

ATSS-BAR

22 October 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR Group Room L09, United States Army Sergeants Major Academy, Ft Bliss, TX, 79918

Subject: Haines Presentation Paper for Group 2, L09

1. Thesis: Soldiers are better trained and more confident for the challenges of today because they are better trained than in previous years.
2. Discussion: The intent of our paper is to demonstrate that Basic Training (Initial Entry Training) has improved over the years. We will show how the Army has learned from history and improved Basic Training over the years.
3. Haines Award: We do request award board consideration of our paper for the General Haines Award for Excellence in Research. *Writing Research Papers, Tenth Edition* by James D. Lester Jr. is the guide used in the preparation of this paper.

JAMES G. HASH
MSG, USA
Chairperson

MSG Marcus L. Campbell
MSG Mio L. Franceschi
MSG Joe Irvin
SGM Stanley D. Singell

Running Head: Soldiers are Better Trained and More Confident for the Challenges of Today

Soldiers are Better Trained and More Confident for the Challenges of Today

MSG James G Hash

MSG Marcus L. Campbell

MSG Mio L. Franceschi

MSG Joe Irvin

SGM Stanley D. Singell

United States Army Sergeants Major Academy

Class 58

SGM RODNEY A. NICHOLS

Group Room L09

29 November 2007

Outline

Thesis: Soldiers are more confident for the challenges of today and prepared for combat because they are better trained than they were in previous years.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide you a brief history of Army basic training, challenges for new Soldiers meeting the Army physical fitness requirements, scandals that have shaped our Army, warrior skills training, and a service comparison between the Army and Marine Corp. Training our Soldiers receive during basic training properly prepares our Soldiers for combat and the new physical fitness program has created strong, dependable, and physically fit Soldiers. In 1997, Congressional committee reports indicated the reason for the sexual misconduct in the Army was due to the Army gender-integration policy. In 2004, senior Army leaders mandated an overhaul of basic training and added numerous combat tasks without expanding the length of training. The Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) approved a 10-week Basic Training regiment so the trainers can have the necessary time to train new Soldiers.

- I.** History of Basic Training
 - A. World War I: The war to end all wars
 - B. World War II: Lessons not learned
 - C. Korea: Coming over the 38th parallel
 - D. Vietnam: Almost there
 - E. All Volunteer Force: The hollow Army to today's victories

- II.** Physical Fitness
 - A. Basic Training Physical Fitness Program
 - B. Traditional Physical Fitness Program

- III.** Scandals
 - A. Events that prompted investigations
 - 1. Drill Sergeant Misconduct
 - 2. Losing the trust of the new recruits

 - B. Investigation findings
 - 1. Problems with gender-integration in the Army
 - 2. The Army replies to the findings

- IV.** Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills
 - A. Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills Evolves
 - B. Changes to Basic Training

- V.** Service Comparison
 - A. Army
 - B. Marines

VI. Conclusion Argument

In the past, the government argued that the Army did not need to stand ready as we are today. The logic for the last century was to maintain a smaller force and the government would have a smaller military budget. History has shown the initial loss of forces just came as a cost of doing business, a calculated risk. Critics of the current gender-integrated program in Army basic training feel this program is not effective. The Aberdeen Proving Ground scandal was the stepping-stone used to prove their point. The segregated basic training program of the Marine Corps illustrated this point.

VII. Conclusion

Soldiers are more confident for the challenges of today and prepared for combat because they are better trained than they were in previous years. The Army was in a slow transformation to meet what it thought was the up and coming threat. On September 11, 2001, our focus changed dramatically forever and we learned a valuable lesson. The Army changed Basic Training curriculum to fit the challenges of the Global War on Terrorism. Our Army will continue to change rapidly for the current threat and challenges of the future. Basic Training will continue to change with the times and that is why Soldiers will be ready for combat.

Table of Contents

Abstract	Page 6
History of Basic Training	Page 7
A. World War I: The war to end all wars	Page 7
B. World War II: Lessons not learned	Page 8
C. Korea: Coming over the 38 th parallel	Page 8
D. Vietnam: Almost there	Page 8
E. All Volunteer Force: The hollow Army to today's victories	Page 11
Physical Fitness	Page 11
A. Basic Training Physical Fitness Program	Page 12
B. Traditional Physical Fitness Program	Page 13
Scandals	Page 15
A. Events that prompted investigations	Page 15
1. Drill Sergeant Misconduct	Page 15
2. Losing the trust of the new recruits	Page 16
B. Investigation findings	Page 16
1. Problems with gender-integration in the Army	Page 16
2. The Army replies to the findings	Page 17
Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills	Page 18
A. Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills Evolves	Page 19
B. Changes to Basic Training	Page 20
Service Comparison	Page 21
A. Army	Page 22
B. Marines	Page 22
Conclusion Argument	Page 23
Conclusion	Page 24
References	Page 26

