

"I appreciate more than I can say, your handling of my remarks at West Point and am delighted that you had such a favorable reaction. Needless to say, my farewell to the Cadets was a poignant moment for me and I am glad that it was treated in so dignified a manner by your fine paper."

Douglas MacArthur



FROM THE PAGES OF
THE NATIONAL OBSERVER

GENERAL DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S

"DUTY HONOR AND COUNTRY"

A patriot's quietly-spoken convictions can thunder louder than a giant fire-cracker. Such a demonstration occurred on May 12, 1962, when General of The Army Douglas MacArthur addressed the cadets of the Military Academy at West Point, upon his acceptance of the Sylvanus Thayer Award for service to his nation. A few words of this stirring address were enough to inspire the editors of The National Observer with the realization that here was more than a speech, here was more than a passing headline. General MacArthur literally had spoken "from the heart." He had no prepared text, not even notes. Fortunately, a tape recording had been made and was available. From this tape, The National Observer was able to present to its nation-wide audience General MacArthur's moving farewell address. The address appeared exclusively in The National Observer of May 20. It evoked a huge and enthusiastic response from grateful readers everywhere. Thousands of requests for reprints already have been received. If you have not yet read this stirring message, do it now. If you wish a colorful reprint suitable for framing, free of charge, let us know. Address: Mr. O. Quintin DiMaria, The National Observer, 44 Broad Street, New York 4, N. Y. Dept. WJ.

As I was leaving the hotel this morning, a doorman asked me, "Where are you bound for, General?" and when I replied, "West Point," he remarked, "Beautiful place, have you ever been there before?"

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

No human being could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this. [Thayer Award] Coming from a profession I have served so long and a people I have loved so well, it fills me with an emotion I cannot express. But this award is not intended primarily for a personality, but to symbolize a great moral code—the code of conduct and chivalry of those who guard this beloved land of culture and ancient descent.

Duty, honor, country: Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

Unhappily, I possess neither that eloquence of diction, that poetry of imagination, nor that brilliance of metaphor to tell you all that they mean.

The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase. Every pedant, every demagogue, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid.

What the Words Teach

They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success; not to substitute words for actions, nor to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm, but to have compassion on those who fall; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future, yet never neglect the past; to be serious, yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness; the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength.

They give you a temperate will, a quality of imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, an appetite for adventure over love of ease.

They create in your heart the sense of wonder, the unfailing hope of what next, and the joy and inspiration of life. They teach you in this way to be an officer and a gentleman.

And what sort of soldiers are those you are to lead? Are they reliable? Are they brave? Are they capable of victory?

Their story is known to all of you. It is the story of the American man at arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless.

His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. . . .

Witness to the Fortitude

In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand camp fires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

From one end of the world to the other, he has drained deep the chalice of courage. As I listened to those songs of the glee club, in memory's eye I could see those staggering columns of the first World War, bending under soggy packs on many a weary march, from dripping dusk to drizzling dawn, slogging ankle deep through mire of shell-pocked roads; to form grimly for the attack, blue-lipped, covered with sludge and mud, chilled by the wind and rain, driving home to their objective, and for many, to the judgment seat of God. . . .

I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory.

Always for them: Duty, honor, country. Always their blood, and sweat, and tears, as we sought the way and the light. And 20 years after, on the other side of the globe, again the filth of murky foxholes, the stench of ghostly trenches, the slime of dripping dugouts, those boiling suns of the relentless heat, those torrential rains of devastating storms, the loneliness and utter desolation of jungle trails, the bitterness of long separation from those they loved and cherished, the deadly pestilence of tropical disease, the horror of stricken areas of war.

Swift and Sure Attack

Their resolute and determined defense, their swift and sure attack, their indomitable purpose, their complete and decisive victory—always victory, always through the bloody haze of their last reverberating shot, the vision of gaunt, ghastly men, reverently following your password of duty, honor, country. . . .

You now face a new world, a world of

change. The thrust into outer space of the satellite, spheres and missiles marks a beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a greater, a more abrupt or staggering evolution.

