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ABSTRACT

Many argue that the American educational system is under siege. Students bring with them to school an array of social problems never before seen in this country. Illegal drugs, raging violence, brutal crime, abject poverty, and hopeless desolation pervade our children's lives. Loaded firearms, deadly weapons, and lethal substances are confiscated daily in urban, suburban, and rural schools. Administrators are shot, teachers are mugged, students are stabbed. Schools are in crisis; the war rages. How do school administrators cope?

This investigation concerns the interrelationships, definitions, and applications of several phenomena: war, education, administration, leadership, and power. Through the experiences of the researcher as a fighter-bomber pilot with the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers, during World War II and as an educator for nearly fifty years, comparisons between these two principle environments will be made in light of the phenomena under study.

The present study, then, is an historical case study of the development of the Flying Tigers in relation to educational administration and leadership in the

---

1 In text, the 22nd Bomb Squadron and The Flying Tigers will be used somewhat interchangeably.
current school environment. Historical research was used for detail concerning
the development of the squadron and its experiences during World War II.
Literature on situational leadership in and outside education was examined in
relationship to the experiences of the researcher as a fighter-bomber pilot
during the war and as an educator for fifty years.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many argue that the American educational system is under siege. Students bring with them to school an array of social problems never before seen in this country. Illegal drugs, raging violence, brutal crime, abject poverty, and hopeless desolation pervade our children's lives. Loaded firearms, deadly weapons, and lethal substances are confiscated daily in urban, suburban, and rural schools. Administrators are shot, teachers are mugged, students are stabbed. Schools are in crisis; the war rages. How do school administrators cope?

This investigation concerns the interrelationships, definitions, and applications of several phenomena: war, education, administration, leadership, and power. Through the experiences of the researcher as a fighter-bomber pilot with the 22nd Bomb Squadron,\(^1\) the Flying Tigers, during World War II and as an educator for nearly fifty years, comparisons between these two principle environments will be made in light of the phenomena under study.

\(^{1}\) In text, the 22nd Bomb Squadron and The Flying Tigers will be used somewhat interchangeably.
Background

Public education in the United States predates the establishment of this country. As early as 1685, laws were proposed requiring towns to provide schools, political leaders to select teachers, and children to attend school for at least seven years. Both boys and girls were included, although educated separately, and children of the Indians [sic] and of the poor were invited to attend as well. Curriculum was practical and involved reading, writing, and arithmetic for all children as well as manual trades for boys and domestic training for girls.

Over time, United States public schools have become a model for educating the masses for living in a democracy. The American system is based on the presumption that an enlightened citizenry is a requirement of a free, truly representative society.3

- The cultivation of free men for a free society was an ethic that took into account both the humanistic belief in the inalienable right of man to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the instrumental use of education to provide for the intelligent and responsible leadership that was necessary to ensure such a free society.4

---


4 Best and Sidwell, 90.
The United States educational system, therefore, in some sense was established to create leadership for our country. Throughout American history this fact has been demonstrated both politically and militarily.

The stability of schools as an institution has reinforced its role as an instrument of social change. As a public system, it is capable of far-reaching change unlike any other establishment or resource in this country.

Like all simple and unsophisticated peoples we Americans have a sublime faith in education. Faced with any difficult problem of life we set our minds at rest sooner or later by the appeal to the school. We are convinced that education is the one unfailing remedy for every ill to which man is subject, whether it be vice, crime, war, poverty, riches, injustice, racketeering, political corruption, race hatred, class conflict, or just plain original sin. We even speak glibly and often about the general reconstruction of society through the school. We cling to this faith in spite of the fact that the very period in which our troubles have multiplied so rapidly has witnessed an unprecedented expansion of organized education. This would seem to suggest that our schools, instead of directing the course of change, are themselves driven by the very forces that are transforming the rest of the social order.5

Within the past decade, however, in addition to curing the ills of society beyond the walls of the school, the school is expected to solve the world’s problems since they have now arrived in the school.

---

The Problem

A comparison can be made between war, defined as an "... armed conflict between nations, tribes or other groups ... a concerted effort to put down, reduce or exterminate ... a state of hostility without resort to arms," and the current environment of public education. Even educators see themselves as warriors. For example, in reporting about Ruben Perez, an Assistant Principal in Denver who was publicly berated for suspending a slew of children from Horace Mann Middle School for chronic disruptive behavior, journalist David Hill noted,

As I left his office, I realized that Ruben Perez sees himself as a man fighting a war of his own—not just a war against disruptive students but also a war against the bureaucrats who won't let him do his job the way he sees fit. And just like Patton, he has no intention of giving in to his critics.7

As education-bashers will clearly state, war extends into the school districts between children and parents, children and teachers, parents and teachers, parents and administrators, parents and school boards, teachers and administrators, administrators and school boards, and so on.

During World War II, this researcher, who later became an educator, was a fighter-bomber pilot as a member of the Flying Tigers. Drawing on

---

observations and historical investigation, the following research questions were posed:

1. How did the Flying Tigers come to be?
2. What was the importance of the Flying Tigers to the success of the United States in World War II?
3. What was the administrative and leadership mode of the Flying Tigers?
   a. Was the mode appropriate for the military?
   b. Was the mode appropriate for the time?
4. How does wartime combat compare to the educational environment today?
5. How does the administrative and leadership mode of the Flying Tigers apply to today's educational scene?

These questions will be answered primarily through examining the history of the establishment and the action of the Flying Tigers and then comparing that information with current educational administrative and leadership practice as evidenced both by the literature and by the experience of the researcher.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND METHODOLOGY

During World War II, this researcher, who later became an educator, was a fighter-bomber pilot as a member of the *Flying Tigers*. Drawing on observations and historical investigation, the following research questions were posed:

1. How did *the Flying Tigers* come to be?

2. What was the importance of *the Flying Tigers* to the success of the United States in World War II?

3. What was the administrative and leadership mode of *the Flying Tigers*?
   a. Was the mode appropriate for the military?
   b. Was the mode appropriate for the time?

4. How does wartime combat compare to the educational environment today?

5. How does the administrative and leadership mode of *the Flying Tigers* apply to today’s educational scene?
The Nature of the Historical Problem

Time is running out for recounting their history for those who served in the military during World War II between 1941 - 1945. They are significant primary living resources who can assist in validating the concepts of leadership, organization, and administration that are addressed in this study. The research questions posed here are verifiable by those who were a part of the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers, and, for the most part, many participants are still able to remember their experiences even to the minutest detail. Many were contacted and eagerly shared their experiences.

The history of the 22nd Bomb Squadron unfortunately remains unwritten. Documentation is critical, however, for those who lived through both the happy times and the horror. In some cases, combat crews witnessed anti-aircraft, machine gun, and enemy aircraft fire, or they flew through the jaws of hell. Silenced for fifty years by memories of the atrocities of war, survivors now feel compelled to recount their experiences as their mortality faces them in the mirror each day.

As important as this history is for the participants of the Flying Tigers, it is also crucial for their families and all those who loved them. They, too, paid the supreme sacrifice donating the lives of those they loved to the cause of freedom. They know that their young men, in many cases, fell to the ground in balls of flames and their remains are now a part of the dust of China, India, or Burma. Equally critical, almost every member of the 22nd Bomb Squadron
had a roommate, friend, or acquaintance who was killed either in combat or by accident while serving in the squadron. This story honors love, friendship, and memories.

For purposes of research, the story of the Flying Tigers needs to be told in another perspective. By analyzing the administration, leadership, and organization of the 22nd Bomb Squadron in relationship to the current war on the educational battlefield, situational leadership can be examined. Some lessons that were learned may be useful in buttressing the principles and the qualities of these three phenomena. The situational leadership styles used need to be noted, scrutinized, evaluated, analyzed, and carefully recorded in order to apply these qualities in future leadership training. The same careful consideration needs to be done with the organizational concepts and the skills, techniques, and practices of administration.

The Nature of the Leadership Problem

All members of the 22nd Bomb Squadron displayed loyalty to the United States in several ways. First, they willingly accepted the call to arms in World War II. Second, they obeyed without question orders that sent them 15,000 miles from their homes and families. Every member of the 22nd Bomb Squadron also demonstrated leadership in a variety of ways. Therefore, both the leadership and administrative practices of the Flying Tigers during World War II have been described as well as both the ideal and catastrophic
administration. In addition, organizational structure has been explained and
depicted.

Definitions

The definitions have been divided into four subsections: leadership,
organization, administration, and acronyms.

Leadership

Leadership can be defined as the position or functions of a leader who
has the ability and talent to lead by giving guidance and direction to groups
such as an army or movement or political association. It includes the direction,
supervision, or management of a group or an organization. Further, leadership
is "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts
toward goal achievement in a given situation."¹ [Emphasis added.]

Leaders are ubiquitous. They may be emergent--that is, informally
acknowledged, elected by the group, or appointed by the organization of which
the group is a part, as is the case in the military. A leader, by definition, may
thus be a gas station manager, a chief executive officer (CEO) of a
multinational company, or a person who happens to be the most influential in a
group.

¹ Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational
Most of the original leaders of the Flying Tigers could be considered emergent because they were selected on the basis of prior achievement. Emergent leaders are usually identified by asking such questions as "Whose opinion do you value most in this group?" or "Whom would you most like to have as your leader?" In addition, they tend to be slightly more intelligent, somewhat larger, and more visible and socially adept than other group members. The group members perceive that the emergent leader is able to provide the needed skills and/or economic or political resources to help the group achieve its goals.

Leadership, for the purposes of this study, included policies that were formulated by the Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS), the Fourteenth Air Force, 69th Composite Wing, 341st Bomb Group, and 22nd Bomb Squadron, with the authority to establish rules and regulations. The Combined Chiefs of Staff established the overall direction and objective for World War II after Prime Minister Winston Churchill, along with his military chiefs of staff committee and supported by both the British Joint Plans Committee and Joint Intelligence Committee, consulted with President Franklin Roosevelt on the combined grand strategy. President Roosevelt then appointed the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee that included General Henry "Hap" Arnold, Army Air Forces (AAF) chief, on the initiative of General George Marshall.²

² Haywood S. Hansel Jr., The Strategic Air War Against Germany and Japan: A Memoir (Washington, D.C.: Office of Air Force History, USAF,
Leadership policy was determined by the Air War Plans Division under the president's directive. The Air War Plans Division (AWPD/1) was a newly created agency within the Air Staff on 11 September 1941. The leadership policy document clearly explained the leadership direction of air power and strategies that would be followed in any future conflicts using tactical and strategic weapons and their uses to defeat the enemy. The AWPD/1 policy statement, the primary leadership policy document, called for 10 groups of medium bombers specifically composed of B-25 and B-26 models and explained how they would be used.3 (See Appendix A, Photocopies of Airplanes in Combat)

One could argue that almost everyone is a leader of at least some groups and a follower in innumerable others. Personality is not enough, however, and recent studies support the notion of training as necessary for grooming leaders as the military has always done. A particular trait would not necessarily identify a leader.4

Organization

An organization is a rational, legitimate, and ideally dynamic relationship of people, coordinated formally through specialization, authority, hierarchy, 1986), 44-45.


division of labor, communication, and standard procedures toward the accomplishment of certain goals, objectives, or some common, mutually agreed upon purposes. Organizations constitute a particular kind of social system which has certain formal characteristics. Formal organizations exhibit:

- Specific goal orientation
- Division of work into subtasks and assignment as official duties to established positions in the organization
- Hierarchical arrangement of positions and clearly established authority relationships
- General and impersonal rules which govern, to a large extent, what people do in their official capacity and which guide interpersonal interactions among people in the organization

Organizational behavior is more precise than a related term, human relations. While human relations suggests "the interactions between people in all kinds of situations in which they seek, through mutual action, to achieve some purpose," organizational behavior refers to "a discipline that seeks to describe, understand, and predict human behavior in the environment of formal organizations."  

An organizational chart is a simplified graphic presentation of the formal interrelationships of the various structural and functional units of an organization in terms of their

---


6 Ibid., 23.
channels of formal communication
purposes and objectives
lines or levels of formal authority, control, and coordination
tasks, processes, activities, and their location.\(^7\)

**Administration**

*Administration* refers to the sum of all the ideas, techniques, procedures, and processes which are employed to help an organization maintain, coordinate, and control formally and informally organized human and material resources for achieving its predetermined goals. The *administrative code* under which an organization operates is a complete set of administrative rules and regulations, while *administrative control* is the continuous job of evaluating, planning, organizing, regulating, restraining, analyzing, verifying, and synchronizing the activities of the organization.

Every organization requires management. *Administrative decision-making* refers to any act of decision-making concerned with the establishment, maintenance, revision, or abandonment of goals, objectives, policies, and other related actions of an organization as made by the head, heads, or other members of top management. An *administrative officer* is a high-level staff member.

---

officer who may be in charge of personnel, training, budgeting, or other related administrative functions.

The overall administrative structure, usually consisting of line, staff, and auxiliary agencies or departments through which the management and control of personnel and operations are accomplished, is called the *administrative organization*. In order to administer the organization effectively, *administrative planning* is necessary. This is a systematic process of looking and thinking ahead to recognize and define future trends, to see the relationships between these trends and organizational objectives, and to take the necessary actions to adjust to these in terms of the general framework and objectives of the organization, with the feasible, efficient, and economic use of personnel, money, methods, and other resources.

Every organization, in order to operate effectively, needs defined policies and procedures. *Administrative policy* is a statement of a rule, decision, or judgement which, by defining and outlining the objectives and goals of an organization, can guide and regulate organizational policies and methods. Similarly, *administrative procedures* are the fundamental procedures and methods by which an organization or agency can coordinate or regulate its own actions.8

---

8 Ibid., 105-108.
**Acronyms**

Words formed from the initial letters or groups of letters of the words in a name or phrase are called *acronyms*. Examples include *WAC*, *Women's Army Corps*, or *LORAN* from *long range navigation*. The military is famous for using acronyms in describing almost any name.

**Literature on Leadership**

Management became a science with the publication of Taylor's *Pig Iron* studies in 1911. Like educational theory, management concepts renew and recycle over time. According to Hersey and Blanchard, between 1911 and 1991, twenty-eight major theories of management, noted as milestones in the development of motivation and leadership, were put forward.

Leadership research has focused on men primarily in business situations. Warren Bennis, for example, identified four common traits shared by all ninety leaders he studied:

- **Management of attention**—The ability to communicate a sense of outcome, goal, or direction that attracts followers.
- **Management of meaning**—The ability to create and communicate meaning with clarity and understanding.
- **Management of trust**—The ability to be reliable and consistent so people can count on them.

---


10. Hersey and Blanchard, 95.
Management of self--The ability to know one’s self and to use one’s skills within limits of strengths and weaknesses.\textsuperscript{11}

McCall and Lombardo, in their study of leaders who should have made it to the top, found the following \textit{fatal flaws}:

- Insensitive to others: abrasive, intimidating, bullying style
- Cold, aloof, arrogant
- Betrayal of trust
- Overly ambitious: thinking of next job, playing politics
- Specific performance problems with the business
- Overmanaging--unable to delegate or build a team
- Unable to staff effectively
- Unable to think strategically
- Unable to adapt to boss with different style
- Overdependent on advocate or mentor.\textsuperscript{12}

Personality traits among leaders may or may not be the most important attribute of leadership; situation may be.

The following four assumptions are generally used to describe and understand leadership:

- Leadership is describable in terms of styles of behavior that leaders use in relating to groups.

