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Abstract

This document presents a historic context, integrity analysis, structural analysis, and restoration cost estimate for the Mountain View Officers’ Club (Building 66050) at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. The report meets requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for federal agencies to address their cultural resources—defined as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object. Especially relevant is Section 110 of the NHPA, requiring federal agencies to inventory and evaluate cultural resources. Identification of potentially significant properties is achieved only through a survey and evaluation to associate a property within a larger historic context. The club was dedicated on 6 September 1942 and was utilized for the recreation of black officers stationed at Fort Huachuca from 1942 until 1945. It is the determination of the current survey that while the Mountain View Officers’ Club is individually significant under Criterion A for the black military experience historic context and under Criteria A and C for the World War II temporary building historic context, it does not retain historic integrity under either criteria due to major modifications to both the setting and the building. Therefore, the Mountain View Officers’ Club is recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCLAIMER: The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. All product names and trademarks cited are the property of their respective owners. The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.
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Project Summary

Agency: U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Huachuca

Project Title: Analysis of the Mountain View Officers’ Club

Fort Huachuca Report Number: FH-12-5

Contractor: Engineer Research Development Center – Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (ERDC-CERL)

MIPR: 10091854

Project Description: This document is a historic context, integrity analysis, structural analysis, and restoration cost estimation for the Mountain View Officers’ Club (Building 66050) at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. The club was dedicated on 6 September 1942 and was utilized for the recreation of black officers stationed at Fort Huachuca from 1942 until 1945.

Project Location: ERDC-CERL surveyed the Mountain View Officers’ Club and its immediate area within the Fort Huachuca cantonment area.

Dates of Fieldwork: 29 November–2 December 2011

Number of Properties Surveyed: 1 building

Properties Recommended Individually Eligible: None

Properties Recommended Not Eligible: Mountain View Officers’ Club (Building 66050)

Comments:

It is the determination of the authors that the Mountain View Officers’ Club is significant under Criteria A and C for both World War II temporary building construction and the black military experience. However, the facility lacks 5 of the 6 applicable aspects of integrity (design, setting, materials, feeling, and association) and does not convey its historic significance. Therefore, it lacks the integrity to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to: a complete redesign of the interior floor plan; the removal of the original mural in the dance hall; most of the original windows were removed from the first floor; and all of the windows and their openings were removed from the second floor and clerestory level. This survey satisfies Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, and was used to determine the eligibility of the club for inclusion on the NRHP. Through a structural analysis, an estimated cost of
$3,689,300—$4,360,100 would be required to bring the building back to its original integrity and configuration.
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## Unit Conversion Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>To Obtain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acres</td>
<td>4,046.873</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees Fahrenheit</td>
<td>(F-32)/1.8</td>
<td>degrees Celsius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feet</td>
<td>0.3048</td>
<td>meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallons (U.S. liquid)</td>
<td>3.785412 E-03</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>1.0 E+04</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inches</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
<td>meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles (U.S. statute)</td>
<td>1,609.347</td>
<td>meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles per hour</td>
<td>0.44704</td>
<td>meters per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>0.09290304</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square inches</td>
<td>6.4516 E-04</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>2.589998 E+06</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>square yards</td>
<td>0.8361274</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yards</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
<td>meters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Methodology

The Mountain View Officers’ Club was constructed from the 700 series of Army Quartermaster temporary building plans for service clubs. The building falls under the purview of the 1986 World War II Temporary Building Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement. It was evaluated for eligibility in 1998, and a condition assessment was completed in 2004. Fort Huachuca considered the 1998 evaluation report inadequate and the condition report outdated, and due to the ongoing interest, funded a re-evaluation of the building to correct the inaccuracies in the 1998 report and also to update the structural assessment.

1.1 Background

The U.S. Congress codified the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the nation’s most effective cultural resources legislation to date, in order to provide guidelines and requirements for preserving tangible elements of our past. This was done primarily through the creation of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Contained within this piece of legislation (Sections 110 and 106) are requirements for federal agencies to address their cultural resources, defined as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object. Section 110 requires federal agencies to inventory and evaluate their cultural resources. Section 106 requires the determination of effect of federal undertakings on properties deemed eligible or potentially eligible for the NRHP.

Fort Huachuca is located on the eastern slope of the Huachuca Mountains north and east of Sierra Vista, Arizona (Figure 1). The heart of the cantonment for the fort is its historic district which is nestled in a valley overlooking the San Pedro River valley (Figure 2).

The Army established Camp Huachuca in 1877; it did not become a permanent Army post until 1882. Most of the buildings within the Old Post area date from the late 1880s. The post grew again in the 1910s prior to World War I. From 1913 to 1931, the Tenth Cavalry was stationed at Fort Huachuca. The Army changed the post from a cavalry to an infantry orientation in 1931, and it was home for the 93rd and 92nd Infantry Divisions from 1942 to 1945.
The Mountain View Officers’ Club\(^1\) (Building 66050) was dedicated on 6 September 1942. The construction of the club utilized temporary building plans from the Army’s Quartermaster Construction Corps. The plans were for Service Club Type SC-3 of the 700 series. It was subsequently utilized for recreation, a dinner theater, office space, and is now vacant.

Fort Huachuca performed a previous evaluation of the Mountain View Officers’ Club building in 1998. This study of the Mountain View Officers’ Club was suggested in the early 1990s as part of the nationwide Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement for World War II temporary buildings. The study’s report, *Determination of Eligibility and Historic Documentation for Building 66050, Performing Arts Theater, Fort Huachuca, Arizona* was written by Matt C. Bischoff (Statistical Research Inc.) under contract to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.\(^2\) This report found the Mountain View Officers’ Club eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A (association with events). The report also stated that the Mountain View Officers’ Club was “largely unchanged from its original construction” and that it “retains a high level of integrity.” The period of significance given for the Mountain View Officers’ Club was 1942–1945.

In addition, *Historic Building Condition Assessment Report of the Mountain View Officers’ Club, Fort Huachuca, Cochise County, Arizona* was written by Ralph Comey Architects and Janet H. Strittmatter, Inc. in March 2004. It provided (1) an evaluation of existing conditions, (2) a preservation plan, and (3) a cost estimate for exterior stabilization, structural stabilization, and preservation of visible, historically significant, exterior features.

---

\(^1\) Through all of the research material gathered there is an inconsistency of the club’s name; it is either Mountain View or Mountainview and it is called the Mountain View Colored Officers’ Club on the installation. For consistency, ERDC-CERL has used Mountain View Officers’ Club throughout this report unless the term is located in a quote.

Figure 1. Location of Fort Huachuca, Arizona, outlined in blue with its cantonment area indicated by the red box (Fort Huachuca ICRMP).
Figure 2. Map of the Fort Huachuca cantonment, 2011 with the Mountain View Officers’ Club located within red box (Fort Huachuca).
1.2 Objective

The objective of this effort was to research the history and write a historic context, perform an integrity analysis, perform a structural analysis, and determine an estimated restoration cost for the Mountain View Officers’ Club at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. This final report includes recommendations for eligibility to the NRHP.

1.3 Researchers

This project was conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineering Research Development Center, Construction and Engineering Research Laboratory (ERDC-CERL) based in Champaign, IL. The research team included Adam Smith, Master of Architecture as project manager and architectural historian, Dr. Susan Enscore as historian, Samuel Hunter as the structural and restoration cost analyst, and Andrea Sforza as research assistant.

1.4 Site visits

1.4.1 Fort Huachuca

ERDC-CERL personnel made one trip to Fort Huachuca during the week of 30 November 2011. During that week, members of the team evaluated the Mountain View Officers’ Club for its historic integrity and structural integrity. The historian visited the Department of Public Works (including cultural resources, engineering [the map vault], and real property), and the Fort Huachuca Museum.

1.4.2 Archival repositories

The architectural historian and the historian visited the National Archives at College Park, Maryland, during the week of 31 October 2011. The researchers examined and analyzed information from these Record Groups at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA):

- RG77 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers
- RG92 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General
- RG107 Records of the Office of the Secretary of War
- RG111-SC Records of the U.S. Army Signal Corps (photos)
- RG159 Records of the Office of the Inspector General (Army)
• RG160 Records of the U.S. Army Service Forces (World War II)
• RG 394 Records of the U.S. Army Continental Commands 1920-1942
• RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General’s Office

The historian visited the University of Arizona Library in Tucson, Arizona, and the Arizona State Archives in Phoenix, Arizona, during the week of 7 December 2011 to gather relevant information for the building historic context.

The historian also visited the Billy Rose Theater Collection at the New York Public Library Archives in New York, New York, on 28 February 2012 to research the United Services Organizations (USO) and the variety of performers who might have visited Fort Huachuca during the period of significance.

1.4.3 Archival research

The first phase of the project established the historic context of the Mountain View Officers’ Club through archival research used to identify and locate primary sources. This research included finding, gathering, and reviewing all sources relevant to the project. These sources consisted of the Fort Huachuca Museum, the National Archives at College Park, the University of Arizona Library, the Arizona State Archives, and the Newspaper Library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [Phoenix Newspapers (1941-1945), Tucson Newspapers (1941-1945), Bisbee Newspapers (1941-1945), and regional and national black newspapers (1941-1945)].

The research team also used secondary literature to determine the historic context of the Mountain View Officers’ Club. This involved reading published material on the Mountain View Officers’ Club and on the black military experience. Items looked at and reviewed included the histories of Fort Huachuca, the previous architectural inventory, the *Historic Context for the African-American Military Experience* (1998), other books on the black military experience, and looking through the project archives of Steven Smith at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology & Anthropology. Secondary sources were utilized more heavily for the non-Mountain View Officers’ Club specific history. These sources are accepted and used by the Fort Huachuca history office and other historians. Information specific to the Mountain View Officers’ Club came predominantly from primary
sources such as newspapers. The few secondary sources used for Mountain View Officers’ Club specific information were checked to ensure the cited authors had utilized primary sources for their work.

1.4.4 Analysis and evaluation

After initial research was completed, the team analyzed the gathered information. Archival and field information was integrated throughout the course of the research. Using archival sources, the research team extracted relevant historical information. The material was then integrated to tell the story in both text and images. The information available was contained in text documents, photographs, and history maps.

Using information from the historic context, the overarching integrity as defined by the NRHP was evaluated. A cultural resource can retain or lose historic integrity, meaning that it either does or does not convey its historic significance. From this process, a recommendation of eligibility to the National Register was made. The evaluation followed guidelines in the National Register Bulletin #15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation; National Register Bulletin #16, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form; the National Register Bulletin, How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations; and The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
2 Historic Context for the Mountain View Officers’ Club, Fort Huachuca, Arizona

During World War II (WWII), Fort Huachuca was home to first the 93rd, then the 92nd Infantry Division, both of which were composed of black troops. As such, the fort was the largest training facility for black soldiers and therefore unique in this aspect. During 1941 and 1942, the historic border outpost underwent a massive development program designed to house and support the requirements of a full-strength combat division. A full-size city was constructed in that time, complete with housing, logistical, utility, administration, education, recreation, and religious facilities.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club at Fort Huachuca has been utilized for many different functions since its construction in 1942. The first use after construction, as an officers’ club for the 93rd and then the 92nd Divisions’ black officers, is the only use for which the building has significance. Part of the installation’s WWII cantonment, the Mountain View Officers’ Club provided an off-duty social outlet for the member officers. Primarily a facility for dining and parties, the club also hosted organized entertainment activities and cultural events. This context provides information necessary for understanding the significance of the Mountain View Officers’ Club.

2.1 World War II Army expansion

The rapid expansion of Germany across Europe in 1940 solidified fears at the United States War Department that America might soon be party to an expanding conflict. The first steps toward preparation for this impending war were taken when Congress authorized the president to call up the National Guard and approved the Selective Service Act of 1940. As a result, the Army increased in troop strength from a low of 230,000 to over 1.6 million by December 1941. This rapid influx of soldiers resulted in a tremendous need for construction – not only expanding existing military installations, but also creating entirely new training camps from scratch.

---

3 The text in this section was originally created for: Adam Smith, Susan Enscore, Karen Zimnicki, and Elizabeth Campbell, *Fort Leonard Wood Building Survey 1941 to 1945*, (Champaign, IL: Engineer Research and Development Center, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, 2003), 2-1 – 2-5.

4 David W. Hogan, Jr., *225 Years of the Army*, (Tampa, FL: Faircount, LLC), n.d., 292-293.
Germany’s 1 September 1939 invasion of Poland sparked concern in the United States and prompted President Roosevelt to proclaim a limited national emergency one week later. Troop strength was increased slightly, and the Army began to build temporary shelter to house them. During the late 1930s, a series of cantonment drawings begun a decade earlier were updated and revised by the Construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps. These “700 Series” drawings formed the basis for the small amount of new construction that fall required by the declaration of limited emergency. Events on the world stage during the spring of 1940 jolted American military and government strategists, awakening them to the potential threat to the United States evinced by the rapid German occupation of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands. By the end of June, supplemental military appropriations approaching two billion dollars had been requested and granted to Roosevelt. Troop strength expanded first to 375,000, and $217 million became available for military construction.\(^5\)

These were the first of many appropriations and troop expansions, and in the following months vast sums of money were expended to recruit, house, train, supply, and feed 1.5 million new soldiers. Twenty new cantonments were completed by the time America formally entered the war on December 7, 1941.\(^6\)

To speed construction and provide ease of oversight, the cantonments were developed according to standardized plans. General guidelines for WWII training cantonment layout provided the Army’s principal requirements concerning troop placement, facilities siting, and safety concerns:\(^7\)

Every unit, large and small, would remain intact. Companies would be grouped into battalions and battalions into regiments. Regimental areas would adjoin a central parade ground. Hospitals would be in isolated spots, away from noise and dirt. Storage depots and motor parks would be near railway sidings or

---


along main roads. To prevent the spread of fire, one-story buildings would be at least 40 feet apart, two-story buildings, 50. Firebreaks, no less than 250 feet wide, would be spaced at 1,000-foot intervals throughout the length of the camp. Showing grid-platted streets and straight rows of buildings, the typicals envisaged a quadrangular arrangement.

Early in the war, the most common design shifted from a quadrangle to a triangle layout, as Army organization shifted to Triangle Divisions consisting of three regiments under a Division command. Each leg of the cantonment triangle contained a regiment, with their training ranges adjacent. Cantonments were based on the “company block” concept, with each 125-man company unit provided with two 63-man barracks with indoor plumbing and a separate mechanical room for the furnace, one mess hall, one recreation building, and one administration and supply building (Figure 3).

Although the cantonments were standardized in size, shape, and contents, allowance was made for location. Each site would have its own peculiarities, and the plans were often adjusted to fit the local topography and other conditions. Constructing Quartermasters on-site had the authority to make minor changes on the spot that would expedite construction.

Design for buildings placed in the cantonment also proceeded rapidly through standardization. Many individual types of mobilization buildings were designed, providing every necessity of life in these virtual towns. Plans were created for laundry facilities, bakeries, motor pools, administration, hospitals, officer’s quarters, chapels (one per regiment), athletic arenas, clubs, warehouses, communications, etc. The 700 Series of standard plans envisioned structures that would meet the criteria of housing an expanded Army for an indefinite period of time in a manner that would provide a degree of comfort to the newly inducted soldier. Primary distinguishing characteristics of the more than 300 building types designed included the use of wood stud construction with exteriors painted an ivory color, concrete foundation piers and footings, doors on the narrow front gable ends, ventilators in the gable end wall of two story buildings, and

---

10 Fine and Remington, Construction in the United States, 211.
skirt-roofs – an overhanging eave over the first floor windows that continued around two-story buildings to protect the exterior from water (Figure 4 and Figure 5). These design elements were chosen for ease and speed of construction, and consideration of the unskilled laborers likely to be accomplishing the construction.11

Figure 3. Plan of Cantonment Regimental Grouping, 1940 (Garner 1993, 66).
Figure 4. Standard barracks at Fort Huachuca, 1941 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 5. Typical barracks for 63 Men (Mayes 1941).

The 800 Series of standard building plans supplanted the 700 Series during 1941, and were the primary designs used in the latter part of that year and 1942 for mobilization construction. The new designs altered the 700 Series by eliminating the skirt-roof, which tended to leak, raised the ceiling heights in two-story barracks to allow double bunks and increased the length to allow quarters for specialized personnel, scaled back the eave depth, and reduced the number of nails per connection. As lumber became scarcer in late 1942, asbestos shingles were sometimes used instead of shiplap siding.¹²

With construction proceeding on an assembly-line structure with framing crews moving from one building to the next, the physical labor was also

formalized for efficiency. The combination of standardized layouts, standardized building plans, expedited alterations, and specialized crews resulted in cantonments that seemed to leap into existence. From August 1940 to June 1941, the Quartermaster Corps built facilities for nearly one million troops, including some who were learning to call Fort Huachuca home.

### 2.2 Black soldiers in World War II

The racial divisions present in United States society continued during the war. Issues involving quotas, separation of races, provision of equal facilities, the level of training offered, and career advancement arose within the military as they did in the civilian population. The Army was torn between crafting new policies and procedures to reduce these issues, and trying to maintain the status quo so as to not detract energy and resources from the critical need to gear up to fight a difficult war. This dichotomy was not fully resolved by the time the war ended.

#### 2.2.1 Drafting

Some of these issues came to light at the very beginning of mobilization. By mid-1940, plans were proceeding for greatly expanding the nation’s military strength. This need for a rapid influx of recruits resulted in the Selective Service Act of 1940, authorizing the United States government to institute a program of conscription into the armed services. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 contained language providing that “there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.” The implementation of this language, however, led to difficulties throughout the war.

The general positions on black troops held by the War Department at that time were:

---


14 MacGregor, Integration of the Armed Forces 1940-1965, 12.

• Blacks would be mobilized in representative numbers to their proportion of the general population’s strength of military age men, approximately nine percent.

• Black soldiers would be utilized in all units for which they qualified, including combat arms.

• Black troops would be organized into all-black units, but would likely be attached to larger white units.

• Officers for these units could be black or white, but the black units would have a higher number of officers. Black officers were to receive the same training, at the same schools, and to the same standards, as white officers. Black officers would only serve in black units, only commanding black troops.

• Black troops would be “trained, officered, quartered, clothed, and provided with all facilities in the same manner as white troops.”

These general policies held throughout America’s entry into the war, and most of them held for the duration. The strength limit of black soldiers as a percentage comparable to the general population was maintained throughout. According to Steve Smith in his historical review of black soldiers at Fort Huachuca:16

By December 1942, the number of blacks enlisted in the Army had increased from a 1939 level of 3,640 men to 467,883. This trend continued throughout the war. Total African American representation in the military climbed as high as 701,678 in September 1944 and as high a total percentage as 8.81% in December 1945. Enlisted personnel reached the 10.29% figure that same month.

2.2.2 Segregation of housing and recreation programs

The policy on facilities in essence required the War Department to construct or provide existing facilities for black soldiers in a “separate but equal” fashion. The decision to house and support black troops “as if the colored contingent formed the garrison of a separate camp or cantonment,” posed the greatest problems in the distribution and use of recrea-

16 Smith, The African American Soldier at Fort Huachuca, 77.
tional facilities. Separate housing was less of an issue on most of the WWII expansion posts, due to the recent nature of the construction and the identical nature of the barracks. Very rarely were there any added amenities to these buildings, so there was no need to investigate differences in quality between the barracks assigned to black soldiers. But it did create difficulties in finding posts for the increasing numbers of black troops. The problem is succinctly expressed by Smith:

The Army policy of segregated housing for African American troops caused mobilization and training complications at installations and camps across the nation. Because so few blacks were in the Army at the war’s beginning, camps and forts already built were not designed for, nor could they be adapted readily to separated, self-functioning housing, recreational, and in some cases, training areas for black units. Even when there were empty or underutilized barracks and recreational facilities awaiting troops, these spaces were not necessarily adaptable for housing black troops because of imposed black unit size restrictions. As noted, at the beginning of the war black units were restricted to brigade or smaller units. Traditionally, military units had always been housed by unit to maintain unit cohesion, control, and to build morale. Installation housing was designed with this in mind. However, where black units did not correspond in size and complexity to white units, housing and recreation facilities would either be crowded or underutilized in order to maintain the policy-driven separation of white and black units. Such complications often resulted in installations housing their newly formed black units in make-shift areas, after white troops had been fully housed. If there was no space available, they were tented until separate housing could be built.

---

17 War Department, Adjutant General’s Office, Washington, “War Department Construction Policy,” 19 August 1941, RG 92 Quartermaster General, General Correspondence 1936-45, Box 699, File: “600.1 Misc 1940,” National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

Recreation facilities posed a related but different problem. These facilities, covering everything from libraries to swimming pools and ball fields to movie theaters, were allocated to installations during WWII based on unit size. The larger the units posted to the installation, the more recreational amenities they received, and certain types of facilities were allocated only when the installation population crossed certain thresholds. Since black units were by policy smaller units attached to larger white units, they were at a distinct disadvantage in the allocation of these recreational amenities. As Smith explains:\(^\text{19}\)

Recreational facilities for blacks would be determined by their representation at various installations “. . .as if the colored contingent formed the garrison of a separate camp.” In other words, if a black company was stationed at an installation, they would have separate recreational facilities normally associated with a company-sized unit, if a battalion was stationed at an installation, it would have recreational facilities to serve a battalion. Thus, although there was no official policy about separate recreational facilities, the housing policy of unit segregation by race carried over into un-stated policies regarding recreational facilities. Separate housing had some rationale when observed from the viewpoint of unit cohesion. Since units were housed separately by tradition and policy to enhance unit cohesion, unit segregation fit without reference to segregation by race. But segregated recreational facilities stood out more clearly as racial discrimination since usually they were shared by many units at a single post.

While the allocation seems straightforward, there was also an exception that could be applied to provide additional facilities for posts in isolated areas that had no recourse to civilian recreational amenities. There were no clear guidelines for applying this exception, which muddied the waters somewhat. It seems to have been used on a case-by-case basis, when requested by post commanders. This program for additional facilities was established by order of the Secretary of War on 31 March 1941, with an ini-
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tial appropriation from the 4th Supplemental National Defense Act of 1941. These allotments were also based on troop strength, with set numbers for allocations of service clubs, theaters, guest houses, and recreation buildings.

Even more disruptive than the lack of adequate recreational facilities was the fact that they were segregated, with black soldiers denied the right to use recreation facilities assigned to white soldiers. The War Department took a step to address this issue by issuing a directive on 10 March 1943 “forbidding the assignment of any recreational facility, ‘including theaters and post exchanges,’ by race and requiring the removal of signs labeling facilities for ‘white’ and ‘colored’ soldiers.” The use of separate facilities by unit was still allowed, so the directive had little impact and resulted in enough confusion that local commanders often simply ignored it altogether. The flashpoints seemed to be theaters and post exchanges, and these two were addressed separately in a War Department directive issued 8 July 1944 that, although allowing separation by unit, insisted all post exchanges and theaters must be open to all. Again, this directive was applied haphazardly across the installations, and the issue remained divisive for most of the war.

2.3 92nd and 93rd Infantry Divisions in World War II

2.3.1 Creation of black divisions

The War Department had been discussing the idea of larger black units in fall 1941. As Army manpower was being increased, the proportionate rise in black soldiers created a difficulty in assignment. The policy of assigning black troops to smaller organizations was running up against the need to place more and more black troops. Basic training for black soldiers was being carried out at Camp Blanding, Florida; Fort McClellan, Alabama; Fort Devens, Massachusetts; Fort Benning, Georgia; Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Fort Knox, Kentucky; and Camp Claiborne, Louisiana, among others including Fort Huachuca. There were also concentrations of black
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troops at many installations, including Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Camp Livingston, Louisiana; Camp Davis, North Carolina; Fort Belvoir, Virginia; Camp Lee, Virginia; Fort Sill, Oklahoma; Fort Clark, Texas; and Aberdeen, Maryland. Creating larger black units was a potentially useful option as Army divisions would utilize a large number of soldiers in one place. The first public mention of this idea occurred on 8 December 1941, when General George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, spoke to a group of black editors. He informed them that “an entire Negro division will be formed in the spring at Fort Huachuca.” The announcement met with a good amount of hostility, as black leaders had been advocating for a large volunteer unit not defined by race, and they felt the creation of an all-Negro division simply reinforced the Army’s segregated structure.

