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Pvt John W. Rose reported for duty in Peking, China, with the Marine Corps’ U.S. Legation Guard in July 1924. He arrived by train from Tientsin and walked from the station through the Tian An Men gate to the Legation Quarter, carrying with him—it can be presumed—the same camera he had used to document his previous duties at the San Diego Recruit Depot, at Mare Island, and at a stopover at Chefoo, now Yantai. He was assigned to the radio section, and in the succeeding months filled his off-duty hours producing scores of well-composed “snapshots” which outline the lives of the guardsmen and the exotic nature of the capital city around them. In one such photograph—the cover of this issue—a fellow Marine is an understandably timid companion to a fierce sculpture in Peking’s Yellow Temple. MTU DC-7 Commander Col Charles J. Quilter II, who received John Rose’s photo album from his widow for the Museum, tells the story, beginning on page 12.
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Memorandum from the Director

Soviet Military Historians: Return Engagement

"TWO YEARS AGO it would have been totally unthinkable that a Soviet general would give a lecture in the Pentagon, but I will now confirm that the lecture will definitely take place."

With that opening statement, ColGen Dmitri A. Volkogonov, head of the Soviet Union’s Institute of Military History, on 6 April 1990 began a brilliant address entitled "Stalinism and Its Effects on the Soviet Union," to a capacity audience in Room S5070, the Pentagon’s largest auditorium.

There had been a strong round of applause as he moved to the podium hung with the seal of our Department of Defense. Behind him, against the backdrop of a blood-red theater curtain, the USSR flag, at stage left, shared space with the US flag at stage right.

GEN VOLKOGONOV is the author of a four-volume biography of Stalin, Triumph and Tragedy, already published in the Soviet Union and, in German translation, in Germany where it is a best-seller. It is due for publication in English next year. He is now at work on a biography of Leon Trotsky, an enterprise that would have been impossible under the old Stalinist regime.

Gen Volkogonov is a short man with thinning gray hair. A little portly, he wears the double-breasted uniform coat of a senior Soviet officer. His eyes, which are dark brown, very bright, and very knowing, are his most noticeable feature. He was born in 1930 in Siberia. His father, an agricultural specialist, disappeared in 1937. It would be many years before the boy would learn that his father had died in the awful purges of that time. He entered the Red Army as a cadet in 1945.

His two-hour lecture, delivered in Russian and expertly simultaneously translated by Mr. John Glad, was the capstone of a week’s visit by a delegation, headed by himself, of five top Soviet military historians. The visit was the reciprocal of that made by U.S. service history chiefs to the Soviet Union last April. (See “Mission to Moscow,” Fortitudine, Spring 1989.)

VOLKOGONOV told his Pentagon audience, a large percentage of whom were Russian studies experts, that he would address three questions: What was the essence of Stalinism? What was the genesis of Stalinism? What was the evolution of Stalinism into liberalism? “Stalinism,” according to Gen Volkogonov, “was neither accidental nor inevitable,” but was caused by a “multiplicity of errors” by Communist Party leadership. He identified three early major errors.

The Revolution was not accomplished by the Bolsheviks alone, as claimed, but also by others, said Gen Volkogonov, most notably by the Social Revolutionaries. Lenin had understood the importance of political allies, but in the summer of 1918 he and the Bolsheviks had split with the Social Revolutionaries over the issue of the Brest Litovsk treaty which ended the war with Germany. This was the first major error. From that point on the Bolsheviks held a monopoly on thought and freedom. The loss of the Social Democrat view was the second great error.

Young Lenin had himself been a Social Democrat, but inherent in Lenin’s personality was a penchant for radicalism and this became the third great error. Lenin perceived no need for democratic government. Lenin’s life was short. Before he died he realized Russia was on the wrong track, but he was too late. He had run out of time. Lenin was not understood by his contemporaries. After his death he was transformed into an icon or human deity.

UNDER LENIN’S SUCCESSOR, Stalin, the Bolsheviks attempted to gain everything in “one great leap.” Stalin’s slogan in the 1930s was “100 years of progress in 10 years.” Any means was permissible.

Fifteen years ago, when Gen Volkogonov began his work on Stalin, he found that there were 400 books and major articles on Stalin published in ColGen Dmitri A. Volkogonov, right, addresses a large Pentagon audience on “Stalinism and Its Effects on the Soviet Union,” receiving a simultaneous translation by John Glad, left. Gen Volkogonov is the author of a four-volume biography of Marshal Stalin.
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Arriving at the Marine Corps Historical Center, Gen Volkogonov, second from left, is accompanied by Bernard Orenstein, fourth from left, of the U.S. Army Soviet Studies Office. The Soviets were interested in the combined arms nature of the U.S. Marines.

English, but none in Russian. In developing Stalin’s biography, he interviewed a great number of persons who had had immediate contact with the dictator. He also, after years of effort, gained access to Stalin’s personal papers.

For his listeners in the Pentagon, Gen Volkogonov sketched a thumbnail portrait of Stalin as a “strong but malicious” figure, a man who was “not a refined intellectual, but who was intelligent and practical” and endowed with an incredible memory. According to Gen Volkogonov, Stalin needed no notes or memory crutches, he never forgot and he never forgave. He preached a single methodology: force. He was the most merciless of history’s dictators. He could assume a gentler pose, but at heart he was totally merciless.

Stalin marked his papers with blue pencil. Gen Volkogonov found this marginalia most revealing. Often it was a condemnation to death of a previous comrade. Even Trotsky was defenseless against Stalin and Stalin made Lenin into a “stuffed animal.”

But, said Gen Volkogonov, there is no denying that under Stalin a backward country became a powerful state. Unfortunately, he went on, these achievements were twisted and deformed by Stalin.

Gen Volkogonov postulated that there were four stages of Stalinism. The first stage was 1929-34 when Stalinism was established, a period of increasing dogmatism. The next stage was 1934-41, when Socialism was transformed by repressive methodology and a loss of Socialist ideals, a period culminating with the purges. The third stage, 1941-45, the years of the Great Patriotic War, Volkogonov saw as a partial retreat from Stalinism caused by the catastrophic beginning of the war. (Elsewhere during the visit, Volkogonov said we must “give the devil his due; he was a great war leader.”) Volkogonov characterized the final stage, 1945 to 1953, as a reversion to or conservation of Stalinism. Stalin saw no reason for change.

Stalin died in 1953. De-Stalinization, a process not yet completed, began with the 20th Party Congress in 1956. As a digression, Volkogonov noted that World War II had left a legacy in at least some of the people’s minds: “With Stalin we were victorious.”

As for Gen Volkogonov (as with many Soviet and East European Communists), Socialism has lost its luster, “but still offers opportunities.” He cited the ideals of Marx and Lenin of justice, equality, and fraternity, as ideals drawn from the French and American Revolutions and as ideals not yet attained in the Soviet Union.

He characterized the task of Gorbachev as one of renewal and reaching back. He saw a chance for success “if there is sufficient patience and courage.” He warned that Stalinism and neo-Stalinism have not died out. He receives, he said, some 30 to 40 letters a day commenting on his biography of Stalin. Some 65 to 70 percent support his portrayal, but 15 percent express extreme condemnation of his writings. (One correspondent stated that he should be reduced to private and shot!)

In summing up, Gen Volkogonov said, “History is eternal. It cannot be changed. But the views of history can change.” There is, he said, an opportunity to learn from the tragic but heroic Russian history of this century. Stalinism was a distorted form of Marxism. The alternative now offered is for the Soviet Union to become a democratic and civilized society. If current crises deepen, the chances of the recurrence of Stalinism in a new form increase. But Volkogonov is optimistic. There is, he believes, a chance for the Soviet Union to gain a respectable position in the world community.

The day of the Pentagon lecture, which was preceded by an office call on Gen Colin L. Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and followed by a luncheon in the Chairman’s Mess, was a Friday and the end of a busy week for the Soviet visitors. They had arrived in this country the preceding Saturday and were billeted in the Embassy Suites Hotel, Crystal City, Arlington. Their principal hosts

On a tour of Center offices are, from left, Gen Volkogonov, Nicholas Oresko of the U.S. Air Force, Soviet Army LtCol Vitaly Bogdanov, and Dr. Burton Wright of the U.S. Army Center of Military History.
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were the U.S. Army's Center of Military of
Military History and on Sunday the Ar-
my's Chief of Military History, Col (BGen-
Sel) Harold W. Nelson, took them for a
battlefield tour of Harper's Ferry and
Antietam.

On Monday they came to the Wash-
ington Navy Yard. The morning was spent in
a visit to the Naval Historical Center. Next
stop, after a Navy-hosted luncheon at the
officers club, was the Marine Corps Histori-
ical Center where they were given a top-
to-bottom tour followed by a light buffet
self-catered by the staff. In my welcoming
remarks, "Ten Minutes on the Marine
Corps Historical Program," I not only out-
lined our historical program, but also
sketched in the present size and organiza-
tion of the Marine Corps. Soviet Marines
are a relatively minor force of naval infan-
try and the visitors showed great interest
in the combined arms nature of the U.S.
Marines, particularly our aviation
elements.

That evening, after the group had visit-
ed Mount Vernon, BGen William A.
Stofft, former Army Chief of Military His-
tory, hosted an elaborate dinner at the Fort
Belvoir Officers Club.

O
n Tuesday there was an all-day
seminar at the National War Col-
lege, Fort McNair, co-chaired by Gen
Volkogonov and myself. Nine papers were
presented, translated, and discussed.

Gen Volkogonov led off the morning
session with "Strategic Leadership of the
Soviet Armed Forces during the Great
Patriotic War (1941-1945)." He attributed
the early Soviet defeats to the lack of com-
mand apparatus at the highest level. All
power was concentrated in the person of
Stalin and not until a week after the Ger-
man invasion began on 22 June 1941 was
the Stavka or main headquarters of the
Supreme High Command organized.
Volkogonov emphasized that the Great
Patriotic War was a continental war. He
credited Stalin with a strategic vision that
Hitler lacked so that the Germans, despite
their initial tactical and technical superi-
orty, were doomed to eventual defeat.
From the beginning Stalin was the
Supreme Commander-in-Chief. From
almost zero beginnings he developed and
learned to use his general staff. Hitler,
on the other hand, did not take personal
command of the German ground forces
until December 1941, after the German
invasion had been halted, and was increas-
ingly at odds with his staff and principal
commanders.

