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News Note

Ceremony Marks Publication of Nisei Linguists

Senator Daniel K. Akaka of Hawaii, chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, hosted a ceremony on Capitol Hill on 20 March 2007 to celebrate the publication and release of the new book by James C. McNaughton, Nisei Linguists: Japanese Americans in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II, and to pay tribute to the soldiers who inspired it. The Nisei linguists were a talented group of second-generation Japanese American soldiers who served in the Pacific and Southeast Asian theaters during the Second World War as interpreters, translators, and interrogators with the Military Intelligence Service. The U.S. Army Center of Military History published the book, and the author addressed the gathering, which included dozens of Japanese American veterans. Now the command historian of the U.S. European Command, McNaughton was previously a historian with the U.S. Army, Pacific, and the Defense Language Institute. The chief of military history, Jeffrey J. Clarke, discussed the genesis of the book. Norman Y. Mineta, a former congressman and secretary of transportation; Brig. Gen. Bert K. Mizusawa, president pro tempore of the Asian American Veterans Association; Robert Nakamoto, president of the Japanese American Veterans Association; and Grant Hirabayashi, a veteran of Merrill’s Marauders, also offered remarks. Diane Donovan, who edited the book at the Center of Military History, also attended the ceremony.
On 14 March Lt. Gen. James L. Campbell, the director of the Army Staff; Joyce E. Morrow, the administrative assistant to the secretary of the Army; and Keith Eastin, the assistant secretary of the Army for installations and environment, exchanged a series of memorandums of agreement that transferred the supervision of the Center of Military History from the director to the administrative assistant and gave operational control of the National Museum of the U.S. Army project to the office of the assistant secretary. These changes evolved from a series of Army headquarters reorganization studies completed during the winter of 2005–06, and the Center had been informed of the projected moves in May 2006. They are part of a larger restructuring designed to streamline the Army Staff and Secretariat, making the offices of both the director of the Army Staff and the administrative assistant much leaner and more tightly focused organizations. However, except for the National Museum project, these modifications will not affect how the Center fulfills its missions.

I have had close working relationships with a succession of administrative assistants. Their post is the highest ranking civil service position in the Department of the Army, carrying a status equivalent to that of a lieutenant general. Ms. Morrow, the current incumbent, is an experienced administrator who was previously the head of the Army Audit Agency, and she has the trust and confidence of the Army’s senior leaders. She and her deputy, Larry Stubblefield, visited the Center of Military History last September and came across the river to see us again soon after the transfer was put into effect. Briefed in detail on both the Center and the Army’s larger history and museum programs, they have been extremely impressed by the professionalism of our entire Army-wide work force and by the broad range of services we provide. Ms. Morrow and I have high hopes that there will be great synergy between the Center and the other elements of her evolving organization, which includes the Human Resources Management Division (personnel), the HQDA Resource Management Office (financial resources), the Army Information Management Support Center (information technology), the Army Publishing Directorate, the Army Records Management and Declassification Agency, and the Institute of Heraldry. Over time, a closer partnership with each of these key organizations should greatly assist the Center in performing its missions and enhance its ability to furnish timely and effective support to all of you who help the Army understand its history.

Within the Center, I would like to recognize the fine contributions of Bill Epley, Rich Davis, Rob Rush, Col. Gary Bowman (one of the Center’s individual mobilization augmentee officers), and other staff members who have been redoubling the Center’s efforts to provide responsive historical support to our deployed forces. Last year Gary traveled to Afghanistan and worked with historical officers there, covering local operations and collecting a significant quantity of electronic records. In March 2007 Bill did the same in Iraq, preparing to write a history of the operations of Lt. Gen. Raymond Odierno’s III Corps in that country, a task that will absorb most of his attention for the next year. In addition the Center is striving diligently to provide historians to the division headquarters being deployed to Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, to send more reserve historians and artists into the theaters of these operations, to establish a closer relationship with the deployed military history detachments, and to more effectively evaluate the detachments’ collection endeavors. The recent publications of the Center and, especially, the Combat Studies Institute also underline the Army history program’s overall commitment to furnish more direct historical support to the field. If you can join us in this undertaking in any way—and many of you have—I encourage you to do so and to keep us informed of your actions, needs, and achievements in this area.

Once again, thanks for everything you do for our Army at war.

Army historians face a number of unique challenges not confronted by our academic counterparts. Being professional subject-matter experts in one narrow field is not enough; we need to be experts in the entire range of military history from ancient Sumer to urban operations in Iraq. Serving often as one of the few historians at a unit or installation, or possibly even as the only one, we are asked questions both trivial and important about historical events or lessons, and we are expected to know the answers or to find them immediately. In addition to our technical expertise, we must also
“Evidence suggests that the belated decision to appoint black chief musicians was influenced by the extraordinary musical talents of Walter H. Loving, who rose from poverty in the rural South to spend more than seven years as an army musician and chief musician before joining the Philippine Constabulary and developing its band into a world-famous organization.”

Roger D. Cunningham
Before the Civil War, black men were rarely allowed to bear arms in the nation’s defense. Most white citizens, especially in the South, considered armed African Americans threatening. Black noncombatants, however, such as personal servants, waiters, and musicians, were readily accepted into military units beginning in colonial times. Black musicians belonged to antebellum state militia units, continued to play in the bands of the U.S. Colored Troops units that were organized during the Civil War, and provided music for the black regiments that were added to the postwar Regular Army.

Until the early twentieth century, however, white chief musicians led the Regular Army’s black regimental bands. Evidence suggests that the belated decision to appoint black chief musicians was influenced by the extraordinary musical talents of Walter H. Loving, who rose from poverty in the rural South to spend more than seven years as an Army musician and chief musician before joining the Philippine Constabulary and developing its band into a world-famous organization. Loving’s successful musical career with both military and paramilitary organizations provides an example of how a talented individual could overcome some of the limitations that racism imposed on African Americans.

Walter Howard Loving was born to former slaves in December 1872 at Lovingston, the Nelson County seat, on the eastern edge of the Blue Ridge Mountains of west central Virginia, about midway between Lynchburg and Charlottesville. His mother, Emily, died in 1874. Six years later, he was the next-to-the-youngest member of an eight-person household headed by his father, Alex, and including two older brothers and two teenaged sisters, one of whom was married with a one-year-old daughter.

The 7,508 black citizens who constituted almost half of Nelson County’s population had few opportunities for advancement, but in 1882 Walter left his crowded home and went to live with his older sister, Julia Farley Loving, in St. Paul, Minnesota. There were far fewer African Americans living in that state—only 1,564 in 1880. Julia, who had been born in 1857, worked as a domestic, probably in the household of Charles E. Flandrau, a successful lawyer and former associate justice of the state supreme court. In 1883 Flandrau’s daughter Martha, or “Patty,” married Tilden R. Selmes Jr., who owned a ranch on the Heart River near Mandan, Dakota Territory (now in North Dakota). The couple soon befriended a young fellow rancher named Theodore Roosevelt. Julia and Walter joined the Selmes family in Mandan and almost certainly met the future president on several occasions. After Patty gave birth to a daughter, Isabella, in 1886, Julia began taking care of the little girl. When the Selmes family left their unprofitable ranch and returned to St. Paul, Walter went to school there and perhaps did odd jobs for the family. By 1891, however, he had moved to Washington, D.C., where he demonstrated musical talent, playing the cornet and directing the Second Baptist Church choir. In 1892 he graduated from the M Street High School, the only black secondary school in the nation’s capital.

After graduating, Walter returned to St. Paul, where Julia continued to work as a domestic for the Selmes family. In June 1893, perhaps hoping to emulate the black soldiers who had been stationed at nearby Fort Snelling when he was a boy, Walter enlisted in the Army. Almost 800 other African Americans also enlisted during that fiscal year, and they were assigned to one of four segregated regiments—the 9th and 10th Cavalry regiments and the 24th and 25th Infantry regiments—whose soldiers composed 8.4 percent of the Army’s 25,361 enlisted men. Since first enlisting in the Regular Army in 1866, black soldiers had earned an excellent reputation. In 1889 Secretary of War Redfield Proctor’s annual report noted that “they are neat, orderly, and obedient, seldom brought before courts-martial, and rarely desert.”

Identifying his occupation as “musician,” Loving was assigned to the band of the 24th Infantry, which was then stationed in the Southwest—the regimental headquarters and four companies at Fort Bayard, New Mexico Territory, and four other companies at Fort Huachuca, Arizona Territory. Established in 1866 in southwestern New Mexico, Fort Bayard sat at an elevation of 6,132 feet and was “blessed with a tolerable climate and attractive surroundings.” Troops first had been stationed there to protect copper miners and other settlers from Apache raids, but by 1893 the Army had not campaigned...
against Indians in the Southwest for several years. Nevertheless, the soldiers of the black regiments remained at isolated Western posts, which reduced the chances for racial conflicts with white settlers.5

Private Loving arrived at Fort Bayard with eleven other recruits in July 1893 and was assigned to a company before transferring to the band in January 1894. At that time, there were estimated to be 10,000 active bands across the country. They were “a pervasive aspect of American life,” which some viewed as a “measure of civilization itself.” One of the most popular bands in the nation was led by John Philip Sousa, who had organized it in 1892, after leading the United States Marine Band for twelve years. Among Sousa’s most celebrated works were military marches, such as “Semper Fidelis” (1888) and “The Washington Post” (1889), which helped to earn him the nickname “March King.”6

Military bands were an important part of every regiment, and the Army’s black bands enjoyed especially good reputations, perhaps because they were able to attract talented musicians with fewer opportunities for steady civilian employment. Fort Bayard set aside a barracks for its band members, and they were excused from many additional duties so they could practice their craft. Financed through contributions from unit members as well as the post fund, bands wore distinctive uniforms and made an impressive showing at parades and concerts, which sometimes attracted crowds from nearby towns. On their own time, the bandsmen also played at unit dances. An Army and Navy Journal correspondent reported that Loving and three other musicians provided “excellent” music at a company masquerade ball one January evening.7

In the summer of 1894, Fort Bayard’s routine garrison and escort duties were disrupted by the government’s decision to intervene in a nationwide strike called by the American Railway Union in support of Pullman Company workers. Much of the Army was deployed to keep trains running. In July Private Loving accompanied several companies of the 24th Infantry that traveled to Raton, New Mexico, and nearby Trinidad, Colorado, where they helped federal marshals protect railroad property. The black soldiers finally returned to Fort Bayard in early September.8

In October 1896 the 24th Infantry was transferred to Fort Douglas, just outside Salt Lake City, Utah. This was the first time in its history that the whole regiment had been assigned to a single post and one that was not located in a remote locale. The black soldiers looked forward to their new station, but initially they were not welcomed. Only about 600 African Americans lived in Utah, which had just become the forty-fifth state, and the capital city’s white citizens dreaded the arrival of an almost equal number of armed black men. A Salt Lake Tribune editorial, entitled “An Unfortunate Change,” underscored this racist attitude. In 1897, however, the newspaper apologized for its earlier apprehensions, recognizing the regiment’s good conduct by noting the unit’s parades and the fact that “on many occasions the splendid band has supplied music, and it has always been with a hearty and cheerful spirit.” The Tribune admitted that the African Americans were “now appreciated . . . as citizens and soldiers above reproach.”9

While stationed at Fort Douglas, Loving played the cornet and violin, gave free vocal lessons, and assisted in orchestrating the high school minstrels’ music, “which was well rendered at the New Grand theater” in January 1898. The 24th Infantry remained in Salt Lake City until April, when the United States declared war on Spain. The regiment was then ordered to join the 15,000-man expeditionary force that was being organized to attack Spanish forces in Cuba. The black regulars proceeded across the country to Camp George H. Thomas, Georgia, and then on to Tampa, Florida. Loving’s five-year enlistment ended there on 21 June, a week after his regiment sailed to Cuba. The private had performed his duties well, and his discharge papers rated his character as “excellent.”10
Why Loving decided not to reenlist in the Regular Army is not known, but perhaps he thought that he could secure a higher rank in one of the black volunteer units being organized for the war. He returned to Washington, and Allen Allensworth, the 24th Infantry’s black chaplain, soon provided him with a letter certifying that he was “a fine musician” and that he believed Loving “would be successful as a Chief Musician of a regimental band.” Congress had authorized a total of forty regimental chief musicians to serve as music instructors when it reorganized the Army in 1869. They were to be paid $60 per month—more than any other noncommissioned officer (NCO)—and to receive the same allowances as quartermaster sergeants. Shortly after Loving enlisted, the pay of chief musicians who reenlisted was raised to $65. By law, all the black regiments’ enlisted billets were supposed to be filled by African Americans, but a white man continued to serve as the chief musician in each unit, a disparity that would not be fully corrected until 1909.11

Chaplain Allensworth’s letter soon proved useful because Loving decided to enlist in the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry (USVI)—one of ten infantry regiments that Congress specially authorized as part of the Volunteer Army raised for the war. These units were formed from 10,000 men allegedly “possessing immunity to diseases incident to tropical climates” and were popularly known as the “Immune” regiments. After President William McKinley’s “first call” for 125,000 volunteers, most governors did not include black units in their state troop quotas, so in May the government decided to reserve four of the new regiments—the 7th to 10th U.S. Volunteer Infantry regiments—for African American enlisted men and lieutenants. Washington’s Evening Star endorsed raising black units because “the peculiar immunity of the colored man from such diseases as those to which the American army might be exposed in Cuba and other tropical and semi-tropical stations recommends them for such service.”

