

Eisenhower's Heroic Transformation: The transition of heroic leadership to managerial leadership philosophies from the late-19th century through World War II

by

Trenton David Conyers

B.A., University of Portland, 2010

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2020

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Andrew Orr

Copyright

© Trenton Conyers 2020.

Abstract

Dwight David “Ike” Eisenhower’s style of leadership and mentality transformed from a heroic leadership philosophy to a managerial leadership philosophy before the United States’ entry into World War II in 1941. From the late-nineteenth century through World War II, the US Army underwent the same transformation. The US Army’s shifting focus from heroic to managerial leadership enabled Eisenhower to gain additional administrative education to enhance his managerial skills. Exploring Eisenhower’s military career provides a window to investigate the transformation of officer professionalism that was occurring in the early twentieth century. He interacted with leaders still firmly planted in “heroic-age leadership,” but he was also mentored by those that accepted or even promoted the “managerial” concept of leadership.

The Army’s concurrent use of distinct styles of leadership, during a time of transformation, is not unlike the concept of “paradigm shift” used by Thomas Kuhn. New ideas do not merely displace old ideas; instead, the two can exist simultaneously with one another. The term “heroic” includes the concepts of fraternal, seniority-based organization, and deference to tradition as well as an individual piece which includes traits such as courage, valor, and personal image. On the other hand, the term “managerial” challenges traditional notions of the military, focuses on innovative solutions to military problems, and favors bureaucratization. Eisenhower is an excellent example to illustrate the way in which the US Army moved from a focus on heroic leadership toward managerial leadership. That Eisenhower was able to hone his administrative skills at army schools, such as the Army War College, illustrates that the Army began focusing on the science of leadership over the art of war.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 - The Cause for Managerial Leadership.....	14
Problems with a Heroic Army	14
General Emory Upton	19
Root Reforms	24
Eisenhower in Abilene, Kansas	30
Chapter 2 - The Service and Education of a Managerial Leader	36
Eisenhower at West Point	36
Before Camp Colt	42
Camp Colt	45
Service Schools and in the Service of Generals.....	50
General Douglas MacArthur.....	59
Chapter 3 - The Gamble for Managerial Leadership	69
Louisiana Maneuvers	70
North Africa	75
The Team for Operation Overlord	89
Conclusion - Reflections on Managerial leadership	101
Bibliography	107
Primary Sources	107
Secondary Sources	109

Introduction

At 7:15 a.m. on June 6, 1944., General Eisenhower's orderly, Sergeant Michael "Mickey" J. McKeogh, found the General sitting quietly in his trailer reading a western novel. Eisenhower had gone without sleep and had filled his ashtray with cigarette butts.¹ On this morning, he could do nothing but wait for the reports of the airborne operations and landings on the beaches of Normandy. He had been preparing for this invasion since his time in the War Department in 1942 and had built a team that helped manage the opening of a front in France. Eisenhower's team consisted of "heroic" leaders such as General George S. Patton and Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery. His team also consisted of "managerial" leaders such as General Omar Bradley. Just as a football squad needs specialists who integrate to make the team stronger, so Eisenhower believed he needed a diverse group of leaders to ensure that he had "fighting men" on the front lines and managers to point them in the right direction. At 6:40 a.m., Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force's (SHAEF) advanced command received the first report of the airborne operations executed behind enemy lines in Normandy.² They were generally optimistic. Reports received from the Normandy landings were unbearably slow and indicated mixed successes and failures. The most harrowing reports came from Omaha Beach, where the collapse of the beachhead seemed a distinct possibility. Eisenhower could do nothing to help the landings on the beaches. He had been elevated to being an armchair general. He had built his team, organized his armies, supported training and equipment fielding. Eisenhower had done everything taught to him as a managerial leader, but the Normandy landings were a

¹ Carlo D'Este, *Eisenhower, A Soldier's Life* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2002), 531.

² D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 530.

soldier's battle, not a general's. As an embodiment of the U.S. Army's shifting attitudes towards a managerial style of leadership, the Normandy landings put Eisenhower's managerial, diplomatic, and logistic skills to the test.

Major General Leonard T. Gerow, V Corps commander, was awaiting the initial reports on the amphibious command ship *USS Ancon* along with Major General Clarence Huebner, 1st Infantry Division Commander. After two hours, there was still no confirmation of any successes nor word that any beach landing had reached its objectives. Gerow and Huebner soon learned the landings on Omaha were on the verge of total failure. Although three-quarters of the radios with the 116th Infantry Regiment did not work, the two generals began to receive short and gloomy reports. These reports included: "Too many vehicles on the beach, send more combat troops, thirty landing craft tanks waiting offshore, troops pinned down on the beach." Huebner pushed the 18th Infantry Regiment to land immediately as reinforcements. Gerow, always "studiously calm under pressure," pressed for more information and sent his assistant chief of staff to conduct reconnaissance of the landings to gain any new information.³ Both Huebner and Gerow were closer to the action, and knowledge and intelligence were critical in their decisions to organize and direct reinforcements.

On Omaha Beach, the commander of L Company, 16th Regiment, 1st Infantry Division, Captain John R. Armellino, made a "successful" landing. Though they had made it onto the beach successfully, their mission still had many objectives remaining. The landing craft of his company took a beating carrying the troops to the beach, with several landing craft getting hit by German mortar and artillery fire. He noticed immediately that the air support had missed most

³ Russell F. Weigley, *Eisenhower's Lieutenants: The Campaign of France and Germany, 1944-1945* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1981), 78-9.

of the obstacles and German fortifications. Armellino's craft came under intense German fire approximately one-quarter mile from the beach and continued until the ramp dropped onto the beach. Immediately several members of his company fell wounded or killed on the boat and shore. The German machine guns were set up with overlapping fields of fire that peppered Armellino's men. Many of the green American recruits never made it to the bluff. The more seasoned soldiers from the African and Sicilian campaigns knew proper movement and assault techniques to avoid the withering German fire. Armellino only had 125 of his original 200-man company by the time they made it to the rally point.⁴

Armellino's actions and the actions of his lieutenants illustrate a mix of managerial and heroic styles of leadership. He was able to combine his knowledge of the operations with the complex problems presented in front of him. Armellino placed himself in a position in which he could direct his company and began to organize the chaos by directing soldiers and subordinate leaders to execute tasks. These were not small tasks, and the actions taken by his junior officers exemplify heroic leadership styles. Armellino's subordinate leaders demonstrated heroic leadership by courageously exposing themselves to enemy fire, and gallantly leading soldiers into the fight. He sent First Lieutenant Jimmie W. Monteith to take a group of soldiers to knock out the German pillboxes. They were successful, but Monteith was killed in action while leading soldiers into the fight and was one of twelve Medal of Honor receipts from the day's efforts.⁵ As

⁴ John R. Armellino, "Captain John R. Armellino 6 June 1944," American D-Day online, October 13, 2019. http://www.americandday.org/Veterans/Armellino_John_R.html.

⁵ Lieutenant Monteith was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions on the beach. His citation bears reading to illustrate the "heroic" language used (emphasis added by author), "For conspicuous **gallantry** and intrepidity **above and beyond** the call of duty on 6 June 1944, near Colleville-Sur-Mer, France. 1st Lt. Monteith landed with the initial assault waves on the coast of France under heavy enemy fire. Without regard to his own personal safety he continually moved up and down the beach reorganizing men for further assault. He then **led the assault** over a narrow protective ledge and across the flat, **exposed** terrain to the comparative safety of a cliff. Retracing his steps across the field to the beach, he moved over to where 2 tanks were buttoned up and blind under violent enemy artillery and machinegun fire. Completely **exposed** to the intense fire, 1st Lt. Monteith led the tanks

tanks arrived on the beach, Armellino began directing tank fire on the German fortifications and took an anti-tank round, which wounded him. Medics quickly recovered and moved him to an evacuation staging area where Armellino continued his efforts to manage and direct the soldiers landing and preparing the evacuation of critically wounded soldiers.⁶ The chaos and noise were constant, and the managerial and heroic leadership styles combined to ensure the success of the landings.

Dwight David “Ike” Eisenhower’s style of leadership and mentality were transformed from a heroic leadership style to a managerial leadership style before the United States’ entry into World War II in 1941. The U.S. Army’s shift of focus from heroic to managerial leadership enabled Eisenhower to gain additional education in the art and science of administration which eventually enhanced his managerial skill and altered his perceptions of the leadership style needed for senior commanders and staff officers. The way in which Eisenhower’s leadership style and views came to align with a managerial approach points to a transformation that occurred within himself, as well as within the U.S. Army. Examining Eisenhower’s military career provides a window into a new understanding of officer professionalism. He interacted with leaders who were still firmly committed to “heroic-age leadership,” but he was also mentored by those who accepted or even promoted the “managerial” concept of leadership.

on foot through a minefield and into firing positions. Under his direction several enemy positions were destroyed. He then rejoined his company and **under his leadership** his men captured an advantageous position on the hill. Supervising the defense of his newly won position against repeated vicious counterattacks, he continued to ignore his own personal safety, repeatedly crossing the 200 or 300 yards of open terrain **under heavy fire** to strengthen links in his defensive chain. When the enemy succeeded in completely surrounding 1st Lt. Monteith and his unit and while leading the fight out of the situation, 1st Lt. Monteith was killed by enemy fire. The **courage, gallantry, and intrepid leadership** displayed by 1st Lt. Monteith is worthy of emulation.” Jimmie W. Monteith, “Medal of Honor Citation of Lieutenant Jimmie W. Monteith, 6 June 1944”, National Medal of Honor Museum Online, October 13, 2019. https://mohmuseum.org/medal_of_honor/monteith-jimmie-w/.

⁶ Armellino, American D-Day online.

Eisenhower's managerial skills propelled him to leadership during a time of "special flowering in World War II."⁷

The Army's concurrent use of distinct styles of leadership, during a time of transformation, recalls the concept of "paradigm shift" advanced by Thomas Kuhn. Kuhn described the way in which scientific revolutions have taken place over time. New ideas do not merely displace old ideas; instead, the two can exist simultaneously with one another. He gave various reasons why old ideas continue to exist. For example, some senior scientists may merely choose not to change, and some old ideas may continue to work as simple explanations in some small and casual experiments. Newton's Laws of Motion was thus accepted and disregarded when they were put forward. The concept of a paradigm shift fits how managerial leadership arose where heroic leadership had long been dominant. The use of a paradigm also helps to show that the terms "heroic" and "managerial" are not necessarily opposites, in the same way that the Theory of General Relativity is not opposite from Newton's Laws of Motion. The rise of something new did not negate the continuation of something old.⁸

This thesis has three main chapters. Chapter One describes the way the U.S. Army of the late 19th and early 20th centuries changed drastically from an army motivated by heroic special action to one whose performance depended on an increasingly effective organization. The U.S. Army faced many problems following the Spanish-American and Philippine Wars. These problems, many of which General Emory Upton had already pointed out following the American Civil War, included the Army's system of professional military education for its officers.

⁷ Russell F. Weigley, "The George C. Marshall Lecture in Military History: The Soldier, the Statesman, and the Military Historian," *Journal of Military History* 63, no. 4 (October 1999), 808.

⁸ Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 4th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Secretary of War Elihu Root stepped in to make many of these radical reforms to the Army, which set the environment in which Dwight D. Eisenhower received his military education.

Chapter Two focuses on Eisenhower's military, professional, and personal experiences and education. In his time at West Point, Eisenhower showed disdain for tradition and military regulation, and these early years provided the first glimpse of his disposition toward more open-minded, or managerial leadership. Early in his career, the Army's perspective was channeled through a heroic lens, and necessarily so junior an officer as Eisenhower was viewed as unsubstantial. It was not until Eisenhower became commander of Camp Colt during World War I that he was able to demonstrate his administrative abilities. Army service schools refined his raw managerial skill and his attendance at the Command and General Staff School was a watershed moment for Eisenhower. His vision of leadership philosophy became more cemented in favor of managerial leadership. The time he spent serving under prominent generals, such as Douglas MacArthur, John Pershing, and Fox Conner, proved immensely valuable in providing Eisenhower an education that was both personal and professional.

Chapter Three explores Eisenhower's experiences immediately before and during World War II, his emergence as an expert managerial leader, and the way in which General Marshall gambled on Eisenhower's leadership philosophy during World War II. For the Army, the Louisiana Maneuvers provided the opportunity to test new unit structures and doctrine and to weigh the potential of younger officers, such as Eisenhower, Patton, and Mark Clark, for future generalship. Marshall and President Franklin Roosevelt gambled on managerial leadership and chose Eisenhower to take command in Europe, sending him first to North Africa to earn essential combat experience before taking overall command of allied forces. D-Day served as the culmination of education and experience that enabled Eisenhower to put together the best team to

execute a successful invasion of Europe. Eisenhower applied the lessons he learned in how he built and sustained allied and staff relationships.

Sociologist Morris Janowitz defined “managerial leadership” as reflecting the “scientific and pragmatic dimensions of war-making.” Managerial leaders are the military professionals who tend to be those with “effective links to civilian society.” In contrast, “heroic leadership,” according to Janowitz, entailed the “perpetuation of the warrior type, the mounted officer who embodies the martial spirit and the theme of personal valor.”⁹ Janowitz argued that heroic leaders tended to come from upper or middle-class society, as well as prominent military families. For example, Janowitz saw General Douglas MacArthur as fitting the heroic mold. MacArthur was an intelligent officer with a certain panache or flair and individuality. The heavy personal emphasis on the valor of the individual, on maintaining one’s image, and on strict adherence to traditional U.S. Army methods landed him squarely in the heroic group. Officers who came from more humble origins, including people from the working class or rural areas, generally proved more disposed to the managerial type of leadership. Janowitz aptly argued that Eisenhower was predisposed to the managerial leadership category as Eisenhower came from a humble, rural Kansas background and later did not readily conform to U.S. Army traditions or regulations.¹⁰

Janowitz’s terms “managerial” and “heroic” were meant to describe differences in actual construction of styles of leadership and relationship to authority. Janowitz also used the term “managerial” to include the notion of manipulation, persuasion, or the influence of others or events. The use of manipulation here does not imply a negative connotation. It is also slightly

⁹Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait* (New York: The Free Press, 1960), 21.

¹⁰Janowitz, *Professional Soldier*, 154-60.

different than the “art of persuasion” in that one usually persuades another person, but one can “manipulate” events to further one’s goals. Manipulation mirrored the techniques used by society in the industrial growth of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. By this argument, Janowitz saw the military as more reflective of society and less resistant to change, as many in society had come to believe. He also included concepts such as seniority-based hierarchy, fraternal brotherhood, deference to tradition, authoritative, and dominative to help define the term heroic.¹¹ Authority is derived from an officer’s position within the U.S. Army and not necessarily on mutual respect from their subordinates. Acting on one’s authority, where mutual respect does not exist, is domination. Janowitz saw a correlation between heroic and managerial leadership and the use of domination and manipulation, respectively.¹² This thesis applies Janowitz’s sociological understanding of the “heroic” and the “managerial” to the study of the U.S. military.

For this thesis, the term “heroic” includes fraternal organizations based on seniority, as well as deference to tradition. These concepts identify the institutional part of heroic leadership. Hazing, either plebes at West Point or soldiers newly assigned to a unit, is an excellent example of tradition. Senior leaders helping friends or helping former classmates and helping out the sons of friends is an example of an organization according to fraternal order. Seemingly brash actions and an emphasis on courage, valor, and image constitute the personal or individual part of the term “heroic.” MacArthur’s iconic image of wearing a scarf along with a corn-cob pipe is an excellent example of the personal image factor of heroic leadership. Patton’s popularity among

¹¹ Morris Janowitz, *Military Conflict: Essays in the Institutional Analysis of War and Peace* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1975), 225-27.

¹² Janowitz, *Military Conflict*, 221-23.

his troops, willingness to expose himself to enemy fire, and his being perceived as a “soldiers’ leader” also highlight heroic leadership. Heroic leaders emphasize qualities such as bravery, narcissism, being a “soldiers’ leader,” dominance, and favor the status quo. They also favor ideas such as tradition, fraternity, authoritarian, self-image, and the “fighting spirit.”

In contrast, the term “managerial” challenges many traditional notions of the military, focuses on innovative solutions to military problems and favors bureaucratization, which was the hotbed for innovation. Managerial leaders accentuate qualities such as organization, open-minded thinking, compromising, and attention to detail. They also favor concepts such as meritocracy, negotiation, team building, and diplomacy. This does not mean that heroic leaders cannot have these qualities. Eisenhower’s dislike of hazing and discipline while at West Point was a sign of his discomfort with behaviors favored by tradition. Both Eisenhower’s and Marshall’s emphasis on younger generals demonstrated the way they challenged the seniority-based organization. Marshall’s selection of Eisenhower over Patton, who was the more senior in rank and years, also exemplifies “managerial.” Managerial leadership was developing in the whole of society and not just in the military, and it was apparent in the trend toward professionalization in many professions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. That Eisenhower was able to hone his bureaucratic skills at Army schools, such as the Army War College, shows that the Army began focusing on the science of leadership. This science of leadership called for attention to detail of logistics, diplomacy, and the sophisticated numerical breakdown of material strength weighed against the enemy.

In Eisenhower, the heroic and managerial styles of leadership overlapped. Eisenhower showed excellent managerial skill while still leveraging the fraternal order within the Army to shape his staff and command teams. Eisenhower’s ability to build teams and to offer

compromises and his emphasis on “we” promoted a spirit of cooperation or “buy-in.” He is a managerial leader because he used managerial traits to a higher degree, such as team-building and diplomacy, than heroic leadership traits such as showmanship and dominative authority.

Historian Carol Reardon aptly shows the shift from a traditional military towards one that reflected the society’s new commitment to professionalization at the end of the 19th century.¹³ She argues that a realignment in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that called for a professionalization of the officer corps specifically required changes in the institutions at which officers were educated, such as the creation of the Army War College and expanding West Point’s training for officers. The reforms’ outcomes are best illustrated by the class of 1915, Eisenhower’s graduating class begot more generals than any other class in history. The class of 1915 was one of the first classes to be eligible for all these newly reformed schools. Their timing also provided the opportunity for gained experiences as junior officers during World War I. The class of 1915 was early enough to serve during World War I but young enough to continue service during World War II. Military reforms and specific timing of significant international conflict provided graduating classes of the 1910s with a great opportunity in which the class of 1915 achieved the highest number of generals. Reardon examines the military reforms of this period and the individuals and concepts that influenced them, such as Brigadier General Emory Upton and Secretary of War, and later State, Elihu Root. Upton served in the U.S. Army from 1861 to 1881 and wrote influential works advocating army reform.¹⁴ Elihu

¹³ Carol Reardon, *Soldiers and Scholars: The U.S. Army and the uses of Military History* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1990).

¹⁴ Two of the most useful works for this essay by Emory Upton are *The Armies of Asia and Europe: Embracing Official Reports on the Armies of Japan, China, India, Persia, Italy, Russia, Austria, Germany, France, and England* (NY: D. Appleton & Co., 1878) and *The Military Policy of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904) which was published after his death.

Root served as Secretary of War from 1899 to 1904 following the Spanish-American war in 1898 through the Philippine War, which officially ended in 1902. He also served as Secretary of State from 1905 to 1909. Reardon does not, however, provide a detailed look at how these reforms changed in practice when they took effect or at how they influenced leaders. Reardon's argument that there was a shift in military education complements historian James Abraham's synthesis of political, social, industrial, and military changes during the early Progressive Era.

Abraham shows the parallels between the professionalization of occupations within society and the professionalization of the officer corps occurring within the military.¹⁵ Whereas Reardon's argument is specific to military reform, Abraham's argument connects military reform to changes within society. Abraham explains the way in which social reforms from the Progressive movement of the late 19th century and professionalization of occupations had a direct influence on the U.S. military. During this period, the Army officer corps sought to identify itself as a profession. Historian Joseph T. Glatthaar stipulates that a "profession is first and foremost an identity. Army officers perceived themselves as professionals, and others recognized them as such."¹⁶ How society perceived the officer corps was just as important as the officer corps' perception of itself as a profession. Furthermore, societal emphasis on applying science to everything led to an increase in scientific management, which, especially for military officers, entailed planning and defining war's unknowns and intangibles.

Historian Antulio J. Echevarria II states that Clausewitz's *On War* is an example of the use of scientific methods to create awareness of "war's intangibles." Intangibles are crucial to

¹⁵ James Abraham, *American Arms for a New Century: The Making of a Giant Military Power* (New York: Free Press, 1981).

¹⁶ Joseph T. Glatthaar, *American Military History: A Concise History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 27.

his argument for separating and defining military art and science. Echevarria then combines art and science into the single term “practice.” Here, instead of using the terms heroic and managerial, Echevarria uses the terms “military art” and “military science.”¹⁷ He provides the same examples to illustrate military practitioners, Patton and MacArthur, and further argues that “art is not essential for military success – only for military glory.” Echevarria’s argument falls in line with both Janowitz’s and this thesis’ assertion that the pursuit of honor and glory fall within a traditional or “heroic” perspective of military leadership.

Most historians quickly point out Eisenhower’s ability to foster positive diplomatic relations or to understand grand strategy. Weigley aptly points out Eisenhower’s skill at maintaining relations with the allies, stating that Eisenhower was “amiably diplomatic.” He had the “ability to foster friendly Allied teamwork, through a thoroughly internationalized supreme headquarters.” Eisenhower was also viewed favorably by the British due to his “success in maintaining Anglo-American harmony” in North Africa and the fact that Eisenhower was less traditional than previous American commanders.¹⁸ Huntington said much the same: “Eisenhower functioned in political and diplomatic roles.”¹⁹ Janowitz called Eisenhower the “image of a military manager,” someone who “reflected the technical and pragmatic dimensions of war-making.”²⁰ Glatthaar and Echevarria II both call upon operational thinking, or

¹⁷ Antulio J. Echevarria II, *Reconsidering the American Way of War, U.S. Military Practice from the Revolution to Afghanistan* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2014), 47-9.

¹⁸ Weigley, *Eisenhower’s Lieutenants*, 36.

¹⁹ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 322.

²⁰ Janowitz, *Professional Soldier*, 154.