2.3.2 Stationing and deployment

A more formal announcement of the decision to locate the new black division at Fort Huachuca was made by the War Department on 22 January 1942 by Secretary of War Stimson. The unit’s creation was part of the Army’s larger expansion to 3.6 million men. Also announced at this time was the designation of the unit as the 93rd Infantry Division, one of 32 triangular divisions to be created that year, and the stationing of the 93rd at Fort Huachuca. Stationing was a critical issue for the War Department, as considerations for placing black troops included finding posts with sufficient available facilities and considering the attitudes of the local population near the post. For the 93rd, Fort Huachuca was likely seen as the logical choice, as it was “a post which had housed Negro troops traditionally and which was far enough away from civilian communities to minimize local protest over sending so large a unit there.” Another favorable factor was the already-established presence of black troops at

26 “Plans for Negro Division At Fort Huachuca Revealed,” Atlanta Daily World, 10 December 1941, 1.
29 Ibid.
30 Lee, The Employment of Negro Troops, 106.
Fort Huachuca provided the new division with seasoned non-commissioned and lower-grade black officers in the 25th Infantry.31

Plans for the formation were well underway by the time the division was announced, with composition and construction both mapped out. According to a 20 December 1941 article in a leading black newspaper:32

Maj. Edmund K. Daley, of the quartermaster general’s office in Washington, D.C. arrived in Fort Huachuca, Ariz., last week and checked the site and layout for the proposed new building to house the enlarged force. ...Plans for the expansion of Fort Huachuca to accommodate an extra 11,309 soldiers who, combined with the troops in the 25th and 368th infantry would make a triangular division, are definitely under way and construction, when started, will be completed in a maximum of six months. The combined force here would be 17,903 men.... Composing the division will be three infantry regiments, quartermaster and engineering battalions, a medical battalion and artillery and service units.

The announcement triggered speculation about the leadership of the division, with particular interest in the possible assignment of black officers. This speculation was put to rest by a 5 March 1942 announcement from Secretary Stimson that detailed the activation of the 93rd at Fort Huachuca in May, with Brigadier General C. P. Hall commanding and a number of black line officers assigned to the division.33 There were not enough black officers to fulfill the pledge that the 93rd be “partly officered by Negro officers,” so the 5 March announcement also included a call for “all Army reserve officers not already on active duty to be sent to Fort Benning for the necessary training.”34 Once training was completed, they would be posted to Fort Huachuca and the 93rd Division.

Buildings for the new division were receiving finishing touches the first week of May and on 15 May 1942, the 93rd Infantry Division was officially
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reactivated as part of the Third Army (Figure 6). The recruits then immediately began their training to become soldiers (Figure 7-Figure 9). This consisted of a 17-week course including “Close order drill, military courtesy and discipline, first aid, marksmanship, and many more things that all come under the general heading of Military Science.”

35 “The original 93rd served with distinction in World War No. 1 and was composed of National Guard colored troops from the east. It comprised four infantry regiments: the 269th, the 370th, 371st, and 372nd.” From: “Fort Huachuca Becomes Major Training Center,” Nogales International, 14 August 1942, 1.

Figure 8. Major General Fred W. Miller, 93rd Infantry Division Commanding General, watches rifle training at Fort Huachuca, 1943 (NARA).

Figure 9. Soldiers of Battery B, 93rd Division swing a 105mm Howitzer into position, Fort Huachuca, 1942 (NARA).

The division strength as of August 1942 was 875 officers and 13,345 enlisted men.37 That December, a similar strength of 13,000 enlisted men was estimated.38 Over the next year, changes in officer composition by race were taking place, as “in the eighteen months between mid-1942 and the end of 1943, the number of white officers in the division decreased from 634 to 279 and the number of Negro officers increased from 250 to 575.”39


By April 1943, the 93rd Division had been dispatched to Louisiana to participate in Third Army maneuvers. At completion of this training in June, the division reported to the Desert Training Center at the California-Arizona Maneuver Area for additional exercises and maneuvers held in November. The training was all in preparation for their subsequent deployment to the South Pacific front. Beginning in January 1944, the 93rd were deployed initially to the Solomans, then to Guadalcanal where individual units were broken out. Members of the 93rd saw some initial combat, but by June-July the 93rd had been assigned to rear duties of security, labor, and training. These remained their duties for the war’s duration.

Within a period of weeks after the departure of the 93rd, the 92nd Division was moving to Fort Huachuca for training. This was the second all-black troop division created during the war. There was a special inspection of the black troops at Fort Huachuca on 14-19 July 1943 by Brigadier General B. O. Davis, U.S. Army and Mr. Truman K. Gibson, Acting Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War. The subsequent report mentions the composition of the 92nd at that time to be 886 officers and 14,551 enlisted troops. In addition, there were 2 quartermaster corps battalions with another 47 officers and 1,817 enlisted, as well as various smaller support units and the military hospital, which combined increased the total of officers by nearly 200 and enlisted by another 3,000-4,000.

The 92nd followed the same training path as the 93rd, including Louisiana maneuvers from February to April 1944. Upon returning to Fort Huachuca, the division prepared for overseas deployment, with the 370th Regimental Combat Team departing first, on 15 July 1944 for Italy. The full division followed through October and supported the Fifth Army line. The division units were subsequently detached and served in various campaigns until the Italian surrender on 2 May 1945.
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2.4 Fort Huachuca in World War II

2.4.1 From small beginnings

At the beginning of WWII, Fort Huachuca was a small installation with a cantonment, service areas, and training lands. As of June 1940, the post was occupied by “the 25th Infantry, a colored unit, with 1065 enlisted, a medical detachment with 29 men, and a quartermaster corps detachment of 49 men.” Ten months later, these troops had been joined by the 368th Infantry Regiment, bringing the total strength of black troops at Fort Huachuca to 5,292. This increase coincided with the first major building phase for the WWII cantonment area. In addition to the regular Army buildings constructed, a Federal Works Agency Defense Housing project provided duplex housing for 30 families of non-commissioned officers of the two regiments.

2.4.2 World War II buildup

The WWII cantonment at Fort Huachuca grew in distinct phases, dictated by the pending arrival of troops and War Department budgets. As one phase ended, plans and specifications were being created for the next mass of construction at the post. The work progressed mostly at full speed, as illustrated in a newspaper article discussing the first phase of construction, and commenting that, “well over 200 of them [buildings] were built within 90 days, an average of 2.6 completed buildings a day. A mess hall was readied for use within 12 hours at the start of work.” By the end of construction, over a thousand buildings had been completed, presenting a sea of identical barracks and supporting buildings spreading down the slope, with the mountains as a backdrop (Figure 10). According to Steve Smith in his historical review of black soldiers at Fort Huachuca, “...by January 1941 some six million dollars was already at work building the cantonment for the 368th Infantry, and when it was decided that a full division would train there, another 23 million dollars were spent to construct 1,242 buildings for housing, 58 facilities (clubs, recreational buildings, post office, churches, guest houses, headquarters’, guard houses, hospitals) and 26

47 “Expanded Army to Keep Racial Bars,” The Baltimore African-American, 1 June 1940, 1.
storage buildings on 75,000 acres of land. To support this city on the desert, over 1,400 civilians were employed.”

2.4.2.1 First phase of cantonment construction, 1940-41

Conducted under Procurement Authority No. QM 7616 P1-3211A, the fixed-fee contract for the first cantonment construction was negotiated during October 1940 and used the architecture/engineering firm of Headman, Ferguson & Carollo of Phoenix to assist with supervision of the construction. The Del E. Webb Construction Company of Phoenix handled the actual construction, with White & Miller, Contractors, Inc. of Tucson as a junior member. The site layout “had been made during the year prior to the start of actual construction by the War Department, resulting in a definite location of site with reference to the established Post and the well water supply.” The project began on 24 October 1940 with the troop housing completed by 28 February 1941. During this first phase of new cantonment construction, housing for 5,240 men and officers was built, resulting in 80 barracks (63-man), 26 mess halls, 27 day rooms, 27 storehouse and company administration buildings, 5 officers’ quarters (40-
man), 2 officers’ mess halls, and 18 other buildings for utilities, storage, security, and recreation. The latter category included a regimental-size recreation building, a theater (364-man), a guest house, and one service club (type SC-3, plan 700-1275). Additionally, this contract covered construction of a 190-bed hospital with wards, mess hall, infirmary, storehouse, dental clinic, administration building, and quarters for nurses and officers. To accomplish this in a period of months, over 3,600 persons were employed and weekly payrolls ran as high as $160,000.

Located to the east of the existing cantonment, the new construction extended east-west along a spur of the Southern Pacific Railroad (Figure 11). The regimental buildings were placed on 1st Street, facing inward to the cantonment. Located on slightly higher ground, occupants of these buildings were provided with a view over the regimental area. Figure 12 looks across the southern leg of the “triangle” to the east in 1948, with 1st Street visible as the nearest north-south street. There was a recreation center between Railroad Avenue North and D Avenue, visible in Figure 12 as the triangular area just left of center. Contained within this area were a “post office, theater, post exchange, regimental recreational building, service club, fire hall, and guard house.” All cantonment buildings in this first phase were likely of the 700 Series of temporary building standardized plans. Project Architect Sam Headman was quoted in a local newspaper stating that, “the buildings will last almost indefinitely.”

### 2.4.2.2 Supplemental construction in 1941

An addition construction contract to the same firms was let shortly after the original construction for 10 additional buildings. The $134,644 contract included two regimental chapels, three barracks for an anti-tank company, a post exchange, patients’ recreation building, mess hall, recreation building, and a storehouse and administration building. The work was completed on 15 August 1941. The two recreation buildings and the post
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exchange were constructed under the effort to provide additional recrea-
tional facilities for black troops (Figure 13).59

By mid-September, the final addition to the cantonment for the 25th and
368th Infantry Regiments was started. Also constructed by the Del. W
Webb Construction Company, the 36 buildings include 22 barracks, six
battalion administration buildings, two company storehouses, two recrea-
tion day rooms, two mess halls and two native-stone gatehouses. By 15
November, the additional buildings were complete, and the troops then
moved in, bringing the two regiments to full war-time strength.60 By the
end of the full first phase of construction, over $7 million had been ex-
pired on creating the cantonment and 300 new buildings were in place.
At the same time, the post population had expanded from about 1,300 to
more than 6,000.61 This expansion was just a hint of things to come.

59 Russell G. Carlin, 1st Lieut., Q.M.C., Assistant to Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War, Office of the As-
sistant Secretary, 27 October 1941, RG 107, Office of the Assistant Secretary of War 1940-1947, Box
242, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
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Twelve Months,” Nogales International, 5 December 1941, 1.
Figure 11. Map of Fort Huachuca showing layout of WWII cantonment, 1945 [north is to the left] (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 12. Partial view to the east of WWII cantonment, 1948; Mountain View Officers’ Club is in the lower right (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 13. A post exchange at Fort Huachuca in full swing, 1942 (NARA).
2.4.3 New cantonment

The firm of Headman, Ferguson & Corollo was selected to provide architectural and engineering services for the new training camp at Fort Huachuca on 28 March 1941. This was part of a group of firms announced for the 28 new camps planned as part of the increase of forces in anticipation of American involvement in WWII. The Fort Huachuca project was described as a Triangular Division for 30,000 troops, the same as new camps in Alabama, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. The projects all had different architecture-engineering firms assigned that were regionally located to their assigned camp construction project.62

The new construction took place under a revised War Department construction policy. Released on 19 August 1941, the policy reflected the strain on resources caused by the massive building program and other Army expansion costs; it limited the numbers and types of buildings that could be constructed in the new cantonments, particularly suspending the construction of family housing for married officers and non-commissioned officers.63 For the new camps, the essential facilities included in the policy, in addition to barracks, were administration, supply, service, maintenance, security, recreation, welfare, and health. At existing posts, the policy dictated that new construction of service, administrative, and recreational buildings were to be provided only where these facilities were considered essential for the increased garrison. Funding would not be made available for construction of swimming pools.64 Instead, it was suggested that Works Progress Administration (WPA) funds be used for this purpose.

In a 4 November 1941 correspondence from the Quartermaster General’s Office to the Constructing Quartermaster in Zone VIII, the cantonment facilities required by the location of a full triangular division at Fort Huachuca are laid out. Funded by part of a 1942 Supplemental National Defense Bill, this construction effort was designed to provide the additional facilities needed for an authorized total strength of 18,633 officers and
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enlisted men. According to testimony given at the appropriation hearing by Brigadier General Brehon B. Somervell, chief of the Construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps, “we have had on the ground a group of engineers for some months, who have been doing the advance planning; we have made surveys, laid out buildings, the water and sewer system, roads and other facilities.” Preliminary plans had been submitted and approved in early September. Subsequently, the list of facilities had been revised, approved, and a contract awarded by 20 January 1942.

Funding for the division-size cantonment project at Fort Huachuca was approved by the House Appropriations Committee on 3 December 1941 at a cost of $11,590,720. The pace of activity increased immediately. That same day, Army officials were on the ground at the fort looking over the site and the finalized plans for the planned cantonment:

The architect engineering firm adapted the layout here from a typical layout provided by the War Department. The infantry regiments will be ranged along one side of the parade and recreation area, approximately 6,000 by 3,000 feet, with the artillery, special battalions and division troops on the other. Motor storage areas will be in the rear of these. Each infantry regiment will have 224 motor vehicles, the artillery 599, and the special troops 518.

The project was designed to provide the facilities needed to increase the size of the post’s military population to 17,903, an increase of 11,309
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men.\footnote{Ibid.} Construction of the necessary buildings was expected to be completed in 5.5 months.\footnote{Ibid.} These buildings were all of standardized construction (mostly 700 Series temporary type) identical in style with those at Army posts across the country (Figure 14). The building list included:\footnote{“Bids for Fort Expansion are to be Sought,” \textit{The Arizona Daily Star}, 6 December 1941, 1.}

158 barracks, 71 mess halls, 65 company and administration buildings, 67 company recreation buildings, more regimental chapels, six post exchanges, 11 storehouses, five infirmaries, seven guardhouses, one central dental clinic, one sports arena, 14 motor repair shops, 11 officers quarters, two residences for regimental commanders, two for brigadier generals, and one for a major general; one oil shed, 12 oil houses, 17 wash racks, 12 grease and inspection racks, one dispatcher house, four serve stations, nice 12,000 gallon fuel tanks, 38 dispensing nozzles, one station quartermaster office, one station finance office, two theaters with stages, three fire stations, 10 general warehouses, one ordinance repair shop, one inflammable storage building, two loading ramps, 15 portable igloo magazines, one stockade office and tool house, four sentry boxes, one laundry including a boilerhouse, one bakery, one quartermaster utility shop, one clothing and repair shop, two incinerators, five shop company maintenance buildings with arms rooms, 19,000 lineal feet of fence, and the addition of 12 bays, six by 25 feet each, to the post office. The hospital will be expanded by 741 beds, with all attendant necessities such as operating rooms, clinics, and the like.
The advertisement for bids on the project went out 8 December and responses were due 29 December. In addition to the massive amount of buildings, the specifications included complete water and sewer systems, an electrical distribution system, motor fuel supply and distribution system, a natural gas distribution system, and 15 ammunition magazines. A contract for the project was awarded to the Del E. Webb Company of Phoenix, along with the Ford J. Twaits Company and the Morrison-Knudson Company, both of Los Angeles. Work was underway immediately, and the cantonment was largely ready for the arrival of the 93rd Infantry in May, 1942. A diagrammatic map of the cantonment was produced in 1943 (Figure 15).
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The only other major construction at the post during the war was a new compound for several hundred Women’s Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) soldiers that were attached to the 92nd Division. Facilities for women at that time were segregated as fully as those for blacks. The necessary barracks, mess halls, administration buildings, recreation buildings, and oth-
ers facilities were constructed in an area that was generally “off limits” to men. The construction contract, priced at $100,000 was won by the Murphey-Keith Company of Tucson.78

2.5 Recreation at Fort Huachuca, World War II

2.5.1 Morale problems

The remote location of Fort Huachuca placed severe limits on the recreational opportunities available to the military population in their off-duty hours. The lack of a nearby sizable black community compounded the isolation for black soldiers. These geographic factors, combined with homesickness, the strangeness of sudden military life, and the daily difficulties inherent in black soldiers under the command of high-ranking white officers brought about a serious morale problem at the fort among both the black enlisted men and black lower-ranking officers. Soldiers needed places and activities to blow off steam. A 1942 newspaper article outlined the difficulties:79

Whatever civilian communities exist are widely separated and at great distances from the fort. The natural conditions are not suitable for the accommodation of colored troops in their social and other recreational activities. This fact was recognized by the War department during the construction of the cantonment and an effort was made to provide amusements and recreational facilities that would offset these natural advantages.

2.5.2 Recreation facilities off post

Transportation between the fort and the major cities of Tucson and Phoenix was time-consuming and unreliable, particularly for soldiers without access to automobiles. The closer towns of Bisbee and Tombstone were utilized, but relations between the towns and the fort were not always easy.

Construction of the massive cantonment drew hundreds of workers who gathered outside the gates in the small community of Fry, Arizona. The presence of the workers, and the rapidly increasing numbers of soldiers on

79 “Huachuca Soldiers To Get Clean Amusements At Fry,” Pittsburgh Courier, 12 September 1942, 1.
post drew even more to the makeshift town. Fry rapidly became an unsavory place, with prostitution, drinking, and gambling as the major activities, particularly in an area adjacent to the Fort Huachuca gate, which became known as “The Hook.”

Efforts to improve the situation came largely in a two-pronged attack. One approach was medical-based, with an information campaign concerning venereal disease and the establishment of prophylactic stations at the fort’s gate into the Fry area. The other approach involved finding more constructive ways for the recruits to spend their time. In addition to creating more on-post recreational facilities, the town of Fry received a USO building (Figure 16). These buildings were constructed by the Army and by late 1941, 25 of them were under construction or in planning stages in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arizona. Each USO recreational facility included a “social hall, dance floor and auditorium and a stage for the presentation of motion pictures and stage productions. Other features of the buildings include a spacious lounge, several club rooms, a kitchen, soda fountain and refreshment bar, a dark room for amateur photographers and shower, locker and rest rooms.”

![Figure 16. USO building at Fry, Arizona, 1942 (NARA).](image)

The efforts seemed to pay off, as about one year later, the *Baltimore African-American* ran an article stating that the community of Fry was getting cleaned up and becoming a “decent, respectable place of recreation for the nearly 20,000 soldiers stationed here...canteens, theaters, grocery stores,
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sandwich shops and the USO Center are landmarks of decency.” In reality, this was a bit optimistic, as the more disreputable activities continued at a lower level. Even so, the USO Center remained active throughout the war, as an article in the Atlanta Daily World on 10 December 1944 illustrates:

The Fort Huachuca U.S.O. has recently increased all recreational program activities, with the arrival of new units at this station. Motion pictures, dances, hobby, discussion and study groups, and feature contests are popular activities at this U.S.O. ... The U.S.O. program, along with the two service clubs, forms a major part of Fort Huachuca’s extensive recreational, entertainment, and educational program, under the personal director of Colonel Edwin N. Hardy, Post Commander.

2.5.3 Recreation facilities on post

The amount of recreational facilities constructed at installations during the WWII build-up was directly related to the number of troops posted. The War Department construction policy provided the specifics. As of 7 August 1940, triangular and square division encampments included one day room per company, one recreation building per regiment, one service club per division, and two movie theaters per division (Figure 17). Two months later, this was amended to add one guest house per division, and the provision of a service club was further clarified, “for camps over 5,000 and less than 10,000 capacity, one service club will be provided for each station.” For Fort Huachuca, this meant one service club in the 1940-41 first expansion. The growth of the post in 1941-42 meant that the post was entitled to a second service club. The 19 August 1941 construction policy added a field house for garrisons with more than 10,000 enlisted, and au-
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authorized a recreation building for posts with more than 200 officers. Officers’ clubs were not specifically included in the approved list of buildings.

There were hostess houses (also called guest houses) often constructed near service clubs and officer clubs for housing visiting relatives of soldiers for a few days (Figure 18). In an area as isolated as Fort Huachuca, there would have been few options available for short-term housing of blacks near the fort, so these guest quarters served a vital function for morale purposes.  

![Figure 17. Day room, Fort Huachuca, 1942 (NARA).](image1)

![Figure 18. Interior of Hostess House, Fort Huachuca, 1942 (NARA).](image2)
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In addition to facilities, there were various hobby clubs, theatrical groups, musical groups, and newspapers produced on post for the enjoyment of the soldiers (Figure 19 and Figure 20). Plays were presented in the various regimental recreation halls. Many new recruits possessed skills that proved useful in providing entertainment, teaching courses, or running workshops, in addition to ex-newspaper men that established papers for both the 93rd and the 92nd Divisions.

Figure 19. The Post Headquarters Band at practice, 1943 (Special Service Bulletin March 1943, Fort Huachuca Museum).

90 The 93d Blue Helmet was published from 18 Sept 1942 to 26 March 1943, and The Buffalo, was published for the 92d Division. (Stephen C. Gregory, Museum Technician, Fort Huachuca Museum to Martyn Tagg, Cultural Resources Manager, 7 March 2011), used with permission from both parties.
The Special Service Division assigned soldiers to entertain soldiers. In its own band, it has obtained the pick of enlisted musicians in the West. An original musical show, produced and written at Fort Huachuca, "GI Rhapsody," traveled the state and was filmed by Hollywood cameramen.

The 29th Special Service War Bond carnival was one of several put on by the Post which sold over $3,000,000 worth of War Bonds in two drives.

Entertainment by Special Services carried groups to picnics, excursions and trips to historical places.


Above: Outside celebrities were brought to the Fort, too, among whom was gracious Lena Horne.

Left: Two Service Clubs were nightly scenes of merriment as parties, dances and entertainments of all kinds were offered to soldiers.

Figure 20. Recreational activities at Fort Huachuca during WWII (Apache Sentinel 22 September 1944, Fort Huachuca Museum).
A 22 November 1941 article in the *Baltimore African-American* discusses the efforts undertaken at Huachuca to keep up the morale of the enlisted men (excerpts from article):  

The USO, the YW and YM and a Catholic organization have all sent representatives. Add these to two chaplains, three hostesses and a librarian...Howard University has lent one of its best drama coaches to Huachuca to prepare for troop performances...Mrs. Mary Carter is senior hostess... Mrs. Beatrice Gildersleeve is junior hostess in charge of the guest house...the names of Ella Fitzgerald and Jack Teagarden are scrawled in her guest register...Miss Mary M. Brooks, junior hostess in charge of the cafeteria...the PX serves sandwiches and light lunches, the meal halls are going full blast, and the bowling alley has a lunch counter...There is a first rate band...the swing band is good, too, but it is more or less a private enterprise among the men...There is a nature club, art group, camera club, tap dancing group, acting, writing and journalism activities. There is a baseball field and a basketball court for every company. There's bowling...and of course the men have movies and recreation halls – and both regiments have chapels. The service club is the center of interest...Dances are held in the service club at least once a week.