The Washington Post ridiculed the immunity concept, however, noting, “Among all the fallacies and crack-brained nonsense bred by the war, we know of none so extravagant as the ‘immune regiment.’”12 Immune units recruited from different regions of the country. The 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry’s twelve companies came from Tennessee (four), Kentucky (three), West Virginia (two), the District of Columbia (two), and New Jersey. The last company mustered into service on 24 July, but Loving waited until 18 August to enroll at the regimental headquarters at Fort Thomas, Kentucky, a picturesque post overlooking the Ohio River just upstream from Cincinnati, Ohio. He probably decided to join the 8th because he had friends and acquaintances among the more than 150 Washingtonians who had enrolled in Companies B and G in June and July. One of the young officers of the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry was 1st Lt. Benjamin O. Davis of Company G, who had graduated that year from the M Street High School, Loving’s alma mater. Davis would later earn a commission in the Regular Army and become the U.S. Army’s first black general.13

Loving was appointed as the chief musician of the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry—one of eight NCOs who composed the 8th’s regimental noncommissioned staff (NCS). He combined the regiment’s two principal musicians, both also members of the NCS, with musicians he selected from the two authorized to each company to form the regimental band, a troupe which gradually improved as it played for afternoon guard mounts. Good musicians must have been hard to find because in late September Loving traveled to Louisville in search of them. By November, however, Washington’s Colored American reported that “Prof.” Loving had “succeeded in building up for the 8th Immunes one of the finest regimental bands in the service.”14

Julia Loving was not far away. After her employer, Tilden Selmes, died in 1895, she had accompanied Patty and Isabella Selmes on their move from St. Paul to the farm owned by Patty’s maternal aunt, Julia Dinsmore, in Boone County, Kentucky. The Dinsmore homestead was located less than twenty miles west of Fort Thomas, and in September 1898 the twelve-year-old Isabella planned to accompany Julia Loving (and probably at least one other adult) when Julia visited her brother’s regimental encampment, Camp
Authorized in 1899, the chevron for chief musicians was worn with the horn facing forward.
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Capron, just outside the grounds of the military post.15 Only one of the four black immune regiments, the 9th U.S. Volunteer Infantry, deployed overseas. Its Louisiana and Texas recruits were organized in New Orleans by Col. Charles J. Crane, who as a 24th Infantry captain probably had known Loving at Forts Bayard and Douglas. Colonel Crane and his men sailed to Cuba in August 1898 and performed occupation duties until April 1899. The other three black immune regiments trained at various camps in the South. In October 1898 the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry moved from Fort Thomas, Kentucky, to Camp George H. Thomas in Chickamauga Park, Georgia, just south of Chattanooga, Tennessee. Here the black soldiers endured strained relations with the local white community. The 8th USVI’s commander, Col. Eli L. Huggins, explained to the Army’s adjutant general, “My colored officers and men have quietly submitted to slights and insults which would not patiently be borne by white troops & I hope they will continue to do so in future. But each [sic] prejudice is a source of constant danger to regiments constituted as mine is and stationed in the South.” In November the New York Times reported that Chattanooga’s mayor had informed Secretary of War Russell Alger that the black troops’ “presence near the city is undesirable and prejudicial to good order.”16

The War Department kept the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry at Camp Thomas until it mustered out on 6 March 1899. As a train left Chattanooga carrying about half of the discharged soldiers home, the New York Times reported that a number of them, “who had in some way secured revolvers, began to discharge them in the air and into sheds and vacant houses.” The shots wounded two local men and some soldiers. Police roughed up the black soldiers when their train passed through Nashville, and the Times reported that they “presented a battered appearance” when they reached Louisville. After the discharged men of Company G arrived in Washington on the evening of 8 March, two of them were hospitalized for treatment of gunshot wounds.17 Neither the black nor the white immune regiments had lived up to their name—a total of 7 officers and 241 enlisted men in the ten regiments had succumbed to various diseases—but African American indiscipline caused much greater public concern. A November 1898 shooting affray involving members of the 9th U.S. Volunteer Infantry in Cuba, the unruly homeward journeys of veterans of the 8th and the 10th U.S. Volunteer Infantry regiments, and disciplinary problems in a few black state units generated much adverse commentary in the press and convinced many white Americans that expanding black participation in the “splendid little war” had been an unfortunate error. The New York Times expressed this attitude in an editorial stating that creating the immune regiments was a mistake because “they were not ‘immune’ from anything but the obligations of law and discipline and decency.”18

In spite of his travails as an immune, Loving probably returned to Washington with a great sense of accomplishment. Colonel Huggins had been so impressed with his talents that he had written him a letter stating that he was “a gentleman of high personal character, an educated and accomplished musician, and in every way equal to organize, teach, and conduct a band either in the military service or elsewhere.” As Loving readjusted to civilian life in the nation’s capital, he attended an April reception hosted by the Second Baptist Church for black Republican Congressman George H. White of North Carolina, who spoke about “the part taken by colored soldiers in the Spanish-American War and the cause of the sentiment against colored people in the United States at the present time.” When White’s paper was discussed, Loving may have shared some of his own “war
had been musicians in the 8th U.S. Volunteer Infantry.

Loving returned to Fort Thomas, where the 48th USVI was being organized. In November the regiment traveled across the country to the Presidio of San Francisco. A smallpox outbreak struck the unit, and while it recovered at the embarkation depot on Angel Island in San Francisco Bay, Loving demonstrated another aspect of his musical talent by organizing a 400-man regimental chorus. After being released from quarantine, the volunteers sailed for the Philippines in December, and, during short layovers in Japan, the chorus sang in two cities. One of Loving’s fellow NCOs sent a letter to the *Richmond Planet* reporting that the singers had “made for themselves a reputation that will live in the minds of the people of Yokohama and Nagasaki.”

The 48th U.S. Volunteer Infantry arrived in the Philippines in late January 1900. The *Manila Times* soon announced that 200 of its “trained singers” would perform at the Luneta, the city’s public park, accompanied by the regimental band, whose bandmaster was “a skilled musician of some merit.” As the black volunteers deployed on the firing line that the Army had established around Manila to defend against Filipino attacks, Loving and his musicians did their best to bolster morale, and the *Army and Navy Journal* reported that their unit established “quite a musical reputation.” The chorus continued to give concerts with up to 160 voices, and the *Journal* opined, “If music hath the effect on the savage breast declared by the poet, it would seem that the 48th would be just the men to send against the wild tribes in the mountains.”

In mid-March the 48th began moving by battalions to the city of San Fernando, the coastal capital of La Union Province in northwestern Luzon, and within five weeks the regiment had fully consolidated its more than 1,400 officers and men there. The soldiers found the new locale to be mountainous and covered with “almost impenetrable” growth.
There were few roads, except for one running along the coast of the South China Sea. Within three months, however, the regiment had practically pacified its inhospitable area of operations. Impressed with what his black officers and men had accomplished, Col. William P. Duvall, the 48th USVI's commander, later wrote that there was "no better soldier material to be found than that which abides, abounds, and flourishes in the American negro."[24]

In March 1901 Loving was discharged to accept a commission as a second lieutenant in the regiment. His discharge characterized his military service as "honest and faithful," his character as "excellent," and his physical condition as "good." After accepting his commission at San Fernando, the new subaltern was assigned to Company I. Maj. Sedgwick Rice, one of the 48th USVI's three battalion commanders, commended the former chief musician for his work: "The high state of efficiency to which you have brought the band when hardly two men knew how to make a note when they first reported seems almost beyond belief and the development of the regimental chorus of four hundred voices all bear witness to your ability."[25]

Loving did not wear shoulder straps for long. The 48th U.S. Volunteer Infantry returned to the United States at the end of May—part of a gradual redeployment that would reduce the Army's strength in the Philippines by about 40 percent over the next year. The regiment mustered out of service at the Presidio of San Francisco at the end of June. Colonel Duvall presented Loving with a letter stating that he was "distinctly the best band leader I have ever known, in thirty-two years of service."[26]

Duvall also "strongly recommend[ed]" Loving for a commission as a lieutenant in the Regular Army, which as of mid-1901 had only three black line officers—Capt. Charles Young of the 9th Cavalry, who had graduated from West Point in 1889, and new second lieutenants Benjamin O. Davis of the 10th Cavalry and John E. Green, who had been commissioned in the 25th Infantry after almost two years as an enlisted man in the 24th Infantry. African Americans constituted 6.8 percent of the Army's enlisted strength, but, out of 2,940 officers, only these three men, four chaplains, and a paymaster were black. The Army's refusal to commission more than a handful of African Americans mirrored the white majority's prejudices.[27]

Loving again returned to Washington, but he was interested in further military service in the Philippines. Before he left the islands, Congress had in February 1901 authorized the president to enlist up to 12,000 native Filipinos "for service in the Army." The resulting Philippine Scout units were armed with .45-caliber Springfield carbines and organized as light infantry to operate with U.S. units in the field, fighting what one modern historian has called "a mixed bag of true revolutionaries, bloodthirsty cutthroats, and armed religious fanatics." The Scout companies were commanded by officers temporarily assigned from the Army, and their lieutenants were either Regular Army noncommissioned officers or former volunteer officers and NCOs who received Scout commissions.[28]

Hoping to become a Scout lieutenant, Loving sought the help of influential men from Minnesota. In July 1901 Senator Moses E. Clapp wrote President McKinley to recommend that Loving be commissioned in one of the "native regiments" in the Philippines. Another distinguished Minnesotan, Charles Flandrau, dispatched a similar recommendation for "a colored friend of mine" to Brig. Gen. Alfred E. Bates, the Army's paymaster general. General Bates referred the recommendation to the adjutant general and then composed an introductory letter for Loving to present to Maj. Henry A. Greene, an infantry officer serving in the Adjutant General's Office, requesting that "if there is any proper way in which you can assist him I hope you can do so."[29]

When these recommendations did not achieve their purpose, Loving sought help from his sister's employer, Mrs. Tilden Selmes. From the Dinsmore farm in Kentucky, Patty Selmes wrote her old friend, now Vice President Theodore Roosevelt, who informed her on 20 August 1901 that he was willing to help "Julia's brother," but he needed "copies of the letters backing him from his own officers." Roosevelt promised to lay those letters before Secretary of War Elihu Root with his endorsement, which would "at least ensure Mr. Root's attention to the matter." Five days later, however, Loving asked Roosevelt for an appointment as a messenger in the U.S. Senate, explaining that the War Department would not commission African Americans to serve with "native troops." Loving assured Roosevelt that he could "serve the [messenger] position with honor and dignity," but his request was not granted. On 7 September Roosevelt explained the situation to Mrs. Selmes, noting that he already had a "colored messenger, . . . and the other messengers are appointed by the individual [s]enators. They would not tolerate any advice from the Vice President about them."[30]

