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ABSTRACT

FIELD MANUALS AND PLACE: AN EXAMINATION OF PLACE AND NARRATIVE THROUGH THE CHANGING NATURE OF LEADERSHIP DISCOURSE AT THE GENERAL GEORGE PATTON MUSEUM OF LEADERSHIP

Madison Lindsey-Paige Thompson

April 17, 2020

This thesis is an analysis presenting several arguments surrounding leadership discourse within the Army and its connections to the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. Leadership discourse within Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine have evolved from 1948 to 2019. I argue leadership discourse within the Army Field Manuals can be seen in situ at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and can be studied using rhetorical fieldwork and adapt current leadership discourse into a living Field Manual, a leadership narrative, which can be learned from and taught.

This thesis consists of seven chapters which provide: an introduction to Fort Knox history, General George Patton, leadership, narratives, and rhetorical fieldwork; a literature review, method, and my positionality; an analysis of Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine; fieldnotes from the museum; a discussion of the analyses; a discussion of limitations, suggestions for further research, and a summary of the thesis.
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INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Military is an organization which has become synonymous with the term leadership. Through the years, branches of the military, including the Army, have made it their mission to create effective leaders to fight and win the nation’s wars. The Army presents itself as an immovable pillar of strength and leadership while subtly evolving tactics and methods over time to maintain a competitive advantage in a global environment. I elected to take a closer examination of how Soldiers are trained and where they learn about leadership, specifically by reading through Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. An examination of archived Field Manuals revealed a progressive evolution of the definition of leadership from being “the art of influencing human behavior” and “handling men” (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 1), to “the activity of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization” (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 1-3).

For this “pillar of strength and leadership,” it seems counterproductive to change the definition of leadership; however, just as tactics and methods evolved over time, so have the definitions of leadership and leadership discourse. Both paraphrased definitions from 1948 and 2019 address the influence of behavior, but the Field Manuals progressively added objectives, achievable tasks, and methods for effective leadership.
These definitions and techniques have been inscribed in Field Manuals and taught through lessons and training exercises to create leadership discourse through the Army. Therefore, it is imperative to look at the Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine because they provide a baseline and standard for training, learning, and teaching purposes for every Soldier. The wealth of information about leadership, how to maintain oneself and others, as well as strategies and leadership styles make the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine a valuable resource which cannot be ignored or dismissed. After I examined the manuals, it is clear leadership discourse has changed over time. The purpose and objectives have not changed, but the definition has slowly become more inclusive by incorporating how a person executes effective leadership, “by providing purpose, direction, and motivation” (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 1-3). This means how leadership has been taught and executed has changed as well. It begs the question of how else leadership discourse can be seen or taught.

I argue the leadership discourse located in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine can be viewed in places using rhetorical fieldwork as a method of text collection for evaluation. I believe that the leadership within the Army Field Manuals can be seen in situ at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and can be studied using rhetorical fieldwork. If the Field Manuals have transitioned from text to be visible in a location, it would be important because leadership in location presents another way for leadership to be taught and experienced not only by Soldiers but also by the public. Connecting Patton’s narrative to the manuals creates a face and a name for people to relate to and to better comprehend the contents of leadership as it is portrayed by the Field Manuals. I believe the manuals have fused themselves, their definitions, tactics, and
styles, with the museum, using Patton as a primary example and the essential protagonist of how leadership should be executed.

The leadership discourse in manuals complement Patton and the museum through his Army career and the narrative of his life, therefore adapting the current leadership discourse into a leadership narrative which can be seen and taught. Evaluating the combination of U.S. Army Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership will show the leadership discourse told by the Army and how it has evolved into a leadership narrative. The reason for selecting this museum over other museums and monuments such as the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C. or the National Infantry Museum in Georgia is not only because of the Patton museum’s location at one of the most prominent Army bases in the United States, but also because of Patton’s significance as a role model and icon within the Army for his strategies, tactics, and leadership styles.

The original inspiration behind the topic resides in a personal experience from an internship I participated in for three consecutive summers at Fort Knox. The U.S. Army Cadet Command offered me an internship to cover Cadet Summer Training at Fort Knox (Kentucky), I did not anticipate learning more than writing and photography skills. Cadets from universities across the nation and territories came to train at Fort Knox, just as I did; though they were learning other skills such as land navigation and first aid. They also learned about the essential quality of leadership. They learned how to lead others in tactical situations, how to motivate one another through difficult missions, and most importantly how to embody the qualities of a good leader.
After participating in the internship for three consecutive summers, I began to see emerging patterns in how Cadets trained and their leadership techniques. My work with U.S. Army Cadet Command writing about Cadets and their leadership experiences combined leadership and narrative. The overarching themes of leadership permeated my thoughts and raised questions. What were the contributing factors to leadership? Where were Cadets and Cadre finding their leadership themes? What role did narratives have in leadership? The answer to these questions resided in the official Army Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership located at Fort Knox.

The recently renovated General George Patton Museum of Leadership showcases General George S. Patton Jr. during his youth through his career during World War II. His ideals of leadership and what leadership requires are by many people’s standards some of the greatest leadership and tactical techniques in United States History (Axelrod, 2006; Sklenka, 2002; Wong, Bliese, & McGurk, 2003). Patton may not have directly written the Field Manuals, but his legacy arguably helped shape the trajectory of leadership and develop the template for modern soldiers. His lessons are only one of many contributing factors including the lessons taught from the Army Field Manuals.

The Army Field Manuals consist of values, lessons, principles and doctrine which serve as guidelines and prerequisites for the modern soldier. The manuals also provide definitions and logic maps around the concept of, “Be, Know, Do,” and associated attributes, competencies, and requirements (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. vii). Manuals update every few years and previous editions are archived for future reference and say what a Soldier should do and how they should conduct themselves, but also allow for circumstantial innovation. The Field Manuals have evolved over time to maintain
currency and, upon review and comparison, the Army’s provided definition of leadership has also evolved but the essence, the characteristic traits and end objectives, has remained the same.

The combination the Army Field Manuals from 1948 to 2019 weave a leadership discourse which is observable in places such as Fort Knox. Analyzing the leadership discourse within the General George Patton Museum of Leadership through the steady evolution of the Field Manuals using rhetorical fieldwork to study place will demonstrate how the textual leadership discourse can be seen as a leadership narrative. Before continuing, it is important to briefly introduce the place (Fort Knox and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership) because Fort Knox is one of the primary locations Cadets learn how to implement their leadership styles and practice what they have learned and the theories (narratives and rhetorical fieldwork) involved.

History of Fort Knox

Fort Knox is not only a place for the national treasury where the Gold Vault sits under supervised guard and security. It is also a place of training and official military history. Fort Knox is located just off Dixie Highway in Kentucky. It is surrounded by dense forests and hills with only specific areas being clear-cut for safety measures. The Gold Vault sits to the left just before arriving at the Visitor’s Center and visitors must provide identification to enter through the gates, a process which only takes a few minutes. There are houses, schools, aquatic centers, and even a golf course for the stationed Soldiers and their families.

Originally serving as a training installation during the Civil War and later founded in 1903 and named Camp Young, the property comprised of local farmland and local
cemeteries dating back to the Civil War (Kempf, 2004). Fort Knox still possesses cemeteries of fallen Civil War soldiers along roads among training grounds in thick trees and underbrush. As a historical site, Fort Knox serves as a place of memory from its Camp Young years to its current incarnation as a secure fortress of training and leadership.

In 1903, land was placed to the side for a set of military maneuvers and was temporarily dubbed Camp Young until later years when the land seemed optimal for additional aspects of training after World War I. Kempf (2004) wrote, “In 1918 the government condemned and purchased land in Hardin County and a small portion of Meade County for a permanent military base” (p. 41). It was after the purchase of the land that Camp Young was renamed Camp Knox after Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, who served many essential roles such as Chief of Staff of the Army and Secretary of War (Rector, 2005, p. 9). It was not named Fort Knox until 1932 (Rector, 2005, p. 45). The installation was closed temporarily after World War I because of the decrease in Army soldiers and it was not until 1932 that Fort Knox re-opened its gates as an installation and its responsibilities increased, serving as a mechanized cavalry headquarters and a growing population (Rector, 2005).

In 1937, the 7th Cavalry Brigade was tasked with the security of the United States Treasury, known to many as The Gold Vault. Shortly thereafter, World War II called the troops to action as the Armor school was relocated to the base to prepare soldiers for the war (Rector, 2005). Subsequent to the second world war, Fort Knox was named the 3rd Armored Division on July 15, 1947 (Rector, 2005). It held one of the largest training exercises which entails infantry tactical movements and weapons qualification during the
time involving 300,000 Soldiers (Rector, 2005). Because of the Army Reorganization Act, cavalry and armor merged to form a new armor branch (Rector, 2005, p. 119). To this day, Fort Knox still stands as a training pillar among other installations; some of the building and places remaining unchanged or slightly updated, modified over time through renovation and preservation.

Historically, officers and noncommissioned officers alike have trained Cadets and soldiers, emphasizing the foundational building blocks of the Army values to persevere through the different pieces and parts of Fort Knox’s past. The Army values, I believe, have seemingly infused themselves with the concept of leadership, weaving throughout time as its own narrative. Now, U.S. Army Cadet Command, Recruiting Command, and the recently activated Fifth Corps (U.S. Army, 2020) are located at Fort Knox. For the past five years (STAND-TO, 2015), Fort Knox has been home to one of the largest training exercises to train Cadets, who come from the United States and territories with the intent to commission as officers in the United States Army – Cadet Summer Training.

General George S. Patton, Jr.

Fort Knox has been a training installation for a century. It consists of Cadre, commissioned and non-commissioned officers of a higher rank, and instructors who instill the founding building blocks of leadership in cadets and privates. Cadre and instructors pull from modern examples when instructing cadets. They also examine Soldiers in the past who have proven to be timeless leaders. It is important to examine the timeless leaders such as General George S. Patton Jr., an iconic figure whose legacy continues to shape the meaning of leadership at Fort Knox. Patton was a man who possessed guidance and tactical knowledge during the second World War and considered
by many academics as a great leader (Wong et al., 2003; Sklenka, 2002). A closer examination of General George Patton Jr. and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership reveals not only a history of the General himself, but also the attributes and essential characteristics he emphasized in what makes a good leader and what others have attributed to him.

Patton also imbued the American army with a commitment to victory through individual initiative and personal leadership. To be sure, this aspect of his legacy is less tangible than the tactical lessons, but, for the commanders of today and tomorrow, it is even more urgently indispensable. (Axelrod, 2006, p. 7)

Patton’s career and leadership presence have contributed significantly to the current leadership training. A museum located on Fort Knox is dedicated to General Patton which showcases elements of his youth to his contributions in leadership, incorporating quotes, mottos, and themes he iterated throughout his career. The museum features artifacts from Patton’s past such as uniforms and medals he earned. There are images of Patton performing tasks Cadets and Cadre are required to perform such as land navigation, terrain association, functioning in group work, and being present at the front lines.

Patton often emphasized that leaders lead from the front, which means being with them on the front lines and not directing Soldiers from the safety of behind the lines. Why, he would ask, would your troops, your Soldiers, follow you if you yourself have not done the things you have asked them to do? Would you follow someone who hasn’t had the experience they are asking you to do? Patton believed it was important for soldiers to see their lead commander with them at the front of battle versus planning in a
distant war room miles away from the battle. The message, narrative, of a demonstrated leader to future generations is to be seen and heard by the soldiers a leader leads and are thought to embody the Army values through every mission. Patton’s contribution to leadership narrative is seen through modern training exercises, not only through Cadet Summer Training, but the narratives soldiers tell of their experiences.

Leadership

Patton is one example of an Army leader. While there are many great leaders within the Army, Patton remains as a prime example because of his use of military tactics, but also the leadership qualities and values he portrayed. The United States Army, since its inception, has deep roots in many traditional values such as honor, duty, loyalty, respect, integrity, personal courage, and selfless service (which actually can form the acronym LDRSHIP) which are associated with leadership (United States Department of the Army, 2004, p. 1-6). The values of the Army extend farther than the origins of the United States itself, and other cultures and societal defense systems possess similar standards and ideals as the U.S. Army (Zion, 2016; Israel Defense Forces, n.d.). These Field Manuals serve as guides and references which possess detailed how-to’s and descriptions of leadership styles among other tactics (depending on the manual). It is these fundamental building blocks which are consistently taught through the progressing editions of the Soldier’s Guide as well as classroom teachings, training exercises out in the field, and training installations and bases across the United States. The building blocks assemble the ideal foundation of leaders and leadership.

Leadership is an important concept within organizations including branches of the military or specific people in the military because every Soldier needs to be able to
perform as a leader (Callaghan & Kernic, 2003; Camacho, 2009). Disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and communication have approached leadership, leadership styles, and how to define leadership to better understand what does or does not make an effective leader. Leadership itself is a concept many people can identify; yet, based upon an examination of the variations of studies in established literature, find difficult to define. Even Patton himself is quoted saying, “I have it, but I’ll be damned if I can define it,” (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Some researchers have similarly defined leadership through their examinations.

