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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED

The Negro has served in every war this country has fought. For the most part, he has performed menial tasks until the advent of the Korean War. Some Negro individuals who served in combat had proven themselves good soldiers. However, the majority of segregated Negro units had failed to perform with acceptable combat efficiency. Integration as a solution in the past was not seriously considered because of the prevailing American attitudes toward integration. The few Negro individuals and Negro units were considered exceptions and were not applied to the Negro race.

Robert J. Dwyer states that the use of the Negro before the Korean conflict followed a pattern during wartime. At the beginning of each war, the Negro as a potential fighting soldier was ignored. When he was accepted, it was for the purpose of menial tasks -- waiters, building crews, truck drivers etc. When the war became critical, a small proportion of Negroes were put into combat. However, when the peace was won they were put back to their low status occupations with the service.¹

Statement of the Problem:

On September 30, 1949, President Truman ordered integration

of the Armed Forces. This change of policy was to proceed as quickly as possible without any impairment of morale or efficiency. The various services integrated with varied speed. By 1953, integration was an almost total fact. The operation had been accomplished quite smoothly and with unexpected success.¹

With the introduction of the Army Integration program the service man found a change of environment in which the old attitudes and behavior patterns underwent a change. It was found that white soldiers and Negroes could live, work, and fight together without conflict. The research problem of this study was focused upon the reason for the smooth operation despite the difficulties that racial integration has produced within other institutions of this country. A close analysis of the historical background is required in order to determine if a favorable climate for integration existed. The organization of the policy, legal base, and actual procedure point to the support of the conclusions of this study. This environmental climate resulted in co-operation and not conflict.

From the historical data of this research a particular situation presented itself to the questionnaire group upon their entrance into the service. They were immediately placed within an integrated unit -- eating, sleeping, working and sharing the same post recreation with Negroes. The individual could not make a choice. It was made clear that resistance on his part within these areas would make trouble for

himself. However, if he chose not to associate with Negroes on off-duty time nothing was done or said about this decision. The historical background relates that the majority cooperated with this situation. Since this situation was a new experience, some individual adjustment had to take place. The individual could either accept this new situation because he had not been very prejudiced against Negroes before; he had been prejudiced and continued to be so, but Army policy discouraged overt obstruction; he could ignore the situation as much as possible and be indifferent to it; or his attitudes underwent a change to the point where he could accept the Negro as a fellow soldier.

The focus of this study will be upon attitudes of Army student veterans before entrance into the service and after service in an integrated unit. By necessity of location in which the questionnaire was given only attitudes of Army student veterans from the western section of the United States was available. All possible social contact before service time will be sought as a comparative basis for social contact after service time.

The author believes that the social contact of white soldiers and Negroes functioned smoothly because the situation into which they were placed had group support and legal foundation for integrated co-operation. Also because a firm establishment of the inevitability that co-operative action was the only course — other than an action which would create trouble for the individual — the integrated units functioned beyond expectation. The author believes that with tho
situation in the Army as stated above the majority of white soldiers chose an adjustment pattern of expediency and indifference. Therefore, the questionnaire will seek to determine if the above factors existed within the Army as the historical data seems to indicate. This pattern of expediency and indifference is being inaugurated by the Supreme Court and the Justice Department of the United States in the integration of public schools. The Supreme Court stated that integration of public schools would proceed with all possible speed. The Justice Department, with case after case, has been closing every avenue of legal escape from the Supreme Court ruling.

The Army has been chosen for this study because I have observed its integration at first hand. Because the Army has the largest units of men, the oldest traditions, and presented the strongest initial opposition, the author believes these factors give the most intensive test of the principles applied in the service program.

The success of the Army program (as with the other services) has held great importance for the Army, the Negro, and the nation. According to all of the author's experiences and research material, Army integration has meant elimination of duplicate facilities and personnel thus cutting wasteful expenditure. It has also meant the full use of manpower; every individual free to move ahead as his desire, experience, education, and intelligence would allow. The total result has meant increased morale and efficiency.

To the Negro, the success of the service program has meant another step forward to full citizenship. For those within the service
It has meant equal opportunity with the whites.

To the nation it has meant another step closer to its democratic ideals, utilization of every service man for the betterment of its defense program, and a stronger moral position for its leadership of democratic nations against Communism.

**Specific Questions to be Answered:**

The specific statement of the problem will investigate the attitudes of individual white soldiers toward their environment in integrated companies and attempt to probe how positive or negative these attitude positions are within each individual.

The geographic area of youth and rural-urban environment is only slightly significant. The number of Negroes in childhood communities does not show any significance in attitudes toward Negroes. The occupations of fathers show no significance except for the skilled and unskilled group. The education of parents shows no significance except for those who attended college.

**Feasibility of the Study**

Integration of the Negro within the boundaries of Army jurisdiction and within the stated definition seems to have worked. All Army units, schools, and facilities are now integrated with no riots or other serious troubles having occurred. Army command states that it has worked and there is nothing to indicate that the policy will be changed. Civilians within the South seem to accept it as long as it stays within Army boundaries.
Just how much personal attitudes are affected has not been proved
to the knowledge of this author in any controlled scientific manner.
The Army has conducted surveys and questionnaires, but extensive study
of those beyond summary reports are not available for stated security
reasons. These seem to have been done mainly in the area of how many
units were being integrated and how smoothly the operation was
proceeding. Committee and individual observations and reports are
available, but their research methods are not available.1

Because there has been no serious trouble in the service program,
I feel that attitudes of the men have played a major part. From past
experience this nation has learned that no policy is effective for
very long without acceptance by the majority. Attitudes take on a
greater significance when it is realized that the integration program
in the Armed Forces has been the first in this country to have been so
successful (within the stated intentions) for such a large group of
people from all kinds of backgrounds.

Never before had such an extensive program of integration of
races been inaugurated within a formal institution. Also, since the
program was established with no pre-educational program for the
recruits, the college males questioned had an opportunity to watch
and experience a program of human relations that could have had
profound effect upon attitudes. College males with service time
since 1948 could have had both the experience of segregated units

1James C. Evans, and David A. Lane, Jr., "Integration in the
and integrated units. Even those moving directly into integrated units had a unique experience of being a part of a program that was still very new with problems still being ironed out.

After entering the Army, such factors as length of service or geographic area of service will be determined. Does continued association on an integrated basis lessen or strengthen personal attitudes? Does service time in traditional prejudiced areas change attitudes, either to positive or negative positions, which had been formerly held by men raised in western states? Does overseas time in countries, free from prejudiced attitudes toward Negroes, break down traditional attitudes concepts? Also such specific questions will be asked to determine attitudes of sharing the same barracks, swimming pools, mess tables, classrooms, and the number of times Negroes were included in groups that included off-duty activities. Finally each individual will be questioned as to the most frequent reason he felt to be the cause of word calling or fights.

Definitions

1. Integration

Integration has meant equal opportunity for promotion and jobs. Educational schools are opened to all if they meet the requirements of the particular school. No racial factors are considered -- even as to percentage of Negroes to be promoted, percentage in a particular job or within a class.

Fort facilities are open to all including recreation facilities, housing, dependent's schools, transportation, post exchanges, and commissaries.
Social mixing is left to the individual except on such occasions as are considered duty functions; at which time social mixing is expected.

Intermarriage is not forbidden, but these cases are not sent to posts in the United States where a law exists forbidding them. In such cases, the men must go alone or be willing to be transferred with their families to a state where no law against intermarriage is on the statute books.

2. Army Career Man

An Army career man is a Regular Army officer, a Reserve Officer on indefinite duty, or a Noncommissioned officer beyond the first enlistment.

3. Attitudes

For the purpose of this study an attitude is defined as the individual tendency to react, either positively or negatively, to the social value of integration as established by the Army.

A negative attitude will be considered as any overt action to oppose the Army policy, either by the use of derogatory words addressed to Negro soldiers, resistance to mixing on duty time and social activities with Negroes or any individual action to impede the integration policy. Negative attitudes will also include any personal resentment, whether resulting in overt action or not, that is held against the Army integration policy.

