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ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the nature of civil-military relations is integral to a state’s elite social reproduction. It is a riposte to a formidable orthodoxy, at the center of which lies Samuel Huntington's normal theory. Whereas Huntington proposed that a military’s obedience to civilian authority depended upon its officer corps' professional isolation from the society which raised it, this work contends that the acceptable patterns of civil-military relations in the United States, specifically, have always reflected the native dispositions and sociality of the same provincial elite families who together have led the country’s political and military affairs. To build its case, this thesis employs a collective biographic approach guided by Pierre Bourdieus social reproduction paradigm to reveal the elite origins and social interactions of the 67 army officers commissioned in 1884, a cohort whose career spanned the period Huntington identified as the U.S. Army's professionalizing confinement from American society. By design, this project bridges the macro and micro levels of analysis. Areas of emphasis thus include the historical evolution of commissioning practices as coterminous aspects of military professionalization and American state development, as well as the interlinkages between social capital formation and the proliferation of norms extending individual, group, and intergenerational family advantages. This dissertation concludes at the individual level with an historical case study of the U.S. Senate's disposal in 1917 of cohort member Colonel Carl Reichmann, the U.S. Army's most senior German-born officer, on charges he harbored German sympathies. This case reveals that Reichmann owed his exoneration and subsequent reassignment to counter-subversive operations to his social capital, a durable network of interrelated civilian and military relationships that helped to compurgate an otherwise unpardonable wartime indiscretion. Whereas orthodox approaches typically examine officers in isolation, this dissertation demonstrates that the character of a state’s civil-military relations manifests in its commissioning practices, which themselves reflect the social structure of political and military power. The result is an improved socio-cultural approach that better explains civil-military relations more generally, beyond the limits of the unique American case.
PREFACE

In its purest sense, theories of civil-military relations ponder the best means of maintaining civilian control of armed forces, especially in democracies. Popular interest in the topic rapidly developed in the late 1950s with the publication of Samuel Huntington’s *The Soldier and the State*, followed a few years later by Morris Janowitz’ *The Professional Soldier*. While the two books employed different methods and offered opposing remedies, they both pointed to similarly alarming trends in the expansion of the American defense sector or to changing social factors in recruitment as potentially jeopardizing civilian control. More importantly, both helped to popularize conceptual biases about military service and those who perform it, and have further helped to normalize our understanding of civilians and soldiers as occupying distinctly separate and innately antagonistic spheres of activity. Since then, it is safe to say more ink has been spilt on the subject of American civil-military relations than in any other country. And almost 60 years later, American scholars and pundits still regularly point to portents of civil-military breakdowns.

What makes this activity all the more remarkable, though, is that none of their fears have ever materialized. In fact, for all this air of pending danger, the larger interactions between uniformed and civilian leaders in the United States have been amongst the most stable in the world for over 200 years, despite continual amendments to the country’s institutions and changes to its social fabric. Moreover, there is no evidence that constant reminders of the dangers of posed by breaches in civil-military etiquette have kept the peace between soldiers and civilians. Nonetheless, the civil-military relations corpus has long-since moved away from examining civilian control to claim a wider range of social and behavioral themes, like military professionalism, culture, psychology, recruitment, families, gender issues, decision-making, or veteran affairs, usually when these topics intersect with some aspect of the broader public. But with each new turn, misleading assumptions about the nature of civil-military relations have remained largely intact and become more deeply embedded in our understanding of the phenomenon.
I am hardly the first to question the insufficiencies of the classical civil-military relations texts, or their assumptions about the natures of soldiers and civilians. Both works invited some controversy from the day they were published, and occasionally still do. I contend, however, that earlier challenges to these theories failed to take root because they either lacked sufficient evidence, or they failed to employ intellectual frameworks that elegantly articulated any competing possibility in a reproducible manner. This thesis does one better by re-examining the so-called civil-military problematique within the tested social reproduction frameworks conceived by Pierre Bourdieu. Put very simply, it proposes that the organization of national armies and the selection of those who lead them are one-for-one reflections of a nation’s dominant dispositions. While armies certainly have their own institutional cultures, these again take their cues from the nation’s dominant cultural and mental structures in which they are seated. This transposition is not imposed from above, *per se*, or by well-meaning Cassandras. Instead, it is a natural consequence of peopling the military field with those we recognize as possessing a state’s dominant dispositions, facilitated by the generation of exclusive, structurally conforming commissioning practices. In other words, the character of a state’s civil-military relations develops organically in a reflection of the groups from which its leaders are recruited.

I have taken strains to avoid judging these social practices, partly to avoid the debates on politics and etiquette such opinions invite, but also because I consider that doing so is far more distracting than structurally revealing. To me, a given set of commissioning practices is merely one consequence out of a great many possible outcomes as people go about institutionalizing a highly complex and broadly preferred order to social life, and nothing more. That said, in light of on-going public disputes over identity, power, and privilege – concepts which, themselves, are at once plastic and charged – I feel compelled to explain some terms of reference to preempt charges of cynicism. My use of ‘elite’ and ‘elites,’ for example, is meant in a broadly relative sense to describe dominant individuals, groups, and ideas. Their use implies nothing more sinister is at work. Indeed, my approach in this thesis directly challenges those who understand elites as composing a conveniently monolithic and changeless hierarchy.
Similarly, I use ‘provincial’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ spatially rather than qualitatively as a means of locating those individuals, groups, and ideas, within a broader structure of relationships. Readers also will note I use the terms ‘privilege’ and ‘advantage’ interchangeably, and I do so as shorthand for the profits accruing from beneficial relations. Again, my intent here is not to judge outcomes. Finally, international readers may find my use of the demonym ‘American’ as uncomfortably narrow. Apart from remaining the most broadly recognized term for a citizen of the United States, this thesis is an historical work set in a period when to be recognized as an American meant a great deal to those claiming the title. These included ‘my officers,’ as I have come to call them, who would not have contemplated any other appellation.

During the 19th century, there were three means of receiving a commission in the U.S. Army: graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York; direct appointment from civil life; and selection from the ranks or, what was then termed ‘from the army.’ While not strictly intended at its founding in 1802, throughout the 19th century West Point commissions steadily became accepted as the more prestigious, and by the 1870s Congress had officially recognized the academy as the nation’s preferred commissioning source. As subtle context, I have identified West Point graduates by their graduation year on their first mention in the text, using the two-digit year for 19th century graduates (e.g., USMA ’84), and the four-digit year for those graduating in the 20th century and beyond (e.g., USMA 1916). The same convention applies to graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy (e.g., USNA ’64).

It has taken a long time in getting here. In that space, I have come to discover what all doctoral students learn: that, like Jacob Marley’s chains, the dissertation is a special torment of one’s own making. The more deeply one invests in the effort, the more one daydreams there were easier ways to design the project, collect the data, and structure the argument, all of which would have sped completion. Nevertheless, it has also remained hard to stick the proverbial fork in it, so frequently tempted have I been to dig for more evidence, or chase another citation, or rewrite a paragraph for the umpteenth time.

I know for certain that I could not have undertaken, let alone conceived this work as a younger man. I lacked the time and the discipline to see it through, as well as insights accrued
through countless personal relationships and observations, at home and abroad. That said, early on I was fortunate to have studied under some truly remarkable scholars, the foremost being Dr. Linda Levy Peck and the late Drs. Gunther Rothenberg and Gordon Mork at Purdue University, as well as Dr. Karen Rastler and Dr. William R. Thompson at Indiana University. Each inspired me by their examples in the classroom and by their scholarship. I also count myself lucky to have worked alongside some wonderfully talented scholars, including my old friend and colleague Dr. Wayne R. Austerman, a deadly shot, a first-rate historian, and a master story teller in any form. This project started life at the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where I concluded a long and varied military career by teaching strategy and policy to senior officers and government civilians. There, I was quite happy to have fallen into the orbits of Dr. Jerry Comello, Professor Chuck Allen, Dr. Larry Goodson, Dr. Stephen Gerras, Dr. Patrick Bratton, Dr. Michael Neiberg, Dr. Rob Citino, and the late Dr. Paul Jussel. I will remain forever grateful to each for their fellowship and encouragement, but more importantly for their pointed critiques and for patiently indulging me in seemingly endless theoretical discussions. I am especially indebted to Dr. Frank Jones, a consummate scholar/practitioner, a living catalog of social science literature, and an invaluable sounding board.

To engage critically, not only with the texts but also with learned colleagues, is foundational to good scholarship. For this reason, I particularly thank my examiners, Dr. Adrian Gregory of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Dr. Dan Todman of Queen Mary University of London, whose thoughtful insights during a most productive and thoroughly enjoyable viva helped me to further sharpen my analysis. Above all, I am grateful to my thesis supervisors, Dr. Robert Foley and Dr. Helen McCartney, both of King’s College London. Bob and Helen have shared my shackles patiently and with good humor, all the while juggling the pressing demands of teaching, service, scholarship, and – most importantly – parenting. Truly, this work would not have been realized without their sponsorship and guidance. If this thesis is found lacking in any way, it is not for want of excellent counsel, but rather my inability to deliver.
There is no single repository for the biographic information needed to produce this thesis, and thus creating a coherent picture of the lives of my 67 army officers and their families has been an indescribably awesome task. In addition to scouring the official registers and rolls, it involved countless hours mining for fragments in genealogies, census returns, local histories, school catalogs, city directories, membership lists, gazetteers, newspaper articles, obituaries, photographs, and the like, usually with little more than intuition to guide me. Where conventional manuscript collections did exist, my work would have been impossible to undertake without the help of a great many professionals and volunteers around the country and overseas. Close to home, the late Dr. Richard Sommers, ably assisted by Rich Baker, directed me to important manuscript collections at the U.S. Army Historical and Education Center (USAHEC) and elsewhere. When I was still teaching at the War College, I was happy to work with talented interns Douglas Steinberg, who helped me locate sources on WWI training camps, and Andrew Boynton, who helped to translate some highly idiomatic German texts. Special collections librarians Elaine McConnell, Suzanne Christoff, Susan Lintelmann, and Alicia Maudlin of the U.S. Military Academy Library hosted a first-class research visit, and during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown of 2020 they went the extra mile to locate and send addition material to me on short notice. Cecily Marcus and Kate Hudja of the Elmer Anderson Library at the University of Minnesota were equally gracious in hosting my access to the Carl Reichmann Papers. Others included Adam Berenbak and Brian McLaughlin of the National Archives and Record Administration; Senate Historian Don Ritchie; James Stack of the University of Washington; Daniel Burniston of the University of South Dakota; Ronald Lee of the Tennessee State Library and Archives; Pat Medert, of the Ross County Historical Society in Chillicothe, Ohio; Nelson Newcombe and Woody Bentley of the National Sojourners, Inc.; Jose Marrero, Sr., of Fort Leavenworth’s Hancock Lodge 311; and Corps Borussia Tübingen, especially Stephan Biastoch, Jörg Hartmann, Clemens Wrzodek, and Malte Husemann, who provided materials on Carl Reichmann’s student days. I also wish to thank Francis Roudiez for generously providing materials and insights on his grandfather, 1884 cohort member Colonel Leon S. Roudiez.
Readers will detect quickly this study’s emphasis on the reproduction of family advantages, and I have been as privileged by the sustainment of loved ones during this seemingly interminable process. I am grateful for the supporting good humor and high-brow antics of my equally talented children, Grace, Connor, and Nellie. Each went from grade school to university over this project’s course, and each granted me the space to work on it. They also are a most collegially competitive bunch, and in that vein my oldest, Grace, has asked I give her special mention as the one child who actually read an entire draft chapter willingly, and made constructive remarks. Most of all, I could not have finished this without the loving forbearance of my wife, Jennifer. She patiently endured years of separation during my military service, only in our retirement to endure years more of my rambling on about my officers. To my family, I owe everything, and to each of them I dedicate this work.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction:
Challenging the Civil-Military Orthodoxy

Amongst the many controversies following the 2016 election of Donald J. Trump as the 45th President of the United States was his nomination of several senior military officers to key defense and foreign policy positions. These included the president’s pick for Secretary of Defense, retired Marine Corps General James Mattis, and his nominee to lead the Department of Homeland Security, retired Marine Corps General John Kelly, who later served as chief of staff. Trump also picked Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster (USMA 1984), a serving officer with a doctoral degree in history, as national security advisor when scandal forced his first choice, retired army Lieutenant General Michael Flynn, to step down. Even Trump’s nominee to head the Central Intelligence Agency, Kansas Congressman Mike Pompeo (USMA 1986), had been an Army officer during the Cold War. Pompeo later became Secretary of State.

Almost at once, Trump’s appointments drew fire from those who worried so many military men would have a dangerous influence on the president. One of the first to weigh in was foreign policy specialist Gordon Adams, a professor emeritus at American University. Adams roundly denounced the selection of so many military men to high office as ‘an unprecedented event in American history, a serious challenge to the tradition of civilian control over the military, and a danger to U.S. national security.’ Adams further exclaimed the appointments had violated ‘an important tradition of separation between civilians and the military in U.S. governance,’ after which he lambasted the officer corps for their ignorance of

1 On their first appearance in the text, 20th-century military (USMA) and naval academy (USNA) graduates are identified by four-digit years, and 19th-century graduates by two-digit years for easy identification. The 1884 graduates are only identified in this way in Chapter 3.
4 Gordon Adams, “If All You Have Is a Mattis, Everything Looks Like a Nail,” Foreignpolicy.com (02 Dec 2016).
statecraft, their record of failure in the Iraq and Afghan wars, and their promise to militarize policy. Carleton University political scientist Stephen Saideman likewise worried the appointments of so many men unfamiliar with civilian norms of decision-making and who had spent much of their careers living apart from society might erode civilian control of the military. \(^5\) Journalists piled on. Writing in the *Wall Street Journal*, Gordon Lubold, Damian Paletta, and Ben Kesling declared that by circling himself with so many generals Trump was ignoring ‘an important constitutional tenet of civilian oversight of the government.’\(^6\) Another journalist, Rebecca Berg, called the appointments ‘unusual,’ again invoking the supposed ‘longstanding [American] tradition of limited military influence over the president.’\(^7\)

In the United States, however, civilian control of the military is not a tradition, as Professor Adams wrote. Rather, it is the law. The U.S. Constitution clearly establishes civilian preeminence, as Lubold and his co-authors suggested. It does so by making the president the commander and chief, but also by giving the Congress specific powers to raise, regulate, and fund the military and naval establishments, as well as to legislate limits on their use in war and other emergencies.\(^8\) But nowhere does this charter limit military influence over the chief executive, much less define what constitutes such influence. In fact, most U.S. presidents have been veterans, themselves, starting with George Washington, who as a sitting president briefly donned his old uniform and took the field during the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794.\(^9\) In all, 25 of President Washington’s 44 successors had worn a uniform before they took the presidential oath, whereby they swore to ‘preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States’, as the U.S. Constitution requires.

---


8 U.S. Const., art. 2, sec. 2, cl. 1; U.S. Constitution, art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 11-16.

States’ to the best of their ability. Some were long-serving Regulars who commanded wartime armies, like Zachary Taylor, Ulysses Grant (USMA ‘43), and Dwight Eisenhower (USMA 1915). Others, such as Rutherford B. Hayes, Theodore Roosevelt, and George H.W. Bush, served for much shorter terms as Volunteers or, in the 20th century, as Reserve officers. Clearly, in the United States there is no tradition of a civil-military separation, so far as the presidency goes. Just as clearly, the oath’s injunction commands a president to use whatever resources necessary to defend the national way of life which, logically, might include appointing senior advisors with some military experience.

In addition to the presidency, quite a few veterans and active soldiers have held top-level posts in the federal government. Consider General of the Army George C. Marshall. As a five-star general, Marshal technically was bound to serve on active duty for life. Nevertheless, Marshal put on mufti to serve first as Secretary of State and later as Secretary of Defense in the administration of President Harry Truman, himself a veteran artillery officer who saw action in Europe during the First World War. Marshal was the first career soldier to lead the Department of State, but he was not the last. Retired General Alexander Haig (USMA 1947) held the post for President Ronald Reagan, and retired General Colin Powell did so for President George W. Bush. Also, both men had worked in the White House while still in uniform. Haig’s first tour was as an assistant national security advisor, and later he was chief of staff for Presidents Nixon and Ford; Powell also served as national security advisor, for Ronald Reagan. Reagan’s successor, George H.W. Bush, chose retired Air Force Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft (USMA 1947) as his national security advisor. It was Scowcroft’s second time in the post. The first time was under President Ford.

In more recent times, resistance to former soldiers serving in top government posts has spread to the selection of national intelligence leaders. In 2006, for instance, a ballyhoo erupted over Air Force General Michael Hayden’s nomination to head the Central Intelligence Agency.

---

(CIA). Although Hayden had just concluded a successful tour directing the National Security Agency, opposition lawmakers argued the general’s appointment to CIA threatened to extend the Pentagon’s dominion over the nation’s intelligence community, a community the military had in fact invented.\textsuperscript{11} Despite the kerfuffle, Hayden easily passed his Senate confirmation to become the seventh military man to lead the spy agency, including Eisenhower’s wartime chief of staff, General Walter Bedell Smith, who remained on active duty during his tenure, and Admiral Stansfield Turner (USNA 1946), who served in that role after he retired from the U.S. Navy.

As a philosophical point, Americans have in fact worried about undue military influence in policy since Independence. Nevertheless, from the very first Regular Army establishment up to the present day, the nation’s civilian leaders have constructed progressively larger and more intrusive national security institutions, all the while citing necessity. As a consequence, American presidents have always been subject to military influence of some degree or another, whether by their own personal experience or through their advisors. Moreover, countless thousands of soldiers and veterans have served together with civilians in posts of public service great and small, from the provincial to the federal, since the country’s founding. And yet in all this time, Congress has passed relatively few laws to make this civil-military separation sacrosanct. Even the National Defense Act of 1947, which barred recently serving Regular officers from becoming Secretary of Defense, has been amended once and waived twice to allow Generals Marshall and Mattis to serve in the top post, again citing necessity.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, the Senate again waived the bar in 2021, when Donald Trump’s successor, Joseph Biden, nominated retired General Lloyd Austin as Secretary of Defense, making the general the first African American to hold the position. And yes, once again the announcement

\textsuperscript{11} “Military Directors of the CIA,” CIA.gov (accessed 01 May 2017); “Bush Nominates Hayden as CIA Chief, Some Lawmakers Question Selection of Military Officer for Post,” CNN.com (accessed 09 May 2016).

gave writers the vapors. While the Constitution’s mandate for civilian control is unambiguous, this thumbnail history should suggest to us that wholly separating civilians and soldiers is much less a tradition than an ideal, and that this ideal is enshrined much less in the law than it is in theory. In fact, the very notion that civilians and soldiers occupy distinctly separate social spaces was only popularized some 60 years ago by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington, who then argued persuasively that maintaining that distance was both normal and necessary for maintaining civilian supremacy, even in the absence of evidence. And it is that theory which today informs a formidable orthodoxy.

This dissertation challenges that Huntingtonian orthodoxy by presenting civil-military relations as the product of elite social and cultural reproduction, following Pierre Bourdieu’s paradigm. It argues that in the natural course, national armies reflect the dominating mental and objective social structures that produce them, and that the exclusionary practices we understand as professionalization are integral to instantiating a nation’s peculiar social and symbolic order. This introductory chapter begins by summarizing the orthodox perspective of separation made popular by Huntington, and some of the conceptual flaws that undercut his theory’s strength. After presenting the thesis, the chapter goes on to review the uneven attempts by historians to rebut Huntington’s narrative, and reviews Bourdieu’s *Practice Theory* as it relates to military professionalization. This chapter concludes by discussing the dissertation’s methodology and sources, and by previewing the subsequent chapters.

1.1 The Orthodox View: *The Soldier and the State*

Writing at the beginning of the Cold War, Samuel Huntington proposed separating what he believed were two wholly distinct spheres of human activity, one military and the other civilian, in his political classic, *The Soldier and the State*. To Huntington, the brutal nature of warfighting meant the military sphere was naturally conservative, and that its

---

inhabitants thus shared an outlook – his ‘military mind’ – that was at once ‘pessimistic, collectivist, historically inclined, power-oriented, nationalistic, militaristic, pacifist and instrumentalist.’ This outlook, Huntington judged, was dangerously at odds with the predominantly liberal civilian sphere, especially in a newly nuclearized world in which decisions might be quick and existential. To skirt the danger, Huntington proposed something of a Devil’s bargain. Limiting the military’s influence in government, he decided, was necessary to strengthen civilian authority, preserve liberal government, and avoid bellicose foreign policies that risked the nation’s ultimate destruction. At the same time, Huntington suggested limiting civilian interference within the military’s professional jurisdiction would satisfy a distrusting officer corps’ ambitions by giving them space to maintain an effective national defense.

Huntington wrapped his theory in an imaginative frontier-era narrative of the army officer corps’ professionalization, inspired by two widely circulated texts. The first, Major General Emory Upton’s (USMA ‘61) Military Policy of the United States, was a scathing critique of Congress’ budgetary neglect and meddling in military affairs. The second was Colonel William Ganoe’s (USMA 1907) then-standard history of the U.S. Army, which further popularized Upton’s take. Huntington argued that after the Civil War, the army officer corps had betrayed their solid middle-class origins and hardened into an aristocracy inconsistent with democratic values and antagonizing to the public. Banished to their frontier garrisons, Huntington wrote, ‘the blanket hostility of American society isolated the armed forces politically, intellectually, socially and even physically from the community which they

---

Fortunately for the army, their so-called isolation proved fecund for the service’s professional development because, according to Huntington, it had inspired the officer corps to look inward and make important reforms that factored prominently in the army’s triumph in the First and Second World Wars. Professionalism, however, had come at a price: all those years spent in isolation had only deepened the officer corps’ distrust of civilians and had made them aliens in their own society. So, Huntington reasoned that if isolation from civilian society was important to a military’s professional health, then upholding that separation was key to sustaining an effective national defense under what he termed objective civilian control.19

As the first truly comprehensive theoretical approach to civil-military relations, Huntington’s presentation deserves great credit for engraining in the popular consciousness that in a democracy separation is the normal state of relations between civilians and the military, and this for two reasons. One, his narrative made a lasting impression on the historiography of the U.S. Army officer corps. As historian Edward Coffman wrote, Huntington’s forceful style and the relative immaturity of the military history field of the 1950s made Soldier and the State an important secondary source for historians just at time when the field was expanding.20 Many historians adopted Huntington’s interpretation on its face as the starting point for their own scholarship, including the late dean of American military historians, Russell Weigley, whose magisterial History of the United States Army replaced William Ganoe’s as the standard reference on the institution.21 By consequence, the deep divide Huntington imagined as separating the military from civil society seeped into the popular consciousness, remembered not as an abstraction intended to smooth out the wrinkles in his political theory, but as an

---
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historical fact. A second reason was that the West Point professoriate eagerly adopted Huntington’s model of military professionalism as the service’s own. While army educators naturally rejected Huntington’s pessimistic view of the military’s influence on policy, his advocacy for a separate professional jurisdiction free from political meddling aligned precisely with the preferences of army leaders raised on Uptonian polemics. Moreover, Huntington’s reverential tone with respect to the military and his use of sources recognized as legitimate in army circles made Soldier and the State a credible textbook in army classrooms and a perennial favorite on the professional reading lists of senior army leaders up to the present day. All of this, together with its popularity on civilian campuses, helped to catalyze Huntington’s theory into an historical and psychosocial truth.

Despite its continued appeal, Huntington’s theory is profoundly flawed. For instance, Huntington’s core understanding of the civil-military problematique drew on class prejudices common in mid-20th century scholarship that understood the trend towards more destructive warfare as the net effect of mass democratic social movements and technological advancements many feared were displacing the liberal elite order. Some feared that bureaucratic commissioning practices used to raise larger and more technically specialized armies threatened to proletarianize the officer corps by placing the military instrument into the hands of untutored social groups more comfortable with military order than liberal rule. Even

Huntington’s intellectual rival, Morris Janowitz, pointed to demographic changes within the officer corps as stark evidence the army’s new leadership held less in common socially, intellectually, or ideologically with governing civilian elites, and were thus potentially more self-interested than those of past generations.\(^23\) These conclusions, however, failed to consider that the social composition of civilian elites – the same groups that select and regulate the officer corps – was undergoing comparable changes at the same time.\(^24\) Indeed, in the longer historical view these social dynamics happen continually. As new social groups entered the ranks of the governing elite, it therefore stands to reason that those they selected to lead the army would continue to meet the threshold of social and political reliability, despite any alarming demographic shifts.

The problem of induction presented another serious flaw, in that Huntington’s prescription of separation validated his own subjective model of military professionalism and its ethic. For example:

‘Obviously, no one individual or group will adhere to all the constituent elements of the military ethic, since no individual or group is ever motivated exclusively by military considerations. Any given officer corps will adhere to the ethic only to the extent that it is professional, that is, to the extent that it is shaped by functional rather than societal imperatives. Few expressions of the ethic by an officer corps indicate a low level of professionalism, widespread articulation of the ethic a high degree of professionalism.’\(^25\)

Here, Huntington clearly understood that officers displayed great diversity in their politics, beliefs, and thought. Yet he chose to substitute the complexity of social life and its influences with an archetypal ‘military mind’ that universalized the outlook of all officers as reactionary and autocratic, ostensibly in the name of parsimony.\(^26\) At best, his archetype was merely a caricature of military attitudes, perhaps subconsciously impressed upon him during his stint in


\(^{24}\) The ethnic composition of the American elite already was changing at the time Huntington and Janowitz wrote. See, Richard D Alba and Gwen Moore, “Ethnicity and the American Elite,” *American Sociological Review* 17, no. 3 (Jun 1982), 373-383.

\(^{25}\) Huntington (2001), 61-62.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., vii-viii, 59-61.
the army shortly after the Second World War. At worst, it was prejudicial. Certainly, we might take the point that ‘the unique functional aspect of the military’ powerfully influences an officer’s thinking, as Huntington wrote. But we cannot altogether dismiss modes of thought and action learned long before one’s military service, any more than we can discount the influence of daily social interactions, unfolding events, and the larger national culture. Thus, the circular dependency of professionalism on Huntington’s military ethic reveals more about its author’s fears and preferences than it does about the true nature of civil-military relations.

Finally, by omission or commission, Huntington failed to place his primary evidence for the officer corps’ social isolation in a wider historical context, which would have shown quite the opposite of what he intended. While the period’s army officers may have possessed little in common with the broader public, they were far from aliens in their own society. Rather, they were an integral part of the nation’s elite social and political fabric, root and branch. Huntington’s judgment, for example, that fin-de-siècle Americans viewed army officers with blanket hostility does not square with the fact that most officers came from the same prominent provincial families who lead local affairs, or that the socially powerful continued to wed their daughters to army officers, or that the activities of officers and their families remained prominently featured in the society pages of the day’s newspapers, a medium that served the interests of elite recognition. Moreover, it fails explain why Congress even tolerated the alleged existence of an army so profoundly, and hence so dangerously out of step with the rhythm of American life. Bear in mind that in the United States, Congress plays the signal role in raising and regulating the armed forces, to include approving standards of officer selection and promotion. Although some scholars contend Huntington’s empirical errors do not by themselves invalidate his theory’s power, such a proposal seems rather chauvinistic when we recall that his isolation narrative is the empirical lynchpin of his theory. Pull this pin, and the

27 Ibid., 59.
wheels come off the cart, opening the pathway for more powerful explanations of civil-military relationships.

1.2 An Alternative: Social and Cultural Reproduction

This dissertation employs a framework of social reproduction adopted from Pierre Bourdieu’s *Practice Theory* to better explain both the historical origins and character of civil-military relations in the United States, specifically, and one that better reveals the nature of these relations more generally. It challenges two guiding tenets of the Huntingtonian orthodoxy: one, that soldiers and civilians exist in wholly separate spheres identified by their allegedly dissimilar social origins, their opposing ideologies, and their distinctly separate roles in society; and two, that maintaining this separation has been the basis of effective civilian control. Instead, this work’s guiding assumption is that those in political power – be they military or civilian – raise armies to defend the prevailing social and symbolic order, and thus when free to choose tend to organize their security in ways that complement and instantiate the dominant order. How a state selects its military leadership reflects this tendency.

This dissertation makes four claims. One, the character of American civil-military relations today originated in colonial commissioning practices that favored the sons of provincial elites: the local politicians and functionaries, physicians and attorneys, merchants and farmers, manufacturers and bankers, educators and clergymen – men typically relegated to a middle class – who held outsized influence in their local communities. Two, by intent bureaucratic commissioning practices adopted in the 19th century upheld the officer corps’ elite character while metering access for upwardly mobile newcomers willing to adopt elite dispositions in exchange for the privilege of membership. Three, the interdependency of civil-military elites for their social reproduction, displayed in family, fraternal, and other voluntary associations, proliferated a more cosmopolitan *mentalité* encompassing a respect for hierarchy,

legitimate norms and sanctions, and unifying patriotic narratives, all of which broadly
transcended purely sectional or partisan differences. And four, adhering to ‘the rules of the
game’ enabled army officers and their families to pool advantages in ways that manifested in
the unconscious reproduction of the very same social groups from which the army traditionally
recruited its officers. In short, intra-elite sociality not only underwrote the character of civil-
military relations, it also made possible the extenuation of the resilient federal republic we
know today.

This work thus concludes the origins of civil-military relations are not located in a
closeted Dark Age of navel gazing. Nor are they the product of an arbitrary professional ethic.
Like American state development more generally, these norms evolved through countless
interactions between mutually recognizable elite status groups, reproduced and concentrated
over time as legitimate. Through what Bourdieu often termed a social alchemy, American
military and political leaders have come to broadly share a common understanding of each
other’s place in the national order.30

1.3 Uneven Challenges to Huntington’s Influence on History

Huntington’s presentation has endured partly because he stole a march on military
historians by over a decade. As Edward Coffman noted, most American military historians
focused their attention on the Civil War and the Second World War in the 1950s, when
Huntington wrote. By comparison, the late-frontier period attracted little interest.31 When
scholars did get around to challenging Huntington, it was not for his depiction of the officer
corps’ social dislocation; Russell Weigley had forcefully mainstreamed that idea for military
historians by 1967.32 Instead, historians challenged Huntington’s assertion that the army had
professionalized in isolation, and presented as evidence the intellectual similarities between the

31 Coffman (1991), 70.
32 Ibid., 74.
Progressive Era’s army and civilian reformers.

Early on, Graham Cosmas observed that army leaders couched their modernization campaigns in language reflecting contemporary political, business, religious, and philanthropic sensitivities for the nation’s expanding role in international affairs.  

John Gates likewise noted that the methods employed by U.S. Army administrators in the newly acquired Philippines bore ‘a marked resemblance [with] urban reformers in America.’  

Others followed. Andrew Bacevich (USMA 1969) concluded that military reform truly was indistinguishable from civilian sector trends promoting scientific management, and that military officers ‘consistently saw business corporations as prototypes of efficient organization.’  

James Abrahamson (USMA 1959) claimed an elite homophily bridged the so-called civil-military divide, writing that ‘military leaders had always maintained close social and intellectual ties with America’s business, professional, and political elites and shared their outlook.’  

Changes within the army were so integral to the nation’s reformist mood that Jack Lane and Peter Karsten even dubbed military reformers ‘armed progressives.’  

Indeed, Karsten considered the army could not have implemented its reform agenda without ‘the sustained support of civilian allies in the Army or Navy Leagues, the Congress and the Executive, the worlds of agriculture, commerce, banking and war-related industries.’  

Not all scholars agreed that professionalism had its origins in the Progressive Era’s managerial revolution. Historians of the antebellum period pointed out that advances in military
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engineering, administration, officer education, and the formulation of a public service ethic eschewing political partisanship actually began in the decades before the Civil War, much earlier than Huntington had claimed. One might even trace the army’s professionalization to the founding of the U.S. Military Academy in 1802, a venture army leaders were unlikely to have accomplished without civilian direction and support. In sum, the fascination of Progressive Era reformers with scientific management might have inspired a greater leap towards implementing best practices than during any previous period. But those efforts were nonetheless built on countless incremental changes that had passed largely unnoticed since the army’s founding. Moreover, they depended on sustained interactions between elites, in and out of uniform.

Historians have spilt much ink documenting the U.S. Army’s reform, and most now agree that professionalism did not spring from the insulated musings of the ‘military mind.’ Far less effort has been spent refuting the army’s broader social estrangement. John Gates issued the most forceful response to Huntington’s assertion in an important Parameters essay. Published more than thirty years ago, Gates offered empirical evidence from strength reports to show many officers were absent from their frontier posts on lengthy detachments to urban centers, where they performed duties as recruiters, attachés, National Guard advisors, or military instructors at civilian schools. According to Gates, an officer graduating West Point during the 1870s would have spent half or more of his career back East, where he had ample opportunity to mingle with civilians. Andrew Bacevich produced evidence of civil-military


42 Ibid., 32-34.
mingling in his essay about a social club started by a group of promising young officers, dubbed ‘the Family.’ Begun before the First World War in a townhouse convenient to the White House, the Family was an informal gathering of the ‘national service elite,’ and included military officers, diplomats, businessmen, and mid-ranking government functionaries bound to each through a common outlook on the role of American power in the world. In addition to using their social networks to assist each other in their assignments and careers, Family members influenced policy. One contemporary British observer, educator Graham Wallas, actually got the impression the United States government was ‘really run by a little group of young fellows suggest[ing] most of the things to be done [by] their bosses.’ Admittedly, Bacevich’s study examined only a minute subset of civilian and military elites enjoying especially privileged access to policy makers. Nevertheless, his paper suggests such civil-military interactions were a by-product of elite cultural homophily, rather than clientelism. Similarly, Kevin Adams concluded in a broader study that the cultural tastes and attitudes of 19th-century officers reflected their mostly privileged social origins.

Peter Karsten singled out John Gates as having settled once and for all the question of the officer corps’ social isolation. However, scholars still disagree about the quality of late-19th century civil-military sociality. For instance, the same historians who argued so convincingly that the army began to professionalize in the antebellum period nevertheless accepted Huntington’s claim that any intimacy between soldiers and civilians had dissipated after the Civil War. Even Bacevich hedged when he implied the Family might have been a blip of genteel conviviality set against a background of public hostility. In his ‘post-
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revisionist view,’ Terrence Gough dismissed the evidence of any civil-military symbiosis as mere rhetoric. In a partial defense of Huntington, Gough pointed to officer infighting to show line officers indeed remained psychologically at odds with society, while the army’s savvier technical and staff officers, whose mentalities he styled as more civilian than martial, were the true bridge builders to the outside commercial world. Gough’s evidence, however, was no less impressionistic: line and staff squabbles had less to do with professional primacy and more to do with the staff bureaus’ structural advantages over the power-augmenting social networks that all officers depended on for their career advancement. This, in itself, suggested that officers of all branches – line and staff – indeed were struggling amongst each other to remain as socially connected to the civilian world as possible, even as together they resisted political incursions of the military field.

Historians have, on one hand, vastly improved our understanding of the army institution, its evolution, and its professionalization. On the other hand, however, even revisionist scholars have unconsciously sustained the leitmotif of separation by failing to enlist new methods to rethink the fundamentals of civil-military relations. For several decades now, historians have focused their attention on the experiences of oft-neglected groups such as citizen-soldiers, other ranks, minorities, immigrants, and women; the case of the Regular Army officer corps – a comparable bastion of privilege – has stirred little new interest. So, the wooly depiction of the alienated army officer endures, while Huntington’s orthodoxy has since become thoroughly entangled in the bosky purlieus of civil-military etiquette. That Huntington’s theory has survived despite its lack of compelling proof dictates that any feasible


alternative must combine a powerful explanatory framework with rich empirical evidence. In this dissertation, the theories of Pierre Bourdieu inform the framework, and prosopography delivers the evidence.

1.4 Why Bourdieu? Concepts and Corpus

By this date, it seems hardly necessary to note the many contributions of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) to a wide range of scholarship. Philosopher by training and ethnographer by practice, Bourdieu’s commitment to empirical research made him a key figure amongst mid-century French academics struggling to legitimize the field of sociology as a valid scientific enterprise. With the publication in English of his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* in 1977, Bourdieu’s theories of social and cultural reproduction quickly gained traction with British and American sociologists who were no less committed than the French to vindicate sociology as a social scientific field.\(^{51}\) Now translated in more than 30 languages and published in over 40 countries, Bourdieu’s corpus has achieved a truly global reach.\(^{52}\) So many scholars have adopted, tested, expanded, or critiqued his core concepts that many credit Bourdieu not only with re-discovering the existence of ‘social facts,’ but also for the cultural turn in such a diverse array of academic fields as sociology, gender studies, history, political science, economics, international relations, geography, social work, public health, and so on.\(^{53}\) And as the growing number of research programs incorporating his frameworks clearly demonstrates, this Bourdieusian turn is far from a passing fad.\(^{54}\)

While Bourdieu borrowed much of his jargon from Marx, his rendering of social reproduction encompassed social life much more broadly than the means of production, and his


\(^{54}\) Santoro, et al. (2018), 22.
emphasis on agency and structure made his body of theory anything but deterministic.

Bourdieu understood social reproduction as the larger product of coextensive social interactions that trended towards preserving structures of advantageous social relationships and cultural preferences. At its most basic level, social reproduction included fertility and inheritance strategies. In its higher form, it embraced the proliferation of dominant themes and meaningful symbols, mediated by social, religious, and government institutions, the foremost being schools.

The more central of his many concepts were habitus, capital, and field. The habitus was a system of internalized dispositions and subjective schemas embracing the individual’s history, expectations, and psychic boundaries. Habitus took shape first in the home through ‘imperceptible apprenticeships from the family upbringing,’ and later was influenced through more formal education. Not only did one’s habitus mediate the production of conforming practices, it was a prototypical cultural resource or form of capital that Bourdieu likened to ‘the feel for a game.’ In addition to the economic form, other Bourdieusian species included social capital – power-augmenting social networks – and symbolic capital – prestige, honor, or authority. Apart from the inherited habitus, accumulating the less tangible species of capital required conscious effort, as well as material investments or the possession of some important cultural knowledge. Moreover, the various species were fungible, in that like money capital the forms could be traded to open access and opportunities for recognition. For instance,
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investments in education provided expertise or conveyed a mark of distinction, just as surplus wealth enabled the leisure time for community service, or membership in multiple voluntary associations that expanded social circles to increase one’s prestige or reputation.60

For Bourdieu, social reproduction principally occurred in fields of practice, the multiverse of bounded yet overlapping spaces of shared meaning, like law, or education, or art. Fields developed as struggles between the holders of relevant capital, the intent of which was to improve or maintain their relative positions and the value of their investments. Each field was thus more or less exclusive and was ordered by its own internal logic. Each also possessed a habitus broadly reflecting the experiences and outlook of its members.61 For the insider, the struggles reaffirmed the legitimacy of a field’s structure by producing an organic solidarity between the dominant and the dominated. For the outsider, activating one’s capital resources in a corresponding field afforded entrée on the basis of mutual recognition with the field’s cohabitants, which in turn reaffirmed both the value of one’s capital and the field’s internal structures and practices.62 Later in his career, Bourdieu expanded his theories to include the state, a mental and objective structure he modeled as emerging to regulate the value and rates of conversion of meta capital in a territorially bounded space, in ways that tended to institutionalize the reproduction of dominant practices on a national scale.

Bourdieu only touched lightly on the military. While he acknowledged militaries as important components of a state’s coercive capital and counted France’s senior military schools with the grandes écoles that helped reproduce that state’s social order, the security field did not


receive the attention he lavished on the educational, religious, and juridical fields.\textsuperscript{63} That said, with increasing regularity scholars have focused the Bourdieusian lens on security writ large, as well as agents cohabiting that field.\textsuperscript{64} Bourdieusian frameworks are at their best when considering social interactions over larger time scales, as when Elizabeth Macknight employed the concepts of habitus and practice to analyze the historical production of French martial honor codes and their linkage to the reckless behavior of officers in battle during the Third Republic.\textsuperscript{65} Archaeologists also have turned to Bourdieu to help interpret the relationship of artefacts to the reproduction of societal roles and spaces, while classical scholars have applied his frameworks to understand the role the Roman army played in instantiating the legitimacy of Rome’s social and political order.\textsuperscript{66}

More to our purpose, scholars also have tackled the social reproduction of military elites, and the British military is a favored subject. One of the more important papers remains


sociologist Keith MacDonald’s examination of habitus and British army officer recruitment and promotion patterns. MacDonald found those educated at elite public schools — institutions analogous to France’s *grandes écoles* — were more likely to receive postings to career-making elite regiments and to receive promotions to the highest grades, despite a steady increase since the mid-20th century in the number of cadets entering the Royal Military Academy from state schools. MacDonald traced the phenomenon in part to the resemblance of the public-school habitus to that of the academy, which conveyed a structural advantage enabling higher academy performance and mutual recognition between cadets and serving officers with similar social origins. As the saying goes, ‘ducks pick ducks.’ Studies by sociologists Oscar Grusky and Sue Diamond on the careers of Royal Navy officers came to complementary conclusions. Indeed, Grusky, whose work predates Bourdieu’s wider influence, suggested that senior officer promotion patterns served to validate British society’s dominant values and helped to maintain the nation’s social structure. However, he also predicted that naval officer selection patterns would proletarianize as national values changed and the old elite died out, a forecast wholly dependent on an accommodatingly stagnant elite, and one which remains unrealized a half century on.

Readers might find the relative stability of elite reproduction in the British officer corps unremarkable. As an integral component of Britain’s highly stratified society, the corps’ image as chock-full of second sons, old boys, and Sloanes is deeply embedded in the popular consciousness. The crucial subtext of these studies, however, is that recognition and recruitment once based mostly on stores of desirable social capital — networks of advantageous relations — has gradually come to include in greater measure the possession of certain cultural
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and symbolic capital, like academic credentials. Moreover, with time these resources have become more widely available to meet the needs of a more differentiated work force. By using a longer timeline (1897-2016), Aaron Reeves confirmed as much, that graduates from posh Clarendon schools were indeed 94 times more likely than others to land elite positions – including those in the military.70 Reeves also found, however, that while elite graduates still enjoyed privileged access, they no longer enjoyed exclusive access because, as his team also noted, Great Britain’s present-day elite recruitment base has expanded well beyond the reproductive capacity of the public school. Reeve’s team explained this shrinking monopoly as the outcome of growing social diversity and changing opportunity patterns, as well as the adoption of more bureaucratic recruitment standards privileging education.71 The point here is that the boundaries encompassing traditional elite fields, including an officer corps, are unlikely to proletarianize as Grusky once predicted. Instead, bureaucratic practices meter the replenishment or expansion of an elite from amongst those individuals and families able to amass the capital then in demand, like obtaining a relevant formal education.

Andrew Wood’s look back at British officer social mobility between the Glorious Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars bears this out. Once the exclusive domain of aristocrats, Wood found that increasing social differentiation and the army’s modernization actually combined to open the officer corps to some commoners, and that those possessing a formal education had even better chances of achieving high rank.72 Wood did not frame education as a Bourdieusian species of enabling capital, though his analysis clearly demonstrated as much; apart from practical skills and knowledge, formal education enabled mutual recognition between newcomers and the educated generals from more established families, opening a
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72 Andrew B. Wood, “The Limits of Social Mobility: Social Origins and Career Patterns of British Generals, 1688-1815” (PhD Diss. London: London School of Economics, 2011), 93, 131-137. Wood considered Bourdieus’s variables difficult to measure, and thus favored more conventional social mobility frameworks; he also preferred the theme of ‘modernization’ to ‘professionalization.’
gateway to patronage. The promotions of some educated commoners, however, should not be mistaken as an early effort at social leveling, as the cost of a formal education was well beyond the economic means of most. More importantly, the fact that a substantial percentage of Wood’s newcomers entering the upper ranks were later made peers suggested that the army was not merely reproducing itself, but that it also played its part in reproducing the nation’s larger social structures. Woods’ study helps us envision over longer time scales how agency plays its part in the reproduction of a dominant social order, in that army leaders raised up from new families would be seen in the fullness of time as the founders of old and noble lines no less committed to upholding the dominant social order than those preceding them.

Research on 18th-century Denmark and Sweden and on contemporary Israel have reached similar conclusions about the role militaries play in reproducing national structures. Perhaps the most striking study in this regard is political scientist Ernesto Seidl’s prosopographic analysis of the social origins of Brazilian army officers between 1850-1930. Seidl found that despite the steady importation of meritocratic recruitment practices from Europe, like academic qualifications and testing, the social origins of senior officers did not substantially change. Indeed, the reproduction of military elites even survived the country’s transition from dynastic state to republic. Just as significantly, Seidl found that the Brazilian army’s new emphasis on technical competency did not eliminate altogether the need for officers to amass social capital to advance their careers. Officers employed a variety of strategies, such as marrying into influential families, joining private clubs, and accepting the reciprocal obligations of Freemasonry in efforts to enhance their prestige and recognition with
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military superiors and governing elites, alike. In what Seidl termed a hybrid of bureaucratic and social practices, elite military reproduction legitimized the state and made a Brazilian nation viable. 78

For many reasons officer selection practices may change with time, but the state’s imperative to maintain a corps of loyal officers does not. This said, dictates, proclamations, laws, oaths, or even arbitrary professional ethics are unlikely to compel the loyalty of officers who do not share an interest in upholding a state’s underwritten dispositions, a concern 19th-century Prussia’s nobility well understood. To modernize their army yet preserve the dominant feudal habitus, the Prussian nobility carefully opened the officer corps’ doors to well-educated commoners who internalized those outlooks, and as surely closed them to those who did not, as documented by historian Steven Clemente. 79 Militaries, though, seldom enjoy free rein over their commissioning practices, no matter the regime type. In the British Army, for example, commissioned officers administer practices negotiated with and approved by Parliament in the name of a liberal monarch. A similar form of elite bargaining has existed in the United States since its founding as a liberal republic. And the same was true of post-Peterine Russia, a state that was anything but liberal. In his history of the Russian officer corps’ westernization, Igor Fedyukin showed that Russian nobles pursued strategies to either evade or comply with new military educational requirements in order to secure their own reproductive ends. 80 Unable to bring all the nobles to heel, yet still dependent on their service for national defense, the post-Petrine government accommodated recalcitrant nobles in ways that both reaffirmed pre-existing divisions within the elite and sustained the longer-term viability of the state’s educational reform agenda. 81

78 Seidl does not explicitly make the connection between these practices and nation building in his article, but confirmed as much in an email, Seidl to Author, 17 Feb 2019.
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81 Ibid., 579.
Fundamentally, states raise armies to defend an established social order, a priority revealed in a state’s commissioning practices. These practices evolve through elite interactions, between the governing and the governed or, as Bourdieu would put it, the dominant and the dominated. In modern bureaucratic states, formalized commissioning practices have all but succeeded the elite sociality which in earlier times formed the basis of officer selection. But no matter how we stylize evermore regulated methods of officer selection – be it bureaucratizing, modernizing, ‘meritorizing,’ westernizing, or professionalizing – the evidence from Bourdieusian scholarship indicates these evolving practices continue to emulate existing elite social preferences, and that access to a commission remains no less dependent on amassing the required social, cultural, or symbolic resources. Moreover, by demanding this capital of newcomers the state instantiates the symbolic order as legitimate.

Scholars have yet to focus Bourdieu’s frameworks on the U.S. Army with the same intensity shown in the studies of armies in other parts of the world. That circumstance is far from regrettable, as it only compounds the contributions of the present work to reconceiving the relationship of the U.S. Army to the society it is raised to protect.

1.5 Methodology

Historian Gary Nash once warned the popularity of narrow case studies risked creating a ‘chaotic version of the past’ when researchers failed to locate their work within larger coherent frameworks. With Nash’s critique in mind, this dissertation makes use of collective biography, or prosopography, within a Bourdieusian theoretical framework to document the social origins and social interactions U.S. Army officers. More specifically, this project examines the army officer cohort of 1884, the group of 67 officers who received commissions from one of the three avenues open at that time: graduation from the U.S. Military Academy; direct presidential appointment from civilian life; and meritorious promotion from the enlisted
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ranks, men known colloquially as ‘rankers.’

This cohort’s social context is especially relevant in challenging the civil-military relations orthodoxy for three reasons. One, these officers entered their careers in a period when federal officials – military and civilian – began to normalize access to commissions in efforts to maintain the officer corps’ recognition with other elite fields like medicine and law, and to eliminate political interventions in what was increasingly becoming recognized as a distinct military jurisdiction. This period, therefore, is ideal for revealing the interlinkages between elite social preferences and the formulation of these bureaucratic practices.

Two, the careers of cohort members spanned the period of Huntington’s alleged era of professionalizing isolation, from the late-Frontier Era through victory in the First World War, or about 1880-1920. This span also accounts for the nomination, appointment, and matriculation of West Point cadets, as well as the enlisted careers of rankers commissioned in 1884. For civilian appointees, the period covers time spent in civilian or military schooling, or in other pursuits. By 1920 or shortly thereafter, most of these men had reached the statutory retirement age of 64 years, and most of their offspring had by then embarked on their own adult careers, revealing the reproduction of advantages in the following generation. Special attention is thus given to the resources, both social and cultural, that marked officers and governing civilians as belonging to coherent elite groups, separated not so much from each other as from the broader public. These attributes include family origins; educational experiences; and the construction of social networks, or social capital, through endogamous marriages and participation in voluntary groups, including social clubs, patriotic organizations, professional associations, and the fraternities popular in the day.

The third reason for studying this cohort is wholly practical: its size. As late-19th century commissioning cohort’s go, the one from 1884 is amongst the smaller, making for a more manageable and empirically rich sociography. Ideally, the cohort’s small size begs a broader comparison to other cohorts, before and after. Apart from space, however, uneven source availability is a limiting factor. Whereas the late 19th century witnessed a boom in the publication of local histories, genealogies, social registers, and the like exploited in this study,
such materials are more rarely encountered before the Civil War, and steadily drop off in the decades after 1920, pacing changes to tastes and the character of elite sociality, as well as concerns for privacy. To compensate for any shortcoming in this regard, this study draws deeply on wide range of existing scholarship to narrate within the Bourdieusian prism the evolution of American commissioning practices starting from the colonial period, in order to place the cohort in a wider temporal context that indeed reveals a consistency over time.

This project works down from the macro level of analysis to the individual level to take full advantage of Bourdieu’s rich cosmology. Alongside the broader examination of the cohort, this thesis concludes with a look at the life and career of cohort member Colonel Carl Reichmann as a case study in the acquisition and deployment of social capital. Born in Germany and immigrating to the United States as an adult in 1881, Reichmann enlisted in the army and earned a commission from the ranks, after which he enjoyed a successful career culminating in his selection for general officer as the United States mobilized for war in 1917. At the time, however, allegations surfaced that Reichmann, then the U.S. Army’s ranking German-born officer, harbored German sympathies, prompting a U.S. Senate investigation. The investigation’s conclusions were mixed: denied promotion and command of troops, Reichmann was in fact exonerated and reassigned to Chicago, where he coordinated counter-subversive activities with civilian law enforcement officials. A closer examination illustrates how, despite the penalties he endured, Reichmann’s social capital, a reputation vouched for by a durable network he accrued over long service, helped compurgate testimony which might have otherwise ended his career, or worse.

1.6 Sources

As suggested above, no single source contains the type of data needed to construct a sociography of the late 19th-century officer corps. Official records, like those available at the U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, contain mostly glimmers of the family and extended relationships that locate individual officers in a wider social context. And while unpublished military manuscripts, especially those held by the Library of Congress, contain
substantial evidence of social connections extending beyond the military, only a small number of the more prominent officers in the period deposited papers. A few published memoirs have yielded valuable, if spotty insights on childhoods. So, the author has scoured hundreds of published and unpublished genealogies, county histories, social registers, obituaries and memorials, census returns, school catalogs and alumni bulletins, membership lists, gazetteers, city directories, and hundreds more articles from American and international newspapers to fill the large gaps left in the official record. Here, non-profit on-line repositories maintained by the HathiTrust Digital Library and Internet Archive have been immensely valuable, as have commercial databases like Newspapers.com, or like Ancestry.com, which store thousands of state, local, and federal records. The need to draw from so many sources to flesh out the most basic detail consequently reflects in the density of citations.

So far as Colonel Reichmann goes, congressional sources were useful, but mostly disappointing. We know, for example, the Senate paid the princely sum of $209.83 to the stenographic firm of Rexford L. Holmes to print the transcript of Reichmann’s hearing. The volume’s 204 ½ pages of testimony and 22 inserts, however, are lost to time.\footnote{Holmes’ fee today would amount to over $4,000. U.S. Congress, Senate, \textit{Report of the Secretary of the Senate Submitting a Full and Complete Statement of the Receipts and Expenditures of the Senate from July 1, 1917 to June 30, 1918}, 65\textsuperscript{th} Cong, 3d Sess., 1918, S. Rep. 309, serial 7459, Vol. 3, 130.} Congressional manuscripts from this period also are notoriously fragmentary. The destruction of personal papers by well-intended family members or staff, such as that encountered by Senator Duncan Fletcher’s biographer Wayne Flynt, also presented formidable obstacles.\footnote{Wayne Flynt, \textit{Duncan Upshaw Fletcher: Dixie’s Reluctant Progressive} (Tallahassee: Florida University Press, 1971), vii.} Fortunately, Reichmann’s closed-door hearing attracted national attention and newspaper accounts often included testimony leaked by interested partisans, just as today. A file contained in Senator Miles Poindexter’s papers at the University of Washington was particularly insightful. Deliciously entitled “Reichmann Treason Case,” the file contains the largest discovered collection of documents pertaining to the Senate hearing, including evidence pointing to
Poindexter as the source of many press leaks.

Finally, to place matters of historical economy in context, readers will note modern values are listed either in the text or footnotes when monetary sums are mentioned. These have been calculated using the excellent academic web tools available at Measuringworth.com, cited here once for brevity.85

1.7 Chapter Outline

The remaining chapters are arranged thematically, yet progress from the macro to the micro levels of analysis. Chapter Two explores the intellectual origins of the dominant American frameworks of civil-military relations, separatism and fusionism, as presented mainly in Huntington’s political treatment, The Soldier and the State, but also in Morris Janowitz’ sociological classic, The Professional Soldier, respectively. The chapter shows how both frameworks, despite their inherent tensions, are deeply rooted in class prejudice and fear that mass social movements would lead to larger and ever more destructive wars. After examining some of the critical flaws in these approaches, it recounts how the U.S. Army adopted mostly Huntington’s model of the isolated professional to emphasize the special nature of commissioned service at a time when many felt the commitment of America’s youth to public service was flagging.

Chapter Three delivers the dissertation’s conceptual framework. The first half presents Pierre Bourdieu’s practice theory in greater detail at the individual, group, and state levels. Through this lens, the second half narrates the evolution of U.S. military commissioning practices, from the dynastic means of selection used in the pre-colonial period, to the steady introduction of bureaucratic standards centered on education during the late-19th and early 20th centuries. The chapter advances two arguments. One, the introduction of stiffer educational pre-requisites was not an act of social leveling. Rather, higher educational requirements upheld

high boundaries by playing mostly to the advantage of provincial elites best able to convert economic and social resources into the required schooling for their sons and to attract the recognition of political gatekeepers. Two, privileging provincial elites under the rubric of professionalization enabled the federal government to secure a legitimate monopoly over the coercive instrument.

**Chapter Four** establishes the 1884 cohort’s provincial elite origins. It begins by using census data to determine the narrow population of American men potentially eligible to receive a commission. Next, the chapter delves more deeply into the social backgrounds of the 67 men commissioned that year, by source of commission, in order to chart the army officer corps’ social contours. **Chapter Five** expands the case for cohort’s elite identification by revealing their efforts to accrue social capital. This chapter draws heavily on Bourdieu’s proposition that generating social networks not only required conscious investments, but that doing so also concentrated individual and group capital advantages while instantiating reaffirming behavioral structures and norms. Endogamous cohort marriages and membership in voluntary associations are the focus. The chapter concludes by summarizing the reproduction of family advantages revealed in cohort offspring education, career, and marriage patterns.

**Chapter Six** argues that while by the First World War the army’s hardening bureaucracy had made it more difficult to mobilize social capital accrued outside the service for crude career gains, extended social capital could still multiply the good feelings for an efficient officer by making the objective differences between merit and favoritism indecipherable. The career of Colonel Carl Reichmann, culminating in the U.S. Senate’s investigation in 1917 on charges he harbored German sympathies, is the chapter’s centerpiece. It concludes that while Reichmann’s criticism of the war had crossed a sensitive line, his judges evaluated his loyalty according to his social standing as a career officer, vouched for by his wider social network, civilian and military. Finally, five appendices of richly cited tables detailing the social circumstances of the cohort and their offspring follow the conclusion.
1.8 Concluding Remarks

Readers will find this study demonstrates a more profound degree of social interdependence between American soldiers and civilians than is traditionally presumed. They will also note, however, it stops well short of suggesting these civil-military elites ever co-existed in perfect political harmony, or ever will, or that the U.S. case is in any way immune from breakdowns. Most importantly, this study intentionally avoids prescribing norms of etiquette to govern the daily intercourse of soldiers and civilians, which the author views as a perilously partisan mug’s game. Nevertheless, because this thesis confronts a formidable orthodoxy it is necessarily ambitious. Here, the author has taken great pains to translate a highly complex set of sociological propositions into a more easily relatable and scalable theoretical scaffolding from which we might better visualize the development of American civil-military relations specifically, but also one we might better apply to international cases more generally. And as a history, it is empirically rich. By bringing together a trove of freshly considered information, firmly seated in a wide range of existing scholarship, it opens a unique window on the lives and social interactions of late-19th century American civilians and soldiers, in ways that generate fresh implications for the present era and beyond.
CHAPTER 2

‘A Political Tract for the Times:’
The Intellectual Origins of Civil-Military Relations Theory

2.1 Introduction

Theoretically, the proposition that war is a deliberate act of policy means armies are subordinate to political authority. Civil-military relations theories generally consider what interactions best ensure political control over the military, mostly by civilians in democracies. The scholarship’s main thrust approaches soldiers and civilians as wholly distinctive social groups, each separated from the other by profound differences in social origins, organizational culture, intellectuality, and political ideology. This tense dichotomy reflects on the one hand the civil sphere’s presumed preference for tranquility, and on the other the military’s imperative to fight and win wars effectively. While the study of civil-military relations is not limited to a particular service, scholars generally view armies as posing the greatest possible danger to their own civilian populations because they usually are a state’s most handy coercive instrument, hence they receive the lion’s share of attention.

As an interdisciplinary subject area, the study of civil-military relations began to crystalize in the United States with the 1957 publication of Samuel Huntington’s signal work, *The Soldier and the State*, followed two years later by sociologist Morris Janowitz’ classic study, *The Professional Soldier*.¹ Huntington and Janowitz share credit for inspiring a number of challengers, and their respective separatist and fusionist frameworks remain the dominant lenses through which we study civil-military relations, even more than a half-century on. Confident with its conclusions, the subject now generates few new theories, and so today’s literature has become more notable for ringing partisan alarm bells over breeches in civil-military etiquette, or by calling attention to alleged cultural gaps that scholars in the United
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States, especially, fear might estrange altogether the military from civil society.\(^2\)

This chapter delves more deeply into the intellectual origins of these theories, and how they came to influence the broader public and its officer corps. As Cold War artefacts, both of the domain’s founding texts are exceptionally American in character. Even so, these American presentations bear the unmistakable influences of European intellectuals writing in the interwar period, who worried that mass social movements threatened the old liberal order and presaged more destructive wars. This chapter thus begins by examining these intellectual origins and their subsequent influence on Huntington’s and Janowitz’ theories. The chapter argues that while we usually contrast these scholars’ methodologies and prescriptions, embedded in both are heavily freighted assumptions about the interplay of class, ideology, mentality, psychology, and culture that reflect more the mid-century anxieties of Europeans rather than historical experiences of Americans, and which have since blurred the delicate line separating archetypes from stereotypes.

After discussing the European influence, the chapter examines in detail historical flaws and conceptual biases inherent in these two main approaches, and how mid-20th century army educators nevertheless helped to reify the civil-military divide by adopting Huntington’s model of the isolated professional to advance their own professional interests. After briefly reviewing some alternative theories, the chapter concludes that Bourdieu’s *Practice Theory* offers a more powerful framework to understand the evolution of civil-military relations in the United States and elsewhere.

### 2.2 Through a Monocle, Darkly: Europe’s Anxious Antecedents

If whether to the victor or the vanquished all wars leave some indelible stain on a nation’s social order, the size of that left by the First World War is difficult to grasp. In a larger

sense, the war had been fought to maintain a global status quo. It did not. Instead, the cascading consequences of shattered empires and economies, of tens of millions of empty chairs, of millions more shattered minds and bodies, were the emergence of new voices, new narratives, and new power centers. To the old establishment everything now was different. And the lull that followed brought with it a terrifying uncertainty as more rapid modernization and social upheaval threatened to undo entirely the tattered remains of Western civilization. It was in this fraught atmosphere that the kernel of today’s civil-military relations theories took shape.

During this interwar period, European intellectuals worried especially about the spread of Bolshevism and Fascism and the prospects for another large war. Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset famously captured this mood in his *Revolt of the Masses*, published in the late 1920s. Ortega’s masses did not rise up from the so-called laboring classes, as one might infer from his work’s title. ‘Mass-men’ were the bourgeois majority, a metaphor for the new wave of technicians and scientists who had turned on the ‘cultured minority,’ his term for the intellectual elite. 3 Eschewing politics, art, and religion, these amoral specialists would harness the power of the state through violent direct action, first to collectivize and then to crush the creative minority until all would ‘live in the service of the State.’ 4 According to Ortega, as science overtook reason and uniformity suppressed autonomy, the old liberal social order would fade away.

As a member of the threatened cultured minority, Ortega was hardly a dispassionate observer. Nonetheless, *Revolt* became a best seller in Europe, especially in Germany. 5 Ortega’s work also resonated with Americans who, though comparatively untouched by the war, looked apprehensively in their own country to social movements stemming from five decades of intense immigration, urbanization, and industrialization. *The Wall Street Journal* hailed Ortega
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4 Ibid., 121.

for revealing ‘the fundamental causes of the world’s distress.’ So, too, did political scientist Harold Dwight Lasswell, though he doubted the Spaniard’s remedy of European unity was feasible. Even so, Lasswell’s garrison state thesis would later bear the marks of Ortega’s influence.

In the United States, strains of Ortega’s argument hummed in the background at top American college campuses, where exiled German academics sowed the future influences of Huntington’s and Janowitz’ theories. Political scientist Sigmund Neumann, writing from Wesleyan University in 1938, assessed the transition from ‘liberal democracy, i.e., from the rule of the classes of property and culture to mass democracy,’ had upset the fixed social order and formed a vacuum into which rushed Europe’s new demagogues. Around the same time Harvard historian Alfred Vagts concluded that militarism, which he defined as the intrusion of a ‘military mentality and modes of acting and decision into the civilian sphere,’ had triggered not only the First World War, but had also rekindled European tensions, this time ignited by status-seeking pretenders who had risen from the lower classes to command the armies of Germany and Italy.

