a buoyed consistent explanation of presence that is best summarized by the phrase, “Army leaders are expected to look and act as professionals. Skillful use of professional bearing-fitness, courtesy, and proper military appearance can help overcome difficult situations.”¹⁶ ADRP 6-22 does not assert any doctrinal change to presence or its four components of military bearing, fitness, confidence, and resilience. The doctrinal reference publication varies in context and content from the 2006 field manual within the chapter on presence. However, the spirit and rhetorical theme remain unchanged and in large part the same when comparing the two chapters on presence. Presence is how followers and others perceive the leader. “Actions, words and the manner in which leaders carry themselves convey presence. Presence is not just a matter of showing up; it involves the example the leader projects to inspire others to do their best and follow their lead.”¹⁷ An obvious difference between the FM and the doctrinal reference publication is the detailed chapters expounding on environment and the context of organizational and strategic leadership.

ADRP 6-22, chapter 11, entitled “Strategic Leadership”, provides more discourse in the form of detailed text about the strategic leadership level requirements and the complexity of the environment, more so, than the preceding chapter on organizational leadership.¹⁸ “Due to their elevated level of responsibilities and visibility, strategic leaders are held to higher expectations and receive increased scrutiny. They must exude positivism and confidence.”¹⁹ Despite the broader rhetoric on strategic leadership, in a section that is partially titled “Displaying Confidence in Adverse Conditions,” the section debatably articulates the cognitive processes versus physical requirements of strategic leaders in uncertain and complex environments. This reads as a failing promise, by negating to contextually elevate the physical demand requirements

of presence, resiliency or confidence, within the section as eluded to within the section's title. The ADP and ADRP 6-22 become systematized in the future round of Army leader publications.

Department of the Army, *Training, Education, Experience, ALDS, The Army Leader Development Strategy 2013* establishes, not only the strategy for developing Army leaders, but also, establishes development of Army leaders as a program. However, presence remains unchanged.²⁰ The text largely focuses on guidance and intent for the ends, ways and means of leader development as a program in financially challenging times. Early on, the document's content establishes the need to look at the programmatic implications of the Army's critical financial documents, the Program Objective Memorandum and Future Years Defense Program.²¹ Noteworthy is that the attributes of presence remain unchanged within the strategy that would influence human dimension concept design in leader doctrine.

In 2014, TRADOC revised the *Human Dimension Concept* pamphlet 525-3-7 asserting the assumption that the "investment priority" through 2020 is leader development with a mid-range objective from 2020 to 2030 of sustained combat overmatch achievable by recalculating ongoing science and technology ventures.²² The shift toward science and technology implies a need for a cognitive attribute focus. This phased prioritization assertion can be diversely interpreted. One possible perspective could be a transition from the focus and priority of leader development to science and technology, with an expectation that the systematized leader development strategy and program has become baked in and ingrained into the Army culture by 2020. The concept includes cognitive, physical, and social human dimension components. The concept document changes the moral components to the term social, adding holistic health and fitness, and does not use the term presence. The components make up the lens of the framework that includes both military and civilian Army personnel covering a career timeline composed of

the phases; Identify, Recruit/Assess, Develop, Employ, Retain/Sustain, and Transition.²³ The concept restates the complex operational environment that will require Soldiers and deployed Civilians to face more demanding physical requirements, however omitting Civilians by only stating that Soldiers need to be more physically agile and resilient.²⁴ The failure to include Civilians in the statement pejoratively diminishes their inclusiveness in the concept. The holistic health and fitness approach incorporates traditional physical fitness that includes aerobic, strength, flexibility, endurance, and coordination inclusive of sports medicine, healthy diet, psychology, and rest and recovery contributions.²⁵ Holistic health fitness protects against the environment and stress with direct linkage to cognitive and social well-being.²⁶ The focus of the content of the concept appears firmly focused on holistic health and fitness, not leadership presence, although, the concept makes no change to the leadership attribute of presence.