Dr. Richard A. Russell followed with
"Soviet-American Cooperation in the
North Pacific during World War II,"
singling out the little-known Navy lend-
lease operation at Cold Bay, Alaska. In this
secret operation a U.S. Navy detachment
in a six-month period, April to September
1943, trained the crews—12,400 Soviet
officers and sailors—and transferred 149 U.S.
vessels, mostly patrol frigates, minesweep-
ers, and sub-chasers, to the Soviet Pacific
Fleet for possible action against the
Japanese. By the time the program was
abruptly terminated on 3 September it
had lost its purpose. The war was over.

LTCOL VITALY BOGDANOV, the young-
est member of the Soviet delegation,
was next with "The Second World War in
Soviet Historiography." His paper was an
intensive descriptive bibliography of the
huge body of Soviet publications on World
War II, including a detailed description of
the keystone 12-volume History of the Sec-
ond World War 1939-1945 completed in
1982 (and not yet available, to my knowl-
dge, in English). Bogdanov, a member of
the Institute of Military History, speaks ex-
cellent English and is at work on his doc-
toral dissertation which will be a history
of the U.S. Armed Forces. (I did my best
to ensure that he understood the evolu-
tion and position of the U.S. Marine Corps
within those armed forces. The Soviets,
even military scholars, dominated by the
all-encompassing Red Army, have
difficulty in understanding the separate
natures of the U.S. Armed Services, but
then so do some Americans.)

I closed the morning session with a
paper on "The U.S. Marines in the Pacific
War" in which I traced the evolution of
our organization and doctrine from the
Spanish-American War to the eve of World
War II and then quickly took the listeners
through the Marine Corps' island cam-
paigns. I had a missionary purpose in this.
Soviet military histories give almost no at-
tention to the Pacific Theater in World
War II and credit the defeat of Japan to
the "August Storm," their whirlwind inva-
sion of Manchuria against Japan's Kwan-
tung Army in the last days of the war.

After lunch at the Fort McNair Officers
Club, the seminar resumed with a paper
by Dr. Richard O. Davis of the Office of
Air Force History entitled "The American
Strategic Bombing Campaign in Europe,
1942-1945." There was an obvious mission-
ary purpose in this paper also. The Soviets,
no great believers in conventional strategic
bombing, in their histories give the
American and British strategic air effort
scant credit for contributing to the defeat
of Nazi Germany.

COL ROBERT A. SAVUSHKIN of the
Institute of Military History spoke next
on "Forms of Enemy Destruction in
Strategic Offensive Operations in the
Great Patriotic War." His opening state-
ment was: "During the Great Patriotic War
which lasted 1418 days Soviet troops con-
ducted 9 campaigns among them 7 offens-
ive and 2 defensive. Each campaign
included several strategic operations. All in all there were 51 of them including 13 defensive and 38 offensive.”

Strategic offensive operations were usually conducted by two or three “fronts,” i.e., army groups, organized into a “front group.” To ensure the destruction of the enemy, a 2 to 2.5 superiority in troop strength and a 2 to 4 superiority in materiel were the norm. Operations would be carried out on a front of from 500 to 1,000 kilometers with a depth of from 150 to 500 kilometers.

“The basic forms of enemy destruction during the war were the following: encirclement of enemy large formations, splitting of his order of battle by a violent deep attack with subsequent enemy destruction by parts and fragmentation of enemy strategic grouping by a number of resolute strikes delivered on a wide front in several directions with their further exploitation in depth and along the flanks.”

Col Savushkin is the editor of a new, still-in-work, 10-volume The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People 1941-1945, which, according to LtCol Bogdanov, will “differ in essence” from what has been published before because perestroika “demands new approaches to interpreting military-historical events, keeping strictly to the principle of their dialectical interrelation, and truthful historical account.”

Col David A. Glantz, USA, of the Soviet Army Studies Office at Fort Leavenworth, was the next speaker. Col Glantz probably knows more about the Soviet operational art, that broad band of operations that lies between strategy and tactics, than any other American, but his paper was on a completely different subject: “Observing the Soviets: Army Attacks in Eastern Europe during the 1930s.” He examined the question, “To what degrees did U.S. military attaches perceive and how accurately did they assess specific trends or events in the Soviet military that had significant subsequent impact on Soviet military development?”

The answer, which tends to refute the contentions of those who deride the role of the military attaché, is that the system worked amazingly well. For example, by April 1934 our War Department General Staff had published an intelligence summary which stated: “The present combat principles of the Soviets are based on mass employment of armored forces, the so-called deep tactics and annihilating operations... which they count on yielding better results than the combat methods of the World War.”

Col Richard M. Portugal’skiy, head of the history department at the famed Frunze Academy in Moscow which trains officers at the mid-career level and corresponds to our command and staff colleges, spoke next. His paper was entitled “Problems of Operational Art: Ways of Their Solution During the Great Patriotic War.” In a way, it built on Col Savushkin’s paper. He offered a virtual mathematical formula for the Soviet application of the operational art in World War II. The numbers are staggering. A front would number nearly 1,200,000 troops, 1,700 to 2,200 tanks, 15,000 pieces of artillery, and 2,000-3,000 aircraft. It could consist of three to nine combined-arms armies, one to three tank armies, one to two air armies, and a number of separate tank, mechanized, and cavalry corps. As a rule, a combined-arms army would have two or three rifle corps (a total of six to 12 rifle divisions) plus one or two tank or mechanized corps.

Col Igor Venkov, Chief Archivist and Chief Historian of the Soviet General Staff, gave the last paper, “Military Archives in the USSR.” He traced the development of Soviet military archives forward from a decree signed by Lenin on 1 June 1918. In an additional decree, signed 27 March 1919, Lenin enjoined “military commissars in all places to take under protection documentation of units and institutions of the former Armed Forces of Russian Empire.”

Col Venkov has the “colossal and primary task” of supervising the collection of data for an “All Union—Soviet Book of Memory” aimed for publication in 1995 which will list all the known dead from the Great Patriotic War. In a separate conversation, he said that the count had reached 27 million.

That evening Dr. Richard H. Kohn, Chief of Air Force History, hosted the delegation elegantly at his McLean, Virginia, home.

On Friday afternoon there were briefings in the Pentagon on the historical programs of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by Mr. Willard J. Webb, the Joint Staff historian, and of the Office of the Secretary of Defense by Dr. Goldberg. Time was also found for a quick visit to the Marine Corps Exchange at Henderson Hall.

That evening there was a reception and buffet dinner given by the Soviet military attaches at their offices on 2552 Belmont Road, somewhat restrained in mood, I thought, possibly because of the on-going Lithuanian affair.

After the buffet, the delegation broke up into pairs for dessert and coffee at some of the American history chiefs’ homes. I drewCols Portugal’skiy and Savushkin.
Col Portugal’skiy, the most effervescent and outgoing member of the Soviet party, waved aside an offer of vodka and asked for the most American drink, so one round of bourbon preceded dessert. Portugal’skiy said that he had noticed that Americans, upon introduction, always gave a little biographical resume, and that while Russians would not ordinarily do that, he would act in the American manner. He was born, he said, in Leningrad in 1932. Orphaned by the war and raised in a state orphanage, he entered the Red Army as a cadet, and, after service in the infantry, became an official historian, completing his master’s degree and doctorate.

CRUSHING HISTORY ALIVE

Your recent Fortitudine article by Col R. D. Heinp, Jr., about the potential of military history for Marine Corps education (“Memorandum from the Director,” Spring 1990), speaks to the current concern with light infantry in maneuver war. As the Colonel used to say: History comes alive when students manage to relive it.

My own opportunity for dealing daily at the Naval Academy with explicit bits of combat history, led me deliberately to encourage the sort of vicarious experience Col Heinp advocated. Our ultimate solution adapted a method used during the mid-1930s at the Harvard Business School. It evolved as an interactive, classroom problem, drawn from historical evidence but stripped of any “school solution.” For example, one problem put each student in the role of a French naval officer, charged the night before Trafalgar with advising his admiral how to thwart Nelson’s impending attack.

That sort of problem served with virtually any historical situation, to involve at least some students in a genuine learning process. Of course it helped when the teacher coached his situation in honest terms, and refused to repeat the problem too often. In today’s context such a problem may well help Marines convert historical information into contemporary light infantry practice.

Randomly selected student solutions to many such problems stand currently among the Marine Corps Museum collection of private papers. In the light of current interest in maneuver warfare, some officer concerned with teaching combat history might find them useful.

WILLIAM H. RUSSELL

Gwynedd, Pennsylvania

EDITOR’S NOTE: The writer is emeritus professor of history of the U.S. Naval Academy, the author of numerous seminal articles on the origins of amphibious doctrine and the background of the Fleet Marine Force, appearing principally in Marine Corps Gazette, and a longtime friend of the Marine Corps’ historical program and its official historians.

A SERIOUS OMISSION

I have enjoyed Fortitudine for several years. It is a wealth of historical information. But I was perplexed to note in the Spring 1990 issue that the article by Robert V. Aquilina on pp. 22-23, “The U.S. Marine Corps and the Vietnam War,” does not even mention the fierce battle for Con Thien. This is a glaring oversight.

Any 3d Division Marine who served in northern I Corps in the fall of 1967 will tell you that the “siege” of Con Thien from 4 September to 15 October was a bitter, hard-fought struggle that merits remembering. Marines from 3/9 were dug in on Con Thien proper and 3/26, 2/4, and 2/9 were maneuver battalions fighting for their lives to keep Con Thien from being encircled and overrun by an estimated 20,000 NVA hidden in bunkers within and below the adjacent DMZ. I know this for a fact because I was there with 3/9 and experienced this personally. Outnumbered Marines, supported by massive air power and helicopter resupply, persevered in the face of constant monsoon downpours, unending artillery bombardments, and abominable mud conditions. If Con Thien fell to the NVA, then the entire Leatherneck Square area (which included Dong Ha, Cam Lo, and Gio Linh) would soon be lost. We had to hold Con Thien at all costs . . . and we did!

I just cannot understand how Bernard Fall’s death, or the fact that the first woman Marine reported for duty in Saigon at MACV HQ took precedence over the battle of Con Thien as the most noteworthy historical events of the United States Marine Corps in Vietnam during 1967.