“operational science,” to refer to Eisenhower’s devotion to the planning process, which earned him his place in the War Department.²¹

Adrian Lewis argues that Eisenhower’s vision of leadership, and the military in general, during World War II is different from those of other officers despite their common backgrounds, such as West Point, Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College, and their common service in World War II. Lewis argues that “Eisenhower did a disservice to the Army, not by his frugal policies, but by his failure to insure [sic] that the Army retained its center and fighting spirit.”²² Lewis leaves unrecognized the distinct and different experiences an officer can have at each of those institutions. Experiences varied wildly among Eisenhower, Patton, MacArthur, and Bradley. Lewis also fails to understand the importance of familial background, which Janowitz listed as a contributor to a tendency of managerial leadership.

There are two important points missing from Lewis’s argument. One, Eisenhower was not “peculiar” in the sense of being alone in his style of leadership. Two, Lewis seemingly does not understand the transformation that had taken place within Army leadership to create more officers like Eisenhower. This thesis supports Janowitz’s paradigms of heroic and managerial leadership and attempts to provide a more detailed practical examination of the transformation suggested by Reardon, which took place in the early 20th century. It is critical to understand that practical application does not immediately change just because policy changes. It takes time for those changes to reverberate throughout an organization.

²¹ Echevarria II, *Reconsidering*, 110; Glatthaar, *American Military History*, 76.

²² Adrian Lewis, *The American Culture of War: The History of U.S. Military Force from World War II to Operation Iraqi Freedom*, 3rd ed. (NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2018), 152.

Chapter 1 - The Cause for Managerial Leadership

In the late 19th century and early 20th century, the U.S. Army changed drastically from a force presumably based on heroic leadership to one increasingly shaped by managerial organization. Events such as the Spanish-American and Philippine Wars and individuals such as General Emory Upton and Secretary of War Elihu Root were significant in causing and leading the change. Root and other leaders believed that weaknesses uncovered in mobilizing for the Spanish-American War and in fighting it proved that Upton had been right when he claimed that the U.S. Army needed fundamental reforms. The inadequacy of management and organization compelled Root to enact radical reforms to transform the U.S. Army into a modern organization. In this transformation, Root drew inspiration from Upton's writings, which played a vital role in influencing the changes that occurred in the early 20th century. Eisenhower's early reflections of the military, West Point instruction, and early military career were indirectly affected by the ideas of Upton, the failures of the Spanish-American War, and Root's educational reforms. Eisenhower was a product of the transformation of the Army from a heroic fraternity into a management-based organization.

Problems with a Heroic Army

In both the Spanish-American War and the Philippine War, the U.S. Army embraced a heroic style of leadership. The Army lacked a system for general staffing, nor were they standardized either in equipment or in training. Moreover, the U.S. did not have a clear delineation of authority between the civilian and military control of its armies. Politicians and senior Army officers emphasized courageous and brave leaders, held tradition paramount, and believed in the republican system of volunteer militias. Theodore "Teddy" Roosevelt exemplified the heroic leadership style. In his first public address as the Assistant Secretary of

the Navy in 1897, Roosevelt stated: “No triumph of peace is quite so great as the supreme triumphs of war.”²³ Roosevelt was highlighting gallantry in war, and that triumph in war was “more manly” than any triumph of peace. This kind of heroic statement on the “triumphs of war” shows Roosevelt’s heroic leadership style. He put himself forth as a dominating figure, reluctant to compromise, which also encouraged perceiving him as a heroic figure. Further, in his descriptions of the battle of San Juan Hill (Kettle Hill), Roosevelt wrote, “when on horseback, I could see my men better and they could see me better.”²⁴ His description presumes his conscious decision to adhere to a self-prescribed image as a “Rough Rider.”

The war with Spain highlighted some critical failures in the U.S. military: Coordination between the civilian and military leaders, the volunteer system, and planning and organization. From the beginning, the mobilization for the Spanish-American War in 1898 by the War Department was “abysmally prepared,” as historian Joseph T. Glatthaar puts it. Commanding General Nelson A. Miles and Secretary of War Russell Alger did not synchronize their plans and held different visions of the war with Spain. Secretary Alger called for numerous volunteer regiments to immediately embark toward Cuba, while General Miles hoped for a more organized campaign later that year.²⁵ The lack of unified decision-making begged the question of who commanded troops in the field.

²³ “Naval War College Opened, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt Appeals for a Great Navy,” *New York Times*, May 3, 1897, quoted in, Gregg Jones, *Honor in the Dust: Theodore Roosevelt, War in the Philippines, and the Rise and Fall of America’s Imperial Dream* (New York: New American Library, 2012), 26.

²⁴ Theodore Roosevelt, *The Rough Riders* (New York: The New American Library, 1961), 85.

²⁵ Glatthaar, *American Military History*, 48.

Troops in the Army numbered nearly 28,000 regular soldiers and increased with volunteer and militia as the war neared, which then grew the Army to over 220,000.²⁶ These soldiers were not uniformly trained, nor were either the regular, militia, or the volunteer soldiers drilled in movement operations larger than a regiment.²⁷ The Army deployed to Cuba by the U.S. was an unorganized mishmash of regular soldiers and citizen soldiers who were unprepared and ill-equipped to fight a war. The embarkation of troops at Tampa was haphazard and poorly planned and compounded the problems that plagued soldiers once they landed in Cuba. The War Department failed to provide transports to Cuba; therefore, unreliable private transports were contracted. General Shafter failed to properly prioritize food, ammunition, and medical supplies that were loaded, and what supplies were brought were unsystematically piled onto the beach.²⁸ A traditional leader who had been a Civil War hero, Shafter failed to suitably manage logistics for the campaign in Cuba and subsequently suffered many casualties due to illness and exposure. In addition, Shafter's request to Secretary of War Alger to move to better ground was denied, further exemplifying the disconnection between the highest levels of both civilian and military leadership.²⁹

Toward the end of the Spanish-American War, rumors carried by the press spread word of negligence and incompetence in the War Department and senior military officials. General Nelson Miles and Dr. William Daly, a surgeon, accused War Department officials of criminal

²⁶ Echevarria II, *Reconsidering*, 98; "Statistical Exhibit of Strength of Volunteer Forces Called Into Service During the War With Spain; with Losses From All Causes," (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), US Army Center of Military History Historical Branch.

²⁷ Echevarria II, *Reconsidering*, 98.

²⁸ Glatthaar, *American Military History*, 48-49.

²⁹ Echevarria II, *Reconsidering*, 100-101.

negligence by sending “embalmed” canned beef to U.S. soldiers in Cuba.³⁰ McKinley appointed General Grenville Dodge as president of the commission charged with investigating these allegations of corruption and negligence. The “Dodge Commission” failed to find any evidence of the corruption that General Miles had alleged, and the McKinley administration was able to avoid serious damage.³¹ As a result of this commission Secretary of War Alger was replaced by Elihu Root. Although it cleared the McKinley administration of the specific charges it investigated, the Dodge Commission still highlighted the mismanagement of the military during the Spanish-American War and its very existence exposed the distrust between its civilian and military officials.

In the war with Spain, the U.S. annexed the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico, as well as making Cuba a protectorate.³² Concurrent with and following the “splendid little war,” as Secretary of State John Hay famously dubbed the fighting with Spain, the U.S. Marines and Volunteers were embroiled in a “nasty little war” fighting an insurgency in the Philippines.³³ American perceptions of the war distinctly changed following the “massacre” at Balangiga, where villagers attacked the military garrison, killing 36 soldiers and wounding 22. Historian Brian Linn argues that “Balangiga profoundly shocked Americans and touched off an immediate outcry for vengeance.”³⁴ This appetite for vengeance gave rise to the cruel and harsh policies of

³⁰ Frederic L. Borch, “From Frontier Cavalryman to the World Stage: The Career of Army Judge Advocate General George B. Davis,” *Army History*, no. 74 (Winter, 2010), 11-12.

³¹ U.S. Congress, Senate, *Report of the Commission Appointed by the President to Investigate the Conduct of the War Department in the War with Spain*, 1900, 56th cong., 1st sess., 1900, S. Doc. 221, 110-111.

³² Jones, *Honor in the Dust*, 90.

³³ Jones, *Honor in the Dust*, 148.

³⁴ Brian McAllister Linn, *The Philippine War, 1899-1902* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000), 312.

General Jacob Smith, whose orders to his men to “burn and kill” were revealed in a series of court-martials in 1902 when stories of the harsh treatment of Filipinos by American soldiers broke into public view. Linn argues that the “trials seem to embody the brutality, ambiguity, and frustration of our first Asian guerilla conflict.”³⁵

Linn is describing a significant defeat of “American Exceptionalism” or the belief that God’s will or Providence protects America. Military victories against Mexico and Spain had seemingly reinforced the concept that wars could be won with the militia and volunteers, heroic leaders, and without a well-coordinated strategy. The chaotic mobilization for the war with Spain, poor logistical management, the Philippine insurrection, and scandals about alleged brutality demonstrated to Secretary of War Elihu Root that changes were needed. Although Elihu Root certainly had the Spanish-American and Philippine Wars to examine their respective failings, he was influenced by other theorists such as Spenser Wilkinson, author of *The Brain of an Army*, and General Emory Upton. In laying the cornerstone for the Army War College in 1903, Elihu Root said: “Were Upton living today, he would see all of the great reforms for which he contended substantially secured.”³⁶ Root looked to Upton for inspiration in driving out some of the outdated traditional practices of the Army in favor of a more professionalized officer corps and a better organized and better managed method for planning for future conflicts.

³⁵ Linn, *The Philippine War*, 319.

³⁶ Elihu Root, *The Military and Colonial Policy of the United States: Addresses and Reports by Elihu Root*, ed. Robert Bacon and James B. Scott (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916), 125.

General Emory Upton

General Emory Upton was significant in laying out reforms both in the realm of theory and in actual practice that he believed were required to modernize the Army and the officer corps. Upton wanted to eliminate the threat of uneducated, untrained, or popular leaders. Instead, his reforms endorsed professional and advanced military education to train leaders who would not, in Upton's mind, lead men to slaughter. His experiences in the Civil War molded his views on military practice and management. In battle, Upton demonstrated qualities of a heroic leader. Even as a young officer, he had begun to offer practical changes in tactics and recognized the importance of professionally educated military leaders. Heroic, or traditional leaders were discontented with Upton's ideas that laid the seeds for a shift to favoring managerial leadership, which influenced future administrations to enact serious restructurings within the Army.

Upton was a progressive military leader, one who was open to new ideas that supplanted established traditions. He pushed for an ideological and organizational transformation within the U.S. military. He believed that military leaders should receive new and better military education and that the Army required reorganization, including the creation of a better general staff system to manage the military more efficiently. Emory Upton was born in 1839, as the tenth of thirteen children, in New York. Before entering the academy at West Point in 1856, Upton attended Oberlin College for two years.³⁷ Upton was commissioned in the Army just as the Civil War had begun in 1861. After his first taste of battle on July 21, 1861, at the Battle of Bull Run near Blackburn's Ford, Upton quickly became a battery commander and further distinguished himself

³⁷ David John Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton: Misunderstood Reformer* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017), 7-8.

during the Peninsula Campaign in 1862. He also saw battle at Antietam, where he turned back several advancing units of Confederate soldiers with his artillery battery.³⁸

After the Battle of Salem Church and on the eve of the Overland Campaign in early 1864, Upton learned lasting critical lessons. Upton's time at West Point and his years fighting in the Civil War enhanced his disdain for politicians. Writing to his sister Louisa, Upton said: "Our defeats emanate from Washington, for with poor generals the courage of our troops would surmount the obstacles the rebels oppose to our march. How I would like to see that general rise who would lead us to great deeds."³⁹ Upton claimed that only through the sheer courage of troops could incompetence emanating from Washington be overcome. Historian David J. Fitzpatrick aptly connects these words with reforms later proposed by Upton who sought to limit the influence of politicians upon the military. Another lasting lesson is the importance of discipline and training. Upton recognized the difference between the untrained volunteers at the First Battle of Bull Run and the highly trained and disciplined volunteers under his command at Salem Church.⁴⁰ Upton held that trained volunteers were just as good as seasoned regular troops and could be just as successful.⁴¹

The last two years of the Civil war experience served to solidify the lessons that Upton learned. Witnessing the high cost of incompetence in war, Upton firmly held that the loss of soldiers' lives could have been significantly reduced. This idea fueled his passion to reform the

³⁸ Peter S. Michie, *The Life and Letters of Emory Upton* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1885), 53-55, 59-65.

³⁹ Emory Upton to Louisa Upton, Dec. 23, 1862, Emory Upton Collection, USMA Library Special Collections quoted in, Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 52.

⁴⁰ Michie, *Letters of Emory Upton*, 71-73.

⁴¹ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 53.

Army.⁴² Upton's performance at Spotsylvania Court House on May 10, 1864 illustrated how he was rethinking not only tactics but also purpose, intent, and follow-on actions. He wrote that "most of our assaults had failed for want of minute instructions, and particularly at the moment of success."⁴³ Upton planned to charge a weak point along the Confederate line of breastworks with a heavily reinforced infantry brigade. Unique to this charge was that troops would not pause to fire but would quickly charge with bayonets into the breastworks of the Confederates. Speed was key. If the first units attained a breakthrough, follow-on units would quickly rush through the breakthrough to exploit the offensive and overwhelm the Confederates.⁴⁴ The tactics were not unlike those used by August von Mackensen and others during World War I, which contributed to blitzkrieg tactics in World War II. Upton's assault as a whole failed to achieve the success intended. Senior military leaders failed to support his assault and exploit the breakthrough, and Confederate forces were able to quickly reorganize and counterattack Upton's forces, pushing them back to Union lines.⁴⁵ Upton believed that his senior leaders had failed to support his actions, which, he believed, would have been successful with their support. Examples such as this led Upton to believe increasingly that inept generals unnecessarily increased the war's devastation and duration.⁴⁶

Emory Upton believed that traditional military policies were outdated and left the U.S. vulnerable to foreign nations. Upton reflected on his experiences in the Civil War and he also

⁴² Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 54.

⁴³ Emory Upton to Adam Badeau, Dec. 26, 1873, Adam Badeau Papers, Library of Congress, quoted in, Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 59.

⁴⁴ Michie, *Letters of Emory Upton*, 92-100.

⁴⁵ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 60-1.

⁴⁶ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 83.

conducted a seventeen-month long review of the armies in Asia and Europe. Then he compared the armed forces of those other nations with those of the United States. He argued that military reforms were required to strengthen the Regular Army, and so was a redesigned general staff system based on the Prussian model, thus eliminating several inefficiencies within the American design. Upton observed the lack of advanced military schooling for military officers, the inadequacy of staff support for general officers, and a failure to cycle field and staff positions. Upton also criticized the citizen-soldier system, arguing that it fostered an antiquated system that would not stand up to a formidable foe. However, he believed that the training at West Point was superior to any in Europe.⁴⁷ As noted earlier, Upton was critical of the Civil War-era volunteer system but not the volunteer soldiers themselves. Upton believed that through training and discipline volunteer soldiers were just as formidable as any other soldiers.

Upton listed the causes of the U.S. Army's weakness in the introduction to his posthumously published *The Military Policy of the United States*. Upton cited undisciplined troops, short enlistments, politicians' intrusion into military affairs, and failure of military education, to name a few.⁴⁸ Short enlistments, as Upton experienced during the Civil War, left little to no time for training, which inevitably led to higher casualties, something he wanted to avoid.⁴⁹ Upton saw warfare as the business of military professionals and believed that intrusion by politicians caused inefficiencies and miscommunication and that it would lead to the deaths of more troops. In his published and unpublished works, Upton highlighted several instances where

⁴⁷ Emory Upton, *The Armies of Europe and Asia: Official Reports on the Armies of Japan, China, India, Persia, Italy, Russia, Austria, Germany, France, and England* (London: Griffon and Co., 1878), 360-363.

⁴⁸ Emory Upton, *The Military Policy of the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), XIV.

⁴⁹ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 183.

political machinations negatively intervened in military affairs. He directly attributed volunteer units' lack of preparedness to Congressional incompetence. He added that "it is important to bear in mind the respective duties and responsibilities of soldiers and statesmen."⁵⁰ There is no doubt that Upton would have viewed the chaotic mobilization for the Spanish-American War in the same light. Upton saw the U.S. military as lagging behind its European counterparts in postgraduate education, where senior officers can continue their military education in strategic theory and sciences. This gap in education led to generals' inability to manage properly the logistics of large armies.⁵¹

Upton's reforms fell into two broad categories: technical military reforms, such as those pertaining to the general staff and to mandatory retirement age, and the other category, which required new legislation such as a new militia or volunteer act. According to historian Richard C. Brown, Upton argued for "interchangeable appointments between staff and line" positions and compulsory retirement for old generals who, he believed, would resist reform.⁵² Upton argued that, in order to make a dynamic transformation, the traditional generals had to be pushed out to allow room for younger, more progressive generals. The bias in favor of younger generals anticipates what General George C. Marshall did later in selecting men such as Eisenhower to be generals.

Upton's proposed system would have expanded the Regular Army, created an army of National Volunteers commanded and supported by the Federal Government, and retained the

⁵⁰ Upton, *Military Policy*, 304-5.

⁵¹ Michie, *Letters of Emory Upton*, 418-9.

⁵² Richard C. Brown, "General Emory Upton – The Army's Mahan," *Military Affairs* 17, no. 3 (Autumn, 1953), 127-8.

militia supported exclusively by the states.⁵³ The National Volunteers would have worked much like the modern National Guard. The National Volunteers were organized locally and would train regularly following a standardized federal curriculum, and its officers would have received the same military education as regular officers. Upton hoped that this would allow the U.S. military to expand quickly with trained troops while recognizing the importance and symbology of a “volunteer” force.⁵⁴ Though not copied directly, Upton’s concept for reforming the Militia Act of 1792 inspired Secretary of War Elihu Root to reform and standardize the militia or National Guard.

Root Reforms

Secretary of War Elihu Root sponsored the reforms that changed the U.S. Army from a heroic fraternity to a management-based institution.⁵⁵ His reforms greatly emphasized education for officers and directly influenced the type of military education that Eisenhower received at West Point and later in postgraduate schools. Significantly influenced by Upton, Root sought to “fix” the major concerns laid out by Upton in his posthumously published *The Military Policy of the United States*. Root perceived the administrative failings during the Spanish-American War and connected the causes of failure with the concerns laid forth by Upton. On the reform of military education and rethinking concepts of leadership, historian Russel Weigley argued that a

⁵³ Emory Upton, *The Military Policy of the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), XIV.

⁵⁴ David John Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton: Misunderstood Reformer* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017), 187-9.

⁵⁵ Secretary Root did not enact all the reforms associated with the “Root Reforms.” His reforms, and the associated Root Reforms started an avalanche of reforms and restructuring that attempted to both modernize and professionalize the military.

significant difficulty for Elihu Root was a conceptual “transition from ‘heroic leadership’ to the ‘managerial’ concept of military command.”⁵⁶ In other words, Root’s transformation of the military was shaped by a need for an ideological shift.

Root became Secretary of War in 1899 and laid the groundwork for significant reform of the U.S. military in organization, training and education, and officer development. Following the inadequacies of Secretary of War Alger and the chaotic mobilization during the Spanish-American War, Secretary Root reorganized the War Department which better defined its relationship to the armed forces. Root was heavily influenced by Upton’s *The Armies of Asia and Europe*, his personal writings and letters, and the unfinished *The Military Policy of the United States*, as well as by the Dodge Commission and by Spenser Wilkinson’s *The Brain of an Army*. Providing a British perspective on the German general staff system, Wilkinson argued that the general staff was the brain of the German Army. The general staff is the cornerstone of the Army’s organization. The general staff plans for war, increases the efficiency of the Army, and acts as a training academy and institution for learning with each of these functions formed under a Chief of Staff. Secretary Root’s significant contributions toward military reform included the Militia Act of 1903, also known as the Dick Act after Congressman Charles Dick, the 1903 General Staff Act, and the establishment of the Army War College in 1903.⁵⁷ These three major reforms enacted in 1903 spoke to some of the gravest problems that Emory Upton had pointed out. There were other reforms sponsored by Secretary Root, such as enlarging the academy at West Point or inspired later reforms, such as the National Defense Act of 1933,

⁵⁶ Russell Weigley, “The Elihu Root Reforms and the Progressive Era” in *Command and Commanders in Modern Warfare: Proceedings of the Second Military Symposium, U.S. Air Force Academy*, edited by William Geffen (Washington D.C., 1969), 11.

⁵⁷ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 243-45.

which officially established the National Guard as a reserve component in the U.S. The reforms of 1903 set in motion a dynamic transformation from a traditional military towards a modern professionalized military.

In an address during West Point's centennial in 1902, Root spoke about the type of leaders then needed. "Armies are large," he said, "and the problems of supply, of transportation, have become complicated and difficult, requiring the best art of the best-trained minds." He further suggested that an "increase in the scientific qualities of attack and defense" made it essential to have leaders who can understand these complexities.⁵⁸ Speaking at the cornerstone laying of the Army War College in Washington, D.C. Root stated:

The officer who keeps his mind alert by intellectual exercise, and who systematically studies the reasons of action, and the materials and conditions and difficulties with which he may have to deal, will be the stronger practical man and the better soldier.⁵⁹

As part of several educational reforms and reorganizations, Root placed a significant emphasis on postgraduate education. On numerous occasions, he noted the changing military complexities in war. He understood that a drastic transformation favoring a managerial style of leader was required to ensure that the military would be able to manage new complex problems in war. With the emphasis on higher military education, Root intended to force a transformation from the traditional Army to a managerial army.

The Militia Act of 1903 set forth new regulations for transforming the militia into the National Guard. The lack of discipline in volunteer units and their inability to defeat "savages" in the Philippines were taken as proof of the need to federalize the training of the state militias,

⁵⁸ Root, *Military and Colonial Policy*, 116.

