STATE OF ARIZONA
MILITARY DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
747 WEST VAN BUREN STREET
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

11 December 1953

Honorable Howard Pyle
Governor, State of Arizona
State House
Phoenix, Arizona

Dear Governor Pyle:

Since Mrs. Bateman called me Wednesday, regarding new demand of the local office of the Corps of Engineers for a commitment on Fort Huachuca, I have, when possible, attempted to locate bits and pieces that would help in working out this crossword puzzle.

In the mail this morning I received a reference slip from Mrs. Bateman, together with copy of letter from local office of the Corps of Engineers, dated 6 October 1953. Their letter refers to another letter from their office dated 2 October 1952 and, in addition, quotes from your answer of 22 October 1952.

I have gone over Chapter 44, Session Laws of 1952, referred to in 1952 Cumulative Supplement to State Code in two places, Sections 11-202 and 64-237. Chapter 44 certainly gives you the authority to execute the necessary instruments of conveyance. The Corps of Engineers and Sixth Army were familiar with the provisions of this Chapter 44, prior to 2 October 1952, as subject chapter was approved by you 13 March 1952.

It may be that I am wrong, but way in the back of my mind there is a feeble thought trying to emerge, telling me that a letter was sent from your office early last year, presumably shortly after you signed the bill (Chap. 44), either to the local office of the Corps of Engineers or to the Sixth Army. The reason why I say this is because I was able to glance at a letter in May or June of last year which, in effect, said no one was to take action on turnover by State of Fort Huachuca to Federal Government. Your file can determine what action was taken.

This letter of 6 October 1952 is confusing to me. Apparently Fort Huachuca is wanted, but without the terms you impose, specifically "providing the United States of America, desires the retaining of Fort Huachuca, Arizona, as an active installation." The paragraph at bottom of first page determines this by saying, "Fort Huachuca has been declared inactive because of the current world situation rather than being declared surplus." Why does Mr. Farrington say that, unless it was recommended that it be declared surplus to the needs of Sixth Army.

Honorable Howard Pyle 11 December 1953

What is meant by the language used at top of second page? Various approvals have been secured, assuming Arizona will donate Fort Huachuca. Who approved what is not stated.

Then there is a quote from the Sixth Army indicating the Department of the Army includes Fort Huachuca in a long range mission. The three words used as they are--long range mission--leaves a lot to be desired in the way of information you can act upon.

The lid is put on the jar completely in the last sentence of the last paragraph of letter 6 October 1953. Quote, "its future use not presently foreseeable," end quote. What happened to the long range mission?

I would suggest that Sixth Army and the Corps of Engineers, one or both, be required to furnish you with the complete program of the Department of the Army insofar as Fort Huachuca is concerned. Also, request the Corps of Engineers to explain why a year passed since receipt of your proposal of 22 October 1952, and further, why it is necessary at this time to change your position.

In August 1952 they knew Fort Huachuca was going to close, so, in October 1952, they quote from Chapter 44, word for word, and ask the Fort be returned. You, knowing it was to be closed, acted as you did, which surprised them. I would not change your letter of 22 October 1952, unless it would be to add the words "or inactive" after the word active, so it would read "active or inactive installation."

I am sorry that I cannot help you more on this problem, but will do my utmost to assist in every way possible.

Respectfully yours,

Frank E. Fraser

FRANK E. FRASER
Brigadier General, NG Az
The Adjutant General