Perhaps the most influential of the lot was Hans Speier of the New School in New York, then a leading light amongst the German émigrés in Washington’s wartime foreign policy circles. Using Nazi Germany as his model, Speier theorized the growing interdependence of a country’s armed forces and its industrial base was a precursor for total war. Modern warfare, Speier argued, required a broader base of recruitment that was
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6 Quoted in Ibid.

7 Harold D. Lasswell, review of The Revolt of the Masses by Jose Ortega y Gasset. American Political Science Review 27, no. 1 (Feb 1933), 120.


upending the ancient social order. Where once the landed classes had commanded armies composed of rural folk, the military’s mechanization required the skills of urban industrial workers and the sons of wealthy commoners, meaning those possessing the highest technical intelligence would now bear the greatest risk in war. In turn, pursuing greater military effectiveness required a permanent war economy that would overturn capitalism and proletarianize the once independent middle classes. Even industrial elites would feel the sting of change as political elites would now dictate the use of private property for production. In these effects, Spier concluded, the Nazi war economy and the United States’ mobilization plans differed only by degrees.

Reacting to troubles abroad, the German exiles helped plant the ideological seeds that located the source of illiberalism and endless wars in barracks influence, while absolving civilians of willful complicity. Modern war, they argued, required a new breed of soldier. Recruited from the lower social strata and selected more for technical competency than sociability, the new officer class placed greater confidence in the military’s hierarchy, culture, and order than it did the old liberal dispensation, for which these newcomers lacked any appreciation. Inevitably, the military would subsume the old order as it extended its influence into the civilian realm to better fight its wars. It was a kind of Devil-made-me-do-it explanation for a half-century of brutality, and the Devil wore khaki.

Ultimately, this interpretation struck a chord with American scholars like Harold Lasswell, a pioneer in elite psychoanalysis at the Library of Congress who ran in the same wartime policy circles as Speier. In 1941, Laswell penned his influential garrison state thesis, which tracked closely with Speier’s assessment. Using Imperial Japan as his model, Lasswell foretold the rise of a garrison state as military officers – his ‘specialists in violence’ – expanded their competency into areas typically reserved for the civil sector. ‘With the socialization of

11 Speier (1939), 377-380.

danger as a permanent characteristic of modern violence,’ Lasswell warned, ‘the nation becomes one unified technical enterprise,’ and as the military consolidated power, it would abolish legislatures.\footnote{Harold Lasswell, \textit{Essays on the Garrison State} (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 43; Harold D. Lasswell, “The Garrison State,” \textit{American Journal of Sociology} 46, no. 4 (Jan 1941), 455-459, 461-462.} Lasswell also shared the Europeans’ concern for the diminishing social origins of the new military elite: ‘The foremost positions will be open to the officer corps,’ he decided, ‘and the problem is to predict from what part of the social structure the officers will be recruited.’\footnote{Lasswell (1941), 462.}

Like many American scholars in his day, Lasswell believed in the superiority of American democratic values, and that the field of political science should actively work to prevent war and other social ills.\footnote{Gabriel A. Almond, \textit{Harold Dwight Lasswell, 1902-1978: A Biographical Memoir} (Wash., DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1987), 256.} In this regard, Laswell thought academics should ‘promote a fusion of military and civilian skills’ to thwart the militarizing tendencies of the garrison state that threatened democratic values.\footnote{Lasswell (1941), 467.} It was this notion, that civilianizing the military would uphold a liberal social order, that Samuel Huntington later challenged with his separation thesis, and that Lasswell’s acolyte, Morris Janowitz, would later defend with his fusionist argument. Despite their seeming opposition, together the pair’s presentations helped generations to imagine the civilian and military spheres as ideologically and socially distinct, and thus mutually antagonistic.

\section*{2.3 Huntington’s Separation}

Retrospectives often cite the American defense sector’s Cold War expansion, the spectre of nuclear war, or the tensions between presidents and their generals as inspiring
Samuel Huntington to write *Soldier and the State*. So, too, did Harold Lasswell’s earlier treatment of the subject, important parts of which Huntington challenged. For instance, though Huntington agreed with Lasswell about the dangers a militarized bureaucracy posed for liberal society, he nevertheless disagreed that infusing the military with liberal civilian values or by expanding the military’s tasks to include nonmilitary functions would protect the liberal order. Doing so, Huntington countered, not only would dangerously undermine military effectiveness and expose the nation to its foreign enemies, ultimately it would lead to what he called subjective control, whereby shifting civilian factions might wield the military for selfish ends.

Moreover, Huntington doubted liberalism, embodied in the U.S. government’s constitutional authorities, posed much of a practical restraint on the military when facing an existential threat.

In response, Huntington proposed to strictly separate what he decided were two conflicting spheres of endeavor: a military sphere pre-occupied with the management of violence – a concept he borrowed from Lasswell – and a civilian sphere concerned with peace, after Vagts. Ideological differences, argued Huntington, lay at the heart of this mutual antagonism. On one hand, soldiers possessed an immutable ‘military mind,’ conservative-realist in outlook whose guiding ethic he styled as ‘pessimistic, collectivist, historically inclined, power-oriented, nationalistic, militaristic, pacifist and instrumentalist.’ Huntington’s civilians, on the other hand, were not so single minded, though they loosely shared a liberal propensity for individualism, rationality, and progressivism. Because these spheres were ideologically irreconcilable, civil-military elites needed to strike a balance: in exchange for the

---


19 Samuel P. Huntington, “Civilian Control and the Constitution,” *American Political Science Review* 50, no. 3 (Sep 1956), 676-699.


21 Ibid., 59, 86,146.
military’s autonomy over its peculiar jurisdiction, the military would restrict itself from political intervention, an arrangement that would guide the soldier’s professional ethic. Such a separation would engender what Huntington styled as objective civilian control, without sacrificing an effective national defense.\textsuperscript{22} Scholars have since termed Huntington’s the purist or \textit{Normal Theory} of civil-military relations.\textsuperscript{23}

To advance his argument, Huntington wrapped his theory within an imaginative history depicting the late-19\textsuperscript{th} century U.S. Army officer corps as wholly isolated from a public increasingly hostile to all things military.\textsuperscript{24} From their exile in scattered frontier garrisons, according to the narrative, a creative core of army officers like Emory Upton focused on reforms to professionalize the service, which they accomplished in the decades between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of the First World War.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed, Huntington claimed the army’s world-war triumphs would not have been possible without the inspiration sparked by the public’s earlier rejection.\textsuperscript{26} Professionalism, however, came at a price. All those years in isolation, according to Huntington, meant the officer corps emerged from its cocoon a triumphant ‘stranger in [its] own household…with values and outlook basically at odds with those of the mass of [their] countrymen.’\textsuperscript{27} This was, to be sure, an expedient transformation.

By casting the 19\textsuperscript{th}-century army officer as having professionalized in wholesale isolation, in one go Huntington not only reified the changeless nature of his archetypal military mind, he also had fashioned a convenient pedigree which validated both his proof for separation and his model of objective control – Q.E.D.

In one contemporary review, Princeton University’s Gordon Craig praised \textit{Soldier and

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 83, 89-94.


\textsuperscript{24} Huntington (2001), 227.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 233, 240.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 229.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 230.
the State for its fresh data and analytical depth. At the time, however, Huntington’s thesis was more widely panned, with critics accusing him of over-generalizing, promoting value preferences, and ‘sawing and stretching’ facts to fit preconceived notions. Howard White, a former Midwest Political Science Association president, considered Huntington’s seeming denunciation of American values especially galling, coming so close as it did to the end of the Second World War. In this regard, White highlighted the work’s many inconsistencies and considered objectionable Huntington’s exclusive identification of conservatism with the “military ethic” and the “military mind”. Famed Nuremberg prosecutor Telford Taylor judged ‘the author’s political opinions [had] surged like a tidal wave over the theoretical and historical structure of his book,’ and concluded his theory was ‘nothing more than a political tract for the times.’ Fellow jurist Dennis Lyons’ verdict was even more pointed: ‘Professor Huntington’s cure [was] worse than the disease.’ The clamor spread even to Huntington’s own department at Harvard, where outraged colleagues managed to block his first bid for tenure.

For all the scholarly criticism of his theory, Huntington’s presentation of the U.S. Army’s isolation appeared to offend no one. In fact, while Professor Albert Norman considered Soldier and the State ‘far from brilliant,’ the Norwich University historian declared ‘the book [was] at its best in its historical sections, dealing with the growth of the military profession
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32 Amitai Etzioni, review of The Soldier and the State, by Samuel P. Huntington. Contemporary Sociology 34, no. 5 (Sep 2005), 484.
since 1789. \footnote{Albert Norman, review of *The Soldier and the State*, by Samuel P. Huntington. *Political Science Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (Sep 1957), 472.} At that time, Norman’s approval was understandable. Huntington had drawn important parts of his narrative from Upton’s *Military Policy of the United States*, and Colonel William Ganoe’s *History of the United States Army*, itself based largely on Upton’s telling. Both books were well known amongst American historians at the time, and Ganoe’s was then the standard history on the U.S. Army. Indeed, Professor Norman likely used both books to teach his cadets at Norwich, the oldest of the country’s six senior military colleges, so he would have recognized Huntington’s chronicle as wholly conventional. This did not mean, however, that Huntington’s narrative was wholly objective.

To army historians, Emory Upton easily remains the most recognizable 19th-century reformer. A veteran of the Civil War, Upton began writing *Military Policy* in the late 1870s to reconcile his own troubling wartime experiences with the advances he observed in foreign militaries during a lengthy overseas tour. In it, Upton employed a sweeping narrative and dense statistics to show that the unnecessary length and cost of America’s wars stemmed mainly from inadequate resourcing, the army’s dependency on untrained militia, and frequent political interventions in the military’s domain of expertise. \footnote{Upton, (1907), vii, xiii-xiv.} In short, Upton pointed to civilian ineptitude as the ultimate source of the army’s ineffectiveness. In case after case, Upton blamed congressional negligence, public apathy, or the systematic interference of civilian officials for the army’s setbacks, while mostly pardoning the personal failings of military commanders and their staffs. \footnote{Ibid., 394.} As remedies, Upton suggested reforming army administration and education, creating a larger standing army, and fashioning a general staff on the Prussian model that would give the army’s leadership greater autonomy over military affairs. \footnote{Ronald J. Barr, *The Progressive Army: U.S. Army Command and Administration, 1870-1914* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998), 15.}

Upton committed suicide in 1881 before finishing the book; an intracranial tumor likely caused the severe headaches that led to his physical and emotional decline, which he
relieved with the aid of his service revolver in his quarters at the Presidio of San Francisco.\textsuperscript{37} After his death, however, extracts of his unfinished work circulated approvingly in army circles, and within a few years West Point Professor Peter Smith Michie (USMA ’63) edited a volume of Upton’s letters and included a lengthy interpretative essay of *Military Policy*, which Michie likely shaped to justify his own agenda to reform the military academy.\textsuperscript{38} *Military Policy* entered wider circulation in 1904, when Secretary of War Elihu Root ordered it published to add steam to President Theodore Roosevelt’s military reform agenda. Upton’s single-minded treatment of civilians, though, moved Root to caution readers that *Military Policy* represented a purely military viewpoint ‘colored by the strong feelings natural to a man who had been a participant in the great conflict of the civil war [sic],’ and that in parts the author had failed ‘to appreciate difficulties arising from [an American] form of government…[in] which civil government has necessarily to deal in its direction of the military arm.’\textsuperscript{39}

Thereafter, Upton’s *Military Policy* became an important source for military historians who, ignoring Root’s caution, uncritically adopted Upton’s anti-civilian tone in what historian Russell Weigley later termed ‘Uptonian pessimism.’\textsuperscript{40} The earliest to do so was Ganoe in his *United States Army*, first published in 1924. In it, Ganoe added color to Upton’s analysis by describing the post-Civil War period’s fiscal austerity as the army’s Dark Ages, when the officer corps was forced to endure ‘cudgelings of stress, neglect and hostility’ meted out by a public unsympathetic to the needs of national defense.\textsuperscript{41} This was hardly more than narrative license describing the collective disappointments of a generation of officers like Upton who,


\textsuperscript{39} Upton (1907), iv.


\textsuperscript{41} Ganoe (1942), 295, 355.
weaned on great battles, were then forced to settle for the relative humdrum of peacetime constabulary work. Nevertheless, Samuel Huntington borrowed Ganoe’s exaggerations on their face to paint army officers as having been exiled by an antagonistic public, as military historian Edward M. Coffman pointed out.42

The influence of Upton and Ganoe on Huntington’s historical narrative is well documented. However, the intellectual debt Huntington owed to U.S. Army Colonel Trevor N. Dupuy (USMA 1938) has largely gone unnoticed. In 1952, Dupuy took up the post of professor of military science at Harvard, where he and Huntington taught American history, government, and civil-military relations courses to Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) cadets.43 For Huntington, his colleague Dupuy was an important guide to historical military sources as well as contemporary military attitudes, and so he asked the colonel to comment on his finished manuscript.44 Dupuy’s remarks have not surfaced. However, the colonel likely approved of Huntington’s depiction of the estranged frontier army; Dupuy and his father, retired Colonel R. Ernest Dupuy, had only recently published Military Heritage of America, a cadet textbook on military leadership, tactics, and campaigning with a narrative similar to Huntington’s.45 Like Upton and Ganoe before them, the Colonels Dupuy kept the ‘tinseled gentlemen of the political class’ squarely in their crosshairs in a snarky style repeated soon after in their next collaboration, Brave Men and Great Captains, published in 1959.46 Of the latter work, historian Otis Singletary lamented the Dupuys’ ‘condescension toward the citizen-soldier, their suspicion of the diplomat, and their impatience with “visionary” political leaders and “parlor strategists” [that] reflect[ed] all to clearly the restricted viewpoint of the professional military man.’47

42 For a thorough discussion see, Coffman (1991), 72-73.
44 Huntington (2001), ix.
46 Dupuy and Dupuy (1956), 214.
sum, Singletary concluded the Dupuys were prisoners of their own narrow past experiences. It seemed Huntington had in his army colleague a convenient sounding board who also personified the military mind.

Huntington’s secondary sources might not have passed academic muster by today’s standards. But at that time, there simply was nothing better, as Edward Coffman reminded us. Nevertheless, Huntington’s primary evidence for the army’s wholesale isolation possessed an even more ornamental quality. This evidence consisted of four anonymous quotations untethered to context and whose notable military contributors – T. Bentley Mott (USMA ’86), Bradley Fiske (USNA ’74), William Harding Carter (USMA ’73), and Hunter Liggett (USMA ’79) – lay buried in the endnotes. When examined in context, however, Huntington’s witnesses not only offered scant evidence for the army’s isolation, their writings in fact suggested a far greater degree of civil-military elite sociality than the scholar otherwise claimed existed.

In one excerpt, Huntington quoted Colonel T. Bentley Mott as saying his West Point classmates were ‘military monks’ ‘vowed to poverty.’ The sampling was wonderfully poetic. But it was hardly empirical evidence of the Army’s general isolation. Nor did it describe Mott’s own army experiences. Bentley Mott was commissioned in the artillery after graduating from West Point in 1886 and, like most officers of his branch, the majority of his postings were not on the frontier, but to urban centers where he freely mingled with citizens of his own social station. In fact, Mott spent his first assignment at the Presidio of San Francisco. Stuck in that so-called ‘Paris of the West,’ Mott remembered he ‘had plenty of time, though very little money, for enjoying [himself] in town,’ and during one winter attended so many Shakespeare performances that he was unable to honor his monthly mess bill. During this first assignment Mott’s hardship duty totaled all of six months on an Indian reservation. And if Mott harbored any ill feelings towards civilians on principle, he certainly felt no compunction against exploiting his many social connections, civilian or military, in order to secure a plum posting.
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Subsequent assignments to New York found Mott rubbing elbows with the Astors, ‘the Sloans, the J.P. Morgans and the Hamilton Fishes,’ and as an aide-de-camp in Chicago he dined regularly at the Chicago Club in the rarified company of Marshall Field, George Pullman, Robert Lincoln, and others.\footnote{Ibid., 49-53. Mott suggested John Jacob Astor use his political influence to obtain a commission during the Spanish-American War. John Gates highlighted many of these social connections using the same source as had Huntington. See, Gates (1980), 35.}

Circulating with powerful civilians was a life to which T. Bentley Mott had been well prepared from youth. He was raised in Leesburg, in the fox hunting country of Virginia’s Loudoun County, some 50 miles west the nation’s capital.\footnote{Mott (1937), 19-23.} Mott’s kin, by his own description, belonged to the county’s ‘best people.’\footnote{Ibid., 21.} His mother, Virginia Bentley, was the daughter of Robert Bentley, one of Loudon’s large planters; his father, Dr. Armistead Randolph Mott, earned his medical degree at the University of Pennsylvania. Alongside his practice, Dr. Mott managed his wife’s 400-acre estate, Rokeby, and was lead partner in the town’s pharmacy, Mott and Purcell.\footnote{Alexandria Gazette (Alexandria, VA: 02 May 1881), 2; Eugene School, “At Littlejohn’s Pharmacy, ‘Hobby’ Filled More than Prescriptions,” Washington Post (07 Dec 2003).}

Dr. Mott’s service as chief surgeon to Confederate Lieutenant General Daniel Harvey Hill (USMA ’42) did earn him a short stretch in Washington’s Old Capitol Prison towards the end of the war.\footnote{George G. Kundahl, Confederate Engineer: Training and Campaigning with John Morris Wampler (Knoxville, TN: Univ. of Tennessee Press, 2000), 138.} But after his pardon, Dr. Mott resumed his place in Leesburg society, where he still had means to raise and educate his son as a gentleman, sensitive to the importance of position and lineage.\footnote{Alexandria Gazette (Alexandria, VA: 15 Jun 1864), 2; Alexandria Gazette (Alexandria, VA: 23 Mar 1866), 3; Mott (1937), 21-22; Alexandria Gazette (Alexandria, VA: 23 Mar 1900), 1.}

T. Bentley Mott likely overstated his vow of poverty, too. Although the war certainly had reduced his family’s fortune from its antebellum high, there were means aplenty to support Mott later in his career when he served several tours as a military attaché in the real Paris, in
France.\textsuperscript{56} We know this because at least through the First World War, the army preferred to select its attachés from amongst officers whose private means might offset the extraordinary costs associated with social life in foreign capitals.\textsuperscript{57} Taken together, Mott’s career experiences offered little proof either of isolation or poverty, and thus the colonel was in no position to testify to the conditions endured by his brother officers, Huntington’s intent notwithstanding.

If one forgave Huntington’s uncritical acceptance of Mott’s exaggerations, his short selection from Commander Bradley Fiske’s U.S. Naval Institute prize-winning essay seemed purposefully slender. Advocating the U.S. Navy’s modernization in a wide-ranging 1905 article, Fiske criticized his service’s lack of political influence in Washington. ‘The fact that naval officers are separated so much and so long from each other and from other men,’ quoted Huntington, ‘must tend to lack of unity of purpose, and therefore to lack of influence with the public.’\textsuperscript{58} Huntington obviously intended to show that naval officers shared the army’s isolation. Commander Fiske, however, would have found that conclusion ludicrous. Had Huntington read closely, he would have understood Fiske’s concept of the ‘public’ was a narrow one, as it included only men in public life who might help press the Navy’s case with Congress: the country’s ‘physicians, lawyers, engineers, architects, clergymen, journalists, and diplomats.’ ‘When we go to clubs,’ Fiske advised, ‘we ought to go to clubs where we can meet lawyers and men of affairs…not to army and navy clubs.’\textsuperscript{59} By comparison, Fiske also complained the army’s political alliances were far more profound, as ‘the Senate, the House, the Presidential Chair, the Cabinet, the Judiciary, and all the places of influence in the country were alive with generals!’\textsuperscript{60} Clearly, Fiske’s idea of the public did not mean all Americans – only those with political influence. And in Fiske’s opinion the army actually played the

\textsuperscript{56} Mott (1937), 73; Wirt Robinson, ed., \textit{Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point}, vol. 6, part 1 (Saginaw, MI: Seeman and Peters, 1922), 426.
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influence game quite well, a view Huntington chose to ignore. Thus, and with some irony, Fiske’s advocacy for a naval influence campaign was poor evidence of the army’s political isolation.

Huntington further mischaracterized the state of civil-military sociality in a 1906 essay he cited from Brigadier General William Harding Carter. To illustrate civilian antipathy for the officer corps, Huntington paraphrased Carter to claim the period’s ‘officers were conscious of their social isolation, highlighted by the absence of military leaders from important social functions, something unheard of in the early days of the country.’

Once again, Huntington’s reading seemed deceptively selective. Writing in the *North American Review*, Carter indeed complained that smaller numbers of army officers circulated amongst the ‘principal social set of the nation’s capital’ than had in the past. However, the general did not blame their absence on blanket public hostility or on remote assignments. Instead, he cited high inflation, low pay, and slow promotion as the reason officers found it difficult to mingle within their own social set. Carter reminded his readers that ‘in all countries which maintain regular armies, the social position of officers [was] never questioned except on personal and individual grounds.’ Now, however, ‘the excessive cost of living [had] unquestionably compelled the families of many excellent and talented public officials, civil and military, to avoid a society in which to go the pace means debt, social or pecuniary.’ Carter’s op-ed echoed the findings earlier that year of the U.S. Army Paymaster General, who reported that three decades of stagnant pay threatened officer retention.

The bigger issue for Carter was the looming erosion of the officer corps’ social composition, which he only partly blamed on the low pay and slow advancements that discouraged the sons of the well-off families from choosing army careers. A twin dilemma was Congress’ increase to the number of commissions available to enlisted soldiers after two years.

---
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of service. While the general allowed that ‘many excellent young men have enlisted in order to secure commissions,’ he groused that overall ‘many misfits have resulted from too free a construction of the statute; and, altogether, the real object of the law – to elevate the character of the whole personnel of the ranks – has not been realized in the slightest degree.’ To Carter the officer corps was not becoming socially isolated. Rather, it risked becoming socially diluted.

Finally, there was the quote from Colonel Hunter Liggett. At first glance, Liggett’s observation that America’s was ‘an alien army’ due to its ‘practically complete separation from the lives of the people from which it was drawn’ most conveniently summarized Huntington’s narrative. The colonel’s description, though, was little more than hyperbole in the heated campaign to relocate obsolete frontier garrisons nearer to the country’s points of embarkation. Liggett’s was one in a series of War Department editorials published in *The Independent* and entered into the Congressional Record in 1912 to shine a light on the high operating costs of Fort D.A. Russell, a frontier post established in Wyoming in 1867. Despite the frontier’s closing, the post continued to grow so that by 1912 it had become the army’s largest, thanks to the patronage of Wyoming Senator Francis E. Warren, a distinguished Civil War veteran and powerful chair the U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee. In his critique, Liggett further noted that townspeople living near old posts like D.A. Russell ‘had become accustomed to the presence of the troops, and [liked] them, no doubt, for the life and color they helped to provide,
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but also for the commercial benefit the troops meant to the community.\(^{68}\) However, with its
troops then engaged overseas the army needed ‘collective efficiency’ to conserve resources and
keep pace with foreign military developments. So far as Liggett was concerned the army was
thoroughly connected to the people – just to those in the wrong parts of the country. Placed in
context, Liggett’s splendid sentence would have turned Huntington’s theory on its head.

Despite these disabling historical flaws, Huntington’s depiction of the U.S. Army
officer corps as a wholly isolated sphere of activity has proven as durable as his theory of civil-
military relations. In essence, separation also was the conceptual starting point for Morris
Janowitz’ rival Convergence Theory, reflected in his earlier writings but best remembered from
The Professional Soldier, published in 1960. Whereas Huntington considered soldiers and
civilians as profoundly separated by differences in ideology and social function, Janowitz
framed separation as a consequence of class differences, a bias that similarly resembled the
concerns of interwar intellectuals, and which has left an equally durable mark on subsequent
scholarship.

2.4 Janowitz’ Fusion

On balance, Morris Janowitz shared Samuel Huntington’s dismal outlook for civil-
military relations, just from a slightly different perspective. While Huntington blamed tensions
on an immutable military mentality out of step with the liberal mainstream, Janowitz located
the source of conflict in the changing patterns of officer recruitment.\(^{69}\) Janowitz held that
during the 19\(^{th}\) century, elite sociality had been key to maintaining the army’s investment in
civil society, and he equated the former ‘old-family, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, rural, upper
middle-class professional’ social groups from which the army once recruited its officers as the
American equivalent of Europe’s aristocracies.\(^{70}\) However, Janowitz also agreed with the
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German expatriates that during the 20th century officer recruitment in all the industrialized nations had changed from a ‘narrow, relatively high-status social base to a broader, lower-status’ one in order to feed the demand for larger numbers of trained specialists. As evidence, he pointed to a survey of more than 700 serving officers conducted by Dartmouth College scholars John Masland and Laurence Radway showing that between 1910-1950 the number of officers identifying as ‘upper’ or ‘upper-middle class’ had fallen nearly 50%. This ‘“democratization” of the officer recruitment base,’ as Janowitz called it, did not necessarily accompany the ‘“democratization” of outlook and behavior.’ Janowitz reasoned that because officers selected lower in the social strata were less aware of democratic traditions, they valued military service mostly for its social mobility, and thus conditions of employment, more than commitment to the institution and its traditions, now governed their loyalty.

Janowitz thus prescribed a civil-military fusion, much as Harold Laswell had; before being drafted into the army during the Second World War, Janowitz analyzed German war propaganda under Lasswell at the Library of Congress, so the similarity was only natural. Whereas Huntington insisted that limiting the soldier’s influence over policy would avoid subjective civilian control, Janowitz argued that progressively overlapping civil-military roles made it impractical to enforce a strict separation. What’s more, the armed forces’ unique expertise in the military instrument of power meant it was imperative that uniformed leaders inform national security policy. In effect, keeping the military at arm’s length was potentially
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more dangerous than embracing it. Janowitz thus reasoned that exposing the new crop of low-status officers to a broad and liberal education would join them more constructively to civil leadership and aid the making of thoughtful national policies and strategies.

Empirically, *Professional Soldier* offered a stronger case than *Soldier and the State*, and its historical analysis was more thoughtful. For example, Janowitz saw through the polemics of army professionalization to see men like Emory Upton as patriotic pragmatists who strove to reform the nation’s military structures to provide a better defense, but in ways that also embodied American values. Janowitz’ appreciation of the social factors in civil-military relations also added much-needed depth to Huntington’s institutional treatment. Here, the importance he placed on pedagogy not only embraced Emile Durkheim’s theories that education awakened ‘moral states’ reinforcing social values, it anticipated socio-anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu’s later work on the role of education in cultural reproduction. Most significantly, his fusionist presentation of civil-military relations understood foreign policy formulation pragmatically as a collaboration between senior civilian and military leaders. After all, national security had never been a discreet undertaking, and it was unlikely to become so. In contrast, Huntington’s ideal state of separation remained just that.

To modern eyes, however, Janowitz’ sociology appears as chauvinistic as Huntington’s political science. For starters, Masland and Radway did not design their survey to rigorously test for social origins, and so in using their data Janowitz may have exaggerated the corps’ relative social decline. The tendency of Americans in public life either to downplay privileged
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backgrounds or to misrecognize their social advantages also is well documented.⁸² Although we usually associate this so-called log cabin effect with elected officials, army officers were just as liable as political elites to understate their status.⁸³ For instance, while the present work will indeed demonstrate that 19th-century officers came from high-status families, at least relative to their home localities, culturally the officer corps was also sensitive to critics who contended the army’s leadership was a de facto aristocracy, a barb used to attack the United States Military Academy almost from its founding.⁸⁴ Even as late as the First World War some critics still regarded the officer corps as a privileged caste of ‘the rich unemployed.’⁸⁵ Made wary, officers usually avoided discussing status or ideology too freely, a habit Janowitz even acknowledged.⁸⁶ So durable was this trait that officers likely continued to lowball their status on the Masland-Radway surveys.

Even if Janowitz was right about the officer corps’ changing social origins, American elites were hardly as monolithic as he idealized. Over time, migration and immigrant settlement patterns meant the character of the nation’s elite groups reflected regional variations in ethnicity, lifeways, and religion. More troubling, by dismissing lower-class officers as mere social climbers Janowitz ignored the historic role that commissioned service played in elite recruitment, and silk-stocking sociologist E. Digby Baltzell proposed as much. Although Baltzell, himself, lamented the decline of the old-family white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant elites to which he belonged, he also acknowledged that reproductive limitations and the swelling
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national bureaucracy’s demand for more leaders meant that with time such labels oversimplified the governing elite’s character. Rather, American elites traditionally regenerated by assimilating newcomers who shared their sensibilities.\textsuperscript{87} Scholars C. Wright Mills, Allen Potter, Edward Pessen, and Jackson Turner Main charted similar evolutions over the course of American history.\textsuperscript{88} The dynamic nature of these elites therefore meant the weight Janowitz gave to any changes in the corps’ nativity, religious affiliation, or ethnic identity begged a more rigorous comparison not only to changes in the nation’s continually evolving electorate – the pool from which officers were chosen – but also to changes within the groups empowered to select military leaders. As new social groups influenced military appointments, it stands to reason that officers drawn from those emerging constituencies continued to meet the threshold of social and political acceptability, even if by such benign characteristics as religion, race, and ethnicity they were more diverse. In sum, superficial changes in the officer corps’ composition did not necessarily augur a substantial decrease in its loyalty.

Still more disabling were Janowitz’ biases about the intersections of class, ideology, and the military’s place in society. Such presumptions were rife in scholarly circles at the time, perhaps indicative of the reflexive failure of a generation of academics plucked from college to fill the ranks during the Second World War, some by choice but others compelled, including Janowitz and Huntington.\textsuperscript{89} What moral injury, one wonders, led army veteran and sociologist Felton D. Freeman to conclude the military personality was a ‘psychosis,’ on account of its supposed fixation with order and hierarchy?\textsuperscript{90} That said, at least one clear-eyed army veteran and sociologist called out Janowitz. While Joseph Gusfield otherwise praised his colleague’s
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work as a welcomed tonic to Huntington’s reductionism, he rejected the notion that social class
determined ideology. The development of ideology and behavior, Gusfield countered, was a
more complex process, shaped not only by education, as Janowitz proposed, but also by
‘socialization into primary work groups, work experience, and personal alliances.’

Despite his more pragmatic presentation of civil-military relationships, Janowitz’
confirmation of contemporary social biases about the officer corps’ character did as much as
Huntington to fix in the popular consciousness that military leaders were worlds apart from the
civil society they protected.

2.5 Apart or a Part? The Army Embraces Huntington

As reactions to a brutal century, Huntington’s and Janowitz’ theories helped popularize
for generations that the character of a state’s civil-military relations is the dependent variable in
violent policy choices. By today’s standards, however, their studies reaffirm dubious historical
narratives or confirm deeply held class biases which still lead many today to imagine the U.S.
military as socially, ideologically, and intellectually separated from the very society it is raised
to defend. Perhaps most astonishingly, U.S. Army educators were especially complicit in
promoting Huntington’s normal theory. In attempts to raise the prestige of commissioned
service during the late 1950s, West Point’s professoriate adopted Huntington’s model of the
isolated professional, even as they embarked on broad curriculum reforms intended to better
prepare young officers for greater roles in national defense policy, much as Janowitz had
suggested. The U.S. Military Academy’s curriculum study of 1957-1959 bore witness to this
tension.

91 Joseph R. Gusfield, review of The Professional Soldier, A Social and Political Portrait, by
Department Founder Joseph Gusfield Dies at 91,” USC San Diego News Center (29 Jan 2015) at
http://ucsdnews.ucsd.edu/feature/sociology_department_founder_joseph_gusfield_91_dies (accessed 14
Jul 2016).

92 Although Professional Soldier appeared in print after West Point concluded its curriculum
review, the committee was conversant in Janowitz’ earlier work on the topic.

93 Report on the results of the Superintendent's curriculum study, 1957-59, II-6; Records of the
United States Military Academy, 1800-1993; Records of the Office of the Superintendent 1838-1989,
In 1957, the U.S. Military Academy surveyed thousands of graduates and current cadets to help determine the competencies army officers needed in the modern army, in preparation for a broader curriculum review. The responses from seasoned graduates were overwhelmingly positive. Not only did they believe the old curriculum had adequately prepared them for their careers, they further felt imbued with same high ethical standards of previous generations. Moreover, most remained interested in pursuing their careers to full term. The surveys, however, detected a troubling trend amongst more recent graduates and current cadets, as far fewer were committed to a life of uniformed service. In fact, fully 12% of the Class of 1957 responded that if given a second chance they would never have attended West Point, and of the Class of 1962 – cadets who had matriculated in 1958 – only 6% planned to pursue a full career in the army. Instead, 64% reported they had no intention of staying in the army beyond five years, and another 10% felt graduating cadets should not be compelled to serve in the army at all.

West Point’s curriculum committee blamed the fading appeal of service on the enormous growth in American prosperity. As the last modern economy left standing after the Second World War, the United States entered an extended post-war economic boom. Between 1940-1960, the country’s gross domestic product rose from around $101 billion to some $527 billion, accompanied by a 27% rise in population thanks to new immigration and the post-war baby boom. By 1960, college enrollments had doubled to 3.7 million as the country added almost 1,000 new campuses to meet the public sector’s demand for better-educated managers.
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and to receive the legions of veterans promised education benefits under the G.I. Bill.\textsuperscript{100} Even with millions more college-educated men available, average annual incomes for those with four or more years of college continued to climb, from about $2,600 in 1939 to over $8,600 by 1958, 40\% more than a newly minted second lieutenant then received.\textsuperscript{101} So, as it periodically happened, West Point found itself increasingly in competition for talent with the public sector. Worse still, the curriculum committee worried America’s youth had become sullied by consumerism and the pursuit of personal luxury, and were no longer interested in the academy’s ‘transcendent values of service, self-discipline, and “Duty, Honor, Country.”’\textsuperscript{102}

In a way, these circumstances were little different than those Huntington’s erstwhile witness, General William H. Carter, complained about a half-century earlier when another expanding economy had led talented elites to pursue business, civilian professions, or the idle life rather than render to ‘the state some gallant or useful service.’\textsuperscript{103} The problem, though, was one of scale. At the time Carter wrote, the United States faced no serious foreign threats, and the Regular Army’s 70,000 officers and other ranks were engaged mostly in constabulary duties at home or in newly acquired overseas possessions.\textsuperscript{104} By the late 1950s, the army was ten times larger and was supposed to face down a nuclear-armed Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{105} What the committee needed, they reckoned, was a more attractive learning environment and to boost the prestige of a career in commissioned service.

Of the first task, the committee recommended adding electives and advanced versions of core offerings, and to place greater emphasis on the humanities and social sciences to make
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the curriculum more appealing.\textsuperscript{106} Such changes would break the tedium of the traditional engineering program and bring West Point more into step with competing elite civilian schools, like Princeton and Harvard, which had already begun to reshape their ROTC curricula along similar lines, albeit with some controversy.\textsuperscript{107} In theory, a broader education also would prepare cadets for policy and strategy positions later in their careers by imparting ‘a sound understanding of the role of the military establishment in a democratic society and its relationships to other elements of the government,’ without sacrificing the expertise in science and engineering needed to navigate the complex defense industrial base.\textsuperscript{108} These initiatives clearly reflected the thinking of Masland, Radway, and Janowitz that still informs discussions of professional military education to this day.\textsuperscript{109}

The second task of raising the officer corps’ prestige necessarily would take longer to accomplish. While the committee acknowledged that an officer’s career remained attractive with some young men, they were also concerned these men remained products of a self-indulgent society.\textsuperscript{110} Therefore, the educators borrowed Huntington’s imagery of the isolated professional to raise the Corps of Cadets’ awareness that fundamental differences in commitment and purpose separated soldiers and civilians, and that as members of ‘a unique professional class’ they were obliged to live according to higher values than those typically observed in civilian society.\textsuperscript{111} In the committee’s eyes, Huntington’s model would further rationalize for cadets the purpose of West Point’s more highly structured military environment, by distinguishing it from the disorder and self-interest of the civilian world.

West Point’s faculty broadly agreed with the fusionists’ emphasis of professional
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education. However, the acceptance of Huntington’s separation thesis as a model for cadets was far from universal. One detractor was Colonel George A. Lincoln (USMA 1929), a Rhodes scholar and long-time head of West Point’s Department of Social Sciences. Lincoln accused Huntington of ‘straining to maintain the purity’ of his thesis by locating the genesis of army professionalization in the frontier-era’s alleged isolation, and of placing too much emphasis on the supposed ideological differences separating military officers from civilians; for that matter, even the committee concluded Huntington’s ‘military mind’ was merely one impression that ignored the changeable character of military service. Moreover, Lincoln felt Huntington had gotten the crux of the civil-military problematique exactly wrong. The dilemma was not how to maintain separate military and civilian spheres, but rather ‘how to assure the effective integration under civilian leadership of the total national security effort,’ given that military and political considerations overlapped. Finally, Lincoln judged Soldier and the State was more suited to the graduate seminar, where students could read the text critically to generate discussion and alternatives. It was not long after, though, that Soldier and the State became a fixture in professional military education.

Read Soldier and the State closely and one can easily sense why Huntington’s presentation of a separate professional military sphere seemed tailor-made to the army’s needs. First off, Huntington’s chronicle of civilian hostility and the army’s 19th-century isolation reaffirmed the service’s own historical memory, as implanted by Emory Upton and cultivated by Peter Michie, William Ganoe, and the Dupuys. Moreover, his exposition on the military’s ethic described in ideal terms how army reformers since Upton had long viewed their profession: a distinct calling requiring mastery of specialized knowledge to steward a uniquely
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legal and morally bounded jurisdiction. In fact, the ink had barely dried on Huntington’s tract when the committee borrowed agreeable excerpts to describe the military professional as a manager of violence, motivated not by economic gain, but instead from a ‘technical love for his craft and the sense of social obligation to utilize this craft for the benefit of society,’ sentiments that quickly entered U.S. Army canon. Finally, Huntington appealed directly to the army’s vanity. In the final pages, Huntington fawningly contrasted the academy’s ‘community of structured purpose’ with the ‘garish individualism’ of Highland Falls, the civilian village just beyond its gates. Often quoted since, Huntington described West Point as ‘a bit of Sparta in the midst of Babylon,’ a garrison ‘suffused with the rhythm and harmony which comes when collective will supplants individual whim,’ and one that ‘embodies the military ideal at its best.’ ‘Modern man,’ Huntington concluded, ‘may well find his monastery in the Army.’ The army bought it.

In the six decades since its publication, it is fair to say that no presentation has shaped our understanding of the profession of arms more thoroughly than Huntington’s Soldier and the State. Army leaders continue to reach almost reflexively for Huntington to articulate the service’s professional ethic and to stress the moral and legal distance separating soldiers from civilians in a democratic republic. The book even remains a fixture on military syllabi, and appears frequently on military professional reading lists alongside classics by Clausewitz, Jomini, and Mahan, praised by senior army leaders for its emphasis on ‘the military outlook for national policy’ and its ‘rigorous historical analysis.’ That said, the army’s fixation with Huntington has had unwelcomed consequences. By embracing Huntington’s distortions to
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elevate the special nature of military service, the army conditioned generations of officers and civilians, alike, to accept as fact a greater civil-military distinction than ever truly existed. This is especially vexing when we recall that the U.S. Army, no matter how unique its role, remains a reflexive subset of the larger national culture. Moreover, exposing generations of officers to Soldier and the State’s narrow presentation of policymaking actually undermined the very objectives of mid-century army educators to better prepare officers to partner with civilians. As former U.S. Army War College Commandant William E. Rapp observed, the military’s long embrace of Huntington’s separation thesis has made many senior officers reluctant to sally forth from their cones of excellence to assume more responsibility in policy and strategy development, even in cases where civilian and military roles merge more completely, such as in stability operations and in managing humanitarian disasters.\(^\text{120}\) In appropriating Huntington’s articulation of their professional ethic, army leaders ironically have perpetuated the tension they sought to resolve at West Point more than half a century ago.

### 2.6 Concluding Remarks

The study of civil-military relations emerged in the mid-20\(^{th}\) century as an anxious response not only to immensely destructive wars, but also to unsettling social, cultural, and political trends the early writers believed would only lead to greater military conflict. Some scholars feared the national defense sector’s expansion had outpaced the reproductive capacity of the old guard elite, and that as the defense enterprise penetrated ever deeper into American society an illiberal underclass threatened to take hold of the policy instrument of violence. Building on these anxious antecedents, Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz offered dueling remedies each believed would preserve a liberal democratic order without sacrificing national security. Huntington found his solace in maintaining the officer corps’ allegedly
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historic separation from civil society. Janowitz believed a more broadly educated officer corps would better appreciate liberal government and prepare them to cooperate with civilian policy makers. Despite their tensions, both scholars’ remedies were equally nostalgic: for Huntington, maintaining civilian control meant returning to an imagined frontier past, while for Janowitz it meant preserving an idealized elite order. And the U.S. Army, in its long quest for professional legitimacy, has helped perpetuate both.

In the decades since, few scholars have produced truly competing theories. In the 1970s, sociologist Charles Moskos blended separatist and fusionist perspectives in his Institutional/Occupational Hypothesis, from which he argued the return to an all-volunteer force had accelerated the army’s devolution from a profession to an occupation, a transformation which eventually would civilianize military service.121 While today Moskos’ musings are all but forgotten, his argument’s lexical semantics live on in the army’s longstanding paranoia about the creeping bureaucratization of the military profession.122 Much more recently, Duke University political scientist Peter Feaver penned one of the more promising variants in his Armed Servants.123 Feaver parted with his former mentor Huntington to propose a Principal-Agent Framework. In the context of daily decision making, Feaver reasoned that a spectrum of incentives and sanctions influenced the submission or resistance of senior military leaders to civilian oversight, what he called ‘working’ and ‘shirking.’ Feaver’s theoretic game certainly offers a more deductive alternative to Huntington at the working level, presuming rewards and punishments are foremost on the minds of military decision makers. However, his study’s lack of historical depth left intact many of Huntington’s questionable assumptions about the soldier’s relationship to civil society, including that part about mutual enmity. His cost-benefit calculus also fails to fully account for patriotism, nationalism, or family reputation, admittedly messy variables which might nevertheless suggest that civilians
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and soldiers share more unity of purpose than typically is claimed. Feaver’s work thus stands as an important refinement of separatism rather than a wholesale deviation.

One of the more promising alternatives to Huntington appeared much earlier in British political scientist Samuel Finer’s *Man on Horseback*, published in 1962. Although Finer agreed a military’s subordination to civil authority was unnatural, he rejected the notion that an arbitrary professional ethic – which for Huntington comprised expertise, responsibility, and corporateness – was an effective safeguard. As Finer reminded us, the German *Wehrmacht* and the Imperial Japanese Army were highly professional bodies, if by any definition other than Huntington’s, yet both had intervened in politics. Instead, Finer understood a state’s civil-military relations as integral to its unique political culture, classified according to its political development. Finer concluded that cooperative civil-military relationships were greatest in nations at the higher end of his typology: those possessing morally legitimate institutions and whose population enjoyed a high degree of social cohesion, if not equality. By implication, civilian and military elites in such societies shared the dominant outlooks underpinning the mode of governance, whether or not it was democratic. He thus warned against drawing easy comparisons between the American experience and, for instance, those of coup-prone states emerging in the rush to decolonize after the Second World War, whose military leadership reflected the social preferences of former colonial powers rather than the newly liberated political elite. Regrettably, Finer’s work often is lumped with the coup literature, and these days attracts little attention in American circles.

Much more recently, Rebecca Schiff delved into this cultural territory with her *Concordance Theory*. Schiff did not eschew separation altogether. She instead argued it was
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not the dependent variable in effective civilian control. Using comparative methods, Schiff observed that harmonious patterns in a state’s civil-military relations reflected certain structural and cultural variables. These included the state’s manner of military recruitment, its mode of political decision-making, and its ‘military style,’ a mélange of symbols, rituals, and traditions manifested, for example, in uniforms, regulations, martial music, and the like, that both paced a given state’s prevailing culture and reinforced the division of social roles and responsibilities.128 Perhaps the signal variable informing the officer corps’ obedience to civilian leadership was its social composition. Because officers acted as stewards of the military institution’s competencies and values, it was vitally important the corps shared with its civilian leadership important cultural and social characteristics to keep both groups in step.129 As with Finer, the power in Schiff’s approach was that it was more descriptive than normative, allowing us to imagine the formation of military institutions and the patterns of civil-military relations as a more generalizable phenomenon subject to social forces. Unfortunately, mainstream specialists have consigned her presentation to the footnotes. One orthodox scholar even panned her work as exaggerating cases of ‘superficial harmony’ – surely an unjust charge given the great weight some orthodox scholars routinely attach to fleeting disharmonies.130 A more constructive critique is that Schiff made bricks without straw in that she only lightly explored the social and cultural dynamics central to her argument.

Despite its artificiality, separatism has proven a remarkably durable paradigm with American scholars not only because of its theoretical elegance, but also for the insufficiency of alternatives. Nevertheless, by insisting military and civilian mentalities are fundamentally distinct, immutable, and irreconcilable, Huntington’s civil-military distinction creates its own


intellectual blind spot, concealing the important roles already played by the deeper social and cultural processes at work in civil-military relationships. This, Finer and Schiff fully appreciated. For scholars studying foreign militaries, Huntington’s wide appeal poses a special problem: his ideal types are so firmly rooted in an idealized American past they do not translate easily to the historical experiences or social conditions of other nations. Thus, scholars often gauge the military professionalism of foreign armies according to their deviation from Huntington’s model, rather than according to social realities on the ground, generating calls for better frameworks.\footnote{See, Andrew A. Szarejko, “The Soldier and the Turkish State: Toward a General Theory of Civil-Military Relations,” Perceptions 29, no. 2 (Summer 2014), 139-158; Olaf Bachmann, “Civil-Military Relations in Francophone Africa and the Consequences of a Mistaken Analysis,” Small Wars & Insurgencies 25, no. 3 (2014), 607-627; Rocky Williams, “Towards the Creation of an African Civil-Military Relations Tradition,” African Journal of Political Science 3, no. 1 (Jun 1998), 20-41.}

To do one better, any competing paradigm would have to tackle four tasks. One, it must account for the role that social structures play in the creation and reproduction of norms and group behavior over time, something most orthodox approaches take pains to avoid. Two, the framework should transcend the levels of analysis by establishing the linkages between large structural processes and human agency – in other words, to understand how and why people institutionalize structures and how they might behave within them. Three, it should be rooted in an historical approach that can directly challenge the orthodoxy’s foundations. Not only is this essential for calling to account Huntington’s mythology, a longer time scale is vital for revealing the larger interactions that might aid prediction. Finally, such a framework should be able to generate implications that go beyond the exceptional American experience, even as it critically re-examines that case. Expanding Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of social and cultural reproduction to civil-military relations accomplishes these four tasks.

The following chapter discusses Bourdieu’s theories and applies them to the growth of U.S. Army profession in the 19th century. The chapter posits the character of civil-military relations is a byproduct of social reproduction, revealed in military commissioning practices that reflect a state’s dominant or elite dispositions. The officer’s commission is a symbolic
grant of trust, established in earlier times through elite sociability. As the nation differentiated, bureaucratic military commissioning practices steadily evolved that emulated these elite preferences, in effect reinforcing boundaries that restricted access to the officer corps mostly to men from social groups versed in the nation’s dominant dispositions – the same groups that provided the nation’s political leadership. Far from separate, the American officer corps was an inextricable constituent of the nation’s public service elite, what Progressive Era essayist James Whelpley dubbed, ‘the class which took an interest in military affairs.’

3.1 Introduction

Despite the dueling nuances of separatism and fusionism, the main thrust of civil-military relations scholarship accepts that militaries are fundamentally distinct from the societies they serve. Deeply embedded in this perspective, however, are cozy assumptions that in several ways beg the question. The orthodox view assumes that social status correlates strongly with political ideology, even though drives like loyalty, patriotism, and nationalism routinely join in common cause groups from disparate backgrounds and conflicting partisan views. Or, that an arbitrary professional ethic is the glue binding military leaders to their government, when the inheritance of a society’s larger narratives, customs, values, and norms begins long before one’s military service. Or, that sociality’s role in proliferating values and norms is a practice exclusive to old families, when presumably old families were at one time young ones. Or, that an officer’s commission is freely available to all classes, even as those in political power influence the standards for selection and advancement. Addressing civilians and soldiers as wholly separate social entities only extends such fallacies.

Fundamentally, an army’s vital function is to preserve the social order that produced it, whether as a force-in-being or through war. Certainly, raising an army presents a seeming contradiction: empowering a few to wield the kinetic instrument in a society’s defense invites the risk of usurpation. This dilemma is not unique to democracies, monarchies, or military dictatorships. Nor is it a problem unique to our time. Given this possibility, those in political power, be they soldiers or civilians, have a natural incentive to entrust military leadership only to those social groups versed in their society’s dominant values and dispositions, even in democratic ones. We cannot arrive at such a logical conclusion while simultaneously insisting that soldiers and civilians exist in isolation, or that officers come from some different part of the social structure than those who lead civil affairs, or that military mentalities share nothing in common with civilian outlooks. Constitutional limits, laws, official oaths, professional
ethics, and even the officer’s commission, itself, are unlikely loyal bonds for those who do not share a common interest in preserving a nation’s underpinning dispositions and a vision of its place in the world.

Previously, this dissertation traced the orthodoxy’s European origins, as well as the empirical flaws and biases that informed its two greatest American texts by Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz. Also discussed was the important role professional military education has since played to skew our appreciation of the mentalities and proper interactions of American soldiers and civilians. This chapter presents civil-military relations as a more muscular expression of social reproduction, intergenerational interactions that trend towards preserving social order and culture, as an alternative framework.\(^1\) Its guiding premise is that military institutions are as integral to the reproduction of a nation’s dominant or elite lifeways as civilian institutions. These tendencies reveal themselves in a state’s commissioning practices: the methods and standards by which those in political power select their military leadership. In earlier times, trust between military and civilian leaders was made possible due to the commission’s relative scarcity and the dependency for admission on elite sociability.\(^2\) As society differentiated, the army adopted bureaucratic practices that nevertheless emulated elite social preferences, even as they allowed some mobility of newcomers, like the German immigrant Carl Reichmann, who were able to acquire the social and cultural capital for entry.

The chapter begins by summarizing the central concepts of Pierre Bourdieu’s *Practice Theory* from the individual through state levels. The chapter then focuses this Bourdieusian lens on the evolution of U.S. Army commissioning practices from the colonial period through the early 20\(^{th}\) century. Considerable attention is given to the evolution of practices governing admissions to the U.S. Military Academy, which gradually became the primary means of reproducing the nation’s officer corps in peacetime. Practices regulating meritorious
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promotions from the ranks and direct appointments from civil life, the other two means of obtaining Regular Army appointments in 1884, receive subsequent attention. The chapter argues that while early professional reforms opened some opportunity to men from new groups, the steady adoption of more bureaucratic selection practices later in the century continued to privilege the same provincial elite groups from which the army traditionally selected its officers, in ways that both reproduced the nation’s dominant dispositions and enabled the federal government’s concentration of coercive capital. Because formal education played an increasingly important part in officer selections, the chapter discusses at length the relative availability of education in the United States during the 19th century.

As a final note, the chapter treats exposure to higher education as a proxy for cultural capital to distinguish it from the symbolic capital of a college degree. The award of degrees was much rarer throughout the 19th century than it has since become, and many schools then counted non-graduates as alumni, to include the U.S. Military Academy.

3.2 Social Reproduction, à la Bourdieu

For Pierre Bourdieu, social reproduction was the outcome of complex and nested interactions, both conscious and unconscious, which produced and reaffirmed structures of meaningful relationships and conforming practices. At the core of Bourdieu’s cosmology lay the concepts of habitus, field, and capital. Bourdieu described the habitus in one of many ways as history embodied yet forgotten, ‘internalized as second nature.’ The habitus of an individual or group comprised layered schemas that reflected their experiences, expectations, and their doxa, a set of subconscious boundaries and undeniable truths. Habitus mediated the production and reproduction of conforming practices, and might display itself in one’s physical bearing and mannerisms, or hesis. At its most basic level, the production of an individual’s primary
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habitus began forming in the home through ‘imperceptible apprenticeships from the family upbringing,’ by observing and participating in the rituals of daily family life. Thought another way, one’s primary habitus was a social group or class habitus.

Because the family was the locus of one’s primary socialization, Bourdieu reasoned that an individual’s primary habitus was durable, though not strictly immutable; it was subject to revision and might adapt to new encounters or to unexpected situations. Any changes, though, tended to be slow and imperceptible, occurring in historic time. Spliced to this was the secondary habitus, somewhat more malleable schemas produced through social interactions, work group influences, school experiences, or other pedagogic actions. Whereas the secondary habitus enabled one to interrogate and cope with new experiences more dynamically, it remained by degrees subject to the inertia of the primary habitus. Taken together, one’s habitus was a cognitive reference point that plotted social outlook and trajectory, and when embodied it telegraphed that position to others in a structure of social relations.

As suggested, Bourdieu’s habitus was both the product and mediator of practices. But it did not predetermine thought and actions. Instead, Bourdieu likened the habitus to a tacit set of rules, or ‘the feel for a game’ played out in particular fields of practice: social spaces of shared meaning and objective relations, like law, or journalism, or education, or religion, or security. Each field was governed by its own internal logic, and each produced a tertiary habitus broadly approximating the shared experiences and outlook of its members. Entering a
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field required the possession of relevant qualifying capital for recognition, the type and value of which varied with the field. In some fields, for example, recognition of a fitting hexis might suffice, such as received accents, manners, or dress, that established rapport with a field’s cohabitants. Entering other fields might require money capital or cultural capital, or both. In 19th century America, for instance, the knowledge of ancient Greek and Latin was gateway cultural capital to those fields requiring a post-secondary education, competencies that did not come cheaply. The type and value of access-granting capital might also fluctuate with time, as was the case in the U.S. Army officer corps. Early on, entrée depended heavily on one’s gentlemanly hexis and stocks of social capital, defined here as a durable network of personal connections. Yet, over time cultural capital, as in a formal education, rose in importance as a supplemental mark of distinction.13

While moderately autonomous, by varying degrees fields remained susceptible to exterior influences in part because they often overlapped, intersected, shared homologies, or were otherwise nested within other fields, each with its own logic and regularities.14 The field of education, for example, counts a host of specialized yet interrelated academic subfields and interconnecting social spaces: the classroom, the college, the academy, and so on. Similarly, we can envision an officer corps as a subfield, ordered by its own logic, hierarchies, and spatial contexts – the foxhole, the barracks, the headquarters – nested within progressively larger military and security fields, altogether overlapped by ever larger public service and political fields, each with their own divisions. Bourdieu thus reasoned that agents occupying broadly homologous positions within different fields might enjoy varying degrees of practical recognition based on certain shared affinities or interdependencies.15 At the risk of being reductive, it is useful to imagine the correspondence between the scientific and medical fields, or the juridical and political fields, or the security and public service fields, each structured

13 Bourdieu (1986), 249.
somewhat differently, yet according to an externally recognizable internal logic. For the army officer, this meant enjoying a certain status recognition with elites in adjacent or related fields, even when those elites might be less familiar with the minutiae of the military field’s peculiar divisions or rituals.

Together, Bourdieu expressed these concepts as \([\text{habitus} \ (\text{cultural capital})] + \text{field} = \text{practice}\).\(^{16}\) Returning to Bourdieu’s game analogy, a field’s practices took shape as agents occupying various positions interacted to possess or regulate forms of capital particular to that field of struggle, the stakes of which were to improve or maintain their relative standing.\(^{17}\) Entering the game not only required the opposing agents possess an appropriate bankroll of capital, doing so implied they agreed as to the rules of the game, the value of their investments, and their objective chances of securing the stakes. In other words, it was a subtle form of collusion between the dominant and the dominated that reaffirmed the structure of their relations and attending practices.\(^{18}\) Applying these concepts in a practical sense, we might imagine the benefits of predisposition accruing to children who, raised with a habitus respecting the place of public service, might grow to seek an officer’s commission. If equipped early in life with the rules to the game, each possessed a certain structural advantage in amassing the cultural and social bona fides needed to enter the officer corps. By conforming to the commissioning prerequisites, they acknowledged the officer corps’ boundaries as legitimate. And by accepting a commission, these new officers then developed an inherent interest in ensuring the stability not only of the officer corps’ internal divisions, but also in maintaining the corps’ practical recognition with other related fields in efforts to secure the value of their investments and their future status. The upshot was that this outlook tended to
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legitimize and concentrate practices that promoted structural stability.\(^{19}\) For those lacking the benefits of predisposition, we can similarly imagine any successful struggle to acquire the relevant capital for recognition as merely compounding the loyalty to structure and practice from which they hoped to benefit.\(^{20}\) Think, here, of the immigrant Reichmann, who spent a lifetime amassing the competencies and capital that would fully integrate him in an elite structure of relations. Thus, as scholar Matthias Walther elegantly put it, ‘by acting in conformity with the structure, the structure is confirmed and reproduced.’\(^{21}\)

As suggested earlier, interactions and interdependencies within and between fields make it quite difficult to envision that any given field exists in complete isolation. This also is the case with national armies and their leaders, those recruited from amongst a state’s citizenry. For instance, an army’s leaders carry with them a durable habitus reflecting not only their respective social origins but also the social and cultural preferences of those possessing the power to appoint them, the intersections of which at once inform and correspond to a tertiary habitus reflected in the army’s internal structures.\(^{22}\) An army’s internal structures – both the mental and the objective – are thus the product and producer of practices conforming to valued aspects of the dominant or national habitus. This is why on the face of it, an army’s appearance reveals its state’s symbolic order, expressed in fashion, colors, ceremonies, customs, and the multitude of insignia that differentiate rank and purpose, as Rebecca Schiff suggested.\(^{23}\) On a more functional level, an army’s roles and missions, its hierarchy and administration, its


\(^{21}\) Walther (2014), 14.

\(^{22}\) Burawoy (2018), 385. Even in contemporary Pakistan, where the army exercises considerable influence over the state, the military is established in civil law. See, C. Christine Fair and Shuja Nawaz, “The Changing Pakistan Army Officer Corps,” Journal of Strategic Studies 34, no. 1 (Feb 2011), 63-94. See also, Nina Harding, “You Bring It, We’ll Bring It Out: Becoming a Soldier in the New Zealand Army” (PhD Diss. Manawatū, NZ: Massey Univ., 2016), a Bourdieusian study that found military service did not erase the pre-service habitus.

rewards and punishments, and its terms of service are rooted in the larger practices recognized as legitimate to those in political authority. And on a psychological level, an army’s world view conforms in the broadest sense to its state’s dominant outlook. As a state’s commanding lifeways change with time, these changes steadily reflect throughout the military field. In these ways, a national army is socially and culturally inseparable from the social structures that produced it.

Bourdieu’s frameworks help us not only to imagine how the complexities of higher-level social life spring from a kernel of institutionalizing tendencies at lower levels, but also how these tendencies reproduce as legitimate the dominant preferences and dispositions in ever larger structures over time. Later in his career, Bourdieu extended these concepts to help understand the development of the modern state, and the major role the state plays in reproducing a nation’s social and cultural order. Because an army is the centerpiece of the modern bureaucratic state’s monopoly on coercive capital, any study of the officer in a state’s social reproduction would be incomplete without locating commissioning practices within Bourdieu’s model of state formation.

### 3.3 The Officer and the State: Reproduction in the Field of Fields

Bourdieu did not treat the state as a mere abstract. Instead, he proposed a four-phase model of state formation which bore many similarities to his exposition on fields. Here, the first three phases are germane. Bourdieu thought of the state as both a mental and objective structure of social relations occupying an administrative space in the field of power, a ‘field of fields’ encompassing and running through the social constellation. Within this meta-field, elites holding various species of capital interacted with one another for dominance, sometimes
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violently or polemically, but also politically, juridically, or pedagogically. In Bourdieu’s first phase of development, the state emerged coextensively with the various social fields of practice to regulate for the opposing agents the value of their capital and the rates of conversion. Through a process Bourdieu described as concentration, the state’s regulatory role gained legitimacy as the antagonists became dependent on its intervention to secure their respective stakes. This initial concentration of capital assumed a dynastic form in the second phase, with the state embodied in a king who mediated social relations for a natural nobility. Because the dynastic state’s organizing principle centered on the ‘king’s house,’ social reproduction was synonymous with maintaining the royal household’s patrimony through marriage strategies, kinship networks, and family alliances. As society differentiated, however, the dynastic state gradually yielded to a more bureaucratic form in the third phase when the juridical field’s steady intrusion into the affairs of state precipitated a rupture in lineage-based reproduction. In what we might call a doxic shift, the former logic of nepotism now lost legitimacy as the emerging bureaucratic state’s organizing principles became more firmly rooted in ostensibly fairer administrative law. The upshot was a devolution of power from a consanguineous nobility to a new administrative nobility who, working through institutions such as the army, the churches, and the schools, became the dominant brokers of practices reproducing the progressively complex relations in the field of power until, as Bourdieu summed up, ‘cousins are replaced by neighbors.’

Bourdieu’s model of state development bears a likeness to those proposed earlier by
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Max Weber, Norbert Elias, and Charles Tilly. Like his predecessors, Bourdieu’s concept of concentration included foremost the state’s staking a claim to a legitimate monopoly on coercive capital – over the army and the police – within its territorial jurisdiction. What truly set Bourdieu’s model apart from these earlier works, however, was his consideration that *symbolic violence* was the subtler mechanism that legitimized the state’s domination of physical violence. By this, Bourdieu meant the state’s ceaseless efforts to unify its constituents by curating a natural order to an otherwise arbitrary social life. Bourdieu pointed to the English invention of the commission as one of many symbolic *rites of institution* that states used to inculcate the natural social order. By the spectacle of commissioning, the sovereign shared some state power with trusted agents appointed to tackle missions deemed socially important. It was a practical gesture. But it also amounted to a subtle cooption on a grand scale as in the public’s eye, *consecrating* capable agents recognized for their adherence to the dominant dispositions not only reaffirmed those outlooks, it also confirmed the state’s authority to appoint. By the same measure, elite opposition to the state weakened as those commissioned became more dependent on state resources to fulfill their societal obligations and to maintain their communal status. Bourdieu dwelt on the formation of civil commissions meant to tackle complex public problems like urban planning, as contemporary examples. Nevertheless, his concept extends just as easily to military commissions as a means of
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legitimately concentrating state power in this way: whereas the control over the army is the blunt end of a state’s coercive monopoly, officer commissioning practices are the symbolic mechanisms which legitimize this claim.