James P. Coan

Stockton, California

EDITOR’S NOTE: The continuing feature “The U.S. Marine Corps and the Vietnam War” aims at recording a few of the daily significant events of the war, thus reasonably including the death of Dr. Fall or the reporting in of the first woman Marine. It is not intended as a chronology of daily operational events; for that more detailed information, in accompanying notes readers are urged to refer to the volumes of officially published history within the series U.S. Marines in Vietnam. That being said, however, we think the writer makes a valid and important point. The struggle for Con Thien in Operation Kingfisher during the fall of 1967 was one of the epic battles of the war. It should have been introduced in the feature and we regret that it was not.
Civil War Private's Letters An Important Gift to Corps

by J. Michael Miller
Curator of Personal Papers

ON 14 OCTOBER 1861, Pvt George Riddell began his Marine Corps service in the bloodiest conflict in American history, the Civil War. During the next two years, Riddell wrote letters about his experiences in the war, until he was captured when the USS Clifton was destroyed on 8 September 1863 at the battle of Sabine Pass. Twenty-six of these letters became available to the Marine Corps Historical Center through a New York dealer in historical papers and were purchased by the Marine Corps Historical Foundation for permanent retention by the Corps.

The letters offer a glimpse of the Marine Corps at the beginning of the Civil War and of the life of an enlisted Marine of the period. Riddell first answered his country's call by volunteering for three months in the 1st Delaware Infantry Regiment in May 1861. The regiment saw no combat during Riddell's tour of duty, and was engaged only in protecting the railroad lines in Maryland from raids of "Rowdy Secessionists." At the end of his three-month enlistment, Riddell declined to volunteer for the rest of the war in the regiment. Instead, he chose to offer his services to the Marine Corps. Being 19 years old, Riddell had to have written per-

his transfer from Philadelphia to the Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. He assured her of his current fitness but also asked her to excuse him for not writing sooner as he had been ill. Riddell received his first dose of Navy medicine at the Washington 8th and I barracks, writing "I felt so bad I had to go on to the doctors list and he gave me a dose what would have killed a horse. . . he put a hot mustard plaster across my belly and today he gave me a horrid dose of thick red stuff." Riddell recovered after several days of such treatment with only "a soar throat which came from the medicine I got."

PVT RIDDELL was also less than pleased with the food at 8th and I. He described the daily rations to his mother. "The smell of the rotten coffee they give would make a hog sick and stale bread without any salt in it and salt pork cut up raw and fresh meat boiled till it has no taste. . . anyone who wants to can get anything they want at the canteen on time . . . they charge double for paying cash." Discipline at the barracks was also harsh. "One soldier for taking a drawn sword. . . has been carrying a ball and chain for 35 days now on bread and water."

On 6 February 1862, Riddell was transferred with 14 other Marines to the USS Clifton, a 210-foot, side-wheel steamer purchased in December 1861 from the New York Union Ferry Company. The steamer was converted to military use by placing six muzzle-loading cannon on board, but living conditions were still those of a Staten Island ferry. Riddell wrote to his mother on 19 February that, "we ain't got our hammocks swung yet nor any fire on board til last night. . . . It is pretty cold. Our birth Deck is only 4 feet 6 in high and we are bent all the time we are below."

One month later, Riddell and the USS Clifton were laying off Ship Island on the Mississippi River as part of a federal expedition to capture New Orleans. Riddell's main duty was as a crewman on one of the cannon. He wrote on 1 April 1862, "We
The ship on which Riddell served, the 210-foot, side-wheel steamer USS Clifton, is at right in this contemporary engraving.

We continued fire for 3 hours from 22 mortars each throwing a shell 240 pounds, taking 20 pounds of powder to load.

The largest contribution of Riddell and his shipmates during the battle was to remove Confederate "Fire Rafts" from the river. He explained to his mother, "the way the(y) fought was to send fire rafts down to try to set fire to the vessels but we would tow them ashore as fast as the(y) would come round the point. The river clear up to New Orleans is full of fire rafts ready to send down with about 50 cords of Pine Knots and barrels of rosin."

Pvt Riddell then participated in the capture of New Orleans, writing his brother John, "Hauling down their flag amid groans of the excited crowd and the Stars and Stripes fling to the breeze before their eyes their was quite an excitement there for a week or so our captain said." The Clifton then took Confederate prisoners down river for transport to Northern prisons. Riddell and his fellow Marines made sport of the prisoners.

"They were so mad they could not agree with us on their buttons with C.S.A. on, they argued it was for Confederate States Army when our side of the argument was Can't Settle Accounts. . . . We also beat them on ther [sic] tents. They claim to have the Sibley tent while we claim they have discontent. Poor fellows they would like to have the sweet end of a sour pickle."

Riddell continued on blockade duty on the Gulf Coast, through the rest of 1862 and into the summer of 1863. He wrote his brother John on 21 March 1863, "It has been a curious winter to me having seen no ice or snow." This is his last surviving letter. On 8 September, the Clifton ran aground during the attack on Sabine Pass, Texas, and was forced to surrender to the Confederate forces. Pvt Riddell spent the remainder of the war as a prisoner of the Confederacy, and finally returned to the Union after the close of hostilities in 1865. He was discharged from the Marine Corps on 24 October 1865, at Marine Barracks, Philadelphia, the same station from which he enlisted.

The Clifton is at left in this view of Union vessels attacking the Confederate Fort Jackson on the Mississippi. Pvt Riddell thought it was "one of the grandest sights ever witnessed."
**Command Museums**

**Feature to Provide News of Marine Historical Exhibits**

*by Col Brooke Nihart, USMC (Ret)*

**Deputy Director for Museums**

With this issue we start what we hope to be a standing feature in *Fortitudine*. "Command museums" are part of the Marine Corps Historical Program. They usually are established by the initiative of the activity commander with his resources in shelter, funding, and staffing. Museums at Parris Island and San Diego are the first examples. Command museums are in planning in other major activities. A related area, "historical displays," may range from lineage and honors certificates and photographs of former commanding officers at a headquarters or a piece of ordnance in front of the headquarters to a formal exhibit of unit history. This recurring feature will bring readers information on developments in these areas.

Our goal for command museums is to have one at each of the three major activities on both the East and West Coasts. To date museums have been completed at the Recruit Depots at both Parris Island and San Diego. The latter is supported with volunteers and additional funding by an incorporated non-profit depot historical society. Parris Island is following suit by beginning the organization of a historical society.

In addition to exhibits on the history and mission of the depot, Parris Island features a gallery on Marines in the Korean War and a second gallery showing "From Dawn to Setting Sun: Marines in the Pacific War," an exhibit created by the HQMC Museums Branch and on display at the Marine Corps Museum for several years. A new exhibit features artifacts excavated from the 1585 Spanish fort Santa Elena on the depot together with paintings reconstructing the life and times of the Spanish garrison.

At San Diego the museum is featuring "The Eagle and the Dragon: Marines in the Boxer Rebellion, 1900," another major exhibit created by the Museums Branch and shown at the Marine Corps Museum for nearly two years. Col Charles H. Waterhouse's paintings "Marines in the Conquest of California," and the art show, "75 Years of Marine Corps Aviation," are also showing.

Under the leadership of retired MajGen Marc Moore and the Commanding General's Museum Advisory Committee and sponsorship of retired LtCol Robert M. Calland's MCRD Historical Society, the San Diego command museum has three other programs going for it. First is a strong volunteer effort which augments the services of federal civilian employee curator George Kordela and exhibits chief MSgt David Dendy. Second, the museum store, with an ever-growing variety of Marine-related goods, is turning a profit from the 60 to 100 thousand visitors per year. These monies are used to support the museum with supplies and equipment beyond that provided by the depot. Finally, the Warfare Leadership Symposia are presented in classroom space in the museum in three segments, for field grade, company grade, and noncommissioned officers. At each symposium a battle or campaign is presented at a level appropriate to the audience by senior retired and knowledgeable officers in the area.

Other command museums are in the making. Farthest along is MCAS El Toro where the MCAS Historical Foundation, another incorporated non-profit entity, under the leadership of retired BGen Jay W. Hubbard, and the G-4 staff are well along towards a modest command aviation museum. Building 243, once a squadron headquarters, has been rehabilitated to house offices and a museum while next door Building 244, a hangar, will shelter four to six of the most valuable, historic, or fragile aircraft. El Toro has a total of 16 aircraft, 11 of which were provided by the Museums Branch. Squadrons have adopted aircraft and are responsible for their restoration and upkeep on a spare time, no-cost-to-the-government basis.

Well along are the efforts of the A. A. Cunningham Air Museum Foundation towards a world-class aviation museum as MCAS Cherry Point's command museum. Major fundraising appears to be progressing successfully under the leadership of foundation executive director, retired BG Dames M. Mead. Ground breaking for the $8 million building was to occur this summer.

Another ambitious project is the Pacific War Memorial Museum at MCB Camp Pendleton. An incorporated non-profit entity has been formed under the leadership of retired LtGen Edward J. Miller and conceptual approval to initiate a feasibility study and to begin planning has been given by HQMC. So far this has been limited to seeking funding for a major fund-raising feasibility study. A 35-acre site has been identified by the base on the slope between the Main Gate Guardhouse and Wire Mountain housing.

Finally, at MCB Camp Lejeune, Onslow County has proposed a joint County/Camp Lejeune Museum. The County would erect the museum on base land between the Beirut Memorial Grove and the Cemetery. The base would be given about half the building as a command museum and would provide a curator and exhibits for that portion. Conceptual approval for negotiation and planning has been granted by HQMC but execution appears to be several years in the future.

Historical holdings or displays are the other half of the program to bring Marine Corps history to Marines. Two noteworthy examples of this are at Camp Lejeune, where the 2d Marine Division has installed art and exhibits on its history in LtGen Julian S. Smith Hall, its new headquarters, and the 2d Marines has set up similar but smaller displays on regimental history at its headquarters.

This page is planned as a regular feature in *Fortitudine* but filling it well depends upon activities and units sending in copy and photographs to the editor. Subjects can range from a historical display of a recently restored piece of ordnance to a well done case or panel exhibit in a unit headquarters to a major exhibit, event, or program in a command museum. As in all things Marine Corps, success depends upon the field.
Since 1982, the Reference Section has compiled ongoing, current Marine Corps chronologies to highlight important events and dates in contemporary Marine Corps history. The chronologies have grown from 85 entries in 1982 to more than 125 entries in 1989.

