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From Korea to Kampuchea to Kyoto

From the 8th through the 11th of September the International Institute of Strategic Studies held a conference in Kyoto, Japan. The IISS is London-based, quite prestigious, and fairly well oriented on the so-called Western World. Most of the 28 annual conferences held so far have been in Britain or Europe. A noteworthy one was held in Williamsburg, Virginia, a few years ago. This was the first time the Institute met in Asia. IISS has something like 2,600 members in 72 countries, of whom about 300 came to Kyoto. The theme of the conference was “East Asia, the West and International Security: Prospects for Peace.”

I had not been back to Japan since 1971. The last and only time I had ever visited Kyoto was to pass through it briefly in September 1950 when the 1st Marine Division was staging through Japan for the Inchon landing. I was then the commanding officer of Weapons Company, 3d Battalion, 1st Marines. The battalion had been assigned billets in an old Imperial Japanese barracks at Otsu on Lake Biwa, a few miles outside of Kyoto. The barracks had just been vacated by a unit of the U.S. 25th Division which had already deployed to Korea.

In those days Japan was just emerging from the rubble of World War II. As all the world knows, things have changed. Everything now is brisk, shiny, and efficient, like the Hondas, Datsuns, and Toyotas that have ravaged the American car industry.

After enjoying a strong American dollar in my foreign travels, it was a numbing experience to be on the wrong end of the currency exchange. When I was last in Japan, the rate had been 320 yen to one dollar. It is now about 150 to one. The horrendous prices now prevailing in Japan are no news to Marines serving in Okinawa or in the home islands.

The basic coin is the 100-yen piece. The nominal value is 67 cents. It is slightly smaller than a quarter and so is its purchasing power. With it you can buy a stamp to send a postcard airmail to the States, or a small can of soft drink from a vending machine, or a thin English-language newspaper, or make a phone call.

The conference sessions were held in the magnificent Kyoto International Conference Hall, a new structure outside of Kyoto set in beautifully landscaped gardens against a backdrop of mist-covered mountains. The setting reminded me of a Japanese woodblock print—or one of
those scenic postcards which cost me 67 cents to mail back home.

We stayed at the old Miyako Hotel, which some of our veteran Marines may remember from the days of the Occupation or of the Korean War. If you have been there more recently you know that the old Miyako is not very “old” any more. There is a new Western-style wing where the accommodations are indistinguishable from a first-class Holiday Inn.

The service is impeccable. The young bellboys in their Philip Morris uniforms respond so briskly and are so polite in accepting a 100-yen tip—which, as I have said, is not very much—that you are quite certain that they are on the first rung of the management ladder that will lead them to the management of the Miyako.

The conference was opened by the Foreign Minister of Japan, Tadashi Kuranari. He started by speaking in English, remarking that it was the first occasion for him to speak as Foreign Minister at an international meeting. After also conveying Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone’s personal high regard for the IISS he then switched to Japanese which was simultaneously translated into English for the benefit of the foreigners. The gist of his remarks was that there was a requirement for a global dialog on the question of “Western” security and that the security of Europe and of the Asia-Pacific region should not be considered in isolation from each other.

It was a busy week for Mr. Kuranari, a week that included a visit to Tokyo by Soviet Vice Premier Gury Marchuk. Reportedly on his agenda was a planned visit to Tokyo by Party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, probably early in 1987.

Mr. Kuranari’s welcoming remarks were followed by the first plenary session in which Dr. Henry Kissinger was paired off with Professor Masataka Kosaka on the subject of “East Asia, the Pacific and the West: Strategic Trends and Implications.” A long-time member of the Institute, Dr. Kissinger is one of its star players. My ears perked up when I heard him say that the United States should not link its balance of payments problems with Japan to arguments that the Japanese should be paying for a larger share of their defense. His reasoning was that trade balance problems were one thing and U.S. security requirements quite another.

Professor Kosaka, who was paired off with Dr. Kissinger, is a professor of international politics at Kyoto University. He gave a very measured assessment of strategic trends and implications in East Asia since the fall of Saigon.

There were a number of other plenary sessions, some of them with single speakers, others continuing the technique of two speakers addressing the same topic. There were also six committee discussions. This is what had brought me to the conference. I had been asked to prepare a paper for one of these committees.

I was paired off with an interesting person: Professor Zhang Jing-yi of the Institute of North American Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing. Professor Zhang became even more interesting after I got to know him and learned that he was a retired senior colonel or brigadier of the People’s Liberation Army; that he had learned his English,
which is excellent, as a student at an American missionary school in Tsingtao; that as a 16-year old he had been present at the race track in Tsingtao on 25 October 1945 when the Japanese garrison surrendered to the 6th Marine Division; that disillusionment with the Chinese Nationalist government had caused him to go over to the Communist side; and that he had fought on the Western Front in Korea, which probably put him opposite the 1st Marine Division.

The topic, “Korea to Kampuchea: The Changing Nature of Warfare in East Asia, 1950-1986,” assigned us was far too sweeping for me to handle in my allotted 4,000 words so I confined myself to a comparison at the operational level of the Korean and Vietnam wars from an American viewpoint.

Many of Professor Zhang’s perceptions and conclusions were at least compatible if not identical with my own. He compared the peninsular nature, as did I, of the two theaters of operations, Korea and Indo-China. Of both wars, he said, in a sentence I believe worth repeating: “New weapons and new tactics appeared one by one in these protracted confrontations between the modern western concept of war and the ancient Oriental art.”

I spoke of the underuse and misuse of our vastly superior air and naval power. Professor Zhang made this vivid with respect to the Korean War with two striking sentences:

In Korea, the Chinese refined the “tunnel warfare” that had been used by guerrillas during the anti-Japanese war into a powerful positional warfare means to enhance the power of the regular army and effectively neutralize US air and ground superiority in firepower. The Americans tried “to kill hens with knives meant for butchering oxen,” i.e., to accomplish conventional operational and tactical missions the US began using strategic bombers.

He noted that in both wars our major security concerns remained focused on Europe and that this limited the flexibility of our military operations in both action and scale.

He also said, and I cannot disagree, that: “...no matter how important naval and air forces might have been in these wars, ground forces remained the decisive factor.”

There is another sentence in his paper that I liked: “The two Vietnam Wars were fought by Vietnamese against the French and, later, Americans, with guerrilla warfare against counter-insurgency, air defense against air attack and only in the final stages set-piece actions between larger units.”

There were many other parallels in our two papers, but let me leave his paper and get back to a summary of my own.

Korea was a conventional war fought with conventional uniformed forces using conventional weapons in a conventional way. It was a war of east-west lines moving up and down a north-south axis until equilibrium was reached. The pattern of operations was roughly analogous to the pattern of the First World War as fought on the Western Front. The first year was a war of movement characterized by sudden and dramatic successes and reverses as new impulses of force were introduced. After the truce talks began, the fighting settled down to a stalemated war of position, during which neither side risked a general offensive, until the armistice was signed.

A clear operational pattern in the Vietnam War is much less discernible. Following a long ten-year period of U.S. advice and support to the changing Sai-gon governments, a period of applied "counterinsurgency" theory which was filled with circumlocutions and circumventions, American ground forces were introduced into the war in gradual numbers and at first in a semi-garrison way. The en-
enemy was largely invisible and at the same time he seemed to be everywhere. He fought unconventionally and artfully countered American efforts to force him to fight on conventional terms. Even so, each time he risked a battle of any size he lost. This was true in the opening rounds of 1965 and 1966, most certainly true of his attempt at a general offensive in 1968, and again true in 1972, even after most of the Americans had departed. Not until 1975, when all American troops were gone, did the enemy win on the battlefield.

In both wars, the enemy had guaranteed sanctuaries, both geographic boundaries and thresholds of military action that they knew the Americans would not cross. After the first year in Korea, the enemy knew almost with certainty that the war would not be carried into the Chinese homeland.

The guarantees in the Vietnam War were even more constraining. The Chinese homeland was never threatened. The Soviet Union was immune. High technology efforts to seal off the borders of South Vietnam from North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were expensive and ineffective. Clandestine efforts to penetrate these areas were in general a failure. The brief incursions into Cambodia and Laos in 1970 and 1971 were in the first case a transitory success and in the second case a disastrous failure. Strategic weapons such as B-52s and aircraft carriers were used as tactical weapons at great expense and with limited results.

America's supremacy in tactical air power over the battlefield in both wars was offset by the enemy's passive and active defenses growing out of his long-learned experience going back to his wars with the Japanese and the French. Strategically, North Vietnam was bombed at a level of intensity that steeled North Vietnamese resolve but did not threaten the homeland with physical destruction which was quite within the American capability.

America's naval near-monopoly was used more effectively during the first year of the Korean War. After that there were virtual guarantees that there would be no further amphibious operations against the North Korean coasts. During the Vietnam War, amphibious operations against North Vietnam were much discussed (Vinh was seen as a target comparable to Inchon), but never seriously contemplated. The North Vietnamese were secure in their knowledge that their homeland would not be invaded.

In the Korean War, Seoul was twice taken by the enemy and twice recaptured. Similarly, Pyongyang was taken by the U.N. forces and retaken by the Communists. Loss of these respective capitals did not end the war for either side. Loss of Saigon in 1975, however, was the deathknell of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Viewed in operational terms, Korea was a qualified success, and Vietnam was a qualified failure. In Korea, territorial status quo ante was achieved, but not all military objectives were attained. Vietnam, despite the ultimate collapse of the South Vietnamese government, was not, in operational terms, a complete military failure. From 1965 until 1972, American military might, at great cost and not always with admirable efficiency, dominated the battlefield. This of itself was not sufficient to attain an acceptable outcome to the war. Of all the lessons of the Vietnam War, perhaps the greatest lesson is that force alone does not translate into power.

Both wars demonstrated that America is in truth a Pacific power, not an Asian power, and there is a difference. Certainly this is a lesson that has been learned just as it has most certainly been learned that America is at grave risk whenever it essays a ground war in East Asia.

If there were common threads running through the conference they were about as follows:

Old ideas of geography, and of the East and West no longer apply. What was once the "Far East" is now not so very far, and Japan is now a "Western power."