- A key issue is the extent to which leader behavior should be directive (authoritarian), on the one hand, or participative (democratic), on the other hand.

- There is no one universal, best way to exercise leadership under all conditions; it is necessary, therefore, to use some system for assessing the situational contingencies in selecting a style of leader behavior.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 98.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 99.
In choosing a leadership style (for example, to be directive or participative), the appropriate criterion is effectiveness (for example, which style produces the greatest organizational effectiveness?).

Hersey and Blanchard proposed the relative concept of situational leadership. Maturity, they believe, is defined as "the capacity to set high but attainable goals, the willingness and ability to take responsibility, and the experience of an individual or group," Further, the maturity of both individuals and the work group determines the appropriate supervisory or leader behavior. Situational leadership applies directly to both military and educational environments because it relates both the leader and the group.

Related to the situational leadership model is the contingency leadership model. Developed by Fred Fiedler, this model suggests that leaders perform best in situations which are favorable to them. Favorableness to the leader may be related to these factors:

- The quality of relations between leader and followers
- The degree to which the task is well structured
- The power of the leader's position

---

13 Owens, 157-158.


15 Owens, 162.
In other words, the leadership style must be appropriate to the situation.

Therefore, leaders need to be trained with the intent of:

- increasing the skills required for engaging in the behaviors required for diagnosing the situational contingencies
- increasing the skills required for engaging in the behaviors required to implement a range of leadership styles
- understanding one’s own behavior and acquire and experiment with new behaviors

The three areas of skills required for effective leadership in given situations are situation sensitivity, situational management, and style flexibility.

Methodology

The design of this study was historical, observational, and retrospective. The researcher, as a member of the Flying Tigers, had the advantage of contact with key participants and primary document sources involved in the period under study. In addition, as an educator with nearly 50 years of experience combined with the review of the literature on administration, leadership, and organization, he was able to draw comparisons between both his personal and documented history as one of the Flying Tigers and his current experience as a classroom educator.

---

16 Owens, 180.

17 Ibid.
To the extent possible, quantitative data profiles were collected on the surviving members of the 22nd Bomb Squadron. Leadership and administrative skills were noted where appropriate, and background information was reported as known. Primary documents were examined through the historical archives of the Air Force Historical Research Agency (HRC) at Maxwell AFB, Alabama, and secondary resources were also reviewed.

Historical research is a complex process; therefore, applicable research procedures were carefully incorporated in order to establish an effective design. For example, external and internal criticism procedures were used to insure proper documentation with both an internal and an external, or third-party, evaluator. Consequently, both internal and external validity are built into the evaluation design.18

Another compensatory safeguard employed to guard against the pitfalls and problems with oral historical reports was triangulation cross-checks. Triangulation methodology involves the use of several different methods to study the same object. A form of replication, triangulation cross-checks can be achieved by collecting the same data from different samples, at different times,

and in different places. This activity increases confidence in the validity of the research regardless of the type of analysis used.¹⁹

**Observational Research**

Observational research is used primarily for investigating human behavior. In the context of this study, observation was, in the strictest sense, retrospective because the issues now under investigation were not recorded at the time. The advantage to this *ex post facto* approach, however, is that the presence of the observer, the researcher, had no impact on the behavior of the participants. Further, observer bias is diminished because of the initial lack of attention to the topic, but high interest to the activities of *the Flying Tigers* during the events themselves.

One subset of observational research, however, is the case study. Involving the detailed study of a single subject or phenomenon, the case study can be used "...as an example of a class of events or a group of individuals."²⁰ Relying primarily on interviews and documents, historical case studies of organizations can provide insight into issues of organizational development, leadership, and administration. The present study, then, is a historical case study of the development of *the Flying Tigers* in relation to educational administration and leadership in the current school environment.

¹⁹ Ibid., 393.
²⁰ Ibid., 488.
CHAPTER 3

THE HISTORY OF THE FLYING TIGERS

During World War II, this researcher, who later became an educator, was a fighter-bomber pilot as a member of the Flying Tigers. Drawing on observations and historical investigation, the following research questions were posed:

1. How did the Flying Tigers come to be?

2. What was the importance of the Flying Tigers to the success of the United States in World War II?

3. What was the administrative and leadership mode of the Flying Tigers?
   a. Was the mode appropriate for the military?
   b. Was the mode appropriate for the time?

4. How does wartime combat compare to the educational environment today?

5. How does the administrative and leadership mode of the Flying Tigers apply to today's educational scene?
Introduction

How did the Flying Tigers come to be? The history reported here concerns the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers, who were part of the World War II action between 1942 and 1945 in China, Burma, and India, known as the CBI Theater. (See Appendix B, Maps of the CBI Theater.) Trained by the educational system of their own country, these Americans used every fiber of their intellects to thwart the enemy. The Flying Tigers exhibited natural and learned leadership and administrative skills in their battle for freedom. This is their story of the part they played, whether significant or unimportant, in this phase of United States history and how their leadership relates to the current educational environment.

On the morning of 7 December 1941, at 7:55 A.M., Japanese airplanes attacked Hickam Field and Pearl Harbor on the island of Oahu in Hawaii. Four days later, Germany and Italy joined Japan in a declaration of war against the United States. Nearly four years later, the United States ended the war by releasing a single atom bomb over Nagasaki from a B-29 four-engine bomber on 9 August 1945. Between the first bomb dropped on the United States to the final bomb dropped by American pilots, many lives were lost, but the United States and her allies were victorious against the Axis powers.

The 22nd Bomb Squadron, 341st Bomb Group, 69th Composite Wing, Fourteenth Air Force, the Flying Tigers, China-Burma-India, Asiatic-Pacific Theater, played a significant role in helping the United States of America
defeat the Axis powers of Japan and Germany. Yet, in 1939, this group simply did not exist, for it had been neither visualized nor materialized as it had not been needed before.

An Overview of the United States Army during World War II

The army developed by the United States to fight World War II represented a kind of artistry and truly expressed the spirit of its age like great architecture or poetry or music. This new army was idealistic, inventive, and optimistic. Had it failed, the world would still be reeling from the crash.

The army created by the United States for World War II went to war and never lost a campaign. Losses involving Americans were minimal. The fall of the Philippines, directed by Americans, for example, was actually fought by Filipinos. In fact, the war-time army lost only one battle, at Sidi-bou-Zid in Tunisia, of more than one hundred fought around the world. Further, Americans suffered only one other major check which transpired at the Rapido River crossing. In conclusion, nothing in the annals of war compares with this army, and no other army ever compiled a comparable record of victories.¹

An Overview of Aviation History Prior to World War II

In order to understand the need for the 22nd Bomb Squadron, it is helpful to review the first four decades of aviation history. Since Orville and

Wilbur Wright flew their plane at Kitty Hawk in 1903, World War II was only the second time that the United States had entered a major air war. Although Americans had invented the airplane, its development and military adaptation were delegated to other nations.

The army purchased its first airplane in 1909. Congress authorized the army's first special appropriation for aviation, in the amount of $125,000, in 1911. By 1914, the United States ranked fourteenth in total funds appropriated for aviation, well below countries such as Greece and Bulgaria. From 1909 to April 1917 when the United States entered World War I, the army had acquired only 224 aircraft, and none was a combat model and few were still in commission when finally needed. At the time war was declared, the Army had only two flying fields and 55 trainers. In fact, General Pershing later remarked of the trainers, "Fifty-one were obsolete and the other four obsolescent."

Even though the only requisites for air power are raw materials and enthusiasm, it is obvious that the United States literally had no air force in 1917. For World War I, however, little psychological or material preparation had occurred because of a lack of lead time. On the other hand, during the long truce between the two world wars, people understood clearly, certainly by 1939, that peace could not be sustained. Consequently, the period between

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 6-7.} \]
1939 and 1941 witnessed hurried re-armament. Even so, when war came, the United States was not quite prepared.

The history of the Army air arm, the Air Service, during the period from 1917 through 1941 reflects the general pattern set by United States military policies. Created from no previous experience, the Air Service had just over two months of combat experience in France in World War I followed by a peacetime period. As a result, in 1919, the Air Service was rapidly and thoroughly demobilized. In addition, following World War I, national military policy opposed a large and expensive establishment in the interest of world peace and domestic economy. The Air Service, as the junior member of the military with no control over its own future, died of a lack of funds and personnel. In 1939, however, as the nation began again to gird for war, the need for expansion of the Air Corps was conditioned by the efficacy of the Air Service during World War I as well as by two decades of peace.3

Unfortunately, the story of the Air Service during World War I, upon which their existence in World War II depended, had been more of promise than of achievement. Their combat record, although excellent, was brief, and it was far more modest than the public was led to expect or believe. Official reports of the activities of the Air Service during wartime were a combination of statistics and apology and, therefore, failed to achieve their brave promises

of 1917. As a result, the extravagant assurances of the Air Service received a great deal of public criticism because of the public perception of the feebleness of the air effort. In order to keep the Air Service alive, those in charge of military aviation, who were both civilians and officers, made rash predictions in order to secure support for unprecedented amounts of appropriations. Their claims, however, were totally unwarranted and resulted in bitter reactions from both politicians and the public upon exposure.  

A summary of the development of aviation is described as a time line in Table 1.

The Problem of Organization and Leadership in the Air Service

The first Army aviation office was set up as the Aeronautical Division of the Signal Corps on 1 August 1907. The Chief Signal Officer was no aviator; therefore, with so small an officer corps, the Army Signal Corps turned to civilian sources for leadership. Of course, at that time, few had knowledge either of aviation requirements or military procedure. To provide legitimacy to the Air Service, a law of 1 October 1917 gave to the Aircraft Production Board, a subsidiary of the Council of National Defense, legal status as the Aircraft Board. This new entity was headed by a civilian and contained two other civilians and six officers, three each from the Army and Navy. The purpose of this panel was to supervise and direct the purchase and production of all

---

4 Ibid., 5.
aircraft engines and related materials, as authorized by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Table 1

Aviation Time Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Orville and Wilbur Wright fly the first airplane at Kitty Hawk, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>First Army aviation office, Aeronautical Division of Signal Corps, established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Army purchases first airplane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Congress appropriates $125,000 for aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1917</td>
<td>United States enters World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1917</td>
<td>Aircraft Board created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Foulois appointed Chief of Air Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Patrick replaces Foulois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1918</td>
<td>World War I Armistice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Air Service demobilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Army Air Corps created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>GHQ Air Force established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>XB-17 tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>B-17 power overestimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Office of the Chief of the Air Corps (OCAC) created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Greater appropriations mark the beginning of Air Corps expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Expansion by 2,400% of American aircraft industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Air power used as a striking force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>AWPD/1, World War II air doctrine, developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 1941</td>
<td>Army Air Force established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In spite of the establishment of the Aircraft Board, the organization and training of air units continued to be the responsibility of the Chief Signal Officer, who did not have a controlling voice in the production of material. As a result, the air program assumed a position of semi-detachment from the rest of the war effort with a shaky organization and no precedent to serve as a guide. American leaders, therefore, turned to European Allies for advice, for, although they had plenty of money, Americans had no precise knowledge of aviation requirements.

The European consultants did not understand the situation in America, however, so coordination with the overall military program was faulty. In spite of this lack of assistance, in July 1918, an extensive training program was inaugurated using American universities for ground school training and newly-built fields for primary flight instruction. Advanced flight training was scheduled overseas where the combat experience of the Allies could be exploited. In addition, instruction in mechanics was similarly divided between American and European schools.\(^5\)

Brig. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois was appointed by General Pershing to the position of Chief of Air Service in November 1917. Foulois brought with him a large staff including recently commissioned civilians. As a result of this mix of career and civilian officers, internal jealousies flared. Also, air and

\(^5\) Ibid., 7-8.
ground officers hated one another, and no one in the Air Service was willing to take advice from men who resolutely refused to enter a plane. The interaction involved ground officers who accused aviators of being temperamental, undisciplined, and disorderly. In fact, while General Pershing perceived these new Air Service men to be of quality, he also felt that General Foulois had them running around in circles.

Because of his disappointment with Foulois, on 29 May 1918, General Pershing appointed in his place Brig. Gen. Mason M. Patrick, an engineer who had never been in an airplane. Simultaneously, the whole administrative structure of the Air Service was revamped. By Armistice Day in November, only forty-five squadrons had been assigned to the front. Even at that point, the American Air Force was dwarfed by that of the Germans, the British, and the French. In spite of its limitations, however, the Air Service had shot down 781 enemy planes. Further, while the Armistice brought relief from battle, the Air Service continued as the War Department's anomaly. This resulted in negative attitudes by and towards the Air Service.

The three paramount trends of the period related to the creation of a real air force in the United States were the effort to establish an independent air force, the development of a doctrine of strategic bombardment, and the search for a heavy bomber. From 1919 to 1939, those goals permeated all

6 Ibid., 9-12.
efforts in the development of the air force which was ultimately required to wage the war begun in December 1941.

Most important was the fight for the independence of military aeronautics. Originally a jurisdictional problem within the Army, it became a major national issue when the aggressor nations began to march in the mid-thirties. Before that, the problem of national defense seemed to many Americans simply an academic exercise invented by the militarists. World War I, the war to end all wars, created widespread skepticism and profound distaste for militarism and for war in general. In addition, neither isolationism nor pacifism, neither the Great Depression nor the New Deal was conducive to heavy expenditures for the Army and Navy.

Similar to the situation in government spending today, in the inevitable competition for limited funds the requests of each service were guided by its peculiar philosophy of national security. For example, the Navy wanted a strong battle fleet, and the Army to increase its size. The Air Service, on the other hand, favored a small body of highly trained professionals welded into a compact striking force ready for instant service. This proactive view found little support in the General Staff, composed exclusively of ground officers who were only mildly interested in air power. Further alienating itself, the Air Service requested a separate budget.\footnote{Ibid., 18-19.}
Other sources of friction within the Air Service included personal ambition, rivalry, the tendency toward empire building, and service loyalties and jealousies. The Air Service had few general officers, and promotions were controlled inexorably by seniority, and pilots found themselves many files behind ground officers because their training took longer. In addition, few pilots had graduated from West Point and they were discriminated against on that basis as well. The underlying issue, however, was clearly a negative attitude toward the airplane and air power.

To most airmen the plane was a genus rather than a species. The airplane was a new and unique instrument of destruction of such revolutionary potential that it demanded a sweeping reorganization of the national defense structure. Only by securing a considerable measure of autonomy could the Air Service formulate its own combat doctrines, develop appropriate equipment, and direct its forces in battle. Representative Fiorello H. La Guardia of New York, an aviator in World War I and an ardent supporter of the independent air force, testified in 1926:

There is one obstacle in the way of new legislation, Mr. Chairman. That is the General Staff. If this committee does not lock the doors to the General Staff, you will not get a bill through. . . The General Staff are either hopelessly stupid or unpardonably guilty in refusing to recognize the necessity of making a change in aviation.⁸

---

⁸ Ibid., 23.
The far-reaching and permanent changes demanded legislative sanction; as a result, much of the struggle was aired publicly.\(^9\)

The Need for Air Power during World War II

Several new planes were invented after World War I. For example, in July 1935, the XB-17 underwent its first test flight with an average speed of 232 miles per hour and a range of 2,100 miles. Delivered as the B-17 in 1937, it was enthusiastically received and was seen as an excellent bombardment aircraft for coastal defense. The Air Service was limited, however, to flying seaward only one hundred miles beyond the shore at that time. In addition, a range of only 2,100 miles would not enable a plane to cross an ocean.