Within a few more months, additional athletic facilities had been provided including volleyball courts, a “hardball diamond in the Old Fort with grandstand,” and several baseball and softball fields (Figure 21).  
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Cross building where personnel did welfare work.93 A newspaper article several months later notes the presence of a football field.94

In addition to recruits that left careers as performers, there were also athletes turned soldiers stationed at Fort Huachuca. Their skills were also utilized for providing recreational outlets. A former professional boxing instructor and trainer, now Private Jones, became the post’s primary boxing instructor in the fall of 1942. It is likely that many practice bouts and competitive matches were held on post. The post team was very successful, so they may have often given exhibitions.95

93 “Huachuca Soldiers To Get Clean Amusements At Fry,” 1.
95 “Jones Boxing Tutor At Fort Huachuca,” Atlanta Daily World, 3 July 1943, 4.
Figure 21. Athletic activities at Fort Huachuca during WWII (Apache Sentinel 22 September 1944, Fort Huachuca Museum).
Exhibitions were also given by professional boxers who found themselves working for Uncle Sam. Joe Louis, the heavyweight boxing champion, was a visitor to Fort Huachuca, although he was stationed in Texas. His first visit was 17 May 1943, and during his two-day stay he visited soldiers in the hospitals and refereed boxing bouts. In addition, he visited post headquarters, trained with the men on the field, and dedicated a recreation hall (Figure 22). He was quartered in the enlisted barracks during his stay.96

![Figure 22. Sergeant Joe Louis and Colonel Edwin Hardy, Fort Huachuca, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).](image)

He returned to Fort Huachuca from 19-21 November 1943. This time, with Corporal Sugar Ray Robinson, he put on three exhibition bouts with 92nd Division opponents. With crowds estimated at 14,000 for each of the exhibitions, at least two of the three were held during halftimes at the football stadium.97 Although there are assumptions made that Joe Louis used a boxing ring located in the old 25th Infantry training area near the Mountain View Officers’ Club, the soldiers stationed at the fort put on many practice and competitive matches and this could be the reason for the ring

96 “Sgt. Joe Louis Visits Fort Huachuca Today,” *Arizona Daily Citizen*, 17 May 1943, 1; Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011.

near the Mountain View club. There is no documentary evidence of Joe Louis using the ring, which seems to have been in place since 1941, according to Steve Gregory at the Fort Huachuca Museum. Documentation of the ring consists of a 1941 8mm film segment, and a 1956 aerial photo that shows the ring and a set of old bleachers. As the demand to observe a fight would have been huge, it is likely that the only other known fight, the third of the Sugar Ray Robinson exhibitions, would have been in the field house.

For holidays or other special occasions, there was an astonishingly broad variety of activities available to the soldiers. A good example is Labor Day 1942, when members of the 93rd Division were treated to full day:

Beginning at 8:30 in the morning field meets were held in all the infantry regiments and the division artillery. Champions were crowned in the various athletic events. In charge of these meets were the special service officers of the various units. In the afternoon a matinee dance was held in the big sports arena here with the thousands of soldiers in attendance. Girls from Tucson, Ariz., and the fort danced with the soldiers. A popularity contest was held to select the most popular girl at the dance. After the dance a carnival and puppet show was held in the sports arena.”

2.5.4 Performances

In addition to “in-house” talent, many notable performers came to entertain the troops at Fort Huachuca. These artists sometimes came on their own, or in small groups, but were most often organized into traveling shows. As such, they would visit many different military posts as part of a larger tour. The most famous of these were put on in later years by Bob Hope and a large retinue of performers (Figure 23). The administrative organization was Camp Shows, Inc., run by the USO. Camp Shows, Inc. would receive requests from installations for performers, and a group of entertainers would be dispatched. Most of the artists were at least somewhat well-known nationally, and they included singers, actors, magicians,

98 “Jones Boxing Tutor At Fort Huachuca,” 4; Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011; Stephen C. Gregory, Museum Technician, Fort Huachuca Museum e-mail to Susan Enscore, ERDC-CERL, 28 April 2012.

99 “Fort Huachuca, Ariz.,” Chicago Defender, 12 September 1942, 8.
puppeteers, musicians, dancers, and comedians. There were several of these troupes made up of black artists that were organized to entertain the black soldiers. For these troupes, life on the road was more demanding than for their white counterparts:100

By the middle of the war, only two of twenty-five such shows on the road were for blacks, and the black performers involved found that, while white performers were fed and provided with hotel rooms or sleeping accommodations while traveling, black performers did not enjoy similar provisions. They had to fend for themselves – find restaurants that would feed them and places to stay overnight, and sit up in day coaches. And instead of including black plays similar to the dramas that white troops saw, the shows for blacks, one participant said, were ‘patterned on the Shuffle Along of twenty years ago.’

Fort Huachuca received visits from many entertainers, either as part of the USO program or celebrities making appearances on their own.101 As with all soldiers, the men at Fort Huachuca were starved for diversion, and these events were highly anticipated. The shows would be put on most often in the theaters. Depending on demand, the more famous headliners would perform in the field house, or outdoors at the open-air arena. There were also many performances in the service clubs for the enlisted men. For example, Ella Fitzgerald performed at a concert and dance in the newly built service club on 22 June 1941. The audience was a combination of officers and enlisted men.102 On 31 January 1942, Etta Moten, the first black to perform at the White House, sang for a capacity house in the post theater.103 Dinah Shore sang for the troops in the field house on 9 Janu-

101 Fort a list of entertainers at Fort Huachuca during the war, see Appendix A. The list is not meant to be comprehensive, but includes the information available to the authors.
103 “Sing For Soldiers,” *Cleveland Call and Post*, 31 January 1942, 8B.
Figure 23. *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* article on the USO Camp Shows, Inc., 1946 (Billy Rose Theater Collection [USO], NY Public Library Archives).
ary 1943, and gained acclaim for signing hundreds of autographs and posing for photos with the soldiers (Figure 24). Upon her departure, she said, “the 93rd division soldiers are one of the grandest audiences I have ever sung before. I hope I can come back soon.” Louis Armstrong performed at the field house on 18 August 1944, playing two shows. The show was not confined to Fort Huachuca, as it was broadcast over “173 Blue Network radio stations and by short wave to troops overseas.”

![Figure 24. Dinah Shore signing autographs for men of the 93rd Division, Fort Huachuca, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).](image)

One of the most famous performers to visit the troops at Fort Huachuca was Lena Horne. She joined up with the USO early in WWII, and toured both in the United States and overseas. For black soldiers, she was more than just a singer; she was a symbol of beauty and provided the men “someone we can pin on our lockers.”

Ms. Horne was also in the process of becoming a staunch champion of civil rights. Due to the segregation in the military, when she performed for the troops on posts, she usually had to give two performances—the first for a white audience and the second for a black one. There is a widely told story concerning her reaction to discovering black attendees sometimes restricted to the rear of the seating area, with German POWs occupying the seats in front. Depending on the source, the story is that Ms. Horne either

---

105 “Dinah Shore Likes Huachuca,” Cleveland Call and Post, 13 February 1943, 4B.
moved to stand behind the Germans and in front of the soldiers and then
gave her performance, or tried this tactic but then abruptly stormed off.\textsuperscript{108} There is documentation to support her refusal to sing for, or displeasure at
having German POWs hear her, at least at Fort Riley, Kansas, and Camp
Robinson, Alabama.\textsuperscript{109} As Ms. Horne later recalled the Fort Riley incident,
“I just walked off the stage and went up and sang to the back of the
room... It happened a couple of times, and they finally said, 'Get her out of
the USO.' I just reacted as Lena, you know.”\textsuperscript{110} As a result, she apparently
left the USO and performed at her own expense, exclusively at posts with
large contingents of black troops.\textsuperscript{111} No reliable documentation was found
of Ms. Horne refusing to sing for German POWs at camps in Arizona.

The star singer had a special relationship with Fort Huachuca, for several
reasons. The first reason was purely familial since her uncle, Sergeant
John B. Horne, was stationed there and assigned to the editorial staff of
The Buffalo, the 92\textsuperscript{nd} Infantry’s newspaper.\textsuperscript{112} The second reason pertains
to the racial situation discussed above. With its majority of black troops,
Fort Huachuca did not pose the same performance dilemma. In fact, she
seemed to enjoy performing at the post and vistied multiple times. After a
stay of several days in mid-March 1943, she announced that “her heart be-
longs to the 92\textsuperscript{nd} Infantry Division.”\textsuperscript{113} During that stay, she performed at
the field house, both service clubs, and the station hospital.\textsuperscript{114} According to
an article in the Blue Helmet, she also joined the Deep River Boys, a Gosp-
el group, in the Headquarters Annex to record an album at some point
during the March visit.\textsuperscript{115} Ms. Horne was back at Fort Huachuca in August
1943, to dedicate Theater No. 5 as the Lena Horne Theater (Figure 25).
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\textsuperscript{113} “ News of the 92d Division,” Bisbee Daily Review, 16 May 1943, 5.
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\textsuperscript{115} Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011, referencing the Blue Helmet, 26 March 1943.
She sang at a baseball game at Foster Field and posed for photographs on 22 August, and then took part in the dedication ceremony on 23 August (Figure 26).\textsuperscript{116} Her newest film, “Stormy Weather,” premiered at the newly renamed theater. In return, the soldiers crowned her the “Sweetheart of the 92\textsuperscript{nd} Division” (Figure 27).\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{116} “Lena Horne Glamourizes Baseball at Fort Huachuca,” \textit{Cleveland Call and Post}, 9 October 1943, 2B; Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011.

\textsuperscript{117} Finley, “World War II at Huachuca 1940-1949,” 60.
There were also many entertainers that visited Fort Huachuca, but possibly performed at the USO Club in Fry, not on post. In his history of the fort, Cornelius C. Smith Jr. mentions that the USO club was a popular place, “playing host to such luminaries as Dinah Shore, Lena Horne, Pearl
Bailey, Hattie McDaniels, Joe Louis, Louis ‘Satchmo’ Armstrong and many other stars of stage and screen.118 “Playing host” could have meant providing accommodation; it is not necessarily documentary evidence of a specific entertainer performing there. Smith’s list of performers at the USO club is not given a citation in his book.

### 2.6 Enlisted service clubs and officers’ clubs

According to Stephen Gregory, Museum Technician at the Fort Huachuca Museum, there was a difference between service clubs and officers’ clubs that went beyond rank. The former were intended for use by enlisted men and were run by the Special Service Division, Services of Supply, U.S. Army. “Service clubs (or Servicemen’s clubs) were funded evidently from morale funds for the benefit of enlisted men and did not require dues.”119 The Service clubs had civilian hostesses and ran the social affairs and staffed the on-site library (Figure 28). Mr. Gregory believes that social activities and entertainment were the predominant uses of service clubs, not dining.120 As such, they had snack bars or cafeterias but not more elaborate dining rooms (Figure 29).

---


119 Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 2 November 2011.

120 Ibid.
Standard plans were utilized for service clubs. Several designs existed for buildings to support varying numbers of troops. These sets of plans were replicated across the country with nearly every camp or fort receiving some version of the service club designs.

2.6.1 Enlisted service clubs

Recreational activities at Fort Huachuca were the responsibility of the Special Service Division of the post complement in the Army Service Forces. This complement was in charge of maintaining the fort and was entirely stationed at Fort Huachuca as other units such as the 92nd and 93rd Divisions rotated in and out for training. Special Service was in charge of operating the “theaters, athletic fields, stadiums, and field house; the service clubs; the two officers’ clubs; libraries; canteens, postal service, post newspaper...poster shop with its silk screen process; makes up schedules for athletic teams, theatrical troupes, regular and dance bands; handles correspondence courses, classes of all kinds and organizes any new ones where there is sufficient demand; and operates a summer nursery school,

---

educational motor tours, educational films and map studies.” With all these duties, the organization was quite complex (Figure 30).

![Figure 30. Organization chart of Special Service Division at Fort Huachuca (Special Service Bulletin July 1943, Fort Huachuca Museum).](image)

When new soldiers reported to Fort Huachuca, they were usually placed in the Special Service Division if they had experience in the performing arts, visual arts, and writing, or if they were athletes who could assist with the sports program. The WAAC units at Fort Huachuca were assigned to the Special Service Division and played a large role in the entertainment programs, both administratively and as performers. They performed variety shows in service clubs, the post exchange, the officers’ club, chapels, and day rooms to large crowds (Figure 31). In addition, the units arriving at Huachuca were also tapped for individuals with performing or athletic ex-

---

122 Ibid.
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perience to become cast members, team members, or fill other voluntary slots in the recreation program.124

![WAAC band playing for a Fort Huachuca field house dance, WWII](Image)

Figure 31. WAAC band playing for a Fort Huachuca field house dance, WWII (*Huachuca Illustrated*, 1993, p 35, Fort Huachuca Museum).

There were two service clubs constructed in the new cantonment, Service Clubs #1 and #2, with #1 built first (type SC-3, plan 700-1275) during the initial phase of cantonment construction Oct 1940–May 1941. It was located on Third Street near the railroad tracks and next to the fire house; it was assigned building number T-1404 (see Figure 15).125 Service Club #2 was built during the second phase of cantonment construction to enlarge the post for a division. Club #2 was located on the other side of Third Street, past the Division Headquarters. On the 1943 map by Anna R. Russell, there was also a building referred to as the “sgts club” below the tennis courts.

As the enlisted service clubs were among the most popular and widely used recreational facilities, much work went into programming and making sure the clubs were running smoothly (Figure 32–Figure 34). An example of the programming at Service Club #1 is given in a 1943 newspaper article:126

> There are two special service men’s clubs close to the 92nd Division’s headquarters office at the fort. No. 1, with Mrs. M.M. Carter as hostess, provides a sample of how they are used. From two to four thousand a

---

124 “Fort Huachuca At War,” 8.
126 “Fort Huachuca At War,” 8.
day use its large recreation room and eat the full meals (not short orders) served there. It is there that 144 decks of cards are worn out each month, where the two pianos and juke boxes constantly are played and where the floor is worn out by dancers who shuffle through the new routine called “sanding.” There they also use the 5,000 books in the library, write letters, and entertain their best girls.

Figure 32. Writing letters on the balcony of a service club, Fort Huachuca, 1942 (NARA).

Figure 33. Listening to the piano player at a Fort Huachuca service club, 1942 (NARA).
The activities at the enlisted service clubs were widely publicized in the post newspaper and other outlets (local and national), and activities were often rolled up into unofficial reports (Figure 35). One such article appeared in the *Pittsburgh Courier*, detailing activities for the past year:

More than 100,000 soldiers and guest have been entertained during the past year at Service Club No. 1...Besides being able to serve the soldiers and their guests from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., the club offers many other types of service and entertainment...The most popular has been “Talent Night,” when the soldiers put on a show. “Swinging in Cadence,” a show which lasted more than an hour, is the product of some of the men on Talent Night. So well received was it that nearby towns and camps have asked for reproductions in their respective localities. Each Friday night is dance night, with four top-notch bands composed of musicians of fame, presenting a variety of style. The soldiers, the guests, and the WAAC’s make merry from 7 to 10 o’clock...Usually on Wednesday nights, whist, bridge and bingo are played. To add to the in-

---

127 “Army Service Club Entertained 100,000 Soldiers Last Year,” *Pittsburgh Courier*, 13 March 1943, 10.
terest, prizes are offered. There are also two new regular size pool tables. The club has a sanitary cafeteria efficiently operated under the supervision of Mrs. Vivian Lowery.

Figure 35. Article on the Service Clubs at Fort Huachuca, Special Service Bulletin, March 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).
The importance of the service clubs to the enlisted men is encapsulated in a quote from Sergeant Fred Christian, Service Co, 368th:\textsuperscript{128}

Of all of the programs offered at the Fort I like the Service Clubs best. I like the good food served in the cafeterias, reading in the libraries, the evenings of dancing, music, amateur shows, the games such as Pool and Ping Pong, and the make yourself at home, soldier spirit of the hostesses. I do wish that we had a few more girls to dance with.

2.6.2 Army officers’ clubs, white and black

Officers’ clubs were categorized as “open messes,” were operated through membership dues received from officers on post, and were run by an appointed officer.\textsuperscript{129} An “open mess” denoted a facility in which officers could “dine and recreate in an ‘open’ environment with other officers without the structure of rank interfering.”\textsuperscript{130} Officers’ clubs were places for relaxation and an informal atmosphere often prevailed, allowing an opportunity for officers to discuss command issues and advise junior officers.\textsuperscript{131}

The relaxation of protocol in the officers’ clubs was a strong tool for building unit morale and advancement of careers. In the case of black officers, this opportunity was often not available. According to Steven Smith, in writing about a black officers’ club at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri:

Officers’ clubs, and all the important interaction that occurred in these buildings were almost universally denied the black officer in WWII. For while white officers worked side by side with black officers on duty, off-duty, few white officers wanted to socialize with black officers, and in some cases, vice versa. Black officers were routinely denied access to the officers’ clubs across the country. At posts where there were

\textsuperscript{128} Finley, “World War II at Huachuca 1940-1949,”\textsuperscript{107}.

\textsuperscript{129} Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 2 November 2011.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.; Smith, \textit{A Historic Context Statement for a World War II Era Black Officers’ Club at Fort Leonard Wood}, 75-76.
Due to the lack of facilities for black officers at many installations, existing buildings quite often were repurposed into clubs, such as at Fort Leonard Wood. In some cases, attempts were made to construct black officers’ clubs from scratch. These instances were usually derived from the installation having enough black officers to justify a club, such as the Tuskegee Airmen at Selfridge Field, Michigan. The black officers there were denied use of the existing officers’ club, but after protest, the installation command arranged for a “separate but equal” club to be built for them. The unit, however, was transferred before the club could be completed. At Camp Hood, Texas, funds were requested for the construction of “one (1) Officers’ Club (colored), Type RB-A-TMod, 32’ x 100’” along with a black service club and a guest house for troops at North Fort Hood. The response was to provide one service club, “modified to provide for both officers and enlisted men (colored) at this Post.”

For many black officers during WWII, the denial of access to an officers’ club was humiliating and detrimental to their careers. In a 26 June 1943 letter to the President of the Afro-American Newspapers, one such officer related the difficulties he faced:

Then, there is the most painful case of all. I a commissioned officer of the United States Army, am denied the rights and privileges of an officer. I am excluded by members of my own rank and station in the Army. I am denied the privilege to use the Officer’s Club. Although members of my race are used as waiters and general help around the club, I am denied the privi-

---


134 Colonel C.M. Thirkeld, Post Commander Camp Hood, Texas to Commanding General, Eighth Service Command, SOS, Dallas, Texas, 9 March 1943, RG 77: Chief of Engineers, Entry 393: Historical Record of Buildings 1905-42, Box 95: Fort Huachuca Thru Camp Huffman, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

135 Lieutenant Colonel L.O. Vogelsang, Corps of Engineers, Eighth Service Command, ASF, Dallas, Texas to Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Washington, 15 April 1943, RG 77: Chief of Engineers, Entry 393: Historical Record of Buildings 1905-42, Box 95: Fort Huachuca Thru Camp Huffman, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
lege of using it. It has been a source of embarrassment for a Negro soldier working there to ask me if I am denied the privilege of the club. I ask you, gentlemen, what would you say or do if a soldier, who respected you as an officer of the Army, knew that you, an officer sworn to uphold and defend the principles of this democracy, were being denied the very thing you are asking them to lay down their life for. How can we demand the respect of men under our command when we are not respected by members of our own rank.\footnote{Lowry G. Wright, et al., “Letters from African-American Soldiers during World War II,” in America Firsthand, Volume II: From Reconstruction to the Present, Robert D. Marcus and David Burner, eds. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 220-238, http://us.history.wisc.edu/hist102/pdocs/Wright_Letters.pdf.}

It is quite likely that the sting of not being allowed into the clubs was a proverbial “last straw” for many black officers, as it exacerbated the higher-level problem of black officer authority. “The Army staff practice of forbidding Negroes to outrank or command white officers serving in the same unit not only limited the employment and restricted the rank of black officers but also created invidious distinctions between white and black officers in the same unit. It tended to convince enlisted men that their black leaders were not full-fledged officers.”\footnote{MacGregor, Integration of the Armed Forces 1940-1965, 37.}

### 2.7 Black officers’ club at Fort Huachuca

The old post officers’ club was located in the building that is now the main Fort Huachuca Museum facility (Facility 41401; Figure 36). It is likely that the building was given another occupant when the Lakeside Officers’ Club was opened for white officers in August 1942.
2.7.1 Creation and construction of Mountain View Officers’ Club

The authors were not able to locate documents detailing the authorization or appropriation of funds for the Mountain View Officers’ Club. Neither actual construction documents nor a construction completion report were located during the project research. This is unfortunate, as it is still not clear who approved the construction and for what reasons, what type of facility was originally approved, when the construction work began, if the building started out as another enlisted service club on post, or if it was intended as an officers’ club all along, even if it did utilize a service club design.

It was possibly approved as part of the program to provide additional recreational facilities to installations with significant numbers of black troops. The time period fits, but the existing documents on initial designs for the new cantonment mention only one officers’ club to be constructed and this likely was the building that became the Lakeside Officers’ Club. As a local newspaper reported, “included in buildings at one end will be an officers’ club, while at the opposite end will be division headquarters and a sports arena...”138 This location was mentioned before any actual construction began, and it seems not to have been exactly followed as the

---

Lakeside Club was not actually located in the new cantonment. Included in the revisions to the 4 November 1941 list of facilities for the new cantonment was a curious statement from Eighth Corps Headquarters saying, “No comment is made at this time [4 December 1941] in regard to the substitution of a selected design for the Officers Club as requested by the Post commander as no information as to cost or design of the proposed club is available at this headquarters.”139 A message the next day from the Eighth Construction Zone Constructing Quartermaster’s office to the Constructing Quartermaster at Fort Huachuca requested “drawings of the Officers Club requested by the Post Commander to replace the ORM-2 be furnished.”140 The Executive Officer of the Area Engineer office at Fort Huachuca responded the next day that no action was being taken on the request as the officers’ club had been included in the Station List for the Triangular Division. This decision was later overturned, as in a 2 February 1942 letter from the Corps of Engineers, Ground Troop Section to the Commanding General, Eighth Corps Area, revisions are mentioned that resulted in the construction of one large officers’ club instead of a small one and several auxiliary facilities:

Officers’ Club: The authorized building schedule includes one (1) Service Club for Officers, Type SC-3, Modified, in lieu of the five (5) Officers’ Day rooms, Type ORBL-3, and one (1) Officers’ club, Type ORM-2, listed in the schedule of 10-30-41. Instructions to the field provide that modification of the SC-3 will be limited in design, space and cost to the SC-3 authorized, and that features not in harmony with mobilization design will be avoided.

In a 1 April 1943 letter to the Adjutant General, the Director of the Special Service Division makes a case for an additional theater at Fort Huachuca. In the course of his argument, he lists the types of recreational facilities authorized at Fort Huachuca between 15 December 1941 and 3 March 1943. Included in the list is “1 Officers’ Club, type SCOL-1,” indicating that the design decision made on 2 February 1941 to build a Service Club for

139 Leavey, Office of The Quartermaster General, Washington, D.C. to Zone Constructing Quartermaster, Zone VIII, 4th Ind. 4 December 1941.
140 Ibid, 5th Ind., 5 December 1941.
Officers, Type SC-3, Modified, is what actually was built.\textsuperscript{141} Why only one officers’ club was mentioned remains unknown.

In fact, in terms of the authorization and construction of the club, there are more questions than answers. If the officer corps for the new Division was expected to be composed of more white officers than black officers, then it is logical to assume the one officers’ club approved for construction in the initial list was expected to be for white officers, and was therefore located nearer to the Old Post area (likely Lakeside). Then, as the Division moved into place, there could have been a rising number of lower-ranking black officers, which with Fort Huachuca’s segregated policy for facilities, would have required another club. A 2008 documentation report on the Lakeside Officers’ Club lays out the course of events this way:\textsuperscript{142}

Both officers clubs were erected beginning in 1942, although Lakeside was originally the only officers club built at the fort. The second club, Mountain View was built shortly thereafter when African-American officers began complaining that they were not allowed in to Lakeside. The Army reportedly tried to encourage intermingling between the races at the club, but white officers apparently refused. The Army responded by building an additional club for African-American officers, although the segregation of these facilities did not sit well with the black officers, allegedly referring to Mountain View as “Uncle Tom’s Cabin.”

Unfortunately, the citations given for this information do not seem to support the timeline or the effort to integrate the new officers’ club at Fort Huachuca.\textsuperscript{143} This report goes on to say that “the Lakeside [White] Officers

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{141} Brigadier General F.H. Osborn, Director, Special Service Division, to the Adjutant General, 1 April 1943, RG 160: Headquarters Army Service Forces, Entry 196A: Office of the Director of Personnel, Box 436: Fort Huachuca, File: Fort Huachuca, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
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Club (Building 43002) was completed in August 1942, and the Mountain View [Black] Officers Club (Building 66052) a short time later.”144 A 5 February 1943 article in the 93rd Blue Helmet described the duties of the Special Service Division and includes information about both clubs’ opening dates. According to this article, the Lakeside Officers’ Club opened on 8 August 1942, followed by the opening of the Mountain View Officers’ Club on Labor Day (September 7) 1942.145 With these dates in mind, it is not clear how the Lakeside Officers’ Club could have opened and been in use before the Mountain View Officers’ Club was even begun, since the article states that Lakeside opened just a few weeks before the Mountain View Officers’ Club opened. Additionally, the order issued by the post commander specifying separate officers’ clubs was issued in June 1942, so there would have been no opportunity for black officers to attempt to use the Lakeside club as it didn’t open till August. At this point, neither of the statements about attempted integration of the Lakeside Officers’ Club nor the rationale provided for construction of the Mountain View Officers’ Club can be taken at face value.