In their essay, “What We Know about Leadership,” Robert Hogan and Robert B. Kaiser recognize the importance of leadership and acknowledge it is an understood but complicated concept (2005). The authors propose leadership is a collective effort, a networked view of leadership that consists of viewing different approaches such as traits, behaviors, and actions. It is a combination of an individual leader and the leadership of the group that allows the group to thrive. Leadership is an adaptive tool, something that can be learned and taught to others (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Greer suggests leaders gradually compile knowledge and skills through training, experiences, mentoring, and self-discipline (2011). Greer’s work proposes that leaders are not just born with key characteristics. If leaders were only born, leadership could not be taught. Instead, Greer notes leaders are created and achieve recognition through their continuous learning and drive to be more effective (2011). Finally, Wong et al. (2013) suggest it is through examples in history such as Dwight D. Eisenhower and George S. Patton that leadership can be separated and broken into its components (p. 657). Needless to say, there are multiple perspectives to examine when it comes to models of leadership.
Though many factors go into identifying and defining leadership, it is the definition of leadership and the models that are provided in Field Manuals and Army publishing directorates which are essential for this thesis. The factors which help identify and define leadership in its latest incarnation in 2019 is that leadership as more of a democratic process (an activity) which implies that it could be performed individually or collectively. Army leadership possesses a hierarchical organization, but leadership as a democratic process implies that leadership requires both leaders and followers contribute to achieve the goals of the group. An Army Doctrine Reference Publication (ADRP) No. 6-22 published in August 2012 does specify that one key difference between leadership in other professions and military leadership is that,

Soldiers must be prepared to use deadly force and have the courage to overcome hostile forces. Army leaders exercise a profound responsibility because the consequences of their decisions and actions affect the lives of Soldiers, their families, the enemy and non-combatants. (U.S. Army [DA], ADRP 6-22, 2012, p. 1)

Leadership within the Army deals with lives of many individuals with the added factor of the responsibility of national security.

Army leaders, military leaders, pull from the discussed values found in the Field Manuals and ADRPs as well as their experience. They, “draw from deep-rooted values and professional competence to demonstrate resolve to do what is right at the right time for the right reason. National and Army values and expectations inspire professional development, instilling a desire to acquire the essential knowledge to lead” (U.S. Army [DA], ADRP 6-22, 2012, p. 1). Leaders are constantly learning to better prepare
themselves for their work. They strive to uphold the Army values, the building blocks for
the foundation, while also leading their fellow soldiers through the unknown scenarios of
the future. They apply what they know from their studies, their experiences, their
training, and from each other to assess and move forward (U.S. Army [DA], *ADRP 6-22*,
2012). Leaders seek knowledge and experiences to make them better at their profession,
so they are prepared for the decisions and potential consequences of their decisions.

Army leadership is defined by the Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) in the
following way:

Leadership is the activity of influencing people by providing purpose, direction,
and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.

Leadership as an element of combat power, coupled with information, unifies the
warfighting functions (movement and maneuver, intelligence, fires, sustainment,
protection and command and control). Leadership focuses and synchronizes
organizations. Leaders inspire people to become energized and motivated to
achieve desired outcomes. An Army leader is anyone who by virtue of assumed
role or assigned responsibility inspires and influences people by providing
purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the
organization. (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-3)

The Field Manuals define attributes of influence, purpose, direction, and motivation to
leave the definition of leadership clear with little misinterpretation. Influence breaks
down into, “persuading people to do what is necessary” (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*,
2019, p. 1-3), direction is defined here as, “telling others what to do” (U.S. Army [DA],
*ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-4), motivation is seen as both internal and external, “the will and
initiative to do what is necessary to accomplish a mission” (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-4), and purpose is given or conveyed by leaders and explains, “why something should or must be done and provide context” (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-3). This characterization, carefully defined and laid out, is taught and reiterated through doctrine and training. The models and logic maps of, “Be, Know, Do,” emphasize requirements and tasks such as character, presence, intellect, achieves, develops, and leads (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. vii). Each piece of the definition attempts to account for the leadership theories and approaches addressed by other researchers. It is precise and attempts to account for behaviors, traits, and skills potential leadership may possess. Thought and precision created the most recent definition of leadership.

Leadership, the requirements model, and the Army values are taught through diligent training. Men and women alike instruct Cadets in these values and exercises in leadership. The instructing Soldiers, called Cadre – consisting of both commissioned and noncommissioned officers – are located at training installations, military bases, and universities. Cadre are tasked with upholding the foundational values on which the Army is built on as well as training the next generation of leaders. Bases and installations such as Fort Jackson (South Carolina), Fort Benning (Georgia), and Fort Knox (Kentucky) are often first associated with Army military training. Signs at the gated entrances display the phrase “Fort Knox, Strength Starts Here. Army Strong,” supporting the substance of the location and the driving force behind its strong narrative. It is important to discuss narratives and how they are studied because it is the narrative of Patton’s life in the Army that is linked to the leadership in the Field Manuals and how they evolved over time.

**Narratives**
Narratives, as defined by Fisher, refer to, “a theory of symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2). Researchers such as Thomas Nissen and Jeffry Halverson, H.L. and Goodall Steven Corman (2011) defined narrative as, “a system of stories that share common themes, forms, events, and participants, and create expectations for how those elements can be assembled to satisfy a desire that is rooted in conflict” (2013, p. 71). Narratives provide examples in history as well as through personal experiences as a way of communicating some message or another. Stories engage readers and listeners. Narrative is also important in strategic communication to both internal audiences, military personnel, and external audiences, the civilian population. It allows narrative to reside in the heart of operational planning, activities, and compelling audiences to drive them forward (Nissen, 2013; Corman & Finlayson, 2013).

Fisher’s theory of narratives states that humans are storytellers, *homo narrans*, and we derive meaning through stories (Fisher, 1985a; 1985b). While Fisher’s theory of narratives is similar to narrative paradigm, which is an interpretive perspective to narratives, both bring relevance and importance to narratives. Humans do not only communicate through rhetoric, argument, and debate to derive meaning (Fisher, 1985a; 1985b). Stories allow people to connect with one another and learn from other peoples’ experiences. Many people can contribute to a story as well as learn from them, much like how Soldiers can contribute and learn from leadership discourse by upholding values and standards leadership defines. Each individual contributes to the overall narrative. There is an emphasis of teamwork and the bonds of brotherhood and sisterhood within the Army. “The military’s narrative is based upon the individual narratives within it; service
members, their family, independent organizations within the military, and those who are affected by it” (McNamara, 2014, p. 11; Fireman, G.D., & Jr, T.E.M., 2002). General George Patton Jr.’s narrative of his Army officer career, therefore, is part of the Army’s narrative.

Rhetorical Fieldwork

Rhetorical fieldwork is a method where the researcher places themselves into a situation or place and analyzes the circumstances, speeches, and artifacts in those locations. The researcher engages in these locations with people and the environment to determine the significance and importance of the artifacts. Michael Middleton, Danielle Endres, and Samantha Senda-Cook observed that rhetoricians were placing themselves in the field, utilizing techniques such as ethnography, to identify place and space as significant elements which deserved attention. The authors realized that place and space, which Endres and Senda-Cook (2011) defined specifically, were just as important as traditional texts (e.g. speeches) because they provided both context and created another way to provoke discussion among scholars (Middleton et al., 2015). Rhetorical fieldwork is similar to ethnography, but Middleton et al. note specifically that it is not another incarnation of ethnography because of the length of time spent in situ and where researchers place their focus is different.

The significance of rhetorical fieldwork is its utility studying leadership in situ. Both were conceived within the oral and textual tradition. Approaching text as intertextual pieces, a concept originally initiated by Julia Kristeva, who proposed texts could be cross-referenced with other texts as well as context, is a way to corroborate information between sources, text and place (Raj, 2015, p. 77). Chapter two will add a
thorough explanation of intertextuality as well as rhetorical fieldwork and its significance to this thesis.

Research Questions

What is the changing, or evolutionary, nature of leadership in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine? How is the evolution of leadership reflected at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership? What do we learn about leadership from a rhetorical analysis of the Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership?

So far, I proposed rhetorical fieldwork can be utilized to show leadership from the Field Manuals in places at Fort Knox by evaluating Army Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. I established context with the history of Fort Knox and pieces of General George S. Patton’s military career. I also established a baseline for narrative and rhetorical fieldwork. This thesis aims to examine whether or not leadership discourse within the Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine, which has evolved from 1948 to 2019, can be seen in situ at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and if it can be studied using rhetorical fieldwork. I aim to discover if the leadership discourse in the manuals complement or differ from Patton and the museum through his Army career and the narrative of his life, therefore adapting the most contemporary leadership discourse into a leadership narrative. Within the following chapters, I will discuss and analyze the texts and address the questions listed above.

Chapter two is a literature review on rhetorical fieldwork and the concepts of what constitutes as text, intertextuality, narratives, and how they are utilized through other analyses. The purpose of this chapter is to conduct a theoretical discussion of
narratives and leadership, specifically narratives of leadership, to better understand
Patton’s leadership narrative.

Chapter three addresses the method I use, rhetorical fieldwork. I explain my
positionality as well as the perspectives I bring into the field as well as discuss what I
constitute as my text, my place, how I analyze them, how many times I approached the
museum, and how I am operationalizing my terms. I also briefly discuss the significance
of rhetorical fieldwork and text within this section as it is pertinent to the analysis of the
Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and the General George Patton Museum of
Leadership.

In chapter four, I analyze the content in the Army Field Manuals and publishing
discipline. I lay out the evolution of leadership definitions, noting the change in language
from leadership being an art to a democratic process, an activity, performed by
individuals. I show how these definitions of leadership discourse have evolved, what was
maintained over time, and the significance of these changes in Army leadership.

In chapter five, I analyze the General George Patton Museum of Leadership by
incorporating vignettes and photographs from in situ fieldwork. I break down the
information and draw clear connections between the leadership discourse and the
physical location which supports the primary argument of this thesis – that leadership
discourse has evolved over time and the latest manuals can be seen in places such as the
museum. I will show how the manuals have seemingly fused themselves to the museum’s
narrative of Patton and his Army career.

Chapter six consists of a discussion of the implications of the results from
rhetorical fieldwork. I will discuss the data located in chapters four and five and draw out
themes and connections from the leadership discourse to the museum. I will also discuss the implications of what I uncovered in chapters four and five – that the General George Patton Museum of Leadership is a living Field Manual. Leadership in the Field Manuals are linked to the museum through narratives of Patton’s Army career.

Chapter seven, the final chapter, summarizes this thesis, reiterating what was discussed in previous chapters while suggesting areas of further research.
Chapter one introduced the primary concepts of narratives, leadership, General George Patton Jr., rhetorical fieldwork, and the argument of this thesis. This chapter further engages the theoretical basis for this thesis. By integrating the use of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and rhetorical fieldwork, I illustrate how the leadership discourse can reside in places and become inscribed on bodies which can be interpreted and studied. I will also argue how this leadership discourse connects with Patton’s life story, thereby connecting Patton’s narrative to leadership discourse making a leadership narrative. By the end of the chapter, I will evaluate narratives and leadership theories by discussing their origins, their theoretical perspectives, how these theories can be integrated with one another. I also will demonstrate how they serve as an essential component for analyzing leadership discourse at Fort Knox through Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership.

Narratives

The narrative paradigm is important to acknowledge as it opened the door for narrative examination and observing narrative as an aspect of human communication. Though I do not examine leadership discourse through the paradigm Fisher created because I am not analyzing Patton’s narrative itself, but rather how Patton’s narrative is
used in tandem with the Field Manuals and leadership within the museum. Because the museum uses Patton’s narrative, it is important to understand narrative theory and how other researchers use narrative analysis.

Walter Fisher proposed narrative paradigm in 1984 when he proposed not all conversation and interaction were rhetorical (Fisher, 1984); rhetorical meaning written or oral communication intended to present an argument (Fisher, 1984, p. 2). He assessed human communication and determined it held the potential for rhetoric and argument, but also saw it should be viewed situationally and narratively (Fisher, 1984). Each communication situation, Fisher observed, should be viewed as both situational and historical, one story competing with another story and brought together as a whole by good reasons and rationale (Fisher 1984).

Fisher (1984) described humans as *homo-narrans* and defines stories and narrative as, “a theory of symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2). There is debate about what constitutes as narrative text which Mieke Bal, cultural theorist and narrative critic, addresses in, “Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.” Bal (1997) addresses the “obvious” first- “novels, novellas, short stories, fairy tales, newspaper articles” (p. 4). Narrative, simply put, is a story. Because they can exist in many formats, narratives and what constitutes as narrative text can be broadly interpreted.

Narratives teach and guide listeners like how the leadership discourse in the manuals teaches and guides Soldiers and allow listeners to participate in the narrative. Being able to actively participate in a narrative and observe it is a point not addressed by Fisher or other researchers. Narratives have been studied and used by many disciplines
including communication and psychology as well as marketing, sociology, law, and politics. They have also been used in the military. Though more often associated with strategic narrative and conveying messages to Soldiers and the public, narrative has been integrated into recent literature regarding how to best utilize the paradigm. Fisher stated narratives help establish meaningful connections to our world and interactions.

Regardless of the form they may assume, recounting and accounting for are stories we tell ourselves and each other to establish a meaningful life-world. The character of narrator(s), the conflicts, the resolutions, and the style will vary, but each mode of recounting and accounting for is but a way of relating a ‘truth’ about the human condition. (Fisher, 1984, p. 6)

Researchers such as Hanska (2014), Nissen (2013), Finlayson & Corman (2013), and McNamara (2014) have all evaluated narratives within the military, proposing how narratives can be used as training tools for leadership and strategic communication as well as serve as a lesson that other fields other than strategic communication should be researched and utilized. All of them view narratives as Fisher did – through traditional text.