To produce the current chronology, numerous primary and secondary sources, consisting literally of hundreds of pages, are researched each week. They include official records such as operational summaries and summaries of activities for HQMC, unit command chronologies, and message traffic. Also reviewed for items of interest are a variety of newspapers, magazines, journals, and press releases.

Below are a few selected entries from the 1989 Marine Corps Chronology:

10 Feb — Elements of the 3d Light Armored Infantry (LAI) Battalion disembarked at White Beach, Okinawa. Its assignment to the III Marine Expeditionary Force marked the first full-scale deployment of a LAI battalion overseas. Primarily a swift mobile reconnaissance unit, the LAI battalion is charged with seeking out an enemy.

27 Feb-22 Mar — The 4th Marine Expeditionary Brigade participated in Exercise Cold Winter 89, a NATO exercise held in northern Norway. The exercise marked a first for the Marine Corps when six heavy lift helicopters and more than 120 Marines were flown from Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, to Norway on board three USASB “Galaxy” transports.

13-18 Mar — Marine Corps Col James F. Buchli and Robert C. Springe were on board NASA’s space shuttle Discovery. They served as mission specialists who launched the primary payload, a tracking and data relay satellite. This was Col Buchli’s third shuttle flight and Col Springe’s first.

15-23 Mar — Marines from the III Marine Expeditionary Force participated in Exercise Team Spirit 89 in the Republic of Korea. The 14th annual joint-combined training exercise focused on rapid deployment for the defense of South Korea.

26 Mar — Gen Lewis W. Walt, 76, former Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps and a highly decorated combat veteran of three wars, died at Gulfport, Mississippi. The first assistant commandant to attain a four-star grade, Gen Walt had retired with 35 years of Marine Corps service.

27 Mar — Requirements for individual combat skills training changed when Almar 52-89 canceled the use of the Essential Subjects handbook and test, and authorized the use of the new Battle Skills Training/Essential Subjects handbook and accompanying test.

18 Apr — A detachment of Marines left San Diego on board the USS Juneau bound for Alaska’s Prince William Sound to assist with clean-up operations stemming from the 24 March wreck of an Exxon oil tanker that spilled more than 10 million gallons of crude oil in the sound.

30 Apr-26 May — More than 40,000 U.S. military personnel, including Marines of the II Marine Expeditionary Force and the 4th and 6th Marine Expeditionary Brigades, participated in Exercise Solid Shield 89. Held at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and other east coast locations, the exercise was designed to emphasize the command and control of military forces in a simulated combat environment.

11 May — The Marine Corps sent 147 Marines and 16 light armored vehicles (LAVs) from Company A, 2d Light Armored Infantry Battalion, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, to U.S. bases in Panama. They were among about 1,000 new troops dispatched by President George Bush to protect American citizens and the strategic Panama Canal in the troubled Central American country.

23 Jun — For the first time in the 74-year history of Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Paris Island, South Carolina, male and female recruits earned the title “Marine” together during the same ceremony. The history-making Marines who participated in this first combined graduation were 210 male Marines from Company H, 2d Battalion and 98 female Marines making up the 4016 series of Company N, 4th Battalion, Recruit Training Regiment.

11 Jul — Almar 127/89 announced the establishment of the Marine Corps Professional Reading Program. The new program was designed to support the professional military education program for NCOs, SNCOs, and officers. Marines would be required to read books from a carefully selected list of military biographies, battle accounts, and other warfare-related topics.

29 Jul — The USS Wasp (LDH 1), the first of the new class of multipurpose amphibious assault ships designed to conduct over-the-horizon operations, was commissioned at Norfolk Naval Base. The new Wasp has a flight deck for operating helicopters and vertical/short takeoff and landing aircraft, and a well deck for launching air cushion and conventional landing craft. It has a crew of 1,081 and room for 2,000 deployed Marines.

1 Aug — The Marine Corps University (MCU), an integral part of the Marine Corps Combat Development Command at Quantico, Virginia, was activated. The mission of MCU is to develop, recommend, implement, and monitor the resident and non-resident professional military education policies and programs for all Marines.

15 Aug-18 Sep — The 7th Marine Expeditionary Brigade joined U.S. Navy, U.S. Air Force, and Royal Thai Navy and Marine Corps units for Exercise Thaiykai 89 in Thailand. Under the umbrella of this exercise were Exercise Freedom Banner 89, which involved the deployment and employment of the marines prepositioning force, and Exercise Valiant Ulster 89 that featured amphibious operations by the 11th Marine Expeditionary Unit (Special Operations Capable) and the Royal Thai Marines.

24 Sep-10 Oct — More than 640 Marines and Navy medical personnel arrived in the Charleston and Myrtle Beach area of South Carolina to provide disaster relief support after Hurricane Hugo slammed into that area on 21 September.

10 Oct — The Immigration and Naturalization Service released a statement on its agreement with the Marine Corps to conduct joint training and surveillance operations along the southwest border of the United States in support of the Bush administration’s war on drugs.

17 Oct — A deadly earthquake shook the San Francisco Bay area. Marines from Battalion Landing Team 3/1, the 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit, Marine Aircraft Group 42, and Marine Medium Helicopter Squadron 166 and others provided disaster relief support.

5 Nov — Jim Hage, a 31-year-old resident of Lanham, Maryland, won the 14th Annual Marine Corps Marathon in Washington, D.C. with a time of 2:20:23.

8 Nov — The first three AH-1W Super Cobras made their debut in the 2d Marine Aircraft Wing at Marine Corps Air Station, New River. The “Whiskey” Cobras were assigned to Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 167. The AH-1W is an upgraded version of the AH-1T Sea Cobra.

20 Dec — Operation Just Cause was launched in Panama to protect American lives, restore the democratic process, preserve the integrity of the Panama Canal Treaty, and apprehend dictator Gen Manuel Antonio Noriega. Although it was predominantly an Army show, all Marines on the scene were fully committed to a wide variety of operational tasks that included a preemptive attack against the Panamanian Defense Forces on the southeast side of the canal. One Marine, Cpl Garrett C. Isaac, was killed and three others were wounded during the operation.

Reading a squad assault weapon during the December Operation Just Cause preemptive strike at Panamanian Defense Forces, is LCpl William Orbin, a scout with Company D, 2d Light Armored Infantry Battalion, participating in the attack on La Chorrera.
Marine’s Lively Photos of 1920s Peking a Rich Gift

by Col Charles J. Quilter II, USMCR
Commanding Officer, MTU DC-7

AROUND 1977 at our family’s annual “Marine Corps Birthday Party” I met an older vigorous-looking gentleman who gained the honor of oldest Marine present for our little cake ceremony. He was nearly 76 and his name was John Rose. I asked him when he had served and he told me he had done a three-year hitch as a member of the famous Peking Legation Guard in the mid-1920s. Since my academic major had been East Asian history, I was immediately fascinated.

Rose invited me over to his house and showed me an album of pictures he had taken. They depicted all aspects of the life of a Marine private in the Guard. No subject was too sacred and there were photos of parades, Chinese girlfriends, equipment, the famed Mounted Detachment and a wonderful one of Rose and a friend in dress blues at a table with beer bottles, hat askew, entitled “Rough Seas Ahead.”

I took some notes and what follows is the story of how these photographs came to be.

JOHN ROSE WAS BORN on 19 November 1901 in Osborn County, Kansas. Too young to be in World War I, he was employed as a steel worker in Kansas City when he met—in true Tien Tavern fashion—a Marine Corps recruiting sergeant in a pool hall. He duly enlisted for three years and was sent to MCRD San Diego for boot training in October 1923. One of the more obscure activities he photographed there was squads of men pushing about a seven-foot-high leather ball. He qualified with his Springfield ‘03 rifle at the range on a plateau that would later become Camp Kearney. In keeping with policy, this rifle accompanied him through all his subsequent duties until his enlistment expired.

He was ordered to the Marine detachment on Guam but passed out on guard duty while awaiting the ship at Mare Island. After getting his tonsils removed, he was pronounced fit and sent on to fill a vacancy at Peking. He sailed on the USS Chaumont via Pearl Harbor, Guam, Cavite, Shanghai, and Chefoo (now Yantai), sleeping in four-decker bunks. Arriving in Tientsin (now Tianjin) in July 1924, he found the countryside under water during one of the Hai Ho River’s periodic floods. There he boarded the train for Peking where he noted that only the tracks and a few bits of high ground were above water.

From Peking Station he walked through the Tian An Men gate to the Legation Quarter just inside of the huge wall that surrounded the T’artar City. (The wall has subsequently been demolished and turn-

Rose produced “an early morning view” over the Forbidden City, the Chinese imperial compound, and part of the Legation Quarter in the foreground. The Legation Quarter was located inside the massive wall that then surrounded the one-time T’artar City.
Winter uniforms were greens with high tunic collars, double-breasted great coats, and trousers wound with puttees. The wide brim baracks cover was beginning to come into use but many wore the older—and saltier—narrow stovepipe caps. Summer wear included "wash khaki" shirts buttoned at the top without a necktie, while officers wore wash khaki tunic blouses with Sam Browne belts. Stetson campaign hats—identical to those worn by DIs today—were worn during field duty. Dress blues with dark stovepipe covers were the normal liberty uniform and, once out of sight of higher-ups, troops often affected malacca canes.

PEKING OFFERED MANY diversions for a Marine on private's salary with extra radio specialist's pay. No drinking was permitted on the Legation grounds since apparently the Volstead Prohibition Act was in effect even there. Nonetheless beer was smuggled inside by willing vendors who passed it through drain holes in the south wall of the compound. Rose's favorite bar outside was run by an expatriate American with a Korean wife. He had to get a suit of civilian clothes made up after he discovered that rickshaw pullers invariably hauled Marines in uniform off to a brothel no matter where they wanted to go. In any case, these establishments were conveniently numbered, each featuring women of one nationality and often catering exclusively to members of a particular legation's guard.