The nations of East Asia are so diverse in their cultures, politics, and economies that there is little or no basis for regional security arrangements such as NATO. The present disarray of ANZUS—the Australia, New Zealand, United States treaty—was several times mentioned. Although it was not discussed, I thought of the sad fate of SEATO—the South East Asia Treaty Organization—which was meant to be the Asian equivalent to NATO but which did not survive even the opening rounds of Vietnam.

U.N. Commander Gen Douglas MacArthur was not permitted to bomb the important logistic base of Northeast China.

The obvious conclusion is that security arrangements in East Asia are best made on a nation-to-nation, bilateral basis, as is the case with Japan and the United States.

There was general recognition that the Soviet Union had greatly improved its military posture in East Asia in the last decade. I winced to hear a speaker say that the Soviets had "built" great naval bases at Da Nang and Cam Ranh Bay.

Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at Vladivostok on 28 July was a coincidental backdrop to the conference and gave an immediacy to the proceedings. Our newspapers seemed to have missed the significance of that speech. What reached the headlines was his announcement that the Soviet Union would withdraw six regiments from Afghanistan by the end of the year and would expect a corresponding reduction in Western support of the guerrillas. This would reduce the Soviet troop strength by six percent—not exactly earth-shaking, and the White House indicated that it did not attach any great importance to the announcement.

That was what was in the headlines and on the front pages. You had to go to the back pages of such thick newspapers as The
New York Times to read what else Mr. Gorbachev had to say in Vladivostok. Or better, you had to read his full speech, as published in the English-language edition of Pravda. He had, in fact, laid out a clear agenda of Soviet intentions in East Asia.

He began his speech with: "Dear Comrades! I have long intended to visit the Far East . . . ."

That this was his first visit to this Asian extremity of the Soviet Union was in itself a strong signal. He went on to say: " . . . being here in Vladivostok, it is natural to examine issues of world policy from the Asian-Pacific point of view."

Here are some of Gorbachev's other statements:

The concept of nonalignment was formed here in Asia, a movement which now includes in its orbit more than 100 states . . . .

The acknowledged leader of this movement is great India, with its moral authority and traditional wisdom, unique political experiences and enormous economic potential . . . .

The friendly relations between the USSR and India have become a stabilizing foundation of international scope.

The Pacific region as a whole is still not militarized to the degree that Europe is. However, the potential for its militarization is truly enormous and the consequences are extremely dangerous . . . . We will not forget that it was in Asia that American imperialism conducted the two largest wars after 1945—in Korea and Indochina.

Since the second half of the '70s, the US has taken large-scale measures to build up its armed forces in the Pacific Ocean. The Washington-Tokyo-Seoul militarized 'triangle' is being formed under pressure from the US.

I want to affirm that the Soviet Union is ready at any time and at any level to most seriously discuss with China the issues of additional measures to create an atmosphere of good neighbor relations . . . .

We have offered to cooperate with China in space, which could include training Chinese cosmonauts.

The Soviet Union also borders the United States in the Pacific region. It is literally a close neighbor, at a distance of seven kilometers exactly from the Soviet island of Big Diomede to the American Little Diomede. The United States—we clearly give their due—is a great Pacific power.

I would also like to say that the Soviet Union is a staunch advocate of disbanding military groups and renouncing foreign bases in Asia and in the Pacific, and of withdrawing troops from other nations' territory.

We propose beginning negotiations to reduce the activities of military fleets in the Pacific Ocean, primarily vessels equipped with nuclear weapons.

I would also like to say in general that if the US were to give up military presence in the Philippines, for example, we would not leave this unanswered.

Gorbachev also said:

We will do everything possible to strengthen friendship and step up multifaceted ties with the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the People's Republic of Kampuchea . . . .

We are ready to expand ties with Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Burma, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Brunei, the Maldive Republic, and with the very young participants in the region.

Listing some of those "very young participants" he included the Republic of Kiribati. Last year the Soviets gave Kiribati $1.7 million for fishing rights. Those rights are now being renegotiated. We Marines knew Kiribati better by its earlier names of the Gilbert Islands and Tarawa.

Marines move through a cornfield on operation in Vietnam in 1970. Professor Zhang told the Kyoto assembly that Americans "tried to kill hens with knives meant for butchering oxen" when they began using strategic bombers for conventional objectives.
How Center Got NVA Canteen; Korea Vets Add Details

CANTEEN IS BITTER MEMENTO

It was June of 1968. I was running supplies on Route 9 between LZ Stud/Ca Lu and Khe Sanh to troops from my Battalion, 2/9, who were posted at all of the bridges along the road. We were making two and three runs a day with three vehicles: a jeep, a PC, and a 6by. I was in charge and had about eight riflemen and an M60 mounted on the 6by. We were ambushed twice during this period. We earned the name "The Rat Patrol" from the grunt companies we were supplying.

The day I obtained the canteen, we were making our usual run. I rarely ever rode anywhere except in the jeep. I either drove or rode shotgun. This day a pay officer came up to me at LZ Stud and said he was going with us. He had the pay checks for the line companies. He was traveling with a company clerk and a guy from one of the line companies. I knew those two guys, for I had been in their presence off-and-on over a period of time. I didn't know the pay officer. I am sorry but my memory cannot retrieve their names.

Talk about fate; the pay officer asked if I would mind riding in one of the trucks so that they could use the jeep. I didn't mind and I hopped in with the 6by driver. On the back of the truck were about eight new recruits who had just arrived in country. I was to drop them off at their respective companies. The jeep led, as usual, followed by the PC, then the 6by. About halfway up, we were coming around a bend, the jeep temporarily out of sight ahead of us, an explosion ripped through the air. As we turned the bend, I saw the jeep sitting in a heap of dust and smoke. Small arms fire broke out and our two vehicles came to a halt. We immediately exited the vehicles firing our weapons wildly into the dense jungle hillside and took up defensive positions along the road bank. I looked at the jeep as it suddenly limped off. Its wounded driver had gotten it started. Its tires were blown out on one side. The pay officer lay back against the flattened seat. The company clerk lay hanging out of the back of the jeep, his hands dragging the ground as the wounded driver slowly drove off. They were both killed instantly. I am sorry that I cannot recall their names, maybe you can find it in the historical records.

Some grunts from one of the line companies, who were about a mile away, soon appeared, meeting the jeep on their way. We gathered ourselves, and the eight new recruits, and walked up to meet them. It was over as quickly as it happened. We were totally shook to say the least. Some of the grunts wept openly over the death of their friends and cursed the war.

We checked the area where the explosion was set. It was set up on a high bank and blown down into the vehicle. We found a wire and followed it to about 15 feet wherein we found the place where the NVA soldier hid and hand-detonated the explosive. That is where I picked up the canteen.

Following that, I rode in the jeep with two flack jackets. Not that it would have made a difference, it just made me feel good.

Enclosed is a photo of our "Rat Patrol." Notice how we placed sandbags on the jeep. I'm behind the wheel.

Paul A. Ferraro
Forest City, Pennsylvania

EDITOR'S NOTE: Enemy equipment that is well documented, such as Mr. Ferraro's North Vietnamese Army canteen, is desired by the Museum. The stories behind these objects are considered to lend great interest to their display.

THE 'ROCK' AND 'WINDMILLS'

The "Korean War Chronology" in the Fall 1986 Fortitudine caught my eye since my Korean service covered the period—September-December 1951—concerned. The third paragraph from the end caught my full attention because I was privileged to command the 2d Battalion, 5th Marines during the action described . . . .

. . . It was disconcerting to find that I could recognize little of what I take to be the official albeit condensed version of 2/5's activities. As I remember it, 2/5 was assigned to take certain enemy-held terrain on the northeast rim of the Punchbowl, to wit, Hill 812 and the adjoining and higher hill to the west (was it Hill 954?). We took Hill 812 just after dawn on 18 September (I presume it was the 18th; I have no handy record of the dates involved) and were advancing on the next objective when we were told to stand fast. We therefore dug in on Hill 812. I was told later that the attack was discontinued because further advances would have stretched Division's resources beyond the breaking point. In any case, there was a
Higher hill beyond 954 and a higher hill beyond that, etc., etc. Thus ended what turned out to be the last U.N. offensive of the Korean War.

After dark on the 18th—or was it the 19th—the North Koreans came down from Hill 954 to retake Hill 812. They tried all night, off and on, but Companies E and F plus much help from the battalion’s 81mm mortars beat off the attacks and drove out one limited penetration. After that, things were relatively quiet and I suppose he could be there still.

As for the “Rock” cited officially as the object of the struggle, I can only assume that this refers to a tall and distinctive outcropping of rock on a finger ridge leading from 812 up to 954. We had reached that point when the attack was called off but had pulled back to more defensible ground. The North Koreans occupied it, however, although it was so close to our lines as to be almost within hand grenade range. Presumably it was an outpost, and it must have been the most uncomfortable outpost in Korea at the time. It wasn’t much of a threat to us, but it was certainly a challenge. The Marines called it “Luke-the-Gook’s-Castle,” and hit it repeatedly with just about every weapon in the Division’s inventory, including 90mm tank guns. The Wing got in the act with rockets and some kind of guided air-to-ground ordnance. A raid or two found nobody home—Luke sometimes pulled out when things got too hot, but he always came back. He was in his castle when the Division turned the position over to the ROKs, and I suppose he could be there still.

As for Operation Windmill II, I don’t recall it as having supported 2/5, at least not directly. Later that winter, LtCol George Herit’s HMR 161 lifted us to defensive positions on Hill 884—the first helicopterborne relief of a front-line position—but that was some miles to the east and several Windmills later.

Col Houston Stiff, USMC (Ret)
Scottsdale, Arizona

Pages 34-35 of the Fall 1986 edition of Fortitudine concerns a part of the Korean War in which I participated as a rifleman with the Division Reconnaissance Company, 1st Marine Division . . .

