

35th Infantry Division's Mobilization, Training, and Integration in World War II: A Lesson in Deploying National Guard Divisions for Large-Scale Combat Operations

A Monograph

by

MAJ Shelby P. Wilson
Missouri Army National Guard



School of Advanced Military Studies
US Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS

2019

Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 23 05 2019		2. REPORT TYPE MASTER'S THESIS		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JUNE 18-MAY 19	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 35th Infantry Division's Mobilization, Training, and Integration in World War II: A Lesson in Deploying National Guard Divisions for Large-Scale Combat Operations				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ Shelby Paul Wilson				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The realities of World War II compelled the US Army to activate the National Guard en masse. Federalizing the National Guard proved critical prior to potentially utilizing expeditionary military forces. At the time, the National Guard acted as the largest component of the Army and contained not only troop strength, but also provided command and control capabilities organic in its division headquarters. National Guard units became vital to quickly mobilize forces for national defense and eventually the execution of the largest expeditionary war the United States has ever seen. The 35th Infantry Division became one of these divisions first mobilized in 1940. The process of mobilizing, training, and integrating National Guard divisions into the Regular Army has not occurred in-scale, since World War II. This monograph strives to identify successes and shortfalls of activating the 35 th Infantry Division during World War II for overseas service. With eight division headquarters currently nested within the Army National Guard, synchronization of the Total Army in preparation for large-scale combat operations is a contemporary challenge.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)
(U)	(U)	(U)	(U)	45	913 758-3300

Monograph Approval Page

Name of Candidate: MAJ Shelby P. Wilson

Monograph Title: 35th Infantry Division's Mobilization, Training, and Integration in World War II: A Lesson in Deploying National Guard Divisions for Large-Scale Combat Operations

Approved by:

_____, Monograph Director
Amanda M. Nagel, PhD

_____, Seminar Leader
Andrew J. Watson, COL

_____, Director, School of Advanced Military Studies
Kirk C. Dorr, COL

Accepted this 23rd day of May 2019 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, PhD

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Army Command and General Staff College or any other government agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

Fair use determination or copyright permission has been obtained for the inclusion of pictures, maps, graphics, and any other works incorporated into this manuscript. A work of the US government is not subject to copyright, however further publication or sale of copyrighted images is not permissible.

Abstract

35th Infantry Division's Mobilization, Training, and Integration in World War II: A Lesson in Deploying National Guard Divisions for Large-Scale Combat Operations, by MAJ Shelby P. Wilson, Army National Guard, 46 pages.

The realities of World War II compelled the US Army to activate the National Guard en masse. Federalizing the National Guard proved critical prior to potentially utilizing expeditionary military forces. At the time, the National Guard acted as the largest component of the Army and contained not only troop strength, but also provided command and control capabilities organic in its division headquarters. National Guard units became vital to quickly mobilize forces for national defense and eventually the execution of the largest expeditionary war the United States has ever seen. The 35th Infantry Division became one of these divisions first mobilized in 1940. The process of mobilizing, training, and integrating National Guard divisions into the Regular Army has not occurred in-scale, since World War II. This monograph strives to identify successes and shortfalls of activating the 35th Infantry Division during World War II for overseas service. The contemporary US Army has a preponderance of forces in the Army National Guard and the US Army Reserve. In aggregate, US Army resources amount to three corps headquarters and eighteen division headquarters to employ in large-scale combat operations. Cohesively, the three compositions (COMPOs), which are known as the Total Army include COMPO 1 Regular Army, COMPO 2 Army National Guard, and COMPO 3 Army Reserve. With eight division headquarters nested within the National Guard, synchronization of the Total Army becomes critical to US Armed Forces' success in the next conflict against a near-peer adversary in a contested operational environment. The United States faces threats from competitors such as Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and violent extremist organization in a complex and interconnected world. The story of the 35th Infantry Division's preparation for the European Theater of Operations during World War II informs today's challenge to effectively integrate the Army National Guard with the Regular Army. Army National Guard and Regular Army divisions will meet these contemporary challenges.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Acronyms	vi
Section 1: Introduction	1
Research Question.....	1
Hypothesis	1
Methodology	1
Criteria.....	2
Background/Significance	3
US Army’s Condition Prior to World War II.....	4
Section 2: Role of the 35 th Infantry Division in World War II.....	9
Mobilization	9
Training	14
Integration versus Assimilation.....	27
Section 3: Lessons Learned.....	28
National Guard Division Mobilization for Large-Scale Combat Operations.....	28
Recommendations	32
Conclusion.....	35
Bibliography.....	37

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my monograph team from the School of Advanced Military Studies for their assistance and guidance with this monograph. The acknowledgement of the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library is also warranted due to the invaluable primary documents I was able to review. Of course, I would like to thank my wife and children for their continued support with all of my professional endeavors.

Acronyms

A2/AD	Anti-Access/Area Denial
ADP	Army Doctrine Publication
COMPO	Composition
FM	Field Manual
ID	Infantry Division
IPF	Initial Protective Force
ISCARL	Ike Skelton Combined Arms Research Library
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
PMP	Protective Mobilization Plan
VEO	Violent Extremist Organizations

Section 1: Introduction

For a people who are free, and who mean to remain so, a well-organized and armed militia is their best security.

—Thomas Jefferson, *8th Annual Message*, 1808

The 35th Infantry Division (ID) became one of the first National Guard divisions to mobilize for federal service prior to the US declaration of war during World War II. The division's mobilization, training, and integration into the Regular Army exemplified a lengthy process, common among most National Guard divisions. The 35th ID's journey began in 1940 at home station among several mid-western states and the long preparation was realized with their first combat actions in vicinity of Normandy, France in 1944.

Research Question

How did the 35th ID effectively integrate into the Regular Army during World War II and how does this experience inform future National Guard division mobilizations?

Hypothesis

The 35th ID's performance in World War II established a template for National Guard divisions/division headquarters to deploy and integrate with Regular Army units in order to fight in large-scale ground combat operations. This historical example could provide the basis for future integration of National Guard divisions as part of the operational force.

Methodology

This paper will include a case study analysis of the 35th Infantry Division's mobilization, training, and integration. This case study will incorporate a maximum utilization of primary sources from the attached bibliography. The body of literature concerning the mobilization, training, and integration of the 35th Infantry Division during World War II is adequate to explore the considerations for the rapid deployment of National Guard divisions during large-scale combat operations. Leavenworth Combined Arms Research Library, the Harry S. Truman

Presidential Library, and the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, in addition to online archives, provide all primary resources. The following monograph will consist of three sections.

Section 1 will include introductory material and will detail the significance of the proposed research. The backdrop of the US Army's condition prior to World War II will be underscored for the audience. A working hypothesis will be linked to the research question at hand, which explores the 35th ID's capability to effectively integrate into the Regular Army. The conclusion of this section details the lens of the current *U.S. National Security Strategy* and *Field Manual 3-0 Operations*, which the research question and hypothesis will be evaluated through.

Section 2 examines the role of the 35th Infantry Division in World War II. This section focuses on the specific mobilization, training, and integration requirements the division underwent to become combat ready. Mobilization sites, command relationships, and training with Regular Army units prior to deployment will be considered in this section. An effort will be made to identify successful and unproductive aspects of the mobilization, training, and integration in order to infer application of this case study for the future.

Section 3 details the quantitative usage of lessons learned by the activation of a National Guard division and explores how this experience can inform the Army as a whole. This section will consider future threats and possible requirements for a National Guard division to deploy in large-scale combat operations. The purpose of this section is to glean from the experience of the 35th Infantry Division in World II and consider the implications of these findings in relation to a National Guard division deploying again under similar circumstances.

Criteria

By utilizing the *U.S. National Security Strategy* and *Field Manual 3-0 Operations*, this monograph will compare the 35th Infantry Division's deployment in World War II with contemporary requirements of a US Army National Guard division. The criteria for the monograph addresses the variables in the methodology. The criteria will include *National*

Security Strategy requirements for a National Guard division based off of contemporary threats and the 2017 *Field Manual 3-0* guidance for division headquarters in large-scale combat operations.