During his 27-month tour, Rose visited most of Peking's tourist sights. Then—

Pet Rose, left, predicted "rough seas ahead" beneath a photo of himself and another Marine sharing a beverage.
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as now—photography was prohibited at many of them and he was forced to buy commercial photos which he also put in his album. For the strong of stomach there were weekly executions of criminals just outside the south wall. Rose once watched six thieves get dispatched at one time with a pistol shot each to the back of the head. Other activities photographed by him included traditional papermaking, camel caravans, the results of some single-plane bomb raids near Coal Hill, and the arrival of a new warlord, Chang Tso Lin, at the train station. Many aspects of Marine life were also covered, such as parades, inspections, the radio station, annual rifle qualification, and the “Bummersville Ice Follies of 1926,” staged on a rink inside the Legation compound.

John Rose returned home and was discharged as a private in October 1926. Had he reenlisted, he probably would have been promoted to private first class. China duty was said to be the best the Corps offered and he might have been tempted to stay on. Indeed some of his fellow guard members had served in Peking for over a dozen years. He went on to a successful career in business, and then retired to Laguna Beach, California. He was killed while riding his motorbike at the age of 83 after leading his lawn bowling team to victory. His widow Alice died in February 1990, and in the album was a note that she desired Rose’s album to go to me and the Marine Corps. It is now in the collection of the Marine Corps Historical Center in the Washington Navy Yard.

When I visited Beijing in May 1988, I expected to find nothing remaining of the Legation Quarters, let alone the Marines’ presence there. I was wrong. The stately and dignified former Legation buildings still stand behind their original brick walls on the tree-shaded avenue that used to be known as Morrison Street. Its huge, red sheet-iron gate is closed. Behind it one can see that the radio towers, like the city walls, are gone. So are the two barracks of the Marine guard. The guard headquarters building with its officer apartments is there, but the parade ground is now covered over with unsightly temporary buildings and storage areas of the Beijing Municipal Public Security Force. Tian An Men Square is immediately adjacent, as is the old railway station where John Rose snapped the arrival of the “Old Marshal,” Chang Tso Lin. They are all reminders of another age in China and a particular epoch of Marine history.

### Historical Quiz

#### Marines and Television

**by Lena M. Kaljot**

**Reference Historian**

Identify the following television series or personalities:

1. Lee Marvin, a private first class who fought in the Marshalls and was later wounded in action on Saipan in June 1944, starred in this 1957-1960 police series.
2. This series, which aired during the 1963-1964 season and starred Gary Lockwood and Robert Vaughn, sought to convey what life was like for a newly commissioned officer in the peacetime Marine Corps.
3. Although he eventually attained the rank of “captain,” this favorite children’s television personality served as an enlisted Marine during World War II.
4. Jim Nabors played the title role in this comedy series (1964-1970) about a gas station attendant who gives up his job and joins the peacetime Marine Corps.
5. This actor, best known as Maxwell Smart, Agent 86 in the situation comedy “Get Smart” (1965-1970), served four years in the Marine Corps during World War II, although he saw no combat.
6. This well-known talk-show co-host served as a Marine fighter pilot in World War II, and was later called back to active duty during the Korean War, flying more than 85 combat missions, which earned him six Air Medals. He is now a retired colonel, USMCR.
7. Glenn Ford, a former sergeant in the Marine Corps, starred in these two television series during the 1970s.
8. This 1976-1978 series starred Robert Conrad as Major Gregory “Pappy” Boyington and was loosely based on the World War II exploits of the “Black Sheep Squadron” (Marine Fighting Squadron 214).
9. In this popular detective series set in Hawaii, the title private investigator was a former Vietnam Special Forces veteran who often utilized the services of two of his wartime buddies, “Rick” and “TC,” former Marines.
10. This current series stars Gerald McRaney as a conservative career Marine who marries a liberal newspaper reporter with three daughters.

*(Answers on page 20)*
EARLY IN 1989, the Polish Ministry of Defense proposed to the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) that there be an exchange of visits by official military historians of both nations. This action would be in keeping with similar glasnost-prompted visits by history and museums officials of other Warsaw Pact countries (See Fortitude articles concerning visits by Russian and Hungarian historians and museum officials to the U.S., and by American counterparts to the U.S.S.R., in issues for Winter 1988-1989, Spring 1989, Fall 1989, and elsewhere in this issue.). The Polish proposal was accepted in principle by the U.S. Joint Staff. I felt fortunate at the prospect of seeing Poland and representing the Marine Corps when, last fall, I was asked by History and Museums Division Director BGen Edwin H. Simons if I would like to be our delegate.

After the details of the visit by the U.S. historians were ironed out, the delegation included one representative of each Service historical agency, plus one from the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Historical Division and one from the DOD Historian's Office. The leader of the six historians was the Secretary of the Joint Staff, Col Michael E. MacAleer, USA. Representing the DOD Historian was his deputy, Dr. Stuart I. Rochester, JCS Historical's representative was its chief, Mr. Willard J. Webb, who was the able U.S. action officer for the whole project.

The Army's representative was Col Michael D. Krause, Deputy Commander of the Center of Military History. Dr. Dean C. Allard, the Director of Naval History and a close personal associate for 34 years, was to provide a number of supportive opportunities for me to "explain" the Marine Corps' unique position in the U.S. Armed Forces. Mr. Herman S. Wolk, the Air Force Historical Office's Deputy Chief Historian for Publications, rounded out the delegation's historians.

An Air Force Reserve NCO with multiple language talents, came on active duty to join us. Army Maj Peter Podbielski joined us in Warsaw, where he had been detailed frequently for translator duties.

Assembling at Washington's National Airport on Sunday afternoon, 20 May, the delegation had an uneventful trip to New York's Kennedy International Airport. On our trip overseas, an overnight direct flight to Warsaw which took nine hours, most of us found room to sleep a few hours. Arriving at Warsaw's Okecie International Airport, we were met by Col Kazimerz Sobczak, Vice Commandant of the Polish Military Historical Institute (MHI), and a number of members of the Institute's staff. We also met Maj Podbielski, who had flown in the previous day from London, and the defense attaché at our embassy, Army Col Glenn A. Bailey, who was to join us frequently during our various visits to sites in Warsaw. Col Sobczak, who was to be our constant companion throughout the visit, introduced us to the official Polish translator, Mr. Wacla Krysiak, a World War II veteran of the Russian front.

At Okecie we boarded a 45-passenger touring bus with large windows that was to take us everywhere in the Warsaw area, and proceeded to our first destination, the military garrison officers' hotel. The hotel, which proved to be a pleasant place with good individual accommodations, was on Belwederska Street, part of an old royal road that led to the Wilanow Palace in the suburbs.

ONCE WE HAD HAD A chance to unpack, our hosts laid on a typical Polish breakfast of two courses. Next on our schedule was a visit to our embassy, which proved to be only minutes away, and where we were briefed by Col Bailey and others on the current political and military situation in Poland and on various personalities we would meet.

Back on our bus for the only formal event of the day, we went to the nearby Tomb of the Polish Unknown. A formal guard and band of the Honor Company of the Warsaw garrison, the only Army unit to still wear the famed four-cornered czapka cap in dress uniform, formed two files which flanked our party as we followed the wreath bearer to the tomb. Later, the delegation also visited memorials to the dead of the 1943 Ghetto Uprising and the 1944 Polish Home Army attacks on the German garrison.

Since the Poles had considerably allowed for jet lag, which was beginning to have its effect, when we returned to the hotel in mid-afternoon for lunch we had no further program for the day. We also discovered lunch was the day's big meal for most Poles and that the first course, Members of the American delegation pose with Polish colleagues in front of the Military History Institute. Third from the left in the front row is LtGen Tadeusz Szacilo, commander of the Institute and senior host for the visitors' week of tours and briefings.
Although a meal in itself, was not the main course. After lunch, some of the delegation went for walks in the park across from the hotel, but most opted for a look at Old Town, a restored (from extreme war damage) area which has small shops, open squares with vendors, and narrow streets virtually without cars. After supper, normally a lighter meal like breakfast, we were all glad to turn in, as the next four days’ schedule showed little free time.

The next morning we travelled to the Military History Institute located in a parklike setting in Rembertow, a close-in suburb. We met our senior host, LtGen Tadeusz Szacilo, commandant of the MHI, who had until recently been the Vice Minister of Defense for Political Education, a position that the new Solidarity government had abolished. Gen Szacilo was with us on many occasions in Warsaw and proved an astute and entertaining speaker and conversationalist.

All of us had prepared, and the JCS had translated, short presentations on our respective historical programs. Rather than read these, with translation taking at least an equal amount of time, we all gave a brief summary of the papers’ contents. This allowed time for questions which proved interesting and rewarding to both groups. The Poles were curious about how we coordinated our efforts, about what access we had (and they would have) to official archives, and what our writing programs encompassed. It also soon became obvious that the Polish historians were well aware that histories written under the Communist regime were not wholly accurate or complete. Throughout our stay there were frequent references to the “white spots” or “blank spots” in their modern history that would have to be readdressed.

Although there are 10 centuries of Polish military history, the thrust of the Military History Institute effort is forwards towards World War II and later years. Of late, accounts of the Poles serving with the Allied forces in the west and of the Home Army, the Allied-supported guerilla army in Poland, have been brought to the fore, eclipsing the operations of the Poles serving with the Russians and as part of the Russian-backed People’s Army guerilla units in the east. The Russian-sponsored monument to the People’s Army which we saw on several occasions was unvisited and graffiti-covered. The monument to the Home Army, an obvious visitor favorite, presents a tableau of fighters entering and emerging from the sewers in the epic battle to win control of Warsaw in 1944. Partially as a result of the Home Army’s unsuccessful attacks, Hitler ordered the city destroyed, an order the Germans executed with efficient ferocity. Most of the Warsaw we viewed had been resurrected from these ruins, often to an exterior appearance, as in Old Town, exactly as it had been in prewar years.

On Wednesday, we returned to the officers’ club setting of the day before to hear the postponed presentation on Polish naval history by Commander Jerzy Przybylski, the senior naval member of MHI (his rank is the equivalent of a U.S. Navy captain).

Following this, the Poles discussed a possible joint history on U.S. and Polish involvement in World War II in Europe. This subject had been brought up a number of times and was resolved by an agreement to present and publish papers on U.S. and Polish cooperation during the war at a conference with a theme of coalition warfare to be held by the International Commission on Military History in Warsaw in 1992.