We deal now, not with things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and as yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We are reaching out for a new and boundless frontier. We speak in strange terms of harnessing the cosmic energy, of making winds and tides work for us . . . of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but instead to include his civil populations; of ultimate conflict between a united human race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy; of such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all times.

And through all this welter of change and development your mission remains fixed, determined, inviolable. It is to win our wars. Everything else in your professional career is but corollary to this vital dedication. All other public purposes, all other public projects, all other public needs, great or small, will find others for their accomplishment; but you are the ones who are trained to fight.

The Profession of Arms

Yours is the profession of arms, the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory, that if you lose, the nation will be destroyed, that the very obsession of your public service must be duty, honor, country.

Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide men's minds. But serene, calm, aloof, you stand as the nation's war guardians, as its lifeguards from the raging tides of international conflict, as its gladiators in the arena of battle. For a century and a half you have defended, guarded, and protected its hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice.

Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government: Whether our strength is being sapped by deficit financing indulged in too long, by Federal paternalism grown too mighty, by power groups grown too arrogant, by

politics grown too corrupt, by crime grown too rampant, by morals grown too low, by taxes grown too high, by extremists grown too violent; whether our personal liberties are as thorough and complete as they should be.

These great national problems are not for your professional participation or military solution. Your guidpost stands out like a tenfold beacon in the night: Duty, honor, country.

You are the leaven which binds together the entire fabric of our national system of defense. From your ranks come the great captains who hold the nation's destiny in their hands the moment the war tocsin sounds. . . .

The long, gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from their white crosses, thundering those magic words: Duty, honor, country.

Prays for Peace

This does not mean that you are warmongers. On the contrary, the soldier above all other people prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. But always in our ears ring the ominous words of Plato, that wisest of all philosophers: "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and re-echoes: Duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final roll call with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps, and the corps, and the corps.

I bid you farewell.

President loathed by uniformed forces

Right or wrong, to most serving soldiers and veterans, retired Gen. Harold Campbell's comments that President Clinton was a "gay-loving," "pot-smoking," "draft-dodging," "womanizer" were dead on target.

Clinton's relationship with soldiers remains a barbed wire-lined sleeping bag. In their eyes, he can't lose his Vietnam War baggage or the widespread view that he's morally unfit for the job. The perception is that he doesn't understand or respect the military culture and that he gives his duties as commander in chief a backseat ride to domestic issues.

White House spin master George Stephanopoulos says Clinton's relations with the armed forces are "quite strong." Yet, from Korea to Kuwait I find the rumbling in the ranks louder than the roar of a B-52. As usual, "Boy George" is wrong.

Clinton has made big mistakes in his military policies, such as insisting gays serve openly in the ranks, putting women in combat slots, placing unqualified civilians



David Hackworth

in high Pentagon and security posts and selecting politically correct top brass who won't fight his agenda to swap fighting ability for social opportunity.

These and his dithering use of military force have turned off most warriors, past and present.

The character issue haunts Clinton. He lied about the draft, waffled with "I didn't inhale," and generally doesn't care to tell it like it is. Instead, the truth gets washed, spun and dried, be it the distant past or what happened last month in Somalia or Bosnia.

Clinton's values and the military's don't mix. A soldier's code is straightforward: "Don't lie, cheat and steal and don't tolerate people

who do." Many soldiers feel Clinton hasn't set the example of integrity, decisiveness, courage, leadership and vision that warriors expect of their president.

Herbert Shughart, the father of Sgt. Randall Shughart, refused to shake hands with Clinton following the White House ceremony last May when his son was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor. Shughart, who reportedly told Clinton, "You are not fit to command," captured the feeling of most warriors and veterans I've interviewed.

Clinton's continuing flip-flops and fumbblings over Somalia, Bosnia, North Korea and Haiti have widened the gap between the president and the military community. His apparent inability to focus on national security and develop a coherent defense strategy has put warriors in harm's way.

His weapons acquisition policy is pure pork. He buys unnecessary, gold-plated weapons while neglecting the stuff that's needed. His indifference has resulted in badly de-

fined and frequently changing political and military objectives.