A positive attitude will be considered as any overt personal response that co-operated and supports the integration program of
the Army. It will especially include a readiness to accept the Negro as a fellow soldier.

An indifferent attitude will be considered as little or no personal feeling held about negative or positive attitudes of fellow white soldiers and an indifference to any action that these soldiers may do. It also will include an indifference to what the Army may want them to do or not to do as concerning the integration program and a personal attitude of not caring if Negroes share Army life with them.

Hypothesis

It is the purpose of this study (1) to compare the attitudes toward Negroes of Army student veterans before service time and after service time in integrated units; (2) to show that the majority of attitude adjustments the student veterans made followed a pattern of expediency and indifference and (3) that these attitude adjustments came about because of a controlled situation of group support, legal base, and inevitability of the Army integration program.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RACIAL INTEGRATION IN THE ARMY

A number of pressures, by both public and private agencies and individuals, had been exerted upon the government to end segregation in the services. Some of the agencies were the National Urban League, NAACP, Anti-Defamation League, etc. While some of the individuals who strongly supported the integration of the services were Secretary James V. Forrestal, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, General John C. H. Lee, Stuart Symington, etc. However, probably the strongest pressure came from without the country in the form of difficulty in diplomatic operations and repeated criticism from foreign newspapers and magazines. The United States had become a world leader and a promoter of the United Nations. In this position the prejudice against the colored minorities, especially when noticed with service troops stationed overseas, brought strong criticism from the world. This need to maintain prestige as a democratic nation gave force to those who had fought for integration in the services as well as other areas of human relations.¹


Also the author, from personal recall, remembers this world criticism from articles and books stating the racial position of the United States as quoted in foreign newspapers and used effectively as Red propaganda.
In addition, such events as the Supreme Court decision on integrated public schools, ban on segregated public carriers, openings within occupations formerly closed to Negroes, indicate that the majority of public sentiment had turned against discrimination.

A. FIRST THE NAVY AND AIR FORCE: LAST THE ARMY

On September 30, 1949, President Truman ordered integration in his executive order 9981. The U.S. Air Force moved with considerable speed in its integration program. This action did not cause them many adjustment problems because they had only been formed as a service branch a few years before. The U.S. Navy achieved some effective integration in its Marine Corps. In the Navy, Negroes had traditionally served as Mess Stewards. Initially, the Navy did not try to move the Negroes out of this branch but instead moved Filipinos into this branch. The Navy put six whites on as Stewards. This action ran into immediate trouble so the Navy withdrew the whites. On shore duty there was some mixing of the races. However, in the Navy proper, integration was achieved in 1950.2

The Army had some complex problems in its integration program. With its large units of men in the majority of the Army's organization, it was a possibility they would have more trouble. Also, with most of its personnel, particularly the large troop units, being stationed in the South, the Army was fearful of trouble with its

---


civilian-military relations. Racial tradition in the Army presented another extensive problem. Negroes had been in segregated units since the Revolutionary War, and the officers and non-commissioned officers who had spent a good part of their lives in the Army, accepted the old way as part of the tradition of the Army. Some of them had served with pride or shame in these segregated units. They had strong feelings about the place of these Negro units in the Army. This was a part of tradition, and tradition is an important reality in the Army and much of the esprit-de-corps of the men is part of this.  

In the reports coming out of the areas in the Navy and Air Force where integration was achieved, the facts indicated that morale and efficiency increased with integration.  

This author has found in conversations with Army officers that there is some disagreement that efficiency has increased, but all have agreed that efficiency was not impaired in any way. Nevertheless, in the beginning the Army had not found enough answers to its particular problems to be convinced of the soundness of the policy.

---

1William Addleman Ganoe, *The History of the United States Army* (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1943), p. 193-194. Colonel Ganoe writes of the daily life and routine of the United States Army in 1844. The attitude of the professional soldier, his duty, and life are striking in resemblance to the present day. This routine and attitude are woven together into a strong tradition that is part of the very core of Army life.

B. CONGRESSIONAL FIGHT FOR INTEGRATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

1. 1950 Three Year Extension of Draft

In May of 1950, a bill calling for a three-year extension of the draft was pending in Congress. In the House, two amendments were attached to the bill forbidding racial discrimination and segregation in the Armed Forces. One amendment was proposed by Representative Adam C. Powell, Jr. -- a Democrat from New York. The other amendment was initiated by the Republican representative, Jacob E. Javits of New York. Under the House bill, men could be registered but none could be inducted until Congress declared an emergency. The bill was in the Armed Services Committee under the Chairmanship of Representative Carl Vinson -- Democrat of Georgia. A third amendment to protect Negro selectees against Jim Crow practices while in the service was offered by Representative Isaiah Dollinger, Democrat of New York. It was thrown out on point of order as not relevant. The House rejected the two amendments barring discrimination.2

2. Optional Segregation

The Senate bill left decision with the President as to when inductions should take place. Senator R. B. Russell, Democrat of Georgia, sponsored the amendment that became known as "optional segregation."3 This would permit all volunteer enlistees,

---

1 New York Representative from Harlem, a Negro.


3 Ibid. (Senate) 96:Part 7, p. 9073, June 22, 1950.
registrants and inductees to choose assignments where they could be with units of their own race if they so desired. Proponents of this amendment stressed that those who wished assignment in "mixed" units would have the opportunity to be assigned to such units.  

The amendment went on to state that an officer who denied an expressed wish to be placed in a segregated unit and sent such an individual to an integrated unit would be subject to trial and punishment. Also, some believed that this amendment would apply to Reserve units and National Guard.

Some senators believed the Senate Armed Services Committee had accepted the Russell Amendment because it could be used as a trade with the House. Thus, the "optional segregation" amendment could be dropped if the House would agree that calls for induction be left to a Presidential decision.

On June 22, the bill came on the floor. The Committee members had supported it as a matter of form; however, several voted against the Russell Amendment on the floor. Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democratic floor leader of Illinois, made a motion to strike the Russell Amendment from the draft bill. Supporting Lucas's motion were five Democratic Senators from the east: Myers of Pennsylvania, Lehman of New York, Douglas of Illinois, McNamara and Benton of Connecticut. A vote of 42-49 killed the Russell Amendment.  

---

1Ibid.

Senator Hubert H. Humphry had a number of anti-segregation measures to present but declined to make a motion to add these as amendments to the bill. He stated as his reasons the immediate need of getting the bill passed before the deadline and his fears that the action might lead to extended discussion and possibly filibustering. He also expressed confidence in the ability of President Truman and the high command of the military forces to continue and extend the present program of stamping out segregation that was already in operation.

Senator Knowland of California expressed the consensus against Senator Russell's amendment when he stated that the reasoning of allowing men to choose units of their own race was in a like parallel of "letting men choose their own states in which they would be stationed and trained."

C. COMMITTEE ON EQUALITY OF TREATMENT AND OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

When President Truman created the Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services, headed by Charles A. Fahey, the Army had done little effective integration. The committee had begun in midsummer of 1948. They were to check the results of the use of Negroes on a competitive basis of individual skills and abilities. They were also looking for increased efficiency and adaptability of the white soldiers to the new policy. The committee members felt the steps taken to inaugurate this program had to be voluntary and fully supported in each service branch and each subdivision of those branches. Their report came after twenty-two
months of cooperative work with the Army, Air Force and Navy. They predicted equal opportunity of all personnel in the Armed Forces in the "reasonably near future."¹ The results had been very encouraging to the members. Their report had been based on observations and results of integration applied to practical problems. They had found a consistent increase in morale and efficiency when discrimination had been eliminated; however, they realized that the services had a long way to go. However, they had noticed that at some times and in some places it was possible to accelerate the program. They found individuals quite willing to forget color -- at least when it concerned common goals -- and to accept their Negro companion when he could measure up with skill and intelligence. The Commission felt this change came about because the individual was freed from group pressure and conformity.²

It can be stated that the Commission might have had some bias in their observation and possibly in some of their conclusions. After all, the Commission was composed of men who had strong personal desires that the program be successful. However, some basis for their optimistic attitude could be justified -- at least from the negative point of view. No riots or obstructions had occurred in

²Ibid.
the establishment of the program in any of the Services. Whatever
the personal attitude of men and officers might still be, these
attitudes were not expressed in any overt action or behavior.