The article advises . . . that on 19 September 1951 HMR-161 successfully transported 224 Marine combat troops to the front. The assemblage was the Division Reconnaissance Company, with the support of Heavy Machine Gun Platoon, 2d Battalion, 7th Marines; some forward observers for the 1st Battalion, 11th Marines; and some folks from ANGLICO. The procedure was called Operation Summit, and it was in fact the first use of helicopters in modern warfare.

Barry D. Murphy
Vienna, Virginia

Pages 34 and 35 of the Fall 1986 Fortitudine speak to the first helicopter operations. It is not complete. The first was Operation Summit, followed by Windmills I and II, followed by Operation Blackbird, the first night tactical operation.

LtGen Victor H. Knulak, USMC (Ret)
San Diego, California

In Memoriam

Okinawa Operation Veteran, Marine Corps Public Affairs Notable Die

BGEN GALE T. CUMMINGS, USMC, RET., a native of Beatrice, Nebraska, died at the age of 89 in Los Angeles, California, on 23 October 1986. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in October 1917, and in December the following year he was commissioned a second lieutenant. He was discharged in September 1919, and returned to active duty in March 1921 as a regular officer. During the interwar period, he served in the Mail Guard Company, at various stateside posts and stations, and on board the Seattle and the Oklahoma. He joined the staff of the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet in April 1942, and two years later he joined the I Marine Amphibious Corps staff on Guadalcanal. During the Okinawa operation, he was the G-1 of III Amphibious Corps. At the time of his retirement, June 1949, Col Cummings was Post Legal Officer at Marine Barracks, Quantico, and was advanced to the rank of brigadier general for having been specially commended for the performance of duty in combat.

COL RICHARD S. STARK, USMCR, RET., died of a heart attack 12 December 1986 at his home in Stogrande, Spain. He was born in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and was a graduate of Cornell University. He received an aviation specialist’s commission in 1944 and served in World War II in the Pacific with Marine Air Warning Squadron 12. At the end of the war, he resumed a career in radio and then went into television, where he was perhaps best known for a commercial he made in which he shaved a peach with an electric razor. He remained active in the Marine Corps Reserve and returned to active duty during the Vietnam War in 1966, heading the III Marine Amphibious Force Combat Information Bureau in Da Nang. Following Vietnam, he became head of the Marine Corps Public Affairs Office in New York City. He remained in New York until his retirement in 1975. For his services in Vietnam he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of a second Bronze Star Medal. He had earlier received the Legion of Merit.

by Bentz M. Frank
Head, Oral History Section
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Conservation Practices Save Marine Artifacts for Posterity

by John H. McGarry III
Marine Corps Museum Registrar

The method originated by the Marine Corps Museum to catalog and record information concerning new donations to its collections, through use of an in-house computer, was described in the Fall 1985 issue of Fortitudine. This ongoing accumulation of data gives staff and researchers ready access to facts on items in the collections and indication of their current status. But, while this records-keeping function is indispensable to the growing Museum, it is far from being the only work required to complete accession of gifts.

When historical objects, or collections of photographs and papers, are received by the Museum, a detailed study is made of their material composition and their present condition. These observations lead to procedures which constitute the scientific aspect of museum work known as conservation.

Conservation practices, which respond directly to the analysis of an object, are actions taken to prolong its life for posterity. It is hoped that an object added to the collections of the Museum will be held, for study and potential exhibition, forever.

So, steps must be taken to help safeguard it from natural and accidental destruction.

There are many factors which affect the useful lifetime of objects. Certainly one is the environment in which they are stored or displayed. Many objects—particularly paper, photographs, and textiles—are sensitive to light. Exposure to ultraviolet light, found in normal sunlight and many types of artificial lighting, causes fading of colors and sometimes structural weakening. At the Museum, efforts are made to control the amount of ultraviolet light which reaches objects. Recently, to assist in protecting the Personal Papers Collection, plastic covers were fitted over flourescent lights to filter out damaging rays. Likewise, many objects placed on display are mounted behind plexiglass which contains the same filtering material. In all storage areas attempts are made to control lighting at an acceptable level.

Assorted environmental dangers are posed by heat and humidity. Museums strive for an average humidity level of 55 percent. When humidity is too low, certain materials, particularly wood and paper, warp and curl. Too much humidity encourages the growth of destructive mold and causes fibers to swell. Thus, the Museum attempts to maintain a midpoint range through the use of humidifiers and air conditioning.

Heat is extremely damaging to museum objects. It greatly increases the probability of unwanted chemical reactions such as rusting and a host of others which hasten decay. Slight changes in temperature cause movement of an object's component materials, so that over time it literally "rubs itself to death." The most acceptable temperature for a museum environment is a constant 65 degrees.

Fortunately, insect infestation has not been a serious problem for our Museum. Occasionally a new donation is received that contains some type of pest. Two common ones are the powder post beetle and the carpet beetle, insects which feed, respectively, on wood and organic material. The museum has been successful in eradicating them by sealing suspect artifacts in plastic bags together with vapor strips. This is a slow process, sometimes taking months, but one which conforms to federal regulations regarding the use of insecticides. While there are other means of fumigation that are more efficient, they can be damaging to artifacts and to the

Registrar John H. McGarry III performs conservation steps which will help preserve a Marine Corps Mameluke sword. Museum objects are intended to last forever.
people who subsequently handle them. Some objects have a problem of “inherent vice.” The term is used to describe materials that are self-destructive no matter what is done. An example is the type of leather used in many pieces of World War I equipage. Changes in the tanning process from the 19th to the 20th century introduced faster and cheaper chemicals. It has been found, however, that these chemicals—after a period of perhaps 50 years—break down the cellular structure of the leather. Normally this problem is called “red rot” and is seen as the surface of the leather turning to a red powder and dusting off. A great deal of study is being done to find a solution, but for the time being, most museums can only place these objects in a stable environment to minimize the damage.

An area of the Museum that has serious problems with “inherent vice” is the Personal Papers Collection. The modern manufacture of paper includes a step whereby wood pulp is broken down with the aid of acid. Better-quality paper benefits from many washings to remove remaining acid. Cheaper grades of paper, such as newsprint, are incompletely washed and contain high concentrations of acid. As a result, this paper over time becomes “burned.” Everyone has seen an old newspaper that has turned brown, and is crumbling. This is the result of acid “burning.” The problem is increased by the presence of strong ultraviolet light.

One way to control the acidity of paper is to store it in acid-free envelopes or folders. At the Museum, special file folders and dividers are made of a fine grade of paper which tends to draw the acid from the object into the folder itself. Separating important documents into these folders also prohibits the acidity of any one document from migrating to another one adjacent to it. Thus, those same file folders which can be so inconvenient for a researcher with volumes of material to view, are in fact helping to preserve the papers for further use.

A major conservation problem facing the Marine Corps Museum is the development of new techniques to deal with 20th-century synthetic materials. This is a particular problem for military museums because of the number of innovative materials used in military hardware in this century.

An example is aluminum. Widely applied in aircraft, landing vehicles, and even mess kits, it is a lightweight but strong metal. Unfortunately, when used in conjunction with other, dissimilar metals, it reacts with them and breaks down, a major problem, for example, for the fine collection of LVTs at Camp Pendleton. The aluminum components of such vehicles, along with the other metals used in the internal structure, are deteriorating. To date, there is no method to resolve the problem.

Another problem facing military museums is the increasingly wide use of synthetic materials, such as plastics. An example might be a modern flight helmet. Different types of styrofoam have been used as padding in these items of headgear. In time these materials become very unstable, and are almost impossible to conserve in recognizable state.

The development of an exhibit for the Museum always is a complex undertaking. Beyond the multiple tasks of detailed pre-research, viewing and selection of appropriate artifacts, and the design and construction of the exhibit, are considerations of conservation. The required uses of acid-free mat board, stable metal structures, and special plexiglass screening must be figured into planning and execution. Environmental conditions—light and temperature, as examples—of the exhibit area itself also must be accounted for in planning and mounting the show.

Scientific conservation work performed by the professional staff at the Marine Corps Museum has proven to be both interesting and challenging. The staff has reason to be proud of its track record in the care and preservation of irreplaceable objects in its care. Their work is helping to ensure that these items of historical significance will be around for Marines to study and learn from for generations to come.

Air Power History Grants

The U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center has announced the availability of grants of up to $2,500 each for graduate research into the history of air power in the USAF historical document collection. Information is available from the Director, USAF Historical Research Center, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112-6678.

Historical Quiz

Nicknames of Marine Corps General Officers

by Lena M. Kaljot
Reference Historian

Match the nickname with the appropriate Marine general officer:

1. “Old Gimlet Eye” a. Gen Holland M. Smith
2. “Bigfoot” b. LtGen Lewis B. Puller
3. “Harry the Horse” c. BGen Hiram I. Bearss
4. “Howlin’ Mad” d. MajGen Merritt A. Edson
5. “Red Mike” e. MajGen Smedley D. Butler
6. “Sunny Jim” f. LtGen John A. Lejeune
7. “Hike’em Hiram” g. Gen Alexander A. Vandegrift
8. “Old Indian” h. MajGen Joseph H. Pendleton
9. “Cheasty” i. BGen Harry Liversedge

(Answers to quiz on page 25)
Foundation Hears LtGen Cheatham on Hue Battle

The Marine Corps Historical Foundation held its eighth annual meeting on 2-3 November 1986, beginning with a brunch at Quantico and highlighted later by an address to the general membership gathered at the Marine Corps Historical Center by LtGen Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr., USMC, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower at Headquarters Marine Corps.

The first event of the meeting was a visit to the Marine Corps Air-Ground Museum followed by the brunch at the Quantico Officers’ Club. Traveling by bus and their own cars, 28 members and wives led by Board of Directors member LtGen George Axtell, USMC (Ret), arrived at the Museum at 1030 and were greeted by Col Brooke Nihart, Deputy Director for Museums, and LtCol Rudy Schwanda, Officer-in-Charge of the Air-Ground Museum. The group was divided with each half guided through the “Early Years” and “World War II” exhibit hangars by one of the two officials and spending 45 minutes in each. After the tour, the group repaired to the Wailer Room of Harry Lee Hall.