I have never heard more bad-mouthing of a president, be he Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower or Jimmy Carter.

With Clinton, it's not just the brass and right-wingers grouching; it goes down to the grunt, where the buck stops with bullets. And in their dangerous world, Clinton is despised.

Even with divine intervention, he's not redeemable by the standards of most warriors and veterans.

To ease the pain, Clinton should stop his trite speeches, cosmetic wreath-laying and military stumping. All are viewed as insincere political schmoozing.

His wearing military jackets and hats for photo opportunities is bad enough, but his preppy saluting to warriors is even worse. FDR understood the salute is a symbol of respect that can only be earned, so he elected to hold his hand over his heart instead. Clinton should follow suit.

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

Curbing the Pentagon

As a voice that has championed a better defense, we agree that the Pentagon budget can be cut, which would certainly be politically helpful in cutting the rest of the government. But if the U.S. is to maintain its capability to defend itself and the Free World from Soviet intimidation and expansionism, it is vitally important how defense is trimmed.

Especially so since the usual Pentagon budget cuts typically trim costs in any one fiscal year while making defense more costly over time. The absolutely worst thing to do is to stretch out procurement of new arms over a longer period, as former President Gerald Ford has suggested. This fiscal sleight of hand, tried repeatedly in the 1970s, resulted in a steady dete-

bolic cost of such a decision would have to be offset by other action to preserve our land-based deterrent. Our suggestion would be defending present Minuteman sites with something like the Swarmjet, which shoots a shotgun blast of simple rockets in front of an incoming ballistic missile, thus introducing a huge element of uncertainty into an attacker's plans.

None of these caveats means that nothing in the Pentagon can be cut. The Grace Commission has suggested numerous specific reforms that could save some \$92 billion over three years "without diminishment of the defense program." Among the more important suggestions was reorganization of the bloated executive structure of the Defense Department. A place to start would be reform of the Joint Chiefs; procurement and strategic decisions today are subject to a paralyzingly high number of planning staffs, which engender pointless bureaucratic careerism among the officer corps. Substantial savings and improved preparedness could be gained from cutting personnel and streamlining the bureaucratic process.

Base realignments and closures are also overdue. Since 1968, the U.S. military and civilian employee population fell to three million from five million; yet only limited progress was made in base closings in the early 1970s, and this process now "has virtually dried up," the Grace Commission said. It estimates the cost of maintaining unnecessary bases at \$2 billion to \$5 billion.

Probably an even bigger cause of Pentagon fat lies in constant efforts by Congress to micro-manage defense. One high officer says the Pentagon could sharply cut its overblown staff structure if it did not have to cope with the greatly expanded involvement in defense management of congressmen and their own overblown staffs. Often, that interference has nothing to do with defense capability and a great deal to do with politics. Some congressmen consider the Pentagon budget to be a welfare program for their home districts; the congressional logrolling process attempts to insure that every congressman gets his share. The result is that some weapons continue to be built and some bases maintained long after they have outlived their usefulness.

The problem with all this is that it requires choices. And decision making is not the federal government's strong suit, especially when every decision is second-guessed by Congress and the Washington press. But the new budget regime forced on Washington by the imperatives of low-inflation economics means only one thing: Economic choices must be made. They particularly need to be made in something as large as the Pentagon budget. If the U.S. is to get both a better defense and lower costs, the choices must be made with great thought and effort, not with some easy way out.

Cutting the Budget— IV

An Editorial Series

rioration in U.S. military capabilities. The "savings" turned out to be illusory, because when you stretch programs or curtail production runs, unit costs of weapons systems invariably rise. When production programs are stretched, the economies of mass production and large-scale parts and subsystem procurement are lost. Contractors entering into new procurement agreements with the Pentagon tend to inflate prices to offset the expected vicissitudes in year-to-year budgeting.