Background/Significance

The commencement of World War II in the late 1930's caught the US government off-guard. The National Guard was the largest component of the Army from 1922 to 1939 and accounted for a significant portion of potential combat power. National Guard units were utilized in order to quickly expand the Regular Army as US involvement in the war loomed. The first National Guard divisions to be activated were essential to the Allied victory, which included the 35th Infantry Division.

This monograph will explore a comparison of the 35th Infantry Division's 1940 mobilization to the current requirements for the deployment of a National Guard division in the event of large-scale ground combat operations. The topic seeks to identify successes and shortfalls of the mobilization, training, and integration of the 35th Infantry Division during World War II. This information will identify critical factors for future deployments of National Guard divisions in a high intensity conflict with a peer adversary.

The US Army provides an extensive body of knowledge concerning 35th Infantry Division's participation in the European Theater of Operation. The US Army's official histories detail the story of 35th Infantry Division soldiers storming Omaha Beach at Normandy in June 1944 to the fall of the Third Reich. This monograph will contribute to the literary discussion on the specific challenges of mobilizing a National Guard division. Comparatively, less information exists regarding the process of mobilizing, training, and integration of a National Guard division during the World War II than on the 35th Infantry Division's actual battlefield exploits.

This comparison will provide a venue to identify opportunities and risks in regards to future mobilizations. This research question seeks to provide answers that will result in

recommendations for the effective mobilization, training, and integration of National Guard divisions into the land component command to participate in large-scale ground combat operations against a near-peer threat. The comparison is quantitative in nature and relies on historical data and the proposed adversarial challenges outlined in the current national security strategy.

US Army's Condition Prior to World War II

The US Army was not prepared to fight a multi-front conflict during the interwar period from 1919-1940 due to economic, social, and governmental considerations. Major Kyle Brown highlights the poor condition of the US Army prior to World War II in his 2016 monograph, "The Truth Unveiled: An Inquiry into the Reasons for a Lack of US Military Readiness for World War II." US citizens did not desire a large standing army, as reflected by social norms during the interwar period.¹ Military leaders met resistance to train and equip the Army while tensions in Europe grew throughout the 1930s. Mobilizing National Guard divisions and limited selective service preceded the large drafts that occurred after Pearl Harbor. The American people began to realize that the large expanses of water separating the United States from Europe would not shield US protectorates in the upcoming conflict.² The fascist governments of Europe and the imperial Japanese had global designs. The interwar Army of less than 120,000 soldiers would simply not suffice for the emerging challenges.³

After World War I, economic progress in the United States waned as the market growth of the Roaring 20's dissipated. The Wall Street Crash of 1929, coupled with overproduction of consumer products leading to stagnation, ended an era marked by economic expansion, advances

¹ Kyle Brown, "The Truth Unveiled: An Inquiry into the Reasons for a Lack of US Military Readiness for World War II" (master's thesis, School of Advanced Military Studies, US Army Command and General Staff College, 2016), 4.

² Ibid., 11.

³ Ibid., 32.

in technology, and social reform. With the onset of the Great Depression, competition in governmental budgets for social welfare programs outweighed the maintenance for a large standing Army. It was projected that in early 1933 over 18 million Americans needed some apportionment of government assistance in order to survive.⁴ The under-resourcing of the US Army continued, even though political events brought European states closer to all-out conflict. Namely, German militarization in violation of the Treaty of Versailles and Japan's voracious empire expanding in China and the South Pacific served as an indication to future conflict. As the decade ended, Franklin D. Roosevelt regarded this emerging truth with increasing gravitas. President Roosevelt supported the Neutrality Act and in August 1936 summed up his feeling in a speech concerning the Spanish Civil War, "I have seen war on land and sea . . . I hate war."⁵ Regrettably, Americans doubted the possibility of another conflict on the scale of the Great War, trusted the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans as natural barriers, and did not desire a large standing Army for US domestic policy, which was still largely driven by economic problems. Even as conflict became more apparent there maintained a strong desire within the American populace to stay out of any emerging European conflict.

An official history by the War Department on US Army mobilization titled, *Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations* clearly articulates the cycle of disbelief and realization. This document, created in the aftermath of World War II, explained the abysmal readiness of the US Army during the interwar period and the rush to preparations that followed. The Chief of Staff made seven specific points to explain the US war footing cycle: the public's initial opinion that war would not come to America, the discovery that war would come, a scramble for personnel and material, production and training of the Army, success in the field, rapid

⁴ George McJimsey, *The Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 97.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 190.

demobilization, and the reduction of funding for the military.⁶ This admittance in official government documents reflecting on 1919 to 1940 illustrates the US public's apathy in war preparations. It also highlights the social environment that influenced politics in the postwar era. General George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, charged with expanding the US Army in 1940 from its decrepit interwar capacity, would eventually fight a two-front war over the expanses of the globe. While serving as Secretary of State after World War II, Marshall reflected upon the current readiness of the Army in 1940 by stating, "By successive stages the strength of the Army was cut and cut until in 1935 it had declined to 118,750."⁷

In regards to governmental considerations prior to the war, mobilization was essentially planned in three phases, the first of which was the Initial Protective Force (IPF). The IPF comprised of the Regular Army and National Guard forces.⁸ The IPF would not be expeditionary at its onset. Defensive in nature, the IPF would allow for further mobilization in the 1933-1940 concept, which would offer an expeditionary corps by "Mobilization III." The Regular Army was the numerically smaller element in the IPF. The National Guard began entering federal service in 1940 and 1941, totaling 200,000 personnel. This fell short of the projections of 235,000 National Guard soldiers expected to have received some sort of training and readiness anytime after 1933.⁹ The Army Chief of Staff's considerations for IPF's first phase highlight the connectivity between the modern-day Regular Army composition 1 (COMPO 1) and Army National Guard composition 2 (COMPO 2) forces.

The IPF expected the National Guard to provide the lion's share of force structure during the first mobilization phase to achieve rapid mobilization. The 35th Infantry Division was one of

⁶ US Department of War, *Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations* (Washington, DC: Historical Division of the Department of the Army, 1950), 23.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁹ *Ibid.*

the first National Guard divisions to mobilize in 1940. The National Guard constituted the majority of the US Army in 1940 and early 1941. In 1920, Chief of Staff General John J. Pershing originally planned for a larger National Guard force structure due to the National Guard's ability to quickly augment Regular Army forces before the generation of mass volunteers or conscripts. General Pershing's 1920 Protective Mobilization Plan (PMP) depended on the assumption of 280,000 enlisted soldiers in the Regular Army with the National Guard providing 450,000 total soldiers.¹⁰

General Pershing's PMP relied even more heavily on the National Guard than the IPF General Marshall utilized during World War II. This revelation speaks volumes regarding the professionalization and uniformity achieved by the National Guard during World War I. The Army knew that the National Guard would provide the majority of soldiers in the opening months of a large-scale conflict. Planners assumed this force would act as the first line of defense while expansion occurred. The National Guard, by the nature of these prewar plans, would constitute the vast majority of the nation's initial forces when conflict became inevitable.

The Regular Army and federal government had a strained relationship before the National Guard's 1940 mobilization into federal service. The National Guard Association, a centralized lobbying body, negotiated on behalf of individual states from 1939 to 1941 to willingly relinquish control of state forces for additional funding, equipment, and resourcing from the federal government.¹¹ The 1920 National Defense Act authorized a 400,000 end strength for the National Guard, but in 1939 the states had only half that due to the lack of government funding.¹² Unlike the Army Reserve, which was designed for individual augmentation, the

¹⁰ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 30.

¹¹ Robert B. Sligh, *The National Guard and National Defense: The Mobilization of the Guard in World War II* (New York, NY: Praeger, 1992), Preface.

¹² *Ibid.*, 13.

National Guard had eighteen infantry and four cavalry division headquarters.¹³ With mobilization dependent on utilizing these organizations, the National Guard slowly abdicated control of forces for more funding required to increase readiness.

The National Guard's experience as the strategic reserve of the US Army leading up to World War II is currently relevant. Every major conflict reestablishes the National Guard's contribution to national defense. The mass National Guard mobilizations during the World Wars also reaffirmed the importance of the quality training and standardization of the force along active service lines. The evolution of the National Guard from lessons learned allowed rapid operationalization during the last two decades.