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide you a brief history of Army basic training. The challenges for new Soldiers meeting the Army physical fitness requirements, the scandals that have shaped our Army, warrior skills training, and a service comparison between the Army and Marine Corp basic training. Basic training our Soldiers receive today prepares them for combat and the new physical fitness program has created strong, dependable, and physically fit Soldiers. In 1997, a Congressional committee report indicated the reason for the sexual misconduct in the Army was due to the Army gender-integration policy. In 2004, senior Army leaders mandated an overhaul of basic training and added numerous combat tasks without expanding the length of training. TRADOC approved a 10-week Basic Training regiment so the trainers can have the necessary time to train new Soldiers.

History of Basic Training

Since the birth of our Army to today, military readiness and training our Soldiers receive plays an important role in how our Army wages wars and wins. General George Washington knew as he watched the British Redcoats that his untrained undisciplined Army was no match for their more disciplined force. It was this acknowledgment on his part that led him to have Prussian General Baron Von Steuben come to America to train our Revolutionary Army.

Our Army of World War I just as in the Revolutionary War was not ready for what it was about to undertake. We never learned the lessons of having a well-trained, well-equipped Army ready to deploy when necessary. The Army ignored these lessons for the next century until the All Volunteer Force came to fruition. We will focus on the last 100-year history of our Army.

World War I: The War to End All Wars. Europe entered into war with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914. Americans wanted to maintain a policy of isolationism and President Wilson felt that nothing that happened in Europe could cause America to enter this war. His attitude did not change with the sinking of the cruise ship “Lusitania” in 1915 where over 100 Americans lost their lives. Then Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA) Major General Leonard Wood could not persuade the President or Congress to prepare for War. The Army force consisted of just 122,000 enlisted Soldiers and 6,000 officers, and we were not ready.

With the implementation of the draft and the flood of new recruits to basic training centers the personnel required and the infrastructure did not meet the ever-burdening need. The war started with too few men and the qualified men along with the drill sergeants shipped to Europe very quickly. The remaining Army was too unorganized for expansion and the bottleneck of personnel and equipment left much needed training undone. Recruits simulated with wooden sticks since the rifles that were available went with the deploying expeditionary force. In some

cases, Soldiers finished their training and left out with the equipment still brand new in the boxes.

World War II: Lessons not learned. The Second World War was not as bad as hostilities once again broke out in Europe. Hitler seemed as if he was the only one who had learned from our mistakes of the past. He had calculated in 1939 that it would take America 2-3 years to prepare a fighting force, by then he would have conquered the European continent. If he had not opened the front with Russia, he might have succeeded. Once again, as America mobilized an Army for war, the military equipment lagged behind.

The process of converting factories for war, appropriations, construction contracts, and facilities all left the new millions of Soldiers without uniforms, barracks, equipment, and supplies. As the recruits who were so initially eager to sign up after Pearl Harbor arrived at these inadequate camps their morale and enthusiasm quickly faded as they remained idle waiting for equipment.

The Noncommissioned Officers assigned to these camps lacked the proper personnel and equipment and became quickly overwhelmed. The Army could ill afford too many qualified NCOs to remain at one camp and spread them thin throughout the Army. Training camps lacked supplies because the forces that were deploying to Africa naturally needed the equipment the most. Training camps used equipment that was obsolete and had been around since World War I. The lack of equipment and proper training resulted in lower effectiveness of the Soldiers trained and higher casualties in combat. The inadequate training was all too clear as these green forces were beat in their first encounter with German forces at Kasserine Pass in Africa. The Army may never know the casualties sustained from poor Basic Training.

Korea: Coming Over the 38th Parallel. The Army once again had a problem as North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel on 25 June 1950. The Army had quickly demobilized from a 12 million man Army at the end of 1945 to just over 1.5 million in 1950. In addition, these forces were spread too thin as we occupied much of Europe, the Pacific Isles, and Japan. We were only just now beginning to feel the effects on our Forces leading up to the Cold War. Qualified officers and NCOs shunned basic training units because they considered this a death sentence to their careers. The officers and NCOs sent to training units were at the end of their careers and did not care what type of training they were conducting. Limited infrastructure again was a factor in poor morale of the trainer and trainee.