The day before Roosevelt sent this second letter to Mrs. Selmes, a self-proclaimed anarchist had shot President McKinley while he was attending the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York. At first, McKinley seemed likely to recover from his wound, but his 14 September death elevated Roosevelt to the Oval Office. Loving evidently believed that this would improve his chances for patronage. He waited a month and then asked the new president for a commission in the "Native Troops of the Philippines," pointing out that he could speak Spanish fluently. Although Roosevelt had previously assured Mrs. Selmes that he was willing to help Loving, he instructed his secretary to inform the War Department that he did not "wish any unusual action taken" in the case, and the Scout commission never materialized.[31]
Loving’s desire to return to the Philippines was not unique. Veterans of the 48th and 49th U.S. Volunteer Infantry regiments reenlisted to serve in the 9th Cavalry, one squadron of the 10th Cavalry, or the 24th or 25th Infantry regiments, which were stationed in the islands until the summer of 1902. Other discharged black regulars and volunteers remained in the islands as civilians, often settling down with Filipina girlfriends or wives. These men had no desire to return to America’s racial animosity that, at its worst, included the continuing horror of lynching, as well as oppressive state laws requiring segregation and producing racial disfranchisement. Among the many black expatriates was one of Loving’s fellow second lieutenants in the 48th, Adolph J. Wakefield, who worked in Manila as a civilian packer in the Quartermaster’s Department until he died of Asiatic cholera in July 1902.32

That same year, Loving was finally able to return to the islands as a subinspector in the Philippine Constabulary. Created in the summer of 1901, the Constabulary, which grew to a strength of over 7,000, served as the civil government’s police force, maintaining “public order beyond the capabilities or jurisdiction of the often inefficient native municipal police.” The force was headed by Capt. Henry T. Allen, a Regular Army cavalry officer who was initially given the pay and prerogatives of a brigadier general and in 1903 received that temporary rank as well. The Constabulary’s almost 300 officers, at first called inspectors, were primarily Americans Allen recruited, but Filipinos gradually secured commissions. The organization attracted ambitious Regular Army officers “who sought to enhance their reputations with some combat duty during peacetime.” General Allen interviewed prospective officers, believing that it was “of the utmost importance that high-grade officers, thoroughly courageous, upright, sober, intelligent, and energetic, be placed over them [i.e., Filipinos].” Loving was lucky to serve under Allen because the general had a relatively high opinion of African American (and Filipino) capabilities. As Allen’s biographer has pointed out, his “moderate racial views put him in the minority among the senior officers of his day.”33

The Constabulary’s enlisted men and Filipino officers were carefully chosen from the provinces in which they would serve. General Allen explained to a government official, “For inspectors, the greatest care has been used in selecting men of military instincts and training, of good moral character, and of marked sobriety.” Allen’s men, however, were not as well armed and equipped as the Philippine Scouts. Carrying Remington shotguns and .45-caliber Colt revolvers, they often found themselves battling bandits armed with superior Mauser and Krag-Jorgensen rifles that had been captured from Spanish or U.S. Army patrols. “The Constabulary is armed only with shotguns and revolvers and events might go wrong with them,” noted a Frank Leslie’s Weekly author, who also opined, “The success of these brown men at arms under white officers will determine largely the success or failure of the United States in the Philippines.”34

A month after Loving’s February 1902 appointment, the La Union provincial board asked General Allen to assign him to that province, explaining that “Mr. Loving was very popular here, both among the Ilocanos and the Americans and we believe his service would be valuable here.” Loving remained in Manila, however, and in mid-October he again began to work in his field of expertise—organizing a Constabulary band. He did this at the request of William Howard Taft, who had become the first governor-general of the Philippines in mid-1901. During an earlier visit to the islands as a member of the Philippine Commission, Taft had heard the 48th U.S. Volunteer Infantry band play at San Fernando and was so impressed that he had promised Loving that, if he became governor, he would form a military band with him as its conductor.35

Loving was promoted to second lieutenant before the end of 1902 and to first lieutenant in August 1903. Using his exemplary musical skills and fluency in Spanish (and later Tagalog), he began developing thirty musicians into a first class band. Filipino musicians were not hard to find. They had “played a vital role in the fabric of Philippine life” during the earlier colonial period, as Spanish Army regimental bands paved the way for civilian brass bands that performed at fiestas and other celebrations. Most of Loving’s musicians came from the Manila area, but a few, like Pedro B. Navarro from Ilocos Sur Province (directly north of La Union), came from outlying areas. Navarro also had played in the bands of the 29th U.S. Volunteer Infantry and the 6th Artillery, and, after joining the Constabulary, he became a clarinet and piccolo soloist. He could play all of the band’s wind instruments, as well as compose, and his talents eventually enabled him to succeed Loving as the band’s director.36
Manila’s citizens greatly enjoyed the two-hour evening concerts that the Constabulary band began playing on the green of the Luneta, fronting Manila Bay. Taft’s wife, Nellie, described the sparsely landscaped public park as a place where “everybody in the world came and drove around the oval [drive], exchanging greetings and gossip.” One of the band’s early programs started with John Philip Sousa’s “Hands Across the Sea” and included selections composed by popular European composers Vincenzo Bellini, Tomás Bretón, Amilcare Ponchielli, Johann Strauss Jr., and Leslie Stuart. Years later the New York Times reported, “The evening concert in the Luneta of Manila, cooled by the sea breeze, is one of the few lively Spanish traditions that has survived American efficiency.”

The band’s first opportunity to impress people outside the Philippines came in 1904, when St. Louis hosted a great exposition, or World’s Fair, to mark the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase. The authorities in Manila decided to send a contingent of about 1,100 Filipinos to create a 47-acre exhibit in St. Louis that would give Americans a much better understanding of their newly acquired overseas possession. Reconstructed villages highlighting the primitive lifestyles of Igorot and Moro (Muslim) native peoples offered a sharp contrast to the disciplined Scout and Constabulary units that attended the fair. The Constabulary’s visiting battalion was composed of 12 officers and 280 men, and, thanks to a 1903 concert that had impressed two American officials searching the islands for appropriate fair entries, Loving and his 80 bandsmen also were among them.

The Constabulary battalion arrived in St. Louis in April, and the band maintained a busy schedule, playing for all its parades and exhibition drills, as well as furnishing music for opening ceremonies and other official functions. After the Philippine exhibit officially opened in mid-June, the band’s evening concerts and triweekly daytime concerts helped to make the exhibit the most popular attraction for the fair’s almost nineteen million visitors. During one evening concert, the band especially impressed its audience when the power went out and the Filipino musicians continued to play the William Tell Overture in the dark, without missing a note. Loving, who quickly tied a white handkerchief to his baton so that it could be seen, had insisted that his men memorize their repertoire.

The Filipino musicians also found time for short side trips to perform in other midwestern cities. In Louisville the band led a 10,000-man parade of the Knights of Pythias and received “a tremendous ovation along the
route.” In Milwaukee it played at the Wisconsin State Fair, helping to attract a record opening-day crowd of 20,000. In late November President Roosevelt spent a day at the St. Louis fair, and he and Loving seem to have met because, a few days after his visit, Roosevelt wrote to thank him for a shield of miniature Filipino weapons. Because the Constabulary band was a major factor in making the Philippine exhibit a great success, Loving was also the subject of a letter written by Col. Harry H. Bandholtz, the assistant chief of the Constabulary. Colonel Bandholtz had accompanied the battalion to St. Louis and informed General Allen that Loving deserved “promotion or some recognition in the way of an increase of salary.” The chairman of the Philippine Exposition Board endorsed the letter, indicating that a promotion for Loving would be “richly deserved.”

A shortage of officers and almost continuous field work made 1905 a “most trying” year for the now-7,000-man Constabulary. In his 30 June annual report, General Allen indicated that his men had killed 1,297 outlaws, while suffering 84 casualties. Between August 1904 and May 1905, five officers had died. Another thirty-three officers had been asked to resign, and Allen had summarily dismissed nineteen in a little more than a year. Amid this personnel turbulence, Loving’s career was progressing nicely—he was directing seventy-six musicians—but he wrote the commanding general of the Division of the Philippines to request a recommendation for a commission as a second lieutenant in the Philippine Scouts. The Scouts also had a band, and it had remained in the United States after the World’s Fair to play for Roosevelt’s inauguration. Loving probably hoped to become its director, although he also may have wanted to command a Scout company in the field.

From a racial perspective, Loving’s request was not unreasonable. Two African Americans—Edward L. Baker Jr. and David J. Gilmer—were already serving as Scout second lieutenants, and a third was about to be appointed. Baker, who joined the Scouts in 1902, had first enlisted in the Army in 1882, earned a Medal of Honor as a 10th Cavalry sergeant major during the Spanish-American War, and then served as a first lieutenant in the 10th U.S. Volunteer Infantry and as a captain in the 49th U.S. Volunteer Infantry. Gilmer had served as a first lieutenant and captain in the 3d North Carolina Volunteer Infantry (1898–99) and as a captain in the 49th before joining the Scouts in 1903. Eight days after Loving penned his request, George S. Thompson also became a Scout subaltern, after spending almost twenty years in the bands of the 10th Cavalry and both the 24th and 25th Infantry regiments.

Loving evidently also sought a recommendation from Booker T. Washington, the prominent black educator who headed the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in
Alabama. In June 1905 Washington wrote Taft, who had replaced Elihu Root as the secretary of war the previous year, to ask if it was possible to appoint Loving in the Philippine Scouts and then detail him to Tuskegee to take charge of military and band training for its students. Taft replied that he did not think Loving was eligible to be a Scout officer, and, even if he were, “it would be contrary to the general practice to transfer a man from the Philippine Scouts to a detail in this country.” Taft indicated, however, that he would discuss the matter with the chief of staff and the president, write a letter to General Allen, and “advise you further with respect to him.”

Taft decided against appointing Loving in the Scouts and then detailing him to Alabama, but he proposed an alternative candidate. Later in June he advised Washington that he could furlough an Army NCO, Elbert Williams, and send him to Tuskegee, if that was satisfactory. Washington was amenable to this proposal, and Williams arrived at Tuskegee in August. A month later, perhaps sensing that Loving did not feel his talents were appreciated, General Allen informed him, “It gives me pleasure to attest to the marked success you have attained in organizing the Constabulary Band and bringing it to such a highly satisfactory state.” Loving remained with that band, and in August 1906 he received more substantial recognition by being promoted to captain.

Meanwhile, the chief musicians of the Army’s four black regiments remained white, and in 1906 Booker T. Washington’s personal secretary, Emmett J. Scott, complained about that fact to Secretary of War Taft. Without mentioning Loving by name, Scott cited his career to justify appointing black chief musicians: “The colored volunteer bands were led by colored chief musicians, one of which [sic] was promoted to the grade of second Lieutenant in recognition of his ability as a chief musician and his efficiency as a soldier.” Scott suggested that the white chief musicians in the Army’s four black regiments should be transferred to white units and replaced by African Americans. President Roosevelt agreed, and in November 1908—probably influenced by Loving’s great success—he instructed Luke E. Wright, who had succeeded Taft as governor general of the Philippines in 1904 and as secretary of war in mid-1908, that, as soon as the action could be taken “without injustice,” he wanted all of the black regiments “supplied with colored bandmasters.” Wade H. Hammond, who had been the bandmaster at Western University in Quindaro, Kansas, for two years, assumed that position in the 9th Cavalry, followed by Alfred J. Thomas in the 10th Cavalry. By March 1909 the 24th and 25th Infantry regiments had also appointed Edward Polk and Elbert Williams as their chief musicians.
stringed instruments, and, when Taft returned to the Philippines in 1907 to inaugurate its first national assembly, he heard Loving’s musicians play as a symphony orchestra. After Taft was elected president a year later, he underscored his great fondness for the band by inviting it to perform at his inaugural festivities. Mrs. Taft loved classical music—she had founded the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra—and probably voiced an important opinion as to whether the Constabulary band was good enough to play for the big event. The inaugural committee offered to pay the band $650 for two concerts on 5 and 6 March 1909, and Brig. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, the chief of the War Department’s Bureau of Insular Affairs, accepted the offer. The Army and Navy Journal reported that the decision had been made to send the band “if some way was found to pay the expense of the long journey,” which was estimated to be about $28,000. George C. Sellner, the editor of the Manila Times, proposed that the band cover the trip’s cost by staging a concert tour across the United States, and he then arranged for a contract to be signed.47