To rectify this problem, the Douglas XB-19, the Army's largest prewar bomber with a range of 5,200 miles, was delivered on 27 June 1941. Unfortunately, the size and weight of the plane were too great for the power plants. This factor necessitated the creation of the B-29. This rapid technological development inspired commanding general of the GHQ Air Force, Frank M. Andrews, to urge in June 1937,

The world struggle for strategic air bases and effective air fleets is well under way and will become intensified with the fast moving technical development of the airplane. Air power is as vital a requirement to the military efficiency of a great nation as land power and sea power, and there is no hope for victory in war for a nation in which it is lacking.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^9\) Ibid., 20-23.

\(^{10}\) Greer, 92.
The International Perspective on Air Power Before World War II

While debate about the existence of an independent air force and the development of more powerful bombers raged in the United States, it was clear that Japan, Italy, and Germany had already recognized the airplane to be a worthy weapon in achieving their goals of expansion, but they varied in the doctrine, material, and organization which characterized their air arms. Similar considerations determined the status of air preparations in Great Britain, France, and other nations opposing the Axis powers. The clues were obvious, even at that time, that air power would be an important and possibly decisive factor in the outcome of World War II.

The Japanese had tested air power in their undeclared war against China, and the Russo-Manchurian border fighting in 1939 gained them valuable combat experience. In Europe, the Rome-Berlin Axis seized upon the Spanish Civil War of 1936-1939 as a proving ground for their weapons. In addition, the Italian conquest of Ethiopia in the mid-thirties involved the use of warplanes in tactical experiments. These gave the totalitarian powers an initial advantage over the allies. The veil of censorship effectively concealed the activities and potential of the Japanese air forces. As a result, American air officials tended to underestimate those forces.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 75-76.
The United States Responds to World Aggression
by Building Air Defense

As early as 28 January 1938, President Roosevelt declared United States national defenses inadequate in the face of warlike preparations abroad which were threatening world peace and security. He then asked for appropriations to improve American defense capabilities. A year later, on 12 January 1939, he asked for a larger sum, and the Air Corps accounted for more than half the total requests. These appropriations marked the beginning of a radical change in our foreign policy and marked the beginning of Air Corps expansion which then peaked in 1944.

President Roosevelt had urged that $300 million be appropriated to purchase aircraft for the Army. On 16 May 1940, with the extension of the war in western Europe including the fall of France and the Battle of Britain, the President called for an annual output of 50,000 aircraft and equal air strength between the Army and the Navy. The American aircraft industry was asked to expand its normal capacity of 2,000 planes a year to more than 4,000 a month, an increase of 2,400 percent over the previous year. The proximity of the war in Western Europe lent a grim incentive to American efforts.\(^\text{12}\) As a result, by the time the United States entered World War II, the Air Corps had in production heavy bombers--B-17s and B-24s, medium bombers--B-25s and B-

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 101-108.
26s, light bombers--A-20s and A-24s, and pursuits--P-38s, P-39s, P-40s, and P-47s.

Preparation by the United States for World War II

The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor thrust the United States into a war for survival. Consequently, the nation’s forces were marshalled on land, on sea, and in the air. Uniquely, for the first time in military history, air power was employed as a striking force. This factor drastically altered the course and nature of the struggle and decisively influenced the outcome.

Where did American air power come from? It was the product of men and machines. It also depended upon practical and usable ideas. The air force, still in its infancy, had neither traditions nor theories developed over long centuries of experience. Air warfare entered the war scene with dramatic suddenness and, in an incredibly short time, presented awesome and revolutionary weapons of destruction. Consequently, human imagination was staggered by this new medium which required vision for optimum use for both offense and defense. Beyond this challenge, stakes were enormously high in terms of national power and survival.

According to Major George Fielding Eliot, the history of civilization recounts three revolutionary military inventions or discoveries: discipline, gunpowder, and the airplane. The airplane has provided warfare not only the means of striking the enemy's army or navy, but also the ability to hit directly the source and seat of power, the citizenry, the capital city, and the political,
industrial, and commercial centers without having to overthrow the enemy's armed forces.\textsuperscript{13}

The Development of Air Doctrine

The development of air doctrine is a story of an unprecedented intellectual achievement involving bold imagination, stern logic, and new patterns of thought. Persistence was also evident in the face of fierce opposition, vested interest, and rigid thinking. By the time the crucial test came in 1941, America had the makings of air power—both the men and machines as well as a carefully developed doctrine which could readily be translated into a plan of military action. While the soundness of that doctrine has been affirmed by the positive results of America's air war, it is important to examine the correct and incorrect steps taken by the air arm during its formative period between 1917 and 1941 which ultimately led to the creation of the Flying Tigers.\textsuperscript{14} Table 2 outlines the development of United States air doctrine before entry into World War II.

\textsuperscript{13} Greer, vii.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., vii.
Table 2

Development of United States Air Doctrine 1917 - 1941\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917 - 1918</td>
<td>Army Air Arm</td>
<td>Only test of American airmen and equipment prior to World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919 - 1926</td>
<td>Heroic Age of Doctrinal Development</td>
<td>Army Air Corps established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 - 1935</td>
<td>Air Force Idea</td>
<td>Technological advances in airplane design and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of the GHQ Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1939</td>
<td>Refinement and Substantiation of the Long-range Bomber Concept</td>
<td>Created Office of the Chief of the Air Corps (OCAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 - 1941</td>
<td>Preparation of Air Doctrine for World War II</td>
<td>AWPD/1 document approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Army Air Force established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fight for Air Force Autonomy

The agitation for a separate branch did not come from the airmen, but rather it emanated from Rep. James Hay, Chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, in February 1913. The proposed bill would have created a separate Air Corps as a line component of the Army. Hearings showed, however, that most military men, including flyers, were opposed to separation at that time. For example, acting Chief Signal Officer Col. George P. Scriven felt that aviators were young men without the requisite scientific knowledge and mature judgement. Other future leaders of American air power such as Benjamin D. Foulois, Henry H. Arnold, and William Mitchell thought it was

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., v-vi.
too early for a separate Air Corps but that separation was only a matter of
time. Captain Paul Beck, another leader, favored separation and charged that
the longer the Signal Corps controlled aeronautics, the smaller the potential for
autonomy. As a result, the rift between aviators and their non-flying superiors
continued to widen.

American forces in 1917 also had to move from the field of theory to
the field of action. This tended to strengthen the influence of the ground
officers because the war had to be fought with available weapons, and the
battle on the Western Front was already frozen in a complex pattern of ground
operations. It was a struggle of infantry, trenches, and artillery; of attack and
counterattack; of attrition and reinforcement. The high command regarded air
operations as an adjunct to the mighty ground forces which had been
committed to mortal and decisive combat rather than as a strength unto itself.

A proponent of an autonomous air force, General Billy Mitchell was
court-martialed for unbecoming conduct on 17 December 1925 and was
suspended from duty for five years. After he resigned from the army on 27
January 1926, the supporters of air power retreated in disillusionment to more
moderate ground. As a result, the Army Air Corps was created in 1926.

After 1926, the tenor of the arguments changed because of technological
advances in aircraft design and production. Many new developments like the
creation of the high-speed bomber, the two-engine B-9 and B-10, and the
four-engine B-17 Flying Fortress as well as the move of the Air Corps Tactical
School from Langley to Maxwell Field, Alabama, helped the cause of autonomy. At Maxwell Field, airmen were able to wrestle vigorously with problems such as the nature of war, the employment of air power, and the tactical doctrines of aviation. The General Headquarters (GHQ) Air Force became a reality in 1935.16

Struggles in China, Ethiopia, and Spain during the 1930s were neither major wars nor real trials of modern air power. They were, instead, limited proving grounds for weapons and techniques of aviation support. The new direction was not set until President Roosevelt promoted air power build-up in 1937. On 1 March 1939, Roosevelt gave jurisdiction of the GHQ Air Force to the Chief of the Air Corps and created the Office of the Chief of the Air Corps (OCAC).17

By 1939, the development of air doctrine accelerated because of Hitler's obvious bid for superiority. As more and more of the countries of the world became involved in the struggle against Axis domination, the pressure to add to the demand for powerful military aviation became intense. In July 1941, the United States air planners in Washington were required to transform their theories of air doctrine into a practical plan for air action against the nation's potential enemies. This document was designated AWPD/1 and was submitted

16 Greer, 44-75.

17 Ibid., 76-106.
to and approved by the War Department. AWPD/1 served as the actual blueprint for air operations against the Axis powers.

The War Department and Congress finally understood the need for an autonomous air force. Consequently, the Army Air Force was established on 20 June 1941 in Army Regulation 95-5. Directed by a chief who also served as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Air and coordinated all the activities of military aviation, the commander was aided by the Chief of the Air Corps, who was still charged primarily with training and material, and by the Commanding General, Air Force Combat Command, which was a redesignation for GHQ Air Force. In addition, an Air Council comprised of the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, the Chief of Army Air Forces, the Chief of the War Plans Division, the Chief of the Air Corps, the Commanding General of the Air Force Combat Command, and other members as appointed by the Secretary was established to make periodic reviews and to coordinate major aviation projects of the Army. This was the organizational structure in place for the United States Air Force on 7 December 1941. (See Appendix C, Organizational Chart and Tactical Unit History).\(^{18}\) The infrastructure for successful air power was now in place.

\(^{18}\) Greer, 107-127.
The Birth of the 22nd Bomb Squadron

Prior to its reorganization as the 22nd Bomb Squadron in 1938, the 22nd Aero Shooting Star Squadron saw action on the Western Front during World War I from September 1918 until the Armistice, 11 November 1918. Based at Belrain, Souilly, and Toulon, France, it fought as a pursuit squadron, and the unit shot down thirty-five German planes and sustained the loss of seventeen pilots. An exemplary leader, Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz, then a lieutenant, was among the daredevils who flew the rickety airplanes, started the 22nd on its historical path, and won a Distinguished Flying Cross (DFC) for shooting down two enemy aircraft. 19 Three years before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, on 1 November 1938, the 22nd Bomb Squadron (H) 20, 7th Bomb Group (H), was reorganized at Hamilton Field, California.

The 22nd Bomb Squadron at the Beginning of World War II

On 7 December 1941, the 22nd Bomb Squadron was a part of the 7th Bomb Group and was comprised of B-17s; therefore, it was considered a heavy-bomb group unit. At the moment of the Japanese attack, some of this group were flying unarmed to Pearl Harbor from their base on the mainland. They were forced to circle helplessly while the Japanese fighters and bombers were


20 H denotes heavy bombers.
unleashing their missiles on United States territory. Historically, this incident gave rise to the 22nd Bomb Squadron, which later became part of the Flying Tigers, in World War II.21

The Rebirth of the 22nd Bomb Squadron, Bombing Eagles, in 1942

According to official records, the 22nd Bomb Squadron was activated, or reborn, pursuant to General Order (GO) #84, Headquarters, 3rd Air Force, Tampa, Florida, dated 26 April 1942, retroactive to 4 April 1942. Attached to the 17th Bombardment Group (M)22 for training and personnel, the 22nd Bomb Squadron was assigned through Special Order (SO) #71, Columbia Army Air Base, SO #5, 67th Observation Group, Sub Base, Esler Field, Louisiana, SO #116, Key Field, Mississippi, and by further orders attached to the 17th Bomb Group and other organizations for rations.23 The insignia under which the Bombing Eagles flew is located in Appendix D.

The development of the 22nd Bomb Squadron can be traced from its military infancy in Columbia, South Carolina, through the year 1942. In that year, it became a full-fledged bombing unit in the China-Burma-India (CBI)

---

21 Historical Research Agency (Hq USAF HRC), 22nd Bomb Squadron, 1941-1945, Documents - Copies on File, (Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 7-20 July 1994), 1941 Files.

22 M denotes medium bombers.

23 Historical Research Agency (Hq USAF HRC), 22nd Bomb Squadron, 1941-1945, Documents - Copies on File, (Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 7-20 July 1994), 1942 Files.
Theater, part of the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Combat, under the command of the United States Army Air Force. The new recruits came from Georgia, New Jersey, Washington, and Kansas; from Fort Worth, Chicago, New York City, and Portland; from large cities, small towns, and farms. They had been machinists, farmers, jewelers, singers, teachers, doctors, and factory workers. Some had made their careers with the army, while others had just entered. The national emergency known as World War II had transformed them into pilots, bombardiers, mechanics, ambulance drivers, bomb sight experts, and supply clerks. From widely separated camps, they were expedited to Columbia, South Carolina, the birthplace and nucleus of the squadron.24

Deployment began shortly after Pearl Harbor. The 22nd Bomb Squadron (H) Engineering Section moved to Amberly Field, thirty-five miles from Brisbane, Australia, on 24 December 1941. That group remained there to assemble P-40 fighters and A-24 dive bombers. The 22nd and 11th Bomb Squadrons (H) embarked on board the U.S.S. President Polk on 17 January 1942 and arrived at Java about 28 January 1942. Further, the Air Echelon began to reach Java about 3 January 1942 under the command of Major Hobson. On the night of 25 February 1942, the 22nd and 11th Bomb Squadrons (H) evacuated Java and returned to Australia in order to become part of the 19th Bomb Group (H). Before they could reach Australia,

24 Ibid., 1942 Files.
however, they were redirected to India and arrived in Karachi on 13 March 1942. In the meantime, the remainder of the 7th Bomb Group (H), consisting of the Headquarters Squadron, 9th Bomb Squadron, and 88th Reconnaissance Squadron, attached, sailed from Brisbane, Australia, on 4 February 1942 to join the Air Echelon in Java.25

On 26 April 1942 at Columbia, South Carolina, the Ground Echelon of the 22nd Bomb Squadron (M) was activated and embarked from Charleston on 28 May 1942 bound for India to operate with the 7th Bomb Group. The Air Echelon of the original 22nd Bomb Squadron (M), formed from Project #157 at Columbia was commanded by Lt. Blair M. Sorensen and was composed of officers and enlisted men from the 17th Bomb Group and the 89th Reconnaissance Squadron of the Columbia Army Air Base. The Air Echelon embarked for Morrison Field, West Palm Beach, Florida, after two weeks of training in Columbia and were joined by members of the 11th Bomb Squadron's Air Echelon which was part of the same squadron. The first flight departed the continental limits of the United States on 1 May 1942, destination Karachi, India, via Pan American Airways' South Atlantic Ferry Route.

Not everyone made it to India. One leader, Lt. Daniel E. Kelly, landed in Vichy French territory, and he and his crew were interned for the duration of World War II. Lt. Eero A. Wiitala, another leader, ran out of fuel and

25 Ibid., 1942 Files.
landed on a beach on the coast of Liberia damaging his landing gear. The airplane was later salvaged for parts. Lt. Keith H. Thomas and crew on yet another plane were presumed lost in a thunderstorm approximately thirty minutes after taking off at Accra. They were never found. With only minor repairs, the remainder of the squadron arrived at Karachi, India, on 16 May 1942, with Lt. Joseph L. Skeldon, Lt. Robert V. Ford, and Lt. Blair M. Sorensen and their crews arriving first.