Fisher laid the foundation for narratives and has been highly influential in the study of narratives. He did, however, overlook how narratives can be studied in place, *in situ*. He did not address whether narrative could be examined anywhere other than text and speech. I suggest the narrative of Patton’s Army career can be examined not only in text and speech, but also places. The leadership styles and messages expressed by Patton throughout his career represent aspects of leadership seen at Fort Knox and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. Being with the Soldiers you are leading and
acquiring knowledge through experiences are some of the leadership attributes Patton possessed and emphasized through his career and messages emphasized in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. Studying Patton’s narrative and how he is portrayed in the museum will expand on Fisher’s notion of narrative theory because Fisher did not conceive studying narrative in place.

Leadership

Leadership can be observed from every profession and academic discipline. Different approaches and theories have developed and evolved over time from trait-based approaches and “great man” phenomenon to behavioral theories and actions that matter (Northouse, 2016). Leadership has also been directly studied within the military and by the military (Boe, 2015; Boe & Holth, 2015a; Boe & Holth, 2015b; Day, 2013; Wong et al., 2003). It is evident that the literature surrounding leadership approaches, theories, and approaches are vast. It is even safe to say this literature review cannot begin to scratch the surface of leadership research and, because of the diverse level of study surrounding leadership, it was a challenge to find a way to contribute to the current body of literature. It was after my internship with U.S. Army Cadet Command working with Cadets and Cadre and through rhetorical fieldwork and the study of narrative in place which opened the door to study leadership discourse in place.

When discussing leadership discourse, I refer to the discourse presented in the evolving definition of leadership within the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and the leadership requirements model located in the latest Field Manual. One analysis of this thesis focuses on the reading of leadership within the Field Manuals and interpreting the meaning of the definitions. The current incarnation of leadership changed over time,
beginning with an introductory pamphlet in 1948 as an “art” to its integration in the latest 2019 publishing doctrine as a democratic process, an “activity.” Its steady evolution has added to the Army leadership discourse because it helped guide and train Soldiers to the Army standard, making distinct linguistic alterations while maintaining the overall objective of leadership. This is evident because not only have the manuals changed over time and because Soldiers are trained to the manual’s baseline. Though there are other factors such as teaching and training style from Cadre members, it is safe to say the standardized definition of leadership and the leadership requirements model have contributed to the formation of its Soldiers. The leadership requirements model examines core leader attributes and competencies. This model follows the iconic, “Be, Know, Do,” model of the Army as it breaks down the categories of what leaders should understand and accomplish. This model does not provide a definition, but it does break down key attributes which increase a leader’s competency and skillset in working with followers. The model attributes consist of character, presence, and intellect while competencies include leading, developing, and achieving (U.S. [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 1-7). It provides what a leader should keep in mind while leading their followers.

Leadership approaches and theories possess different perspectives on how leadership should be defined (Northouse, 2016). For example, the skills-based approach, established by Katz and referenced by Northouse, examines leadership requiring specific skills, which include, “the ability to use one’s knowledge and competencies to accomplish a set of goals or objectives,” (Northouse, 2016, p. 44). Comparatively, authentic leadership surrounds the notion of genuineness from the leader, based around what a leader knows and conveys through regulation and an honesty in the relationship.
between the leader, follower, and the context surrounding them (Northouse, 2016, p. 196). I want to expand the vast field of leadership literature by examining it within place. Rendering a criticism of leadership based on the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine allow me to test the consistency and coherency of leadership textually and materially. To bridge the gap between studying textual leadership and material leadership, a broader definition of text is required – a feature which rhetorical fieldwork promotes.

Rhetorical Fieldwork and Text

Michael Middleton, Danielle Endres, and Samantha Senda-Cook observed an area of research which had not been examined in depth before in the rhetorical tradition. Other researchers had approached the subject of studying the field, but it was a combination of an article written by Aaron Hess and Middleton et al. (2011) where rhetorical fieldwork was conceived. Traditional rhetoric involved examining orators, texts, and speeches to obtain text necessary for criticism and determined “close reading” would be enough to draw conclusions and prompt questions about the examined subject (Middleton, Hess, Endres, & Senda-Cook, 2015, p. 3). Rhetorical fieldwork has gradually been adjusting the way researchers view and analyze nontraditional texts (Middleton et al., 2015, p. xiv; Middleton et al., 2011, p. 393). I discuss rhetorical fieldwork in depth in chapter three, but it is important now to state this method redefines and reconsiders how the researcher is connected with the text, context, field, and even the audience and how the experience of the researcher plays an integral part in the analysis (Middleton et al., 2015, p. xiv).

Rhetorical fieldwork possesses a unique relationship with text because it involves creating the text which the researcher analyzes, an important element for this analysis. By taking a step back from traditional text and addressing how an individual can examine
and interpret an event or place, new opportunities become available for examination, such as the objective of this thesis. There are three key assumptions of rhetorical fieldwork when it comes to rhetorical fieldwork and text, but I focus on the first which is, “Texts are embedded in social practices, performances, and contexts” (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 15). This means that text exists all around us and possesses a constant presence. It signifies that the pieces around us function as their own form of text which can be analyzed and separated into smaller components as text, practices, and contexts. The authors emphasize, “All texts, whether created and experience by critics through field-based presence or documented and reproduced by rhetors or other observers (e.g., media practitioners), have rhetorical significance” (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 92). Rhetorical fieldwork simply broadens the horizon on what text is and offers more information for rhetoricians. It considers context – place and space – with text and artifacts. “All rhetorical texts interrelate with context” (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 92).

The Army Field Manuals and published doctrine function as text for this thesis and served as a traditional form of text. The Field Manuals’ foundation as traditional text allows me to draw on it to form connections with places. Reading the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine definitions of leadership and using rhetorical fieldwork creates corroboration between sources and makes the analysis stronger. The Field Manuals were created by the Department of the Army by the order of the Secretary of the Army (Table 1). The Field Manuals serve as a standard definition, a constant for training and teaching material for Soldiers, Cadre and Cadets alike. It is because the definition was created by military personnel and because of its standardization among service members that the Field Manuals and definition play such an integral part of analyzing the readings from
rhetorical fieldwork. The museum functions as a piece of military history and should be approached from an insider, military definition to complete the analysis. The way I approached the text and the Field Manuals may be approached from other definitions and styles of leadership; however, I have elected to use the manuals as a guide for my leadership definition.

I also examined older versions of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine beginning from 1948 to the present. In total, there were sixteen I was able to find archived. I examined the text which specified “leadership” or “military leadership” and took note of the definitions (Table 2). The terms change over time, becoming more precise and detailed in their descriptions. Leadership evolved from being an “art” to a more democratic process (Department of the Army, 1948; U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019). The terminology moves from “influencing human behavior” to “influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation” (Department of the Army, 1948; U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019). There is a steady progression of Field Manuals serving as guides teaching tools which changed from the late 1940s into its current account. The latest edition of the Field Manual is what I argue can be seen in place, specifically in the museum.

Based on the discussion of this chapter surrounding theories, I claim leadership can be studied in situ. Patton’s Army career and his life’s story reside within the museum at Fort Knox. Patton’s legacy is his identity as a leadership icon within the Army, and it is through the museum that his leadership is told through stories of his life. Therefore, by studying Patton in this place, leadership can be studied in place.
This chapter has evaluated leadership and narrative theory to support the claim that leadership can be studied in place. I have examined the broadened definition of text under rhetorical fieldwork and how context and place cannot be separated from text. The following chapter will describe the methods and application of rhetorical fieldwork and will address how it will be used in tandem with leadership discourse. I will describe how it will be used in place, specifically in the General George Patton Museum of Leadership at Fort Knox, Kentucky. The following chapter will discuss the examination of Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and the conceptualization of terms which will be measured and applied in situ.
METHODS

In chapter two, I evaluated the primary concepts of leadership and narratives and how they are used throughout the course of this thesis. I integrated previous literature about narratives and leadership and tied theoretical concepts to one another, placing them in conversation and discussed previous pieces of literature which used similar concepts and approaches as this thesis. In this chapter, I state my positionality for context within this thesis. I also identify what I look for in situ for leadership, leadership discourse, and how I examine the text formed by rhetorical fieldwork. I integrate rhetorical fieldwork to evaluate leadership discourse in place through examining the General George Patton Museum of Leadership at Fort Knox, Kentucky. I examined the archived Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine through the lens of rhetorical field methods. This chapter also offers the guidelines and steps I used for potential replication in future studies. Before addressing my positionality, it is relevant to address a brief background of rhetorical fieldwork not only because it is the method I use to perform my analyses, but it will establish this method for future researchers.

Rhetorical Fieldwork

Rhetorical fieldwork was initiated by Michael Middleton, Danielle Endres, Samantha Senda-Cook, and Aaron Hess. They observed more researchers were utilizing
ethnography and fieldwork in their analyses because the information from “close reading” provided limited perspectives in researching the environment. There were pieces of information missing from traditional text which required a critical eye recording and observing from a first-person perspective. Researchers who use this method produce fieldnotes and interviews, both formal and informal, as well as receive privileged information from an insiders’ perspective, which gives them a unique perspective on the information and analysis (Middleton et al., 2015, p. xvi). As Middleton et al. (2015) iterate, “Critics’ bodies function as research instruments, collecting multisensory information” (p. xxiii; Middleton et al., 2011, pp. 393-394).

A researcher using rhetorical fieldwork engages in locations with different pieces of information such as the interviews and artifacts, examining the significance and importance of the gleaned information. It is the researcher, the rhetorical critic, who can better determine what is important and relevant for analysis and being in the field allows the researcher to further examine the aspects they deem relevant. Reading an established text limits the perspectives available to the researcher. Rhetorical fieldwork promotes the first-hand perspective and allows rhetorical critics to further engage in their surroundings, asking questions and challenging what they see around them and recording the experience as text for further analysis. Middleton et al. (2015) concluded it is the field notes from the experience and the insights of being present in the moment provide a first-hand account rather than reading a second-hand experience that makes rhetorical fieldwork so valuable (p. 17). Researchers can, “Appreciate the firsthand knowledge and wisdom gained through direct experience within rhetoric” (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 23; Middleton et al., 2011). It is not to say that rhetorical fieldwork negates or replaces
established rhetorical methods of analysis, but rather it adds to the researcher’s ability to expand their research and add to the current literary body available. An insider perspective provides an otherwise unaddressed perspectives gained by being present in the environment because new tactics and strategies of recording and reading information are required (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 23).

Positionality Statement

When entering the field to analyze text, it is important to keep positionality in mind. Positionality refers to an individual’s background, biases, and perspectives (Positionality, 2019). It is integrated in how we interpret the world and is inseparable from observations and opinion forming. What researchers must do is understand that their backgrounds have some effect on their observations and the environment around them when they engage in fieldwork and text.

I know that my background as someone who comes from a Caucasian middle-class family may have a different perspective or draw different conclusions from someone with a different background, but it also gives me the unique experience from being on the outside. Being a university student also plays a role in forming and articulating thoughts and ideas. Also, being on the outside of the Army keeps me curious and researching, asking questions which I may have known the answers to if I had grown up on an insider’s perspective. To effectively convey my approach, I must make my positionality known so future researchers may take my perspective into consideration when formulating ideas and making connections.

When I enter the General George Patton museum of Leadership, I acknowledge I have spent hours researching and understanding Fort Knox as a training cite as well as a
military base and Patton’s influence there, but know I do not have years of experience like someone with a military family would have. I also participated in an internship for three consecutive summers at Fort Knox, Kentucky photographing and interviewing Cadets and Soldiers about Cadet Summer Training. This opportunity allowed me to gain an understanding of how training is conducted and the processes Soldiers go through to make effective and well-rounded leaders. An accumulated year of time does not make me an expert on Army culture or training Soldiers receive and, because of this fact, I have spent time reading and researching about Army history and current literature about the Army in preparation to address and evaluate leadership discourse. I also acknowledge that reading about concepts like leadership and not experiencing it first-hand can create a romanticized point of view. Experience from the internship allowed me to see motivated individuals immersed in training and practicing leadership, but the surrounding context promoted this environment. I know the leadership discourse I saw during that time which inspired this thesis may be based on an idealistic mindset and I have taken that into consideration for analyzing text and place.

As stated in my positionality, my perspective factors into how I view the world and how I analyze the Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. The following subsections will address how I identify and conceptualize the concepts I approached and studied including leadership, leadership narrative, and the Field Manuals.

Leadership in Place

I went to the General George Patton Museum of Leadership a total of three times during the academic year of 2019-2020 for the purposes of this thesis. The first time was
a brief visit to understand the overall geography of the museum as well as the hours of operation and potential rules and regulations which may restrict my documentation. The next two times, I stayed for several hours undisturbed and moved at my leisure between the exhibits and panels of information. I tested the Field Manual and publishing doctrine definition of leadership as seen in Table 2 and the leadership requirements model located within the same Field Manual as it possessed a summary of leadership requirements, attributes, and competencies expected in Army leaders (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. vii). I was looking for potential parallels between the leadership definitions in the manuals from 1948 to 2019 and the leadership requirements model and the artifacts, plaques, and quotes in the museum supporting my claim that leadership can be studied in situ. Because I test the definitions against the material in the museum, I use a more grounded theory approach, meaning I see the definitions and manuals how they are, to analyze and test the material. I interpret the meaning of leadership within the manuals from my reading and test whether these definitions reside in the museum or not.