Another equally easy and equally destructive idea is a cap on active military pay. This was also tried during the Carter years, with enormous devastation of morale and effectiveness throughout the military services. The cap idea is another quick-fix substitute for long-term reform of military compensation. Real reform would involve getting the Pentagon—as well as the rest of the federal government—to redesign its retirement and health-care programs. The Grace Commission cites one telling example: Air Force officers who retired in 1972 get more retirement pay today than officers of the same rank on active duty get in salaries. If Mr. Reagan and Mr. Weinberger will search the files they will find some excellent studies of past years, now gathering dust, that describe how changes in military compensation can improve the pay of military personnel by putting the military pay and retirement structure on a footing that more nearly resembles pay in the private sector.

A third easy trap is to shrink programs to the point where they have little military utility. This happened to the U.S. anti-ballistic missile program after SALT-I, and now seems to be happening to the MX program, which Congress has reduced to 10 missiles. We can understand why Sen. Barry Goldwater proposes to kill the program entirely, though the heavy sym-

Army at Odds

West Point Posting Becomes a Minefield For 'Warrior' Officer

Col. Hallums Won Medals
But Lost Career in Fight
Over Academy's Vision

A Bully, or Victim of PC?

By THOMAS E. RICKS

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WEST POINT, N.Y. — Col. James Hallums, a veteran of two wars, had seen lots of nasty skirmishes in his career. But he thought his combat days were behind him when he arrived to instill a "warrior spirit" in the leadership department of the U.S. Military Academy here.

He was wrong. Soon, some subordinate academic officers would rise up in open revolt, and eventually some female faculty members would complain that he was sexist.

This was hard for a tough infantry officer to take. West Point, though a college, is still part of the Army and the colonel expected to be obeyed. This insurrection was all insubordination and nonsense, in his estimation, and he fought back.

Yet today Col. Hallums, who once seemed assured of a promotion to general, finds himself pilloried as a bully — and out of the Army, his 30-year-career brought to an ugly end.

He was brought to the academy out of worries that the venerable institution had lost its military and disciplinary edge. But late last year, after a tumultuous one-year stint and a rancorous investigation of his actions by academy superiors, he lost his post as head of the leadership department, sacked for "abusive leadership."

Among the charges against him: that he harassed some of his female subordinates by lecturing them about their personal lives and showed a gender bias because he was so gung-ho about combat forces, a branch that excludes women from direct combat roles. Col. Hallums, whose supporters say he sometimes showed a clumsiness around women professionals, had been maverick enough to favor giving women a role on the front lines.



Col. James Hallums

His supporters, a number of West Point women among them, remain bitter about his treatment, and use a military metaphor to describe what befell the colonel: ambush. They contend that the same divisive culture wars that have been raging in the corridors of U.S. education, religion and the workplace have now broken out in the military. Col. Hallums, a soldier of the Old School, had been plenty good enough to lead men into deadly combat and win medals of valor. But, supporters say, he didn't pass muster with the "weenie" element of the modern Army. Too gruff, blunt and demanding for the academics around him; too proud of his warrior past. He was, they charge, drummed out of the service for being politically incorrect.

Detractors have another version. They say the colonel was a bullying loudmouth who went out of his way to offend and humiliate certain of his subordinates. He treated his post like an infantry command, running roughshod over the academy's academic mission. In the end, critics say Col. Hallums proved himself a macho, oafish officer out of step with the reality of a peacetime Army whose purpose is now more complicated than storming a machine-gun nest — and whose culture now includes technicians and managers as well as warriors like himself.

More neutral observers wonder whether he wasn't simply what one calls "the wrong man for the wrong times." But neutral observers are hard to find.

"What West Point did to Col. Hallums is sordid," says retired Col. Robert Seigle, an ardent supporter of the colonel. But Brig. Gen. Fletcher M. Lamkin Jr., dean of West Point's academic board, defends the academy's decision, saying Col. Hallums was undone by his style, not his politics. "Abusive leadership has no place in the Army," the general says.

The polarized sides in this fracas do agree on one thing: The culture war isn't over, and it is a fight for the Army's soul and future. Indeed, the West Point skirmish follows a host of sexual abuse and harassment charges that have bedeviled the military in recent months. In one high-profile case involving a number of drill sergeants at Aberdeen, Md., affairs took an even more divisive turn this week when four female soldiers recanted rape allegations against superiors — saying they had been pressured by overzealous Army investigators.