The 2014 US Army Combined Arms Center's, *The Human Dimension White Paper, A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance*, intentionally mirrors the 2013 leadership strategy document utilizing ends, ways and means to assert its current programmatics in accordance with the previous leadership strategy and corollary doctrine.²⁷ The white paper asserts that the "Chief of Staff of the Army has directed the Army to become the nation's leader in human performance optimization."²⁸ Primarily the textual focus of the white paper is on the Army's internal program and policy efforts and resources, but also addresses partnerships and membership in counsels and task force organizations to influence agility in institutions and doctrine that are both effecting, and are affected by, experiential human performance enhancement and optimization education, training, research and assessment endeavors. The white paper expounds on the efforts to systematize Army Leader Development beyond strategy and concept to codify the Army's current efforts to reach the asserted goal of the Army Chief of

Staff on human performance optimization. Also in 2014, the TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1 *The US Army Operating Concept, Win in a Complex World 2020-2040*, affirmed the previous physical domain within doctrine. The Army operating concept stated the requirement to “train resilient, adaptive, agile leaders who thrive in uncertainty against persistent danger able to accomplish the mission across the range of military operations in a complex environment against a determined adaptive enemy”²⁹

Correlating the Army’s Contemporary Physical Domain Doctrine

The continuity of the 2013 leadership strategy within the Combined Arms Center’s white paper in 2014, and the most current 2015 Army Human Dimension Strategy is pervasive. The most evident consistency is the content on programmatic. The 2015, *Army Human Dimension Strategy, Building Cohesive Teams to Win in a Complex World, Cognitive Dominance - Realistic Training – Institutional Agility*, utilizes the ends, ways and means format to articulate vision and systemic programs. Although an Army headquarters document, similar to the white paper, the text focuses on the Army’s internal program and policy efforts and resources, councils and organizations that influence institutions and doctrine on human performance enhancement and optimization education, training, research and assessment endeavors. However, interestingly, the 2015 strategy on the human domain places the physical component under the number one line of effort, “cognitive dominance” as a supporting objective.

Whereby the human dimension contains the three components of cognitive, physical and social, the new strategy conjoins the physical and social components under the prime cognitive component as the first strategic line of effort.³⁰ Essentially, the Army’s 2015 human dimension strategy subordinates the physical and social components of the human dimension under cognitive dominance. This implies a shift toward science and technology creating tension with

the goal of leading the nation in human performance optimization. This change supports the 2014 operating concept shift in 2020 from the human dimension to science and technology to achieve combat overmatch, but adversely distracts from the stated goal in the Combined Arms Center's white paper asserting the goal of the Army to lead the nation in human performance optimization. Simultaneously, within an annex, the strategy asserts that cognitive dominance relies upon athletic performance and performance enhancement over the course of an Army professional's career. The language of the strategy indicates a potential pivot, or transition, to a triad relationship of the components of the human dimension, placing physical requirements as "supporting objectives" to cognitive dominance.³¹ Also listing physical requirements as "key tasks" relatively near the bottom of the list of tasks for the effort of cognitive dominance.³² Should the Army transition to a triad relationship of the human dimension components? This is a significant consideration while the ways and means of holistic health and fitness, and human performance research and assessment, and human dimension capability development are matured and sustained by the offices of a human dimension steering committee and human dimension program manager.³³ However, these offices or entities did not mature to fruition after the publication of the strategy. The Chief of Staff of the Army's Unified Quest Human Performance Seminar, lead in partnership by the Army Capabilities Integration Center's Human Dimension Division and the Future Warfare Division, have reframed the strategic way ahead for human performance.³⁴

The elevation of the cognitive component of the human dimension over the social and physical components inspires the need for discussion over whether or not the three component's relationships are a trinity or a triad. The three components of the Army's human dimension and the relationship of the physical domain require further study, scholarship, and discussion.