D. PROJECT CLEAR

The Army surveys may have been a bit more objective. The Army
had harbored many doubts and were reluctant to deviate from their
established policy. They had one objective in mind when they
followed President Truman's order to integrate. That was to "secure
maximum effective utilization of all manpower." They were not
concerned with moral rights or social experiments. As it turned out,
both of those factors became a part of the total integration program
picture. However, they had felt at the time that these were
responsibilities of the civilian world. The Army's ultimate goal is
combat efficiency. Thus, in the statements and reports coming out
of this change of policy, the Army gave close scrutiny to its initial
efforts at integration. Every aspect of the Army's combat and
training program had to show at least the same efficiency as before.

The Army conducted a survey of the new race policy entitled
"Project Clear." In combat under mass attack, the Negroes in mixed
units reacted about the same as whites. The conclusion came from

---

1 Conn, loc. cit.
2 Konworthy, loc. cit.
3 J. C. Evans, and D. A. Lane, Jr., "Integration in the Armed
Services," Biblio. F. Tab., Annual American Academy of Political and
85 per cent of the officers interviewed. Before integration, Negroes had been classified as being careless in care of weapons. After integration, Negroes were the same as whites in this respect according to 90 per cent of the officers questioned. 1

On July 8, 1951, Brigadier General Trudeau made a progress report at Fisk University before many educational and community leaders. He stated that the Army's integration program had moved rapidly since the Korean War. Korea erased all doubts about the efficiency of integrated units in combat. The General in command of First Constabulary Brigade found a direct correlation between educational improvements and military training programs. In West Germany all men were required to complete their education to a high school level, or to clearly demonstrate an ability to handle work beyond this level. The Army had realized big dividends when they began recruiting men who were stable and intelligent regardless of race. Through the Army's educational program, minority groups were given the opportunity to get an education which they had been denied before. By providing high goals for Negroes, many of the former problems the Army had with Negroes were dissolved.

In this program in West Germany, an average of 436 Negro soldiers per month had graduated from one grade level to the next. Of this number, an average of 52 men per month had completed the high school level and received their diplomas from U. S. High Schools or an equivalent certificate.

---

1 "Unbunching," _Ibid._, cit.
The General stressed the fact that responsibility lies heavy on the U. S. educational system to provide opportunities for minority groups so that they may take advantage of the new career openings.

At the same institute, James C. Evans, civilian assistant to the Secretary of Defense, told the audience that civilian communities must now provide the climate for equal treatment and opportunity in order for the military program to succeed.1

Simpson and Yinger state that "Many studies show that individual behavior can be modified by changes in the situation, independently of personality structure. Or to put this in terms that we believe are theoretically more adequate, a very high proportion of persons have tendencies toward nondiscrimination that may be called out by strategic situational changes even though such tendencies normally are dormant. There are, in Merton's terms, many fair-weather liberals and illiberals. Group supports, legal sanctions, pressures, and firm action on the part of the leaders can create the kind of climate in which their nondiscriminatory tendencies bloom."2

E. Army Program Applied to Theories of Race Conflict

Within the many theories of race conflict and the resulting conclusions for illumination of such conflict, the Army integration program is creditable to some and not to others. The economic theories

---


of Edgar F. Thompson and Conn do not apply. Thompson believes that discrimination against the Negro began with the plantation system of the South. Importation of the Negro gained momentum because plantation owners needed inexpensive labor that could be easily controlled. To facilitate easy control Thompson believes that the power group of plantation owners encouraged discrimination. In this way all whites were considered superior to Negroes. Whites felt justified in withholding legal rights, economic and educational advantages from Negroes and thus the Negro could be kept in a servile position where a few whites could maintain easy control over an increasing number of Negroes. In this way Thompson believes that discrimination became a southern way of life.¹

Conn believes that discrimination was an outgrowth of the capitalist system. According to Conn, this system needed a minority group to exploit for economic reasons. Thus by the establishment of a socialistic system, he feels the white worker would feel a bond with the Negro and racial conflict would disappear.²

Since the Army's purpose is preparedness in case of war, any theory of economic exploitation does not apply as reason for service riots during World War II and the lack of such conflict now.

²Ibid. p. 345.
Myrdal's theory of a conflict between ideals as set down by the constitution and the discrimination against Negroes does not apply to the Army situation before and after integration. The "American Creed" of "fundamental equality of all men and of certain inalienable rights of freedom" is a cause to fight for but does not enter as policy in Army integration nor as everyday racial contact for the soldier. Policy was directed to efficiency in combat. Everyday contact brought about an indifferent attitude for the majority; not a feeling of brotherhood of free men. Therefore, the lack of conflict could not have resulted from an elimination of the lay of morals with ideals.

Frazier also follows Myrdal's line of reasoning to some extent. He believes as Myrdal that the "American Creed" and Christian ideals played an important part in American attitudes but unlike Myrdal he believes that this has been a causative factor in reducing discrimination. Frazier does not reason that these moral ideals conflict with the desires and material aims of the individual. Besides the above factor of reducing discrimination, Frazier believes that the growth of secondary relationships reduces racial conflict, while in primary groups discrimination still remains strong. Strong discrimination in primary groups does operate within the Army, at least with seclusion from family groups, off-post activities and resentment of intermarriage.

---

The ethnic group concept of fear and dislike of differences of in-group and out-group as supported by Frazier does give a partial reason for success of the Army program. Before integration, the out-group was firmly established with Negroes segregated in separate units. After 1950, Negroes were integrated and placed with the in-group. However, this can only be a partial reason because in-groups and out-groups could still develop within the integrated units.  

Probably the theory that comes closest to explaining actually what happened with the Army is Merton’s four types of people — all-weather liberal, fair-weather liberal, fair-weather illiberal and the all-weather illiberal.

The all-weather liberal believes implicitly in the American Creed, but according to Merton, he may be so self-adjusted that he feels no need to influence others to his beliefs. The fair-weather liberal takes the course of expediency — whatever the situation may be they conform to the in-group actions. The fair-weather illiberal does not believe in equal rights but gives lip service to it. The all-weather illiberal believes in discrimination and supports it by word and deed.

Military integration was accomplished within a short period of time. From the beginning the Army stated that they were not interested in social reform. They wanted a method of training men and using combat units in wartime that was efficient and effective.

During World War II the Army realized that segregated units were deterring from efficiency and combat effectiveness. However, it wasn't until experience in the Korean conflict that they became convinced that integrated units would be the answer.

Thus, the Army's particular situation does not apply to the theories of Conn, Thompson, Frazier or Myrdal. The economic theories of ruling and labor class, agrarian culture, or conflict between ideals and practice does not exist as a cause for segregated units. Segregated units had existed because it was considered efficient in both peace and wartime. The Korean War indicated that segregated units were not accomplishing what had been expected and integration seemed to be the answer.

Therefore, from the beginning the Army did not set out to change racial attitudes. The Army integration began as a policy where individuals were expected to co-operate to gain a more efficient Army. In this situation the individual soldier who was an all-weather liberal, fair-weather liberal and the fair-weather illiberal could remain essentially the same in an integrated unit as before service time. His racial attitude toward Negroes underwent little change as shown by the questionnaire. But although the majority attitude changed little, the majority co-operated because the situation provided this course of action as the only expedient recourse. It was only with the all-weather illiberal that co-operation was unacceptable. From the historical data and the research of the questionnaire these individuals were few and they were in a situation
where overpowering group control and conformity were against them. Like it or not, they had to reform.

Norton also states that where integration is strongly encouraged, it tends to perpetuate itself, bringing out the best in brotherhood relationships and causing discrimination to recede. This seems to be the case as indicated within the historical data where comments supporting integration have been quoted. Also it is indicated more strongly within the questionnaire where the majority stated they did accompany Negroes to off-duty post functions and facilities. These are cases where the decisions were entirely those of the individual and he chose to accept the Negro as an equal.