Moreover, the Hallums matter, and its handling, points to a long-simmering debate within West Point itself. "In the last 30 years, West Point has had an intellectual crisis as to whether it's a military academy or an Ivy League college," says retired Lt. Gen. Richard Trefry, a West Point graduate and former inspector general of the Army who also has served as an academy adviser.

The bad blood left behind and the handling of the matter remain so controversial that few in the academy would speak on the record about it. But interviews with insiders, and details in a West Point investigator's report and scores of other government documents, paint the

Please Turn to Page A9, Column 1

An Officer Finds West Point a Minefield

Continued From First Page
picture of a culture war at West Point.

When this all began, Col. Hallums was seen as a solution, not a problem. In 1990, Col. Seigle, then commander of the 18th Aviation Brigade at Fort Bragg, N.C., wrote a fierce letter to West Point's commanders to complain that "for those of us out in the Army, the product you're putting out doesn't measure up." Specifically, he said the leadership department needed a genuine warrior in charge, not a mild academic in uniform.

Complaints from commanders of hot-shot combat brigades resonate in the Army. And Col. Seigle was articulating a frustration that had been bubbling within the Army's ranks for years. The criticism hit home at the academy, in the midst of its own soul-searching about, among other things, a rise in the flameout rate of West Point graduates who leave the Army. When an academy committee began looking for a chairman of what is formally called the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, it turned to Col. Hallums.

The colonel was known throughout the Army as a tough infantry commander from the West Point class of '66, on which the Vietnam War fell heavily. As a young lieutenant, he had fought in the battle of Hue and twice was decorated for valor. At age 24, he became one of the youngest company commanders in the elite 101st Airborne Division there.

A decade later, his brigade commander, one Col. Colin Powell, evaluated him as "a forceful, tough leader as well as a brilliant staff officer" with "a great enthusiasm and love for the Army." He called James Hallums a general in the making.

Col. Hallums's Army career included an unusual six additional tours in six different countries. He advised the military of El Salvador — and then went to Harvard to co-author a monograph critical of how the U.S. handled guerrilla war there. He led a sensitive mission in Honduras and then served on the front lines of the drug war in Bolivia.

When the West Point post came up, Col. Hallums recalls being "practically ordered" to take it. He was shipped off to Vanderbilt University to earn the doctorate he needed to burnish his academic credentials. He reported to the academy in the summer of 1995 for what normally would have been a posting of five years or more. The real plum: a brigadier general's rank upon retirement from West Point and the Army.

Enemy Territory

Col. Hallums, given his considerable command experience, figured he was ready for anything. Besides, he had bagged what seemed like a helpful degree, in sociology. But West Point's leadership department had few similarities to his familiar terrain.

Housed in the faux-Gothic fortress of

atmosphere and consensus management. Many of its permanent faculty members, though Army officers, are essentially tenured professors — and view themselves with the same independence. Col. Hallums was shocked by his initial meetings as the department prepared for fall 1995 classes. He recalls encountering what he considered "a visceral antimilitary feeling."

Other arrivals from the regular Army felt the same way. Col. Michael Anderson, a senior instructor who had led an infantry battalion at Fort Lewis, Wash., was stunned to hear his experiences derided by some academics as mere war stories. "I was told that professional experiences I had in my operational assignments had no place in the leadership course I taught," he later wrote in a memorandum to Brig. Gen. Lamkin, the dean.

Col. Hallums set out, in his words, "to bring the department back into the Army." This proved no simple matter. Small and energetic, his normal communication is a bellow—a trait some faculty interpreted as macho aggressiveness. He ended the practice of calling superiors by their first names; he wanted to be addressed as "Colonel Hallums." On the first day of classes, he ordered officers to wear their "Class A" uniforms, the equivalent of business suits; before, they had dressed in military sweaters and slacks.