On its way to the United States, the band stopped in Japan and gave a two-hour concert in the dining room of the Nagasaki Hotel. The Nagasaki Press opined that the musicians had been invited to Washington “to correct the impression reigning in many parts of the United States that the dog-eating Igorrot [sic] typifies the Filipino.” After arriving in California, the band played its way across the country to much acclaim. Indianapolis’s black newspaper, The Freeman, said that Captain Loving “brought out telling effects in the climaxes with the full power of the eighty-six instruments.” After one of the band’s concerts at the Hippodrome, on Young’s Million Dollar Pier in Atlantic City, New Jersey, the New York Times noted the excellent appearance of “the little brown men” dressed in the Constabulary’s “natty” uniform and added, “The audience was large at both performances, and showed great enthusiasm. Encore after encore was demanded at the end of each regular number.”48

After the band’s first inaugural concert in Washington, the Evening Star reported, “As the program proceeded the audience became more and more enthusiastic and appreciative of the efforts of ‘the little brown men’ and their director.” Washington’s black community was especially proud of Loving’s musical accomplishments. In late April he and some of his men were invited to visit
his alma mater, the M Street High School, where they were entertained by its student band. After the concert, the school’s teachers presented an ivory baton with an inscribed silver band to their celebrated alumnus.49

Before leaving Washington, the band played at the White House for a dinner honoring Japanese dignitaries. Its concert tour continued with performances in New York City, Buffalo, Detroit, Cincinnati, Chicago, Denver, Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The band also played for two weeks at the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, staged on the grounds of the University of Washington, in Seattle. Finally, as the band’s Army transport ship crossed San Francisco Bay, en route to Manila, President Taft, who happened to be visiting the area, ordered his vessel—a revenue cutter—to pull alongside the transport. While the Filipino musicians played “Hail to the Chief” on the bridge, Taft “shouted across the water to the khaki clad soldiers: ‘Good-by, boys; I wish you a pleasant voyage.’” A few days later, the band stopped in Hawaii and serenaded deposed Queen Liliuokalani with her own composition, “Aloha Oe.”50

In 1915 the Constabulary band returned to the United States to play at another World’s Fair, the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco. The host city was eager to show the world how well it had recovered from the disastrous 1906 earthquake and subsequent fires. During the exposition’s five-day autumn musical festival, Loving and his musicians were joined by the United States Marine Band. When the latter’s celebrated former conductor, John Philip Sousa, was asked at a banquet which band he considered the best, the “March King” selected the Filipinos. Unfortunately, Loving had been sick for some time “from a severe attack of throat trouble,” so he passed his baton to his chief musician, Pedro Navarro, and was hospitalized at the Presidio. In the spring the doctors sent him to Fort Bayard, which the War Department had in 1900 converted into a general hospital specializing in the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis. While convalescing in New Mexico, Loving again tried to maintain contact with Theodore Roosevelt, who was considering another run for the presidency. He wrote to offer his services, “humble as they might be, for any help that I may be to you should you decide to enter the campaign in the fall.” Roosevelt’s brief reply thanked Loving for his “particularly nice” letter.51

In 1916 Loving requested medical retirement from the Constabulary. When he conducted his farewell concert at the Luneta, he was presented with a watch from the local community, and the band gave him a loving cup. His successor noted that unlike most band directors, he had trained his individual musicians, which had been a “unique achievement.” Retired as a major for “total disability,” Loving moved to Oakland, California, and decided to end his bachelorhood. Ten years earlier, in Manila, he had met Edith McCary, the young daughter of an Army paymaster’s clerk. After the McCary family had moved back to the United States, the two had stayed in touch, and they married in August, shortly before Edith’s twenty-first birthday. In May 1917 their son, Walter Jr., was born.52

Hoping to play an active role in the 1916 presidential campaign, Loving wrote William Howard Taft in New Haven, Connecticut, where the former president was now a professor of law at Yale University. Loving asked Taft for a letter introducing him to Charles Evans Hughes, the Republican candidate in that year’s presidential election. To support Hughes, Loving got his chance when the latter task, the section relied on Loving, its “only long-term black agent.” His mission was to circulate through the nation’s African American communities, determine what racial problems existed, report on them, and then through conversations and formal talks persuade black citizens that any adverse actions being considered should be abandoned.55

Just before Loving was hired, a rash of summer race riots had swept the country, and the MI Section became concerned about the possibilities for “Negro subversion” of the war effort. There were black majorities in over three hundred southern counties, and “conspiracies could be read into any unusual activity.” In July official concerns were exacerbated by events in East St. Louis, Illinois, where four days of bloody rioting produced scores of black casualties. One historian observed that the riot “was a pivotal moment in the response of black Americans to World War I,” and
the government’s recognition of this changed attitude “sparked a massive expansion of the surveillance” of African Americans and their leaders. The head of the MI Section, Col. Ralph A. Van Deman, insisted that “at the bottom of the Negro unrest German influence is unquestionable.” Van Deman’s section began to maintain “Negro Subversion” files in August, as the bloody “mutiny” of a battalion of the 24th Infantry stationed at Camp Logan, in Houston, Texas, raised serious concerns about the wisdom of forming new black combat units.56

Angered by the abusive treatment that they had suffered at the hands of both civilians and police in the “Bayou City,” an armed mob of more than one hundred 24th Infantrymen went on a rampage on 23 August 1917, killing sixteen white Texans, including four policemen, and losing four of their own. The Army disarmed the battalion; transferred it from Houston to Columbus, New Mexico; and in November court-martialed sixty-three of the men for murder and mutiny at Fort Sam Houston, in San Antonio. Five soldiers were acquitted of these charges, but most received lengthy prison sentences and thirteen were sentenced to death on 8 December and hanged without prior public notice three days later. The fact that they were executed so quickly, without either the secretary of war or President Woodrow Wilson reviewing their sentences, outraged African Americans across the country.57

Among the many reports prepared by Major Loving during the course of his intelligence work was one related to the Houston riot. In a March 1918 memorandum on the subject of “Negro Subversion,” he reported that he had called upon the mother of Cpl. Larmon J. Brown, one of the thirteen 24th Infantrymen who had been executed. The woman had been informed that her son’s body was being shipped to Washington, and Loving told her about a rumor that “certain organizations” would attempt to make the occasion of her son’s funeral “the means for spreading discontentment among the colored people of this city.” He reported that after their talk, she had “consented to have a quiet funeral,” and that he would be there to “note any unusual proceedings.”58

W. E. B. Du Bois, the influential black civil rights activist and editor of the Crisis, the monthly journal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), also sought a commission to assist with military intelligence work, but Loving opposed this. In his July 1918 report on “Conditions among Negroes in the United States,” he expressed his “personal opinion that Dr. Dubois [sic] should not be commissioned in the army but that he should continue to edit the Crisis as heretofore.” Loving greatly respected the NAACP and its work, and Du Bois respected Loving’s musical accomplishments with the Constabulary band, having nominated him for the association’s 1917 Spingarn Medal (which went to singer and composer Harry T. Burleigh) for outstanding achievement by a black American. Loving, however, expressed the opinion that Du Bois’s “career as a race leader would be cut short by his acceptance of a commission.” Historian Mark Ellis has written that Loving “pour[ed] cold water on the idea of recruiting Du Bois” because he feared that the arrival of Du Bois and several younger black officers “would have eclipsed Loving’s solo operation” in what (as of February) had become the MI Branch. Loving may have been jealous of Du Bois, but his understandable desire to limit the number of those aware of his work was underscored in the same document, when he stressed that his reports “be handled in such manner as never to come under the scrutiny of any colored official or employee.” Du Bois did not receive a commission.59

In August 1918 the MI Branch was upgraded to a division and authorized to be headed by a brigadier general. Colonel Van Deman, who by that time had made more than a few enemies, had been dispatched to new duties in France in June, and Lt. Col. Marlborough Churchill temporarily pinned on one star and replaced him as the director of military intelligence. Some of Loving’s first reports to Churchill resulted from his visits to eleven Army camps housing black draftees in September and October 1918.60

Nearly a year later, Loving’s last report to General Churchill, a fifteen-page “Final Report on Negro Subversion,” offered a well-written survey of the “present conditions among the Negro population with regard to radical sentiment and propaganda.” Loving began by discussing “Socialism Among Negroes,” which had had its inception in New York City under the principal leadership of Chandler Owen and A. Philip Randolph. Loving advised that “one who would study the development of radical sentiment
among Negroes should keep in touch with the situation in New York.” He noted that socialism had “been given added impetus by the very bitter feeling among Negroes throughout the country on account of mistreatment of Negro officers and enlisted men in France.”

Loving next discussed the League for Democracy, the International Workers of the World, the Universal Negro Improvement Association, the NAACP, and the National Association for the Promotion of Labor Unionism among Negroes. He also surveyed four “Radical Negro Publications,” reporting that the Crisis, edited by Du Bois, had awakened bitter resentment by exposing the propaganda that white Americans had leveled at black troops in France. Loving’s analysis of “Race Riots and Their Causes” addressed the increased number of bloody racial confrontations that occurred in the summer of 1919. He identified the spark for the riots as “the awakened spirit of the Negro soldier returning from France full of bitter resentment.” He said that the “total absence” of racial prejudice among Frenchmen made the returning black soldiers “impatient and resentful of proscription at home.” He added that while black soldiers “were shedding their blood in France, their brothers at home were being lynched and burned at the stake.” Loving warned, “As a whole Negroes have resolved never again to submit to the treatment which they have received in the past.”

The report concluded with sections on segregation and conditions in New York. Loving thought that segregation was a “menace to public safety” and that the best relations resulted when “the Negro population is scattered throughout the community.” As far as New York was concerned, he thought that the city was “the fountain head of all radical propaganda among Negroes.” Loving warned that Harlem required “continual vigilance on the part of the government” and recommended that an operative be retained there. Two weeks after the report was prepared, General Churchill underscored his great respect for Loving’s work when he informed a Department of Justice official that “Major Loving has rendered most excellent service and it would be unfortunate if he should be made to suffer because of his willingness to assist us in the study of the negro problem.”

Loving’s service with military intelligence ended in August 1919, and in November he and his wife and young son sailed to the Philippines, where he once again began directing the Philippine Constabulary Band. A 1920 Manila ordinance also enabled him to instruct the City Boys’ Reformatory band for six months, at the rate of ten pesos per day. A year later, he wrote the Army’s assistant chief of staff, Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, who also had served in the Constabulary for more than a decade, including several years as its chief. Loving explained to General Harbord that the band “went down to such an extent that I was brought back here . . . to re-organize and build it up again.” After indicating that he was under contract until the end of the year, Loving opined that there should be an African American designated as an MI Division agent or a War
Department special agent “with a roving commission” to travel around the country and “keep the department posted as to the actual state of affairs existing among negroses.”

Major Loving’s attempt to secure further employment as a military intelligence operative failed, so he remained with the band. In 1923 when Missouri Congressman Leonidas C. Dyer visited Manila a year after unsuccessfully trying to craft a law making lynching a federal offense, Loving presented him with a tribal cane on behalf of a committee of African American citizens. Later that year, he conducted a second farewell concert at the Luneta. Returning to California, Loving was appointed in 1924 as a major in the Officers’ Reserve Corps and worked as a realtor in Oakland. In spite of his past association with several notable Republicans, he may have campaigned to secure black support for at least one Democratic candidate, Isabella Selmes Greenway, who had grown up to be elected Arizona’s first congresswoman in 1933.

In 1936 the Constabulary was merged into the Philippine Army as the Constabulary Division, and the president of the Commonwealth, Manuel Quezon, decided to ask the retired major to again apply his “Loving touch” to the new Army’s band. Loving accepted the offer, and he and his wife and son returned to Manila in October 1937. To honor President Quezon, who made him a lieutenant colonel in the Philippine Army, he composed the “Marcha de los Colectivistas,” the march’s name honoring the political party headed by Quezon. Loving continued to maintain high musical standards, and in early 1939, after the Constabulary had been separated from the Philippine Army, he brought the band back to the United States to play at San Francisco’s Golden Gate International Exposition.