Other issues arise, however. In light of the directive limiting alterations, how was the Lakeside Officers’ Club actually constructed in a highly modified and enhanced form (Figure 37 and Figure 38). Perhaps it was authorized and funded through some other mechanism that was not subject to the construction restrictions. It is conceivable that at some point during the construction of the authorized officers’ club (at the Lakeside site), it was decided it would be a new club for white officers. The Mountain View Officers’ Club then could have been built as a “separate but equal” remediation for black officers.

144 Steely and Levstik, “Lakeside Officers Club, 1942-1977,” 5. Again, no specific citation is given for this information. No other sources were located that provide this timeline.
145 “Special Service Important To Army Morale,” 93rd Blue Helmet, 5 February 1943, 6.
This “separate but equal” explanation still leaves the question of why Lakeside was so nicely enhanced, while Mountain View Officers’ Club was very basic. The Lakeside Officers’ Club was completed at a cost of $251,868, while only $78,648 was expended for the Mountain View Officers’ Club.146 Those responsible for the design and construction of the Lakeside Officers’ Club somehow got permission and funding for the extensive modifications to the simple design. For example, a War Department construction policy revision released 19 August 1941 prohibited use of military construction funds for swimming pools. If necessary, they were
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146 “Facility No. 66050,” Real Property Record Card, Real Property Office, Master Planning Division, Fort Huachuca, Arizona; “Facility No. 43002,” Real Property Record Card, Real Property Office, Master Planning Division, Fort Huachuca, Arizona.
to be built as a WPA project, using WPA and post exchange or recreation funds. This restriction was not rescinded in the War Department’s construction policy revision on 16 April 1942. While this may explain why the Mountain View Officers’ Club did not have a swimming pool, it leaves confusion as to how the Lakeside Officers’ Club did construct a swimming pool.

Among the instructions in the April 1942 construction policy revision was guidance on facilities in cantonments being limited to “those essential for the operation of a temporary station, including administration, supply, service, maintenance, security, recreation, welfare, and health.” Additionally, construction at existing installations was restricted to mobilization type temporary construction, and the policy required that they be “of the simplest type.” This phrase did not appear in the earlier policy. Perhaps the building that became the Mountain View Officers’ Club was begun after this revision in policy, and for that reason the resulting structure bore little difference from a standard enlisted club. However, the 2 February 1942 designation of the allotted officers’ club design as a “Service Club Officers-Large” may have been intended to replicate an enlisted service club.

The information we do have on the building comes largely from the Real Property records held on post, but even that source is less than straightforward. The Real Property Record Card for the Mountain View Officers’ Club, Building 66050, says it was completed on 9 November 1942, yet documented sources indicate the club had been open for two months by then, preceded briefly by the Lakeside Officers’ Club in August. Newspaper accounts describe a September opening gala at Mountain View and a dance held in October. This discrepancy in dates is likely the result of a delay in creation of the property card for the new building, with the card first being filled out on 9 November. These two buildings lagged behind

---

148 War Department, Adjutant General’s Office, Washington, D.C., “War Department Construction Policy, Revised,” 16 April 1942, RG 92: Quartermaster General, General Correspondence 1936-45, Box 700, File: 600.1 1943, National Archives and Records Management Administration, College Park, Maryland.
149 Ibid.
150 “Facility No. 66050,” Real Property Record Card, Real Property Office, Master Planning Division, Fort Huachuca, Arizona.
the general cantonment construction, which was essentially completed in May 1942 when the 93rd Division arrived. It is not known why the clubs were completed over three months after the cantonment. If a second club was authorized and funded after the cantonment construction was well underway, that could explain the delay for the second club, but not for the first one.

Originally given the designation of T-1562, the Mountain View building was constructed as a temporary building, standard plan SC-3, except that the design was “flipped” for allowing better views of the landscape from the major public areas. The building designation was changed to T-7045 by 1 June 1943 and later to T-66050. For a description of the Mountain View Officers’ Club as originally built (Figure 39 and Figure 40) and current conditions, see Chapter 4 of this report, “Structural and Condition Analysis with Recommendations.”

Figure 39. Mountain View Officers’ Club when new, looking northeast, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum). Note nearby barracks buildings in the background.

152 “Facility No. 66050,” Real Property Files, Real Property Office, Master Planning Division, Fort Huachuca, Arizona.
As mentioned previously, these SC-3 large service club designs were constructed on many military posts across the country in the WWII buildup. A brief perusal of Corps of Engineers construction records from 1940–1942 at the NARA facility in College Park, Maryland, revealed many examples of SC-3 clubs constructed as part of the general WWII buildup and as part of the supplemental recreational facilities for black soldiers. Among the many locations where the same building was constructed were Fort Huachuca (Service Clubs No. 1 and No. 2); Fort Belvoir, Virginia; Fort Custer, Michigan; Camp Davis, North Carolina; Fort Dix, New Jersey; Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Fort Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; Camp Lee, Virginia; and Camp McCoy, Wisconsin (Figure 41-Figure 45).153

153 RG 77: Chief of Engineers, Entry 391: Construction Completion Reports 1917-43, Box 134: Fort Huachuca, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Figure 41. Service Club No. 1, Fort Huachuca, 1941 (NARA RG 77).

Figure 42. Enlisted Service Club (Type SC-3) at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 1941 (NARA RG 77).

Figure 43. Enlisted Service Club (Type SC-3) at Fort Custer, Michigan, 1941 (NARA RG 77).
2.7.2 Segregation

The segregation of the officers’ clubs at Huachuca was instituted through an order from the office of the post commander on 4 June 1942. The order simply states (emphasis in original) that “Membership in Officers Lakeside Club will be composed of all WHITE officers on duty at Fort Huachuca. Membership in Officers Mountainview Club will be composed of all COLORED officers on duty at Fort Huachuca” (Figure 46).\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{154} “Segregation at Ft. Huachuca: One Clubhouse For White Army Officers; Another For Colored,” Pittsburgh Courier, 4 July 1942, 1.
It is highly unlikely that the Mountain View Officers’ Club was not already under construction at this point (June 1942), as it opened approximately 9 weeks later and was already named. If already under construction, it was constructed as an officers’ club, but not as a segregated club for black officers. If not under construction in late June, it was certainly planned and funds appropriated. Whether it was planned as a service club or an officers’ club is still not clear from the available archival documentation, but it does not seem to have been originally planned as an officers’ club for blacks. If speculating, it could be supposed that both officers’ clubs were planned to be open to both races, but this plan changed before construction was completed. On the other hand, it may have been planned by the fort’s high-ranking staff to segregate the clubs all along, with the announcement only made in late June. Without documentary proof, there is no way to be certain.

There was an immediate backlash in the black press, once the segregation announcement became public. In a scathing article, the Pittsburgh Courier said the post commander’s segregation order exposed the presence of Jim Crow attitudes at the fort, and decried the impact of the “calculated, officially-sanctioned segregated setup.”

It is not known if the commanding officer consulted the white officers to learn if they wished to have a separate clubhouse. It is not known if he consulted the
colored officers to learn their wishes. He may have acted upon the basis of a recent War Department directive in which separation of barracks and messes for white and colored officers was indirectly suggested...This segregation is going to be a serious detriment to the morale of colored citizens throughout the nation. It is going to depress the spirits of those colored soldiers who will have to fight behind these colored officers who, indirectly, are told they are not good enough to associate in a clubhouse with their white fellow officers.

The paper followed up with another article three weeks later, presenting a long interview with Colonel Hardy, in which he set out his position on the issue:156

In an interview with Colonel E. N. Hardy, post commander at Fort Huachuca, this correspondent learned definitely that there would be two separate officers’ clubs in operation on the post pursuant to War Department policy. The Mountainview Club will be opened for use by the colored officers, and the Lakeview Club will be for use by the white officers. The clubs will serve officers of the Post Complement and also the 93rd Infantry Division.

“Right or wrong,” said Colonel Hardy, “the War Department has provided for two officer’s clubs at Fort Huachuca. In doing so, it has expended approximately $150,000 and approximately evenly divided the money between the two clubs.”

“The purposes of officers’ clubs are to provide places where officers can get away from the daily grind of their intensive training program, relax, freshen up, and be in a better state of mind and body to carry on the next day’s work. Everybody recognizes that morale and relaxation of mind and body are necessary in building an efficient military organization. That is why

the War Department has been willing to spend so much money on these officers’ clubs, especially in view of the fact that Fort Huachuca is in a very isolated part of the United States, far removed from civilian contacts or opportunities to obtain recreation in communities already established. In other words, at Fort Huachuca, we have to make our own fun – we cannot depend upon amusement places already established by civilian communities.”

“As to whether or not the War Department made a mistake in deciding that there would be two separate clubs for colored and white officers, presents a problem which is not up to the Post Commander, the Division Commander, or officers under them to decide. In any case, having separate clubs follows a traditional pattern not only as pertains to the relationship between the white and colored races, but between all races. It has been the custom throughout the world for people to organize clubs according to their races. For instance, in Manila one could find an English Club, Spanish Club, Chinese Club, Filipino Club, and others. Here in our country, there are also separate schools, churches, fraternal organizations, and social clubs.”

“I believe that the good sense and devotion to duty of all officers at Fort Huachuca, both colored and white, will be such that this problem (if it be a problem) will be satisfactorily solved by them, as they are the ones mainly concerned. The friends of these officers on the outside should not become too much disturbed, because, with the other urgent and important problems which have to be solved in these critical times, the problem of separate officer’s clubs fades into comparative insignificance.”

“The situation is not as rigid as many persons, not acquainted with the conditions at Fort Huachuca, assume it to be. Apparently they think that a colored officer will never put foot inside the white officer’s club, and that a white officer will never put his foot inside
the colored officer’s club. This is far from representing the facts. Approximately every month there will be a general get-together on a Dutch treat basis of all officers of both races, where they will mingle together as officers of the same army, preparing to fight a common enemy. One month these meetings will be held at the colored officer’s club and the next month they will be held at the white officer’s club. In addition to this, officers of each club are at perfect liberty to invite, whenever they choose, officers of the other club as guests.”

“At first it seemed apparent that a large number of colored officers interpreted the plan for the two clubs as being a rigid policy of segregation, which was not intended and will not be practiced. Now that the idea has been make clear, many of the officers who previously declined membership in the Mountainview Club (colored) have withdrawn their refusals and are now members.”

“After all, we have to learn that when large numbers of men are brought together for the purpose of being trained to fight the enemy, we cannot use such occasions to solve the many problems of an evolutionary nature, which time and developments in our country must be depended upon for fair and broad solutions.”

This is a statement from the Post Commander, a soldier and a gentleman of the United States Army, who is carrying out the orders of his superior officer which in case you have forgotten is the War Department.

Between the time that the segregation of the clubs was announced and the clubs were opened, Brigadier General B. O. Davis inspected the troops at
Fort Huachuca. In a Memorandum by the Inspector General to Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, the Brigadier General reports that:

Approximately 300 colored officers are stationed at Fort Huachuca, and, with the exception of Medical Corps officers, are to a large extent first and second lieutenants. The colored and white officers eat in the same mess, live in the same barracks, serve in the same companies, and apparently are striving to the end of making an efficient fighting division out of the 93rd.

The only matters brought to the attention of General Davis which stress racial problems pertain to the construction of separate clubs for white and colored officers. General Davis considers that in view of the size of the garrison two clubs are essential, but believes that General Hall [Division Commander] and the Post Commander could have met the problem without these clubs having been designated as clubs for either white or colored officers.

Race relations on post had not improved much over the next year. In the report of Brigadier General Davis’ 1943 inspection, there is a list of grievances relating incidents of racial discrimination on and off post. It is noted that the promotion policy regarding colored officers was creating a morale problem as they saw it as unfair and felt they received less respect from many officers and enlisted men as a result of lower rank or slower promotion. The report continues by stating, “the establishment of separate clubs and messes has a like effect.” Although not specifically referring to these “clubs” as officers’ clubs, the focus of the discussion is the colored officers, so it is likely the report was referencing the separate officers’ clubs. In the report’s recommendations section, it specifically stated that “the setting aside of separate clubs and messes for colored officers be discontinued.”

---

157 Virgil L. Peterson, Major General, The Inspector General to the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 6 August 1942, RG 407: Army AG Project Decimal File 1940-45, Entry 363-A Decimal File, box 4438, file: 451.9 to 470.1 Fort Huachuca, Arizona 1-1-40, National Archives and Records Management Administration, College Park, Maryland.
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2.7.3 Opening

The official opening of the Mountain View Officers’ Club was held as part of festivities for Labor Day weekend 1942. The fort was the scene of much fanfare and entertainment that weekend. The main offering was on Sunday, 6 September and consisted of a Hollywood Victory Committee-sponsored show featuring 33 members of the cast of “Cabin in the Sky,” then filming in Hollywood.\(^{160}\) This program was held at the 93rd Division Open-air Arena on post, near Division Headquarters. The event was open to the entire Fort Huachuca population. Performers included Ethel Waters, Louis Armstrong, Eddie “Rochester” Anderson, and Lena Horne.\(^ {161}\) Members of the troupe were guests of the post, arriving on Saturday afternoon and departing on Monday. Clarence Muse acted as master of ceremonies for the variety show that headlined the dedication program. Nearly everyone on post came to see the show, with attendance at more than 22,000.\(^ {162}\) The show was described in the press as a “howling success” and was most likely the biggest entertainment event at Fort Huachuca during WWII.\(^ {163}\) As reported, a wide variety of acts were represented at the show:\(^ {164}\)

The show, headed by Clarence Muse, Mantan Moreland and Ben Carter, remained over for 2 days in the camp. Beauteous Lena Horne, was the feminine star of the show, and was heartily received by her grateful soldier audience, as was the act of Monte Hawley and Mantan Moreland, the interpretive song and recital of Mrs. Olive Ball, the Hula number of Princess Luana, accompanied by her husband Woody Strode, the precision tap dancing of Sunshine Sammy, the piano rhythm of Hattie Morrison, the smooth-styles singing and fly hipslinging dance of Chinkie Grimes, the witty British-accented dialogue between Clarence Muse and

\(^{160}\) It is possible that the Cabin in the Sky cast performance was scheduled independently, and the date was then selected as the opening of the Mountain View Club to take advantage of the visit of so many top black celebrities. The show could also have been scheduled as an invited part of the club’s opening. Documentation was not located that would confirm either option.


\(^{162}\) “Stage and Screen Stars Shine Before Soldiers Of The 369th,” *Chicago Defender*, 19 September 1942, 21.


\(^{164}\) “Stage and Screen Stars Shine Before Soldiers Of The 369th,” 21.
London-born Freddie Clark, and several other interesting acts including the tap dancing of Soldier Noodie Bowman of Chicago, and the singing of Soldier Rico Harrison of New York.

As with nearly all entertainments on post, local talent was also relied on for the big open air arena show, as “Cpl. Noodie Bowman, formerly with the Chicago Defender is director of music and dramatics for the 369 infantry, 93rd division,” and Rico Harrison was also apparently stationed at Fort Huachuca.165

The club opening was covered widely in the black newspapers, with the Chicago Defender stating that the Mountain View Officers’ Club was “classed as one of the finest club houses for officers at any army post in the country, one for several hundred high ranking colored officers.”166 A variety show was scheduled at the Mountain View Officers’ Club for the following evening, featuring the same group of entertainers.167 Because the article mentioning a variety show at the club with the same cast was written the day before the club opening, it is possible that the cast performance did not occur. A report of the 7 September opening of the Mountain View Officers’ Club in the post newspaper simply says that the “Cabin in the Sky” cast were “on hand,” not mentioning a performance.168 No other evidence of a performance on 7 September at the club was found during the research for this project.

2.7.4 Entertainment

Fort Huachuca Museum Technician Steve Gregory discovered many mentions in the Blue Helmet of entertainment such as concerts, dances and performances across the facilities open to enlisted men on post. In contrast, there were very few mentions of activities at the Mountain View Officers’ Club, “either because not much was happening there, or because it was more an enlisted-focused newspaper.”169 According to Mr. Gregory, it is also possible that the lack of existing coverage on club activities has to do with the club being famous for being segregated.170 It is conceivable

167 “Top Negro Stars of Hollywood are Heard at Huachuca,” 3.
168 Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011, referencing the 93rd Blue Helmet, 5 February 1943, 6.
169 Ibid.
170 Ibid.
that some entertainers and newspaper editors declined to support the club in an effort to keep it from being a success. When the Mountain View Officers’ Club first opened, there was a boycott of officers who refused to “cross the threshold” of the club.

In his study, *African-American Soldiers at Fort Huachuca*, Steve Smith succinctly discusses the issues involving the segregated club:\(^{171}\)

For their part, black officers at the fort were outraged and boycotted the black club, writing letters of protest to the black newspapers. A situation report to the NAACP noted that the black club was known by the black officers as "Uncle Tom’s Cabin." Another report mentioned the fact that the African American Officers’ club had no swimming pool while the white club did.\(^{172}\) A medical officer at the post described the tension at the post in regard to the officers’ club:

“Before the new cantonment here was built there was only one officers' Cantonment on the Post. I am told relations were most harmonious. When the Division (93rd) started coming in it brought with it a large number of the cheapest type of cracker officers.\(^{173}\) Segregation was instituted in that a large new, spacious, elegantly furnished [white] officers’ club was built for them in an out of the way place with 5 guest rooms in it and a fishing pond stocked with trout and bass. For the Negroes a Service Club building was


\(^{173}\) “Cracker” is a derogatory term most often used by African-Americans to describe racist white southerners.
built like the one built for soldiers with few appointments and no guest rooms and it was built up against two dormitories for enlisted men’s guests. The furniture was nothing like the whites had. The Negro officers refused to join it or those that had, sent in their resignations. When Bousfield [Lieutenant Colonel M.O. Bousfield, in charge of Station Hospital #1] got here he ordered every man in his outfit to cancel his resignation. The men of the 318 Medical Battalion which was attached to the division, refused almost to a man to cross its doorsill. Those of us in Colonel Bousfield’s unit pay our dues but the most of us never cross the doorsill. Had it not been for that surrender most of the officers believe that the Commandant of the Fort would have abandoned the project and admitted us to the one club.174

Despite these issues, the Mountain View Officers’ Club did become a social center for black officers at Fort Huachuca (Figure 47 and Figure 48).175 There would most likely have been any number of private parties, dances, local entertainment, banquets, and receptions held at the club. It is estimated that at the height of the fort’s population during WWII, there were approximately “20-25,000 troops at one time, including between 650-1,000 officers, about 80% of whom were African American.”176 This would mean a total of about 520–800 black officers at most, with enlisted men the vast majority of troops on post. While the Mountain View Officers’ Club and Lakeside Officers’ Club would have been the hubs of social activity for officers, the enlisted clubs, along with the theaters and the recreational facilities, were truly the social centers on Fort Huachuca during the war due to the sheer numbers of enlisted men.

---

174 Letter of Roscoe C. Giles to Louie, June 3, 1944, Papers of the NAACP, Part 17, Group II, Series A, Microfilm, Reel 20, University of South Carolina, Columbia: microfilm, Thomas Cooper Library, Copy from Collection of Steven D. Smith, Columbia, S.C.
175 Although the article in Figure 48 implies the club was not constructed until fall 1942, it is likely this article was written in 1942 and reprinted in the Special Service Bulletin that was published in March 1943. It is also possible that the article is incorrect in the construction timeline for the club.
176 Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011.
The assistant club officer in February 1943 is quoted in the *Blue Helmet* discussing the types of entertainment usually provided at the Mountain View Officers’ Club. As with the venues for enlisted men, the officers at the
club were mostly entertained by talented soldiers stationed at the fort. As the club officer states, “like all of Fort Huachuca, we rely on the entertainment produced here by our many talented people, and our club walls have echoed to appreciative applause for the WAACs, the singers and pianists, and specialty numbers too many to mention.”

Among the documented entertainment at the Mountain View Officers’ Club was a dance hosted by the officers of the 93rd Cavalry Reconnaissance Troop in October 1942. This event was noted in a newspaper article as “the first time since the formal opening of the club that any distinct officers' units undertook to ‘give out’ socially.” In January 1943, a musical recital was given by members of the post Special Service Unit to an audience of around 200. In February 1943, the WAACS stationed at Fort Huachuca presented a variety show that was recorded for broadcast. A highlight of the show was WAAC Mercedes Jordan, who had previously been a performer at the famed Cotton Club.

According to an article in the Blue Helmet, important visitors were sometimes invited to socialize at the Mountain View Officers’ Club as part of a visit to Fort Huachuca. Distinguished visitors mentioned were Brigadier General Benjamin O. Davis, Brigadier General Spencer C. Dickerson, T.K. Lawless the dermatologist, Paul Williams the architect, and “many others well known in the military and professional world.” Brigadier General Davis was the highest-ranking Negro officer in the U. S. Army at the time, and made several inspection tours of Fort Huachuca during the war. For a March 1943 visit, a banquet and reception for 200 guests was held at the Mountain View Officers’ Club, with entertainment provided by the Deep River Boys quintet, who were on post for the entire month providing entertainment in many venues. This is the only reference found during this study to a performance by a non-post entertainer at the Mountain View Officers’ Club, other than the opening. The following month, a large military review was held at Fort Huachuca with thousands of spectators present, including prominent residents and high-ranking officers from Ar-

---
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182 “General B. O. Davis Feted At Huachuca,” Pittsburgh Courier, 13 March 1943, 23.
Arizona military installations. After the review, Colonel Hardy hosted “500 of the men spectators at a barbecue in a nearby canyon while the women were entertained at the Lakeside Officers’ Club and the Mountain View Officers’ Club.” The entertainment offered was not described.

It is not unlikely that famous entertainers visiting Fort Huachuca for the purpose of entertaining either at post facilities or the USO Club were also invited to the Mountain View Officers’ Club for a social evening. Particularly, repeat visitors like Lena Horne might have had occasion to be invited to the Mountain View Officers’ Club. “Rochester” of the movies [and Jack Benny Show fame], was mentioned by name as a visitor to the club in the 19 February 1943 *Blue Helmet* article. It could be there were impromptu performances, but unlikely there would have been scheduled performances by these stars at the club. For the most part, entertainment on post was intended as a morale-raising activity for the enlisted men and women, and held, therefore, in venues open to enlisted troops. As no enlisted soldiers could enter the club if not working or performing there, it would have been seen as elitist and a show of entitlement for the officers to get to experience these performances when the enlisted troops could not. As an enlisted man, Joe Louis would have needed a personal invitation from a ranking club member to get in. It is much more likely that he would have socialized with the enlisted men at a service club.

### 2.7.5 Art exhibit

The Fort Huachuca Mountain Officers’ Club made national news in the spring of 1943. The club was selected as the site to exhibit a prestigious collection of 83 works by 37 black artists. The works were selected by Holger Cahill, national director of the Federal Art Project of the WPA. They were arranged under the supervision of Lew Davis, former state supervisor of the Arizona Art Project. All the works of art were produced under the WPA Art Project program.

A gala dedication ceremony for the art exhibit was held in the Mountain View Officers’ Club on 16 May 1943 (Figure 49). Attendance included many officers from the 92nd Division; Thomas E. Campbell, former Gov-

---

184 Gregory e-mail to Tagg, 7 March 2011.
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186 *The Art Digest*, Issue 7, August 1943:15.
ernor of Arizona, and Mrs. Campbell; Colonel and Mrs. E. B. Maynard; Mayor and Mrs. Louis Hudgin of Nogales; Mr. and Mrs. Lew Davis; Mr. and Mrs. John Wood of Warren; Lieutenant Colonel M. O. Bousfield; and Lieutenant Colonel and Dr. Olaf A. Anderson, Dean of the University of Arizona College of Fine Arts. Families of many named above also attended. In addition, several of the honored artists were in attendance, including Hale Woodruff, Vernon Winslow, and Richmond Barthe; all three addressed the audience as part of the program (Figure 50). Captain Homer Roberts, assistant governor of the Mountain View Officers’ Club, was assisted by a number of club hostesses, many either spouses of Fort Huachuca officers or WAAC officers themselves.