At the following day’s general membership meeting, featured speaker LtGen Cheatham described his part in the battle for Hue City during the 1968 Tet offensive in Vietnam. Gen Cheatham, who commanded the 2d Battalion, 5th Marines, at the time, provided a number of interesting insights into the problems of a commander and his Marines who were entering combat in a built-up area for the first time. The last such action for Marines had occurred in the capture of Seoul, coincidentally also the 1st and 5th Marines, in 1950. And to the surprise of no one in the audience, the institutional memory of urban street fighting techniques had vanished. The audience, incidentally, included LtGen Donn J. Robertson, USMC (Ret), who had commanded the 1st Marine Division at the time, and MajGen Norman J. Anderson, USMC (Ret), who

Information for this report was derived from materials prepared by Col Brooke Nihart, on the visit to the Air-Ground Museum at Quantico, and by Mr. Henry I. Shaw, Jr., on the presentation by LtGen Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr.

Interestingly, Gen Cheatham, when he received his order to take his battalion north to Hue, immediately went to “the book,” reading two manuals on urban combat obtained from his training aids library. Partially as a result of this preparation, but mainly as a result of accumulated military knowledge, he swept up every 3.5-inch rocket launcher he could lay hands on, a regiment’s allowance, and took all his 106mm recoilless rifles in order to supplement his 81mm mortars and have weapons that could blow holes, big holes, in the buildings that were likely to be a dominant part of his combat area of operations.

As the motley motorized column of infantry-company Marines and those from two headquarters outfits, his own battalion’s and the 1st Marines’ regimental command echelons, drove north up Highway 1 into the southern outskirts of Hue, there was a smattering of enemy sniper fire and an outpouring of Marine return fire that slowed the advance until commanding officers supplied the impetus to get things moving again. A happy find in a gas station along the way was three copies of a standard tourist map of Hue, delineating each major building and street at a scale of about 1:12,500. From then on, Gen Cheatham and his two forward-most company commanders had a vital aid to help

them coordinate their actions. The standard terrain maps available showed Hue in such small scale as to be useless for the close-in, house-to-house, street-to-street fighting that followed. As a part of his presentation to the foundation members, Gen Cheatham used an opaque projection of the tourist map paired with contemporary photographs to illustrate graphically his objectives and his myriad of obstacles (most with gaping holes from his battalion “artillery”).

Assigned by the 1st Marines to drive west from Highway 1 along the banks of the Perfume River and take everything in its path, the 2d Battalion, 5th Marines, as Gen Cheatham described the action, performed somewhat like the good guys in a western movie in a “clean-up-the-town” scenario. Snap-shooting around corners, out of windows, often going one-on-one with the North Vietnamese, the Marines moved slowly, very slowly, westward.

It took 10 days of fighting, where streets were death-traps, and every window and shadow held a potential sniper, wherever they showed up; Ontos were too thin-skinned to venture into the NVA fire lanes. The battle was one of infantryman against infantryman with the Marines backed up by organic support weapons with almost unlimited ammunition. The enemy Tet offensive had stopped a Marine ammo supply column headed north toward the DMZ on the outskirts of Hue, and Cheatham’s battalion as well as the others under the 1st Marines, drew down liberally on this treasure trove. All the ammo you wanted, Gen Cheatham recalled; thousands of rounds went through each available tube, so much so that when the battalion withdrew from combat weeks later, the armor could say of its heavy mortars, “They are the best 84mm mortars around!”
On the Trail of the China Marines

Tracing the Footsteps of the 4th Marines in Shanghai

_ by J. Robert Moskin _

To hunt for the billets and haunts of the Marines who were on duty in Shanghai between World Wars I and II is intriguing but frustrating. Communist Shanghai today looks like a busy anthill compared to the hedonistic, often embattled, International Settlement of the city that from 1927 until 1941 was the home of the 4th Regiment of U.S. Marines. In those days, Shanghai was a wide-open port of some 3 million people; and today, the Chinese claim, it is the largest city in the world. But under the People's Republic of China, both the Settlement and the Marines have disappeared.

The newly arrived 4th Marine Regiment's first "action" occurred on 23 March 1927, when the 3d Battalion set up a machine gun at the intersection of Carter and Sinza roads to protect the right flank of the British Coldstream Guards. And its last took place late in 1940 when Maj Lewis B. "Chesty" Puller led 22 Marines to confront 80 Japanese soldiers who had invaded the International Settlement and rounded up 200 Chinese. Puller had two heavy machine guns set up and drew his pistol on the Japanese officer. The Japanese left without their prisoners.

The story of the "China Marines" is one of the strangest in the Corps' legend-filled history. A decade after World War I, one quarter of the entire Corps was stationed in China, where the Marines lived a dazzling life with White Russian girl friends, one-dollar Johnnie Walker Black Label, and roomboys to do their chores. Shanghai was called the City of Blazing Night—the Paris of the East. Back home the U.S. was wallowing in a massive Depression. In Shanghai a Marine could live like a king.

Between the two world wars, Shanghai was the center of the China Marines. Today it seems strangest of all to visit Communist Shanghai and try to imagine

J. Robert Moskin is the author of _The United States Marine Corps Story_, published by McGraw-Hill. He is a senior editor of World Press Review.
On 23 March, part of the 3d Battalion was sent to Soochow Creek to support the British at Markham Road Bridge, which has been called "the key to the Foreign Settlement." In the wind and rain, they set up a machine gun a block back from the creek at the intersection of Carter and Sinza roads to protect the right flank of the Coldstream Guards.

Two days later, BGcn Smedley Darlington Butler (he with two Medals of Honor) arrived with portions of the 6th Regiment and the headquarters of the 3d Marine Brigade. Brigade headquarters was set up at 47 Avenue Road. The colorful, outspoken Butler wrote Commandant John A. Lejeune that Shanghai was "the cesspool of the world." In April 1927, there were 271 Marine officers and 4,843 enlisted Marines in China. By summer, Butler took all his Marines except the 4th Regiment up north to Tientsin and environs. He seemed attracted there where he had fought and been wounded during the Boxer Rebellion 27 years before. The 4th Regiment, which would be redesignated the 4th Marines in 1930, stayed in Shanghai continuously until just before Pearl Harbor—14 years. They became the "China Marines."

Seven of its China-duty members eventually became Commandants: Vandegrift; Clifton B. Cates; Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr.; Randolph McC. Pate; Shoup; Greene; and Robert E. Cushman, Jr. After winning public attention and acclaim in World War I, the Marine Corps had to find a new mission. BGcn Butler was perceptive when on 12 May 1927, he wrote Commandant Lejeune that he should send three Marine regiments to Peking, Tientsin, and Shanghai. Butler wrote: "It will give our Corps a wonderful reason for existence and increase in size. It will also crown your administration as the most successful one in the history of our Corps."

The two dominating features of Shanghai in those days were The Bund along the Whangpo River, and Soochow Creek (now the Suzhou River) which flowed into the Whangpo (now the Huangpu). (The Whangpo in turn flowed into the mighty Yangtze, which made Shanghai the port for much of China's interior.) The Bund was (and still is) a Western-built boulevard and park next to which are the piers and jetties for the bustling Shanghai trade. The Bund had long replaced the towpaths where coolies had pulled boats before they were power driven.

Across The Bund the large European-built office buildings, banks, and hotels still stand in a row as a facade to the city. The office buildings and banks now mostly hold Communist and government bureaucracies. The former Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank now houses the People's Municipal Government. The British Consulate at No. 33 is a Friendship Store. The famous domed Cathay Hotel facing The Bund at the foot of Nanking Road, the main shopping street, is now called the Peace Hotel. The elegant playwright Noel Coward settled in the Cathay in 1928 and in four days wrote Private Lives, but today the hotel is rather dark and shabby. It still has a lounge where in the evening a Chinese troupe plays "Big Band" music.

Soochow Creek marked the northern border of the International Settlement and was the line that the Marines and the armed forces of the other nations had to be prepared to defend. Today, Soochow Creek is a narrow, muddy stream with new high concrete walls. The creek is probably 50 yards wide and 100 yards at its mouth where it flows into the Whangpo.

Once, a "free ferry" crossed the mouth of the creek. Later, bridges were built, the most important of which were the Garden Bridge or Free Bridge, which in 1907 replaced the ferry, and the well-known Markham Road Bridge further upstream. During their years in Shanghai, the 4th Marines defended both bridges. The steel Free Bridge still rumbles with traffic. Markham Road Bridge is now the Hengfeng Bridge; it was rebuilt in concrete in 1948. Last year, concrete emplacements at

A three-story red-brick building at the intersection of Avenue and Ferry roads in 1930 housed an infantry platoon of the 1st Battalion, 4th Marines. Barbed wire still winds around the doorway, although the building is now used as a kindergarten.
the bridge were removed. A police kiosk stands in the center of the approach to the bridge, and a policeman directs traffic through what is now a busy industrial section of Shanghai.

When you visit the interior neighborhoods of Shanghai today, you walk on quiet, often tree-lined streets, where not an Occidental is to be seen. The corner of what used to called Avenue Road and Perry Street is a broad pleasing intersection. Avenue Road is now West Beijing Road and Perry Road is called Ikang Road.

I was taken there by two helpful Chinese. Han Zhihui is a bright young member of the Shanghai Journalists Association who enjoyed trying to locate former Marine sites. Mr. Han brought along Chiang Hoa, who was born in Shanghai in 1908 and was a university graduate. Mr. Chiang remembers Shanghai in the 1930s when the Marines walked the streets and some buildings in the International Settlement denied entry to Chinese and dogs.

Together we tried to follow the maps of 1927 and 1930 photocopied for me at the Marine Corps Historical Center. It was difficult because the Chinese have renamed all the streets. But Mr. Han and Mr. Chiang were able to identify, by their architecture, the occasional buildings that had been built in the 1920s and 1930s.

On one corner of the Avenue Road-Ferry Road intersection stands a three-story, red-brick building. In 1930 it housed an infantry platoon of the 1st Battalion. Strands of barbed wire still wind around the doorway, although the building is now used as a kindergarten. A bit further north in the next block of Perry Road or Xikang Road, we could spot what had been the hospital. It is also red-brick and European-style. Today above the building flies a red flag and a gold star is set in the concrete at the entrance. Now this is the Xikang Road No. 3 Primary School. I was told that the building long ago was owned by two Chinese brothers. Their father had treated them equally and given them each an identical half of the building.