The delegation then went to a cemetery at the village of Kielpin outside Warsaw to lay a wreath at a memorial to a U.S. B-17 crew shot down there on 18 September 1944 during the all-out attempt by Army Air Forces units to resupply the Polish underground troops fighting the Germans. Local people erected the memorial in gratitude for the American effort. On the return trip to Warsaw, we stopped off at the church where Father Jerzy Popieluszko was once pastor. The grave of the martyred priest, killed by Polish security police in 1984, is bordered by a wall of plaques dedicated to similar victims. On our behalf, LtCol Kwiecien placed flowers on Father Popieluszko’s grave.

In the evening it was our turn to act as hosts to our new familiar Polish peers. With Col Bailey’s help, a magnificent dinner was arranged at the Gessler restaurant not far from the Vista Rivet which bises
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the city. The discussions across the table were both social and substantive as our guests included Gen Szczoli and all the officer historians with whom we had had discussions during the first three days of our visit.

Thursday Belonged, for the most part, to the naval historians and it started early and ended late. Shortly after 0800, we were airborne in a twin-jet JAK 40 with LOT (Polish Airlines) markings and a military flight crew. We flew from a military airbase near the Okocie airport to a military field at Malbork, home to a vast 14th Century castle, seat of the Teutonic Knights, who had clashed with the kings of Poland in medieval times. The Poles defeated the Knights in 1410 at the battle of Grunwald, or Tannenberg as the Germans know it. It was not until 1457, however, that Poles were at last able to occupy the castle. At the end of World War II, the Malbork area was in the path of the Russian advance towards Berlin and the castle was severely battered in the fighting. The Germans also attempted its destruction in their retreat. The damage was extensive, but again the Poles undertook a highly successful restoration.

After our visit to Malbork, we flew on to Gdynia, the major base of the Polish Navy and home of the Naval Academy. There at the academy, Dr. Allard and I made presentations to the faculty. Our prepared papers on the state of our respective services on the eve of World War II were turned over for later translation.

Our schedule in Gdynia was crowded, and we moved on to the Blyskawica (Lightning), a destroyer that had escaped to the West when Poland fell in 1939, and which had amassed a distinguished war record fighting with the British Navy. The ship is now the Polish Naval Museum and filled with historical displays, while retaining much of the appearance of its wartime role. We also were guests of RAdm Lukasik, the newly appointed Chief of Staff to the Polish Navy’s CNO, a post equivalent to our Vice CNO, at the Gdynia Naval Officers Club. The admiral, a man in his early 40s with a background of naval sea command, was pleasant and outgoing, interested in discussing the role and organization of our joint staff.

Following lunch, we boarded the admiral’s barge, a triple-engined motor yacht which had been used to carry President Bush to Westerplatte, perhaps Poland’s best-known World War II memorial. We now duplicated the Bush visit to the small, 148-acre peninsula in nearby Gdansk’s harbor which had housed a Polish ammunition depot and garrison at the outbreak of World War II. It was here the Germans first attacked on 1 September 1939 in overwhelming force. It was six days later that the 210-man force of service troops finally surrendered. Their epic defense inspired the Poles then and now and the monument commemorating their battle and the Dr. Allard and Mr. Shaw, as naval representatives, placed a commemorative wreath at the Westerplatte memorial.

Prelate Henri Jankowski, a Solidarity leader, poses with the American and Polish historians in the courtyard of St. Brigida’s Church. Fr. Jankowski wears the Order of the White Eagle, Poland’s highest decoration. He hosted a supper at his rectory for the group.

The battlefield, now forested but then fairly open, is part of a naval base. After we followed a circling path up a 220-foot manmade hill to the monument base, Dr. Allard and I, as naval representatives, ascended a steep flight of narrow steps to lay a commemorative wreath.

After our return voyage through the open water and docking passages of the harbor, we tied up at the foot of Gdansk’s central city market place. Restored from rubble to its prewar appearance, the area is open for pedestrians for hundreds of yards and bordered by four- and five-story houses. We stopped by the old city hall, now a museum, and nearby saw our first Polish Marines, who wear blue berets. These men, part of a force of about 4,000, serve as coast defense troops in the Gdynia/Gdansk area. The Polish Army has an amphibious assault brigade, also stationed in the Gdansk region, which more nearly performs traditional U.S. Marine missions.

Walking a short distance from the museum, we reached St. Brigida’s Church, the seat of Prelate Henri Jankowski, a Solidarity leader and spiritual advisor to Lech Walesa. Father Jankowski, a charismatic man who impressed us all with his patriotic fervor and wide-ranging interests, was our host for a pleasant supper at his rectory. Holder of the Order of the White Eagle, non-Communist Poland’s highest decoration, which he
wore on his habit, he charged “his
colonels” to readdress the blank spots in
Polish military history and to adjure the
laying of blame. Our visit with Father
Jankowski was a lengthy one and the sub-
sequent bus trip to Gdynia’s military air-
port and jet flight to Warsaw brought us
back to our hotel near midnight.

OUR LAST FULL DAY featured a morn-
ing visit to the Polish General Staff
Academy, also located in the military park
at Rembertow. Our host was MajGen
Mroz, director of the academy, who gave
the delegation a briefing on its mission
and organization and its future course.

Returning to downtown Warsaw and a
Ministry of Defense building, we met with
the new Vice Minister of Defense for Edu-
cation, Mr. Bronislaw Komeroski. A man
in his late 30s, the minister is the first
civilian to hold his office since 1945. He
was a historian and teacher before becom-
ing prominent in Solidarity.

In the afternoon, we visited the Muse-
um of the Polish Armed Forces, met the
director and senior curators, and were
guided through a selection of its extensive
exhibits. The armor collection was Pol-
ished-oriented and most comprehensive, in-
cluding to my pleasure an impressive mount-
ed figure of a winged hussar, which we
later found was the focal point of a poster
we received that advertised the museum’s
70th anniversary in 1990.

After this too-brief tour, we had an
hour or so of free time which most of us
spent again shopping or sightseeing in the
Old Town. That evening LtGen Szacilo
and the MFI were our hosts for a dinner
at the hotel.

At breakfast on Saturday the 26th, as
we prepared to return home, we all found
an individualized packet of photographic
prints at our place which documented our
visit. Later, both LtGen Szacilo and Col
Sobczak were at Okecie to see us off.

If one impression of the visit came
through to us above all others, it was that
the Poles like Americans.

---

Interviews Conducted with Marines Who Served in Panama Operation

by Benis M. Frank
Head, Oral History Section

In the past few months, the Oral
History Section completed interviews
with two retired general officers who
received the Naval Academy (MajGen
Calhoun J. Kileen, ’49, and BGen Jacob
E. Glick, ’41) and another who is a gradu-
ate of Texas A&M, LtGen John H. Miller,
’49.

At the time of his retirement in 1982,
Gen Kileen was Deputy Commander,
FMFPac. Gen Glick retired in 1971 when
he was Deputy Director for Command/
Areas and Deputy Director for Operations
Regional Operations), Joint Chiefs of
Staff. Gen Miller’s last tour was as com-
mander of FMFLANT, and he retired in
Nofolk in 1984.

The Oral History Program has em-
barked upon a series of issue-oriented
interviews related to the deployment of
Marines to Panama in early 1988 in
response to the crisis mounting there, and
over Marine participation in Operation
Just Cause in December 1989. I made two
trips to Camp Lejeune to interview former
commanders, members of the staff, and
subordinate unit commanders of Marine
Forces, Panama (MarForPA), a unit estab-
lished under 6th Marine Expeditionary
Brigade to direct the operations of the Ma-
rine units in Panama. These trips were also
a sort of “scavenger hunt” to seek out
Panama-related documents for accession
into our archives. In mid-May 1990, through
the courtesy of BGen Michael P.
Downs, CG of the 6th MEB, I was able to
go to Panama to interview members of
MarForPA still in country and to see for
myself the terrain and conditions in which
the Marines are operating.

Meeting me at the airport was Maj
James W. Schindler, MarForPA S-4; Capt
Keith A. Oliver, MarForPA Public Affairs
Officer; and four enlisted Marines, all in
civies and all carrying loaded Beretkas
under their shirts. We travelled back to Rod-
man Naval Base, where MarForPA head-
quartes are located, in two cars, each
carrying loaded M-16s for each member of
the welcoming committee. Travelling in con-
voy of two cars with all hands armed is
SOP for the Panama-based Marines. Col.
Michael Hayes gave me a full briefing on
the current situation the next morning,
and then Maj Schindler guided me on a
tour of the command’s area of operations,
including the Arrajiain Tank Farm, which
was the scene of a major firefight between
Marines and infiltrating Panama Defense
Force personnel the night of 12-13 April
1988. Following this, we travelled to Ver-
acruz, Vaco Monte, and the town of Ar-
rajain, all places where there are small
Marine detachments and all scenes of Ma-
rine activity during Just Cause. During my
four-day stay, I conducted interviews with
a number of Marines, some of whom had
been in Panama since November 1989.
One interesting place I visited was the old
Marine Barracks, which is now the head-
quarters of the Marine Security Guard
Company. The present CO, Maj Robert B.
Neller, and his predecessors have all been
Marine Corps history-conscious, and the
halls of the barracks are covered with
historic photographs, some of which date
back to the time of the building of the
Panama Canal.

In the last week of May I visited Nor-
fork to interview LtGen Ernest T. Cook,
CG, FMFLANT and other FMFLANT Marines
who also played a role in the Corps’ opera-
tions in Panama.
The Marine Corps Flag Manual, Marine Corps Order P0520.3B, was recently published and distributed to Marine Corps units in the field. Prepared in the Reference Section of the Historical Branch, the new Flag Manual is the first substantive revision of the order in 18 years and sets forth policies and procedures covering the design, acquisition, display, and use of flags, guidons, streamers, and other related emblems in the Marine Corps.

The manual is directive in nature and provides information and instructions on the appropriate use and display of heraldic items by Marine Corps organizations and personnel. Among the more significant changes in the revision are the addition of a history of the Marine Corps flag, an updated table of organizational flags authorized to designated organizations and activities, and a list of authorized Marine Corps streamers with stock numbers.