Figure 49. Cover of program for art exhibit opening, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

---
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Other artists represented in the exhibited collection included Charles Sebree, Archibald Motley, Dox Thrash, William Carter, Charles White, Charles Sallee, Raymond Steth, Claude Clark, Samuel Brown, and Sargent Johnson.\textsuperscript{189} One of the most distinctive pieces of art was a mural by Charles White, titled \textit{Progress of the American Negro (Five Great American Negroes)}; Figure 51. This was the eminent muralist’s first public work, part of the WPA program.\textsuperscript{190} The large mural was given a prominent position at the Mountain View Officers’ Club, placed on the wall between the two staircases in the ballroom (Figure 52).

\textsuperscript{189} “Exhibition of 37 Negro Artists, Fort Huachuca Arizona,” Event Program, (collection of the Fort Huachuca Museum, 1943), 4-6.

\textsuperscript{190} Andrea D. Barnwell, \textit{Charles White}, (Petaluma, CA: Pomegranate Communications, 2003), 34.
Lieutenant Colonel C. F. E. Nelson, post Special Service Officer, was master of ceremonies for a program that included a welcome address by Colonel Hardy, who also presented the collection to Lieutenant Colonel M.O. Bousfield, governor of the Mountain View Officers’ Club (Figure 53). In addition to the three artists previously mentioned as speakers, Dr. Anderson, Dean of the University of Arizona College of Fine Arts, delivered a brief address. The program also included several musical interludes, with Private Harold E. Brown and Orchestra providing piano-based music, and
Staff Sergeant Whisonant, a nationally famous baritone, performing as well.191

![Colonel Hardy speaking at the art exhibit opening, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).](image)

The artwork was exhibited at the Mountain View Officers’ Club from 16–22 May, after which it was moved to Service Club No. 1 from 23–29 May. The exhibit was then hosted by Service Club No. 2 from 30 May–5 June. Following this showing, the collection was returned to the Mountain View Officers’ Club for permanent hanging.192

2.7.5.1 A Second mural for the Mountain View Officers’ Club

Lew Davis, the organizer of the Mountain View Officers’ Club art show, was a native Arizonan artist with an international reputation as an artist and muralist. He worked at Fort Huachuca before being inducted into the Army and was later stationed at Fort Huachuca. He was the civilian sponsor of the Art Workshop at Fort Huachuca (Figure 54).193 During his enlisted time at the fort, he served as the managing editor of the post newspaper, the Apache Sentinel, directed the Silk Screen Poster Shop at the fort which “supplied posters to all 62 installations in the 9th Service Command

---

area at which black troops were stationed.” For his “meritorious service in designing and executing posters and painting depicting black history,” T/4 Lew E. Davis was awarded the Legion of Merit on 28 October 1944.

In addition, Sergeant Davis was invited by Colonel Hardy to paint a series of murals at the fort, with two in the Lakeside Club and the other in the Mountain View Officers’ Club. Murals depicting the Founding of Fort Huachuca and the Surrender of Geronimo graced the walls of the Lakeside Club. His subject for the Mountain View Officers’ Club was The Negro Soldier in America’s Wars (Figure 55). The mural at the Mountain View Officers’ Club was completed last of the three and dedicated on 20 August 1944, so it was not present during the previous year’s art exhibit. Colonel Hardy presided at the dedication ceremony and spoke of the challenges and successes in training large numbers of black soldiers. Focusing on a need to created “proper attitude of mind,” he included the fort’s recreational and cultural activities as being “one step ahead of Washington” in realizing their importance. As he stated:

---

Ibid.
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Our facilities for education, entertainment, solution of personal problems, athletics, and the capacity to entertain each other, I believe, set a pattern for the United States Army... Call these things entertainment, orientation, education or what you will, I call them culture. It was our purpose to lay a foundation of true and broad culture upon which to build our war effort... It seemed, therefore, entirely fitting that our culture and inspirational program at this post should include some sort of definite representation of the deeds of Negroes in America’s wars. It was my belief that this sort of representation would give to our soldiers here, pride in the past, inspiration for the present, and confidence in the future. It was our vision that the most appropriate place for this piece of art would be here at the Mountain View Officers’ Club at this time.

On 15 September, 1944, Colonel M.O. Bousfield wrote to the President of Howard University, a historically black university in Washington, D.C. Colonel Bousfield was concerned about the fate of the artworks in the club, due to the pending closure of Fort Huachuca once the war ended. The letter requested assistance in finding a repository for the artwork, and Colonel Bousfield was hopeful that Howard University would be interested in acquiring the collection. Colonel Bousfield mentioned that because the club was a large building, Colonel Hardy had secured a large number of WPA artworks by black artists for decoration. The collection contained 38 oils, 44 prints and drawings, 2 murals, and 3 pieces of sculpture. Around 1 October, President Johnson of Howard University telegraphed...
Colonel Bousfield and indicated the university’s desire to acquire the collection. Approval from Colonel Hardy must have been quickly forthcoming, as a letter from the Howard University President’s office, dated 4 October 1944, was sent to James C. Evans, Assistant Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War, stating that the University was grateful for Evans’s office being willing to assist them in acquiring the collection.\(^{201}\) The collection was apparently received at Howard University in 1947.\(^{202}\)

### 2.7.6 End of use as a black officers’ club

The departure of the 92\(^{nd}\) Division over the summer of 1944 did not necessarily signal the end of use for the Mountain View Officers’ Club. There may have been a period of little use, but the 372\(^{nd}\) Infantry, an all-black unit, arrived at Fort Huachuca in November 1944 for training. Their officer corps was entirely made up of blacks, probably consisting of approximately 20 officers. The 1922 Service Command Unit (SCU) remained at the post, keeping things running, and had a few black officers. The Station Hospital was still in business and was partly run by a black officer corps. Finally, the Women’s Army Corps (WAC), formerly the WAAC, detachment remained on post and likely had several black officers.\(^{203}\)

This group of maybe 40 officers might have been enough to keep the Mountain View Officers’ Club staffed and operating, but there is no documentary proof of this timeline. It is likely that even if the club did remain open after the departure of the 92nd Division, the departure of the 372\(^{nd}\) Infantry in the spring of 1945 probably meant the end for the facility’s use as a black officers’ club.\(^{204}\)

On 26 July 1948, President Truman issued Executive Order 9981, declaring it would be “the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin.”\(^{205}\) This order did not

---

\(^{201}\) G. Frederick Stanton, Administrative Assistant to the President, Howard University, Washington, D.C. to James C. Evans, Assistant Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War, Washington, D.C., 4 October 1944, RG 107: Entry 188, Box 208: Office of Assistant Secretary of War Civilian Aide to the Secretary, 1940-47, File: “Fort Huachuca,” Fort Huachuca, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

\(^{202}\) Barnwell, Charles White, 34.

\(^{203}\) Stephen C. Gregory, Museum Technician, Fort Huachuca Museum, e-mail to Susan Enscore, 25 May 2012.

\(^{204}\) Ibid.

\(^{205}\) MacGregor, Integration of the Armed Forces 1940-1965, 312.
contain a deadline for implementation, and several years would pass as the Army slowly moved toward integration. In April 1950, the Army lifted the quota on black soldiers, and the eruption of the Korean War a few months later resulted in a rapid influx of blacks into the Army, particularly in combat units. The resulting over-strength in black units was eventually utilized by assigning new black replacement troops to under-strength units regardless of racial makeup. Expediencies of war in organization and budgeting precluded new segregated units, and the success of the integrated units in Korea lent weight to the integration argument. This informal integration was made official in the Eighth Army 1 July 1951, when General Matthew B. Ridgway’s request for authority to abolish segregation in his command, for increased combat effectiveness, was approved. On 29 December 1951, all major Army commanders were ordered to prepare integration programs, and segregated units were a thing of the past by November 1954.

2.8 Changes after World War II

2.8.1 Closure of Fort Huachuca

After V-J Day (2 September 1945), Fort Huachuca was mostly empty. The fort became a separation center to process soldier discharges on 15 September 1945, a duty which continued until 15 December of that year. On duty at the post during this time period were the unit handling the separation center (64 personnel), the 1922 SCU, and the WAC detachment. During 1946, a caretaker detachment (Corps of Engineers military and civilians) took over the fort and remained until 15 September 1947 when Fort Huachuca was officially closed. At that point, the War Assets Administration began dismantling and selling the WWII cantonment, with much of it gone by 1949 (Figure 56).
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The rest of Fort Huachuca was turned over to the state, with the Arizona National Guard using the remaining facilities for summer camps. With the service clubs already demolished, the Mountain View Officers’ Club may have begun its future use as a service club during that time. Fort Huachuca was reopened for the Korean War, serving the 417th and 419th Aviation Brigades, and the 45th, 304th, 923rd, and 934th Engineer Aviation Groups. A temporary post-war closure ended on 1 February 1954 when Fort Huachuca was reopened as the Army’s Electronic Proving Ground (EPG). The fort has been continually manned by active-duty Army since that time.

2.8.2 Alterations to the Mountain View Officers’ Club

Many changes have been made to the Mountain View Officers’ Club over the years since the post was reopened in 1951 (Figure 57-Figure 59). The following is a concise summary of these changes in both physical structure and uses:

---
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8 May 1953 – Used as a Service Club for Aviation Engineers; 1177.5 sq. ft. addition to building for use as a Hobby shop; shed type roof, concrete floor, added at NW corner of existing Bldg.; no cost listed.

Mid-1950s – used as a general Service Club (for EPG).

1959 – in use as a non-commissioned officer (NCO) Club/NCO Open Mess until 1966

10 May 1960 – constructed Patio; $366.00

25 June 1960 – constructed Dance Floor in Patio; $1,262.00

17 February 1961 – screen doors installed; $70.00

21 April 1961 – garbage Rack constructed; $1,176.00

1966 – in use as an Enlisted Men’s Service Club until 1971

6 Dec 1971 – renovated former Rocker Club [name for the Enlisted Men’s Service Club] to a Special Service Entertainment Workshop at a cost of $551.00; this was a basic renovation of some kind.

19 June 1973 – rehabilitation of Special Service Entertainment Workshop at a cost of $37,443.64; included new stage curtain.

Dec 1983 – handrails for stairs to second floor.

14 Sept 1983 – large renovation project that included construction and installation of new sound proof walls, and upgrade to heating and cooling; total cost of $90,066.00.

11 June 1991 – use changed from Entertainment Workshop to Administrative General Purpose; was subsequently used for some period by the Army Career and Alumni Program (ACAP) Job Assistance Center (JAC).

April 1994 – evaporative cooler added; $4,220.85.

26 Oct. 2004 – building had been vacant for (unspecified) years; use code change to Private/Organizational Club in preparation for lease of the building to the Southwest Association of Buffalo Soldiers (SWABS) who would begin restoring facility.
- SWABS received the lease in October 2006; they began renovations in January 2009 and the lease expired (not renewed) on 30 September 2011.

Figure 57. Building 66050 in 1955, looking west (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 58. Building 66050 in 1955, looking northeast (Fort Huachuca Museum).
2.9 Context conclusions

Fort Huachuca may have had more recreational facilities than less isolated posts, but the facilities they received were all standardized and replicated at many Army posts across the country; the facilities at Huachuca were in no way unique.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club was constructed from a standardized plan for a large service club, Type SC-3. This design was mostly constructed as an enlisted men’s service club. There were no significant deviations from the standard plan. There is no distinguishing element of the design or construction that would indicate it was built for any particular race. During the period of use, the only physical aspect of the club that indicated it was for use by black officers was the presence of a collection of art by prominent black artists. This collection was removed when Fort Huachuca was closed after WWII. The two murals are of particular interest as, by their nature, they were the most visually striking of the black artwork displayed in the club. They would have been mounted to the walls, so were semi-permanent fixtures in the fabric of the building. Removal of the murals, along with the other black art significantly damaged the integrity of the building as relating to black officers.
No evidence was found that the Mountain View Officers’ Club was purposely built for black officers. The order segregating the two officers’ clubs on post came only about 9–10 weeks before the Mountain View Officers’ Club opened. This would certainly be well after the club was planned and funding allocated, and would most likely also have been after construction was underway. The two clubs were mentioned by name in the order; it seems unlikely they would have received names if they were not already physically present on the post.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club was restricted to black officers and remained that way throughout WWII. As such, it is one of a handful of black officers’ clubs established during the war. Other locations with black officer clubs during WWII included Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Walterboro Army Airfield, South Carolina; Freeman Army Airfield, Indiana; and the Army Air Forces Intelligence School in Orlando, Florida.214

While Fort Huachuca received visits and performances from many entertainers and athletes, the events were usually only one stop on a much more expansive tour that took the performers to many military bases across the country and eventually overseas to theaters of combat. While many of the performers that came to Fort Huachuca were black, there were also well-known white entertainers that visited and performed for the troops. To ensure access for as many personnel as possible, these events were usually held at the field house, the football stadium, the outdoor arena, on stage in the theaters, or in the enlisted men’s service clubs.

The only evidence found for high-profile entertainers at the Mountain View Officers’ Club was the dedication ceremony when the club opened, 7 September 1942, with the cast of “Cabin in the Sky” on hand, and the event for Brigadier General Davis in early 1943 when the Deep River Boys performed at the club. While many events were held at the club, including an important show of black art, nearly all were local affairs such as wedding receptions, anniversary parties, celebratory dinners, and other social events. While music was often present, it was primarily performed by soldiers stationed at Fort Huachuca. It is possible that visiting black celebrities were taken to Mountain View Officers’ Club to socialize by 92nd or

93rd Division officers. It is far more likely, however, that they would visit an enlisted service club.
3 Evaluation

3.1 Categories of historic properties

The identification of historically significant properties is achieved through evaluation of their position within a larger historic context. According to the NRHP, historic contexts are defined as “…the patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within prehistory or history is made clear.”215 A historic property is determined as either significant or not significant by applying standardized National Register Criteria for Evaluation to a property within its historical context. The NRHP categorizes significant properties as buildings, sites, districts, structures, or objects. The definitions of these property categories are given below.216

**Building:** A building is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. Examples of buildings include: administration building, house, barn, stable, train station, church, or shed.

**Structure:** Structures are distinguished from buildings by being functional constructions made for purposes other than creating human shelter. Examples of structures include: aircraft hangars, bandstands, bridges, canals, fences, kilns, or windmills.

**Object:** The term object is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment. Examples of objects include boundary markers, fountains, monuments, sculptures, or statues.

**Site:** A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure. Examples of sites include: battlefield, campsite, ceremonial site, designed landscape, rock shelter, or village site.

**District:** A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district can comprise both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve as focal points. A group of features lacking in individual distinction may even be considered eligible if the grouping achieves significance as a whole within its historic context. While a district derives its importance from being a unified entity, it can contain build-
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ings, structures, sites, objects, or open spaces that do not contribute to the significance of the district if these properties do not adversely affect the district's integrity.

3.2 Criteria for evaluation

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation define how historic properties are significant by categorizing a property’s associations with important historic qualifiers. The National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation lists four major criteria to which a historic property can be associated; Criterion A-important events, Criterion B-persons, Criterion C-importance in design and construction, and Criterion D-information potential. Although there are other criteria considerations, the four major criteria are described in more detail below.217

A. Event—associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. Person—associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. Design/Construction—embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. Information Potential—yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

3.3 Significance

Through researching the archival records and developing a detailed historic context, the researchers determined that the Mountain View Officers’ Club is significant for two separate themes.

3.3.1 Black experience at Fort Huachuca (Criterion A)

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is significant for Criterion A – Black Soldiers in WWII. The first use after construction, as an officers’ club for the 93rd and then the 92nd Division’s black officers, is the only use for which the building has significance. Fort Huachuca was the only Army post in the country that housed a full division of black troops during WWII. Training and support of the divisions greatly expanded Fort

---

Huachuca to include a new cantonment. The Mountain View Officers’ Club was constructed from a service club Type SC-3 standardized plan and its first use was as a black officers’ club at Fort Huachuca. It served as a counterpart to the white Lakeside Officers’ Club also on post (the two clubs together were commonly called “The Bookends” on the installation). By order of the commanding officer, the Lakeside Officers’ Club was for white officers, while the Mountain View Officers’ Club was designated for black officers. The Mountain View Officers’ Club provided an off-duty social outlet for the member officers. Primarily a facility for dining and parties, the club also hosted organized entertainment activities and cultural events. As far as can be determined, it is one of only two remaining black officers’ clubs on U.S. Army installations with the other one located at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

3.3.2 World War II temporary buildings (Criteria A and C)

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is significant for Criteria A and C – World War II Temporary Construction for being constructed from a standard WWII temporary construction design. This significance is derived from the report *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Construction* where it states “From the perspective of architectural history, the war mobilization buildings are significant for their design, construction and technological innovation.”218 With events in Europe during the spring of 1940 alerting the U.S. to the impending military threat, the War Department began to receive massive appropriations to gear up for war. Posts for training were a primary need, and twenty new cantonments were completed by the time America formally entered the war on December 7, 1941. These cantonments were vast new cities, complete with housing, logistical, utility, administration, education, recreation, training, and religious facilities. In order to expedite these new and expanded military posts, standardized plans were drawn up for the layout and the individual building types. Speed of construction, repetition, and inexpensive materials provided the resulting vast seas of two-story, rectangular barracks that sprang up like weeds across every new cantonment. Having been selected to house a full division of troops, Fort Huachuca gained a new cantonment in 1941-1942. Along with all other necessary building types, the fort gained recreation buildings. The Mountain View Officers’ Club is an example of a standardized plan for a service club. These clubs were built on installations across the country. In 1986,

the DoD entered into a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement for demolition of the remaining WWII temporary buildings. As part of this agreement, it was determined that all remaining WWII temporary buildings may meet the criteria of the NRHP, but the Section 106 aspects of these buildings were mitigated by the previously mentioned temporary building report and a series of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) which included one for service clubs.

3.4 Aspects of historic integrity

In addition to possessing historical significance, to be eligible to the NRHP a property must also retain sufficient physical integrity of features in order to convey its significance. Historic properties both retain integrity and convey their significance, or they do not. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities of a property that define the concept of integrity. To retain historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of those seven aspects. The retention of specific aspects of historic integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant. The seven aspects of integrity listed in National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation are: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association.

Integrity has very specific connotations in defining historic and cultural resources. Integrity is the authenticity of physical characteristics from which resources obtain their significance. Historic properties convey their significance through their integrity. Individual resources have their integrity if they possess a majority of these seven aspects.

The 700 series of temporary buildings was developed in the late 1930s by the Army’s Quartermaster Corps; plans for this series included barracks, administration buildings, recreation buildings, hospitals, and chapels. Included in the group of plans for recreation buildings were plans for a service club with plan numbers that start at 700-1275 and end at 700-1289 (Figure 60). The Mountain View Officers’ Club was constructed from flipped plans for a Service Club Type SC-3 700 series temporary building

The Army Quartermaster Corps (and subsequently the Corps of Engineers) utilized the Service Club Type SC-3 at many installations that needed service clubs (Figure 67).

Figure 60. Service Club Type SC-3 Plan 700-1275 original plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
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220 The 700-series and 800-series of temporary building plans were drawn in such way that the building could be oriented to the prevailing winds or topography simply by flipping the plans, without having to redraw the plans; thus the text in the drawings shown on Figures 61 to 66 are backwards.
Figure 6.1. Original first floor plan for a service club (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 62. Original balcony/second floor plan for a service club (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 63. Original front elevation for a service club (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 64. Original west elevation for a service club (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Besides flipping the plans (a common practice based on installation needs), two other modifications were made to the original plans: (1) moving the dance hall porch from being accessed by both the dance hall and café to the other side of the dance hall so that it would have views of the
mountains (Figure 68), and (2) adding a wood walkway from the front entrance porch around the south and west sides to access a patio off the dance hall porch (Figure 69).

Figure 68. Early 1940s-era postcard of the Fort Leonard Wood service club porch and patio (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 69. View to the northeast of the Mountain View Officers' Club in 1943 [note Guest House #1 to the right which is now demolished] (Fort Huachuca Museum).

3.4.1 Location

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The location of the Mountain View Officers’ Club is intact (Figure 70 and Figure 71).
Figure 70. Location of the club during WWII, indicated by red box (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 71. Location of the club in 2011, marked by red box, showing its location has not changed (Fort Huachuca Master Planning Office). Note that the scale of this map is the same as that in Figure 70.
3.4.2  Design

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. It results from conscious decisions made during the original conception and planning of a property (or significant alteration to same) and applies to activities as diverse as community planning, engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture. Design includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials.

3.4.2.1 Exterior

The exterior design of the Mountain View Officers’ Club has been significantly altered from its original plan with five major additions to the building and two removals from the building. These seven alterations are: (1) the front wooden porch has been replaced with a concrete porch and a long concrete handicap accessibility ramp (Figure 72); (2) a series of rooms wrap around the southwest corner of the building (Figure 73); (3) the porch on the northwest corner was enclosed and more rooms were added to the building on the northwest corner (Figure 74); (4) a lean-to room was added to the east to house the freezer (Figure 75); (5) the boiler room has been removed (Figure 76 and Figure 77); (6) a large exterior freezer/cooler building was added to the northeast corner (Figure 78); and (7) most of the windows were removed and covered over by new siding (76 windows and openings are covered by replacement siding while 20 windows only have their openings remaining (Figure 79–Figure 81).

Figure 72. Front entrance comparison (left as-planned, right in 2011); note: the door on the left of the current view appears to be original, although it is not shown on the standard plan. (ERDC-CERL).
Figure 73. Addition on the southeast corner (left as-built and right in 2011), showing windows and door that were removed within red box (ERDC-CERL).

Figure 74. Northwest porch enclosed and the additions of rooms (left as-planned and right in 2011) showing former northwest porch in red box (ERDC-CERL).

Figure 75. Freezer/cooler addition on east (left as-planned and right in 2011) with the red box showing the area where the addition was added (ERDC-CERL).
Figure 76. Red box highlights former location of Boiler Room (left as-planned and right in 2011) (ERDC-CERL).

Figure 77. Boiler foundation pad (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 78. Freezer/cooler structure on northeast corner (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 79. Window removal example 1; note: former window locations marked by red boxes, door appears to be original, although not shown on standard plan (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Due to these alterations, the integrity of the original design of the building is severely lacking. The windows on the first floor, the second floor, and the clerestory roof level were an integral element in the design, flooding the interior with light and ventilation at all levels. The original drop-lap siding on the second floor and the clerestory roof level has been replaced with clapboards (Figure 82).
3.4.2.2 Interior

The interior design of the Mountain View Officers’ Club bears no similarity to the original interior plan of the club during its period of significance except for the overall open space in the dance hall.

Vestibule

The front doors currently are two sets of doors that open out to the porch, and each door has four lights. The front vestibule originally was a large space with wood coat racks on the left side of the room. The right side of the room was originally modified from the service club plan from a coat rack area to a restroom (Figure 83 and Figure 84). The walls were originally lacquered lengths of wood. The flooring type was 1 x 4 wood planks. An elliptical arched opening connected the vestibule to the dance hall.

The vestibule floor plan has been modified, with a half-wall constructed on the south to form a divider (Figure 85). Currently, the front doors are replacements but still in the style of the original doors. The flooring is bare plywood with portions of original flooring to the left of the plywood.
(Figure 86). The walls are wallboard over wood studs. The original west wall was removed, and a portion of the storeroom was added to the vestibule. The original light fixtures were replaced with recessed fixtures and non-recessed fixtures (Figure 87). The arch between the vestibule and the dance hall was widened and boxed (Figure 88).

Figure 83. Original service club vestibule floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 84. Historic view of restroom wall in the vestibule marked by red box, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 85. Extant vestibule floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).