From Manila, Loving stayed in touch with his stateside friends. Several months after Col. Benjamin O. Davis was selected to be the Army’s first black brigadier general in 1940, Loving sent “Ollie” a belated congratulatory letter. Davis’s selection had been announced a week and a half before that year’s presidential election, and, although the colonel had an outstanding military record, many observers considered his promotion to be an attempt by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to win black votes. Loving said that he was “amused by the howl that went up from the headquarters of the Negro Republicans when your name was sent to the senate for confirmation. . . . They were afraid to rejoice over the appointment for fear that such rejoicing might work against them at the polls.”

Colonel Loving may have retired again shortly before the United States entered World War II, but he and his wife continued to live in Manila. When Japan invaded the Philippines in December 1941, American and Philippine forces on the island of Luzon withdrew to the Bataan Peninsula and the fortified island of Corregidor, while Manila was declared an open city so that it would not be attacked and destroyed. In early January 1942 the city’s Japanese occupation force began interning more than 3,000 American, British, and other foreign civilians on the grounds of Santo Tomas University.

The Lovings were among those who were initially interned, and, as the months went by, living conditions at Santo Tomas deteriorated. Edith Loving was forced to sell her diamond earrings to purchase Epsom salts to relieve her husband’s high blood pressure. In deference to Walter Loving’s age, the couple was eventually released from Santo Tomas and placed under house arrest at their residence in the city’s Ermita district, reporting to Japanese authorities twice each week. Filipino friends urged the couple to try to escape, but they refused. In early February 1945, after American forces had returned to the Philippines and were poised to liberate Manila, about 20,000 Japanese defenders were trapped in the city and prepared to make its capture “a bloody time-consuming ordeal.” The Japanese set fires, and as Manila burned, the Lovings tried to reach the shore of Manila Bay, but an enemy soldier separated them. Edith was sent to the Bay View Hotel, with other women. She last saw her husband being led away with a group of several hundred prisoners. The Japanese killed him, and his body was never recovered, although some Filipinos claimed to have seen it lying at the Luneta—the setting for so many of his band’s concerts.

After Manila’s liberation, Edith Loving returned to the United States. She was invited back to the Philippines in 1952 for the celebration of the Constabulary band’s fiftieth anniversary. She died in California in 1996, shortly after her 101st birthday. After helping Isabella Greenway care for her children, Walter Loving’s sister Julia also moved to California, and Isabella helped her financially for at least part of the time until her death in 1954. After 2½ years of enlisted service during World War II, Walter H. Loving Jr. entered Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia, and was commissioned as an infantry officer in June 1945. A year later he transferred to the Organized Reserves, and, after serving as an artillery captain during the Korean War, he joined the National Guard. After an active duty career that included several overseas assignments, the bandmaster’s son retired as a colonel in 1969. He died in California in 1998.

Over five decades, Walter H. Loving was able to use his exceptional musical talents to rise through the ranks from humble private in the 24th Infantry to lieutenant colonel in the Philippine Army. During the same period, the racism that permeated American society allowed few African Americans to earn Army commissions and even fewer to achieve field rank. Only in the segregated state militia and the black volunteer regiments specially raised for the Spanish-American and Philippine Wars and in the units assigned to the 92d and 93d Divisions during World War I were significant numbers of black officers commissioned, and most of them were lieutenants who were only allowed to serve for the duration of their respective wars.
Realizing that the “color line” prevented them from becoming Regular Army officers, Loving and other talented African American soldiers—such as Edward Baker, David Gilmer, and George Thompson—sought their fortunes in the Philippines, where, initially, racial relations were far more relaxed than what they were used to. As time passed, racial discrimination gradually increased in the islands, but African Americans generally lived and worked comfortably among those whom William Howard Taft paternalistically called “our little brown brothers.” A 24th Infantry sergeant major summed up all this in a letter to the Savannah Tribune advising that “color prejudice has kept close in the wake of the flag and is keenly felt,” but “everything considered, . . . the Philippines offer our people the best opportunities of the century and [I] would advise emigration.”

During his youth, Loving’s close association with the Selmes family taught him the value of mentors, and through the years he carefully maintained contacts with important men, such as Taft and Theodore Roosevelt, whom he hoped could assist him whenever he encountered career obstacles. Strong or influential women also played a significant role in Loving’s success. Although she was only a domestic, Julia Loving initially “rescued” her much younger brother from the stultifying atmosphere of rural Virginia. Patty Selmes later wrote letters on his behalf, and Nellie Taft may have assisted him as well. As a classical music aficionado, Mrs. Taft probably voiced important opinions in determining who should lead the Philippine Constabulary Band and whether it was later good enough to play for her husband’s inaugural festivities. There is little evidence, however, that these relationships allowed Loving to cut corners—African Americans were not allowed that luxury. He had to work hard for everything that he achieved, and his impressive accomplishments with the bands of the 8th and 48th U.S. Volunteer Infantry regiments, and especially the Philippine Constabulary, underscore both his exceptional musical skills and his strong work ethic. Loving’s achievements also seem to have been a major factor in convincing President Roosevelt to order the Army to appoint black chief musicians in 1908.

Major Loving’s service as a military intelligence operative during World War I stands alone as a fascinating chapter in a career otherwise devoted to music. He clearly enjoyed intelligence work, and his well-written reports on “Negro Subversion” and other race-related topics demonstrated that he was good at it. Loving often found himself sympathizing with the African Americans that he was called upon to judge, however, and, as historian Mark Ellis has pointed out, his reports constitute “a fascinating record of a man pulled in two directions: knowing that the people he is investigating are right, but unable to endorse their tactics or their timing.” Although his motives were patriotic, and there was nothing wrong with what he was doing, Loving was certain that his peers would not approve of his investigations, so he asked that his reports be handled carefully, and few were aware of his work.

If the Army had been more amenable to commissioning black officers, Loving’s insightful intelligence reports and foreign language proficiency suggest that he could have served as a very effective military attaché to countries such as Haiti and Liberia, just as Charles Young and Benjamin Davis did. Given his proven skill as an educator, there is also every reason to believe that he would have been as effective as Young and Davis were as professors of military science and tactics at Tuskegee Institute and at Wilberforce University, in Xenia, Ohio. Anyone assessing Loving’s extraordinary career would have to wonder how much more he could have achieved, if only racism had not “muted” the full force of the “Loving touch.”
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perform as “historical action officers” on a wide variety of staff issues, not the least of which is defending our budgets, personnel slots, office space, or even our very existence on the staff! To accomplish this, we need skills far beyond our professional education as historians. We need a deep knowledge of the Army and its staff operations, as well as expertise and training in supervisory and leadership skills at a scale far beyond that required of our counterparts in academia.

Typically the focus of our early lives as historians-in-training at various colleges and universities has been getting the degree. Whether we attained a master’s or the coveted Ph.D., we devoted many years of study to acquiring that diploma in history. Some historians, having obtained their doctorate, consider that they have reached the end of their formal education and stop there. Army historians cannot afford this luxury. If we are to do our jobs successfully both as historians and as historical action officers, while competing with our military counterparts for more responsible positions, we must continue to pursue further education and development.

Professional growth for the Army historian involves more than just going to the occasional academic conference or writing an article for a journal, even for such an outstanding one as Army History! True professional development must mean seeking out additional training and education at Army leadership and development courses, convincing your supervisor that you need those classes, and then arranging (perhaps despite being a one-person shop) to attend them. We require more education to succeed as managers and leaders, not just as historians.

The recent announcement of the new Civilian Education System gives us a chance to reflect on how each of us can use its offerings to become better managers and leaders as a critical part of our occupational growth as Army historians. This educational program will provide four progressive levels of leadership development: a foundation course for all new civilians, a basic course for new team leaders, an intermediate course for direct and indirect supervisors, and an advanced course for those exercising senior-level indirect supervision. Although this system will lack the centralized selection and specific ties to promotion that are features of the military-leader education and development program, it is still a progressive leadership training structure similar to that historically available to Army officers with their basic course, advanced course, Command and General Staff College course (intermediate-level education), and Army War College (senior staff college).

The Civilian Education System is thus the first serious attempt at centralizing and aligning the training worlds of the Army’s military and civilian personnel. This is a direct result of the greater leadership requirements that are being placed on our civilian work force as a consequence of reductions in the uniformed force, the growing reliance on civilians and contractors, and the stress produced by the ongoing war on terrorism. The new system will give us better tools for improving our ability to lead change, for building better teams, and generally for enhancing our skills as historical program managers. At the very least, this additional chance to be trained in and to experience increased levels of leadership and management will allow our subject-matter experts to vie for promotions with former military officers who bring a wealth of expertise in higher-level management and leadership to their applications, even if their credentials as historians may be inferior. If we take full advantage of the Civilian Education System, we can change this dynamic and compete with retired officers on the basis of both technical competence and leadership capacity.

I urge each of you to examine your own level of knowledge about how our Army works and how well you know and can apply the principles of personnel leadership and project management. I challenge each of you not to rest on your academic laurels but to seek new opportunities in civilian education and professional development to perform better as historical action officers, supervisors, and leaders. The Army History Program will benefit from this commitment, and so will you.

You may find more information about the new Civilian Education System at www.amsc.belvoir.army.mil/ces.

**Conference of Army Historians Slated for 7–9 August 2007**

The Army has scheduled the Conference of Army Historians for 7–9 August 2007. This year’s conference will be held at the Crowne Plaza–Washington National Airport, located at 1480 Crystal Drive in the Crystal City section of Arlington, Virginia. Its theme will be “The U.S. Army and Irregular Warfare, 1775–2007.” Sponsored by the Army Center of Military History, the Conference of Army Historians is the premier professional training and development program for the Army’s historians.

Those planning to go to the conference may request hotel reservations at 800–972–3159 or 703–416–1600. Conference attendees may obtain government per diem room rates by making reservations before 6 July 2007 and mentioning the U.S. Army Center of Military History or the Conference of Army Historians. One of the Center’s Web pages, http://www.army.mil/cmh/CAH2007, contains a link to the conference registration form.
Few officers in the Army of the Potomac compiled as notable a combat record or more exemplified the ideal of the citizen-soldier rising to high command on the basis of merit as Francis Channing Barlow. In 2003 Barlow’s life and career were effectively chronicled in Richard F. Welch’s The Boy General: The Life and Careers of Francis Channing Barlow. (Welch’s book was originally published by Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; Kent State University Press reissued it in a paperback edition in 2005.) “Fear Was Not in Him” provides a well-edited compilation of Barlow’s personal correspondence that should appeal to students of the Civil War who have not read Welch’s book and will be of some value to researchers looking for primary source material on the war in the East.

Of course, Barlow was hardly the typical citizen-soldier of the Civil War. The scion of a notable Massachusetts family, Barlow settled in New York City after graduating at the top of the Harvard class of 1855 and was practicing law and comfortably hobnobbing with New York’s and New England’s cultural and intellectual elite when the war tocsin sounded in 1861. Like many in his social circle, which included Robert Gould Shaw, the future commander of the fabled 54th Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, whom he tutored in New York, Barlow found in the Civil War an incredible outlet for his talents, ambition, and energy. In April 1861 he traveled to Washington, serving first as a private and then a lieutenant in the 12th New York Volunteer Infantry, a three-month unit, but saw no action during the operations that culminated in the Union defeat at First Bull Run (Manassas).

After returning to New York, Barlow was commissioned a lieutenant colonel of the newly organized 61st New York Volunteer Infantry, and he had assumed command of the regiment by the time it, along with the rest of the Army of the Potomac’s Second Corps, traveled to Virginia’s York-James peninsula to participate in Maj. Gen. George McClellan’s ill-fated effort to deliver the coup de grace to the Confederacy. At Seven Pines (Fair Oaks) Barlow saw major combat for the first time and won praise from his superiors for his performance. Then, during the Seven Days’ battles, the young New Yorker further distinguished himself, leading his brigade commander to proclaim Barlow an officer who “possesses in an eminent degree all the qualities of a good commander.” (p. 90) At Antietam, as joint commander of the 61st and 64th New York Volunteer Infantry regiments, Barlow was the one who broke into and through the rebel position at the Bloody Lane, receiving in the process a painful wound that kept him away from the war for several months.