The sniping began soon enough. Col. Anderson, in his memo to Gen. Lamkin, said some officers cracked "that Col. Hallums just wanted to show off his war medals and display the contrast with the rest of the faculty with little to no combat experience." Another groused that Col. Hallums, in his insistence on more formal uniforms, "obviously had no identity outside the military," according to a memo by Lt. Col. Randall Chase that became part of the investigation. He is a career artilleryman and another department member.

The new chairman also irked faculty members by judging them, in part, by their fitness for combat, viewing this as relevant to their role of training future military leaders. At age 53, he was a hard-body fitness nut whose two-hour daily regime alternated weightlifting with running. He amused himself by showing others he could undulate chest muscles beneath his shirt.

Several younger officers welcomed this new approach, especially those fresh from combat units. Maj. Christopher Putko, a former battery commander in the premier 82nd Airborne Division, based at Fort Bragg, later told investigators in a written statement that the new chairman had been "a breath of fresh air" in a department mocked by other faculty as "touchy-feely."

Academics Strike Back

But the handful of lieutenant colonels who served as permanent faculty were appalled — and began resisting. Among these senior officers, one in particular stood out: Michael Hughes, who taught psychology and counseling after an earlier

stint in the infantry, had embarked on a military career in counseling. In a memo written during the investigation, Lt. Col. Chase noted that at one autumn meeting Lt. Col. Hughes said "someone needed to tell Col. Hallums that this was not his department, but theirs and the academy's." (Lt. Col. Hughes, like all of Col. Hallums's departmental critics, declined to be interviewed for this story.)

Meanwhile, Col. Hallums gave his subordinates some ammunition. He called in the department's civilian female teachers and asked if they had any romantic entanglements he should know about. Early in September, Barbara Hunter later recalled, the colonel told her she was expected to serve at West Point "for the long haul and that I couldn't be expected to get married and move." Unaware that she was divorced, the colonel, a married man with three daughters, told her he thought people who divorce lack commitment. A few days later, Col. Hallums had a similar conversation with civilian professor Patricia Rooney.

One senior faculty member, Lt. Col. Gayle Watkins, learned of these conversations and criticized them. Col. Hallums sent an apology down the chain of command; he says he doesn't recall hearing any other objections to his behavior during the entire academic year. But there would be some, dumped in one load at the end of the year. "I didn't realize they were keeping book on me," he later said.

On Sept. 8, Col. Hallums, while working out, learned from a junior faculty member, Special Forces Capt. Kevin Berry, that the lieutenant colonels were being openly critical of him. Such dissent was common in the old leadership department, but Col. Hallums saw it as improper in a military unit — his unit. He told his executive officer, Lt. Col. Chase, that senior faculty members "were saying things that in any unit he had ever been in would have been seen as disloyal," the XO later wrote in a memorandum.

Col. Anderson, who as the department's electives director supervised several of the dissident lieutenant colonels, tried to head off the looming confrontation between the chairman and faculty. On Sept. 29, he sent a blunt warning memo to Lt. Col. Hughes and others that Col. Hallums wasn't to be trifled with: "He does not want to be one of your colleagues," the memo said.

More provocatively, Col. Hallums insisted the department's attitude, not his, must change. In January, he found a line of cadets waiting to file course change slips. What branch are you going into, he asked one. "Infantry," came the answer. Responded a pleased Col. Hallums: "Go to the head of the line."

But he confounded those who would later portray him as sexist by selecting a woman, Maj. Deirdre Dixon, for a departmental plum: directing its core course on military leadership. It was, Col. Anderson later noted, a position that "traditionally goes to the most dynamic officer in the department." Maj. Dixon herself was a

GI museums may be history

**By Wilson W. McKinney
and Gary Martin**
Express-News Staff Writers

A little-noticed provision in a bill to enact President Bush's defense spending cuts would strip military museums nationwide of millions of dollars and virtually close all five such facilities at San Antonio bases.

At least a dozen civilian jobs would be lost here.

Three of those museums played major roles in the city's 50th anniversary commemoration of World War II, both with their own exhibits and by supporting displays at the Witte Museum and San Antonio Museum of Art.

Vehicles from the Fort Sam Houston Museum often are seen in Fiesta parades and other public events.