⁵⁹ Root, *Military and Colonial Policy*, 123.

enacted as part of the 1903 Militia “Dick” Act. This act standardized training and equipment, which in many cases was antiquated, such as the use of muskets at a time when manufactured repeating rifles existed.⁶⁰ The Dick Act required that all National Guard units conform to all the rules and regulations that governed the Regular Army. When under the authority of the United States, the National Guard was “subject to the same Rules and Articles of War as the regular troops.”⁶¹ The former militias were required to conform to the standard of uniform, equipment, arms, and practices of the Regular Army and would be compensated for this massive undertaking. One of the biggest benefits from the Militia Act of 1903 was that pay and entitlements matched those of the Regular Army. In addition, National Guard officers received the same education and opportunities as Regular Army officers.⁶²

Not since the Militia Act of 1792 had the United States modified the way its services would be organized, how they were trained and interacted, and what they could be called upon to do in a time of war. The Militia Act of 1903 seemingly solved several problems presented by Emory Upton. The Dick Act standardized the militia into a National Guard, federalized its training, and afforded officers expanded military education. However, the Dick Act had limitations, such as allowing enlistments in the National Guard to be as short as nine months and letting the states keep control of appointing officers in the National Guard. Further reforms, such

⁶⁰ Jones, *Honor in the Dust*, 350, 360.

⁶¹ U.S. Congress. Senate and House. *An Act To Promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes*. 1903. 57th cong., 2nd sess., 1903. S.H. Doc. 33, 775-76.

⁶² U.S. Congress. Senate and House. *Promote the efficiency of the militia*, 776-79.

as the Militia Act of 1908 and the National Defense Act of 1933, fixed many of these problems.⁶³

Root held Emory Upton in high regard, and Upton's writing greatly influenced Root and many of his reforms. Root himself compared his reforms to those proposed by Upton. In the speech he gave at the cornerstone laying of the Army War College, Root stated, "Were Upton living today, still upon the active list of the Army, he would see all of the great reforms for which he contended substantially secured."⁶⁴ Emory Upton would not have agreed with everything Root did. For example, Upton would have had mixed feelings about the General Staff Act of 1903, which created the Chief of Staff, allowed for a general staff corps of 44 officers, and decreed that the Chief of Staff "shall have supervision of all troops of the line."⁶⁵ The specific act giving the Chief of Staff authority over field armies would most certainly have pleased Upton, because he strongly disliked civilian intrusion into management of the Army. Russell Weigley argues that Secretary Root applied private business practices to the military. For example, Root stated:

Economical and business principles seem to justify the bringing together of these bureaus under a single chief, who will have general direction of all and who will be able to decide promptly and on business principles what shall be done by each particular bureau in the mobilization and concentration of troops.⁶⁶

⁶³ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 244.

⁶⁴ Root, *Military and Colonial Policy*, 125.

⁶⁵ U.S. Congress. Senate and House. *An Act To increase the efficiency of the Army*. 1903. 57th cong., 2nd sess., 1903. S.H. Doc. 88, 830-31.

⁶⁶ Letter from Root to the Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, March 3, 1902, quoted in Otto L. Nelson, Jr., *National Security and the General Staff* (Washington: Infantry Journal Press, 1946), p. 52, quoted in, Weigley, "Elihu Root Reforms," 13.

Root clearly understood progressive reform in the civilian realm, and applied it to military organization. Upton also would have applauded temporary service and term limits for officers on the general staff. Secretary Root, in the General Staff Act of 1903, clearly placed the Secretary of War position within the chain of command, placing the Chief of Staff between himself and the field armies. However, to Root's chagrin, and surely Upton's as well, Secretary Root was unable to place all the military bureaus under the direction of the Chief of Staff, such as logistics.⁶⁷ The general staff would create plans for mobilization and various other contingency plans, which served to promote bureaucracy and management within the Army. As Root insisted, "the General Staff must not 'operate.' It must instead 'supervise.'"⁶⁸

The establishment of the Army War College in 1903, expansion of the United States Military Academy at West Point, and later the founding of the Army Industrial College all served to modernize and professionalize the officer corps. Upton had argued that Army leaders' incompetence had led to unnecessary deaths during the Civil War and had urged the Army to create postgraduate military education for all Army officers.⁶⁹ Just as American society during the Progressive Era sought to create rational order and encouraged science, Root intended that military education drew on a new emphasis on the science of management.⁷⁰

The era of Root's reforms led to a conflicting dynamic in the Army, where senior leaders still had a significant influence on the education of junior officers and on the direction of the

⁶⁷ Fitzpatrick, *Emory Upton*, 244.

⁶⁸ Report of the Secretary of War, 57th cong., 2nd sess., House Docs., IV, No. 2 (serial 4443), 1902, 46, cited in, Weigley, "Elihu Root Reforms," 20.

⁶⁹ Upton, *Military Policy*, XIV.

⁷⁰ Weigley, "Elihu Root Reforms," 13.

U.S. Army in general. The Spanish-American and Philippine Wars touched the lives of many throughout the country, and, certainly, this was true of those who were related to or knew the volunteers of Funston's 20th Kansas Volunteers. Society viewed the military in heroic terms and would continue doing so Throughout the extended process of implementing the Root Reforms.⁷¹ Eisenhower's, and society's, opinion of the military was affected by the military's actions during the Philippine War through the opinions of those around him. However, the beliefs of his mother had the most significant impact on his initial impressions of the military.⁷²

Eisenhower in Abilene, Kansas

Eisenhower's rural upbringing inclined him to accept and then to favor cooperation and to develop raw managerial skills and attributes uniquely suited for managerial leadership. This background as a "farm kid" certainly set him apart from the likes of those like George Patton, who graduated earlier in 1909, whose family history was full of exemplary military service.⁷³ His background is similar to classmate Omar Bradley, who was also born into a working family and later became an influential managerial leader.⁷⁴

Dwight D. Eisenhower was born on October 14, 1890, in Denison, Texas into a family descended from 18th-century German immigrants who soon moved to Abilene, Kansas.

Dwight's father, David, worked in the Belle Springs Creamery in Abilene as a maintenance

⁷¹ Janowitz, *Professional Soldier*, 39-42.

⁷² Eisenhower's mother, Ida, strongly discouraged military play or any recounting of the *USS Maine* or the Rough Riders. Additional material in Eisenhower's *At Ease*, D'Este's *Eisenhower: A Soldier's Life*.

⁷³ Terry Brighton, *Patton, Montgomery, Rommel: Masters of War* (New York: Crown Publishers, 2008), 17-18.

⁷⁴ Omar N. Bradley, *A Soldier's Story* (New York: Modern Library, 1999 [1951]), vii.

engineer. The owner was part of the “River Brethren” community that had included Eisenhower’s ancestors when they lived in Pennsylvania. Dwight’s mother, Ida, stayed at home to raise the growing the family and used a vast array of home remedies to heal the many minor injuries occasioned by fights between Dwight and his brothers.⁷⁵ From a young age, Eisenhower was said to have had a terrible temper, which only served to exacerbate the rivalry that existed between Dwight and his older brother Edgar. This temper, exacerbated from frustration or passion, could have swayed Eisenhower toward heroic leadership. Being overtly passionate or showy are traits of heroic leadership. Instead, this rivalry served to push both boys to continually strive to outperform each other in every way, but especially in sports.⁷⁶ He made use of his passion and competitiveness to make himself better, not just to look better.

The two brothers also received the most oppressive hand of punishment from their father, especially for any infractions affecting the family’s reputation, threatened their education, and finances. Edgar and Dwight learned hard lessons about family and, in particular, about not putting the family in jeopardy.⁷⁷ Edgar Eisenhower later noted that one of the most important lessons that each Eisenhower brother learned was the value of hard work and determination. He stated: “There was bred into us a certain independence and a determination to rise above our humble beginnings and try to someday amount to something.”⁷⁸ These statements are not to be confused with those of personal valor, which is a heroic trait. Statements of “independence,”

⁷⁵ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 24-26.

⁷⁶ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 31-32.

⁷⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *At Ease: Stories I Tell to Friends* (Fort Washington, PA: Eastern National, 2011 [1967]), 36-37.

⁷⁸ McCallum, John, *Six Roads from Abilene: Some personal Recollections of Edgar Eisenhower* (Seattle: Wood & Reber, 1960), 26, quoted in, D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 32.

“determination,” or “humble beginnings” reinforce Janowitz’s argument that those from humbler beginnings are independent or more creative in their thought processes, which generally imbues them with a managerial style of leadership. For example, MacArthur was raised in the shadow of his father, striving to live up to the family name. Instead of learning independent or out-of-the-box thinking, he followed the path of his father into military service and the path of heroic leadership. The emphasis placed on pragmatic decisions, those which are thought through logically and not passionately, is indicative of managerial traits. Eisenhower’s father was not imbuing his sons with false pride, but rather the pride in working as a family, or team.

One of Dwight Eisenhower’s earliest mentors was a local man named Bob Davis, who was a fisherman, hunter, and guide. Besides teaching young Eisenhower several skills in camping, hunting, and campfire cooking, Davis taught Eisenhower the art of poker. Davis taught Eisenhower the game and the concept of percentages and calculated chance. Eisenhower recalled that Davis “dinned percentages into my head night after night.”⁷⁹ According to Eisenhower, this was his first significant lesson in odds and working with numbers, which provided him with an early sense of calculation and its practical uses, not to mention extra money from regularly winning poker games as a young man and junior officer.⁸⁰

In school, his favorite subjects were arithmetic and grammar. Grammar helped him to speak eloquently during conversations, and arithmetic covered odds and chance. These two subjects combined when he played poker, which also gave him practice in these two subjects. Eisenhower’s logical mind enjoyed the lack of ambiguity that existed in arithmetic and grammar. His and the community of Abilene’s insistence on practical knowledge was a part of their

⁷⁹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 89.

⁸⁰ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 88-90.

personalities.⁸¹ Abilene was quiet, isolated politically, and conservative, and it fostered a tight-knit sense of community. The high school was collocated with the city hall, and students also served as volunteer firefighters in the event of an emergency.⁸² Abilene did not offer as many opportunities that could be found in a city, but Eisenhower continued to strengthen his skills in arithmetic, grammar, and work ethic. In high school, Eisenhower was very popular, though he had little time for socializing due to his after-school work schedule. Dwight had laid out his priorities, which included sports, work, hunting, and his studies. The girls liked him for his “seemingly carefree personality,” but he described himself as “gangly and awkward, with few of the social graces.”⁸³ Eisenhower did not have the flair or showmanship associated with a heroic leader. A carefree or independent attitude is more comparable to managerial leadership than heroic leadership. A few years after World War II ended, Charles Harger, an editor of the *Abilene Daily-Reflector*, described Eisenhower as “a natural leader. He organized groups and was popular with teachers....and [was] a healthy boy with a serious mind.”⁸⁴ He did not hold in respect those teachers whom he deemed incompetent, asking questions designed to embarrass them. In addition to the skill of identifying weaknesses and strengths in people, Eisenhower also acquired the ability to remember detailed information after hearing it the first time.⁸⁵ The kind of education that Eisenhower got strengthened in him traits that would support a managerial style

⁸¹ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 39.

⁸² D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 39-40; Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1990), 17-18.

⁸³ Transcript, “Young Mr. Eisenhower,” CBS Television news special, interview by Harry Reasoner, September 13, 1996, quoted in, D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 42.

⁸⁴ Charles M. Harger, “The Eisenhower I know...,” *American Magazine*, Nov. 1951, quoted in, D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 43.

⁸⁵ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 44.

of leadership, which, once refined in the Army, gave Eisenhower an edge at understanding many intricacies in military planning.

Shortly after high school, a friend and mentor of Eisenhower, Joseph W. Howe, was impressed by his mind. Howe was an editor for the *Dickinson County News* and gave Eisenhower unfettered access to a trove of papers, works, and books. Howe also provided Eisenhower with one of his earliest opportunities to speak in public at a Democratic Party meeting at the local pool house, or country club. Howe certainly encouraged Eisenhower to seek his future outside of Abilene, KS, and Eisenhower's friend Everett E. "Swede" Hazlett certainly sealed the deal. Eisenhower's friend Swede had initially sought an appointment to West Point to pursue his genuine interest in the cavalry; but he was given an appointment to Annapolis instead, due to his father's intervention without consulting Swede. While back in Abilene to study for a reassessment after failing the entry examination, Swede Hazlett urged Eisenhower to seek an appointment to Annapolis as well.⁸⁶

Utilizing his likable personality, or perhaps manipulation and natural grasp of diplomacy, Eisenhower was able to acquire several recommendations and sponsorship from both Democratic and Republican politicians, civic leaders, and businessmen in the area. After having sent Senator Joseph L. Bristow two separate letters, Eisenhower was afforded the opportunity to compete for one of Senator Bristow's nominations.⁸⁷ Eisenhower finished second overall by a close margin and received the appointment to West Point only because Senator Bristow sought out recommendations from his friend Phil Heath, who placed Eisenhower as the first choice. Dwight traveled to Jefferson Barracks, MO, to complete his four-day entrance examination to West

⁸⁶ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 54-55.

⁸⁷ Joseph L. Bristow Papers, Kansas State Historical Society Archives, Topeka, cited in, D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 56.

Point. By chance, another poor young man from rural Missouri also traveled to Jefferson Barracks to take the entrance examination. That man was Omar Bradley.⁸⁸

Swede and Dwight studied intensely for the examinations, in much the same way that Eisenhower would study with his friend Leonard T. Gerow on that upper-floor barracks room at night while attending Command and General Staff School. His quick mind and strong memory served him well, and he recalled the questions and answers he had studied with Swede. It helps to point out the importance of Eisenhower's modest background that the Army required new cadets to pay for their first clothing issue and transportation costs. Eisenhower arrived at West Point with five dollars to his name.⁸⁹ This illustrates a clash within the West Point admittance program between those who came from an upper or middle-class background, favored by the traditional Army, and those of lesser means such as Eisenhower or Bradley. An unreasonable burden was placed on Eisenhower, which reflected the nature of the Army at that time. This was the first of many clashes Eisenhower had during his time at West Point as a young leader with raw managerial skill, placed within a very traditional training curriculum where he questioned and defied several rules and regulations.

⁸⁸ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 56-58.

⁸⁹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 108.

Chapter 2 - The Service and Education of a Managerial Leader

Eisenhower's education at various Army service schools and his time served under influential and intelligent generals distinctly refined his organizational skills and placed him on a stable path toward managerial leadership. Eisenhower's early career and time at West Point showed that he did not fit into the model of an ideal army officer that was widely held in the early twentieth century. Not until he served as a camp commander during World War I, where his raw managerial skill was put to the test, did Eisenhower demonstrate his superior qualities in administration. The period between 1922 and 1939 saw tremendous growth and refinement of Eisenhower's managerial skill. His time at the Command and General Staff School was a watershed moment from which he emerged with an understanding of the critical nature of management without which the most dramatic postures were useless at best. This accounted for his most significant divergence from heroic leadership and from those who followed that line of thinking, such as Patton or MacArthur. His time serving under generals Conner, Pershing, Mosley, and MacArthur provided critical experience, training, and education that solidified his career as a managerial leader.

Eisenhower at West Point

Eisenhower's time at West Point provided vital experience which shaped his career by reinforcing managerial traits, such as coaching, team building, and innovative thinking. This is not to suggest that heroic leaders cannot coach but that heroic leaders are more likely to be dominative, which does not promote an atmosphere suitable for coaching or team building. While at West Point, Eisenhower scoffed at tradition and took every opportunity at "bedeviling super-serious upperclassmen in their attempts to make us over." In other words, he fought back

when upper-classmen attempted to haze them. In one instance, Eisenhower and a friend were ordered to report in “full-dress coats,” which meant to report in the cadet dress uniform with long tails in the back. They decided to report wearing only those dress coats and nothing else. In another example, Eisenhower danced in a taboo manner with the daughter of a West Point professor. Getting a rise out of upper-classmen and flirting with a professor’s daughter are just two examples of the way in which Eisenhower pushed the boundaries of tradition and regulation, which is representative of managerial leadership. After a second infraction, he was demoted in cadet rank, was assigned extra duty, and was confined to his barracks when not at the gym or in class.⁹⁰ His list of demerits went on, and at the end of his cadet years, he ranked 61 of 164 overall in his graduating class but 125th in discipline.⁹¹ Concerning discipline, Lieutenant Colonel Morton F. Smith, the Commandant of Cadets at West Point, recommended that Eisenhower “should be assigned to [an] organization under [a] strict commanding officer.”⁹² His chafing at tradition and regulations and his average overall ranking suggest that Eisenhower was not what most more senior leaders in the Army were looking for in a junior officer; the Army expected discipline and strict adherence to regulations.

In a testament to Eisenhower’s disdain for tradition and hazing, one particular altercation especially showed him apart from a traditional leadership style. Early in his second year, a first-year cadet, or “plebe,” ran into Eisenhower, sending the plebe onto the ground. Eisenhower responded “with a bellow of astonishment and mock indignation.” He continued to ask what the

⁹⁰ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 7-9.

⁹¹ Standing at Service Schools and in Examinations for Appointment or Promotion, 1915, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, Dwight D. Eisenhower Personnel Records (PR), Eisenhower Presidential Library (EL), Abilene, Kansas, USA.

⁹² Summary of Efficiency Reports, 1915, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

plebe's previous condition of servitude was and stated to the plebe, "You look like a barber." The plebe was, in fact, a barber from the Midwest, having a background similar to Eisenhower's. Eisenhower recalled that he had "managed to make a man ashamed of the work he did to earn a living." From that point on, for the remaining three years at West Point, Eisenhower did not haze another plebe. Eisenhower diverged from the traditional stance, usually held core to heroic leadership qualities. As his reaction to hazing showed, Eisenhower's background of hard-work living had already swayed Eisenhower against the tradition. Within the seniority system and with authority to haze, Eisenhower chose to follow another path illustrating the clash between heroic leadership and managerial leadership philosophies.⁹³

Eisenhower had a passion for sports, especially football, and seemingly he was set for his time at West Point. His years of scrapping with his older brother Edgar had properly toughened him up for the rigors he would face as a light running back and linebacker. Eisenhower worked hard to gain more muscle mass and to impress the coaches to attain a spot on the varsity team. Eisenhower later claimed that "in no game or practice session could the coaches claim that I lacked pugnacity and combativeness."⁹⁴ He followed the same work ethic he had when studying for examinations and quickly earned himself a reputation on the field for his "love for hard bodily contact."⁹⁵

An unfortunate injury on the playing field and subsequent further injury during horsemanship "monkey drill" landed him in a cast and ended his ability to do anything entailing

⁹³Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 18.

⁹⁴ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 14.

⁹⁵Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 13.

hard contact, and it nearly ended his military career.⁹⁶ In a game against Tufts University, a week before the Army-Navy game, Eisenhower had suffered a knee sprain that landed him in the hospital for a couple of days. He had been plunging through the line, attempting to break through when he became twisted up after being tackled at his lower leg. After discharge from the hospital, Eisenhower went straight back to his regular routine, which included horseback riding. Attempting to vault over his horse as it leaped over a low hurdle caused intense pain to his knee, and he fell to the ground. Eisenhower later said that the “doctors spent four days straightening my leg, a process so painful that I scarcely slept during the ordeal.”⁹⁷ The incident ended his sports career, ended his chances to join the cavalry, and nearly cost him his career in the military.

His knee injury proved pivotal in Eisenhower’s life. The injury forced him away from focusing on his own performance in sports and left him with more time for academics, meanwhile fostering a different approach toward leadership that depended less on an impression of his own excellence. Following his recuperation, two instances gave evidence that Eisenhower was best suited for managerial leadership. In one instance, utterly unprepared for a mathematics problem, Eisenhower came up with a shorter, more logical conclusion than the instructor, who then accused Eisenhower of cheating. Eisenhower, later acquitted of those charges, was applauded the instructor’s supervisor for his innovativeness, and his answer incorporated into the

⁹⁶ Monkey drill is made up or improvisation while practicing or drilling while on horseback. In this case, Eisenhower was having some fun while riding bareback on his horse and went to jump off the horse to vault over him as the horse jumped a hurdle. He landed horribly and his leg twisted behind him, leaving his knee with torn tendons. Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 14.

⁹⁷Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 14-15.

curriculum.⁹⁸ It is critical to point out that his overall ranking of 61 out of 164 is misleading. Clearly, Eisenhower possessed a raw talent for understanding problems, but his resistance to traditional methods at West Point held him back.

Eisenhower's different but correct answer also illustrates a clash between the strictly traditional approach taken by West Point and originality. Eisenhower's natural affinity for numbers, which went back to his time learning poker with Bob Davis, enabled him to rethink the problem to come up with another solution. This is evidence of managerial leadership philosophy which sought logic and simplicity and could view problems from a different perspective.

In the second instance, as part of his post-injury transformation, Eisenhower took up coaching football. He did so well at coaching the junior varsity team that people started attending both practices and games of the junior team.⁹⁹ He had an unusual skill at identifying the strengths and weaknesses of his team, and he had a personality that could inspire anyone to work harder. While assessing the strengths and weaknesses of subordinates is not specific to managerial leadership, it compliments more managerial leadership traits, like team-building, training, and diplomacy. Eisenhower also took up the role of head cheerleader in his senior year, leading pep rallies and getting every cadet excited for the game the next day. Being a pep-rally leader served as practice for speaking effectively in public and for learning how to inspire others.¹⁰⁰

His inspirational personality is an early example of Eisenhower showing the leadership trait of team-building, inducing others to "buy-in" to the project at hand. In building a team, or a

⁹⁸ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 20.

⁹⁹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 23.

¹⁰⁰ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 70.

staff, Eisenhower was less authoritarian (a heroic trait) and chose to pull ideas and strengths from within his team. Eisenhower's friendly manner and leadership within his group of friends offered several chances for Eisenhower to exercise the art of persuasion, or in other words, manipulation.¹⁰¹ In two early instances, while at West Point, Eisenhower protected his friends from earning a demerit. In the first instance, a classmate held in confinement was attempting to escape for a night of fun. Because the classmate was a starting football player, Eisenhower took it upon himself to convince his classmate to stay in confinement and not jeopardize his standing with the football team. In another occasion, Eisenhower occupied the time of an instructor long enough for the bugle to call an end to class. He had done this when he realized that a classmate was struggling with an equation written on the board. Eisenhower had saved his friend from both a demerit and humiliation.¹⁰² The sense of "we" or team means that everyone has a stake in the overall success of the mission, whether it is a football match or something of larger consequence. The importance of a break from dominative leadership is that it makes more feasible the use of a more collaborative style of leadership, which is a significant identifier of managerial leadership philosophy. Eisenhower, in his assessments of the planning for Operation Overlord, consistently referred to his staff as his team and offered the pronoun "we" when describing actions taken and decisions made. What he learned as a coach served to refine and expand his abilities as a manager of men and training. Throughout his early career, Eisenhower served as the football coach at nearly every unit he joined because of his ability to organize and train.