With a brigadier’s star on his shoulder straps, Barlow returned to the Army of the Potomac in April 1863 to assume command of a brigade in Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard’s ill-starred Eleventh Corps, although his unit managed to avoid falling victim to Stonewall Jackson’s celebrated rout of Howard’s command at Chancellorsville. The great black mark on Barlow’s record came in his debut as a division commander at Gettysburg. On 1 July he moved his two brigades forward from their designated position north of Gettysburg to secure possession of an elevation then known as Blocher’s Knoll. There, his badly positioned and overstretched command was routed by Maj. Gen. Jubal Early’s division of the Confederate Second Corps, setting in motion the collapse of the entire Union position north of Gettysburg, with Barlow suffering a severe wound during the engagement. After recuperating from his injury, which precluded his participating in the Eleventh Corps’s transfer to the western theater, Barlow received a division in the Second Corps and led it through the Overland Campaign of 1864. Throughout that horrible campaign and into the initial stages of the Petersburg Campaign, Barlow and his division played a conspicuous role and paid a terrible cost in casualties. Finally, in the late summer of 1864, with his health shattered by the almost continuous fighting and having just lost his wife to typhus, Barlow relinquished command of his division. After a sojourn to Europe to recover his health, he rejoined the Army of the Potomac shortly before Appomattox and ended his military career as a major general of volunteers.

His career was remarkable, and it is effectively chronicled in Fear Was Not in Him. Thorough in its treatment of Barlow’s life and career, the letters and other materials in this volume are informative and make for interesting reading. Christian Samito deserves praise for bringing these letters to print and for his work as editor of this book. The letters are supplemented by well-researched footnotes identifying noteworthy individuals and events mentioned in Barlow’s correspondence; by well-written, insightful, and comprehensive introductions to the book and each chapter; by useful descriptions of the larger operational and tactical contexts that shaped the events described in Barlow’s letters; and by a conclusion that provides a good account of Barlow’s notable postwar activities.

Still, while the letters and supplementary material are excellent, there are only about 70 of the former in all, nearly half of which are from 1862. Indeed, the sections on 1863 and 1864 consist to a large extent of narratives of events written by the editor. Including Barlow’s official correspondence and reports would have made for a more substantial book. Moreover, although enjoyable and quotable, the book does not offer many new insights into Barlow and the war in the
East. Barlow’s image as a strict disciplinarian, capable combat commander (with the notable exception of Gettysburg), opinionated and headstrong officer, and a man who had an unseemly prejudice against the Germans who served under his command is well established, having been thoroughly documented in Civil War literature, notably in Welch’s biography. And while the maps provided for Gettysburg and Spotsylvania are good, readers will regret the lack of any for the other operations in which Barlow participated. Considering the book’s rather hefty $55 price, readers should get more.

Dr. Ethan S. Rafuse is an associate professor of military history at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and has taught history at the U.S. Military Academy. He is the author of George Gordon Meade and the War in the East (Abilene, Tex., 2003) and McClellan’s War: The Failure of Moderation in the Struggle for the Union (Bloomington, Ind., 2005).

**The Life of Yellowstone Kelly**  
*By Jerry Keenan*  
*University of New Mexico Press, 2006, 377 pp., $29.95*

**Review by Frank N. Schubert**

Back when Indians still represented a military obstacle of consequence on the far side of the Mississippi, what was said about people who abandoned comfortable sedentary routines to head West into the unknown or semi-known was that they were going “to see the elephant.” *The Life of Yellowstone Kelly* is about a man who saw the elephant, maybe even rode it a bit, but who changed with the times, albeit a little slowly, a little reluctantly, and with marginal success. Along the way, he had a varied association with the U.S. Army, as an enlisted regular soldier, a scout, a civilian clerk, and a volunteer officer.

This book follows Luther S. “Yellowstone” Kelly through his years in the West, first briefly as a soldier, then as a hunter and trapper, and finally as a scout for the Army during some of the climactic campaigning in the late 1870s. After leaving the northern plains for a clerical niche in the military bureaucracy in Chicago, New York, and Washington, Kelly participated in two minor exploring expeditions to Alaska and then served as a company commander in the Philippines. He worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, running the San Carlos reservation in Arizona, a woeful place immortalized by Owen Wister as untouched by the God who created the Garden of Eden, “a sample of the way they did jobs before He came along.”

Author Jerry Keenan considers “Yellowstone” Kelly to have lived “a truly remarkable life,” (p. xvii) at least the equal of legendary figures Daniel Boone, Bill Cody, Kit Carson, and Davy Crockett. But that is not all. According to Keenan, Kelly was “an exemplary soldier and explorer, an able administrator, and a gifted writer.” (p. xxi)

Indeed, some aspects of Kelly’s career were unusual. He enlisted in the Army toward the end of the Civil War, before his sixteenth birthday. He did not see combat but did develop “swollen veins in his left testicle, a condition that produced considerable discomfort” (p. 15) throughout his life. At the other end of his career, just over fifty years old and commanding a company of the 40th U.S. Volunteer Infantry under fire in southern Luzon, he displayed uncommon bravery in assaulting a guerrilla position. In between, he guided a reconnaissance of the Yellowstone River for Maj. George Forsyth and was very useful to Col. Nelson Miles, both against Sitting Bull’s Hunkpapa Sioux and other holdouts after Little Bighorn in 1876–77 and in the subsequent campaign against the Nez Perce. Along the way, Kelly got to know Miles, Brig. Gen. Alfred Terry, and Theodore Roosevelt, but these connections never helped him get more than some obscure federal clerkships, a short-term volunteer commission, and a five-year stint among the San Carlos Apaches.

Kelly completed his memoirs a few years before his 1928 death. Yale University Press had him delete the post-frontier portions and assigned Milo Quaife to smooth out the prose, apparently not sharing Jerry Keenan’s belief that Kelly was a gifted writer. Quaife first claimed that Kelly had “lived a Daniel Boone career from his early years.” (p. 295) So Keenan just added Cody, Crockett, and Carson to the list. But try as they might to elevate this career into something transcendent or archetypical, I do not think it can be done.

Frontier characters of Kelly’s generation all faced the same challenge, adjusting to a rapidly evolving modern society. In the mid-1880s Kelly bought some land in northwestern Colorado, got married, and struggled to make ends meet as a farmer, before finding employment as a general services clerk in the Army’s Department of the Missouri office in Chicago. Keenan thinks that “his life from here on would reflect his continuing effort to find a niche within the affluent upper middle class.” (p. 158) If so, it shows he was not as well connected with reality as he was with the military brass. In Chicago he ran into old acquaintance Bill Cody, there with his Wild West Show for the World’s Fair of 1893. Cody had adapted well to the new entrepreneurial age, with its nostalgia for the frontier, at the very time that Frederick Jackson Turner, also in town for the fair, was reading his seminal paper on the disappearance of that frontier. And while Cody had his gunslingers and warriors and was raking in the money, Kelly had his useless wilderness skills and his job as a clerk. He was becoming an anachronism.
Keenan thinks Kelly saw the handwriting on the wall, but if he did, he did not deal with it well. When the USS Maine exploded in Havana harbor, Kelly took another chance to see the elephant. Miles, now commanding general of the Army, found him a place on an expedition to Alaska, a strange enterprise that, reminiscent of the southwestern camel experiment of the 1850s, tried to use reindeer as pack animals. Kelly apparently did his bit for cultural anthropology, reporting to George B. Grinnell on how the Lapp herders loaded packs on the creatures. He went yet again to Alaska in 1899 with a private party financed by railroad magnate Edward Harriman, a jaunt that was part Harriman family vacation and part a serious resource survey. This time Kelly used his experience on the northern plains to assess potential transportation routes and compare the cultures of various native groups.

Kelly sailed for the Philippines as a captain and company commander at the end of 1899. He served for roughly a year and a half, saw combat, and then stayed in the islands as a civil servant for two years. He tried and failed to get a regular commission in the Quartermaster or Subsistence Department before going to San Carlos. He was then fifty-four years old, going from one young man’s job as a combat soldier to trying to land another. All told, he never made the transition from frontiersman to the middle class successfully. By accepting the positions on the Alaska expeditions, he may even have damaged whatever chance he had to rise beyond inconsequential and short-term situations. This whole period of his life, opposing the war with Spain yet seeking a military commission, looking for stability for himself and his wife while heading to Alaska without her, shows a man unsure of who he was and how the world was changing. I don’t think Luther Kelly ever got it, and I’m not sure that Jerry Keenan does either.

This book’s strengths are in the treatment of Kelly’s later years and to a lesser degree his struggle to come to terms with life after the frontier. Although the chapters on Kelly’s years after the Philippines, at San Carlos and during the final years in Nevada and California, deal with a period of his life that is not particularly important, these chapters are based on quite extensive research in manuscript sources. Earlier chapters are very heavily dependent on Kelly’s own memoir, raising questions about the necessity for this book. Chapters one through seven have 456 endnotes, 277 (61 percent) of which cite the memoir, and 178 (39 percent) of which cite only the memoir. Since the memoir is still readily available—the front cover of the 1973 edition being coincidently almost identical to the one on Keenan’s book—readers interested in Kelly’s frontier years might prefer to go there. 

Dr. Frank N. Schubert was a historian with Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the Army Center of Military History; and the Joint History Office from 1977 until his retirement in June 2003. He now divides his time between homes in Virginia and Győr, Hungary. He is the author of Voices of the Buffalo Soldier: Records, Reports, and Recollections of Military Life and Service in the West (University of New Mexico Press, 2003) and other books on the American West.
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William Harding Carter and the American Army: A Soldier’s Story
By Ronald G. Machoian
University of Oklahoma Press, 2006, 388 pp., $34.95

Review by Graham A. Cosmas

Largely unknown today, Maj. Gen. William Harding Carter played a pivotal role in the period of transformation that prepared the United States Army for the challenges of the twentieth century. Serving in the adjutant general’s office from 1897 to 1903, he was the principal military assistant and adviser to Secretary of War Elihu Root in the creation of a modern Army command and staff organization, and he was a leading proponent of advanced professional military education. Outside of his work in the War Department, Carter published prolifically in both military professional and general interest journals, carrying the case for Army reform to a wide uniformed and civilian audience. Although destined never to command large forces in battle, Carter helped to lay the groundwork for the great American armies of World Wars I and II.

Born in 1851 in Nashville, Tennessee, to a Unionist family, Carter received his first taste of military life at the age of twelve as a volunteer dispatch rider for the Army of the Cumberland. He entered West Point in 1868 and graduated as a member of the class of 1872. Carter spent most of his Army career in the cavalry, a branch of service that he loved, becoming an expert on matters of horsemanship and cavalry equipment. Serving on the frontier in the last major Indian campaigns, he was awarded the Medal of Honor for valor against the Apaches in the battle of Cibicu Creek in 1881 and later participated in the Wounded Knee campaign of 1890–91.

Whereas many officers of the “Old Army” stagnated intellectually under the numbing routine of frontier service, Carter developed into a keen student of his profession. He became a disciple of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Emory Upton, the era’s prophet and martyr of Army reform. In 1889 Carter published his first article on “The Army Question.” His progress as an Army intellectual accelerated when he and his troop of the 6th Cavalry were assigned to the Infantry and Cavalry School of Application at Fort Leavenworth.
Founded by General William T. Sherman in 1881, the school in the 1890s was evolving into a full-fledged institution of advanced military education under the leadership of Capt. Arthur L. Wagner and others. Besides leading his troop on field exercises, Carter joined the Leavenworth faculty and served as editor of the Journal of the United States Cavalry Association, one of the military professional magazines that proliferated during the Army’s intellectual awakening of the 1890s. As did his colleagues, Carter repeated Upton’s call for centralized federal control of the Army by professionally qualified officers, for an expandable Regular Army, and for a truly national reserve to replace the state-dominated National Guard. Like most line officers, Carter advocated command and staff reform to reduce the power and autonomy of the War Department’s staff bureaus and to enhance the role of line officers in the making and execution of military policy.

In 1897 Carter joined the Adjutant General’s Department in Washington, D.C., as an assistant adjutant general with the rank of major. There, in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War, Carter’s career as an Army reformer reached its climax. Carter’s moment came in August 1899 when Elihu Root, a New York lawyer with no previous military experience, took office as secretary of war. Root’s initial mission was to develop policy for the overseas dependencies—Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—that the United States had won in the conflict with Spain. Root, however, headed a department plagued by wartime scandals and controversies and hence inevitably was drawn into issues of Army reorganization and reform.