Little documentation is available regarding the first flags carried by early American Marines. The battalion of Marines that Capt Samuel Nicholas led ashore on New Providence Island in March 1776 quite likely carried the Grand Union flag and may also have displayed the Rattlesnake flag. During the early 1800s the standard carried by Marines consisted of a white field with gold fringe and bore an elaborate design of an anchor and eagle in the center. Prior to the Mexican War, this flag bore across the top the words “To the Shores of Tripoli.” The legend was revised to read “From Tripoli to the Halls of Montezumas,” shortly after the war.

During the Mexican and Civil Wars, Marines apparently carried a flag similar to the national flag, with red and white stripes and a union. The union, however, contained an eagle perched on a shield of the United States and a half-wreath beneath the shield, with 29 stars encircling the entire design.

In 1876 Marines began carrying the Stars and Stripes with “U.S. Marine Corps” embroidered in yellow on the middle red stripe. By the time of the Veracruz landing in 1914, a more distinctive standard was carried by Marines. The design consisted of a blue field with a laurel wreath encircling the Marine Corps emblem in the center. A scarlet ribbon above the emblem carried the words “U.S. Marine Corps,” while another scarlet ribbon below the emblem carried the motto “Semper Fidelis.”

Orders were issued in April 1921 direct ing that all national colors be manufactured without the yellow fringe and without the words “U.S. Marine Corps” embroidered on the red stripe. This was followed a year later by a March 1922 order retiring all national colors still in use with yellow fringe or wording on the flag.

Following World War I, the Marine Corps adopted the Army practice of attaching silver bands carrying inscriptions enumerating specific decorations and battles on the flagstaff. This practice was eventually discontinued on 23 January 1961.

MajGenComdt John A. Lejeune signed Marine Corps Order No. 4 on 18 April 1925 designating gold and scarlet as the official colors of the Marine Corps. The order specified that “All guidons, banners, athletic ribbons, pennants, and other articles ordinarily designed to represent the Marine Corps colors, will be made accordingly.” These colors, however, were not reflected in the official Marine Corps standard until 1 January 1939, when a new design incorporating the new colors was approved. The design was essentially that of today’s Marine Corps standard.

For a brief time following World War I, the inscribing of battle honors directly on the colors of a unit was in practice. The procedure was discontinued, however, when the multiplicity of honors and the limited space on the colors made the system impractical.

A Marine Corps Board, convened on 29 July 1936, recommended that battle streamers be attached to the standard Marine Corps flag of such organizations as might be entitled to them. The board based its recommendation on the custom in vogue in the Army since 1921, whereby streamers were attached to the staffs of regiments and similar organizations to commemorate participation in battle or the award of a decoration.

Marine Corps Order No. 157, dated 3 November 1939, and signed by MajGenComdt Thomas Holcomb, finally authorized the board’s recommendations and initiated the system of attaching streamers to the staff of organizational colors still in practice today.

Among the more significant provisions of this landmark order was a basic change in the terminology used in describing the Marine Corps flag. The term “Marine Corps standard” was officially approved for use in referring to the Marine Corps flag, replacing the term “flag, regimental.” The order also set specific standards for determination of award of streamers, design and dimensions of the streamers, and the colors and specific embroidery. Finally, the order provided instructions on displaying streamers including the provision that “the addition of streamers to Marine Corps standards or of stars to streamers will be marked with appropriate ceremonies.”

Near the end of World War II, another Marine Corps Order, No. 205 dated 14 March 1945, was issued which would have lasting impact on the Marine Corps system of flags and streamers. This order further defined a distinction between the “Marine Corps Battle Standard” and the “Marine Corps Standard”:
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The Marine Corps Standard shall have the words “United States Marine Corps” embroidered upon the scroll. When the lettering is replaced with the name of a specific Marine Corps organization, the Standard shall be known as a “Marine Corps Battle Standard” and shall be issued to combat units only.

This order, signed by Commandant of the Marine Corps, LtGen Alexander A. Vandegrift, further specified which combat units were authorized issue of the Marine Corps Battle Standard. Included were air and ground units down to regimental/group level (battalion/squadron size units were not yet authorized issue.) A list of 30 organizations was also included that were authorized the Marine Corps Standard. Finally, the order stated that:

The standard issued the Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., shall bear the battle streamers authorized for the Marine Corps as a whole by Marine Corps Order No. 157, and shall be known as “The Battle Standard of the Marine Corps.”

The first Marine Corps Flag Manual, issued in May 1960, extended the authorization for the Marine Corps Battle Standard to all FMF units down through battalions and squadrons. The awarding of streamers to those battalions and squadrons organic to regiments and groups, however, was still precluded by the order.

In a rather detailed statement prepared by the Historical Branch in August 1965, a strong case was presented for authorizing the display of streamers to “those battalions and squadrons which are currently being deprived of the recognition” which they earned. The Historical Branch statement pointed out the change in deployment patterns during the 1950s and 60s, in which battalions and squadrons “form the basis for tactical task organizations and are assigned missions independent of their parent regiment/group.” This use of component units in deployments such as Lebanon, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic was pointed out as reason “to prompt a reconsideration of the unit eligibility criteria, especially since these units are already authorized Battle Standards.” Authorization for battalions and squadrons to display streamers followed shortly thereafter.

The next major milestone in the Marine Corps’ system of flags and streamers came in 1968 with the formal establishment of the lineage and honors program. In August of that year the Chief of Staff approved a proposal which set forth the “procedures, actions, and responsibilities for a lineage and honors program in the Marine Corps.” It assigned the responsibility for determination of eligibility of Marine Corps units for streamers and their chronological lineage to the Historical Branch, G-3 Division. Instituted for the first time was the issuance of embossed certificates of lineage and honors to all color-bearing units of the Marine Corps.

By the time of publication of the second edition of the Marine Corps Flag Manual, MCO P10520.3A, in October 1971, the new Historical Division had taken cognizance over many of the sections of the order. In 1974, the newly combined History and Museums Division, which had just acquired a number of functions in the museum, collections, and archival areas, also took on primary cognizance over and responsibility for the Flag Manual, with coordination, when required with other Headquarters agencies.


One noteworthy change in the manual is in the three types of organizational standards, previously designated Types I, II, and III. These flags are now contained in a joint service specification with all Marine Corps flags designated as Type III flags. The three kinds of organizational standards are now:

1. Type III, Class 1, Command Battle Standard and Organizational Standard, USMC (for designated units of the FMF and major non-FMF commands authorized the organization designation embroidered on the scroll)
2. Type III, Class 2, Organizational Standard, USMC (for regular general officers and active non-FMF activities not authorized the Class 1 standard; all have

“United States Marine Corps” on the scroll
3. Type III, Class 3, Organizational Standard, USMC (for general officers of the Reserve in an active status, and Reserve units not authorized battle standards; these have “United States Marine Corps Reserve” on the scroll).

Table I contains the list of organizations authorized the three classes of Type III flags.

A series of eleven annexes to the manual consist of a collection of both historic and current public laws, presidential proclamations, executive orders, Navy regulations, and Department of Defense directives relating primarily to the proper use and display of flags. Among these documents is the Presidential Proclamation signed by John F. Kennedy on 12 June 1961, stating that the American Flag should be displayed both day and night at the Marine Corps Memorial in Arlington, Virginia. This proclamation, incidentally, was the occasion prompting “Change 1” to the first Flag Manual of 1960.

Change 1 to the new Flag Manual is now in preparation and will address the changing and somewhat ambiguous legal status of the American Flag. Annex A currently includes Public Law 90-381, approved by the 90th Congress on 5 July 1968, prohibiting desecration of the flag and setting penalties for “Whoever knowingly casts contempt upon any flag of the United States by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning, or trampling upon it...”. Recent Supreme Court decisions overturning flag desecration laws have prompted a national debate on the issue, the outcome of which will form the basis for this first change to the new Flag Manual.

Answers to Historical Quiz

Marines and Television
(Questions on page 14)

1. “M Squad”
2. “The Lieutenant”
3. Captain Kangaroo (Bob Keeshan)
4. “Gomer Pyle, USMC”
5. Don Adams
6. Ed McMahon
8. “Baa Baa Black Sheep”
9. “Magnum, P.I.”
10. “Major Dad”
Histories to Mark Anniversary
(Continued from page 24)
related special event in the 1991-95 period will involve the historical resources of the Services, all of the military historical agencies, including those of the Coast Guard and National Guard Bureau, took part in a formal inaugural meeting of interested parties chaired by Gen Arter. The participants examined a number of proposed responses to anticipated needs and all present, including Marine Corps Director of History and Museums BGen Edwin H. Simmons and Deputy for History Col Daniel M. Smith, could agree with the purposes of the anniversary commemorations: (1) to reacquaint Americans with World War II, an integral part of their heritage; (2) to provide present-day Service and civilian members of the DOD with a clearer understanding of the history of World War II; and (3) to honor the war’s veterans.

In this and subsequent meetings, correspondence, and personal contacts, it was determined that each DOD historical agency would develop a series of historical pamphlets for popular audiences that would commemorate events in World War II important to them and that each, as appropriate, would produce museum exhibits and displays that similarly highlighted these events. There were other agreements that would require individual and mutual effort, international military exchanges, symposia, and ceremonies, but the key charges that Gen Simmons accepted for the Marine Corps were 50th anniversary popular histories and related museum exhibits.

The number of events that could be commemorated, which could be unending, had to become finite. The decision was made that the major campaigns of the war from the Marine viewpoint would be the focus of effort. Clearly the capture and defense of Guadalcanal would be a highlight of 1992-93 commemorations, but the immediate prewar period, including the Iceland occupation in 1940-41 and the anxious few months after Pearl Harbor in 1941-42, when Marines on Wake and in the Philippines fought and died or were captured, would also be covered both in story and artifact. At the war’s end the battles in 1945 for Iwo Jima and Okinawa were obvious subjects for coverage as were the immediate postwar occupations by Marines of North China and Japan. In all, 28 subject areas were identified for historical and museum exploitation during the 1991-95 period.

How was the History and Museums Division to accomplish this formidable additional tasking while still carrying on its normal and considerable day-to-day workload? The answer was Marine traditional—additional duties—but hopefully anticipated and programmed over the six-year period so that work already underway would continue and be completed near schedule. In most instances, on-board historians and curators are going to be the researchers and writers of the needed histories and in all cases the scripters and suppliers of the anticipated exhibits. A lead time of at least a year is needed in all cases before publication of the history or completion of the planned exhibit. This means that we expect the writer of the Guadalcanal history to have a finished draft in August 1991, or in my case, writing again the history of Marines on the verge of war, to have a complete manuscript by December of this year. Obviously, in view of the need to get the program started, to produce prototype production examples, and to provide the many contemplated authors guidance on what is wanted, the first programmed history has to be produced much sooner than that and will be subject to some experimentation on format and context.