As the Basic Training camps of the 1940's were rapidly erected these same barracks and facilities of the 50's had quickly degraded. Overflowing toilets, furnaces that would not work, paint that was peeling, broken windows, rusted pipes and sagging buildings all met the newly arriving draftees. In a rush to get combat troops to the conflict, NCOs to lead and train these men were also lacking. In some cases, a ratio of NCO to trainees was 1-66. Trainers took new recruits who showed any sign of leadership and placed them in charge of their fellow recruits, and these recruit leaders were poor substitutes for real NCOs. These results were an effect on the cold battlefields of Korea and in homes across America as we lost over 50,000 troops in three years of conflict.

Vietnam: Almost There. As we deployed Advisers to Vietnam, General Maxwell D. Taylor became the new CSA. As an officer who experienced the harshness on the battlefields of World War II and Korea, he had seen the result of poor training, equipment, and facilities. He vowed he would not let this happen again. General Taylor wanted to change basic training and how the

Army trained new Soldiers. He had all the Army basic training manuals rewritten to model the Marines.

Drill sergeants went to Parris Island Marine Corps Depot for their drill training and he required all drill sergeants to look and act as sharp as their Marine counterparts. Only the smartest best qualified could count on selection as a drill sergeant and NCOs received precedence for assignments upon completion of their tour. All NCOs were instructors for 18 months and only the best of the best retained for an additional year. Training facilities received makeovers and Soldiers received training on the same equipment used in combat. This instilled a new sense of pride and esprit de corps in the drill sergeants and in the new recruits.

The results paid big dividends for the Army in the field as competent, and confident Soldiers arrived to their gaining units. We were finally almost there, but it was too little too late for Vietnam. This program only lasted two years as Vietnam escalated into a full war. With the escalation, the need for new recruits almost doubled by 1967 and the new CSA, General Harold K. Johnson, once again placed the priorities with the combat units. Replacement Soldiers from basic training units and their drill sergeants were soon on their way to Southeast Asia. Their replacements were not infantry, discipline declined, and the lack of training standards was soon evident.

The lack of drill sergeants caused the Army to place Corporals straight from advanced infantry training into these slots. Some basic training units were operating at only 60% of their authorized Table of Distributions and Allowance (TDA). Much of the basic trainee's classroom time was by videotape leaving no room for questions, testing or retraining as necessary. With the withdrawal from Vietnam, the demoralization of this era affected the Army ranks for years to come.

All Volunteer Force: The Hollow Army to Today's Victories. Things were at an all time low as the All Volunteer Force (AVF) replaced the draft that was in place for most of the last century. With the drawdown after Vietnam came the “Hollow” Army of the 70’s. Discipline was low, drugs were prevalent, and morale sagged as our NCOs felt the sting from the pullout in Vietnam. The units felt the effects as the Pentagon’s budget dwindled. This decline continued until 1981 when President Ronald Reagan took the oath of office. He understood the need for a highly trained force that was ready to fight at a moment’s notice. To retain AVF new recruits deserved to arrive at the best facilities, receive the best training, and train on the best equipment. First impressions went a long way in keeping our young men and women in uniform.

For the first time in almost a decade, the Pentagon received a significant increase in the defense budget. The neglect and lack of funds would take time to overcome. And overcome we did, but it would take years to replace or renovate infrastructure that was thrown together in the 40’s. Slowly modern facilities replaced WW II buildings. The Army replaced rifles, machine guns, and grenade ranges. Uniforms and equipment were mass-produced to fill backlogs and replace old stockpiles. Drill Sergeants stood sharp and ready to lead, train, and mentor the Soldiers that would lead our Army of tomorrow. History has proven that the Basic Training that Soldiers receive today does make them a trained and confident fighting force for our Nation. Physical fitness and mental toughness has had a lasting impact on our Soldiers.

Physical Fitness

Physical fitness Soldiers receive in basic training has changed their outlook. It has saved the Army time and money by preventing injuries sustained during basic training. Prior to 1999 running and training hard was the mentality of physical fitness. It resulted in numerous injuries and developed Soldiers with a run until you drop attitude.

Basic Training Physical Fitness Program. The American people expect Soldiers to be physically fit to meet the demands of combat. Commanders consider physical fitness levels at basic training at top priority. Commanders have seen a trend of overweight Soldiers, APFT failures, and injuries. The physical requirements for graduation are the greatest concern. In 2002, the Army Accessions Command selected the Army Physical Fitness School to develop a new physical fitness program. The purpose of the program was to improve Soldiers performance and not cause additional injuries.

Studies show that Soldiers who have a low physical fitness level are more at risk to injuries. The new program will push Soldiers to their limit while reducing injuries among the trainees. This will allow Soldiers to become an asset to their gaining unit. First, is to identify the Soldiers and their fitness level. Second, develop a physical fitness program and define the specific “exercise that will best support the tasks in training and the overall fitness outcome” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). Third, develop the fitness program for a universal program for all basic training Soldiers. Fourth, “is to develop a physical fitness strategy for basic training that meets the Army requirements” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). In addition, the final step was to test the program and report the findings to the Army.