War duties began immediately. Lieutenant Sorensen was directed to fly a secret mission to China for the purpose of surveying the possibility of operating aircraft in combat there. The 11th Bomb Squadron was reorganized and combined with crews from the 22nd Bomb Squadron to bring it to full strength. The 11th Bomb Squadron then flew to China where they stayed until the end of the war. The remaining crews of the 22nd Bomb Squadron were attached to the Headquarters and Headquarters Squadron of the 7th Bomb Group (H) and were assigned special duties throughout India such as reconnaissance, coastal patrol work, and bombing missions to Burma.²⁶

On 15 September 1942, the 22nd Bomb Squadron was made a part of the 341st Bomb Group, Tenth Air Force, by General Order #5, Karachi Air Defense Area, Karachi, India. That meant that the 22nd Bomb Squadron had become a full-fledged member of the CBI theater of operations within the

²⁶ Ibid., 1942 Files.
Asiatic-Pacific Theater. In addition, the 491st Bomb Squadron was activated and assigned to the 341st Bomb Group. To lead the 491st Bomb Squadron, 1st Lt. James D. Pigg, 1st Lt. Edward Garrett, and 2nd Lt. Frank I. Redman were assigned.

The Problem of Leadership in the CBI Theater

Six Army air forces figured in the CBI equation:

- Fifth (Southwest Pacific)
- Seventh (Central Pacific)
- Tenth (India-Burma)
- Eleventh (North Pacific)
- Thirteenth (South Pacific)
- Fourteenth (China)

Widely scattered throughout the Pacific and the CBI, these separate air forces performed in isolation. As a result, they became characterized by the quality of their leaders so that each was unique. Further, the war against Japan lacked unity of command which exaggerated the eccentricities of the groups. While United States forces in World War II reflected a somewhat disjointed nature from theater to theater, the goal, in theory at least, was to undergird all operations with an over-all strategy formulated by the Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS) and with a common dependence upon a single pool for material resources.
Two particular problems inhibited the success of the Allies. The logistical problem in CBI was more formidable than in any other theater because of the distance from either the United States or the United Kingdom. Compounding the problem, transport facilities were unequal to wartime needs. Even China was totally dependent for supplies upon airlifts operating under grave natural and military hazards.\(^{27}\)

The second problem was the lack of a common objective besides the defeat of Japan among the Allied powers. Because the political aims of the Chinese, the British, and the Americans diverged substantially, any agreement on strategy was forestalled, and a command system of bewildering complexity was fostered. Even among United States generals there was a lamentable lack of accord.

The United States was quite clear on its goal in the CBI Theater. The chief aim was to help keep China in the war by providing lend-lease materials and technical assistance. This objective involved little in the way of ground force commitments, so service and air forces constituted the main contribution. The Tenth Air Force's mission was to protect the *Hump* air route over the Himalayan mountain range between India and China by which China was nourished and to aid in clearing a trace for the Ledo Road which was to supplement the airlift with a ground line of communication (LOC) from Burma

\(^{27}\) Perret, vii.
to Kunning. The Fourteenth Air Force in China helped guard the Hump Route, aided Chinese ground operations, and attacked Japanese air forces and shipping.\textsuperscript{28} (Refer to Appendix E for appreciation from the Chinese.)

The Tenth Air Force

Air transport played a unique role in China where the Hump airlift was the sole means of supply and where air activities were limited less by the size of United States forces than by the tonnage available for fuel, bombs, and ammunition. In the CBI Theater, primitive rail and highway systems imposed a heavy brake on the movement of material. Supply and maintenance suffered also from a dearth of proper facilities handicapped by low priorities and difficult lines of communication. On the bright side, improvements occurred eventually so that some rear-area bases were comparatively well-equipped. At advance bases, however, facilities remained primitive, temporary, and makeshift. As a result, aviation engineers developed great skill in the rapid development of airstrips and other installations, and stories of ingenious improvisations in maintenance and modification have become almost legendary. At times, however, the plentiful use of bailing wire and tin cans could not keep the planes operable in spite of Yankee ingenuity.

Primitive conditions in the forward bases affected men as well as machines. In the tropical jungles of India and the crude situation of China,

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., viii.
climate, disease, and fatigue took their toll. Air crews and ground crews lived constantly in tents and on field rations. War is not intended to be pleasant and the circumstances that shape morale are complex; however, the Pacific and Asiatic theaters generally suffered in comparison with the European Theaters of Operations (ETO) and the Mediterranean Theater of Operations (MTO) insofar as the Army Air Force (AAF) was concerned.29

Conflict Within the Tenth Air Force

Even before the United States entered World War II, President Roosevelt appointed Gen. Claire Chennault (Appendix F), a retired career military man, to assist China in its defense against Japan. Chennault, an instructor at Maxwell Air Force Base, was a leader and free-thinker, not a yes man who followed instructions without questioning. He was able to develop a positive relationship on behalf of the United States with both Chiang-Kai-Shek and Mao Tse-Tung, Chinese leaders, so that the president could initiate a lend-lease program for supplies and equipment with them. Chennault, who had written a book on pursuit flying, also became the leader of the American Volunteer Group (AVG), a band of mercenaries consisting of pilots and mechanics who received a $500 bonus from the Chinese for every Japanese plane they shot down.

29 Ibid., ix-xiii.
A significant part of General Chennault's plan was his demand of a free hand in the employment of air forces in China; he disliked subordination to the Tenth Air Force. Friction had developed with Gen. Bissell, who came to the CBI theater as Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell's air adviser and later became commanding general of the Tenth Air Force. In fact, Bissell was purposely given one day's seniority over Chennault in his promotion to brigadier general.

On the other hand, Chennault enjoyed the special confidence of Chiang Kai-shek and the applause of the Chinese people. The Generalissimo had been disappointed by the failure of the Americans to place a larger air force in China, and he was suspicious of British influence over the India-based Tenth Air Force. He seemed also to have anticipated making use of the proposed change in command arrangements to resurrect the moribund Chinese Air Force which included trained pilots but had no aircraft. These issues, rooted in differing concepts of strategy, came into focus at the beginning of 1943 with the question of an independent air force for Chennault.30

The Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS) met at Casablanca in January 1943 to discuss the intrinsically complex problem of the CBI Theater. General Stilwell persisted in the belief that it would be necessary to reopen a land route to China using Chinese armies which he had trained and would lead. After all, he had already trained 45,000 Chinese troops at Ramgarh, India, in the

---

30 Craven and Cate, 436-437.
summer and fall of 1942 as the $X$ Force. He had twenty-seven divisions of Chinese in Yunan Province, the $Y$ Force, to collaborate with his $X$ Force. He would then use the $X$ and $Y$ forces as a pincer movement forcing the Japanese out of Northern Burma. His plan was to build a new road behind the $X$ Force as it advanced southeastward from Ledo in India until land communications could be reestablished with China by the juncture of the two forces.

Chennault bitterly opposed this strategy because he felt that Stilwell had overlooked a unique opportunity to use air weapons. In addition, he strongly believed that Stilwell's strategy would only prolong the war and that the manpower should be used to construct additional airfields in Assam, India, and China for the building of an effective air force in China. Chennault proposed instead to destroy Japanese air power in China by employing 500 aircraft deployed from Chinese bases. This modest use of air power would be more strategically located and would be better able to infiltrate the most vulnerable points held by the Japanese.\(^{31}\)

The 22nd Bomb Squadron's mission for 1943 was to support the campaign in Burma to rid the Japanese of their positions. Flying out of Chakulia, India, their responsibility was to harass and destroy the enemy by sea and by land. Although hampered by monsoons and inadequate supplies, they were successful.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 435-436.
The Japanese ground forces, supported by their Navy, had moved swiftly north in Burma and were opposed by the British Burma 1st Division, the Indian 17th Division, and the Chinese 5th and 6th Army under the command of General Stilwell. The Japanese outnumbered the Allied defenders in Burma, drove toward Toungoo, and attacked Magwe Airfield, destroying nine Blenheim bombers and three AVG P-40s and shooting down three defending Hurricane fighters. On 2 April 1942, Prome, on the Irrawaddy River, fell.

Shortly after, the Japanese carrier force of six moved into the Indian Ocean. Airplanes of their strike force sank the British cruisers *Dorsetshire* and *Cornwall*, heavily bombed Colombo and Trincomalee on Ceylon Island, raided shipping on the Indian Ocean and in the Bay of Bengal, sank fifteen ships, and sank the British aircraft carrier *Hermes*. The Japanese ships landed reinforcements at Rangoon on 6 April 1942. Magwe and Meiktila were evacuated before the fast-moving enemy and the fall of Lashio, the terminus of the Burma Road into China, completed the total blockade of China by the Japanese.

At this point, the Japanese controlled central Burma, so the Allied forces were ordered back to positions along the Indian border. Mandalay was evacuated on 30 April; Akyab, on 4 May; Myitkyina, on 8 May 1942. Allied forces subsequently established themselves north and south of Kalewa along the Naga Hills and the Chin Hills. Imphal, India, then became the hub behind
the new lines. The fighting dwindled as the Monsoon season arrived and the Japanese immediately began consolidating their vast gains in Burma.32

Col. Robert L. Scott, one of Colonel Haynes' ABC Ferry pilots, longed to fly a fighter rather than a transport. In April 1942, he convinced Claire L. Chennault, leader of the American Volunteer Group (AVG), that he could do something about the Japanese planes roaming free over northern Burma and endangering the flights of the ABC Ferry. Chennault gave Scott permission to take over the next P-40 arriving in India on its way to China. Colonel Scott took the P40-E to Dinjan, had a shark mouth painted on the nose, and flew it on 30 April 1942.

On 5 May, Colonel Scott flew alone, hunting the enemy from Myitkyina to Lashio, and he spotted a twin-engine Sally bomber being refuelled in a corner of Lashio Airfield. He flew three passes, shot up the bomber which caught fire, and watched it burn. This was the first Japanese plane destroyed by a Tenth Air Force fighter. On the same mission, Scott also effectively strafed a column of Japanese troops and set four trucks on fire. In sixty-three days through the 1st of July, he and his lone P-40 E flew 371 hours, sometimes flying as many as four missions a day. He was a one-man fighter force over Burma, striking at troops, gun positions, vehicles, and barges. He even flew a few missions from China with the Flying Tigers. At the beginning of July 1942,

Scott was ordered to leave the ferry service and take command of the newly activated 23rd Fighter Group.  

From June-October 1942, ground fighting was minimal in Burma near the Indian border during the monsoon season, and both sides secured their positions. Brig. Gen. Earl S. Naiden became the third commander of the Tenth Air Force on 26 June 1942. On 4 July 1942, the AVG’s were disbanded in China and its planes and some of its pilots were inducted into the 23rd Fighter Group and activated the same day in Kunming. The 23rd was a mixture of the AVG, new pilots, and a Ground Echelon that had traveled from the United States to India along with the Headquarters section of the Tenth Air Force. The 23rd Fighter Group, plus the 16th Fighter Squadron and the 11th Bomb Squadron (B-25 Mitchells), was placed under command of the China Air Task Force (CATF), a Tenth Air Force sub-command activated 4 July 1942 with Chennault as its commander. In March 1943, the CTAF became the Fourteenth Air Force with Chennault as commanding general. The Tenth Air Force in India had two weak groups with few aircraft—the partially equipped 51st Fighter Group and the slightly better furnished 7th Bomb Group, now a composite bomb group with heavy and medium squadrons. Of its two medium squadrons, the 11th was in China flying with CATF and the 22nd was non-operational, lacking aircraft, spare parts, and personnel. Created

33 Ibid., 9.
from almost nothing out of the ashes of the Java campaign, the 22nd was no better off than when it had started.\textsuperscript{34}

The 22nd Bomb Squadron during 1943

During 1943, the squadron members loyally flew and fought as they had been trained to do. They were unaware of any of the administrative and leadership controversies taking place in upper echelons within the CBI Theater which vitally affected their life-and-death struggles for survival.

The Fourteenth Air Force, \textit{Bombing Bulldogs}, during 1944 in Yangkai, China

The 22nd Bomb Squadron (M), United States Army Air Force, was transferred from the Tenth Air Force to the Fourteenth Air Force in January 1944. The advance echelon of the squadron departed from Chakulia, India, on 7 January 1944 and arrived in Yangkai, China, the next day. By the end of the month, nearly all squadron personnel had been transported to the new station. Some of the personnel and equipment were transported over the \textit{Hump} by Air Transport Command (ATC) in C-46s, C-47s, and C-54s, and some by squadron B-25 Mitchells. The 22nd Bomb Squadron’s strength for that month included 74 officers and 268 enlisted men. Six were missing in action as of 23 January, but they had not yet been dropped from the records; an additional 39 were

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
transferred. The insignia of the *Bombing Bulldogs* is located in Appendix G.

Many more men arrived in Yangkai during February 1944. The B-25 Mitchells which were waiting for engine changes at Chakulia and Chabua flew over the Hump as soon as they were able. The challenge for these planes was to fly at 18,000 feet using the super-charger. This required that all crew members wear oxygen masks when the temperature plummeted to below freezing. Even with using the super-charger, however, the fully-loaded aircraft struggled to maintain altitude and stability. Consequently, the trip over the Hump was a frightening experience even for the most hardened combat men. One group, in particular, who traveled in an unarmed transport sighted four Japanese Zero fighter aircraft which, fortunately, did not attack.

The types of missions were different from the Burma milk runs; flying in this theater became exciting with the low-level, mast-high missions. In the few weeks of operations, both the 22nd and the 491st Bomb Squadrons had inflicted such damage that this section of the Hanoi-Saigon railroad was closed to traffic for several months. The difficulties of February with bad weather, unfamiliar terrain, new bombing techniques, and plane and personnel losses all added up to a different story: each crew returning from a successful mission reported something new. High altitude and mass bombing of a pin-point target

---

35 Historical Research Agency (Hq USAF HRC), *341st Bomb Group 1941 - 1945 Documents*, (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL), 1944 Files.
were no longer routine. Instead, at most high levels the pilot could see the
direct results of the attack. These missions required every crew member to
engage his resourcefulness because they were all directly involved in the action.
Even though the danger of each mission increased, the flying was never dull.36

The squadron divided geographically around the first of May. Eleven
combat and ground crews were at Yunnanyi while the rest of the outfit
remained at Yangkai. This venture was poorly planned because the length of
the runway and the height of the surrounding hills made it inadvisable to use
the field for tactical operations. On 6 May, Major Weatherly led the formation
of planes with skeleton crews back to Yangkai, and the rest of the attachment
followed by Air Transport Command (ATC) and motor convoy.

The squadron was fortunate to have no member missing or killed in
action during July, but a tragedy occurred that gravely affected all personnel.
Chaplain Thomas Clare was lost on a mission over the Hump. Returning to
the United States to join his family, Chaplain Clare was flying in a B-24 four-
engine bomber converted to a cargo/transport airplane. Sadly, it never
reached its destination at Chabua, most likely having crashed in the mountains.
This was not a solitary misfortune either. It was this tragedy, however, that
capped the first two years since the 22nd Bomb Squadron had been born at
Columbia, South Carolina. Despite a series of distressing growing pains, the

36 Ibid., 1944 Files.
22nd Bomb Squadron developed into an effective arm of the Tenth Air Force and later the Fourteenth Air Force.