Figure 86. Looking west in the vestibule with the half-wall (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Dance Hall

The dance hall was the most significant space in the Mountain View Officers’ Club. It was the largest room by far and had two levels plus a clerestory roof. All three levels had window openings. The second level consisted of a balcony accessed by four staircases — two by the vestibule arch and one on each side of the fireplace. The dominant feature of the dance hall was a large two-level brick fireplace. The dance hall level had one fireplace
and a “lounge” on the second level had the other but both could be seen as one entered the dance hall from the vestibule. A large mural by Charles White titled *Five Great Negro Americans* hung over the vestibule arch opposite the double fireplace during WWII.

As already stated, the vestibule arch was widened and boxed compared to the original smaller width and elliptical arch (Figure 88). The two sets of stairs by the vestibule arch have their original railing and treads (Figure 97 and Figure 98). The balcony on both sides does not have its original railings. The staircases on either side of the fireplaces were enclosed at some point (Figure 99 and Figure 100). The flooring for both the dance hall and the balcony is original. The double level fireplace was covered over at some point with wallboard and the two mantels and hearths were removed. The brick mantel and hearth for the dance hall fireplace was rebuilt but the “lounge” level fireplace mantel and hearth are still missing (Figure 101 to Figure 103). The balcony that wrapped around the fireplace end of the dance hall forming a “lounge” was removed. The wood wainscot has been removed from the first floor but is still in place on the balcony level (Figure 104 to Figure 107). The light fixtures for the dance hall were replaced with ones salvaged from the Lakeside Officers’ Club (Figure 108 and Figure 109). The mural was removed along with one by Lew Davis also displayed at the Mountain View Officers’ Club, and both are now housed at Howard University in Washington, DC (Figure 110 and Figure 111).
Figure 89. Original dance hall floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 90. Current dance hall floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 91. Original balcony floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 92. Current balcony floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 93. Historic photo of the dance hall looking back toward the vestibule, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 94. Current photo of the dance hall looking back toward the vestibule (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 95. Historic photo of the dance hall looking towards the fireplaces, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 96. Current photo of the dance hall looking towards the fireplaces; notice “lounge” floor on the balcony is removed (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 97. Elevation of staircase near the vestibule (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 98. Current view of vestibule staircase (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 99. Original elevation of staircase near the fireplaces depicting its open form and railings (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 100. Current view of staircase near the fireplaces showing now enclosed staircase marked by red box (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 101. Historic drawing of the fireplaces (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 102. View of lower fireplace with reconstructed mantel (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 103. Current view of upper fireplace with chopped-off mantel and missing hearth (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 104. Historic drawing of wainscot (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 105. Historic view of wainscot, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 106. Current view of lack of wainscot marked by red box on the dance hall level (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 107. Current view of wainscot on balcony level highlighted by red box (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 108. Original light fixture drawing (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 109. Current view of light fixtures installed from the now-demolished Lakeside Officers' Club (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Reading Room

The reading room was on the second floor directly above the vestibule. It was accessed by the two staircases in the dance hall and then by doors that opened to the balcony (Figure 112). The reading room was brightly illuminated by ten windows and had wood bookshelves on the wall that separated it from the upper level of the dance hall.

Currently the reading room is broken up into several smaller spaces, one of them being a projection booth and others bathrooms (Figure 113–Figure 115). Four large openings were cut into the wall overlooking the dance hall.
Figure 112. Historic reading room floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 113. Current reading room floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 114. Current view of projection booth room addition in the old reading room (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 115. Current view of one of two bathroom additions in the old reading room (ERDC-CERL 2011).
The former café area was accessed through an arched opening on the east side of the dance hall, past the staircase to the balcony. The café was a large open room lined with windows on both the north and south sides. A clerestory level had smaller windows further illuminating the café (Figure 116 to Figure 123). Opposite of the entrance to the café was the service area, which contained a soda fountain and sandwich serving area.

Currently the room has a double metal door in a boxed opening. The room is divided into two spaces, with a smaller room near the entrance that was turned into an electrical service room. The larger room has a bar in place of the former soda fountain and sandwich serving area. A closet was added to the southeast corner of the old café. The ceiling trusses have been painted black. All of the original windows on the first floor are missing, and all of the windows on the clerestory roof level were removed and their openings sided over.

Figure 116. Historic café floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 117. Current café floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).

Figure 118. Historic photo from 1943 depicting original entrance into the café as highlighted by red box (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 119. Current entrance into the former café (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 120. Current view north into the electrical service room addition inside the old café (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 121. Current view looking toward bar area, where the old soda fountain was once located (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 122. Current view to the south side of the old café (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 123. Former clerestory roof window locations marked by red boxes (ERDC-CERL 2011).

**Kitchen**

The former kitchen was a large room with a variety of counters and appliances. There was a dishwashing room on the southwest corner with a pass-through to the old café and a storeroom in the southeast corner. A door on the east led to the outside (Figure 124).

All of the original appliances and work areas have been removed (Figure 125 and Figure 126). The door to the outside now goes into the freezer/cooler addition (Figure 127).
Figure 124. Historic kitchen floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 125. Current view of kitchen (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 126. Current view of kitchen storeroom (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Men’s Restroom

For the Service Club Type SC-3 floor plan, a men’s toilet was between the vestibule and the café (Figure 128). When the service club plans were modified for the officers’ club, it appears that two restrooms were created out of the space in the vestibule that was planned for wood coat racks and the men’s toilet. The floors of the restrooms were originally bare concrete.

Currently, the eastern portion of the vestibule and the old men’s restroom are divided into three rooms. The first room is entered from the vestibule and is an anteroom to a larger room (Figure 129). The anteroom has non-original blue ceramic wall tile and non-original fired-ceramic floor tile. The second room has its original wood walls but the same non-original fire ceramic floor tile as the anteroom (Figure 130). The other room is accessed from the dance hall and has pink, laminate-coated fiberboard over the original wood walls (Figure 131). This fiberboard was installed in the early 1960s. The floor is still bare concrete.
Figure 128. Historic service club men’s bathroom floor plan (ERDC-CERL Collection).
Figure 129. Blue tiled anteroom (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 130. Original wood-paneled room (ERDC-CERL 2011).
The original plan for the Service Club Type SC-3 had a series of small rooms to the west of the vestibule that contained the foyer to the women’s restroom and from that into the women’s toilet. To the north of the women’s restroom was the front office and an office for the hostess (Figure 132). It appears from two of the historic photographs that the service club design was changed when it was modified for use as an officers’ club. The modification had a large seating area in this space instead of the offices and women’s restroom and toilet. This large seating area had double doors that opened to the porch and a single door that opened out to the front deck (Figure 133 and Figure 134). From the remnant of concrete flooring, the large storeroom was still directly to the west of the vestibule.

The current floor plan is completely muddled. A wall has been constructed (along a dimension line in the original floor plan) and all other original walls have been removed. A corridor was constructed along the south and west sides of the exterior walls with a series of doors that accessed the large addition to the south and the west (this addition area previously was not accessible; Figure 135 to Figure 138).
Figure 132. Historic service club floor plan; note that most of the interior walls were not constructed (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 133. Historic photo showing single door from officers' club seating area to wood deck (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 134. Historic photo of seating area with tables and chairs (bottom red box) and single door to wood deck (upper red box), 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 135. Current floor plan of former game room (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 136. Non-original hallway along south wall; note non-original wall studs and wallboard (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 137. Non-original walls (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 138. View to the north showing former opening to the old porch within red box (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Porch

The porch on the historic floor plan for Service Club Type SC-3 extended the length of the dance hall and had double doors to the café. For the plan of the Mountain View Officers’ Club, the porch was flipped over to the other side of the dance hall for a view to the mountains. There were two sets of double doors that allowed access from the west side of the dance hall to the porch and a series of windows (Figure 139 to Figure 145).

At some point the porch was enclosed. The roof was extended out and this new area was screened in. It is unknown when the double doors from the porch to the north patio were added or when the former porch was divided into smaller rooms and double doors added to new walls. All window openings between the dance hall and the porch were covered over. The two sets of double doors were also modified. The porch does have its original wainscoting (although it is painted) and its original floor.

Figure 139. Center area of photo shows historic view from dance hall to the porch, 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 140. View to the south in the former porch; note the original wainscoting on the left and the original flooring (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 141. View to the north in the former porch (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 142. Original flooring in the old porch (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 143. Former window opening to the dance hall now covered (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 144. Original double door opening to the dance hall; no original doors are extant (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 145. Original double door opening to the dance hall closed in with wood studs and wallboard (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Northwest addition

The area between the seating area (likely game room) and the porch was not part of the original Service Club Type SC-3 design or the officers’ club modifications. At some point a large, screened room addition was added on to the porch. This subsequently was added on to again in 1953 for use as a hobby shop when two large rooms were added to the west (Figure 146—Figure 150).

Figure 146. Current addition floor plan (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office).
Figure 147. North elevation showing the original porch location (left box), the screened-in porch addition (middle box), and the room addition (right box) (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 148. Detail within red box of siding differences between original drop-lap siding and the addition’s siding (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 149. Window openings covered up on the west side of the northwest addition (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 150. Interior of the northwest addition looking south (ERDC-CERL 2011).
The Mountain View Officers’ Club has lost its exterior design integrity due to the addition on the southwest corner, the kitchen's addition to the east, the boiler room removal, and the almost wholesale removal of its fenestration. It also does not retain its interior integrity due to modifications of the vestibule, the room additions in the former game room, the room additions in the café, the addition of rooms in the former reading room, and the lounge’s removal from the balcony.

### 3.4.3 Setting

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property. Setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space.

The larger setting for the Mountain View Officers’ Club is at the western edge of the southwestern-most area of the WWII temporary building cantonment (Figure 151). A diagram of the WWII cantonment is shown in Figure 152. To the east of the club was a series of bachelor officers’ quarters and a guest house for visitors to the officers’ club (Figure 153). To the southeast, down an embankment, was a boxing ring and seating area, but these were not associated with construction of the Mountain View Officers’ Club (Figure 154). A baseball field and backstop was located further to the north of the tennis court (Figure 155).

The officers’ club had a wood deck on the southwest corner that was accessed by a single door. The deck led around the west side of the club to an open area and a tennis court. Currently a stone patio surrounds the west and north sides of the officers’ club (Figure 157 and Figure 158). The tennis court and baseball field are still extant (Figure 157 and Figure 156). The baseball field directly north of the officers’ club is not original. It is unknown if a barbecue between the west side of the officers’ club and the tennis club is original (Figure 157). All of the bachelor officers’ quarters were demolished, as well as the boxing ring. A driveway on the south side of the officers’ club allowed access to the front entrance and terminated in a cul-de-sac (Figure 159).

The setting surrounding the Mountain View Officers’ Club has been massively changed by the demolition of the entire segregated WWII cantonment (highlighted by red outline on Figure 151). Except for the view outward to the mountains, the building has completely lost any association
with its historic setting. As stated, the bachelor officers’ quarters and the hostess house that were associated with the Mountain View Officers’ Club were demolished along with the boxing ring down the embankment from the club.

Figure 151. WWII cantonment area (north is to the right) in 1946 and in 2011 depicting how the setting for the Mountain View Officers’ Club has completely changed with the demolition of the other temporary buildings (Fort Huachuca Real Property Office, left; and Master Planning Office, right.).
Figure 152. Diagram of the World War II cantonment area with north to the right. Mountain View Officers' Club is shown by location of red boxA (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 153. The setting for the officers’ club in 1956, looking north-northeast and highlighted in red box (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 154. Close-up of the boxing ring and seating area below the bachelor officers’ quarters in 1956, looking north-northeast (Fort Huachuca Museum).
Figure 155. Historic view of the rear of the officers’ club and the baseball field in 1954, looking south (NARA).

Figure 156. Current view of original location of the baseball field (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 157. West patio, barbecue, and tennis court (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 158. North patio (ERDC-CERL 2011).
3.4.4 Materials

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration, to form an historic property.

Wood structure and drop-lap wood siding were the original materials for the officers’ club. The wood structure is intact; however, the drop-lap siding is only intact on the first floor. Normally the fenestration of a building would fall under design, but there were originally ninety-eight windows on the officers’ club; thus windows were almost as primary a material as the wood structure and siding. Only two of ninety-eight original windows remain.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club does not retain its integrity due to the removal of almost all of its original windows, the change in siding on the second floor, and the change of the monitor roof level from drop-lap siding to clapboards (creating a very noticeable change to the shadowlines on the facades).
3.4.5 **Workmanship**

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

Unlike many high-style buildings where workmanship is a key element for integrity, the WWII temporary buildings constructed across the country were built in almost an assembly line and as quickly as possible. They were sturdily constructed but do not have the architectural details usually considered under workmanship.

Since WWII temporary buildings did not have the usual qualities of workmanship considered under this category, this aspect of integrity is not applicable and therefore is not assessed.

3.4.6 **Feeling**

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular time period.

Since the Mountain View Officers’ Club plan and design follows the Service Club Type SC-3 floor plan, the feeling of the officers’ club is that of a service club rather than that of an officers’ club (Figure 160). Although there were some modifications to the service club floor plan (moving a porch from one side of the dance hall to the other and having the game room area instead of office space), the overall plan follows that typical Service Club Type SC-3 floor plan very closely (Figure 161). This is very different from the Lakeside Officers’ Club which also was based upon the Service Club Type SC-3 plan but was heavily modified (Figure 162).
Figure 160. Service Club at Camp Grant, Illinois (ERDC-CERL Collection).

Figure 161. Mountain View Officers’ Club 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).
The feeling for the interior was dominated by the light-filled dance hall (Figure 163). All of the windows on the three levels of the dance hall have been removed. Windows on the first floor were removed and the opening covered by plywood; windows on the second floor and the clerestory roof were removed and the opening covered by siding.

The murals (Figure 164) and the black art were what identified this building with the black experience. The murals were removed after WWII and
moved to Howard University in Washington, DC (Figure 165 and Figure 166).

Figure 164. Dance hall with view of the Charles White mural in 1943 (Fort Huachuca Museum).

Figure 165. Close-up view of *Five Great American Negroes* mural (courtesy of the Howard University Gallery of Art).

Figure 166. Lew E. Davis mural, *The Negro Soldier in America’s Wars* (courtesy of the Howard University Gallery of Art).
Without the light-filled dance hall and the murals depicting *Five Great American Negroes* and *The Negro Soldier in America's Wars*, the building does not have the feeling necessary to convey its significance as a black officers’ club. Additionally, what is left of the building conveys a typical enlisted service club and not an officers’ club.

### 3.4.7 Association

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A period appearance or setting is desirable; integrity of setting, location, design, workmanship, materials, and feeling combine to convey integrity of association.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is directly associated with the construction of temporary buildings during WWII across the country. These buildings followed a standard format of wood construction in standardized plans so that they could be built quickly. The officers’ club (following the plans for a service club) does not have this association as it lacks the multitude of windows from when it was constructed; its primary interior spaces do not resemble the interiors from its period of significance especially with the removal of the windows and the lounge from the ballroom, and the removal of the windows and the addition of interior walls in the café.

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is associated with the black military experience at Fort Huachuca and across the country; however, this association has been lost by the removal of the *Five Great Negro Americans* mural (over the entrance to the dance hall), and *The Negro Soldier in America's Wars* mural. The murals were the only direct association between the club and the black military experience since everything else in the building was associated to its plan as a service club. While its location is the same, its setting has been heavily modified with the demolition of the surrounding WWII segregated cantonment. The segregated cantonment with the club far from the heart of white Fort Huachuca provided part of the association with the black military experience.
4 Structural and Condition Analyses with Recommendations

4.1 Structural analysis

The structural engineer’s analysis conducted for this report answered questions in four areas:

1. How was the building was originally designed, how was it originally constructed, and what were the original construction materials? (This review allows researchers to identify issues that may be compounded to affect the building’s current structural integrity.)

2. How have structural modifications from the time of construction affected the building’s structural integrity?

3. How has the structure been maintained over time? (This evaluation will provide the building’s current condition and how that current condition affects the building’s historic integrity.)

4. Are there other reports that can be evaluated to collect additional information relating to the building’s structural modifications?

4.1.1 Original design

During the military construction boom related to WWII, the demand for new wood buildings was unprecedented. This demand overwhelmed not only the supply of usable timber, but also the available workforce of designers, artisans, and supervisors experienced in wood construction techniques. To reduce the demands placed on engineers and architects, the Army developed standardized designs guided by five principles of speed, simplicity, conservation of materials, flexibility, and safety that would fit most cases. These standardized designs also included consideration of wind, snow, and seismic loadings. The structural engineer concluded that since there is very little snow in the area of Fort Huachuca, the facility is structurally overdesigned for this location in relation to any potential for a standing snow load.
The Army’s standardized drawings allowed the project manager, site engi-
neer, and construction foreman to make changes to adapt the building
plans to the site at the time of construction. Some of the site adaptations
allowed for buildings included following a mirror image of the drawings,
dropping the roof slope of the long part of the building from 3:12 to 1.15:12
(or from approximately 14° to 5°), and using wooden piers instead of con-
crete piers.

4.1.2 Construction materials

Because the demand for wood construction materials overwhelmed the
wartime supply of usable timber, wood suppliers could not use the nor-
mally harvested wood from fast-growing plantations. Instead, suppliers
used “older growth” wood from the slow-growing virgin forests to meet
demands. Older growth wood tends to have better quality and higher
stress values. The Army, therefore, increased the design stress grades of
the lumber to 85 percent of the values set forth by the USDA Forest Ser-
vice and Forest Products Laboratory in 1929.222 In layman’s terms, this
meant that construction crews were using better quality wood which could
withstand higher loadings than the designed values, making the buildings
stronger than they looked.

4.1.3 Summary

The facility is structurally overdesigned for this location. First, the building
is over engineered for the non-existent snow load of the Arizona location.
Second, the use of old growth lumber gives the building an additional
structural strength. Thus, the structural engineer observed that there are
no errors that have perpetuated over time and would now affect the struc-
tural integrity of the officers’ club. In fact, the findings show just the oppo-
site—the design, construction, and materials have helped the structure en-
dure longer than expected.

Grading of Lumber: Practical Concerns for Lumber Producers,” U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest
Products Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin, 7; http://www.fpl.fs.fed.us/documents/fplgtr/fplgtr07.pdf
4.2 Structural modifications over time

The structural modifications that potentially affect the structural capability of the building are shown in Figure 167–Figure 169.\textsuperscript{223}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{first_floor_plan}
\caption{Changes to building over time on first floor (ERDC-CERL).}
\end{figure}

Figure 168. Changes over time to the second floor (ERDC-CERL).

Second Floor Plan

Figure 169. Changes over time on upper level (ERDC-CERL).

Third Floor Plan
A listing of these structural changes is given below.

1. An early addition to the facility was the removal of the wood walkway and the installation of a 45 square foot cold freezer room/addition on 3.5 x 5.5-inch wood posts imbedded in the soil on the east side of the building off the kitchen. This freezer room was later expanded to a total of 278 square feet. These piers were replaced around 2010 and no longer affect the overall structural integrity.

2. Completed on 8 May 1953, a hobby shop of 1,177 square feet was added to the building according to Determination of Eligibility and Historic Documentation for Building 66050, Performing Arts Theater, Fort Huachuca, Arizona. This occurred on the northwestern corner and was achieved by remodeling the former sunrooms and enclosing the open porch with a shed-type roof and installing a concrete floor. This new addition featured a bank of double-hung screened windows. This modification appears to have no impact on the overall structural integrity.

3. Built sometime between 1955 and 1982, a 671 square foot hip-roofed, wraparound, 10 foot wide frame addition with five small rooms was placed on the southwest corner, using a foundation of Styrofoam CMU (concrete masonry unit) blocks. This addition affected the overall structural capability negatively as these blocks cannot support structural loads effectively.

4. A patio was constructed in May 1960. The following June, a dance floor was constructed on that patio. This modification appears to have no impact on the overall structural integrity.

5. The 390 square foot open balcony was removed sometime between the year of original construction and 1982. This involved removing the north lounge, the 30 square foot hearth, the two corresponding support columns and railings, and then adding 20 feet of low walls and partitions to enclose the balcony. Even though part of the balcony was removed, this modification appears to have no impact on the overall structural integrity.

6. In 1982, Finical and Dumbrowski Architects and Engineers of Tucson, Arizona, modified the building to become a theater and

---

music center. Those structural modifications appear to have no impact on the overall structural integrity and include:

(a) Installing a set of double doors on the building’s northeast corner and a 28 square foot steep concrete ramp.

(b) Installing a 100 square foot handicap-accessible ramp, replacing a 320 square foot wooden walkway and stairs with concrete, and extending the sun canopy 2 feet to match the stairs for the main entrance.

(c) Installing a frame proscenium arch for a stage at the northern end of the dance hall in order to convert the dance hall to a theater.

(d) Removing the 287 square foot boiler room with all its equipment and installing a massive exterior-located heating, ventilation and cooling (HVAC) system with ceiling ductwork, visually altering the former exposed truss and open ceiling condition, and adding additional loading to the roofing members.

(e) Cladding some columns on the first floor and adding some interior partitions between some columns.

(f) Building a 498 square foot music rehearsal room in the former east-wing café.

(g) Partitioning the 795 square foot west-wing game room to become a rehearsal space that could be divided into two rooms by a central folding wall.

(h) Removing the coat racks and creating a 93-foot long hall between the rehearsal space and the poorly constructed wraparound southwest addition in order to gain access to the old screened porch.

(i) Further partitioning the 1,177 square foot northwest addition built in 1953 (enclosed patio), creating two food service rooms totaling 678 square feet.

Almost all modifications mentioned above appear to have no overall effect to the structural capability of the facility. Three modifications that did affect the structural capability are the wooden piers under the cold freezer room, the frame proscenium arch, and the foundation under the southwest addition.
4.3 Current condition

4.3.1 Inspection

Inspection of many structural elements can be somewhat cursory because of the overlaying floor, wall, and ceiling finishes. An inspector makes visual observations and then looks for tell tale signs that would indicate problems. From these observations, the inspector can make some inferences. For example, the inspector may not actually see the structural members of the exterior wall; however, by looking down the side of the building issues such as a wall out-of-plumb and bowing can be determined. Another example would be that the inspector cannot see the floor joists; however, by just walking and/or jumping on the floor, ‘soft spots’ can possibly be found, inferring that the floor joists in that area are probably damaged in some way. If the observed condition is serious enough, calculations would be performed on that component to determine its structural capability.

During the analysis, the engineer looked for the following structural components in locations where the structural members could be easily observed. Other observation covered tell-tale signs that could imply damage.

- Piers and footings—under the café and kitchen
- Floor girders/beams—under the café, kitchen, and balcony
- Floor joists—under the café, kitchen, and balcony
- Exterior walls—from the exterior of the building, from the inside of the café, and various locations throughout the building
- Columns—only interior columns
- Trusses—in the café, dance hall, and game room
- Rafters—under the “sun roof” and enclosed patio
- Purlins and roof sheathing—in the café and game room

During the structural assessment, the evaluation team looked for the following distresses that are common to wood structural components. Distressed components compromised to the degree the component’s ability to perform is affected are classed as “excessive” and “extreme.”

- Excessive deformation—warping, bowing, twisting
- Excessive amounts checks and splits especially on the ends
- Excessive shrinkage
- Excessively out of plumb
- Water stains and deterioration
- Fungus/insect damage
- One component overly distressing another component
- Extreme weathering
- Improperly spliced boards and connections
- Loose and/or missing connections

4.3.2 Results

Previous experience on structural assessments meant the team expected to encounter varying severities of the above-mentioned distresses throughout the facility. However, just the opposite was true—few examples of distress were found. The lack of distresses can be attributed initially to the dry climate that has helped to preserve the facility.

The following sections provide an in-depth discussion of each of the components. A table containing the evaluations follows the discussion.