On November 5, 2003, TRADOC standardized the physical training program and updated the basic training “standardized physical training guide on January 4, 2005” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). The program includes warm-up activities and a cool-down. The calisthenics consist of 10 exercises called drill 1 and complement each other. This results in complete total-body conditioning, and includes activities that strengthen and build on the “mobility required with the aerobic and anaerobic endurance needed for the Army Physical Fitness Test” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). The cool-down helps the Soldier with flexibility utilizing low intensity

stretching for long durations, and reduces injuries. “Health experts, the medical community, and commanders understand that lower body injuries are due to overuse, which account for most injuries” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.) in basic training.

The new program reduces the miles and builds on the endurance training providing an adequate training result. The typical program for healthy individuals included “three to five exercise sessions for 30 to 60 minutes per week” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.) during the physical training hours, and progression is determined from the initial assessment at the start of the program. A conditioning stage is for approximately four weeks to allow the Soldier time to adapt to the program.

The aerobic and muscular endurance trains at a moderate level at 40% to 60% of the target heart rate with “the most improvement seen during the initial training period” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). The improvement stage follows the initial stage. “This stage is for 4 to 5 months and the intensity is advanced (*sic*) to a target of 50% to 85% of the heart rate, within this range is the best timeline for physical training” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). Due to the fitness level of some Soldiers, some Soldiers will not adapt enough within the nine weeks, and unable to pass the APFT.

Traditional Physical Fitness Program. Since the 1980’s the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) was the focus of Physical Training (PT) for the basic training Soldiers. The push-up, sit-up, and 2-mile run were the measure of physical fitness. Even though the “APFT is a good measure of physical fitness, the Single-minded training for the APFT” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.) can be a problem. Injuries to the lower extremities due to excessive running can be costly.

Studies have shown that training time lost by trainees due to injuries varied by the injury. Fractures account for the most of lost days, followed by sprains, and sometimes injuries can result in Soldiers not being able to complete training. The primary stress on basic training Soldiers is aerobic weight-bearing activities such as walking, marching, and running. An average of 25% of new Soldiers sustained injuries during basic training (DoD: >\$390 million/year spent on IET, Army spent \$13,500/recruit for 1-2 months, \$21,500/recruit for 3-6 months; Attrition Rate, all causes, 9.85% for 1-2 months (\$82 million), 5.69% for 3-6 months (\$72 million); DoD: >\$750 million/year spent for disability; VA: >\$4 billion/year spent for disability (*GAO Report, Jan 1997: FY94 data in '96 dollars*).

Injuries increase during the first three weeks and then peak in the third week and then decrease to around 2-3 percent. TRADOC Regulation 350-6 states that “Soldiers will be Administered a diagnostic APFTs as part of Phase I, II, III, and IV performance evaluations. Basic training Soldiers conduct the record APFT within the last 2 weeks of training to determine if the Soldier has achieved the APFT standard for graduation (60 points per event; 180 minimum total points). Soldiers who fail to complete the final APFT due to medical profile, but have successfully passed a diagnostic test (scored 60 points minimum on each of the 3 events on the same test), are given minimum credit (60 points per event) for meeting the APFT requirement” for graduation.

“On November 5, 2003 TRADOC standardized the physical training program and updated the basic training standardized physical training guide on January 4, 2005” (William Reiger, Shawn Scott, n.d.). This is a better program, fills the ranks of the units, and meets the need of the Army. It allows leaders and units to meet the rigors of training and combat with Soldiers capable of meeting all physical fitness requirements. TRADOC has established a program for basic training

that breaks down Soldiers into ability groups, which allows the Soldier to develop and build upon their physical fitness. The program has proven to reduce injuries and provide the Army with trained Soldiers. Although basic training physical fitness improved over the years, the Army had other problems surface causing a problems for the Army.

Scandals

In 1994 under the oversight of President Bill Clinton, the Secretary of the Army Togo D. West ordered gender-integration of certain basic training units (Center for Military Readiness, 2003). In the fall of 1996, there was a sex scandal discovered at Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. Drill Sergeants and officers in the 143rd Ordnance Battalion were taking advantage of female trainees by having forced or consensual sex with Soldiers. This type of behavior is illegal in accordance with military law, and wrong by any measure (Center for Military Readiness, 2003).