Nonetheless, Army institutions endure to undertake the efforts required to develop future leaders. This requirement reveals itself in the 2015, United States Army Military Academy, *West Point Leader Development System Handbook* that embodies the beginning foundational development of the physical domain and human dimension requirements for tactical and direct leaders. Although the text only references the 2013 *Army Leader Development Strategy* as its foundational document,³⁵ the context provides that a direct and tactical leader requires the ability to face “the physical challenges inherent in worldwide military operations and the duties required of a commissioned officer.”³⁶ Further, the handbook states the required ability of “inspiring others through personal example, conduct, and appearance.”³⁷ In fairness, the document addresses the cognitive and social components of leadership, but without subordinating one or more of the components to the others. The legacy of doctrine on the physical domain within the human dimension is ingrained and baked into Army leadership and its culture. The reverence and deeply held respect for the strength derived from diversity within America’s armed forces will forever remain as the moralistic fiber that propels the Army’s capabilities and capacities forward. Soldiers and leaders, as our most important weapons, should be capabilities based in design and development. Historical examples of Army Strategic Leaders reveal the embodiment of presence pervasiveness in Army culture.

Strategic Leadership Biographical Vignettes Exemplify Historical Culture

The innovations of telecommunications and the inter connectedness of computers has rapidly evolved the ever changing Information Age. However, the continuity of the Army’s doctrinal philosophy on the physical domain of leadership is easily replicated by reviewing a couple of strategic Army leaders in history. Historian and author Dr Frank Vandiver described John J. Pershing’s physical features positively as “tall, straight, well-built, and striking combined

with winning looks, a friendly manner, smooth talk, and personal charm that made Pershing's possibilities endless."³⁸ In 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt held such respect for Pershing that he promoted him to the rank of Brigadier General returning him to the Philippines in 1907 as Governor of Moro Province and the Sulu areas.³⁹ Captain Pershing bypassed three ranks in his promotion to Brigadier. Noteworthy are his actions at the battle of Bagsak Mountain in 1913. At the age of 53, Pershing personally led two days of reconnaissance culminating in an assault through obstacles and over the walls of a fortified strong hold succeeding in the defeat of the enemy through close hand-to-hand combat. The Philippine people regarded Brigadier General Pershing so highly that they appointed him as a chief and sultan.⁴⁰ Pershing's strategic leadership in the expedition into Mexico earns him assignment above superior general officers to lead the American Expeditionary Force into Europe with an aggressive mobile offensively focused mindset through World War One. Pershing served as strategic leader and statesman of America's Expeditionary Army from 1917 through 1919 with promotion to General of the Armies, and in 1921 assignment as Chief of Staff of the Army.⁴¹ General of the Armies, and Chief of Staff of the Army, General John J. Pershing served our nation beyond his years of active military service from his hospital suite at Walter Reed through World War Two.⁴² General Pershing served 38 years of active duty retiring at age 64 in 1924, but served as a civil leader, mentor and advisor up until his death in 1948.⁴³ Leading through personal example and authentically perceived presence is a style achieved by many strategic leaders of the past.

Before the Korean War, General Matthew Ridgeway first jumped with his troops into World War Two as the Commander of the 82nd Airborne Division. General Ridgeway joined his men leading by example while jumping into the invasions of Sicily, Italy and France.⁴⁴ General Ridgeway assumed command in the Korean War of the Eighth Army while in the army was in

the defense approximately located near the 38th parallel following a “300 mile retreat.” Three of the four American divisions were battle weary and degraded with only one Republic of Korea division and a British brigade were combat capable.⁴⁵ Ridgeway would use an out front presence to change the war in Korea. General Ridgeway delivered his leadership by trooping the line upon arrival of his army’s area of responsibility for 72 hours by jeep from the forward line of troops to the headquarters of his general officers. Ridgeway discovered that Eighth Army’s lines of communication were not secured from positions of dominant terrain and his commanders were focused on looking to move south versus north.⁴⁶ Ridgeway, leading face to face with his leaders and by personal example, directed his commanders to lead from the front and personally inspect the conditions of their troops while ensuring that they were adequately supported. Despite an initial defeat, General Ridgeway directed aggressive patrolling to retake porous and unsecured terrain that motivated and inspired the troops while building the fighting spirit of his forces. General Ridgeway capitalized on the Korean peninsula’s western terrain that allowed for mechanized forces to maneuver. The Eighth Army’s “offensive spirit soared” allowing them to take Seoul and return to roughly the same geographic position previously held at the 38th parallel in just three short months after Ridgeway assumed command.⁴⁷ Another famous paratrooper served with distinction as a strategic leader.