Indeed, we can trace a state’s transformation from dynasty to bureaucracy in the reciprocal alterations to its commissioning practices. On the more esoteric level are changes in the rituals of officer consecration. In dynastic states, for instance, the pledges of personal fealty to a monarch, like in the dubbing of medieval knights famously described by historian Marc Bloch, became in bureaucratic states the oaths of loyalty taken in defense of a nation’s unifying laws, embodied in a constitution. 39 Also, we can account for changes to the type and value of the capital required for a commission that respect the transformation in a state’s organizing principles. Monarchs, for example, assigned a high value to social capital in efforts to divide opposition and increase the circle of loyal retainers, such as by extending commissions to the second sons of potentially rivalrous noble families or to respectable outsiders. 40 But as dealing in patronage was made unseemly, the bureaucratic state adopted practices that placed a higher value on cultural capital, like education, to regularize selections in the interest of maintaining broad legitimacy with the public. The concomitant specialization of the warring function, marked by the gradual diffusion of education in the military field of practice, further dissolved the purely social basis of officer selection. 41 So, as the organizing principle of the state changed, so too did the character of practices used to select its military leadership. And all the while in the background, the state further concentrated its monopoly on coercive capital as at first paid professionals displaced feudal levies, in much the same way as latter-day Regulars subsumed provincial militias. 42

42 Ibid.
This said, because the state was at root a composition of oppositions, Bourdieu believed the transition to a bureaucratic state did not eliminate altogether the influence of social practices originating with the family. In another break with Weber and Elias, in particular, Bourdieu reasoned that traces of the dynastic state thus remained in what he called the semi-bureaucratic state, a transitional phase exhibiting the inherent tensions between the reproductive imperatives of the family and those of the bureaucracy.\(^{43}\) With nepotism reframed as corruption, elites naturally would attempt to safeguard their family’s position and resources, at times by blocking or circumventing emerging practices that threatened their group position, or by exploiting social networks beyond the family group, or by otherwise concealing any notion of privilege within the mechanisms of bureaucratic practice.\(^{44}\) Ernesto Seidel’s study of 19\(^{th}\)-century Brazilian officers reveals this hybrid of dynastic and bureaucratic practices at play, in that officers embarked on social strategies to enhance their professional standing despite their army’s adoption of meritocratic standards of selection and promotion.\(^{45}\)

Not only did Bourdieu note the ability of elite families to blunt at times the seeming march of progress, he also stressed they occupied innately superior positions from which to convert economic and social resources into more highly valued cultural capital in efforts to conserve old advantages as the principles of state organization changed.\(^{46}\) Again, think of education as a cultural resource growing in demand, the attainment of which requires economic resources. Bourdieu cited as examples the behaviors of elites in business and public service. Both groups, Bourdieu argued, invested in their children’s education when the family became too large to absorb into its own enterprise, or when they no longer could depend on social connection to find suitable public placements for their offspring.\(^{47}\)

\(^{43}\) Bourdieu (2014), 222.
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Even more directly, elites could participate in rule making that played to their family advantages, and in ways that effectively limited penetration by outsiders.\textsuperscript{48} Cultural historian Benjamin Elman presented an especially strong case for this in his Bourdiesuan analysis of late Imperial China’s civil service.\textsuperscript{49} While lauded as a premodern example of merit-based elite recruitment, Elman showed instead the service’s qualifying examinations were structured in a way that catered to elite advantages. Any hope of passing the exams, for example, meant internalizing the trove of neo-Confucian philosophy in the elite Mandarin tongue, a feat which all but eliminated over 90 percent of a public who either lacked the vital language competency or the freedom from toil to spend years memorizing the texts.\textsuperscript{50} As Elman put it, by meeting the bureaucracy’s manpower needs in ways that accommodated elite interests, the examination system became a sort of ‘educational gyroscope’ that stabilized the imperial state’s reproductive imperatives for more than 500 years.\textsuperscript{51} In a more conventional history of the 19\textsuperscript{th}-century Prussian officer corps, Steven Clemente documented a more brazen case of elite intervention. Here, Prussian officials applied academic commissioning standards developed to meet the demands of industrialized warfare as a sort of professional camouflage to disguise bars to social and intellectual undesirables, the intent of which was to extend the familiar social order.\textsuperscript{52} The German navy used broadly similar reproductive strategies to ‘feudalize’ the more highly educated bourgeoisie it permitted to hold commissions, as historian Holger Herwig observed.\textsuperscript{53}

When viewed objectively, harnessing the reproductive imperatives of elite families to formulate bureaucratic practices worked in the semi-bureaucratic state’s favor, but only when
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doing so appeared broadly legitimate. Bear in mind that for Bourdieu the state was a complex of social interactions devised to mediate elite power relations and public perceptions. Also, recall Bourdieu’s discussion of fields, in that exclusive practices and social closure not only fostered insider solidarity, but also outsider attraction. Thus, on one hand we might reasonably conclude that rewarding the loyalty of select family groups was in itself a form of symbolic violence inculcating a natural social order with the general public. On the other hand, however, an increasingly educated public likely would see through reproductive practices so obviously totalizing as those employed by the Qing Dynasty or Wilhelmine Germany. And then there is the more general problem of biology, since the vagaries of birth rates and the tendencies for societies to expand and diversify make elite regeneration crucial. These realities require that states must eventually place elite public goods, like military commissions, within the reasonable reach of suitable outsiders in ways that broaden participation in the state’s reproduction, yet maintain the stability of the social structure. In this sense, old families must be replaced by new families which, in the fullness of time, become old families.

Sociologist John Brewer demonstrated a similar transference in his study of the paramilitary Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC). Charged with extending the authority of the Crown to Ireland in the early 19th century, the RIC initially recruited its officers from amongst the graduates of elite English public schools, and even required those in the ranks be well-educated ‘men respected by the people and [able to] obtain the good opinion of the gentry.’

While committed to maintaining high standards, by the century’s end officials had deliberately adopted practices encouraging the recruitment and promotion of educated Irish natives, which in fact proved attractive with able Irishmen who looked to service with the RIC as a means to better their own status. The results, perhaps, were better than expected: although once a thoroughly English and Protestant institution, by the beginning of the First World War the
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RIC’s intake had become mostly Irish and Roman Catholic. In essence, by indigenizing recruitment practices, the elite security field assisted in mutualizing Great Britain’s dominion in Ireland for those with a stake in the game. Brewer’s observations are even more significant considering the relatively short timeline for the conversion.

To sum up, Bourdieu’s state model describes what he called a double process of domination and integration revealed in both the evolution in the basis of power – from the social and dynastic personal to the legalistic and bureaucratic impersonal – and a shift in its locus from the provinces and to a centralized national state. His semi-bureaucratic state may thus be seen as occupying a transformational middle ground, one marked by some devolution of power to proxies, and one in which dynastic mechanisms of family reproduction coexist with or even resemble bureaucratic mechanisms. In this contested milieu, elites converted their former economic and social capital advantages into newly recognizable species that tended to conserve family advantages even as they participated in the reconstruction of legitimizing practices that opened opportunities for new members. These processes extended to selecting their military leadership in ways that lent both the dominant habitus to the military institution and legitimacy to the state’s monopoly on coercive capital. Through this Bourdieusian lens, the following sections view the evolution of U.S. Army commissioning practices from the colonial period to the years before the First World War.

3.4 The American Officer and the Semi-Bureaucratic State

Anthropologist Alan Macfarlane famously quipped that England’s North American colonists ‘did not merely shed their social structure as they walked down the gang-plank into the promised land.’ In this vein, the social structure 18th-century Great Britain shared with its
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American colonies clearly exemplified Bourdieu’s semi-bureaucratic state in three ways. Most apparent was the collaboration at the national level between a dynastic monarchy and a Parliament of appointed peers and elected representatives that oversaw a juridical intercession in royal prerogative; that the colonists eventually pursued independence as a consequence of being left out of Parliament demonstrated a belief in the legitimacy of the state’s legalistic organizing principles, even if they objected to certain practices. The second element was the devolution of considerable power to minor officials in what historian Joanna Innes called ‘inferior politics.’60 As the Crown in Parliament mediated practices on behalf of the nation, the daily exercise of British power both at home and in the colonies rested largely in the hands of a nascent administrative elite composed of inferior officers, locally elected officials, clergymen, and gentlemen amateurs, whose good families lent weight to their offices.61 Finally, there was the comingling of family and proto-bureaucratic modes of reproduction. Although laws and process steadily regulated many aspects of social life, kinship and reputation remained the principal basis of trust and reliability, which in turn helped make boundaries fairly fluid for those enjoying wealth and connection. In the American colonies, these semi-bureaucratic structures manifested in socially dense communities that were as interdependent, as stratified, and as patriarchal as those in Britain, and whose broadly homologous cultures radiated through the institutions regulating colonial life.62 Thus, if the character of American social life deviated at all from the mother country with time, distance, and the patterns of settlement, north and south, it remained broadly recognizable, if only on a smaller scale.63

As Bourdieu would have it, the interrelated public service and security fields had not


yet fully emerged, and so in this period the concepts of social structure and military organization were conceptually inseparable. Therefore, American colonists naturally patterned their defense after the mental models readily available: the English county trainbands as they evolved from the reforms of Elizabeth I. While some variety of local levy had been the ancient core of England’s defense, Elizabeth extended the Crown’s direct control over this coercive capital by formally placing them under Lords Lieutenant, local magnates especially commissioned for the task. Crown policy further stipulated that the ranks from top to bottom be filled with ‘good freeholders, fermers & housholders or the sones of such meete.’ In modern parlance, this meant the militias ‘had skin in the game.’ Associating property with military obligation was thought essential for raising a reliable force as family fortunes, great or small, became intertwined with the fate of the state. Doing so also created a military hierarchy that closely resembled and therefore reaffirmed the natural order of social life, and helped legitimize the state’s concentration of coercive power. Enthusiasm for these militias waxed and waned during the succeeding regimes and by the Restoration period they had become largely moribund, replaced in importance by a standing army similarly officered by peers and well-off commoners. But when interest in the militias rekindled in the middle of the 18th century, the Crown once again selected their officers from amongst the local gentry in a practice that clearly reflected the prevailing social structure.

Colonists kept abreast of military developments at home and sometimes modified their local establishments accordingly. That said, American militias were anything but mirror images of those in England. American militias were more malleable than their English counterparts,
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and there also were differences from colony to colony, where local geography, threats, attitudes, and traditions influenced the peculiar patterns of defense.68 What the Americans and British did hold in common, though, was the long-standing practice of conferring the obligation of military leadership on those of higher social status. Up and down the seaboard, euphemisms like ‘the better sort,’ or ‘men of substance,’ or ‘substantial Freeholder’ described the citizens chosen through election or appointment to lead both the unpaid local militias and the larger paid provincial regiments raised during emergencies.69 Harvard lawyer and part-time soldier Timothy Pickering preferred men of ‘Fortune, Weight, and Figure’ to lead military affairs in Massachusetts.70 Indeed, mid-18th century tax rolls revealed the residents holding military commissions in Pickering’s home town of Salem paid seven times the town’s average annual levy, a certain indication of their propertied condition.71 Many also occupied civil posts or elected offices, further demonstrating the interlacing of elite military and civil power.72 In the Quaker middle colony of Pennsylvania, a pacifist ethic and relative tranquility delayed the passage of a compulsory militia act until the late date of 1757.73 But when it did, the Pennsylvania’s Assembly specified that to hold the rank of captain, one required a freehold valued at £150 or, in the absence of property, wealth in the amount of £350; today, the comparable economic status of such sums might range from £320,000-740,000.74 Perhaps of all the colonies, it was the military establishment in Virginia that most closely resembled the English model’s marriage of social and military structure. Virginia’s governor had the power to

68 Ibid., 19; Shy (1963), 181.
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72 Boucher (1973), 127. Boucher found almost 40% of Salem, MA, militia officers also held civil appointments.

73 Alexander (1945), 22.

74 Joseph J. Holmes, “The Decline of the Pennsylvania Militia, 1815-1870,” Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine 57 (Apr 1974), 202. As a percentage of estimated GDP and given the scarcity of specie, the ‘influence value’ is calculated at £2.6-5.2 millions.
appoint all the colony’s officers. He made colonels of his councilors and appointed County Lieutenants from amongst the most substantial land owners to supervise local military affairs, a role that corresponded to the Lords Lieutenant back in England. One such lieutenant was William Fairfax, agent for his cousin Thomas, 6th Baron Fairfax of Cameron, whose Northern Neck Proprietary encompassed substantial portions of the modern states of Virginia and West Virginia.

All the same, militia and provincial officers were not always a community’s richest or most powerful men. Colonial governments often exempted high-status men performing critical communal roles or levied stiff fines that enabled the very rich to commute their service obligations, practices which of course also reaffirmed the social hierarchy. Still, command and capital in all its forms went hand in glove. Like in England, wealth enabled officers to divert their attention to the details of office while real property signified the candidate’s personal interests where inextricably bound to the greater community’s defense. Social capital was an equally important marker of reliability. Just as economic investments demonstrated a vital connection to local fortunes, ample social capital in the form of extended friendships, church membership, and connections to more established families telegraphed strong linkages to community and adherence to a familiar habitus. Such success in social life conveyed an obligation to serve as well as the prerogative, if not always the native ability, to lead. That this entitlement corresponded to the prevailing social order further helped to maintain the veil of legitimacy, especially when exigencies forced locals to accept for service other ranks with little


78 Main (1985), 31, 321, 333; Shy (1963), 176.; Breen (1972), 84.

connection, and thus little loyalty, to their communities.\textsuperscript{80} Finally, these bonds were looked upon as a form of social insurance, in that the well-connected officer acquired a social obligation to surrender the power given to him ‘when the general weal shall require it.’\textsuperscript{81}

This interdependence between sociality and the officer’s commission was in fact its own reproductive mechanism. With no specific professional qualifications beyond achieving the confidence of local power brokers, men with only modest wealth and a circle of helpful connections could pursue a commission as a means to bettering their positions within those tightly woven provincial communities, strategies which again tended to reaffirm the prevailing order. Arguably the most famous of these upwardly mobile provincial elites was George Washington, whose friendship with William Fairfax produced the Virginia commission that helped set him on path from poor gentility to global fame.\textsuperscript{82} Indeed, at the start of the War of Independence the provincial legislatures, in a reflection of their own compositions, overwhelmingly officered the core of their first national army from amongst the same provincial elites who had defended their towns and villages before the rebellion. This included the appointment by their delegations in the Continental Congress of George Washington as general and commander in chief in 1775.

Having repudiated the British state but with their own government on colt’s legs, America’s wartime commissioning practices blended old traditions, provincial elite preferences, and political deal-making. The terms of Washington’s congressional commission vested him with the authority to temporarily fill all officer vacancies below the rank of colonel, subject to review by the interested provincial authority.\textsuperscript{83} In turn, Washington’s assumption that possessing a gentlemanly habitus would make a better officer colored his choices and reflected

\textsuperscript{80} Neimeyer (1996), 8-10.

\textsuperscript{81} On selecting a general to command the Continental Army, quoted in Sidney Kaplan, “Rank and Status Among Massachusetts Continental Officers,” \textit{American Historical Review} 56, no. 2 (Jan 1951), 322-323.


in his orders to subordinates.\textsuperscript{84} For its part, Congress retained the authority to appoint all senior line and staff officers, a practice that boiled down to bargaining by provincial delegations intent on retaining influence over the direction of the war. In making appointments, Congress certainly weighed the candidate’s past military experiences. Maintaining geographic balance, though, was of paramount concern in order to promote unity of purpose and legitimacy, factors which by consequence sustained the association of military leadership with high provincial status.\textsuperscript{85} Even the selection of Washington to lead the army was as symbolic as it was practical. In addition to his experience in frontier warfare, appointing a high-status Southerner to command a force then composed largely of New Englanders transformed what might have been mistaken as a regional quarrel into a national affair.\textsuperscript{86}

In name, the new army was a national institution. The extent of local influence over selections, however, produced an officer corps that was mostly provincial in character, and one in which the determinants of an officer’s elite status varied greatly according to their local contexts. In a Bourdieusian sense, the common goal of independence from Great Britain failed to mask stark differences in the local values of status capital, like comparative wealth, education, relationships, and manners. And so, with each officer’s prestige firmly tethered to his local origins, clashes over seniority and elite recognition erupted frequently and produced bouts of disharmony within and between the army and Congress throughout the conflict.\textsuperscript{87} Eventually, the crucible of war would make these provincial leaders more cosmopolitan in

\textsuperscript{84} Charles Royster, \textit{A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character, 1775-1783} (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979), 94; Kaplan (1951), 323-325.

\textsuperscript{85} Wright (1989), 26; Most historians, building on Mark Lender’s analysis of the social origins New Jersey officer, accept that Continental officers represented the top third of colonial society by wealth. In a rare challenge, Derrick Lapp contended that Lender’s conclusions did not hold true in Maryland. His argument nevertheless highlighted that social capital remained essential for those lacking in economic capital. See, James Kirby Martin and Mark Edward Lender, \textit{A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789} (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1982), 106-107; and Derrick E. Lapp, “Did They Really ‘Take None But Gentlemen?’ Henry Hardman, the Maryland Line, and a Reconsideration of the Socioeconomic Composition of the Continental Officer Corps,” \textit{Journal of Military History} 78, no. 4 (Oct 2014), 1239-1261.

\textsuperscript{86} Wright (1989), 25-26.

\textsuperscript{87} Royster (1979), 86-95, 140-141.
thinking and thus more nationalistic in outlook.\textsuperscript{88} But as the late historian Charles Royster observed, for a time ‘America’s would-be gentlemen did not always recognize each other.’\textsuperscript{89}

Provincial sociability would remain the principal factor in American commissioning practices for some decades after the war. Even so, officer selections gradually became more centralized as the state adopted a stronger federal structure. For instance, under the post-Independence Confederation government, the state legislatures reserved the authority to appoint all military officers in national service below the rank of general, which Congress divvied up according to each state’s troop contributions.\textsuperscript{90} However, under the stronger constitutional framework ratified in 1788, the states surrendered their power to appoint federal officers to the newly created office of president, subject to confirmation in the newly formed Senate; the states reserved only the right to appoint the officers leading their respective militias, which they wrongly wagered would remain the core of national defense in perpetuity. While the proviso of Senate confirmation sustained some role for local politics in federal military appointments, the new Constitution established a more effective framework on which to produce a standing army and to institutionalize the reproduction of the officer corps on a national level, thereby setting the new federal government on a path towards steadily concentrating its monopoly on coercive capital.

From an Olympian view, the structure and vision of American government which lent its name to the Federalist Era (1788-1800) was little different than the semi-bureaucratic model of Crown in parliament it had replaced. A bicameral legislature checked the power of a chief executive, and a high court checked the power of both. Of course, executive tenure in the
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United States was determined by election rather than blood. Nevertheless, legalistic procedure quite naturally existed cheek by jowl with family modes of reproduction, demonstrated in the steady proliferation of federal public offices and the appointment of intimates as secretaries, clerks, judges, and other fiduciaries who were the antecedents to Bourdieu’s bureaucratic state nobility. On war-making, the Constitution also provided a stronger outline of executive and congressional powers than had the Articles of Confederation by making the president the commander-in-chief and empowering Congress to enjoin the states and raise monies for defense. Although philosophically Americans viewed standing armies as potential hazards to local prerogatives and liberty, almost from the start the preferred militia system had proven too clumsy a defense against the restive Native Americans, meddling foreign powers, and disaffected citizens whose threats to national stability were anything but theoretical. Congress thus continued to support the small standing force raised by the Confederation government, and in 1789 established a War Department, empowering the president to appoint a cabinet secretary to administer on his behalf what was fast becoming the more complex business of national defense. Amongst his many duties, the new Secretary of War filtered the applications of men seeking commissions and, in conference with interested parties, forwarded his recommendations on appointments to the president.

At first, these structural changes to the national government did not markedly alter American commissioning practices. To some degree, geographic balance remained important
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for the sake of national legitimacy, and qualifying capital still favored provincial elites. Thus, in practice the president selected his officers from amongst those men possessing property and personal traits of gentility, industry, high morals, and patriotism – social and cultural goods produced in notable families and vouched for in wider connections to community.°

Formal education, what Durkheim later called ‘the conservation of a culture inherited from the past,’ also figured prominently as a selection criterion.°

Indeed, historian William Skelton found that 10-20% of army officers appointed in the first decades after Independence enjoyed some exposure to colleges or academies, while historian Robert Gough reported that in 1798 alone, 75% of applicants rated favorably by a special commissioning panel had some higher education, this in a period when less than one percent of the public had.°

In short, the new constitutional order clearly sustained the linkage between social standing and commissioned service.

What did change, however, was the social distance separating would-be commission seekers from gatekeepers. Whereas the aspiring officer once needed only to catch the eye of a town elder or provincial assemblyman to win a military appointment, the more centralized governing structure meant that obtaining a federal commission required even greater stocks of capital to achieve federal recognition. Much more than simply wealth, this included possessing a social network that transcended the local level, and was sufficiently durable to withstand vetting by cabinet officials, congressional heavyweights, and other intervening parties. A great many of those receiving commissions after 1790 therefore enjoyed family connections to serving or former high officials, including senior military officers, state governors, federal


° Quoted in, Bourdieu (1973), 57.

legislators, judges, and distinguished Revolutionary veterans, again as documented by Skelton. Demonstrated political loyalty also proved especially critical for selection. With the guiding vision of the state's organizing principles still in play, the Federalists then in power took pains to reject applicants they suspected of harboring ‘antifederal’ views or who were members of the rival Democratic-Republican Party. In essence, the officer corps had become an even more exclusive field than it formerly had been, a circumstance driven by Federalist preferences for highly centralized government and their desire to build a corps of loyal officers who shared that vision.

3.5 Social Reproduction in the Military Academy

When Thomas Jefferson’s Democratic-Republican Party unseated the Federalists in the general election of 1800, to ensure the army’s loyalty his administration vigorously set about replacing Federalist officers with men more committed to Jefferson’s vision of republican government. To that end, Jefferson helped draft the Military Peace Establishment Act, which the Republican-controlled Congress passed into law in 1802. Amongst its provisions, the law reduced the officer grade plate, enabling the president to expedite removal of the more recalcitrant Federalists holding higher rank. The act, though, was more notable for creating the United States Military Academy, an officers preparatory school at West Point in New York. The idea was not new. George Washington had first floated the concept of establishing a professional military school for officers, but detractors then argued the idea was dangerously aristocratic. Jefferson’s goals for the academy, though, were two-fold. One, he intended the school’s curriculum would cultivate rarer technical skills, like artillery and engineering, useful
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not only to the military but also in building the country’s infrastructure at a time when an education in the mechanical arts was available only in Europe.\textsuperscript{103} Two, Jefferson planned the academy would, as historian Theodore Crackel wrote, ‘train men from the good Republican stock of the country for positions of leadership in the new army.’\textsuperscript{104} To accomplish these aims, the president placed the academy under the supervision of a newly formed Corps of Engineers, which he had personally selected and directed. Next, the president took a hand in developing the academy’s curriculum, and then carefully assigned school faculty who either shared his ideological vision for the United States, or who at least did not oppose it too stridently.\textsuperscript{105} West Point’s establishment thus represented the first significant effort to institutionalize the reproduction of an American army officer with a truly national character.

During Jefferson’s two terms in office, 115 men received appointments to the academy, of whom 52 received commissions.\textsuperscript{106} The president made his appointments strategically, some to inspire the loyalty of Federalist opponents disgruntled by their changing fortunes.\textsuperscript{107} In fact, a number of the earliest appointments went to residents of profoundly Federalist New England, including the school’s first graduate, Joseph Gardner Swift (USMA ’02), a dyed-in-the-wool Massachusetts Federalist who once confided the president’s utopian democracy was ‘too far in advance of the intelligence of the people.’\textsuperscript{108} The president also used appointments to inculcate a broader nationalism, evinced by some extraordinary appointments made in the newly acquired Louisiana Territory. On the advice of Captain Meriwether Lewis, the president favored six young men from the extended Chouteau clan of St. Louis, as a reward
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for their family’s quelling dissent amongst former French subjects who worried about the implications of American rule. Remarkably, the territory’s share of appointments came to 30% of all those made from 1804-1805, long before any of its free white population of 50,000 had cast a vote. For Jefferson, it was a practical gesture to add to his officer corps men intimately familiar with the new territory’s physical and human terrain, and who would return home from the academy as living symbols of American authority.

When more politically secure in his second term, Jefferson made further appointments to party loyalists, and a high percentage went to Vermonters. That state had been home to some of the earliest and most active Democratic-Republican societies, which likely explained why so few Vermont men had held commissions under the Federalists. In 1804, however, Vermont’s Republicans succeeded in running the Federalists from state office, and their share of academy appointments increased markedly. By the end of Jefferson’s administration, fully a third of the men who had graduated from the academy had applied from Vermont, a state whose population was then about four times smaller than that of Federalist Massachusetts.

It is tempting to cast the Jeffersonian Republican victory over the Federalists as the ordinary citizen’s triumph over an entrenched aristocracy, and contemporaries certainly did. But on closer examination, the membership rolls of the political societies supporting Jefferson suggest in most cases Republicans were every bit as locally auspicious as the Federalists they opposed, lending weight to a Bourdieusian vision of provincial elite groups contesting the relative value of their capital within the maturing field of power. To that point, the leadership
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of Vermont’s societies included some of the state’s largest landowners, as well as high county
officials, legislators, jurists, physicians, churchmen, and militia officers.\footnote{Adelson (1964), 7; Matthew Schoenbachler, “Republicanism in the Age of Democratic Revolution: The Democratic-Republican Societies of the 1790s,” \textit{Journal of the Early Republic} 18, no. 2 (Summer 1998), 242-243.} This pattern
repeated itself in Republican strongholds like western Pennsylvania, New York, and in the
South.\footnote{Albrecht Koschnik, “The Democratic Societies of Philadelphia and the Limits of the
American Public Sphere, circa 1793-1795,” \textit{William and Mary Quarterly} 58, no. 3 (Jul 2001), 620;
Marco M. Sioli, “The Democratic Republican Societies at the End of the Eighteenth Century: The
Western Pennsylvania Experience,” \textit{Pennsylvania History} 60, no. 3 (Jul 1993), 290-292; Eugene Perry
Link, “The Democratic Societies of the Carolinas,” \textit{North Carolina Historical Review} 18, no. 3 (Jul
1941), 262.} If anything, Republicanism seemed to appeal to men whose newer wealth, shallower
connections, and provincial seats had excluded them from a proper share of power.\footnote{Koschnik (2001), 620. Link (1942), 55-65.} In short,
this was a classic struggle between rising and entrenched elites, as much a feature of 19th-
century American state building as indeed it remains today.

By extension, rising Republican political prospects did not proletarianize Mr.
Jefferson’s officer corps. On the contrary, some of West Point’s early Republican cadets came
from nationally prominent families, including two of the Vermonters, Hannibal Allen (USMA
’04) and his brother Ethan (USMA ’06). Both were sons of General Ethan Allen, who famously
captured Fort Ticonderoga from the British early in the American Revolution. The Corps of
Cadets also counted Livingstons from New York, Huntingtons from Connecticut, and
Armisteads from Virginia. Although many of Jefferson’s cadets came from families whose
surnames were less auspicious, the correlation between social connection and the commission
meant these young men were just as likely related to influential men as the Federalists they
replaced. West Point’s tenth graduate, Joseph Gilbert Totten (USMA ’05), was one. Totten, the
son of George Washington’s vice consul to Santa Cruz, received his appointment with the help
of his maternal uncle, Captain Jared Mansfield, a Yale graduate and Jefferson’s pick as the
academy’s professor of mathematics.\footnote{National Academy of Sciences, \textit{Biographical Memoirs}, vol. 1 (Wash., DC: Nat’l. Acad. of
Sci., 1879), 37-39; Edward Deering Mansfield, \textit{Personal Memories, Social, Political, and Literary, with
suitable additions}, 2nd ed. (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1892), 363-365.} Family ties also helped Totten’s classmate, William
McRee of South Carolina, the son of a veteran Continental Army officer who owned a rice plantation in Brunswick County. Young McRee was away at a private boarding school when his father died and the money dried up, forcing his return home. Fortunately, the academy’s superintendent, Colonel Jonathan Williams, had known the lad’s father during the war and arranged an appointment for young McRee. In turn, beneficiary became benefactor: McRee’s younger brother Samuel received an appointment in 1815 and graduated in 1820.

The secondary educational experiences of early West Point cadets probably varied greatly, especially for those living closer to the frontier. Even so, many of Jefferson’s cadets were rather well-educated for the day, like the school’s founding graduate, Joseph Swift. Son of a Nantucket physician, Swift prepared for Harvard by reading Latin, Greek, and geometry at the Reverend Mr. Simeon Doggett’s Bristol Academy in Taunton. Likewise, brothers Samuel (USMA ’04) and William Gates (USMA ’06), sons of a U.S. Army officer based in Boston, had studied at Phillips Academy in Andover, as had Henry Burbeck Jackson (USMA ’03), also the son of a serving officer. Others attended colleges before their appointments came through, like the New Yorker, Christopher Van De Venter (USMA ’09), who had studied at Williams College, and the Vermonter, Justus Post (USMA ’07), who graduated from
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Middlebury. At least three cadets had attended Dartmouth: Sylvanus Thayer (USMA '08), Alpheus Roberts (USMA '08), and Alden Partridge (USMA '06). This is only a sampling, yet together these men accounted for 17% of Jefferson’s subalterns, a figure well within the range determined by William Skelton for their Federalist predecessors.

In exchange for their service, those fortunate enough to graduate from the academy were repaid with high social status, even as junior officers. Their recognition as elites enabled officers engaged in defense or development projects to extend their social networks far from their boyhood homes to commercial and political worthies around the country. While officers might not get rich on army pay, their compensation did afford a fairly comfortable standard of living in most localities. In 1830, a second lieutenant’s annual combined pay and allowances totaled almost $1,300 with allowances, or just under $40,000 today, not counting emoluments for special duties. That was $100 more than the annual salary then paid to New Hampshire governor Benjamin Pierce. Granted, paydays might be few and far between in remote assignments, and some officers grumbled their salaries compared unfavorably with civilian professionals or were inadequate to meet social obligations. Then again, federal officers were paid in gold or silver coin, a significant advantage in a period when sound money was scarce. And for those officers dissatisfied with army life, the connections they made in the service usually opened doors to post-army careers in business, public office, or politics.

In theory, the low entrance standards initially set by Congress put the academy and its
rewards for service within easy reach of most men. The army commission, however, was an extremely scarce public good, which in turn made the Corps of Cadets a highly exclusive fraternity. West Point classes typically were small, a consequence of slow officer promotions, a fixed peacetime establishment, and terms of service amounting to lifetime tenure. In most years fewer than 50 lieutenants passed through the academy, and in 1821 the school produced only 24 graduates.\(^{130}\) That same year the nation’s eligible population of free white males aged 16-18 years was then more than 180,000.\(^{131}\) Moreover, the dependency on social capital for presidential recognition virtually ensured the antebellum officer corps remained the preserve of sons whose fathers possessed substantially greater influence, and this usually meant those living in the nation’s more established districts.\(^{132}\)

This association between privilege and appointments did not escape the notice of elites in the nation’s periphery, and Congressman David Crockett of Tennessee was one of the school’s earlier critics. Crockett charged the academy educated at public expense ‘generally the sons of the rich and influential who [were] able to educate their own children,’ while ‘the sons of the poor for want of active friends [were] often neglected or if educated even at the expense of their parents or by the liberality of their friends, [were] superceded [sic] in the Service by Cadets educated at the west point [sic] academy.’\(^{133}\) To Crocket, the school thus promoted an aristocracy inconsonant with the American social contract, much as critics of George Washington’s original scheme had warned. So, in 1830 the congressman introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to abolish West Point. Crocket’s bill failed, as did similar bills

\(^{130}\) Cullum (1868), 5.

\(^{131}\) U.S. Secretary of State, Census for 1820 (Wash., DC: Gales & Seaton, 1821), 19. In the early years, cadets could be as young as 14 years, and as old as 21. See, Act of 29 Apr 1812, ch. 72, 2 Stat. 721.


brought by the Ohio and Maine delegations in 1834 and 1843, respectively.¹³⁴

Despite these failures, periodic attacks on the academy revealed common concerns about the federal government’s encroachment on provincial prerogatives and the implications this had for family social reproduction in the back and beyond. As Crockett wrote, the disadvantaged class he defended were not necessarily poor in money capital. Rather, they were poor in social capital, the empowering networks the backcountry solon knew were essential for a family’s social mobility. To men like Crockett, West Point symbolized a narrowing of the aperture to commissioned service that threatened to cheapen the value of hard-fought family capital for those living farther from the center of power. Crockett’s arguments were in fact similar to those Republicans used against Federalists only three decades earlier. That said, it was hardly surprising Crockett’s bill, and others like it, failed to receive wider support in Congress, especially from the larger delegations whose constituents benefitted most from the institution. This included New York’s, which vigorously defended the school on the Hudson River.¹³⁵ Perhaps for others, the federal army’s small size made any threat to local prerogatives hugely conjectural, especially since in wartime the United States remained dependent on state governors to raise militias and Volunteers. After all, it would be another 70 years before those prerogatives would all but disappear.

Public criticism of West Point did prompt a significant change in academy appointment practices in 1843, when Congress put into law a previously unofficial quota of one nomination per congressional district and territory, as well as 10 additional at-large appointments; by the end of the century the number of at-large appointments expanded to 40 and each state received two additional nominations, one for each senator.¹³⁶ While this change preserved the advantages of settled states, the emphasis on geographic distribution ensured frontier


¹³⁶ Coffman (1986), 46; Betros (2012), 74.
constituencies might regularly enjoy a more proportionate share in future academy appointments. Meanwhile, the president retained his prerogative to nominate cadets and to make direct appointments to fill any unexpected vacancies, so long as candidates were of good moral character, met certain physical requirements, and possessed vague attainments testifying to their fitness for service.\textsuperscript{137} These presidential powers helped keep the academy open to the sons of serving and former officers or other government officials whose duties typically removed them from their families’ local seats, as well as the sons of prominent citizens living in districts whose quotas had otherwise been filled. Ultimately, for the remainder of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century all original officer appointments and promotions remained subject to Senate confirmation, a practice designed not just to check the power of the executive, but also to maintain a delicate balance of reciprocal obligations that featured so constantly in political life.\textsuperscript{138}

Another consequence of all the criticism was that for some 50 years West Point administrators recorded the social circumstances of new cadets in efforts to demonstrate how broadly they represented the American public. They did so, however, in ways that often obscured their fathers’ relative wealth and influence, even as they recorded separately the names of public figures who bore an interest in the appointments.\textsuperscript{139} All this emphasis on social origins in turn conditioned prospective cadets to downplay any social advantages they might possess rather than run the risk that their relatively high social standing would bar them from the academy. Later on, academy Professor Charles Larned (USMA ’70) drew on these records in his centenary paean to West Point to create a lasting impression that the 19\textsuperscript{th}-century Corps of Cadets was more socially diverse than it ever really was, and that by extension,

\textsuperscript{137} August V. Kautz, \textit{Customs of Service for Officers of the Army} (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincot, 1868), 148.

\textsuperscript{138} Under current statute, the Senate confirms only original appointments and promotions of field grade and general officers. See, Armed Forces, 10 U.S.C. § 531 (2011).

commissioning boundaries were more porous than they really were.\textsuperscript{140} All this notwithstanding, access to federal gatekeepers remained essential for securing an army commission, and the introduction during the mid-19th century of more rigorous entrance examinations would raise the bar even higher.

3.6 Reproduction by Bureaucratic Means

When the U.S. Military Academy opened in 1802, there were no pre-requisites for admission, apart from the most essential physicality. Candidates received appointments based on politics and on assessments of their character, as vouched for by sponsors. Academic preparation received little attention; though Americans highly regarded education as a medium of elite recognition, schooling opportunities varied so widely in the early Republic that social relationships remained the most practical arbiter of cadet suitability. Even so, despite their families’ outsized influence, some entering cadets could barely write or cypher, skills essential for managing soldiers and resources in the line, to say nothing of passing the engineering curriculum. From the West Point perspective, uneven academic preparation thus presented a formidable challenge for a faculty bent on transforming the school into the nation’s center of engineering excellence.\textsuperscript{141}

Education, or more properly the lack thereof, also reflected in the poor behavior of some cadets. Even the most basic education imparted moral touchstones of personal discipline, and cadets with inferior schooling surely proved distracting to the faculty’s desire for order. So, at the urging of the army’s engineers, Congress specified in 1812 that prospective cadets be ‘well versed in reading, writing, and arithmetic.’\textsuperscript{142} Although to modern eyes the standard may seem modest, it was then in keeping with criteria adopted by elite civilian colleges to tighten discipline at their own institutions, which bore further witness to the relative scarcity of


\textsuperscript{141} Skelton (1992), 102.

\textsuperscript{142} Act of 29 Apr 1812, ch. 72, \textit{2 Stat.} 721.
primary and secondary educational opportunities in many parts of the country. Moreover, to
a Congress in which nearly half its members had attended colleges like Harvard, Yale, and
Princeton, the standard would sensibly bar the more thoroughly rusticated young men from the
army’s leadership.

Over the next 40 years, academy administrators gradually ratcheted up entrance criteria
with help from friends in Congress. Perhaps the most far-reaching changes were made to the
entrance examinations used to screen nominees. Before the Civil War, entrance exams had
been administered orally, and examining faculty enjoyed subjective leeway to pass slower
students who, in their judgement, otherwise demonstrated good character or showed promise.

By the end of the Civil War, Congress agreed to modify the exams by adding subjects like
grammar, United States history, and American geography, a step once again reflecting changes
at civilian colleges that had been ongoing since the 1840s. In turn, West Point’s Academic
Board, the powerful body charged with managing the school’s curriculum, seized the
opportunity to make the entrance examination more rigorous, and by 1870 the board had
replaced the old oral format with a largely written one which, scored anonymously, afforded
examiners little wiggle room to evaluate nominees.

Exam content also became more challenging. In addition to American geography,
examiners might have asked nominees to trace the nearest sea route linking St. Petersburg and
Bombay, and to name all the countries they would pass on the journey, or to describe the
general direction and flow of China’s Yellow River, and where it emptied. To pass the
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reading exam nominees now needed to demonstrate the ‘proper accent and emphasis,’ a task more easily said than done depending on one’s regional origins. Curiously, candidates might be asked to take dictation from works of British poetry to demonstrate proper punctuation, writing, and orthography, another challenge that might have been as cultural as mechanical. Even the solutions to some mathematics questions demanded a more cosmopolitan depth. In one example, candidates were asked to calculate the number of times £641 14s. 11¾d. contained £2 15s. 6¼d., a feat requiring algebraic skill and more than a passing familiarity with Britain’s peculiar pre-decimal denominations. In short order, the academy’s academic rejection rate more than doubled, from a high of just over 15% before the Civil War to around 37% during the 1870s. What’s more, the new emphasis on cultural content tripped up nominees from some regions more so than others: in 1880, the academy rejected 5 out of 8 nominees from Alabama and Arkansas on account of poor scores in reading, writing, and orthography, even though they all had passed in arithmetic and geography.

The new examinations proved controversial with older graduates like Major General Winfield Scott Hancock (USMA ’44), then commanding the Military Division of the Atlantic. Hancock felt the new examinations privileged intellectual capacity over the ‘moral and physical qualities that [were] so essential and important to officers of the army,’ and he counseled that a congressman was in a better position than the academy’s examiners to judge a nominee’s ‘character, habits, and moral qualifications.’ To the academic board’s director, however, it was precisely this dependency on social connection that risked making West Point’s boundaries too porous and which by consequence jeopardized the officer corps’ social
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and professional standing. Addressing the Military Service Institution in 1879, Professor Peter Michie declared the academy’s previously low graduation rate, which had averaged 53% from 1838-1875, gave many the impression the intellect of cadets was ‘rather below the average in mental range and calibre’ of those entering schools like Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{155} Raising admissions standards to a level approximating the elite civilian colleges, he suggested, would produce higher graduation rates and thus help transform the service into a more professional body. Already, claimed Michie, higher standards had pushed the commencement rate to 61%, and he suggested it would have been higher still had congressional sponsors nominated fully qualified candidates.\textsuperscript{156} Moreover, Michie felt the potential pool of more highly qualified candidates actually was quite deep, and as evidence pointed to ‘the spread of common schools.’\textsuperscript{157} Backing his play was Professor George Leonard Andrews (USMA ’51), a fellow board member. Andrews declared West Point’s new standards would level the social playing field as now capable men, rather than just the well-connected ones, would benefit from that public institution.\textsuperscript{158} In short, if the academic board could do nothing about the political and social sourcing of cadets, they wanted their pick of the litter. This meant young men who were most like themselves.

The pair’s belief that the academy’s higher standards were easily attainable clearly reflected their own formative experiences. Andrews’ home state of Massachusetts long led the country in quality secondary education, and the four-year high schools in Boston were at the time the country’s finest. In a 25-hour school week, Boston students not only studied the academic branches tested at the military academy, they also were exposed to chemistry, physics, zoology and a range of modern languages, and two hours each week were devoted to calisthenics or military drill. College-bound scholars even could take instruction in pre-

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 158-159.
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\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 183; Dartmouth College, \textit{Triennial Catalogue of Dartmouth College} (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth Press, 1873), ix.
requisites like Greek and Latin. Such preparation enabled Andrews to graduate in 1846 from the Bridgewater State Normal School, one of the country’s first professional teachers’ colleges, before accepting a nomination to West Point the following year.

Since the 1790s, Americans also viewed their schools as important for inculcating a civic-minded habitus, then called moral education, and in this Massachusetts likewise excelled. Alongside academic subjects, state law mandated curricula instill ‘the principles of morality, justice, a sacred regard for truth, love of country, humanity, and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, frugality, chastity, temperance, &c.’ Indeed, the potential was high that students exposed to such a rich curriculum would possess the ‘aptitude for study, industrious habits, perseverance, an obedient and orderly disposition, and [the] correct moral deportment’ that West Point faculty sought in their cadets.

The academic resources available in Massachusetts, however, were exceptional. While most every state and territory had adopted broadly similar moral education goals by the 1860s, graded public high schools remained uncommon in the United States until the early 20th century. Those that did exist outside the Northeast serviced mostly urban centers, where they educated only a small percentage of American youth, like Peter Michie; an Ohioan, the professor had graduated in 1857 at the top of his class from Cincinnati’s Woodward High School, the same choice institute where future president and chief justice William Howard Taft would later prepare for Yale. In fact, by 1880 there were only about 800 graded high schools
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in the entire country, and these produced only about 11,000 male graduates annually at a time
when the nation’s total population of 17-year-olds was some 940,000.\textsuperscript{165} Upwards of two-thirds
of American children still were educated in rural common schools, subject to agrarian life
cycles and plagued by short terms, poor teachers, and ‘instruction devoid of spirit and lacking
in the conditions to steady progression.’\textsuperscript{166} Such schools were not all located in the country’s
midsection or on the frontier. In Maine’s District 27 only two of the three enrolled students
regularly attended the five-week summer term.\textsuperscript{167} It was doubtful students educated under such
conditions would have possessed the knowledge, skill, or even the deportment reformers
expected of cadets, and academy statistics bore witness. Nominees from states with the least
developed school systems, such as Arkansas, West Virginia, and Tennessee, failed at rates
many times higher than those coming from states with more developed ones, like Pennsylvania,
New York, and Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{168}

Of course, public school quality made little difference to parents who could afford to
hire tutors or send their sons to private academies and preparatory schools. Some schools even
specialized in helping young men pass West Point’s entrance exam, and a former artillery
lieutenant named Caleb Huse (USMA ’51) offered the very best. Although a Massachusetts
man by birth, Huse had resigned his commission in 1861 to take up a Confederate appointment,
and for most of the war was posted to Britain, where he ran guns and munitions for the rebel
government.\textsuperscript{169} In 1876, Huse began tutoring West Point hopefuls at his first school in Sing
Sing, New York, and after three years he moved to Highland Falls, the village outside West
Point’s gates, in order to steal a march on a rival school opened by Brevet Colonel Henry C.
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Over the next twenty years, Huse used his proximity to the academy to give his students the inside scoop on changes to the entrance examinations and to socialize them with serving cadets. While some criticized Huse of coaching rather than educating, his methods proved quite the trick for young men like James K. Thompson (USMA ’84), Frederick L. Palmer (USMA ’84), and future General of the Armies John J. Pershing (USMA ’86). Huse’s system, however, did not come cheaply. While hopefuls on a shoestring could pay as little as $65 a month for a short course, the full year’s recommended course of study at ‘The Rocks’ cost $500 in tuition and fees, rates that rivaled most colleges and universities and which would have consumed the average skilled worker’s salary. If, as Professor Andrews predicted, emphasizing education in commissioning practices would level the social playing field, it did so mostly for the minority of American students with access to better secondary schools or whose parents possessed the commitment and capital to educate their children to the higher standard.

Michie’s anxiety about academy attrition, though, did not pass muster, as before the Civil War it was on par with the very same elite civilian colleges the professor envied. Also, there was little to indicate the high failure rate effected army readiness, which suffered far worse from officer resignations and extended leaves of absence, to say nothing of enlisted desertions. What’s more, General Hancock likely was right: a great intellect probably was unnecessary to perform the typical duties of the mid-century American officer. For one, only a
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very few officers became engineers or artillers, and placements in these fields already went to the highest performing cadets, like Irving Hale (USMA ’84); son of a Colorado educator, Hale accepted an engineer appointment after achieving the highest academic record ever at the academy. For another, the U. S. Army still was engaged mostly in constabulary duties on the frontier, which meant the knowledge of American geography sufficed. No foreign power directly threatened to invade the country, and it would be a generation before familiarity with China’s Bohai Sea might figure in America’s foreign defense interests. Finally, as Hancock indeed suggested, social relationships were in fact more likely than academic testing to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of one’s character, even if the judgment was subjective.

For Michie, however, the deeper issue was the sense West Point had fallen behind the elite civilian colleges. When the academy opened in 1802, there were fewer than 40 schools of higher learning in the whole country. Because civilian colleges typically offered classical curricula suited best for reproducing clergy, the academy’s unique focus on mathematics, science, and engineering helped it fill a critical niche in the American state’s early development. West Point’s advantage in engineering, however, was in decline by the 1850s, as civilian colleges began adding engineering faculty to meet demands from urbanization, industrialization, and the expansion of the nation’s railroads. By the 1860s, demand for higher education had increased the number of colleges in the country almost tenfold, and by 1870 the number of schools offering training in the mechanical arts had risen to 70, thanks in part to government land grants made available under the first Morrill Act of 1862. All the while, civilian schools were tightening entrance requirements, diversifying curricula, and increasing classroom rigor to improve professional standards in elite fields like teaching, law, and medicine, which had long suffered in uniform quality. In short, West Point had lost its
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monopoly on technical education. So, for reformers like Michie it was essential the academy raised its profile to maintain its recognition as an elite institution, and by extension the officer corps as an elite calling. Professor Michie declared as much when lamenting that most of the well-educated men with whom he circulated believed ‘members of the so-called learned professions [were] by far, and ought to be, more highly educated than a corresponding number of equally prominent members of the profession of arms.’¹⁷⁹ Such attitudes were a far cry from those at the country’s founding, when military leadership was viewed as best left in the hands of educated gentlemen. To Michie, academic rigor was the surest means of restoring the officer corps’ status recognition with civilian elites.

For its part, Congress indulged the academic board’s reforms, for three reasons. For one, West Point’s higher standard did nothing to abridge congressional privilege. In fact, as early as 1873 congressmen like Robert Barnwell Roosevelt of New York City sponsored competitive examinations to identify suitable candidates before forwarding their nominations, in efforts to winnow the swelling field of contenders.¹⁸⁰ Such events earned political capital with a watchful public, but may also have helped insulate politicians like Roosevelt from friends and powerful patrons with mediocre sons. That said, ethical practices promoting transparency in political appointments still were evolving, and so exam sponsors did not always honor the test results, as friends of Powhatan Henry Clarke (USMA ’84) alleged in 1880. The cultivated son of a college professor, Clarke failed to win Louisiana Representative E. John Ellis’s nomination to the U.S. Naval Academy, even after reportedly scoring highest on the 2nd District exam.¹⁸¹ Unfazed, family connections in another congressional district produced an appointment for young Clarke to attend West Point, instead.

A second reason was that Congress was slowly adopting practices that would similarly tighten access to federal civilian employment. The growth in government throughout the 19th

¹⁷⁹ Michie (1880), 154.
century had long outstripped the capacity of elites to appoint trusted intimates to manage daily affairs. As a consequence, party bosses dug more deeply into the social matrix to fill the growing multitude of federal offices with hacks less interested in public service than in lining their own pockets before possibly getting the boot in the next election cycle. The corruption and sheer incompetence generated by this spoils system had so diminished the status of civilian government employment that one contemporary observer charged the clerical state had become staffed ‘to a very considerable extent by [the nation’s] refuse.’ Congress’ first effort to reform appointment practices in 1871 was ineffective, and it took the assassination of President James Garfield by a deranged office-seeker in 1881 to create a sense of urgency. The product was the Pendleton Act of 1883, which established competitive examinations to fill specially classified posts at the core of a new and permanent civil service. By tying placements to exam performance, the act not only helped to raise the Washington bureaucracy’s effectiveness, it made government service attractive to college-educated Americans. In fact, from 1886-1895 about a quarter of those passing the clerk or copyist examinations in Washington, DC, alone, possessed some higher education. In the long run, these more exclusive practices made federal public service a more specialized and respectable vocation.

Thirdly, but most importantly, West Point’s higher standard played to the schooling advantages already enjoyed by most congressmen and many of their own provincial elite constituents, the very same families who in fact supplied the academy with its cadets. We know this by comparing the schooling levels of congressmen, which historically were far higher than in the general population, with the education of the young men they nominated in 1880. In fact, about 60% of the representatives in the 46th Congress (1879-1881) had either attended or graduated from a college or university, and another quarter had been educated by tutors or at
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private secondary schools, a profile that closely resembled the 7th Congress (1801-1803) that oversaw West Point’s founding in 1802.\textsuperscript{186} Of the 37 men who graduated from West Point in 1884, 46% already had attended a college before they entered the academy, and the remaining had received their secondary educations in those extraordinary private academies or public high schools (see, Appendix B).\textsuperscript{187} Needless to say, all were post-secondary graduates after 1884. Bear in mind that in 1880, only around 2% of Americans aged 18-24 years studied in colleges or universities.\textsuperscript{188} Clearly, the more systematic selection practices did not level the social playing field, again as Professor Andrews suggested it would. Rather, the figures testified to the abilities of provincial elites to convert their existing family advantages into education as changing norms further regulated the use of social capital to secure privilege. This further indicated that as a group, the officer corps continued to hold more in common socially with their sponsors than with the broader public.

To hammer the point, consider how rare a privilege it was to attend a college in 1880s America. Nationwide, there were only about 500 colleges and universities educating some 60,000 pupils annually. Many schools excluded all but those whose expositions on Xenophon, Cæsar, and Virgil confirmed their command of classical geography, Greek, and Latin, knowledge usually gained in prep schools or through private tutors, or through those few highly developed public schools, like those in the Northeast.\textsuperscript{189} This included Yale College, where James Clark Sanford (USMA ’84) studied before moving on to West Point.\textsuperscript{190} In fact, poor classical language skills accounted for upwards of a quarter of all college rejections in 1879, alone.\textsuperscript{191}
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While the costs of an education varied widely, tuition and fees presented yet another obstacle, even for the erudite. At the University of Lewisburg in Pennsylvania, the annual tuition and board was $120, while at Kenyon College in Ohio, tuition, room and board, fuel, lighting, washing, and incidentals totaled $425, all payable in advance.\(^{192}\) Both schools were a bargain compared to Harvard, where tuition was $150 and a year’s ‘moderate’ expenses came to $812.\(^ {193}\) There were cheaper schools, like Middlebury College, alma mater of Stephen Miller Foote (USMA ’84). Although ranked today as one of the uber-exclusive ‘Little Ivies,’ tuition at the Vermont school in 1880 was only $45, and some scholarships were available.\(^ {194}\) Rate breaks at other schools were more explicitly reproductive. For instance, some church-affiliated colleges waved tuition for astute co-religionists or the children of active clergy; at others, the qualified children of faculty attended gratis, like future General Tasker Bliss (USMA ’75), son of Reverend George Ripley Bliss, a Lewisburg professor who taught ancient languages and biblical exegesis.\(^ {195}\) State residency was all one needed to qualify for free tuition at a number of public schools, which may have encouraged Ernest Smith Robbins (USMA ’84) to attend Purdue University in Indiana.\(^ {196}\) Still, the $150 or more Purdue charged to cover board and fees would have kept that school well beyond the reach of many Hoosier farm families.\(^ {197}\) The availability of seats was an equally significant limiting factor. Enrollments at most schools were small. Middlebury, for instance, enrolled only 35 students, while the larger state-funded schools like Purdue seated on average about 200.\(^ {198}\) The fact was, 
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schools of higher learning could service only a slender percentage of the country’s potentially qualified population, no matter the tuition costs. As Americans increasingly turned to education as a marker of distinction, such limitations easily delineated civilian and military elites from the broader public.

3.7 ‘Rankers’ and Appointees

In 1884, there were two other means of receiving one’s shoulder straps in peacetime, ideally as supplements to graduation from the academy. One was the meritorious promotion of non-commissioned officers (NCOs), whose former status as enlisted soldiers suggested the backhanded nickname, ‘rankers.’ In the first several decades after Independence, there were no laws barring enlisted soldiers from seeking a commission, but convention hardly enabled them. Army leaders as far back as Washington typically opposed the practice, a reluctance partially rooted in class prejudice, but also in practical concerns that a proper social distance was essential for maintaining military discipline.\(^{199}\) In the army’s formative years, however, opportunities sometimes opened for those with ample stocks of social capital. For example, Simon Magruder Levy (USMA ‘02), the military academy’s second graduate and more notably its first Jew, had served eight years as a sergeant in the 4\(^{th}\) U.S. Infantry Regiment when his captain, Benjamin Lockwood, endorsed his appointment. Levy had much to recommend him, including distinguished service at the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794 and an aptitude for mathematics which he probably learned at schools in Lancaster, Pennsylvania.\(^{200}\) Whether family connections helped to grease Levy’s appointment is hard to say, but it seems likely. His father, Levi Andrew Levy, made his pile in furs and speculating in Indian lands as a major investor in the Illinois and Indiana Companies, and thus he was very well connected not only

\(^{199}\) For example, see Gough (1986), 467.

within his native Pennsylvania, but also in Maryland, where he had since relocated.201

Wartime opened the greatest opportunities for enlisted soldiers hoping to enter the officer corps, and a number of men were so promoted to meet needs during the War of 1812 and the Seminole Wars in Florida. It was, though, not until 1847 that Congress formally legislated a pathway to commission distinguished NCOs, and once again it was a matter of urgency, this time to support the Mexican War.202 Just like the early academy appointments, selecting officers from amongst the enlisted depended almost entirely on the support of networks and sponsors who could vouch for a subject’s ‘habits of propriety,’ which included a ‘liberal education, general intelligence and gentlemanly deportment.’ Such was the experience of Sergeant Major Arthur Donaldson Tree. In civilian life, Sergeant Major Tree had been a merchant, but during an economic slowdown in 1835 he enlisted in Company F, 1st U.S. Dragoons.204 When Congress passed the new law, the sergeant major turned for assistance to his older brother, Lambert, whose position as the District of Columbia’s assistant postmaster allowed him to move within the capital’s best social circles.205 The scion of a notable Philadelphia family, Lambert Tree petitioned the Keystone State’s congressional delegation on Arthur’s behalf, and extolled his brother’s ‘commanding figure…good education, and clever talents’ to drum up support for his commission.206 In the event, Lambert swayed the delegation and President James Polk commissioned Arthur Tree in July 1847 as a lieutenant in the 2nd U.S. Dragoons. The younger Tree served conspicuously during the Mexican War, and remained in
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the army until dying a decade later at Fort Riley in the Kansas Territory.\textsuperscript{207}

Congress again passed legislation in 1854, this time to encourage enlistments by authorizing the promotion by brevet of deserving NCOs, as judged by a board of officers specially chosen for the task.\textsuperscript{208} The law did not altogether eliminate political influence in these promotions, but it did delegate the task to serving officers who were in better position to make any quality cuts. Legislation that followed in 1878 and 1892 added formal commissioning examinations and restricted eligibility to unmarried NCOs under the age of 30 with at least two years of service, and later to American citizens.\textsuperscript{209}

On one hand, these laws somewhat broadened commissioning opportunities for less substantially connected Americans while helping the army meet its needs for officers with a demonstrated military faculty. On the other hand, the wickets candidates negotiated amounted to cultural means testing and actually complemented existing commissioning barriers. At first, only a commanding officer could initiate the promotion process, presumably after noting a soldier’s suitability as a potential colleague; it was not until 1892 that Congress granted soldiers the right to request consideration. Even then, regulations put the onus on commanders to certify a candidate’s ‘fidelity and sobriety.’ Once a nomination passed, candidates sat for preliminary medical and academic examinations administered by a board of officers at the departmental level.\textsuperscript{210} Finalists then advanced to an army-wide competitive exam that was every bit as rigorous as that used at West Point to screen nominees. Topics included English grammar, American history, the Constitution and civics, geography, astronomy, arithmetic and geometry, and the ‘general principals which regulate international intercourse.’\textsuperscript{211}

If the academic requirements were not tough enough, satisfying for a board of officers the ‘extent to which [one’s] talents had been cultivated’ would have been a deuced hard row to
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hoe for anyone not raised in the habitus of the late-Victorian American gentleman.\textsuperscript{212} To that end, War Department orders further instructed both the preliminary and competitive boards to exercise great care assessing a candidate’s ‘moral character and antecedents.’\textsuperscript{213} In 1893, Lieutenant William Power Burnham estimated that only 1 in 5 enlisted candidates successfully passed through these examinations.\textsuperscript{214} And Burnham knew his business: after attending the academy for three years, he enlisted in 1881 and was selected from the ranks for a commission in 1883.\textsuperscript{215} In sum, any advantages from the family upbringing still mattered a great deal in commissioning, no matter the source.

High standards meant that the NCOs selected often came from backgrounds quite similar to those who entered the academy, which emphasized the importance mutual recognition played in enlisted promotions. And like the West Pointers, a ranker’s education was the most visible indicator. Of the 11 men commissioned from the ranks in 1884, three were college educated before enlisting (see, \textit{Appendix B}). Joseph Elwyn Maxfield held a mathematics degree from Harvard; John Park Finley held bachelor and master of science degrees from the forerunner of Michigan State University, and later spent a year studying law at the University of Michigan; and Carl Reichmann, the German immigrant, had studied medicine at universities in Tübingen and Munich.\textsuperscript{216} Five others benefitted from an Eastern secondary education and one other, Julius Henry Weber, was so sufficiently prepared he later earned a law degree from Georgetown University in Washington, DC.\textsuperscript{217} For whatever these men lacked in social capital, in terms of cultural capital they certainly were far richer than most.
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As the third and final form of appointment, the president could fill any outstanding authorizations directly by commissioning suitable civilians. Commissioning men directly from civil life was the oldest form of appointment and remained necessary to increase the establishment during emergencies, as well as to fill extraordinary vacancies in peacetime. As one might suspect, the need to catch the eye of the chief executive meant candidates for direct appointment usually enjoyed substantial ties to power within their state or at the federal level. The upshot was that appointees typically were the sons of serving officers, prominent citizens, or graduates of the various local military colleges, schools which naturally catered to provincial elite families.\footnote{218 Coffman (1986), 302; Burnham (1893), 118.}

The obviously political nature of these appointments meant charges of cronyism were unavoidable. In 1879, one anonymous critic grumbled that some congressmen intended to ‘pitchfork thirty-seven civilians into the rank of Second Lieutenant [sic]’ allegedly as plums for protégés and other associates, despite the lack of vacancies.\footnote{219 “Civilians in the Army,” New York Times (15 Jul 1879), 4.} While a colorful allusion to the spoils system, the charge was somewhat overblown given that the president, and not a congressman, remained the original appointing authority for all officers. That said, the chief executive was just as inclined as other politicians to use his authority to honor social and political obligations. In 1876, Margaret Olivia Slocum Sage, wife of Wall Street titan Russell Sage, pleaded with President Grant to ‘temper with mercy’ the decision to expel her nephew, Cadet Herbert J. Slocum, from West Point after he failed his graduate engineering examination.\footnote{220 Letter, Margaret Olivia Sage to U.S. Grant, 18 Jun 1876, in John Y. Simon, ed., The Papers of US Grant, vol. 25 (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003), 209; U.S. Military Academy, Official Register of the Officers and Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy (Jun 1876), 10.} In the event, Slocum did not graduate. But as a favor to Mrs. Sage, Grant commissioned Herbert Slocum on 22 June, a week after West Point’s graduation exercise. Assigned to the 7th U.S. Cavalry to fill a vacancy opened by the regiment’s slaughter that summer at the Little Bighorn River, Slocum ultimately served more than four decades in the
saddle before retiring in 1919, when he had reached the statutory age of 64.221

Such occurrences naturally conflicted with the designs of reformers like Peter Michie and Emory Upton that West Point superintend the profession. Recall that Upton especially blamed the Civil War’s high butcher’s bill on the influence of so many politically connected state Volunteers accepted into federal service. The nation’s dependency on gentlemen amateurs also had far-reaching consequences for the career progression of West Pointers in the decades after the war had ended. Quick promotions and priority consideration for peacetime retention meant that civilian appointees who entered the army as wartime Volunteers outnumbered academy graduates in the far smaller post-war army, especially in the field grades. Indeed, Michie had calculated that as late as 1879 some 53% of the officers on the active list had entered the army from civilian life, most of whom won their spurs in the late war.222 Furthermore, all those wartime promotions to high rank of so many young men produced a glut of so-called ‘boy colonels,’ a bottleneck made even narrower by glacial promotions and career tenure to age 64. Consider the career of Lieutenant General Nelson Appleton Miles, a former Volunteer officer who served as the army’s last commanding general from 1895-1903. In 1861 at the age of 22, Miles was a lieutenant in a Massachusetts infantry regiment, and within three years he held a meritorious brevet as major general of Volunteers. The federal government retained Miles after the war, and in 1866 he was made colonel of the 40th U.S. Infantry Regiment, at the tender age of 26. Meanwhile, an academy graduate commissioned that same year, like Henry Harrison Chase Dunwoody (USMA ‘66), would have to wait in line 32 years before making colonel.223 When Miles retired in 1903 for age, he had served in the Regular
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222 Michie (1880), 155-156.