F. INTEGRATION IN THE ARMY

The Army did not conduct its integration program on a piece-meal basis. It was a total process begun in January of 1950 and to be accomplished three months later. All jobs and schools for military personnel were opened without restriction. The race quota was held to the 10 per cent quota (approximate percentage of Negroes in the total U. S. population) but this was soon withdrawn. Also, the designation of white or Negro was soon dropped from the qualification records. Negroes were no longer to be assigned to post overhead or to Negro units. All enlistments within the general branches -- that is, those not requiring special knowledge or experience -- were open to all.
The military facilities were open to all. These included clubs, theaters, exchanges, athletic teams, housing and schools. The officers and men were to be assigned to jobs and promoted according to merit, regardless of race or color. Merit assignments gave Negroes the opportunity to demonstrate ability and skill. It was efficient because it released personnel from the numerous impositions of segregation. The extra cost of separate messes, housing and recreation facilities was eliminated. Important field and staff assignments were now open to Negroes. ¹

Social mixing was left to the individual. The men gradually included their Negro associates of duty hours in off-duty activities. However, Nichols found that generally the presence of Negroes was "discouraged" at white dances. ² He does not describe what methods were used to discourage.

Planning seems to have been limited to the above inclusive program of integration to all units. However, it was made clear that those who made trouble would find themselves in trouble. ³ Failure to comply with President Truman's executive order 9981 would subject an individual to military discipline.

²Ibid.
Officers in all the Services have been surprised at the ease with which the change was accomplished. Among Southern officers the new policy offends ingrained beliefs, although they do not like it, they admit integration is working well. As individuals they cannot agree with the wisdom of the policy, but as officers their respect for the Army does not allow any blocking of the program.

Southern Congressmen will not make an issue of Armed Services integration programs. Privately they condemn it, but, either because of its apparent success or for political reasons, they have found it unwise to fight the order.

Mr. James C. Evans stated in October 1952 that integration in the Armed Forces was "now over the hump." The program was a matter of routine. At that time, four-fifths of the program was physically effective. Two-thirds of the service felt there was justification for the policy and had accepted it. One-third of those who had opposed it were rapidly changing their minds. These latter two figures are overt expressions and do not reflect subjective feelings. However, the objective goals have proceeded ahead of schedule despite what subjective feelings may remain.


H. Conn stated in a report on military civil rights that it has "taken intelligence, hard work, ingenuity, and sheer force to make it work."¹

The Services published some figures in 1954 in which they showed the extent of integration of personnel. In Table I the percentage of Negroes in the personnel of the Armed Forces by service is shown for the date of July 1, 1949 and July 1, 1954. This shows a slight rise of personnel for both officers and enlisted men in all the services except with Navy enlisted men. This Table is particularly significant in the officer groups where it shows that integration opened an area of opportunity to Negroes and officer percentage rose in every service.

In Table II on page 29 the total number of enlisted men increased for both white and Negroes in all the services because of the Korean War. The figures for the Negro enlisted men show the elimination of the 10 per cent system. Particularly significant are the figures showing the increased use of Negro officers as indicated in Table I. In Table II the number of Negro officers in the Navy indicates the lag of this service behind the others in giving opportunity to become officers by 1952.

The Chaplain Corps did not become integrated until March of 1951. Before this time, neither the General Commission on Chaplains nor the

¹Ibid. Mr. Conn's use of the term "sheer force" needs some clarification to the author. In none of the references or personal conversations that the author has had, has there been any indication that force was used at all.
TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF NEGROES IN THE PERSONNEL
OF THE ARMED FORCES
BY SERVICES — JULY 1, 1949 — JULY 1, 1954*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army Officers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Enlisted Men</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Officers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Enlisted Men</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Officers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Enlisted Men</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Officers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Enlisted Men</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Army</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 - also AF</td>
<td>189,839 (EM)</td>
<td>4,500 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,489 (O)</td>
<td>5 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>660,473 (EM)</td>
<td>71,189 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77,272 (O)</td>
<td>1,173 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1,558,000 (EM)</td>
<td>180,000 (EM) - est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142,800 (O)</td>
<td>10,000 (O) - est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>419,347 (EM)</td>
<td>21,036 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57,851 (O)</td>
<td>316 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>773,350 (EM)</td>
<td>60,295 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129,350 (O)</td>
<td>830 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>124,202 (EM)</td>
<td>4,500 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,023 (O)</td>
<td>0 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>449,575 (EM)</td>
<td>17,460 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,975 (O)</td>
<td>8 (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>820,000 (EM)</td>
<td>24,000 (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83,000 (O)</td>
<td>60 (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

several chaplain corps had gone on record that they desired a change of the segregated pattern among chaplains.\footnote{"Chaplains should practice Nonsegregation too," \textit{Christian Century}, 68:292, March 7, 1951.} When assignments came on a non-segregated basis they worked very successfully for the most part. In Korea, a Negro chaplain was accepted in an ordnance battalion which was all white except for one Negro company commander. Another was commended by his white company commander in an Infantry regiment and received the Silver Star.

However, in some instances the chaplain was not accepted despite proof of his ability. One Negro chaplain was assigned to a white unit and asked to be relieved. His stated reason was that he could be more effective in his ministry if he were with soldiers of his own race. Despite the fact that he had won the Bronze Star for meritorious achievement, the soldiers would not accept him as their chaplain. Thus in some cases where the chaplain had proved his bravery he was accepted for religious guidance; but in other cases the fact that he was a Negro kept him from acceptance as chaplain. More data than was available in these two cases is needed to determine the cause of the discrepancy in what seem to be two similar situations.\footnote{"Good News From Korea; Negro Chaplains," \textit{Christian Century}, 68:651, May 30, 1951.}

G. INTEGRATION FOR DEPENDENTS AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

In the fall of 1953, the Army schools on government property were integrated. However, before the formal order came down, a
number of the schools had already integrated. Such schools on
government property which were operated by local agencies were to
integrate by January 12, 1954. Under special circumstances, the time
was extended until September 1, 1955, but that was to be the dead-
line. The above action was concluded four months before the Supreme
Court decision on public school integration. By June 11, 1954, an
order was issued to eliminate discrimination in defense contracts.
The Secretary of Defense put out a program designed to clarify the
President's directive for contracting officials and administrators
and any other personnel concerned. An educational program followed
as a prior step to stop trouble before it started.

Under the Fair Practices Act, the Civil Service employees
connected with the Army have been integrated. In the other areas
of civilian employment, according to Evans and Lane, Negroes --
especially women -- have not realized integration to the full extent.
In test procedures, guidance programs, and in the resulting assignments
much remains to be done.

Enforcement of the ruling is needed in this area. Needed hand in
hand with enforcement program is an educational program by the Army.
Since much of this employment is under civilian handling, it may be
some time before full integration takes place. However, separate
facilities for employees have been eliminated. In civilian military
relations where situations could have produced conflict, it did not
materialize. Instead, a working arrangement was created by
cooperation. This source of information did not indicate just what the working arrangement was, nor did it state exactly what the situation included that could have produced conflict. Therefore, it is impossible for the author to evaluate this situation.

---

1Evans and Lane, loc. cit.
CHAPTER III

THE WAY OF THE INVESTIGATION

A. SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

The historical data has presented how and why the Army integration was established. And within the provisions which the Army wanted to accomplish, the program was a success. The question that remains is why the program was a success within the stated area. The author believes the cause for success is to be found in the method which the Army used to establish its program. The historical data illustrate that a controlled situation of group support, legal authorization and inevitable compliance was a clearly stated position of the Army integration program. The author believes these factors resulted in success. However, theoretical proof was needed. A useful method of determining the effectiveness of these factors was to study the reactions of those who had been involved.

The most direct approach would have been research among Army personnel who are at present involved in the Army integration program. This was not possible because of the location of Montana State University, being too far removed from any large Army post. Even if this were not the case, it is doubtful if a civilian individual could have conducted the research necessary on an Army post. The Army has avoided any extensive publicity about its program and they have been reluctant to cause extra attention to the program among their personnel. They introduced their program quietly and from what the author has been
able to deduce from personal conversation, it seems that the Army believes this has been a factor in the success of the program. This may be true. Research in another area would be necessary to determine if the quiet approach is indeed a factor in the success. Therefore, it was necessary for the author to look for a different source for investigation.