General Lyman Louis Lemnitzer earned his parachutist badge at Airborne School at the age of 51.⁴⁸ Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Lemnitzer, was often referred to as “bear-like” for his height, athletic build, loud voice, and visible delight in accomplishing things displaying his “infectious laugh.”⁴⁹ While in command General Lemnitzer played on men’s softball teams, was a “star” player on a bowling team, and remained a life long avid devoted golfer, but was also well known

for his “grasp of detail and gift of total recall.”⁵⁰ Lemnitzer exposed himself to grave physical danger on more than one occasion in his career. He once traveled in a “secret submarine behind enemy lines,” for the planning of the invasion of North Africa and once manned a machine gun aboard a shot up bomber destroying an enemy plane. He even traveled behind enemy lines wearing disguises to negotiate the surrender of “more than a million German troops.”⁵¹ General Lemnitzer remained a strategic leader until the 1980s after retirement until his failing health affected his none profit position in the Supreme Allied Commander Europe’s office at the Pentagon, where he advocated politically and militarily for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.⁵² Perhaps leading through presence in the information age may require innovation, nuance, or even change in what physical and virtual presence is.

Leading from the front, and command presence often implies face to face, or personalized forms of communication at critical points along lines of communication, while successfully managing distributed span of control through and by other leaders with industrial age analog and information age technology systems. Modernization, globalization and innovations in warfare create a complex threat environment containing a myriad of capabilities that include weapons technology, information technology, as well as, hybrid and asymmetric warfare tactics.⁵³ Theoretically, strategic leadership will have the added requirement to lead and influence by providing multi-domain mission command and boundary spanning influence from “integration centric Multi Domain Operations Centers with fully integrated information systems that allow aggregation of data for information sharing with other military services, US Government agencies, allies, partners, private companies and individuals with the authorities to direct multi-domain operations.”⁵⁴ The relative utility and value of virtual presence skills in relation to actual physical presence may become contextually important as the digital age

evolves. The private sector potentially provides some contributions to human dimension capability development without compromising the Army's values and moralistic culture.

Prospective Contributions to Human Dimension Capability Development

The scholarship on the physical domain from researchers of the academic discipline of leadership, and practitioners of influence, outside the military reflects aspects of Army doctrine and culture. Academics that study leadership, the chief executive officers of the business world, and successful media personalities potentially offer an outside the military perspective on the research and development of the physical domain requirements of leaders. Although debatable, media personalities are largely not considered as leaders, however they do possess an ability to influence people. Kristina Rickett academically asserts, "What makes every leader special is a combination of factors, including demographic, physical, psychological and behavioral differences."⁵⁵ The interactive relational fields of heredity, the environment, and individual characteristics form a corollary nexus. Heredity comprises an individual's genes, race or ethnicity, and gender. The environment a leader is exposed to, or developed in, comprises the physical environment, parental influence, culture and education. The individual's characteristics are made up of one's personality, values, abilities and skills, leadership styles and behaviors. A leader's genetics, exposed to an environment interact to shape the "individual differences" that make a leader who they are.⁵⁶ Ruth Moody, in writing for the British Business Blog, iterates that devoting time to "developing our physical characteristics – those qualities that are just as important in making us believable, inspirational and credible" are equally as important as professional proficiency and competence.⁵⁷ Further, Moody adds the important significance of being able to present the calculated application of the appropriate amount of emotion in a confident tone of voice. Moody also correlates physical fitness to energy and alertness, as well

as, as an element of a positive presence.⁵⁸ Other academics offer methods to improving physical attributes.

Author Mitchell Posner writes six chapters dedicated to executive health in *Executive Essentials*. Posner shares research results of the benefits obtained from Transcendental Meditation (TM), “a unique state of rest,” on both the individual and the organization. The author uses one study to show that job performance and satisfaction increase, as well as, teamwork and morale. He also shares research results that show TM practitioners utilized less oxygen, lowered their heart rate, and achieved greater states of rest. Included is the data garnered from a General Motors study that reveals that TM users drank less alcohol and caffeine, smoked less, felt emotionally more confident and emotionally more stable.⁵⁹ Academics also offer psychological research on how physical attributes affect decision-making in marketing strategies to influence individual decisions.