Sixty years later, after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of reserve component personnel, the Department of Defense announced the operationalization of the reserve components across all services. The October 29, 2008 Department of Defense Directive 1200.17 outlines policy in order to manage the Reserve Components as an Operational Force. The total force is defined as the active component and reserve component of military elements and within in these forces the three COMPOs of the Army are referred to as the Total Army.¹⁴ The development of three COMPOs within the Total Army of today still places the primacy of US Army soldiers in the National Guard (COMPO 2) and the Army Reserve (COMPO 3). The Army National Guard has approximately 350,000 Army soldiers in its ranks, while the Army Reserves has over 200,000. In aggregate, this exceeds the Active Duty (COMPO 1) by 100,000 personnel.¹⁵ The disparity between the number of reserve and active component forces is fewer than World War I or World War II, but the vast majority of soldiers are still billeted in the operational reserve. The National Guard is the only reserve

¹³ Sligh, *The Mobilization of the Guard* (1992), 13.

¹⁴ US Department of Defense, *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*, Department of Defense Directive 1200.17 (Washington, DC, October 29, 2008), 8.

¹⁵ "2017 Index of Military Strength," The Heritage Foundation, accessed September 27, 2018, <https://index.heritage.org/military/2017/assessments/us-military-power/u-s-army>.

component that has operational division headquarters resident in their force structure. In short, the opening months of any large-scale combat operations will heavily rely on reserve component mobilization. In order to command and control fielded forces in the Total Army and follow-on recruitment efforts, the eight National Guard division headquarters are essential to the war effort.

Experiences of the past shaped the current composition of the Total Army. There was a steady progression in readiness from World War I and World War II. This was a product of the National Guard accruing combat experience, increased funding for training, and strengthening ties with the active component through military education opportunities. This progression continued after World War II until the National Guard reached its current status as an operational reserve. This evolution would not be possible without the lessons learned in the early days of preparation prior to the US entering World War II. The National Guard was the only option to rapidly build an Army with such a small existing active duty force.

The reality of 1940's economic, social, and governmental considerations heavily influenced the shell of an Army. The National Guard and its warfighting organizational headquarters played a pivotal role in the initial mobilization of the US Army. Units like the 35th Infantry Division stood as the vanguard for what would become the largest Army the US would ever put into the field. These early days of preparation highlight the importance of the ability to mobilize, train, and integrate a National Guard division in order to prepare for large-scale combat operations. The 35th Infantry Division's World War II exploits, shaped by this initial mobilization, used their training to fight through the battlefields of Europe until they demobilized in 1946.

Section 2: Role of the 35th Infantry Division in World War II Mobilization

Before the US officially declared war on any Axis Powers, the National Guard was mobilized in force. President Franklin D. Roosevelt federalized the first National Guard units for

World War II on September 16, 1940.¹⁶ Each Guard division was authorized a strength of 22,000 soldiers, but the vast majority only had half that in their ranks.¹⁷ The Guard suffered equipment shortages as well, resulting in soldiers training with sticks and stove pipes. During the first weeks of mobilization, units were garrisoned in their home unit armory. Unfortunately, due to the lack of facilities, most soldiers ate meals in local cafes and stayed at home during the nights.¹⁸

The absence of military funding during the Great Depression and the inability to coordinate with the Regular Army as a result of competing political views over control of the National Guard negatively affected its readiness. Due to manning shortfalls, there was no National Guard division in active service in the spring of 1941 with any less than thirty three percent draftees.¹⁹ Multiple factors drove these manning shortfalls, including exemptions for critical civilian employment and evaluations during mobilization, which left guardsmen unqualified for federal service.

The 35th Infantry Division was one of the first National Guard divisions to mobilize and begin training in 1940. The division mobilized on December 23, 1940 at Camp Robinson, Arkansas.²⁰ Initially, units from the Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska National Guard manned the division.²¹ As one of the first National Guard units activated to federal service, the 35th Infantry Division struggled with personnel and equipment shortages in its first stages of mobilization. Personnel shortages required units to augment with selectees during the mobilization process. The 35th Infantry Division used a significant amount of time to mobilize and train. The mobilization

¹⁶ Sligh, *The Mobilization of the Guard* (1992), 126.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., 127.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Stars and Stripes, *Attack! The Story of the 35th Infantry Division* (Paris, France: Desfoss`es-n`eogravure, 1944), 2.

²¹ Ibid., 2.

began at the end of 1940 and the 35th Infantry Division did not enter the war until their baptism by fire in the European Theater of War in June 1944.

First person accounts of the 35th Infantry Division's mobilization provide a snapshot of the prevailing attitudes and opinions of personnel, creating an emerging understanding of the system of National Guard mobilization. Understanding individual stories conceptualizes the strategic and operational context of the National Guard deployment throughout the war. Orval Eugene Fabius, a selectee incorporated into the 35th Infantry Division at Camp Robinson, wrote a detailed personal narrative, *In This Far Away Land*, providing a first-person perspective of the 35th Infantry Division's mobilization. His account spanned his arrival on May 18, 1942 at the mobilization station to his action in Europe.²² Fabius capitalized on occasions that provided an opportunity to visit with other soldiers from his home in Madison County, Arkansas. Fabius revered Sundays when his fellow hometown soldiers would reminisce about the "Hills of Home" in the Ozarks.²³ By providing articles to his county paper, Fabius attempted to maintain cohesion, keeping the community apprised of local service members. This proved especially important as units' identities morphed with the onslaught of volunteers and draftees from all over the country.

Fabius's story underscores the "hometown heroes" composition of the 35th Infantry Division and other National Guard division during mobilization. As the ranks backfilled with soldiers from around the country, the division's regional identity was gradually diluted. The 35th Infantry Division's political identity and cohesion as a local unit faded, leaving a residual resentment among the original leadership. In order to stand up fully manned and equipped divisions, volunteers and draftees bolstered division numbers throughout mobilization. This requirement created a disaggregated organization since divisions were composed of National

²² Orval Eugene Fabius, *In This Far Away Land* (Conway, AR: River Road Press, 1971), 40.

²³ *Ibid.*, 57.

Guard units from several states, new enlistees into the National Guard, draftees, and Regular Army personnel.

Major General R. E. Truman exemplified the diversity of the 35th Infantry Division. As the division's commanding officer, Truman, a native of Kansas City, served in the Army during the Spanish-American War, the Mexican Expedition, and World War I.²⁴ Specifically, he was affiliated with the 35th Infantry Division and Missouri National Guard since 1917. A cousin of the future President Harry S. Truman and the former Chief of Staff of the 35th ID, the local communities involved with the 35th knew and supported General Truman.²⁵ The Department of the Army charged Truman with the responsibility for the initial mobilization of the 35th ID. Like many commanding generals, he did not make it through the gauntlet of the pre-war maneuvers, which notoriously weeded out many of the National Guard and Regular Army officers who became institutionally insulated because of their seniority during the interwar period.

Chief of Staff General Marshall, aware of the optics of favoring Regular Army officers over National Guard officers, oversaw Army restructuring as commanders were relieved and the Army itself was reimaged into the organization required to meet the challenges in Europe and the Pacific.²⁶ While serving with the Illinois National Guard as a Regular Army officer during the interwar period, General Marshall studied the inner workings of the National Guard and its ability through political leaders to influence military matters at the federal level. General Marshall reorganized the National Guard during mobilization leading to the mixture of draftees, Guardsmen, and Regular Army in National Guard units under Regular Army control.²⁷ This was

²⁴ 35th Infantry Division, *Thirty-Fifth Division: Camp Robinson, Arkansas 1941* (Little Rock, AR: Arkansas Printing and Lithographing, 1941), 1.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Sligh, *The Mobilization of the Guard* (1992), 163.

²⁷ Ibid.

precipitated by shortages in personnel within National Guard divisions as a process of activation to federal service.