In general, however, we have a pretty good idea of what we want to do when it comes to the appearance and content of the histories. We have determined that they will be soft-bound pamphlets, relatively short (25-75 pages), and heavily illustrated. The target audience is twofold: first, the readers who are interested in a war that their parents and grandparents experienced but who are not too sure what happened, or when or where; and second, the veterans themselves, known as tough and critical readers who are always interested in how what they did plays out.

Some former Marines and friends of Marines who are accomplished authors have expressed interest in being one of the writers in this ambitious 50th anniversary program. The one-time chance to write an official history not loaded with footnotes and appendices has an appeal. These potential “outside” authors, and others who may be approached to take on a topic well within their experience or expertise, will all have to agree to the same guidelines that will govern the “inside” authors of the History and Museums Division. For instance, we consider that the existing operational monographs and five overall volumes of World War II history that the Marine Corps has produced provide a strong base account of Marine Corps combat activities. Since these histories were completed, however, there have been many personal accounts written of battles and Service life, as well as oral history interviews, that can provide zest to any narrative. In our personal papers collection, there are lots of items that can lend a touch of human interest or otherwise illuminate or illustrate straightforward facts. So this will be every author’s challenge to produce a readable and accurate popular history based upon what we have already written and enlivened by material from first-hand narratives, oral histories, and personal papers.

In a sense, the challenge to the Marine Corps historical agency to commemorate the anniversary of World War II in a successful fashion has yet to be met. Thus far, we have only plans and small beginnings, but we also have an excellent track record of past performance. The readers of Fortitude will have a continuing “how goes it” picture of 50th anniversary accomplishments. And, hopefully, you will all be here at the finish when we hope to merit your “well done”.

Teachers of Vietnam War Courses Hear Seminar at Historical Center

Twenty-four professors of history and related disciplines from throughout the country, attending the 1990 Summer Institute on the Teaching of the Vietnam War sponsored by George Mason University, visited the History and Museums Division on 10 July. Jack Shulimson, head of the Histories Section, and Dr. Edward Marolda, head of the Current Histories Branch, Naval Historical Division, conducted a seminar on source material on the war available in the Marine Corps and Navy Historical Centers, assisted by staff members Benis M. Frank, Danny J. Crawford, Jack Dyer, Ms. Evelyn Engleander, Mrs. Joyce Bonnett, J. Michael Miller, and Charles R. Smith. There was an extended question and answer period.
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The U.S. Marine Corps and the Vietnam War: 1966

by Robert V. Aquilina
Assistant Head, Reference Section


1 Jan — U.S. Marines numbered approximately 38,500 of the 181,000 U.S. Armed Forces personnel in Vietnam. Total Marine Corps strength was approximately 214,500.

3 Jan — A Special Forces camp at Khe Sanh airstrip reported 20 rounds of incoming 120mm mortar fire. This was the first confirmed enemy use of these weapons in the Vietnam War.

20 Jan — President Johnson requested additional funds to activate another 18,000-man Marine Corps division to add to the three divisions currently in the Corps.

28 Jan-19 Feb — Operation Double Eagle I, a search and clear mission, was conducted in southern Quang Ngai Province by Task Force Delta. This was the biggest amphibious landing since the Members of the 4th Marines move up a blasted slope toward heavy contact with North Vietnamese Army regulars in Operation Hastings two miles from the Demilitarized Zone in July.

Marines of the 3d Division stand perimeter guard with an M-60 machine gun during one of the numerous search and destroy operations which characterized the year for Marines in Vietnam. Korean War and the largest sustained operation conducted in Vietnam by the Marine Corps to date.

6-8 Feb — The meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii, between President Johnson and South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky resulted in a "Declaration of Honolulu," which emphasized winning the Vietnam War through a combination of military action and civic reforms.

19 Feb-1 Mar — Operation Double Eagle II was conducted approximately 30 miles south of Da Nang.

1 Mar — The 26th Marines was activated at Camp Pendleton, California, thus initiating the reactivation of the 5th Marine Division.

4-7 Mar — Task Force Delta conducted Operation Utah southwest of Chu Lai in Quang Ngai Province. This joint U.S. Marine Corps and Republic of Vietnam Army (ARVN) operation defeated a North Vietnamese infantry regiment during a fierce four-day battle.

Marines of Company G, 2d Battalion, 4th Marines reach an assembly area during their pursuit of the enemy in Quang Tri Province north of Dong Ha during July in Operation Hastings.
9-12 Mar — The North Vietnamese 95th Regiment overran the A Shau Special Forces Camp in western Thua Thien Province. Marine helicopters from HMM-163 assisted in the evacuation of Special Forces and ARVN troops.

10-30 Mar — A serious political crisis developed in South Vietnam when Premier Nguyen Cao Ky removed LtGen Nguyen Chanh Thi, the Commanding General of I Corps. Pro-Thi, antigovernment protests under Buddhist leadership began in Saigon, Da Nang, and Hue. Normalcy did not return until the end of June, when government forces succeeded in putting down the “Buddhist Revolt,” and LtGen Thi went into exile.

18 Mar — MajGen Wood B. Kyle assumed command of the 3d Marine Division from Gen Lewis B. Walt, who continued as Commanding General of III MAF.

20-25 Mar — In Operation Texas, Task Force Delta Marines killed 149 Viet Cong as the Marines swept the area south of Chu Lai.

26 Mar-6 Apr — The Special Landing Force Battalion (SLF), BLT 1/5, conducted a surface and helicopter assault against Viet Cong forces operating in the Rung Sat Special Zone about 27 miles southeast of Saigon in Operation Jack Stay.

29 Mar — MajGen Lewis J. Fields established the 1st Marine Division Headquarters at Chu Lai. This marked the first time since World War II that the Marine Corps had two divisions (the 1st and 3d) committed to combat in a war zone.

26 Apr — Regimental Landing Team 7 (RLT-7) was awarded the Navy Unit Commendation Streamer for its action in Operation Starlite in August 1965, thus becoming the first Marine ground unit in Vietnam to receive this award.

10 May — Operation Georgia, a 20-day search and destroy mission conducted by the 3d Battalion, 9th Marines, ended south of Da Nang with 103 Viet Cong killed.

16 May — MajGen Lewis B. Robertson relieved MajGen Keith B. McCutcheon as Commanding General, 1st Marine Aircraft Wing.

7-30 Jun — The 3d Marine Division conducted Operation Liberty, an extensive pacification sweep and clear operation in the Da Nang area.

18-27 Jun — In Operation Deckhouse I, the first of a series of Special Landing Force (SLF) operations on Viet Cong coastal strongholds, Marines swarmed ashore some 12 miles northwest of Tuy Hoa in Phu Yen Province. Enemy resistance was light.

7 Jul-2 Aug — Operation Hastings, the Marine Corps’ largest multibattalion operation to date, was conducted 55 miles northwest of Hue, under the command of Task Force Delta. Six Marine battalions and five Vietnamese battalions ultimately were committed to the operation. The enemy suffered 824 killed.

3 Aug — U.S. Marines began Operation Prairie in the former Hastings area of operation. Prairie soon expanded into a multibattalion campaign and continued through the end of the year.

15-18 Sep — Operation Deckhouse IV, an amphibious search and destroy operation, was conducted in conjunction with Prairie I, approximately eight miles northeast of Dong Ha.

17-27 Sep — During the annual effort to protect the rice harvest, Operation Golden Fleece, Marines safeguarded the harvesting of 7,620 tons of rice and captured 727 tons of Viet Cong rice in Quang Ngai province.

10 Oct — The 3d Marine Division was ordered to displace to Thua Thien and Quang Tri Provinces to conduct offensive operations as directed, while the 1st Marine Division assumed responsibility for all three southern provinces (Quang Nam, Quang Tin, and Quang Ngai).


23 Nov — The Office of Civil Operations was established in Saigon, South Vietnam, to direct U.S. civilian support of revolutionary development in Vietnam.

6 Dec — Sgt Robert E. O’Malley became the first Marine since the Korean War to receive the Medal of Honor. As a squad leader with Company I, 3d Battalion, 3d Marines, he led repeated assaults against the enemy during Operation Starlite, 18 August 1965.

19 Dec — Operation Chinook, an attempt to prevent Viet Cong access to the rice-rich coastal area of Vietnam, began and would continue into 1967. Participating Marine units (under the control of the 4th Marines for the operation) included the 2d and 3d Battalions, 26th Marines; the 3d Battalion, 12th Marines; reconnaissance troops from Phu Bai; and support units.

Corps Histories to Mark WWII 50th Anniversary

by Henry I. Shaw, Jr.
Chief Historian

A great many of the readers of Fortitudine, certainly the majority of active duty Marines to whom distribution is made, were not born when World War II began on 1 September 1939. An unscientific survey of our individual subscription readers, however, including many members of the Marine Corps Historical Foundation, would indicate that the majority of them were witnesses to or participants in the events of World War II. With the 50th anniversary of the war’s beginning—Hitler’s overwhelming attack on Poland—already behind us, we are not far from the 50th anniversary of America’s entry into the fighting, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor of 7 December 1941.

Inevitably, there will be intense interest in 50th anniversary occasions in this country as well as in those of our wartime allies and former enemies. Not surprisingly, the Department of Defense and all the Services recognize that this awareness will vitally and demandingly involve them. Not only are there millions of veterans of World War II, and even greater millions of their family members, but there are a couple of recent generations of other Americans who know precious little about what has been called “the seminal event of the 20th century.”

Anticipating a need and an obligation for the Armed Forces to respond to the already evident renewed public interest in World War II, the Army took the lead in developing an overall concept for the DOD participation in anniversary commemorations. The Secretary of the Army’s Special Assistant for the Bicentennial of the Constitution, retired LtGen Robert Atter, was appointed Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army for the 50th anniversary of World War II. And the Army also took on the role of executive agent for the Department of Defense for the 50th Anniversary.

Since almost any commemoration or (Continued on page 21)