An academic study of the psychology and affects of media and marketing on individual decision making processes iterates how attractiveness has been associated to the term “halo affect” indicating that the positive perception of one or more physical attributes of a person influences how other people consider that person.⁶⁰ The ability to project an appearance of similarity with individuals can purposefully project influence on people.⁶¹ Beyond clothing, morals and values, projecting similarities in recreational activities, hobbies and sports has been shown to influence people’s decision calculus. “Many sales training programs now urge trainees to mirror match the customer’s body posture, mood, and verbal style, as similarities along each of these dimensions have been shown to lead to positive results.”⁶² Some business research statistics exist to support the assertion that physical attributes affect more than perception. Correspondent Drake Baer writing for Business Insider utilizes the findings of other researchers

to show that approximately a third of Fortune 500 chief executive officers with visible physical presence earned a mean income of “\$187,000 more in pay and led companies with more than \$440 million more in assets” than their competitors.⁶³ Baer also uses research that shows that chief executives with physical prowess lead businesses with earnings up to ten percent higher than those led by less physically astute chief executives, also linking fitness to resiliency to stress and cognitive processes.⁶⁴ America’s fascination with pop culture offers possible insights into the influence of virtual media personalities.

The study of emotional intelligence’s link to physical attributes helps relay their interconnectedness. Thespian authors Halpern and Lubar writing on the topic of leadership present a model for consideration on presence to achieve resonating authenticity. The actors relate the many roles an actor portrays to the many roles people execute on a daily basis in their lives. “It is a paradox of the theater that, in order to pretend, the actor must be real.”⁶⁵ The authors developed the “PRES” model of leadership presence that they use to expound upon in the discourse of their book. The “P” in the model represents the ability to be present in the moment while being agile enough to adjust to the unexpected. Present in the moment is about eliminating distraction and focusing on the environment. The “R” is for reaching out attaining an authentic connection that creates relationships by listening with empathy. Reaching out is listening for the emotion in the communication, not the problem. The “E” equals expressiveness presenting the capability to emit feelings and emotion in calculated application through the selection of words, facial and physical expression to send a resonating message. The intent is to create communication with the people you work with to feel the leader’s true emotional wavelength. The “S” is for self-knowing, accepting yourself, to be authentic by shaping behaviors and conclusions through the lens of shared values.⁶⁶ Self-knowing relates to creating

real meaning that bonds people together for a purpose greater than one's self. Academics, chief executive officers of the business world, and successful media personalities that study leadership, present prospective external venues of contributing research and development of the physical domain requirements of leaders.

Recommendations

It is necessary to generate informed and educated discussion on how the United States Army will doctrinally assert its cultural and ideologically held beliefs on the physical requirements for strategic leaders in support of the Army Human Dimension Strategy of Holistic Health and Fitness. The 2015 human dimension strategy, as well as, the Combined Arms Center's 2014 white paper provide ways and means that can provide the deterministic relationship of the attributes within the human dimension. However, some aspects of the 2015 strategy never achieved any capability or capacity.

- **First recommendation:** The Human Dimension Steering committee did not evolve from the 2015 strategy. The US Army Capabilities Integration Center (ARCIC) Human Dimension Division (HDD) currently leads the Human Dimension effort for the Army, and should continue to define the relationship of the human dimension components as equally interdependent on one another. HDD should sustain and improve existing culture and efforts on physical attribute requirements within doctrine and across the DOTMLPF-P in developing strategic leaders.
- **Second recommendation:** The Human Dimension Program Manager also never developed from the 2015 strategy. ARCIC's HDD should produce and provide linked social, physical, and cognitive domain capability development concepts.

- **Third recommendation:** HDD should develop research commitments to experiential human performance enhancement, athletic performance, personal readiness, and holistic health and fitness over the course of an Army professional's career.
- **Fourth recommendation:** HDD should inculcate the associated complimentary benefits of research and development of science and technology created by agencies and organizations outside of the Army for the physical domain concept design and research commitments in developing strategic leaders.