The National Guard Association perceived this reorganization as the Regular Army's way to permanently seize control of the National Guard as it became the federally controlled reserve.²⁸ Friction between the National Guard Association and the Chief of Staff of the Army destroyed hard won trust and informed later political actions, such as the 1948 Gray Board recommendation that Air and Army Guard units merge with the Regular Army.²⁹ Robert Sligh's *The National Guard and National Defense* proposes that the legislation leading to the federalization of the National Guard during World War II shaped the conceptualization of the National Guard.³⁰ Indeed, Sligh's assertions ring true when taking into account the National Guard as a beneficiary of federal funding as a loaned force to the states from the federal government. In short, the National Guard Association negotiated increased funding by ceding autonomy to the federal government and increasing the influence of the Regular Army on National Guard units.

In retrospect, General Marshall exercised exceptional insight by mobilizing the National Guard for a year of training prior to possible deployment. Marshall recognized the consequences of large-scale combat operations and employing division elements from the National Guard. With the increased intensity of conventional warfare and the complexity of operating an organization of 20,000 personnel, the additional time aided in training the reserve component. Arguably, General Marshall identified the correct time frame to mobilize the entirety of the National Guard to increase readiness and create capacity to train volunteers and draftees feeding the expansion of the Armed Forces with the threat of conflict looming.

²⁸ Sligh, *The Mobilization of the Guard* (1992), 164.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 168.

Training

As Army mobilization began in earnest in 1940, the Army lacked qualified soldiers to train the expanding federalized force structure. Many of the experienced soldiers in the National Guard fell from the unit rolls due to exemptions. This left the National Guard with new recruits and a growing number of draftees without a cadre to train them. Regular Army officers and non-commissioned officers scattered to mobilization sites to assist with training across the country.³¹ National Guard units had to dilute their veterans throughout the divisions in order to train the growing number of green soldiers. The crisis for experienced personnel continued to grow as more volunteers, and later draftees, filled the rosters of divisions in the National Guard and Regular Army.

In regards to training, Chief of Staff of the Army General George C. Marshall wanted all eighteen National Guard infantry divisions federalized in 1940.³² General Marshall believed the National Guard could backfill Regular Army units in a stateside service role.³³ The proposed plan would allow Regular Army units to serve in expeditionary roles if the situation required. In addition, Marshall believed Guard divisions could absorb the raw recruits needed with the expansion of the Army and provide training from the experienced Guard soldiers within the ranks.³⁴ The National Guard also had a limited amount of equipment useful for training and unit readiness appeared generally lower than the Regular Army.³⁵ Based on this premise, General Marshall orchestrated the initial mobilization of the National Guard in order to execute a year of training in to increase overall readiness of the entire Guard.³⁶ This year of pre-conflict training

³¹ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 186.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, 193.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 194.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

proved essential in bringing National Guard division to a higher state of readiness prior to any declaration of war. Full mobilization and intense training facilitated operational success in the performance of divisions such as the 35th during 1944.

The summer maneuvers of 1940 brought 90,000 Regular Army and National Guard soldiers together to expose personnel to the operating environment developing in Europe at the time.³⁷ During this training, the National Guard's under-resourcing became evident. The Regular Army task organized the Guard under the antiquated "square" division template rather than the new "triangular" division structure, thus exposing Guard shortcomings. The use of three maneuver regiments instead of four, drastically changed the division tactics. The lack of modernized equipment also became painfully apparent. National Guard units did not have the new anti-tank guns, light or heavy mortars, and only a quarter of the newly fielded Springfield M-1 Garand rifles.³⁸

The maneuvers focused General Marshall's attention to the current training program for National Guard division mobilized in 1940. The purpose of the Guard training program during mobilization strove to accomplish two objectives. General Marshall wanted to build readiness of National Guard organizations, developing a cadre for training new volunteers and selective service trainees in order to support Army personnel expansion.³⁹ General Marshall felt that starting from the top down was the most beneficial way to increase readiness of National Guard divisions by mobilizing headquarters prior to the main body arriving at mobilization station for training.⁴⁰ The general's guidance ordered additional training for Guard division staffs one month prior to units arriving for training and brigade staff to operate for three weeks before their

³⁷ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 209.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 211.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 212.

formations arrived.⁴¹ This served as a mechanism to empower Guard command teams as they prepared for the projected training event.

General Marshall's experience serving with the Illinois National Guard before World War II informed his understanding of the Guard, an asset during the complete mobilization of the National Guard. General Marshall's insight to ensure training and time for headquarters to prepare for their soldiers proved invaluable during the 1940-1941 mass mobilization of the National Guard. The ready division headquarters acted as the anchor to follow on trace units. The advanced mobilization of staffs allowed for the opportunity to deconflict billeting, equipment, and training for the division. In addition, it provided a provision to plan for possible shortfalls that would ease the yearlong training ahead of each divisional organization. General Marshall clearly recognized the importance of the training time frames needed for National Guard division staffs and their units in order to achieve a state of readiness similar to the Regular Army.

The Chief of Staff of the Army was deeply concerned with training of units down to the individual division level. On July 30, 1941, General Marshall sent letters to all of the National Guard division commanders regarding an evaluation of their training by General Headquarters.⁴² The divisions in question had received efficiency ratings varying from excellent to poor, but overall, the average was far too low according to Marshall.⁴³ General Marshall attributed the low ratings to poor morale as a reflection of command.⁴⁴ The Chief felt that National Guard divisions suffered more than the Regular Army from low morale due to the professional knowledge level of Guard officers compared to their Regular Army counterparts. General Marshall prioritized training Guard officers and Reserve officers at service schools over new officers.⁴⁵ This allowed

⁴¹ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 212.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 231.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

the opportunity for Guard officers in a division to gain institutional knowledge from various Army service schools, previously not provided prior to mobilization. This increased training, in theory, would improve the officers, which would improve the overall morale of the unit they served.

September 1941 brought the last and largest maneuvers of the prewar period to the United States throughout Louisiana and Texas.⁴⁶ This exercise included Regular Army and National Guard divisions. The Second and Third Field Armies employed over 400,000 soldiers for this monumental field exercise.⁴⁷ The Louisiana Maneuvers and the subsequent exercises in the Carolinas highlighted several areas of concern throughout National Guard and Regular Army divisions. Dissatisfaction in the training of small units, employment of antitank weapons, massing of armor, coordination of tactical air forces, motor transport, and radio communication became apparent among senior leaders.⁴⁸ These shortfalls all informed the training plans the divisions would embark on after the maneuvers.⁴⁹ National Guard and Regular Army units unwittingly stood at the cusp of a declaration of war, which would test the training executed throughout the year.

The declaration of war, in addition to the previous results of the maneuvers, brought to the forefront and highlighted the failings of some officers in the Regular Army and National Guard. General Marshall showed conviction to remove these underperforming officers prior their fielding in large-scale combat operations. Seniority, not performance, determined the interwar officer promotion system within the Regular Army. The National Guard officer corps suffered from political influence and lacked contemporary standardization in officer education and training. With Congressional support, Marshall wanted to retain and promote officers on the basis

⁴⁶ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 237.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 239-240.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

of maximum efficiency.⁵⁰ General Marshall assumed the National Guard would look for disparity between how the Army would review Regular Army officers versus National Guard officers. This assumption proved accurate and created contention.

General Marshall designed an Advisory Board for the Reserve Components to ensure the optics of fairness to National Guard officers considered for separation.⁵¹ The board included well-known and respected officers from the National Guard and Reserves.⁵² The reassignment of over age-in-grade officers outside of line units did not totally prevent their capacity to serve in other ways as the war effort expanded.⁵³ After the reclassification boards convened, only three-fourths of one percent of the National Guard officers dropped from the roles.⁵⁴ The separation from service for the officers of the National Guard proved fewer absolutely and relatively to that of the Regular Army officer corps.⁵⁵

This officer culling allowed physically fit leaders to take command of combat organizations and still gain experience in the administrative realm. General Marshall's foresight enabled the promotion of the best and the brightest among the National Guard, Reserves, and Regular Army without gutting the experience needed to negotiate the bureaucracies of training, equipping, and managing an Armed Forces of sixteen million at the height of the war. The removal of National Guard officers, especially from command, did not come without any political fallout. The National Guard Association remained a vocal supporter of National Guard officers relieved of command and communicated directly to the Chief of Staff of the Army's office. This does not even begin to illuminate congressional inquiries and pressure from influential governors.