As he turned to reform, Root quickly adopted the ideas and agenda of the Regular Army followers of Emory Upton, and Carter became his principal tutor and adviser. Carter worked closely with Root on the measures that laid the foundation for the U.S. Army of the twentieth century: the establishment of a progressive system of professional military education capped by the Army War College, an Army reorganization bill that provided for rotation between the staff bureaus and the line, legislation creating a General Staff and a chief of staff, and a law enlarging federal support of and control over the National Guard. A friend and confidant of Secretary Root as well as an adviser, Carter developed proposals, drafted bills, and worked to build congressional and public support for the reforms. In his final report as secretary of war, Root gave “special credit” to Carter, now a brigadier general, “for the exceptional ability and untiring industry” he had contributed to the establishment of the General Staff. “If the new system shall prove to be an improvement,” Root declared, “the gain to the country will have been largely due to him.” (p. 196)

Following his years with Root, the remainder of Carter’s Army career was anti-climactic. He returned to line duty in 1904, held various geographical-department commands in the Philippines and the continental United States, and rose to major general, then the Army’s highest rank. From 1910 to 1912, he served as an assistant to Army Chief of Staff Leonard Wood. Although Wood and Carter held similar views on Army reform, clashing personalities and egos rendered their relationship contentious and unproductive. Carter welcomed the two opportunities he received to command maneuver divisions on the Mexican border, but otherwise his last years in the Army were a time of frustration. He retired from active duty in 1915 but published a steady stream of influential books and articles on Army reform. Before his death on 24 May 1925, he had seen his work with Root reach fruition in the mighty American army of World War I.

Ronald G. Machoian, a serving U.S. Air Force officer who holds a doctorate in history, tells William H. Carter’s story in this scholarly and readable biography. He has mined manuscript sources in the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the Center of Military History, and the U.S. Army Military History Institute, as well as collections at West Point and Fort Leavenworth. Machoian also obtained access to previously unused Carter papers in the possession of the general’s descendants. His bibliography of published documents, books, and articles is extensive and thoroughly covers both Carter’s own numerous works and the secondary literature.

The author has woven his material into a clearly written, concise narrative, well flavored with anecdotes of Carter’s life both in the old frontier Army and in the Washington staff bureaus. Machoian places Carter’s career in the context of the movement among turn-of-the century Army officers to make their service more professional and truly national, and he relates this endeavor to similar trends in the emerging civilian professions of the time. Examining the collaboration between Carter and Secretary Root, Machoian shows that the success of early twentieth century Army reform resulted from a fruitful interaction between an astute, open-minded civilian leader and progressive professional soldiers, typified by William H. Carter. In sum, this volume is a fine example of biography at its best. It belongs in the library of anyone, military or civilian, interested in the Army’s transition from the nineteenth century to the twentieth and in the continuing issues of military transformation and civil-military relations.

Dr. Graham A. Cosmas was a historian at the Army Center of Military History from 1979 to 2001 and has been chief of the Joint Staff History Branch of the Joint History Office in the Pentagon since then. He is the author of An Army for Empire: The U.S. Army in the Spanish-American War, 1898–1899 (Columbia, Mo., 1971) and MACV: The Joint Command in the Years of Escalation, 1962–1967, United States Army in Vietnam (CMH, 2006), and coauthor of The Medical Department: Medical Service in the European Theater of Operations, United States Army in World War II (CMH, 1992). The Center is currently preparing for publication his manuscript “MACV: The Joint Command in the Years of Withdrawal, 1968–1973.”
Friedrich von Boetticher is one of those secondary historical figures indeed deserving of a book-length biographical study. His personal story is complex and intriguing, and his historical influence as military attaché to the United States during the crucial years 1933–41 is as important as it is controversial. In Hitler’s Ambivalent Attaché, Alfred M. Beck has brought decades of extensive research to fruition in a well-written, detached, and balanced biography, though one which leaves open key questions. In Beck’s account, Boetticher’s life and military career are illustrative of the general tragic history of the German Army in the first half of the twentieth century. However, in Boetticher’s individual case, one particularly definitive aspect is the special relationship between the officer corps of Germany and the United States, on which he placed so many of his hopes and around which he framed so many of his military and political analyses.

Beck portrays Boetticher not as the stereotypical Prussian officer, but as a man whose cosmopolitan heritage and education made him the kind of culturally versatile observer well suited to attaché duties in a critical time and place. Born of a bourgeois father and American-born, British-bred German mother, Boetticher was bilingual. His career would be much from a classical humanistic education as from the brilliant professional training and technical expertise he received from the Prussian military system. After succeeding at the highly selective, prestigious Kriegsakademie, this young captain was posted to the General Staff in 1913 and General Wilhelm Groener during the war; he ended his wartime service as an adviser at the armistice negotiations. After the war he remained at the very center of the efforts to sustain a military establishment under the strict restraints of the Treaty of Versailles. He headed the foreign armies section of the war ministry and participated in the disarmament talks at the League of Nations until 1932, before being assigned as military attaché to Washington in 1933. With the outbreak of U.S.-German hostilities in December 1941, he was exchanged back to Germany where he lingered with mostly insignificant military tasks. Incarcerated but never charged after the war, he was released by the Americans in June 1947. He then had to endure years of recrimination, even erroneous accusations of war crimes, from former German diplomatic colleagues convinced that he had encouraged Hitler’s aggression with gross underestimations of American military strength. Subsequently vindicated by certain postwar German military publications, Boetticher returned to historical writing until his death in 1967.

The traditional historiographical treatment of Boetticher reflected the highly negative assessments made by former German Foreign Office professionals associated with the anti-Nazi resistance. The interpretations of well-known scholars of German history such as Gordon Craig, Gerhard Weinberg, Joachim Remak, and Andreas Hillgruber have ranged from those critical of his professional competence to the personally derogatory. These depictions contrast rather sharply with the opinions of those German and American military professionals who knew him well or were familiar with his work. The historian Percy Schramm, who kept the war diaries for the German High Command; Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel; and the American military experts on Germany Col. Truman Smith and General Albert C. Wedemeyer praised his professional competence as well as his efforts as military attaché. Although Beck argues that the complexities of Boetticher’s story defies easy classification, he definitely tends to side with the latter school of thought. Beck provides a substantial amount of evidence demonstrating that Boetticher was, in fact, quite good both at collecting and analyzing military intelligence and, in his capacity as attaché, at establishing key relationships with his military counterparts in his host country. And describing Boetticher’s sensitivities to and tactful handling of American sentiments and public opinion, Beck also makes a strong case for his centrality in U.S. diplomatic as well as military affairs. Beck does seriously question, however, Boetticher’s own romanticized postwar account that President Hindenburg personally charged him with a special “mission” to maintain U.S.-German cooperation. But whether entrusted by Hindenburg with this mission or not, Boetticher does appear to have devoted himself assiduously to that aim. Moreover, according to Beck, what Boetticher “actually told German authorities in Berlin is strikingly different from what his detractors later claimed.” (p. 2)

Boetticher established these pivotal relationships with U.S. officers in Europe in the 1920s, and he rekindled and expanded them later while in Washington. In the mid- to late 1930s, these contacts were well placed in the U.S. military hierarchy. Among others, Truman Smith was General George C. Marshall’s primary confidant on Germany; Wedemeyer would draw up the Army’s Victory Plan; Col. (later Brig. Gen.) E. R. Warner McCabe was the Army’s G–2 (Intelligence Division) chief; and Brig. Gen. George Strong, later a major general and wartime G–2 chief, was involved in Anglo-American military consultations. Boetticher’s networking with U.S. military experts on Germany left him well placed in the U.S. military establishment. Among others, Truman Smith was General George C. Marshall’s primary confidant on Germany; Wedemeyer would draw up the Army’s Victory Plan; Col. (later Brig. Gen.) E. R. Warner McCabe was the Army’s G–2 (Intelligence Division) chief, and Brig. Gen. George Strong, later a major general and wartime G–2 chief, was involved in Anglo-American military consultations.
Boetticher proved quite adept at acquiring intelligence and providing sober, accurate analyses of U.S. industrial and armaments capacity, manpower, and military mobilization. Some of his most important intelligence concerned U.S. airpower modernization and potential deployment, for which he drew heavily on data compiled by the popular German aviator Peter Riedel, then also attached to the German Embassy. Rather than underestimating U.S. military progress, Boetticher remained fairly consistent in warning against “an underestimation of the armed forces and the energy and capability of development in the American people.” (p. 127) Equally significant, he accurately predicted mid-1941 as the turning point in effective U.S. mobilization, when industrial capacity and military demands would match. That anticipated turning point became the cornerstone of his advice to Berlin on possible U.S. military intervention in Europe. Beck argues that, though Boetticher’s advice did not encourage Hitler’s expansionist plans, it did affect Nazi timetables in 1939. Also particularly noteworthy is the mutual exchange of important military intelligence between Boetticher and his U.S. Army contacts from the outbreak of war in Europe to 1941.

However, the same U.S. intelligence officers that proved so essential to his capacity to collect important military data were likewise responsible for his serious errors in miscalculating U.S. political developments that led first to greater U.S. support for England and subsequently to U.S. entry into the war. Boetticher had misinterpreted the anti-interventionist stance of these intensely anti-Roosevelt officers as the sentiments of the American people. He had placed too much faith in their ability to counteract the president’s effectiveness in guiding the country politically, psychologically, and ultimately militarily not only to increase support for Britain but also to engage in hostilities. Boetticher’s realization of this political miscalculation coincided with the crucial tipping point he had predicted in U.S. mobilization (June 1941), as he alerted Berlin that Anglophiles and the “Jewish element” now occupied top military positions.

All of this is quite informative. But the reader is still left with a sense of unease about whether he really understands Boetticher and his motives, particularly regarding the more controversial aspects of his relationship to Nazism and anti-Semitism and how this relationship may have affected his perspectives on America and how he interpreted the U.S. situation to Berlin. If Beck’s contentions on these points are to be convincing, we need to know more about what exactly Boetticher did think of National Socialism, its leaders, and its policies. Simply asserting without detail or explanation that he was a non-Nazi conservative in the old Prussian tradition is inadequate. This is especially true regarding the Jewish Question, as Beck’s account in this sphere is contradictory and insufficiently developed. Critical accounts have cited Boetticher’s cables and reports as evidence of an anti-Semitism that negatively affected

the intelligence reports he sent to Berlin. Providing fuller texts of representative samples to convey their true flavor and content would have greatly assisted the reader in deciding whether these reflected an actual belief or, as Beck contends, strategically placed Nazi jargon to ensure their receptivity by the Nazi hierarchy, especially Hitler himself. Since this issue is so contentious and relates to interpretive disagreements, one would expect at least some coherent, fairly well-developed segment on what Boetticher actually did believe about Jews. Beyond employing bureaucratic tactics in reaching Nazi ears, did Boetticher believe, as Nazis did, that Jews were an eternal enemy engaged in conspiratorial machinations in America? Or did he accurately perceive Jews in America as primarily a foreign policy problem in that their anti-Nazism (like Nazi anti-Semitism) complicated his mission to sustain amicable U.S.-German relations? This question takes on additional importance considering that Boetticher based his political hopes on that segment of American military intelligence that really did believe in such conspiratorial Jewish power and influence.

In general, Beck’s study makes significant contributions to German as well as U.S. military and diplomatic history. It illuminates crucial aspects of the German-American relationship leading to World War II that historians of these subjects cannot ignore. The personalities involved, as well as the intricacies of their motives, activities, and effects, are also insufficiently appreciated (often actually unknown) by nonspecialists in the history of military intelligence. Moreover, this study should encourage additional work on the important, though under-researched, subject of military attachés, for which there remains an abundance of unexploited archival documentation.