In my fieldnotes, I recorded similarities, dissimilarities, conflicts, and congruencies between the information within the museum and the Field Manual leadership and compared my experience in situ to the editions of the Field Manuals between 1948 and 2019 to see how the information in my fieldnotes aligned with those documents. I compared my fieldnotes with other editions of the Field Manuals because I want to see and show how the Field Manuals have evolved into the current incarnation of leadership discourse and whether or not the leadership discourse could be located and studied in place. I believe, based on the literature review, that the leadership discourse located in the manuals’ text can be seen and studied in situ at the museum and that the
text complements the museum by surrounding Patton’s Army career and turning it into a leadership narrative.

According to the Army Doctrine Publication (ADP), leadership is supposed to influence individuals toward a common goal or mission which is meant to improve the group (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-3). A leader is supposed to provide direction, motivation, and purpose for their followers (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-3). These directives are meant to be paired with intelligence and information to serve as an element of combat (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. 1-3). These things combined with the core competencies and leadership requirements model require intellect and development of a leader demonstrate the definition and logic map are clearly linked (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. vii). Using this definition of leadership allows me to compare Army doctrine and practices with the museum. The Army definition of leadership, therefore, is essential for the analysis of text and place.

I photographed the artifacts and plaques and made note of when I saw a connection with the leadership definition and leadership requirements model while in the museum. Whether the connection was a part of the text on a plaque or the artifact itself, I associated the words and meanings behind them directly to the definition of leadership. For example, on a plaque near a historical munition piece, there was a plaque titled, “Providing Motivation and Inspiration,” which referred to Patton’s techniques of being seen with his men on the front lines.
I incorporate my fieldnotes as vignettes of my time within the museum within my analysis to give context. Providing motivation is part of the Army definition of leadership, making it a valuable contribution to this thesis. Others may argue the Army definition may not be the most effective, but I argue that a leadership discourse and the museum should be evaluated by a term they defined.

Because rhetorical fieldwork allows the researcher to be subjective and interpret the material from readings, both textual and environmental (place and space), there are natural limitations such as a shift in perspective because of the acquisition of first-hand knowledge. As Middleton et al. (2015) state,

> When critics embody the dual role of researcher and audience member, they become decentered in making critical judgments as they gain firsthand knowledge of audiences’ engagement with rhetorical practices, elevating the voices of others into the critical project. (p. 13)

These were accounted for by acknowledging that taking an active role in the environment naturally opens a different perspective. Firsthand knowledge of a group can bring about understandings not available to the public. Reasons why things are done the way they are
may become clear and are no longer in need of justification. Because of these reasons, a researcher’s perspective can shift with gaining information and knowledge about the group. For example, interacting in the environment of the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and reading about military leaders and leadership theories may have adjusted how I perceive the Army and their styles of leadership; why they do things the way they do them. I maintained thorough fieldnotes and attempted to maintain objectivity through my subjective experience. What I perceived and observed as narrative may not be what others perceive and observe. I viewed the leadership discourse through the Field Manuals’ definition and pulled from charts, tables, diagrams, and text. Adhering to the text provides a guide for future research, like how the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine provide a guide for Soldiers, as they examine leadership discourse and leadership narrative in place.

Summary

In all, I visited the General George Patton Museum of Leadership three times after reading through the Field Manuals published between 1948 and 2019 and establishing the definitions I intended to use. The first visit established potential limitations and availability of the location. The subsequent two times, I was able to spend hours, around six to seven hours combined, uninterrupted reading and photographing the environment. I applied the latest Field Manual definition of leadership and the leadership requirements model to the artifacts, plaques, and posters as I walked through the museum. I utilized rhetorical fieldwork to place myself in the environment.

I have explained in this chapter my positionality and how I approach the different themes and elements within this thesis including the Field Manuals and publishing.
doctrine, the museum, and leadership discourse. The next chapter will cover the analysis of the Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. I will also draw connections between leadership discourse, text from rhetorical fieldwork, and the museum.
ANALYSIS OF FIELD MANUALS AND PUBLISHING DOCTRINE

The previous chapters have introduced the methods used to analyze information within text and readings, rhetorical fieldwork and an analysis of text. I spent time in the previous chapters analyzing the current research and literature and explained my connections on a theoretical base. I visited the museum three times and spent several hours during each visit taking field notes and photographs. In this chapter, I analyze the text within the Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and use the Field Manual definition of leadership as well as the leadership requirements model located in the text.

Evolution of Leadership Discourse in Field Manuals

Every Field Manual and publishing doctrine regarding leadership discourse and training tactics possesses a definition of leadership. As seen in Table 2 of the appendix, these manuals were released at intermittent intervals, often around three to six years, the longest gap being thirteen years. The manuals within Table 2 represent fifteen archived manuals and one recently released manual. Other archived manuals regarding leadership within other branches of the Army may exist either in an unknown location archived on the internet or military library.

The first Field Manual was released as a pamphlet in 1948 for, “The information and guidance of all concerned” (Department of the Army, 1948, p. ii). It was created as a guide and a basis for instruction, not as a final treatment or a “how-to” to create leaders.
(Department of the Army, 1948, p. iii). The pamphlet discusses within the introductory paragraphs that leadership is, “The art of influencing human behavior. Put into everyday words, it is the ability to handle men” (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 1). Shown by Table 2 in the appendix, the available archived Field Manuals and publishing doctrine have eight iterations of the definition which can be broken into three categories – leadership as an art, leadership as a process, and leadership as a democratic process, an “activity.”

Comparatively speaking, the latest definition comprises of more material to clarify the definition and specifies what each term means. What this means for leadership and leadership discourse is that more has been taken into consideration when the later manual was formed. It is precise and attempts to account for behaviors, traits, and skills necessary for effective leadership. The pamphlet released in 1948 possesses the focus of achieving the mission and governing subordinates and directly states that leaders can be both born and made and that there are innate traits which can be developed and acquired over time. Some of the earliest leadership theories emerged around this time, such as the trait approach and skills approach, and only proposed that leaders possess traits with which they were born (Northouse, 2016). What this indicates for leadership and leadership discourse was that there was some shift in thinking where the trait approach was incorporated in later manuals but did so in a way that made leadership accessible and teachable to others.

The manuals shift from leadership being an art, to a process, and finally into a democratic process (activity). The following subsections will break down leadership within these three categories.
Leadership as an Art

When considering terminology and language used, pamphlet from 1948 to the manuals published in 1965 classify leadership as an art form. Historical examples of leadership as an art would reside in heroic names from history such as George S. Patton Jr., Julius Caesar, and Dwight D. Eisenhower come to mind as individuals with an unparalleled, natural talent for leadership while pouring themselves into studying and practicing their messages of leadership. The word “art” insinuates that everyone can attempt leadership, but a select few will excel. “Art” implies innate talent, skill, and precision which a handful of people may possess, but can develop over time. The art of leadership is identified in a similar way by the pamphlet and manuals and provides primary concerns and objectives. “The art of the leader is concerned with the desires, the needs, and the mental states of individuals and groups – of men as individual soldiers and as groups in military units” (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 5). This quotation implies that a leader is born with certain, innate traits which requires genuine interest in people and an empathy for the followers. My analysis suggests leadership as an art seems to require a level of inborn altruism and understanding, distinct traits of an individual. Altruism is arguably a trait as is empathy, but can also be developed and practiced according to psychologists. What does this mean? It means leadership as an art can be, Acquired, cultivated, and practiced by anyone who possesses the mental and physical ability and the moral and ethical integrity expected of a commissioned or noncommissioned officer. Developing the art is a continuing process which involves the recognition and practice of the basic traits of leadership and the
The manuals released in 1958, 1961, and 1965 all reinforce the above definition of what leadership as an art can do. They emphasize that leadership as an art is both innate teachable. For leadership theories, this identification of leadership as a teachable art means that there is a fusion of several early theories and approaches, specifically about traits, skills, and behavior, that are being combined. Leadership is not just an art, but a teachable art. Much like how not everyone is born or can become a Picasso or a Mozart, people can still learn about art and music, attempting the skills and striving to be better than before. Leadership as an art form is the same way. Not all people will be proficient or be able to execute leadership as well as other people, but the ability to learn leadership as an art which makes the pamphlet from 1948 and the subsequent Field Manuals to 1965 unique for their time.

The pamphlet also established that leaders, “Must always set the example,” regardless of situation (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 4). What this indicates is that this pamphlet proposes leadership is a combination of multiple leadership approaches and perspectives, adopting aspects of trait and skills approach as well as the behavioral approach (Northouse, 2016). This is important to note because the evolution of leadership discourse modifies the terminology, but the essence and meaning are consistent from manual to manual. To bring in context regarding leadership theories and approaches, trait approach was created by Ralph Stogdill, submitted to *The Journal of Psychology* in 1947 where it was published in 1948, proposed leaders possessed specific traits which he identified as, “Intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-
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classifying leadership as an art did not remain the norm in the following manuals. Over the course of the 1948 pamphlet and five Field Manuals, the definition of leadership began to evolve and incorporate other aspects. “Leadership is the art of influencing human behavior,” shifted to advise that techniques will change due to circumstance to incorporating what a person in a leadership position should attempt to obtain such as willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 1; U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-10, 1951, p. 1; U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1958, p. 7; U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1961, p. 3; U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1965, p. 3).

There is a shift between the 1965 Field Manual and the 1973 Field Manual where leadership is now identified as a process and not as an art form. Based on the acquired archived documents, there was an abrupt shift in leadership’s classification as a process and no longer an art. The definition in 1973 was condensed to no longer include a requirement to obtain “Willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation” (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1965, p. 3), and instead proposed that it is, “The process of influencing men in such a manner as to accomplish the mission” U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1973, p. 1-3).

Regardless of the shift in terminology, what leadership as an art means for leadership discourse is that there is a finesse and presence from the person who has either developed necessary skills or was born with them.

**Leadership as Process**

The way leadership was defined changed in manuals in 1973 and remained the same through 2015, making the switch from leadership being an art to leadership being a process. The exact reason of why leadership shifted from an “art” to a “process” is not
explicitly addressed; however, I have a few working theories as to why the shift occurred. The first potential explanation surrounds the cultural climate of the 60s and 70s. At the time, the Civil Rights Movement was happening in the United States. The second is that the United States was engaged in the Vietnam War. The cultural climate combined with the active troop engagement may have had a direct influence on why leadership was shifted. It could have been the cultural climate and war made people in leadership positions question how to better teach and present leadership to Soldiers and to the public. Leadership and war seem less of an art when you are in the trenches, from the perspective I have gained based on my research into the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine.

The definition employed in 1973, “Military leadership is the process of influencing men in such a manner to accomplish the mission” (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1973, p. 1-3), adjusted one more time in 1983, becoming, “The processes by which a soldier influences others to accomplish the mission. He carries out this process by applying his leadership attributes (beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and skills)” (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1983, p. 54). The definitions from 1973 and 1983 act as a transitional period for the more refined and polished classification of leadership in 1990. Small, subtle changes are made every few years to the manuals, if changes are made at all.

After the 1965 manual, leadership as an art is not how leadership is defined, but art is still integrated in different ways. For example, tactics is identified as both an art and a science in 2006. The 1999 manual identifies leadership as a blend of an art and science (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1999, p. 5-1). Art is not completely removed from
leadership, but it is no longer within the definition. Regardless, the examined Field Manuals and publishing doctrine do reveal that there was a shift between leadership as an art and leadership as a process, which is specifically defined as,

The process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction, and motivation. Effective leadership transforms human potential into effective performance. (U.S. Army [DA], AR 600-100, 1990, p. 1).

A process implies a step-by-step order which, if followed, can attain the objective to the best of the leader’s ability. Leadership as a process means that leaders have a directive they can follow, a workable method.

Like an instruction manual setting up a child’s toy and following the flow of how each piece should be placed, a process suggests that there is always a step to solve the next problem. Leadership moves into a methodical, applicable entity; a set of procedural pieces seemingly standardized and immovable. The Field Manuals contribute to the leadership discourse in another way because it initiates a “next step,” by providing a secondary part to their definition as well as a motive. “Leadership is the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization” (Department of the Army, 2006, p. 1-2; U.S. Army [DA], AR 600-100, 1993, p. 1; U.S. Army [DA], ADRP 6-22, 2012, p. 1-1; U.S. Army [DA], FM 6-22, 2015, p. 1-3).

Process also means to comprehend. It means to take in the information present and to understand it on multiple levels. Multiple levels refer to what information means tactically, logistically, and emotionally to name a few. A leader has to process information quickly and make the best, most informed decision based on experience and
records available to them as the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine acknowledges. This implies flexibility and adaptability, qualities which could arguably be inborn or learned. A “process” implies that, for this next incarnation of leadership discourse, that a certain amount of knowledge and intellect is required for a leader to process the information they are provided.

Leaders need to rely on their knowledge and past experience, points which the Field Manuals emphasize in different ways. The manuals from 1953 to 1965 and the pamphlet from 1948 emphasize that nothing inspires like a demonstration of knowledge (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 7; U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1953, p. 8; FM 22-100, 1958, p. 21; FM 22-100, 1961, p. 23; FM 22-100, 1965, p. 17). Field manuals from 2006 on emphasize becoming lifelong learners and that it is from a range of sources including history, current events, and fellow Soldiers (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100 or FM 6-22, 2006, p. 2-8; ADRP 6-22, 2012, p. 1-6; FM 6-22, 2015, p. 1-1; FM 6-22, 2015, p. 1-5; ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 10-6). Being a lifelong learner contributes to a leader’s knowledge, their expertise, innovation, and judgment – their intellect – a category on the leadership requirements model and a core leader attribute (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, pp. 1-6 – 1-7). All of the previously stated attributes, characteristics, traits, and learned skills contribute to leadership discourse in the manuals. The leadership requirements model is no exception. Leadership relies on providing purpose, direction, and motivation which can all be executed by a leader’s character, presence, or intellect (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 1-7; 1-3). The leadership discourse from the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine rely on core competencies because the categories in the
model represent and describe the attributes the Army deems necessary for effective leadership.