⁵⁰ US Department of War, *Prewar Plans* (1950), 242.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 244.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 244-245.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

The 35th ID was not immune to this purge of officer throughout the force. 35th ID commander Major General Ralph E. Truman transferred from division command to the position of president of the Second Army Classification board in October of 1941.⁵⁶ This relief of command, in the disguise of a transfer, saved face within the 35th. General Truman was widely popular within the division and the communities, which supported it. Major General William Hood Simpson, an active duty officer, replaced General Truman adding to the controversy. The official reasoning for General Truman's reassignment cited his age; within a year he would be turning sixty-two, over the age limit for a major general at the time.⁵⁷ By 1942, the Army would retire General Truman, though he still had a significant influence on the politics of the Guard. The case of General Truman's transfer and later retirement exemplifies the concern of National Guard leaders at the time. Some felt that the Regular Army sought to tear apart their organization and replace Guard leadership with Regular Army officers.

General Truman's correspondence with soldiers of the 35th Infantry Division during and after World War II reiterates this resentment among leaders in the National Guard. This disdain is evident in a letter sent to the General on September 22, 1943 from Lieutenant Colonel H.S. Crow, at that time on the inactive rolls. In reference to the treatment of the 35th Infantry Division after their initial training, Crow wrote:

I have often wondered just what Fates worked in the cases of so many of the National Guard officers who had put their hearts and energies into the job of building up the Guard, and then when it came time to have active duty, to be summarily relieved. I have tried to think the whole thing through, and I always run up against the same obstacle, Politics. Eleven National Guard division commanders relieved of command within the space of about three months just don't add up to good sense.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ 35th Division, *The Covered Wagon of the 35th Division: Camp Robinson News Digest, Vol. 1 No. 22, October 10, 1941*, 35th Division Association Records: Box 23, Folder: 35th Division Association Records World War II Files, "The Covered Wagon," 1, Truman Presidential Library Archives.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Letter, Lieutenant Colonel H.S. Crow to Major General R.E. Truman, September 22, 1943, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 1, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence "B, C" 35th Division, Truman Presidential Library Archives.

Crow's reflection provides insight into the Guard's perspective of the Regular Army's handling of Guard divisions after mobilization and training. Eleven of the eighteen Guard division commanders' replacement is no small metric. This is with the consideration that the overall number of National Guard officers taken off active duty was equivalent with Regular Army statistics of the original officers filling billets during the interwar period. Crow's letter to General Truman illustrates the bifurcation felt by some between the Officer Corps. There was the Regular Army and everyone else. The National Guard Officer Corps' believed that prejudice influenced officer billeting.

Crow highlights his discontent concerning the treatment of National Guard officers with hope for retribution in the future. Crow's letter to General Truman concludes, "Perhaps someday, there may come a general airing of past events for too many good officers have been sidetracked or washed out completely and when the day of reckoning comes, we may all learn a lot of interesting facts. However, the history of World War I is only being repeated."⁵⁹ Primarily veterans of World War I, senior Guard leaders felt unappreciated during the first war and during the interwar period. The under-resourcing of the Guard during the interwar period had far reaching consequences for national defense, and the leadership within the National Guard divisions may have felt cast aside during 1941 and 1942. The actions of the National Guard Association during the initial mobilization underscores this sentiment. The states organized separate from the federal government into a lobbying body called the National Guard Association to demand funding and equal treatment. The Second World War in Europe compelled the federal government to hear the Guard's grievances. This dialogue continued in post war Congressional

⁵⁹ Letter, Lieutenant Colonel H.S. Crow to Major General R.E. Truman, September 22, 1943, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 1, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence "B, C" 35th Division, Truman Presidential Library Archives.

investigations, which were influenced by politically connected officers who had served in the National Guard.

Equality and fair treatment were not the only concern among National Guard officers; resident experience was also paramount to the war effort. Many leaders argued the experience of National Guard officers led to increased efficiency, compared to their younger counterparts in the Regular Army. In a letter to General Truman dated February 2, 1945, Major Oscar T. Honey articulates much of the same concern as Crow in Crow's previous letters. Honey writes:

During the last few months of my service I saw some of the most valuable and efficient Officers that we had, placed on the inactive list, therefore all this talk that we hear over the radio, and what we read in the paper regarding the manpower needs, and the needs of the army just don't make sense. I saw job after job that was handled efficiently as could be, turned over to in experienced [sic] young officers that were physically fit for service over there, yet did not have the experience necessary to make a success of the job that they were assigned to over here.⁶⁰

Honey was another leader of the 35th ID transferred out of the division and stationed stateside. Honey's resentment is evident, but he also offers a plausible argument in the favor of the experience of National Guard officers increasing efficiency within their duty position compared to their Regular Army contemporaries. Most of the senior leaders in the Guard participated in World War I and prior conflicts and personified themselves as experienced due to this previous exposure to war. Many leaders in the Guard felt they were more efficient than draftees or some of the Regular Army. They understood how their divisions worked, since many officers were assigned to multiple positions within the organization over the years. This prior service also contributed to the phenomenon of loyalty and a sense of ownership to their specific division. Sometimes connection to an organization or unit was stronger than to the bond of the Army itself.

⁶⁰ Letter, Major Oscar T. Honey to Major General Ralph E. Truman, February 2, 1945, Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988), Box 1, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence "G-I" 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

The Regular Army's criticism, in addition to the transfer and relief of National Guard officers, created animosity among the divisions and their higher headquarters. A May 16, 1941 after action review of the 35th ID by Second Army commander Lieutenant General Ben Lear clearly illustrated palpable tension. The memorandum from General Lear to General Truman highlighted items such as, "Gentlemen, this morning I saw a sergeant instructor attempting to teach his squad how to stack arms, and he couldn't execute the very first motion in that department . . . I have been disappointed---disappointed . . . I thought that you were better than they have told me. I thought that your organization was better than that. I have had hope."⁶¹ General Lear's critique focused on minor individual soldier infractions, underscoring the overall discipline of the division or lack thereof. General Lear went as far as to admonish the soldiers for training in the woods instead of the parade field.⁶² The Second Army commander strongly implied that he heard the division performed poorly prior to training at mobilization station. General Lear confirmed his opinion that the 35th Division's current performance was less than stellar, evidenced by his interactions with junior enlisted soldiers.

General Lear's interaction with the 35th ID is not synonymous with all Regular Army officers and their interaction with the National Guard, but it does present vital insight into the early mobilization and training of this specific division. General Lear was described as "hale, hearty, formal, and somewhat pompous" by his contemporaries.⁶³ In addition, this was the General's last opportunity to achieve his military ambitions being within four year of the statutory retirement age of 64.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Letter, Lieutenant General Ben Lear to Major General Ralph E. Truman, May 16, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, May, June 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Jim D. Hill, *The Minute Man in Peace and War: A History of the National Guard* (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole, 1964), 392.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

Pertinent remarks from General Lear in General Truman's personal correspondence from May 1941 indicate further discontent with the National Guard from previous experience he had in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. General Lear stated, "I told you that I knew about the National Guard and I want to repeat that I know about the National Guard. My regiment went to the Philippines with inexperienced officers. We had men in the outfit who had held better positions socially in the community than our Captain but they were probably not his equal in a business sense."⁶⁵ General Lear's prejudice towards the Guard, informed by previous experience, seems evident. The general's articulation of these preconceived notions may have given the officers in the 35th Division the impression they were going to be treated unfairly. Undoubtedly, this affected the overall mobilization, training, and integration of the division in preparation for deployment. In many ways it was a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure as General Lear reinforced his preconceived notions. The narrative of incompetence among National Guard divisions preceded a rash of investigations and relief of commanders. These actions further diminished morale among National Guard soldiers and focused efforts on surviving the political turmoil instead of training the division. General Lear's clear contention with Guard officers were that they were believed to be political appointees rather than competent Army officers. The National Guard Association's display of non-cooperation in the Army's time of need also supported General Lear's opinion, reinforcing his past experiences serving alongside the National Guard, which he felt was led by politicians rather than professional officers.