Today, 252 Xikang Road is a four-story gray stucco building with large windows. This was probably a battalion headquarters of the 4th Marines. It is now the Jinning District Vocational School (the fourth floor seems a recent addition), and local people there told my guides that it had once been used as a crematorium. Nearby was another red-brick building that is broken up into apartments. One resident told us that this had been the headquarters of foreign troops in the distant past.

By 1929, things had quieted down and the 3d Brigade returned to the United States, leaving only the 4th Regiment in Shanghai. Then in 1931 the Japanese invaded Manchuria. And in January 1932, the Japanese garrison in the city attacked the Chinese 19th Route Army in Shanghai's Chapei district north of Soochow Creek. The Marines took to the barricades and guarded about four miles of the creek. By March the fighting stopped.

On 7 July 1937, Japanese and Chinese troops clashed at the Marco Polo Bridge outside Peking and the Second Sino-Japanese War began. In August, Japanese landing parties entered Chapei, and in response the 87th and 88th Chinese Divisions poured into the same area. The fighting was fierce with artillery shelling and repeated air raids. The Marines helped the International Settlement Police keep the belligerents out of the International Settlement by guarding 7,200 yards along Soochow Creek. Barriers were erected at the bridges.

At this time, the 4th Marines' 2d Battalion was commanded by LtCol Clifton B. Cates, a hero of Belleau Wood in World War I. Headquarters was in Haiphong Road. Company E was commanded by Capt Wallace M. Greenc, Jr., and he organized it into four-man fire teams for street fighting. These were the forerunners of the Marines' World War II fire teams.

As the battle intensified, bombs fell in the International Settlement, killing hundreds of Chinese. That 13 August became known as Bloody Saturday. The bridges were closed across the creek and the Marines manned their sandbagged positions with bayoneted rifles. On 17 August the United States started evacuating women, children, and the elderly.

On 19 September, 1,435 more Marines arrived from San Diego, including two battalions of the 6th Marines and the headquarters of the 2d Marine Brigade under BGen John C. "Johnny Beau" Beaumont. Brigade headquarters was set up at 65 Gordon Road, which today is called Jiangning Road. The 4th Marines' regimental headquarters was at the southwest corner of Haiphong and Singapore Roads. There were now 2,536 Marines in
China. During September and October, the 4th and 6th Marines rotated on the line.

By 11 November, the battle was over; and the Japanese, after 92 days of fighting and 40,000 casualties, had conquered Shanghai. On 3 December, 6,000 Japanese troops entered the western end of the International Settlement and staged a victory parade. The Westerners were helpless to prevent it. A Chinese civilian threw a bomb into the line of march, wounding three Japanese, and he was shot dead by a Chinese police constable.

In this period, several China Marines had special experiences that affected the creation of the Marine Raider Battalions of World War II. Maj Merritt A. Edson studied Japanese amphibious tactics—the Japanese already had ramp-type landing craft. Capt Evans F. Carlson traveled north to Yenan in Shansi Province and hiked with the Communist soldiers, studying their guerrilla tactics. And Capt Samuel B. Griffith II (who was stationed in Peking) served as an observer with the Japanese army in Shansi Province just across the mountains from Carlson.

In February 1938, the 2d Brigade and 6th Marines pulled out, again leaving the 4th Marines in Shanghai. Once World War II began in 1939, the 4th Marines were increasingly isolated. The British needed their troops elsewhere; the Italians, French, and Japanese were no longer partners.

Finally, after many delays, on 10 November 1941, orders arrived from Washington to evacuate the 4th Marines. The 1st Battalion left on 17 November and, the next day, the remainder of the regiment formed behind its band and marched down Bubbling Well Road and Nanking Road to Shanghai's Bund. A cheering crowd lined the route. That was the end of the legendary China Marines.

They sailed to Subic Bay in the Philippines and after Pearl Harbor were ultimately assigned to defend the beaches of Corregidor. The Japanese landed on the island fortress on the night of 5 May 1942. After 13 hours of heavy fighting, Col Samuel L. Howard, now commanding the 4th Marines, ordered the national and regimental colors burned.

The 4th Marines was the only regiment in the Corps' history to be captured by the enemy. Losses of the 4th Marines in the Philippines were 330 killed and 357 wounded. Of these, 239 died in Japanese captivity.

Today, in Shanghai, virtually no one knows the story of the 4th Marines. They are part of a past the People's Republic rejects, a past dominated by foreign influences and foreign military power. But the China Marines are indelibly a part of Shanghai's history and the history of the Corps.

Sketches accompanying this article were prepared by Cpl Roland G. James as illustrations to A Marine's Guide to North China, published by Division Intelligence Section, 1st Marine Division, in September 1943, as they appear in a copy of the booklet belonging to Mr. Benis M. Frank.
Guadalcanal Intelligence: A Personal Collection

by Herbert C. Merillat

An unusual personal collection of intelligence materials from the Guadalcanal campaign, recently received by the History and Museums Division, fills some gaps in the division's collection of maps and adds to its file of topographic photographs, captured documents, reports of prisoner interrogations, and patrol reports.

The materials were gathered by William Hollingsworth Whyte, Jr., who served throughout the campaign as intelligence officer with the 2d Battalion, 1st Marines. Lt Whyte contracted malaria on Guadalcanal. In and out of hospitals with recurrent bouts after the 1st Marine Division went to Australia, he was an instructor in map reading and interpretation of aerial photographs for regimental intelligence sections and the Division Scout School. In that capacity he collected and used the Guadalcanal materials, which also later proved useful when he became an instructor in combat intelligence in the Marine Corps Schools at Quantico.

Items of particular interest and value include:

• A long-lost set of pre-invasion aerial photomaps of the north coast of Guadalcanal and of Tulagi.

• Two Japanese maps: one appears to give the Japanese estimate of Marine dispositions a few days before the battle of Edson's Ridge; the other sketches the plan for attack for the battle for Henderson Field late in October 1942.

• A faded Japanese aerial photograph on which Mr. Whyte indicated, with unusual clarity, the Japanese routes of approach to the area south of Henderson Field prior to the October battle.

• An overlay showing patrol actions of the 1st Battalion, 1st Marines, west of the Matanikau on 27 and 28 October.

• Prisoner interrogation reports that supplement those accompanying the 1st Marine Division Final Operational Report.

The "lost" aerial photomaps of Guadalcanal were made in Gen MacArthur's command (Southwest Pacific Area, or SWPA) in July 1942. Guadalcanal buffs will recall that, in the planning phase of the operation, mapping information was scarce. SWPA tried to help out by taking the photographs in question, which were sent to the Commander, South Pacific, in Auckland. But somehow the photos went astray and never reached those who were planning the Guadalcanal operation. As a consequence the 1st Marine Division had to make do with an unsatisfactory map made by Col Frank Goettge's D-2 section, based largely on aerial photographs taken on 16 June 1942.

First Division officers never saw the SWPA photomaps until the division reached Melbourne after its withdrawal from Guadalcanal. Presumably copies exist somewhere in SWPA files. But according to Mr. George McGillivray, the retired CIA map librarian who has been assisting the History and Museums Division to organize its map collection, Mr. Whyte's copy of the nine-sheet mosaic is the first to reach Marine historical files. This copy is a valuable addition to the exhibition of Guadalcanal maps that Mr. McGillivray (himself a Guadalcanal veteran, in the 1st Battalion, 7th Marines) put together in 1982 (Fortitudine, Spring-Summer 1982). That exhibit has since been shown in the Defense Mapping Service, National Archives, Marine Corps Museum, Naval...

(Continued on page 25)
Art Exhibit Recalls Marine Air’s 75 Years in the Sky

by Col Brooke Nihart
Deputy Director for Museums

Nineteen eighty-seven marks the 75th anniversary of Marine Corps aviation. To recognize this diamond anniversary the Marine Corps Museum has put on the road a major exhibition of aviation art. Assembled from the Museum’s art collection by curator John T. Dyer, the 41-piece show is titled “75 Years of Marine Corps Aviation — A Tribute.”

The show forms a pictorial record from the Wright B-1 biplane of 1912 to the McDonnell-Douglas F/A-18 jet fighter of today. It premiered at the Marine Corps Aviation Association convention in Dallas last October, which was followed by a longer showing at the LTV building in downtown Dallas into November. From there it moved back to the Marine Corps Museum in Washington where it opened on 9 January and was to remain until 15 February. It was then to move to the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs for a March-April showing, and finally to come back to the Naval Academy at Annapolis where it is to appear in Dahlgren Hall during May and part of June.

On 22 May 1912, 1stLt Alfred A. Cunningham reported to the Navy’s aviation camp at Annapolis for flight instruction. Cunningham was the first Marine Corps aviator and number five on the Navy’s list of pilots. He was to lead the four-squadron 1st Marine Aviation Force in France in World War I and to be officer-in-charge of Marine Corps aviation in the immediate post-war period. Thus 22 May has become recognized as the anniversary of Marine Corps aviation and is so observed each year.


As adjuncts to the exhibition the Historical Center has produced a poster and a 52-page catalog illustrating all the paintings in the show. These are made available to organizations sponsoring a showing in sufficient numbers to advertise the show and give to invited guests at special openings. In addition to extensive captions by aviation historian Maj Frank M. Batha, USMC (Ret), accompanying each picture, which in themselves provide a history of Marine Corps aviation, these are preceded by a 4,500-word history by Center oral historian Benis M. Frank. The poster features Hugh Laidman’s classic painting of a Henderson Field Corsair being serviced in the rain.

Also highlighted in the show is the original oil by Howard Chandler Christy which was reproduced in the early 1920s as a recruiting poster. The painting has been reproduced again, this time by the Museum Store with the help of Marine Corps Historical Foundation member Fred N. Ropke, and is available at the store for $3.00, or by mail for $4.95.