¹⁰¹ The use of manipulation in this thesis mirrors its use by Morris Janowitz and does not imply a negative connotation. Manipulation is slightly different than the "art of persuasion" in that one usually persuades another person, but one can "manipulate" events to further one's goals.

¹⁰² D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 76.

Before Camp Colt

As a young Lieutenant and then junior Captain, Eisenhower was a promising managerial leader caught in a transformation of the dynamics of leadership within the Army. The Root reforms set in motion an emphasis on officer education and professionalization, but it had yet to filter its way down to the line units where Eisenhower was first assigned. The efficiency reports Eisenhower's superiors filed about him from 1915 through 1918 rated Eisenhower as an average or unremarkable infantry officer. The traits and performance evaluated by his commanders were geared toward rewarding self-oriented characteristics, such as marksmanship, athleticism, bearing, and military appearance. As an officer with raw managerial talent, Eisenhower's skills were consequently overlooked during this period.

His evaluations before commanding at Camp Colt (1915-1917) were all written after 1917. They talked very generically about Eisenhower's skills, and they suggested that Eisenhower was undistinguished.¹⁰³ The late date and generic phrasing of Eisenhower's reports could be indicative of the evaluator not remembering Eisenhower's performance, or not caring about Eisenhower's early service records. Both of these observations are indicative of Eisenhower being unmemorable. Surely, if Eisenhower's service had been superior, a commanding officer would have remembered his excellent actions, even years after the fact. That is to say, Lieutenant Douglas MacArthur's reports as a platoon leader in the Philippines, as an aide-de-camp to his father, General Arthur MacArthur, Jr., or as aide-de-camp to President

¹⁰³ It is not entirely clear when these summary reports were taken. It is fair to assume that they were written at the same time and sometime after 1917 as many of these summary reports include copied statements and seem to be bureaucratic filler. It is expected that these evaluations were based from notes made during this time, or that these commanders were attempting to remember what Eisenhower had done while under their command. Both of these scenarios illustrate the insignificant nature of Eisenhower's duties while under their respective commands.

Theodore Roosevelt most certainly were not generic. His summary reports from 1915 through 1917 contain repeated phrases, such as “is qualified mentally and morally and is fitted physically for all the duties of his position.”¹⁰⁴ This is repeated on five separate occasions by five different commanders. Eisenhower’s first company commander, Captain George W. Helms, rated his military appearance as “very good” and physical fitness as “excellent.” Helms concluded that Eisenhower is “an able man, and when he has had sufficient experience will be an excellent officer.”¹⁰⁵ By Helms’s standards, which favored heroic leadership, Eisenhower was an able, though unexceptional, officer.

His next report was also written by Helms, now a major and a battalion commander. Major Helms repeated his previous comments on appearance and fitness, and he added that Eisenhower was “active and able” and that Eisenhower “needs more experience.” In that same report, a divisional inspector, Major Arthur S. Conklin, also concluded that Eisenhower is “active and able” and that he “needs more experience.”¹⁰⁶ If an officer is outstanding or exceptional, a commander would remember such an officer and have little trouble in writing a unique report. Whereas, if an officer is underwhelming, a commander may find themselves at a loss for words and may lazily “copy and paste” to add filler in an evaluation. The previous two examples illustrate the fact that the summaries are probably administrative filler. For lack of a refined assessment, the evaluators chose to copy the previous report, and are indicative that

¹⁰⁴ By order of the Secretary of War Summary of Efficiency Reports, 27 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹⁰⁵ By order of the Secretary of War Summary of Efficiency Reports, 27 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹⁰⁶ By order of the Secretary of War Summary of Efficiency Reports, 27 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

Eisenhower was not an officer who stood out. Based on their evaluation criteria, Eisenhower fell short of exceptional or superior officer quality.

Captain Eisenhower's last two evaluations before commanding at Camp Colt were written on the Department of Army's Form Number 706, and the rating periods extended from after the U.S. entered World War I to a time before his command at Camp Colt, Pennsylvania. These evaluations best illustrate the discrepancies with rating period and dates, and they further show that Eisenhower was unremarkable when viewed through evaluation criteria determined by the Army, which favored heroic leadership. The rating period covered on the first form is from September 22, 1917 to November 26, 1917 and it was initiated on January 7, 1920 and signed on January 23, 1920. The second evaluation covers the period from December 15, 1917 to March 1, 1918, and it was completed prior to the first form. Viewing Eisenhower through the Army's formulated evaluation criteria, he was evaluated on physical energy, common sense, attention to duty, initiative, organizing ability, and capacity for command which was dictated by the Form 706. Eisenhower was rated "average" on all accounts, except for physical energy, which was rated "above average" on one form.¹⁰⁷ Based on the Army's subjective criteria, Eisenhower was evaluated as average. More importantly, is the lack of detail or description of Eisenhower's abilities in the "comments" section of the form. The discrepancies in dates and bureaucratic filler point to the fact that these commanders were likely too busy and did not believe these evaluations required extra consideration.

Eisenhower's superiors were forced to view him through the formulaic criteria provided by the Army and likely never afforded him the opportunity to demonstrate his organizational

¹⁰⁷ Special Efficiency Report for Regular Officers, Sep. 22, 17 to Nov. 26, 1917, dated Jan. 23, 1920, and Dec. 15, 1917 to Mar. 1, 1918, dated Aug. 10, 1919, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

skills, an opportunity that Camp Colt afforded him. The introduction of new efficiency reports in 1919 showed that the military was going through administrative changes in an effort to bureaucratize, a continuation of the Root reforms. The fact that the evaluation criteria were all based on traditional traits illustrates the way that senior Army leaders still held tradition in higher regard. However, a structured form, which attempted to objectify officer qualities, showed an openness to management innovations.

Camp Colt

Captain Eisenhower's raw managerial skill in training, organizing, and coaching men allowed Eisenhower to distinguish himself for the first time while in command of Camp Colt, PA. He was tasked to train tank crews deploying to France to fight under General Pershing during World War I. As part of tank crew training, Eisenhower helped develop methods for training individuals and small units with whatever equipment happened to be on hand. He was forced to think outside the box to make efficient use of time soldiers spent on maneuvers and tactics. Eisenhower's efficiency report while in command of Camp Colt provided the first glimpse at his managerial skill. In addition, even though Captain Eisenhower held a position usually held by a brigadier general, he struggled to receive brevet promotion to major even as officers junior to him were promoted. Though he would eventually earn a brevet promotion to Major in June 1918, and then to brevet Lieutenant Colonel in October 1918.¹⁰⁸ Years later, on the day on which German forces in the Ruhr Valley surrendered (April 18, 1945), Eisenhower wrote to his friend Edward "Swede" Hazlett that appropriate rank should be given to those in

¹⁰⁸ Colonel I.C. Welborn to the A.G., 12 July 1918, Box 3, Folder Service File 1915-1918, PR, EL.

positions of higher responsibility.¹⁰⁹ During World War I, although reformers were pushing managerial leadership, in practice, preference was still placed on honor, glory, gallantry, and heroic leadership, which was demonstrated on the field of battle, not on the home front.

Captain Eisenhower's efficiency reports for his time in service at Camp Colt, from March to November 1918, at Fort Benning, GA, from December 1918 to March 1919, and at Camp Meade, MD, from March to July 1919 demonstrate increased leadership performance. These reports were written in July 1919 by Colonel I. C. Welborn, Colonel H. E. Eames, and Colonel W. H. Clopton, respectively, while Eisenhower was a part of the 1919 Motor Transport Corps convoy.¹¹⁰

The reports from late 1918 to 1919 list Eisenhower as above average and superior.¹¹¹ As listed in the performance section of the Form No. 706 for his time as commander of Camp Colt, Eisenhower was evaluated by Colonel Welborn as "superior" at attention-to-duty, initiative, and capacity for command. Eisenhower was graded as above average in the remaining three categories. The most telling comment, which is from Welborn, states that Eisenhower was "one of the most efficient young officers I have known" and that the duties and responsibilities of his position were those of a brigadier general.¹¹² There is a significant change in Eisenhower's

¹⁰⁹ Letter from Ike to Swede, 18 April 1945, Box 1, Folder 1945 April 18, Edward E. "Swede" Hazlett Papers 1941-1965, EL.

¹¹⁰ On each of the reports, the unit is written as Trans-Continental Motor Convoy. I opted for the better known title of 1919 Motor Transport Corps convoy. Colonel I.C. Welborn in Special Efficiency Report for Regular Officers, 30 July 1919; Colonel H. E. Eames in Special Efficiency Report for Regular Officers, 1 August 1919; Colonel W. H. Clopton in Special Efficiency Report for Regular Officers, 12 August 1919, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹¹¹ Superior performance is listed as the highest manner of performance.

¹¹² Colonel I.C. Welborn in Special Efficiency Report for Regular Officers, 30 July 1919, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

written evaluation from his previous assessments, where he was given “average” ratings and generic comments from his commanders to his “superior” performance while organizing and training men. The achievement is not that he held the duties of a brigadier general while a captain; it is that he performed these responsibilities well and above the expectations of an officer in his rank. Following World War I, Eisenhower reverted back to his regular rank of captain and would be promoted back to major for the second time in July 1920.

In addition to this excellent evaluation, Colonel Welborn recommended brevet Lieutenant Colonel Eisenhower for the Distinguished Service Medal (DSM) for his outstanding service during his command of Camp Colt during World War I. It is important to note the difference between the Distinguished Service Cross (DSC) and the Distinguished Service Medal (DSM). The DSC is awarded for actions of gallantry against enemy forces, whereas, the DSM is awarded for exceptionally meritorious service in positions of extreme importance, such as chiefs of staff, general ranks, and commanders within the American Expeditionary Force (AEF). During and immediately following World War I, most DSMs were awarded to higher ranking chiefs of staff or commanders within the AEF. Eisenhower was initially recommended for the DSM by Major R. B. Harrison, who stated that Eisenhower demonstrated “unusually good judgment and rare ability” and “overcame all obstacles and difficulties and thereby enabled the Tank Corps to keep entirely up with the shipping schedule, despite the Flu epidemic.”¹¹³ In April 1920, Colonel Welborn followed up on the Recommendation that Eisenhower be awarded the DSM by reiterating that the “services of Lieutenant Colonel Eisenhower were invaluable to the Tank

¹¹³ Major R. B. Harrison in letter from the Director of Tank Corps to AG of the Army, 8 August 1919, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

Corps and indispensable, so much so that he was not allowed to go overseas as he desired.”¹¹⁴

Major General Henry Jervey, then the Assistant to the Chief of Staff, replied on April 21, 1920, who judged that Eisenhower’s work did not justify the DSM for service at Camp Colt.¹¹⁵

Because Eisenhower’s service as camp commander was outside of combat and not of extreme importance, the recommendation was disapproved. Jervey “determined that the services performed by this officer, while efficient, are not exceptionally meritorious services to the Government, performed in a duty of great responsibility.”¹¹⁶ One year later, in April 1921, Colonel Welborn petitioned the Army Adjutant General to reconsider the recommendation of the DSM to Eisenhower. Welborn wrote: “From the beginning of the organization of the Tank Corps to the signing of the armistice, Major Eisenhower performed with marked ability duties of great responsibility.” He also noted Eisenhower’s “zeal and marked administrative ability.”¹¹⁷ Significantly, Welborn’s recommendation for the DSM emphasized Eisenhower’s managerial skill, such as organization, training, and administrative ability. Welborn invoked managerial leadership attributes in contrast to heroic leadership attributes in his recommendation for Eisenhower. This, as well as the fact that Eisenhower was not in a position of extreme importance, hurt his chances to receive the DSM, but Welborn’s use of managerial leadership characteristics marked an ongoing transition within the officer corps that eventually allowed Eisenhower to reach the top of the Army’s hierarchy.

¹¹⁴ Major Welborn in letter to AG of the Army, 8 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹¹⁵ Major General Jervey to AG of the Army, 21 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹¹⁶ Major General Jervey to AG of the Army, 21 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Awards 1919-1920, PR, EL.

¹¹⁷ Colonel I. C. Welborn to AG of the Army, 14 April 1921, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

In short, based on the Army Adjutant General's and Jervey's decision not to award the DSM makes it reasonable that the Army believed that because Eisenhower's duties did not in combat in Europe or in a position of extreme responsibility, they were not exceptional or deserving of an award. Colonel Welborn wrote in May 1922 that he was "so convinced of the merits and justice of such an award that I request I be called personally before the board."¹¹⁸ He adamantly believed that Eisenhower not only deserved recognition for his service during World War I but also that it had been exceptional service. Welborn pushed the office of the Army Adjutant General for four years before Eisenhower finally received his DSM in 1922. The fact that he pressed for recognition for four years testifies to Welborn's conviction that Eisenhower deserved recognition for his service at Camp Colt and may have reflected the degree of antagonism that still existed toward managerial leadership among many officers.

In his DSM citation, Eisenhower was credited with "marked administrative ability" without reference to any position of extreme importance usually associated with the DSM.¹¹⁹ The fact that there are two separate medals highlights distinct perceptions of actions in combat and abilities in critical positions. It also shows that there is recognition for exceptional services rendered outside of combat. It is unclear if the persistence from Colonel Welborn changed the board's mind, or if it was a shift towards acceptance of managerial leadership. The interplay between Welborn and the Adjutant General is an example of the ongoing transformation of leadership philosophies occurring within the Army. On the one hand, the Army now recognizes exceptional organizational abilities, but is more likely to recognize those administrative abilities

¹¹⁸ Colonel I.C. Welborn to AG of the Army, 18 May 1922, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

¹¹⁹ Report of Decoration Board for Eisenhower, 23 September 1922, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

if they have occurred at positions of great responsibility or at war. It is also significant to note that Eisenhower had not received any award for his service during World War I until he received his DSM.

Service Schools and in the Service of Generals

Eisenhower spent most of the interwar years serving as a staff officer for various generals and attending Army Service Schools. He was passed over for command opportunities because he was “needed” on staff and repeatedly called upon for his diligent work.¹²⁰ He finished first in his class at the Command and General Staff School, later called Command and General Staff College (CGSC), and received superior marks while at Army War College and Army Industrial College in 1928 and 1933, respectively.¹²¹ These schools were created as part of the Root reforms and the schools enhanced Eisenhower’s ability to succeed as a managerial leader. These schools were crucial to refining his raw managerial skill, and his time spent under the tutelage of intelligent leaders solidified his leadership style. He served under Generals Fox Conner, John Pershing, George Marshall, George Van Horn Mosley, and Douglas MacArthur. Just as his postgraduate military education refined his managerial skill, Eisenhower’s time under the mentorship of great senior leaders, even if they were heroic leaders, propelled him to become a superior managerial leader.

At a fateful dinner party with Colonel George Patton, Major Eisenhower met General Fox Conner, who was thoroughly impressed with Eisenhower’s new ideas about the tank corps and

¹²⁰ Official Letter from General MacArthur to Major Eisenhower, 30 September 1935, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

¹²¹ Army War College Class Standing Efficiency Report, 30 June 1928, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

doctrine of mobility. Patton and Eisenhower were among the few officers in the Army who advocated expanding the tank corps and the usefulness of mobile tank warfare. In an article titled “A Tank Discussion” in the *Infantry Journal* in November 1920, Eisenhower had discussed the advantages and disadvantages of tanks as they had been used during World War I. He argued that tanks were not just suitable for crossing trenches or for use in “stabilized conditions” with fixed lines. Eisenhower listed the mechanical faults of the tanks of World War I and proposed updated requirements for future tanks, such as increased speed and mobility. He also proposed tactics to improve the impact tanks had on the battlefield. These combined movement of small units in close coordination with tanks to break through enemy lines quickly.¹²² It is also interesting that the lead article of the November edition in which Eisenhower’s article appeared was titled “Infantry: Its Role, Capabilities, Limitations, and Relation to Other Arms.” The author of that article, Colonel Robert McCleave, relegated the tank to just a supporting role and described infantry operations as a “matter of art.”¹²³ McCleave’s notion that infantry was the center of the battlefield and everything else exists only to support the infantry reflected traditional thinking in the Army. Whereas, Eisenhower’s doctrine of mobility with tanks was innovative. McCleave wrote that battle revolved around the infantry and that “the infantry has to bear the brunt of the battle.”¹²⁴ McCleave had a grasp upon combined warfare, but his mindset and strategy were still rooted in the military traditions from World War I. Colonel McCleave’s central role of the infantry, and every other Army branch’s subordination to infantry depict a

¹²² Dwight D. Eisenhower, “A Tank Discussion,” *Infantry Journal* 17, No. 5 (November, 1920), 453-58.

¹²³ Robert McCleave, “Infantry: Its Role, Capabilities, Limitations and Relation to Other Arms,” *Infantry Journal* 17, No. 5 (November, 1920), 442.

¹²⁴ McCleave, “Infantry,” 441.

traditional mindset of senior Army officers. Maintaining this traditional approach to combined warfare, in spite of new technology and new ideas, is suggestive of a heroic leadership philosophy.

Soon after that, General Conner asked that Eisenhower be his executive officer (XO) at Camp Gaillard in the Panama Canal Zone. Eisenhower's current commander, General Samuel Rockenbach, was against the assignment because he believed he could not spare any experienced staff officers. The Army's fraternal order enabled Eisenhower to go with Conner to Panama. Fox Conner had served with distinction under the command of General John Pershing, who was now Chief of Staff of the Army, during World War I. This indirect connection between Eisenhower and the Army Chief of Staff tore through any 'red tape' and secured Eisenhower's position as the XO for General Conner.¹²⁵ As part of the Army's reduction following World War I, Eisenhower was reduced in rank back to captain.

Eisenhower's duty at Camp Gaillard was "one of the most interesting and constructive of my life," he later said, due to "the presence of one man, General Fox Conner."¹²⁶ Reflecting on that assignment, Eisenhower believed his time spent under the mentorship of Conner was pivotal and provided him the foundation required to succeed at Army service schools and while in command. General Conner drilled and questioned Eisenhower incessantly on readings of Clausewitz, on the campaigns of the Civil War, and on the works of other military strategists. Eisenhower called his time with Fox Conner "a sort of graduate school." Not only was Conner preparing Eisenhower for success during his career with broad thoughts and adages, such as

¹²⁵ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 178-82.

¹²⁶ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 185.

“Always take your job seriously, never yourself.”¹²⁷ Conner was also preparing Eisenhower for the rigors of CGSC. Eisenhower was promoted again to major just prior to leaving Conner in August 1924.

The good-ole-boy system, or fraternal brotherhood, stepped in again to help Eisenhower get an assignment to Command and General Staff School. General Briant H. Wells, Chief of Infantry, attempted to prevent Eisenhower from gaining entry into any Army service school. It is probable that Eisenhower’s espousal of concepts of mobility through an expanded tank corps and his published article created discord between Eisenhower and the Infantry branch. Fox Conner, who was now working for Army Chief of Staff General John Hines, had Eisenhower transferred to the Adjutant General Corps and placed on recruiting duty. Given that Eisenhower was thus outside the jurisdiction of the Chief of Infantry, General Conner secured an appointment for Eisenhower to attend CGSC, for which Conner had diligently prepared Eisenhower. General Conner wrote to a worried Eisenhower to reassure him that “you are far better trained and ready for Leavenworth than anybody I know.” On two separate occasions, Eisenhower’s connection with General Fox Conner not only enabled him to do what Eisenhower wanted but also placed Eisenhower in a position to benefit from education to refine his managerial skill set. Eisenhower later admitted: “It’s not *what* you know, it’s *who* you know.”¹²⁸ Eisenhower’s use of the Army’s fraternal order demonstrates the possibility of an officer who favors managerial leadership philosophy using aspects of heroic leadership style. There are times when heroic leadership and

¹²⁷ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 187.

¹²⁸ Eisenhower further explains in *At Ease*, “Always try to associate yourself closely with and learn as much as you can from those who know more than you, who do better than you, who see more clearly than you. Don’t be afraid to reach upward. Apart from the rewards of friendship, the associations might pay off at some unforeseen time – that is only an accidental by-product.” Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 200.

managerial leadership styles act complementary. Bradley is an excellent example of an officer who had the perception as a “soldiers’ soldier” while understanding the complex relationship between the fighting soldier, his equipment, and logistics. Bradley was not tied down trying to figure out how a soldier moves while under fire. As in the case of Eisenhower and Patton, who lean distinctly toward one philosophy of leadership.

Eisenhower called attending Command and General Staff School a “watershed” time in his life.¹²⁹ His time spent wargaming and writing operations orders with Fox Conner had prepared Eisenhower to take full advantage of the education throughout the rest of his career. Eisenhower committed fully to his studies at CGSC and enlisted his friend from Fort Sam Houston, Major Leonard Gerow, who later commanded V Corps during Operation Overlord, as a study partner. Together they retrofitted a makeshift command post in the extra space above Dwight and Mamie Eisenhower’s apartment.¹³⁰ Their study together paid off as Eisenhower came out first among 245 graduates in their class, and Gerow was less than “two-tenths of one percent” behind Eisenhower in overall ranking.¹³¹ Eisenhower’s motivation to succeed, his organization and managerial skill, and his attention to detail proved “tailor-made” to benefit from instruction at Ft. Leavenworth.¹³²

Another example of how the CGSC was a watershed moment for Eisenhower was that it served as a diverging point for him and Patton. They espoused similar views of speed,

¹²⁹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 200-2.

¹³⁰ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 202-3.

¹³¹ Class Standing General Service Schools, 18 June 1926, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1921-1930, PR, EL; Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 203.

¹³² D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 181.

maneuver, and mobility regarding tank warfare. But Patton changed branches, leaving the Infantry for the Cavalry, while Eisenhower remained in the Infantry. Eisenhower leaned heavily on the importance and practice of planning and organization, but Patton espoused heroic traits that emphasized execution and immediate action. Patton wrote to Eisenhower: “I don’t try for approved solutions any more but rather to do what I will in war.” He recommended to Eisenhower that he “stop thinking about drafting orders and moving supplies and start thinking about some means of making the infantry move under fire.”¹³³ Patton’s heroic leadership philosophy toward warfare was in stark contrast with Eisenhower’s. Patton did not see how management could be guided by leadership just as combat could be, so he was unable to see the merit in what proved to be crucial to Eisenhower.