General Lear continued his illustration concerning the Philippines and cited how the National Guard officers who did their jobs were treated unfairly when they returned home due to

⁶⁵ Letter, Lieutenant General Benjamin Lear to Major General Ralph E. Truman, May 16, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, May, June 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

politics.⁶⁶ Specifically, General Lear cited the National Guard captain he served with as a company first sergeant. General Lear indicated the captain became a social pariah after returning home from federal service for doing the “right thing” by enforcing discipline within the unit.⁶⁷ General Lear then continued his remarks saying this play of politics was occurring in the 35th, “You are not Nebraska, Missouri, or Kansas. You are the 35th Div in Federal Service. You do not owe allegiance anyplace but here. Your loyalty is here –thoroughly and completely. It can’t be any other way. I don’t give a damn if you go home unpopular or not, it matters only whether or not you are popular with me.”⁶⁸ Some of the officers within the division surely resented the general’s demands of loyalty to himself above loyalty to community. National Guard divisions, historically, have ties to their states intertwined with the heraldry of their units. This heraldry is synonymous with the historical importance the Regular Army propagates within units. This example highlights the tension resident in the organization as it progressed through training at the division level and echelons below. The friction is annotated in the personal correspondence of General Truman and his officers in which the breaking of the Guard is cited.

General Truman attempted to provide a solution in order to preserve the identity and continuity of the division, knowing that the Regular Army would scrutinize the officer corps by age and performance. In a letter to General Lear on February 11, 1941, General Truman wrote, “As you may recall, I discussed with you, during your visit, a proposed plan of making our own officers. I have given it much serious consideration. I feel that I have, among my non-commissioned officers, those who would make good officers if they were only given the

⁶⁶ Letter, Lieutenant General Benjamin Lear to Major General Ralph E. Truman, May 16, 1941, Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988), Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, May, June 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Letter, Major General Ralph E. Truman to Lieutenant General Benjamin Lear, February 11, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, February, March 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

opportunity...”⁶⁹ General Truman’s attempted preservation of the 35th as a National Guard division ultimately failed. The attempt to develop the 35th Division’s non-commissioned officers to serve as the future officer corps of the organization highlights the National Guard leadership’s desire to maintain control in the face of the quickly changing demographic within the division. As draftees joined the division, the mobilized units of 1941 looked different than the mobilized units of 1940. With the relief of National Guard officers, the infusion of draftees, and differing regimental assignments across the country, the identity of the 35th Division quickly changed.

General Truman revealed his own thoughts on the relationship with the National Guard divisions and Regular Army in a letter to Captain Herbert F. Wickham on September 15, 1942, in which he proposed the deliberate effort by the Regular Army to break the Guard. General Truman described the situation:

The powers that be in the Regular Army attempted to break the National Guard Divisions during the last war and they told us the National Guard would always be maintained as National Guard Units when this one started, but apparently they have about succeeded in wrecking the Guard as a whole. They called us friends and brothers for 24 years and as soon as an opportunity came they broke every promise they made to us. I have about come to the conclusion Hitler is a gentleman, when it comes to lying he cannot hold a light to some of the lies that have been told to us by high ranking regular army officers or breaking faith.⁷⁰

General Truman’s words describe the National Guard division leaders’ sentiments as the Regular Army relieved officers, especially from commands, and the identities of the organization diluted with draftees and Regular Army leadership. Many National Guard leaders believed that the Regular Army was utilizing an opportunity to exercise supremacy over the National Guard in order to gain a lasting control over the organization. This may not have been a concerted effort by the Regular Army, but the experience left a lasting memory within the institution. A post-World

⁶⁹ Letter, Major General Ralph E. Truman to Lieutenant General Benjamin Lear, February 11, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, February, March 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

⁷⁰ Letter, Major General Ralph E. Truman to Captain Herbert F. Wickham, September 15, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 2, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, “W” 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.

War II narrative would support this sentiment with National Guard divisions suffering casualties in the five figures, which included the 35th ID.⁷¹

The division organization is an integral part of combat power for the Army. In 1940, the number of trained and mobilized divisions expressed potential military strength in overseas operations. The original mobilization and training of the first ten Regular Army divisions and eighteen National Guard divisions in 1940-1941 proved building readiness an exceptional duty. The 1942 division training program testifies to this arduous task. The official US Army's document outlining the preparation of personnel for World War II, *The Army Ground Forces, the Procurement and Training of Ground Combat Troops*, templates a division's training period as forty-four weeks.⁷² The Regular Army later reduced this training period to thirty-five weeks. The Regular Army used a model of individual/basic training, unit training, and then combined training, resulting in a significant preparation period to build divisional readiness.⁷³

World War II provided an abundance of resources to the Army, but under serious time constraints, especially after the attacks on Peral Harbor. In January 1942, General Marshall stated that, "The Army used to have all the time in the world and no money; now we've got all the money and no time."⁷⁴ With "no time," the Army needed planners to orchestrated these vast amounts of resources into a coherent effort. Then Major Albert C. Wedemeyer was responsible for the 1941 Victory Plan written to address the challenge, which would become known as World War II.⁷⁵ Major Wedemeyer based the plan, to address German aggression, on the Reich's ability

⁷¹ John K. Mahon, *History of the Militia and the National Guard* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1983), 188.

⁷² Robert R. Palmer, Bell I. Willey, and William R. Keast, *The Army Ground Forces, the Procurement and Training of Ground Combat Troops* (Washington, DC: Historical Division of the Army, 1948), 444.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Charles E. Kirkpatrick, *An Unknown Future and a Doubtful Present: Writing the Victory Plan of 1941* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990), 35.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

to muster divisions into the field.⁷⁶ Wedemeyer calculated that Germany could not raise and maintain more than 300 divisions and with additional Axis divisions, the US Army would have to face 400-500 divisions in the European Theater of Operations. The Allied Powers would have to raise 700-900 divisions and Wedemeyer projected that July 1, 1943 would be the earliest the United States could enter the ground war.⁷⁷ These initial running estimates drove the necessity for a massive mobilization of personnel and materiel from the US.

Integration versus Assimilation

Assimilation, not integration, described the reality of the 35th Division as it blended into the Regular Army. The Department of the Army retired National Guard officers or dispersed undesirable officers into other organizations, divorced the division of political ties, and reconstituted the soldiers with an increasing composition of selective service draftees. The debate over the motives of the Regular Army dismantling the eighteen National Guard divisions reached a fever pitch during 1941-1942. The National Guard perceived division assimilation and the loss of identity as a failure, though in retrospect the 35th ID performed exceptionally well under Regular Army commanders in the field within the assimilation construct. This fact is highlighted during the successful combat operations in the breakthrough at St. Lo and the subsequent block of the German counterattack.⁷⁸

The National Guard continued to keep its state interests in mind during the interwar period. This state centric focus, resulting from political ties wielded by the Guard, influenced units during the onset of activation. General Marshall continually sparred with the National Guard Association from the initial muster to the publication of mobilization orders while the conflict in Europe and later Japan became imminent. General Marshall's negotiation skills, informed by his

⁷⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Writing the Victory Plan of 1941* (1990), 82.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Hill, *The Minute Man in Peace and War* (1964), 462.

knowledge of the Guard through his service with the Illinois National Guard, facilitated the early necessity of Guard mobilization for national defense.

As draftees filled the ranks, the National Guard started to lose political clout with the Regular Army. No negotiation was necessary when an army could be built from scratch. The dismantling of National Guard divisions was evident by 1941. Soldiers trained and the country began to mobilize in earnest. The National Guard Association began to lose its political footing. Specifically, the authorization of federal funding prior to mobilization gave the Regular Army and National Guard Bureau the power of the purse in military matters. The states lost influence as forces were federalized and the Guard, as an entity, was funded by the US federal government in active and inactive service.

Early in the mobilization process, governors and US Congressmen applied political pressure. As the war effort sped up, fed by new recruits, the National Guard divisions lost their unique identities. Regular Army officers commanded most of the divisions, especially as they deployed overseas. Without identity, political ties atrophied. The 35th Division became one of the hundred Army divisions by 1942-1943 and ceased being identified as a National Guard division. It is important to decipher if this assimilation is possible or necessary for National Guard divisions in the contemporary operating environment, which may include large-scale combat operations.