223 Heitman, v.1 (1988), 708-709, 389. Henry H.C. Dunwoody received a ‘tombstone promotion’ to brigadier general the day before he retired. He was the great-grandfather of General Ann E. Dunwoody, the U.S. Army’s first female four-star general.
Army almost four decades as a senior officer, and the last two as a general. By comparison, when Dunwoody retired in 1904, he had been a colonel just six years. Not only were these imbalances as source of bitterness, they also made it challenging for West Point to attract the well-educated sons of provincial elites who increasing turned to civilian fields, like business and the traditional professions, which offered potentially more rewarding career progression than did the army.224

In the late 1870s, Congress officially recognized the military academy as the nation’s primary commissioning source of Regular Army officers, and thereafter army leaders and their civilian allies gradually took steps to more tightly regulate appointments from other sources. To reduce the dependency on civilian appointments, Congress prioritized enlisted promotions to fill any vacancies remaining after West Point’s annual graduation exercise. The army further adopted new entrance examinations comparable to those used at West Point to certify the academic qualifications of civilian applicants, and new regulations placed age restrictions on original appointments.225 Whereas West Point accepted cadets between the ages of 17-22 years, civilians could apply for a commission only between the ages of 21-27 years.226 Presumably the difference accounted for the time civilians spent in college, but the slightly older bracket for civil appointees virtually ensured that few would achieve higher rank than their academy peers before reaching the mandatory retirement age, notwithstanding any fortunes of war. That and natural attrition would help West Point resume its institutional dominance by the beginning of the 20th century, much as Michie predicted.227

The higher emphasis on education in civilian appointments did serve as a quality check, and though applicants only had to sit for one battery of exams, some hopefuls still failed to make the grade.228 That said, the standards did not altogether eliminate the value of elite

224 Carter (1906), 870-872.
226 Burnham (1893), 111.
227 Michie (1880), 157.
228 For names of some who failed see, Army and Navy Journal 21, no. 51 (19 Jul 1884), 1043.
networks. Army examiners enjoyed far less leeway to reject civilian applicants, and were instructed to weigh a candidate’s fitness mostly on the merits of a brief autobiographical essay and testimonials provided from ‘institutions of learning and prominent men.’\textsuperscript{229} Moreover, any resulting decrease in the number of authorized billets only meant those so selected would be even more socially or politically connected than the typical cadet. And of those commissioned from civil life in 1884, virtually all had the antecedents or education to demonstrate it, as examined in depth in the following chapter.

As a final note, the most far-reaching changes to American commissioning practices outside the academy occurred in the years leading the First World War, just as the 1884 cohort was nearing retirement. The nation’s expanding foreign interests inspired reformers like Secretary of War Elihu Root to lobby for greater federal control over defense in order to improve efficiency. Most consequential were a series of revisions to the Militia Act that gave federal authorities more control over the organized militia in exchange for federal funding and recognition.\textsuperscript{230} In effect, these revisions strengthened the federal government’s hand to reject the wartime gubernatorial appointments which had long been a vector for political interventions in the Regular Army, which in turn all but eliminated any vestige of the military prerogatives provincial leaders had retained at the Founding. Meanwhile, the minimum time in service for non-commissioned officers to seek a commissioned appointment dropped to one year, while appointments from civil life became more highly regimented.\textsuperscript{231} Although the president retained leeway to appoint as junior officers any applicant who ‘demonstrated in business, athletics, or other activity that he possesse[d] to an unusual degree, the ability to handle men,’ Congress now expected all candidates be highly educated and possess some prior military training supervised by Regular Army officers.\textsuperscript{232} To that end, the army briefly

\textsuperscript{229}Burnham (1893), 110-117. For NCO commissioning standards see, Act of 18 Jun 1878, ch. 263, 20 Stat, 150.

\textsuperscript{230}Act of 21 Jan 1903, ch. 196, 32 Stat. 775.


experimented with six-week summer training camps meant to prepare business elites and college men for commissioned service in national emergencies.233 By 1916, Congress formally confirmed the linkage between higher education and peacetime commissioning practices when it expanded military training at civilian colleges around the country under the ROTC.234 While arguably this program created a more regionally diverse population of well-educated provisional officers for the new Officers Reserve Corps, its dependency on expensive college educations also reaffirmed the U.S. Army officer corps as a preserve of the country’s dominant classes, what Brigadier General Eben Swift (USMA ’76) then styled ‘the best blood of the Country [sic] and its highest type.’235

3.8 Concluding Remarks

About the time that Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz were penning their theories, the late Sir Michael Howard wisely perceived that problems in civil-military relations actually occur when society and its military no longer share the principles of social order.236 Pierre Bourdieu’s social reproduction frameworks not only help reveal to us how armies are indeed integral to a state’s social organization, they also allow us to imagine in a more general way how the problems Sir Michael warned of might come about. Through the alchemy of professionalization, American commissioning practices once rooted in a dynastic sociality became converted into bureaucratic practices that at once emulated elite predispositions and provided the impetus for inculcating those outlooks with acceptable newcomers. Significantly, this transformation was no more the wholly conscious invention of civilian authorities any


more than it was the army’s. Rather, these changes manifested in a decades-long elite bargain within the field of power between civilian and military agents seeking to stabilize the relative value of their advantages in the midst of broad social changes. The upshot was the steadier reproduction of a Regular Army officer corps that was truly national in character, under the legitimate aegis of the federal government. By implication, the loss of the federal government’s monopoly on commissioning practices, or any alteration which failed to reflect the inevitable changes to the state’s social and symbolic order, might presage a truly systemic breakdown in civil-military relationships, the likes of which the orthodox scholarship, so focused as it is on etiquettical slights, might fail to detect.

Building on this chapter, the final three chapters examine more closely the Regular Army officers commissioned in 1884, a group whose professional careers spanned Samuel Huntington’s alleged period of isolation. Chapter Four examines the cohort’s social origins demographically and biographically, in order to chart the unequal resources these officers possessed in terms of relative family status, levels of influence, and education. Chapter Five delves more deeply to examine the commission as a mediator of elite recognition, and how the cohort’s pursuit of social capital contributed to a civil-military mentalité or national habitus, even as it enabled the extension of family privileges. And to further highlight the officer corps’ place in the period’s social structure, Chapter Six culminates at the individual level in a case study of the career and tribulations of Colonel Carl Reichmann.
CHAPTER 4
‘To the Manner Born:’
The Social Origins of the Officer Cohort of 1884

4.1 Introduction

After Bourdieu, a state’s military establishment, as with any social institution, tends to reflect the social order that produced it. This extends to commissioning practices, or the ways in which societies select their military leaders. Early in American history, these practices were embedded in elite sociality, and thus officer selections most visibly conformed to the prevailing social structure. As these more dynastic modes of social reproduction became illegitimate, elite sociality became reconstructed in bureaucratic practices approved by Congress and administered by the army. We recognize this conversion more commonly as professionalization, in which cultural means testing in the form of education came to stand proxy for the sociality that preceded it. These practices continued to play foremost to families best able to convert existing economic or social advantages into the species of cultural capital then growing in demand. They also, however, placed the army commission within the reach of some cultivated men from less auspicious families who were willing to internalize the military field’s dispositions in exchange for the privileges of officership. The upshot was that by the late 19th century the social boundaries surrounding the U.S. Army officer corps remained tightly drawn, and that by and large the corps remained the preserve of the same provincial elite social groups versed in the country’s dominant dispositions and who traditionally led their communities’ affairs, despite the new touch of anonymity in selections.

As evidence, this chapter examines in greater depth the family circumstances of the 67 men who comprised the U.S. Army commissioning cohort of 1884, according to the three commissioning sources then available: by graduating from the U.S. Military Academy; by direct presidential appointment; and by meritorious selection from the ranks. All these men began their careers in the years following the federal government’s adoption of more stringent
commissioning practices. Moreover, their careers spanned Samuel Huntington’s purported period of isolated professionalization. To get a feel for the Regular Army officer corps’ exclusivity, the chapter begins by taking the cohort as a demographic to place its small size in a national context. Here, demographic markers include gender, race, age, health, education, local origins, and nativity. Later sections zoom in on the officers themselves by drawing on a wide range of historical and genealogical sources to reveal their families’ economic, social, and cultural advantages, which marked them mostly as belonging to local families who, if somewhat regionally diverse in character, nevertheless composed the country’s provincial elite. A final section draws attention to nativity and religious affiliation as subtle indicators that the officer corps’ demographic had been undergoing gradual changes reflected in the nation’s electorate well before the mid-20th century, when scholars began to worry for the officer corps’ diminishing social origins. The chapter concludes that while the officer corps remained far more representative of the country’s white, higher-status provincial families, newer families were entering all along, evinced most visibly, but not exclusively, by the rankers.

4.2 Commissioning Boundaries as Demographic

In 1884, the U.S. Army was tiny. With around 2,100 officers leading just over 24,000 troops, the Regular Army represented only about .05% of the total United States population of some 50 million.\(^1\) Becoming an officer in that army was no easy task. One first needed a vacancy, and in that year, there were only 67. Of the men who filled them, 37 had graduated from the U.S. Military Academy; 19 had received direct presidential appointments from civilian life; and 11 were raised from the ranks after passing batteries of examinations for
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fitness. Most were commissioned as second lieutenants, which was by then the highest grade of original appointment available in the line during peacetime. Three others, however, entered the army as staff officers at higher grades. Two of these were medical doctors from Virginia, Walter Drew McCaw and Jefferson Randolph Kean (pronounced ‘cane’), both of whom received commissions as assistant surgeons in the grade of first lieutenant. The third was Andrew Huckins Young, a Civil War veteran from New Hampshire who was appointed to a vacancy in the Quartermaster Bureau with the rank of captain. Demographically, this cohort was in many ways an exclusive subset of American society, beginning most visibly with its gender and racial composition: all were white men of European descent.

Although historically women have always played a part in war-making, 19th-century American men and women largely assumed females should not serve openly in the military, let alone hold a commission. Instead, they acknowledged themselves as occupying separate, if interdependent gendered military spaces reflecting the traditional family structure, with women serving most visibly in distaff roles as laundresses, cooks, and in nursing the injured. This extended to the military household, where officers’ wives and daughters played a crucial role in managing the family’s social and cultural capital by tending to the reciprocating obligations of social life. Far from a trifling part, partaking in the polite rituals of daily life – the correspondence, receptions, teas, dinners, and dances, called ‘hops’ – was essential for maintaining both a military family’s sympathetic relations and the stability of community, within the garrison and without. In fact, so integral were these roles to military life that

---


4 Adams (2009), 79-80.
officers’ wives fully thought of themselves as members of their husbands’ regiments. It is true, of course, that in wartime some women participated much more actively as scouts or spies, like the famed Washington socialite and Confederate spy Rose O’Neal Greenhow, grandmother to 1884 cohort appointee Treadwell Woodbridge Moore; indeed, Mrs. Greenhow exploited her presumed feminine innocence to circulate unsuspectedly within the capital city’s predominantly male power circles. There also were cases, at least up until the Civil War, of women enlisting in the ranks disguised as men. Enabled by the superficiality of the day’s medical examinations, perhaps as many as 400 women shouldered arms clandestinely in Union blue; maybe 250 more wore Confederate gray. Changes in social attitudes and manpower needs beginning in the mid-20th century would gradually accelerate the broader acceptance and integration of women in the armed services, so that today gendered military roles have virtually disappeared. But in the period under study, the army officer corps was a male space, full stop.

Racialist bars to military service, though substantial, were rather more fluid, especially in the face of wartime necessities. For instance, while the federal government used blood quantum laws devised before Independence to deny Native Americans the full rights of citizenship, a few Indians did receive commissions, like David Moniac (USMA ‘22). A mixed-ancestry Creek from Alabama, Moniac received his academy appointment in 1817, probably as reward for his family’s loyalty to the United States during the Creek War (1813-1814). After

---

graduation, Lieutenant Moniac returned home to his people a living symbol of the American state, and though he shortly after resigned to care for his family’s estate, he later accepted a majority to lead Indian Volunteers during the Second Seminole War. Fatefully, Major Moniac was killed in 1836 in action against the Seminole Chief Osceola, his kinsman by marriage. A more celebrated case was that of Colonel Ely Parker, General Ulysses Grant’s military secretary who helped to draft the instrument of General Robert E. Lee’s (USMA ’29) surrender at Appomattox in 1865. A classically educated Tonawanda Seneca chief from upstate New York, Parker had read law, studied civil engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and was a Master Freemason, all cultural capital enabling mutual recognition with white Americans similarly cultivated. More importantly, Parker was personally acquainted with Grant before the war, which trumped the War Department’s initial reluctance to commission him. Parker left the army with a Regular Army brevet to brigadier general, in 1867.

Such exigent flexibility also held true for the nation’s largest minority group, African Americans. During the War for Independence, perhaps some 5,000 men of African descent had served in the Continental Army and Navy, including some numbers of slaves Congress allowed to enlist in exchange for their freedom, and during the War of 1812 the War Department quietly opened the ranks to some free blacks. Yet from 1792-1863, the War Department otherwise barred the peacetime recruitment of African Americans, a policy surely assuaging to Southern slave holders unsettled by the portents of arming blacks. Congress again relented at the height

---

9 Hauptmann and Dixon (2008), 342.
of the Civil War when, desperate for manpower and under political pressure from abolitionists, they authorized the president to accept black men into the Union Army’s ranks. Despite near universally low expectations, African American troops acquitted themselves well on the battlefield, and by war’s end more than 180,000 blacks had served in segregated Union regiments and on navy ships, predominantly under the leadership of white officers. Indeed, African Americans continued to serve with distinction after the war as Regulars in the smaller frontier army’s four black regiments, the two each of cavalry and infantry collectively remembered as the ‘Buffalo Soldiers.’

The acceptance of blacks as commissioned officers, however, was a different matter entirely. On top of raw bigotry, blacks were legally ineligible to become citizens before the Civil War, and by consequence unqualified to hold a federal commission. And although during the war some 100 African Americans did acquire temporary commissions in state regiments raised early on in Massachusetts, Kansas, and in Union-occupied Louisiana, the War Department officially discouraged the practice, ostensibly on grounds of maintaining good order and discipline. Actually, not long after those Louisiana regiments were mustered into federal service their district commander, Major General Nathaniel Banks, used competency boards to remove all the units’ black officers, including those who had passed their exams.

13 Black troops were raised under Act of 17 Jul 1862, ch. 195, 12 Stat, 589, the so-called Second Confiscation Act, and Act of 17 Jul 1862, ch. 201, 12 Stat, 597, which revised the Militia Act.


15 Initially, the army retained six segregated colored regiments in 1866, but consolidated them into four by 1869. The nickname ‘Buffalo Soldiers’ originally was given to the 10th U.S. Cavalry Regiment, but in later days applied to all. Coffman (1986), 331-332.

16 Roger D. Cunningham, “Douglas’s Battery at Fort Leavenworth: The Issue of Black Officers During the Civil War,” Kansas History 23 (Winter 2000-2001), 202; Martin W. Öfele, German-Speaking Officers in the U.S. Colored Troops, 1863-1867 (Gainesville, FL: Univ. of Florida Press, 2004), 141-142; Coffman (1986), 226. A Wikipedia entry entitled “Military History of African Americans in the American Civil” putting the number of black officers in the Civil War at 7,122 appears to have lumped NCOs with commissioned officers and did not differentiate colored unit leaders by race. See the cited source article, Herbert Aptheker, “Negro Casualties in the Civil War,” Journal of Negro History 32, no. 1 (Jan 1947), 12n5, which actually addressed this statistical pitfall.

Thereafter, the number of African American line officers dwindled to a bare handful, and the balance served out the war as chaplains, physicians, or in other positions that afforded them some status, but little or no authority.\(^{18}\)

The ratification of the Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment in 1868 made citizens of native-born African Americans, thus making it technically legal for black men to pursue direct commissions or appointments to the U.S. Military Academy.\(^{19}\) But to say the chips were stacked against them understated the challenge. Most white officers remained disturbed by the prospects of accepting blacks as peers, let alone superiors, and further advised against the practice of commissioning them. Moreover, few in Congress would sacrifice a rare academy appointment on a black prospect with so many white constituents competing for the rare vacancy. And if bigotry were not obstacle enough, most African Americans simply were unprepared for West Point’s academic rigor, which even then was getting tougher. In 1870, almost 80% of the country’s 4.8 million blacks were illiterate, compared to around 12% of whites.\(^{20}\) Poor education was particularly acute in the recently emancipated South, where most blacks resided and where much of the antebellum slave population had been denied access to even primary schooling. With help from the Freedman’s Bureau and Northern missionary societies, black school enrollments expanded rapidly during the Reconstruction Era (1865-1877), with over 800,000 pupils attending by 1880.\(^{21}\) Even so, that year 70% of African Americans remained illiterate, compared to around 9% of whites.\(^{22}\) The disparity in quality educational opportunities was so profound that it would take nearly a century for the literacy
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\(^{18}\) Douglas’ Independent Battery was the only colored unit officered by blacks during the Civil War. See, Cunningham (2000-2001), 205-206.

\(^{19}\) While the country’s relatively small population of Asian immigrants were not permitted to naturalize until the mid-20th century, the 14th Amendment extended citizenship to native-born Asians.


\(^{21}\) U.S. Bureau of Education (1880), lxii-lxiii.

\(^{22}\) U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883), 920, 924.
gap to close, in 1979.\textsuperscript{23}

For the few African Americans who did manage to secure an academy appointment, the disparity in education often showed. One of the first black appointees, Michael Howard of Mississippi, had only one year of schooling before his selection, when many of his white peers had prepared under tutors or had spent years in expensive private schools.\textsuperscript{24} In all, 22 black men were nominated to attend West Point between 1870-1887. Of those, only nine passed the academic and physical examinations for entry.\textsuperscript{25} Michael Howard was not amongst them. What’s more, a gauntlet of cruel hazing, humiliation, and social isolation awaited those who did matriculate, and felled all but three who passed through to receive their commissions: Henry O. Flipper (USMA ’77), John H. Alexander (USMA ’87), and Charles D. Young (USMA ’89). Each was fairly well educated, though of the three Alexander was the only one whose family background and preparatory education approached close enough to the experiences of his white classmates to serve as any basis for mutual recognition. Son of an Arkansas slave who later prospered in business and served a stint in the state legislature, the younger Alexander had taught school and studied for two years at Oberlin College in Ohio, where he excelled in all subjects and earned a reputation as a disciplined student.\textsuperscript{26} Although Alexander suffered many indignities at the academy, his biographer, Willard Gatewood, noted that his intellect, bearing, and a talent for social circumspection earned him the genuine respect, if not the complete acceptance, of his white classmates and the officers he later he served.

\textsuperscript{23} Snyder (1993), 9.
\textsuperscript{24} William P. Vaughn, “West Point and the First Negro Cadet,” \textit{Military Affairs} 35, no. 3 (Oct 1971), 100.
\textsuperscript{25} Brian G. Shellum, \textit{Black Cadet in a White Bastion: Charles Young at West Point} (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 2006), 42; Wesley A. Brown, “Eleven Men of West Point,” \textit{Negro History Bulletin} 19, no. 7 (Apr 1956), 148. Coffman cited 12 blacks as entering West Point. See, Coffman (1886), 226.
\textsuperscript{26} Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., “John Hanks Alexander of Arkansas: Second Black Graduate of West Point,” \textit{Arkansas Historical Quarterly} 41, no. 2 (Summer 1982), 109-111.
alongside in the field.\textsuperscript{27}

Only one of the black graduates, Charles Young, enjoyed a long career. He rose to colonel and died while on assignment in West Africa, in 1922. Flipper was cashiered after just five years in service on a court martial conviction for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and Alexander died suddenly in 1894 from a ruptured aorta.\textsuperscript{28} Almost a half century would pass before West Point graduated another African American. Race relations were even bleaker in the navy. Between 1872-1897, three blacks received appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy, none of whom made it through to commissioning. In describing the life of black naval cadets at the Annapolis school, one anonymous faculty member called such appointments ‘unfortunate,’ because ‘no ordinary man could stand it [and no] intelligent person would desire it.’\textsuperscript{29} Annapolis would not graduate its first black ensign until 1949.\textsuperscript{30}

In the post-Civil War army, a few African Americans received direct appointments as chaplains assigned to black regiments, and John Roy Lynch, a former Mississippi congressman and Spanish-American War veteran, received a direct appointment from President William McKinley as a paymaster with the rank of captain in 1901.\textsuperscript{31} That same year, the army promoted its first black rankers when two Buffalo Soldiers, Corporal John Ernest Green of the 24\textsuperscript{th} U.S. Infantry, and Sergeant Major Benjamin Oliver Davis Sr., of 9\textsuperscript{th} U.S. Cavalry were

\textsuperscript{27} Gatewood (1982), 115-117, 119-120, 122.


\textsuperscript{30} Coffman (1986), 229.

made lieutenants in black regiments. Green retired a lieutenant colonel of infantry in 1929, and in 1940, Davis became the Regular Army’s first black general officer. In turn, the sons of both would attend and graduate West Point: Benjamin O. Davis, Jr. (USMA 1936), who became the U.S. Air Force’s first black general, and Robert W. Green (USMA 1950), who led engineers in the Korean War. The gradual acceptance of these men and their sons’ ensuing mobility marked an oftentimes grudging progress towards a modern army that increasingly reflects the country’s racial diversity. In the profoundly segregated army of the 1880s, however, the officer corps remained all but a white enclave, which practically reduced the eligible pool of officer candidates to about 44% of the nation’s total population, or just over 22 million men.

Deductions for age reduced the eligible population further. Only men aged 17-22 years could enter the academy, while for civilians without prior commissioned service the span for direct appointments typically was 22-27 years. Enlisted men could not be commissioned over the age of 30; while it was technically possible that a soldier might earn a meritorious promotion by the age of 19, it was unlikely one would catch their commander’s eye before the age of majority. The age span for an original officer’s appointment thus reasonably ranged from 21-30 years, yielding an eligible population of perhaps just over four million men. There were exceptions, of course, for men with the right social capital. At 57 years old, quartermaster


33 The younger Davis was the academy’s fourth black graduate. Green reportedly left the army as a captain to pursue a civilian career. See, “East Bay Marine Cited for Conspicuous gallantry; Others Win Medals, Promoted,” *Oakland Tribune* (31 May 1951), 38.


35 Burnham (1893), 59-61. The total number of white males in the age range was 4,069,160. See, U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883), 548.
Captain Andrew Young was the cohort’s oldest officer, an allowance made for his service during the Civil War, his status as a brevet lieutenant colonel of Volunteers, and his Republican Party connections. On the other end of the spectrum was Selah Reeve Hobbie Tompkins, son of the army’s assistant quartermaster general. When Tompkins failed his West Point entrance examination, family friends in high places fudged his birthdate so he could wrangle a presidential appointment. So, at the age of 20 he became the youngest officer commissioned that year. These outliers aside, the cohort averaged 26 years on commissioning.

Within the eligible age range, illiteracy eliminated a further 8% of white males from consideration. Membership in the ‘defective, dependent, and delinquent classes,’ an unfortunate catch-all for the deaf and the blind, the insane, those suffering intellectual and developmental disabilities, felons, and the destitute, disqualified another 1%. Incurable or chronic diseases impeding ‘the functions of one or more organs or members,’ as well as a range of physical deformities richly described in manuals written by army surgeons Charles Stuart Tripler and Roberts Bartholow, barred perhaps another 1% of military-age males. But as suggested above, until the last quarter of the 19th century medical examinations were little more than skin deep. Oftentimes a candidate’s fitness was left ‘to the sagacity of the Surgeon [sic],’ a


39 U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883), 922-923. Within the age bracket, 325,533 white men likely were illiterate based on a sustained rate of about 8%, leaving 3,743,627 white men.

40 Ibid., 926-929. Total ‘3-D’ population of white males was about 0.83% of total white male population, or very roughly 58,542 men, leaving an eligible population of 3,685,085 white males.

last resort potentially concealing inexperience, incompetency, or intent. Consider the case of John Alexander, the black West Point cadet. Although a civilian physician initially disqualified Alexander for military service on account of his ‘pigeon breast,’ army physicians passed on a defect that likely indicated the cardio-vascular condition which ended his life abruptly at the age of 30. Medical screening, though, was just becoming less subjective as the army copied practices inspired by actuarial science and anthropometry then employed in Europe to improve the physical quality of officers and other ranks, alike. These eventually included standard biometric tables for height, weight, and chest circumference, which the U.S. Army would adopt by 1887. This turn to scientific management sometimes ruffled feathers when they conflicted with the old prerogatives of pedigree, as when West Point reportedly rejected Major General Winfield Scott Hancock’s grandson for being two pounds underweight. Rising to the young man’s defense, retired Major General John Gibbon (USMA ’47) groused that subordinating potential genius to metrics would ‘as likely to rule out a Napoleon as a blockhead, on a feature…remedied by government rations.’ Like the tougher academic exams, the scientific approach to medical readiness closed doors to some unfortunate sons of otherwise fortunate families. Nevertheless, men enjoying higher standards of living remained more likely to meet those higher physical standards, however measured.

All told, this meant that only about 3.6 million white American men, or about 1 in 6, potentially met the most basic intellectual, moral, or physical qualifications for commissioned service. This, of course, says nothing of inclination or academic preparation, the lack of
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42 Tripler (1858), 31.
43 Gatewood (1982), 117. Medically, the condition is termed *pectus carinatum*.
46 Total eligible (3,631,752) divided by total white male population (22,130,900) equals 16.4%.
which would have greatly reduced the eligible population even more. Indeed, data collected on 88% of the 1884 cohort show they enjoyed educational experiences that were exceptional in their day and which enabled them to pass the army’s high testing standards (Table 4-1). Thus, if we rolled together all the country’s graduates from those superb urban high schools, public and private; those educated by private tutors or at boarding schools and academies; and those men who had attended a college or university in the period, perhaps fewer than 500,000 American men might actually have been as well prepared as the cohort to sit for the army exams. It was into this pool that the army dipped to fill those 67 vacancies occurring in 1884.

Table 4-1: Highest Civilian Schooling by Commissioning Source, 1884

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Source</th>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Private School</th>
<th>Tutors</th>
<th>College/Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMA (37/37 officers)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life (14/19)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankers (8/11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 59/67 officers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Appendix B  
*Does not include 5 x service academy failures or transfers

4.2.1 Regional Character

In 1884, social prejudice and some objective limitations effectively collapsed the nation’s eligible commissioning population to perhaps 1% of its total. In character, the 1884 cohort also was slightly more metropolitan in origin than the general population. Only about 61% of officers had rural origins, at a time when around 74% of Americans lived in the countryside. This possibly reflected not only the commission’s high educational requirements, which were more easily met in cities, but also the steady uptick in urban migration generally. Even so, the cohort’s regional origins were fairly well spread, representing 28 of the country’s

---

47 See Appendix A for cohort family seats. Approximately 13,000,000 Americans lived in cities of 8,000 or more in 1880, accounting for about 26% of the country’s population. U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883), xxx.
then-38 states, the District of Columbia and two of its nine territories, Dakota and Washington, in rough proportion to the distribution of the country’s white population (Table 4-2). For example, most – about 60% – hailed from Northern states where 67% of the country’s white population lived. The North’s dominance of the officer corps had been rather consistent throughout the 19th century, and the reason was partly structural. Recall that officially linking military academy appointments to congressional representation starting in the 1840s had by then become a well-established practice, and naturally this favored states with denser populations. Indeed, better than 1 in 3 cohort officers had applied from the most densely populated Northeast. Moreover, Northerners generally enjoyed better access to the education that had become essential for passing pre-commissioning examinations, no matter the commissioning source. Of course, politics figured broadly in all appointments, but this was particularly true of direct appointments, which were unaffected by congressional quotas. Instead, these appointments were subject to presidential favor which could, in rather more random fashion, skew slightly the geographic distribution in any year. For example, New York Republican Chester A. Arthur occupied the White House in 1884, and it was unlikely a coincidence that 32% of his direct appointments went to men who had applied from his home state. That helped bring New York’s total share of commissions that year to 18%, at a time when that state accounted for 10% of the nation’s white population. (Table Follows)

48 In 1889, Dakota Territory entered the union as the states of North and South Dakota. In 1884, Alaska was a district of the United States, and not a territory. It became a federal territory in 1912.


50 Skelton (1992), 154-155.

Table 4-2: Appointment Origins by Commissioning Source, 1884

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Source</th>
<th>North % White pop.</th>
<th>Former Confederacy %</th>
<th>Border States %</th>
<th>West %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Commissions</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Appendix A

Although Northern dominance was typical, the slight over-representation of men from the Border States and the West that year might have been a one-off, owing to the commissions granted in 1884 to the sons and relations of army and navy officers who applied mostly from those areas. Southern men, however, had been routinely overrepresented in the officer corps. Before the Civil War, for instance, only 20% of the nation’s white population lived in the 11 Southern states which would secede to form the Confederacy. Yet in antebellum America, Southern officers typically made up 30% or more of the corps, and by the eve of the war, in 1860, as many as 43% of officers on the active list claimed Southern roots.  

---

52 Percentages rounded. Here, regions are modified from modern U.S. Census Bureau definitions to reflect 19th-century regions. Dakota Territory is thus counted with the West. The District of Columbia and the wartime border states of Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and West Virginia, are counted together separately from the former Confederacy. See, U.S. Census Bureau, “Census Regions and Divisions of the United States,” at https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf (accessed 15 May 2021).

53 See Appendix A, and Tables 4-8, 4-9, and 4-10, below.

54 The Confederacy included the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. In 1860, the white population in the states and territories stood at 25,957,471, whereas the white population of the seceding states was 5,436,721. Figures compiled from Bureau of the Census, Population of the United States in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census (Wash., DC: GPO, 1864).

probably lay in the U.S. Constitution’s former three-fifths clause, which had permitted the South to count a portion of their enslaved population for the purposes of congressional representation, and not the overhyped martiality of Southern men.\textsuperscript{56}

Expectedly, the South’s share of commissions did drop steeply in the decade following the war, to between 4-7\%, for several reasons. Most obviously, the sting of defeat made it less likely Southerners would join an army that was then a visible instrument in Congress’ efforts to restructure Southern society.\textsuperscript{57} Also, Federal law barred even penitent Confederate veterans from holding commissions in the U.S. Army, a practice which removed from consideration a sizeable population of otherwise qualified Southern men.\textsuperscript{58} Moreover, there were plenty of loyal, Northern men to choose from. In drawing down the wartime establishment, Congress gave retention priority to Volunteer officers with excellent service records and who hailed from states like New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio which had contributed the largest number of troops to the victorious Union armies.\textsuperscript{59} This meant that even if a Southerner loyal to the federal authority sought a commission, there were few vacancies and little sympathy amongst those holding the power of appointment.

With the end of Reconstruction in 1877, however, the political fortunes of white Southerners began to rise again, and they steadily returned to the officer corps in larger numbers. In 1884, 14 men from the former Confederacy received commissions, accounting for more than a quarter of that year’s academy class and 21\% of the cohort’s total, in a year when those states comprised 18\% of the country’s white population. An increase in Southern political influence and the regeneration of a military-age male population too young to have seen

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{56} Skelton (1992), 155-156. The ratification of the U.S. Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment in 1868 effectively repealed the three-fifths clause.

\textsuperscript{57} Grandstaff (1998), 526-527.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 525-526; Coffman (1986), 219.

\textsuperscript{59} Coffman (1986), 219. Over 500,000 New Yorkers served in the Union Armies, more than from any other state or territory. See, Frederick Phisterer, comp., \textit{New York in the War of the Rebellion, 1861-1865}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Albany, NY: Weed, Parson and Co., 1890), 45-46.
\end{flushleft}
Confederate service partly explain the increase. White commissioning hopefuls, however, also benefitted structurally from the South’s preponderant black population which, though systematically disenfranchised after Reconstruction, still counted fully in congressional apportionment calculations under the Fourteenth Amendment, thus inflating the South’s academy quotas.\(^\text{60}\) Indeed, the former Confederacy’s share of commissions continued to increase steadily, so that by the 1920s Southerners made up over 29% of the active list, close to their antebellum average, yet their share of the country’s white population remained essentially unchanged at 18%.\(^\text{61}\)

As evidence of the South’s political rehabilitation, most every Southerner commissioned in 1884 came from families who had vigorously participated in the rebellion, and yet remained prominent in Southern society. Surgeon Jefferson Randolph Kean’s father, Robert Garlick Kean, had been chief of the Confederate Bureau of War and later helped to craft the Lost Cause narrative in the pages *Southern Historical Society Papers.*\(^\text{62}\) Surgeon Walter McCaw’s father, Dr. James Brown McCaw, also was ‘a typical Virginia gentleman of the old school’ who during the war had directed the Confederacy’s famous Chimborazo Hospital in Richmond.\(^\text{63}\) The families of Lieutenants John Thornton Knight and William Nivison Blow, Jr., were part and parcel of Virginia’s old planter aristocracy, the Knights from their seat at Poplar

---

\(^\text{60}\) Combined, the former Confederacy’s white and black population in 1880 was about 26% of the nation’s total. See, U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883).


Hill in Prince Edward County and the Blows from Tower Hill in Sussex County. Both men’s fathers also served in the war as captains of Virginia cavalry. The families of officers from other southern states were as notable for their past treason, like Lieutenant Robert Houston Anderson, Jr., a Georgian. His father, Brigadier General Robert H. Anderson, Sr. (USMA ’57), had resigned his federal commission to take up one in the Confederate army. After the war, General Anderson served as the police chief of Savannah under his uncle, Mayor Edward Clifford Anderson, another former Confederate general. And then there was the father of Lieutenant De Rosey C. Cabell. Algernon Sidney Cabell had been a Confederate major, and at the time of his son’s appointment to the military academy he was sheriff of Logan County, Arkansas – arguably an office as powerful as any in the unreconstructed South.

The upshot was that structural practices conceived to ensure a regional balance actually did produce a cohort that broadly represented white America at least in geographic terms, and that it did so despite high academy attrition and intermittent cronyism. And so, while the nation’s official population center in 1884 lay near Taylorsport, Kentucky, in what today is an airport parking lot, the cohort’s geographic midpoint was located only 230 miles to the

---


northeast, outside the town of Waldo, Ohio, in a farm field east of the Olentangy River. That said, as a group these men were far from purely sectional in character. It was true that many of the cohort’s families, like the Southern ones mentioned above, had deep roots in their home regions, such as the Finley’s of Michigan, the Taylors of New Hampshire, and the Styers of Pennsylvania. But just under a third of the cohort had applied for their appointments from a state other than the one in which they were born, and this figure does not take into account the rankers, all of whom applied for their appointments ‘from the army’ after leaving home. Add them, and the figure climbs to just under half. Not all of these transients were the sons of army officers, like Samuel Sturgis, Jr., who followed their fathers across the country on assignment. Isaac Newton Lewis, for one, was born in Pennsylvania to a farm family, but moved to Kansas where he lived with his brother-in-law’s family and taught at the local school before applying to the academy. All this describes young men and their families who were then on the move, extending sympathetic networks of varying densities that would steadily crisscross the nation, like William Cullen Wren: himself the son of a New Orleans native, Wren was born in Minnesota, educated near Philadelphia, and possessed an influence network that stretched from the Midwest to New England before he even took up his appointment. The cohort was thus already well on its way to becoming more cosmopolitan in outlook and it would only become more so as its members shuttled about the world on assignments, married into new families, and settled into their retirements, oftentimes far from their boyhood homes.

---

68 The 1880 census compilers confused the closest contemporary settlement to the midpoint, Taylorsport, for Taylorsville, a town southeast of Louisville. The midpoint’s coordinates are 39°04′08″N 84°39′40″W. See, U.S. Department of the Interior, v.1 (1883), xxxi. The cohort’s midpoint of 40°28′45″N 83°2′14″W was determined using the GeoMidpoint.com calculator at http://www.geomidpoint.com and Google Earth.

69 See also, Appendix A.


4.2.2 Nativity

Officer selections in the so-called ‘nation of immigrants’ did favor native-born Americans. Although foreign-born officers had figured prominently in the Continental Army, it was not long after Independence that Americans began to fear that foreign influence within its military might undermine the fledgling republic, and so in 1808 Congress officially barred all but American citizens from holding U.S. Army commissions. The law did not restrict foreigners from enlisting, probably to meet manpower needs, so for much of the 19th century the number of foreign-born in the ranks sometimes surpassed the percentage of immigrants in the general population. Consider, for instance, that in 1884, when almost 15% of American residents were immigrants, more than 40% of those enlisting in the army had been born overseas, mostly in Germany and in Ireland. At the same time, only about 8% of Regular Army officers were foreign-born. In fact, within the cohort there were only three immigrants: Hugh John Gallagher, a native of Perth, Ontario, entered West Point from Iowa, whereas the French-born Leon Samuel Roudiez and the German-born Carl Reichmann received their appointments from the ranks. While to modern eyes this great disparity in commissioning and enlistment practices might seem prejudicial, it nevertheless underscored the officer corps’ formidable role as steward of an institution that at once symbolized and upheld the established social order.

72 Act of 12 Apr 1808, ch. 43, 2 Stat. 483.
74 For officer totals by relative rank and foreign-born officers see, U.S. Adjutant General, Official Army Register for 1884 (Wash., DC: 1884), 342-354. While 184 officers were listed as being born overseas, only 176 were actually foreigners.
The meaning of citizenship evolved throughout the 19th century, but getting there typically included a five-year residency period, a sworn declaration of intent, and a loyalty oath administered by a federal judge at the appointed time.\(^{76}\) As it had with racistist bars, the need for manpower during the Civil War made these formalities elastic, and President Lincoln even authorized the Department of State to drum up professional soldiers in Europe for positions in the growing Union armies.\(^{77}\) While the practice proved unpopular with career U.S. Army officers, finding a place for foreign professionals in the federal forces at least kept them off the job market and out of the Confederate Army.\(^{78}\) By 1862, the law caught up with practice when Congress altogether waived the residency and declaration requirements for aliens over age 21, and for the war’s duration foreign-born soldiers with as little as a year’s military service qualified for naturalization.\(^{79}\) The law proved especially popular with prominent men from the nation’s various foreign heritage groups, like the German-born Franz Sigel, the Hungarian-born Julius Stahel, and the Irish-born Thomas Francis Meagher, whose commissions at once validated their own status recognition with native-born elites and vouched for their communities’ patriotism.\(^{80}\) In response, when Congress reinstated the five-year residency requirement for citizenship after the war, the law exempted honorably discharged foreign-born veterans to recognize the wartime sacrifices of so many immigrants.\(^{81}\) This exemption allowed then-First Sergeant Carl Reichmann, who enlisted in the army shortly after emigrating from Germany in 1881, to accept a commission in 1884 even though he was still a declarant alien.


\(^{78}\) Ibid., 273.

\(^{79}\) Act of 17 Jul 1862, ch. 200, 12 Stat, 597.


As it happened, remote postings in the Indian Territory delayed Reichmann’s naturalization for three more years, and it was not until his reassignment to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, in 1887 that he finally took his oath of citizenship before Judge Robert Crozier.  

About the time Reichmann accepted his appointment, the percentage of foreign-born officers in the Regular Army actually had about reached its peak, and any sense of obligation to the foreign-born soldier was wearing thin. From around 1880-1914, over 20 million immigrants entered the United States, more than double the number who arrived in all the years before the Civil War. Most were Eastern and Southern Europeans, groups that native-born Americans deemed even less desirable than the waves of Western European immigrants who preceded them. Moreover, the popular association of newcomers with radical labor movements in the urban and industrial pockets in which they settled again stoked fears of social upheaval and rekindled a virulent nativism. Evolving guidelines for both commissions and enlistments reflected these fears, and by 1892 army general orders specified that only American citizens could apply for meritorious promotions from the ranks. Then in 1894, Congress passed the country’s first recruiting law specifically intended to Americanize the army. The law restricted original enlistments to citizens and to declarant aliens, so long as they ‘could speak, read, and write the English language.’ The War Department even scrutinized the status of serving

---


foreign-born officers, and in 1895 re-verified Reichmann’s citizenship with both the district court in Kansas and the German Imperial Consulate in St. Louis, Missouri.⁸⁷ Reichmann, it seems, had received his commission just under the wire.

It is worth pointing out that as a result of these changes in practice, the numbers of foreign-born serving in the Regular Army in all grades ultimately dwindled in the decades leading to the First World War. By 1916, immigrants made up only about 10% of the Regular Army’s annual enlistments and only 2.6% of the officer corps.⁸⁸ Technically, the president may have retained some leeway to appoint declarant aliens to some officer vacancies, such as by rewarding honor graduates of distinguished colleges.⁸⁹ The chances were slim, though, that any president in this period would carelessly exploit such a loophole when there were plenty of eager, qualified, and connected American citizens already vying for vacancies. After the United States declared war on Germany in 1917, enlistments and conscription nudged the number of foreign-born other ranks higher to 18%, but the percentage of foreign-born officers in the Regular establishment dropped even further, to about 1.8% by war’s end.⁹⁰ The composition also had changed. Whereas German immigrants were well represented in the post-Civil War officer corps, by 1920 about 60% percent of foreign-born Regulars were former British subjects, whose cultural affinities allowed them to better integrate in an increasingly

---

⁸⁷ Certificate of Naturalization, 05 Dec 1887, Folder 1, CRP.


⁹⁰ Nancy Gentile Ford, “‘Mindful of the Traditions of His Race’: Dual Identity and Foreign-Born Soldiers in the First World War American Army,” Journal of American Ethnic History 16, no. 2 (Winter 1997), 35-57. In the Regular Army, commissioned officers in 1918 totaled 10,951 in all grades, of which 193 were foreign born. See, U.S. Adjutant General, Official Register for 1918 (Wash., DC: 1917), 1055-1118; Curran (1975), 93. These figures do not include the National Army, units raised after 1917 to supplement the regular establishment only for the war’s duration.
xenophobic America.91

* * * * *

Judging by the 1884 cohort’s demographic, the Regular Army officer corps of the late 19th century was the preserve of typically better-educated, mostly rural, largely Northern, and overwhelmingly native-born white males, a body fewer than 1% of Americans might have qualified to join. To become one of those 67 officers, however, required much more than a fortunate birth. In addition to opportunity, hopefuls needed the right blend of social and cultural capital to attract federal recognition, no matter the commissioning source. The following sections delve more deeply into the cohort’s social origins to reveal the resources that bettered their odds of selection, and which marked them generally as belonging to the provincial elite groups from amongst whom the army traditionally recruited its officers.

4.3 Social Origins of West Point’s Class of 1884

For almost half a century, U.S. Military Academy administrators diligently recorded cadet declarations of their family social circumstances – ‘affluent,’ ‘moderate,’ ‘reduced,’ or ‘indigent’ – to demonstrate for critics the Corps of Cadet’s middling origins (Table 4-3).92 Most cadets, of course, listed their family conditions as moderate, and so a cursory glance at those records indeed gives the impression these cadets came from a broad cross section of the American public, especially when combined with the simple titles they used to describe their father’s occupations, like teacher, merchant, or farmer. To illustrate, of the 37 cadets in West Point’s Class of 1884, all but five listed their fathers’ economic status as moderate.93 Of those remaining, four listed their fathers as living either in reduced or indigent circumstances. Only one cadet, the Canadian immigrant Hugh John Gallagher, declared his father was affluent.

---

92 Cadet declarations contained in NARA RG404, “Circumstances.”
93 Cadets Hutcheson, Knight, and Ladd entered West Point in 1879 and for various reason dropped down to the join the junior class. See, Heitman, v.1 (1988), 560, 606, 610.
The average cadet family, however, was not your average American family. Instead, most were headed by community leaders or of otherwise prosperous men, whose success in life afforded the leisure time to participate in public affairs and enabled them to build the social connections to attract the recognition needed for their sons’ appointments. For some cadets, like Hugh Gallagher, this interplay of wealth, service, and connection was transparent. In academy circles it was well known that Gallagher’s father was both hugely rich and influential in his home state of Iowa, and that it was his father’s close friendship with the powerful businessman and former Union general Grenville Dodge that produced a congressional appointment to the academy. Yet there were many more like Cadet Grote Hutcheson, whose claims of modest origins belied their families’ wealth or influence. Although Hutcheson was orphaned at a tender age when his father, an attorney and former state representative, was mortally injured in a freak train accident in 1864, he was taken in by his maternal grandfather, Ebenezer Smith Turpin, whose various business enterprises enabled him to amass an estate valued at several millions in today’s money. Remembered as ‘a man of great public spirit, and always liberal in helping along with public improvements,’ Turpin was marvelously well positioned to collect on obligations that would open opportunities for his grandson. (Table follows).

---


95 “A Railroad Train Caught in a Hurricane,” New York Times (04 Sep 1864); Henry A. Ford and Kate B. Ford, comps., History of Hamilton County, Ohio (Cleveland: L.A. Williams & Co., 1881), 270. The 1870 census is difficult to read, but appears to have been over $300,000. In 1860, Turpin’s estimated his estate at over $115,000, or over $3.6 millions today. 1860 United States Federal Census, Anderson, Hamilton, Ohio, s.v. “Ebenezer Smith Turpin” (b. 1808), Ancestry.com; 1860 United States Federal Census, Anderson, Hamilton, Ohio, s.v. “Ebenezer Smith Turpin” (b. 1808), Ancestry.com.

96 In Memoriam Cincinnati, 1881, vol. 1 (Cincinnati: Western Methodist Book Concern, 1881), 265. Hutcheson entered West Point with the Class of 1883, but took leave from West Point to manage his recently deceased grandfather’s estate. He returned the following year and graduated with the Class of 1884. See, Army and Navy Journal (07 Feb 1880), 529.
Table 4-3: West Point Class of 1884

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Cullum No.</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>Appt'd</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, Irving (c.3021)</td>
<td>28 Aug 1861</td>
<td>N. Bloomfield, NY</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, James Clark (c.3022)</td>
<td>26 Sep 1859</td>
<td>Palmyra, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, Hiram Martin (c.3023)</td>
<td>25 Oct 1858</td>
<td>Yorkshire, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, Cassius Erie (c.3024)</td>
<td>19 Dec 1859</td>
<td>Tonawanda, NY</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Red’d-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaillard, David DuBose (c.3025)</td>
<td>04 Sep 1859</td>
<td>Fulton XRDs, SC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Harry (c.3026)</td>
<td>26 Jun 1862</td>
<td>Tilton, NH</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, William Luther (c.027)</td>
<td>12 Oct 1860</td>
<td>Gadsden, AL</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, John, Jr. (c.3028)</td>
<td>29 Jun 1862</td>
<td>Penn Yan, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell, Charles Loring (c.3029)</td>
<td>08 Dec 1862</td>
<td>Hingham, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, Stephen Miller (c.3030)</td>
<td>19 Feb 1859</td>
<td>LaSalle, MI</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Indigent-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Isaac Newton (c.3031)</td>
<td>12 Oct 1858</td>
<td>New Salem, PA</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, Eugene Frederick (c.3032)</td>
<td>19 Sep 1859</td>
<td>Thetford Ctr, VT</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, Samuel Davis, Jr. (c.3033)</td>
<td>01 Aug 1861</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>DAK</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, Wendell Lee (c.3034)</td>
<td>10 Aug 1859</td>
<td>Carlton, NY</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, Everard Enos (c.3035)</td>
<td>18 Jul 1859</td>
<td>Liberty, ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Fred. Langworthy (c.3036)</td>
<td>08 May 1863</td>
<td>Rome, GA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, James Alfred (c.3037)</td>
<td>04 Nov 1861</td>
<td>Palmyra, NY</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, DeRosey Carroll (c.3038)</td>
<td>07 Jul 1861</td>
<td>Fort Smith, AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbutt, Edwin Burr (c.3039)</td>
<td>26 Jul 1862</td>
<td>West Troy, NY</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, Elisha Spencer (c.3040)</td>
<td>22 Jan 1859</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayre, Farrand (c.3041)</td>
<td>17 Jun 1861</td>
<td>Monticello, MO</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Red’d-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Wilds Preston (c.3042)</td>
<td>20 Mar 1861</td>
<td>Hunt County, TX</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, Hugh John (c.3043)</td>
<td>25 Jul 1861</td>
<td>Perth, Ontario</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Affluent-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, Clarence Eugene (c.3044)</td>
<td>09 Apr 1859</td>
<td>Pittston, PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, Grote (c.3045)</td>
<td>01 Apr 1862</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, James Kaster (c.3046)</td>
<td>03 Jul 1862</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, George Oscar (c.3047)</td>
<td>18 Sep 1862</td>
<td>Hancock, IL</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, Ernest Smith (c.3048)</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Shelbyville, IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styer, Henry Delp (c.3049)</td>
<td>21 Sep 1862</td>
<td>Sellersville, PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Indigent-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, John Bellinger (c.3050)</td>
<td>15 Apr 1862</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer, Waldo Emerson (c.3051)</td>
<td>06 Mar 1860</td>
<td>Lawrence, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, Robert Houston (c.3052)</td>
<td>03 Nov 1861</td>
<td>Federalsburg, MD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, David Cary (c.3053)</td>
<td>06 Apr 1861</td>
<td>Salem, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, Benjamin Clarke (c.3054)</td>
<td>15 Oct 1859</td>
<td>Macon, MO</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, John Thornton (c.3055)</td>
<td>18 Apr 1861</td>
<td>Farmville, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, James Bryan (c.3056)</td>
<td>17 May 1863</td>
<td>Goldsboro, NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Powhatan Henry (c.3057)</td>
<td>09 Oct 1862</td>
<td>Alexandria, LA</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendices.
Almost certainly, fewer cadets at the academy enjoyed the monied wealth of the Gallaghers and the Turpins. Nevertheless, it is just as certain that most cadets were better positioned in their home communities than their modest declarations suggested. When Irving Hale of Central City, Colorado, entered West Point in 1880, he listed the occupation of his father, Horace Morrison Hale, as ‘school teacher.’ The elder Hale, however, was a far cry from the typical frontier educator. Horace Hale was the town’s school superintendent and president of the State Teachers Association, posts he held concurrently during his second term as Central City’s mayor. Only a few years before, Hale held consecutive gubernatorial appointments as the Colorado Territory’s superintendent of public instruction, a post he relinquished when that state entered the Union in 1878. In later years, he served as president of the University of Colorado. Certainly, Horace Hale was a local worthy.

Admittedly, Central City was no metropolis. Once a bustling mining town with more than 10,000 people, by 1880 its boom had bust, and scarcely 3,000 residents remained. As such, Horace Hale’s status as an educator might have paled in comparison to those back East. That, however, did not matter. What did matter was that within his native Coloradan milieu, Hale was able to raise his son in a manner respecting the prevailing habitus, equip him with the cultural capital required to pass an entrance exam, and pulse his own networks to attract recognition from provincial gatekeepers with federal connections, which indeed he did.

There were others. Irving Hale’s classmate, Harry Taylor of New Hampshire, likewise described his father, John F. Taylor, as a merchant of moderate means. Nevertheless, Cadet

---

97 NARA RG404, “Circumstances.” Note the table lists ‘Cullum numbers,’ which were assigned to all cadets sequentially, in order of graduating merit, from the academy’s first graduate until 1977, after which numbers were assigned alphabetically by class year.


Taylor’s father had ample time to serve stints as town treasurer, as well as state representative and senator, positions of public trust which likely helped to open doors for his son. In the same way, Emery H. Simpson of Van Buren County, Michigan, was far from the common farmer his son, Cadet Wendell Lee Simpson, described. Alongside his farming interests, Emery Simpson was a political power. He served twice as township supervisor and had served a term as a Republican in the state legislature. When not holding office, Simpson’s father often was a delegate to the conventions that chose his party’s political leadership, the same men whose privilege it was to nominate promising young men like Wendell to West Point.

Modesty may have moved some cadets to downplay their family’s circumstances, either out of ritual politeness or to make for easier mingling with classmates from diverse regional backgrounds. Others may have even intentionally lowballed their family circumstances to avoid the possibility, however improbable, of getting the boot; despite appearances, it was no easy thing to refuse or remove a cadet who otherwise had met the academy’s standards. It was more likely, though, that many cadets simply failed to recognize the full weight of their family advantages. Cadet DeRosey Cabell, for example, claimed his family’s circumstances were moderate, and that may have been the case so far as money was concerned. Yet in terms of his family’s martial reputation and influence, no less an observer than the Arkansas Democrat’s editor declared the young man was unmistakably ‘to the manner born.’ Another was Cadet David Cary Shanks. Shanks submitted his father, David C. Shanks, Sr., was a ‘lumber dealer’ of moderate means in the Virginia village of Salem. In actuality, the elder Shanks had long been a wealthy man. In 1850 and at the age of 26, David C.
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Shanks, Sr., estimated his wealth at $25,000, and in 1870 he declared an estate totaling $62,000, or what might be $1.2 millions today. Estimates of Shanks’ wealth have not surfaced for 1880. It was, however, unlikely he had become poorer, as Salem then ‘contained more wealth and business caliber than any town in the Southwest,’ thanks to new railroads and land speculation. Granted, Davey’s father may not have held a candle to a railway baron. But he was easily comfortable enough to afford his son’s $50 tuition at nearby Roanoke College, at a time when Virginia’s annual per capita income averaged only $85.

Even some cadets who reported their families lived in reduced circumstances lacked perspective, like Farrand Sayre. Farrand was the eighth and final child of Emilius Kitchell Sayre, an 1828 graduate of Amherst College in Massachusetts, and Elizabeth Stanford Pierson, the daughter of a wealthy New York City silk merchant. At some point, Emilius moved his family to Kentucky to join his uncle, David Austin Sayre, a celebrity silversmith and banker in Lexington. There, Emilius read law at Transylvania University, practiced before state and federal courts, and became an advisor to his banker uncle. Emilius Sayre was so successful

---
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that by 1853 he had retired and moved his family to a 4,000-acre estate in Missouri.\textsuperscript{110} All was
dandy until 1874, when Sayre made a bad investment with some St. Louis pork packers and
had to forfeit a sizeable chunk of his estate.\textsuperscript{111} Emilius Sayre might have been entirely ruined,
had it not been for a generous legacy provided by his late uncle which enabled him to retain
1,500 acres.\textsuperscript{112} Consequently, the Sayres remained comparatively better off than most
American families, even if from young Farrand’s viewpoint his kin had fallen on hard times.

The sons of serving officers, like Cadets Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr. and Edwin Burr
Babbitt, were as apt as civilian children to misrecognize their families’ considerable good
fortune. For starters, the pair were the sons of very senior officers, Colonel Samuel Sturgis, Sr.
(USMA ’46) and Colonel Lawrence Sprague Babbitt (USMA ’61). In 1880, there were only 66
army colonels on active duty, which as federal officials made them somewhat rarer birds than
the 72 senators of the 46th Congress.\textsuperscript{113} This meant colonels enjoyed instant recognition at the
highest levels of government, and their routine access to senior politicians, including the
president, would have easily opened doors for their children. The fact that both cadets were
academy legacies worked to their favor, too, as their upbringing made them vicarious insiders.

Not only were young Sturgis and Babbitt raised from an early age to appreciate the Regular
Army’s ‘rules of the game,’ their family names had real value in society at a time when a
notable lineage implied a genetic predisposition to the same. That went double for Cadet
Babbitt, whose grandfather and namesake, Brevet Brigadier General Edwin Burr Babbitt
(USMA ’26), also was a graduate. Moreover, by any measure the Sturgis and Babbitt families
were economically well off. In 1880, a colonel’s annual salary topped out at $4,500, not
including the use of government housing, allowances for sundries like fuel, or the special

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 638. A slave owner, Emilius Sayre reportedly voted against secession as a delegate to
the 1861 Missouri Constitutional Convention.
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emoluments paid some positions. As a relative income, the prestige value of such compensation might have equaled $1.4 millions today, and in 1880 it enabled both colonels to educate their sons at private schools and colleges before their selections to attend West Point, which were made by presidential appointment.\footnote{Ibid., 280.} Bear in mind that by comparison, the unskilled farm worker in 1880 might dream of earning $20 a month, which came to a bit more than a private soldier’s annual base pay of $156.\footnote{Against the rate of inflation, the salary would be $116,000 dollars today. For an explanation of relative income see, \textit{Measuringworth.com}. For educational experiences see, NARA RG404, “School History.”} No matter what these young men thought of their families’ conditions, they both possessed exceptional social, cultural, and economic capital.

Wealth notwithstanding, helpful friends and relations remained critical resources for attracting federal recognition for any cadet. Here, consider that only 19 of those commissioned in 1884 had been selected to sit for the academy exams after more or less winning some local competition.\footnote{RG404, “Circumstances.”} The rest had received their nominations directly from the president, like Sturgis and Babbitt, or had been handpicked by a member of Congress who held an interest in his selection.\footnote{Practices specifying procedures for ‘competitive’ and ‘non-competitive’ selections did not come about until the 20th century. See, Betros (2012), 77-78.} Powhatan Henry Clarke, son of a college professor, had a go at both. Clarke originally set his sights on Annapolis and sat for local exams sponsored by Representative E. John Ellis of Louisiana’s 2nd Congressional District. For whatever reason, Ellis endorsed another young man even though reportedly Clarke had scored higher marks. As it happened, though, the Clarke family network ‘spread from Natchitoches to New Orleans,’ and this included Congressman Joseph Barton Elam of the state’s 4th District, a former colleague of Clarke’s late grandfather, Judge Henry Boyce.\footnote{“Powie Clarke,” \textit{Louisiana Democrat} (Alexandria, LA: 25 Aug 1880), 2.} In the event, Elam ‘gracefully and
appropriately conferred’ his vacancy on ‘Master Powie.’

Cadet Hiram Chittenden also received help from a family friend and neighbor, in one Dr. Henry Van Aernam of Yorkshire in Cattaraugus County, New York. Van Aernam and Hiram’s father, a dairyman named William Fletcher Chittenden, had served together during the war in their home regiment, the 154th New York Infantry: William Chittenden as a private soldier and Van Aernam as the regimental surgeon. It was while campaigning in Northern Virginia in 1863 that Van Aernam, in his sagacity, diagnosed Chittenden with terminal tuberculosis and arranged for the farmer’s discharge so he might return home to die. Despite the odds, however, Chittenden not only got better, he also lived 60 more years to age 87, which in itself suggested Van Aernam was a far more loyal friend than army regulations might otherwise allow. After the war, Dr. Van Aernam was elected to Congress to represent New York’s 33rd District, and in 1879 he nominated the son of his neighbor and wartime comrade to the academy.

Hiram Chittenden became one of the most respected army engineers of a generation, and historians since have depicted his seeming rise from rural moderation as something of an Horatio Alger tale. They point, for instance, to Van Aernam’s once styling the Chittenden farm as ‘poor,’ or the fact that Hiram toiled away at his father’s dairy to earn tuition for the private Ten Broeck Academy, a preparatory school in nearby Franklinville. To be sure, young
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Chittenden labored hard like any farmer’s child, and hard work in school earned him an academic scholarship to Cornell University, where he studied for two terms to broaden himself before devoting his life to military service. But Hiram Chittenden was no Ragged Dick. In 1879, Chittenden’s 175-acre Blue Hill farm was amongst Yorkshire’s larger dairies, and valued at more than $6,500 dollars in land, livestock and machinery. What’s more, his farm produced 6,000 gallons of milk and 300 pounds of cheese worth $800 that year, a relative output today of possibly $1.6 millions. This was about twice the output of his nearest neighbors. True, William Chittenden was far from the wealthiest farmer in Cattaraugus Country, as a glance at the county’s agricultural census schedules makes clear. But that Hiram was made to repay his school fees by laboring on the farm was most certainly a father’s lesson in the value of money, and not a statement of his family’s poverty. And let us not forget that William Chittenden had an important friend in Van Aernam, which surely counted amongst his valued assets.

As this review suggests, cadet backgrounds varied mostly in terms of absolute income or local prestige. What their families largely held in common, though, was sufficient means and commitment to educate their children to the standard expected at the academy. When times were good, Emilius Sayre managed to send his first seven children, sons and daughters, to some of the better colleges across the nation, like Lafayette in Pennsylvania, Washington and Lee in Virginia, and Princeton in New Jersey. Emilius apparently was short on funds by the time his youngest son, Farrand, came of university age, but the lad had a superb tutor in his older sister Elizabeth, who had graduated from Vassar in 1869. Compared to his siblings,
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Farrand’s preparation may have been less than ideal. Nevertheless, it proved a sufficient foundation on which to earn his commission, as well as a Ph.D. in philosophy from Johns Hopkins University while in his retirement, at the age of 77.\footnote{“Farrand Sayre,” *Assembly* 7, no. 1 (Apr 1953), 42-43.}

The Sayre family’s commitment to education was far from unique. We know this because almost 80% percent of cadets in the Class of 1884 benefitted from private secondary schools and tutors, or had attended a college or university before receiving their appointments (see, Table 4-1). For example, Cadet James Clark Sanford prepared at the prestigious Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, before passing a year at Yale.\footnote{Phillips Academy, *Catalog of Phillips Academy* (Andover, MA: Warren F. Draper, 1876), 14; Yale University, *Alumni Directory of Yale University* (New Haven: Yale Univ., 1920), 41.} Cadet Eugene Frederick Ladd, attended the Vermont State Normal School in Randolph for a year before entering West Point, and Cadet Ernest Smith Robins attended Purdue.\footnote{Randolph Normal School, *The Normal Register: A History of the First Vermont State Normal School, Its Instructors and Alumni* (Montpelier: Argos and Patriot, 1885), 55; Purdue University, *Fifth Annual Register of Purdue University, 1878-1879* (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Journal Co., 1879), 10.} Before entering the military academy Cadet John Thornton Knight, the Virginia planter’s son, briefly attended Hampden-Sydney College, his father’s alma mater.\footnote{Joseph Lyon Miller, *The Descendants of Capt. Thomas Carter of “Barford,” Lancaster County, Virginia* (Thomas, WV: J.L. Miller, 1912), 69-75; George Walker and D.M. Allen, “Hampden-Sydney Alumni and Teachers,” *Record of the Hampden-Sydney Alumni Association* 5, no. 3 (Apr 1931), 7.} And for two years Cadet William Luther Siebert attended the University of Alabama before attracting the sponsorship of Congressman William H. Forney, who nominated him for West Point in 1880.\footnote{Edward B. Clark, *William L. Sibert: The Army Engineer* (Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co., 1930), 23-25.} Recall that at the time, only about two percent of the general public attended such schools.