4.3.2.1 Piers and spread footings

The piers and spread footings structural members and components appear to be sound and intact, performing as intended. The evaluation team did not observe any excessive deflections, distortions, settlement, deterioration, or other structural distress. The team observed that there had been some recent work completed on the piers and spread footings under the kitchen and former café. This work had been recommended in previous studies of the building.\(^{225}\) Only two issues were encountered concerning the foundations. First, the 1,700 square foot addition on the southwest corner was built on “Styrofoam CMU blocks” which do not have much structural capability (Figure 170). The second issue was that there are no foundations under the 278 square foot freezer/cold storage room addition where 3.5 x 5.5-inch wood posts are imbedded in soil. Both additions were not part of the original design and should be removed due to their structural issues and the fact that they were not original to the building’s construction.

4.3.2.2 **Floor girders/beams**

The investigators observed that the first floor girders/beams and the second floor girders/beams supporting the balcony appear to be sound and intact. By walking around the interior of the building, the team also did not observe any external signs of damage such as bowing, warping, and material deterioration (softness). Therefore, these structural members are performing as intended.

4.3.2.3 **Floor joists**

The analysis found that the first-floor joists under the kitchen and café along with the second-floor joists under the balcony appear to be sound and intact. The team could also not observe any external signs that there were any issues such as bowing, warping, and material deterioration (softness). The only observable distress was a number of water stains on the second floor joists (Figure 171); however, the evidence of water intrusion has not affected the structural capability of the member. Therefore, these structural members are performing as designed and constructed.
4.3.2.4 Exterior walls

The inspection found that the load-bearing exterior walls appear to be sound and intact. By looking down the building’s exterior sides, the team could not find any visible deflections, distortions, settlement, deterioration, or bowing (Figure 172 and Figure 173). The team did observe from the exposed walls in the kitchen that some members are slightly weathered and water stained (Figure 174); however, this has not affected the structural capability of the member. Therefore, the structural engineer concluded that the members are performing as designed, constructed, and maintained.
Figure 172. Exterior wall at the site of the former boiler room, showing no visible deflections or bowing (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 173. Current view of upper-level exterior wall showing no deflections or bowing (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 174. Current view of exterior wall from inside the café with circled areas show weathering and water staining (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.3.2.5 Columns

The inspectors used an instrument to tap on the first- and second-floor columns and concluded that they appear to be sound and intact. By looking down the column sides, the team could not find any signs of deflection, distortion, out-of-plumb deterioration, or bowing (Figure 175). They did encounter small amounts of low-severity checking and splitting in the columns, but it appeared the distress has not affected the structural capability of the members (Figure 176 and Figure 177). Therefore, this evaluation concludes that the members are performing as intended.

Figure 175. Current view of columns in dance floor (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 176. Current view of dance hall column, with checking in the column highlighted by red oval (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 177. Column and beam connection detail with checking in the connection, highlighted by red oval (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.3.2.6 Trusses

The inspectors found the trusses had no missing or loose bolts (Figure 178), and they appear to be sound and intact. By looking down the truss bottom chord in the building's interior, the team could not find any visible sagging (Figure 179), distortions, out-of-plumb, deterioration, or bowing. However, the team observed that the structural members which extended beyond the exterior wall did show varying degrees of splitting, distortions, deterioration, and weathering. These distresses started at the trusses’ exposed ends and, in many cases, dissipated by the time the member reached the exterior cladding (Figure 180). However, these distresses currently pose no structural issues. Therefore, the members are performing as intended.

Figure 178. Current view of trusses over game room, showing no noticeable loose bolts as highlighted by red circles (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 179. Current view of dance hall ceiling, showing no noticeable truss sag, as highlighted by the red oval (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 180. Current view of heavily weathered rafter ends (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.3.2.7 Rafters

The structural engineer found that the trusses and rafters appear to be sound and intact. After a walking inspection on the roof and in the building’s interior, the team found no indications of deflections, distortions, settlement, or deterioration. Very few instances of low-severity splitting and checking were found, and what was found was mostly on the enclosed patio rafters (Figure 181). The northwest addition rafters have been slightly notched as has the main entrance porch roof (Figure 182 and Figure 183). These notches do not appear to be causing any structural problem. Therefore, the members are performing as intended.

Figure 181. Splits and checks in the rafters as highlighted by red ovals (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 182. Rafters, beams, and columns in the enclosed patio, with red ovals showing notched rafters (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 183. Current view of sun canopy showing notched rafters (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.3.2.8 Purlins and roof decking

The analysis found that the purlins mostly appear to be sound and intact (Figure 184). However, the purlins and roof decking in the kitchen and café have low-to-medium severity weathering and some slight splitting and checking. There are no indications that these distresses are affecting the structural capability of the members (Figure 185 and Figure 186). Additionally, the team found no glaring issues with deflections and distortions by looking down the purlin edges from the floor. Therefore, the team concluded that these structural members are performing as intended.

Figure 184. Current view over game room of purlins and roof sheathing appearing sound and intact (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 185. Current view of café trusses, purlins, and roof decking. The newer material was installed when the facility became a theater (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 186. Current view of café purlins showing weathering but no bowing. Roof sheathing shows weathering, minor splits, and checks (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.3.3 Conclusion

The structural engineer’s analysis found that most structural components are sound and intact; there were no indications of deflections, distortions, sagging, or settlement. There was, however, low-to-medium severity weathering on some components, especially on the purlins and roof sheathing in the café. Some components also showed signs of low-severity splitting and checking, but, there were no indications that these distresses are affecting the structural capability of any members. The analyst concluded that since no distresses were affecting the structural integrity of the building, the structural system is in good condition and is overall performing how it was designed, built, and maintained.

4.4 Building performance state analysis

The performance of a building refers to how effectively, safely, and efficiently it performs at any time during its life cycle. A building’s performance state, which changes during time in service, is reflected by two different indicators: (1) the physical condition state as determined by the condition assessment and (2) the functionality state as determined by the functionality assessment. The physical condition state or condition assessment relates to a facility’s general “physical fitness,” independent of its mission, as it deteriorates due to routine aging, excessive or abusive use, or poor maintenance. The functionality state or functional assessment relates to the facility’s suitability to function as intended and required for the mission. Changes in functionality may be driven by factors such as changing user requirements, revised building codes, or growing obsolescence of materials and technology. The functionality state is distinct from, and determined independently from, the physical condition state.226

4.4.1 Condition assessment

Condition assessment requires an inspection process to gather essential information. Any method developed for condition assessment must take into account the type and amount of information gathered and the method used for that gathering. Thus, the inspection process itself must contribute to the assessment purpose and method.227 The inspection process should

---


include the steps listed below. After following the inspection, the asset manager can then develop a work plan and prioritize the plan to determine the most cost-effective repairs.

- Inventory the building by dividing the building systems into components and subcomponents.
- Evaluate each system, component, and/or subcomponent using an inspection procedure based on specific defects, including levels and quantities which are correlated to a condition.
- Use the inspection results to assess the building’s condition and functionality.

One engineering inspection procedure is based on specific condition defects, levels, and quantities to form repeatable and objective measure of degradation for Sustainability Maintenance Systems such as BUILDER™, MicroPAVER™, ROOFER™, and RAILER™ (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Rating Category</th>
<th>Amount of Deterioration Present</th>
<th>How the Distress affects the Functionality</th>
<th>Type of Maintenance and Repair Required to Repair the Distress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Minimal deterioration</td>
<td>Functionality is not impaired</td>
<td>Preventive/minor maintenance, or minor repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Minor deterioration</td>
<td>Functionality is slightly impaired</td>
<td>Preventive/minor maintenance, or minor repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate deterioration</td>
<td>Functionality is somewhat impaired</td>
<td>Moderate maintenance or minor repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Significant deterioration</td>
<td>Functionality is seriously impaired</td>
<td>Significant maintenance or moderate repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Severe deterioration over a small amount (10% to 25% of area)</td>
<td>Functionality is critically impaired</td>
<td>Major repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Severe deterioration over a moderate amount</td>
<td>Functionality barely exists</td>
<td>Major repair but less than total restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Severe deterioration over a large portion (&gt; 66% of area)</td>
<td>Functionality is Lost!</td>
<td>Total restoration!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Condition rating scale and criteria (ERDC-CERL).

---

The team also examined these additional building systems with each system’s respective components:

- Exterior closure system (including exterior wall finish, windows, doors, soffits, and fascia)
- Roofing system (including roofing membrane[s], flashing, gutters, downspouts, and fascia boards)
- Interior construction system (including interior partition construction, windows, doors, and interior finishes of walls, floors, and ceilings)
- Plumbing system (including potable water and sanitary waste)
- Fire protection system
- Electrical system
- HVAC system

4.4.2 Functional assessment

Functional assessment involves the following three items:

- General technical obsolescence—the driving factor on obsolescence is the component’s age because new materials and technologies improve efficiency, maintainability, and overall performance; therefore existing components become obsolete and have decreased capabilities.
- Regulatory/code compliance—as new codes, regulations, or organizational policies take effect, the existing system is “grandfathered” in the new system; however, at some point, changes to the system must be made to bring them into code compliance. Code issues also include life safety issues. Maintaining historical facilities also falls into this category.
- Changes in user requirements—as tenant requirements change or the underlying designated mission changes, the capability to provide service to users is affected and/or new customers are added to the system. 232

To rate any functional issues, this report used the functionality scale shown in Table 2.

---

Table 2. Functionality scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The system/component meets all user requirements, does not pose a life safety problem or health issue, no obsolescence, and complies with all codes and regulations. There is little, if any, functionality loss within the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The system/component meets most of the user requirements, but the mission is not affected to the level of red, the system complies with most codes and regulations, has some issues with obsolescence, life safety is not an issue, and health is not a problem. There is a functionality loss somewhere between green and red which implies a sense of caution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The system/component does not comply with all codes and regulations, has significant issues with obsolescence, poses a life safety or health issue, and/or does not meet all user requirements, significantly affecting the mission. There is a serious loss of functionality or no functionality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.1 Exterior closure system

Exterior cladding

Approximately 3,000 square feet of the exterior cladding on the first floor walls is the original 1 x 8 inch tongue-and-groove siding as seen in Figure 187. Painted 1 x 4 inch members installed vertically serve as trim and to cap the corners. The first floor cladding has low-severity weathering, especially on the building’s south face, and there is some splitting and cracking of the wall trim.

Figure 187. First-floor exterior cladding measurements (ERDC-CERL).

---

During a 1982 renovation to convert the facility to a theater, approximately 3,600 square feet of 8-inch, tapered, masonite clapboard siding with a wood-grain pattern was installed on the exterior walls of the second- and third-floor levels. There are a few warped and weathered pieces, and it is also historically inappropriate clapboard siding. The structural engineer recommends replacement if the building is to regain its historic integrity (Figure 188).

To protect the crawl space there are random-width "weather boards" (plywood) that form an above-grade skirt. Some of these boards are broken, missing, and weathered. The structural engineer did not recommend any repair strategies because the boards are serving their intended purpose.

![Figure 188. Historic, non-historic, and above grade skirt (ERDC-CERL 2011).](image)

**Exterior doors**

Currently there are six non-historic single leaf doors and six sets of non-historic double doors. The wooden doors show signs of weathering and deterioration, but the metal doors appear to be in good condition. Several doors have also been boarded over during earlier improvement initiatives. The structural engineer recommends replacing the doors with historically appropriate doors and installing panic hardware, weather stripping, and thresholds. Before installing these doors, an evaluation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements must be made to determine if the
original size and design can be reinstalled or if a larger door will have to be installed to meet the code.

*Exterior windows*

The second and third levels are missing approximately 50 windows that were part of the original design (Figure 189 and Figure 190). Additionally, the patio had a bank of double-hung, screened windows, approximately 3 ft wide x 5 ft high each. These openings are now filled with plywood and wallboard and sealed from the interior, creating an “enclosed” patio (Figure 191). Other non-historic additions have covered up five additional windows on the first floor. Several windows on the first floor are broken and/or covered up. Two windows were replaced with non-historic windows. The structural engineer recommends that windows should be uncovered, repaired, and/or replaced with historically appropriate windows as necessary, and all missing windows should be reinstalled with historically appropriate items.

![Figure 189. Current view showing no second-story windows (ERDC-CERL 2011).](image-url)
Figure 190. Current view showing weathered ends and no second-story windows (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 191. Current view of northwest addition, showing boarded-up screened windows (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Roofing system membrane

The original design called for asphalt shingles on the roof. Currently there is approximately 10,000 square feet of modified bitumen roof and approximately 3,500 square feet of asphalt shingles covering the enclosed patio. It is unknown if the modified bitumen roof was a construction change or later replacement. The southwest addition also has asphalt shingles while the northwest addition is modified bitumen. There is severe deterioration of the shingle surface and at several locations, shingles are missing (Figure 192). The structural engineer also observed medium-severity alligator cracking in several locations on the modified bitumen roof (Figure 193). SWABS personnel reported leaks due to the cracking in the bitumen roof. The structural engineer recommends replacing the asphalt shingles immediately and replacing the modified bitumen roof later for due to the deterioration of the roof.

Figure 192. Current view of poor condition of asphalt shingles (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Fascia boards, gutters, and downspouts

The enclosed patio and rafter ends have approximately 600 feet of fascia. Approximately 300 feet of fascia board cap the second- and third-story purlins, which bear on the double top chords of trusses. The truss ends are exposed (Figure 194). The main entrance porch eaves are comprised of end rafters and 1 x 6 inch fascia with 60 feet of galvanized steel flashing (Figure 195). The main porch is the only location that has a gutter and downspout, mounted to the eastern post. The inspection team encountered sections of fascia and trim that have low-severity weathering, deterioration, and peeling paint, especially on the building’s southern face. In addition, certain boards and trim were missing. The inspection team did not encounter any distresses on the gutter and downspout. The structural engineer recommends replacing the damaged or missing fascia boards and drip edge as well as repainting fascia boards to delay further deterioration.
Figure 194. Current view of damaged roof drip edge and weathered fascia board (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 195. Current view of main porch (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.4.2.2 Interior Construction

Interior walls

Most interior walls of the original building were 1 inch plywood with a horizontal 1 x 6 inch tongue-and-groove wainscot installed to a height of 4 ft 2 in. above the finish floor, such as on the balcony and dance floor (Figure 196 and Figure 197). In various locations throughout the building, the original wall cladding has been altered either by outright removal, removal and/or replacement by just plywood sheathing, removal and/or replacement by just sheetrock, or a combination of these three alterations. For example, gypsum wallboard has replaced the original wainscot on the western exterior wall areas of the dance hall (Figure 198) and the northwest addition. One restroom has a pink laminate paneling on the walls (Figure 199). Gypsum wallboard encased some interior columns, while others, especially in the dance hall, were encased in painted 1-in. thick boards. Throughout time, modifications required removal of several original walls and the installation of “newer” walls. The structural engineer recommends removal of all walls that are not part of the original design and rebuilding any missing walls that were part of the original design. Installation of the original wall surface (plywood and wainscot) is highly unlikely because of the necessity to comply with current fire codes. Most likely the walls will need to be resurfaced with 1 x 6 in. tongue-and-groove wainscot installed over 5/8 in. fire-rated gypsum board.
Figure 196. Current view of original wall finish on balcony, showing height of wainscoting (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 197. Current view showing height of wainscot on north wall of dance floor (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Figure 198. Current view of non-historic wall finish in dance hall (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 199. Current view of laminate paneling in restroom (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Interior ceiling

The original ¾ inch wallboard ceilings exist by the dance hall upper truss chords, in the original bathrooms, and on most sloped surfaces. The ceilings in the dance hall and café were painted a bright white that helped with lighting.

Elsewhere, especially in renovated or recently constructed rooms, ceilings are framed and clad in ¾ inch gypsum wallboard. It also appears that some of these rooms (e.g., the reading room) may have had a suspended acoustical ceiling installed (Figure 200). The interior ceiling inspection found that good portions of the original gypsum wallboard ceilings have fallen down and/or are missing, especially on/under the balcony and in the reading room (Figure 201). The structural engineer recommends replacing all damaged and missing gypsum ceilings. However, installation of the original ceiling surface is highly unlikely because of the necessity to comply with current fire codes. The new ceiling surface will most likely have to be 5/8 inch gypsum wallboard. It is also recommended that the replacement wallboard be painted a brilliant white to match the original design.

Figure 200. Current view of missing ceiling in reading room which most likely was last covered with suspended acoustic tile (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Interior flooring

The original flooring in the café and the dance hall was 1 x 3 inch tongue-and-groove hardwood (Figure 202). Elsewhere, all rooms that featured a hardwood floor were 1 x 4 inch tongue-and-groove (Figure 203). Concrete topping floors were used in the storage room, the former porch portion of the northwest addition, in parts of the kitchen, and most likely the bathrooms. Currently, most of the original finish flooring remains except in the kitchen and dishwashing rooms which now have 6-inch square red quarry tile over plywood and sleepers (Figure 204).
Figure 202. Current view of dance hall flooring, showing original 1 x 3 in. hardwood flooring (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 203. Current view of former game room showing subfloor and pile of torn-up 1 x 4 in. original hardwood finish flooring (ERDC-CERL 2011).
The inspection team found that the flooring in the dance hall has low-severity damage due to cupping. Plywood was used to replace a small amount of hardwood flooring next to the south stairs. Plywood was also used to replace the entire hardwood floor in the main vestibule (Figure 205). The inspectors also determined that the café’s hardwood flooring had its varnish removed and was painted at some point, in addition to having another type of flooring installed directly on it (Figure 206).
Figure 205. Current view of vestibule, showing hardwood floor replaced with plywood (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 206. Current view of café’s hardwood flooring (ERDC-CERL 2011).
The wood floors on the balcony are in poorer condition than the wood floors in the dance hall. Several areas of the balcony floor show water damage from roof leaks (Figure 207) and the north part of the balcony is missing (Figure 208). The concrete topping in the men’s restroom has several cracks. There are pieces of kitchen tile broken and missing. The structural engineer recommends replacing the plywood flooring with historically appropriate hardwood flooring, and sanding the existing hardwood floors and refinishing them where possible. It is also recommended to replace the concrete topping in the men’s restroom, clean all tiles, and replace broken and missing tiles. Additionally it is also recommended to re-install the missing portion of the hardwood floors on the north part of the balcony.

Figure 207. Current view of water-damaged flooring in former reading room (now a restroom) (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Interior doors

The fourteen original interior doors were solid core or paneled wood. Some of them had lites. The structural engineer recommends reinstalling all the doors in compliance with ADA requirements after determining if reusing the original size or installing larger doors would be more appropriate for historic integrity.

Interior windows

The original design did not specify any interior windows. However, installation of interior windows/openings to the reading room occurred during the modifications that turned the dance hall into a theater (Figure 209). The structural engineer recommends removing these windows and refinishing the walls to match the original design.
Insulation

The original building did not have any insulation; however, with today’s emphasis on energy reduction, it is highly probable that insulation will be required to be installed on any exterior walls that are currently exposed before refinishing them. The structural engineer recommends installing insulation where possible.

4.4.2.3 Electrical system

The inspection found Romex wiring and conduit hanging from the ceiling or walls, unsecured bare wires, and open junction boxes (Figure 210, Figure 211, and Figure 212). It also appears there has been an attempt to install smoke detectors. The structural engineer has determined that the electrical system lacks integrity and continuity. It is recommended to remove the existing electrical system and install a new system throughout the building.
Figure 210. Current view of hanging wires in front of doors to the café (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 211. Current view of hanging wires and conduit in the former screened porch addition on the northwest corner (ERDC-CERL 2011).
Plumbing system

The inspectors observed several cut pipes in the crawl space that had significant calcium carbonate deposits, indicating the facility has been without water for some time. It is recommended that the existing potable water and sanitary systems be abandoned and new systems installed.

Fire protection system

Current codes require the installation of a fire-protection system even though it was not part of the original design. The structural engineer determined that an attempt had been made to install such a system, but the project was not completed (Figure 213 and Figure 214). The structural engineer could not determine if it is possible to reuse the fire protection piping and fittings left in the facility to complete a new system. Removing the remaining components of the old system and installing a new system is recommended.
Figure 213. Current view showing that fire protection line has been cut (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 214. Current view showing that installed fire-protection system was not completed (ERDC-CERL 2011).
**HVAC system**

The original design called for hot-water radiant heating throughout the building. In 1982, modifications removed the original system to install a large HVAC unit and cooling tower when the building was converted to a theater. This HVAC system only served the reading room, the dance floor, and the café. The remodeling included installing sheet-metal ductwork, up to 50 x 24-inches in size between the trusses (Figure 215) and down the balcony walls in the northern half of the dance hall space (Figure 216). This ductwork greatly distracted from the historic character of the space. In addition, smaller ceiling-mounted trunks were extended into other spaces. Two large, round, metal exhaust fans were mounted on the southern façade wall for the first-floor toilet rooms (Figure 217), making a major visual impact on the façade. Venting for the second-floor restrooms is through the roof. Investigators could not find evidence that any part of the HVAC unit and cooling tower still existed from that project. The structural engineer recommends removing all the remaining ductwork, removing the restrooms on the second floor, installing new restroom fans that would not detract from the original view, and installing a hot water heating system.

*Figure 215. Current view of added ductwork above dance hall area (ERDC-CERL 2011).*
Figure 216. Added ductwork in the balcony over the north half of the dance floor (ERDC-CERL 2011).

Figure 217. Current exterior view of exhaust fan for first-floor restroom (ERDC-CERL 2011).
4.4.3 Results

The building’s condition assessment is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Results from building assessment (ERDC-CERL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building System</th>
<th>Condition Rating</th>
<th>Functionality Rating</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Closure</td>
<td>Fair to Poor</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Generally performing. Remove and replace non-historical items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Good to Fair</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Asphalt shingles need replacement. Fascia boards and trim needs repair. Consider replacing rest of roof system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Construction</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Many compromised historical components. Non-historic repairs need removal and some historic components need repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Very Poor to Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Currently has very little functionality. System does not comply with all codes and regulations, poses a life safety or health issue, and does not meet all user requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Abandoned in place. Replacement required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>System not complete and shut off. Replacement required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Replacement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Suggested projects

4.5.1 Approach for cost analysis and estimates

The structural engineer developed a schematic cost estimate for renovating the Mountain View Officers’ Club which was based on site visits, discussions with SWABS personnel, and the condition assessment. Repair costs to bring back the facility to its original design were estimated.
Because there is no definitive design or design program on which to base an estimate, a complete description of the work and detailed cost estimate cannot be made. Therefore, it must be cautioned that this budget estimate is intended as a point of departure for further decisions, programming, and design development. It is inappropriate to use this estimate as a government estimate for bidding purposes.

The structural engineer used R.S. Means cost data books,\(^{234}\), \(^{235}\), \(^{236}\), \(^{237}\), \(^{238}\). If a particular item was not included in the R. S. Means database, the engineer searched for cost data through the Internet, telephone calls, and personal conversations, then duly noted the source of that particular cost estimate.

The evaluation took quantities from the provided drawings, engineering studies, interviews with SWABS personnel, and site visits. Collecting this data measured quantities as accurately as the source data allowed and included waste factors to provide an estimate with a level of accuracy appropriate for a budget-level cost. Quantities for mechanical and electrical items that were not evident in the available drawings were approximated by using *The Whitestone Building Maintenance and Repair Cost Reference*\(^{239}\).

The structural engineer adjusted the cost totals for location using an area cost factor (multiplier) of 1.10 per UFC 3-701-1\(^{240}\) and a historic adjustment of 1.05 per UFC 3-730-01.\(^{241}\) A 10%–30% contingency was added to the adjusted cost totals.


\(^{240}\) HQUSACE, United Facilities Criteria (UFC) DoD Facilities Pricing Guide* UFC 3-701-1, March 2011, Change 3, September 2012 .

4.5.2 Total project costs

The summarized cost estimate is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Cost estimates for projects necessary to bring Mountain View Officers Club to its original design (ERDC-CERL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area or Item</th>
<th>Estimated Cost + 10% Contingency</th>
<th>Estimated Cost + 30% Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Walls, Windows, and Siding</td>
<td>$376,200.00</td>
<td>$444,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>$99,900.00</td>
<td>$118,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area A Kitchen and Dining Areas</td>
<td>$193,500.00</td>
<td>$228,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area B Front entry and restrooms</td>
<td>$251,300.00</td>
<td>$297,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area C Game Room</td>
<td>$121,600.00</td>
<td>$143,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area D Enclosed Patio and offices</td>
<td>$87,000.00</td>
<td>$102,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area E Dance Hall</td>
<td>$367,200.00</td>
<td>$433,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior—Area F Balcony and Reading room</td>
<td>$202,800.00</td>
<td>$239,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$601,300.00</td>
<td>$710,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumbing</td>
<td>$275,700.00</td>
<td>$325,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>$356,300.00</td>
<td>$421,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$756,500.00</td>
<td>$894,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,689,300.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,360,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Building projects by system with costs

4.5.3.1 Building exterior

The estimated cost to bring the Mountain View Officers’ Club exterior closure system back to its historical original design is $376,200–$444,600; that estimate includes but is not limited to the following tasks.