Defining the role of the physical domain within the human dimension of leaders across a career glide path facilitates doctrine that outlines physical domain requirements at each level of leadership in the Army that potentially benefits experiential human performance research, and the development, and sustained improvement, of Army Leader development Programs.

Conclusion

The physical domain requirements described in US Army doctrine apply to all military and civilian leaders. The qualitative and quantitative amount of doctrine specifically attributable to strategic leadership reveals itself by executing a literary review and analysis of the contemporary and historical Army leadership doctrine because it presents the influential relationship on the Army as it matures its Human Dimension Strategy and leader development programs. The potential possibilities to revolutionize the Army's physical domain requirements for strategic leaders are pervasive within the discourse of existing doctrine, while alluding to a mindset dedicated to experiential human performance enhancement research and assessments.

The Army maintains a positive self-image deeply seeded in its history and culture. The cultural value the Army places on the physical presence of leaders serving in direct through

strategic leadership roles needs to remain at the forefront of Army ideology. The transition of the Information Age over the Industrial Age is influencing the requirements to train and improve the cognitive domain of the human dimension, leading to discussion on the role of the physical and social domain of the human dimension. Leading through physical presence, both live and virtual, in the future complex environment presents a difficult problem in defining the abstract or metaphysical relationship of the social, physical, and cognitive domains. The Army's human dimension and leadership development doctrine remain relatively unchanged in continuity equally supporting all three components within the human dimension. However, the 2015 human dimension strategy describes a new relationship triad by placing the physical and social domains of the human dimension under cognitive dominance without changing the physical domain defined under the term presence. The Army needs to retain its ideology regarding the relationship of the physical domain in becoming a national leader in human performance optimization. The shared interdependence of the attributes or domains facilitates the development of concepts for research and development of science and technology efforts to build the capabilities and capacities of Army leaders. Congruently, agencies and organizations outside the Army offer an abundance of potential contributions to human performance capability development.

Notes

¹ Department of the Army, US Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile* (2006), 2-4.

² The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7-01, *The US Army Study of the Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024* (April 2008), 1.

³ The US Army Doctrinal Publication (ADP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*, Headquarters, Department of the Army (2012), 5.

⁴ Department of the Army, *Building Cohesive Teams to Win in a Complex World, Cognitive Dominance - Realistic Training – Institutional Agility, The Army Human Dimension Strategy* (2015), Annex D.

- ⁵ Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, 5-1.
- ⁶ Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, 1-1.
- ⁷ Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, 5-1.
- ⁸ Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, 1-3.
- ⁹ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01, *Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, i.
- ¹⁰ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01, *The Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, iii.
- ¹¹ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01, *The Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, iii.
- ¹² TRADOC PAM 525-3-7-01, *The Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, iii.
- ¹³ ADP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, iii.
- ¹⁴ ADP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, iii-4.
- ¹⁵ ADP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, 6.
- ¹⁶ The US Army Doctrinal Reference Publication (ADRP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*, Headquarters, Department of the Army, (2012), 4-1.
- ¹⁷ ADRP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, 4-1.
- ¹⁸ ADRP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, 11-1 to 11-10.
- ¹⁹ ADRP 6-22, *Army Leadership*, 11-4.
- ²⁰ Department of the Army, *Training, Education, Experience, ALDS, The Army Leader Development Strategy 2013*, (May 2013), 7.
- ²¹ *ALDS, The Army Leader Development Strategy 2013*, 9.
- ²² The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7, *Human Dimension Concept*, (May 2014), 6.
- ²³ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7, *Human Dimension Concept*, 11.
- ²⁴ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7, *Human Dimension Concept*, 14.
- ²⁵ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7, *Human Dimension Concept*, 14.
- ²⁶ TRADOC PAM 525-3-7, *Human Dimension Concept*, 14.
- ²⁷ The US Army Combined Arms Center, *The Human Dimension White Paper, A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance*, (October 2014), iii-6.
- ²⁸ *The Human Dimension White Paper, A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance*, iii.
- ²⁹ The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-1. *The US Army Operating Concept, Win in a Complex World 2020-2040*, 31 October 2014, 32.
- ³⁰ Department of the Army, *Building Cohesive Teams to Win in a Complex World, Cognitive Dominance - Realistic Training – Institutional Agility, The Army Human Dimension Strategy*, (2015), 10-11.
- ³¹ *The Army Human Dimension Strategy*, 2015, 8.
- ³² *The Army Human Dimension Strategy*, 2015, 14.
- ³³ *The Army Human Dimension Strategy*, 2015, 10-11.
- ³⁴ Unified Quest 2017 Human Performance Seminar, Interim Report, 14-16 December, National Conference Center, Leesburg, Va., (24 March 2017).
- ³⁵ The United States Army Military Academy, *West Point Leader Development System Handbook*, (May 2015), 5.
- ³⁶ *West Point Leader Development System Handbook*, 10.
- ³⁷ *West Point Leader Development System Handbook*, 11.
- ³⁸ Frank E. Vandiver, *John J. Pershing and the Anatomy of Leadership*. (Colorado: United States Air Force, 1963), 5.