There were, of course, cadets at the academy whose families were genuinely less fortunate or even poor, but only three graduated in 1884. Cadet Cassius Erie Gillette’s father,
Dr. Ralph Gillette, was a down-on-his-luck dentist from Pennsylvania’s northern tier.\footnote{135}{“Dentist,” \textit{Wellsboro Agitator} (Wellsboro, PA: 21 May 1862), 2; RG404, “Circumstances.”} Cadet Stephen Miller Foote’s father once was a successful farmer, but by the 1870s William Henry Foote was indigent and laboring near Middlebury, Vermont.\footnote{136}{RG404, “Circumstances.”} Perhaps the poorest cadet in the class was Henry Delp Styer. His father, William Barrett Styer, had been a farmer, but in 1880 was without employment.\footnote{137}{Ibid.} That little detail has surfaced on the trio’s fathers further supports their claims to truly modest origins, and suggests the cadets, themselves, were intently looking forward by forgetting their pasts. That said, each of their sons managed to acquire the cultural capital needed to attract elite recognition. Cassius Gillette benefitted from an excellent public education, allowing him to best 16 other aspirants in competitive examination sponsored by Congressman John Mitchell of Pennsylvania’s 16\textsuperscript{th} District.\footnote{138}{\textit{Canton Independent-Sentinel} (Canton, PA: 16 Apr 1880), 8.} The Foote family was well established in Vermont, and so relations likely paid for Stephen Foote’s private education, first at the Beeman Academy in New Haven, and later at Middlebury College, where Stephen studied for two years.\footnote{139}{Abraham W. Foote, \textit{Foote Family, Comprising the Genealogy and History of Nathaniel Foote of Wethersfield, Connecticut and His Descendants}, vol. 1 (Rutland, VT: Marble City Press, 1907), 370, 483-484. The Foote family was well established in Vermont.} This preparation helped him beat out nine others in competitive examinations to win an academy nomination from Congressman Charles Herbert Joyce of Vermont’s 1\textsuperscript{st} District.\footnote{140}{Jacob G. Ullery, comp., \textit{Men of Vermont: An Illustrated Biographical History of Vermonters and Sons of Vermont} (Brattleboro, VT: Transcript Publ. Co., 1894), 65; Wiley (1917), 274; \textit{Burlington Free Press} (Burlington, VT: 22 Sep 1879), 3.} Much less is known about Cadet Henry Styer’s childhood, which he spent near Sellersville, Pennsylvania.\footnote{141}{Email, Dr. Mila Rechcigal to Author, 3 Aug 2017. Dr. Rechcigal is a noted authority on the contributions of Czech immigrants to the United States.} Nevertheless, by some undetermined providence Styer studied for a year at Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, before Congressman Reuben K. Bachman of Pennsylvania’s 10\textsuperscript{th} District picked him for the
In sum, there were few genuinely poor men at the academy, and those who managed to enroll still possessed extraordinary cultural goods and access to appointment authorities in order to take their seats.

### 4.4 Social Origins of Direct Appointees

The War Department made no special effort to conceal the origins of officers commissioned from civilian life, probably because most contemporary observers already assumed those selected enjoyed powerful connections, and that this in truth was one reason West Point strained so to depict their student body as more broadly representing the public. Like appointments to other government offices, the president oftentimes used direct commissions to repay social or political obligations. Congressional limits steadily made this practice rarer in the decades before the First World War, but that rarity only compounded their political value. The upshot was that many of the families of the 19 officers receiving direct commissions in 1884 were even more prominent than those of the West Pointers (Table 4-4).

A superb example was Andrew Huckins Young, the old Civil War veteran appointed to the Quartermaster Bureau. Young was born in 1827 in Barrington, New Hampshire, to Lydia Daniels and Aaron Young, a farmer and important Whig legislator. At the age of 25, Andrew Young embarked on his own public service career when he won election as Barrington’s school superintendent on the Republican ticket. Three years later, he settled in nearby Dover and ran successfully as the county’s register of deeds, and by 1860 he received an appointment as clerk for the county’s supreme court. When war broke out in 1861, Young resigned his government post and accepted a lieutenancy in the 7th New Hampshire Infantry Regiment. He
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participated in all the major eastern campaigns and for a time served as quartermaster to Major General Winfield Scott Hancock. Later, President Lincoln appointed Young as paymaster for the Army of the Potomac, and towards the end of the war rewarded him with a brevet lieutenant colonelcy.\footnote{Ibid.}

\textit{Table 4-4: Officers Appointed from Civilian Life, 1884}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Appt'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O'Neil, Joseph Patrick</td>
<td>27 Dec 1862</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, Abraham Perry</td>
<td>01 Jan 1857</td>
<td>Carrington, Iowa</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, Charles Lewis</td>
<td>30 Dec 1860</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, William Cullen</td>
<td>19 Dec 1860</td>
<td>Crow Wing, MN</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jr., Robert Houston</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Treadwell Woodbridge</td>
<td>24 Aug 1861</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, Charles Wilkinson</td>
<td>16 Mar 1858</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krug, Frederick Valentine</td>
<td>28 Aug 1863</td>
<td>Lancaster, PA</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, Edwin Babbitt</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Raymond Rogers</td>
<td>23 Nov 1861</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, William Jencks</td>
<td>25 Mar 1860</td>
<td>Oswego, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Andrew Huckins</td>
<td>16 Jun 1827</td>
<td>Barrington, NH</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, Walter Drew</td>
<td>10 Feb 1863</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, Harry Leroy</td>
<td>27 Nov 1859</td>
<td>Winona, MN</td>
<td>KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, Everett Edwards</td>
<td>15 May 1860</td>
<td>Riverhead, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins, Selah Reeve Hbbie</td>
<td>17 Jul 1864</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., William Nivison</td>
<td>11 Aug 1855</td>
<td>Petersburg, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, James Thomas</td>
<td>26 Mar 1862</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, Jefferson Randolph</td>
<td>27 June 1860</td>
<td>Lynchburg, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendices

Young returned to private life in New Hampshire, but only briefly. In 1869, President Grant appointed him as revenue collector for New Hampshire’s 1\textsuperscript{st} Congressional District, a
plum he held for 13 years.\textsuperscript{146} Alongside his public work, Andrew Young engaged in banking, railroad promotion, and experimental agriculture on his large farm near Madbury. He also maintained an active civic life as a member of the state historical society, various veterans’ organizations, and as a warden for his church, the Congregationalist First Parish of Dover.\textsuperscript{147}

For whatever reason, in 1884 Young returned to the army when President Chester Arthur appointed him a quartermaster captain.\textsuperscript{148}  ‘Always…patriotic and public spirited,’ Andrew Young’s career had benefitted from ‘his large acquaintance with public events and prominent men.’\textsuperscript{149}

For Young, recognition and political loyalty yielded opportunity, and amongst the cohort’s appointees, he was atypical only in terms of his age. While the cohort’s younger men necessarily drew more deeply from their family’s social capital than their own, the familial circumstances of men like Lieutenants James Thomas Anderson and Charles Lewis Beckurts were in all ways comparable.

Lieutenant Thomas Anderson hailed from Marion, Ohio, and his family’s legacy of service to his nation – and the Republican Party – led to opportunity. Like Andrew Young, Anderson grew up in a political family. His grandfather had been a prominent Whig judge and his father, James House Anderson, was similarly active in the state’s Republican Party and for a time was the city’s mayor.\textsuperscript{150} In 1861, President Lincoln tapped James Anderson as U.S. Consul in Hamburg, Germany, a post that was critical for keeping open the Union’s supply
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lines to Europe, and for keeping tabs on Confederate contraband heading for Jamaica.\textsuperscript{151} In both duties, Anderson excelled, and once reportedly arranged the sinking at Hamburg of a lighter ferrying artillery and carriages to an awaiting Confederate blockade runner, drawing praise from Secretary of State William H. Seward.\textsuperscript{152} Success overseas led to a federal appointment back home in Ohio as an internal revenue collector, where Anderson’s circle of Republican intimates included Senator John Sherman, brother of the famous general, and Congressman Thomas Ewing, the general’s brother-in-law. In the event, Anderson’s social capital proved sufficient to place his son Thomas in an officer’s vacancy after the young man graduated from the Ohio State University.\textsuperscript{153}

Lieutenant Charles Lewis Beckurts was the son of a wealthy German immigrant, Herman Beckurts, who had built his wealth from commerce and banking in his adopted home of Louisville, Kentucky.\textsuperscript{154} Unlike Young and Anderson, Herr Beckurts held no public office during his lifetime. The Republican Party, however, was nonetheless indebted to him for services rendered during a stint he lived in Colorado. Beckurts had moved to Denver in 1875 in a bid to restore the failing health of his consumptive wife. The change in climate proved too late to help Mrs. Beckurts, but the timing was otherwise propitious for Mr. Beckurts as he had arrived on the eve of the territory’s admission to the Union. In short order, he bought the Denver Tribune, and in little time transformed the once ailing rag into the Republican Party’s most important voice in Colorado, quadrupling circulation and securing contracts for three
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quarters of the new state government’s printing needs. As the general election of 1876 neared, the Republican-controlled legislature chose the reliable Beckurts as one of Colorado’s three electors, whose votes ultimately pushed Republican Rutherford B. Hayes past the post to beat Democrat Samuel J. Tilden in what had been the nation’s tightest and most controversial presidential election. And in 1884, party leaders repaid their debt to Herman Beckurts by ensuring the petition of his son Charles, then a recent graduate of the elite Virginia Military Institute, landed on President Chester Arthur’s desk.

For some appointees the passage of time has obscured the exact political mechanisms of their selections, leaving only their fathers’ local status as suggestive evidence. Take, for instance, Myron Pardee, the father of Lieutenant William Jencks Pardee. In 1848, Myron Pardee co-founded the board of trade in Oswego, New York. Later, he built the city’s first grain elevator and operated a fleet of merchant vessels that did a flourishing trade on the Great Lakes. Another was James Quincy Buffington, a pioneer settler of Louisa County, Iowa, and the father of Lieutenant Abraham Perry Buffington. The elder Buffington owned a thousand-acre farm and operated the county’s first successful gristmill that did a large business in the surrounding area. In addition to acumen, businessmen like Pardee and Buffington depended for their success on social networks and a reliable trade in reciprocal obligations, paid in favors political and pecuniary, which they undoubtedly parlayed into presidential recognition of their
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sons.

Party loyalists and the very wealthy were not the only citizens who benefitted from the president’s authority over direct commissions. So, too, did the sons of career military officers. In 1884, almost half the fathers of civilian appointees were either serving or former officers. Like brevet Brigadier General William Henry Penrose, father of Lieutenant Charles Wilkinson Penrose.160 The Penroses were of old Pennsylvania stock and their history of service to the nation was beyond question. Young Charles’ great grandfather, Lieutenant Colonel William Hoffman, served conspicuously in the War of 1812, and his grandfather, Major James Wilkinson Penrose (USMA ’28), earned a brevet majority for gallantry at Cerro Gordo in the Mexican War, but later died of his wounds.161 His granduncle, Brevet Major General William Hoffman (USMA ’29), likewise served with merit in Mexico and in the late rebellion.162 Finally, Charles’ father, the general, was himself breveted for gallantry during the Civil War at Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, and the Wilderness.163 Generations of loyal service in uniform suggests the Penroses possessed a social network that was at once complex and dense, on which young Charles Penrose relied to obtain a vacancy in the 11th U.S. Infantry Regiment after an unsuccessful attempt to enter West Point in 1879.164

As military lines went, the Penroses were more prestigious than many. Respect for the bloody shirt, however, remained high in the decades after the Civil War, and appointments sometimes went to sons of more obscure but gallant officers, usually at the behest of wartime

162 Heitman, v.1 (1988), 535. General Hoffman died in 1884 and was the brother of J.W. Penrose’s widow, Mary Ann. See, Leach and Penrose (1903), 119, which contains some inaccuracies.
colleagues or influential family members. One young man, Lieutenant Joseph Patrick O’Neil, barely knew his birth father, Major Joseph O’Neil. A native of Cork, Ireland, Major O’Neil was severely wounded in 1862 during the Irish Brigade’s storied assault at Fredericksburg, and seven months later distinguished himself in New York’s infamous Draft Riots. Major O’Neil never recovered from his wounds and when he died shortly after the war his widow, Mary Ann, remarried to an Irish-born ranker, First Lieutenant John Murphy of the 14th U.S. Infantry Regiment. Despite a series of remote postings, Lieutenant Murphy provided his stepson with an excellent education, first at St. Mary’s College near Topeka, Kansas, and later at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, where Joseph graduated with honors in 1883. Desiring a military career, Joseph O’Neil twice applied for an appointment to the military academy, in 1882 and again in 1884, and twice he met with disappointment, despite endorsements from Indiana Congressman George Washington Steele, Utah Territorial Governor Eli Houston Murray, and a slew of generals that included the famed Indian fighter Major General George R. Crook. By some route, however, O’Neil’s request for a direct appointment made its way to President Arthur, and in 1884 he was made a second lieutenant in Company B, 14th U.S. Infantry Regiment, in the same company his stepfather still served as a first lieutenant.

Many good families saw an army commission as means of securing a respectable future for a relation who might otherwise have had few prospects, and distinguished matrons

---


were just as apt as eminent patrons to poll their connections in the cause. Mrs. Rebecca Krug Reynolds was one. Daughter of a Pennsylvania banker, Rebecca Reynolds was the widow of Rear Admiral William Reynolds, a scion of the illustrious Lancaster family whose younger brother, Major General John F. Reynolds (USMA ’41), had been killed on the first day of the Battle of Gettysburg. Rebecca Reynolds adopted her nephew, Frederick Valentine Krug, on the death of her brother and raised him as her own in Washington, DC. Frederick applied for the academy but, like Lieutenants Penrose and O’Neil, was unsuccessful. The admiral’s widow, however, moved in the capital’s higher circles and an endorsement from General Philip Sheridan (USMA ’53), then commanding the army, likely smoothed the way for a direct presidential appointment, which Frederick Krug accepted 31 October 1884.

Reformers like academy Professor Peter Michie generally disapproved of direct appointments on the grounds the practice threatened West Point’s primacy in the officer corps’ professionalization. Michie, though, found it especially galling that a young man might be expelled from West Point yet later secure a direct appointment through political connections. William Cullen Wren was one of those failed cadets. Wren had graduated with honors and a degree in civil engineering in 1879 from the Pennsylvania Military Academy, a Presbyterian prep school in Chester, Pennsylvania. The next year he entered the U.S. Military Academy, but was expelled in 1882 for poor grades. Although Wren’s father, a former contract army


172 Michie (1880), 160.


surgeon, had long since passed away, the young man was fortunate to count amongst his patrons former New Hampshire Governor Benjamin F. Prescott, former Iowa Governor Samuel Merrill, and New York District Attorney Daniel G. Rollins, a Republican Party heavyweight who, as the opposition political press put it, was ‘an especial pet of President Arthur’s.’¹⁷⁵ In the event, on 30 October 1884 Wren accepted a direct appointment as a subaltern in the 10th U.S. Infantry Regiment.¹⁷⁶

To Michie, commissioning failed cadets like Wren confounded efforts to tighten commissioning standards, which he further blamed on the meddling of civilian politicians.¹⁷⁷ But serving senior officers were able meddlers, themselves. One was Colonel Charles Henry Tompkins, the army’s assistant quartermaster general and a former member of the famous Hunter Commission which had tried the conspirators in President Lincoln’s assassination.¹⁷⁸ Colonel Tompkins had prepared his son, Selah, at the Shattuck School in Fairbault, Minnesota, and in 1883 the young man received a nomination to West Point from Congressman Charles D. Farwell, a Republican representing the Illinois 3rd District.¹⁷⁹ Against his better judgment, Selah reportedly spent the evening before his entrance exams on a spree in a Highland Falls tavern, which found him out in a failing English exam that cost him his appointment. Tompkins’ father, however, promptly brought the issue to General Sheridan, who in turn approached President Arthur. The next year, Selah Tompkins received a commission, three years earlier than if he had entered West Point, and he spent the next 43 years as a cavalryman before


¹⁷⁷ Michie (1880), 160. Incidentally, Michie’s son received an academy appointment. In 1898, Captain Dennis Mahan Michie (USMA ’92) was killed at the Battle of Santiago in Cuba. See, Heitman, v.1 (1988), 707-708.


¹⁷⁹ Sometimes called the Shattuck Military Academy, the Shattuck School is now known as Shattuck-St. Mary’s. “U.S. Military and Naval Academies, Cadet Records and Applications, 1800-1908,” s.v. “Selah Reeve Hobbie Tompkins” (b. 1864), digital image available at Ancestry.com.
retiring in 1927.\textsuperscript{180} In a way, the apple did not fall far from the tree: after dropping out of West Point in 1849, Colonel Tompkins enlisted in the dragoons and obtained his commission from the ranks on the eve of the Civil War, during which he served with distinction.\textsuperscript{181} It was a hard slog convincing such practical soldiers – and fathers – like Colonel Tompkins that test scores were better predictors of officer potential than personal acquaintance.

Finally, some direct appointments went to graduates and near graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy. Harry LeRoy Hawthorne, son of a war-era Volunteer officer, graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis as a cadet-engineer in June 1884. But owing to a surplus of naval cadets he was mustered out of the navy and into a vacancy in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} U.S. Artillery Regiment.\textsuperscript{182} Similarly, Edwin Babbitt Weeks, cousin of Edwin Burr Babbitt mentioned above, graduated from Annapolis in 1883, but resigned less than a year after joining the Asiatic Squadron to take up an appointment in the 5\textsuperscript{th} U.S. Infantry Regiment.\textsuperscript{183} Transfers like these were fairly rare, but they also were a sensible means for the government to recoup its investment in officers who were otherwise entitled to return to civilian life. However, the performance at the naval academy of a third would-be sailor who joined cohort was less remarkable than his family ties. Raymond Rogers Stevens entered Annapolis in 1879 from a distinguished navy family. His grandfather, Captain Thomas Holdup Stevens, was a hero of the 1812 Battle of Lake Erie, and his father, Rear Admiral Thomas Holdup Stevens, Jr., was next in line to command the Pacific Squadron.\textsuperscript{184} In fact, Raymond’s older brother, Thomas Holdup

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{180} Heitman, v.1 (1988), 965; Carroll, (1984), 68.
  \item \textsuperscript{181} Ibid., 964.
  \item \textsuperscript{184} “Admiral Stevens Dies,” \textit{Washington Post} (05 Oct 1914), 4; Cornelia Bartow Williams, comp., \textit{Ancestry of Lawrence Williams} (Chicago: 1915), 268.
\end{itemize}
Stevens III (USNA ’68), had already embarked on his own promising naval career, and so it surely was a blow to the admiral when his younger son was discharged from the academy for poor grades. Professor Michie must surely have bristled when he learned the president had appointed young Stevens to a vacancy in the 23rd U.S. Infantry Regiment, as it gave the impression the army was the navy’s dumping ground. A more polite assessment was that direct appointments to the Regular Army remained a viable avenue for men possessing extraordinary influence, if not always extraordinary talent.

4.5 Social Origins of ‘Rankers’

Although commissioning enlisted men had become commonly accepted since the Civil War, some officers certainly remained opposed to the practice, on prejudicial grounds if nothing more. One former army surgeon, Rodney Glisan, recorded in 1874 that his brother officers viewed rankers as ‘generally unrefined, uncultivated and uncongenial’ intruders. Former Lieutenant Duane Greene, put it more harshly when he lamented in his oft-cited 1880 exposé how painful it must have been for ‘ladies of refinement…to become the wives of…men …who still reek[ed] with the odor of the ranks.’ If such feelings were widely held, modesty certainly forbid most officers from expressing themselves so carelessly. Moreover, it was a civility to which Greene, himself, was a stranger, given he penned those words in revenge after having been forced to resign his commission three years earlier for allegedly seducing the wife of a brother officer. The truth was that plenty of officers like Greene, a former Volunteer,
had proven themselves morally unworthy of the trust bestowed upon them, no matter how they
had received their commissions.

That said, 11 enlisted men were made officers in 1884. Whether or not they had
personally experienced the prejudices described, each had successfully demonstrated for their
superiors that they possessed the required gentle habits and education to overcome the various
hurdles to promotion (Table 4-5). When compared to academy graduates or appointees, their
social backgrounds were, in truth, something more of a mixed bag. Some undoubtedly were
raised in truly modest families, if going by the dearth of information on their lives before the
army. Little has come to light about George Worthington Ruthers’ early life, apart from his
growing up in West Virginia. Perhaps if Jerome John Weinberg had lived longer, he might
have left a larger mark than he did. A former hospital steward, Weinberg claimed St. Louis,
Missouri, as his home, but his background was a mystery even to his colleagues. When in 1886
Weinberg was mortally injured in an oil lamp explosion, his brother officers had no idea how to
contact his family.189 Only slightly more is known of Julius Henry Weber’s family before he
enlisted in the Signal Corps. Like Weinberg, Weber also was from St. Louis, where his father, a
German immigrant, owned a saddle and harness shop on the city’s south side.190 Discharged for
medical reasons in 1891 rather than accept a transfer to the infantry, Weber went on to earn a
law degree but died in relative obscurity in Southern California in 1908.191

1855), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Lieutenant Weinberg at Rest,” Kansas City Times
(Kansas City, MO: 24 Aug 1886), 2. Weinberg had served in the Signal Corps, but at the time of his
officer selection he was a hospital steward in the 3rd U.S. Cavalry Regiment, having earlier transferred to
the Medical Department. See, Heitman, v.1 (1988), 1014.

190 1880 United States Federal Census, St. Louis, Saint Louis, Missouri, s.v. “George Weber”
(b. ABT 1819), Ancestry.com; David B. Gould, comp., Gould’s St. Louis Directory for 1880 (St. Louis,
MO: David Gould, 1880), 1074.

meteorology duties transferred from the army to the Department of Agriculture in 1891, some signal
officers were reassigned to the line, like J.P. Finley and F.R. Day. See, Gary K. Grice, ed. The Beginning
of the National Weather Service: The Signal Years (1870-1891) as Viewed by Early Weather Pioneers
(Wash., DC?: National Weather Service, 1991), 6, 7; “Army and Navy Gazette,” Boston Post (18 Feb
1891), 2.
Others, however, had family backgrounds that appeared little different from the men who attended the academy. Corporal Frank O. Ferris, who enlisted in the 3rd U.S. Artillery in 1881, was the son of Orsemus Ferris, a well-off farmer and Baptist deacon living in Wilson, New York. Alongside farming, Mr. Ferris dabbled in local Republican politics, twice having been elected as a town supervisor. The father of cavalry First Sergeant William David McAnaney, also named William, was an Irish immigrant who owned a boot and shoe store in the village of Fairport in northwestern New York, and was an occasional candidate for local office on the Democratic ticket. Signal Sergeant Frederick Raynsford Day’s father, Marvin Day, made his money during the war selling horses to the Union army. Afterwards, he partnered in the firm Muzzy and Day, a livery in Owego, New York, and later he kept a hotel. Even First Sergeant Carl Reichmann’s family had enjoyed high status in his native Unterböhringen, where his late father had been pastor of the village church. As a group, these families also provided their sons relatively good educations for the day, though mostly at public schools, and as mentioned three had studied at universities before entering the service (see, *Appendix B*). In sum, we could easily imagine such men sitting at West Point, if judged solely on their family backgrounds. (Table follows.)

---


Table 4-5: Officers Promoted from the Ranks, 1884

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Enlisted Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, John Park</td>
<td>11 Apr 1854</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>SGT, Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, Carl</td>
<td>23 Dec 1859</td>
<td>Württemberg, DE</td>
<td>1SG, INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, Joseph Elwyn</td>
<td>03 Apr 1860</td>
<td>Salem, MA</td>
<td>SGT, Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Julius Henry</td>
<td>23 Aug 1853</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>SGT, Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Frederick Raynsford</td>
<td>11 Jan 1862</td>
<td>Oswego, NY</td>
<td>SGT, Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, Leon Samuel</td>
<td>07 Jun 1859</td>
<td>Jarnac, FR</td>
<td>1SG, INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, William David</td>
<td>21 July 1855</td>
<td>Spencerport, NY</td>
<td>1SG, CAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, Frank Orsemsus</td>
<td>26 Feb 1857</td>
<td>Wilson, NY</td>
<td>CPL, ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, George Worthington</td>
<td>22 Nov 1858</td>
<td>Charleston, WV</td>
<td>CPL, INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, Jerome John</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Hosp. Steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, Alfred Sidney</td>
<td>05 Feb 1858</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>SGT, INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendices

For some of these men, enlistments offered an escape from restlessness or unemployment during the Long Depression of 1873-1879. For whatever reason, McAnaney left school early, in 1870, and spent most of the decade hopping between jobs throughout the Midwest and in Texas before coming to stop in San Antonio. There, he enlisted in the 8th U.S. Cavalry Regiment under the alias William M. Clare, reportedly to spare his family the shame of his serving as a common soldier.196 Alfred Sydney Frost, the son of a deceased English house painter from Essex, clerked for several hardware companies, and for a time worked as a traveling salesman before chucking it all in 1881 to enlist in 11th U.S. Infantry Regiment.197 Like McAnaney, Frost also had enlisted under an alias, his as William A. Dalzell.198 When Carl Reichmann enlisted he was in dire straits. A failed medical student perilously short of funds, Reichmann was just months off the boat when he enlisted under his true name in Chicago on 06

---

197 Biographical Notes, Box 2, Alfred Sydney Frost Papers, South Dakota National Guard Collection, Northern State University Archives and Special Collections, Pierre, South Dakota, hereafter ASF; Heitman, v.1 (1988), 438.
December 1881, giving his occupation as ‘druggist.’

At the time, enlisting in the infantry or cavalry required little if any cultural capital. Many troops were illiterate and 15% could be counted on to desert each year, which put pressure on army recruiters to keep the ranks filled no matter a recruit’s antecedents. Thus, men with excellent educations such as McAnaney, Frost, and Reichmann had exceptional opportunities to convert their cultivation into the social capital needed for a commission at the retail end of military service, in garrison and on the campaign trail with the very same officers with whom they would one day share the mess. Private Reichmann’s erudition and ‘close application to duty,’ for instance, obviously impressed his commander, Captain Loyd Wheaton, as the rare soldier with whom he could relate and trust to share in his company’s leadership and administrative burdens, within the customary social distance maintained between officers and other ranks. In the event, Wheaton promoted Reichmann to company first sergeant in 1883, after only 18 months enlisted service. A year later, Wheaton sponsored his top soldier’s subsequent promotion to second lieutenant.

Commissioning enlisted men was never intended as an alternative commissioning pathway, but instead as a contingency to fill extraordinary vacancies with practical soldiers. Indeed, army regulations prior to 1892 forbade other ranks from requesting consideration which, in light of the unpredictability of yearly vacancies, made it unthinkable that recruits should enlist for the express purpose of obtaining a commission. Nevertheless, Leon Samuel Roudiez appeared to have done just that, seemingly abetted by his commanding officer.

---


200 Coffman (1986), 371; Wooster (2009), 256.

201 For Reichmann’s temperament see, Charles Judson Crane, The Experiences of a Colonel of Infantry (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1923), 164. Wheaton’s prénom did not follow the Welsh convention.

202 “Company Orders No. 11” (24 Jun 1883), folder 1, CRP.
Roudiez was born in Jarnac, France, in 1860, the son of a French army officer. After France’s defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, Roudiez moved with his family to Brazil, but when his father died there in 1873, Leon made his way to Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, to the home of his uncle, a homeopath. After graduating from Chicopee’s well-equipped public high school, Roudiez moved with uncle in 1878 to Chapman, Kansas, where at some point he made the acquaintance of Captain Clayton Hale at nearby Fort Riley. Once again, an educated young man like Leon Roudiez was indeed a good catch: with the captain’s encouragement Roudiez enlisted in the army on 26 January 1879 to pursue a commission, and was promptly assigned to Hale’s company of the 16th U.S. Infantry Regiment. Roudiez spent much of his enlisted service campaigning with distinction against various Native American tribes, and after only 16 months, Hale made him his right hand as company first sergeant. And in 1884, the captain recommended Roudiez for a commission, which his top soldier accepted that August.

Unlike the line branches, in the late 1870s entering in the U.S. Army Signal Corps was highly competitive, and thus potential recruits required significant social and cultural capital just to enlist. In 1870, Congress had assigned the Signal Corps the responsibility of managing a nationwide weather service, and this entailed manning almost 300 weather stations scattered across the country with technically competent enlisted men able to perform independent duties as weather observers. To that end, the division’s chief scientist, Harvard meteorologist

---


204 For Dr. Pierre Vallante Roudiez see, Abilene Weekly Chronicle (Abilene, KS: 09 Nov 1893), 2.

205 Email, Francis Roudiez to Author, 04 Jul 2020.


Cleveland Abbe, preferred to recruit college-educated men for the positions, like the cohort’s Harvard mathematician, Joseph Elwyn Maxfield. Another was John Park Finley of Ann Arbor, Michigan. Holding both a bachelor’s and master’s degree, Finley probably was the most highly educated of the entire cohort. But when he traveled to Washington enlist in 1877, Finley learned there were more than 1,000 names on the waiting list, and was advised to provide letters of recommendation to better his chances of selection. Fortunately, his family was politically active, and so John Finley ‘was well supplied with letters from public men.’ Thus enabled, Finley easily enlisted in the Signal Corps on 08 March 1877, and after training at Fort Whipple in Washington, DC, he was assigned to posts in the Midwest, where he pioneered the study of tornadoes. On 10 July 1884, he accepted a commission as second lieutenant of signals.

As these vignettes show, promoting accomplished enlisted men was not an act of social leveling. Instead, the chances an enlisted man might receive a commission just about required a proper alignment of the moon and the stars, and deliberately so. In setting a high mark, federal gatekeepers consciously restricted entry to the officer corps to other ranks able to muster the relevant cultural and social goods, activated in the appropriate field, in ways that surely reproduced the army’s established social and symbolic order.

4.6 Old and New Families

So far, we might hastily conclude that Morris Janowitz’ impression was apt, that the 19th-century officer corps was drawn from a quasi-aristocracy composed of ‘old-family, Anglo-
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211 Fort Whipple is present-day Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall. Galway (1985), 1389-1391.
Saxon, Protestant, rural, upper middle-class professional’ social groups. Indeed, the premium placed on cultural and social capital meant the majority of Regular Army officers would in fact come from old American families deeply invested in their localities, some for generations. We see this perhaps most tellingly in the elite sons of the South, but also in the scions of old Northern lines like the Youngs of New Hampshire and the Andersons of Ohio, as well as in the heirs to illustrious military dynasties, such as the Penroses, the Stevenses, and the Babbitts. The concentration of capital in such families had, over time, manifested in marks of distinction easily recognizable as qualifying them for membership in the officer corps’ fraternity.

Alongside these notables, however, were relative latecomers, represented most suggestively by the rankers, but also more subtly by the immigrants and first-generation Americans appearing throughout the commissioning categories. Here, we see a natural, steady assimilation, in that the odds so steeply stacked against a recent immigrant receiving a commission, like Roudiez or Reichmann, had within a generation improved markedly for Joseph O’Neil and Charles Beckurts, men whose immigrant fathers had in their own time banked the relevant cultural and social resources for their sons’ later recognition (see, Appendix A). Thus, while commissioning boundaries remained intentionally high, an intergenerational mobility was possible as new families found their corresponding places within the social structure, a feature of American society that had been playing out in the background since before the nation’s founding, and one which we typically take for granted.

The cohort’s religious composition presents another indicator that social changes in the nation’s electorate were gradually reflecting within the officer corps. Although the U.S. Army did not record its officers’ religious affiliations, reliable information on the cohort’s religious preferences was developed for 58 of the 67 members, or 87% (Table 4-6). Predictably, the data show the majority of the officers belonged to one of the country’s then-22 Protestant denominations, as did most Americans in the period; only one officer, Wendell Lee Simpson,
specified he did not belong to a church. Of these, 45% of the cohort were Episcopal. At that time the Episcopal Church was the country’s eighth largest Protestant denomination, yet Episcopalians and their Anglican antecedents had pride of place in American political and military affairs from colonial times, a product of English settlement, social factors, and geography. Their high frequency in the cohort also was consistent with estimates of the officer corps’ religious identity made by historian William Skelton for the years 1830 and 1860, which he placed at 37% and 41%, respectively (Table 4-7). More surprisingly, though, was that Roman Catholics made up the second largest group of officers commissioned in 1884, accounting for 17% share of the cohort. This was a 5% increase over the earlier averages determined by Skelton.

Changes to the country’s political demography accounts for this increase in Catholic officers. Despite an anti-Catholic hostility that pulsed regularly in the American body politic, by 1850 Catholicism had become the country’s single largest religious denomination. States like Maryland and those carved out of the Louisiana Territory or former Mexican possessions had long hosted substantial populations of ethnic-English, French, and Spanish Catholics. They were joined by millions more Irish and German Catholic immigrants, and untold numbers of converts who had settled since the 1830s in the cities along the Eastern Seaboard and in the upper Midwest, and whose consequent rise to political prominence and mainstream acceptance enabled their influence over officer selections. Thus, within the cohort we encounter

---


generational Catholics from new American families, like William McAnaney and Hugh Gallagher, alongside Catholics from old families that at some point converted from Protestant faiths, like the Cabells, the Bellingers, the Babbitts, and the Sturgises.

**Table 4-6: Cohort Religious Identification by Commissioning Source, 1884**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Source</th>
<th>Episcopal</th>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>Methodist</th>
<th>Presbyterian</th>
<th>Baptist</th>
<th>Congregational</th>
<th>AUA</th>
<th>Huguenot</th>
<th>Moravian Church</th>
<th>German Reformed</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Point (32/37)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life (17/19)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranks (9/11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (58/67)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendix A. Abbreviations: Episc – Episcopal; RC – Roman Catholic; Meth – Methodist (various); Presb – Presbyterian; Bapt – Baptist; Congl – Congregational; AUA – Unitarian; Hu – Huguenot; MC – Moravian Church; Ref’d – German Reformed.

**Table 4-7: Religious Identification by Percentage, 1830, 1860, 1884**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>%217</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1884</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample: 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: For 1830 and 1850 data see, Skelton (1992), 162, Table 9.6. For 1884 see Appendix A.

Admittedly, these samples are small. But even subtler changes in the frequency of the Protestant denominations within the cohort also paced changes in the country’s religious demographic. Once again using Skelton’s samples for a comparison, Methodists had come to

---

217 Figures are rounded from Skelton’s.
slightly outnumber Presbyterians by 1884, while Congregationalists continued to lose ground to Baptists. These trends appear consistent with the substantial growth amongst Methodists and Baptists nationally since the religious revival of the Second Great Awakening, which was at its height before the Civil War.²¹⁸ Excepting the Episcopalians, this meant the frequency of Catholics and the largest Protestant denominations in the cohort aligned with their frequency in the country’s population: Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, then Baptists. Taking this forward to the near present, those professing a Christian identity have since decreased across the military services, to about 66% by the early 21st century, while fully a quarter of servicemen cited no religious preference at all; in the balance are a mix of religious beliefs, some of which would have been alien to the 19th century army. At the same time, the Roman Catholic presence has increased to about 20%, and the Episcopal has dropped to about 1%.²¹⁹ Again, these trends appear consistent when compared to larger American social trends.

In sum, the provincial elites who largely composed the officer corps were not so monolithic as Janowitz presented. Instead, the country’s social and political landscape was constantly changing. As new families amassed the qualifying capital for recognition and entry, the benign characteristics of the officer corps’ social composition changed accordingly in a delicate process that had been ongoing for many decades before mid-20th century scholars discovered the fact. This steady, albeit slow process by which new groups achieved recognition would similarly account in later generations for the broader acceptance into the officer corps of racial minorities, women, and even those of differing sexual orientations, something which at the Founding was as unthinkable as an army commanded by Roman Catholics.²²⁰

²¹⁸ In order, the Methodist, Presbyterians, and Baptists were the three largest Protestant denominations in 1884. See, Gannett (1883), lxii.


²²⁰ General William T. Sherman, a non-practicing Catholic convert, commanded the U.S. Army from 1869-1883.
4.7 Concluding Remarks

The pathway to an army commission had always been deliberately narrow, strewn with physical and intellectual barriers, and signed by social preferences, prejudices, and politics. Successful passage thus required that young men possessed the relevant social and cultural resources to demonstrate their personal and symbolic connections to community. In 1884, officer selections thus privileged mostly the cultivated sons of provincial men with exceptional influence, if not always exceptional wealth. These included the prominent merchants, farmers, judges, doctors, educators, clergy, and military officers who as social pillars had led both their communities and the army since the nation’s Founding. For men born without those advantages, promotion nevertheless depended on their acquiring the pertinent capital, and to develop as best as possible the rare opportunities to deploy it for recognition. The same held true for men from newer American families, and eventually for newly accepted groups of Americans as the country’s political demography changed. The upshot was that the professionalizing of commissioning practices begun in the 19th century would continue to validate the country’s social and symbolic order, as surely as the dynastic practices which preceded them.

This chapter examined American officers in the context of their fathers’ relative capital advantages. The pursuit and reproduction of capital advantage, however, did not end with an officer’s commissioning. Officers pursued capital in their own right, not only to enhance their standing within the service, but also to attract the recognition of homologous groups which they might pool for the reproductive benefit of their own families. The following chapter examines their pursuit of family and non-family social capital, such as through marriage and membership in voluntary associations.
5.1 Introduction

American commissioning practices had been based in elite sociality since long before the republic’s founding. Provincial elites officered their local forces from amongst their own ranks: the landowners, merchants, physicians, lawyers, clergy, and educators recognized as such by their relative command of economic, cultural, or social capital, and by their embodiment of a dominant habitus. The men thus selected led local political affairs or at least enjoyed sympathetic relations with those who did, and their high local status conveyed not only an obligation to participate in the defense of their communities, but also the right to do so. In short, these men had skin in the game. And just as their collective habitus shaped their local military establishments, their selection to lead military affairs naturally reaffirmed the symbolic order of the communities from which they profited.

The 19th century, however, witnessed some extraordinary trends in American commissioning practices. Alongside the rising importance of the Regular Army in the nation’s defense, Congress and the army cooperated to adopt higher academic commissioning prerequisites, as well as to limit the availability of peacetime direct appointments traditionally reserved for the uber influential. Pierre Bourdieu would put it that as the legitimacy of elite sociability in officer selections began to rupture, the state adopted progressively more bureaucratic commissioning practices that instead privileged the possession of cultural capital in the form of education. In more common parlance, to be commissioned was steadily becoming a matter of what one knew, rather than who one knew. This process we understand today as professionalization. In the army, it manifested foremost within its premier institution, the U.S. Military Academy, where entry and graduation requirements steadily tightened to pace the rising costs of elite recognition in neighboring social fields, like law, medicine, education, and theology. What’s more, these shifts did not occur in isolation. Instead, they were enlaced in broad and disruptive social changes brought about by the country’s rapid industrialization and
expansion. For the individual, investing more heavily in education was one possible
counterweight to these anonymizing forces that threatened to dissolve hard-fought family
advantages. For the institution, adopting higher academic standards was a surer means of
legitimately filtering the swelling pool of potentially acceptable newcomers who demanded
access to a rare public good.

Bourdieu would have recognized 19th-century America as progressing through a
transitional semi-bureaucratic period in its state evolution, one in which dynastic or family
modes of reproduction resembled bureaucratic ones. In other words, the greater emphasis on
education in officer selections was anything but social leveling. While it certainly was true the
adoption of bureaucratic practices had opened some opportunities for less substantial yet
qualified newcomers, the education needed to enter the officer corps was then such a rare
commodity that provincial elites remained in superior positions to convert their economic and
social advantages into this form of cultural capital. Moreover, the act of amassing these cultural
goods for federal recognition, whether by old or new families, served to instantiate and
reproduce the nation’s symbolic order as surely it had in the days when a good name was all
one needed to open doors. Thus, we find the fathers of those commissioned in 1884 bore a
marked resemblance to all those who came before them: men who, within their native
provincial milieus, possessed extraordinary resources, if not always extraordinary wealth. In
essence, adopting more formal commissioning practices at the federal level under the rubric of
professionalization reiterated the nation’s established social and symbolic order, while it
accelerated the legitimate transfer of coercive capital from the provinces to the state.

This transition did not altogether erase the value or even the necessity of individuals to
amass social capital. While a family’s pooled resources may have helped their sons achieve the
recognition for a commission, the birthrights of most officers remained closely fixed within

---

1 It would be difficult to determine the absolute beginning of this semi-bureaucratic phase, or its
absolute termination. For instance, while 21st-century America has become a far more sophisticated
bureaucratic state than what preceded it, bureaucratic and family modes of reproduction remain deeply
intertwined.
their native local context, and diminished the farther they moved beyond the pale of family influence. Thus, to fully transcend their provincial elite origins officers had to amass in their own right the capital needed to ensure sympathetic recognition with homologous groups across the country, which in turn would help reproduce for their own families the privileges they, themselves, had inherited.

This is a lengthy chapter. It examines the 1884 commissioning cohort’s social interactions to reveal how army officers pursued social capital from the late-Frontier Era to the years preceding the First World War. The first section briefly revisits Bourdieu’s presentation of social capital, which theorized how generating social networks at once reproduced individual and group capital advantages while instantiating reaffirming behavioral structures and norms. Although work relationships and service reputation were important components of an officer’s social capital, the subsequent two sections dwell instead on cohort marriage patterns and membership in voluntary exclusive associations, such as social clubs and fraternities, that locate these officers within a wider social context. A final section surveys the educational and career patterns of the cohort’s children as indirect evidence that the acquisition and concentration of capital, social and otherwise, helped to reproduce family advantages in the succeeding generation.

Within this chapter, two larger implications of social capital formation come to light. The first is that the breadth of these social interactions marked civilian and military elites as belonging to vicarious communities separated not so much from each other as from the wider public. The second is that the efforts of these groups to secure family capital engendered commonly held norms of deference, obligation, reciprocity, discretion, and patriotism constituting a truly national civil-military doxa, or mentalité, the formation of which paced the federal state’s nationalization of coercive capital. The chapter thus concludes that just as exclusive, bureaucratic commissioning practices validated the nation’s social and symbolic order, inter-elite sociability continued to play the signal roles not only in proliferating the behavioral underpinnings of American civil-military relations, but also in reproducing the very same social groups from which the army traditionally recruited its officers.
5.2 Bourdieu’s Social Capital

To review, Pierre Bourdieu’s practice theory outlines how social interactions produce objective structures that tend to reflect a given group’s dominant dispositions, which are then embedded in and reproduced through the group’s practices. Central to his theory were the concepts of habitus, field, and capital. The habitus embraced internalized dispositions and sensibilities informed by past experience and that generated a range of reasonable or common-sense behaviors recognized as such within the limits of a particular field, or social environment. Habitus thus formed the basis of identity, and when activated together with capital – wealth, cultivation, and connections – it not only helped establish one’s standing in that field, it also generated conforming practices advancing that status.

Of these endowments, Bourdieu defined social capital as ‘the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition.’ Social capital was, in other words, a form of potentially power-enhancing credit derived from membership in groups which, combined with the other forms of capital, constituted one’s social stock in trade within a relevant field. In addition to reputation – being known – the potential profits from these affiliations ranged from the more mundane mechanical advantages, like finding jobs or receiving inside information, to the highly symbolic, such as the prestige that came with membership in exclusive groups. Family initially mediated this recognition on an individual’s behalf, and for those born to a family with high communal status or a great name, activating inherited social capital might lead to instant recognition by, according to Bourdieu,

---

2 Bourdieu (1990), 55-56.
3 Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), 119.
5 Ibid., 249; Portes (2000), 2.
transforming ‘all circumstantial relationships into lasting connections.'\(^6\) For comparative unknowns like Carl Reichmann, however, amassing effective social capital beyond one’s own genealogy required investment strategies and more effort. Marriage strategies, for instance, could help preserve any inherited capital and extend recognition by making allies of other families and building sympathetic ties to their acquaintances. Other attempts might require the expense of money capital, or the acquisition and use of certain cultural knowledge, or the demonstration of personal competencies, factors recalling Bourdieu’s emphasis on the fungibility of the different forms of capital.\(^7\) Here, recall the importance of education and connection in obtaining an army commission, the possession of which became symbolic gateway capital for extending relationships. Or, consider the requirements for joining private clubs or fraternal associations, where introductions, an embodied habitus, or hexis – such as manners, dress, or accents – and other cultural goods elicited recognition from gatekeepers charged with maintaining a group’s exclusivity. Entrée might also require paying fees, purchasing regalia, or participating in initiation rites, what for Bourdieu amounted to forms of consecration.\(^8\) Consecration at once affirmed the individual’s identity by right of membership and reproduced the group by reaffirming its own boundaries and referential habitus.\(^9\) Ultimately, the volume of one’s social capital depended on the size and solidarity of the kinship and non-family networks one effectively could bring to bear, with each member effectively serving as each other’s proxy.\(^10\)

On the face of it, Bourdieu’s concept of social capital appears strictly acquisitive on account of its agonistic tenor, its emphasis on agency, and its illumination of the reproduction of inequalities. As a consequence, some have called his presentation the dark side of social capital, and contrast it with those made by sociologist James Coleman and political scientist

\(^6\) Bourdieu (1986), 250-251.  
\(^7\) Portes (2000), 2.  
\(^8\) Bourdieu (1986), 250.  
\(^10\) Bourdieu (1986), 249; Bourdieu (1990), 35.
Robert Putnam, whose rival treatments were more explicitly communitarian and normative.\textsuperscript{11} Doing so, however, overlooks the vital linkage Bourdieu’s practice framework made between the micro and macro levels of analysis, a refinement not present in the theories of Coleman and Putnam, but one which nevertheless accounted for normativity in the pursuit and creation of social capital.\textsuperscript{12} For example, micro-level normativity began with the formation at home of an individual’s primary or class habitus, which embraced one’s mental reflexes, limits, and expectations – norms by other names – that at once reflected and reproduced kindred dispositions, as well as enabled congenial recognition outside the family.\textsuperscript{13} These primary dispositions were durable. However, they also remained subject to revision when extending non-family social networks, as when agents internalized a new field’s peculiar dispositions in exchange for the institutionally guaranteed rights and obligations of membership. This, in turn, helped proliferate group norms which, themselves, had evolved from the ceaseless, reciprocating interactions of members, each bent on regulating access to and expenditures of their group’s pooled resources.\textsuperscript{14} We see this at play, for example, in the socialization of officer cadets. Because the commission’s status recognition depends on both the proper regulation of officer accessions and the proper conduct of each consecrated member, cadets are reminded at turns the conduct of each reflects on the honor, good order, and discipline of the whole. So, while it certainly is correct that Bourdieu viewed the fruits of network building as inhering in


\textsuperscript{14} Bourdieu (1986), 249-251; Rothenberger, et al. (2017), 185. Coleman independently shared Bourdieu’s view that norms could proliferate only in exclusive relationships, in which the members were bound to each other in expectations of reciprocal obligations. See, Coleman (1988), S104-S108.
the individual, a position neither Coleman nor Putnam shared, he also maintained that an individual’s social capital could not exist independently from the rules, practices, and relationships which had made its accumulation possible in the first place.\textsuperscript{15} In sum, by pursuing social capital for themselves, agents and the groups to which they belonged proliferated reciprocating expectations and norms of behavior to ensure the future value of their social resources, which at once tended to validate the structures of those relationships as legitimate.

While much of Bourdieu’s writing concerned the reproduction of elites, it is important to emphasize here that the exchanges he described were not unique to any particular group or class of individuals. Nor was it especially associated with one particular human culture, or located only in a specific period of social organization. Instead, the struggle to acquire and reproduce social capital was a blend of subconscious imperative and conscious calculation practiced by all individuals and social groups to stabilize or extend the relative advantages they already possessed, regardless of demographic or economic status.

This said, there are three important points to bear in mind about these social activities that clearly undercut the separatist orthodoxy of civil-military relations. First, as it pertained to the U.S. Army officer corps the reproduction and use of social capital undoubtedly was an elite activity. As revealed at length in the preceding chapters, the men who composed the U.S. Army officer corps belonged mostly to social groups that dominated local affairs. These provincial elites did not ditch their native dispositions when they took up their commissions. Instead, the army institution’s mental and objective structures broadly reflected the logic of its members sensibilities. These included an adherence to recognizable narratives, norms, conventions, and codes that were reproduced, concentrated, and revised over historic time through commissioning practices designed to accept men – and in later years, women – who either shared those dispositions, or who were willing to adopt them in exchange for the privilege of membership. And as the character of American society changed over time, the character of its officer corps gradually changed with it. Thus, from the beginning the American officer

\footnote{\textsuperscript{15} Bourdieu (1986), 249. See especially, Recke (2011) and Rothenberger, et al. (2017).}
personified the social structure of political power in the United States.

The second point is that as the state – the ‘field of fields’ – broadly intervened in the production and use of social capital, elite social life remained a defense against the differentiating forces of immigration, industrialization, and bureaucratic practice that threatened to rupture ancient family modes of reproduction.\textsuperscript{16} The veritable explosion of patriotic societies, social clubs, and fraternities during the last quarter of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century bears witness to this. These circles, with their attending rituals, entertainments, and celebration of ancestry created opportunities for confreres to mingle casually and in plain sight within, as Bourdieu put it, ‘the logic of laissez faire.’\textsuperscript{17} At the same time, such doings inculcated preferred dispositions with acceptable newcomers and fostered norms of prudence and discretion that enabled the expected repayment of social obligations to fade from view in public life.

Third, for network resources to remain useful they must be maintained. As Bourdieu noted, ‘the reproduction of social capital presupposes an unceasing effort of sociability, a continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and reaffirmed.’\textsuperscript{18} Because social capital depends upon the continuous collection and repayment of obligations, lapses can quickly erode the trust that makes this resource feasible in the first place.\textsuperscript{19} As such, 19\textsuperscript{th}-century elites, from the wholly provincial to those more cosmopolitan in outlook, expended considerable effort at sociability. What’s more, army officers were no less consumed than civilians with extending and sustaining their social connections because the alternative was social familicide. We know this because the period’s army officers exercised great care in maintaining and extending family and non-family networks, in ways we shall now discuss.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{17} Bourdieu (1986), 250.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{19} Ostrom (1999), 179-180.

\textsuperscript{20} Gates (1980), 32-34.
5.3 Family as Social Capital

Family is the center of gravity in social capital formation, this because life in the home typically produces the strongest bonds, deepest affection, and most meaningful schemas. While it is possible to generate social capital without enjoying the benefits of a strong family, it is much more difficult to do so. As a consequence, marriage strategies play a formidable role in developing or extending a family’s comparative advantage within a given social order, alongside the more obvious imperative of physiological reproduction. This is somewhat more straightforward in traditional societies, where dowry practices are meant to discourage destabilizing misalliances and protect family resources.\(^{21}\) However, social homogamy, or the tendency of people to wed those of similar status, education, or habitus, is a well-documented tendency even amongst groups who no longer employ the more traditional mechanisms of family reproduction.\(^{22}\) Sometimes called class endogamy, intermarriage facilitates the pooling of family goods, like wealth, status, and relationships for future use.\(^{23}\) Homogamy also serves as a primal sort of social closure. Choosing a partner with a similar social background, for instance, not only facilitates trust, it also increases the likelihood that parents will pass down a shared identity to their children, including a habitus that will enable their offspring’s recognition with homologous, power-augmenting groups.\(^{24}\) Because homogamy tends to reproduce privilege, it also tends to proliferate norms of behavior intended to preserve those privileges. Thus, in a reflexive sense we might view intermarriage as one of the foremost


products and producers of social capital, and army officers were no less subject to these imperatives than civilians of their status or, indeed, the population at large.  

The officers commissioned in 1884 clearly were of the marrying sort (see, Appendix C). Fully 85% wed during their careers, a rate only slightly lower than the national average of about 88%. By subgroup, West Pointers enjoyed the highest nuptiality: 92%, compared to 82% for those raised from the ranks and 74% for direct appointees. Half of all cohort officers married within five years of their commissioning, and all but one had wed by 1902; Robert Houston Noble did not marry until 1921, at the age of 60. Even counting Noble, the cohort’s median marriage age was 28 years for officers and 23 years for their brides, which was slightly older than in the general population, where the median age for men and women was 26 and 22 years of age, respectively. Years spent in post-secondary schooling and time serving army enlistments may partly explain the cohort’s slightly older marriage age, as might frequent assignment rotations and the vagaries of local marriage markets. Even so, these findings track with scholarly observations that nuptiality occurred later in life for non-farming, higher status men during the late-19th century.

If natural preferences or family pressures to marry within one’s class were not enough, army culture discouraged its officers from marrying women beneath their status in order to uphold the corps’ social standing. Thus, the cohort tended to marry women closest to them in


28 This was the median age of marriage in United States in 1890, according to Fitch and Ruggles (2000), 63. Expressed as a mean, Michael Haines put the average at 27.65 years for men and 23.71 years for women. See, Michael R. Haines, “Long-term Marriage Patterns in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present,” *History of the Family* 1, no. 1 (1996), 15-39.

29 Fitch and Ruggles (2000), 75.

30 Rosenfeld (2008), 2; Coffman (1986), 108; Adams (2009), 79-81; Skelton (1992), 188-190.
status. We know this in part because school catalogs, memorials, social registers, and the society pages of local newspapers, printed by and catering to a provincial elite, provide glimmers of social lives: of friends, travels, graduations, and, of course, engagements, weddings, and obituaries. From such sources we know that a number of cohort brides were similarly well-educated as their grooms. Out of 57 first unions, 11 brides had some higher education before taking their marriage vows – a whopping 19% in a period when much less than 1% of American women did.31 Some attended colleges catering to women. Mary Wheatley Lewis had studied at New York’s Vassar College, whilst three others attended Wellesley in Massachusetts. Katherine Ross Davis broke new ground as one of the first women admitted to the forerunner of the University of South Carolina, three years before marrying engineer Lieutenant David DuBose Gaillard, in 1887.32 Even for those not attending college, the evidence suggests they benefitted from extraordinary primary and secondary school experiences. Examples include Bertha Tracy Bement, the future Mrs. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., who got her start at Chauncey Hall, one of Boston’s elite boarding schools, and Henrietta Parker, the future Mrs. Martin Chittenden, who met her husband while both were students at the more provincial yet well-equipped Ten Broeck Academy in Upstate New York.33 Some even traveled abroad, like Florence Mann, the future Mrs. Alfred Sydney Frost, who left her Illinois home as a teenager to study for three years in Europe.34

Admittedly, information on the school experiences of officer wives is only fragmentary. However, a closer inspection of their fathers’ occupations, data which is ample by comparison, offers strong corroboration that on balance the cohort’s brides came from similarly advantaged families. Of the cohort’s 57 first marriages, occupational information was found on

31 Snyder (1993), 64-69.
32 The university was then known as South Carolina College. Third U.S. Volunteer Engineers, 1938 Year Book (n.p.: Banner Publ. Co., 1938), 24.
34 “Suburban News,” Inter-Ocean (Chicago: 24 Sep 1877), 3.
54 fathers-in-law, accounting for about 95% of cohort unions. The findings, detailed in Appendix C and summarized below, show that across the board cohort fathers-in-law were highly successful in their local milieus (Table 5-1). Moreover, this generally held true no matter the groom’s commissioning source, which in itself testified to the commission’s high value in status recognition.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{Table 5-1: Summary, Fathers-in-Law Occupations, by Commissioning Source}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commerce/Industry</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Farming</th>
<th>Gov't</th>
<th>Trades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendix C

Fully a third of cohort first marriages were to women whose fathers engaged in commerce and industry, like Henry Paschal, a Polish immigrant who built a successful estate agency in Council Bluffs, and whose daughter Amelia wed Hugh John Gallagher, the affluent West Pointer who had emigrated from Canada as a child.\textsuperscript{36} Frederick A. Wilcoxson of Massachusetts had been an army Volunteer quartermaster in occupied South Carolina who shrewdly stayed on in the South after the war to make his pile brokering cotton. His daughter, Mary, accepted the hand of appointee William Jencks Pardee.\textsuperscript{37} Still another successful in-law was Hiram Hayes Hobbs, a sea captain from Maine who made his money in the San Francisco

\textsuperscript{35} Father-in-law occupational data was determined for all but four couples: Weber-Howard, Day-Enright, Sanford-Mason, and Babbitt-Fenno. Miss Enright was employed in her own right as a clerk for the state of North Dakota when she married Lieutenant Day. Percentages cited here are taken from the number of known fathers-in-law.


trade before giving his daughter Anna’s hand in marriage to Lieutenant Frank Ferris, a former enlisted man.\textsuperscript{38} The prominence of these men ranged from the purely local, as in the case of Henry Paschal, to the truly national, like Pardon Armington. Armington, whose daughter Alice married Lieutenant Waldo Emerson Ayer, was co-founder of the Armington and Sims Engine Company of Providence, Rhode Island, a major supplier of high-speed horizontal steam engines to the Edison Electric Company.\textsuperscript{39} Also at the higher end was William Webster Wood of Piqua, Ohio. In 1835, Wood started a steam cooperage to supply the Cincinnati trade, and in 1865 parlayed that stake in his first linseed oil mill. Four other plants followed, and by the 1880s the Wood Linseed Oil Company made Piqua the nation’s second biggest producer.\textsuperscript{40} His daughter, Marion, wed Lieutenant Wendell Lee Simpson in 1886.

The next largest category were marriages to the daughters of serving or deceased officers. These accounted for just under a quarter of all unions, which by percentage were split almost evenly between West Pointers and officers commissioned from civilian life. While none of the cohort’s rankers married into military families, there is no indication that systemic prejudice about their former status as enlisted soldiers played any part. Indeed, most army ladies who wed cohort West Pointers had been raised in the households of appointees or former enlisted soldiers, while only three were the daughters of academy alumni. If anything, the fact emphasizes the commission as a transformational instrument enabling a mutual recognition. For example, when Lieutenant John Thornton Knight wed Edith McFadden Young in 1886, he did not dismiss her father, Major Samuel Baldwin Marks Young, as a former enlisted man, but

\textsuperscript{38} “Captain Hiram Hobbs Dead,” \textit{Evening Sentinel} (Santa Cruz, CA: 02 May 1900), 3; “Officers of the Grand Jury,” \textit{San Francisco Call} (10 Aug 1897), 5.

\textsuperscript{39} When the company failed in the Panic of 1893, it was valued at $326,500 – which as a share of GDP perhaps was analogous to nearly half a billion dollars today. Welcome Arnold Greene, ed., \textit{The Providence Plantations for Two Hundred and Fifty Years} (Providence, RI: J.A. & R.A. Reid, 1886), 260; Association of Edison Illuminating Companies, “\textit{Edisonia:}” \textit{A Brief History of the Early Edison Electric Lighting System} (New York: Edison Illuminating Co., 1904), 41; Horace A. Wadsworth, comp., \textit{History of Lawrence, Massachusetts} (Lawrence, MA: Hammon Reed, 1880), 158; Sampson and Murdoch, \textit{The New England Business Directory and Gazetteer}, no. 26 (Boston: Sampson, Murdock & Co., 1893), 1798.

\textsuperscript{40} Standard Oil acquired Wood’s company in 1886 but he stayed on to manage affairs, a move which likely made him even more wealthy. “Century Passes Since the Arrival in Piqua of William Webster Wood Who Became Leading Industrialist,” \textit{Piqua Daily Call} (Piqua, OH: 28 May 1937), 3.
rather as his legitimate superior. As it happened, Major Young, who started his career as a private in a Pennsylvania infantry regiment in 1861, ended it as a lieutenant general and the army’s first chief of staff, in 1904, a transition which itself suggests his former enlisted status did not handicap his career as an officer.\textsuperscript{41}

Marriages to women raised in professional households – those whose fathers practiced as attorneys, physicians, engineers, or clergy – were the third largest category, and accounted for about a fifth of the cohort. One of these professional fathers was Mason Young, a prominent New York attorney and all-around clubman who graduated from Yale in 1860 before studying law at Columbia.\textsuperscript{42} In 1894, Young wed his daughter, Louisa Hurlbut Young, to army surgeon Jefferson Randolph Kean.\textsuperscript{43} Another was Robert Coleman Bunker Bement, whose daughter Bertha had married artillery Lieutenant Sam Sturgis. An 1869 graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic, Bement was chief engineer of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad.\textsuperscript{44} Like those engaged in commerce, some professional in-laws lived out more provincial lives, such as Dr. Francis H. Welty. Sometime after graduating from the University of Maryland Medical School in 1868, Welty traded his family’s seat in Baltimore for Wyoming, where he practiced on the Wind River Indian Reservation.\textsuperscript{45} There, in 1891, his daughter – another Bertha – married Lieutenant Frederick Krug.\textsuperscript{46} Other in-laws, however, were of a thoroughly more cosmopolitan stripe. Frederic René Coudert, Sr., the son of a French immigrant, graduated from Columbia College in 1850 and later pioneered with his brothers the practice of international law in the Manhattan firm which bore the family name. His daughter, Marie Clarisse, met Lieutenant John B. Bellinger at a West Point ball, and married him in

\textsuperscript{41} Heitman, v.1 (1988), 1067; Miller (1911), 188.

\textsuperscript{42} “Mason Young, Yale ’60,” \textit{Hartford Courant} (Hartford, CT: 26 Apr 1906), 19.

\textsuperscript{43} Kean (1928), 29.

\textsuperscript{44} Burnquist (1924), 388; “Colonel Bement Dead,” \textit{Anaconda Standard} (Anaconda, MT: 08 May 1920), 9.

\textsuperscript{45} Welty’s father, the Reverend Elias Welty, also practiced medicine. University of Maryland, \textit{Sixty-First Annual Circular of the School of Medicine, 1867-1868} (Baltimore: Kelly & Piet, 1868), 23; “Mrs. Eliza A. Welty,” \textit{Baltimore Sun} (Baltimore, MD: 20 Oct 1906), 11.

Sprinkled throughout the cohort, but in much smaller numbers, were in-laws engaged chiefly in politics, farming, civilian government service, or trades. Of the five officers who married into political families, Lieutenant Carl Reichmann was one of three who wed the daughters of judges. His wife, Anna, was the daughter of the Honorable John Adams Vanderlip, who rode the circuit from Dansville, New York. Another was Lieutenant George Cress. He married Dora Scott Dean, the daughter of Judge Ezra Van Ness Dean, who presided in Wooster, Ohio. Some of these political families were Democrats, like the Vanderlips and the Deans. Others were Republicans, such as Lieutenant Frost’s father-in-law, Dr. Oscar Henry Mann, the mayor of Evanston, Illinois. As for the country set, of the five officers who married farmer’s daughters, four had been raised on farms, themselves, including Iowa appointee Lieutenant Abraham Buffington, and Maine’s academy graduate, Lieutenant Everard Hatch. Finally, there was Tichenor Miles, father-in-law to New Hampshire Civil War veteran Andrew Huckins Young. Though Miles styled himself a carpenter, he was more likely akin to a general contractor and builder, pursuits he combined with farming.

Alongside their personal affairs, cohort in-laws typically were active in their communities or held positions of public trust. Frederick Wilcoxson followed in his father’s footsteps by serving as the senior warden at St. John’s Episcopal Church in North Adams,

---


48 Originally ‘Van Derlip,’ the family used both spellings. “People in General,” Washington Post (29 Nov 1890), 4.

49 “12th District Convention,” Marion Star (Marion, OH: 27 Sep 1890), 1; “Judge E.V. Dean Dies,” Cincinnati Enquirer (13 Jan 1916), 10.


Massachusetts, and donated liberally to his parish from the profits of his cotton trade. Pardon
Armington was appointed clerk of the town relief committee when the Pemberton Mill in
Lawrence, Massachusetts, collapsed and burned in 1860, killing or injuring over 360 men,
women, and children. Six years later he was elected the town’s mayor on the Republican ticket,
and in 1877 was again elected as an alderman. Mr. and Mrs. Bement were counted amongst
the most prominent residents in St. Paul, Minnesota, and when the United States declared war
on Spain in 1898, Robert joined up as a Volunteer major of engineers. Even the builder
Tichenor Miles served his community as a selectman and justice of the peace, and during the
Civil War he volunteered a 60-day enlistment in his home militia, the Strafford Guard, when in
his 50s.