Leadership as a process naturally implies that this step-by-step method can be employed by whomever elects to accept a leadership role. Being knowledgeable, embodying character and presence, developing and inspiring those who follow are essential qualities which can be learned and enhanced over time.

Leadership as a Democratic Process

The leadership discourse progresses again into what it is today – a democratic process. Leadership is officially defined as an activity in July of 2019, meaning this particular definition is still being taught to Soldiers and Cadets now in 2020; however, my reading suggests that leadership is more of a democratic process. Leadership as a process and leadership as a democratic process vary in definition for a few reasons. Leadership as a process implies the procedural process and steps leaders can take and, most importantly, it is employed by a singular leader and their followers. Leadership as a democratic process allows input from followers and fellow leaders through the hierarchical structure of the Army. Even though my reading sees leadership as a democratic process, leadership as an activity is defined by the 2019 Field Manual as the following:

Leadership is the activity of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.

Leadership as an element of combat power, coupled with information, unifies the warfighting functions (movement and maneuver, intelligence, fires, sustainment, protection and command and control). Leadership focuses and synchronizes
organizations. Leaders inspire people to become energized and motivated to achieve desired outcomes. An Army leader is anyone who by virtue or assumed role or assigned responsibility inspires and influences people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization. (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 1-3)

Leadership is no longer a process or an art, but a democratic process (an activity). I identify leadership as a democratic process instead of an activity for a few reasons. One of the reasons for leadership being a democratic process is because, based on my readings, leadership relies on gathering information and opinions of fellow Soldiers. It is more like a collective process because leadership is now something that an individual or a group of individuals can perform. Leadership can be solo, one person leading a team, or a group activity, several individuals making decisions and leading the followers. This implies leadership and leaders do not need to act alone. Leadership has often been conceptualized as one individual leading a group of individuals. Leadership as a democratic process, based on my analysis, means multiple people can chime in and contribute simultaneously, offering opinions and suggestions for the benefit of the whole group. Leaders, “Recognize that other people have good ideas and they recognize those who do. To be innovators, leaders rely on intuition, experience, knowledge, and input from subordinates, peers, and superiors” (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. 4-2).

Listening to others and taking their opinions into account alludes to the necessity of adaptability in leadership, requiring quick-thinking and knowledge to draw on to make quick decisions and implement the plan of the group quickly, another reason why leadership is a democratic process. Adaptability comes from training, practice, and also a
person’s individual intuitive innovation in the heat of the moment or whatever the
scenario presents. Mentioned for the first time in the Field Manual published in 1965,
adaptability is essential when examining any situation whether it is tactical, formal, or
informal (U.S. Army [DA], FM 22-100, 1965, pp. 4-5). Though it is not stated directly by
the Field Manual, I believe this passage implies that Soldiers can, at best, only be
prepared with training and reenacting different simulations. No two scenarios are going
to be exactly the same, so they can only be taught up until a specific point. So, it is a
combination of the training and intuitive decision making which aids in Soldiers’
leadership capabilities. Leadership relies on both the leader’s capabilities as well as the
Soldiers who follow them. It is a blend of methods, similar to the blend of leadership
being inborn and learned and developed.

Leadership as a democratic process promotes the followers to practice leadership
and exercise their leadership qualities. The followers must understand that if something
happens to the leader, they could be leading the organization or the group next. The
activity of sharing information and offering informed suggestions once again promotes
both the hierarchical system, where the next person in charge is the next highest ranking
officer or non-commissioned officer, and a democratic one because it is up to the leader
to ensure the essential information is known and to take opinions into consideration when
giving an order. The act of examining the situation and compiling information from
multiple sources including subordinates, peers, and superiors requires a leader to make an
informed decision based on facts, experiences, and opinions from others. It is not to say
that there is not a procedure or methodology to the Army’s hierarchical system of
leadership, but rather leadership as an activity incorporates leadership as a process by
creating more of a democratic system where the leader must take many factors and perspectives into account when making a decision. There are orders from leaders which must be followed instantaneously and with trust, leaving little room for information acquisition and opinion gathering; however, leadership is still a collective effort both from the followers and fellow leaders. Even the 2019 Field Manual acknowledges the collective effort leadership requires.

Every member of the Army, military or civilian, is part of a team and functions in the role of leader and subordinate. Being a good subordinate is part of being an effective leader. Leaders do not just lead subordinates – they also lead other leaders. Leaders are not limited to just those designated by position, rank, or authority. (U.S. Army [DA], *ADP 6-22*, 2019, p. v)

Based on this reading, leaders are not just the individuals currently in charge and making the final choice. Instead, leaders are spread throughout all the ranks within the Army. Leaders being spread throughout proves leadership as a democratic process is essential. The opinions and perspectives leaders can offer one another create dialogue and insight into alternative methods of tackling the same problem. This is important not only as recognizing leadership as a democratic process, but also because there is an emphasis on leaders communicating and sharing information through the hierarchy in the Army. Leadership as a democratic process presents itself in ways different than previous editions of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. It seems to allude to leaders not needing to work alone while also emphasizing complete personal development through acquisition of knowledge and skills. There is no step-by-step process, but rather
guidelines of aspects which will make a better leader and more successful leadership period.

The method of leadership as a democratic process can be brought back to the leadership requirements model which encompasses and breaks down the, “Be, Know, Do,” model of what is necessary for a leader to possess. “Be,” refers to how a leader holds themselves – their character and their presence. These aspects break down into traits such as empathy, humility, confidence, fitness, and resilience while also integrating skills and external motivations such as Army Values, professional bearing, and the overall ethos of the Army culture (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. vii). “Be,” suggests both attributes of traits and skills within this model as traits are inborn and often affected by genetics while skills are learnable tools. Leadership, as discussed, also relies on the, “Know,” aspect, intellect, ethics, expertise, and tact (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, p. vii). This feature also could arguably be either a skill or a trait because some people are naturally born with an aptitude for intelligence while others strive and study to develop their minds. The three remaining under, “Do,” represent competencies – achieves, develops, leads – and are listed as action verbs, meaning they are being used to describe what a leader does. The three competencies can be viewed as behaviors learned over time or inherent characteristics of leadership as a position.

Leadership presented by the Field Manuals evolved from being a form of art to a process to a democratic process. The most recent definition built upon the previous editions, but leadership still possesses the core of leaders being both born and made. Leaders are born with innate traits and developable skills, but must employ different methods depending on the situation. Sometimes, leaders must make a quick judgment call
and do not have time to take the opinions of followers and fellow leaders into account; however, when time allows, leaders are encouraged to absorb all information possible sources and make an informed decision. This is significant because it blends multiple approaches and theories of leadership by integrating the individual’s innate skills and traits with the acknowledgement that not all skills develop independently. It does not go against the grain of the first three approaches discussed including trait, skill, and behavioral. It is a combination of these three leadership approaches which strengthens internal consistency within the manuals because the themes from all three exist in all of the Field Manuals.

These approaches view the leader from an extrinsic point of view, what other can observe them doing, rather than intrinsic point of view, what they are working on internally. Regardless, these theories and approaches seem to work in tandem within the 1948 Field Manual description of leadership addressing that leaders can be born, made, and observed (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 1). From my observations of leadership discourse, it seems this first leadership pamphlet in 1948 as it is the first documented attempt of the Army to standardize, define, and teach this term. It precisely identified terms believed, at the time, to be essential to executing effective and positive leadership skills. As new leadership theories developed and emerged such as servant-leadership, situational approach, and leader-member exchange, how researchers and military personnel interpreted and applied leadership changed (Northouse, 2016). The external world changed and, to adapt, so did the terms and approaches in the Field Manuals – presenting this evolving discourse of leadership into how it is conceptualized now.
This discursive shift in leadership discourse within the Field Manuals is why the Patton museum is essential for this thesis. It is one thing to say the leadership discourse has shifted over time. It is another to demonstrate the shift and show how it has materialized in place. It is essential to understand Patton’s methods and how he is portrayed in the museum because his methods have been identified as timeless and iconic according to researchers. Patton as an icon serves as a prime example of leadership in the Army. Though he is not mentioned directly by the Field Manuals of publishing doctrine directly, he has been studied before as a historical figure and is renowned for years as a pillar of leadership by multiple researchers. Based on my research into Patton’s life and from existing literature, it would be remiss to exclude him as an example even though he is not directly quoted in the Field Manuals. Patton’s leadership messages represent aspects of what I analyzed in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. The previous literature about Patton described his methods such as leading from the front and continuously learning – aspects which I pulled out from the readings of the Field Manuals; however, it is not enough to compare him to leadership literature. Patton’s methods of leadership and the characteristics he emphasized have been examined by researchers who have not placed him in direct contact with the content in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. Patton is consistently discussed in tandem with written literature and leadership styles and approaches. The materiality of leadership is missed from a purely textual analysis of Patton and leadership. Therefore, analyzing Patton’s leadership style, attributes, characteristics, and what the museum pulled from his past to place in the museum to examining them through the Field Manuals are crucial to fully understand how the leadership discourse has changed. Interpreting leadership from the
Field Manuals does not provide true texture and substance to leadership. A two-dimensional perspective to leadership, what the manuals provide, lays the groundwork. Studying leadership within a place provides a three-dimensional perspective to leadership, how leadership is executed and laid out spatially and materially. Analyzing the General George Patton Museum of Leadership complements the manuals and fills in the gaps from the textual reading because it provides a flesh and blood example, Patton, to what the Army defines as effective leadership. Studying the museum provides a physical demonstration of how the Army portrays Patton and what Soldiers should learn from him, something which is not done in the manuals.

This chapter described the text of the Field Manuals and its significance in setting the baseline for the analysis of the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. The following chapter will integrate in situ fieldnotes from the museum and how they carry on the leadership discourse.
ANALYSIS OF GENERAL GEORGE PATTON MUSEUM OF LEADERSHIP

The previous chapter established Field Manuals and publishing doctrine as the foundation of defining leadership discourse through the Army. This chapter will examine the General George Patton Museum of Leadership by incorporating vignettes from in situ fieldnotes and integrating Field Manuals and publishing doctrine definitions discussed, demonstrating how textual leadership discourse can be seen and inscribed in places. It is important to analyze the General George Patton Museum of Leadership because it provides materiality to leadership, a flesh and blood example of what the Army defines as an effective leader. What is missed in the analysis of the Field Manuals is that singular example which Soldiers can adhere to and emulate. The manuals provide what is expected of Soldiers and lay the groundwork for what is expected, but it is in the museum that leadership takes on life through Patton. The museum can evoke emotions, feelings, and the image of Patton’s legacy which the manuals cannot describe on their own. Therefore, it is important I analyze the Patton museum in tandem the Field Manuals from 1948 to 2019, building off of what I discussed in the previous chapter about how leadership was conceptualized as an art, a process, and finally as a democratic process in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine.
I found in the previous chapter that each manual built off of one another, adjusting and evolving while keeping true to the end goal – to influence people for the purpose of achieving a goal for the common good of the group. Because each definition contributed to making the latest definition of the manual, it is appropriate to see how the Patton museum aligns with the different editions to better understand leadership’s evolution.

The necessity of analyzing the museum resides in the subject of the museum, Patton. Patton has been examined by researchers for years from his leadership styles to his Army career and personal background. Yet Patton has not been examined through place. The museum memorializes Patton through incorporating events and artifacts from his life. The museum also focuses on his leadership styles and how he became the leader he did. Examining the museum and comparing it against the leadership discourse has not been done, making it necessary to examine Patton less from a historical perspective and more from a physical perspective. Analyzing the museum in tandem with the manuals is the only way to further understand Patton and how he is conceptualized as a leader by the Army.

_I arrived early in the morning at Fort Knox (Kentucky), passing through the base’s security and driving to the General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership. Just outside the museum were several tanks and pieces of machinery. It provided context for Fort Knox, which has a history of armor and cavalry training, and the museum because of Patton’s armor branch training._

_One thing which caught my eye, possibly more symbolic in nature, was the covered pathway leading up to the museum. The pillars on either side of the walkway_
seemed to stand at attention. There were red bricks laid three deep leading up to the museum on either side, some of them inscribed with names of Soldiers or partnered companies. Another interesting accompaniment to the museum is the Armor Memorial Park which honors armor and cavalry units from World War II to the present. Passing by these figures seemed to set a tone of reverence and memory before entering the museum.

The museum itself and the history within the area sets the scene for Patton and the contents within the museum. Fort Knox is well established as a place of training, teaching, and learning because of Cadet Summer Training and Army Recruiting Command. Addressing the surrounding area before analyzing the museum is important because the environment surrounding the museum is rich with a teaching and learning culture.