Dr. Alfred M. Beck served as a historian and editor from 1968 to 1994 at the Army Center of Military History and the history offices of the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Air Force.
On 13 July 1943 off the Axis-held island of Sicily, 1st Lt. Oliver P. Board of the 3d Infantry Division Artillery took off in an L–4, a militarized Piper Cub, from a 216-foot-long, 10-foot-wide runway on a decked-over landing ship, tank—LST 386. He then headed toward the beach at Gela where his division was conducting an amphibious assault. En route he discovered that his radio was not working. He landed on the beach, but his efforts to repair the set failed. The plan had been for a second pilot to take off later so that between the two they would provide continuous observation for naval gunfire throughout the landing. With Board unable to perform his portion of the mission, the second pilot, 2d Lt. Julian W. Cummings, volunteered to fly off LST 386 immediately. As soon as he passed the shoreline, he located German and Italian batteries firing at the beach and directed naval gunfire that quickly silenced them. Landing when he ran out of gas, he begged some fuel from a passing Army truck driver. Regaining the air, he continued to identify enemy positions, kept U.S. commanders informed of the location of advance U.S. elements, and, at one point, called off naval gunfire that was holding up an attack by Army Rangers. Eight days later the commander of the U.S. Seventh Army, Lt. Gen. George S. Patton Jr., awarded Cummings the Distinguished Service Medal for his actions during the invasion.

Cummings, who had been born on 17 December 1915 in Salt Lake City, Utah, had loved the idea of flying from the time he was a small boy. He eventually qualified as a pilot by participating in the Civil Aeronautics Authority’s pilot training program at the University of Utah. Upon graduation, he was commissioned as a reserve field artillery officer and ordered to report to Camp Roberts, California. In mid-1942 he learned that the Army was seeking field artillery pilot volunteers for the new Air-Observation-Post Program. He responded and entered Pilot Class 2 at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, in August 1942. There he learned an early version of “pop up” tactics, designed to limit exposure to enemy fighters, which earned the L–4s the nickname “grasshoppers.” Graduating in September, he was part of the Western Task Force in Operation TORCH, the invasion of North Africa. Landing only after combat ended, he was quickly ordered to patrol the border between French and Spanish Morocco to warn against any German thrust from Spain. In early 1943 he was ordered to Tunisia where he trained for the invasion of Sicily.

Cummings’s flights over the beaches at Gela represented his introduction to combat and in many respects marked the high point of his military career. He continued to fly combat missions in Sicily and the campaigns in southern Italy. After the fall of Rome in June 1944, the War Department returned him to Fort Sill under its policy of introducing officers with recent combat experience into the training base. A few months later he became involved with experiments to fire rockets from the Stinson L–5, a light plane slightly larger and faster than the L–4, and to mount a television camera in the larger aircraft. He had received orders to report for helicopter pilot training when the War Department sent him instead to the Philippines to test the ability of the television cameras under combat conditions to provide real-time images of the front to Army command posts. (The man who filled his vacancy at the helicopter school, Lt. Col. Robert Ely, would become the Army’s first rotary-wing-pilot.) When the war ended, Cummings and a team were in northern Luzon attached to the U.S. 6th Infantry Division.

Like many other veterans, Cummings yearned for a return to normalcy. Although he remained in the reserves, where he eventually achieved the rank of major, he devoted most of his energies to his family and to the decorative wrought-iron business he founded. Cummings, however, never forgot his World War II experiences, and in spare moments he began to work on his wartime memoirs. A severe stroke in 1998 made him heavily dependent on his wife, Gwendolyn Kay Cummings, an author and illustrator of several children’s books, to complete his manuscript. He died in 2002, just after they finished writing the present volume.

Published by Kent State University Press, this slim, handsomely illustrated book provides all-too-brief insights into one soldier’s wartime experiences. Gela was important not only to Cummings’s career but also to the overall development of the concept of organic Army aviation. Cummings’s accomplishments at Gela reinforced the success his fellow pilots had achieved in the campaign just ended in northern Tunisia. In the process, Cummings and his associates validated the idea that field artillery aviation could make an important contribution to the U.S. Army’s performance in combat. When he is recounting his own experiences, Cummings’s recollections appear highly accurate and track very well with contemporary records. His account of events that he knew secondhand is more problematic. The volume also suffers from a certain repetitiousness, some of which the author might well have eliminated if he had been younger and in better health. Kent State University Press is to be commended for making the memoirs of this Army pilot available to a wider public.
**BOOK REVIEWS**

Dr. Edgar F. Raines Jr. has been a historian at the Army Center of Military History since 1980. He is the author of Eyes of Artillery: The Origins of Modern U.S. Army Aviation in World War II (CMH, 2000). He received his doctorate in history from the University of Wisconsin in 1976.

"A Defense Weapon Known to Be of Value": Servicewomen of the Korean War Era

By Linda Witt, Judith Bellafaire, Britta Granrud, and Mary Jo Binker

University Press of New England, 2005, 320 pp., cloth $60, paper $24.95

Review by John S. Brown

Military historians generally argue that a nation’s armed forces reflect the society they serve. I cannot think of a better demonstration of this premise than the account that appears in “A Defense Weapon Known to Be of Value”: Servicewomen of the Korean War Era. This fine study focuses on military women in the period between the end of World War II and the end of the Korean War and artfully weaves the experiences of the nation as a whole, of military women collectively, and of individual military women as examples into a coherent whole.

After a thoughtful introduction, A Defense Weapon Known to Be of Value progresses in broadly thematic chapters, each of which develops a particular aspect of the servicewomen’s history. These themes include women’s—and servicewomen’s—“place” in post–World War II America; servicewomen’s recruitment, integration, and retention; finding “proper employment” for servicewomen; the imperative of securing skilled servicewomen for military medicine; the need for servicewomen to fill out cadre; and the combat experiences of nurses in Korea. The book wraps up with a chapter summarizing recurring issues relating to military women, followed by a conclusion. Each chapter is laced with personal vignettes and photographs, set apart in such a manner that the reader knows what they are but located where they reinforce the text. The vignettes are truly engaging, and they wonderfully enliven the narrative.

One might have thought that “Rosie the Riveter” of World War II had swept away doubts concerning women’s capabilities and set us on an uninterrupted path toward gender equality. Actually, the postwar era was a period of retrenchment in that regard, and the prejudices prevailing in society as a whole manifested themselves in the military as well. Although institutionally accepted as a permanent feature of the military establishment, servicewomen found their service—in particular their service in the combat theater—even more circumscribed than it had been during World War II. The ready availability of drafted manpower rendered efforts to reduce gender barriers even more difficult. Nevertheless, our servicewomen soldiered on and positioned themselves for the breakthroughs that would occur when society itself advanced. Understandably, some of the women in command when the greatest breakthroughs occurred were junior officers during the period of the narrative. Their vignettes can be particularly interesting.

The authors of A Defense Weapon Known to Be of Value are certainly well qualified for the work they undertook. Judith Bellafaire is the chief historian of the Women In Military Service For America Memorial Foundation. Mary Joe Binker is an assistant editor with the Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project at George Washington University. Britta Granrud is the curator of collections for the Women In Military Service For America Memorial Foundation, and Linda Witt is a senior fellow with the Women In Military Service For America Memorial Foundation. The authors of this fine study have done their homework well and documented it exhaustively. Two hundred fifty-four pages of text are supported by forty-two pages of notes. The book is amply supported with photographs but has no need of maps, figures, or charts.

If I were to voice a criticism, it would be the minor one that the authors are conscientiously even-handed in their discussion of the services. My understanding has been that the Air Force was the most progressive with respect to integrating military women, the Navy the most retrogressive (in this and much else), and the Army and Marine Corps somewhere in between. If this is true, it would be good to know how the biases manifested themselves and what the consequences were for the individual services. Although potentially controversial, differences in service performance and culture seem a part of the story.

A Defense Weapon Known to Be of Value is a superb book. I strongly recommend it to all libraries supporting servicemen and women, to all institutions sponsoring social history programs, and to all readers interested in the history of our Army, the Korean War era, and our military servicewomen.

Retired Brig. Gen. John S. Brown was the Army’s chief of military history from 1998 to 2005. He commanded the 2d Battalion, 66th Armor, in Iraq and Kuwait during the Gulf War and returned to Kuwait as commander of the 2d Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division, in 1995. He holds a doctorate in history from Indiana University and is the author of Draftee Division: The 88th Infantry Division in World War II (Lexington, Ky., 1986).

Dr. Judith Bellafaire was a historian at the Army Center of Military History from 1989 to 1996.

★★★★★
The Army Center of Military History has issued new books on the U.S. Army’s handling of insurgencies in the period from World War II to the Vietnam War and on the service of Japanese American linguists in the Asian and Pacific theaters in World War II. It has also published a volume of papers delivered at a conference in Austria in 2005 focusing on multinational operations and military cooperation as well as pamphlets on the introduction of a new armored vehicle, the Stryker, into U.S. Army operations in Iraq and on the joint American-French campaign that ended with the victory at Yorktown in the Revolutionary War.

**U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine, 1942–1976**, by Andrew J. Birtle, addresses the evolution and application of the U.S. Army’s doctrine on combating guerrilla forces and other elements seeking to destabilize and supplant governments supported by the United States during the years of its coverage. Birtle is a historian at the Center, and the work is a sequel to his history of the same subject covering the years 1860 to 1941, a book the Center published in 1998. The new volume addresses U.S. Army experiences with insurgents in Greece, Korea, the Philippines, Latin America, and Vietnam and traces how the Army in the 1950s and 1960s developed a dual strategy that sought to combine aggressive military measures with political and socioeconomic reforms. It has been issued as CMH Pub 70–98 (cloth) and 70–98–1 (paper). The Government Printing Office is offering the clothbound book for $52 and the paperback for $49.

**Nisei Linguists: Japanese Americans in the Military Intelligence Service during World War II**, by James C. McNaughton, narrates the story of the recruitment and service of Americans of Japanese ancestry who were trained as linguists by the Military Intelligence Service during the Second World War. Some of these Japanese Americans were recruited from internment camps. They provided translation, interrogation, radio-monitoring, psychological warfare, and other intelligence services in the Pacific and Southeast Asian theaters to U.S. Army and Marine units and headquarters. These linguists also helped arrange the surrenders of Japanese forces and contributed to the success of the occupation of Japan. McNaughton is the command historian of the U.S. European Command. He served previously as a historian with the U.S. Army, Pacific, and the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. The book was published in paperback and is listed as CMH Pub 70–99–1. The Government Printing Office is selling it for $29.

**Multinational Operations, Alliances, and International Military Cooperation, Past and Future**, edited by Robert S. Rush and William W. Epley, publishes twenty-four papers read at the fifth workshop of the Partnership for Peace Consortium’s Military History Working Group. This workshop was held in Vienna, Austria, in April 2005. The authors represented ten nations, five of which had been in the Warsaw Pact and five in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during the Cold War. The papers deal primarily with international relations and military cooperation since the middle of the nineteenth century. The editors are historians at the Army Center of Military History. This paperback book is CMH Pub 70–101–1.

**From Transformation to Combat: The First Stryker Brigade at War**, by Mark J. Reardon and Jeffery A. Charlston, is a 73-page pamphlet that examines the training at Fort Lewis, Washington, and the initial operations in Iraq of the 3d Brigade, 2d Infantry Division. The brigade was the first in the U.S. Army to be equipped with the Stryker, a 19-ton, wheeled armored vehicle that the Army acquired in 2002. In the eleven months beginning in December 2003, the brigade served south of Baghdad at An Najaf and north of the capital at Samarra, Qayyarah, and Tall Afar, bringing its equipment to bear against growing internal violence. Reardon and Charlston are historians at the Center of Military History and the National Reconnaissance Office, respectively. Charlston was a historian at the Center until 2006. This pamphlet is CMH Pub 70–106–1. The Government Printing Office is offering it for sale for $6.

**March to Victory: Washington, Rochambeau, and the Yorktown Campaign of 1781**, by Robert Selig, is a fifty-page pamphlet that provides an account of the combined French and American and joint land and naval campaign of 1781 that culminated in the critical Revolutionary War victory at Yorktown. The account focuses on the cooperation of these forces and on their supply and transportation as they converged toward the scene of the decisive siege. Selig, who served two years in the German Bundeswehr, has taught history at colleges and universities in Ohio and Michigan. The pamphlet is CMH Pub 70–104–1. The Government Printing Office is selling it for $4.25.

Each of the aforementioned publications may be obtained by Army publication account holders from the Directorate of Logistics–Washington, Media Distribution Division, ATTN: JDHQSV/PAS, 1655 Woodson Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63114-6128. Account holders may also place their orders at [http://www.apd.army.mil](http://www.apd.army.mil). The facility accepts customer service inquiries by phone at 314-592-0910 and by e-mail at the customer service link at the aforementioned Web site.
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