"I see this legislation as a slap in the face of every person who has ever served in the armed forces or who cares about the history of this nation's armed forces," said Joan

**“ Thank you,
Sergeant Jones, for
storming ashore on
Omaha Beach on D-
Day. Please pay \$5 to
see the uniform you
wore that day. ”**

**— Joan Gaither,
Fort Sam group chief**

Gaither, president of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Fort Sam Houston.

"(The bill) says, 'Your suffering and sacrifice are no longer important. We are going to save money by discarding your history,'" she said.

President Bush is seeking to cut

See **MILITARY/14A**

Military museums in S.A. could be history

Continued from 1A

\$4 billion in military spending by slashing various budgeted items.

Although Bush did not target funding for existing military museums, legislation sponsored by U.S. Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., contains a provision that would eliminate funding for the facilities.

"If it is passed, a lot of museums would go out of business," said Cody Phillips, acting chief curator for the Army.

Phillips said the provisions would cut more than \$8.4 million to 63 Army museums nationwide.

In Texas, \$900,000 would be slashed for 12 Army museums, including the Army Medical Museum at Fort Sam Houston and the Fort Sam Houston Museum.

Military museums receive about 85 percent to 90 percent of their funding through congressional appropriation. The remaining revenue come from concession sales or recreation and morale funds, or from private sources.

The elimination of appropriated funding at the Fort Sam Houston facilities would mean a loss of \$380,000 and 12 civilian jobs, Phillips said.

"If this bill is passed, the two museums at Fort Sam would have to close. You can't take away 90 percent of their money, plus lose

funding for the staff, and stay open," Phillips said.

"The legislation does not say what is to become of the artifact collections of the museum," said John Manguso, curator of the Fort Sam Houston Museum.

"We have about 5,000 artifacts and several hundred cubic feet of archival and photographic materials," he said.

The museum's collections are valued at more than \$1.5 million, he said, and most items cannot be replaced.

"You can't just lock up the front door and walk away from these artifacts," Manguso said. "They require carefully controlled environmental conditions and security."

"If you just leave them, they deteriorate and will soon cease to exist."

Manguso said the Defense Department is legally responsible for the care and preservation of historical artifacts in its custody, many of which were donations from private individuals or transfers from other agencies.

Budgeted expenses for Air Force, Navy and Marine museums were not immediately available. And while there are no Navy or Marine museums in Texas, the provision in Byrd's bill would virtually close the History and Traditions museums at Lackland AFB

"You can't just lock up the front door and walk away from these artifacts. They require carefully controlled environmental conditions and security. This is the new style for quote blocks starting on June 3."

— John Manguso, curator of the Fort Sam Houston Museum

and the related USAF Security Police Museum.

The History and Traditions Museum, used extensively as a resource for basic trainees at the Lackland Military Training center, has an operations and maintenance budget of almost \$100,000 a year, base spokeswoman Irene Witt said.

That money covers only civilian payroll, maintenance of items in the collections and utilities, she said, including some \$2,000 for utilities at the Security Police Museum, the only funding that facility gets.

The money cannot be used for acquisition of new items or modification of the building housing the museum, Witt said.

In common with other military museums, a foundation helps fund new exhibits and donations are re-

lied upon to augment the collections. Volunteers do a lot of the work under the direction of museum professionals.

Any cutoff of the appropriated funds to run the museums would force a reassessment, Witt said.

"We would make every effort to continue operating," she said.

Also affected would be the Hangar 9 Edward H. White II Memorial Museum at Brooks AFB and an Air Force museum at Dyess AFB near Abilene.

Other affected Army museums include four at Fort Bliss in El Paso.

Among that group is the Replica Museum, an almost-life-size frontier adobe fort, and two at Fort Hood.

Gaither has not been the only one to point out that military museums provide a link between the

military and the public — especially military veterans.

The society she heads, a private, non-profit organization dedicated to supporting the Fort Sam Houston Museum and preserving the heritage and historic structures on the post, is typical in many ways of the non-governmental support received by most military museums.