The traveling exhibition is available to major Marine Corps installations upon request to CMC (HD). Up to 150 feet of running wall space available to all Marines and the public would be required and showings would be from one to two months. In particular, Marine Corps air stations are encouraged to request the show.
Christy’s 1920 ‘Fly With the Marines’ Returns to Print

by Col Brooke Nihart
Deputy Director for Museums

Shortly before America’s entry into World War I in 1917 until the immediate post-war era was the heyday of the colorful recruiting poster. Color photolithography was a burgeoning technique and the N. C. Wyeth-Howard Pyle school of book illustration flourished. From about 1912 onward some of the leaders of this movement created recruiting posters for the Marine Corps. They included such luminaries as James Montgomery Flagg, Joseph Leyendecker, Frank Schoonover, C. B. Falls, L. A. Shafer, Sydney Reisenberg, and Howard Chandler Christy. Instead of the pasted-up "mechanicals" of today’s artwork that go into a poster or advertising spread, these artists turned out a finished oil painting including the lettered message. The paintings were then converted photographically to color printing plates. The Marine Corps Art Collection includes a number of these oils, at least one from each of the above artists. Many can be seen today on the second deck of the Historical Center.

Howard Chandler Christy was one of the better-known artists of the genre. His first military art known to the writer is a series of prints produced at the time of the Spanish-American War showing various Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officers. His last known military work is his version of the Iwo Jima flag-raising done in 1945 and on exhibit in the Marine Corps Museum. At the pre-World War I Naval Academy, he was well known for his “middie girls” painted for the Lucky Bag yearbook. Christy’s career as a military artist thus spanned an amazing 47 years, at least.

One of the finest paintings in the Marine Corps art collection was done by Christy about 1920 to be used for Marine Corps aviation. Titled, “Fly With the U.S. Marines,” it shows a khaki-clad Marine astride a flying eagle together with a DeHavilland DH-4 fighter-bomber. Inexplicably, while we have the original painting, we do not have an example of the poster in the collection. Lack of a poster of the Christy painting had led to speculation that perhaps the painting was commissioned and delivered but never reproduced as a poster. The doubts were recently laid to rest when retired Marine Maj John M. Elliott, who is a neighbor here in the Navy Yard where he works for Naval Aviation History and Archives of the Naval Air Systems Command, sent us the two photographs shown here.

According to Maj Elliott, shortly after Col Thomas C. Turner took over as OIC of Marine Corps aviation he led a flight of two DeHavillard DH-4Bs from Washington to Santo Domingo and return. The two DH-4s from Flights C, D, E, or F at Brown Field, Quantico, left Bolling Field, Anacostia, on 22 April 1921 on a 4,482-mile round trip. The overwater portions of the trip were the longest unguarded flights up to that time. The first plane was piloted by 1stLt Basil G. Bradley with Col Turner in the rear seat while the second was piloted by...

(Continued on page 20)
MTU Activities Range from Twentynine Palms to Southern Norway

by Capt Meredith P. Hartley, USMCR

Maj Ronald J. Brown, USMCR, participated in Exercise Gallant Eagle 86 with the I Marine Amphibious Force (I MAF) from 19 July to 3 August 1986. Gallant Eagle 86, a United States Central Command-sponsored joint exercise, took place at the Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California. Maj Brown was assigned as the MAF historical officer and was tasked with the preparation of historical reports.

Working in the field, Maj Brown wrote the I MAF command chronology, went on 11 tours of MAF and subordinate command operations, and completed a "real world" narrative of the exercise for I MAF historical use. He also conducted 26 field interviews for use as oral history. Additionally, he trained other MAF members to conduct oral history interviews, corrected small errors in previous command chronologies, and left extensive written guidance for the next historical officer.

2dLt Bernard McLane, USMCR, took part in Exercise Northern Wedding 86 with the 4th Marine Amphibious Brigade from 5 to 9 September 1986. Northern Wedding 86 was a NATO combined exercise that took place in the Sandeford area of southern Norway. Lt McLane is currently working on an extensive historical report of the exercise.

Recently joined to the unit is Col Charles J. Quilter, Jr., who served in Vietnam, flying 252 combat missions, and was released from active duty as a captain in 1969. In 1972, he became a pilot for Western Airlines, where he continues to work today. His project is to write the history of VMEA (AW)-531.

A self-taught historical writer, Maj Joe F. Myers, is newly joined to the unit. He served in Vietnam and was released from active duty in 1976. Currently a retail salesman, his project is to organize and catalog the personal papers of LtGen Julian C. Smith.

Recently reappointed, Capt Brian R. Sullivan joined the unit as a specialist officer-historian. Originally commissioned in 1967, he served on active duty until 1970, including a tour in Vietnam. He received a doctoral degree in 1984 from Columbia University and is currently an assistant professor of history at Yale University. His project is to write the history of Marines in the Mediterranean after 1945.
Oral History Program Celebrates Its 20th Anniversary

by Benis M. Frank
Head, Oral History Section

Each year, as section and branch heads provide input for the History and Museums Division annual program progress report, they see graphic and statistical evidence of how the projects and programs under their management have fared in the previous 12-month period. In the case of the Oral History Section, this year’s report marked a milestone, for it was 20 years ago that the present form of the Marine Corps Oral History Program took shape with the publication of a Marine Corps order in June 1966 setting up the program.

At that time, the oral history program consisted of interviews conducted at interview centers at major Marine Corps commands (13 in all); interviews conducted at the scenes of crisis actions (such as in Vietnam) by interview teams organized by brigades, divisions, and wings; and interviews conducted with prominent retired Marines by the Oral History Section itself. Since 1966, the Oral History Program has been expanded to include interviews recorded on the scene or following significant Fleet Marine Force operations, deployments, exercises, and maneuvers; interviews recorded by support, development, training, and base-type organizations; interviews concerning unique events or assignments recorded with or submitted by individual Marines; recorded end-of-tour interviews; recorded presentations, briefings, debriefings, and speeches; interviews with prominent retired Marines; and issue-oriented interviews.

Since 1966, the Marine Corps Oral History Collection has accessioned 6,500 field interviews submitted by FMF organizations and field units—most of them concerned with Vietnam. The Oral History Section has conducted 667 interviews, transcribed 335 of them, and accessioned 300 transcribed interviews representing in excess of 25,000 pages of transcript. As meaningful as these statistics may be, it still is necessary to determine whether the objectives of the program were achieved by, in turn, determining how often and in what manner the collection as a whole has been exploited.

Initially, the Vietnam-related field interviews were to be used together with other official documentation by our historians as they wrote the multivolume history of Marine Corps operations in Vietnam. As these interviews began coming in from the field by the hundreds monthly during the height of the war, they were accompanied by documentation sheets which provided information enabling us to list the interviews by name of interviewee, the unit to which he belonged and of whose actions his comments concerned, and the subject of the interview. As a result, the Oral History Section devised a rudimentary but effective retrieval system which permits researchers to find the interviews they need by interviewee name, unit identification, or subject. In addition, house historians, historians and researchers from other Service historical agencies, as well as academicians, freelance writers, and students have used these interviews.

Vietnam veterans have been visiting the Marine Corps Historical Center to read the command chronologies of the units to which they belonged. They also have been listening to the interviews which deal with actions in which they participated or which were conducted with Marines with whom they had served. In addition, the Vietnam-related field interviews have been used successfully in treating veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome.

Our in-depth interviews with retired prominent Marines provide a broad picture of events, personalities, and issues of historical importance to the Marine Corps which date from the Spanish-American War to the present. While many serving Marines have only a fleeting and perfunctory knowledge and understanding of the post-World War II unification struggle and the Marine Corps’ fight for life during the period leading to the enactment of the National Defense Act of 1947, those who were closely involved have a very vivid memory of those times and have related in their interviews the means by which the Marine Corps survived as an institution. Among the number of retired Marines who were deeply involved and interviewed about this period were general officers Gerald C. Thomas, James D. Hittle, Samuel R. Shaw, Victor H. Krulak, and Edward C. Dyer, and Col Robert D. Heinl, Jr. In this body of interviews with retired Marines are personal combat experiences, in-depth descriptions of long-past noted Marine Corps personalities, and stories of the development of Marine Corps doctrine. Although Gen Holland M. Smith’s death in January 1967, the same month in which he had agreed to be interviewed, meant the loss of personal recollections, he left behind a legion of officers who served with him and who were able to recreate his personality and meaningfully discuss his decisions and actions in World War II. These interviews were used by Norman Cooper in writing a biography of Gen Smith for his doctoral dissertation. In the same manner, BGen Frederick P. Henderson was able to describe the personality and professionalism of LtGen Roy S. Geiger, under whom he served in the III Amphibious Corps in the Pacific and who died before the onset of the Oral History Program. Incidentally, Gen Henderson’s interview is equally important in detailing the history of the development of naval gunfire support techniques in World War II, and when we accession the interview of MajGen Donald M. Weller—the father of modern naval gunfire support—we will have a nearly complete story of the development and employment of this supporting arm in the Pacific.

Relating to a Marine personality of an even earlier time, old Marine China hand Clem D. Russell, who served in the Peking Legation Guard in the early 1930s,

(Continued on page 25)
Visitors to the Marine Corps Museum are likely to see two kinds of exhibits, standing and temporary. Standing (but not permanent) exhibits are exemplified by the Museum’s “Time Tunnel,” which presents a history of the Corps chronologically from 1775 to the present. These exhibits change but slowly.

Temporary exhibits, such as those that change every six months to a year in the special exhibits gallery of the Museum, explore a single theme, an aspect of Marine Corps History, for a limited amount of time. This year, “From Dawn to Setting Sun” presented Marines in the World War II Pacific campaigns. We will be sending this exhibit to the Parris Island command museum following its display in the Museum during 1986. It is being succeeded in Washington by a short-term exhibit of aviation art in observance of the 75th anniversary of Marine Corps aviation and, subsequently, by a larger, longer-term exhibit on Marines in the multinational force during the 1900 “Boxer Rebellion” in China.