I entered the museum and in the main entrance of the museum is a wood carved statue of General George S. Patton himself. The caption noted the artist, Armand LaMontagne, and described that LaMontagne’s representation is what Patton wanted to impress upon his Soldiers and those who knew him.
What struck me immediately in the first room was the tall banner seemed to be in the shape of a waving flag with Patton’s photograph accompanied by the phrase, “What is leadership?” Patton’s response, and the Army Field Manual definition of leadership.
Seeing the banner in the shape of a flag waving in the wind seemed symbolic and was arguably intentional. The curved banner acknowledges U.S. military history and is paired with one of the greatest leaders (Wong, Bliese, & McGurk, 2003; Axelrod, 2006; Sklenka, 2002). The museum paints the picture of a patriotic man. Patton’s patriotism is paired with and a flag shaped banner. This is significant because of its symbolism and its direct link to the Field Manual definition of leadership. The same picture of a patriot can be said for the wooden statute in the front room. Patton wanted his Soldiers to see him and imagine him in a particular way of being strong, self-confident, and trim in proper uniform. How Patton wanted to be perceived is important to note as it seems Patton, according to this plaque, was concerned with aesthetics and appearances, at least in front of his men.

The artful portrayal of Patton via this wooden statue evokes the exact image the first leadership pamphlet in 1948 presented. How Patton presented himself was undoubtedly seen by his Soldiers because he frequently led from the front. His image as a leader would have meant a lot to him and those influenced by him. This is significant because his image would have affected his presence and how he developed his Soldiers as seen by some of the icons and plaques in the museum beyond the curved banner. The banner, just below Patton’s quote of how he would define leadership, states, “Leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation” (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.; U.S. Army [DA], FM 6-22, 2015, p. 1-3). My interpretation of leadership from this direct quotation is that leadership possesses requirements of the leader. A leader needs to be able to create or point out a purpose to their followers. A leader must provide guidance and be able to inspire their followers as
well. Through influence, a leader must accomplish these three tasks to perform leadership.

*There were six other illuminated banners which each possessed what I identify as a traits and characteristics. The banners were titled as character, presence, intelligence, leads, develops, achieves, each accompanied by a photograph of Patton with his family, with his Soldiers, or his childhood.*

![Image of illuminated banners]

*Figure 5: Illuminated Banners (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.)*

They looked like illuminated chapters of a book, waiting to be read and explored. Artifacts including items including helmets and crossbows Patton collected and uniforms he wore in his youth, such as his uniforms from fencing, football, and his time as a Cadet, were stored in tall glass cases accompanied by descriptive plaques.

*Taking a moment, I flipped through the brochure and noted that the different sections – Leads, Character, Intelligence, Presence, Develops, Achieves – were all broken down into different sections within the building, much like how a book or novel is broken into chapters. I had not noticed this connection in previous visits. There is a*
physical segmentation of timeline information within the museum, creating a non-sequential line of events and yet all pertaining to one leadership discourse contributing to the Army.

This vignette gets at the organizational structure of the museum and how it directly links to the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. Seeing the areas on the map that are labeled identically with the manuals and leadership requirements model shows that the manuals and the lessons within them were consulted as the museum was organized. Seeing these illuminated banners strengthens the argument that the Field Manual and publishing doctrine can be seen and studied in the museum. The titles of these banners directly correspond to the leadership requirements model, which is the first instance where I saw leadership discourse is being tied to Patton and events from his past and his military career – his narrative.

Patton’s narrative, from my interpretation of Patton and narratives, could include many aspects of his life. The story of his life could exclusively include his time as a young child. The narrative could also be about one particular battle or situation which Patton encountered during his Army service. Patton’s story could also be about his flaws and how there were times when he struck his Soldiers with his gloves because the Soldiers were afraid and weeping in their cots. His story could incorporate many facets of his existence but based on my analysis in the museum includes times where he truly embodied the Army requirements model. The museum is where Patton’s narrative represents him as a man who was born, shaped, and developed because of his personal drive for knowledge and victory in battle. The museum is also where Patton’s leadership narrative shines and where Patton demonstrates leadership attributes such as character,
intellect, and presence as he developed, led, and helped his Soldiers achieve victory using examples in his past.

The way each room was set up after this connection between segmentation and division of rooms and how they can be interpreted as chapters in a narrative suddenly clarified curiosities of why the museum was not in sequential order. The location is telling a story and not just displaying artifacts left behind by history. The way the sentences described the artifacts and how Patton lived suddenly seemed less of how a traditional museum would set up an exhibit, in a descriptive way, and more how an expert on this individual would describe and narrate how these things were integrated into this person’s life. Suddenly, the use of vibrant adjectives such as “legend” and “self-confident” became personable and allowed the character, Patton, to come to life in this place. Leadership presence, according to the leadership requirements model, requires self-confidence which is important because leadership requires the physical attribute as well as the assurance that you are making the right decision.

I moved into the second room and several pieces immediately stood out. The first things I noticed were an old Cadillac, a tank, and several large posters beside mounted wall cases with items inside. There was a waist high barrier surrounding the Cadillac. There were also plaques attached to the barrier with information about the Cadillac, Patton, and the significance of the vehicle. The room overall was dimly lit with spotlights highlighting the plaques and posters on the walls and the encased memorabilia. I shifted from the prominent artifact in front of me to view the cases affixed to the wall and began reading about the items which had come from Patton’s childhood.
Aligning toys and pieces from Patton’s past with statements of how his character developed through his childhood is a good design choice for the museum and pairs like information together, which makes the above vignette important because it provides a snapshot of what I encountered and how I observed the artifacts.

The informational plaque titled, “The Boy Makes the Man” described different attributes which shaped Patton’s character such as beliefs, continuous education, and experience – seemingly alluding to inherent traits and skills which he actively enhanced over time through his actions – and how his character helped develop him into the leader he is known as (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.; Northouse, 2016). What this means for leadership discourse is that Patton was viewed both from the trait approach and the skills approach. The combination of the trait approach and the skills approach reinforce the concept that leaders can be both born with attributes which
strengthen their leadership abilities, but leaders can also develop through study and practice. The introductory paragraph of the plaque states that background and upbringing play a role in character building, a component also in the leadership requirements model. It also states that character building is a life-long process and this process occurred at a young age, indicating that these skills and traits can be developed and learned over time.

After examining the artifacts on the wall, I turned my attention to the plaque next to them. They were about Patton’s beliefs and convictions as he grew up as well as photos of him with his family and throughout this military career (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). One thing I found particularly interesting is actually on the plaques surrounding the Cadillac. The entrance presents his early life and character growth into adolescence, but it also shows his death, all within the first twenty feet or so of the entrance to the second room (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). The Cadillac in the room is the same vehicle where Patton’s neck was broken after his driver was unable to avoid a low speed collision in 1945 (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton passed away almost two weeks after the accident at the age of 60, but not before he called off the investigation which had been launched against the driver of Patton’s Cadillac (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

Several pieces stood out. The first being the address of Patton’s life and death within the beginning of the museum. The guests and visitors are not there to witness Patton’s entire life. Instead, they are shown how Patton embodies leadership from the Field Manual and publishing doctrine texts. In a seemingly blunt way, the museum covers his early youth and death quickly, almost to get it out of the way for greater focus
to be placed on the information later in the museum. Though major moments of his life are integrated through artifacts and written on plaques, the integrated events in some way, shape, or form contribute to his development as a leader. The brevity and quick address of Patton’s life and death indicates something else. The focus of the museum is not directly on Patton, but the leadership and qualities of leadership he represents and embodies. The museum is emphasizing Patton and how he models the leadership narrative of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and the legacy he left behind as well as what we can learn from it (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). It takes Patton and pulls him in as a prime example of leadership by drawing on his micro-narratives and scenarios he encountered throughout his military career.

While most museums seem to function in a sequential order, this museum focuses on grouping content together as seen by the sections of “Develops,” “Intelligence,” and “Character.” Another example of how leadership narrative is emphasized is the selective content within each section. The section of, “Character,” contains an account of the II Corps and their command before Patton arrived (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Prior to Patton’s command, the II Corps suffered a massive loss to the German army because of the ineffective tactics and lack of presence and character from the general (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). It was with Patton’s fighting spirit accompanied with his desire to win and his formula of enforcing standards and training on his Soldiers that gave them the courage to win several major battles days after Patton asserted his command (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). He was able to use his character and inspire and motivate his Soldiers.
Character, identified by the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine as consisting, “Of the moral and ethical qualities of an individual revealed through their decisions and actions,” and includes the Army Values (LDRSHIP) among other attributes, is essential because good character can inspire others to do the same thing (U.S. Army [DA], ADP 6-22, 2019, pp. 2-1 – 2-2). If it were not for Patton, it is unlikely that those battles would have been won, but that is not the primary point. The point is that this documented account further ties Patton to the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine directly. Patton’s micro-narratives during his service are being integrated into the leadership narrative, moving from text to being seen in place. This is just one example in the second room of this direct intention of connection Patton directly with the leadership narrative from text to place.

The other plaques address empathy and note some of Patton’s recognized quotations such as, “Always do everything you ask of those you command,” and, “Never tell people how to do things. Tell them what to do and they will surprise you with their ingenuity” (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).
Patton’s early childhood and death occurred in a short amount of time, rapidly addressing these events. This seemed to denote that the focus was less on Patton’s life and more about the events which made him who he was. There were plaques of his beliefs and convictions, attributes which he upheld throughout his life. He held these beliefs and convictions, apparently, up until his death after the accident. Seeing the foundation of his character helped in two ways; providing a connection to the leadership discourse within the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and establishing Patton for the rest of the museum.

The plaques about Patton and the artifacts within the glass frames described a lifelong learner who independently sought out information and challenged the notion of groupthink, articulating that, “If everyone is thinking alike, then somebody isn’t thinking,” (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton’s lifelong pursuit of knowledge allowed him to become the first, “Master of the Sword,” and recognized as a Caesar like character because he studied tactics from the United States
history as well as history from Rome among other countries (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton stressed learning and frequently engaged in independent study. He once spent an entire summer learning and training with the saber and sword, hoping to act innovatively and introduce a swordsmanship course in the United States (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). The life-long pursuit of knowledge provides another link to the textual leadership discourse.

Not only is intellect a pillar of the leadership requirements model, it is also emphasized as a way to motivate and provide direction. The more a leader knows, the more competent they can be perceived to be. The Field Manuals indicate that knowledge and intellect can be powerful tools to establish credibility among Soldiers. Even if a leader does not understand a concept, they are encouraged to be transparent and inform that even though they may not know, they are willing to learn. What this means for leadership and the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine is there is flexibility and adaptation accompanying the leading and learning process.

Patton identified himself as a lifelong learner and his constant drive for knowledge. From the earliest attempt at the Field Manual and publishing doctrine to the most recent release, there is a section addressing the continuous pursuit of knowledge in every subject. Every manual in sequential order states it is important to acknowledge what you do not know followed by an encouragement to study the military profession and the world around you (See Table 1; p. 8; p. 11; p. 19; p. 8; pp. 21 – 22; pp. 23 – 24; pp. 17 – 18; p. 1; p. 1-7; p. 6-5; p. 3; p. 2-1; p. 3-33; pp. 6-2 – 6-3). “In short, be alert, study, observe, listen, and look things up” (Department of the Army, 1948, p. 8). Once again, the museum ties Patton to the leadership narrative within the Field Manual and
publishing doctrine text by integrating Patton’s educational journey beginning from homeschooling to his time at West Point (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton’s educational foundation began as he was homeschooled, but it was at West Point where Patton continued his development as a Soldier. Patton was internally motivated to excel and develop intellectually and physically because he believed that was what his Soldiers deserved. He believed that if he wasn’t giving his all at whatever objective he was tasked with, then his Soldiers shouldn’t be expected to give their all for the objective. A plaque on the wall directly references Patton’s continuous pursuit of knowledge by calling him a lifelong student multiple times throughout the museum (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

![Figure 8: Patton as a Lifelong Learner. (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.)](image)

Once through his own pursuit of knowledge and once in a plaque referencing a letter General Patton had written to his son (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

“Develops,” incorporated that adaptability was an essential characteristic just as a drive to develop the whole organization, in this instance referring to the Army. The museum incorporated teamwork, cohesion, and diversity, emphasizing that honest and
open communication is key to the success of the organization. To my surprise, the museum also incorporated a segment on Patton’s concept of developing self-awareness, describing it as an understanding of your traits, weaknesses, and behaviors. The museum placed a poem written by Patton about the first fallen Soldiers next to this segment. It was unexpected to imagine this titan of a man, larger than life, taking a moment to compose a poem for those who had been lost. It was a fascinating experience and one I will not soon forget.

![Figure 9: Our First Dead, a Poem Written by Patton (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.)](image)

The segment “Develops” of the museum discussed self-development, honest communication and understanding yourself. What this means for leadership discourse is
that a person needs to understand their traits and personal attributes and how to utilize them to their advantage. This perspective falls in line with the trait approach because traits are inherent aspects of our personality and inborn characteristics.

