



# The President's Page



## THE AFTERMATH

WHEN the accredited representatives of the National Guard Association of the United States appeared before the Long Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee concerning the provisions of the then-pending Armed Forces Reserve Act, and recommended that the matter required further study before final action was taken, they realized that there would be rather sharp disagreement with the Association's position, on the part of those who desired that the measure should prevail, irrespective of the soundness of the Association's position and which, unquestionably, time would vindicate.

The National Guard Association, being essentially a democratic organization, organized and operating as a true town meeting—although there are those who would like to make it appear otherwise—nevertheless granted the right to all others to thoroughly and completely disagree with the position taken by the Association. At no time in connection with the hearings, or in connection with any other matter, had the National Guard Association criticized the other reserve components, impugned their motives, or remotely questioned whether those concerned voiced the sentiments of those for whom they presumed to speak or had a right to do so.

In marked contrast, however, is the testimony of Brigadier General E. A. Evans, former Executive Director of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, and of Major General Melvin J. Maas, USMCR-Retired and President of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association and Vice-President of the ROA, on the evening of 28 May 1952. It was all too evident that these officers were testifying in anger, and not only did they give utterance to sentiments which better would have been left unsaid, but it would have been far better for them, and for all concerned, had they waited until their anger had cooled and permitted logic and reason to govern their statements. They served no purpose whatsoever, and easily could have brought about a breach in the friendly relations which heretofore have existed among the several reserve associations.

The National Guard Association has no apologies to make, and is not only supremely confident that the stand which it took will be vindicated, but is being justified by the sober reflection of not only the Senate Committee, but of eminent military analysts of the metropolitan Press. The National Guard was not willing to be a party to selling the Country and the Congress on the idea that they would be the recipient of a so-called "Magna Charta" where the Nation's reserve forces were concerned, when the reverse was true, nor was it willing to be a party to the establishment of a reserve system which sold veterans down the river by placing them in jeopardy again and again while thousands of others would continue to evade any military service or liability. Neither would it concede that the Armed Forces Reserve Act could stand without the establishment of a system of universal military training and service. On 30 July 1951, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Personnel, stated before the Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee on Civilian Compo-

nents that the Armed Forces Reserve Bill which was being presented to it at that time, and the UMT&S Act, were twin foundation stones in a sound structure of National Security . . . that the two were inseparable and one could not be effective without the other. A year later, testifying before the Long Subcommittee, she and others contended that the Bill should be enacted, whether we have universal military training and service or not, and that the Bill had been so designed that it would meet the requirements under either contingency.

We do not agree with the Assistant Secretary of Defense and others that the Armed Forces Reserve Act will work without UMT&S, and we do not see how the claim that it will do so, jibes with the earlier contention that the two are inseparable. Others since have taken a similar view. In its report to the Senate, No. 1725, the Long Subcommittee held that specific events which happened after the House Committee approved the Bill, profoundly affected certain provisions of the Bill. The Committee further stated that it was unable to see that there would be any meaningful and clearly defined line of demarcation between the Ready and the Standby Reserve, and that there was no common understanding among the several Services as to even the relative magnitude of the Ready Reserve or its functional composition. The Committee further contended that a basic fallacy of the Bill was that liability for active service was related to whether the emergency had been declared by the President or by the Congress, and that the Bill did not solve the problems developed during the Korean recall program.

Nationally known military analysts have contended that the Bill is not a "Magna Charta" for the Reserves. Mr. Walter Millis of the New York "Herald-Tribune," writing under date of 16 July, stated that this Nation is still a long way from a sound military manpower policy, although the new Armed Forces Reserve Act may offer at least a foundation on which it might be possible to build, and that the Act will give us a real and substantial filing-case Army, but most of it will remain in the filing cases. He further contended that our real "Ready Reserve" is the National Guard, formed and equipped, in units immediately mobilizable, and to a lesser extent, the Organized Reserve, formed but equipped sketchily, if at all. He contended that few of the real questions have been answered either equitably or safely. Even Mr. Hanson Baldwin of the New York "Times," never a friend of the Guard, and a consistent advocate of Federalization of the Guard, commented at length on 15 July as to faults in the Armed Forces Reserve Act, and stated that the force ready to fight remains largely names on a mailing list, and that the Act originally was a companion measure to UMT, and that one without the other was useless; that the Act tries to kill two birds with one stone and misses both. Surprisingly enough, and especially to the National Guard, Mr. Baldwin observed that a completely Federalized National Guard merged with the Army and Air Force Reserve, with no check-rein held

(Please turn to page 21)

## THE National Guardian



Official Publication of the National Guard Association of the United States, 400 Sixth Street, N. W., Washington 1, D. C.  
Phone: District 0341 TWX: WA 208

Publication Office  
Telegraph Press Bldg.,  
Harrisburg, Penna.