Clearly, officers married women from families that reflected their own, and some
looked no farther than their own home towns to find the right match. Eleven of the cohort
married ladies they had known before entering the army, including Lieutenants Buffington,
Chittenden, and Hatch. Joseph Elwyn Maxfield, the Harvard-educated signal officer promoted
from the ranks, probably attended Salem High School in Massachusetts with his future wife,
Harriet Mansfield, whose late father had clerked for one of that town’s large mills. David
Gaillard also knew his bride, Katherine Davis, from their childhood days in Winnsboro, South
Carolina, where their families had been close for generations. In fact, David’s uncle, former
South Carolina state representative Henry Augustus Gaillard, was law partner to Katherine’s

---

53 When Wilcoxson’s widow, Annie, died in 1912, she bequeathed a final $8,000 to St. John’s
Church, worth over $200,000 today. “Frederick A. Wilcoxson,” North Adams Transcript (11 Jul 1908),
4; “Gift of $8,000 for St. John’s Church, North Adams, Mass.,” The Churchman 106, no. 6 (10 Aug
1912), 23.

54 Maurice B. Dorgan, Lawrence Yesterday and Today, 1845-1918 (Lawrence, MA: Dick &
Trumpold, 1918), 55-57, 220-221, 229.


56 G. Parker Lyon, New Hampshire Annual Register and United States Calendar for the Year
1854 (Concord, NH: McFarland & Jenks, 1854), 77; “U.S. Civil War Soldiers, 1861-1865,” s.v.
“Tichenor Miles” (b. ABT 1811), Ancestry.com.

57 George Adams, The Salem Directory (Salem, MA: Henry Whipple and Son, 1855), 103, 196;
brother, R. Means Davis, the same man who had lobbied for Lieutenant Gaillard’s appointment to West Point in 1880.\(^{58}\) Other officers found their brides amongst the familiar social groups with whom they mingled on their varied assignments across the country, once again an indication that provincial elites highly regarded their daughter’s commissioned beaus. West Point engineer Lieutenant Cassius Erie Gillette was supervising improvements to the Muskingum River near Zanesville, Ohio, when introduced to his future bride, Anna Abbott Hamilton, the daughter of prominent coal operator.\(^{59}\) Lieutenant Clarence Dentler, one of Gillette’s classmates, met Delia Gellatly at the Oregon State Agricultural College at Corvallis, where he was detailed as professor of military science and she was a student.\(^{60}\) Their seven-month courtship gave Delia ample time to graduate before they exchanged vows on her father Andrew’s 400-acre farm near Philomath.\(^{61}\) And army surgeon Jefferson Kean was serving at St. Augustine, Florida in 1893 when he met his future bride, Louisa Young, as she holidayed with her family. Whilst smitten, for Kean the meeting was somewhat premature: the aptly-named Louisa was only 16 at the time, so the surgeon ‘had to wait a year…for her to let down her dress and put up her hair,’ so that her father, the New York attorney, would give his blessing.\(^{62}\)

The most potentially profitable marriage market was that enclosed within the stockade. Military intermarriage conveniently produced couples who already shared expectations about the peculiar practices and hardships of military service. And because virtually all the marriageable ladies on post were the daughters of senior officers who already enjoyed wider army recognition, wedding a boss’ daughter was especially profitable as it might instantly


\(^{60}\) The school was the forerunner to Oregon State University. Holden, v.4 (1901), 392.

\(^{61}\) Andrew Gellatly had emigrated from Scotland and was active in Republican politics. “Local Lore,” *Weekly Gazette-Times* (Corvallis, OR: 03 Sep 1894), 5; David D. Fagan, *History of Benton County, Oregon* (Portland, OR: A.G. Walling, 1885), 513; “Death’s Harvest,” *Corvallis Gazette* (Corvallis, OR: 30 Mar 1898), 3.

\(^{62}\) Kean (1928), 29.
boost sympathy for a son-in-law within his field. Of 13 cohort members who married into military families, seven had in fact married the daughters of their superiors, like Lieutenant Knight of the 3rd U.S. Cavalry Regiment at El Paso, Texas, and Lieutenant Alfred Cole of the 6th Cavalry at Fort Bayard in the New Mexico Territory. De Rosey Cabell actually married both the daughters of his commanding officer in the 8th U.S. Cavalry, Colonel Elmer Otis (USMA ’53). Cabell married Mary Otis in 1888, but a year later she died giving birth to their only child. Then in 1892, Cabell wed Martha Otis, the departed Mary’s younger sister. Although this regimental endogamy was strongest amongst the cohort’s cavalrmen, it was not exclusive to the mounted set: Lieutenant Hale, the engineer, and Lieutenant Harry Hawthorne, a gunner, both served under their fathers-in-law.

Service colleagues and their wives also proved effective matchmakers. George Cress most likely met Dora Dean with the encouragement of Charlotte Dean Wilkinson, Dora’s sister and the wife of Cress’s 7th U.S. Cavalry messmate, Lieutenant John W. Wilkinson (USMA ’72). Similarly, Carl Reichmann was assigned to the 24th U.S. Infantry at Fort Sill in the Indian Territory when he became acquainted with his future wife, Anne Vanderlip, through her sister Fanny. At the time, Reichmann was a subaltern in Company G, and Fanny’s husband, Captain Bethel Moore Custer, commanded Company C. In a seeming role reversal, Lieutenant Charles J. Naylor (USMA 1901) introduced his sister Florence to his cavalry troop

commander, Captain James Bryan Hughes, during her February 1905 visit to the Presidio of Monterey, California.\(^{68}\) Captain Hughes and Miss Naylor were engaged that same month, and in June that year they exchanged vows at Florence’s home in Philadelphia’s toney Chestnut Hill suburb, with the blessing of her father, John Samuel Naylor, president of a local iron works.\(^{69}\) The ladies, of course, could be similarly resourceful. While visiting in far-away Alaska in the summer of 1912, Lulu Gray Horan encountered Major Leon Roudiez, a widower who was then in command of Fort Gibbon in Tanana; Roudiez’ first wife had died from complications of a burst appendix eight years before.\(^{70}\) The meeting, though, was hardly by chance, as Miss Horan doubtless received advanced intelligence on Roudiez through sympathetic friends at the post, Captain and Mrs. Robert Hamilton Pierson.\(^{71}\) After what the newspapers implied was a whirlwind engagement, Roudiez and Horan married at Fort Gibbon that autumn.\(^{72}\)

Of course, it was unthinkable that 22-year-old Lulu Horan, the daughter of a politically well-connected New York attorney, would have traveled to Alaska to get hitched without her parents’ consent. Courtships like those of the Hughes-Naylors and the Roudiez-Horans usually were lengthier affairs than the society pages let on, during which patriarchs and matriarchs carefully vetted marriage offers to regulate an outsider’s access to their own family’s capital. For the prospective groom with little or no family, uniformed colleagues or the commission, itself, might stand as status proxies to build confidence in a match. Consider George Ruthers, a

---


\(^{70}\) Roudiez married his first wife, Sara Beth Stokes, in Minnesota in 1892. She died from complications of a burst appendix in 1904 at the Presidio of San Francisco. “Major Roudiez’ Wife Dies at the Presidio,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (01 Apr 1904), 13.

\(^{71}\) Captain Pierson was the post physician, and Miss Horan was fast friends with his wife. “Social News of the Week,” *Fairbanks Daily Times* (Fairbanks, AK: 25 Aug 1912), 6; “Pierson-Rogers,” *Democrat and Chronical* (Rochester, NY: 03 Jan 1909), 17; *Junction City Daily Union* (Junction City, KS: 12 Oct 1912), 1.

\(^{72}\) “Society Notes,” *San Francisco Examiner* (08 Oct 1912), 11; “The Smart Set,” *San Francisco Call* (05 Oct 1912), 19.
lieutenant promoted from the ranks who courted Sarah Perce, the daughter of former Republican congressman and Civil War Volunteer, Colonel Le Grand Winfield Perce of Chicago. Bearing little more than his commission to vouch for his honor, Ruthers likely received some assistance from fellow ranker Alfred Frost, whose father-in-law, Dr. Mann, was friendly with Colonel Perce in Chicago’s Republican Party circles. In the event, when Ruthers asked for Sarah’s hand in 1889, the old veteran had come to recognize his would-be son-in-law not as a former corporal, but rather as a fellow officer and gentleman. Perce said yes.

For men like George Ruthers, the company they kept might elevate status recognition to enable matches that would have been inconceivable whilst enlisted, underscoring the commission’s cachet. The orphaned young lady, however, faced a different dilemma, as they were deprived of the principal intermediaries who might secure her future. In such instances, married siblings or extended relations typically filled in to sponsor introductions or screen marriage offers, as was the case for Emily Fenno. Emily was the daughter of a Boston broker, but by the age of 15 she was orphaned. Enter, Katherine Everleth Maynadier Browne, the wife of Boston patent attorney Causten Browne, and mother-in-law to Emily’s younger sister, Cordelia. Mrs. Browne also was the daughter and sister of deceased West Point generals. So, probably in 1883, the matron located a suitable match for Emily in Cadet Edwin Burr Babbitt, a

---


76 Cordelia Fenno Browne, a popular librettist, was married to Katherine Browne’s son, William Murray Maynadier, and later to David Stevens. The Maynadiers pronounced their surname as ‘man-a-deer.’ “Unusual Honor,” Boston Globe (10 Apr 1909), 8; “Funeral of Mrs. David Stevens Tomorrow Noon,” Boston Globe (23 Apr 1934), 2.
young man likely well-known to her through his own West Point connections.77 Although an announcement of the couple’s engagement has not surfaced, Mrs. Browne sent Emily to the nation’s capital in December that year to visit her mother, Sarah Maynadier.78 There, over several weeks, the general’s widow would have instructed the young lady in the finer points of military etiquette and the social responsibilities of an officer’s wife. The following June, Babbitt was commissioned after graduating from the academy, and by November he and Emily were man and wife.79

Interactions like those described above occurred with countless repetition across the country, as with the promise of each union families, assisted by their intimates, maneuvered to secure or enhance their relative positions in society. What’s more, the case of Emily Fenno Babbitt was not unique, given that around a quarter of the cohort’s first marriages were to well-bred ladies whose fathers already were deceased. This fact, alone, hints at the enormity of time and capital expended in the pursuit of a fitting match, as much as it highlights the very high regard in which elite Americans held their officer corps: a readymade population of certified gentlemen with whom they might secure the virtues of their exposed relatives. All that remained was the usual ceremony to consecrate the union in the eyes of God and the state, and that would validate the happy couple’s passport into the social sets with whom they would circulate.

The wedding, itself, was little different than the symbolic initiations into any exclusive group. It just did so on a public scale. Whether done in an extravagant church affair or more intimately at home, cohort families typically advertised their expansions in the smarter sections of the day’s newspapers, both civilian and military, and often in multiple cities to reach interested family and friends. There, one read thick descriptions of the pomp, personages, and parties that telegraphed to the wider audience the comingling of capital, such as the great choir

77 Heitman, v.1 (1988), 177-178, 699
78 “Table Gossip,” Boston Globe (02 Dec 1883), 12.
79 “Table Gossip,” Boston Globe (09 Nov 1884), 12.
greeting the future Mary Wilcoxson Pardee in North Adams; the coadjutor bishop blessing the
Sturgis-Bements in St. Paul; the large reception honoring Lieutenant and Mrs. George Ruthers
at the Perce’s mansion in Chicago. Similarly, the convention of conserving maiden names, as
when the newly-wed ‘Anne Day Vanderlip’ became ‘Anne Vanderlip Reichmann,’ reified a
melding of ancestries that at once served as the basis of expanding mutual recognition within
vicarious circles. In sum, these so-called society weddings solemnized unions as surely as they
consecrated membership in the country’s more active classes. As Zanesville’s Times Recorder
decided when reporting the Gillette-Hamilton wedding in August 1889, the newlyweds ‘would
be a welcome addition to the society people of the city.’

5.3.1 Dishonor, Divorce, and Death

The notion that social capital pools in strong families is guided in part by a deeper
sense that families somehow share a collective responsibility for each member’s conduct.
Indeed, while socially endogamous marriages helped to concentrate resources and trust within
cohort families, their great potential to maintain important non-family relationships was partly
contingent on each member upholding that family’s honor by avoiding embarrassing public
scandals. This was even more critical for army officers because as public officials their conduct
in private life was fair game for the press and thus had the potential to harm the officer corps’
collective reputation. In such events, relations might band together more tightly to right
perceived wrongs, depending on the stakes involved, their level of trust in one another, and the
strengths of their extended networks, no matter the truthfulness of any allegation. Or, they
might choose to sanction or let go members whose conduct had greatly tarnished their image,
and the more quietly the better. From all appearances, the latter befell George Ruthers.

80 “Pardee-Wilcoxson,” North Adams Transcript (North Adams, MA: 22 Jun 1897), 1; “Fort
Snelling,” Army and Navy Journal (05 Sep 1896), 5; “Miss Sallie C. Perce is Now Mrs. George
Apart from the birth in 1891 of his only child Ethel, nothing really went right for Ruthers after he joined the Perce family. The Perces’ sympathy for their son-in-law likely began to thin in 1895 with the death of their daughter, Sarah, from heart disease at age 26. Afterwards, Ruthers left Ethel in Chicago to be raised by her grandparents.\(^{82}\) Then in 1900, Ruthers was the subject in a nationwide scandal after a government detective falsely accused him of conspiring to sell government rations for profit. Although his accuser admitted to libel, the damage was done: the next year, a Northeastern paper reported Ruthers’ reassignment to the Philippines under the fake headline, ‘In Charge of Commissary in Luzon Despite Crookedness.’\(^ {83}\) Another scandal followed in 1903 when his second wife, Glady Grey Dorsey, successfully petitioned a California court to annul their marriage on grounds she had eloped with Ruthers as a minor and without the consent of her parents, just weeks before he shipped out to Manilla, alone.\(^{84}\) Of course, the moral implications were startling, and papers from Los Angeles to Seattle had a field day reporting the misadventures of the ‘dashing wearer of Uncle Sam’s army blue.’\(^ {85}\) Ruthers married a third and final time in 1907, but that marriage also ended in failure a year later.\(^ {86}\) Although the Chicago papers did not pick up Ruthers’ lady troubles, even gossip of that sort could have politically injured his father-in-law, and might even have threatened the prospects of catching a respectable mate for his daughter, Ethel. Indeed, the Perces appear to have altogether purged Ruthers from their circle, unremembered even in their obituaries.\(^ {87}\) Likewise, Ruthers’ public indiscretions would have placed him in a

\(^{82}\) “Sarah Perce Ruthers,” Inter-Ocean (Chicago: 09 Nov 1895), 3.

\(^{83}\) “Six Months in Durance for Jay Holland,” San Francisco Examiner (02 Jun 1900), 2; “Praise Officials, In Charge of Luzon Commissary Despite Crookedness,” Lowell Sun (Lowell, MA: 07 Jun 1901), 2.

\(^{84}\) “Summonses,” Recorder (San Francisco: 08 Jul 1903), 3; “Court’s Decree Ends Romance,” San Francisco Call (18 Sep 1903), 7.

\(^{85}\) “Hasty Marriage Ends Unhappily,” San Francisco Call (30 Apr 1903), 14; “Ruthers’ Home Minus a Wife,” San Francisco Call (16 Nov 1903), 12.


dim light with superiors in Washington, and the army quickly approved Major Ruthers’ request for early retirement in 1911.88 Thus, what had started out as a promising career as an officer in 1884 ended with his death in relative obscurity in Boston in 1918.89

Divorce was rare in the cohort, and only three other marriages ended in the courts. Apart from death, nothing had more immediate natural potential to disrupt a family’s network and sully reputations. This was especially true of regimental marriages, where the merger of professional and personal bonds of affection made divorces especially risky affairs. Captain Harry LeRoy Hawthorne, the son of a Kentucky businessman active in Republican politics, accepted such a risk when in 1903 he divorced Belle Sinclair, the daughter of his former commanding officer, retired Brigadier General William Sinclair (USMA ’57).90 The Hawthornes’ divorce received little publicity, and so the reason for their separation is undetermined. The charges, though, were sufficiently grave that in granting the divorce the presiding court further permitted Belle to resume her maiden name, driving a final stake through the heart of their families’ former alliance.91 Fortunately for Hawthorne, his discretion and fame likely insulated him from any serious repercussions from Sinclair intimates following the break: in 1892, Hawthorne had been awarded a Medal of Honor for directing the Hotchkiss guns at Wounded Knee Creek, an action in which he was severely wounded.92 Though the battle is considered an atrocity today, at the time Hawthorne was widely feted in his circles as a hero, and so antagonizing him for his divorce a few years later would have served neither the army’s nor the Sinclair family’s interests.

89 Maj George W. Ruthers, Indian Fighter, Dead,” Boston Globe (29 Apr 1918), 5.
91 Army and Navy Journal (07 Mar 1903), 658.
Broken marriages outside the regiment could also be professionally disabling for the officer, especially if widely publicized. Not only did such an exhibition invite wider speculation about an officer’s character, bad publicity exposed the officer corps to scrutiny, as when the evocative headline “Army Wives Free” announced Emma Howell’s successful suit against her husband, Major John Conklin.\textsuperscript{93} When Howell, the West Pointer’s second wife, sued him for a divorce in 1908 on grounds of ‘intolerable severity,’ newspapers reported testimony from another officer that Conklin frequently was drunk in public and used profane language towards his wife. The court found for Mrs. Conklin and awarded her custody of their minor daughter.\textsuperscript{94} Had such testimony been introduced at court martial, Major Conklin would surely have faced dismissal. Even so, revelations in the press of his dysfunctional home life almost certainly earned a rebuke from his superiors, who may have encouraged his request for voluntary retirement while in good health four years later, 14 years shy of the service age limit.\textsuperscript{95} Cases like Conklin’s confirmed for the public the worst stereotypes of army life, and reflected poorly on an institution whose privileged position in society rested in part on maintaining a gentlemanly image. Thus, divorce joined a catalog of improprieties ingraining within the service’s habitus a disdain for airing one’s dirty linens in public, which may also explain why Conklin’s classmate, Brigadier General John Bellinger, waited a full year after he retired from the service to seek a divorce from his wife, Marie Clarisse Coudert, on grounds she had deserted him a decade earlier.\textsuperscript{96}

The deaths of spouses and the odd divorce led to 17 subsequent cohort marriages. These later marriages were not always celebrated as publicly nor as richly as the first. Nevertheless, these brides’ social backgrounds were generally no different than their


\textsuperscript{95}Conklin was promoted to colonel several months before his retirement, probably to ease him out the door. U.S. Military Academy, \textit{Sixty-Third Annual Report of the Association of Graduates} (Newburgh, NY: Moore Printing Co., 1932), 144. “Men and Women,” \textit{Buffalo Commercial} (Buffalo, NY: 28 May 1912), 11.

predecessors’ (see, Appendix C, Table C-5). Even Mrs. George Ruthers, marks II and III, were society ladies.97 Some of these later marriages produced children, as happened for Leon Roudiez and Lulu Horan. But given the median age at remarriage was 57 for men and 36 for women, mutual comfort and security probably motivated most subsequent unions, rather than physiological or social reproduction. Indeed, the oldest of the cohort to remarry, John Park Finley, was 87 and in seriously poor health when he wed a cousin, Flora, who was 72.98

* * * * *

On balance, the 1884 cohort’s marriage patterns reflected their social origins. As mostly the sons of provincial elites, these officers wed women from families typically resembling their own. By consequence, this tendency to intermarry laid a formidable foundation on which newly extended families might combine their capital within trusting, like-minded family networks, while opening the way to important non-family relationships based in sympathetic status recognition. As in any bounded relationship, realizing the advantages of family membership proliferated norms of behavior intended to uphold the family’s standing. What’s more, these ostensibly family affairs deeply intersected army life. Just as well-placed families expected to symbolically profit from marrying their daughters to uniformed gentlemen, the army expected its officers’ marriages would conform to norms that preserved the institution’s place within the nation’s social and symbolic order. All this considered, creating social capital did not begin with the playing of Wagner’s “Bridal Chorus,” any more than it ended to the familiar strains of Mendelssohn’s “Wedding March.” In manifold ways, banking social capital carried on after marriage in seemingly mundane activities, from the observance of social obligations and received traditions, to active membership in a variety of more or less exclusive associations promoting sociability, patriotism, professionalism, and loyalty.


5.4 Banking Non-Family Social Capital

The popularity of more or less exclusive associations like social clubs, patriotic orders, and secret societies has waxed and waned throughout American history. Bourdieu offered that such groups rose to stem the rupture of family capital under pressure from bureaucratic practice, by which elements of dynastic practice might survive inconspicuously behind the camouflage of routine sociability: of games, dinners, entertainments, and so on.99 Philadelphia’s 18th-century dancing and fishing clubs were perhaps the earliest example of this kind of association in America, in which selective sociability provided both the venue and pretext for wealthy elites to close social ranks at a time when ‘imperial crisis, revolution, nation making, and democratization’ threatened to unsettle the received symbolic order, as told to us by historian Kate Haulman.100 These types of associations continued in diverse forms after Independence. In fact, one of Philly’s colonial-era clubs, the Schuylkill Fishing Company, still exists today.101 However, the greatest expansion and diffusion of exclusive groups occurred between 1870-1930, when a large number of Americans pursued stability or improvement in communion with others like them, again during a time of threatened economic, social, and political dislocation.102

In the face of anonymizing pressures, associating as such was almost as fundamental as family to accruing social capital. Just as a great strength of endogamy was its potential to build trusting relationships and to pool resources for the future benefit of family members, parlaying


those resources to enter exclusive associations might lengthen networks of sympathetic relations beyond one’s family, yet within homologous social circles. The material or symbolic profits from these non-family associations derived in part from a range of selective entry requirements like letters of recommendation, initiation fees, lineage, specialized knowledge, or the possession of some cultural capital – a college degree, for instance. Exclusion, as such, helped proliferate norms and habits of mind engendering solidarity and a broader trust. Association boundaries also proliferated legitimate sanctions. Just as families expected their members to behave honorably to uphold the family’s standing, realizing the profits from non-family relations meant internalizing codes of thought and behavior, affirmed and reaffirmed in ritual courtesy and the respect of obligations, all the while avoiding slights or scandals which might otherwise despoil the combined reputation of one’s associates. Maintaining multiple prestigious memberships in good standing naturally multiplied one’s stock of social capital in real terms by expanding and range of one’s non-family connections, while also elevating expectations of trust within their social circles. In short, one was known by his honored associations, and the more the better.

The 1884 officer cohort married well, and like many high-status Americans they participated in a variety of more or less exclusive associations. Drawing from a wide range of sources, the tables at Appendix D record membership data for 61 of the 67 officers under study, or 91% of the cohort, listed under four broad categories of association in order of the frequency of affiliations: social, patriotic, professional, and fraternal. Admittedly, the data offer only a snapshot, as no single source exists listing every association to which these officers were party. Except in the case of the fraternal orders which men typically entered fairly early in their adulthood, it appears most of the officers broadened their membership activities around the turn

---

104 Bourdieu (1986), 50; Coleman (1988), S104-S105.
of the century, after having spent close to two decades in uniform. The rise in their participation around this time tracks with the growth in popularity of such associations generally, but other possible explanations for this include more time spent in urban assignments later in their careers, or increases in disposable income made available from extended family sources following marriage or through inheritance.

Despite these limitations, the data reveal that together these 61 officers held over 250 documented affiliations in any one of more than 80 named associations, summarized below (Table 5-2). As a group, the data show no obvious correlation between commissioning source and the tendency to affiliate. Typically, each officer held about four memberships, though individually the number of their affiliations varied a great deal, probably for a complex of reasons. On the low end, for example, Major Joseph E. Maxfield, the Harvard ranker, held only a single membership in the Army and Navy Club of Washington, as did Colonel Hugh John Gallagher, the affluent West Pointer. At the extraordinary end, though, were Brigadier General Robert Noble, an academy graduate who held 14 affiliations, and Major Charles Lewis Beckurts, a wealthy direct appointee who held 11. Indeed, it was a former enlisted man, Colonel John Park Finley, who may have seized the cohort record. The celebrated meteorologist reportedly belonged to more than 30 unnamed scientific societies, on top of an honorary fellowship in the British Royal Society of Science, Letters, and Art. The following sub-sections deal with each category of affiliation in detail.

Table 5-2: Cohort Voluntary Associations, by Commissioning Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioning Source/Population</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Patriotic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Fraternal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMA (35/37)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life (19/19)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranks (7/11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (61/67)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendix D

---

106 These unnamed were discounted when tallying affiliation totals.
5.4.1 Private Clubs

Of the four categories of associations, just under 80% of the officers joined at least one private civilian or military social club located in the larger cities where they were assigned, making these the cohort’s biggest diversion.\(^{107}\) Top civilian clubs included New York’s Metropolitan and Union League, and the various University Clubs in Denver, Chicago, or the Canal Zone in Panama.\(^ {108}\) The most popular military clubs were the Army and Navy in Washington and New York. Whether civilian or military, these clubs were unapologetically restricted spaces where men sharing a mutually recognizable habitus and broadly similar interests could interact convivially, safely removed from the public eye.

While some clubs were strictly social, such as Brigadier General John Bellinger’s unquestionably upper-class Metropolitan Club, many others organized around some special objective. For instance, the Cosmos Club in Washington, another of Bellinger’s haunts, formed in 1885 to bring together prominent ‘persons interested in science, literature or art.’\(^ {109}\) The goals of the Union League Club were loftier still. Formed during the Civil War to promote loyalty to the United States government, members also hoped ‘to elevate the idea of American citizenship’ by the time Grote Hutcheson and Isaac Lewis joined.\(^ {110}\) Seattle’s standout Rainier and Arctic Clubs were of another common type, those which catered to professionals and businessmen to promote commerce.\(^ {111}\) Brigadier General Hiram Chittenden mingled at both. Then there were the athletic and country clubs that entertained the sporting set. Major Beckurts

---

\(^{107}\) Unless otherwise specified, all percentages of membership cited in this section are figured against 61 of the 67 officers for whom data was discovered.

\(^{108}\) New York City hosted the original University Club, and about 50 non-affiliated clubs similarly organized sprang up in cities around the world before the First World War. See, James W. Alexander, *A History of the University Club of New York, 1865-1915* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1915), 462-463.


took his pleasure at the toney Merion Cricket Club on Philadelphia’s Main Line, while Colonels Harry Taylor and Eugene Frederick Ladd mixed with congressmen and cabinet secretaries at the high-powered Chevy Chase Club, located just outside of Washington.\textsuperscript{112}

Private clubs were bastions of elite civility, and their executive committees kept them that way. Sometimes elected in rotating classes to ensure continuity of practice, these committees carefully screened sponsored nominees for their ‘clubbability,’ a euphemism simultaneously embracing a range of desired attributes and prejudices.\textsuperscript{113} Some membership restrictions were wholly subjective, as in a candidate’s not possessing the desired habitus. Others were made quite plain. The Boston City Club, where Colonel Harry Hawthorne served on the Arts and Library Committee, restricted women, a common practice in its day.\textsuperscript{114} So, too, did the Catholic Club of the City of New York, which further expected its candidates to be educated Catholic gentlemen ‘governed by a spirit of fidelity to the Church and devotion to the Holy Father.’\textsuperscript{115} The various university clubs naturally restricted membership to clubbable nominees possessing a college degree or to those who had graduated from the military or naval academy. The University Club of New York’s ‘canon of exclusion,’ though, made allowances for non-graduates, so long as they were of the right character and had studied at least three years at an institution of higher learning.\textsuperscript{116} That club’s Committee on Admissions, however, drew the line at honorary degrees, unless the candidate was sufficiently distinguished, on the scale of a J. Pierpont Morgan or Nikola Tesla.\textsuperscript{117} Membership ceilings were another common method of maintaining exclusivity. The University Club of Denver, where Brigadier General


\textsuperscript{113} For examples see, Union League Club (1898), 23-24; University Athletic Club, \textit{Constitution, By-Laws, Rules and List of Officers and Members} (New York: The Club, 1898), 18-19.

\textsuperscript{114} “Officers and Committees,” \textit{Boston City Bulletin} (01 Oct 1915), 2.


\textsuperscript{116} Alexander (1915), 35-36, 43-44

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 37.
Irving Hale sat on the admissions committee, set a limit of no more than 250 resident members, while the Union League Club capped its rolls at 1,800.\textsuperscript{118} By comparison, the Boston City Club had generously raised its limit in 1915 from 5,000 to 6,000 members, yet they still had on their waiting list over 1,000 names.\textsuperscript{119} Finally, clubs of all stripes adopted fairly universal standards of conduct that maintained their respective habitus and fostered mutual status recognition with other clubs, often with the view of attracting reciprocal relations and privileges for their members.

Personal finances presented an equally formidable barrier to participation. It was not unusual for clubs to charge initiation fees of $100.00 or more. In 1898, the Union League Club charged $300.00, or what would be over $9,000.00 today. Additionally, resident members paid annual dues of $75.00; non-residents paid $45.00.\textsuperscript{120} Add to that bar tabs and dinner subscriptions and the cost of mingling soared quickly. Fortunately for the uniformed set, most clubs offered steeply discounted fees or dues for army and naval officers on the active list, yet another sign of the officer corps’ near universally accorded high status. The Union League Club, for instance, cut the initiation fee in half for officers and reduced their dues to $30, whilst New York’s Catholic Club eliminated fees altogether for qualifying officers, enabling Edwin Burr Babbitt to hobnob gratis with Catholic heavyweights like U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Edward Douglas White and New York City Mayor William R. Grace.\textsuperscript{121} In times of war many civilian clubs further considered it their patriotic duty to waive all entry requirements for officers. During the Spanish-American War, the posh Pacific Club in Honolulu extended temporary clubhouse privileges to Lieutenant Alfred Sydney Frost, then serving as temporary colonel of the 1st South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, while he and his regiment awaited transport
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to the Philippines.\textsuperscript{122} And during the First World War, the University Club of Chicago extended honorary memberships to all army officers assigned to the department headquarters, regardless of degree status.\textsuperscript{123}

Military clubs were just as hospitable to civilians of analogous status. The Army and Navy Club of Washington expanded full eligibility to civilian members of venerable patriotic associations like the Society of Cincinnati; gratis lifetime honorary memberships for the president, vice president, and service secretaries; and temporary memberships to civilian government officials during their tenures in office, or to foreign officers during their assignments in the capital.\textsuperscript{124} Compared to top civilian clubs, joining was a bargain. In 1900, the club scaled fees for full members according to residency status: residents paid $75.00 at entry and annual dues of $50.00, and non-residents paid $60.00 and $5.00, respectively. Temporary members, most of whom were civilian, paid no entry fee, and were charged dues of about $12.00 a calendar quarter.\textsuperscript{125}

All those dues and debentures – loans underwritten by wealthier patrons for capital improvements – financed a bubble of refinement safely removed from the broader public in stately clubhouses with cozy venues like libraries, bars, and billiard rooms where their select associates mixed pleasure with business. Better-equipped clubs even had overnight accommodations, pools, gymnasiums, Russian and Turkish Baths, rifle ranges, bowling alleys, and more.\textsuperscript{126} In 1896, all of these comforts were available to Lieutenant Treadwell Moore as a member of the prestigious University Athletic Club on West 26\textsuperscript{th} Street in Midtown Manhattan.\textsuperscript{127} After bowling a few frames and having a steam, Moore might then have popped
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around to the Camera Club on West 29th Street, another of his hangouts, to indulge his interest in amateur photography in one of their private darkrooms.128

The centers of activity in most clubhouses, though, were the dining rooms. The Boston City Club had 25, with at least one seating up to 100 for the dollar-a-plate Thursday dinners, where loyal toasts and delicacies joined ‘food for thought on some important public or scientific or philosophical question.’129 For larger banquets, Boston City members dined in the club’s capacious auditorium, as happened in December 1915 when more than 1,000 turned out for Colonel Hawthorne’s address on the advances in modern ordnance, which incidentally dwarfed the gathering for British peace activist Norman Angell’s address on “America’s Place in the Community of Nations,” given there just the week before.130 Such dinners were critical rituals in club life, during which members and their invited guests reaffirmed their fellowship with one another in a most convivial atmosphere. Moreover, they presented regular opportunities for members to advertise their associations to a wider audience, as clubs oftentimes published dinner menus, guest lists, and even seating charts. Indeed, the practice had become so deeply seated in America’s clubland that in 1917 army intelligence chief Colonel Ralph Van Deman tried in vain to ban these publications, on the grounds German agents targeted farewell dinners thrown for uniformed clubmen to track army deployments to Europe.131

---
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5.4.2 Patriotic Societies

Patriotic societies were the next most prevalent form of association, and 56% of the cohort belonged to at least one. These spanned a gamut of military orders and heritage organizations dedicated in one form or another to preserving the country’s historical memory, the most select of which restricted membership based on status, ancestry, or both. The granddaddy of them all was the elite Society of the Cincinnati, a federation of 13 state friendly societies organized by veterans in 1783 to assist the families of members made needy by their wartime sacrifices, and to keep alive the public’s memory of their service to the nation.¹³² Membership in the Cincinnati was limited to officers of the Continental Army, of the navy and marines, and of their French allies. To ensure for their posterity, however, the Cincinnati adopted the dynastic practice of primogeniture so that their children would ‘inherit and keep alive the friendship of the fathers, and devotion to their ideals.’¹³³ Denounced as aristocratic by early republican critics, the Cincinnati’s brand of blood patriotism nevertheless inspired many similar associations formed during the 19th century.

The cohort’s only Cincinnati was army surgeon Walter Drew McCaw, though his membership was honorary; the McCaws, ironically, had been loyalists during the Revolution, and the right of membership through his patriot grandfather, Captain John Harris of the brig Mosquito, was at the time encumbered by another descendant.¹³⁴ A number of the cohort did, however, enjoy hereditary membership in societies that resembled the Cincinnati. William Cullen Wren, James Thomas Anderson, and Charles Beckurts each belonged to several, including the General Society of Colonial Wars (GSCW), formed for descendants of military


officers and high civilian officials who had participated in America’s pre-Independence wars from the founding of Jamestown in 1607.\textsuperscript{135} Edwin Burr Babbitt also held several hereditary memberships, two through his father and grandfather. One was the Aztec Club of 1847, which accepted only the descendants of officers who had served in the Mexican War able to afford the $25.00 initiation fee – a sum comparable to around $700.00 today.\textsuperscript{136} Another was the grandiloquently titled Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, or MOLLUS, an association for veteran Union officers that allowed for hereditary admission and charged comparable fees.\textsuperscript{137}

Others in the cohort joined groups organized along similar lines to commemorate conflicts in which they themselves participated, such as the Military Order of Foreign Wars and the Order of Indian Wars. For these, generous dates of eligible service attracted the larger memberships needed to ensure their posterity.\textsuperscript{138} The narrower eligibility terms for some associations, however, doomed them to extinction even before scions could apply, like the Military Order of the Dragon, created by and for commissioned officers who participated in the 1900 China Relief Expedition, or the still tinier Military Order of Pretoria, which only recognized Americans who had served as observers or combatants with the Boer forces during the South African War of 1899-1902.\textsuperscript{139} In fact the latter, organized in Pretoria by journalist Richard Harding Davis and the American Consul, Adelbert Hay, probably counted no more than a dozen members, including Carl Reichmann, who had been the United States military attaché to the Boer republics.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{135} Jennings Hood and Charles J. Young, comps, \textit{American Orders & Societies and Their Decorations} (Philadelphia: Bailey, Banks & Biddle Co., 1917), 62-64.
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There were, of course, patriotic societies in which rank and ancestry played no formal part. Amongst these were the flurry of more inclusive groups formed between the Spanish-American and First World Wars for veteran combatants, which were similarly popular with the cohort. Irving Hale and Alfred Frost actually helped found one of the largest of these groups in Hale’s hometown of Denver in 1901, the National Society of the Army of the Philippines (NSAP). Open to veterans of either service, Hale served four years as the NSAP’s first president, and by extension is credited as the founder of its successor, the Veterans of Foreign Wars.141

Of all the various societies, the ones which proved the most popular with the cohort and their wives were the Sons of the American Revolution (SAR) and its larger analog the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR). Fourteen cohort officers held memberships in the SAR, while eight of their wives were DAR, counting Mrs. Reichmann. As with many such groups appearing in the late 19th century, the SAR and DAR rose partly out of nostalgia for America’s revolutionary past, and partly as a reaction to the older societies whose narrow bloodlines-to-bloody-shirts admission practices excluded all but men from old martial families.142 By expanding the definition of qualifying patriot ancestry to those who had ‘rendered material aid to the cause of American Independence,’ irrespective of military service, rank, or civil office, the SAR and DAR were more inclusive than groups like the Cincinnati or the Aztec Club, but only just.143 For instance, while admission fees ranging from $1.00 to $5.00 were modest compared to the older groups, joining either would have been an extravagance for qualified working class descendants earning the average daily wage of $2.50, and who were

---


143 Sons of the American Revolution, District of Columbia Society, History and Objects (Wash., DC: Gedney & Roberts, 1891), xvi.
unlikely to enjoy the leisure time to research and prepare the required ancestral papers. Moreover, these societies typically put their papered candidates to the ballot or required endorsements from active members, and so even those with acceptable pedigrees might be blackballed if found socially unacceptable, a practice that effectively filtered participation according to race, ethnicity, religion, or reputation.

The attractiveness of hereditary associations varied across the cohort. Doubtless for some, papering their patriot pedigree was the principal benefit of membership at a time when many were anxious that the nation’s rapid growth was blurring family lines and historical memory. As Brigadier General T. Bentley Mott recorded, in his youth discussions of blood and family were constant topics of discussion in his Northern Virginia home. ‘Who was descended from whom, and who was related to whom and in what degree,’ Mott recalled, ‘was a very important matter in those days.’ Collecting hereditary memberships not only reflected this innately dynastic impulse, doing so might also shore up a family’s claim they were old stock. This may explain why Major Charles Beckurts, the son of an immensely wealthy German immigrant, was such an enthusiast. Joining the GSCW, the SAR, and the General Society of the War of 1812 on the strength of his mother’s family line, Beckurts’ multiple memberships might easily have misled casual acquaintances to assume his American ancestry and money were solidly older than they were.

As with private clubs, membership in patriotic societies also filled an important social function. Reunions, conferences, and annual dinners made for agreeable venues to renew acquaintances, reminisce over old campaigns, and rub elbows with the influential. In this
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regard, the relative recentness of the Civil War made membership in MOLLUS particularly useful for men like Babbitt, Sam Sturgis, Jr., Harry Hawthorne, and Joseph P. O’Neil, who might have lubricated linkages to their fathers’ comrades over lobster cutlets and sauternes at Rauscher’s in Washington.\textsuperscript{148} These occasions also attracted notable outsiders. As the appeal to patriotism spread, many societies bestowed honorary memberships on prominent men with unqualifying pedigrees to burnish the social profiles of their own select associations. By the 1880s, even the elite Cincinnati had stepped up its recruitment of honorary members whose high status, ‘abilities and patriotism [were] directed to the same laudable objects with those of the Cincinnati.’\textsuperscript{149} In the decades leading to the First World War these included all the presidents, as well as many governors, members of Congress, and cabinet officials, including Secretaries of War Elihu Root and Newton Baker.\textsuperscript{150}

Finally, the fact that De Rosey Cabell and James Thomas Anderson joined Alfred Frost and Irving Hale as leaders in patriotic societies further suggests that at least some viewed membership as a public service to uphold the nation’s symbolic order.\textsuperscript{151} Patriotic societies of all stripes were powerful agents of Americanism, deeply committed to preserving institutions, defining the obligations of citizenship, and articulating America’s place in the world. As leaders, these officers took a more direct hand in shaping the policies they and their compatriots believed would build stronger communities and unify the country, as when Hale – who between 1898-1908 served several terms as president and vice-president of Colorado’s state SAR – urged members to lobby Congress on behalf of military preparedness and to promote legislation that would criminalize the desecration of the flag.\textsuperscript{152}
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5.4.3 Professional Associations

Also expanding rapidly throughout the period were professional societies dedicated to strengthening the boundaries encompassing discrete fields of expertise. Much like social clubs, professional associations invariably metered entry to proliferate acceptable norms and outlooks, safeguard the value of their members’ pooled capital, and by extension elevate their groups’ recognition as the legitimate authorities within their own specialized jurisdictions, even as they sought to refine best practices and advance knowledge. At least 33 of the cohort’s joiners held one or more memberships in such groups, or about 54% of those known to affiliate. These associations embraced not only ones focused expressly on the military field, but also those in intersecting fields like law, medicine, engineering, and science.

The most frequently encountered affiliation was to the Military Service Institution of the United States (MSIUS). Modeled somewhat after Britain’s much older Royal United Service Institution, MSIUS was established in 1878 at Governor’s Island in New York to foster ‘professional unity and improvement by correspondence, discussion and publication of Essays [sic]…and, generally, the promotion of the military interests of the United States.’\textsuperscript{153} Full membership was more or less limited to Regular Army officers and cadets, though serving naval officers and marines could join as associates. Other applicants were subject to a two-thirds ballot of the executive committee. All members regardless of status paid a modest annual subscription to defray the costs of publishing the society’s journal, which in 1906 was set at $2.50.\textsuperscript{154} To raise its public profile and encourage member contributions, MSIUS sponsored an annual gold medal essay contest with a $100 prize for original papers on important military topics, and offered other cash prizes for papers focused more directly on issues specific to the service arms, such as the Buford Cavalry Prize and the Hunt Artillery Prize.\textsuperscript{155} As with its

\textsuperscript{153} U.S. Military Service Institution, Constitution, By-Laws and Register, Together with Memoranda Relating to the History and Work of the Institution (Governor’s Island, NY: 1906), 8.
\textsuperscript{154} Ibid., 8-9.
\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 13-14.
civilian analogues, MSIUS applied the weight of its collective talent and expertise not merely for self-improvement, but also to lobby influential social groups, politicians, and the public for reforms favorable to national defense and the military profession.

Without doubt, some officers considered their membership as merely an unspoken obligation of commissioned service. The cohort’s publication record, however, clearly shows that quite a number were enthusiasts. From 1884-1917, at least 17 of the cohort contributed more than 60 original papers, commentaries, or translations of foreign military works to the MSIUS journal, on topics as diverse as tactics and equipment to preparedness, engineering, and domestic security, as in “The Use of Troops in Riots.”156 Where some just dipped their toe with a commentary or two, others went at it hammer and tongs. Alfred Frost and Carl Reichmann were amongst the more prolific, especially in their contributions of German translations. Both also contributed original papers, and in 1902 Reichmann took second place in the Buford Prize for his personal reminiscences of the Orange Free State Campaign, winning $25.00.157 Harry Hawthorne also submitted a number of papers, one on observations he made of the Japanese Army while assigned as attaché in Tokyo in 1911.158 And Stephen Miller Foote published no fewer than seven original papers during his career, winning the MSIUS Gold Medal in 1898 for his piece on organizing volunteer armies, and a Hunt Prize in in 1904 for his essay entitled, “Smaller Batteries for Field Artillery.”159

The cohort published in other military journals, too, such as those circulated by the

156 Theophilus F. Rodenbough, comp., General Index of the Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States (Governor’s Island, NY: The Executive Council, 1904), 10.


U.S. Cavalry Association and the Association of Military Surgeons. In 1906, Reichmann wrote a brace of articles for the *Journal of the United States Infantry Association*, one on his observations of the Japanese and Russian armies during his time as an attaché in Manchuria, and the other on defense reforms that would enable the United States to meet its responsibilities as an emerging global power.\(^{160}\) Publishing helped officers build reputations within the service as deeply committed and insightful stewards of their profession. It also could lead to wider public recognition, especially when army leaders turned out their subject matter experts for public diplomacy events, as when that same year Reichmann delivered his lecture, “With the Russian Army in Manchuria,” to a packed house at the Grand Theatre in Atlanta, accompanied by the 7th U.S. Infantry Band from nearby Fort McPherson and illustrated with dozens of stereopticon slides.\(^{161}\)

Belonging to civilian professional associations was a more direct means of extending recognition beyond the service, especially for the medical officers and engineers whose specialties overlapped civilian pursuits. Chief amongst these societies were the American College of Surgeons, the American Medical Association (AMA), and the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). Active participation enabled surgeon Jefferson Kean, for instance, to extend his repute as an expert in camp hygiene and battlefield medicine throughout the larger medical field, partly through articles he prepared for the *Journal of the American Medical Association*.\(^{162}\) Likewise, surgeon Walter McCaw’s frequent contributions to similar publications extended his reputation as an authority in tropical medicine into civilian circles.\(^{163}\)


The cohort’s engineers also were quite active and several earned national reputations as hydrologists by relaying their career experiences and insights in essays on improvements to harbors, waterways, and flood control in the pages of the *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers*.164 Hiram Chittenden, perhaps the cohort’s most widely published author on a range of topics, submitted 10 articles to *Transactions*, alone.165

Again, some of the cohort took a more direct role guiding the practices and agendas of professional associations, both military and civilian. Farrand Sayre, for one, was the long-time vice-president of the U.S. Cavalry Association, while Jefferson Kean served as president of the Association of Military Surgeons from 1914-1915.166 Major General Harry Taylor was elected president of the Society of American Military Engineers in 1925, and the ever-conspicuous Irving Hale served as president of the Colorado Scientific Association and once chaired the American Mining Congress’ committee on metal mines.167 Long after he retired from the army, Major General William Luther Sibert was elected to a term as president of the American Association of Port Authorities, from 1929-1930.168 Finally, James Clark Sanford, an expert in hydraulic dredging, represented the United States for many years in the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, a group that still disseminates globally the best civil engineering practices bearing on maritime navigation.169
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As with any such association, one’s professional contributions might build one’s social capital, and conduct deemed improper could just as easily erode it. To maintain their credibility and prestige, professional associations policed those whose offenses threatened to taint the general membership and their aims. The MSIUS constitution specified dismissal from the service, either by the president or by sentence of court martial, as grounds for immediate termination. So, too, was a felony conviction in a civil court.\textsuperscript{170} The more democratic AMA reserved the right to suspend or eject any member who violated its constitution or code of ethics on a two-thirds ballot of members present at any regular meeting.\textsuperscript{171} And while the ASCE charter did not exactly specify what constituted a dischargeable offense, it only took a vote of half the sitting members to expel a colleague.\textsuperscript{172} As it happened, engineer Major Cassius Erie Gillette never even made it through ASCE’s front door, despite his being one of the foremost engineers of his day. In 1905, the War Department sent Gillette to Philadelphia at the request of its mayor to examine construction contracts for the city’s water filtration plant, and soon after the major accused the plant’s former superintendent, John Hill, and others of corruption.\textsuperscript{173} It seemed to reprise a similar investigation Gillette famously conducted just a few years earlier in Savannah, Georgia, which ended in a court martial conviction and a five-year prison sentence for his predecessor there, engineer Captain Oberlin Carter (USMA ’80).\textsuperscript{174} In Philadelphia, however, the court found for the accused, after which Hill’s friends cooperated to permanently blackball Gillette from ASCE on grounds the major was ‘a good man gone bad.’\textsuperscript{175}
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5.4.4 Fraternalism

Although membership in fraternal orders was fourth in order of popularity in the cohort, it was arguably the most socially consequential. Whereas clubs, patriotic societies, and professional associations created opportunities for agents to build reputations and useful relationships, the very aim of fraternalism was to emulate family-like bonds of obligation based on cooperation and trust. These groups included the several rites of Freemasonry; a vast array of beneficial orders that paid indemnities to members and their families, like the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks and the Knights of Pythias; and college fraternities. The organizing principles of these associations varied. Some organized along social, religious, political, or ethnic and racial lines, and some discriminated just as surely along the same line. No matter their dispositions, however, all were voluntary and acknowledged the existence of a Supreme Being, and many integrated mystical rituals to consecrate new members and convey discreet means of establishing recognition with kindred others. The appeal of fraternalism in all its forms rose markedly during the latter part of the 19th century, as with private associations generally. So pervasive were they in fact, that scholars estimate by 1900, one quarter to one half of the country’s adult white male population claimed membership in at least one of almost 500 fraternal societies active at the time. Cohort membership rates were consistent. Of the 61 cohort officers documented, just over 40% belonged to one or more of these secret societies, so called for their tendency to shield their practices, if not always their membership, from public view. Memberships in Masonic Lodges or college Greek-letter fraternities were by far the most frequently encountered, which together formed the elite end of the fraternal spectrum. In either of these, men typically entered at an

early and impressionable age, thus making for strong, lasting bonds and durably conforming outlooks. Each are discussed in turn, below.

5.4.5 Freemasonry

Speculative Freemasonry was the single largest fraternal undertaking in the United States from the Civil War until at least the 1930s. Alternatively called ‘the Craft,’ the order arrived in North America from England in the early 18th century and was spread largely through the colonists’ interactions with military lodges in British Army regiments. Its character has changed in somewhat subtle ways since then, but Freemasonry might best have been described as a social refuge for men adhering to a philosophy incorporating Protestant virtues of charity, honesty, sobriety, thrift, temperance, piety, and industry, the object of which was self-improvement, mutual protection, and the betterment of society. In its most elementary form, Masons met regularly as a so-called blue lodge led by a worshipful master to practice the three fundamental degrees of membership: Entered Apprentice, Fellowcraft, and Master Mason. Acceptable candidates swore an oath to secrecy, agreed not to discuss politics or religion in the lodge, and promised to submit to Masonic obligations, especially to render appropriate aid to brother Masons. In exchange, initiates received instruction in the secret signs and esoteric knowledge to establish recognition with Masons outside their own lodge. Each blue lodge fell in turn under the jurisdiction of a grand lodge organized along state lines and presided over by a grand master. Grand lodges held the power to charter new lodges or sanction ones that had strayed in order to ensure the authentic reproduction of Masonic practice, and thus could investigate, try, or expel brothers who had violated their oaths or obligations.

---


In principle any freeborn man could become a Freemason so long as they were 21 years of age, physically sound, believed in God, and lived a moral life; in practice, however, lodges usually formed along, and thus reinforced, existing demographic and social divisions. More especially, the Craft was not for the poor, even if it had become less outwardly patrician in character since the 18th century. In addition to a lodge’s peculiar social or moral reservations about any candidate, upholding one’s fraternal obligations required means. Members paid dues and procured special regalia and identification badges, known as jewels, the costs of which increased with every degree or position of responsibility. Because the lodge functioned partly as a friendly society, brothers also were obliged to contribute to the potential relief of fellow Masons and their families, doubtless at scales commensurate to local economic conditions. To expand their prestige, Master Masons with even greater means could join appendant orders, like the York Rite or Scottish Rite, each with their own subordinate bodies and degree structures, provided they remained in good standing with the ‘mother lodge’ wherein they were raised. The upshot was that 19th-century lodges typically reflected the higher end of their host community’s socio-economic profile.

In sum, to enter a local lodge was to enroll in a highly regulated trust network of influential men adhering to a common ethic who were at once instantly recognizable and obligated to one another as brothers, and one that potentially extended well beyond one’s family and locality. The portability of the social capital generated through Masonic affiliation had proved so attractive with provincial elites in the Early Republic that by 1800 as many as 18,000 American men – maybe 1.5% of the eligible population – had formed over 350 lodges.
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across the country. Suspicions about the order’s objectives and a resulting political backlash did bring about a steep decline in membership during the late 1820s and 1830s. However, the hunt for social stability in the face of heightened immigration and urbanization quickly revitalized the fraternity, so that by 1860 some 5,000 lodges catered to around 200,000 Masons, accounting for about 3.75% of the country’s adult white male population. By the time the 1884 cohort received their commissions participation had about doubled, to around 6% of native-born white men.

The number of Masons in the cohort was actually much higher than in the general population: at least 13 of these officers, or 21%, had been raised in various lodges across the country. That total may have been higher still, as some Masons adhered to the virtue of silent circumspection more so than others, even unto death. For instance, Captain Robert Houston Anderson, Jr.’s obituary in The Atlanta Constitution made no mention of his being a Mason after he died of pneumonia in the Philippines in 1901. Instead, the only public trace of his membership were his initials fashioned in the shape of the Masonic square and compasses on his headstone in a Georgia cemetery. Also, young men like Anderson oftentimes followed their fathers into the Craft, as had Waldo Ayer, Harry Hawthorne, William Sibert, and Abraham Buffington. That four others – Captain Everett E. Benjamin, Lieutenant James T. Anderson, Lieutenant Charles L. Corthell, and Brigadier General Wilds P. Richardson – grew

---
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up in Masonic households presents a strong possibility that proof of their membership only awaits its discovery in the records of some local lodge.\textsuperscript{192}

The high percentage of Masons in the cohort was hardly extraordinary, especially considering the Craft found its greatest following amongst the very same provincial elite groups overrepresented in the officer corps, itself. What’s more, the presence of Masons in the army officer corps had actually been quite common since the War of Independence, when 10 military or ‘travelling lodges’ met the fraternal needs of Continental Army regiments in the field.\textsuperscript{193} Historian Steven C. Bullock, one of the few to have put a number to it, found that hundreds of Masons served as officers in the Continental Army, including 42\% of its generals. The attraction, according to Bullock, was that Freemasonry’s practical Christian ethic made a sincere focal point on which dislocated provincial elites thrust together within the army’s hierarchy could build genuine trust with one another and foster the esprit de corps needed to win the war.\textsuperscript{194} After the war, former Continental officers helped the Craft expand to communities in the newly opened frontier, where lodges became outlets for more cosmopolitan views underlying the nation’s emerging symbolic order.\textsuperscript{195} We can only speculate on the number of Mason’s in the antebellum officer corps, as no comparable examination exists. Nevertheless, Freemasonry probably remained a similarly attractive harbor with Regular officers disconnected by distance from their families’ influence, and some may even have regarded it as a patriotic service tradition celebrating the example of their Revolutionary forbears. During the Civil War, though, Masons certainly served conspicuously on both sides, and Masonic jurisdictions, North and South, chartered more than 250 travelling lodges in
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Union and Confederate regiments.196 This meant that possibly tens of thousands of Masons served under arms in these mostly volunteer armies. Long after the war Masons continued to populate the officer ranks at comparable rates that surely paced the fraternity’s rise, and probably even its eventual decline, within civilian society.

Like their British and Revolutionary forebears, late-19th century American army officers were not merely consumers of the order’s philosophy. They also were important proliferators. In 1888 at Fort Leavenworth, Kanas, army officers formed Hancock Lodge No. 311, which bore the double distinction of being the first stationary army lodge in the United States, as well as the only one located on a military reservation, which indeed it remains to the present day.197 Carl Reichmann was one of the first officers raised in Hancock, and soon after Alfred Sydney Frost and William Cullen Wren transferred their memberships, there.198 As the home of the army’s Infantry and Cavalry School, Leavenworth also was ideally situated to service the needs of travelling officers active in Masonic circles, and Wren helped charter the Scottish Rite’s Army Lodge of Perfection No.1 at the fort in 1890, which became popular with garrison officers.199 By 1912, a total of five army Masonic bodies met at Leavenworth, claiming more than 600 members.200 Army Masons also helped spread the Craft beyond Fort Leavenworth, most notably through the Masonic Sojourner Clubs started by officers serving in the Philippines in 1901 and 1907. Reminiscent of the traveling lodges of earlier wars, Sojourners helped to charter the Manila Lodge and several others.201 During the First World War, Philippines veterans reconstituted the Sojourners Club in Chicago to organize serving and

196 Halleran (2010), 50, 141-143, 146.
198 Information provided by Hancock Lodge No. 311. Email, Jose M. Marrero, Sr. to Author, 15 Apr 2020; “New Masonic Lodge,” Leavenworth Times (Leavenworth, KS: 20 May 1888), 5.
200 The blue lodge, Hancock No. 311, had 245 members. The figures include an undetermined number of NCOs who were members. “Army Lodge at Fort Leavenworth,” Masonic Token (Portland, ME: 15 Jan 1912), 147.
201 Royal Arch Masons, Transactions of the Grand Chapter, Royal Arch Masons of the State of Michigan (Charlotte, MI: Charlotte Republican, 1915), 5-12.
former army and navy officers who were Master Masons ‘for the purpose of supporting all patriotic aims and cultivating Masonic ideals,’ and in 1918 its members elected Carl Reichmann as the club’s first vice-president.²⁰² Reichmann later served as president of the Chicago chapter and helped charter the Sojourner chapter in Minneapolis as he approached his retirement from the army in 1924.²⁰³ On these foundations, the club incorporated in 1931 as a Masonic veterans patriotic society, the National Sojourners, Inc., which today operates over 160 chapters worldwide.²⁰⁴

Even for officers who were not Masons, it would have been difficult to escape the Craft’s subtler influences, both in the army and in society, at large. Most every newspaper in the day highlighted notices for lodge meetings and Masonic ceremonies, including the Army and Naval Journal and Gazette, then the army’s newspaper of record. Masonic structures and practices became the model for many of the period’s other voluntary associations, including the Military Order of the Carabao, a patriotic social club formed by veterans of the Philippine wars, whose comical titles for its officers – Grand Paramount Carabao, Patriarch of the Herd, Chief of Mud – resembled fraternal offices.²⁰⁵ The seriousness of Masonic oaths was so universally acknowledged that during an 1895 court martial at Fort Douglas, Utah, the court accepted as exculpatory evidence that the prosecution’s principal witness had previously ‘violated all Masonic ties in perjuring himself while testifying against a brother Mason.’²⁰⁶ The Craft’s association with reciprocating obligation was so widely known that General William Harding Carter instinctively compared Washington politics to ‘a fellowship and a freemasonry [sic]’ to illustrate its nature for the layman in a 1916 essay.²⁰⁷ And if that wasn’t enough, closer to
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home, several of the cohort married the daughters of prominent Freemasons, amongst them Charles Beckurts and Frederick Krug.\textsuperscript{208} In sum, the Craft was all around.

5.4.6 Greek-letter Fraternities

If building social capital was incidental to the Freemasons’ desire to build a better world, constructing advantageous networks was the very object of America’s Greek-letter fraternities. College social fraternities as we know them today got their start in the 1820s but traced their roots to the first Greek-letter fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa, which students of the College of William and Mary in Virginia formed in 1776 as clandestine debating society.\textsuperscript{209} Similar to the earlier institution, the antebellum variety styled themselves as literary societies in which members might polish important rhetorical skills, and they adopted Greek-letter names and secrecy to shield themselves against a periodically hostile faculty. Their larger objective, however, was to serve as family surrogate for students separated from the supporting structures of home while attending school, and to foster the loyal bonds each fraternity brother might rely upon to succeed in life later on.\textsuperscript{210}

To promote easy mingling and trust, Greek fraternities typically excluded all but students who possessed a habitus of masculine gentility characteristically cultivated in wealthier households, and thus selected each new pledge with the care traditionally reserved for adding members to a family, either by invitation or through the sponsorship of an avowed brother.\textsuperscript{211} Membership was for life; whereas well-off Masons might join multiple bodies to increase their standing, rarely did Greek fraternities permit their brothers to join another. Like


\textsuperscript{211} Ibid., 55, 57-67.
Masons, though, initiates vowed to honor their obligations to each other for life and to safeguard the veil of secrecy that was the source of their prestige. The model was quite the draw with higher-status students, and at the Civil War’s start, Greek-letter fraternities had chapters at 77 colleges in 25 states.²¹² By the century’s last quarter, these fraternities and their chapters had evolved into elaborate national networks maintained through alumni clubs, congresses, and publications listing the names, addresses, and accomplishments of alumni for easy recognition.²¹³

Greek-letter fraternities were obviously less populous than Masonic lodges because so few American men attended colleges in the period. In 1883, about 68,000 men claimed membership in 32 national fraternities with over 500 chapters, and just over 4,000 more belonged to local ones, which together accounted for about .2% of the country’s white male population of just over 43 million.²¹⁴ That said, their representation in positions of power was so steeply disproportionate that one contemporary writer fluent in all things fraternal, Albert Clark Stevens, styled them a ‘social and literary aristocracy,’ as browsing through any addition of Baird’s Manual of American College Fraternities would confirm.²¹⁵ Replete with elaborate descriptions and statistics of the country’s college fraternities, Baird’s read like a who’s who of Greeks prominently located in the nation’s most influential fields, from industry, finance, and publishing, to religion, law, and politics, and all points in between, including the army and the navy.

Fraternity men were disproportionately represented in the 1884 cohort, too: of the 29 officers who attended a civilian college or university as an undergraduate before their commissioning, 12 were known members of Greek-lettered social fraternities; astonishingly, a thirteenth, Waldo Ayer, pledged himself to Alpha Tau Omega at Ohio Wesleyan University.