Section 3: Lessons Learned

National Guard Division Mobilization for Large-Scale Combat Operations

National Guard division headquarters have deployed and are currently mobilized in support of contingency operations since 2001. Most notably, the Global War on Terror. National Guard units have weathered deployments through the Army force generation model over the past two decades, but mobilization would look different with large-scale combat operations. The mobilization, training, and integration of these National Guard divisions is critical to national defense, especially during the initial phases of any potential conflict.

Following World War I, military professionals recognized the importance of a ready reserve. In 1928, while at the US Army War College, then Major Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote a thesis concerning the necessity of an enlisted reserve for the Regular Army.⁷⁹ Major Eisenhower's writings explored economically feasible approaches to maintain a ready reserve during the interwar period in preparation for future large-scale combat operations. The National Guard was part of the calculus to provide enough combat power until a draft could be employed. Major Eisenhower points out that the Defense Act of 1920 allowed 435,000 soldiers for the National Guard, which held only 174,000 in 1928.⁸⁰ In comparison, the Defense Act of 1920 authorized the Regular Army 280,000 soldiers and their 1928 strength had plateaued at 118,500.⁸¹ The National Guard factored in as the numerically superior force in the Army's task organization when Major Eisenhower studied the challenge of raising an Army for conflict from peace time strengths.

Major Eisenhower did not believe that the National Guard was an answer unto itself and did not believe the organization would deploy quickly in an expeditionary method. Then Major Eisenhower noted the merits of the National Guard and initial limitations, saying "...the great advantages which will accrue to National Guard units by permitting each to remain at its home station for a short period after M-day are so apparent that undoubtedly such action will be the rule for the great majority of these units."⁸² Major Eisenhower considered proper mobilization time for the National Guard during the interwar period and during the mobilization of the Army in World War II. Proper mobilization time is a vital consideration now that the National Guard has

⁷⁹ Letter, Major General W.D. Connor to Major Dwight D. Eisenhower, May 5, 1928, *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Papers*, Pre-Presidential, 1916-52, Principle File, Box 27. Folder: Connor, William Durward. Army War College Commandant W.D. Connor to Major D.D. Eisenhower on War College Thesis. Page 1. Eisenhower President Library.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*, 5.

been designated as an operational reserve versus its status as a strategic reserve leading up to World War II. A wholistic activation of the National Guard would require planning and resources for a mobilization of over 350,000 soldiers.

As indicated by World War II, the Army is reliant upon the Guard, its personnel, equipment, and experience during the initial onset of a large-scale conflict or preparation due to time constraints. The mobilization of volunteers and draftees have proven to take significant time and is highly sensitive to domestic political considerations. Current conditions may prove similar to the environment prior to World War II. The majority of the Army exists in the National Guard and Army Reserve, similar to the interwar period. A significant amount of combat power resides in the National Guard, including over thirty brigade combat teams and ten division headquarters. The reserve component heavily supplies enablers. The National Guard and Army Reserve have most of the logistics, medical assets, and maneuver support.

The way divisions mobilize, train, and integrate will set conditions in the early phases of conflict, but may also inform the outcome of the war. In World War II, the Regular Army expected to use selective service draftees as it had in World War I. The general population accepted the draft in World War II as conflict became imminent. The Army may have to continue to fight with an all-volunteer army under large-scale combat operations conditions, if the draft is not politically acceptable to US voters. If so, the Guard may have to fill its ranks with its own recruits as opposed to assimilation into the Army in general. The answers to these propositions are critical in determining how Guard divisions will be utilized in a peer to peer conventional fight. Integration may be required, instead of assimilation, as part of the larger fighting force. Cohesive blocks of National Guard divisions and National Guard trace units will have to function within the larger framework of the Army, as it did through the operations for the Global War on Terror.

Under these circumstances, state politics may play an increased role if National Guard divisions remain organic to their states. Uniformity is essential to military operations; hence the

structures of the Army Guard, Reserve, and Regular requires these entities to nest together seamlessly. Soldiers must look, speak, and understand commonalities to fight effectively against an enemy. This is especially true in a conventional fight synonymous to World War II and its expeditionary nature.

Examining the *2017 National Security Strategy of the United States of America (NSS)* provides insight into the expectations of the military instrument of national power to address near-peer/peer-peer threats. The current *NSS* specifically names Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran as challenging the United States.⁸³ Russia and China are definitely considered threats paramount with near-peer/peer-peer status in localized theaters, which allows the adversary to monopolize on their overmatch of anti-access and area denial (A2/AD) systems, which they have invested in to achieve an asymmetric advantage. As dictated by the *NSS* and reinforced by *FM 3-0*, perceived future military threats the United States faces could result in large-scale combat operations requiring a speedy mobilization of the entire Army, including all COMPOs.

This assumption is further operationalized with *FM 3-0*'s pivotal shift for preparation of large-scale combat operations.⁸⁴ Lieutenant General Michael Lundy, in a forward to *FM 3-0*, concisely articulates that the world has changed in the last two decades and old or new threats have reemerged in great power competition.⁸⁵ Specifically, the same threats are articulated as were outlined in the *NSS*. This codifies that the purpose of *FM 3-0* shifts the Army's footing from a primacy on counterinsurgency to one of large-scale combat operations. More than half of the chapters in this publication focus on large-scale combat operations or the preparation for such warfare.

⁸³ Donald J. Trump, *National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: White House, 2017), 2.

⁸⁴ US Department of the Army, *Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2008), forward.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, forward.

The NSS drives the *National Defense Strategy* and the *National Military Strategy*. These key defense documents align with the keystone Army doctrinal manual, *FM 3-0*. Doctrinal revisions led and drove past Army organizational changes. This most current publication of *FM 3-0* is reminiscent of the emergence of the AirLand Battle doctrine after the Vietnam War, which was largely credited for the windfall success of the 1991 Persian Gulf War. This shift in policy and enterprise focus will require the Army to test its ability to provide a robust response to the possibility of a conventional war resulting from the current great power competition playing out on the world stage. Due to the scope of large-scale combat operations, this response will only be possible with consideration to a Total Force concept, active and reserve, which was championed by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird as far back as 1970.⁸⁶

Recommendations

As the US Army pivots toward a renewed focus on large-scale combat operations with the release of the doctrinal cornerstone, *FM 3-0 Operations*, it is critical to look at the current operational Army. The Regular Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve constitute a US Army consisting of almost 1,000,000 soldiers. A scenario similar to World War II will require the total mobilization of these forces. The last seventeen years of rotational mobilization has left the Army National Guard in a much higher state of readiness than during the interwar period, which preceded World War II.

The first recommendation is to ensure synchronization of division mobilization among the three compositions of the Army. The Army Reserve will support existing division headquarters in the Army National Guard and Regular Army in this effort since there are no expeditionary division headquarters within COMPO 3. To ensure this synchronization among existing operational plans, Army National Guard and Regular Army divisions in coordination

⁸⁶ Stephen M. Duncan, *Citizen Warriors: America's National Guard and Reserve Forces and the Politics of National Security* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1997), 140.

with echelons above, must conduct mobilization exercises on a regular basis. All eighteen division headquarters should participate in these exercises with trace unit brigade headquarters and coordination with an assigned corps headquarters.

These mobilization exercises would be limited to headquarters' personnel due to the obvious costs of mobilizing actual trace units. These mobilization exercises would test OPLANs, provide divisional headquarters additional training, and test bureaucratic architecture naturally stressed during a simultaneous activation of all Army COMPOs as seen on the scale the 35th Infantry Division experienced during its 1940 mobilization. This recommendation assumes that there would be a delayed or no response to the question of selective service as the US political system grapples with emerging threats, which would act as a catalyst to a mobilization of all Regular Army and Army National Guard divisions.

The second recommendation is to purposefully attempt to continue the Army's effort to combine all COMPOs for training. It is essential that during exercises for mobilization, a division's brigade trace units are a combination of Army National Guard, Regular Army, and Army Reserve. The experience of the 35th Infantry Division is rife with inclusion. The division went through multiple iterations of having a conglomerate of trace infantry regiments, which were a combination of National Guard and Regular Army.⁸⁷ In the current force approximately forty percent of Brigade Combat Teams, the World War II regimental equivalents, are resident in the National Guard. Taking into consideration the number of higher headquarters and enablers in the Army National Guard, the Total Army is compelled to fight as a team when resources are stretched. In the eventuality of large-scale combat, the compositions will inevitably merge into a homogenous organization, especially if there is a need for new personnel with expansion and replacement of the Army as an organization.