September, 1952 . . . . . Vol. 6, No. 7

General offices: Stewart Bldg., 400 Sixth St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C. Entered as second class matter on September 1, 1947, at the post office at Harrisburg, Pa., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Domestic subscriptions: \$1.50 per year to members of the National Guard Assn. of the U. S.; \$3.00 per year to non-members (Foreign and Canada \$3.50).

HOME DELIVERY TO NATIONAL GUARD ENLISTED MEN, \$2.50 PER SUBSCRIPTION.

SPECIAL RATES TO N. G. UNITS FOR BULK SUBSCRIPTIONS TO ONE ADDRESS.

11 to 50 subscriptions, \$2.00 per subscription.  
51 to 100 subscriptions, \$1.75 per subscription.  
101 or more subscriptions, \$1.50 per subscription.  
Single copies, 25c.

Manuscripts and pictures should be addressed to the Editorial Office. Unsolicited manuscripts must be accompanied by return postage, and no responsibility is assumed for their safe handling.

Address changes should be forwarded to Circulation Dept., the National Guardsman, Stewart Bldg., 400 Sixth St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C. PLEASE INCLUDE YOUR OLD ADDRESS WHEN REQUESTING CHANGE TO NEW ADDRESS.

Copyright, 1952, The National Guard Assn. of the United States. All rights reserved.

### NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

#### OFFICERS

Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, President  
Maj. Gen. Leo M. Kreber, Vice-President  
Brig. Gen. F. M. Waterbury, Secretary  
Maj. Gen. W. H. Abendroth, Treasurer

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION

Maj. Gen. E. J. Stackpole, Chairman  
Maj. Gen. Leo M. Kreber, Vice-Chairman  
Maj. Gen. Leo M. Boyle Maj. Gen. K. L. Berry  
Maj. Gen. Sumter L. Lowry Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord  
Maj. Gen. W. H. Harrison, Jr. Brig. Gen. J. Wallace West  
Brig. Gen. Stanford W. Gregory

#### EXECUTIVE STAFF

THE NATIONAL GUARDSMAN  
Allan G. Crist, Executive Editor  
C. William Evans, Associate Editor

## dear guardsmen:

We like to be light-hearted in what we say in this space every month, but there come times when sadness intrudes.

It was less than two years ago—December, 1950—when, in this same column, we welcomed a new member to our small magazine family: Captain Duane E. Lund, a flight leader in North Dakota's 178th Ftr. Sq.

A veteran of the Ninth Air Force—and of six months' imprisonment in Germany after being felled by flak—Duane came to us with a solid background of journalistic training in radio, AP, and as PIO for the Guard in North Dakota. He slid right into the Associate Editor's chair as though it had been made for him, waded through heaps of manuscripts, batted-out pages of copy in a breeze, and in no time at all, became a beloved "member of the family"—the kind of guy who couldn't possibly have an enemy.

But in a short four months, the mobilization whistle blew for the 178th, and for Duane, as it has blown for many others. We spent his last Washington evening together "on the town," then said our farewells. Intermittent correspondence maintained a connection up to the time of Exercise LONG HORN last Spring, then silence. Duane's chair was waiting for him upon expiration of his term of EAD in another few months; we tried to get in touch with him. There was no reply.

The explanation came not long ago in a terse telegram: Captain Duane E. Lund had died in Letterman Army Hospital, San Francisco, of natural causes at the age of 29. There are reasons for believing Duane knew the final deadline he had to meet; that he blanked himself out from contact with friends, in order to spare them the pain of foreknowing his appointment with Death.

We miss him.

THE STAFF

## contents

The President's Page . . . . .	Inside Front Cover
Tactical Control—A New Mission for the ANG . . . . .	2
Washington Report . . . . .	4
Army School Bells Ring for Guardsmen . . . . .	6
The Story of the Bomber . . . . .	10
In Combat . . . in Korea . . . . .	17
Pentagon Paragraphs . . . . .	18
Kilroy's Commanding Officer . . . . .	21
Technical & Tactical . . . . .	22
Posting the Guard . . . . .	24
Hollywood Trains Cameras on National Guard . . . . .	29
Sound Off! . . . . .	30
As We See It . . . . .	Inside Back Cover

## our cover

Time took a backward step—12 years backward, as a matter of fact—in order to make this month's cover photo. The scene (M1918 helmets, M1903 Springfield) is 1940, but it was "shot" in 1952. It's from the opening sequence of the Republic motion picture, "Thunderbirds," a full-scale Hollywood production about the National Guard, that will show in theaters across the land this Fall. There's more about it, inside this issue. (Photo Copyright, Republic Productions, Inc.)