²¹² Ibid., 26.
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while assigned there as military instructor in 1895.\footnote{Alpha Tau Delta, \textit{Catalog of the Alpha Tau Delta Fraternity, 1865-1897} (Wash., DC: Press of William Gettinger, 1897), 196.} Altogether, this accounted for about another 20% of those in the cohort known as privately affiliating. Not included here were the cohort’s two Phi Beta Kappa men. That fraternity had long since become a prestigious academic honor society by the time Jefferson Kean and Hiram Chittenden were inducted.\footnote{Albert N. Marquis, ed., \textit{Who’s Who in America}, vol. 6 (Chicago: A.N. Marquis Co., 1910), 1047; \textit{National Cyclopædia of American Biography}, vol. 17 (New York: James T. White & Co, 1920), 40.}

Naturally, most of the cohort’s fraternity men had either received their commissions by direct appointment or through West Point, as proportionately fewer of the 1884 rankers had attended college. At the individual level, opportunity and preference further affected participation. Many colleges, for instance, did not have chapters to join and some schools forbid them from forming altogether. The latter was the case at Joseph O’Neil’s alma mater, the University of Notre Dame, which still disallows fraternities. Money and relative social status would also have presented obstacles for some. This may have been the reason why ranker Joseph Maxfield never pledged one of Harvard’s many societies. Maxfield, whose father clerked for a merchants’ guild in Salem, attended school on a Bowditch Scholarship and thus was unlikely to have circulated with Harvard’s fraternity set, if indeed he was even so inclined.\footnote{Maxfield’s father clerked for the Salem Independent Protective Association. Harvard University, \textit{The Harvard University Catalog, 1878-1879} (Cambridge, MA: Charles W. Sever, 1878), 103; “U.S. City Directories, 1822-1895,” s.v. “Joseph Hill Maxfield” (b. ABT 1826), digital image available at Ancestry.com.}

The cohort represented ten different fraternities. Two officers were Kappa Alphas, after a fashion. Treadwell Moore belonged to the Kappa Alpha Society, the oldest of these modern fraternities, which got its start at Moore’s alma mater, Union College in Schenectady, New York, in 1825.\footnote{Kappa Alpha Society, \textit{Kappa Alpha Record, Centennial Edition, 1825-1925} (?, 1926), 118.} Virginia Military Institute graduate Charles Beckurts, meanwhile, pledged the Kappa Alpha Order, a wholly separate fraternity raised in the South after the Civil War ‘to foster and maintain the manners, customs and ideals of character and achievement, other than
"sectional," of the Southern people."²²⁰ Three others belonged to one the nation’s larger fraternities, Sigma Chi, whose brothers sometimes were styled ‘Sigs.’ In 1881, John Thornton Knight joined the fraternity’s Sigma Sigma Chapter at Hamden-Sidney College, and Jefferson Kean pledged the Psi Chapter while a student at the University of Virginia, in 1883.²²¹ The other Sig, Ernest Smith Robins pledged Purdue University’s Delta Delta Chapter whilst a cadet at West Point; though Smith briefly attended Purdue in 1879, he was unable to pledge until 1882, after the Indiana Supreme Court overturned the school’s ban on fraternities.²²² Cohort officers also represented Delta Tau Delta, Alpha Tau Omega, Phi Gamma Delta, Chi Phi, Phi Delta Theta, Phi Kappa Psi, and the especially secretive Chi Psi, to which Stephen Miller Foote belonged.²²³

As Baird’s pointed out, officers who had pledged fraternities were made brothers to some of the most influential men in America. When James Alfred Cole was initiated into Phi Kappa Psi’s Wisconsin Alpha Chapter in 1879, for example, that made him fraternity brothers with President Woodrow Wilson (Virginia Alpha ’79) and U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Tasker Howard Bliss (Pennsylvania Gamma ’70).²²⁴ Advertising such connections in volumes like Baird’s certainly added to a fraternity’s prestige and enhanced its draw with young prospects. However, a brother’s random connection to any single great man was not what made their memberships important social capital, as activating any mechanical advantages remained highly contingent on access, opportunity, and propriety. Instead, the capital advantage lay in the generation of larger networks of sympathetic relations on whom one might genuinely count for information, introductions, endorsements, or actual placements. Thus, when Ernest Smith
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Robins pledged Sigma Chi, his fraternal connection to Indiana Governor Isaac Pusey Gray was much less singular than his linkage to the 3,000 other Sigs who, in 1883, occupied an array of influential positions across the country.225

* * * * *

The 1884 cohort unmistakably were joiners. In quiet club rooms, patriot halls, and fraternal lodges, officers cultivated reputations and potentially useful social connections extending well beyond their families and military colleagues, yet within polite societies whose own boundaries reaffirmed the country’s complex socio-economic, racial, ethnic, and gendered divisions. More profoundly, realizing the profits of these association, either for oneself or one’s family, required submission to – and thus the reproduction of – the norms and more cosmopolitan sensibilities they generated. These included common understandings of hierarchy, honor, obligation, discretion, loyalty, patriotism, and much more, that transcended the otherwise superficial peculiarities differentiating civilian and military fields. Those who crossed the line or failed to measure up faced potentially stiff social consequences, not only within those privileged spaces, but also within the wider fields in which they circulated. As historian Francesca Carnevali put it, to be rejected or ejected from any of these communities ‘would have rippled through a man’s other networks, the social clubs, the Masonic lodges, the municipal administration, damaging him socially and politically.’226

5.5 Cohort Offspring: Reproducing Structural Advantage

Preferentialism, subconscious or otherwise, certainly remained one potential benefit of amassing social capital, and this is the subject of the concluding chapter. But by the 20th century the systemic use of naked favor to exploit personal or group privileges in public life had generally fallen into disrepute, as the destruction of private papers by so many public men suggests. This was, indeed, a reason why associating selectively remained vital for meeting
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social obligations. The highly contingent character of such mechanical advantage, though, meant that in the longer view, the potentially richest profits of the cohort’s sociality were actually far more structural in nature, manifested in the reproduction of corresponding advantages enjoyed by their offspring.

Consider here that for the cohort, successfully conforming to the mental and objective structures within the overlapping military and civilian circles to which they belonged ideally overlaid the more or less provincial habitus they had inherited from their parents. Thus revised, this habitus became, in turn, their offspring’s primary habitus, inherited through those ‘imperceptible apprenticeships from the family upbringing,’ as Bourdieu put it. It was by this psychosocial legacy that the cohort’s children, like their parents before them, were made vicarious insiders, recognizable as the sons and daughters of so-and-so to groups broadly sharing their dispositions. And as in the preceding generation, activating that recognition in conjunction with their family’s pooled economic and cultural resources, and in the proper field, helped these children enter, and thus reproduce, the very same privileged social groups from which they, themselves, had emerged, and from which the army traditionally recruited its officers. For this, the careers and marriages of these offspring, detailed in Appendix E and briefly summarized below, stand as evidence (Table 5-3).

Cohort marriages produced 106 children who lived to adulthood, 53 sons and 53 daughters. Compared to the population at large, cohort sons were exceptionally well educated, no matter their fathers’ commissioning source. Virtually all received college or university educations, counting the 18 who graduated from the U.S. Military Academy and one who had graduated from Annapolis. By comparison, only about 3-5% of American 18-24-year-olds enjoyed such experiences from 1910-1920, the decade during which most of the cohort’s children came of age. Overwhelmingly, cohort sons also converted their family advantages to achieve a social standing comparable to their fathers’, judging by their professions. Eighteen, or 35%, became career military officers, themselves, 12 of whom achieved general or flag rank,
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including both the sons of West Point Brigadier General Henry Delp Styer, Lieutenant General Wilhelm Delp Styer (USMA 1916) and Rear Admiral Charles Wilkes Styer (USNA 1918). This, by itself, suggests offspring enjoyed a superior predisposition to take up their father’s career paths, if given the opportunity. The remaining 34 settled into civilian careers as professionals, businessmen, or scientists, like the Harvard-educated physicist Joseph Pease Maxfield, the son of Harvard ranker, Major Joseph Maxfield. Ten others became academic or professional engineers. Colonel David DuBose Gaillard’s son, David, turned down a West Point nomination to earn his engineering degree at the prestigious Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Colonel Isaac Newton Lewis’ son, Richard, also received his engineering degree from MIT, and for a time helped with the manufacture of his father’s famous machineguns before starting his own company.²²⁸ Even amongst those in civilian careers, the call to duty was strong. Gaillard and Lewis joined 20 others who performed some reserve or wartime military service, mostly as officers, as did Leon S. Roudiez, Jr., who interrupted his education as a scholar of French literature to serve in intelligence during the Second World War.²²⁹

### Table 5-3: Occupations of Cohort Sons, by Commissioning Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMA (42/44)†</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life (5/5)</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankers (4/4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (51/53)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See Appendix E  
†Careers of two sons undetermined  
*Includes 1 x US Merchant Marine engineer officer


Similar to their brothers, cohort daughters were more likely to be college educated. Twenty-seven daughters, or just over half, attended or graduated from a post-secondary school, which represented an increase of about 30% over their mothers.²³⁰ Vassar, Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, and Syracuse University were amongst the schools they attended. Some went on to careers of their own. Colonel Alfred Frost’s eldest daughter, Florence Myrtle Frost, studied at Northwestern, the University of Wisconsin, and earned her doctorate in entomology at the University of California at Berkeley, before going on to a career in tropical medicine.²³¹ Dorothy Wood Simpson, daughter of Lieutenant Colonel Wendell Lee Simpson, became a well-known interior designer in San Francisco, and Dr. Lois Brooke Foote, daughter of Brigadier General Stephen Miller Foote, embarked on a career in medicine after graduating with honors from University of Pennsylvania, in 1921.²³² Several others were educators, like Charlotte Pardee. After graduating from Vassar, Charlotte went on to earn an MA at Columbia University, and for the next 20 years directed religious education at St. John’s Episcopal Church in North Adams, Massachusetts, the same church in which her parents, Major William Jenks Pardee and Mary Wilcoxson, had married in 1897.²³³

Of 53 cohort daughters, 38 married at least once (Table 5-4).²³⁴ Of these, 18 married career army or navy officers, five of whom reached general or flag rank. In fact, both of Colonel Hugh Gallagher’s daughters, Genevieve and Mary Lee, married future admirals: Vice Admiral Adolphus Watson (USNA ’99) and Vice Admiral John Greenslade (USNA ’98). For some, the army marriage market proved as profitable for them as it had for their parents before them. In 1914, Carl Reichmann was second-in-command of the 25th U.S. Infantry Regiment in Honolulu when he gave his eldest daughter Charlotte’s hand to one of his regiment’s

²³⁰ Snyder (1993), 65.
²³² Dorothy Wood Simpson, “Are You Modern?,” Women’s City Club Magazine 2, no. 8 (Sep 1928), 17; University of Pennsylvania, Proceedings of University Day University Councils Graduation Sermon and Commencement, 1921 (Philadelphia: Press of the Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1921), 81.
²³⁴ For five cohort daughters, career or marriage information remains unlocated.
subalterns, Lieutenant Livingston Watrous, the stepson of famed architect Richard Howland Hunt. And in 1916, Brigadier General George Cress’ son, James Bell Cress (USMA 1914), wed Eleanor Chittenden, the daughter of Brigadier General Hiram Chittenden, the elder Cress’ West Point classmate. Like both his father and father-in-law before him, James Cress would end his career as a general. The marriages made between cohort daughters and civilians were likewise endogamous, and attorneys, physicians, engineers, and business executives counted amongst their husbands. Examples include Laura Lewis, the eldest daughter of Colonel Isaac Lewis, who after graduating from Vassar in 1911 married MIT electrical engineer Richard Howland Ranger, a pioneer in radio facsimile transmission. In 1913, Major William Wren’s daughter, Mary, married Walter D. Idema, a Princetonian who went on to co-found Steelcase, Inc., a Michigan company that at one time was the world’s largest supplier of metal office equipment. And in 1923, Dr. Lois Foote married fellow University of Pennsylvania medical school graduate Dr. William Raney Stanford, a respected internist.

Marriages of cohort sons has not been examined in detail, though they likely were as endogamous as their sisters’ unions. (Table follows.)
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Finally, the data underscore the symbolic potential of the army commission to mediate class and status. Not only did commissioned service establish opportunities for old families to further concentrate hard-fought family positions, it also had potential to facilitate an intergenerational mobility for less substantial families. Recall that Henry Styer and Stephen Foote both claimed indigence on their acceptance to the academy. Yet, not only did both conclude their careers as general officers, their children entered highly successful, high-status careers of their own. We see this more obviously amongst the offspring of successful rankers, who started their adult lives at a level higher than that enjoyed by most of their fathers at the time of their enlistments. While no effort has as yet been made to rigorously examine their progeny’s pursuit of non-family social capital, anecdotal evidence suggests cohort offspring continued to interact with mutually recognizable social sets in ways that consciously and unconsciously extended to the succeeding generation the privileges they, themselves, had inherited.

5.6 Concluding Remarks

In civil-military relations, the peculiar American principal of civilian control did not originate in a document, a command, or an academic treatise. Instead, the principal arose organically, through countless intra-elite interactions that reflexively reproduced the mental and objective structures of mutually advantageous social relations on a huge scale. For the state,
these intentions reflected in exclusive commissioning practices that limited entry to men recognized as trustworthy according to their relatively high provincial status. For the individual, it reflected in efforts to acquire the needed capital for entry, and once gained to secure that position for themselves and their posterity through endogamous marriages and other potentially beneficial relationships, all the while avoiding socially damaging slights. In combination, these exchanges engendered a cosmopolitan civil-military mentalité incorporating a respect for duty and authority informed by a practical Christian ethic, norms of civility, and unifying patriotic narratives. In other words, by securing their place in the nation’s evolving social and symbolic order, the 1884 cohort, like those before them, helped to reproduce the very order from which they and their families profited.

The final chapter concludes this thesis at the individual level by examining the mechanical advantages and limitations of social capital, with a special focus on the circumstances and disposal of the U.S. Senate’s investigation of the army’s most senior German-born officer, Colonel Carl Reichmann, who in 1917 stood accused of disloyalty for his remarks about the government’s decision to go to war against Germany.
CHAPTER 6
‘Reichmann Known Here:’
The Soldier as the State

6.1 Introduction

Fundamentally, the officer’s commission is a grant of symbolic trust established through mutual recognition. At the Founding, this trust was seated in the logic of elite sociality, which over several generations became normalized in corresponding bureaucratic practices used to screen candidates according to cultural affinities. By either means, the high bar to a commission privileged older families with deeper investments in community, which made possible the proliferation of reaffirming norms and outlooks. By the same token, maintaining the officer corps’ exclusivity upheld the commission’s attractiveness with acceptable newcomers willing to conform to the field’s dispositions in exchange for membership in an incipient state nobility. The upshot was that despite dynasticism’s fading legitimacy, realizing the structural rewards for faithful service continued to manifest in the coextensive reproduction of a dominant social and symbolic order, underwritten by the state’s strengthening monopoly over the coercive instrument.

This thesis has charted this evolution. It has done so at the conceptual level, and by narrating through a Bourdieusian lens the formalizing of American commissioning practices which occurred throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries. It also has focused on the officers, themselves, documenting how bureaucratic selection practices largely sustained the corps’ privileged provincial origins, even as they made possible some access for cultivated men with less notable backgrounds. The most recent chapter delved even more deeply into the social lives of these officers to illustrate how vitally important elite sociality still remained for engendering norms and congenial recognition with vicarious elite communities, and which if activated tended to extend the structural advantages enjoyed by those officers and their families. In sum, this presentation has thus far shown that army officers and their families were anything but isolated from society. Indeed, it has shown they were members of the very same social groups who led the nation’s affairs, root and branch.
Bourdieu’s concept of social capital has figured greatly in this discussion, and this final chapter continues the thread at the individual level. It does so by first discussing how early 20th century structural reforms designed to improve military effectiveness also engendered norms which constrained, but did not eliminate, the ways an officer might mobilize social capital for career preferment. What follows is a case study in the creation and use of social capital centered on the life and career of the Regular Army’s most senior German-born officer in 1917, Colonel Carl Reichmann, and which culminates in the U.S. Senate’s disposal of allegations he was disloyal. While the senators ultimately cleared Reichmann, they refused to confirm his nomination to brigadier general and barred him from serving overseas. Stranger still, the army afterward reassigned him to coordinate counter-subversive operations in Chicago, headquarters to one of the nation’s most sensitive military districts. This chapter argues that while Reichmann’s promotion and deployment to Europe had become politically untenable, the social capital he consciously amassed over the course of a long and distinguished career compurgated damaging testimony and spared him from far harsher penalties which might have been meted out to an ordinary citizen. As such, his reassignment to important intelligence duties partially rewarded his considerable professional experience and talents for the work. Despite this seeming incongruity, it was unlikely that Reichmann’s judges, both civilian and military, would have extended such trust in the heated wartime environment had they not shared with him a recognizable habitus. This chapter thus concludes that Colonel Reichmann received preferential treatment because, despite his German birth, he had come to personify the American security state at a time when establishment elites were closing ranks to face down an existential threat to the country’s social and political order.

6.2 The Rules of the Game

Recall that Bourdieu conceived social capital as a power-augmenting resource based in mutual recognition that inhered in groups and individuals as a consequence of building
homophilous relationships. The potential profits of social capital were at once tangible, as in the exchange of obligations, as well as symbolic, in that the sum of one’s honorable associations might stand in silent proxy for reputation. Of these, it is that first aspect of social capital, that of facilitating crude mechanical advantages, that typically comes to mind. We observed this in the way men like Powhatan Clarke and David Gaillard activated their relations to secure seats in the academy, and in virtually every man who received their commission directly from the president. Notable here were William Wren and Everett Benjamin, both of whom received direct commissions despite their having earlier failed the academy course. Extended relations also proved beneficial for some rankers. The army’s chief meteorologist, Clinton Abbe, likely recruited Joseph Maxfield for the Signal Corps on the strength of their shared Harvard ties, and John Park Finley partly owed his selection from the ranks to the influence of his wife Julia’s uncle, Brevet Brigadier General Hiram Berdan, the famous leader of Union sharpshooters during the Civil War, who was himself a fellow Michigander. Once in the army, some in the cohort continued to rely on network capital to secure preferred postings or temporary promotions made available by wartime necessities. Although still lieutenants, DeRosey Cabell and Alfred Frost both pulsed family or friends to win temporary promotions as senior officers leading Arkansas and South Dakota Volunteers during the Spanish-American War, over War Department objections. In effect, the social capital they accrued outside the Regular Army’s structures helped Cabell and Frost steal a march on their federal peers, many of whom went to war as their juniors.

Throughout the late 19th century, little precluded these dynastic forays into the military field. In fact, the expectations that connection yielded advantage were so transparently obvious that little effort was taken to disguise the action of personal networks, despite the ballyhoos over corruption and cronyism they increasingly provoked. Quite the opposite was true. Many
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army officers bandied their connections to get ahead, and some shamelessly recorded as much in their memoirs. Hugh Lenox Scott (USMA ’76), the army’s chief of staff at the beginning of the war with Germany, openly credited the strength of his Princeton family’s ties for his appointment to West Point, his posting to the cavalry, and even his selection by President Woodrow Wilson to lead the army. Indeed, officers less socially endowed than General Scott would not have gone to such great lengths to collect endorsements from influential men, in and out of uniform, if they truly believed such influence was inconsequential, as countless soldiers’ official files and personal papers attest. Moreover, institutions like the U.S. Military Academy would not have recorded their cadets’ social connections if their administrators did not believe they carried weight.

Mobilizing social capital, however, remained subject to the rules, practices, and relationships which had made its accumulation possible in the first place, and over the cohort’s service these conditions began to change. Influence peddling was becoming less tolerated within the army as reform-minded officers and their civilian allies sought to blunt political incursions into the service’s administration. Early on, this included the bureaucratic selection practices that increasingly normalized officer accessions, as already discussed at length. Structural reforms made after 1901 further stemmed interventions in what was becoming more widely acknowledged as a discreet professional military jurisdiction, in much the same way as the fields of law, medicine, and engineering were by then regarded. Restructurings included the consolidation of army command and staff functions; the expansion of professional military education; the adoption of boards to determine assignments, promotions, and retirements; and the increase in federal authority over the militia. Together, the new practices these reforms
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generated became the regulatory top cover that army administrators might legitimately employ to resist the interference of provincial politicos in the service’s internal affairs, which consequently aided the further consolidation of the federal government’s monopoly on the coercive instrument.

For officers seeking preferment, these new bureaucratic selection practices also engendered new norms that reframed string-pulling as unprofessional conduct, as Carl Reichmann discovered to his great frustration. In early 1906, after an army board did not select him for the new General Staff, then-Captain Reichmann mobilized his connections in hopes of forcing the issue. These included Brooklyn Congressman George Ernest Waldo, whom he likely recruited through the solon’s more famous cousin, then-New York Deputy Police Commissioner Rhinelander Waldo; Rhinelander and Reichmann had served together in the same regiment in the Philippines and in Washington State. Although Reichmann’s attempts to buck departmental procedure drew the ire of Secretary of War William Howard Taft, he survived the indiscretion on the strength of his service record. And when Reichmann eventually was selected for the staff in 1911, it was a board of senior officers and the army’s chief of staff, Major General Leonard Wood, who placed his name at the top of the selection list, and not his political connections. 

---


The army’s hardening bureaucracy was steadily blunting dynastic interventions, and by America’s entry in the First World War it had become abundantly clear within the officer corps that mobilizing social capital from outside the service counted amongst ‘the forbidden methods’ to pursue preferment. Even so, officers still believed they could rely on the service’s iron respect for seniority, and so when Washington began to mobilize its provisional National Army in the summer of 1917, Regular officers firmly expected the army would reward their decades of patience with a general’s star. This had, after all, been the custom in every previous war, when the country’s smallish standing army faced the need to expand rapidly, and long-service Regulars would earn promotions to lead emergency troops. The General Staff, however, thoroughly dashed those expectations, almost from the outset.

To meet the expanding army’s need for general officers, army Assistant Chief of Staff Major General Tasker Bliss convened a promotion board in July that would consider input from General John Pershing, the American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) commander, before recommending nominations to the president. After observing the difficult conditions facing the British and French armies at the front, Pershing urged the board to select for active service only experienced commanders who were ‘in full mental and physical vigor,’ stressing that few allied division commanders were older than 45 years. ‘We have too much at stake,’ Pershing cautioned, ‘to risk inefficiency through mental or physical defects.’ The general also advocated early merit-based promotions for officers in more junior grades to increase the pool of younger talent eligible for general officer appointments, regardless of branch specialty. The premium Pershing placed on vigor meant, of course, the most senior colonels stood the greatest
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11 Line officers received promotions by seniority within their assigned regiment until 1911, after which promotions were based on their army seniority. See, William Carey Brown, *Abstract of the Military Record of Colonel William Carey Brown, USA Retired* (n.p.: 1919), 25-27.
12 Memo, Tasker H. Bliss to Adjutant General, 12 Jul 1917, Box 241, Tasker Howard Bliss Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, hereafter THB.
14 Cable No. 80-S, Pershing to AGWAR, 03 Aug 1917, JGH.
risk of being passed by, contrary to established practice. Bliss and the board agreed, and by the middle of August they recommended President Wilson nominate some 200 officers according to their ‘zeal, energy, [and] marked ability,’ rather than their length of service.\textsuperscript{15} Eleven of those selected were commissioned in 1884, including Colonel Carl Reichmann, who was chosen over 24 more senior infantry officers, despite being 57 years old.\textsuperscript{16}

The ink had barely dried on the selection lists when protests from passed-over officers and their associates began bombarding the General Staff and War Department.\textsuperscript{17} In their requests for reconsideration, some disappointed officers, like the 1884 cohort ranker Leon Roudiez and the West Pointer DeRosey Cabell, even hoped to score points by emphasizing they had not enlisted outside assistance from influential friends or family.\textsuperscript{18} For its part, the Regular Army was broadly successful in holding the line against political interference in promotion and assignment decisions, thanks in large measure to the cooperation between General Bliss and Secretary of War Newton Baker. Accelerated by wartime necessity, promotion and assignment decisions would henceforth reflect more the officers’ career experiences and the needs of the army, as evaluated by their uniformed superiors, and not their political allies. In other words, the rules of the game had changed. But while the army’s structural changes diminished the potential mechanical profits from an officer’s external relations, they had not altogether invalidated the symbolic value or even the necessity of an officer amassing social capital, within and without the service. Bear in mind the officer corps did not exist in a bubble, as shown, and that civilians and the military habitually interacted throughout the levels of social organization. Thus, building reputable families and extending respectable associations outside the army, while also appreciating the military field’s evolving

\textsuperscript{15} Tasker H. Bliss to SECWAR, 20 Aug 1917, Box 218, THB. For promotion list see, “Two Hundred Generals Appointed by Wilson,” \textit{Los Angeles Times} (15 Aug 1917), 2.

\textsuperscript{16} Estimate calculated from U.S. Adjutant General, \textit{Official Army Register for 1916} (Wash., DC: GPO, 1915), 639, the last register published until 1918.

\textsuperscript{17} For a large sampling of petitions see, Box 225, THB; Container 29, HLS.

\textsuperscript{18} Telegram, Leon S. Roudiez to Tasker H. Bliss, 18 Aug 1917, Box 218, THB; Letter, DRC Cabell to Tasker H. Bliss, 04 Sep 1917, Box 219, THB; Letter, Tasker H. Bliss to DRC Cabell, 25 Sep 1917, Box 220, THB.
structural and normative limitations, might still multiply the good feelings for an efficient officer’s standing and character in far subtler ways that made the differences between favoritism and merit – between sociability and professionalism – indiscernible. Simply put, good officers were still known in part by the company they kept. This surely was the case in the U.S. Senate’s investigation of Colonel Carl Reichmann in 1917, when the accused’s social capital compurgated otherwise damaging testimonial evidence.

6.3 The Tea Table Tempest

Reichmann’s selection for brigadier general was quite a coup, especially in light of his start as a private soldier and advancing age. Of the 11 men in his cohort raised from the ranks, he was one of only three who remained in service by 1917, and he was the only one nominated for a star. Once the Senate confirmed his promotion, Reichmann was to train a new infantry brigade and lead it to France. In the meantime, Secretary of War Newton Baker appointed him to chair a board convening in Chicago to examine interpreters for the U.S. Army in Europe. It seemed that Reichmann was at the top of his game.

Unhappily, not all the news that summer was good news. On 14 August, only days after being nominated for promotion, Senator Miles Poindexter sent a letter to Secretary Baker accusing Reichmann of making statements sympathetic to Germany. The Oregon Republican wrote that he acted on behalf of Amanda Anderson, an American citizen residing in British Columbia, who alleged that in the course of an intimate tea at a Chicago hotel, the colonel had favorably compared German tactics to Union Army methods employed during the Civil War; that he had expressed approval of Germany’s submarine warfare policy; and that he viewed Germany’s Zeppelin bombing raids over England as lawful, which by extension made the killing of civilians legitimate. More alarming still, Mrs. Anderson claimed Reichmann opposed the new conscription law, which he further predicted would incite a popular rebellion.

19 Memo, Adjutant General, 12 Aug 1917, Box 217, THB.
Convinced of Reichmann’s treason, Poindexter urged Baker to take ‘proper action through proper military channels,’ emphasizing that ‘many humble citizens have been arrested and jailed for far less.’

Poindexter’s allusion to a crackdown on speech was no exaggeration. While many Americans shared Reichmann’s alleged doubts about the war, the public’s tolerance for dissenting views had already begun to cool in 1915, with the Lusitania’s sinking by a German submarine. That mood rapidly turned hostile after Congress declared war against Germany in April 1917, which unleashed a super-patriotism reflecting as much the newfound enthusiasm for the coming conflict as it did the country’s profound social anxieties. Chronic labor unrest and the discovery of German plots to suborn the country’s large foreign-born population played to very real concerns that disillusioned immigrant communities posed significant threats to the established social order. The enormous prospect of mobilizing the country and its economy for war had only magnified these fears, especially amongst those in the country’s political establishment, who received President Wilson’s calls to public vigilance as a greenlight to suppression. Politicos at all levels and across party lines responded almost at once with calls to stamp out dissenting speech, and soon followed with legislation. The centerpiece was the federal Espionage Act. Passed by Congress that June, the law restricted speech intended to
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disaffect Americans from the war effort, and authorized heavy fines and lengthy prison terms for violators.\textsuperscript{25} In fact, just days before Poindexter leveled his accusations, authorities in Newark, New Jersey, invoked the act to arrest and later sentence to five years imprisonment Frederick Kraft, an aspiring socialist politician, for uttering on a street corner pro-German comments like those credited to Reichmann.\textsuperscript{26} Inhabitants of the nation’s higher circles proved particularly zealous, evinced days later when a gathering of New York’s ultra-select Union League Club loudly cheered former Secretary of War Elihu Root’s declaration that German sympathizers ‘ought to be taken out at sunrise…and shot for treason.’\textsuperscript{27} The possible consequences even of idle chat had swiftly turned grave, regardless of one’s position in the social order. That included Reichmann, who was anything but a humble citizen, as Senator Poindexter had pointed out.

\textbf{6.4 Earning Everything in Sight}

In truth, Colonel Carl Reichmann was a fully vested member of the American state nobility. By August 1917, he had served close to four decades in federal service, and had become highly regarded in Washington circles as both an able field soldier and military intellectual. That Reichmann, an adult émigré and former enlisted man, should achieve such recognition seems even more extraordinary for the time when bearing in mind how the pathway to commissioned service had narrowed, and how the distrust of immigrant communities had deepened since he first entered the army in 1881. Moreover, he was born a German.


\textsuperscript{27} “Elihu Root Strikes Blow at Pro-German Newspapers,” \textit{Times-Tribune} (Scranton, PA: 16 Aug 1917), 14.
His Americanized handle was short for Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Reichmann, and he was born in 1859 in Unterböhningen, a village southeast of Stuttgart in the Kingdom of Württemberg. As the son of a clergyman, Carl Reichmann’s provincial elite status was virtually indistinguishable from the typical West Pointer, or indeed from many others in his cohort, apart from his foreign birth. The Reichmanns were locally prominent, and though Pastor Reichmann had died when Carl was still a boy, the widow Reichmann continued to cultivate her son in the fashion typical of higher status German families, possibly with the help from extended relations. Carl trained in music, enjoyed a rigorous classical education at the local Gymnasium, and on passing his qualifying Abitur entered the prestigious University of Tübingen to study medicine. While at school, Reichmann also began to make important social connections in his own right by joining Corps Borussia, an exclusive dueling fraternity which, in a fashion similar to its American analogs, bound together young men typically from wealthier families in lifelong loyal brotherhood.

Ordinarily, such an advantageous start in life would have entitled Reichmann to a correspondingly high position in German society as a professional, an academic, or a member of the civil service, had he not squandered it through youthful intemperance. While a hit with

28 “Auszug aus dem Tauf-Register,” Folder 1, CRP. Carl’s father was pastor at Steinenkirch when he died in 1873. See, “Reichmann, Karl Friedrich Philipp,” Württembergische Kirchengeschichte online at https://www.wkgo.de/wkgosrc/pfarrbuch/cms/index/12378 (accessed 01 Oct 2020).


his fraternity brothers, his fondness for strong beer, women, and dueling got the better of his studies, and after eight semesters Reichmann showed little progress towards finishing his degree.\textsuperscript{31} Frustrated, Frau Reichmann sent Carl to the University of Munich, and away from his fraternity, in an attempt to salvage her son’s future. Instead, he continued his ruinous spree until a cousin intervened and arranged Carl’s passage to the United States, in July 1881, to give him a fresh start.\textsuperscript{32} After he arrived in the States, however, Reichmann fared little better: unaccustomed to English and lacking the means or connections to smooth his way, he enlisted in the infantry in a fit of desperation so that he at least might eat.\textsuperscript{33}

After training in Ohio, Reichmann joined Company I, 20\textsuperscript{th} U.S. Infantry Regiment, at Fort Hays in Kansas. There, he thrived. For all his carelessness at university, the German’s perspicacity and verve doubtless made him a standout soldier in ranks typically beset by uneven discipline, poor education, and high desertion. After quickly mastering English – he already was accomplished in French, Latin, and Greek – Reichmann gained the eye of his commander, Captain Wheaton, and rose rapidly through the ranks to company top sergeant. Then in 1884, with fewer than three years in the ranks, Wheaton recommended Reichmann for a commission, which he received that year after passing his officer boards.\textsuperscript{34} Reassigned to the 24\textsuperscript{th} U.S. Infantry, he spent the next several years at Fort Sill in the Indian Territory and in Arizona, where he commanded a company of Indian Scouts, engaged in some light campaigning, and performed the full slate garrison duties usually expected of subalterns.\textsuperscript{35}

At Fort Sill, Reichmann made a lasting impression on at least one contemporary.


\textsuperscript{33} “Nachruf” (1938), 60. He enlisted in Chicago in Dec 1881.

\textsuperscript{34} “Adjutant General Order 98,” (07 Aug 1884), Folder 1, CRP.

Although Charles Judson Crane (USMA ’77) found the newly minted lieutenant a tad green, the future infantry colonel was impressed by his ‘stubborn determination, and close application to duty.’ ‘Reichmann,’ Crane remarked, ‘will earn everything in sight.’ But while Lieutenant Reichmann’s performance was impressive, the monotony of life on a closing frontier surely must have chafed his restless temperament. A welcomed interval came in the late 1880s when he was sent to study at the Infantry and Cavalry School at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and it was there he had the good fortune to enter the orbit of Captain Arthur L. Wagner (USMA ’75), one of his instructors. Wagner was then a luminary amongst army reformers inspired by German innovations in tactics, organization, and military education, and he found in Reichmann a brilliant and enthusiastic collaborator. Wagner thus arranged for his former pupil’s secondment, first to the school as an assistant instructor, and afterwards to the Adjutant General’s Office (AGO) in Washington, where the lieutenant worked for him in the Military Intelligence Division (MID) translating important German military treatises, including ones authored by Prince Kraft zu Hohenlohe-Ingelfingen and Fritz Hoenig. These assignments occupied Reichmann for the better part of the 1890s and unlocked talents marking him as a rising member of the army’s intelligentsia, placing him in the same company with William Harding Carter, Tasker Bliss, and Theodor Schwan.

Working in the AGO must have been a heady experience for Reichmann. For starters, the obvious urban comforts made a posting to the nation’s capital easily more desirable than life in a frontier garrison. Access, however, was the bigger prize. Before the advent of the General Staff, the AGO was the War Department’s nerve center. Officers assigned to its
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36 Crane (1923), 164.


39 Clark (2017), 231.
Washington offices thus enjoyed privileged access to the highest civil-military circles, up to the president, while those assigned in the field served as a commander’s principal assistant.\textsuperscript{40} That a competent officer might develop career-making connections in the AGO was a possibility not lost on Reichmann, and for him the most important of these became Lieutenant Colonel Theodor Schwan, with whom he had much in common. Like Reichmann, Schwan was the son of a German clergyman. Born in Hanover, he had emigrated to the United States in 1857, enlisted in the infantry, and earned a commission from the ranks during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{41} In the years since, Schwan became widely known as a soldier-scholar, and he had just prepared a far-reaching study on the German army which would influence the creation of the U.S. Army General Staff in 1903.\textsuperscript{42} Naturally, Schwan sympathized with his ambitious young countryman, and as a senior assistant in the AGO he was wonderfully positioned to become a sort of professional Godfather to Reichmann, and he did just that.

With Schwan’s help, Reichmann soon embarked on a series of important postings which kept him squarely in the eye of the army’s senior leadership, beginning with his assignment in 1898 as an assistant adjutant in the Second Army Corps during the runup for the war against Spain.\textsuperscript{43} From there, he deployed twice to the Philippines, where he worked on high-level staffs and was decorated for gallantry in action against Insurrectos, and then on to Cuba as a district intelligence officer during the island’s pacification in 1906.\textsuperscript{44} In between these more conventional postings, Reichmann twice was handpicked for special duty as an attaché. In 1900, Major General Nelson Miles, the army’s commanding general, sent him to
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\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 407; Albert F. Gleim, ed., \textit{War Department Gallantry Citations for Pre-WWI Service} (Arlington, VA: Planchet Press, 1986), 32.
observe the Boer forces during the Second Anglo-Boer War, where in the course of his duties he became close to the famed correspondent Richard Harding Davis and U.S. Consul Adelbert Hay, son of Secretary of State John Hay.\(^{45}\) Then again, in 1904, he joined the select teams formed to observe the Russo-Japanese War, and for five months followed the Russian 1\(^{st}\) Siberian Corps in Manchuria, a service for which the Czar later decorated him in appreciation with the Order of St. Stanislaus.\(^{46}\) In both missions, Reichmann truly earned his chops as an analyst of military tactics and technology, and he wasted little time in parlaying his expertise into lectures and journal articles to burnish his professional credentials within the army and with the public.\(^{47}\)

Wagner and Schwan created opportunities for Reichmann to demonstrate his abilities at higher levels than junior officers typically enjoyed, and his performance was repaid in the trust of his superiors and in increasing levels of responsibility. However, not all of Reichmann’s beneficial relations were military. Early on, while still a private soldier, he began cultivating ties amongst the Germans at Leavenworth, who instantly recognized their countryman by his telltale dueling scars, or Schmisse, as belonging to an important family.\(^{48}\)


\(^{48}\) “Captain Reichmann With Boers,” *Leavenworth Weekly Times* (11 Jan 1900), 4.
There, he circulated with fellow expatriate Württembergers, like the wagon makers Frederick Barth and Gottlieb Kuhn, and became lifelong friends with Adolf Lange, a prominent pharmacist from Dresden who on occasion extolled or defended Reichmann’s exploits in the pages of the widely subscribed *Leavenworth Times*. In 1900, for instance, Lange shared a letter from Reichmann with the *Times* after a *Daily Mail* correspondent falsely accused his friend of being the architect of the British defeat at Korn Spruit in the Orange Free State, a violation of diplomatic protocol subject to court martial. Reichmann had done no such thing, and actually spent much of the battle tending to a Dutch attaché, Lieutenant Nix, who was mortally injured in the British shelling, a fact further confirmed by Consul Hay. Lange would take to the papers again defend his friend in 1917.

Reichmann naturally mixed with German immigrants wherever his assignments took him. But it was the deeply interwoven livelihoods of the townspeople and the nearby garrison that made his Leavenworth relations so singular. As the army’s intellectual home, virtually every officer, regardless of specialty, might pass through Leavenworth at least once during their careers, which meant the sincere connections Reichmann fostered with men like Adolf Lange had the potential to build vicarious recognition with later cohorts of younger officers Reichmann might not ordinarily encounter. Moreover, Leavenworth was an important political center, to the effect the 1st Kansas Congressional District to which it belonged produced many West Point graduates with whom Reichmann later served. These included the sons of Barth and Kuhn. Brigadier General Charles H. Barth (USMA ‘81), another of Arthur Wagner’s acolytes


50 Korn Spruit was also known as ‘Sanaa’s Post.’ “The American Attaché with the Boers,” *Press* (Christchurch, NZ: 26 May 1900), 7.


and a translator of German military works, was well acquainted with Reichmann. So, too, was Major General Joseph E. Kuhn (USMA ’85), who sat on Reichmann’s promotion board in 1917. Thus, Leavenworth, like Washington, became an important node in Reichmann’s social network.

Reichman claimed he preferred to spend his private time in study and his money on books rather than on the high life. But when it came to hobnobbing, he actually was one of the 1884 commissioning cohort’s more emphatic joiners. In addition to the obligatory membership in the Army and Navy Club of Washington, Reichmann was an early Carabao, and once while on recruiting duty in West Virginia was made an honorary member of the Wheeling Twilight Club, where he mixed with the city’s worthies, many of whom warmly recalled his fondness for storytelling and beer. Above all, though, it was fraternalism that held a special attraction for him. Fraternal life had great potential to recreate family-like ties based in a mutually binding ethic and shared experiences, making it a quite meaningful form of association for wayfarers and others dislocated from the support of home life, like Reichmann. Thus, whenever possible, he attended Stateside gatherings of Corps Borussia, and he kept in correspondence with his fraternity brothers back in Germany. He was also a very active Freemason. Not only was he an early member of Fort Leavenworth’s Hancock Lodge, he had helped to organize Masonic bodies such as the National Sojourners, a patriotic group which in later life he served as vice president.

Family, of course, is typically the most mutually supportive form of association. Although separated from his German family, he joined himself to a prosperous American
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family in 1890 when he married Anne Vanderlip, whom he had met through her sister, Fanny, the wife of a brother officer at Fort Sill. Daisy, as she was called, was the daughter of a respected judge in Upstate New York, and their marriage logically associated Reichmann with the Vanderlip clan’s extended social and political network.\(^\text{59}\) Easily, the most important of these connections ran through Daisy’s older brother, John Russell Vanderlip, a corporate attorney representing powerful mining interests in Minnesota’s Iron Range, and his wife, Ethel Morrison Vanderlip, who belonged to one of Minneapolis’ pioneer business and political families.\(^\text{60}\) The Vanderlips were thus well-positioned and stunningly rich, to boot.\(^\text{61}\) With these resources they supported Reichmann’s official foreign travel in a period when the army expected its attachés to bridge their expenses from private assets, and they backed him to the hilt in 1917.\(^\text{62}\)

Apart from this occasional financial support, there is no evidence Reichmann mobilized his extended social network for career advancement before 1906, when as a captain he clumsily recruited the Waldos and others in that failed bid to secure a position on the General Staff. The maneuver seemed out of place for Reichmann, and appeared driven by the sense his once fast track had slowed after his two key patrons, Schwan and Wagner, left the stage: Schwan retired from the army in 1901 and Wagner died unexpectedly, in 1905. To make matters worse, before Wagner died he cautioned Reichmann that some on the staff were biased against him on account of his German birth, heightening his anxiety.\(^\text{63}\) Then early in 1906, a


\(^{61}\) When Ethel Vanderlip died in 1921, she left an estate valued at more than $900,000, or some $14.5 millions today. See, “Minneapolis,” *Los Angeles Times* (28 Sep 1922), 7.
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well-meaning friend and Brooklyn brewer, Henry Claus, all but confirmed these fears when he reported hearing secondhand that the staff’s senior infantry officer acknowledged that Reichmann’s German birth barred his appointment, allegedly because another unnamed German-born officer had in some vague way betrayed the government’s confidence. In a lengthy response to Claus, Reichmann wrote despairingly of the staff’s suspicions, prompting him to recall past episodes of soft bigotry. He closed by imploring the brewer not to share his letter to avoid the scandal that would surely follow, but to no avail. By November, the German-language *New York Staats-Zeitung* eagerly published the letter for its own political ends, courtesy of Claus. Picked up and reprinted in English and German papers across the country, Major General J. Franklin Bell, the U.S. Army Chief of Staff, recalled Captain Reichmann from Cuba to explain.

The affair made sensational reading for a few months and his reputation certainly took a brief hit from fellow officers embarrassed by the negative publicity. Still, nothing more serious came of it. Reichmann denied colluding with Claus and when the brewer admitted publicly that he alone had passed the letter to the papers, General Bell chalked the affair up to poor judgement. After all, it seems improbable that Reichmann should have risked his career to score a coup in the German press when he had already been warned off by Secretary Taft the previous spring. Furthermore, airing such grievances in public had been a court martial offense since at least the Civil War, and Reichmann was nothing if not disciplined.

But what of the anti-German business? It was true that mounting distrust of Imperial

---
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Germany’s global aims and the steady rapprochement between the United States and Great Britain it engendered had dampened the former enthusiasm of American officers for all things Teutonic, as Reichmann painfully was aware. He was, after all, no ‘Anglomaniac,’ as he wrote Claus, and instead remained steadfastly suspicious of British ambitions, an opinion he freely shared, and one which likely grated some. Taken in time, however, Reichmann’s conviction that Jingoists on the staff were impeding his career seemed piteously shortsighted of him. As one anonymous general officer confided to a reporter, the army actually had treated Reichmann unusually well, and that his appointments as an attaché were proof of the army’s high confidence in his loyalty. Despite any changes in military attitudes towards Germany, it was more likely that his unyielding personality, and not his nativity, accounted for any demerits. While many found Reichmann a witty and boon companion in social settings, his doggedness in official settings could suggest the stereotype of Germanic solemnity fixated on order and improvement, not only his own, but also of those around him. Even Reichmann realized his assertiveness antagonized some native-born Americans. In sum, one either got on well with Carl Reichmann, or one did not.

In fact, if Reichmann had lost any traction at all it was deuced hard to tell. He was promoted to major in 1907 and late in General Bell’s tenure, in 1910, was selected to attend the U.S. Army War College. Finally, the coveted appointment to the General Staff followed in
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1911, which Reichmann credited to the patronage of Bell’s successor, Major General Leonard
Wood.76 Reichmann had known Wood for years and had served efficiently under the general in
the Philippines and in Cuba.77 Moreover, as practical soldiers and fellow Freemasons they got
on very well, professionally and socially. Their careers, however, were as different as chalk and
cheese. Wood had entered the army as a contract surgeon after graduating from Harvard in
1884, and earned his spurs against the Apaches in 1886, for which he later received a Medal of
Honor.78 From there he made his way to Washington where he served as personal physician to
Presidents Grover Cleveland and William McKinley. All that time in Washington’s highest
circles paid off handsomely, for as the country geared up for the war with Spain, Captain Wood
became a line officer, going from assistant surgeon to colonel of the 1st U.S. Volunteer Cavalry,
the famed ‘Rough Riders,’ with his close friend, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Theodore Roosevelt, by his side as lieutenant colonel. McKinley made the move permanent in
1901 when he promoted his former doctor to brigadier general in the Regular Army ahead of
530 other officers; later, as president, Roosevelt followed suit by making Wood a major
general, in 1904.79 So by 1911, Wood not only was the most senior general in the army, at 51
he also was the youngest, meaning that unlike Wagner and Schwan, his influence would be felt
for some time to come. Moreover, by 1917, Wood’s was a household name, associated
personally with many of the most powerful men in the country. Needless to say, Wood’s
privileged connections and the meteoric rise they enabled remained the subject of intense
controversy in some army quarters for years to come, and his outspokenness during the Wilson
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administration cost him command of the AEF.80 For Reichmann, however, to be recognized as part of that very same network made Wood an especially good man to have in a tight corner.

Not surprisingly, Reichmann’s upward career trajectory continued apace. In addition to high-level staff work, he led Regulars in Hawaii and commanded Wyoming Guardsmen in the defense of the New Mexico border in 1916.81 That same year he was consecrated into the army’s high leadership with a promotion to colonel. It was the highest rank an officer might reasonably hope to score in peacetime, and one conveying a commensurately exalted status in military and civilian circles, alike. His family connections also extended in new and influential directions. While assigned in the islands, the eldest of his two daughters, Charlotte, married Livingston Watrous, one of his lieutenants.82 Reichmann’s new son-in-law was of an old Knickerbocker family, son of the late Walter Willson Watrous, a Tuxedo Park millionaire, and Margaret Livingston, daughter of S. Otis Livingston, whose Livingston Nail Company had fairly cornered the nation’s corporate market in horse nails.83 Margaret’s remarriage also made him stepson to Beaux-Arts architect Richard Howland Hunt, celebrity designer to the Vanderbilts. Although not a university man, Livingston was splendidly educated in the manner of his class: he attended the select St. Mark’s School in Massachusetts, where he chummed up with the Northeast’s best boys, and later graduated from St. John’s, an Episcopal military academy located outside Syracuse, in 1910.84 His direct appointment in the infantry the following year merely validated his high social profile.85 And so as the United States entered the war against Germany, Carl Reichmann, the immigrant ranker, had amassed a great store of

80 Millet (1968), 2. Gen. William Harding Carter’s papers are largely dedicated to his dislike of Wood. See for example, Letter, J.H. Dorst to S.B. M. Young, 27 Dec 1903, Folder 1, William Harding Carter Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.


83 The Watrous estate was valued at $200,000 when he died in 1903, or about $6 millions, today. Club Men of New York (1896), 582; “Widow Fights for Watrous Wealth,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (25 Jun 1903), 7; “Death of S. Otis Livingston,” Iron Age (24 Sep 1903), 54-55.

84 St. John’s also was known as Verbeck’s or the Manlius School. “About Lieut. Watrous,” Leavenworth Times (09 Apr 1912), 5; Albert Emerson Benson, ed., Saint Mark’s School in the War Against Germany (Norwood, MA: Plimpton Press, 1920), 250.

85 “New Second Lieutenants,” Army and Navy Register (02 Dec 1911), 18.
social capital, sitting as he was at the pinnacle of an extraordinary career, undergird by a complex social network with truly national influence.

6.5 Strangers on a Train

In the months immediately following America’s entry into the war in April 1917, Colonel Reichmann’s activities, and those of his patron Leonard Wood, bore directly on the outcome of his Senate hearing. At the time, Reichmann was assigned to the U.S. Army’s Central Department with duty at Columbus as the chief inspector and instructor for the Ohio National Guard.86 To the uninitiated, an assignment with the militia may have seemed discouraging. His status, though, as the senior federal officer responsible for validating their readiness, and by extension their access to federal resources, made him the center of attention with provincial elites interested in the one of the country’s larger state forces. His mission in Ohio had only doubled in importance once war was declared. In May, the War Department announced plans to construct 32 camps to train the greatly expanding army, and the first 16 had to be operational within 90 days.87 Overseeing the effort was Secretary of War Newton Baker, who further ordered departmental commanders to survey prospective sites and forward their recommendations before June. The Central Department’s share of the effort totaled six National Army camps, each designed to house about 35,000 recruits, and Major General Thomas H. Barry, commanding the department from Chicago, appointed Colonel Reichmann to lead a survey team to locate one of the cantonments either in Secretary Baker’s home state of Ohio, or in West Virginia, the secretary’s birth state.88

In response, Ohio’s Adjutant General asked towns throughout his state to submit offers of land, so long as they enclosed at least 1,000 acres, and had good access to water and grounds.

86 Memo, Adjutant General to Miles Poindexter, n.d., Box 117, Folder 10, MPP.
suitable for rifle and artillery ranges. All patriotism aside, community leaders needed little encouragement, for a camp was goldmine. Each new facility would cost millions to build, and the influx of thousands of troops would bring to its lucky community hundreds more jobs and countless contracts for goods and services. Even the sleepy college town of Athens dreamt of striking it rich in the camp sweepstakes. As if to put the enormity of a camp’s promised million-dollar monthly payroll in context for his readers, the editor of Athens’ Daily Messenger estimated it might ‘require 50,000 pounds of ice daily to keep thing[s] cool in the army city.’ ‘Keep in mind,’ he emphasized, ‘this is not an encampment for a few weeks, but a permanent army training camp during the war.’

The pressure from locals on the survey team was immense in Ohio, and it was no different across the country. In South Carolina, delegations interested in campsites descended on Major General Leonard Wood just as he arrived in Charleston to take up command of the Southeastern Department. The city fathers there even held a parade drawing some 10,000 onlookers and presented the general with a 12’x20’ American flag, prompting Wood to wager it was the city’s biggest demonstration since the Civil War, and the best treatment of a Yankee officer ever. Sensitive to the politics of camp selection – and engaging in a bit of politicking himself – Wood decided to conduct his department’s inspections in person, and wherever he traveled enthusiastic crowds led by the best citizens turned out to make a favorable impression. In Atlanta, over 70,000 citizens turned out to greet him, some carrying banners reading ‘WOOD OF TECH’ and ‘WOOD HAS THE BALL,’ reminders the general once lead Georgia Tech’s winning football team as a graduate student there in the early 1890s. In Florida, an

---


90 “Camp Site at the Plains is Now Inspected,” Athens Daily Messenger (Athens, OH: 01 Jun 1917), 1.

91 Wood completed his tour as chief of staff in 1914. Still far from retirement age, he commanded the Eastern Department for three years before transferring to Charleston. Diary entries, Leonard Wood, 14-16 May 1917, Container 9, vol. 1, LWP.

92 Diary entry, Leonard Wood, 17 May 1917, Container 9, vol. 1, LWP

especially keen delegation from Senator Duncan Fletcher’s hometown of Jacksonville could not even wait for him to arrive: intercepting the general’s car late at night 15 miles from the town limits, they escorted him to the Madison Hotel, where they consumed him in discussion until the wee hours of the morning. The following day, the general inspected the prospective site at Black Point, talked ‘off-the-record’ with the political class at the country club, and addressed a crowd of some 25,000 citizens assembled in the town square.\(^94\) Afterwards, Wood reported favorably on Jacksonville, and despite some heated back-and-forth between Senator Fletcher and the War Department, Secretary Baker agreed to place at Black Rock a special facility to train officers for the Quartermaster Corps.\(^95\) Dubbed Camp Joseph E. Johnson, the facility eventually cost over six millions to build, injecting badly needed cash into the local economy and securing Fletcher’s political fortunes, which the grateful senator credited to Leonard Wood’s personal intervention.\(^96\)

Back in Ohio, there were no massive throngs and bands to greet Reichmann’s survey team. Nonetheless, every competing town – Toledo, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, and seemingly all points in between – assembled their leading citizens to escort the army delegation to inspect their prospective sites. The reception given in late May at Chillicothe was typical. There, a committee lead by Chamber of Commerce president John Poland, a local attorney, met Reichmann’s party at the train station and, after the usual pleasantries at a local hotel, escorted them to the proposed site, accompanied by a large group of curious townspeople.\(^97\) Expectedly, Reichmann was courteous and diplomatic. But when it came to inspections, he cut no slack: in 1898, he had witnessed first-hand how poor site selection led to an infamous typhoid epidemic at Camp Alger in Virginia that killed some 2,000 Volunteer troops.\(^98\) In addition to easy access

\(^94\) Diary entries, Leonard Wood, 24-25 Jun 1917, Container 9, vol. 1, LWP.

\(^95\) Flynt (1971), 115-117.

\(^96\) Kreidberg and Henry (1955), 318. Today, Camp Johnson exists as the Jacksonville Naval Air Station. Letter, Duncan Fletcher to Leonard Wood, 14 Jul 1917, Container 105, LWP; Letter, Leonard Wood to Duncan Fletcher, 16 Jul 1917, Container 105, LWP.


to lines of communications, it was paramount that the camp was situated on land with good
drainage and access to plenty of fresh water. As it happened, Poland’s folks knew their
business, too, and offered a piece of land north of town on the banks of the Scioto River that
filled the bill nicely. Later that June, the War Department announced it would construct Camp
Sherman at Chillicothe, based on Reichmann’s positive endorsement.99

John Poland and the citizens of Chillicothe had hit paydirt, but the deal had almost
fallen through had not been for Reichmann’s timely intervention. Within weeks of the
announcement, the site’s property owners raised their demands to $20.00 and acre, $5.00 more
than the Central Department expected to pay.100 Feigning detachment, Secretary Baker let it be
known he was happy to move the camp to West Virginia if no agreement could be reached.
Clearly, however, he preferred to place the camp in Ohio. Advising friends in his home state
that the Central Department was authorized to seize the property if the parties failed to reach an
understanding, Baker said the army would dispatch a man from Chicago to talk over the matter.
That man was Reichmann, who arrived in Chillicothe by train on 29 June with instructions
from General Barry to conclude a deal within 24 hours.101 The landowners stuck to their guns,
but Reichmann and Poland convinced Chamber of Commerce members to make up the $5.00
difference. With a deal in hand, Reichmann next accompanied Poland to Washington to present
the offer for Baker’s consideration. In the final settlement, the government accepted the
Chamber’s offer, and agreed to pay an additional $15.00 an acre to compensate for crop
damages.102 For the citizens of Chillicothe, it was an El Dorado. Camp Sherman cost almost
$13 millions, and the local businesses were barely able to keep up with demand from the camp

and the Spread of Typhoid Fever in the Spanish-American War, 1898,” *Annals of the Association of
American Geographers* 91, no. 1 (Mar 2001), 77-80.

102 “Committee,” *Scioto Gazette* (Chillicothe, OH: 07 Jun 1917), 1; “Squabble Ended” (10 Jul
1917), 4.
for the war’s duration. Moreover, Poland and others agreed that Reichmann had been the deciding factor in their newfound prosperity.

It was later that summer back in the Chicago headquarters that Reichmann was introduced to Amanda Anderson by Eleanor Sowers Faison, wife of a friend and fellow officer, Colonel Sampson Lane Faison. That Reichmann should encounter Anderson was part coincidence and part contrivance, an event set in motion when the two ladies met for the first time on a train from Washington to Chicago, sometime in early August. Faison was travelling to see her husband at Fort Douglas, Utah, and Anderson was just then returning to her home in British Columbia from Europe, where her husband served as a paymaster with the Canadian forces. The ladies’ conversation naturally turned to the war effort. In due course, Mrs. Faison mentioned that a family friend in Chicago – Reichmann – entertained the most outrageous pro-German ideas about the war, and invited Anderson to hear for herself at a tea she would arrange at her Chicago hotel. Anderson agreed.

Mrs. Faison was blithely unaware of just how dangerous a trap she had set for Reichmann, for while her talent for gossip was well-known, she was a rank amateur compared to Mrs. Anderson. Amanda Anderson was born in Buffalo, New York, in 1870, but by the 1890s had made her way to British Columbia. There, to put it politely, she traded on ill-gotten information and published a scandal sheet exposing the private lives of prominent citizens. In short order, Anderson had become quite a power in Canada’s Pacific frontier, and with her

---


105 An account appears in, “A Tea-Table Tempest,” Issues and Events 7, no. 11 (15 Sep 1917), 165-166; Report, Agent Byron to Bureau of Investigation, 07 Feb 1916, digital image available at fold3.com, Investigative Case Files of the Bureau of Investigation 1908-1922, NARA M1085, Old German Files, 1909-21, Case 8000-1433, s.v. “Mrs. James Anderson,” hereafter OGF.
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hooks deeply embedded in the provincial legislature, she and her husband James had made a bundle through various questionable schemes. By 1900, the *Oakland Tribune* estimated Anderson controlled real estate, timber, and mineral rights valued at $10 millions.\(^{108}\) Her crowning achievement, though, came in 1904 when, acting on inside information, she and her husband obtained patents to 10,000 acres of prime government land at the proposed terminus of the Canadian Trunk Pacific Railroad, all at bargain prices.\(^{109}\) The episode, which became known as the Kaien Island Scandal, rocked the provincial government, but left the Andersons and their partners rich and unscathed. As for the tea, Reichmann graciously accepted Faison’s invitation and, mindful of propriety, arrived at the hotel with another officer in tow, Captain William H. Patterson. The exchange between the foursome that followed formed the basis of Anderson’s complaint to Poindexter, which the senator forwarded to the War Department on 14 August.\(^{110}\)

Mrs. Anderson and Miles Poindexter almost certainly were acquainted in some way before the incident. Anderson was, after all, widely known in political and business circles throughout the Pacific Northwest, including in Seattle. Still, Poindexter’s reason for taking up Anderson’s case was not out of any special consideration to the lady. Instead, he was moved by an uncompromising super-patriotism. While even before the war the senator had grown suspicious of German encroachments in the Western Hemisphere, the twin threats of foreign influence and sabotage of key war industries catalyzed within him an absolute hatred for radicals and others opposed to the country’s intervention in Europe, particularly German-Americans.\(^{111}\) Intolerant of any opposition to the war, Poindexter thus became a vigorous


\(^{110}\) Poindexter acknowledged receipt of Anderson’s charges against Reichmann on 07 Aug. See, Telegram, Miles Poindexter to Mrs. James Anderson, 07 Aug 1917, Box 117, Folder 10, MPP.

proponent of the Espionage Act, and in fact authored censorship provisions so illiberal that Congress refused to pass them. In the Washington senator’s view, the consequences of dissent were existential. That went double coming from a man like Reichmann, whose high army status and visibility in the German-American community made his remarks especially alarming. Poindexter thus urged the Senate’s Military Affairs Committee Chairman, George E. Chamberlain of Oregon, to reject Reichmann’s nomination, which in turn prompted the committee to delay a vote until it could investigate the claims.

Poindexter was confident that Reichmann would admit his guilt, and he further expected the army would swiftly cashier the colonel on the accusation’s strength alone; civilian courts had prosecuted violations of the Espionage Act far more vigorously than Congress had intended and surely, the senator thought, the military justice system would be as accommodating. But by 18 August, the senator realized Reichmann’s removal would be anything but a fait accompli. For starters, Reichmann denied the charges unequivocally and, what’s more, the army was standing behind him. General Bliss had assured Secretary Baker there was no truth to Senator Poindexter’s charges, and Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Van Deman, the Army’s intelligence chief, had found nothing incriminating in the colonel’s file. In fact, Van Deman personally vouched for Reichmann, who had been his teacher at Fort Leavenworth in 1895. With Poindexter’s accusations circulating in the Washington press since breakfast, Baker promptly forwarded Bliss’ report to the White House to confirm for President Wilson
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that the army had checked out Reichmann thoroughly before recommending him for promotion, and thus the president remained confident in his nomination.116

An even more important stumbling block to Poindexter’s intentions were Reichmann’s many friends, starting with General Leonard Wood. On 19 August, Reichmann telegraphed Wood at his headquarters in South Carolina asking the general’s help if he believed him loyal.117 In response, Wood dashed off supporting letters to the Adjutant General, as well as to Massachusetts Republican John Wingate Weeks (USNA ’81), a close friend on the Senate Military Affairs Committee.118 Whether by chance or design, Weeks had just been appointed to investigate the charges against Reichmann as part of a three-man subcommittee chaired by none other than Senator Duncan Fletcher, the Florida Democrat so grateful for Wood’s intervention in the late training camp debacle. Wood almost certainly had requested Fletcher’s assistance in the Reichmann matter, as well; the senator acknowledged receiving a letter from the general dated 20 August, but its contents are undetermined.119 Wood also visited Weeks at the Capitol on 23 August, and while the pair discussed mostly the general’s having been sidelined by President Wilson, it is logical to assume Reichmann’s cause received some mention, and that Weeks shared any comments with Fletcher.120 Rounding out the troika was Democrat Henry Lee Myers, a possible sop to Poindexter: like his Washington colleague, Myers blamed German influences for labor strikes and threats of sabotage in his home state of Montana, and so was likewise intolerant of dissenting speech of any kind.121 Nevertheless,

---
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Poindexter suspected the ‘strange committee,’ as he called it, had been slanted in favor of Reichmann from the very beginning.122

As the news of Reichmann’s troubles broke across the country, Poindexter received a few letters from citizens who congratulated the senator for bringing charges against the German-born colonel, so sure he was guilty. All of those letters, however, came from strangers who were personally unacquainted with the colonel. In fact, public support for Reichmann appeared to grow as old friends and comrades wrote letters or took to the newspapers to vouch for Reichmann’s patriotism, like former New York Congressman Edwin S. Underhill. Underhill, whose wife and Daisy Reichmann had been friends since childhood, wrote Poindexter that he had known the couple intimately for years, and believed the charges of disloyalty were bigoted.123 Back in Kansas, Adolph Lange and many other prominent citizens defended Reichmann’s ‘love for America and of his loyalty to his adopted country’ in the pages of The Leavenworth Times.124 A government clerk in Charleston, West Virginia, also was convinced the charges were bunkum. John T. Moore had served under Reichmann in the Philippines, and wrote to his senator, Howard Sutherland, to do whatever he could to secure his former commander’s confirmation.125

Even more remarkably, Reichmann drew strong support from amongst the multitude of newer acquaintances he made whilst conducting all those camp surveys in the Midwest. In his letter to Senator Sutherland, Moore let him know that many of the leading citizens in Charleston also were writing affidavits supporting Reichmann, so impressed were they during the colonel’s recent visit. Letters also began pouring in from new-found friends in Ohio. Tiffin Gilmore, president of Franklin County’s Home Rule Association, wrote the future president, Senator Warren G. Harding, that ‘the colonel’s thousands of friends in Ohio [were] boiling

122 Telegram, Miles Poindexter to Mrs. James Anderson, 20 Aug 1917, Box 117, Folder 10.
123 Letter, E.S. Underhill to Miles Poindexter, 21 Aug 1917, Box 117, Folder 10, MPP.
125 Letter, John T. Moore to Howard Sutherland, 29 Aug 1917, Box 8, Howard Sutherland Papers, West Virginia and Regional History Center, West Virginia University Libraries.
with indignation,’ and John Poland, ever grateful to Reichmann for his part in establishing
Camp Sherman, mobilized the citizens of Chillicothe in his defense. Even a Poindexter ally,
Seattle Post-Intelligencer editor Scott C. Bone, questioned the propriety of pursuing such
allegations against a ranking army officer. After recounting Reichmann’s service record in
admiring tones, Bone judged that without solid evidence, the colonel’s persecution would be
‘as cruel and wicked a wrong as could be visited upon a man.’ With support for Reichmann
mounting, Poindexter advised Mrs. Anderson to obtain affidavits ‘from as influential sources as
possible as to [her] own prominent connections and standing’ and urged her to come to
Washington at once to testify.