Following attendance at CGSC in 1927, Eisenhower was assigned to the American Battle Monuments Commission under the command of General John Pershing and helped to write *A Guide to the American Battlefields in Europe* published in 1927. Pershing praised Eisenhower’s performance in a letter to General Robert Allen, writing that Eisenhower “has shown superior ability not only in visualizing his work as a whole but in executing its many details in an efficient and timely manner” and holds “unusual intelligence and constant devotion to duty.”¹³⁴ Although Pershing may not have subscribed to either managerial or heroic leadership styles, he saw the value of managerial traits. Where before, he served on the western frontier in the late 19th century, there was little role for an officer’s managerial abilities. The importance then, was action, not planning. It was essential to the transformation from heroic leadership to managerial

¹³³ George Patton to Eisenhower, 9 July 1926, Box 91, Pre-Presidential Papers, EL.

¹³⁴ Letter from General John J. Pershing to General Robert H. Allen regarding Eisenhower, 15 August 1927, Box 1, Folder General Historical 1926-1930, PR, EL.

leadership that even the most unlikely sources saw the value or usefulness of managerial skills. In 1927, Eisenhower was given a choice to attend Army War College. Where he said: “For once the Department has given me the choice, and for once I’m going to say yes to something I’m anxious to do.”¹³⁵

At Army War College from August 1927 to June 1928, Eisenhower graduated first in his class and maintained “superior” marks overall on each of his efficiency reports. In his first report written by Major General Hanson E. Ely, who happened to serve with Douglas MacArthur during the Veracruz expedition, Ely observed that Eisenhower was a “superior officer” and “fitted for command and general staff duty.”¹³⁶ General Ely’s comments were worded such that either heroic leaders or managerial leaders could see something good in Eisenhower.

Eisenhower’s end-of-instruction efficiency report by General William D. Connor stated that Eisenhower showed “great promise” and was “generally superior.” General Connor wrote that Eisenhower was “qualified for civilian contact and duty with civilian component” and rated Eisenhower as “superior” in every category except two: physical activity and military bearing and neatness.¹³⁷ Eisenhower’s top marks from his time at the Army War College earned him the opportunity to choose his next assignment. He chose to go back to the American Battle Monuments Commission. For Eisenhower, the reason to return was two-fold. It afforded him the opportunity to go back to work for Pershing, but, more important to Eisenhower, it allowed

¹³⁵ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 205.

¹³⁶ Eisenhower Efficiency Report August to November 1927, 1 December 1927, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1921-1930, PR, EL.

¹³⁷ Eisenhower Efficiency Report December 1927 to June 1928, 30 June 1928, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1921-1930, PR, EL.

him to travel to Europe. It was during this time while working on Pershing's memoir that Eisenhower first briefly met Colonel George C. Marshall, a trusted advisor of Pershing.

Following his time with the American Battle Monuments Commission, Eisenhower was assigned as the executive officer for General George Van Horn Moseley, serving Assistant Secretary of War Frederick H. Payne. Eisenhower later described General Moseley as "a brilliant officer," who pressed for the same interest in strategy and in studying military history as Fox Conner had when Eisenhower was in Panama.¹³⁸ Eisenhower's first assignment was to engage with industrial businesses to acquire the plans they had used in moving to wartime production during World War I and to learn if, in retrospect, they would have done things differently. The office was figuring out whether industries had responded effectively to the needs of policy in wartime as set by the federal government. The department was in the process of creating an Army Industrial College based on the office's findings, a school that Eisenhower later attended and whose name was eventually changed to the Eisenhower School of National Security and Resources Strategy. In retirement after his Presidency, Eisenhower reflected that this had been his first early interaction with what he termed the "military-industrial complex."¹³⁹

Following his time at the Army War College in 1928, every subsequent Efficiency Report from 1930 onward rated Eisenhower as "superior" with a quantified rating of 7.0, except one as a 6.2 when Eisenhower left MacArthur in the Philippines. Even more interesting is that MacArthur did not sign the last efficiency report as he had done for the previous years. Instead, it was written by Major General W.S. Grant.¹⁴⁰ General Moseley wrote to the AG of the Army

¹³⁸ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 210.

¹³⁹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 210-1.

¹⁴⁰ Eisenhower Statement of Military Service, 24 March 1942, Box 3, Folder Service File Jan-Apr 1942, PR, EL.

that Eisenhower was “qualified to occupy positions of the highest importance in the military.”¹⁴¹ Even Assistant Secretary of War F.H. Payne noted Eisenhower’s “special aptitude for quickly picking out the critical points in any subject.”¹⁴² Visitors to the War Department, such as Colonel McCammon, who heard one of Eisenhower’s lectures, commented on Eisenhower’s “thorough preparation” in treating topics that were “received by the audiences with the greatest interest.”¹⁴³

Eisenhower came into his own as a managerial leader while serving on staff in Washington, D.C. under the tutelage of several renowned generals. Their mentorship afforded Eisenhower the chance to attend critical service schools that helped refine his skills as a staff officer and managerial leader. Eisenhower made full use of connections, such as were common practice in the Army for generations, and this helped him to be chosen to attend Army service schools. But this did not mean that he gave priority to the self-focused heroic model of leadership that some of his own contemporaries, such as Patton, embraced. Again, a major indicator of managerial leadership is the use of manipulation or persuasion. Eisenhower’s likable personality, which often differed from the crasser or flamboyant personalities of heroic leaders, gave him a chance to use his direct and indirect connections to further his career. It was Eisenhower’s personality that enabled him to manipulate or influence Conner to get him into CGSC. That Eisenhower did not have to ask for this directly further shows the way he could

¹⁴¹ Memo from General Mosley to AG, 18 February 1933, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

¹⁴² Memo from Payne to AG, 3 March 1933, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

¹⁴³ There are several letters of thanks and commendation regarding Eisenhower’s performance in the War Department and other offices in Washington D.C. It is clear that he had reached a watershed moment prior to arriving in Washington, D.C. and the plethora of commendations and superior efficiency reports attest to this point. Eisenhower Commendation from Colonel W.W. McCammon, 6 June 1933, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

sway others to his advantage. It was his likable personality and interpersonal skill that allowed him to network successfully while in Washington, D.C. to influence his next assignments, such as going back to the Monuments Commission following the Army War College. Understanding that there were competing styles of leadership allowed Eisenhower to take advantage of both paradigms and what each leadership philosophy offered. His detriment of not serving as a unit commander and remaining a skilled staff officer meant that the name of Major Eisenhower reached the ears of the most senior leaders during the interwar years. His art of manipulation, making himself indispensable, and taking full advantage of his bureaucratic skills gave him the upper hand among his peers.¹⁴⁴ Eisenhower's time serving under the Assistant Secretary of War got Eisenhower noticed in Washington, D.C., particularly by Army Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur, for whom Eisenhower occasionally worked, such as during the Bonus Affair (Bonus March) in 1932.

General Douglas MacArthur

General Douglas MacArthur had an immense impact on Eisenhower, expanding the young staff officer's experiences in military, civilian, and political matters. Eisenhower served longer under the guidance of General MacArthur than under any other general. While serving under MacArthur in Washington D.C., a repeated offense by MacArthur illustrates the difference between the two men. As part of his regular staff work, Eisenhower was required to travel from the office to the Capitol building. MacArthur "never once offered Eisenhower a ride in or use of the car." Eisenhower remembered the humiliation he felt having to return the extra fare change

¹⁴⁴ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 209.

and submit travel vouchers regularly. He later recalled: “No matter what happens later you never forget something like that.”¹⁴⁵ The implication here is that Eisenhower sees himself as an officer that absolutely would have offered a ride to a junior staff officer, where MacArthur did not. While this might not show a particular trend of leadership style, it indeed points out how MacArthur’s and Eisenhower’s mentality differed. After serving as his aide when MacArthur was Chief of Staff, Eisenhower was arranged to serve under MacArthur when the General was appointed as Military Adviser to the government of the Philippines. As Janowitz and Echevarria have observed, MacArthur was a clear exemplar of the heroic style of leadership. MacArthur’s iconic image with a corn-cob pipe, his excellent rating of number one in his West Point graduating class, and his military upbringing point towards a heroic leadership style. In addition, he crass decision-making, bravery, and willingness to lead from the front in a skirmish during the Vera Cruz Expedition and during World War I earned him two recommendations for the Medal of Honor.

MacArthur was the son of General Arthur MacArthur, Jr., who himself had been awarded the Medal of Honor for heroic action during the American Civil War.¹⁴⁶ Without question, Douglas MacArthur had much to live up to the image of his father. MacArthur internalized these expectations and then met them by finishing first at West Point and set about to make a name for himself. During World War I, he became famous for his specially made hat, riding crop, and a wool scarf around his neck.¹⁴⁷ MacArthur sought to gain notoriety, fame, and glory. While

¹⁴⁵ Merle Miller, *Ike the Soldier: As The Knew Him* (NY: Putnam, 1986), 259, quoted in, D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 227.

¹⁴⁶ William Manchester, *American Caesar, Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964* (New York: Back Bay Books, 2008), 15.

¹⁴⁷ Janowitz, *Professional Soldier*, 153.

serving in the 42nd “Rainbow” Division, which he helped organize, MacArthur received two Distinguished Service Crosses and seven Silver Stars for bravery in leading troops into battle. He was wounded and gassed twice by German forces and recommended for but denied the Medal of Honor on two separate occasions. There could be no doubt in MacArthur’s mind that paper-pushing staff officers were jealous of him, a successful heroic officer.¹⁴⁸

As Army Chief of Staff, MacArthur led regular troops in Washington, D.C., including Major Eisenhower and Colonel Patton, to remove the “Bonus Army” in 1932. The Bonus Army was made up mostly of World War I veterans, and their supporters, who sought immediate compensation for their services during the Great War. Secretary of War Patrick J. Hurley ordered MacArthur to clear the area of veterans and to demolish the condemned buildings.¹⁴⁹ MacArthur intended to command the Regular force against the protesters, and Eisenhower “told him that I thought this was inadvisable; that the Chief of Staff should not dignify the incident by going out himself.”¹⁵⁰ The photographs, and written reflections of MacArthur and Eisenhower, reveal their respective personalities and opinions on the event. MacArthur was standing with his hands on his hips, looking proud of himself, wearing his dress uniform adorned with every medal, sometimes sporting a cigarette dangling from his mouth. In contrast, Eisenhower is standing in his quickly assembled bland uniform with a blank expression aptly capturing his words, “the whole scene was pitiful.”¹⁵¹ The tension between MacArthur and Eisenhower is due

¹⁴⁸ Manchester, *Douglas MacArthur*, 110.

¹⁴⁹ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 220.

¹⁵⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower, interview by Raymond Henle, July 13, 1967, transcript, OH-106, Dwight D. Eisenhower Oral History, EL.

¹⁵¹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 217.

in large part to MacArthur's vain or self-oriented temperament which did not immediately mesh with Eisenhower's likable personality. To some degree, this difference of character continued through their time together in the Philippines.

Indeed, it says something about Eisenhower's managerial skill for MacArthur to request, or to more accurately put it, to tempt and trick Eisenhower with a possible future command position to keep Eisenhower on MacArthur's staff.¹⁵² MacArthur went out of his way to prevent Eisenhower from command time, much to Eisenhower's chagrin. This was due in part to Eisenhower's success at making himself indispensable and, as MacArthur put it, Eisenhower "invariably demonstrated an ability to organize complicated tasks quickly and efficiently."¹⁵³ In the Philippines, Eisenhower built a relationship with Philippine President Manuel Quezon, due in part to MacArthur's unavailability and in part to Eisenhower's congenial personality. This allowed Major Eisenhower to have a significant influence over President Quezon's decisions and made Eisenhower a useful instrument for MacArthur to exert influence on Quezon. The relationship between Eisenhower and Quezon was strong enough that Quezon offered an award to Eisenhower in June 1942 after Eisenhower became the commander of U.S. forces in North Africa.¹⁵⁴ In Eisenhower's efficiency reports for 1934 and 1935, MacArthur gave him "superior" marks and wrote that "this officer has no superior of his age and grade."¹⁵⁵

Eisenhower's time in the Philippines illustrates the way in which he was stuck in limbo, caught

¹⁵² D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 217.

¹⁵³ Official Letter from General MacArthur to Major Eisenhower, 30 September 1935, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

¹⁵⁴ Entry June 20, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Dwight D. Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁵⁵ Eisenhower Efficiency Report July from 1, 1933 to June 30, 1934, 30 June 1934; Eisenhower Efficiency Report July from July 1, 1934 to June 30, 1935, 30 June 1935, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-35, PR, EL.

between his personal goals and those of one of the most senior officers in the army. Eisenhower was trapped between his desires to take command, following traditional routes, while at the same time being an exceptional manager of personnel and equipment.

Their personalities and leadership styles indeed clashed, but both officers appreciated each other's skills for what they were.¹⁵⁶ The tension between MacArthur and Eisenhower marks the paradigm shift from a heroic leadership style to a managerial leadership style in the Army at large. Their specific leadership styles and preferences inclined them to give different interpretations and find different solutions to the same problems, such as the request to make MacArthur a Field Marshal in the Philippines. Philippine President Quezon's suggestion that MacArthur receive an appointment as Field Marshal of the Philippine Army generated tension among his staff. Eisenhower wrote his position in his diary on February 15, 1936. He presented two reasons why MacArthur should not accept the position, the more prominent being that accepting it would be antithetical to their mission as advisors. Eisenhower stated that MacArthur's appointment would "seriously handicap every effort on our part to secure the necessary cooperation from commanders and staffs in the American Army."¹⁵⁷ As said earlier, MacArthur sought fame and glory, so his decision was predictable. MacArthur could never turn down the opportunity to receive more recognition and accepted President Quezon's offer to become Field Marshal in the Philippine Army. This arrangement was quite unusual in that MacArthur held two different ranks, one for the Philippine Army and the other for the U.S. Army, and received two separate incomes from each government.

¹⁵⁶ Official Letter from General MacArthur to Major Eisenhower, December 1939, Box 4, Folder Awards, PR, EL.

¹⁵⁷ Entry February 15, 1936, 15 February 1936, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Dec. 27, 1935 – July 20, Dwight D. Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

In naming the Philippine Army's Chief of Staff, Eisenhower showed his preference for Colonel Santos, over many generals. He stated that "Colonel Santos is the only logical person to serve as Chief of Staff of the Philippine Army. He understands organization and the necessity of systematic procedure in handling an army." Eisenhower described Santos as an administrative leader, which Eisenhower believed was greatly needed to help build and train the Philippine Army. On this issue, MacArthur agreed with Eisenhower's assessment but believed that the political climate was not stable enough to choose someone so junior to so influential a position.

¹⁵⁸ MacArthur was coaching Eisenhower on the importance of weighing political implications, a lesson that Eisenhower seemingly did not apply later in the invasion of North Africa. As early as May 1936, however, Eisenhower had become increasingly exasperated with MacArthur's unilateral or authoritarian decision making. Without consulting his staff, MacArthur decided to expand recruitment from 6,000 to 40,000 Philippine soldiers. Not only would this require more money to pay the men who were recruited, but it would also significantly increase the spending required for buildings, money that was not in the budget. When Eisenhower and Major Jimmy Ord, a classmate from West Point, attempted to sway MacArthur's opinion, MacArthur exploded. In his journal that evening, Eisenhower vented his frustration: "he gave us one of those regular shouting tirades. He seemed particularly bitter toward me." He goes on to list each of the arguments why MacArthur's decision does not make sense, including lack of funds and the lack of any supply system to support any endeavors. Eisenhower further wrote: "I argue these points with more heat and persistency than Jim – consequently I come in for the more severe criticism."¹⁵⁹ Though he has mellowed his written judgment in his diary, Eisenhower's

¹⁵⁸ Entry February 6, 1936, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Dec. 27, 1935 – July 20 1938, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁵⁹ Entry May 29, 1936, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Dec. 27, 1935 – July 20 1938, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

frustration with MacArthur is quite clear. Critical to the origins of this frustration is the difference in leadership mentality between MacArthur and Eisenhower. MacArthur used a heroic leadership style and demanded an obedient staff. In contrast, Eisenhower's mentality assumed a collective mentality which clashed with each of their assumptions of leadership. MacArthur's unilateral decisions made a mark upon Eisenhower's opinion towards authoritarian leadership. It solidified for him the importance of conferring with staff and building the right team to do so.

In many cases, Eisenhower was commended for his organizational and diplomatic skills. In Eisenhower's 1936 evaluation while in the Philippines, MacArthur wrote that Eisenhower was a "superior military essayist and analyst of military history. Outstanding student in the application of mechanized equipment." The evaluation noted that Eisenhower was "especially suitable for civilian contact or duty with civilian components."¹⁶⁰ As a result of his many managerial successes, Eisenhower was promoted to lieutenant colonel within the regular Army in July 1936. Eisenhower's time with MacArthur and his growing relationship with President Quezon gave Eisenhower critical diplomatic experience, which expanded his managerial skill. MacArthur gave Eisenhower superior marks and a 7.0 rating for 1936, 1937, and 1938. Given the close relationship with and availability of Eisenhower, President Quezon had an office prepared for Eisenhower in Quezon's Malacañang Palace. It was Eisenhower's close relationship with Quezon that led to a major falling-out between MacArthur and Eisenhower in 1938. MacArthur wished to build Philippine morale by conducting a large demonstration or parade. As a diligent staff officer, Eisenhower set out to plan the event, making inquiries where

¹⁶⁰ Eisenhower Efficiency Report July from July 1, 1935 to June 30, 1936, 30 June 1936, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-35, PR, EL.

necessary. President Quezon got wind of this large demonstration and pulled Eisenhower into his office to discuss the plans. Eisenhower gave information requested by the President only to find out that President Quezon knew nothing of the demonstration. This created a firestorm between MacArthur and the Philippine government, and MacArthur viewed Eisenhower's actions as disloyal to him and a direct violation of his authority.¹⁶¹ This forever soured the relationship between Eisenhower and MacArthur.

In an interview in 1970, General Lucius Clay stated that President Quezon had made an offer to Eisenhower to replace MacArthur. On the topic of Eisenhower's reassignment back to the United States from the Philippines, Eisenhower stated that President Quezon "handed him a blank check," and that Eisenhower could ask whatever he liked in an attempt to get Eisenhower to stay in the Philippines.¹⁶² Clay reaffirmed that it was Eisenhower's success at managing and organizing, as well as his diplomatic ability, that gave him a chance to take Quezon up on this offer.¹⁶³ In accordance with his official request to the U.S. Army, Eisenhower was recalled to the United States in 1939, where he served under General Krueger and helped plan, organize, and execute the 1941 Louisiana Maneuvers. MacArthur seemed to take Eisenhower's departure as an affront, which was reflected in a downgraded efficiency report for Eisenhower at 6.2 instead of the 7.0 that had been customary.¹⁶⁴ Ever since the misunderstanding in 1938 involving MacArthur, Eisenhower, and President Quezon over the military parade, the

¹⁶¹ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 225-6.

¹⁶² Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 231.

¹⁶³ General Lucius D. Clay, interview by Jean Smith, November 23, 1970, transcript, Box OH-285 (#1-16), Folder 6 of 31, General Lucius D. Clay Oral History, EL.

¹⁶⁴ Eisenhower Efficiency Report July from July 25, 1939 to December 13, 1939, 20 December 1939, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-35, PR, EL.

relationship between MacArthur and Eisenhower had been strained. Even so, Eisenhower had gained immense experience during his time in the Philippines.¹⁶⁵

Eisenhower's time under the tutelage of MacArthur in the Philippines and in intimate contact with civilian officials provided him with first-hand experience at organizing and training new units and at working with policymakers. For the first time, Eisenhower was able to put the training he received at the Army War College and Army Industrial College to use. In the Philippines, he was able to play a major role in developing policy and in organizing an army. In one instance, Eisenhower was tasked with creating the budget for the Philippine army. Eisenhower laid out the number of howitzers, vehicles, "mobilization equipment," the number of personnel, and operating costs. MacArthur had asked several questions and offered alterations that Eisenhower quickly made. Eisenhower must have done well enough in this task, because, shortly after, MacArthur asked Eisenhower to conduct a similar analysis through the year 1939.¹⁶⁶ Part of this analysis required Eisenhower to work with munition industries in the United States and to create a logistical network that supported the movement of equipment to and between the Philippine Islands. Much of what Eisenhower knew of interdependence between the military and industry came from his time spent at the Army Industrial College. His position forced him to work with politicians in the United States and the Philippines and with foreign military officers, and it required him to prepare complicated logistical plans for supplying the new Philippine Army. Being the assistant to General MacArthur in the Philippines was a test of Eisenhower's managerial skill. The Philippine experience helped shape his success during the

¹⁶⁵ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 254.

¹⁶⁶ Entry June 23, 1937, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Dec. 27, 1935 – July 20 1938, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

Louisiana maneuvers in organizing large amounts of personnel and equipment and put a spotlight upon his managerial skill.

From Eisenhower's time at West Point through his staff work with MacArthur in the Philippines, the experience developed Eisenhower's managerial skill and continued to solidify his career as a staff officer. It had been a long journey. The personality he expressed at West Point was counter to the traditional and disciplined nature of West Point. Eisenhower's early career included some unremarkable postings until he was coerced into a position that required him to use organizational and managerial skill. His work with the tank corps got him noticed and put Eisenhower on a path toward becoming a staff officer of superior managerial skill. The Command and General Staff School was a watershed moment when he came to understand the essential nature of management, and this marked his most significant divergence from heroic leadership philosophy. By the time that he left MacArthur's service in the Philippines, Eisenhower had demonstrated an exceptional aptitude for organization and management, and he had shown diplomatic skill with civilian administrators. When he arrived at the War Department, Eisenhower was an experienced and educated managerial leader prepared to make the most of operational planning for the war that Generals Conner and MacArthur knew was soon headed their way.