⁸⁷ Sligh, *The Mobilization of the Guard* (1992), 139.

A component of the homogenization of the force should include expectations on how to manage state control of units. Once an Army National Guard division is activated, it falls under federal command and control, but this does not necessarily cut the state of origin social ties. The 35th ID and their story, told through robust correspondence among the officers and enlisted personnel, highlights the importance of that tie. Ultimately, the military will use military organizations for military purposes, but the civilian-military relationship must be managed. Organizational assimilation can occur without social alienation from communities and states that support specific Army National Guard divisions, even if the personnel change is due to Army requirements and replacements.

The third recommendation is the socialization of the requirements of large-scale combat operations. The Army is in the process of updating its enterprise of doctrine based on the cornerstone of *FM 3-0*. This will continue to pivot the service, as well as the joint services, towards a focus on a conventional near-peer fight. As this new paradigm is codified into the organization, the necessity of a rapid mobilization of division headquarters, including the eight Army National Guard divisions, must be realized and provisions made.

In the vacuum of speculation, the US Army moves forward with the assumption of fighting with the all-volunteer Army conceived out of the post-Vietnam era of the 1970s. This all-volunteer force has displayed great success with rapid invasions against conventional forces in 1991 and 2003 in Iraq. Both of these conventional operations produced relatively few US casualties during the onset of each conflict. In no way did they compare to the casualties seen in World War II by the 35th ID or other divisions.

A conflict with high US casualties will test the concept of an all-volunteer force and synchronization of all COMPOs of the Army is critical to achieve success. A public affairs campaign and the continued forcing mechanisms of alignment for training is required to synergize the force into one Army before it is tested. If tested with large-scale combat operations,

success will require cohesion among the Regular Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve.

Conclusion

The 35th ID effectively integrated into the Regular Army during World War II and this experience informed future Army National Guard division mobilizations of the need to plan and prepare for the mobilization, training, and integration of all eight Army National Guard division headquarters and the over 350,000 soldiers, which constitute this overarching organization. This is no small task and may have to be executed much faster than the 35th ID experienced from its 1940-1944 evolution before it went into combat in the European Theater of Operation during World War II.

Future adversaries such as Russia and China possess Anti-Access and Area Denial (A2/AD) systems much more sophisticated and possibly more effective than what the Axis powers possessed during the second World War. These systems could preclude a long multi-year approach to national mobilization. In addition, the United States may not be able to utilize personnel which are not eligible volunteers. Due to this political avoidance of considering selective service, a quickly orchestrated mobilization of all divisions might not just be optimal to ground operations, but necessary. A delay in mobilization, training, and integration may be the difference in being denied a foothold or successfully opening a theater of operations.

The future of large-scale combat operations with an all-volunteer force, at least during the onset, will require a seamless progression of all division headquarters into corps and, eventually, a field army. This force will have to act as one and as much friction as possible will need to be resolved prior to mobilization. This task is herculean and has not been tested since World War II in scale. Army National Guard division headquarters have deployed for service during the last two decades, but training has not stressed rapid mobilization requiring integration of all divisions simultaneously.

The rotational nature of deployments which Army National Guard divisions served does not simulate the pressure on states and the National Guard Bureau if all divisions were required to mobilize at the same time. Resources and personnel have to be put through the paces prior to a requirement. Mobilization exercises, even at just division headquarters and above, will be an expensive venture, but needed to discover the strengths and weakness of the Army as a whole. The Army, in its entirety, including all three COMPOs, will be required for large-scale combat operations and the Army should train as it fights.

Bibliography

- 35th Division. *The Covered Wagon of the 35th Division: Camp Robinson News Digest, Vol. 1 No. 22, October 10, 1941*. 35th Division Association Records: Box 23, Folder: 35th Division Association Records World War II Files, "The Covered Wagon," 1. Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- 35th Infantry Division. *Thirty-Fifth Division: Camp Robinson, Arkansas 1941*. Little Rock, AR: Arkansas Printing and Lithographing, 1941.
- Brown, John S. "Winning Teams: Mobilization-Related Correlates of Success in American World War II Infantry Divisions." MMAS Thesis, US Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 1985.
- Brown, Kyle. "The Truth Unveiled: An Inquiry into the Reasons for a Lack of US Military Readiness for World War II." Monograph, School of Advanced Military Studies, US Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 2016.
- Connor, W. D. Major General W. D. Connor to Major Dwight D. Eisenhower, May 5, 1928, *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Papers*, Pre-Presidential, 1916-52, Principle File, Box 27. Folder: Connor, William Durward. Army War College Commandant W. D. Connor to Major D. D. Eisenhower on War College Thesis. Page 1. Eisenhower President Library.
- Crow, H. S. Lieutenant Colonel H. S. Crow to Major General R.E. Truman, September 22, 1943, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 1, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence "B, C" 35th Division, Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- Duncan, Stephen M. *Citizen Warriors: America's National Guard and Reserve Forces & the Politics of National Security*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1997.
- Fabius, Orval Eugene. *In This Far Away Land*. Conway, AR: River Road Press, 1971.
- The Heritage Foundation. "2017 Index of Military Strength." Accessed September 27, 2018. <https://index.heritage.org/military/2017/assessments/us-military-power/u-s-army>.
- Hill, Jim Dan. *The Minute Man in Peace and War*. Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole, 1964.
- Honey, Oscar T. Major Oscar T. Honey to Major General Ralph E. Truman, February 2, 1945, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 1, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence "G-I" 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- Kahn, Eli J., and Henry McLemore. *Fighting Divisions: Histories of Each U.S. Army Combat Division in World War II*. Washington, DC: Infantry Journal, 1945.
- Kaune, Charles. "The National Guard in War: An Historical Analysis of the 27th Infantry Division (New York National Guard) in World War II." MMAS Thesis, US Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 1988.

- Lear, Ben. Lieutenant General Ben Lear to Major General Ralph E. Truman, May 16, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, May, June 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- Mahon, John K. *History of the Militia and the National Guard*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1983.
- McGinnis, Thomas M. "Unit Collapse: A Historical Analysis of Two Divisional Battles in 1918 and 1944." MMAS Thesis, US Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 1987.
- McJimsey, George. *The Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- Moenk, Jean R. *A History of Large-Scale Army Maneuvers in the United States, 1935-1964*. Fort Monroe, VA.: Headquarters, USCAC, 1969.
- Sligh, Robert B. *The National Guard and National Defense: The Mobilization of the Guard in World War II*. New York, NY: Praeger, 1992.
- Stars and Stripes. *Attack! The Story of the 35th Infantry Division*. Paris, France: Desfoss`es-n`eogravure, 1944.
- Truman, Ralph. Major General Ralph E. Truman to Lieutenant General Benjamin Lear, February 11, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 3, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, 1941, February, March 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- _____. Major General Ralph E. Truman to Captain Herbert F. Wickham, September 15, 1941, *Ralph E. Truman Papers 1899-1962 (processed 1988)*, Box 2, Folder: Truman, Ralph E., Correspondence, "W" 35th Div., Truman Presidential Library Archives.
- Trump, Donald J. *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: White House, 2017.
- US Department of the Army. *Combat History of the 137th Infantry Regiment, World War II*. Baton Rouge, LA: Army & Navy Publishing Company, 1946.
- _____. *Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2017.
- _____. *The Army Almanac, a Book of Fact Concerning the Army of the United States*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1950.
- _____. *The Army Ground Forces, the Procurement and Training of Ground Combat Troops*. Washington, DC: Historical Division of the Army, 1948.
- _____. *Strategic Planning for Coalition Warfare, 1943-1944*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief of Military History, 1957.

US Department of Defense. *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*. Department of Defense Directive 1200.17. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2008.

US National Guard Bureau. *Comments on First Phase Second Army vs. Third Army Maneuvers, 22 September 1941*. Official National Guard Register. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1943.

US War Department. *Preparation for Overseas Movement*. National Archive, MMRB (WD 370.5). Washington, DC: War Department, 1943.

_____. *Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations*. Washington, DC: Historical Division of the Department of the Army, 1950.