Other temporary exhibit themes at the Museum over the past nine years include recruiting posters and methods; Marines in World War I; aviation art; infantry weapons development; Marine operations, 1975-1985; and several major art exhibitions. These exhibits usually assemble a large number of weapons, uniforms, equipment, memorabilia, photographs, art, and captions into segments in cases and on large panels. Such exhibitions require a large expenditure of effort and usually have been erected for one-time use.

But activities of the Museums Branch extend well beyond the walls of the Marine Corps Museum. We keep five cases of different sizes and shapes in the lobby of Headquarters Marine Corps filled with colorful exhibits and have rotated 83 different ones through these cases in the past seven years.

We send loan exhibits to the command museum at MCRD, Parris Island; the new museum at MCRD, San Diego; the senior Marine officer of the U.S. Naval Academy; the Pentagon; and nine various activities of MCDEC, Quantico. In the past, these commitments presented problems. The exhibit cases at each of these locations were different shapes and sizes. Each time we moved an exhibit in, effect, had to be redesigned in a different format.

We grappled with these problems for some time before finding a solution. We use built-in cases for our standing exhibits in the “Time Tunnel,” but our collection of temporary exhibit cases, procured commercially over the years or scrounged surplus, are of many different sizes and configurations—wall cases, free-standing cases, and table cases. These cases are heavy, fragile, and bulky. In all, difficult to move. We needed something light, sturdy, small; something that a couple of men can slip into the back of a station wagon or pick-up or be easily crated for commercial shipment. Low-cost and capable of being fabricated in our own exhibits shop were also desirable characteristics.

A request for bids was issued by Headquarters Support Division’s Supply Branch and a contractor selected. Twenty-four cases and stands have been procured. To date they have been used for exhibits on doctrinal development for MCDEC’s...
Education Center; on Combined Action Platoons, Marine advisors in Vietnam, and World War II Raiders for reunions of these groups in Washington; on development of the Eagle, Globe, and Anchor emblem; on Marine POWs' experiences; and on foreign marine corps. Often one case is not enough to tell the story, so up to five cases have been used to make an exhibit. Sometimes the modular cases are combined with panels mounted with just flat graphic material.

The ingenuity of the exhibits staff has resulted in an increased capability to deploy case exhibits beyond the Museum and the Historical Center, where more Marines can be reached. At this time, deployment of modular exhibits is limited to the greater Washington, D.C. area, but plans are now in the making to procure more cases and to construct special shipping cases so that modular exhibits can be made available to an even greater Marine audience.

New Base Facilities' Names Honor Decorated Marines

by Robert V. Aquilina
Assistant Head, Reference Section

A former Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, a Medal of Honor recipient, and seven other highly decorated Marines from the Vietnam War have all been honored recently by commemorative namings at various Marine Corps commands.

To date, more than 650 facilities have been named in honor of some 450 Marines through the Commemorative Naming Program. The following requests were recently approved by the Commandant of the Marine Corps:

From the Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton: To name the airfield at MCAS Camp Pendleton in honor of LtGen John C. Munn, USMC. A native of Prescott, Arkansas, LtGen Munn served as commanding general of Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, from May 1963 until his retirement. His distinguished contributions to the United States over 37 years as a Marine officer included service in the Pacific Theater (notably Guadalcanal and Okinawa) during World War II, and in Korea with the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing. His contributions to the development of Marine aviation included tenure as Director of Aviation at Marine Corps Headquarters from 1958-1960. LtGen Munn died on 14 April 1986 in Encinitas, California, after a long illness.

From the Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton: To name a community center and center court in the Serra Mesa housing area in honor of Sgt Paul H. Foster, USMCR. A native of San Mateo, California, Sgt Foster was serving as an artillery liaison operations chief with the 2d Battalion, 4th Marines, when he was killed in action on 14 October 1967, near Con Thien in the Republic of Vietnam. Sgt Foster was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for heroism in sacrificing his own life by throwing himself upon a grenade to save the lives of fellow Marines.

From the Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Smedley D. Butler: To name six new high-rise family housing buildings in honor of six enlisted Marines who received the Navy Cross posthumously during the Vietnam War:

1stSgt David M. Kaufman, USMC, killed in action on 15 June 1969
GySgt Joseph F. Covella, USMC, killed in action on 3 January 1966
SSgt Willie D. Tyronne, USMC, killed in action on 30 May 1965

Sgt Joseph G. Rodrigues, Jr., USMC, killed in action on 3 March 1969
PFC Roy E. Pitts, USMC, killed in action on 17 February 1969
PFC Darrell T. Ray, USMC, killed in action on 28 February 1966

From the Commanding Officer, Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps: To name a new gymnasium to be constructed at Henderson Hall in honor of Cpl Terry L. Smith, USMC. A native of Nashville, Tennessee, Cpl Smith was killed in action on 20 February 1968 near Khe Sanh. He was posthumously awarded the Silver Star after sacrificing his life by leaving the relative safety of his bunker to warn an approaching Marine helicopter not to land due to intense enemy mortar fire. Cpl Smith was subsequently fatally wounded by mortar fragments, gallantly sacrificing his life so that the helicopter crew might live.

Sgt Paul H. Foster, USMCR

LtGen John C. Munn, USMC, in 1959

Sgt Paul H. Foster, USMCR
On 25 January 1944, Chance Vought received a Navy agreement to a company proposal to build the XF4U-4. This was the beginning of the second major production version of the Corsair, the prototype of which first flew on 19 April 1944. The production model of the F4U-4 completed its first flight on 20 September 1944 and the Navy accepted it on 31 October. Equipped with the new 2,100-horsepower Pratt and Whitney R-2800-18W (water-injection) engine, and a four-bladed, 13-feet-2-inch-diameter, Hamilton-Standard propeller, this new Corsair was rated at 446 miles per hour with a climb rate of 3,870 feet per minute; significantly exceeding the 395 miles per hour and 2,380 feet per minute climb rate of its predecessor, the Goodyear FG-1. Additionally, the F4U-4 featured a completely redesigned cockpit, a new canopy, an armor-plated bucket seat, and regrouped instruments. Other changes improved the downdraft-type carburetor, and moved the intake ducts from the wings to the cowl. It could carry fighter-bomber ordnance from fuselage stations and from rocket launchers on the outer wing panels. Production of the F4U-4 variants totalled 2,357 aircraft, including 297 F4U-4Bs with four-cannon armament (20mm). Despite large-scale cancellations of contracts following V-J Day, production of the F4U-4 by Vought continued until August 1947.

The F4U-4 saw extensive combat action in the Korean War as a ground support/interdiction aircraft. On 11 August 1950, a division of VMF-323 Corsairs from the USS Badoeng Strait were sent forward on a search-and-attack mission near the town of Kosong. They were presented with a rich target of opportunity—an estimated 100 vehicles of the NKPA 83rd Motorcycle Regiment, including jeeps, motorcycles, and troop-carrying trucks. The F4U-4Bs made low-level strafing runs the entire length of the column and vehicles crashed into one another or piled up in ditches while enemy troops scrambled for cover. The halted vehicles were sitting ducks for the Corsairs which raked targets with rockets and cannon fire. After about 40 vehicles were set ablaze, another VMFA-323 flight and Air Force F-51s arrived to add the finishing touches to the "Kosong Turkey Shoot."

A milestone air-to-air engagement occurred on 10 September 1952, when a Corsair pilot downed a Communist MIG-15 jet fighter. Captains Jesse G. Folmar and Walter E. Daniels of VMF-312 were looking for targets near the town of Chinnampo when they were jumped by eight MIGs. The enemy jets made repeated strafing runs on the slower F4U-4s as they tried to exit the area. After one of the MIG-15s completed a firing run on the Corsairs, he pulled up directly in front of Captain Folmar's guns, and a quick burst of 20mm cannon had the MIG ablaze and headed for the ground.

Corsair variants fought the duration of the Korean War before finishing their service career with Reserve units in the mid-1950s.

The F4U-4 at Quantico is bureau number 97369. Its history card indicates service with VMF-222 and VMF-232.

Technical Data

For lightest loading conditions shown in initial airplane characteristics and performance chart.

Manufacturer: Chance Vought Aircraft Inc., Dallas, Texas.
Type: Carrier-based fighter.
Accommodation: Pilot only.
Power Plant: One 2,100 h.p. Pratt & Whitney R-2800-18W.
Dimensions: Span, 41 ft.; Length, 33 ft., 8 in.
Weights: Empty, 9,205 lbs.; gross combat, 14,670.
Performance: Max speed, 446 m.p.h. at 26,200 ft.; Service ceiling, 41,500 ft.; Range, 1,005 st. mi.; Climb 3,870 ft. per min.
Armament:* Six .50-cal. machine guns or four 20mm automatic guns; eight 5-in. high-velocity aerial rockets (HVARS); two 1,000-lb. bombs.

*Includes capabilities developed as modifications to the original model, and does not necessarily reflect a simultaneous loading configuration.
Oral History’s 20 Years
(Continued from page 21)
provided a vivid and evocative description of life in China for Marines in that period and an even more vivid description of famed Capt John W. Thomason, Jr. Mr. Russell also described some other famous Marines who were on duty in Peking at that time. Without the existence of the tape recorder and the oral history concept these memories may never have been captured.

Similarly, the Oral History Program has conducted a large number of issue-oriented interviews. Most recently are the 119-plus interviews with members of the various Marine Amphibious Units deployed to Beirut and the nearly 50 interviews with those Marines and naval officers involved in the Grenada operation. Both groups of interviews were used extensively to support the writing of histories of Beirut and Grenada which are scheduled to be published this year. In addition, beginning in 1975, to support the writing of a planned history of State Department Marines, the members of the staff of the Historical Center conducted interviews 64 Marine Security Guard Battalion officers and enlisted Marines who had served in guard detachments at American embassies throughout the world. Included in this group are those interviews which were conducted with Marines who were taken captive in Tehran when the Shah was deposed and the embassy overrun.

A final group of issue-oriented interviews are those which were done with the assistance of the Marine Corps Aviation Association with former and retired Marine flyers. Although still a small body of interviews, these appropriately supplement the interviews in depth conducted with such Marine Corps aviation pioneers as Generals Francis P. “Pat” Mulcahy, Walter Greasinger “Great” Farrell, Louis Woods, and others.