Students now at Montana State University who had served on active duty in the Army sometime between 1948 (when the integration program was inaugurated) and the present, were concluded to have had adequate experience with integration in the Army. The historical data gave the factual information of how the integration program operated. Some research of the attitudes of those who had been in the Army would give theoretical proof for the hypothesis of this paper. By the analysis of attitudes the respondent's adjustment to the Army integration program could be studied without a conscious effort on his part to supply defense of his reasoning or to supply what he may have thought the author desired. Therefore, a true analysis of the Army integration system could be obtained.

B. THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

The questionnaire form was used instead of the interview form because it was felt that the respondents would feel freed from the restraint in reply to the questions. With this research where data on personal attitude was essential, every means was needed to assure direct honest expression. The questions could be clearly understood and since no background material was needed by the respondent, the
author did not wish to influence answers by any conscious or unconscious use of words or expression.

The first part of the questionnaire was devoted to discovery of facts about the personal history of the respondent. Where he had spent his youth, both as to region, rural or urban residences, what his father's occupation had been, and the education of his parents were asked. Also, how he had entered the service, length of service, and where he had spent three-fourths of his time were asked of him. Any one of these facts could influence his attitude. The residence of the respondent might have influenced his attitude toward Negroes if he had come from an area where he had had a greater contact with Negroes. The occupation of the father could have determined the housing area of the respondent and thus subjected him to possibly greater contact with Negroes. Parents with greater formal education could have had less stereotyped attitudes toward Negroes and transferred these attitudes toward their children. The area and length of service could have given greater contact with Negroes or southern whites and caused a change of attitudes.

The second part of the questionnaire dealt with pre-service time concerning certain experiences such as attending school with Negroes, working with Negroes, etc. The student's attitudes about these experiences were desired. Check responses were used because it was desired to focus attention upon certain pre-service experiences which could be compared with similar experiences in the service. Therefore, this eliminated the tendency to include hearsay, what the individual
had seen someone else do and forced him to concentrate upon his own experiences and reactions.

In the third part of the questionnaire the student was asked about certain situations and his feeling about them. The first question relating to service experience asks the students to check a statement that came closest to their attitude after six months of Army duty in an integrated company. This was done to determine if an attitude they had held before service time would change quickly, not at all, or if a longer time and more involvement within service life would be necessary to change attitudes if they were going to change.

Besides the students' attitudes about using the same barracks, swimming pool, mess table, military class and sport team to determine comparative analysis of close association with a like close association of pre-service, the students were asked if they had observed "Incidents" or arguments between whites and Negroes. They were asked to check statements from 1 to 5 in the order they believed them most frequently the cause. The statements were as follows:

(a) Abuse of new freedom by Negro
(b) Too high percentage of Negroes among whites
(c) Caused by whites who liked to pick on minority groups
(d) The Negro who, as an individual, is a "smart alec" or "wise guy".
(e) Caused by southern whites who did not like Negroes.

Incidents were defined for the students with examples such as name calling or words exchanged between whites and Negroes.
The same list of statements was used for both the "incident" question and the "argument" question. These questions were asked to determine how readily the student would place blame on his own white race or with the Negro race. This could present a clue as to how close their association with Negroes was with a permanent positive value (if such positive attitude existed) or if their association was superficial.

Another question pertaining to this same point was that asking if they had ever accompanied a Negro or group where Negroes were included to any post movies, PX's, or any post-sponsored entertainment activity. Here again, an indication could be found if a strong positive attitude existed that would result in closer feeling of association. Again, the check responses were used to keep the student's attention upon certain situations and upon his own opinions and attitudes.

C. SCREENING

As many Army veterans as could be found who were students at Montana State University and had been on active duty since 1948, were sought out. Those who had only served in reserve units, National Guard units, R.O.T.C. or who had attended summer camp were not used. They could have had only limited experience with total integration. No particular class or social group was sought in order to find as random a sample as possible among the limited number of student Army veterans that were left on the campus.

D. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURE

At first it was thought that the questionnaire could be left at
living groups and picked up within a few days with adequate return. Soon it became evident that not enough returns would come in this manner. The author had to make a personal appearance at living quarters of students. It was found to be more efficient to stay the few minutes while they completed the questionnaire. However, the author made every effort not to comment or influence the respondents' answers other than to explain what the material was to be used for and to show the student that his questionnaire would be mixed with others before leaving his presence. This was to insure that no identity of the respondent could be disclosed. Each respondent was urged to be completely honest in his answers. After completing the questionnaire, the respondents volunteered additional views and experiences of their associations with Negroes while in the service.

E. HOW THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS TABULATED\(^1\)

Each questionnaire was numbered and included in two tables. To compose the Table A each respondent's questionnaire was numbered (1 through 128) and aligned vertically on the left margin. Across the top were placed columns of how the student entered the service, where he spent three-fourths of his time while in the service, geographic area of growth, rural-urban childhood, father's occupation, parents' education, number of Negroes in the childhood community. This gave a table, Table A, where each characteristic of the respondent could be analyzed and cross checked with the second table. Respondents' questionnaires

\(^1\)Samples of Table A and Table B are included in the appendix.
could then be grouped by separate background characteristics for comparison with the positive, negative and indifferent attitudes of each question.

In the second table, Table B, each respondent was put on one side of the table and across the top were placed the attitude questions 9 through 22. Each of these attitude questions of 9 through 22 had been arranged by the author so that the respondent who checked a given answer was at the same time giving himself a numbered attitude from a range of \( f_2, f_1, 0, -1, \) or \(-2\). A \( f_2 \) indicated the most positive attitude a respondent could check with each question. A \( f_1 \) indicated an attitude less than \( f_2 \) but definitely more positive than a 0 or indifferent attitude. A -2 indicated the most negative attitude a respondent could check with each question. A -1 indicated an attitude less negative than -2 but definitely more negative than a 0. A 0 was determined to be an Indifferent attitude in which the respondent had neither a positive nor negative attitude, as indicated by his answer to any particular question. To obtain each student's total attitude the responses to the questions were added algebraically. To gain an attitude index for each question it was simply a matter of adding the total attitude algebraic sums of all the students for each question and dividing by the number of students. Each question's attitude index and each student's total attitude could then be checked with any of the categories of Table A. In this way the Index attitude for each question, for each student and for any of the categories of Table A could be checked. By grouping students, the total attitude index of
one group could be checked against those of another group in order to see if any one group had a wide variation from that of another. When any variation occurred, the background facts of Table A could be checked for possible reasons as to the variation.

A .50 or less algebraic difference between groups of comparison was not considered significant unless commonly recognized principles of sociology were violated. When the author considers such principles violated they will be pointed out and reasons given as to why they are considered violations. This figure of .50 is not a true statistical figure arrived at by mathematical principles but one the author chose to use. Since the respondents numbered only 128 and the figures used in the tables are index figures and not percentage figures, a true statistical figure could not be used.

In the questionnaire, thirteen questions were asked about specific situations both before and after service time where the white student veterans had personal contact with Negroes. Of the total group of 128, the attitude was .1.65. By the weight criteria assigned this average attitude of the entire group is more close to .2 or a very positive attitude than .1, a slightly positive attitude.

In question 9, students were asked if they had attended school with Negroes before service time. Of ninety-four students who had attended school with Negroes, their attitude was .402. This question shows an almost indifferent attitude since it is more close to 0 or indifferent attitude than a .1 or slightly positive attitude.
The students were asked in question 10 if they had ever worked beside a Negro doing the same thing, or essentially the same type of work before service time. Only thirty-two had had this experience and their attitude was \( r = 0.312 \). This question had a much smaller sample but again shows an almost indifferent attitude.

Question 11 asked students if they had been on friendly speaking basis with any Negroes before service time. Sixty-nine of the total 128 had answered the question in the positive. The second part of the question asked the student to give his reason for not having a friendly speaking relationship if there had been contact with Negroes. Of the remaining fifty-nine who answered this question, the attitude was \( r = 0.032 \). A slightly negative attitude is present here in this group of fifty-nine. There is an indication that while they were not against having Negroes for fellow students and workers, they did not care to develop any friendly speaking relationship with them.