In July 1944, Major Loren S. Nickels replaced Major Edison C. Weatherly, squadron commander since October 1943. Major Nickels, an old China veteran with a good understanding of the problems of the CBI Theater, had been Operations Officer with the 341st Bomb Group and the 11th Bomb Squadron. With renewed high morale, the squadron flew 99 sorties with 76 tons of bombs dropped, a record since their arrival in China despite the intermittent bad weather. Similarly, September 1944 surpassed July as the month with the greatest number of flights in spite of consistently bad weather conditions. Although grounded several days at a time, when the sun shone and the weather officer gave the go-ahead, they flew a lot. That month there were 113 sorties with 94 tons of bombs dropped on the enemy.

In October, command changed again. Major Philip Main assumed command of the 22nd Bomb Squadron, relieving Major Loren Nickels who returned to the interior zone. The total squadron strength that month was 313, and eight missions were flown by forty-two Mitchells. October 1944 wound up to be a dismal month of a tragic year, and with the recall of General Stilwell under extremely veiled and cloudy circumstances, the spirits of many an American in China reached a new low.37

---

37 Ibid., 1944 Files.
The End of World War II

Results of the efforts of the 22nd Bomb Squadron were difficult to evaluate because their targets were part of a long-range offense strategy. Missions covered a variety of targets including military installations, storage areas, and highway bridges. Towards the end of the operation, the squadron contributed direct support to the Chinese ground offensive and were awarded special commendation from the field commander as a result. For example, within two weeks of the squadron's last sortie, the Burma-Ledo Road was declared officially open and the first convoy reached China. In total, the squadron had flown 385 sorties and dropped 286 tons of frags, incendiaries, and demolition bombs with only one serious injury. When the fighting was over at the end of 1944, the detachment broke camp and returned to the base by plane and truck convoy.

Rotations out of the CBI Theater increased by the end of 1944. Even after discharge, however, safety was not assured. For example, in February 1945, all but one of the squadron members who had left early that month to return to the United States were reported missing somewhere between Chabua and Karachi, India. Details of the crash were reported in a letter by T/Sgt. Marvin Jacobs, the sole survivor. The transport had somehow wandered off course and crashed in the mountains of Tibet. Jacobs, fortunately, escaped with only a broken ankle and a severe shaking up. The locals who found him and took him to their village where he stayed for two weeks before two other
men were able to parachute to him. For an additional ten days, Jacobs and his rescuers constructed a landing strip for an L-5, a light single engine aircraft with short field landing and take-off capabilities used in World War II for air ambulance service, which eventually brought Jacobs back to a hospital in India. This was the second similar tragedy and a bitter irony in squadron history in which successful combatants never made it home.

In February 1945, the 22nd Bomb Squadron was commanded by Lt. Col. Philip Main and based at Yangkai. In March, however, seven more 22nd Bomb Squadron men were heroically killed in action flying combat missions against the Japanese enemy. Only six missions were flown in April. While American troops were perceived to possess high morale and lots of supplies, the battle waged in the CBI Theater by the 22nd Bomb Squadron was somewhat different. Either bad weather, no gasoline, no bombs, or no ammunition meant no combat missions. In the meantime, the combat crews were prepared to fly and fight; when unable to, their morale began to slump.

The Death of President Roosevelt

On April 13, 1945, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt died. Aside from the shock of the event itself, war-related concerns dominated conversations everywhere in the CBI Theater. How would the president’s demise affect the current war, the future hope for peace, and conditions at home? The flag flown at half-mast served as a daily reminder of the nation’s
loss. In office since 1932, Roosevelt had been in office so long that most of the squadron could not remember another President. The belated air-mail editions of *Time* and *Newsweek* in this time of grief were additional reminders of their isolation and their slim contact with the United States and the war throughout the rest of the world.\(^\text{38}\)

**The War Winds Down**

Although the war in the CBI Theater had not yet ended, victory in Europe, V-E Day, following Germany's unconditional surrender was great news. The celebration was cut short, however, because the 22nd Bomb Squadron flew another mission the next day. The day after that, the squadron was jolted once again into the reality of war with fifteen airplanes on a coordinated medium altitude attack on Pao Ching, China. One of these planes was hit directly in the pilot's cock-pit, crashed, and exploded on the west side of the Tzu Kiang River directly across from Pao Ching. The battle in China was definitely not over yet.

The squadron was to celebrate its third anniversary overseas in May, but orders from higher headquarters postponed the celebration because of an important mission the next day. Even though only five missions flew that

\(^{38}\) Historical Research Agency (Hq USAF HRC), 341st Bomb Group 1941 - 1945 Documents, (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL), 1945 Files.
month, costly losses included two aircraft and thirteen combat crew members.\textsuperscript{39} By 27 June, the squadron was able to observe its third anniversary overseas in spite of inclement weather.

Administratively, the \textit{Bombing Bulldogs} were, for the most part, functioning well. The squadron Supply and Maintenance departments were operating smoothly except for shortages in supply items and parts needed for maintenance all over China. Of the B-25s, 92 percent were in commission throughout the month of June. In addition, communications on base and in the air were excellent; however, the telephone and teletype lines to Kunming were often down. At the same time, much to everyone's surprise, the old reliable B-25 Mitchell was to be replaced by its more modern counterpart, the A-26 Invader. As a result, a large number of the combat personnel were expected to be sent to Fenni, India, for four weeks of transition training, and the squadron looked forward to a superior combat plane which might hasten the end of the war.

The 22nd Bomb Squadron Changes

The real surprise in July 1945 was that the Fourteenth Air Force Commander, Maj Gen. Claire Chennault, had resigned and returned to the United States. That month also marked the beginning of the 22nd Bomb Squadron as a B-25 (M) squadron. (See Appendix H for diagrams of B-25s

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 1945 Files.
and A-26s. Almost immediately, it became an A-26 Light/Attack (L)\textsuperscript{40} fighter-bomber squadron scheduled to move from Yangkai to bases somewhere on the coast of China, probably Foochow which could be used as a staging area. The goal was for the A-26s to make direct attack flights to mainland Japan. Although the Japanese Emperor clearly believed that the Japanese military was invincible, reality demonstrated poundings by B-29s on Tokyo, Nagoya, Osaka, and Kobe. In fact, Nagoya was hit again with a ten-day fire blitz that destroyed over thirty-one square miles. As a result, the Japanese were relying on the wholesale use of \textit{kamikaze} or suicide attacks against assaulting fleets because the only remaining pilots were inadequately trained replacements who were no match for the United States crews. The United States air offensive on Japan destroyed sixty-six cities, counting the two hit by atom bombs, and burned out 178 square miles before the Emperor decided to surrender.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{L} refers to light planes.

\textsuperscript{41} Craven and Cate, xviii-xx.
The War in Asia Ends

The sudden and tragic end to the war on September 2, 1945, *V-J Day*, was astounding since startling scientific developments rather than direct combat precipitated it. As a result of the successful assault on Japan with the atom bomb, those with the technology--the United States, Great Britain, and Canada--commanded the world. At the 22nd Bomb Squadron still stationed in China lengthy discussions argued and speculated on the potential effects of atomic warpower on the future of the world.  

---
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CHAPTER 4

THE IMPORTANCE OF *THE FLYING TIGERS* TO THE SUCCESS
OF THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR II

The 341st Bomb Group, 69th Composite Wing,
Fourteenth Air Force, the *Flying Tigers*

The 341st Bomb Group, activated in India on 15 September 1942,
battled against heavy odds in the CBI Theater. The Japanese, for example,
had cut off the Burma Road by conquering the greater part of Burma and were
threatening to move into India. The job of supplying American units in China
had to be accomplished by transport planes flying from India over the 18,000
foot Himalayas; therefore, few pilots and planes were available to the Chinese
and Indians.

From September through the end of 1942, the 341st Bomb Group was
not yet in suitable condition to commence operations from bases in India
against the Japanese in Burma. Comprised of the 11th and 22nd Bomb
Squadrons which had been assigned to the 7th Bombardment Group (H) and
the 490th and 491st Bomb Squadrons, which were new, the only combat ready
unit was the 11th Bomb Squadron operating under the China Air Task Force
(CATF) in Kunming, China. The other three squadrons as well as the 341st
Group Headquarters were at Karachi, India. Three months later, with additional equipment and personnel, all but the 11th Bomb Squadron, which was stationed in China, moved from Karachi on the west coast of India across the continent to Chakulia and Ondal near Calcutta. The B-25s prepared to strike against targets in central Burma from there.¹

The B-25s of the 341st Bomb Group, using the bases at Chakulia and Ondal as lay-back bases and Argatala as the forward staging field, struck at bridges, locomotives, railroad yards, trackage, and rolling stock in the Moneya-Mandalay-Gokteik region in central Burma; and they ranged as far north as Myitkyina and as far south as Thazi. The main objective of these bombing attacks was to delay the movement of supplies from southern Burma to the Japanese troops fighting in northern Burma.

The bombing of the Myitnge Bridge illustrated the difficulties encountered by the 341st Bomb Group. The bridge, ten miles south of Mandalay, was situated just above the junction of the only two rail lines running from southern Burma. A most vital link in the 2,060 miles of rail lines in Burma, the Myitnge Bridge was a four-span, single-track, steel structure 610 feet long. On 1 January 1943, six B-25s loaded with 500 pound bombs struck at the bridge and scored four hits on the north and south approaches and three on the southern span. Nine days later the Mitchells repeated their effort, but

they were not successful; B-24s of another group, on the other hand, caused extensive damage. The job of the 341st was to discourage the Japanese as they attempted to repair the bridge. On 16 January 1943, five B-25s bombed the bridge with 500 pounders destroying the southern approach which temporarily suspended renovations. This scenario repeated itself many times during the year.  

This cyclical bridge-busting process discouraged the B-25 pilots and crews. In addition, an enormous tonnage of bombs was expended with comparatively small results. Several causes contributed to this bombing ineffectiveness. First, the bridges were constructed so that only a direct hit with a properly-fused, general-purpose bomb inflicted serious damage. Any delay in detonation would allow the bomb to pass through the super-structure of the bridge and fall harmlessly into the water beneath. Second, the B-25s often bombed at high altitudes. A reliable delayed-action fuse was necessary for low-altitude bombing as well as adequate fighter protection. 

Squadron Relocation

Towards the end of 1943, the 22nd and 491st Bomb Squadrons and the 341st GHQ joined the 11th Squadron at Yangkai, China. Only the 490th Squadron was left behind to carry on the fight against the Japanese in Burma.

---

2 Ibid., 341st 1942-1945 Files.
3 Ibid., 341st 1942-1945 Files.
Because of the difficulty in blowing up bridges, the Allied ground forces had made little progress in driving the Japanese out of Burma even as late as the summer of 1944.

On 1 January 1944, Maj. Robert A. Erdin accidentally discovered the trick for destroying bridges while piloting a B-25 at tree-top level the Mu River Bridge. A large tree loomed up dead ahead, and he quickly flew his plane upwards to avoid the tree. By the time he brought the plane to the previous attack level, he was over the target. Cursing his bad luck and believing the tree had ruined the approach, he ordered the bombs to be dumped. The crew looked back expecting to see how much the bombs missed the target. Much to their amazement, two spans of the bridge toppled into the river. This chance discovery combined with added refinements became known as Glip bombing, a combination of glide and skip, and fostered success in wrecking bridges which, in turn, destroyed enemy supply lines.4 (See Appendix I, Distinguished Unit Citation)

As a result of Erdin's discovery, the Allied offensive against Japan began during the summer of 1944. The American, British, Indian, and Chinese forces advanced down the Hukawng Valley of northern Burma besieged Myitkyina. The B-25s of the 490th Squadron provided low-level air support by strafing and bombing troop concentrations as well as by striking at the bridges leading into

---

4 Ibid., 341st 1942-1945 Files.
Myitkyina. The Japanese were in retreat when Myitkyina fell in August 1944. The 490th then also bombed Indaw, Katha, Bhamo, and Lashio. By April 1945, Mandalay had been taken, and Rangoon was captured shortly thereafter. After successful completion in Burma, the 490th Bomb Squadron joined the 341st Group in Yangkai, China.

Administrative and Leadership Mode of the Flying Tigers

Management of the 11th Bomb Squadron

The 11th Bomb Squadron, flying out of Kunming, China, since September 1942, in many ways established the pattern of operational activity which was followed by the 341st Group after their arrival in China in January 1944. For example, the 11th Bomb Squadron had remained on the ground from 15-25 September 1942 because of bad weather and lack of maintenance of the planes. On 25 September, four B-25s, escorted by ten P-40s, set out to drop their bombs on the Gialam airdrome in Hanoi, west of Haiphong. The formation was attacked immediately by Japanese twin-engine fighters. To avoid them, the P-40s had maneuvered into the sun and dived upon the enemy fighters destroying nine planes.

The 11th Bomb Squadron had emphasized certain types of targets and strategies which were then adopted by the 341st Group. These targets included coastal shipping, raids on ports or harbor installations, and visual sea sweeps up and down coastal waters. One strategy consisted of working in pairs and flying
parallel courses within sight of each other. Upon sight of an enemy vessel, one B-25 swept down with machine guns to knock out the anti-aircraft, then the other B-25 did the bombing. They would then exchange roles on the next attack. Another strategy was for the B-25s to conduct sea searches at 400 to 500 feet and make bomb runs from there. In this way, they were able to operate from bases at Kweilin, Suichwan, Kanchow, and Nanking where they covered the Gulf of Tonkin, the Formosa Straits, and a one-hundred-mile extension into the South China Sea.

The coastal attacks were particularly important as the shipping routes from Japan went either from Shanghai south and east down the China coast or from Japan to Formosa and then east along the coast of China. The China coastal route was more practical, so the Japanese chose this most of the time. By interfering successfully with the flow of Japanese shipping, the B-25s were able to deprive Japan of oil from the East Indies, rubber and tin from Malaya, bauxite from Indo-China, tungsten from China, and iron ore from Hainan Island. Therefore, the number one priority of the 341st Bomb Group was to augment the attacks on shipping routes throughout 1943 and 1944.

Supplementing raids on shipping were the interdiction operations performed on the inland rivers and waterways in China in 1944 and 1945, when the Japanese launched their tremendous offensives across China. The B-25s,
alone or in pairs, attacked river craft with demolition, fragmentation, and incendiary bombs or strafed them with machine guns.\textsuperscript{5}

The Japanese offensive prevented the Fourteenth Air Force from destroying its east and south China airfields at Hengyang, Lingling, Kweilin, Liuchow, and Nanking. In defense, the B-25s bombed and strafed river traffic, troop concentrations, airfields, railroads, bridges, and industrial centers. This activity was, however, unsuccessful. By the end of 1944, the Japanese had connected with French Indo-China, and the Allies were forced to face the dismal fact that victories in Burma had been more than offset by the resounding defeat in China.\textsuperscript{6}

Chinese land forces achieved certain victories during the summer of 1945; nevertheless, the war against the Japanese was destined to be decided outside the CBI theater of operations. The B-29s flying from the Mariana Islands, in particular, played the most decisive role during the last months of the war by dropping atomic blasts on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When the war ended in August 1945, preparations were made to move the 341st Bomb Group to the United States in September. On 1 November 1945, the 341st Bomb Group arrived at Camp Kilmer, New Jersey, and was inactivated on the following day.

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., 341st 1942-1945 Files.