Patton often emphasized not only being physically there with the Soldiers, but also being present by interacting and demonstrating that their leader is willing to go as far as they are and more (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

Patton managed to gain a mutual respect from his Soldiers and other officers from allied armies (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). The museum narrates Patton’s time training and competing in the 1912 Olympics for the pentathlon.
(an event comprised of five events), taking care to mention how Patton was willing to push himself to his absolute limits, collapsing after competing and earning third place, because he had an innate understanding that physical fitness was just one facet of being a Soldier and a leader (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). He was willing to push himself beyond his limits and expected no less from his teammates and his Soldiers (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Leadership and leading by example also included providing motivation at strategic points, sometimes through unconventional methods (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton was often seen on the battlefield and the front lines sharing in the hardships of his Soldiers instead of spending time sequestered miles away from the fighting (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

There are numerous examples of Patton leading by example throughout his military career such as the example of him being on the frontlines instead of in a bunker miles away from the fighting. Another example of Patton’s dedication to leading from the front was being present not only on the battlefield, but also in the hospitals where Soldiers spent time recovering from their injuries (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Though Patton did not like going to the hospitals, he knew it was good for morale and for demonstrating support for Soldiers (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.; Table 1; pp. 20-22; pp. 12-13; pp. 21-22; p. 28; pp. 15-16; p. 1-13; p. 7-14; p. 6-11; p. 3-1). Patton led from the front, even if the situation (like the hospital) made him uncomfortable and even if he didn’t like how the situation made him feel (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). What this means for the leadership discourse is that even if the leader is uncomfortable and does not want to perform a task,
they must. There is a dedication and commitment necessary for effective leadership. It is a leader’s duty to carry out the mission and to not only motivate others, but also motivate themselves. This presents an image of mental toughness and persistence of character the leader must possess. Patton demonstrated this mental toughness, a feature addressed in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. Patton emphasized both mental and physical toughness to lead Soldiers.

The remainder of the museum described different battles, situations, and why Patton would sometimes find himself at odds with his superiors because of his decisions or (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). They recounted a few instances when Patton visited his Soldiers in the hospitals, reportedly one of his least favorite things about his work, and actually slapped two Soldiers, one who was crying in his cot and the other who was faking a sickness to avoid going back onto the front lines (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). His harsh behavior almost negated his success and placed him in trouble with his superiors; however, at the same time, Patton asserted that seeing Soldiers losing their nerve so close to the fighting was bad for morale and would unnerve the other Soldiers (General George S. Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.).

After visiting the museum, the General George Patton Museum of Leadership, and analyzing the text of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine, it is clear that using rhetorical fieldwork was essential to make observations of leadership discourse in place. It is because of studying leadership discourse in places that I was able to see the subtle and perhaps subconscious design choices behind the museum.
The analysis of the museum revealed that leadership is an all-encompassing entity which represents an amalgamation of different styles and requires elements of born and learned attributes from each person. Leadership is an accumulation of ideal characteristics and qualities, both learned and natural, which can be learned and adapted to different situations. From the analysis of the museum, I learned leadership cannot mean just one thing because people are born with strengths and weaknesses and it is through perseverance and study that someone can become a great leader. I learned from Patton’s story in the museum that leadership comes by developing natural talents and becoming a well-rounded individual, which means being aware of people, surrounding environments, and taking as much information into consideration in the time given. Leadership means making a clear, concise choice and earning the respect of followers and fellow leaders so that when the time comes a given order will not be second guessed in the moment.

From the word selection on the plaques to the organization of the themes like chapters, the museum functions as a narrative telling the story of Patton’s leadership. Even the museum brochure states in the mission and purpose statement that the museum, “collects, preserves, and interprets Patton artifacts to tell the enduring story of the General’s life-long study of history and human character and how these passions influenced his legendary leadership style,” (Department of the Army, n.d.). Attending the museum did tell Patton’s iconic leadership narrative by segmenting the physical location into section, “chapters” as I see them, but it did something else too; it linked Patton’s leadership directly to the leadership discourse in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine within this place. Linking Patton’s leadership to the manuals within the museum,
in essence, has created a living Field Manual. Soldiers and civilians can go to the museum and absorb information not only about Patton, but how he embodied leadership as the Army has defined it. People can walk through the sections of the museum labeled with terms from the manuals and now have a clear image of what is expected in an Army leader. In a way, the manuals and Patton’s narrative of leadership are inseparable in the museum. Patton has materialized leadership from the manuals within the museum. His identity as a leadership icon within the Army combined with the museum make him a never-ending instructor of leadership within this living Field Manual, a concept which I will expand in chapter six.

In this chapter, I have discussed the relevance of leadership discourse within the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and how it connects with the text. I evaluated how the Field Manual leadership definitions have been embedded in place, the text being linked to an individual and becoming a living narrative within a museum. The leadership narrative of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine can be seen in place, specifically the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. The following chapter will go into a discussion of the analyzed content and further explain how the museum is a living Field Manual. I will break down the connections and support my claims with evidence found in the museum and the text.
DISCUSSION

Chapters four and five were dedicated to establishing leadership discourse within the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and examining the General George Patton Museum of Leadership using rhetorical fieldwork to conclude whether the leadership discourse in the Field Manuals could be seen in situ at the museum. Based on my analyses of the Field Manuals and the museum, I conclude the museum has become a living Field Manual materializing leadership for Soldiers and civilians. So far, this thesis has presented a textual interpretation from the Field Guides and a participation-oriented interpretation of leadership occurring at Fort Knox. The Field Manuals reveal leadership as an evolved concept moving from an art to a process and finally a democratic process. I used the definitions of leadership located in Table 2 and tested its applicability in the museum. The previous definitions (Table 2) identifying leadership as an art (1948 to 1965), a process (1973 to 2015), and a democratic process (2019), all state that leadership may be taught and place a great emphasis on developing skills and innate characteristics to perform effective leadership. All of these definitions are represented by Patton in the General George Patton Museum of Leadership. I argue in this chapter that Patton is an icon of leadership as an art, a process, and a democratic process (an activity) because Patton’s legacy has been idealized and materialized through the museum. Given all of the
parallels between the Field Manuals and the Patton museum, I can interpret the museum as a living Field Manual where Patton embodies and teaches Army leadership to Soldiers and civilians.

The Living Field Manual

After visiting the museum, there were several things which stood out from what I observed which functioned similarly to the leadership requirements model located in the Field Manuals. The manuals connected with the leadership requirements model verbatim. The terms used and how the museum was divided up into “chapters” allowed Patton to be categorized and specific instances were pulled from his life to fulfill the roles of the requirements model. Examples from his career and his homelife growing up were drawn from and fused with these requirements, serving as living examples of the latest manual. There were also instances where Patton is quoted from his youth before the manuals were created saying what he believed made a good leader such as leading from the front, lifelong learning, and the importance of being present with the Soldiers, even if it brought discomfort. The examples from Patton’s career were grouped and categorized under the subheads of presence, character and so forth from the leadership requirements model in the manuals.

The importance of pulling from the manuals and finding them in the museum is that Patton is clearly being linked to the manuals. Not only is Patton being linked to the manuals, he is the linchpin connecting the manuals to the museum. The manuals provide the attributes and requirements for a leader and Patton is used to fill in the blanks. What does it mean to have intellect? It means to be a lifelong learner. What does it mean to have presence? It means the leader needs to be with their Soldiers whether it is on the
front lines or training beside them. Instances from Patton’s Army career are drawn on to fill in the gap and provide an example for future Soldiers. Patton is drawn on as an icon and, for leadership and future leaders, it means that looking at significant individuals from the past help form the future. Historical figures can be turned to when questions of leadership arise. For example, how did Patton boost morale among his men? A person, not just Soldiers, can go to the museum, read, and learn leadership from Patton’s memorabilia and legacy inscribed on the wall plaques. Attending the museum emphasizes the point that leadership can be learned and possesses a strong focus on the development of inherent traits. From a leadership theory standpoint, identifying leadership as a combination of developed skills, innate traits, and observable behaviors is unusual. Leadership theories generally adhere to one approach over the other, skills over traits for example. The leadership styles executed by Patton and portrayed comprehensively in the Field Manuals emphasize a comprehensive model integrating three early leadership approaches. For leadership, it means that there is no singular way to view it. It takes a combined effort of skills, traits, and behaviors to execute effective leadership. Patton integrated multiple approaches based on my analysis of the museum, a fact which further strengthens that the museum is a living Field Manual. How Patton is presented in the museum is a man larger than life, a pinnacle and beacon for other Soldiers to look toward. Patton, in this place, is presented as the prime example of Army leadership in the manuals.

The museum throughout portrayed Patton as a fierce individual, passionate about the causes he believed in and a pillar of strategic and tactical prowess. It seemed from an early age that Patton was almost groomed for the position all of his life while also
pointing out that Patton worked vigorously to achieve the status he did. After displaying his use independent study, sports, and activities as a West Point as a Cadet, Patton could not be a clearer icon and ideal for leadership. His story, as it is portrayed in the museum, is that of heroes of old, a work of art. Not only that, but the way the museum lays out the information is in an organized, procedural way. Each area of the museum is linked to examples of Patton while also integrating how others can do what Patton did. For example, Patton was seen at the front lines frequently, whether it was interacting with the Soldiers or evaluating the next move during WWII. He spent time motivating and speaking with the Soldiers while also laying down a firm hand to boost morale and keep to Army standards. Not every Soldier will have the opportunity to go where they need to in order to motivate and speak with their Soldiers, but when they are with their Soldiers, the leaders need to set the example and be willing to do everything their Soldiers do. The example of Patton was provided as well as how to go about performing that leadership task of motivating Soldiers through development and character. It was a procedural way to set up the museum and the information. Patton serves as an icon, the epitome of leadership. His lessons are inscribed in the museum in a procedural way by suggesting how leaders can go about achieving their tasks to be the most efficient. He serves as an example and symbol. Patton embodies the essence of what it means to be a leader, simultaneously functioning as a conglomerate of many leadership theories, approaches, and styles. It is no coincidence Patton embodies leadership at the museum.

The museum selected specific events which helped create the living Field Manual. The museum could have focused on any point in his life including his early childhood, his education, or his family. Instead, Patton’s leadership is the focal point. The
information in the museum is not fabricated, but instead is idealized as the ultimate standard of what it takes to be a leader. Patton embodies leadership as an art, a process, and a democratic process because and is linked purposefully to the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine. He is a monument which can be seen, studied, and used as the ultimate example because he is a fusion of many leadership theories and models. I believe Patton functions as all of these roles because of the way he is presented not only by the museum but also novels and biographies. He proved that leadership is an art because, though it can be taught, not all who attempt it are as successful as others. He demonstrated his process by laying out what he did and living by example. He showed leadership is a democratic process and activity by showing how it can be performed on the battlefield and through his career and by taking information from his peers.

What does this mean for leadership discourse? It means we need to be thinking about the effect of materialization of leadership. Creating a physical location for people to study leadership from the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine would likely not stand on its own, so the manuals were linked to a narrative, Patton’s narrative, to make it relatable. By placing Patton in contact with the Field Manuals in a physical location, leadership has essentially been materialized into a living Field Manual. The information about leadership, how to learn and execute it, is easier to conceive when an example is provided. The ideals Patton bequeathed to future Soldiers, he demonstrated, are attainable through study and practice as well as presentation and knowledge. Patton did not become “Master of the Sword” overnight. He applied himself and learned independently. Perhaps he was born with a predisposition for excelling at physical activities or maybe he was born with an attraction for intellect. Arguably, those inborn traits were developed over
time. The point is Patton cannot simply fit one definition of leadership within one Field Manual. It requires all of the manuals to fully reach the scope of leadership and how this individual attained such a status.

Patton’s narrative has been idealized as the prime example of leadership. He demonstrated with his life that leadership could be an inborn trait, skills could develop over time, and that what he did and how he did it could be taught to others. His story allows Soldiers who learn from Patton to keep an open mind and not to adopt one leadership tactic, but many tactics simultaneously. He was quoted saying, “I have it, but I’ll be damned if I can define it,” but I believe he has (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Based on what Patton taught and embodied, using the Field Manuals as a reference, Patton essentially is a leadership style. He adopted many forms and made his own way before leadership theories were fully investigated.

What this means is the leadership in the manuals is taking a new role. The Field Manuals guide Soldiers metaphorically through its words and literally through the museum and Patton’s life story by taking passages directly from the Field Manuals and placing them in the museum. This also means for leadership discourse is now is intertwined with Patton’s narrative. Patton was a great leader and now is tied directly to the text as an almost assigned protagonist, a role-model for others to emulate.

The museum is not only linking Patton to the leadership discourse within the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine, but it is also creating a living Field Manual. The leadership discourse is not only readable within the manuals but is now visual and immersive because it was linked Patton’s micro-narratives. It is not just through continuous learning that Patton represents the text, but also through his personal
development, development of his Soldiers, and his presence among them. Patton is portrayed as someone who both related to the Soldiers he trained and led as well as a figure of authority and someone not to be trifled with. Patton understood war and people because of his study and training, points which have been emphasized by the Field Manuals. He would plan on the front lines with his Soldiers instead of a bunker with miles of safety between them (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). There was even an instant where an artillery shell struck a spot where he paused shortly before and sat for a moment (Figure 1) (General George Patton Museum of Leadership, n.d.). Patton expected his Soldiers to push themselves as far as they could for the betterment of themselves and for the betterment of the entire Army. Patton practiced what he preached and truly led by example.

It is clear that the text has transformed into residing in situ and with Patton himself. The General George Patton Museum of Leadership is not just a museum, but a place where guests and visitors can place themselves into the Army Field Manuals. They can travel through the sections like chapters in a book and see how Patton lived the leadership discourse presented by the manuals. By tying the leadership discourse of the Field Manuals to Patton and using his micro-narratives as examples throughout his life and Army career, leadership discourse can be studied in place. It allows someone who has not examined the Field Manuals to enter into a physical place and receive leadership lessons, advice, and knowledge of leadership requirements from a subject, Patton in this case, through examples from his life. The leadership in the Field Manuals becomes a part of all of the visitors and people who attend the museum, Soldiers and civilians alike. In a way, people who attend the museum can learn leadership directly from Patton himself.
He did not construct the museum or place his legacy on the walls, Patton did set the example through his legacy. It allows me to say that the textual leadership discourse is no longer solely textually bound because Patton brought the museum and the manuals alive for the public to see. In fact, by Patton’s leadership being taught at the museum, Patton’s legacy becomes immortalized, unable to perish. Patton’s lessons become part of the visitors and Soldiers who go to the museum. In essence, a piece of Patton lives on through the knowledge each person takes from the museum.