More recently, the Oral History Section completed a marathon 42 and one-half hour interview with LtGen Charles G. Cooper, one of a lesser length with MajGen Alan Armstrong, and one just about completed with LtGen Bernard F. “Mick” Trainor. All of these are pertinent to current Marine Corps historical projects because they contain considerable Vietnam-related material. Both Generals Cooper and Trainor served as battalion commanders in Vietnam and their observations and comments are all the more relevant.

Soon to be accessioned into the Oral History Collection are interviews which were conducted with former Commandant Gen Robert E. Cushman, Jr., who reviewed his transcript before his death, and with LtGen Henry W. Buse, Jr., whose last command was Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

Answers to Historical Quiz

Nicknames of Marine Corps General Officers
(Continued from page 11)
1. e Gen Butler earned his nickname by being a spit-and-polish general, and a cold, hard Marine with a blunt way of expressing his feelings.
2. j Gen Brown was dubbed “Bigfoot” during operations in Nicaragua in 1927, when he wore out two pairs of boots on a five-month patrol and could not get another pair from the quartermaster because of the huge size.
3. i Gen Liversedge received his colorful nickname because of his formidable stature.
4. a Gen Smith acquired his nickname (which corresponds to his first and middle initials) because of his outward appearance of being hard-boiled and severe.
5. d Gen Edson received his nickname because of his red hair.
6. g Gen Vandegrift acquired the name because he was so even-tempered and good-natured.
7. c Gen Bearn earned his nickname during his numerous campaigns when he was often remembered charging to the head of a column that was pursuing the enemy, urging his men to “hike along cheerily.”
8. f Gen Lejeune’s nickname relates to his command of the 2d (“Indianhead”) Division in 1918-1919. Shortly after one of the Division’s victories in France, a London paper depicted the unit as a group of wild Indians led by their chief (Gen Lejeune).
9. b Gen Puller’s nickname was derived from his ramrod posture and protruding chest.
10. h Gen Pendleton’s nickname was bestowed on him because of his smiling, benevolent countenance.

Lost Whyte Collection Illuminates Guadalcanal Operations
(Continued from page 17)
Academy, and Ft. Belvoir Engineer School.

As it turns out, the SWPA aerial photos would probably have added little to the 1st Division’s pre-landing knowledge of the target area. The mosaic, on a scale of 1:40,000, shows even less detail than the aerial pictures on which the Goettge map (scale 1:24,000) was based. Neither set shows the location of the airfield. (The June air shots were taken before the Japanese began construction, and the SWPA photos, which bear simply the date “July,” must have been taken early in that month, for there is no detectable sign of an air strip.) The Goettge map, apparently based on incomplete coastwatcher information, places the airfield farther north than it actually was.

Neither mosaic covers the terrain far enough south to include Mt. Austen, which was mistakenly supposed to lie much closer to the coast and was initially assigned as an objective to the 1st Marines. Both mosaics do show, indistinctly, running roughly parallel to the shoreline, a stream feeding into the river (the Ilu, as it was then labelled) that marked the western boundary of Beach Red. The Goettge map shows that feeder as a very short tributary but does not indicate the thick jungly growth that gave trouble to the 1st Marines.

After the war Mr. Whyte became an editor of Fortune magazine and the author of several books, of which the best known is the The Organization Man. Now in retirement, he lives in New York City.
While truce talks between United Nations and Communist representatives dragged on at Panmunjom, slowed in part over the issue of repatriation of POWs, the 1st Marine Division resumed patrolling activities on the north side of the trenches and outposts captured during the previous autumn's fierce fighting. Marines welcomed the addition of thermal-insulated boots and armored vests, or "flak jackets," as dual protection from the Korean winter and Red Chinese mortars and grenades. The insulated "Mickey Mouse" boot effectively curtailed the incidence of frostbite, while the adoption of armored vests was credited with reducing fatal casualties by 30 percent.

On 1 January 1952 LtGen Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., became the 20th Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general. On 10 January, MajGen Gerald C. Thomas returned to Washington from Korea to become Assistant Commandant. His replacement in Korea as Commanding General, 1st Marine Division, was 58-year-old MajGen John T. Selden. A veteran of both world wars, the Richmond, Virginia, native had most recently served as commander of the Troop Training Unit, Amphibious Training Command, at Coronado. Along with a new commanding general, the division received from the United States a number of replacements who underwent vigorous training exercises in the cold of east-central Korea.

New thermal-insulated boots were welcomed by Marines in 1952, as protection from the severe cold. Heavy construction of this boot saved a foot when a Marine stepped on a land mine.
Marines of the 1st Division attend "school" on land mines and boobytraps in a cold and snowy Korean landscape in January

With the truce talks at Panmunjom curtailing large-scale military offensives, the United Nations Command determined upon a redeployment of forces in Korea designed to strengthen the allied front, and thus improve the U.N. bargaining position at the peace tables. The plan called for the deployment of American forces to the most critical sectors of the front. The solidifying U.N. lines would also include the addition of newly formed Republic of Korea army units.

In late March 1952 the 1st Marine Division was consequently relieved by other units of X Corps, and began a 140-mile move, codenamed Operation Mixmaster, across the peninsula to the operational control of I Corps in west Korea. Six hundred trucks shuttled back and forth, transferring nearly 50,000 tons of Marine equipment.

The heaviest equipment sailed on LSDs and 11 LSTs from Sokcho-ri to Inchon. As the extreme western anchor of the Eighth Army front, the division's new 35-mile sector lay in the direct path of the enemy's invasion route to Seoul. The solidified United Nation's lines resembled the trench warfare of World War I. Across "no man's land" the Red Chinese deployed 15 infantry and 10 artillery battalions with an aggregate strength (50,000) almost double the size of the 1st Marine Division. In some areas of the front, opposing trenches were only 50 to 150 yards apart. Marine artillery and mortar fire were answered by Chinese night raids against 1st Marine Division outposts. A series of enemy attacks against the western portion of the Marine defenses was launched during mid-April 1952. The fierce determination of the Red Chinese assaults is attested by the three Medals of Honor—two posthumous—that were awarded to 1st Marine Division Marines in April and May 1952, for heroic actions in repelling the enemy attacks.

Three Medals of Honor went to Marines involved in repelling attacks by a Chinese force of 25 battalions on their way to invade Seoul in April and May 1952. From left, they are Cpl David B. Champagne, Cpl Duane E. Dewey, and PFC John D. Kelly.

Marine air continued to provide interdiction support to the Fifth Air Force. The United Nations Command emphasis on attacking the North Korean transportation system continued throughout the first six months of 1952, along with increasing utilization of helicopter troop operations. On 5 April 1952 Operation Pronto witnessed the transportation of Marines from the 2d Battalion, 7th Marines, along with 10,000 pounds of rations, in the first major troop lift in the new I Corps sector. Additional helicopter airlifts followed throughout the month.

During the spring of 1952 Red Chinese forces had begun extending their trench system in the direction of the Marine main line of resistance. The aptly termed "creeping tactics" were designed to give the enemy a dominating terrain position on the route to Seoul. By July, the 1st Marine Division found enemy forces uncomfortably close to Marine outpost lines. Though slowed by Marine raids and heavy Korean rains, the stage was set by August 1952 for a renewal of Chinese offensives against the 1st Marine Division. The battle names of Inchon, Chosin, and the "Punchbowl" would soon be joined by "Bunker Hill" and "The Hook," as U.S. Marines began their third year of warfare in Korea.
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vade Seoul in April and May 1952. From left, they are Cpl David B. Champagne, Cpl Duane E. Dewey, and PFC John D. Kelly.
Historical Foundation Notes

Three-Year Terms Begun by 7 New Board Members

Seven new directors — three of them incumbents — are currently serving on the board of the Marine Corps Historical Foundation. With 48 percent of eligible members submitting ballots last fall, the seven were elected for three-year terms commencing with their installation at the 3 November 1986 meeting of the Board of Directors. The seven, and some brief information on their backgrounds, are:

Allan R. Milieu, incumbent. Member of the Awards Committee. Professor of history and director of the Program in International Security and Military Affairs, Ohio State University; author of Semper Fidelis: The History of the U.S. Marine Corps. Active service: Currently colonel, USMCR; commands Mobilization Training Unit DC-7 (Historical); assigned to Advanced Amphibious Study Group, HQMC, and the Command and Staff College, Quantico.


Philip A. Crowl, incumbent. Member of the Grants and Fellowships Committee. Former chairman, Department of Strategy, Naval War College; served on the Commandant of the Marine Corps’ Advisory Committee on Marine Corps History; co-author of The U.S. Marines and Amphibious War. Active service: USNR, 1942-45.

Herbert T. Sweet. Retired Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps; recently retired from staff of the Fleet Reserve Association; active in Marine Corps League and Fleet Reserve Association activities. Active service: 1937-1969.

John G. Miller. Retired colonel; currently managing editor, U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings; former Deputy Director for History, History and Museums Division, HQMC. Author of Battle to Save the Houston. Active service: 1957-1985.


E. Bruce Heilman. Former Marine sergeant; president, University of Richmond, Virginia; educator, lecturer, and consultant, active in numerous educational, civic, and professional associations. Active service: 1944-1947.

The Foundation combined forces with and assisted in sponsoring elements of the History and Museums Division at the Marine Corps Aviation Association's 1986 convention held in Dallas October 9-12. Attending were John T. Dyer, Jr., curator of the Marine Corps Art Collection, who set up an exhibition of art which included 41 paintings commemorating "75 Years of Marine Corps Aviation;" Benis M. Frank, head of the Oral History Section, who conducted individual interviews focused on air operation "incidents;" and Richard Alger, the Foundation's executive director, who was invited to "tell the MCHF story" to the gathering, introducing MCAA members to the support provided to the Marine Corps' historical program by the Foundation. Assistance includes research grants, educational fellowships, gifts to the Museum (including commissioned works of art), professional development support, and the conduct and administration of a variety of awards programs.