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 341st 1942-1945 Files.
Table 3
Summary of the History of the 341st Bomb Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who/What/Where</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituted</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14 August 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>Karachi, India</td>
<td>15 September 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivated</td>
<td>Camp Kilmer, New Jersey</td>
<td>2 November 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>Tenth Air Force</td>
<td>15 September 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India Air Task Force</td>
<td>3 October 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourteenth Air Force</td>
<td>December 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York Port of Embarkation</td>
<td>1 - 2 November 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Camp Malir, Karachi, India</td>
<td>15 September - 30 December 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chakulia, India</td>
<td>30 December 1942 - June 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurmitola, India</td>
<td>June 1943 - January 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunming, China</td>
<td>January - December 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yankai, China</td>
<td>December 1944 - September 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboard C. H. Muir</td>
<td>4 October - 1 November 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Kilmer, New Jersey</td>
<td>1 - 2 November 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding Officers</td>
<td>Col. Torgils G. Wold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lt. Col. James A. Philpott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Morris F. Taber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maj. Loren S. Nickels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Joseph B. Wells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Donald L. Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. James W. Newsome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Honors</td>
<td>India-Burma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China Defensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China Offensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Unit Citations</td>
<td>For Action over French Indo-China</td>
<td>11 December 1944 - 12 March 1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
69th Composite Wing

The 69th Composite Wing was constituted as the 69th Bombardment Wing on 9 August 1943, activated in China on 3 September 1943, assigned to the Fourteenth Air Force, and redesignated the 69th Composite Wing in December 1943. The Wing served in combat from December 1943 until August 1945, was then assigned to the Tenth Air Force in August 1945, and engaged in transport operations after Victory in Japan (V-J) Day. The Wing was awarded the Distinguished Unit Citation (DUC) for the period 1 -30 September 1945, when the wing ferried troops and supplies in China, helped to evacuate prisoners of war, and flew many mercy and other special missions to areas in China, French Indo-China, and Manchuria. The Wing was inactivated in China on 26 December 1945.
Table 4

Summary of the History of the 69th Composite Wing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who/What/Where</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituted</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 August 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>3 September 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivated</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>26 December 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>51st Fighter</td>
<td>1943 - 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341st Bomb Group</td>
<td>1943 - 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>Kunming, China</td>
<td>3 September 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsuyung, China</td>
<td>12 January 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunming, China</td>
<td>April 1944 - December 26, 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding Officers</td>
<td>Brig. Gen. John C. Kennedy</td>
<td>23 December 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Charles H. Anderson</td>
<td>1 September 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maj. James F. Rhodes</td>
<td>15 November 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td>India-Burma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China Defensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China Offensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Unit Citations</td>
<td>China, French Indo-China, Manchuria</td>
<td>1 - 30 September 1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteenth Air Force, *The Flying Tigers*

Background

A gradual build-up of air strength occurred in the CBI Theater even before the creation of the Fourteenth Air Force. The American Volunteer Group (AVG), an organization of American volunteer fighters, had gone to China during the summer of 1941 to defend the Burma Road, China’s last remaining avenue of communication with the outside world. The AVG was
discontinued in July 1942 and replaced by the China Air Task Force (CATF) of
the Tenth Air Force, which absorbed many people and most of the resources of
the AVG. This task force relied heavily upon the 23rd Fighter Group and the
11th Bombardment Squadron (M) for its hit-and-run guerilla war against the
Japanese. The insignia of the Fourteenth Air Force and its history as well as
the chit worn on the jackets of the Flying Tigers who flew combat are located in
Appendix J.

The Arrival of the Fourteenth Air Force

When expansion of the small CATF became possible in the spring of
1943, the Fourteenth Air Force was activated at Kunming, China, absorbing all
CATF resources. The 308th Bombardment Group (H), equipped with B-24s,
moved to China and joined the 23rd Fighter Group which had three squadrons
of its own and another in attached status, all flying P-40s; Flight A of the 9th
Photographic Squadron (L) equipped with P-43s; and the 11th Bombardment
Squadron (flying B-25s). From this meager organizational base, the Fourteenth
Air Force expanded during the remainder of 1943 and 1944, carrying the war
more directly to the Japanese as supplies permitted, since the air units
depended entirely upon an aerial supply line from India for all of their material
resources.7

7 Ibid., 14th 1942-1945 Files.
The 402nd Bombardment Group (M) and the 476th Fighter Group became part of the Fourteenth on 19 May 1943, but neither group had any squadrons, so neither became operational. As a result, both were inactivated on 31 July 1943. Instead, the 51st Fighter Group moved to China in October 1943, with three squadrons of P-40s and one P-38 squadron under its control. That same month, some of the fighter squadrons of the Chinese American Composite Wing (CACW) (Provisional), which formed and trained in India, arrived with P-40 and B-25 aircraft. Two wings, the 68th Fighter and 69th Bombardment, had been activated on 3 September and 23 December 1943, respectively. These wings, now redesignated as Composite wings, became operational. The 68th Wing took control of the 23d Fighter Group, 11th Bombardment Squadron, and bomber and fighter elements of the CACW, while the 69th Wing assumed control of the 51st Fighter Group and, when it arrived in China in January 1944, of the 341st Bombardment Group (M), whose squadrons flew B-25s.

Completing the Fourteenth Air Force, the 33rd Fighter Group arrived in China with P-38, P-40, and P-47 aircraft during March - April 1944 and joined the new 312th Fighter Wing. In May 1944, the 81st Fighter Group arrived with P-38, P-39 and P-40 aircraft, also joining the 312th Wing. In August 1944, the 311th Fighter Group arrived with A-36 and P-51 aircraft, joining the 312th Wing, and in August and September, the 33rd Fighter Group returned to India. Meanwhile, the CACW's 1st Bombardment Group (M) (Provisional) and 3rd
and 5th Fighter Groups (Provisional) had continued sending squadrons to China, and all were engaged in combat with the arrival of the last CACW squadron, the 3rd Bombardment, in September. Still other combat units including liaison, photo reconnaissance, tactical reconnaissance, troop carrier, combat cargo, and night fighter squadrons arrived piecemeal to augment the combat capability of the Fourteenth Air Force. Some of these units were assigned directly to the Fourteenth, while others were placed under the various wings or groups for control.

Once the Fourteenth was formed and free of Tenth Air Force control, Brigadier General Chennault initiated a long-range plan which required the establishment of staggered arcs of air bases, each probing farther into enemy-held eastern China. The first arc was made up of a string of bases running in a northeast - southwest line starting with Hengyang, followed by Lingling, Kweilin, Liuchow, and Nanking. Kweilin served as the hub from which all plans originated.

In time, Chennault further expanded his original line of forward air bases and established a more probing line from Tanchuk through Namyang, Suicheng, Kanchow, Suichwan, and Kian. This second line of attack would put his bombers within easy reach of the lush shipping targets off the east coast of China. Even beyond this line, Chennault proposed to operate his air force from advance bases at Nanchang, Kienow, and Changting, from which Japanese
targets as far north as Manchuria and as far east as the Japanese islands could be hit.

As the Fourteenth gained strength, it threw its weight into two savage air campaigns to deter enemy drives from the Hankow sector on the Yangtze River. After the enemy withdrew, the Fourteenth consolidated its position and launched the CACW with American and Chinese crews flying together, built additional bases in eastern China, and struck at enemy-held ports on China's east coast and at the enemy's coastal shipping lines. On 1 May 1943, the forward echelon of the Fourteenth Air Force moved into eastern China along the Hengyang-Kweilin line. This brought American planes well within range of all major Japanese-controlled bases from northern China to French Indo-China and Thailand. At the same time, this tactic made Japanese shipping in the China Sea doubly vulnerable to air attacks. Also in May, B-24s of the 308th Group delivered a severe blow to enemy shipping when they began sowing mines in the Yangtze River and the harbors of Canton, Hong Kong, Haiphong, Hankow, Shanghai, and Kakao on the island of Formosa. In September 1943, the Fourteenth began skip-bombing Japanese cargo vessels in the South China Sea and the Formosa Strait. By the end of 1943, such low-level attacks had sunk 125,000 tons of shipping in that area.

During the last three months of 1943, the full power of the Fourteenth Air Force was engaged against some 60,000 Japanese troops who carried on an offensive in the area of Changteh and Changsha. Coupled with stubborn
resistance of Chinese ground forces, the Fourteenth succeeded in driving the enemy back to Yangtze River bases with a loss to the Japanese of about 20,000 troops. Also, from 25 November to 6 December, combined attacks by the Fourteenth and Tenth Air Forces and the Royal Air Force were made against Rangoon, Burma, aimed at neutralizing that important enemy-held port and its rail facilities which the Japanese needed to oppose General Stilwell's Chinese-American Task Force invasion of northern Burma from Ledo.

By early 1944, the Japanese controlled three strategic positions: the bend of the Yellow River, the bulge of the Yangtze River, and the Hong Kong–Canton area. During February and March, the enemy set in motion a program of supply accumulation and troop reinforcement in these three base areas in preparation for a major campaign in eastern China. The major offensive began in April 1944, with the Fourteenth Air Force opposed by a numerically superior Japanese Air Force operating from large, fully supplied, and powerfully supported bases.

From about 22 June 1944 to 30 January 1945, the Fourteenth suffered numerous set-backs as the enemy captured base after base. Falling to the enemy were bases at Kengyang, Lingling, Kweilin, Luichow, Paoching, Tanchuk, Nanking, Tushan, Suichwan, Namyung, Sincheng, Nankang, and Kanchow. In fact, it was only the tactical support furnished by the Fourteenth that prevented the total collapse of the semi-trained Chinese armies. Pilots of the Fourteenth
fought bravely, establishing a combat ratio of 7.7 enemy aircraft destroyed for every American plane lost.

One outstanding achievement of the Fourteenth Air Force during these crucial months began in the spring of 1944 occurred when a handful of specially equipped B-24 Liberators began all-out attacks against Japanese shipping in the Formosa Strait and the South China Sea. Each B-24 averaged about 800 tons of shipping sunk per combat sortie. This attrition placed a tremendous burden on the Japanese lines of supply to the Southwest Pacific and on Japan's dwindling merchant fleet as a whole. During 1944, the total claims of the Fourteenth Air Force against Japanese shipping were 640,900 tons sunk, 237,050 tons probably sunk, and 396,950 tons damaged. At the same time, in aerial combat, American pilots destroyed 494 enemy planes, while losing only 64. The enemy also lost 33,450 troops that year.8

January 1945 was the last month during which the Fourteenth was opposed by large numbers of enemy aircraft, and they were able to destroy 211 enemy planes that month. After January, only 98 enemy planes could be claimed as destroyed; none after June 1945. This attainment of air superiority was assisted in some sense by the opening of the Stilwell Road into China in January and the completion of a pipeline to Kunming, although most supplies still had to be ferried across the Hump from India.

---

8 Ibid., 14th 1942-1945 Files.
By spring 1945, the South China Sea and Indo-China coasts came within economical range of newly established bases in the Philippines, and the Fifth and Seventh Air Forces began attacking targets there. This made it possible for the Fourteenth to concentrate increasingly on inland targets of importance, especially on the Japanese communications corridor in China which ran north and south between Hankow and Hengyang. At the same time, the Fourteenth also continued its support of Chinese ground forces, particularly during the Japanese drives of March 1945 toward Hsian and Ankang and later toward Chihkiang. The Americans relentlessly attacked Japanese troops and positions which prevented them from capitalizing on their ground superiority. By the time the enemy surrendered their Greater East Asia corridor and withdrew from southern China in May 1945, they found their mobility and supply lines critically reduced by the attacks of the Fourteenth Air Force.9

Effective 22 June 1945, the XIV Air Force Tactical Air Command (Provisional) was formed, controlling the 68th and 69th Composite Wings. On 9 July, the XIV Air Force Strategic Air Command (Provisional) was formed to control the 312th Fighter Wing and Chinese American Composite Wing. Meanwhile, the Tenth Air Force completed its combat operations in India and Burma and on 23 July and moved to Kunming. One week later, the Fourteenth moved from Kunming to Peishiyi. On 1 August 1945, the Tenth

9 Ibid., 14th 1942-1945 Files.
Air Force assumed operational control over XIV Air Force Tactical Air Command and the 68th and 69th Composite Wings, while Fourteenth used the XIV Air Force Strategic Air Command for its portion of China. These arrangements were short-lived, however, for the Japanese soon surrendered. On 25 August, some organizational reshuffling took place, and the Fourteenth again acquired most of the combat units which had temporarily been allocated to the Tenth Air Force.

From 25 August to the end of 1945, both the Tenth and Fourteenth Air Forces remained in China. They disposed of their subsidiary organizations through inactivation or by returning the units to the United States for disposal. The headquarters along with a number of organizations comprising the Fourteenth left China in December 1945 and were transported to Fort Lawton, Washington, where they were inactivated during the early weeks of 1946.10

May 1945

Germany unconditionally surrendered on V-E Day (Victory in Europe), May 8, 1945. Preliminary announcement among the Flying Tigers stole some thunder from the official announcement; nevertheless, the Chinese Nectar of the Gods flowed freely and even the heavenly aroma of stateside rye or bourbon came from an occasional bottle hoarded for the celebration. The next

10 Ibid., 14th 1942-1945 Files.
day was sobering, however, when they flew their first mission of the month, a gentle reminder that the war in China was not over.

The squadron was even more severely jolted into reality the next day when fifteen of their planes took part in a coordinated attack with three squadrons of the 341st Bomb Group. The target was Paoching, China, a principal Japanese supply point in Hunan Province. Immediately after dropping its bombs, Plane 421 sustained a direct hit somewhere near the cockpit and top turret which were in flames. The plane never recovered from a sudden 45-degree dive, and it crashed and exploded on the west side of the Tzu Kiang River directly across from the town. The Battle of China was not yet over.

At the end of the month, a sudden burst of activity was highlighted by a successful night mission in which twelve planes played havoc with Japanese transportation facilities in French Indo-China. This was the Squadron's first all-night mission in about a year, and happily, all planes and their crews returned safely. The Squadron was just beginning to breathe more easily when two crews were briefed to follow-up the all-night mission. The first plane experienced difficulty retracting its landing gears immediately after take-off because of a break in the hydraulic system. Eventually, it landed safely. Because the first plane could not continue, three efforts were made from the tower to call Lieutenant Wirth, who commanded the second plane, back to the field. Apparently he did not receive the messages, and the plane was not seen
or heard from again, though all airfields and fighter control stations were carefully checked. The personnel on board were reported *Missing in Action*.

**June 1945**

After nearly two years, the Squadron learned through his letter to them that T/Sgt. John W. Boyd was alive. In August 1943, when the 22nd was based at Chakulia, India, his plane had been shot down while making a low level attack on Meiktila Dam. Only Sergeant Boyd and the engineer-gunner, S/Sgt John E. Leisure, were able to leave the plane quickly. Because their chutes did not open until they had almost reached the ground, they were severely injured. As a result, they were captured by the Japanese and imprisoned at Rangoon. Leisure died of malnutrition; Boyd, on the other hand, survived the liberation of Rangoon and was freed.

On 3 June, all sixteen of the B-25s took part in an attack by the entire 341st Bomb Group on Liuchow (24°18'N-109°16'E) in support of the Chinese offensive on the city. The Squadron planes staged out of Luliang, China, in three flights. Major Berryman led Flight *A*; Lieutenant Eck, Flight *B*; Captain Kroeger, Flight *C*, with Lieutenant Schofield as the other pilot. The planes made a successful rendezvous with ten fighters from the 23rd Fighter Group made up of P-51s and P-38s over Ishan at 1325 hours at 10,000 feet. *A* and *B* Flights were over the target at 1338 Hours; *C* Flight, 1353 hours. The entire bomb load of the planes, 161 N-1 and A-1 demos, 18 M-17 incendiaries, and 24
M-18 incendiaries (M-18), were dropped precisely onto the target area assigned on the south and east side of the river in Liuchow. At least two secondary explosions were observed and several fires, resembling oil or gasoline fires, swelled with black smoke. The combination of smoke and clouds obscured accurate assessment of the number of buildings destroyed.