There are several implications for leadership, narrative, and rhetorical fieldwork. The first implication for both leadership and rhetorical fieldwork is that studying leadership in situ does not only need to occur within the Patton museum. Studying leadership in situ can expand beyond the manuals and museum to other locations such as governmental offices and monuments. By studying leadership in situ from a critical standpoint, I learned that place itself took on the role of instruction. Instead of learning leadership from a book or a person, I learned leadership from place. Studying leadership in place let me connect to the material and understand its structure and its foundation. Leadership in place also taught me what information is pertinent and crucial to leadership. The micro-narratives of Patton drawn out by the museum gave precise examples of what the Army is looking for in a leader. While the textual Field Manuals integrate methods, leadership styles, and models of requirements, studying leadership in place gave a physical demonstration of what was essential to leadership. There is only so much surface area in a physical place. The information in the museum had to be picked carefully and integrated in a coherent way to demonstrate prioritized information of leadership and about Patton. Even though there is a prioritization of information because
of the limitation of physical space, the technique of using narratives to condense, connect and provide information is useful. The museum used narratives to connect Patton to the Field Manuals and the manuals’ definitions of leadership. Fisher initially conceived narratives from a textual standpoint, meaning readings and analysis of stories was from written and transcribed stories. Viewing narrative from a special standpoint contributes to the literature because narratives have not been studied in situ.

The General George Patton Museum is a living Field Manual. Patton’s narratives from his Army career and personal life are linked directly to the Field Manuals based on references made in the museum corresponding with information in the manuals. The evolution of leadership discourse from the Field Manuals from leadership as an art to leadership as a process and, finally, leadership as a democratic process is present in how Patton is portrayed in the museum. Patton demonstrates leadership is a combination of the three early leadership approaches (trait, skills, behavioral) and emphasized leadership was a learnable ability which could be enhanced with independent study and development of innate skills and traits. The museum uses Patton’s narrative to present a living Field Manual which carries on Patton’s leadership legacy and teaches it to Soldiers and civilians alike who attend the museum, perpetuating Patton’s leadership and making him an immortal instructor of leadership. This chapter addressed how the analyses of the leadership discourse in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership present a living Field Manual. This chapter also addressed how the leadership discourse within text can be seen and studied in places. Chapter seven will summarize and conclude the findings of this thesis, discuss potential limitations, and provide insights for future research.
CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have discussed the leadership discourse within the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine and its definitional evolution over time. I have linked the Patton and the museum with the leadership discourse by using passages directly from the text and from the location. The General George Patton Museum of Leadership represents a physical manifestation of the leadership discourse and Patton represents the epitome of leadership, combining many theories and styles into an art, a process, and a democratic process. Visitors and guests of the museum are able to place themselves into the leadership narrative presented by the text. Finally, I have concluded based on my interpretation from readings and analyses that the museum is a living Field Manual. Soldiers and civilians who attend the museum perpetuate Patton’s leadership narrative as well as the lessons from the Field Manuals because of the fusion of Patton and the manuals.

In the introduction, I presented three research questions which I intended to discover: What is the changing, or evolutionary, nature of leadership in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine? How is the evolution of leadership reflected at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership? What do we learn about leadership from a
rhetorical analysis of the Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership?

The evolution of leadership in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine began in 1948 as an art and lasted until 1973 where leadership was reconfigured as a process. Leadership as a democratic process (an activity) was released in 2019 and incorporates a comparatively democratic process within the Army’s hierarchical structure to previous iterations of leadership because leaders are encouraged to gain as much information as possible before making an informed decision about what should be done. Leaders are still supposed to give clear, direct orders and may not have as much time to make a decision. In those quick circumstances, it is up to the leaders to gain the trust of their followers as well as other leaders, so orders given in a short amount of time are trusted and carried out effectively. The definitions of leadership have evolved, but certain messages such as leadership can be taught and inborn traits and skills can be developed over time exist throughout all of the leadership manuals analyzed in this thesis. These messages of leadership being both inborn and teachable exist in the General George Patton Museum of Leadership.

Patton is recognized as a leadership icon and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership reflects leadership from the Field Manuals. From an early age, Patton developed character and a desire to pursue knowledge not only from United States history but also from other cultures such as Rome and England. The micro-narratives of Patton’s Army career reflect leadership as an art, a process, and a democratic process (an activity). The information within the museum from the manuals have been fused with Patton, in essence creating a living Field Manual where people can go and learn qualities,
attributes, and competencies of Army leadership. Patton demonstrates that leadership as an art can be taught, but not all who attempt it will be recognized by history. He demonstrated leadership as a process because the requirements are laid out for leaders to develop character and intellect among other qualities. He also demonstrated leadership as a democratic process by modeling how he performed leadership effectively.

What I have learned about leadership from a rhetorical analysis of the Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership is that the museum is a living Field Manual. Leadership involves many moving parts and is about having a well-rounded knowledge and intellect, listening and understanding followers as well as other leaders, and leading by example. Leadership in place demonstrates what qualities are essential enough to put into place such as character, intellect, and development, and that leadership can be learned *in situ*. The information can evolve over time, like how leadership evolved in the Field Manuals, but the overall structure and foundation, whether it is the concrete in the building or the theme of leadership requiring skills, traits, and behaviors, remain the same. What this means for leadership discourse is not only can leadership be studied in places other than the Patton museum, but it also means place can teach leadership in a rudimentary way, meaning the information can be laid out in an explanatory way.

After evaluating the evolution of leadership within Field Manuals and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership, I have contributed to leadership studies and narrative criticism in the following ways.

Leadership
Examining leadership through the Field Manuals revealed connections to three of the earliest leadership approaches – traits, skills, and behavioral. Leadership theories often pull from these early approaches to develop theories about different leadership styles. Leadership and how it is presented in the Field Manuals takes a different approach which incorporates all three of these early approaches by stating in the 1948 manual that leaders can be both born and taught. The contribution to leadership literature resides in a new way of perceiving how leadership approaches and styles can be combined to explain and reproduce effective leadership.

Narratives

Critiquing Patton’s narrative of his Army career and early life provides an insight in how narratives can be used to not only understand information, but also make it relatable to the audience observing the narrative. Patton’s narrative could be classified as a strategic narrative because of how it was used to portray information relating to the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine relating to leadership requirements and attributes. By examining Patton’s narrative in the museum, new insights to how the museum portrayed leadership and how the Army wanted leadership to be viewed were revealed. The Army selected specific narratives from Patton’s past to place them in the museum because those narratives effectively represented desired attributes and qualities for leadership. Patton’s narrative was used as an example of the ideal leadership style – a well-rounded individual internally driven and externally motivated. Using narratives in place to communicate has not been studied extensively, allowing this thesis to contribute to the current literature of narratives.
I argued the leadership discourse within the Army Field Manuals can be seen *in situ* at the General George Patton Museum of Leadership and can be studied using rhetorical fieldwork. I discovered that Patton represented a conglomeration of leadership styles and theories, thereby making him an immortal icon for Soldiers to attempt to attain. I found the leadership discourse in Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine complement Patton and the General George Patton Museum of Leadership through his Army career and the narrative of his life, therefore adapting the current leadership discourse into a leadership narrative which can be learned from and taught.

Chapter One was an introduction to the topics of leadership, leadership discourse, Army Field Manuals and publishing doctrine, Gen. George Patton and the Patton Museum of Leadership, narratives, and rhetorical fieldwork. I proposed my central argument of being able to see the evolution of Field Manuals *in situ* at the museum and that the evolution presented a leadership narrative through Patton.

Chapter Two was an established literature review of research about my areas of interest and how the gap in the literature would be filled with my thesis.

Chapter Three was about the methods I used including an analysis of the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine as well as rhetorical fieldwork where I attended the museum *in situ* and recorded field notes and photographed plaques and artifacts. I also spent time conceptualizing the terms I would use through my analyses.

Chapter Four was where I analyzed the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine, examining how they have evolved, when these changes occurred, and what that means for leadership discourse.
Chapter Five was about the analysis of the General George Patton Museum of Leadership where I applied what I learned from Chapter Four to the museum. I employed the definition of leadership as well as the leadership requirement model to the museum and discovered that the renovations of the museum in 2018 utilized an earlier definition; however, the other pieces of the analysis revealed that explaining the museum would require the definitions of all the manuals because of Patton and his unique leadership style.

Chapter Six discussed implications of what Chapters Four and Five analyzed. I break down that Patton can only be conceptualized if you employ the definitions and content from leadership within all of the manuals. Leadership, for Patton, functions as an art, a process, and a democratic process where Soldiers can learn from and perform leadership.

Other avenues of research regarding this topic could examine other forms of narrative such as performance, specific narratives within the lens of specific leadership approaches and theories, and how leadership can be studied in place, not just through approaches and theories. Also, an investigation of whether conflicts, wars, and military actions are directly linked requires a thorough historical and textual investigation; however, the timing of the release of an evolved definition should be noted for future research.

Through this thesis, I have discussed and analyzed several concepts. I have discussed how the leadership discourse in the Field Manuals and publishing doctrine has evolved over time, shifting from a form of art to a process and, finally, to a democratic process. I have discussed how rhetorical fieldwork within the General George Patton
Museum of Leadership allowed me to read first-hand knowledge and experience essential to observing leadership discourse in place. I have examined the narrative of Patton’s Army career and early life in the museum, applying the Field Manual and publishing doctrine definitions and models of leadership. I have established that Patton’s style of leadership requires the combination of leadership as an art, a process, and a democratic process. Finally, I have established the General George Patton Museum of Leadership as a living Field Manual.
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## Appendix

### Table 1: Field Manuals and Publishing Doctrine Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Department of the Army. (1948). Leadership [Brochure]. [Website].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Leadership is the art of influencing human behavior. Put into everyday words, it is the ability to handle men. It has been said that leaders are born, not made; that leadership is intangible. These are, at best, half truths. Leaders are born. Leaders are also made. Leadership is intangible, but only to the extent that we make it so. It is one of the most definite characteristics in any man's life. In civil life, it means success; in Army life, it means success, too - winning battles, accomplishing the mission. The lack of it in civil life means mediocrity. The lack of it in the Army means, in combat, getting men killed unnecessarily and, in peace or war, failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Leadership is the art of influencing human behavior - the ability to handle men. The techniques will vary depending on the size of the command, the types of men, the personality of the commander, and the particular situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>The military leader must build a command relationship between himself and his men that will result in immediate and effective action on their part to carry out his will in any situation. In the process of building such a command relationship, the successful military leader will obtain the obedience, confidence, respect, and loyalty of his subordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>The art of influencing and directing men in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation in order to accomplish the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>The art of influencing and directing men in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation in order to accomplish the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>The art of influencing and directing men in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation to accomplish the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Military leadership is the process of influencing men in such a manner as to accomplish the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>The process by which a soldier influences others to accomplish the mission. He carries out this process by applying his leadership attributes (beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and skills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Leadership is the process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction, and motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction, and motivation. Leadership is also the product of the leader development process. Leadership is the process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction, and motivation. Effective leadership transforms human potential into effective performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Leadership is influencing people - by providing purpose, direction, and motivation - while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Leadership is the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation while operating to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation, while operating to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Leadership is the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization (ADP 6-22). As an element of combat power, leadership unifies the other elements of combat power (information, mission command, movement and maneuver, intelligence, fires, sustainment, and protection). Confidence, competent, and informed leadership intensifies the effectiveness of the other elements of combat power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Leadership - the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Leadership is the activity of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization. Leadership as an element of combat power, coupled with information, unifies the warfighting functions (movement and maneuver, intelligence, fires, sustainment, protection and command and control). Leadership focuses and synchronizes organizations. Leaders inspire people to become energized and motivated to achieve desired outcomes. An Army leader is anyone who by virtue or assumed role or assigned responsibility inspires and influences people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our First Dead

They died for France, like countless thousands more
Who, in this war, have faltered not to go
At Duty’s bidding, even unto death,
And yet no deaths which history records
Were fraught with greater consequences than theirs,
And unborn babies trembled in the womb,
In sympathetic anguish at their fate.
Far from their home and in ungainful strife
They gave their all in that they gave their life;
While their young blood, shed in this distant land
Shall be more potent than the dragons’ teeth
To raise up soldiers to avenge their fall.
Men talked of sacrifice, but there was none;
Death found them unafraid and free to come
Before their God. In righteous battle slain,
In that their going doomed to certain wrath
A thousand foemen, for each drop they gave
Of sacramental crimson, to the cause.
And so their youthful forms, all dank and stiff,
All stained with tramplings in unlovely mud,
We laid to rest beneath the soil of France,
So often honored with the hero slain;
Yet never greatlier so than on this day
When we interred our dead in her heart.
There let them rest, wrapped in her verdant arms,
Their task well done. Now from the smoke-veiled sky
They watch our khaki legions press to certain victory
Because of them who showed us how to die. (Patton, 2018)
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