When Hangar 9 — which was built at Brooks Field in 1917 — was restored in 1970 to house collections focusing on the history of flight medicine, a committee of prominent San Antonians raised \$100,000 or more to pay for the restoration.

The Army Medical Department Museum, also the beneficiary of civilian support, occupies a 3-year-old building on Fort Sam Houston constructed with \$2.3 million raised by a foundation.

That group currently is in the middle of raising a similar amount of private funding for Phase II of the building project.

Once completed, the buildings are turned over to the Army.

About 250,000 visitors tour Fort Sam Houston each year, Manguso estimates. Many of those also visit the museums on post.

Witt said 33,000 guests registered last year at Lackland's History and Traditions Museum.

Congressional staffers said the

museum cuts in the Senate bill were not in the House version. The provision will become a conference committee item when senators and representatives meet to iron out differences in the two pieces of legislation.

One congressional staffer said the provision in the bill would force the military museums to charge admission fees or seek increases in the recreation funds, which come from a percentage charge for goods at military commissaries.

Gaither's response to that suggestion was heated.

"Thank you, Sergeant Jones, for storming ashore on Omaha Beach on D-Day," she said. "Please pay \$5 to see the uniform you wore that historic day."

Phillips said the suggested alternate avenues to fund military museums were unworkable.

First of all, he said federal law prevents the museums from charging or collecting admission fees at their facilities. Second, he said, is that the facilities have been paid for by tax dollars to educate personnel.

"We don't charge soldiers for every bullet they shoot on a firing range. Why would we charge them for part of their education?" Phillips asked.



Retiring General Honored

Lt. Gen. and Mrs. Carl H. Jark were honored Thursday night at a Chamber of Commerce dinner. Gen. Jark, a 35-year Army veteran, retired Friday as commanding general of the Fourth Army, headquartered at Fort Sam Houston. The Jarks will continue to reside in San Antonio.

STAFF PHOTO



Lt. Gen. Jark's Retirement Ends 35-Year Career



IAL DUTY—Lt. Gen. Carl H. Jark, right, gives the colors to U.S. Continental Army Command's Commanding Gen. Hugh P. Harris for presentation to Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier Jr., next to Jark, during a retirement ceremony Friday. Colglazier succeeds Jark as the commanding general of Fourth U.S. Army, which has headquarters here at Fort Sam Houston.—Staff Photo.

One of San Antonio's most popular military commanders, Lt. Gen. Carl H. Jark, closed a 35-year military career Friday afternoon in retirement ceremonies at Headquarters Fourth Army, Fort Sam Houston.

Commanding general of the Fourth U.S. Army since March 1, 1962, Jark inspected the troops for the last time, was decorated by Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, vice chief of staff of the U.S. Army and then turned his post over to Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier Jr.

Jark, a native of Leigh, Neb., and his wife will continue to live in San Antonio, where he has been an active community leader during the past two years.

In retirement ceremonies Friday morning, Brig. Gen. Charles H. White Jr., Fourth U.S. Army chief of staff, also retired along with five other officers and two enlisted men. White had served 30 years.

Those retiring included Col. Henry Neilson, headquarters commandant and commander of the Fourth Army Special Troops; Col. Charles M. Pack, Fourth Army deputy chief of staff for intelligence; Col. Thomas R. Davis, chief of the Army Reserve Division; Alan A. Chevalier, operations officer of the National Guard Division of the Fourth Army deputy chief of staff for reserve forces; and Lt. Col. Richard B. Bridges, chief of the reconnaissance weather branch in the Fourth Army intelligence office.

Enlisted men retiring were M. Sgt. Curtis Babineaux, senior staff duty noncommissioned officer in the Army chief of

staff's office, and M. Sgt. Harold O. Taylor, administration supervision in the National Guard Division.

Two other officers who also ended careers Friday were Lt. Col. Sterlin C. Moore, inspector-liaison officer in the ROTC division of the Fourth Army deputy chief of staff, and Col. Frederic Carson Cook, deputy commander of Fort Sam Houston.

200,000 Welcome President



President Johnson, followed by Lady Bird, smiles as he walks past greeting hula dancers at airport.

®