Events that Prompted Investigations

Drill Sergeant Misconduct. This was the worse scandal to hit the U.S. Military since the Tailhook incident with the Navy in 1991. With the Aberdeen scandal, an alarming number of similar allegations began to surface from other military installations around the country. The Army wanted to avoid a repeat of the Tailhook scandal in which there were no convictions after aviators assaulted scores of women. With this mindset, the senior leaders of the Army moved quickly with their investigation of this case to assure the public that the Army has a “zero tolerance” for this type of conduct (Gleick, 1996).

A toll-free sexual assault hotline was set up resulting in the reporting of 506 possible incidents of abuse, including 101 relating to Aberdeen. The cases reported did not just involve drill sergeants abusing trainees, it was also male trainees having forced or consensual sex with female trainees,

which is also against military regulations. The Criminal Investigation Command for the Army took charge of these cases (Gleick, 1996).

Meanwhile, a drill sergeant assigned to Fort Leonard Wood Missouri pleaded guilty to the charges of sexual misconduct with three female recruits and trying to have sex with two others. Two other officers were awaiting court-martials and ten other cases were pending. The Aberdeen cases raised the troubling and tough questions about mixed gender basic training, even though Aberdeen Proving Grounds was not a basic training installation.

Losing the trust of the new recruits. Many Soldiers and cadre expressed profound shame regarding the scandal. Some members of the 143rd Ordnance Battalion stated that they could see the fear in the eyes of the newest recruits arriving shortly after the discovery of the scandal on November 9, 1996 after the allegations made the news around the country. The drill sergeants felt that the scandal took away their power base. Soldiers no longer looked at them as a straight and narrow professional, now there was a question in the private's minds about the drill sergeants (Gleick, 1996).

Investigation Findings

Problems with gender-integration in the Army. The importance of understanding the Aberdeen Proving Grounds scandal is because this event prompted probes into the basic training program of the services. There were those that felt the cause was the gender integration of the Soldiers. To approach this issue in an effort for resolution two commissions started an initial inquiry, the General Accounting Office investigated, the Inspectors General office began investigations, and congress conducted hearings. The early reports generated from these investigations were the Army Senior Review panel on Sexual Harassment and the Kassebaum

report. The Kassebaum Task Force had 11 panel members, only four had military experience (Anderson, 1997).

These reports delivered in 1997, indicated serious issues regarding basic training and the conduct of the Soldiers and cadre in those units. The Kasselbaum report also noted clearly the Marines' set the standard (Manning, 2001). Some of the findings were: 1) There should be more sensitivity or values training needed to counter sexual harassment. 2) Co-ed basic training caused females to fail, due to injuries to the lower extremities (Center for Military Readiness, 2003). 3) Gender-integrated basic training could place trainees and cadre in compromising situations. Human sexuality is powerful, it has the potential to influence the judgment of the most moral recruit (Manning, 2001). These early results made it an uphill battle for the Army and its gender-integration program.

The Army replies to the findings. The issues with the findings in the two reports were that the Army overlooked other obvious causes of the problems. Basic training took a back seat to downsizing, budgets reductions, and mission changes at the end of the Cold War. The quality of some basic training staff and their training was poor. The shortening of basic training was an attempt to use military personnel more effectively and to save money. Drill sergeants were stretch thin because of understaffing. To compound the problems, there was not enough supervision by senior enlisted noncommissioned officers and commissioned officers. Correcting the above stated issues would not solve the problems (Manning, 2001).

The Marines basic training was segregated and longer than the other services. Their units had highly skilled drill instructors and there was an incentive program in place rewarding those for outstanding duty performance. Moreover, the single most important thing was chain of command involvement to include the top General of the Marine Corps. The Commandant

actively participated in the evaluation and monitored the effectiveness of basic training. This type of leadership was instrumental in the Marine Corp success (Manning, 2001).

Army senior leaders shared the opinion that if male and female Soldiers are segregated they are not going to have the same level of confidence in each other's ability. In 1994, the United States Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences conducted research showing all females training units had better performance in the classroom and poor performance on the obstacle course. A different mindset was at work for female trainees in these units, which affected how they approached the obstacle course. Researchers found that co-ed units improved mental toughness and confidence in female trainees. Researchers also discovered that males in these units passed the Army Physical Fitness Test with approximately the same scores as their peers in segregated units (Kitfield, 1998).

Based on the results of the investigations, the Army instituted changes to address the issues discovered. (Manning, 2001). In 1997, a third study called the Congressional Commission on Military and Gender-Issues conducted an investigation. This study found gender-integration in the Army was effective. The 105th and 106th Congresses rejected any proposal that would mandate gender-segregated training (Manning, 2001). The Aberdeen Proving ground Scandal was tragic. This scandal brought attention to the sexual misconduct, insufficient staffing, over tasking of drill sergeants, and the lack of senior leadership involvement. It took many years for the Army to overcome the scandals brought on by the sexual misconduct. The turbulence in the mid 90's helped the Army quickly prepare Soldiers for Combat following 9-11.

Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills

Historically Basic Training focused on individual tasks supporting the traditional conventional war. Since September 11, 2001, the Army realized that a dramatic change to basic

training was necessary. The Warrior Task and Battle Drills evolved from the need to address the Global War on Terrorism. “A Warrior Task is an individual Soldier skill. These particular skills are critical to Soldier survival. Examples include weapons training, tactical communications, urban operations, and first aid” (ARTEP 7-1-DRILL, July 2006). “Battle Drills are group skills designed to teach a unit to react and survive in common combat situations. Examples include react to ambush, react to chemical attack, and evacuate injured personnel from a vehicle” (ARTEP 7-1-DRILL, July 2006).

Warrior Task and Drills Evolves

Since the Global War on Terrorism, the Army has moved quickly to develop the right training to meet the requirements for combat. In September 2003, the CSA directed a Task Force to convene at Fort Benning to review the tasks trained in Initial Entry Training (IET), and to make sure the training was relevant to the current fight. A Warrior Task Site Selection Board comprised of subject matter experts reviewed over 400 tasks, narrowing them down to the 39 Warrior Task and 9 Battle Drills. This initiative resulted in the selection and training of Warrior Task and Battle Drills that focused on current operations and provided more rigor and relevance into IET. This action guarantees Soldiers leave the training base better prepared for combat. The driving force of change was from experiences gained during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF).

Since the creation of the Warrior Task and Battle Drills, it has changed with Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTP's) and operational experiences from OIF and OEF. In September 2003, the CSA created the Warrior Task and Battle Drills (39&9). The CSA's 39 & 9 Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills focused on the individual areas of shoot, communicate, joint urban operations, move, fight and battle drills.

TRADOC developed two Programs of Instruction (POI's) for basic training. In January 2004, the Basic Combat Training Brigade at Fort Benning piloted two POI's. The trainers at Fort Benning ran each POI through a test phase, which added more field training time and focused more time and energy on Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills. The immersion POI trained 19 out of 40 Warrior Tasks and 4 out of 9 Battle Drills. The alternate course trained on all Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills. The alternate program spent more time training on military operations in urban terrain and training with more weapons (i.e. crew served weapons). The alternate program trained the Soldiers on all tasks without increasing the nine-week length of instruction.

Changes to Basic Training

In 2004, Senior Army leaders mandated an overhaul of basic training and added numerous combat tasks without expanding the length of training. TRADOC introduced the additional week of basic training (10-weeks) for a trial period through March 2008. TRADOC will suspend the 10-week basic training course until the end of the summer surge. The 10-week basic training is will test the impact it has on advanced individual training (AIT) units. TRADOC will institute the 10-week program permanently beginning in October 2008. Starting on October 1, 2008 Soldiers attending basic training will receive a Combat Lifesaver Course (CLS) and certify Soldiers before graduation. The change adds seven-and-a-half hours to the current curriculum.

Army training leaders have stated that the training program will not extend beyond the current schedule. The additional training time will give the Drill Sergeants time to work on areas that the Soldiers need more training. "The extra time for the drill sergeant will provide to the advanced individual training Commander a better physically fit, more mature, more disciplined Soldier who understands the tasks to master better than he does now," "Gen. William S. Wallace, Commander of Army Training and Doctrine Command, told Army Times, starkly emphasizing

(*sic*) that the extra week does not mean extra tasks” (Cavallaro, 2007). The overall improvements made to basic training have given the newly trained Soldiers confidence to make an immediate contribution to their unit. The changes to Army basic training bring the Army closer in line to the Marine Corp model.

Service Comparison

The Iraq war caused many changes in the world today from how we walk down the street to how we train Soldiers and Recruits. The military has made major changes in the way we fight on the battlefield. In basic training and boot camp, changes have occurred which have made a dramatic impact on our armed forces.

The Army and the Marine Corp hold a high standard for basic training. However, both services achieve their standards differently. The Army and the Marine Corp both performs three events that are the same, but the Marines have additional events to accomplish. The Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) requires Soldiers to do three events in a required time. The three events are Sit-ups (2 minutes), Push-ups (2 minutes), and the 2-mile run (fastest time by gender and age) (Army.com, 2007).

The Marine Corps events are similar but they require each Marine to perform “pull-ups (men) / flexed arm hang (women), crunches, and a 3-mile run” (Woods, 2007, Top End Sports). Even though the Army does not perform the additional events, both branches concentrate on the same muscle groups. In addition, the Army and the Marine Corps focus on improving their toughness, appearance, and self-esteem.