- ³⁹ Frank E. Vandiver, *Illustrious Americans: John J. Pershing*, (Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Corporation, 1967), 54.
- ⁴⁰ Vandiver, *Illustrious Americans: John J. Pershing*, 51-52.
- ⁴¹ Vandiver, *Illustrious Americans: John J. Pershing*, 179-188
- ⁴² Vandiver, *John J. Pershing and the Anatomy of Leadership*, 20.
- ⁴³ Vandiver, *Illustrious Americans: John J. Pershing*, 230.
- ⁴⁴ Frances Hesselbein, and General (RET) Eric K. Shinseki, *Be Know Do, Leadership the Army Way*, (Leader to Leader Institute, 2004), 70.
- ⁴⁵ Hesselbein and Shinseki, *Be Know Do, Leadership the Army Way*, 70.
- ⁴⁶ Hesselbein and Shinseki, *Be Know Do, Leadership the Army Way*, 71.
- ⁴⁷ Hesselbein and Shinseki, *Be Know Do, Leadership the Army Way*, 73.
- ⁴⁸ James L. Binder, *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, (Brassy's Inc., 1997), 3.
- ⁴⁹ Binder, *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, 4.
- ⁵⁰ Binder, *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, 7.
- ⁵¹ Binder, *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, 4.
- ⁵² Binder, *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, 345.
- ⁵³ *Joint Operating Environment (JOE) 2035: The Joint Force in a Contested and Disordered World*, (2016), iv.
- ⁵⁴ Welsh, Mark A. III and Deborah Lee James, *Air Force Future Operating Concept, a View of the Air Force in 2035*, (2015), 36.
- ⁵⁵ Kristina Rickett, "Behaving Intelligently: Leadership Traits & Characteristics," (University of Kentucky College of Agriculture), 3.
<http://www2.ca.uky.edu/agcomm/pubs/elk1/elk1102/elk1102.pdf>
- ⁵⁶ Rickett, "Behaving Intelligently: Leadership Traits & Characteristics," 3.
- ⁵⁷ Ruth Moody, "The Mental and Physical Characteristics of Leadership," (Farscape Development Word Press, July 2010).
<https://farscapedevelopment.wordpress.com/2010/07/08/the-mental-and-physical-characteristics-of-leadership/>
- ⁵⁸ Moody, "The Mental and Physical Characteristics of Leadership."
- ⁵⁹ Mitchell J. Posner, *The One Guide to What Every Rising Businessperson Should Know, Executive Essentials*, (New York, NY: Avon Books, 1982), 172-173.
- ⁶⁰ Robert B. Cialdini, *Influence, Science and Practice*, 5th edition, (Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2009), 146.
- ⁶¹ Cialdini, *Influence, Science and Practice*, 148.
- ⁶² Cialdini, *Influence, Science and Practice*, 149.
- ⁶³ Drake Daer, "3 Physical Qualities People Associate With Great Leaders — For Better Or Worse," (Business Insider, October 2014). <http://www.businessinsider.com/physical-attributes-of-leaders-2014-10>
- ⁶⁴ Daer, "3 Physical Qualities People Associate With Great Leaders."
- ⁶⁵ Lind Belle Halpren and Kathy Lubar, *Leadership Presence, Dramatic Techniques to Reach Out, Motivate, and Inspire*, (New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2003), 6-7.
- ⁶⁶ Halpren and Lubar, *Leadership Presence, Dramatic Techniques to Reach Out*, 9.