- Remove the southwest 1,700 square foot corner addition and the cold storage room on the east side of the building. Make exterior wall repairs as required.
- Remove the plywood covering off all covered windows and doors. Repair or replace broken or missing windows and doors; remove any non-historic windows and doors and re-install using historically appropriate items. Install panic hardware and handicap accessible thresholds on all exterior doors. Make exterior wall repairs as required.
- Repair the window screens to create a screened in porch on the northwest corner of the building.
• Remove the non-historic clapboard on the second and third stories and replace with historically appropriate drop-lap similar to that on the first floor.
• Install storm windows on the inside of all historical windows.

4.5.3.2 Building roofing

The estimated cost to repair the roofing system is $99,900–$118,100; the estimate includes but is not limited to the following tasks.

• Remove existing asphalt shingles on the overhangs, replace sheathing as required, and install new.
• Remove existing bad fascia and drip edge and replace.
• Repair any leaks in existing modified bitumen roof over the dance hall, café, and kitchen.

4.5.3.3 Building interior

The interior was broken down into six areas (Figure 218 and Figure 219):

Area A—café, kitchen, and boiler room

Area B—vestibule, restrooms, and storage room

Area C—game room

Area D—enclosed patio

Area E—dance hall

Area F—balcony and reading room
Red are those items that were installed over time and will have to to be removed in order to regain the building’s historical integrity.
Purple are the items that were part of the original design but have since been removed and will have to be reinstalled in order to regain the building’s historical integrity.
Green are the items that have been installed over time to mostly meet codes and should remain.

Figure 218. First-floor, areas A–E (ERDC-CERL).
Interior Area A—café, kitchen, and boiler room

The estimated cost to bring Area A back to its original design is $193,500–$228,600; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

- Remove walls that make a second room in the café. Make repairs to interior walls as required.
- Repair any damaged interior walls to match original design in kitchen and café.
- Repair ceiling as required, then prime and paint ceiling and trusses a high-gloss brilliant white.
- Remove extra cabinets and millwork in kitchen.
- Replace any broken tile in the kitchen.
- Refinish hardwood floor in café to match refinished floor in dance hall.
- Build a 21 ft (long) x 13 ft 8 in. (wide) x 17 ft 8 in. (high) boiler room, with a set of 3 ft double doors, a transom window above the doors, and concrete floor similar to the original design.

**Interior Area B—vestibule, restrooms, and storage room**

The estimated cost to bring Area B back to its original design is $251,300–$297,000; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

- Remove walls that were not part of the original design and make repairs to interior walls as required.
- Remove existing bathroom under construction and make repairs to interior walls as required.
- Remove existing plywood floor and replace with hardwood flooring. Finish flooring in front entryway to match dance hall flooring.
- Remove existing wall finishes, ceilings, flooring, and any remaining fixtures in remaining bathrooms and reinstall in historically appropriate manner.
- Reinstall and finish walls for coat closet, bathrooms, and storage; replace ceiling and floor covering in bathroom per original design.
- Install new bathroom fixtures, making at least one stall handicap accessible.
- Install new doors to restroom and storage room with historically appropriate items.
- Install coat closet and rods to hang coats, and then paint per original design.

**Interior Area C—game room**

The estimated cost to bring Area C back to its original design is $121,600–$143,700; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.
• Remove all existing loose lumber, remove existing wall that was not part of original design, and finish removing walls and ceiling. Make repairs to interior walls as required.
• Reinstall walls, floors, ceiling, and doors to create a game room.
• Paint walls and ceiling.

**Interior Area D—enclosed patio**

The estimated cost to bring Area D back to its original design is $87,000—$102,800; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

• Repair/refinish walls and ceilings as required and paint.
• Remove “rooms” in enclosed patio that were not part of the original design, make repairs to interior walls, and paint as required.
• Replace enclosure screen.

**Interior Area E—dance hall**

The estimated cost to bring Area E back to its original design is $367,200—$433,900; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

• Refinish hardwood floor.
• Install missing stair handrails and paint to match original drawings.
• Repair, remove, and replace bad wall sections and/or refinish walls and ceilings as required and paint.
• Remove duct work and make ceilings repairs as required.
• Paint ceiling and trusses a high-gloss brilliant white.
• Paint other locations as required.

**Interior Area F—balcony and reading room**

The estimated cost to bring Area F back to its original design is $202,800—$239,700; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.
• Reconstruct balcony lounge on north side to include concrete hearth area around fireplace.
• Repair or remove and replace bad wall sections; refinish the walls and ceilings as required and paint.
• Remove rooms (walls) that were created in the reading room, making repairs to interior walls as required.
• Remove the existing “viewing windows” on the upper deck (i.e., from the reading room) and refinish.
• Remove flooring in the reading room and replace as required in the original design.
• Finish making handrail on upper balcony code-compliant.
• Refinish hardwood floor.
• Install book shelves and paint.

4.5.3.4 Electrical system

The estimated cost to replace the electrical system and bring it up to current codes is $601,710,600—$710,600; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

• Remove all existing electrical items to include conduit, wiring, lights, and panel boxes.
• Install complete new electrical system (i.e., new service, main panel, conduit wiring, egress signs, smoke detectors, and lights). Make repairs to any walls as required.

4.5.3.5 Potable water/wastewater

The estimated cost to replace the plumbing system and bring it up to current codes is $275,700—$325,800; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

• Remove where possible or abandon in place the existing potable water and sanitary sewer systems.
• Install a new complete potable water and wastewater system (i.e. piping, fittings, valves, and vents). Make repairs to any walls as required.
4.5.3.6 Fire protection

The estimated cost to replace the fire protection system and bring it up to current codes is $356,300—$421,100; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

- Remove existing parts of the fire protection system.
- Build a new 7 x 7 x 8 ft high fire protection pump room.
- Install a complete new fire protection sprinkler system.

4.5.3.7 HVAC

The estimated cost to install an HVAC system and bring it up to current codes is $756,500—$894,100; the estimate includes but is not limited to the tasks listed below.

- Install new steam boiler with accessories.
- Install new supply and condensate return lines in crawl space.
- Install steam radiators in locations shown on original drawings.

4.5.4 Summary

The estimated cost to renovate the Mountain View Officers’ Club to essentially its original configuration is approximately $3,689,300—$4,360,100. Current guidance states new construction of a Service Club is $245/sf or $2,980,180, not including any adjustment factors for local area or historical construction.\textsuperscript{242, 243}

\textsuperscript{242} HQUSACE, United Facilities Criteria (UFC) DoD Facilities Pricing Guide” UFC 3-701-1, March 2011, Change 3, September 2012

5 Conclusion and Recommendations

The identification of historically significant properties is achieved only through an evaluation, which associates a property within a larger historic context. According to the NRHP, historic contexts are defined as “...the patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within prehistory or history is made clear.”

5.1 Findings

To qualify as historic, a property must have an association with a relevant historic context as well as having retained its physical integrity through which its historic significance is conveyed. Properties with historic significance must retain integrity and convey their significance, or they are not eligible to the NRHP. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities of a property that define the concept of integrity. “To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant.”

5.1.1 Finding for Criterion A — Event

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is significant under Criterion A for WWII temporary building construction (1941–1945) and for the black military experience during WWII (1941–1945).

5.1.2 Finding for Criterion B — Person

The Mountain View Officers’ Club could not be linked to a particular person important in our nation’s past. Under the guidelines for this

---

245 Ibid., 44.
criterion, the building needs to play a significant role in an important person’s life; no such role could be found.

5.1.3 Finding for Criterion C — Design/Construction/Planning

The design and construction of the Mountain View Officers’ Club could not be linked to a specific architect due to its construction from standardized service club temporary building plans. The design does not possess high artistic values; however, WWII temporary buildings in general were found to be significant for their design, construction, and technological innovation.246 The club does not qualify as a potential district per the guidelines in Criterion C due to demolition of the rest of the WWII cantonment per stipulations in the Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement from 1986.

5.1.4 Finding for Criterion D — Information Potential

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is not likely to yield additional information about the history of its building type or specific black military history.

5.1.5 Finding for integrity

Although it is significant under Criteria A for WWII temporary building construction and for the black military experience during WWII, and also significant for Criteria C under the overall WWII temporary building construction effort, and it has integrity of location, it does not have integrity of:

- **Design** – additions and demolitions plus the wholesale removal of windows
- **Setting** – demolition of rest of segregated WWII cantonment and demolition of the surrounding buildings and structures
- **Materials** – removal of the drop-lap siding and removal of most of its original windows and window openings

---


247 Workmanship was not considered for this integrity assessment (see page 150).
**Feeling** – the building does not have its period appearance to signify that it was constructed from 700-series service club temporary building plans

**Association** – removal of all associated black military experience characteristics defined by the two murals (*Five Great Negro Americans* and *The Negro Soldier in America’s Wars*) as well as the rest of the exhibited works by black artists, and removal of all windows from the dance hall and the café which were the two large public areas that most service members would associate with this building.

**Workmanship**-does not apply due to its temporary construction.

### 5.1.6 Finding from the structural and condition analyses

The Mountain View Officers’ Club is structurally sound and actually over-designed; inspectors found that most structural components were sound and intact. Overall, however, the building is rated in “Very Poor” condition. The results of the condition analysis are reproduced here as Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building System</th>
<th>Condition Rating</th>
<th>Functionality Rating</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Closure</td>
<td>Fair to Poor</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Generally performing; remove and replace non-historical items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Good to Fair</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Asphalt shingles need replacement; fascia boards and trim needs repair; consider replacing rest of roof system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Construction</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Many compromised historical components; non-historic repairs need removal and some historic components need repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Very Poor to Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Currently has very little functionality; system does not comply with all codes and regulations, poses a life safety or health issue, and does not meet all user requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Abandoned in place; replacement required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>System not complete and shut off; replacement required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Replacement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is estimated to cost approximately $3,689,300 to $4,360,100 to bring the building back to its original integrity and configuration.

5.2 Recommendations

Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) evaluated the building in 1998 and recommended it eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A (association with events).\textsuperscript{248} They also indicated the building was historically significant when viewed within the contexts of WWII and African-American service in the U.S. military. SRI stated the building was then largely unchanged from its original construction and retained a high level of integrity, although their report does not justify nor explain this conclusion. Unfortunately, this report does not contain sufficient primary data, and the justification for the eligibility recommendation is inadequate and without any documentation. Due to the ongoing interest in Facility 66050, Fort Huachuca has chosen to reevaluate Facility 66050 for its eligibility and to update or correct the inaccuracies in the 1998 report.

A building that is significant for the NRHP is one that has played a very important role in the history of the country; however, the National Register has outlined and codified how significant buildings have to retain their physical integrity to be eligible for the National Register. There is no doubt that the Mountain View Officers’ Club has played such an important historical role by being one of the few places that black officers of the War Department could seek recreation and relaxation during WWII, and for how the Mountain View Officers’ Club exemplified the policies of the War Department in regards to the separation of the races. However, the Mountain View Officers’ Club has experienced a massive amount of changes to its original design and materials from its period of significance, 1942 to 1945. There is extensive loss of feeling and association as well due to the wholesale demolition of the surrounding segregated WWII cantonment. As a result, the Mountain View Officers’ Club sits alone in the landscape and does not provide any sense of the dense construction that once existed or the bustling activity of a wartime installation. The feeling and association of the building itself is severely compromised by the removal of most of the windows that once filled the dance hall with light and vibrancy. Additionally, aspects of integrity have been degraded by the removal of the collected works of black artists, including the two large murals that once decorated the interior. Thus there is no longer a sense or feeling that this

\textsuperscript{248} Bischoff, 1998.
building once provided recreational and social activities for black officers at Fort Huachuca.

While the current survey found the Mountain View Officers’ Club is individually significant under Criterion A for the black military experience historic context and individually significant under Criteria A and C for the WWII temporary building historic context, it does not have enough integrity to be eligible for the NRHP under either criteria. Therefore, it is the determination of the current survey that the Mountain View Officers’ Club is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
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Appendix A: Documentation of Performers at Fort Huachuca during World War II

Table A1 contains a collation of all documented references to performers/performances at Fort Huachuca during WWII that were found during the course of researching this project. All of the articles from *Atlanta Daily World*, *Baltimore Afro-American*, *Chicago Defender*, *Cleveland Call and Post*, *New York Amsterdam*, *Norfolk Journal and Guide*, and *Pittsburgh Courier* were found online using the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library Online Database search. These newspapers were on the ProQuest Database: ProQuest Historical Newspapers. ProQuest’s Black Study Center also had newspaper articles from *Atlanta Daily World*, *Chicago Defender*, *New York Amsterdam*, and *Pittsburgh Courier*. Information was also gleaned from the Fort Huachuca Museum collection and local Arizona newspapers. This table is not meant as a definitive list, as there are almost certainly visits or performances documented in other sources not investigated for the purpose of this report. The table was compiled by research assistant Andrea Sforza of ERDC-CERL.

Table A1. Documented references to performances at Fort Huachuca during WWII, as compiled during the course of research for this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>ARTICLE DATE</th>
<th>PERFORMER</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DATE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing For Soldiers</td>
<td><em>Cleveland Call and Post</em></td>
<td>Jan. 31, 1942</td>
<td>Etta Moten</td>
<td>&quot;last Tuesday evening&quot;</td>
<td>Post Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta Moten Sings at Post Theater</td>
<td><em>Chicago Defender</em></td>
<td>Jan. 31, 1942</td>
<td>Etta Moten</td>
<td>&quot;last Tuesday&quot;</td>
<td>Post Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta Moten Sings for Soldier at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Jan. 31, 1942</td>
<td>Etta Moten</td>
<td>Jan. 29, 1942</td>
<td>Post Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Huachuca Shows Wonderful Spirit of Troops</td>
<td><em>Chicago Defender</em></td>
<td>Jan. 31, 1942</td>
<td>Etta Moten</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous Actors Participate In Huge Show at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Oct. 3, 1942</td>
<td>Manton Moreland, Monte Howley</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Huachuca Service Men Need More Musical Lifts</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Dec. 5, 1942</td>
<td>Lena Horne, Clarence Muse</td>
<td>Labor Day 1942</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General B.O. Davis Feted at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Mar. 13, 1943</td>
<td>Deep River Boys quintet</td>
<td>Mar. 11, 1943</td>
<td>Mountain View Officers’ Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage and Screen Stars Shine Before Soldiers of the 369th</td>
<td><em>Chicago Defender</em></td>
<td>Sept. 19, 1942</td>
<td>Clarence Muse, Manton Moreland, Ben Carter, Lena Horne, Monte Howley, Woody Strode, Sunshine Sammy, Hattie Morrison, Chinkie Grimes, Freddie Clarke, Noodie Bowman, Rico Harrison</td>
<td>&quot;last Saturday&quot; &quot;remained over for 2 days&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Stars at Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Sept. 19, 1942</td>
<td>Lena Horne, Clarence Muse, Sunshine Sammy, Monte Howley, Manton Moreland, Freddie Clarke, Hattie Morrison</td>
<td>Sept. 17, 1942 weekend</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Sissle on &quot;Spotlight&quot; Show Christmas From Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>Dec. 26, 1942</td>
<td>Noble Sissle’s orchestra</td>
<td>Dec. 24, 1942</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality, Glamour...Plus!</td>
<td><em>Pittsburgh Courier</em></td>
<td>May. 1, 1943</td>
<td>Lena Horne</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Shore Likes Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Cleveland Call and Post</em></td>
<td>Feb. 13, 1943</td>
<td>Dinah Shore</td>
<td>&quot;recent visitor&quot;</td>
<td>Field House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Negro Stars of Hollywood are Heard at Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em></td>
<td>Sept. 6, 1942</td>
<td>Ethel Waters, Louis Armstrong, &quot;Rochester&quot; of Jack Benny's radio program, 33 cast members of &quot;Cabin in the Sky&quot;, Clarence Muse (master of ceremonies)</td>
<td>Sept. 5, 1942</td>
<td>Mountain View Officers' Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWII at Huachuca 1940-1949</td>
<td><em>Huachuca Illustrated</em>, Vol 9</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Lena Horne</td>
<td>March 13–17, 1943</td>
<td>Field House, both service clubs (enlisted), station hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;G.I. Rhapsody&quot; Is being Filmed at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 8</td>
<td>Wed. May 3, 1944</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fort Huachuca Theater No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rochester&quot; to Entertain Soldiers at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 1</td>
<td>Sun. Sept. 26, 1943</td>
<td>Eddie Anderson a.k.a. &quot;Rochester&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 27-Sept. 29</td>
<td>open air theater behind Service Club No.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actress on Hand For Dedication Of New Theater</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 3</td>
<td>Tues. Aug. 24, 1943</td>
<td>Lena Horne</td>
<td>&quot;Saturday evening&quot;</td>
<td>Post Theater No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Louis is Popular with 92nd Division</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 2</td>
<td>Wed. May 19, 1943</td>
<td>Joe Louis a.k.a. &quot;Brown Bomber&quot;</td>
<td>arrival Monday afternoon</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Hite Band Will Play at Fort Huachuca</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 5</td>
<td>Thurs. Dec. 24, 1942</td>
<td>Les Hite Band</td>
<td>will be on Christmas night at 8:45 pm</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Kyser to Play At Fort Huachuca On Thursday Night</td>
<td><em>Bisbee Review</em>, pg. 8</td>
<td>Wed. Oct. 14, 1942</td>
<td>Kay Kyser (famed dance band leader)</td>
<td>upcoming Thursday night, 8pm</td>
<td>93rd Division Field House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Smooth Sailing&quot; USO Show Coming Here October First</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Sept. 25, 1942</td>
<td>Saul Grauman and his &quot;Musical Stairatone&quot;, Caryl Gould (blues and rhythm singer), Smith Rogers and Eddy (comedy and dancing), Bob Ripa (juggler)</td>
<td>one performance at 8p.m. on Oct. 1, 1942</td>
<td>93rd Division Open-Air Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures of Hollywood Victory Show that Appeared Here Sept. 6</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 6</td>
<td>Fri. Sept. 25, 1942</td>
<td>photographed: Monte and Montan, Clarence Muse</td>
<td>Sept. 6, 1942</td>
<td>93rd Division Open-Air Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainers Here To Do Show Series</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 5</td>
<td>Fri. Nov. 20, 1942</td>
<td>Judy Carrol, Anita Brown, and &quot;Nappy&quot; Whiting</td>
<td>Arrived Nov. 14 and will last for 30 days</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Plays Given at USO</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 3</td>
<td>Fri. Nov. 27, 1942</td>
<td>under direction of Mr. W. C. McCleary</td>
<td>Monday and Tuesday Nov. 16-17</td>
<td>local USO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Sissle And His Band Will Be In 93rd Division Christmas</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 8</td>
<td>Wed. Dec. 23, 1942</td>
<td>Noble Sissle's orchestra</td>
<td>Friday, December 25, 1942</td>
<td>Sissle will play for a dance in the Field House; sound system is rigged up for music to be heard in both officers' clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Night At Field House On Christmas</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 1, 1943</td>
<td>Hite, Cpl. Effert &quot;Noody&quot; Bowman with Frances Nealy (ballroom and tap dancing), Helen Andrews (blues singer), Torchy Willis, Chester Calhoun (ventriloquist), Mrs. Aretas Phillips, Auxiliary Mercedes Jordan, Sgt. Lawrence Whisonant</td>
<td>Friday, December 25, 1942</td>
<td>Field House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Shore To Sing Here Sat. Afternoon</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 8, 1943</td>
<td>Dinah Shore</td>
<td>Sat. Jan. 9, 1943</td>
<td>Field House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Sunday Talent Show At Service Club</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 8, 1943</td>
<td>Mrs. Sadie Ellis and Mrs. Parthenia Russell</td>
<td>last Sunday?</td>
<td>Service Club No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song (word is cut off) At Service Club No. 2</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 8, 1943</td>
<td>Mrs. Aretas Hill Phillips</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Service Club No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical at Local USO Is Entertaining</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 8, 1943</td>
<td>Pvt. LeRoy Wayman, Cpl. Effert &quot;Noody&quot; Bowman, Beans and Rose, S-Sgt. Nathaniel &quot;Happy&quot; Robinson, the Spratt and Lynch dance team, Jack Curry and Billie Hill, Two Hits and a Miss, Sgt. Herbert Coleman</td>
<td>Last Wednesday (Maybe Jan. 6, 1943)</td>
<td>local USO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Recital At Mountainview Officers' Club</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 8, 1943</td>
<td>Sgt. Lawrence Whisonant (baritone) and Sgt. Andre Wheatley (pianist)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mountain View Officers' Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Shore, NBC Songstress, Paid Fort Huachuca Visit Last Saturday; Sang In Field House</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>Dinah Shore</td>
<td>last Saturday (Jan. 9, 1943)</td>
<td>Field House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93d Soldiers To Stage Show At Post Theater</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>in rehearsal</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Program Presented Sunday In Service Club</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USO Troupe Gave Show Sunday Night In Service Club</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USO Troupe Entertained At Service Club No. 1</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Swing the Cadence&quot; (Pictures)</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Jan. 15, 1943</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>ARTICLE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMER</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE DATE</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Victory Show Coming to Ft. Huachuca</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Feb. 19, 1943</td>
<td>Standard Oil of California's Victory Show cast &quot;talented Hollywood youngsters&quot;</td>
<td>Wed. night, February 24, 1943</td>
<td>first showing (6 o'clock) at the upper parade grounds of the Old Post; second showing will be on the parade grounds behind Service Club No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Arrives Tomorrow (picture &amp; caption)</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Mar. 12, 1943</td>
<td>Lena Horn (last name spelled without an &quot;E&quot; in this article)</td>
<td>arriving Saturday morning (Mar. 13, 1943)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety Show Here March 13</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Mar. 12, 1943</td>
<td>the famous &quot;Shell Show&quot; with headliners Patricia Lynn, Bert Easley, Phyillisita, Gabby Redwood, Johnny O'Brien, Lloyd Simpson, and the &quot;Man With the Eight-Ball&quot;</td>
<td>Sat. March 13, 1943</td>
<td>Theaters No. 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Horne Visits Fort</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Mar. 19, 1943</td>
<td>Lena Horne</td>
<td>the entire week previous</td>
<td>5 performances: one each at Field House, the two Service Clubs, and Station Hospital and Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivouac WAAC Will Show First Time Saturday</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 1</td>
<td>Fri. Mar. 26, 1943</td>
<td>115 members of the two WAAC Companies</td>
<td>3 nights starting Saturday</td>
<td>Theaters No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Lena Horne And Deep River Boys Making Record</td>
<td>93rd Blue Helmet, pg. 2</td>
<td>Fri. Mar. 26, 1943</td>
<td>Lena Horne</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document presents a historic context, integrity analysis, structural analysis, and restoration cost estimate for the Mountain View Officers’ Club (Building 66050) at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. The report meets requirements in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for federal agencies to address their cultural resources—defined as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object. Especially relevant is Section 110 of the NHPA, requiring federal agencies to inventory and evaluate cultural resources. Identification of potentially significant properties is achieved only through a survey and evaluation to associate a property within a larger historic context. The club was dedicated on 6 September 1942 and was utilized for the recreation of black officers stationed at Fort Huachuca from 1942 until 1945. It is the determination of the current survey that while the Mountain View Officers’ Club is individually significant under Criterion A for the black military experience historic context and under Criteria A and C for the World War II temporary building historic context, it does not retain historic integrity under either criteria due to major modifications to both the setting and the building. Therefore, the Mountain View Officers’ Club is recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), cultural resources management, US Army, Fort Huachuca, historic preservation, black officers, World War II