The Army and Marine Corp are very similar in physical fitness. This is how both branches are putting high quality people on the battlefield. Even if we compare physical fitness in 1974 to now, physical toughness and fitness today is better. From 1974 and earlier, physical fitness was

in combat uniform consisting of combat boots, pants, and t-shirt. In the past, we were only recruiting people that gave the appearance of being in good shape, but today this is not the case. When entering the military today, healthier and better training goes into performing physical activity that helps Soldiers and Marines meet the standard. This is an advantage for today Soldiers and Marines compared to how they achieve standards in the pass.

Army. When we compare each branch, we find there is a significant difference within each branch. The Army basic training at the present is a 10-week course consisting of physical and mental challenges. The training takes place at several different posts like Fort Jackson and Fort Knox. Army basic training consists of several phases that lead to graduation.

Red Phase or Patriot Phase consists of: Orientations, Initial Values Training, Physical Training, Inspections (Barracks, Uniforms, and Equipment), Drill and Ceremonies (Marching), General Subjects (Nuclear Biological Chemical Warfare, Map Reading, Communications, First Aid, and other mandatory classes), and Bayonet Training (Assault Course/Pugil Training/Bouts).

White Phase or Gunfighter Phase consists of Basic Rifle Marksmanship, Values Training, First Aid, Bivouac (Overnight field exercise), Diagnostic Army Physical Fitness Test, Hand-to-Hand Combat, Hand Grenades, and End of Phase Testing

Blue Phase or Warrior Phase is the culmination phase. The Soldier learns more advance combat skills and is then required to demonstrate proficiency on all skills taught throughout the course. This phase consists of: Individual Tactical Training (Individual Movement Techniques, Hand Grenade Training, Weapon Orientation and Buddy Team Live Fire Exercise), Final Army Physical Fitness Test, Final Individual Proficiency Test, Confidence Course, Cold Steel Field Training Exercise (FTX) – Culminating Event, Final Inspection Periods, and Values Training (Today's Military, 2007).

Marines. The Marine Corp boot camp consists of some of the same training as the Army. However, they take their training a step further. Their boot camp is 12 weeks long and has six more tasks to help better prepare their Marines on and off the battlefield. These additional tasks help prepare recruits for the unexpected while on deployment. The additional training the Marine Corp conducts is the Confidence Course, Combat Water Survival, Field Firing, Field Firing Range (FFR), Academic Training, and the Crucible (Marines, 2007).

Additionally, the Marine Corp implemented a new task called “The Crucible.” The Crucible gives the Recruits the opportunity to work as a team and learn the stress level of being on the battlefield. This task consists of the following: “Sleep Deprivation, Food Rationing, and a series of intense mental and physical test that will put an exclamation point on their time in recruit training” (Marines, 2007, U.S Marine Corps). No other branch of service performs this drill during basic training.

After gathering data on these two branches of service, there is no doubt that the world’s safety and security is the most important aspect to our services. After comparing each branches physical fitness requirements for basic training, there is one known fact. The Army and the Marine Corp want to produce the toughest, knowledgeable, and physically fit people. The Army and Marines Corp share many of the same traits and beliefs to protect our country. If we are to maintain a strong Army, we must place values on teamwork, good leadership, and trust. Army basic training and Marine boot camp are producing good quality Soldiers and Marine Recruits.

Conclusion Argument

In the past, the government argued that the Army did not need to stand ready as we are today. The logic for the last century was to maintain a smaller force and the government would have a smaller military budget. History has shown the initial loss of forces just came as a cost of doing

business, a calculated risk. Soldiers must meet physical fitness standards prior to graduating from initial entry training. Society has caused the Army to change their approach to preparing our new Soldiers. Soldiers need to adapt quickly with a strong and hard physical fitness program. Adapting quickly teaches Soldiers to adjust both mentally and physically to the hardships of combat.

Critics of the current gender-integrated program in Army basic training feel this program is not effective. The Aberdeen Proving Ground scandal was the stepping-stone used to prove their point. This scandal brought to light the effects the opposite sex has on Soldiers in a basic training environment. Their focus was the sexual misconduct involving the drill sergeants and trainees in integrated units. Their argument is if the units were segregated, sexual misconduct would decrease significantly. The segregated basic training program of the Marine Corp illustrated this position.

Soldiers lack the necessary skills to meet the needs for the current war. Adding additional tasks will not make our new Soldiers better. It will degrade their ability to adapt to the combat environment and shake their confidence. The American citizen will criticize the military because the politicians and the press will focus on discipline problems, sexual assault and anything that will make the Army look bad.