Major F. M. Sibley

During June, the executive officer who embodied the 22nd, Major F. M. Sibley, ended his tour of duty. The squadron had been led by five commanding officers, and the personnel had so changed that only Major Sibley and three other men recalled the squadron’s India activities. The major had been commissioned a first lieutenant on 22 June 1942, and served in an administrative capacity for three months at Santa Ana Army Air Base. Typically, Sib wanted no more of that stuff and left the United States for overseas at his own request on 7 October 1942. On 1 December 1942, he was assigned to the 22nd Bomb Squadron in Karachi, India, as Mess Officer and Adjutant. On 22 September 1943, having been promoted to Captain fourteen days before, Sibley was transferred to the 341st Bomb Group as the Adjutant. In the middle of November, he returned to the 22nd to begin the eighteen more months of uninterrupted service to the squadron which ended with his rotation to the United States in June 1945. During his period at the 22nd, he was Assistant S-2 Officer, S-2 Officer for six months, and Executive Officer
beginning 1 July 1944. He became a major on 1 October 1944, after earning
five overseas bars, the Asiatic-Pacific ribbon, and two bronze stars for the
India-Burma and China campaigns. (Refer to Appendix K for the Foreword to
the History of 22nd Bomb Squadron, *the Flying Tigers*)
CHAPTER 5

A COMPARISON OF THE MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP
OF THE FLYING TIGERS AND EDUCATION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, Flying Tigers' 22nd Bomb Squadron 1942 - 1945: An Analysis of Management and Leadership Practices, was to examine a series of phenomena related to both military leadership and educational administration. This investigation looked at the interrelationships, definitions, and applications of war, education, administration, leadership, and power.

This study is unique because of the background of the investigator. This researcher, who later became an educator, was a fighter-bomber pilot as a member of the Flying Tigers. Consequently, the methodology used included historical, observational, and retrospective components. Historical research encompassed all available documents pertaining to the Flying Tigers as well as first-hand accounts from surviving members of the squadron. The observational aspects of the research were ex post facto in nature, an advantage in this case because the investigator had no impact on the behavior of the participants. Effectively, then, this is a case study of the Flying Tigers including
their development, their activities during World War II, and their organizational behavior. Information gained from the research was then applied to the experience of the researcher, an educator with nearly fifty years of experience.

Drawing on observations and historical investigation, the following research questions were posed:

1. How did The Flying Tigers come to be?

2. What was the importance of The Flying Tigers to the success of the United States in World War II?

3. What was the administrative and leadership mode of The Flying Tigers?
   a. Was the mode appropriate for the military?
   b. Was the mode appropriate for the time?

4. How does wartime combat compare to the educational environment today?

5. How does the administrative and leadership mode of The Flying Tigers apply to today's educational scene?

This chapter addresses the last question about the application of the research to the current educational environment.
The Application of This Research to Current Education

In considering the twenty-first century, futurists John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene remarked, "The dominant principle of organization has shifted, from management in order to control an enterprise to leadership in order to bring out the best in people and to respond quickly to change."1 Leadership in any environment differs from management or administration in that it is neither coercive nor necessarily hierarchical. Current school administration has, as one of its primary current goals, justification of the entire enterprise called public education. Therefore, the typical concentration of administrators is constantly political and economic rather than educational.

Successful and effective leadership are not the same. For example, every task-oriented group basically needs to achieve its goals and to maintain itself. If these two goals are accomplished, then leadership has been successful. Further, if no cost of that success has impeded reaching the group's goal, then the leadership has also been effective. According to Owens,

When one attempts to lead and the intended behaviors are in fact elicited from members of the group, we speak of successful leadership. However, although successful leadership may produce the intended behaviors in the group, it does not necessarily follow that they actually help the group either to achieve its tasks or to strengthen itself as a group. One could, for example, try to improve the effectiveness of a group by emphasizing orderly standard operating procedures. A leader who was able to get these procedures developed and installed so that

people implemented them could be described as successful. If, however, the processes of establishing the new procedures produced a great deal of dissatisfaction among members of the group and—in the end—the organization did not seem to be any more effective in achieving its goals, then the leadership could hardly be termed effective.2

In a school, for example, a principal may try to initiate a new program and do so successfully. If, however, the teachers and students become rebellious and uncooperative as a result, then the leadership has not been effective.

While leadership may not be a hierarchical activity, the maximum capacity must be obtained from every individual without precipitating disorganization. After acceptance of goals by the entire group, it is critical to engage the creativity of all those involved in solving the problem. This applies in both educational and military environments. For example, every member of the Flying Tigers was engaged in site-based management whenever engaged in a mission. With certain guidelines and operational procedures as standard, the pilot as leader and the crew were totally responsible for the success or failure of the mission. The more urgent the problem, the more important for the group leader to encourage, support, affirm, and reward risk-taking behavior.

During World War II, the upper management in the military had limited understanding of air power and air combat. As a result, lower level leaders lacked a resource for advice and consultation. At the same time, the power structure had problems of defending budget, obtaining supplies, and explaining

2 Owens, p. 158.
circumstances they faced in Asia. Theoretical models had not been established for the situations that pertained; therefore, the on-site staff were stuck in irrelevant theory that did not apply to war combat.

The creation of community is important in both military and educational environments especially in situations where objectives are complex. Arguably, the objective in the CBI Theater in World War II was simple: destroy the Japanese and prevent them from conquering China, Burma, and India. In reality, the task, as has already been demonstrated, was much more complicated. For example, traversing the Hump required a specific maneuver in order to transport supplies from India to China. A new tactic, in another case, had to be developed to blow up bridges. Leaders encouraged and supported their group members in risk-taking; therefore, they did not hesitate to try new ideas for fighting the Japanese. Variation can turn into achievement.

Bonds are formed when groups have deprivation in common. During World War II, a common economy developed among troops in the CBI Theater. Despite life-threatening challenges, the mission of victory could not be compromised. This goal presses individuals to find in themselves strengths and resources that might otherwise go untapped. This is the essential challenge of leadership.

Organization, especially in 1943, was an issue for the Flying Tigers. Although they did not know of or relate to the administrative and leadership
concerns of the upper echelons, squadron members remained committed on a daily basis to their objectives. They did not require external direction because their strategic objective was clear. The leadership demonstrated within the 341st Bomb Group and 22nd Bomb Squadron exhibited, as Warren Bennis has found, management of attention, management of meaning, and management of trust, for the squadron members clearly understood the goal and trusted their leaders.³

Implications of the Research

Leadership

Military officers and educational administrators are often placed in situations which require instantaneous decision-making. The quality of these decisions determines their later characterization as either a manager, an administrator, a bureaucrat, or a leader. For example, in the CBI Theater, Captain Williams and his crew left on a mission, but their engine was hit by anti-aircraft fire and began to smoke. Unable to continue the mission while debilitated, Captain Williams decided to return to base. While circling, he learned that several other fighters were low on fuel and needed to land immediately. He decided to wait as long as he could to let those fighters land. While in queue, his wing started to flame, and he gave the order to bail out, which the men did. As a result of this decision, all but one of the men

³ Ibid.
survived. In fact, the only crew member killed lost his life because he had not followed the instruction to keep his parachute with him at all times. In summary, Captain Williams’ decision to let the other fighters land first enabled all their crews and his own to survive. Consequently, he demonstrated leadership rather than simply command.

This exemplifies situational leadership in which the power of the leader’s position combines with the degree of structure of the task and the quality of the relations between the leaders and the followers. Captain Williams demonstrated a style of leadership which was appropriate to the situation at a time when he might otherwise have exhibited one of McCall and Lombardo’s fatal flaws—he may have been both unable to think strategically and incapable of acting sensitively to the needs of the other planes. He demonstrated all three skill areas required for effective leadership in given situations: situation sensitivity, situational management, and style flexibility.

Administration vs. Leadership

Differences exist, however, between leadership and administration. While both require decision-making, administration more than leadership is concerned with the issue of control. This is evident in schools in the form of

---

4 Owens, 162.

5 Hersey and Blanchard, 99.

6 Owens, 180.
crowd control and avoidance of litigation. For example, before a recent local high school graduation, the principal warned the students that throwing of mortarboards was unacceptable because of potential injury. Any student, he said, observed tossing his or her hat in the air, regardless of the amount of exuberance, would forfeit his or her diploma. In their excitement, several students launched their hats and lost their diplomas as punishment. This exemplifies administration, not leadership.

Sometimes a fine line can be drawn between administration and leadership. An administrator is defined by role and power; a leader is "... a member of the group who helps it to develop ways of interacting that facilitate achieving the goals that the individuals share."7 Both, however, are goal-oriented. As a case in point, a teacher may be a leader but is not, by definition, an administrator. The situation may determine the leadership of the group.

According to Hersey and Blanchard, leadership is "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation."8 However,

Situational theory uses only one variable to analyze the nature of the situation—maturity. Maturity is the capacity to set high but attainable goals, the willingness and ability to take responsibility, and the experience of an individual or group. However, maturity is a relative

7 Owens, 148.
8 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, 94.
concept. An individual or group is not mature or immature in any general sense. Rather, maturity is defined only in relation to a specific task. The question is not Is the individual or group mature or immature? but rather On this specific job or task, what is the level of maturity of the group or individual? . . . . The maturity of both individuals and the work group determines the appropriate supervisory or leader behavior.9

The investigator has observed great change over time in the maturity of the school district in which he works. The goal, historically, was simple and attainable—educate students by teaching them the skills and knowledge needed to function successfully in society. As the district has grown from small-town to large metropolitan area, however, the organizational behavior has changed. This transition is exhibited particularly by the unwillingness of most teachers and administrators to accept responsibility for the actions of this unwieldy monolith. The situation of the organization has changed; leadership has not.

In a school district, administration takes the form of an administrative code and/or manuals on policy and procedure. During World War II, administration of the Flying Tigers was determined by air doctrine, especially as defined by AWPD/1, the primary document concerning the fighting of an air war by the United States. As the war ensued, refinements could be observed as each squadron interpreted, not the overall mission of defeating the enemy, but the procedures required to accomplish this goal. Therefore, strategies

---

included coastal attacks, raids on ports or harbor installations, and visual sweeps up and down coastal waters.

In education, however, the aim is defined as educating students, but the strategy to attain that goal may not be as direct as dropping a bomb on the enemy. It is nearly impossible, for example, to educate a hungry child or to force a student who has witnessed the murder of her mother by her stepfather to pay attention to the details of a textbook. Can a student high on drugs concentrate at all?

Teachers who remain idealistic and committed to the goal of educating students are frustrated, but not daunted by these problems. This researcher has witnessed the success of teachers who have become leaders in extremely difficult or hazardous situations in their schools. For example, in a vocational-technical high school where this investigator has taught, the emphasis is on job skills training so that students earn both a high school diploma and a useful career upon graduation. The environment is, in and of itself, highly motivating for students because the means and the end are closely related. As a result, one would expect that teachers would not have to work hard to motivate students. This is not the case.

Students apparently decide the homework issue around eighth or ninth grade. Until that time, most students actually turn in assignments. By tenth grade, until last year the first grade available in the vocational-technical high school in this district, many students simply refuse to do homework. The
dilemma for the teacher is that work that could previously be assigned for independent learning or review, especially reading, had to consume class time in order for students to receive content. This investigator, as a teacher in the vocational-technical high school which, incidentally, is not the only place with the homework crisis, resolved to circumvent this problem by doing all content in class in a variety of ways. For example, all reading was done aloud for history so that, at a minimum, every student had the opportunity to hear the content. After that, students worked in groups on answering questions and then the entire class participated in a discussion on the topic. Finally, an open-book test was given which could be answered with help from classmates. In other words, every student had a chance to be exposed to the information. This exemplifies leadership in transferring content knowledge.

Implications for Future Research

The study of history can guide the future. Synthesizing the experience of life may also provide direction. The unique feature in this research, however, was the use of two diverse situations which are related only by the fact that the investigator was present in both.

It is almost idiotic to comment that the world is changing. Technology, for example, has enabled people to communicate globally instantaneously. In education, however, schools still operate in a mass production mentality. Connection is not frequently made between real-world and academics. This
problem could be mitigated by conceptual blockbusting—examining two or more seemingly unrelated events with the goal of solving problems in one of them.

Conclusion

There is a radical—and wonderful—new idea in the air these days in at least some of our public conversations: the idea that every citizen is capable of the kind of intellectual competence previously attained by only a small minority of citizens. . . . the notion that all children could and should be inventors of their own theories, critics of other people’s ideas, makers of their own personal marks on the world. It’s an idea with revolutionary implications. If we take it seriously.10

Schools today are a battlefield not terribly unlike the CBI Theater. Legislation, regulation, and fear of litigation have constrained many administrators who eagerly try to educate children. Teachers employed in schools, like pilots and other Air Force personnel, must be taught to do their jobs effectively. Similar to conditions during World War II in Asia, schools must do their jobs and attain their goals without supplies, adequate resources, or trained leadership. Further, models of leadership must come from within education rather than attempting to replicate models from business or the military.11


The military during World War II brought about change in the process of leadership development particularly during the induction phase. It was not an accident that future members of the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers, were molded into an effective combat team. According to Hersey and Blanchard, all four of Schein’s elements of training are present in military leadership training:

- the physical removal of the individuals being changed from the accustomed routines, sources of information, and social relationships;
- the undermining and destruction of all social supports;
- demeaning and humiliating experience to help individuals being changed to see their old attitudes or behavior as unworthy and thus to be motivated to change;
- the consistent linking of reward with willingness to change and of punishment with unwillingness to change.\(^{12}\)

This was significant for the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers, because training included being sent far from home, being removed from contact with their relatives and friends, being subjected to subhuman treatment to become officers and gentlemen, and often being threatened to be forced to complete harsh duties or to lose free time. The ultimate penalty was loss of status as a candidate for officer status.

After successful completion of training, the future leaders quickly moved to the changing phase, first by identifying with the Drill Instructor (DI), and

\(^{12}\) Hersey and Blanchard, 382.
then by emulating informal leaders as the cadets developed into officers. The five percent who proved to be too slow, too fat, too dumb, or too difficult were dropped. The remaining cadets emerged with one passionate desire—to persist as cadets at all costs.\textsuperscript{13} Because of the exigency of the war waged against the principle of freedom, Americans allowed themselves to be subjected to this type of education and training. Each cadet who completed training emerged as a leader dedicated to the defense of freedom and the defeat of the enemy.