In question 12, students were asked if they had had a Negro as a close personal friend. Thirty answered the question stating they had been close personal friends. Of this group, it was impossible to determine the degree of closeness of friendship. Of the remaining ninety-eight, the attitude was \( r = 0.04 \). Of this group of ninety-eight, a surprising number of sixty-eight answered that they might have become friends but the opportunity never presented itself. This group may have answered this question in such a positive manner because their democratic ideals prompted them to a positive statement, especially where it did not involve actual recall of action.
In answer to question 13, a majority of 109 were in integrated units while nineteen had been in both integrated and segregated units. This latter group was too small in comparison to the former to make a sample large enough for comparative attitudes.

After entrance in the service, question 14 asked how the student veterans felt after six months of army duty in an integrated company. The attitude was 7.008 indicating an almost indifferent attitude. Those with only six months time would not have gotten overseas where negative attitudes developed as found in a later table.

In question 15, student veterans were asked if they had observed any "incidents" such as name-calling or words exchanged. If they had, they were asked to list the reasons that such had happened in a frequency order from 1 to 5. However, the majority of those answering this question failed to answer in this manner. Instead, they checked one or two points. Therefore, the author used the information in a simple form of addition of the points checked to determine which stated cause received the most checks. The information is given in Table III.

Of the total group of 128, a group of forty-five had not seen any incidents. The causes given by the remaining group do not vary sharply from each other. Cause d. got the highest number which seems to indicate to this group that "troublesome" individuals could start friction but that racially mixed groups would not of themselves be a cause. Cause e., the second cause most frequently checked, was southern whites who did
not like Negroes. This would indicate racial tradition factors and race of itself and not certain individuals as the greatest cause of dissension.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY CHECKS AS TO CAUSE OF "INCIDENTS"
OCcurring BETWEEN NEGRO AND WHITE SOLDIERS
AS STATED BY SAMPLE STUDENT VETERANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>No. Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause resulted because of abuse of new freedom by Negro</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause resulted because of too high percentage of Negroes among whites</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cause resulted because of whites who liked to pick on minority groups</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Caused by the Negro who, as an individual, is a &quot;smart alec&quot; or &quot;wise guy&quot;</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cause resulted because of southern whites who did not like Negroes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cause d. and cause e. seem to contradict each other. It may be that respondents in cause d. were stationed with troops where there were few southern whites and more Negro individuals which they would classify "smart alec" or "wise guy". With individuals who checked cause e. the reverse situation may have been present.

In question 16, the student veterans were asked if they had occupied the same barracks and if so, how they felt about it. In the printing of the questionnaire, the most negative attitude was not
Included so that evaluation of this question must be separated from the rest of the results. Only four had not shared barracks at some time with Negroes. The remaining 124 showed an almost indifferent attitude, slightly negative, of -.211. With the following questions of sharing facilities with the same almost indifferent attitude, the author would conclude that even if the last point had been included, the attitude index would not have varied much.

Much of the same attitude is expressed in question 17. Here, forty-six had not used swimming pools with Negroes. Of the remaining eighty-two, the attitude index was -.023. This is almost the same response as question 16 -- a slightly negative indifferent attitude.

With question 18, a complete indifference (as complete as is possible in reality) was obtained with an attitude percentage of -.001. This question asked if the student veterans had shared the same mess table with Negroes and how they had felt about it. Only four of the students had not shared a table with Negroes, so this sample was almost total.

In question 19, the students were asked if they had ever attended a military class with Negroes and if so, how they felt about it. Sixteen students had not attended a class with Negroes. Of the remaining 112, the attitude was almost identical with that of question 18. With question 19, the attitude percentage was -.001 -- again an almost totally indifferent attitude.

Students were asked in question 20 if they were on a post sport team with Negroes. Only forty-eight had been, and their attitude
percentage was 1.093. As with sharing swimming pools, mess tables, barracks, etc with Negroes, the white student veterans were indifferent about sharing army life with Negroes.

Question 21 asked the students if they had ever accompanied a Negro or a group where Negroes were included. A high total of seventy-two answered "yes" while thirty-three answered "no". This again clearly shows a readiness to accept the Negro in service life. The action would be entirely voluntary in this question. The individual could avoid the company of Negroes and not cause trouble (as with sharing barracks where refusal would bring disciplinary action) and he would not have to forego his pleasure because Negroes would be there (as in the case of using the swimming pools).

The students were asked in question 22 if they had observed any arguments between white and Negro soldiers which resulted in an exchange of blows. If they had, they were asked to list the reasons that such had happened in a frequency order from 1 to 5. This was the same information desired in question 15 and again the students failed to answer this question properly. Again, the author used an addition form to determine what cause received the most checks.

Table IV differs from table III in that a large number marked d, arguments occurring between Negro and white soldiers caused by the Negro who, as an individual is a "smart alec" or "wise guy".

From a study made about the development of attitudes toward Negroes by Eugene L. Horowitz, white boys from New York and the South within this age group of kindergarten and the eighth grade were tested
for attitudes toward Negro boys. It was found that attitudes begin early and develop gradually. These attitudes came from varied sources, and according to the study, result from interacting environmental factors. Therefore, the author felt it desirable to determine environmental factors in childhood of the college students questioned. Each environment factor was tabulated to gain index attitudes of that particular group.

### TABLE IV

**FREQUENCY CHECKS AS TO CAUSE OF ARGUMENTS OCCurring BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES WHICH RESULTED IN AN EXCHANGE OF BLOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>No. Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause resulted because of abuse of new freedom by Negro</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause resulted because of too high percentage of Negroes among whites</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cause resulted because of whites who liked to pick on minority groups</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Caused by the Negro who, as an individual, is a &quot;smart Alec&quot; or &quot;wise guy&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cause resulted because of southern whites who did not like Negroes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The first category investigated was the rural, urban or rural and urban background of the student veterans. Some students had had both a rural and urban childhood and the author thought this might have caused a different index attitude from that of students with only urban or rural background. However, no significant differences were presented.

**TABLE V**

INDEX ATTITUDE OF STUDENT VETERANS FROM RURAL-URBAN ENVIRONMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Urban</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rural and Urban</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table V, the attitudes according to urban, rural or both rural and urban varies little. With the assimilation of both material and non-material concepts and values to the rural as well as urban areas by modern transportation and communication, these population areas have less meaning today than was true of the past.

The geographic area of growth was predominantly from the West. Of the 128 students questioned, ninety-seven of them had spent their childhood in the West. Unfortunately, the other geographic areas were represented by groups too small to be tabulated.

1In the questionnaire students were told that urban areas meant towns of 2,500 or more, and suburbs surrounding cities of 50,000 or more.
The western student group reflects the over-all attitude of the total group. The ninety-seven students from the West had a positive attitude index of \( \neq 1.71 \). The total group of 128 had a positive attitude index very close to the above -- that of \( \neq 1.65 \).

Another area of environment and rearing that was explored was that of the occupations of the father. Since occupation is one of the areas from which the individual and his family gain status, the security or non-security of this status could have importance for establishment of social values.

**TABLE VI**

**INDEX ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO FATHER'S OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Fathers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>( \neq 1.77 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Businessmen</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>( \neq 1.73 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>( \neq .875 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Skilled Laborers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>( \neq 2.11 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unskilled Laborers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>( \neq 2.46 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occupation groups with significant representation were business, professional, farmers, skilled and unskilled workers.

Attitudes of students whose fathers held business occupations shows a very slight decline in positive attitude from those of professional fathers.
The students of farmer fathers have an almost totally indifferent attitude. Since this group could be assumed to have had little daily contact with Negroes, they are similar to the group with no Negroes in their childhood communities. This latter group also showed an almost total indifference to Negroes. This suggests a significant point in position of racial attitudes. Where there is little or no contact, the attitude seems one of indifference.