Chapter 3 - The Gamble for Managerial Leadership

The interwar years had provided Eisenhower with education and experience that shaped his vision of managerial leadership. Senior officers saw something of value in Eisenhower's perspective and skills and placed him in successive staff positions where Eisenhower significantly influenced the direction of the U.S. Army. As he had at Camp Colt during World War I, Eisenhower demonstrated his ability to manage and organize the training of recruits while chief of staff at Ft. Lewis, WA. These rapid successes, as well as his reputation from the Philippines and Washington, D.C., got him reassigned to support 3rd Army under General Krueger for the Louisiana Maneuvers. Marshall used these exercises to test the validity of new Army doctrine, as well as to prepare and test younger officers such as Eisenhower, who were progressive and open to new ideas. Chief of Staff Marshall became sure enough of Eisenhower's managerial acumen that he selected Eisenhower as the officer with the best chance of bringing victory in North Africa and then in Europe. Marshall was also putting managerial leadership to the test and thus sent Eisenhower to North Africa to gain desperately needed combat experience. The combat experience he gained in North Africa proved critical. Eisenhower learned the "finer" points of going against a genuine enemy, and he also learned the essential nature of his relationships with his subordinates and of their relationships amongst themselves. His realization of the importance of building the right team became the core around which Eisenhower built Operation Overlord. The powerful attitude that "we cannot afford to fail" ensured the success of the operations in North Africa, in the Mediterranean, and in Europe.

Louisiana Maneuvers

The planning and execution of the Louisiana Maneuvers of 1941 further refined Eisenhower as a managerial leader. The exercises proved critical in testing new organizational methods and doctrine that stemmed from military reforms shaped during the interwar period. The maneuvers also prepared the peacetime Army for war, which was pushed vehemently by Chief of Staff General Marshall.¹⁶⁷ The maneuvers also proved to Army headquarters that many generals were unfit to serve, and Marshall systematically removed them in favor of younger, more progressive and forward-thinking leaders. Eisenhower is just one of the younger leaders who excelled during the Louisiana maneuvers, and he was rewarded for his efforts with a promotion to brigadier general.

The Louisiana Maneuvers were the first extensive exercises held under the new Army organization and involved army-sized elements as well as new elements such as mixed mechanized-cavalry regiments.¹⁶⁸ The “battling” armies were comprised of the 3rd Army, under the command of Lieutenant General Walter Krueger, and the 2nd Army, under the command of Lieutenant General Ben Lear. The Selective Training and Service act of 1940 had authorized the drafting of thousands of soldiers who made up a large portion of the troops during the Louisiana Maneuvers.¹⁶⁹ The incorporation of draftee mobilization added to the realism of the exercises

¹⁶⁷ Christopher R. Gabel, *The U.S. Army GHQ Maneuvers of 1941* (Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army, 1992), 12.

¹⁶⁸ Gabel, *Maneuvers of 1941*, 118.

¹⁶⁹ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 277-9.

and forced officers, at all echelons of command, to contend with large numbers of inexperienced but rudimentary-trained soldiers.¹⁷⁰

Before his assignment as the Chief of Staff of 3rd Army under Krueger, Eisenhower was posted to Fort Lewis, WA, where he served as the Chief of Staff for the 3rd Infantry Division and the IX Corps. Following his time as Chief of Staff in the 3rd Infantry Division, Eisenhower was promoted to colonel in March 1941 under the National Defense Act, which created the Army of the United States. Due to the Draft Act, Fort Lewis quickly became one of the busiest army posts in the country and was a management nightmare.¹⁷¹ Eisenhower later recalled: “A quick study of the problem showed that someone in the War Department had not done his homework.” Eisenhower noticed that the staff’s training schedules were not realistic, the staff provided no logistical support for the increased equipment required, and the staff did not provide enough housing for the incoming troops. Eisenhower set forth a plan to create areas of “concentration” or marshaling areas to mobilize and train troops. He set up training and shipping schedules, no doubt aided by his experience in such matters from his work at Camp Colt during World War I.¹⁷² Major General Kenyon Joyce, commander of IX Corps, rated Colonel Eisenhower as “superior” in all categories except military bearing. He added that Eisenhower was “an outstanding officer – one of the ablest in the army” and that “this officer is thoroughly qualified for division command.”¹⁷³ His evaluation from IX Corps is one of many reports that

¹⁷⁰ For a detailed overview of exercises and operations, and comprehensive analysis, read Gebel’s *Maneuvers of 1941*.

¹⁷¹ “Draft Act” was the term used prior to World War II regarding the Selective Training and Service act of 1940.

¹⁷² Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 236.

¹⁷³ Efficiency Report Mar-Jun 1941, 21 June 1941, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1941-1945, PR, EL.

formed the trend to “superior” evaluations for Eisenhower since he learned advanced techniques on the science of management at Army service schools and practiced them during his time in the Philippines.

General Krueger had had his eyes on Eisenhower for some time, placing Eisenhower first among his requests for a chief of staff in the fall of 1940, although Eisenhower was unavailable for reassignment. Again, after taking command of 3rd Army, Krueger “urgently requested” Eisenhower to serve as chief of staff in June of 1941. He stated:

In my judgment, that position demands a younger man, one possessing broad vision, progressive ideas, a thorough grasp of the magnitude of the problem involved in handling an Army, and lots of initiative and resourcefulness. Lieutenant Colonel Dwight D. Eisenhower, Infantry, is such a man.¹⁷⁴

Krueger was explicitly describing a managerial leader and believed that Eisenhower fit the needed role of a managerial leader.

Eisenhower and Krueger were an excellent command team match. Krueger was a heroic leader, who believed that “weapons are no good unless there are guts at both sides of the bayonet.” He was often described as a “soldier’s soldier.”¹⁷⁵ Krueger needed a chief of staff who had the staff experience that he himself lacked and who had foresight and initiative. Eisenhower filled that gap and was a complement to Krueger’s heroic leadership style. Eisenhower’s role in the Louisiana Maneuvers helped to identify failures and inefficiencies with the new Army structure. He also conducted detailed inspections of field troops looking for innovations that could be used on a grander scale to help the armies. One such example was a

¹⁷⁴ Letter from Lieutenant General Kruger to General Marshall, 11 June 1941, Marshall Papers, George C. Marshall Library, Lexington, Virginia, USA. Also noted that Eisenhower had been promoted to Colonel the previous March of that year.

¹⁷⁵ Letter from R.W. MacGregor to Krueger, 31 August 1964, Box 40, Krueger Papers, USMA Archives quoted in D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 274.

cook who had begun cooking on stoves mounted on trucks which proved more efficient at feeding the troops. Eisenhower saw the positive impact on the troops and touted this cook as an example.¹⁷⁶ Eisenhower's giving credit to soldiers coming up with innovative ideas is an example of managerial leadership.

During the Louisiana Maneuvers, Eisenhower opened up to the press who enjoyed his "open, easygoing manner and his willingness to poke fun at himself and the army." Columnists Robert Allen and Drew Pearson praised Eisenhower and credited him with devising the operational strategy that defeated the opposition.¹⁷⁷ His strategy to outmaneuver and outsmart General Lear received praise from local press and from Army HQ. In reality, Eisenhower served as the Chief of Staff, a staff officer with no command authority; therefore, it is important not to trivialize the role of the commander, General Krueger. It is the commander's responsibility, and Krueger's staff was there to make his job more manageable. For recognition of his contribution in the Louisiana Maneuvers, Eisenhower received a promotion to brigadier general. It is also interesting to note that two other up-and-coming officers received critical acclaim coming out of the Louisiana Maneuvers. Brigadier General Mark Clark, who wrote the scenario for the maneuvers, and Major General Patton, who led an aggressive flanking maneuver that fully demonstrated the potential of the armored division, received promotions.¹⁷⁸

The Louisiana Maneuvers served three essential purposes. General Marshal stated: "I want the mistakes made down in Louisiana, not over in Europe."¹⁷⁹ Marshall hoped that lessons

¹⁷⁶ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 278.

¹⁷⁷ Drew Pearson and Robert Allen, *Washington Merry-Go-Round*, 194, quoted in, D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 278.

¹⁷⁸ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 279-80.

¹⁷⁹ Gabel, *Maneuvers of 1941*, 64.

would be learned in these maneuvers rather than in combat at the cost of soldiers' lives. Marshall also hoped to demonstrate to Congress the "deplorable state" of the Army and its unpreparedness for war. The third purpose, one that Eisenhower pointed out, was to "eliminate unfit officers."¹⁸⁰ The Army forcibly retired hundreds of senior officers; in all, over thirty of forty-two commanders at division- and corps levels were relieved of command.

The purging of unfit senior officers was one of several outcomes drawn from the Louisiana Maneuvers. Another outcome was that armor operations proved critical; therefore, an independent anti-tank unit was justified. Senior leaders also learned that massing and concentrating men and equipment would play a crucial role in a war of this scale. For Marshall and Eisenhower, it firmly cemented Eisenhower's position as a managerial leader in the coming war. As noted earlier, Eisenhower was not the only senior leader to see the rising importance of staff officers and managerial leaders. General Krueger gave him a glowing assessment in his efficiency report, and General Marshall brought him to Washington, D.C. to work in the War Department where he was promoted to major general in March 1942 after becoming Chief of the WPD. Krueger rated Eisenhower as "superior," held that he was capable of commanding a division, and rated him second among 170 officers.¹⁸¹ For a staff officer to be ranked higher than several corps, divisional, and regimental commanders was not insignificant, and it hinted at the importance placed on Eisenhower as a managerial leader.

Eliminating senior commanders who were not just old but also unfit was a significant step in the Army's shift from a traditional organization toward being an institution that recognized top-notch management as a key part of true leadership. It is not the action of purging

¹⁸⁰ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 243.

¹⁸¹ Efficiency Report Jul-Dec 1941, 21 January 1942, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1941-1945, PR, EL.

older generals that exemplifies managerial leadership, but rather the consequence of these purges. The replacement of hundreds of senior Army officers gave room for younger and more openminded officers. The significance was the knowledge and understanding that the Army needed younger and more open-minded officers to lead the Army during the next war. In line with Thomas Kuhn's argument of a progressive transition between old ideas and new ideas, not every "old" general was swept away. Some Spanish-American War veterans, such as MacArthur and Krueger, remained in important commands and still held influence. However, unlike some other more senior officers, MacArthur and Krueger understood enough about managerial leadership to incorporate management skills into their respective command staffs. It also does not negate the existence of generals who were comparatively young and brash and sought glory, such as Patton. The importance here lies in the fact that senior military leaders recognized the plethora of incompetent generals and purposefully pushed them aside in favor of younger and more progressive leaders. General Marshall was able to use the Louisiana Maneuvers to justify the removal of unfit generals and to measure and groom commanders who would lead men into the upcoming war.¹⁸² Leaders like Eisenhower understood the details, planning, and management required to run modern mechanized armies.

North Africa

Eisenhower's work in the War Plans Division (WPD) to prepare for operations in North Africa and then their execution of those plans in combat generated the necessary integration of staff managerial skill that Eisenhower had improved since Camp Colt with combat experience

¹⁸² Gabel, *Maneuvers of 1941*, 187.

that he so desperately desired and needed. For the first time, as part of the WPD, Eisenhower's talent in operational planning was put toward near-future combat operations. The measures that Marshall drew upon in reforming the Army and ones he tested in the Louisiana Maneuvers were consistent with what somewhat younger officers of a progressive ideology such as Patton, Clark, Eisenhower, and Bradley all considered worthwhile. North Africa provided the opportunity to train the combat-inexperienced leaders further before they met the full power of the German military in Europe. For the Army to accept completely the merits of managerial leadership, the deserts of North Africa had to be crossed first.

Ever since the Louisiana Maneuvers, General Marshall had been grooming open-minded, progressive generals, such as Eisenhower and Bradley, for generalship in combat operations in Europe. That Marshall picked Eisenhower to be the Chief of the WPD demonstrates the faith and confidence that Marshall had in Eisenhower and in his abilities as a managerial leader. Marshall stated that "General Eisenhower had a refreshing approach to problems. He was most helpful."¹⁸³ It also points to the idea that Marshall already had Eisenhower in mind to become the Allied Commander in Europe. Eisenhower mirrored Marshall in several ways. They both could get very heated, and they both detested stupidity and incompetence. Eisenhower viewed Marshall as a quick and decisive leader, and he watched Marshall closely when Marshall engaged with civilian leadership; this was a task Eisenhower needed to master.¹⁸⁴

Eisenhower was an excellent choice to command U.S. forces in Europe and allied command in North Africa. Eisenhower came to this new position with a promotion in rank to lieutenant general in July 1942. From Marshall's perspective, as noted earlier, Eisenhower came

¹⁸³ Harry C. Butcher, *My Three Years with Eisenhower, 1942-1945* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1946), 248.

¹⁸⁴ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 286-7.

into the position with a fresh outlook and an inquisitive mind. Partly because of an outburst from Marshall in a meeting with Churchill, the British found Eisenhower more “affable” and congenial to work with.¹⁸⁵ Eisenhower also came to the table with crucial experience from his time in the Philippines. In the Philippines, Eisenhower had worked in a governmental relationship between the United States and the Philippines, where he worked through civilian, military, and industrial contracts. As part of developing international relationships, he worked closely with heads of state, policymakers, and military leaders to coordinate their efforts for national defense. This work was not unlike what he needed to do as the allied commander in North Africa. Eisenhower was well placed to utilize his experience, integrating policy and strategy from two national governments to build a unified effort that satisfied each stakeholder.

As leader of the WPD, Eisenhower now had to work closely with civilian policymakers, with the U.S. Navy, and with allies. In his diary, Eisenhower noted his frustration working with the Navy and concluded sarcastically, “what a gang to work with.”¹⁸⁶ Later he was more specific in his frustration. He complained that “we spend our time figuring out how to keep from getting in each other’s way rather than in how to fight the war.”¹⁸⁷ Eisenhower believed that, in its strategy for the Pacific Theater, the Navy called for an approach that would be too slow and too logistically intensive. He did however convince the navy of the importance of cargo ships and continued to micromanage the build-up of landing craft.¹⁸⁸ As Eisenhower took over the WPD,

¹⁸⁵ Robert H. Ferrell, ed., *The Eisenhower Diaries* (NY: Norton and Company, 1981), 109.

¹⁸⁶ Entry February 10, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁸⁷ Entry March 8, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁸⁸ Entry February 19, 1942; May 6, 1942 Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

his diary recorded the importance he placed on logistics as key to stemming the tide of the Japanese advance, meanwhile focusing on preparing to hit Germany through Britain.

In preparation for the eventual invasion of Europe, Eisenhower believed three fundamental steps were required: keep the line of supply open to Britain, keep the Soviet Union in the war, and hold the Middle East.¹⁸⁹ Eisenhower focused his efforts on seeking to alleviate the pressure on the British in the Middle East, and North Africa seemed to fit the bill. But getting the allies to agree on a plan was another problem altogether. By taking Tobruk, German Field Marshal Erwin Rommel seemingly forced the Americans' hand to support the British in North Africa by sending troops to relieve the pressure the British were facing. Eisenhower had all but resigned himself to the desk job at WPD and recommended General Patton to take command in North Africa since he was already training an armored division to face combat in North Africa.¹⁹⁰

Up until the Louisiana Maneuvers and his posting to the War Department, Eisenhower had sought command positions, tried to lead men into battle, and wanted to earn glory, as was the traditional path of an officer. The traditional path of an officer was ingrained in Eisenhower who grew up in an army that emphasized heroic leadership, and it meant field command.¹⁹¹ A rare heated exchange between Marshall and Eisenhower illustrated the tension between heroic leadership and managerial leadership. Eisenhower later recalled that General Marshall told him: "I want you to know that in this war the commanders are going to get promoted and not the staff officers. Eisenhower...you are not going to get any promotion. You are going to stay right here

¹⁸⁹ Entry March 10, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁹⁰ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 300.

¹⁹¹ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 302.

on this job and you'll probably never move.”¹⁹² Eisenhower was greatly frustrated because he wanted desperately to take command in war, yet he knew that he was best suited to a managerial role. In this instance, Marshall was giving voice to the Army's preference still toward heroic leadership but fully aware that the immense scale of personnel, equipment, and logistics needed to execute invasions required a managerial leader.

Thankfully for Eisenhower, Marshall's statement did not hold, and he was made commander of the U.S. forces in Europe in June 1942.¹⁹³ Eisenhower had recommended General Joseph T. McNarney as the American commander, with General Mark Clark as the II Corps commander.¹⁹⁴ Eisenhower's recommendation of Clark demonstrates his preference for a managerial leader, a preference he later changed in tapping the heroic leader Patton. On June 11, 1942, Marshall asked Eisenhower if the plans for Europe were complete, which Eisenhower responded, “yessir.” Marshall continued: “That's lucky, because you're the man who is going to carry them out.”¹⁹⁵ In his diary, Eisenhower showed no emotion and simply wrote, “The Chief of Staff says I'm the guy.”¹⁹⁶

It seemed that Marshall's emphasis on having fresher commanders supported the decision to make Eisenhower the commander of U.S. troops in Europe, but Eisenhower was untested and

¹⁹² “Marshall and Churchill,” 24 August 1967, Box 8, Post-Presidential, Augusta-Walter Reed Series, EL.

¹⁹³ Eisenhower was made commander of European Theater of Operations, United States Army (ETOUSA) in June 1942. He became the Allied Commander in the Mediterranean Theater November 8, 1942. In preparation for Overlord, he became the Supreme Allied Commander of Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF) in December 1943.

¹⁹⁴ Entry June 4, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

¹⁹⁵ Alden Hatch, *General Ike* (Chicago: Consolidated Book Publishers, 1944), 113, quoted in, D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 307.

¹⁹⁶ Entry June 11, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

without combat experience. As part of easing the burden felt by British forces in the Middle East and Africa, the allies sent Eisenhower to North Africa. In North Africa, as the new Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Expeditionary Force in the Mediterranean, Eisenhower intimately understood the logistical complexities, writing to General Marshall that “the difficulties, as presented by the air, the ground, and the supply organizations, are tremendous.”¹⁹⁷

Communications problems always presented a challenge, but they were amplified during invasions or at the beginning of campaigns.¹⁹⁸ Among the problems experienced in the Tunisian Campaign, Eisenhower cited several instances where radio communications prevented timely reports, such as, on one occasion, stating that “owing to bad radio conditions reports today have been meagre.”¹⁹⁹ Early in this campaign, it became critical for Eisenhower to establish formal diplomatic agreements, as well as some gentlemen’s agreements, to smooth over antagonisms that existed between the American and British militaries.²⁰⁰

His diplomatic skills were also put to the test while conducting negotiations with Admiral François Darlan, the de facto leader of Vichy France in North Africa. Eisenhower attempted to woo Darlan to the Allied cause to sign an armistice and not to engage allied troops during Operation Torch. Darlan was the Chief of the French Navy and served as a key leader in pro-German Vichy France. In an attempt to limit the fighting between French forces in North Africa

¹⁹⁷ Eisenhower to CCS, 12 Dec. 1942, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS August 1942 – December 1942 (1), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

¹⁹⁸ Eisenhower to CCS, 9 and 10 November 1942, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS August 1942 – December 1942 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

¹⁹⁹ Eisenhower to AGWAR, 09 November 1942, Box 130, Folder Cables CCS August 1942 – December 1942 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁰⁰ Eisenhower to AGWAR and ABFOR London, 8 November 1942, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS August 1942 – December 1942 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

and the allies during Operation Torch, Eisenhower sought the cooperation of the Vichy Regime in North Africa. After it became apparent that General Henri Giraud's authority would not be recognized by Vichy forces in North Africa, Eisenhower struck a deal with Darlan. Eisenhower acknowledged Darlan as the military commander-in-chief and civilian head of state for French North and West Africa. This enabled Eisenhower, through Darlan, to command French forces to join with the allied forces against German forces.²⁰¹

Again, Eisenhower's noteworthy managerial skill played to his advantage as he used his skills of persuasion and compromise to come to an agreement. His ability to work with civilians, as he did in North Africa, was something previous commanders had commented on in nearly every efficiency report following CGSC.²⁰² His time at Army service schools, notably the Army Industrial College, had improved his ability to work with policymakers, such as Darlan, who was now de facto head-of-state in North Africa. This skill was further polished during his time with MacArthur in the Philippines. Eisenhower was forced to defend his actions on all fronts – before senior military leaders, the press, and civilians. Eisenhower's justification for the agreement with Darlan was that “we are engaged in a military operation whose purpose is to secure North Africa.” Eisenhower's reasoning was based on military necessity, and he did not worry much about the media fallout or political implications. He further criticized the pundits, saying to the press and the War Department that “we did not find the ideal Frenchmen which our critics see from the heights of their ivory towers.”²⁰³ The fact that he was not relieved of command

²⁰¹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe* (New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1949), 109-11.

²⁰² Efficiency Report Dec 1930-Jun 1931, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

²⁰³ Eisenhower to AGWAR, 23 January 1943, Box 130, Folder Cables CCS January – September 1943 (3), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

indicates that either the transgression was not that grave or that his diplomatic acumen was up to the task to defend his decision. Both Roosevelt and Churchill backed up Eisenhower, understanding the military necessity of gaining an ally in North Africa, and they attempted to downplay the controversy.²⁰⁴

Before significant operations and during the build-up before them, Eisenhower leveraged his managerial skill. With an expert understanding of logistics and military operations, he ensured proper personnel and material support, enlisted civilian auxiliary support where needed, and secured command authority under his office. From his earliest days in the WPD, Eisenhower pushed for expanded production of landing craft, because he was certain that any invasion would require extensive use of landing support.²⁰⁵ Whether attempting a deal with Henri Giraud, or with Darlan, Eisenhower understood the importance of establishing civilian control to maintain access to infrastructure to establish supply points for the North African campaign. Maintaining command authority under his position as the allied commander was a continuing preoccupation for Eisenhower. Eisenhower attempted to assess his subordinates to place them in the most suitable roles to support operations in the upcoming campaign. As a managerial leader, Eisenhower chose to select staff and subordinates whose strengths and expertise balanced his own skill, such as selecting Naval Captain Harry C. Butcher as a naval aide. Butcher was preferred not for his strategic acumen but for his journalistic skill. In order to assemble the most respectable plan, Eisenhower put together a team that worked well under his leadership and guidance.

²⁰⁴ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 358-9.