In 1995, the same type of will to win against the enemies of society and to emerge victorious currently challenges all Americans. Especially hard hit, educational leaders in the United States are faced daily with illegal drugs, raging violence, brutal crime, hopeless desolation for many of the students who live on the streets, abject poverty, and a host of other social problems. American schools have become battle zones for gangs, rapes, extortion, immorality, muggings, weapons, and lethal substances. Relatively unheard of in the past, students, teachers, and administrators are beaten, battered, and even shot to death on a regular basis. Most recently, the most heinous threat concocted by American citizens who were educated in United States schools resulted in the fatal destruction of a government building in Oklahoma City, where nearly 200 people were murdered.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 388.
Education is a tool. It can be used to train leaders for war or peace. Schools must, as the military did in World War II, continue to be responsive to the situation which currently exists in the schools. We are at war. We need to prepare and train combatants in the skills, techniques, and art of leadership as the military did in 1942-1945, as we educated future leaders of the 22nd Bomb Squadron, the Flying Tigers.
APPENDIX A

PHOTOCOPIES OF AIRPLANES IN COMBAT
A North American B-25H Mitchell of the 12th Bomb Group over Burma on its way to the target. (Via Bill Hess)
APPENDIX B

MAPS OF THE CBI THEATER
APPENDIX C

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART AND TACTICAL UNIT HISTORY
14th Air Force

China-World War II: 1943-1945

Air Operations Chart
## Tenth Air Force Tactical Unit History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>SQADRON</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1945</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th BG</td>
<td>9th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>436th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>492nd BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493rd BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th BG</td>
<td>81st BS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82nd BS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83rd BS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434th BS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341st BG</td>
<td>11th BS</td>
<td>In China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd BS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490th BS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>491st BS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st FG</td>
<td>16th FS</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd FG</td>
<td>58th FS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59th FS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60th FS</td>
<td>From 12th Air Force</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80th FG</td>
<td>88th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>459th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311th FBG</td>
<td>528th FBS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>529th FBS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>530th FBS</td>
<td>To 14th Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th PRG</td>
<td>9th PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20th PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24th PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40th PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443rd TCG</td>
<td>427th NFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71st LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115th LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14th AIR FORCE TACTICAL UNIT HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Squadron</th>
<th>1943</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1945</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd FG</td>
<td>74th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>449th FS</td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118th TRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st FG</td>
<td>16th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th FS</td>
<td>P-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>449th FS</td>
<td>P-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd FG</td>
<td>58th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81st FG</td>
<td>91st FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92nd FS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93rd FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311th FG</td>
<td>528th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>529th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>530th FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308th BG</td>
<td>373rd BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>374th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>425th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341st BG</td>
<td>11th BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>491st BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th TCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322nd TCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426th NFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

INSIGNIA OF THE BOMBING EAGLES
Eagle Squadron
22nd Bomb Squadron
1942-1944
APPENDIX E

AWARD OF CHINESE WINGS FOR SERVICE
IN WORLD WAR II
Be It Known That

Mr. Jack Schofield

The China-Burma-India Hump Pilots Association, Inc.

Is Awarded

A Pair of Pilot Wings No. 358

of

The Chinese Air Force

In Recognition of Outstanding

Personal And Professional Achievements

In Military Aviation

Given This Date 1 June, 1994.

(SIGNED)

TANG FEI

General, ROCAF

Commander-in-Chief
PRESS RELEASE

For Local Media

NAME JACK SCHOFIELD    YOUR PHONE (702) 582-9638
ADDRESS 1308 South 8th Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104


...was awarded the Chinese Air Force Pilot Wings authorized by General Tang Fei of the Chinese Air Force, Republic of China (Taiwan), with the cooperation of the Chinese Air Force Veterans Association. Presentations were made by Major General Wang Kwang-Ying, on September 1, 1994, during the Hump Pilots Association's 49th Annual Reunion in Sacramento, California.

Colonel Konsin Shah, President of the Chinese Air Force Veterans Association stated that the Government of the Republic of China is honoring these individuals. "While China was encircled from the coast, Hump Pilots missions were the only resource that could carry the war outward. In the 49th year of Japanese surrender, I wish to congratulate members of your Association for a smooth and graceful reunion. We will always remember your efforts in 1943-1945, through our generation into the next generation. Without the Hump Pilots the Chinese Air Force and 14th Air Force could not have fought the war against the Japanese."

The Hump Pilots Association is composed of over 5,000 air crew members and support personnel who were engaged in the China-Burma-India Theater of operation during WW-II. A major portion of the flying provided the entire supplies for the American and Chinese Armies and Air Forces in China--the first time such a massive airlift was ever attempted. The November 19, 1945 issue of TIME magazine reported on page 26: "Unofficial estimates were that 3,000 Allied transport and tactical aircraft had been lost among those jagged peaks (Himalaya Mountains). But for this price, the U. S. had backed China, and U.S. units in China, with invaluable aid: 78,000 tons went over the Hump in the peak month of July." These downed aircraft made an "aluminum trail" over the "Hump," as the Himalayas were called. The terrible weather and rugged terrain posed as constant a danger as the Japanese fighters and bombers.

A three-volume set of books, CHINA AIRLIFT - THE HUMP records a first hand "history" of the CBI Theater during WW-II and are available through the Association. HPA erected a Memorial to those who flew the "Hump" which is located at the Air Force Museum, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. The Museum of Aviation, Warner-Robins Air Force Base, Warner-Robins, Georgia, houses an extensive exhibit of the China Burma India Theater, and displays for future generations what was accomplished by these veterans.

Receiving these wings will long be remembered, and is evidence that the successful efforts to keep an entire nation alive under the greatest of odds, enabling us to achieve victory, has not been forgotten!
空勤胸章證明書

八三桂字第卅三號

對軍事航空具有一定卓越之成就與貢獻

特頒贈中國空軍飛行胸章壹枚

三五八號

此證

中華民國八十三年六月一日
APPENDIX F

PHOTOCOPY OF GENERAL CHENNAULT
Since 1941 an ever growing number of American men—long isolated from the world except by air—have braved fearful weather, uncharted terrain, and an enemy superior in numbers to help smash Japanese dreams of conquest. As members of the original Flying Tigers, or the tiny China Air Task Force, or now the famed 14th Air Force they have all been commanded by a man of indomitable spirit and determination—General C. L. Chennault.
KUNMING, CHINA
HEADQUARTERS

14th AIR FORCE
"FLYING TIGERS"

C. L. CHENNAULT, COMMANDING GENERAL
APPENDIX G

INSIGNIA OF THE BOMBING BULLDOGS
THE Bombing

Bulldogs

22nd Bombardment Squadron
341st Bombardment Group (M)
14th Air Force
China 1945
"THE BOMBING BULLDOG"
Official Insignia of the
22nd Bombardment Sqdn. (M)
SUBJECT: Aircraft Marking for the 22d Bombardment Squadron (M).

TO: Commanding Officer, 341st Bombardment Group (M), A.F.O. 212, c/o Postmaster, New York City.

By authority delegated to the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, by AG letter 400.161 (12-7-42) C8-S-A, dated 19 December 1942, the following insignia for the marking of aircraft of the 22d Bombardment Squadron (M), Army Air Forces, is approved:

AIRCRAFT MARKING: Over and through a lemon yellow disc, border light brown, a caricatured, pugnacious, light brown B-25 aircraft in flight, toward dexter base, wearing a red brown derby and a red-and-white-striped turtleneck sweater, having look of ferocity on caricatured face, machine gun barrels, proper, issuing from nostrils, and a large brown cigar fired, proper, with white band, held in mouth, leaving white speed lines and trailing smoke toward rear, proper, as per record drawing.

The insignia will face toward the front of the aircraft.

HISTORY: The 22d Bombardment Squadron, Medium, was originally organized as the 22d Bombardment Squadron, GEQ, AF, which was constituted and made active at Hamilton Field, California, on 20 October 1939, pursuant to authority contained in AG 320.2 (9-28-39), dated 20 October 1939; inactivated on 6 April 1942 per Radiogram, dated 6 April 1942; authorized to be activated at Columbia, South Carolina, per AG 320.2 (4-18-42) BE-M-AF, dated 21 April 1942, activated 4 May 1942; reorganized as the 22d Bombardment Squadron (Medium), in accordance
HISTORY: with T/O 1-127, dated 1 July 1942, on 15 September 1942; reorganised as the 22d Bombardment Squadron, Medium, in accordance with T/O 1-127, dated 18 August 1944.

The 22d Bombardment Squadron, Medium, has no other history, and its battle honors have not been determined.

For the Commanding General, Army Air Forces:

ROBERT C. JONES,
Colonel, Air Corps,
Chief, Personnel Services Division,
Office, Asst. Chief of Air Staff,
Personnel.

1 Incl.
Drawing.
APPENDIX H

DIAGRAMS OF B-25s AND A-26s
B-25H

Specifications

Rockwell International and its predecessor company, North American Aviation, Inc., have manufactured more military aircraft than any other company in the world. This year Rockwell is celebrating the first flight of two of these aircraft.

The B-25 Mitchell medium bomber was first flown on August 19, 1940. A total of 9,816 B-25's were manufactured.

A total of 15,485 P-51 Mustang fighters were manufactured. First flight occurred on October 26, 1940.
### Specifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>A-26B-60-DL</th>
<th>A-26C</th>
<th>B-26K(A-26A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max speed, mph (km/h)</td>
<td>322 (518)</td>
<td>373 (600)</td>
<td>327 (529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at an altitude of ft (m)</td>
<td>10,000 (3050)</td>
<td>16,000 (4570)</td>
<td>15,000 (4570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruising speed, mph (km/h)</td>
<td>270 (447)</td>
<td></td>
<td>310 (499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial rate of climb, ft/min (m/sec)</td>
<td>1,070 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,090 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service ceiling, ft (m)</td>
<td>24,500 (7470)</td>
<td>22,400 (6740)</td>
<td>30,500 (9295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal range, mls (km)</td>
<td>1,650 (2705)</td>
<td>1,400 (2255)</td>
<td>1,450 (2359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max range, mls (km)</td>
<td>2,514 (4020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,700 (4343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty, lb (kg)</td>
<td>22,365 (10143)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,100 (11359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal loaded, lb (kg)</td>
<td>26,000 (11763)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,000 (16783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max take-off, lb (kg)</td>
<td>41,800 (18960)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>39,250 (17804)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span, ft-in (m)</th>
<th>70-0 (21.34)</th>
<th>70-0 (21.34)</th>
<th>71-6 (21.79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length, ft-in (m)</td>
<td>58-6 (15.44)</td>
<td>51-3 (15.62)</td>
<td>51-7/8 (15.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, ft-in (m)</td>
<td>18-6 (5.94)</td>
<td>18-3 (5.62)</td>
<td>19-0 (5.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing area, sq ft (m²)</td>
<td>540 (50.17)</td>
<td>540 (50.17)</td>
<td>541 (50.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**A-26C bomber version**

**Early production A-26B**

---

![A-26B Invader schematic](image)
APPENDIX I

DISTINGUISHED UNIT CITATION
The 311st Bombardment Group (H) is cited for outstanding performance of duty in action against the enemy. Between 11 December 1944 and 12 March 1945, this group waged an extremely successful and highly dangerous bridge-busting campaign along the land corridor then held by the Japanese between north China and the tremendous raw material potential found in her conquests in southern Asia and adjacent islands. To thwart the Japanese plan to capitalize on this land line, the group was assigned the hazardous task of destroying the numerous steel and concrete bridges on the modern rail lines in French Indo-China. Two primary considerations faced the group in preparing its method of executing this mission. Supplies, gasoline, and bombs were at a premium in air-supplied China, and the Japanese had ringed the bridges with extensive antiaircraft defenses. To meet these considerations, the group developed and employed its own style of attack, "glip bombing," which employed a triple change in bombing level at low altitude as an elusive maneuver over heavily defended, channeled approaches to the targets. This technique yielded such accuracy that the tonnage of bombs expended per bridge destroyed reached a new record low of 7.75 tons per bridge. Despite hazardous conditions of low visibility, rugged terrain, and intense, accurate antiaircraft fire, under which a large part of these "glip bombing" missions were run, the group destroyed 21 major bridges and damaged 17 in 23 missions. Particularly representative of the determination and perseverance of the combat crews are the missions of 27 February and 5 March 1945. A total of 10 high-priority bridges were destroyed and 2 damaged under enemy fire, with the expenditure of 385 bomb tons per bridge. Because the bridges were generally located in gorges and valleys, approach to the targets was restricted to narrow lanes in which the enemy could easily concentrate their defensive fire. Four of the group's airplanes were shot down in these attacks and 31 others were damaged. Twenty crew members were killed and twelve were wounded. The cost was not light to the group, but the interdiction of this overland route was imperative. With extraordinary heroism, gallantry, determination, and esprit de corps, the group not only met the dangerous challenge, but established a new record in economy of operations in doing so. These achievements of the 311st Bombardment Group (H) are worthy of the gallant traditions of the American military service.

See Bibliographical Note.
APPENDIX J

INSIGNIAS OF THE FOURTEENTH AIR FORCE

AND THE FLYING TIGERS
14TH AIR FORCE
HISTORY OF INSIGNIA OF FOURTEENTH AIR FORCE

The Fourteenth Air Force was constituted 5 March 1943 and made active 10 March 1943; it is entitled to battle participation credits as follows:

China Defensive and China Offensive, GO 12, WD, 1 Feb 46

The Fourteenth Air Force insignia was approved 6 August 1943, as a result of a personal request for such approval and adoption from General Chennault. The basis for the design submitted lies in the organization of the Fourteenth Air Force from the A.V.G., commonly known as the "Flying Tigers".

The A.V.G. (Flying Tigers) was not a regularly organized unit of the Army of the United States, therefore no official connection could exist between this group and the Fourteenth Air Force. However, upon the organization of the Fourteenth Air Force, individual members of the group were either called to active duty under reserve commissions or commissioned in the Army of the United States and assigned to duty with the 23d Fighter Group, a unit of the Fourteenth Air Force. Other individual members of the A.V.G. were undoubtedly assigned to other units of that force (General Chennault).

Description of Insignia:

On a blue disc 2-1/2 inches in diameter, a winged Bengal tiger golden orange with black and white markings, below and partially covering a white star 7/8 inches in diameter, charged with a 5/16 inch red disc.

Significance of Insignia:

The design of this insignia is adapted from the insignia used by the A.V.G. (Flying Tigers) members of which now form a part of the Fourteenth Air Force.

USAF UNIT LINEAGE

Constituted Fourteenth Air Force on 5 Mar 1943.
WD Ltr AG 320-2 (3-2-43) CNT-3-AFD-WU-N, 5 Mar 1943.
Activated on 10 Mar 1943.
GO 10, Hq US Army Forces CJT, 10 Mar 43; GC 1, 11th AF, 1 Mar 43; AG Card and AFHQ Form 0-525, 11th AF.
Inactivated on 6 Jan 1946.
WD Ltr 322 (30 Nov 45) US-1-SF-6CU-N, 5 Dec 45 amnd by AG 322 (8 Jul 46)
AC-7-AFCOR (1h7e)-N, 11 Jul 46; Ltr, ASF, SEFE, 8 Jan 46; GO 1, ASF, SEFE, 2 Jan 46.
來華助戰

洋人（美國）

軍民一體

救人（收護）

航空委員會

字第0094號
APPENDIX K

FOREWORD FROM THE HISTORY OF THE 22ND BOMB SQUADRON,

*THE FLYING TIGERS*
Foreword

There will be a day when our combat stories will have lost their zest; when our wild tales of heroism will have been unrecognizably mangled even beyond their original half-truths; when our wife will be bored by the millionth re-telling; when our friends will have shamed us by fibbing more dramatically than we. In short, there will be a day when we will be left alone by the fireplace with our memories, our pipe and our dog. Toward that day this book is dedicated.
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