It is interesting to note that students of skilled and unskilled fathers have a higher positive attitude index than students of business and professional fathers. As to why the significant higher attitude index of the skilled and unskilled group, this author is unable to explain. Other aspects of the questionnaire do not explain this unexpected finding. It may be that many of the skilled and unskilled occupations are connected with the extractive industries of Montana and thus may contain a high percentage of first generation Americans who have not acquired the cultural heritage of Negro prejudice in this country.

Another aspect of childhood environment that was sought by the questionnaire was parental education. Upon this author's belief that ignorance breeds more hate and prejudice while knowledge gives more tolerance and understanding, expectation assumed a continuous scale of a low index positive attitude for the least educated with a steady rise to a high index positive attitude for the more highly educated.
TABLE VII
PARENTAL EDUCATION OF STUDENT VETERANS QUESTIONED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Attended College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Attended College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the questionnaire points out, the author's expectation proves true except for the "attended college" group which unexpectedly drops below all groups. The questionnaire gives no evidence as to why this should prove true. It may be that this group was unable to finish college for economic reasons because of the depression and they may have transferred resentment feelings to a scapegoat minority group. Also, since the group is not overly large, the reason may be a chance selection that does not prove true for this group as a whole.

The last aspect of checking childhood environment to determine whether or not it had any bearing on attitudes toward Negroes was the number of Negroes in childhood communities of the student veteran group.

As can be seen by Table VIII, the student veterans who came from communities where there were no Negroes had an almost totally indifferent
attitude. Thereupon, the positive attitude slowly rises until the group where 50 or more Negroes are found in the childhood communities. At this point, the positive attitude slowly declines and continues to decline in a consistent pattern as the number of Negroes increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Negroes in Community</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Attitude Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Negroes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Individuals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Families</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$1.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or More</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or More</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 or More</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unfortunate that the questionnaire did not produce a sample in communities of 5,000 or more to see if this trend continued as it gives an indication of doing. It would seem to this author that as the number of Negroes increases in the childhood communities, the factors of competition and assimilation become more acute and a positive attitude declines.\(^1\) This line of reasoning seems to be valid when the first group containing no Negroes is considered. Here there is no assimilation

or competition and the attitude is one of indifference. It must be pointed out again that these results come from student veterans of western states and not southern states. Thus there is no traditional cultural attitude toward Negroes.

After entering the Army, the one hundred twenty-eight student veterans were questioned as to their length of time spent in the service. The three categories with a large enough sample were those with six months service time, the two-year draftees and the three-year regular army enlistees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH OF SERVICE OF ARMY STUDENT VETERANS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Attitude Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six months term of service time gives a very positive attitude. Two reasons could explain this. One could be that six months is not a long enough period, especially when eight months is in basic training and four months in specialist school training, to have had contact of a long enough duration to have changed pre-service attitude. The other reason is that this group did not get overseas where negative attitudes developed.
With the two-year service and three-year service time, the positive attitudes decline sharply. These individuals would have a much greater degree of involvement in their jobs, rank, prestige position, attitude of friends, etc., but it is the author's opinion that another factor brought out by the questionnaire is more likely to be the primary reason. Most of these students with two and three years of service time had been overseas during part of their duty time whereas those in the six months group had not. Overseas duty time versus state side has a significant difference as brought out more clearly in a question concerning geographic area of service. The geographic area of service time (where time means roughly three-fourths of the total service time) shows that the attitude index for time spent in Europe and Korea is almost half in positive index attitude from time spent in southern and western states.

**TABLE X**

**ATTITUDE INDEX OF STUDENT VETERANS FOR OVERSEAS-STATESIDE SERVICE TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Attitude Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern States</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western States</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, as can be seen by Table X, overseas attitudes drop considerably from stateside service. The reason for this is not gained directly from the questionnaire. The author was able to question or gain volunteer statements from about twenty of the student veterans who were given the questionnaire. This author also has heard the same point of discussion among Army service groups. The reason for resentment has always been the same. All white soldiers that the author has come in contact with who have been overseas, resent seeing his fellow Negro dating girls of foreign nations. Although this author recognizes that this casual attainment of this factor cannot be considered wholly valid, it does have weight because the reason given has always been the same.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The service integration program along with school integration will probably be recorded in history as the two giant steps of social progress in this decade. In the long struggle of the American Negro for equality, these two accomplishments have the most far-reaching effects and future possibilities. As Lee Nichols expressed the service program: "In this movement the military acted as a catalyst, speeding up the slow process of racial change to an immeasurable degree."1

There are two areas of approach in the service integration program to determine the degree of success. One area is an undeniable success. In the Armed Forces the white and Negro serviceman did train and fight together in unexpected harmony. It took the contingency of the Korean War to prove this.

Within the other area of approach, the answer is not clear. Did the integration program change attitudes to a measurable degree? The research of this study pertained, for the most part, to men reared in the western states. Their answers indicate an indifference toward the Negro before and after service time. Since those questioned were from the west, the attitude before service time may have resulted from lack of much contact with Negroes. The indifferent attitude after service time may be a carryover of childhood attitude or it may result from the integration experience. However, it is clearly evident that the Army

---

student veterans questioned did not resent sharing service life with Negroes. Only in one area of service life, that of overseas duty, did the attitude index decline. As stated before, the author believes the cause to be dating and intermarriage with foreign women. Within this area there is unrelenting prejudice. Lambert and Bressler call such areas "sensitive areas." In interviews with Indian and other Asian students, they found that social relations did not improve when allusion was made to these areas. "In normal social interaction Americans will inadvertently allude to certain national status-rooted 'sensitive areas' the mere mention of which even in a neutral or favorable content will cause the visitor to perceive hostility..."\(^1\)

It is the author's opinion that the majority of Army student veterans may be called "fair weather liberals."\(^2\) They believe in equality of opportunity but in most cases will not disagree with a bigot, preferring not to become involved. However, if a particular situation is favorable to nondiscriminatory relations, they will give active support, as Simpson and Yinger\(^3\) point out: "group supports, legal sanctions, economic pressures, firm action on the part of leaders can create the kind of climate in which their (fair weather liberals) nondiscriminatory tendencies bloom."

---


and with Negroes in his command, he lived up to his word. Possibly this is an example that some greater loyalty of the individual can replace his prejudice.

These are only a few of the areas of social research to be explored within the service integration program. Indication from this research indicates to the author that attitudes toward the Negro are changing, and the white American will grant equal opportunity to the Negro American.
Group support, legal sanction, and firm action on the part of leaders were all factors in the Army integration program. The author also believes that another factor played an important part in the success of the program, especially for those who remained prejudiced -- the "all-weather illiberal." This was the factor of inevitability. This individual had to recognize that, like it or not, integration was there to stay in service life. Troublemakers would get into trouble themselves. The Justice Department under the direction of Attorney General Rogers has used this same approach of inevitability with the integration of the public school system.\(^1\)

In this study, only one small area of attitudes toward the Army racial integration program has been explored. Index or percentage figures of the southern soldiers' attitude would be very valuable. Here it is known what pre-service attitudes are and with these service personnel some change or compromise must have resulted. They have given no strong overt objections or resistance to the service integration program. The author had the opportunity to become well acquainted with one such individual -- an Army officer from an old southern family. This individual was strongly prejudiced in word and deed toward Negroes in every aspect of his life except that of his military role. Within this military role he was willing to admit that the Negro deserved any military opportunity and advantage that he as an individual deserved.

\(^1\)Merton, op. cit.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

It is the purpose of this questionnaire to find out how college males, who have served some time in the Army, feel about the Army's racial integration program. Only those college males who served on active duty in the Army some time between 1948 and the present are to answer. This does not mean those who have only been in reserve units, National Guard units, R.O.T.C., or in attendance at Summer Camp. However, the individual may be in one of these groups at the present, but have had active-duty time (including the six-months' program) in the past, and still answer.