²⁰⁵ Entry February 19, 1942; May 6, 1942 Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

North Africa proved to be the combat training ground for General Eisenhower. Operations during the Tunisian campaign came to a screeching halt as winter weather and the strain on the logistics system compelled Eisenhower to consolidate and wait for favorable conditions. By early 1943, Allied Force Headquarters had started to operate more efficiently. Creation of standardized forms to handle the tremendous number of outgoing and incoming messages and cables streamlined staff processes. For the most part, the standardized forms replaced disorderly memoranda and handwritten notes.²⁰⁶ As part of his day-to-day communications, Eisenhower interacted with a constantly changing mix of dynamic military personnel with varying leadership styles and personalities. Part of being a managerial leader is the ability to adapt to different personalities to streamline communication or to influence the interaction to create a favorable outcome.

How Captain Harry C. Butcher came to be Eisenhower's naval aide is an excellent example of the way that Eisenhower employed his understanding of heroic leadership philosophy to control the system to get the aide that he wanted. Before the war, Butcher had been a correspondent with CBS, and he was commissioned into the Naval Reserves after Germany invaded Poland in 1939. Butcher met him while then Major Eisenhower was working in Washington, D.C. for the Secretary of War and Chief of Staff MacArthur in the early 1930s.²⁰⁷ The request for Butcher had to go through Admiral Ernest King, Chief of Naval Operations (equivalent to Chief of Staff Marshall), with whom Eisenhower did not get along well. Eisenhower once wrote of King: "One thing that might help win this war is to get someone to

²⁰⁶ Conglomerate of cable files in North Africa after December 1942, Box 130, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁰⁷ Butcher, *Years with Eisenhower*, xii.

shoot King.”²⁰⁸ This is an apt example of the existence of interservice rivalry, or at the very least of personality conflict, and the persistence of the infamous Eisenhower temper.

To get Butcher on orders as his naval aide, Eisenhower had to adapt to King’s traditional naval mentality and manipulate the transaction in his own favor. This request was highly unorthodox – no Army general had ever requested a naval aide before. The unorthodoxy most likely lent a hand in accepting the request. Eisenhower did not need to give all of his reasoning before King agreed, who accepted the proposal, possibly because King hoped it might expand the Navy’s influence within Eisenhower’s staff. Eisenhower’s actual reason for requesting Butcher was more personal. He argued: “I’ve got to have someone I can relax with, someone I can trust absolutely.”²⁰⁹ On the surface, Eisenhower was building his team as part of his usual managerial style of leadership, whether that team player is practical or symbolic, as in this case. The deeper meaning illustrates the way Eisenhower could pull strings or favors, in the sense of the fraternal order, to get what he wanted.

A fraternity is categorized under a traditional or heroic leadership philosophy. Throughout his career, Eisenhower took care of his friends and classmates. His repeated use of a trait defined within a heroic leadership style shows the way in which he used different paradigms of leadership philosophy. He appealed to a managerial philosophy when he recommended Patton for promotion by emphasizing his organizational skill, not his aggressive and mobile military tactics. He stated that Patton “operated in a semi-independent status during the

²⁰⁸ Entry March 10, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

²⁰⁹ Kenneth S. Davis, *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Soldier of Democracy* (NY: Konecky & Konecky, 1945), 302-3, quoted in, D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 310.

preparatory period and showed organizational ability in the preparation of his task force.”²¹⁰ As another example, Eisenhower pulled strings to ensure the early promotion of his civil affairs officer, Colonel Julius Holmes. He described Holmes’s great ability in working with civilians and cited his previous diligent staff work, adding that a promotion “would enhance his local prestige” with civilian leaders²¹¹ In his recommendation, Eisenhower portrayed Holmes as both a managerial and heroic style leader, ensuring that Holmes would appeal to different types of leaders. Eisenhower also used his position and the fraternal organization routinely to help the war effort or his friends. In a letter to Vice Admiral Russell Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard Academy, Eisenhower urged him to accept Stanley Smith’s resignation from the Coast Guard so he could join the Army. Eisenhower commented that “his classmates consider him one of the outstanding men of the class.”²¹² This letter is another example of the way in which Eisenhower successfully used the traditional Army system to pull favors in his direction. It is important to understand the difference between a “recommendation” and telling or “urging” someone to help in a situation. Eisenhower was now part of the Army’s fraternity and had enough rank where when he “asked” for something, it was less of a recommendation and more of pulling favors. Understanding the paradigm shift from the heroic and to the managerial leadership style enabled Eisenhower to actively portray himself and other officers as favoring traditional or managerial as needed.

²¹⁰ DDE to GCM Recommendations for Promotion, 19 November 1942, Box 131, Folder Cables Off. GCM/DDE Nov. 12, 1942 – Mar. 27, 1943, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²¹¹ DDE to GCM Recommendations for Promotion, 14 December 1942, Box 131, Folder Cables Off. GCM/DDE Nov. 12, 1942 – Mar. 27, 1943 (3), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²¹² Letter from Eisenhower to Vice Admiral Waesche, 8 May 1942, Box 1, Folder General Historical February – May 1942, PR, EL.

If the Tunisian campaign was Eisenhower's combat training ground, then the Battle at Kasserine Pass in February 1943 was his most trying ordeal. Just days before the events, Eisenhower had been promoted to 4-star general on February 11, 1943. In a report to Washington and London, just before the battle at Kasserine Pass, Eisenhower and his staff were completely unaware of the movements of Field Marshal Erwin Rommel's Afrika Korps. This suggests one of Eisenhower's noted failures – failing to secure accurate intelligence. Eisenhower and his staff had anticipated “limited attacks” by the Germans to protect their lines of communication.²¹³ U.S. reserves were moving up and battered units withdrawing. Eisenhower gambled that he could swiftly move to take Tunis, which would have kept Rommel backpedaling.

His venture proved unsuccessful because the inexperienced commanders failed to recognize the weaknesses in the American position. Eisenhower attributed the Allied failure to four primary causes: “long-shot gamble to capture Tunis quickly,” poor intelligence, failure to understand enemy capabilities, and “greenness, particularly among commanders.”²¹⁴ Eisenhower and his staff were no longer planning in a vacuum, and their decisions yielded very real results. The price of Eisenhower's lack of combat experience, paid in the lives of his soldiers, came to “192 killed, 2624 wounded, 2459 prisoners and missing.”²¹⁵ Learning the importance of careful management of the positions of armies, corps, and divisions, and ensuring continuous reinforcements of men and materials to these units were some of the critical lessons

²¹³ Report from Eisenhower to AGWAR, 3 February 1943, Box 130, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²¹⁴ Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe*, 144-48.

²¹⁵ Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe*, 144-48.

learned by Eisenhower. At the same time, Eisenhower was confident that his men were learning, too.²¹⁶

Eisenhower also had failed in other respects. He failed to relieve General Fredendall, before or during the German attack. During an inspection of the II Corps area, that Fredendall failed to attend, Eisenhower recognized the complacency in soldiers under Fredendall's command but failed to act.²¹⁷ Nor did he replace Fredendall when it became apparent that the Germans had overextended themselves and that Fredendall nonetheless remained in a defensive posture. The Army as a whole learned much from Kasserine Pass, but Eisenhower had learned as well.²¹⁸ Eisenhower relieved Fredendall of command of II Corps on March 5, 1943 and replaced him with Patton, who had been leading the western task force.²¹⁹ In a letter dated the next day, Eisenhower told Patton that he intended to be "cold-blooded" in replacing any commander not up to the task.²²⁰

In his diary, Eisenhower noted some of the lessons learned and the changes implemented immediately following the battle at Kasserine Pass, such as the reorganization of the air units, which Eisenhower believed had failed to provide adequate support for the ground forces.²²¹ The need to ensure that ground forces had sufficient air support was a lesson that proved immensely

²¹⁶ Eisenhower to AGWAR, 15 February 1943, Box 130, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²¹⁷ Eisenhower, *At Ease*, 262.

²¹⁸ Ambrose, *Eisenhower*, 92-5.

²¹⁹ Report to AGWAR, 5 March 1943, Box 131, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²²⁰ D'Este, *Eisenhower*, 398.

²²¹ Ferrell, *Eisenhower Diaries*, 87-91.

valuable to Eisenhower, who tightened control of the Army Air Corps. He believed the Army Air Corps had failed to respond adequately to ground forces during the battle.²²² This point proved important enough for Eisenhower to threaten resignation over it before Operation Overlord. He demanded direct control of the Eighth Air Force for bombing French civilian railways and road networks. This controversial air campaign resulted in the deaths of over 60,000 French civilians.²²³ Eisenhower's experience in North Africa provided him with feedback that improved his leadership skills, such as his diplomatic negotiations and how he might better organize Operation Overlord.

Within managerial leadership, one of its most notable traits is the ability to put together teams, ensure collaboration, and hold them together. When he told Patton of his own need to be “cold-blooded,” Eisenhower showed that he realized that he had failed at the critical task of managing the very best team. He now saw that he needed to continually assess his team. On June 11, 1943, Eisenhower wrote in his diary his current assessments of the key officers under his command. He offered glowing remarks about General Mark Clark, who “is the best organizer, planner, and trainer of troops I have yet met in the American army.” But he later admonished Clark for his decision not to accept command of II Corps from Fredendall and believed that it was a “bad mistake on Clark's part.” Of General Omar Bradley, Eisenhower wrote, “this officer is about the best rounded, well balanced senior officer that we have in the service.” In what he said about Bradley and Clark, Eisenhower was applauding traits that he saw in himself; he praised them as fellow managerial leaders. His description of Patton depicted a

²²² Eisenhower further makes this point in *Crusade in Europe* where he believed that the use of every last bit of force may be necessary to dislodge the enemy, and he needed his Tactical Air Commander, General Elwood “Pete” Quesada, to have control over all air assets, in Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe*, 221-22.

²²³ Stephen A. Bourque, *Beyond the Beach: The Allied War Against France* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2018).

straight and narrow heroic leader. Eisenhower said that Patton “is a shrewd soldier who believes in showmanship to such an extent that he is almost flamboyant. He talks too much and too quickly and sometimes creates a very bad impression.”²²⁴ These descriptions are quite revealing of Eisenhower himself, who favored managerial leadership but relieved a commander whom he thought would serve well training troops at army command level and replaced him with a heroic leader. This decision demonstrates that Eisenhower believed that managerial leadership had failed in the battle at Kasserine Pass. The units and troops in II Corps needed a strong “flamboyant” heroic leader to whip them into shape. This was in contrast to his earliest assessment that a managerial leader, such as Clark, was the right man for the job. Further attesting to the concept of balancing heroic and managerial leadership, Eisenhower quickly placed Bradley, a “well-balanced” officer, in charge of the II Corps following Patton’s tenure as commander. North Africa taught Eisenhower how to better assess the leadership styles and abilities of his subordinate commanders and staff and saw that he would need to be “cold-blooded” if necessary. Eisenhower kept this lesson in mind as his team began to plan for Operation Overlord, which made him more insistent on getting his way in determining commanders and command structure for the invasion of Europe.

The Team for Operation Overlord

In preparation for Operation Overlord, Eisenhower assessed and built his team, developed relationships among the allies, and dealt with friction that existed among his subordinate commanders. The planning for Overlord was the culmination of years of sharpening

²²⁴ Ferrell, *Eisenhower Diaries*, 91.

Eisenhower's managerial skill during the interwar years under the service of great generals, in the Philippines with MacArthur, and in the combat experience in North Africa. For years, Eisenhower was relegated to serving as a staff officer and worked at the pleasure of his commander. His role was reversed when he took command of allied forces in North Africa, and the Battle of Kasserine Pass demonstrated that there was still a period of adjustment – Eisenhower's transformation was not immediate. Eisenhower had failed to accurately assess his command team and staff officers, and he had not properly delegated authority. These lessons were learned at the expense of soldiers' lives, and his written assessments of his most important subordinates from June 11, 1943 illustrate his resolve to do it right for the invasion of France.²²⁵ Operation Overlord was primed to be the most important test thus far for Eisenhower, and the Army, on the validity of managerial leadership.

The lesson of building an efficient and capable team was emphasized during the numerous reviews of the plans for Operation Overlord and the planning of this next campaign. The fact that Eisenhower requested direct control of long-range bombers came from his perception of that bombers had failed to support U.S. troops during the Battle at Kasserine Pass. In part, the desire to exert control over air support, through the IX Fighter Command, was why Eisenhower chose to keep Pete Quesada. Quesada's ideas about providing tactical support were close enough to Eisenhower's notions of ground support that Eisenhower could keep Quesada in place and thus benefit from apparent continuity.²²⁶ Eisenhower hoped this move might solidify

²²⁵ Ferrell, *Eisenhower Diaries*, 91.

²²⁶ Thomas Alexander Hughes, *Overlord: General Pete Quesada and the Triumph of Tactical Air Power in World War II* (NY: The Free Press, 1995), 107-10.

aerial ground-support for the invasion. In a report to the Adjutant General of the War Department (AGWAR) regarding Operation Overlord, Eisenhower stated that his team was:

Convinced that in all discussions full weight must be given to the fact that this operation marks the crisis of the European war. Every obstacle must be overcome, every inconvenience suffered, and every risk run to ensure that our blow is decisive. We cannot afford to fail.²²⁷

Further, in his review of the plans in January 1944, Eisenhower and his team settled on the narrow corridor for the invasion. They asked that more reserve divisions be prepared to ensure that a continuous supply of men and material came ashore. Eisenhower, his staff, and his subordinate commanders were fully aware that, if the men and supplies stopped coming ashore, the amphibious assault would likely fail. The fact that he called for more landing craft, escort vessels, and additional bombers reflects lessons he had learned from the amphibious landings in Sicily.²²⁸ Before going to North Africa, Eisenhower had been correctly obsessed with the production and procurement of landing craft. As early as February 1942 and again in May 1942, Eisenhower demanded an answer from the Navy on who would be responsible for procurement of the landing craft, what types of craft were needed, when would the craft be ready, the suitability of the types of craft, and the number of boats required to move entire units. His years as a staff officer had honed his attention to detail, and he understood that the details would make or break the cross-Channel invasion.²²⁹

²²⁷ Review of Operation Overlord from SHAEF to AGWAR, 23 Jan 1944, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS October 1943 – July 1945 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²²⁸ Review of Operation Overlord from SHAEF to AGWAR, 23 Jan 1944, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS October 1943 – July 1945 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²²⁹ Entry May 6, 1942, Box 1, Folder DDE Diary Jan. 1 – July 6 1942, Eisenhower Diaries, EL.

His allusion to “commanders-in-chief,” or his team, and the fact that they all reviewed the operational plans together exemplify his coaching and buy-in mentality. His repeated use of the term “we” instead of “I” demonstrates his mindset of a “team” mentality and buy-in when planning for Operation Overlord.²³⁰ Instead of calling on heroic dominance and telling his subordinates to “do this because I am the commander,” Eisenhower used compromise or persuasion to be sure to tap the best and strongest efforts. His time in North Africa and Sicily had given him and his commanders the experience they needed to make the most of the planning for Operation Overlord. Eisenhower built his team with support from General Marshall and ensured that this same team would stick together for the best results. Eisenhower understood that keeping a majority of the same staff and leaders would enable quicker and better efficiency, and so he asked that his leading subordinates remain under his command for the invasion of France.

Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, General Omar Bradley, and General George Patton joined Eisenhower to execute Operation Overlord. It was not that Eisenhower was simply looking for the best commanders; he was looking for the best commander in each specific role. For example, in preparation for the allied armies’ linking up following the invasion, 3rd Army commanded by Patton fell under XII Army Group commanded by Bradley.²³¹ Both Bradley and Patton were excellent generals, but Eisenhower recognized each general’s particular style of leadership and where best to use it. Even though Patton had seniority over Bradley in years of service, and over Eisenhower as well for that matter, he was placed in a field army command. Eisenhower knew that Patton was a “fighting general” and that he would likely succeed at

²³⁰ Review of Operation Overlord from SHAEF to AGWAR, 23 Jan 1944, Box 130, Folder Cables – CCS October 1943 – July 1945 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²³¹ Weigley, *Eisenhower’s Lieutenants*, 170-2.

maintaining an attack upon the German army. Bradley, as a “well balanced” leader, would know how to effectively support an aggressive general, while coordinating and managing four armies, twelve corps, and over forty divisions in a coordinated effort. The heroic and managerial philosophies, then, were not necessarily opposed. They could be effective in a complementary relationship.

Keeping this team of excellent military commanders together depended on Eisenhower’s pushing when necessary and also on compromising when needed. He had largely failed at this task in North Africa, and this shortcoming had contributed to the disaster at Kasserine Pass and the replacement of Fredendall by Patton. As Carlo D’Este has noted, Eisenhower had “failed to galvanize his commanders” in the quick pursuit of German forces during Rommel’s organized withdrawal.²³² Therefore, extra attention and effort were placed on the interservice and allied relationships.

While Eisenhower was planning and organizing what he had called the “great and noble undertaking,” Eisenhower was forced to deal with demands on his time to exercise negotiation skills to settle concerns. As a managerial leader with significant experience as a staff officer, he was well suited to the task of working with civilians. His previous experience in the Philippines and in working with policymakers in Washington, D.C. provided ample opportunity to refine his diplomatic skills. On numerous occasions, his efficiency reports described him as well suited for “contact with civilians.”²³³ On one occasion, Winston Churchill had sought passage aboard a command ship to “view” the invasion. Eisenhower had to insist, as he said soon after the war,

²³² D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 394.

²³³ Dec. 22, 1930 to June 30, 1931 Efficiency Report, 14 July 1931, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1931-1935, PR, EL.

that “the chance of his becoming an accidental casualty was too important from the standpoint of the whole war effort, and I refused his request.”²³⁴

The reality of this situation aptly demonstrates Eisenhower’s successful use of manipulation to meet his objectives best. Eisenhower could not “refuse” or order the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to do anything, even if he was right. Through an unknown person, King George VI of England had learned of the Prime Minister’s plans and decided that he would come along as well. The King argued that, if it was the duty of the Prime Minister to witness the invasion, then the King was also obligated to be at the head of British troops. The gravity of the situation was apparent to Churchill; he deferred to the King’s wishes.²³⁵ Eisenhower had made the issue loud enough to reach the ears of the King, who shared Eisenhower’s logic against Churchill going aboard ships during the invasion. Eisenhower understood the importance of treading carefully among allies so as not to create an incident or redirect attention where it did not need to be. Eisenhower had learned the lesson of considering political ramifications from his negotiations with Darlan, in Vichy-controlled North Africa, where he was forced to struggle with both media and politicians.

Friction existed between British and American commands, especially regarding Montgomery and Bradley. While in North Africa, Eisenhower had described Montgomery as “a very able, dynamic type of army commander.” But he also cautioned that “he needs a strong immediate commander. He is intelligent, a good talker, and has a flare [sic] for showmanship.”²³⁶ The need for a strong immediate commander was a fair assessment of

²³⁴ Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe*, 251.

²³⁵ D’Este, *Eisenhower*, 524.

²³⁶ Ferrell, *Eisenhower Diaries*, 91.

Montgomery as he had once told Patton to ignore orders that he did not like.²³⁷ His evaluation of Montgomery was not unlike his assessment of Patton regarding rhetoric and showmanship. Eisenhower's Deputy Commander, Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Tedder, raised concerns about Montgomery's unwillingness to execute orders as directed. During the invasion of France, Tedder had a "fear that General Montgomery may, while agreeing in general terms with you, fail to act on its implications." Tedder further supported his claim that Montgomery was not following orders as directed by describing that he "can see no grounds for satisfaction with the operations in the Eastern Sector." Montgomery's apparent disinterest in seizing the airfields around Caen, a primary objective early in the Normandy landing, justified Tedder's concern.²³⁸

Tedder's concerns about Montgomery corresponded with the friction that existed between Bradley and Montgomery. Regarding the relationship between American and British commanders, Bradley stated: "Had [Field Marshal Harold] Alexander commanded the 21st Army Group in Europe, we could probably have avoided the petulance that later was to becloud our relationships with Montgomery."²³⁹ He further wrote that "quite often during the war I disputed Monty's views, challenged his decisions, and questioned the wisdom of his moves. Like the rest of us, Monty is mortal; and being mortal, he has made mistakes."²⁴⁰ Bradley further insisted that "this attitude never impaired the personal and working relationship that existed between us."²⁴¹ Given the knowledge of the strained relationship between Bradley and

²³⁷ Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 138.

²³⁸ General Tedder to General Eisenhower, 23 July 1944, Box 115, Folder Tedder, Arthur (3) Dec. 1942 – March 1946, Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²³⁹ Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 207.

²⁴⁰ Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 300.

²⁴¹ Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 299.

Montgomery, the latter statement is likely untrue. The antagonism between the pair showed itself during the Battle of the Bulge when Bradley was cut off from some of his units, who then fell under Montgomery's command. Bradley was upset at the idea that his forces would fall under another commander, let alone fall under the command of Montgomery.

Part of the friction between Bradley and Montgomery can undoubtedly be attributed to the differing styles of warfare between the American and British armies. Using Bradley's description of British techniques, he eloquently described the differences in command styles. Regarding military orders, American troops carried out orders instantly, whereas British orders were "a basis for discussion between commanders." Differences in opinion would be fleshed out and revised in an amended order.²⁴² For Bradley, one of the most significant differences between American and British approaches toward the conduct of war was the view of exploitation and "agility of command." According to Bradley, where U.S. forces "preferred to push ahead...in an effort to prevent a fluid front from hardening into a set battle," the British held an "apparent reluctance to squeeze the utmost advantage out of every gain or success." Bradley added: "Monty insisted upon a 'tidy' front."²⁴³ The conflict that existed between U.S. and British commanders went beyond personality conflicts, like the one between Eisenhower and King, but included characteristic differences of opinion about warfare. Eisenhower had to spend much time alleviating friction within his command and easing diplomatic pressures that interfered with his war effort. Among these efforts were certain trips to Montgomery's headquarters to "secure Montgomery's agreement" or "to make sure that the attacks...are

²⁴² Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 138.

²⁴³ Bradley, *A Soldier's Story*, 208.

continued as planned.”²⁴⁴ His managerial efforts helped reduce tension among his commanders, and his command of persuasion ensured they would support the overall operation.