Conclusion

Soldiers are more confident for the challenges of today and prepared for combat because they train better than they were in previous years. The Army was in a slow transformation to meet what it thought was the up and coming threat. On September 11, 2001, our focus changed dramatically forever and we learned a valuable lesson. The Army transitioned its basic training curriculum to fit the challenges of the Global War on Terrorism. Our Army will continue to

change rapidly for the current threat and challenges of the future. Basic training will continue to change with the times and that is why Soldiers will be ready for combat.

Reference

- Anderson, J.H. (2007, November 6). Boot Camp or Summer Camp? Restoring rigorous standards to basic training, Retrieved November 6, 2007, from www.heritage.org/research/politicalphilosophyBG1147.cfm
- Army.com. (2007) Army.com Armies of the World. Retrieved 03 November, 2007, from <http://www.army.com/enlist/APFT.html>
- Base Ops. (2007). *US Air Force Basic Training*. Retrieved 03 November, 2007 from <http://www.baseops.net/basictraining/airforce.html>
- Betts, Richard K. (1995), *Military Readiness, Concepts, Choices, Consequences*, The Brookings Institution
- Carvallalaro, Gina (October 10, 2007) Basic training extended to 10 weeks, Retrieved 12 November 2007 from http://www.armytimes.com/news/2007/10/army_basictraining_071009/
- Center for Military Readiness (2003, May). *Army Gender-Integrated Basic Training*, Retrieved November 6, 2007, from www.cmrlink.org/cmrnotes/gibtsp01pdf
- Collins, John M. (August 2004) *Basic Combat Training: Flashbacks and Forecast*, Association of the United States Army, Retrieved October 23, 2007 from <http://www.proquest.umi.com>
- Coulthard, Michael CPT, (April 2001), *The Analysis of Injury Presentations in Initial Entry Trainees at Fort Benning*, Retrieved 7 November 2007 from Georgia <http://stinet.dtic.mil/cgibin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA420877&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>
- Finnegan, John Patrick (1974) *Against the Specter of a Dragon, the Campaign for American Military Preparedness 1914-1917*

Gleick, E. (1996, November 25). *Scandal in the Military*. Retrieved November 5, 2007, from Time in partnership with CNN: www.time.com

Headquarters, Department of the Army (11 October, 2006) ALARACT 195/2006, Washington D.C.

Headquarters Department of the Army, Army Regulation 350-1 (13 January 2006), Army Training and Leader Development, Washington, D.C.

Headquarters, Department of the Army, ARTEP 7-1-DRILL (July 2006), Washington D.C.

Headquarters, Department of the Army TRADOC Regulation 350-6 (8 May 2007), Washington D.C.

Headquarters, Department of the Army, TRADOC Regulation 350-70, 6 March 1999, Common Task Testing, Washington, D.C.

Kaplik, Joseph J, Darakjy, Salima, Hauret, Keith G, Canada, Sara Et al (January 2006)

Increasing the physical fitness of Low-Fit Recruits before Basic Combat Training, retrieved 5 November 2007 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3912/is_200601/ai_n17180116

Kitfield, J. (1998, February 1), Boot Camp Lite, Retrieved November 5, 2007, from [www_government_com.mht](http://www.government.com.mht)

Manning, L. (2001, August 20). *Symposium-gender-integrated military training-Brief article*.

Retrieved November 5, 2007, from Look Smart: <http://www.findarticles.com>

Marines (2007) U.S. Marines Corps. Retrieved 20 November, 2007 from

<http://www.marines.com/page/usmc>

Rieger, William R., MS* and Scott, Shawn J., PT (n.d.), Chapter 7 Physical Fitness in Initial Entry, Retrieved 8 November 2007, from Training

http://www.bordeninstitute.army.mil/published_volumes/recruit_medicine/RM-ch07.pdf

Smith, Stew (2007) *The Air Force BMT Fitness Test*. Retrieved 03 November 2007 from <http://www.stewsmith.com/linkpages/airforcepft.htm>

Spencer, Jack (2006), *The Heritage Foundation*. Retrieved 03 November, 2007 from <http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/EM758.cfm>

St Amant, Nikki/ The Bayonet (April 12, 2004), Test unit fields new basic battle skills, retrieved 3 November 2007 from http://www.tradoc.army.mil/pao/training_closeup/041804.htm

Today's Military. (2007). Basic Training. Retrieved 03 November, 2007, from <http://www.todaysmilitary.com/app/tm/like/training/basic>

Trapp, B. (2004, February 4). Army Testing New Basic Training Article. Retrieved November 5, 2007 from <http://usmilitary.about.com/cs/armyjoin/a/newarmybasic.htm>

Wood, Rob J., (2007), *Top end Sports*. Retrieved 03 November, 2007 from <http://www.topendsports.com/testing/forces-marine-pft.htm>