This questionnaire is to be used as supplemental material for a graduate thesis. Names of individuals answering are not asked for; and each questionnaire will be placed in a manila envelope, which will then be mixed with others. In this way, no questionnaire can be traced to any individual; and it is hoped that you will be frank and give your honest opinion.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.
1. In what way did you become a member of the United States Army? Check one of the following:

   _____ a) 6-months program
   _____ b) 3-Year regular army enlistee
   _____ c) R.O.T.C. commission
   _____ d) 2-Year draftee
   _____ e) called to duty from National Guard
   _____ f) called to duty from U.S. Army Reserve

2. At what post did you spend 3/4 of your time while on active duty?

   ____________________________________________

   If your duty time was spent in several places of about equal time, please state these:

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

3. When did you serve on active duty? Give the year or years.

   ____________________________________________

4. Before entering the army, where did you spend 3/4 of your growing years? Check one of the following:

   a) East          _____
   b) Middle west   _____
   c) Southwest     _____
   d) South         _____
   e) West          _____
   f) Out of the country   _____
   g) If this part of your life was spent in more than one of these areas, please list below, with the approximate time spent in each.

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
5. During these growing years, were you in urban or rural places? Urban areas would include towns of 2500 or more, and suburbs surrounding a city of 50,000 or more. Please check one.

a) Rural ____
b) Urban ____
c) Both ____

6. What was your father's occupation during these growing years?

__________________________

a) If your father changed his occupation (such as: was a farmer and later moved to town and worked in a factory), please state this change, giving both occupations.

__________________________

__________________________

7. What educational level did your parents achieve? Check one for father and one for mother.

Father 
____a) 8 years 
____b) 8 to 12 years 
____c) attended college 
____d) B.A. degree 
____e) M.A. degree 
____f) Ph.D.

Mother 
____a) 8 years 
____b) 8 to 12 years 
____c) attended college 
____d) B.A. degree 
____e) M.A. degree 
____f) Ph.D.

8. During these growing years, did you live in places where Negroes numbered about:

____a) 3,000 or more 
____b) 1,000 or more 
____c) 500 or more 
____d) 100 or more 
____e) 50 or more 
____f) only a few families 
____g) only a few individuals 
____h) none
9. Before your service time, had you ever attended a school where Negroes were students?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ____

1. If so, how did you feel about having a Negro as a fellow student? Check one of the statements that comes closest to your opinion at that time.
   _____a) You were glad he was there and became friends.
   _____b) You were glad he was there but never became friends.
   _____c) You didn't care one way or the other.
   _____d) You didn't like it and avoided him.
   _____e) You didn't like it and expressed your opinion to him or to others.

10. Before your service time, had you ever worked beside a Negro, doing the same thing, or essentially the same type of work?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ____

1. If so, how did you feel about working with him? Check one of the statements that comes closest to your opinion at that time.
   _____a) You approved of his having the job and treated him as you would have treated another white person.
   _____b) You approved of his having the job, but never said much to him.
   _____c) You didn't care if he had the job or not.
   _____d) You didn't like it, but stayed with your job.
   _____e) You didn't like it, and asked your boss to put the Negro in another job or fire him.

11. Before your service time, had you ever been on a friendly speaking basis with any Negroes, such as friendly teammates in the same school sport or working companions? If teammates, but not on friendly speaking basis, answer no.
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ____
1. If you had been teammates, working companions, or in some situation as this, but the relationship never came to a friendly speaking basis, please check one of the following statements that comes closest to the reason it did not.

_____ a) You tried to be friendly but the Negro did not respond.

_____ b) The Negro did not make any overture for a friendly speaking relationship.

_____ c) You did not make any overture to start a friendly speaking relationship.

_____ d) The other whites you worked with would have objected, and you did not wish to raise their possible anger.

_____ e) You did not want any relationship with a Negro besides having the same job or being on the same team.

12. Before your service time, had you ever had a Negro as a close personal friend?

a) Yes _____

b) No _____

1. If you answered no, why do you think you never became friends with a Negro? Check one of the following statements that comes closest to your reason.

_____ a) You might have become friends with some Negroes, but the opportunity never presented itself.

_____ b) Any Negro you knew did not make any effort to make friends.

_____ c) You never made any effort to be friends, but held no feelings against Negroes.

_____ d) You felt Negroes should have Negro friends.

_____ e) You did not like Negroes.

13. While in the army, which type of company did you serve with?

_____ a) Segregated company

_____ b) Integrated company

_____ c) Both
If you served in an integrated company or commanded such a company, please answer the remaining questions:

14. Check one of the following statements which best describes your attitude after 6 months of army duty in an integrated company.

   a) While in an integrated company, you were happy in this situation.

   b) While in an integrated company, you resented it at first, but changed your feelings before your active service time expired.

   c) You had no feelings either way.

   d) While in an integrated company, you did not resent it at first, but changed your feelings to resentment before your active service time expired.

   e) While in an integrated company, you resented it the whole time of your active service.

15. Did you observe any "incidents" (such as name calling or words exchanged) between whites and Negroes?

   a) Yes ____

   b) No ____

1. If you observed these incidents, why do you think they happened? Number the statements below from 1 to 5 in the order you believed them to be most frequently the cause.

   a) Abuse of new freedom by Negro.

   b) Too high % of Negroes among whites.

   c) Caused by whites who like to pick on minority groups.

   d) The Negro who, as an individual, is a "smart Alec" or "wise guy".

   e) Caused by Southern whites who did not like Negroes.
16. Did you sleep in the same barracks with a Negro or Negroes?
   a) Yes ____
   b) No ____

1. If so, how did you feel about it?
   _____a) You liked it.
   _____b) You resented it at first, but didn't care at the time you left that barracks.
   _____c) You didn't care.
   _____d) You didn't care at first, but didn't like it before you left the barracks.

17. Did you ever go swimming in a pool that Negroes were using?
   a) Yes ____
   b) No ____

1. If so, how did you feel about it?
   _____a) You liked to use the same pool because you felt Negroes should not use segregated pools.
   _____b) You didn't like it at first, but changed your mind at a later time.
   _____c) You didn't care whether they used the same pool or not.
   _____d) You didn't care at first, but changed your mind at a later time to the point where you did not like it.
   _____e) You didn't like it, and for this reason decided not to swim.

18. Did you ever share the same mess table with Negroes?
   a) Yes ____
   b) No ____

1. If so, how did you feel about it?
   _____a) You were glad they shared the table with you.
   _____b) You didn't like it at first, but changed your mind at a later time.
   _____c) You didn't care.
d) You didn't care at first, but at a later time you did not like it.

e) You did not like it.

9. Did you ever attend a military class or school with Negroes?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ___
   If so, how did you feel about it?
   a) You liked it.
   b) You did not like it at first, but didn't mind later.
   c) You didn't care.
   d) You didn't mind at first, but later did not like it.
   e) You did not like it.

20. Were you ever on a post sport team with Negroes?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ___
   If so, how did you feel about it?
   a) You liked it.
   b) At first you did not like it, but later changed your mind to where you didn't care
   c) You didn't care.
   d) At first you didn't care, but later you didn't like it.
   e) You did not like it.

1. Did you ever accompany a Negro, or a group in which Negroes were included, to post movies, P.X's, or any post-sponsored entertainment activity?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ___

22. Did you observe any arguments between white and Negro soldiers which resulted in the exchange of blows?
   a) Yes ___
   b) No ___
If you observed these incidents, why do you think they happened? Number the statements below from 1 to 5 in the order you believed them to be most frequently the cause.

_____ a) Abuse of new freedom by Negro.

_____ b) Too high % of Negroes among whites.

_____ c) Caused by whites who like to pick on minority groups.

_____ d) The Negro who, as an individual, is a "smart alec" or "wise guy".

_____ e) Caused by Southern whites who did not like Negroes.

_____ f) Other reasons:

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
APPENDIX B

TABLES A AND B (SAMPLES)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire No.</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Geog. Area of Growth</th>
<th>Rural or Urban</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Father's Education</th>
<th>Mother's Education</th>
<th>No. of Negroes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>54-56 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>N. E.</td>
<td>53-56 West</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>At Col.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N. G.</td>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>51-52 N. West</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>54-56 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>Few Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52-54 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Unskill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>Few Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>51-54 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>54-56 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 mos.</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>56 West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>500 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>51-54 West</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>55-58 East</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>3,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>54-56 So. West</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>100 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>53-56 East</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>At. Col.</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>3,000 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( f_1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( f_1 )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>