Bibliography

- American Library Association's, "Leadership Traits". Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1996-2016. <http://www.ala.org/nmrt/initiatives/ladders/traits/traits>
- Barko, William F. and Mark A. Vaitkus. *The U.S. Army War College Guide To Executive Health and Fitness*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College, 2000.
- Binder, James L. *Lemnitzer A Soldier for His Time*, Brassy's Inc, 1997.
- Cialdini, Robert B. *Influence, Science and Practice*, 5th edition. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2009.
- Daer, Drake "3 Physical Qualities People Associate With Great Leaders — For Better Or Worse", Business Insider, October 2014. <http://www.businessinsider.com/physical-attributes-of-leaders-2014-10>
- Department of the Army, *Building Cohesive Teams to Win in a Complex World, Cognitive Dominance - Realistic Training – Institutional Agility, The Army Human Dimension Strategy*, 2015.
- Department of the Army, *Training, Education, Experience, ALDS, The Army Leader Development Strategy 2013*, May 2013.
- Department of the Army, US Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership, Competent, Confident and Agile*, 2006.
- Halpren, Lind Belle and Kathy Lubar, *Leadership Presence, Dramatic Techniques to Reach Out, Motivate, and Inspire*, New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2003.
- Hesselbein, Frances and General (RET) Eric K. Shinseki, *Be Know Do, Leadership the Army Way*, Leader to Leader Institute, 2004.
- Joint Operating Environment (JOE) 2035: The Joint Force in a Contested and Disordered World*, 2016.
- Klann, Gene. *Crisis Leadership, Using Military Lessons, Organizational Experiences, and the Power of Influence to Lessen the Impact of Chaos on the People You Lead*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, 2003.
- McBean, Bill, "The 5 Characteristics of Great Leaders," excerpt from, *The Facts of Business Life, What Every Successful Business Owner Knows That You Don't*, Wiley, 2012. <http://www.fastcompany.com/3004914/5-characteristics-great-leaders>
- Moody, Ruth, "The Mental and Physical Characteristics of Leadership," Farscape Development Word Press, July 2010. <https://farscapedevelopment.wordpress.com/2010/07/08/the-mental-and-physical-characteristics-of-leadership/>
- Posner, Mitchell J. *The One Guide to What Every Rising Businessperson Should Know, Executive Essentials*, New York, NY: Avon Books, 1982.
- Rickett, Kristina, "Behaving Intelligently: Leadership Traits & Characteristics," University of Kentucky College of Agriculture. <http://www2.ca.uky.edu/agcomm/pubs/elk1/elk1102/elk1102.pdf>
- The US Army Doctrinal Publication (ADP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*, Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.
- The US Army Doctrinal Reference Publication (ADRP) 6-22, *Army Leadership*, Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012.

- The US Army Combined Arms Center, “The Human Dimension White Paper, A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance,” October 2014.
- The United States Army Military Academy, *West Point Leader Development System Handbook*, May 2015.
[http://www.usma.edu/strategic/SiteAssets/SitePages/Home/WPLDS%202015%20Handbook%20\(FINAL\).pdf](http://www.usma.edu/strategic/SiteAssets/SitePages/Home/WPLDS%202015%20Handbook%20(FINAL).pdf)
- The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-1. *The US Army Operating Concept, Win in a Complex World 2020-2040*, 31 October 2014.
- The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7. *Human Dimension Concept*, 21 May 2014.
- The US Army Training and Doctrine Command Pamphlet (TRADOC PAM) 525-3-7-01. *The US Army Study of the Human Dimension of the Future 2015-2024*, 1 April 2008.
- Unified Quest 2017 Human Performance Seminar, Interim Report, 14-16 December, National Conference Center, Leesburg, Va., 24 March 2017.
- Vandiver, Frank E. *Illustrious Americans: John J. Pershing*. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Corporation, 1967.
- Welsh, Mark A. III and Deborah Lee James, *Air Force Future Operating Concept, a View of the Air Force in 2035*, 2015.