Creating working relationships with his subordinates while assessing their individual strengths and weaknesses was critical for Eisenhower to create and sustain an efficient team. Eisenhower’s managerial leadership skills were honed by years of military education. He had come a long way from the young officer who sought deployment during World War I and glory on the battlefield. He no longer envisioned himself as anything other than a managerial leader, a self-image that was solidified following CGSC. His insistence on managerial leadership never weakened his sense that traditional or heroic leaders were also needed; in short, he recognized that heroic and managerial leadership could coexist. Eisenhower understood the decisive role that heroic leadership had during a time of war. Eisenhower’s reactions to two separate incidents regarding Patton’s behavior show this point. First, in response to the infamous “slapping incident,” Eisenhower told General Marshall:

I have to take responsibility for this volatile fellow. He does the kind of fighting I like. He has a certain feeling. He isn’t like every fighter. He is a great pursuer but there’s very few of those fellows.... I’ll take care of Georgie.²⁴⁵

In Eisenhower’s report of the incident to AGWAR, Patton, while in command of the 7th U.S. Army invading Sicily, had encountered two “unwounded” soldiers in the local hospital who seemed to be physically fit for duty who had been evacuated for “nerve difficulty or what is commonly known as ‘Battle Anxiety.’” Eisenhower then went on to explain his actions taken:

I took the following action. First, I wrote General Patton a letter telling him of the allegations, expressing my extreme displeasure and informing him that any

²⁴⁴ Ferrell, *Eisenhower Diaries*, 125.

²⁴⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, interview by Forrest C. Pogue, June 28, 1962, transcript p.26, OH-10, Dwight D. Eisenhower Oral History, EL.

repetition would result in his instant relief. I told him further that he would necessarily make, on his own initiative, proper amends to the individuals involved, and if necessary, he would take the necessary steps to make the proper amends before his whole army.²⁴⁶

It is hard to tell if this mild punishment from Eisenhower was due to the relationship and friendship that he had with Patton or due to Eisenhower's need for Patton as a field commander. Later in December 1943, in response to a letter from Marshall and suggesting his fear of losing Patton, Eisenhower shrewdly wrote: "As a final word, I want to say again we should not lose Patton's services somewhere as an Army commander."²⁴⁷

Second, Eisenhower upheld his confidence in his friend following a press release in which Patton was reported to be critical of allied policy and Eisenhower's decisions. An investigation later found that Patton had made the remarks in circumstances in which he had felt some pressure and that at first he had tried not to make any statements.²⁴⁸ Eisenhower understood that he and Patton had divergent styles of leadership, and Eisenhower understood that there was a specific role in the way that Patton and those like Patton conduct war. The crisis of the war in Europe made it necessary to accept certain flaws, such as defiance, in favor of an aggressive leader who can get the job done better than most. Patton also had a feud with General Jacob Devers, with which Eisenhower was also forced to contend. In one of several reports to Marshall to smooth over Marshall's discontent with Patton, Eisenhower assured Marshall that the two generals could work together:

²⁴⁶ Cable message from Eisenhower to Marshal, 24 November 1943, Box 132, Folder GCM/DDE July 29, 1943 – February 19, 1944 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁴⁷ Cable message from Eisenhower to Marshal, 27 December 1943, Box 132, Folder GCM/DDE July 29, 1943 – February 19, 1944 (1), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁴⁸ Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe*, 224-25.

It is my impression that Devers and Patton are not congenial. You see I am being perfectly frank with you because I have nothing but impression on which to make that above. I think however that both of them are sufficiently good soldiers that possible personal antagonism should not interfere with either one doing his full duty.²⁴⁹

In these incidents, Eisenhower successfully used the art of persuasion to help his friend, which ensured that the team would stay together.

Operation Overlord took years of planning and months of detailed analysis aimed at ensuring the success of the most critical operation in the war. The cross-Channel invasion of France required a force of over 150,000 allied troops, 5,000 ships and landing craft, 12,000 aircraft, and 1,500 tanks to create a 60-mile-long beachhead at Normandy.²⁵⁰ The logistical feat of concentrating and then deploying a force of this size is almost incomprehensible, yet the team that Eisenhower put together was able to accomplish just that. Of the burden of command for this operation, Eisenhower wrote June 3, 1944: “Probably no one who does not have to bear the specific and direct responsibility of making the final decision as to what to do can understand the intensity of these burdens.” He continued with a discussion in which he weighed the importance of timing, weather, and the airborne operation, and the possible implications of any delay.²⁵¹ It is not just that a managerial leader successfully executed the most massive and most complex amphibious invasion in modern history but that after the invasion Eisenhower remained in command. For his performance and the importance to the allied armies, Eisenhower was promoted to 5-star General of the Army on December 20, 1944, just days before the German

²⁴⁹ Cable message from Eisenhower to Marshal, 18 January 1944, Box 132, Folder GCM/DDE July 29, 1943 – February 19, 1944 (2), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁵⁰ Louis L. Snyder, *The War: A Concise History, 1939-1945* (NY: Julian Messner, 1960), 364.

²⁵¹ Ferrell, *The Eisenhower Diaries*, 118-19.

counterattack beginning the Battle of the Bulge.²⁵² He was promoted just days after the promotion of Marshall and MacArthur to the same rank, respectively. The gamble of favoring younger and more progressive, or managerial, leaders such as Eisenhower and Bradley, proved successful. Their success during World War II solidified the transition from heroic to managerial leadership and brought a rehabilitated focus to leadership within the U.S. Army.²⁵³

²⁵² Eisenhower seemed to have a run of bad luck following promotions, and even noted this in his diary and in *At Ease* where he stated that he was glad there was not a rank higher than 5-star general.

²⁵³ Following WWII, both Eisenhower and Bradley (as chief of staff) published the first official publications dedicated to leadership, and defining leadership in a military context. See FM 22-5, 1946; TC-6, 1948; DAPAM 22-1, 1948.

Conclusion - Reflections on Managerial leadership

Eisenhower's experience at the Command and General Service School firmly cemented his position on managerial leadership before World War II. This watershed moment in his career shaped his perspective, enabling Eisenhower to translate his refined administrative skills into useful managerial action as a staff officer. He was not the only senior leader to come to this realization. General Krueger gave Eisenhower glowing remarks on his efficiency report, and General Marshall brought him to Washington, D.C. to work in the War Department.²⁵⁴

Eisenhower's time spent under MacArthur's tutelage in the Philippines and the intimate contact he had with civilian officials gave him first-hand experience at organizing and training new units and working with politicians. His experiences in the Philippines helped shape his success during the Louisiana maneuvers and put a special spotlight upon his managerial skill. His years of experience as a staff officer and what he learned in his time at Army service schools made Eisenhower the leader to whom Marshall and President Franklin Roosevelt could entrust the country's chance to win the war. Before the decisive moment could be reached, Marshall ensured that such officers as Eisenhower, young and progressive officers with an appreciation for managerial leadership, also received much-needed combat experience in North Africa and Italy. The efforts in North Africa proved immensely valuable in teaching these officers several hard lessons, which translated into the successful completion of Operation Overlord. The detailed planning, teamwork, and administrative capability needed for success in Operation Overlord proved the necessity of managerial leadership in modern war. Managerial leaders' success in the war established managerial leadership as the Army's new leadership paradigm. Postwar

²⁵⁴ Efficiency Report Jul-Dec 1941, 21 January 1942, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1941-1945, PR, EL.

command arrangements also reflected this shift with Eisenhower serving as the next Army Chief of Staff and then as the first NATO commander and with Bradley becoming the first Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, a post which unequivocally requires a managerial leader.

From the time he graduated from West Point until the time he demonstrated his potential at Camp Colt, Eisenhower's earliest reports were unremarkable. His evaluators used non-specific and generic traditional words to offer general encouragement to a junior officer. Descriptions such as "attention to duty," "satisfactory," or "professional zeal" were used often.²⁵⁵ These early reports highlight that Eisenhower was adequate in the eyes of his commanders who did not value managerial skill. Although he may have been well-liked as a football coach, his skills as perceived by traditional leaders were average. During his early years between his graduation from West Point to his attendance at the Command and General Service School in 1922, Eisenhower may not have even recognized that his aptitude for organization would take him on a path toward a managerial leadership style. Following his success as commander of Camp Colt and after his attendance at CGSC, Army War College, and the Army Industrial College, Eisenhower improved his managerial skill. Following his time at the Army Industrial College, Eisenhower dealt with the existence of both the heroic and managerial leadership philosophies and interacted with various "heroic" types and with "managerial" types and he recognized that this could be done for the good of the overall military effort.

Eisenhower was a part of a fraternity within the Army. He took care of his friends and classmates, who also looked out for Eisenhower earlier in his career. The appointment of Harry C. Butcher is a good example of a case where Eisenhower pulled favors for a friend, or more

²⁵⁵ By order of the Secretary of War Summary of Efficiency Reports, 27 April 1920, Box 4, Folder Efficiency Reports 1911-1920, PR, EL.

truthfully, for himself. Eisenhower consciously understood and applied both paradigms of leadership style. Counterintuitively, Eisenhower appealed to a managerial perspective when he recommended Patton for promotion or leveraged the fraternity to help his civil affairs officer. Eisenhower used his position and the fraternal organization to help the war effort or his friends. The paradigm shift from heroic to managerial leadership style allowed Eisenhower to leverage both perspectives to help him build his team. His ability to persuade or influence others is characteristic of managerial leadership. By the end of World War II, Eisenhower clearly grasped the future of the managerial style of leadership, which preferred open-minded officers. Nevertheless, he had not forgotten the existence of a seniority-based organization.

In a letter to General Thomas T. Handy in 1945, Eisenhower stated his position about the possible forced retirement of senior Army leaders over 50 years old – a policy for which Upton had pushed. Further clarifying his position on seniority, Eisenhower expressed disdain for even considering a promotion for Brigadier General Ernest J. Dawley. Eisenhower noted that “the fact is that he is fifty-nine years old and has not performed in this war in such a manner as to warrant considering him for further use.”²⁵⁶ Eisenhower was attacking the old seniority-based promotion system, instead favoring younger officers who might prove to be more useful. Favoring younger officers and relieving incompetent leaders had been goals of George Marshall during the Louisiana Maneuvers as well. Marshall also alluded to the significance of the managerial leader when he congratulated Eisenhower on a magnificent job, saying that

²⁵⁶ General Eisenhower to General Handy regarding promotion qualifications, 8 September 1945, Box 134, Folder Cables Off. GCM/DDE Apr. 19,– Nov. 10, 1945 (4), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers, Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

Eisenhower had “triumphed over inconceivable logistical problems and military obstacles.”²⁵⁷

Significant to the final transformation of Eisenhower’s understanding of effective leadership was his endorsement for General McNarney as his replacement due to his “recognized administrative ability” despite Eisenhower’s previous misgivings about McNarney’s handling of his wartime command.²⁵⁸

One of the most telling lines in Eisenhower’s thoughts on managerial leadership came in his letters to his son, John, when he was going through the Academy at West Point from 1940 to 1944. In one letter, Eisenhower divulged the secret of leadership: “If an officer can keep his position of authority, without ever losing it, and at the same time make his men feel that everything that affects them affects him also, then he will never have any trouble with discipline, training, or effective action.”²⁵⁹ Eisenhower talked about team building and investment, two critical components of managerial leadership. In an earlier letter, Eisenhower was more direct about the importance of cooperation when he stated that “the necessity for teamwork is so impellent that a leader on the battlefield must be rather well trained” in various sciences of the military.²⁶⁰ In both instances, Eisenhower believed that leadership is a “matter of influencing people,” or to use Janowitz’s term, manipulation, as opposed to a dominative style of

²⁵⁷ Marshall to Eisenhower mission completed, 7 May 1945, Box 134, Folder Cables Off. GCM/DDE Apr. 19,– Nov. 10, 1945 (4), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers, Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁵⁸ Eisenhower to Marshall regarding replacement, 8 September 1945, Box 134, Folder Cables Off. GCM/DDE Apr. 19,– Nov. 10, 1945 (4), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁵⁹ Letter from Eisenhower to John, 2 Nov 1944, Box 173, Folder Eisenhower, John S.D. 1943-1946 (1), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

²⁶⁰ Letter from Eisenhower to John, 8 May 1944, Box 173, Folder Eisenhower, John S.D. 1943-1946 (1), Dwight D. Eisenhower Papers Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952, EL.

leadership.²⁶¹ Eisenhower emphasized team building, not because it was new but because he believed it was better. He believed the Army had not always preferred team building.

Eisenhower started his career in the military fully enveloped in an Army practicing heroic leadership. Because of the prominence of heroic leadership, Eisenhower's discipline problems and dislike of tradition made him unremarkable in his early career in the Army. During the interwar years, his managerial skills were both a blessing and a curse. He was regularly called upon for his managerial services and continued to perform in an exemplary manner. However, this in turn kept him from command opportunities, especially while in service to General MacArthur. His time in the service of generals heightened his managerial skill, gained him mentorship, and brought him into the Army's fraternity. By the end of his time under the tutelage of Army Chief of Staff Marshall and after his subsequent service as Commander-in-Chief in North Africa, Eisenhower had a better understanding of the alternative paradigms of leadership that existed within the Army.

His skills as a master organizer and team-builder epitomized the managerial style of leadership. He was able to leverage the traditional methods of leadership through persuasion. Technology and the immense scale of war further intensified the capability and need, respectively, to summon leaders who had managerial skills. This transformation of the concept of leadership from heroic to managerial leadership reflected changes and trends within society. The focus on reforming officer education fell squarely within societal trends for the professionalization of occupations, which is what the Army was attempting to do with the officer

²⁶¹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, interview by Walter Cronkite, May 23, 1961, transcript p.29, Box 24, Folder Cronkite, Walter interview with DDE May 23-29, 1961 (2), Office of Dwight D. Eisenhower Post-Presidential Principle File, EL.

corps. Eisenhower helps to show how the U.S. Army moved from a focus on “heroic” leadership toward “managerial” leadership.

It is also interesting to consider the possible connection between the rise of managerial leadership during World War II and its excesses during the Vietnam War. Managerial leaders took advantage of communications technology, which enabled company commanders to micromanage their respective platoons across the battlefield. Company influence on platoons is to be expected, but brigade and divisional micromanagement became possible as communications technology continued to improve and proliferate. The expanded reach of policymakers to commanders in the field further increased the micromanagement of operations during the Vietnam War. General Westmoreland had called excessive supervision by politicians a “disease,” but this term might equally be applied to the micromanagement of small-unit operations.²⁶²

Regarding managerial leadership and micromanagement, the difference between World War II and the Vietnam War is not necessarily only a difference in the communications capability. The mere fact that a capability to communicate exists does not automatically require that it be used at all, let alone misused in micromanagement. The daily communication between Eisenhower and Marshall demonstrated that Marshall had the capability to micromanage but also that, on numerous occasions, he explicitly chose not to supervise too much. The question then shifts to the mentality of senior leaders and to the philosophy of managerial leadership. In what way did managerial leadership continue to change so that, having been a leading actor during World War II, it became a villain during the Vietnam War?

²⁶² William C. Westmoreland, *A Soldier Reports* (NY: Doubleday & Co., 1976), 18, 31, quoted in, Donald J. Mrozek, *Air Power & the Ground War in Vietnam* (New York: Pergamon-Brassey’s International Defense Publishers, 1989), 75.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Eisenhower Presidential Library and Archives

Dwight D. Eisenhower Pre-Presidential Principle 1916-1952

Dwight D. Eisenhower Post-Presidential Principle File

Dwight D. Eisenhower Oral History

General Lucius D. Clay Oral History

Dwight D. Eisenhower Personnel Records

Dwight D. Eisenhower Diaries

George Catlett Marshall Library

The Papers of George C. Marshall

Armellino, John R. "Captain John R. Armellino 6 June 1944." *American D-Day online*. Accessed October 13, 2019. http://www.americandday.org/Veterans/Armellino_John_R.html.

Bradley, Omar N. *A Soldier's Story*. New York: Modern Library, 1999 [1951].

Butcher, Harry C. *My Three Years with Eisenhower, 1942-1945*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1946.

Chellis Jr., Earl. "Private First Class Earl Chellis, Jr. 6 June 1944." *American D-Day Online*. Accessed October 13, 2019. http://www.americandday.org/Veterans/Chellis_Earl.html.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. "A Tank Discussion." *Infantry Journal* 17, No. 5 (November, 1920): 453-58.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *At Ease: Stories I Tell to Friends*. Fort Washington, PA: Eastern National, 2011 [1976].

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Crusade in Europe*. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc, 1949.

Ferrell, Robert H. ed. *The Eisenhower Diaries*. New York: Norton and Company, 1981.

Marshall, George C. *George C. Marshall, Memoires of My Services in the World War, 1917-1918*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.

- McCleave, Robert. "Infantry: Its Role, Capabilities, Limitations and Relation to Other Arms." *Infantry Journal* 17, No. 5 (November, 1920): 441-450.
- Michie, Peter S. *The Life and Letters of Emory Upton*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1885.
- Monteith, Jimmie W. "Medal of Honor Citation of Lieutenant Jimmie W. Monteith, 6 June 1944." *National Medal of Honor Museum Online*. Accessed October 13, 2019. https://mohmuseum.org/medal_of_honor/monteith-jimmie-w/.
- The Officers' Guide: A Ready Reference on Customs and Correct Procedures Which Pertain to Commissioned Officers of the Army of the United States*. Harrisburg, PA: The Military Service Publishing Co., 1942.
- Patton, George S. *War as I Knew it*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1995.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Rough Riders*. New York: The New American Library, 1961.
- Root, Elihu. *The Military and Colonial Policy of the United States: Addresses and Reports*. ed. Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- "Statistical Exhibit of Strength of Volunteer Forces Called Into Service During the War With Spain; with Losses From All Causes." Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899. US Army Center of Military History Historical Branch.
- Upton, Emory. *The Armies of Europe and Asia: Official Reports on the Armies of Japan, China, India, Persia, Italy, Russia, Austria, Germany, France, and England*. London: Griffon and Co., 1878.
- Upton, Emory. *The Military Policy of the United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. *Report of the Commission Appointed by the President to Investigate the Conduct of the War Department in the War with Spain*. 1900. 56th cong., 1st sess., 1900. S. Doc. 221.
- U.S. Congress. Senate and House. *An Act To increase the efficiency of the Army*. 1903. 57th cong., 2nd sess., 1903. S.H. Doc. 88.
- U.S. Congress. Senate and House. *An Act To Promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes*. 1903. 57th cong., 2nd sess., 1903. S.H. Doc. 33.
- Wilkinson, Spenser. *The Brain of an Army: A Popular Account of the German General Staff*. London: Constable and Co., 1913.

Secondary Sources

- Abraham, James. *American Arms for a New Century: The Making of a Giant Military Power*. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1990.
- Anderson, Christopher J. "Dick Winters: Reflections from Major Winters of Easy Company." *American History Magazine* (2004): 88.
- Borch, Frederic L. "From Frontier Cavalryman to the World Stage: The Career of Army Judge Advocate General George B. Davis." *Army History*, no. 74 (Winter, 2010): 6-19.
- Bourque, Stephen A. *Beyond the Beach: The Allied War Against France*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2018.
- Brighton, Terry. *Patton, Montgomery, Rommel: Masters of War*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2008.
- Brown, Richard C. "General Emory Upton – The Army's Mahan." *Military Affairs* 17, No. 3 (Autumn, 1953): 125-31.
- D'Este, Carlo. *Eisenhower, A Soldier's Life*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2002.
- D'Este, Carlo. *Patton, A Genius for War*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1995.
- Echevarria II, Antulio J. *Reconsidering the American Way of War, US Military Practice from the Revolution to Afghanistan*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2014.
- Fitzpatrick, David John. "Emory Upton and the Citizen Soldier." *The Journal of Military History*, 65, no. 2 (Apr., 2001): 355-389.
- Fitzpatrick, David John. *Emory Upton: Misunderstood Reformer*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017.
- Gabel, Christopher R. *The U.S. Army GHQ Maneuvers of 1941*. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army, 1992.
- Glatthaar, Joseph. *American Military History: A Concise History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Hughes, Thomas Alexander. *Overlord: General Pete Quesda and the Triumph of Tactical Air Power in World War II*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

- Janowitz, Morris. "Changing Patterns of Organizational Authority, The Military Establishment." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, no. 4 (Mar., 1959): 473-493.
- Janowitz, Morris. *Military Conflict: Essays in the Institutional Analysis of War and Peace*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1975.
- Janowitz, Morris. "Observations on the Sociology of Citizenship, Obligations and Rights." *Social Forces*, 59, no. 1 (Sep., 1980): 1-24.
- Janowitz, Morris. "Social Stratification and the Comparative Analysis of Elites." *Social Forces*, 35, no. 1 (Oct., 1956): 81-85.
- Janowitz, Morris. *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. New York: The Free Press, 1960.
- Jones, Gregg. *Honor in the Dust: Theodore Roosevelt, War in the Philippines, and the Rise and Fall of America's Imperial Dream*. New York: New American Library, 2012.
- Koskimaki, George. *D-Day with the Screaming Eagles*. Havertown, PA: Casemate, 2002.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Lewis, Adrian. *The American Culture of War: The History of U.S. Military Force from World War II to Operation Iraqi Freedom*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2018.
- Linn, Brian McAllister. *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000.
- Manchester, William. *American Caesar, Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964*. New York: Back Bay Books, 2008.
- Mrozek, Donald J. *Air Power & the Ground War in Vietnam*. New York: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers, 1989.
- Reardon, Carol. *Soldiers and Scholars: The U.S. Army and the uses of Military History*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1990.
- Snyder, Louis L. *The War: A Concise History, 1939-1945*. New York: Julian Messner, 1960.
- Weigley, Russell F. *Eisenhower's Lieutenants: The Campaign of France and Germany, 1944-1945*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1981.
- Weigley, Russell F. "American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell." *The Journal of Military History*, 57, no. 5. Special Issue: Proceedings of the Symposium on "The History of War as Part of General History" at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, New Jersey (Oct., 1993): 27-58.

Weigley, Russell F. *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977.

Weigley, Russell. "The Elihu Root Reforms and the Progressive Era." *Command and Commanders in Modern Warfare: Proceedings of the Second Military Symposium, U.S. Air Force Academy*. edited by William Geffen. Washington D.C., 1969: 11-34.

Weigley, Russell F. "The George C. Marshall Lecture in Military History: The Soldier, the Statesman, and the Military Historian." *Journal of Military History*, 63, no. 4 (October 1999): 807-822.