For all the momentum building behind Reichmann, realizing the opportunity to defend
himself was a near run thing. General Bliss had accepted the charges against Reichmann as
baseless on their face. However, during a chance meeting with the colonel on the morning of
22 August, the day before Fletcher’s subcommittee was to convene, Bliss began to suspect his
man had indeed spoken indelicately about the war effort, even if academically. Bliss confided
his doubts in a memo to Secretary Baker, and further recommended that if Reichmann could
not deny the allegations entirely, the War Department should withdraw his nomination to spare
the president any further embarrassment. ‘Every officer is the custodian of his own reputation,’
Bliss wrote. If Reichmann had ‘said things which give ground for suspicions now, it is his
misfortune and no else’s.’ Actually, Bliss may have been looking after his own reputation,
given that he had earlier endorsed the favorable report sent to the president.
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129 Tasker H. Bliss to Newton D. Baker, 22 Aug 1917, Reel 1, NDB. Emphasis original, underscored in pen.
Secretary Baker also was in a bit of a pickle: as a fellow Mason and gentleman, he was obliged to Reichmann for having prevailed with the citizens of Chillicothe, who were just then rallying to his cause, yet he had also assured President Wilson that Poindexter’s charges were meritless, albeit based on Bliss’ findings. And so, like any good politician he punted, asking the promotion board to interview Reichmann to check their earlier decision. Before day’s end, Reichmann reappeared before the board, chaired by Bliss and composed of Generals Joseph Kuhn, William Mann, and Henry McCain, each of whom were intimately acquainted with the colonel. Exactly what occurred in that proceeding is unknown. It was apparent, however, that Reichmann was holding back, that in truth he had spoken much more freely about the war than he should have with a stranger in wartime. It was also clear the board did not share Bliss’ reservations, for they sustained his nomination and agreed that Reichmann should be allowed to defend himself in the Senate.130

Senator Fletcher’s inquiry thus opened as planned in an executive session on 23 August.131 What followed over the next week resembled less a modern evidentiary hearing than an ancient wager of law, with the subcommittee weighing the social capital of the defendant against that of the complainant. Backed up by the confidence of the General Staff and War Department, Reichmann entered as evidence his own long and honorable service and produced character witnesses as well as affidavits from colleagues – oath helpers by a different name – attesting to his loyalty and devotion to duty. Assisting in his defense was his brother-in-law, John Vanderlip, whose kinship to the defendant had practical as well as symbolic value. An expert litigator, Vanderlip also was well-known in Congress as consiglieri to powerful Minnesota mining interests which, by association, stood in silent proxy for Reichmann’s

130 Tasker H. Bliss to SECWAR, 23 Aug 1917, Box 218, THB. Once an enclosure, Reichmann’s responses to the board’s questions are missing from the file.

131 At present, the only historical account of Reichmann’s Senate hearing appears in, Joshua E. Kastenberg, “War Time Hysteria, 1917: Senator Miles Poindexter, ‘American-ness’ and the Strange Case of Colonel Carl Reichmann,” War and Society 37, no. 3 (Aug 2018), 147-165. The account contains several biographical errors, but otherwise is well researched.
acquittal. Even two of Poindexter’s key witnesses, Mrs. Faison and Captain Patterson, testified for the colonel, insisting that Mrs. Anderson had deliberately misconstrued Reichmann’s comments, and she had wholly fabricated others. Then, there were all those letters pouring in from folks around the country, to say nothing of Reichmann’s extended family members in high society who surely lobbied in his behalf, or had a discreet word or two with those who did.

Represented by Senator Poindexter, Mrs. Anderson’s balance was comparatively empty. Anderson had yet to arrive, and her co-witnesses to the Chicago tea, Faison and Patterson, proved a bust. In the meantime, the contest came down to Poindexter versus Reichmann. The senator introduced the long-debunked rumor Reichmann had commanded Boer artillery in South Africa as evidence of his German sympathies, and used excerpts from his 1906 letter to Henry Claus as proof he was hostile towards Great Britain and thus by temperament ill-disposed to the war. Poindexter also made much of Reichmann’s having sent his wife and daughters to live with his family in Germany when he deployed to the Philippines over a decade earlier, as well as the $88.00 he sent his mother and sister in the Spring of 1913. Leaked to the press, it was the flimsiest of evidence intended not to prove Reichmann’s guilt but instead to turn public opinion against him.

Poindexter’s big moment came and went on 30 August when Mrs. Anderson finally arrived to give evidence. With her own bona fides in tow, she recanted not a word of her earlier complaint. Senator Fletcher, though, had none of it: unbeknownst to Poindexter, Fletcher had been tipped off earlier about Anderson’s checkered history by a friend in Seattle, and he had
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asked the Bureau of Investigation to look into the woman.\textsuperscript{138} As it happened, the Bureau already was familiar with Anderson, as she had been the subject of an investigation back in 1916 after the agency received complaints she was passing herself off as a secret service agent in the pay either of Great Britain or Russia.\textsuperscript{139} There was also an earlier marriage that ended in divorce. Again, by some agency elements of these reports found their way into the press in efforts to undermine her character.\textsuperscript{140} And it worked. Claiming she had been threatened in the streets and unaccustomed to the spotlight she had long delighted in shining on others, Mrs. Anderson retreated to her hotel for the hearing’s duration.\textsuperscript{141} In a final gasp on 31 August, Poindexter introduced a surprise witness, Edward Northam Walton, brought to his attention by a confederate, Ohio Senator Atlee Pomerene.\textsuperscript{142} Walton, a salesman for the Ohio Body and Blower Company, claimed that just weeks earlier he had conversed with Reichmann in the observation car of a train bound for West Virginia, and ‘was forcibly struck by the army officer’s distinct pro-German sympathies.’\textsuperscript{143} Fletcher had heard enough.

The hearing closed on 01 September. All three senators – Fletcher, Weeks, and Myers – agreed that Reichmann was a loyal officer. Myers alone, however, remained firm that he should not be promoted; though he likely saw through Anderson’s claims, the Montanan may have worried that Reichmann elevation would only embolden pro-German dissenters.\textsuperscript{144} Regardless, Fletcher and Weeks reported favorably to the Military Affairs Committee. Later that month, during a lengthy closed-door session, the committee voted 8 to 2 to confirm
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Ultimately, however, the War Department withdrew the nomination after the holdouts, Myers and Senator Joseph S. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, joined Poindexter and Pomerene in threatening a filibuster. As General Bliss had written Secretary Baker back in August, no officer had ‘a right to expect the President [sic] to bear the odium of a nomination in which he has neither personal nor political interest.’ For Reichmann, it was a humiliation he would bear the rest of his life. It was also a considerably lighter price than paid by the more than 2,000 persons prosecuted under the Espionage Act, many of whom were convicted on as slender an evidence.

Reichmann returned to Chicago to await the army’s pleasure. In addition to losing his chance at a star, President Wilson and the War Department agreed the colonel would not command troops, nor would he go to Europe in any capacity. Whereas the weight of Reichmann’s social capital validated his loyalty, he remained bound by the rules which made its acquisition possible in the first place. His lack of discretion had crossed a delicate line, and with the country in the thick of the war, maintaining the good order and discipline of the army – and keeping faith with foreign allies – counted more than a colonel’s injured pride. Towards year’s end, Major General William Harding Carter, then commanding the Central District, requested the colonel’s talents be put to use as his intelligence chief. General Bliss approved. And so with more than a touch of irony a German-born officer once accused of treason for his table talk became the coordinator of the Military Intelligence Division’s domestic surveillance operations in one of the nation’s busiest centers. For the remainder of the war, he liaised with the Bureau of Information and its civilian auxiliary, the American Protection Association, keeping tabs on suspected enemy agents, disaffected immigrants, socialists, and labor activists. It was Reichmann’s last big show. After the Armistice, he returned briefly to the General Staff,
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and for his final assignment was placed in charge of recruiting at Minneapolis. There, in 1923, he retired without fanfare.150

* * * *

In November 1917, Carl Reichmann was at his lowest when he received a short letter from Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt, the staunch opponent of hyphenated nationalism, also was smarting at having been sidelined in the war. Although the two were long acquainted, it had been some time since they had seen each other, and the former president wanted to assure Reichmann he was one of those men in the army ‘in whom [he] most emphatically believed.’ ‘If you are ever in New York,’ Roosevelt offered, ‘I wish you would give me the pleasure of coming out to take lunch or dinner with me at Oyster Bay.’151 In an equally brief yet emotion-filled response, Reichmann took comfort in the president’s sustained confidence, despite all that had happened. ‘Your country is my country and my country is your country,’ he closed, ‘and there is no other country for either of us.’152

6.6 Concluding Remarks

Colonel Carl Reichmann’s ordeal may not be a classic case study in civil-military relations, per se, as it does not speak narrowly to the issue of civilian supremacy over policy. When viewed through a Bourdieusian prism, however, his life experiences challenge orthodox assumptions that armies and their leaders occupy a profoundly separate social space subject more to the forces of their peculiar institutional culture, rather than by their social origins, received life ways, and life-long interactions. Bear in mind that a military culture reflects the larger social order that produces it, and thus in martialing the capital required for a commission and conforming to the expectations of service, Reichmann did his part in reifying the state’s
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larger symbolic order, from which he and his family received advantages wrought of rank and
social position. There could be no greater evidence of this symbiosis than the Senate’s disposal
of the allegations against him, in which a profoundly dynastic practice – the subjective
weighing of social capital – remained firmly embedded within both the army’s and the Senate’s
more outwardly distinct and objective bureaucratic structures. In the course of Reichmann’s
hearing, it would have been inconceivable for his Senate judges and brother officers to have
recognized compurgatory evidence as proof of his loyalty had they not shared with the
defendant a familiar set of codes, norms, and values, bounded by a mutual understanding of
each other’s place in society. The upshot was that to his many supporters, Reichmann was the
very embodiment of the state, itself.
CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

The American tradition of civil-military relations theory reflects the fraught middle decades of the 20th century, when Samuel Huntington and Morris Janowitz debated the army’s ideal distance from the democratic society it was raised to protect. In Huntington’s view, the American defense sector’s unprecedented expansion made it vital to keep separated military and civilian jurisdictions which historically, he fancied, had been the country’s normal state of affairs. Meanwhile, Janowitz reasoned the ostensible increase in officers recruited from amongst untutored classes required greater emphasis on liberal education and the army’s closer cooperation – if not cooptation – in policy making. When critically examining these presentations today, however, it is their artifactual quality that mostly shines through, a feature that reveals less about the nature of civil-military relations, and more about the boiling social currents and politics of the times in which they were penned. Nevertheless, these approaches remain the dominant fixtures in a corpus that accepts on its face that soldiers and civilians are innately separate and mutually antagonistic social groupings. That this perspective has endured so long also tells us something more about ourselves than it does an army’s complex relationship to its society. For civilians, its simple elegance confirms longstanding social biases about military service and the people performing it. For soldiers, it has become a convenient prop deployed either to articulate the military’s professional autonomy, or to mitigate its share of responsibility in policy making, with equal gusto. So comfortably familiar has this orthodoxy become that the theoretical study of civil-military relations is now all but moribund, inspiring few truly new approaches.

That said, re-examining the civil-military problematique within Pierre Bourdieu’s social reproduction paradigm offers both a compelling alternative to the orthodoxy and a formidable challenge to many of its underlying assumptions. By delving more deeply into a state’s social fabric, these frameworks can reveal how a national army’s formation is intimately bound up in the larger social and symbolic structures generating it, and therefore allow us to
appreciate armies as having profoundly gyroscopic qualities which, similar to civilian institutions, extend a recognizable order to an otherwise arbitrary social life. What’s more, the Bourdieusian prism is superbly suited for making visible the continuities and discontinuities in a society’s practices over longer stretches of time, fostering greater objectivity than is typically encountered in middle-range approaches fixated on evanescent conflicts.

Indeed, by turning these frameworks on the American experience, this study has demonstrated such continuity, as manifested in the country’s military commissioning practices. Originally seated in elite sociality, the methods of officer selection evolved coextensively with the growth and development of the American state to become reconstructed as bureaucratic practices that placed greater emphasis on cultural literacy. These outwardly more progressive practices regularized officer selections and afforded some greater access for less advantaged men able to meet the cultural requirements for a commission. However, the high investments required to achieve cultural recognition, combined with the rarity of commissions as a public good, meant the newer practices continued to privilege the same social groups who had long lent their practical Christian ethic to the civil and military institutions which they, themselves, dominated. Thus, maintaining high boundaries to commissioning not only helped to reproduce mutually reaffirming norms and outlooks, upholding the officer corps’ privileged place in American society reaffirmed as legitimate a social and political order which conferred commensurate advantages to members, old and new, who behaved in accordance with the field’s expectations. In other words, the accepted patterns of civil-military relations in the United States were not imposed, but instead they developed organically as a consequence of recruitment practices. Ultimately, this evolution would have been impossible to consummate without the collaboration, witting and otherwise, of soldiers and civilians.

This thesis has exposed these social forces by paying particular attention to the lives, broader interactions, and fortunes of the 1884 commissioning cohort and their families. Granted, the direct evidence presented in this study can reasonably take us only to period of the Second World War and Cold War, events which catalyzed the paranoia that pervades the work of Huntington and Janowitz. While we should indeed treat the pair’s assumptions with some
skepticism, three decades of conscription and the presumed loosening of officer recruitment practices to feed a burgeoning U.S. defense sector may possibly have changed the overall character of the force for the worse, as the two scholars worried. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that even if that were the case, those long decades represented only an extraordinary bubble in a longer and rather more consistently stable historical experience, and that officer accession practices have thus resumed their more exclusive, late 19th-century character since the return to an all-volunteer force in 1973 and the large troop reductions occurring at the end of the Cold War, in 1991. We can point to higher educational requirements for both officers and enlisted, as well as the criminal background checks, drug tests, and cognitive evaluations that are today’s bureaucratic means of screening prospective soldiers, officers and other ranks, alike.

In fact, today’s entry requirements to high-investment pre-commissioning opportunities – U.S. Military Academy appointments and ROTC scholarships – still privilege men and women possessing greater stocks of cultural capital in the form of scholastic achievement, as much today as ever. At West Point, over 60% of the 1,232 cadets admitted to the Class of 2024 ranked in the top quintile of their high school classes, and scored on average in the 90th percentile on standardized college admissions tests. Other cultural and social markers include disproportionately high participation in student government, community service organizations, school clubs, Scouting, and team sports.1 Comparable statistics hold true for ROTC scholarship cadets attending civilian colleges and universities.2 Examining the family conditions of today’s officers and cadets undoubtedly would reveal that most enjoyed relative social advantages from childhood, sourced in their families’ commitment to education or a legacy of military service, as well as sufficient economic resources enabling attendance at secondary schools with

rigorous curricula and broadening extramural opportunities. This empowering relationship between economic means, educational opportunity, and career prospects is well understood, and yet academic excellence, like sociability, is hardly an indicator of martiality.\(^3\) Nevertheless, in our even more progressively anonymous age, scholastic distinction increasingly has become a proxy indicator for commitment, discipline, and service, which are today the secular analogs to the Founders’ Protestant ethic. Thus, in a broad sense, today’s officer corps continues to embody the present rendering of the nation’s dominant habitus, as surely as it had in Carl Reichmann’s day, and before. What’s more, this consistent emphasis on cultural fluency has enabled the officer corps to diversify along lines of religion, ethnicity, race, family origin, gender, and sexuality that were unimaginable in 1884, but which nevertheless reflect demographic and social changes within the general population.

Exclusive commissioning practices generate their own worries, but the army’s obedience to civilian authority is not one of them. High standards and generous rewards for faithful service have, on one hand, produced an embarrassment of riches, in that the army now fields the most well-educated and capable force in its history. On the other hand, far fewer Americans can meet those standards, even as private soldiers: bars to enlistment now disqualify some 71% of American 17-24-year-olds, mostly on account of obesity, criminal records, and incomplete secondary educations.\(^4\) What’s more, the high prestige of military service appears to be gentrifying the enlisted ranks. An important new study found that American recruits are now more likely to hail from solidly middle-class families with above average socio-economic status.\(^5\) Not only does this finding broadly support this dissertation’s thesis, it demands we critically re-examine our historical preconceptions of enlisted service, as well. This, and the

---


lately rediscovered tendency of the officer corps to recruit from within military families, have led some military officials and observers to worry that as an elite institution, the army increasingly looks like a family business that risks hardening into an insular caste. Readers will recognize such fears as resonating with unrealized alarums from earlier generations.

Although it is far too early to panic at the implications of the present scare, these concerns help to validate an historical continuity in recruitment practices which suggests the true heart of the American civil-military problematique is not by what means civilians control the army. Rather, it is how the whole of the citizenry, both civilians and soldiers, continue to recruit a force that is able to defend their nation, all the while reproducing the social and symbolic structure that produced it.

---

APPENDIX A

1884 Cohort Family Circumstances
As of: 19 Dec 2020

The following tables display the family circumstances of the 1884 cohort by commissioning source. Basic categories include soldier’s name, father’s name, father’s occupation, the family seat, veteran status, and religion. Substantive ranks of fathers who served as career officers are shown in parentheses, and brevet ranks are listed in the endnotes. Occupational data for the fathers of the West Point class of 1884 is based in large part on cadet declarations of their social condition, e.g. ‘moderate/town,’ recorded by academy administrators and contained in RG404, “Circumstances.”

**Table A-1: 1884 Ranker Family Circumstances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Vet.</th>
<th>Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td>F. S. Finley</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Ypsilanti, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Episc²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, C.*</td>
<td>K. Reichmann†</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Württemberg, DE</td>
<td>Episc²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, J.E.</td>
<td>J. H. Maxfield</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Salem, MA</td>
<td>?³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, J.H.</td>
<td>Geo. Weber*</td>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Meth⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>Marvin S. Day</td>
<td>Livery owner</td>
<td>Owego, NY</td>
<td>Episc⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.*</td>
<td>L. Roudiez†</td>
<td>Army Officer</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>RC⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, W.D.</td>
<td>W. McAnaney*</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Fairport, NY</td>
<td>RC⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, F.O.</td>
<td>O. Ferris</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Wilson, NY</td>
<td>Bapt⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, G.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Episc⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, J.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, A.S.</td>
<td>Thos. Frost*†</td>
<td>House Painter</td>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>Episc¹¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Immigrant
†Father deceased at commissioning
### Table A-2: 1884 Direct Appointee Family Circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Vet.</th>
<th>Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, A.P.</td>
<td>J.Q. Buffington</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Derby, IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, C.L.</td>
<td>H. Beckurts*</td>
<td>Distillery owner</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Episc14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, W.C.</td>
<td>Jno. V. Wren†</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Episc15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, R.H.</td>
<td>R.H. Anderson†</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Episc16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, T.W.</td>
<td>S.T. Moore†</td>
<td>Army (LTC)</td>
<td>Wooster, OH</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Episc17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>W.H. Penrose</td>
<td>Army (COL)</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Episc18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüg, F.V.</td>
<td>Jno. H. Krüg†</td>
<td>Tannery owner</td>
<td>Lancaster, PA</td>
<td>MC19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, R.R.</td>
<td>T. H. Stevens</td>
<td>Navy (RADM)</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>USN</td>
<td>Episc21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, W.J.</td>
<td>Myron Pardee</td>
<td>Grain Dealer</td>
<td>Oswego, NY</td>
<td>Episc22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, A.H.</td>
<td>Aaron Young</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Barrington, NH</td>
<td>Congl23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, W.D.</td>
<td>Jas. B. McCaw</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Episc24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>L.R. Hawthorne</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Newport, KY</td>
<td>USV</td>
<td>RC25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, E.E.</td>
<td>H. Benjamin</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Riverhead, NY</td>
<td>Congl26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., W.N.</td>
<td>W.N. Blow, Sr.</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Petersburg, VA</td>
<td>Episc28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, J.T.</td>
<td>J.H. Anderson</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Meth29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, J.R.</td>
<td>R.H.G. Kean</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Lynchburg, VA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Episc30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Immigrant
†Father deceased at commissioning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Vet.</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, I.</td>
<td>H.M. Hale</td>
<td>Sch. Supt.</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>AUA³¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, J.C.</td>
<td>A.C. Sanford</td>
<td>Merch.</td>
<td>Palmyra, NY</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Pres³²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, H.M.</td>
<td>W. Chittenden</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Yorkshire, NY</td>
<td>USV</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>Bapt³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, C.E.</td>
<td>Ralph Gillette</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>Wellsboro, PA</td>
<td>Reduced-Town</td>
<td>³³⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Jno. F. Taylor</td>
<td>Merch.</td>
<td>Tilton, NH</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc³⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>W.J. Sibert</td>
<td>Merch.</td>
<td>Gadsden, AL</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc³⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell, C.L.</td>
<td>J.K. Corthell</td>
<td>Ins. Agt.</td>
<td>Hingham, MA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>AUA³⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, S.M.</td>
<td>H.W. Foote</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>LaSalle, MI</td>
<td>Indigent-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁴⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, I.N.</td>
<td>J.H. Lewis</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>New Salem, PA</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>Meth⁴¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, E.F.</td>
<td>Geo. A. Ladd</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Thetford Ctr., VT</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>³⁴²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, S.D. Jr.</td>
<td>S.D. Sturgis, Sr.</td>
<td>Army (COL)</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>RC³³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, W.L.</td>
<td>E.H. Simpson</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Hartford, MI</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>None⁴⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>E.M. Hatch</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Liberty, ME</td>
<td>USV</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>Episc⁴⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, F.L.</td>
<td>M.L. Palmer</td>
<td>Carriage Mk.</td>
<td>Rome, GA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>Episc⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>Wm. N. Cole</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Palmyra, NY</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>Episc⁴⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.R.C.</td>
<td>A.S. Cabell</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Fort Smith, AR</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>RC³⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td>L.S. Babbitt</td>
<td>Army (MAJ)</td>
<td>Dover, NJ</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>RC³⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, E.S.</td>
<td>J.B. Benton</td>
<td>Contr.</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>Meth⁵⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, W.P.</td>
<td>O. Richardson†</td>
<td>Speculator</td>
<td>Ladonia, TX</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>³⁵²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, H.J.*</td>
<td>H.S. Gallagher*</td>
<td>RR Contr.</td>
<td>Council Bluffs, IA</td>
<td>Affluent-City</td>
<td>RC³³³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, C.E.</td>
<td>J. Dentler</td>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>Pittston, PA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Meth⁵⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td>E. Hutcheson†</td>
<td>Atty.</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁵⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.K.</td>
<td>J. Thompson</td>
<td>Merch.</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>USV</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁵⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, E.S.</td>
<td>A.V. Robins</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Shelbyville, IN</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Pres³⁵⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styer, H.D.</td>
<td>W.B. Styer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Sellersville, PA</td>
<td>Indigent-Town</td>
<td>Ref’d⁵⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, J.B.</td>
<td>A.N. Bellinger</td>
<td>Phys.</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>RC³⁰⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer, W.E.</td>
<td>Perley Ayer</td>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>Lawrence, MA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>³⁶ⁱ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, R.H.</td>
<td>W.D. Noble†</td>
<td>Phys.</td>
<td>Federalsburg, MD</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁶²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, D.C.</td>
<td>D.C. Shanks, Sr.</td>
<td>Lumber Dlr.</td>
<td>Salem, VA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Country</td>
<td>Meth⁶³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, B.C.</td>
<td>B. Morse, Sr.†</td>
<td>Civ. Eng.</td>
<td>Macon, MO</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>³⁶⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, J.T.</td>
<td>J.H. Knight, Jr.</td>
<td>Atty.</td>
<td>Farmville, VA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁶⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, J.B.</td>
<td>J.B. Hughes</td>
<td>Phys.</td>
<td>Goldsboro, NC</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-Town</td>
<td>Episc⁶⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, P.H.</td>
<td>P. Clarke</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Alexandria, LA</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Mod-City</td>
<td>RC³⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Immigrant
†Father deceased at commissioning
1 Florus Samuel Finley was the warden at St. Andrew’s Episcopal Church in Ann Arbor, MI. Arthur Lyon Cross, A History of St. Andrew’s Church, Ann Arbor, Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI: George Wahr, 1906), 138; “Officer Honored by Turks, is Washtenaw Native,” Lansing State Journal (Lansing, MI: 05 Mar 1914), 3; Cox (2002), 105.

2 Karl Friedrich Philipp Reichmann was pastor of the Unterböhringen church. Carl Reichmann married and practiced as an Episcopal in the U.S. Königreich Württemberg, Auszug aus dem Tauf-Registre, dtd 05 Nov 1894, Folder 1, CRP.

3 Joseph Hill Maxfield was a clerk for the Salem Independent Protective Association, a West India goods cooperative, and was at times an officer in Salem’s Ward 5. Adams, Sampson & Co., The Salem Directory (Salem, MA: Henry Whipple & Son, 1861), 195; “U.S. City Directories, 1822-1895,” s.v. “Joseph H. Maxfield” (b. ABT 1825), digital image available at Ancestry.com.

4 George Weber was born in 1819 in Hesse-Darmstadt, Germany. He was a saddler and harness maker, and in 1870 he declared a personal estate of $2,000, or perhaps $40,000 today. Religion assumed from marriage, as Julius Weber married Isabelle Howard at Washington, DC’s Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church in 1886. 1870 United States Federal Census, St. Louis Ward 03, St. Louis, Missouri, s.v. “George Weber” (b. ABT 1819), Ancestry.com; 1880 United States Federal Census, St. Louis, Saint Louis, Missouri, s.v. “George Weber” (b. ABT 1819), Ancestry.com; “Lieut. Julius H. Weber Dead,” Evening Star (Washington, DC: 01 Feb 1908), 18; “The Army and Navy,” Critic (Washington, DC: 26 Mar 1886, 1.

5 Marvin Day bought horses for the army during the Civil War, was partner in the livery Muzzy & Day, and once operation a hotel. J.H. Kidder, rector of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Oswego, said his funeral rights in 1894. Day’s son, Frederick, was married to his first wife in a Catholic Mass. “Marvin Day,” Tioga Country Record (Tioga, NY: 1894), n.p.; “Death of Marvin S. Day” Scranton Tribune (Scranton, PA: 13 Aug 1894), 5; n.a., The Protestant Episcopal Almanac (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1899), 94; Jamestown Weekly Alert (Jamestown, ND: 08 Jun 1893), 5.

6 Leonard Roudiez commanded a sharpshooter battalion during the Franco-Prussian War and afterward emigrated to Brazil with his family, where he died, possibly in 1873. Leon emigrated to the U.S. after his death, and likely stayed with an uncle, a homeopath named Dr. Pierre Vallante Roudiez, in New England, and later in Kansas. There is no evidence to support Dr. Roudiez’ claims he served as surgeon major in the 1st Ohio Cavalry, 27th Ohio Infantry, 47th Iowa Infantry and 44th Iowa Infantry Regiments, or that he was a surgeon in France 4th Hussar Regiment during the Crimean War. Religion presumed. When Roudiez married his second wife, Lulu Horan, in 1912, it was in an Episcopal service. Email, Francis Roudiez to Author, dtd 04 Jul 2020; “U.S. Passport Applications, 1795-1925,” s.v. Leon S. Roudiez (b. Jun 1860), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “The Smart Set,” San Francisco Call (05 Oct 1912), 19 See, “Twenty-Five Years Ago,” Ness County News (Ness City, KS: 27 Dec 1913), 1; “Carried in Three Wars,” Denver Post (22 Feb 1900), 5; “Kansas Enrollment of Civil War Veterans, 1889,” s.v. “Peter V. Roudiez,” (b. ABT 1833), in digital image available at Ancestry.com.

7 William McAnaney emigrated from Ireland. He owned a boot and shoe store in Fairport, NY, and had been nominated as a police justice on the Democrat ticket in 1893. He died in 1896, and was buried a Catholic. Child (1869), 239; “Fairport Democratic Village Caucus,” Democrat and Chronicle (Rochester, NY: 07 Mar 1893), 4; Monroe County Mall (Fairport, NY: 7 May 1896), 5; “Ink Drops,” Fairport Herald (Fairport, NY: 06 May 1896), 3.

8 Orseus Ferris was born at Ovid, NY on 05 May 1814, came to Wilson in 1836. He farmed and twice was elected as town supervisor on the Republican ticket, in 1854 and 1857. He was a prominent Baptist. Sandford & Co., History of Niagara County, New York (New York: George McNamara, 1878), 382, 393; “Republicanism Triumphant in the Cataract County,” Buffalo Morning Express (Buffalo, NY: 18 Apr 1957), 2.

9 Religion assumed from first wife, Sarah Perce. They were married in the Episcopal faith at Epiphany Church on Ashland Avenue in Chicago in 1889. Heitman, v.1 (1988), 855; “Miss Sallie C. Perce is Now Mrs. George Worthington Ruthers,” Chicago Tribune (24 Apr 1889), 3.

10 Weinberg claimed he was born in Missouri and did not identify his parent’s nativity. 1880 United States Federal Census, Fort Sanders, Albany, Wyoming, s.v. “Jerome J. Weinberg” (b. ABT 1855), Ancestry.com; “Lieutenant Weinberg at Rest,” Kansas City Times (Kansas City, MO: 24 Aug 1886), 2.


12 Major Joseph O’Neil died in 1867 of wounds received at Fredericksburg, VA, in 1862. His wife remarried to Lieutenant John Murphy, who in turn adopted J.P. O’Neil. Irene Flower, “Slumann-

Hermon Beckurts emigrated from Braunschweig, Germany, and was a member of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Louisville, KY. “Death of Famous Distiller” Saint Paul Globe (St. Paul, MN: 22 Nov 1890), 5; “Mr. Beckurt’s Funeral,” Courier Journal (Louisville, KY: 23 Nov 1890), 7.


BG Robert Houston Anderson, Sr. The funeral service for R.H. Anderson, Jr. was said at Christ Church Episcopal, Savannah. U.S. Military Academy (1888), 75-81; “To Have a Soldier’s Burial,” Atlanta Constitution (Atlanta, GA: 25 Dec 1901), 4.

Brevet BG Seymour Treadwell Moore (USMA ’47) was married to Florence Greenhow, the daughter of Confederate spy Rose O’Neal Greenhow. He died in 1876 at Fort Gibson, Indian Territory. Religion presumed from 1885 marriage of Moore to Greenhow at St. John’s Episcopal Church (the ‘Church of Presidents’) in Wash., DC.; Heitman, v.1 (1984), 723; “Death of Well-Known Officer Just Reported,” St. Louis Republican (03 Jun 1876), 8; “Marriage in High Life,” Daily American Organ (Wash., DC: 30 Mar 1855), 3.

Brevet BG William Henry Penrose was the son of MAJ James Wilkinson Penrose (USMA ’24), a veteran of the Blackhawk War (’32), Seminole War (’38), and Mexican War (’46). BG Penrose retired in Salt Lake City, UT. Religion presumed from funeral rites. American Ancestry, v.8 (1898), 145; “Old Soldier Laid to Rest,” Salt Lake Telegram (Salt Lake City, UT: 05 Sep 1903, 8.

John H. Krug died in 1869. His family operated a large tannery in Lancaster, PA, for several generations. Major Krug’s obituary notes the family was Moravian. His grandfather, though, was Lutheran. “Major Krug, Native Here, Dies in Paris,” Lancaster New Era (Lancaster, PA: 19 Mar 1930), 1; “The Death of George H. Krug,” Daily Evening Express (Lancaster, PA: 29 Apr 1869), 2.


Aaron Young was prominent in local affairs. His son, Andrew H. Young, was a warden for the First Parish in Dover, which was Congregationalist. George H. Moses, New Hampshire Men: A Collection of Biographical Sketches (Concord, NH: New Hampshire Publ Co, 1893), 286; Quint (1883), 5-6.


LeRoy Robert Hawthorne had diverse business interests. In Minnesota, he owned a hotel, and in Newport, KY, he was secretary of the Newport Light Company, and secretary/treasurer and promoter of the Central Bridge. He was active in county Republican politics and served two terms as City Clerk. During the Civil War, he was a quartermaster brevet major of Kentucky troops. H.L. Hawthorne was buried a Catholic, “Death of L.R. Hawthorne,” Cincinnati Enquirer (16 Jan 1908), 9. “Fighter in Three Wars Succumbs,” Los Angeles Times (10 Apr 1948), 14.

Horace Benjamin was an attorney engaged in Republican politics in the village of Riverhead,


William Nivison Blow, Sr., attended but did not complete the West Point course, and served during the Civil War as a cavalry captain. Religion presumed from relations. American Ancestry, v.11 (1898), 69-70.

James House Anderson was an attorney and former American consul in Hamburg, Germany, during the Civil War. He was very active in Ohio state Republican politics, and was an intimate of the Shermans and the Evings. On his death left an estate valued at over $500,000, or about $13 millions today. He was raised in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications, 21 (Columbus: Fred J. Herr, 1912), 489-491. “Judge Anderson Dead,” Dayton Herald (Dayton, OH: 27 Jun 1912), 2; “The Division of an Estate Valued at $500,000,” Marion Weekly Star (Marion, OH: 21 Dec 1912), 9; Anderson (1904), 500.

Robert Hill Garlick Kean was a prominent attorney and once served as president of the Virginia Bar Association. During the Civil War, he was the chief of the Confederate Bureau of War. The Kears were Episcopal. National Cyclopedia of American Biography, v.12 (1904), 549.


Amos C. Sanford owned a large dry goods store in Palmyra with partner Thomas Birdsell. He was active in village politics, and was a former village president. He was an elder at the Western Presbyterian Church of Palmyra, NY. “Amos C. Sanford,” Democrat and Chronicle (Rochester, NY: 04 Apr 1902), 4; W.H. McIntosh, History of Wayne County, New York (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877), 142-143; Western Presbyterian Church, 1898 Manual of the Western Presbyterian Church of Palmyra, N.Y., digital image transcribed by Betsey Lewis (2006), accessed 08 Aug 2020.

William Fletcher Chittenden was a NY farmer who later prospered in MI cutting lumber. During the Civil War he served as a private in the 154th NY Infantry Regiment. The Chittenden’s were Baptist, assumed form their marriages: in 1857, the elder Chittenden wed in the First Baptist Church in Yorkshire, NY, and in 1885, his son Hiram Martin Chittenden was married by Rev. E.B. Olmsted, of the Baptist Church in Arcade, NY. n.a., Portrait and Biographical Record of Northern Michigan (Chicago: Record Publishing Co, 1895), 376-377 “William F. Chittenden,” Lansing State Journal (Lansing, MI) 04 Jun 1923, 1; “Wyoming County,” Buffalo Commercial (09 Jan 1885), 4; Dunkelman (2006), 47. For Rev. Olmsted see, “Arcade,” Buffalo Morning Express (14 Jan 1884), 6.


Samuel Isaac Gaillard was the superintendent of the South Carolina College experimental farm station. During the Civil War he was a sergeant major in Hampton’s Legion. Edwin L. Green, A History of the University of South Carolina (Columbia, SC: The State Co., 1916), 424; “Sudden Death of Mr. Samuel I. Gaillard,” Watchman and Southeron (Sunter, SC: 05 Oct 1898), 5; “An Appointment to West Point,” News and Herald (Winnabro, SC: 04 Sep 1879), 3; n.a., “The Late David du Bose Gaillard, Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army,” Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, no. 20 (Charleston, SC: Huguenot Society, 1914), 38-42; Third U.S. Volunteer Engineers (1916), 9.

John Franklin Taylor was a flourishing merchant in Tilton, NH. He was active in Republican circles, and served as a state representative and senator. McClintock (Nov and Dec 1885), 327-328, 331n; U.S. Military Academy (1934), 122-123; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 577.

William Joshua Sibert was long-time dealer in wholesale and retail hardware as Sibert & Blair. During the Civil War he was a 2LT in Co. I, 10th Alabama Regiment and later served in Co. G, 48th Alabama at Second Manassas, the Wilderness, and Petersburg. W.J. Sibert was M.E.C., but his son W.L. Sibert was buried an Episcopal in 1935. T.A. DeLand and A. Davis Smith, Northern Alabama: Historical and Biographical (Chicago: Donohue & Henneberry, 1888), 369-370. Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 577.

John Conklin, Sr., was a coal dealer and merchant in Penn Yan, NY, trading as John Conklin & Sons. He was a member of the First Presbyterian Church. “Yates,” Democrat and Chronicle (Rochester, NY: 26 Jun 1896), 4; “Yates County,” Buffalo Evening News (26 Jun 1896), 17.

John King Corthell (b.1822) had been a clothing merchant but when his son entered West
Point he was an insurance agent. The elder Corthell was active in his community and in state Republican politics, and from 1854-57 he was a member of the exclusive Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts. LT Corthell was buried by the Reverends John W. Day and Charles T. Billings, pastor of the New North Church, who were Universalists. Oliver Ayer Roberts, History of the Military Company of the Massachusetts Now Called the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, 1637-1888, vol. 3 (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1898), 247-249; 1880 United States Federal Census, Hingham, Plymouth, Massachusetts, s.v. “John King Corthell” (b. ABT 1822), Ancestry.com; “Lieut. Corthell’s Funeral,” Boston Globe (18 Nov 1893), 8; “Hingham Men Unpledged, “Boston Globe” (22 Sep 1889), 2; Hingham, Massachusetts, History of the Town of Hingham, Massachusetts, vol. 1, part 2 (Cambridge, MA: John Wilson and Son, 1893), 34, 48; “New North Church,” newnorthchurch-hingham.org, at http://newnorthchurch-hingham.org/?page_id=104 (accessed 08 Aug 2020).

40 Member of Vermont’s large Foote family, Henry William Foote was a former farmer who apparently had fallen on hard times and worked in Middlebury, VT, as a laborer. He was living with his second wife, Lenora. 1800 United States Federal Census, New Haven, Addison, Vermont, s.v. “Henry William Foote” (b. ABT 1820), Ancestry.com; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 178.

41 James Headon Lewis was a farmer. Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 329.


43 Brevet MG Samuel Davis Sturgis, Sr., (USMA ’46) and was a Catholic convert. His son was a Catholic, also, though he married his wife in a Catholic service in St. Paul, MN. Heitman, v.1 (1888), 934; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 567; “Funeral of Major General Sturgis,” Evening Star (Wash., DC.: 26 Oct 1889), 5; Alfred Young, Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared, 5th ed. (New York: Catholic Book Exchange, 1895), 609; “Fort Snelling,” Army and Navy Journal (05 Sep 1896), 5.

44 Emery H. Simpson was a successful Michigan farmer, a gentleman who is liked by every one [sic] who knows him for his kind and genial manners, who served several terms as a Republican in the state legislature. Likely raised a Baptist, Wendell L. Simpson ascribed to no denomination. Chapman Brothers (1892), 785-786; Thomas Hutchinson Thompson, A Genealogy of Descendants of John Thompson of Plymouth, Mass. (Lansing, MI: Darius D. Thorp, 1890), 171, 223; “Obituary,” News-Palladium (Benton Harbor, MI: 25 Feb 1888), 4; Beal (1915), 426.

45 Enos Maddox Hatch was a cooper before the Civil War, but turned to farming after losing an arm as a private in the 4th ME Infantry Regiment at the Wilderness. He died in 1921. 1860 United States Federal Census, Montville, Waldo, Maine, s.v. “Enos M. Hatch” (b. ABT 1835), Ancestry.com. “U.S. Veterans Administration Payment Cards,” s.v. “Enos M. Hatch” (b. ABT 1835), available in digital image at fold3.com; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 243.

46 Milo Livingston Palmer was born in NY and moved to Rome, GA, before the Civil War. During the war he worked for Noble Brothers Iron Foundry in Rome, and was a lieutenant in the Rome Works Artillery, a home defense unit. He was a carriage maker, but also farmed and taught school. Frederick Palmer was likely raised Sabbatarian Baptist, but married the daughter of an Episcopal minister and was buried in that faith. William Franklin Langworthy, comp., The Langworthy Family, Some Descendants of Andrew and Rachel (Hubbard) Langworthy ( Rutland, VT: Tuttle Publishing Co., 1940), 126; “Rome Works Artillery,” Rome Weekly Courier (Rome, GA: 30 May 1862), 2; “Rome Works Artillery,” Rome Tri-Weekly Courier (Rome, GA: 21 Jun 1862), 2; Sabbath Recorder 71, no. 14 (02 Oct 1811), 445; American Ancestry, vol. 9 (Albany, NY: Joel Munsell’s Sons, 1894), 217; “Col. F.L. Palmer,” Atlanta Constitution (20 Nov 1933), 6.

47 William Ninde Cole was born in Baltimore, MD. He moved to NY, where he was the owner/editor of the Palmyra Whig, which he later renamed the Wayne County Whig. He later published the Wayne Sentinel. He was prominent in Whig politics, and was appointed postmaster at Lyons, NY, by

48 Algermon Sidney Cabell was the long-time sheriff of Logan County, AR. He held a Confederate commission as major. Although many in the Cabell family were Episcopal, A.S. Cabell was buried a Catholic, and DRC Cabell was married to two Catholics. “Logan County,” Arkansas Democrat (05 Sep 1884), 4 “Obituary,” Daily Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock, AR: 18 Aug 1898), 2.

49 COL Lawrence Sprague Babbitt (USMA ’61). His son, Edwin Burr Babbitt, was a Catholic, possibly a convert as he married his first wife in an Episcopal service. U.S. Military Academy (1940), 145-146; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 21; Catholic Tribune (St. Joseph, MO: 17 May, 1919), 4; “Table Gossip,” Boston Globe (09 Nov 1884), 12.


51 Emilius Kitchell Sayre was a retired attorney and large land owner in Monticello, MO. The family was Presbyterian. Banta (1901), 637-638.

52 Oliver Perry Richardson (d. 1873) was a teacher, farmer and magistrate from South Carolina and served as judge advocate for the 36th Regiment of South Carolina Militia and during the Civil War he served as senior 2LT in Co. A, 10th South Carolina Infantry Regiment. After the war, he moved to Texas with his wife, Hester Wingo, where he farmed, amongst other pursuits. In 1870, he claimed real estate valued at $5000, or about $100,000 today. He was an uncle to AD Banta.


54 Jacob Dentler owned and operated a confectionary and ice cream shop for several decades on the main street of Pittston, PA. He ‘held quite a prominent place among the business men of the town’ and ‘his name was a synonym for uprightness and honest dealing.’ Religion assumed from father, who was buried a Methodist. “Pittston,” Scranton Republican (Scranton, PA: 06 Sep 1898), 8.

55 Ebenezer Erskine Hucheson was a prominent Cincinnati attorney and state representative but died when Grote was young. Grote’s maternal grandfather, Ebenezer S. Turpin, raised him. Turpin was a substantial land owner and dealt in grain. Grote was given a leave of absence from West Point in 1880, presumably to manage the affairs of his recently departed grandfather. He returned to the academy, joining the class of 1884. Grote became an Episcopal, though he likely was christened a Presbyterian; his mother and father were married by Presbyterian Rev. William Scott in 1858. Of interest, Scott was the father of future Army Chief of Staff Hugh L. Scott. Chester E. Bryan, ed., History of Madison County Ohio (Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., 1915), 404; In Memoriam Cincinnati, v. 1 (1881), 265; “In the Tomb,” Cincinnati Enquirer (19 Sep 1879), 8; Army and Navy Journal (07 Feb 1880), 529; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 279; ‘Ohio, County Marriage Records, 1774-1993,” s.v. “Ebenezer E. Hucheson” (b. ABT 1830), in digital image available at Ancestry.com.
56 John Thompson was born in Pennsylvania about 1836 (d. e.1904). He was a long-time resident of Iowa, and represented the lumber firm of Gilbert Hedge & Co in Albia, IA. The firm was one of the largest in the Midwest. He appears to have served in the regimental band of one of the first Iowa regiments raised in Burlington to volunteer for the Civil War, possibly the 6th Iowa Infantry. In 1870, he claimed assets of $6600, or over $121,000 today. His son, J.K. Thompson, was buried with Episcopal rites in 1910. “J.W. Gilbert,” St. Louis Globe-Democrat (St. Louis, MO: 18 Jan 1897), 2; “From Our Neighbors,” Daily Hawk-Eye (Burlington, IA: 15 Nov 1885), 6; 1870 United States Federal Census, Albia, Monroe, Iowa, s.v. “David Cary Shanks” (b. Jul 1862), Ancestry.com; “U.S. Civil War Soldiers, 1861-1865,” s.v. “John B. Thompson” (b. ABT 1836), in Ancestry.com; “Major Thompson Was Our Friend,” Arkansas Democrat (Little Rock, AR: 08 May 1910), 9; “Obituary,” Army and Navy Register (23 Apr 1910), 25.


58 Alfred V. Robins of Shelbyville, IN, was a tobacco merchant for a time and served during the 1870’s at the town’s elected recorder. Religion assumed from father’s marriage. 1870 United States Federal Census, Shelbyville Ward 1, Shelby, Indiana, s.v. “Alfred V. Robbins” (b. ABT 1836), Ancestry.com; “Former Well Known Resident Dies in South,” Shelbyville Democrat (Shelbyville, IN: 19 Oct 1907), 1; “Shelbyville,” Cincinnati Enquirer (16 Jan 1883), 2.

59 William Barrett Styer apparently had been quite a successful farmer near the family’s ancestral seat of Sellersburg, PA. In 1870, he claimed assets of around $4500, or almost $100,000 today. Before 1880, though, his fortunes declined and was living in Lancaster, PA, employed as a weaver and declared as indigent by his son, who was then attending nearby Franklin and Marshall College. At some point William Styer became his son’s dependent, and he died in 1912 at Fort Niagara, NY. The Styers were German Reformed Church, which in the 20th century became the Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS). 1870 United States Federal Census, Rockhill, Bucks, Pennsylvania, s.v. “William Barrett Styer” (b. Dec 1822), Ancestry.com; 1880 United States Federal Census, Rockhill, Bucks, Pennsylvania, s.v. “William Barrett Styer” (b. Dec 1822), Ancestry.com; 1910 United States Federal Census, Porter, District 0130, Niagara, New York, s.v. “William Barrett Styer” (b. Dec 1822), Ancestry.com; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 568.

60 Dr. Amos Northrup Bellinger was a prominent Charleston physician and former Confederate assistant surgeon, known to have gunned down black liveryman Stepney Riley in 1885. The Northrups and Bellingers of this line were Catholic, though one of J.B. Bellinger’s brothers became an Episcopal churchman in New York City. “U.S. Civil War Soldiers, 1861-1865,” s.v. “Amos N. Bellinger,” (b. ABT 1837), in Ancestry.com; Susan Millar Williams and Stephen G. Hoffius, Upheaval in Charleston (Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press, 2011), 81; A. Judd Northrup, The Northrup-Northrop Genealogy (New York: Grafton Press, 1908), 268; Frederick S. Hills, comp., New York State Men: Biographic Studies and Character Portraits (Albany, NY: Argus Co., 1910), 170; Marquis Who’s Who (1975), 41.

61 Perley Ayer (d. 1895), was member of the extended Ayer clan of Lawrence, MA, into which George S. Patton married. Ayer is variably described as a carpenter, mechanic, millwright, or machinist, and in 1873 he was employed by the Russell Mill in Lawrence. In 1860, he declared $4,000 in assets, or almost $130,000 today. He served several terms as a town councilman in the 1860s. “U.S. City Directories, 1822-1995,” s.v. “Perley Ayer” (b. Dec 1817), in digital image available at Ancestry.com; Dorgan (1918), 223-224.

62 Dr. William Davis Noble (d.1879) was father to two physicians, as well as R.H. Noble. R.H. Noble was a devout Episcopal and wrote church music. Reunions of the Davis, Noble and Kinder Families, 1885, 1895, 1905 (Federalsburg, MD: J.W. Stowell Printing Company, 1906), 24, 108 “Indian Fighter to be Given Last Rites Today,” San Francisco Examiner (28 Oct 1939), 11.

63 David Cary Shanks is described in census records as a farmer, while his son declared his occupation as a lumber dealer in Salem, Virginia. D.C. Shanks’ appointment to West Point was not competitive. During the Civil War, he was first lieutenant in the Salem Flying Artillery and served with the Army of Northern Virginia. D.C. Shanks was married in a Methodist Episcopal Church in 1893. Jack and Jacobs, (1912), 21; 1870 United States Federal Census, Salem, Roanoke, Virginia, s.v. “David Cary Shanks” (b. Apr 1861), Ancestry.com; David Cary Shanks, Genealogy of the Shanks Family (Self-publ.: n.d.), 13, 16-17. “Wedding of Miss Nannie Wright Chapman to Lieut. Shanks,” Roanoke Times (Roanoke, VA: 06 Oct 1893), 2.
Benjamin Clarke Morse, Sr., (1814-1864) was a civil engineer born at Barnet, Vermont. He died at Marquette, MI, and his family remained there. Benjamin W. Dwight, *The History of the Descendants of John Elder Strong of Northampton, Massachusetts* (Albany, NY: Joel Munsell, 1871), 300.

John Hughes Knight, Jr. was an attorney and planter, educated at Hampton-Sydney College, Univ. of Virginia, and Columbia Univ. During the Civil War, he enlisted in Co. K, 3rd Virginia Cavalry and rose to the rank of captain. Even after the war he claimed assets of $31,000, or over $600,000 dollars today. His son declared he was a cashier at a bank, and that the family was of moderate means. The Knights were Episcopal, judged by the 1939 wedding of J.T. Knight’s granddaughter, Mary Holmes Knight. “Captain John Hughes Knight,” *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA: 28 Jan 1914), 2; Miller (1912), 73-75; “Mary Knight Becomes Bride,” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* (Brooklyn, NY: 29 Oct 1939), 23.

Dr. James Bettton Hughes graduated from the Univ. of Pennsylvania medical school in 1856, and later took a stage in Europe. He practiced with his father until the Civil War, when he entered the Confederate army as a surgeon with the 2nd North Carolina Infantry. Dr. Hughes’ first marriage was Catholic, and his second was Episcopal. His son was married in a Lutheran service outside Philadelphia. “In Memoriam,” *Daily Journal* (New Bern, NC: 21 Jun 1900), 4; Anna M. Holstein, *Swedish Holsteins in America from 1644-1892* (Norristown, PA: M.R. Willis, 1892), 153-154; *Army and Navy Register* (21 Oct 1905), 17.

Dr. Powhattan Clarke graduated in medicine at the Univ. of New York. He was on the faculty of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning, the forerunner of Louisiana State University, with William T. Sherman before the Civil War. During the war he served as adjutant in the 10th Mississippi Cavalry at Shiloh. He moved to Baltimore after the war and was made professor of natural sciences at the Baltimore City College. The Clarkes were Roman Catholic. G. Brown Goode, *Virginia Cousins: A Study of the Ancestry and Posterity of John Goode of Whity* (Richmond, VA: J.W. Randolph & English, 1887), 377-378; Barry Cowen, *Louisiana State University* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2013), 49; “Obituary Notes,” *Medical Record* 91 (05 May 1917), 778.
APPENDIX B

1884 Cohort Educational Experiences
As of: 19 Dec 2020

The following tables record the cohort’s civilian educational experiences. Included are experiences enjoyed before commissioning, as well as those undertaken while in service or retirement, which are in bold text for ease of identification. Secondary experiences were located for about 70% of the officers. Table columns list the officer’s name; the name and location of their secondary and post-secondary schools; whether they graduated from a college or university; and for graduates, the level of degree and date awarded. In most cases, the tables list a school’s modern name for ease of identification, especially in the case of colleges and universities. Note that during the 19th century, West Point and Annapolis did not grant degrees. Neither did the senior military colleges, like the Virginia Military Institute. For graduates of these institutions, ‘Grad’ is listed in lieu of a degree, except in Table B-3, which already lists all the West Point graduates of 1884. Of interest, the Pennsylvania Military College did grant degrees in civil engineering, and the two cohort members earning these degrees appear in Table B-2, with those officers commissioned directly from civilian life.

School experiences were located for eight of the 11 cohort members commissioned from the ranks, or about 73% of the population. Of these, three attended or graduated from a college or university. Of the 19 officers directly commissioned from civil life, pre-commissioning school experiences were identified for all but two, or about 89%. While a college record has not surfaced for Abraham Perry Buffington, he declared in the 1940 U.S. Federal Census he had completed five years of college. The educational experiences of West Pointers are exceptionally well documented. In addition to the sources cited in the endnotes, West Pointer educational data was collected from RG404, “Educational Experiences of Cadets.” As always, generous footnotes provide additional context. (Tables follow.)
Table B-1: 1884 Rankers’ Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Prep.</th>
<th>Post-Secondary</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td>Ypsilanti P.S., MI</td>
<td>Eastern Mich. Univ., ’69</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>BS ’73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ypsilanti Union Seminary</td>
<td>Mich. State Univ.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Mich. Law, ’74-75</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, C</td>
<td>Gymnasium Tübingen</td>
<td>Univ. of Tübingen, ’77-80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Un. of Munich, ’81</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, J.E.</td>
<td>Salem H.S., MA</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AB ‘81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, J.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown Univ. Law, DC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>LL.B. ’99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>Owego Free Acad., NY³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.</td>
<td>Chicopee Falls H.S., MA²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, W.D.</td>
<td>Fairport P.S., NY²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, F.O.</td>
<td>Wilson H.S., NY³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruters, G.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, J.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, A.S.</td>
<td>Syracuse P.S., NY⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-2: 1884 Direct Appointees’ Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Prep.</th>
<th>Post-Secondary</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil, J.P.</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Coll., KS</td>
<td>Univ. of Notre Dame, IN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>BS ’83²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, A.P.</td>
<td>College (?)?, 5 yrs¹¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, C.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Military Inst.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Grad ’80²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, W.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Penn. Military Coll. USMA ’80-82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CE ’79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, R.H.</td>
<td>Phillips Exeter Acad., NH</td>
<td>Union Coll., NY ’79-84</td>
<td>N⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>Hellmuth Coll., Ont.¹⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüg, F.V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, E.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>USNA ’79-83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Grad ’83²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, R.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>USNA ’79-82</td>
<td>N¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, W.J.</td>
<td>Penn. Military Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CE ’79²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, A.H.</td>
<td>Dover P.S., NH¹⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, W.D.</td>
<td>Private tutors</td>
<td>Medical Coll. of VA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MD ’82²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Univ. Med.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MD ’84²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>Woodward H.S., OH</td>
<td>USNA ’78-82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Grad ’82²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, E.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>USMA ’79-80</td>
<td>N²²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins, S.R.H.</td>
<td>Shattuck Milt. Acad., MN²³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., W.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Military Inst.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Grad ’76²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, J.T.</td>
<td>Columbus H.S., OH</td>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AB ’84²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, J.R.</td>
<td>Episcopal H.S., Alexandria, VA</td>
<td>Univ. of Virginia Med.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MD ’83²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellevue H.S., Lynchburg, VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-3: 1884 West Pointers’ Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Prep.</th>
<th>Civilian Post-Secondary</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, I.</td>
<td>East Denver H.S., CO&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, J.C.</td>
<td>Phillips Andover, MA Private tutor</td>
<td>Hobart Coll., NY ’82 Yale ’79</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, H.M.</td>
<td>Ten Broeck Academy, NY</td>
<td>Cornell Univ., NY ’79-80</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, C.E.</td>
<td>Public H.S., PA</td>
<td>State Normal School, PA ’79</td>
<td>Y&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaillard, D.D.</td>
<td>Mount Zion Inst., SC Highland Falls Acad., NY&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Tilton Academy, NH&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>Country schools, AL Private tutor</td>
<td>Univ. of Alabama, ’79-80</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, J., Jr.</td>
<td>Penn Yan Academy, NY&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell, C.L.</td>
<td>Hingham H.S., MA&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, S.M.</td>
<td>Beeman Academy, VT</td>
<td>Middlebury Coll., VT ’79</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, I.N.</td>
<td>New Salem Public H.S., PA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, E.F.</td>
<td>Thetford Academy, VT</td>
<td>Randolph Normal Sch. VT ’77</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, S.D., Jr</td>
<td>Vireun School, NY*</td>
<td>Wash. Univ. St. Louis ’78-80</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, W.L.</td>
<td>Hartford P.S., MI</td>
<td>Mich. State Univ. ’78-79</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>Mountville P.S., ME&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, F.L.</td>
<td>Rome P.S., GA Highland Falls Acad., NY&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>Portage P.S., WI</td>
<td>Univer. of Wisconsin Law</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LL.B. ’90&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.C.</td>
<td>Private H.S.; private tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td>St. Louis P.S., MO Private Prep School</td>
<td>Wash. Univ. St. Louis</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, E.S.</td>
<td>Springfield H.S., MA&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayre, F.</td>
<td>Family tutor</td>
<td>Harvard, 1920s</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ., MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, W.P.</td>
<td>Private H.S.&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA, ’36 Ph.D., ’38&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, H.J.</td>
<td>St. Benedict’s Coll., KS ’76-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, C.E.</td>
<td>Wyoming Seminary, PA&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td>Private H.S. Private Prep. School*&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.K.</td>
<td>Des Moines P.S., IA Highland Falls Acad., NY&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, G.O.</td>
<td>Hancock P.S., IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, E.S.</td>
<td>Purdue Univ., IN ’79</td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steyr, H.D.</td>
<td>Lancaster P.S., PA Franklin and Marshall, PA&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, J.B.</td>
<td>Private Schools, SC Highland Falls Acad., NY&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer, W.E.</td>
<td>Lawrence P.S., MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, R.H.</td>
<td>State Model School, NJ</td>
<td>Univer. of Maryland St. John’s Coll., MD</td>
<td>Y&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LL.B. ’92 AM ’94&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, D.C.</td>
<td>Roanoke Coll., VA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AM ’79&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, B.C.</td>
<td>Marquette School, MI&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, J.T.</td>
<td>Prince Edward Acad., VA</td>
<td>Hampton-Sydney, VA ’77-79</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, J.B.</td>
<td>Bingham School, NC&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, P.H.</td>
<td>Studied in France Georgetown Prep, DC ’75-76 Baltimore City College</td>
<td>Univ. of Maryland ’77-79</td>
<td>N&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schools specializing in West Point exam preparation

<sup>1</sup> Founded privately in the 1850s, Ypsilanti Union Seminary was Michigan’s first graded high school. Finley pursued a classical course at the Michigan State Normal School, today’s Eastern Michigan University, in his home town of Ypsilanti. Michigan State Agricultural and Mechanical College was the
forerunner of Michigan State University. Finley did not graduate from the University of Michigan law school, but only passed a year there before returning to Michigan State to take a masters. The sources disagree on whether Finley received his BS in 1870 or 1873. “Charles: The Other Woodruff,” Heritage News (Ypsiilanti Heritage Foundation, MI: Jan 2012), 5; Lansing State Journal (05 Mar 1914), 3; Galway (1885), 1389; “Death Notices,” University of Michigan Official Publication 48, no. 83 (03 Mar 1945), 20; Cox, (2002), 105.


3 In the 1800s, Salem High School in Salem, Massachusetts, was a Harvard feeder school. Maxfield took honors in mathematics. Harvard University, Fortieth Anniversary Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1881 of Harvard College, June 1881-June 1921 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1921), 155; Harvard University (1906), 89-90.


5 Day graduated from the Owego Free Academy in 1878 and enlisted in August 1880. The academy had been privately founded in 1827, but had merged with the local public schools in 1864. Leonard (1907), 387; William Burton Gay, comp. and ed., Historical Gazetteer of Tioga County, New York, 1785-1888 (Syracuse, NY: W.B. Gay & Co., 1887), 390.

6 It is possible Roudiez also was educated in Fall River, MA, where his uncle, Dr. P.V. Roudiez, was living. Email, Francis Roudiez to Author, dtd 04 Jul 2020.


8 Assumed; Ferris’ father sat on the village’s school board and supported of public education.

9 Frost was born in Chicago but raised in Syracuse, New York. Leonard (1905), 220.

10 St. Mary’s College is a Jesuit junior college located in Topeka, Kansas. In the 1800s, it was closer to a preparatory academy than a post-secondary institution. Eugene Guard (Eugene, OR: 27 Jul 1938), 2; Leonard (1907), 999.

11 On the 1940 U.S. Census, Buffington declared he had attended five years of college. The name of the school is not yet identified. 1940 United States Federal Census, Other Places, New Castle, Delaware, s.v. “Abraham P. Buffington” (b. 01 Jan 1857), Ancestry.com.


15 Established in 1865 as successor to the London Collegiate Institute of London, Ontario, Hellmuth College was long ago shuttered. Leach and Penrose (1903), 128.

16 Weeks graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1883 and was assigned as a naval cadet on the gunboat U.S.S. Alert with duty on the Asiatic Station. He resigned in 1884 to accept an appointment in the U.S. Army. “Cadet Midshipmen an Engineers,” Army and Navy Journal (05 Oct 1878), 135; U.S. Bureau of Naval Personnel, Register of the Commission and Warrant Officers of the Navy of the United States, Including Officers of the Marine Corps (Wash., DC: GPO, 1884), 162; “Changes on the Asiatic Station,” Army and Navy Journal (03 May 1884), 8; “Died by His Own Hand,” Galveston Daily News (Galveston, TX: 13 May 1890), 1


18 Myron Pardee, William Pardee’s father, had been a patron of PMC for 18 years. “Educational,” Philadelphia Inquirer (12 Jun 1879), 4; Pennsylvania Military Academy (1880), 31.

19 Hurd, (1882), 872.

20 McCaw received his first medical degree at the age of 19. Phalen (1942), 135.
Woodward High School in Cincinnati, OH, was the same elite school Professor Peter Michie and President William Howard Taft attended. After graduating Annapolis in 1882, Hawthorne served two years at sea as a naval cadet, passing his final examination for commissioning in 1884. In October that year, Hawthorne was honorably discharged from the U.S. Navy due to a surplus of naval cadets, and he accepted an appointment as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army as an artillery officer. Knights Templar, Covington Commandery, No. 7 (1878), 301-302; Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Ohio, Circular 13, no.138 (1889), 15 in Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Collection of Circulars of Various State Commanderies, 1882-1900, at HathiTrust.org.

23 Carroll (1984), 66.
24 After graduating with honors from VMI in 1876, Blow worked for several years as an engineer before applying for a commission. American Ancestry, v.11 (1898), 69; Blow (1991).
25 Anderson (1904), 207-208, 501.
26 Both of the high schools listed here were private boarding schools. Kean (1928), 5.
29 Dodds (1973), 2-7.
31 David DuBose Gaillard spent three years at the Mount Zion Institute in Winnboro, South Carolina, and later studied under Col. Huse at ‘The Rocks’ outside the gates of West Point. Of interest, his wife, Katherine Ross Davis, also prepared at Mount Zion Institute. Third U.S. Volunteer Engineers (1916), 11-13, 24.
32 Tilton Academy is a preparatory boarding school founded by the Methodist Episcopal Church. At the time Taylor attended, the school likely served as the area high school, as well. Also known as Tilton Seminary. U.S. Military Academy (1934), 123.
33 Clark (1930), 23-25.
36 Ullery (1894), 65.
37 The New Salem public school was independent from the rest of the county schools, and described in 1882 as ‘fine.’ Franklin Ellis, ed., History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts & Co., 1882), 658.
38 “Ladd,” United Opinion (Bradford, VT: 04 Jan 1895), 4; Randolph Normal School (1885), 55.
39 Henry Clay Symonds operated the Vireun School, also known as the Symonds School, to prepare candidates for West Point’s entrance examinations. It was the competitor to Colonel Caleb Huse’s Highland Falls Academy. Tuition at both schools was high, and both also were frequently criticized for coaching their students, rather than educating them. “Literature,” Public Service Review 1, no. 7 (16 Jun 1887), 107; U.S. Military Academy, Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the Association of Graduates (Newburgh, NY: Moore Printing Co, 1933), 138.
40 Michigan State University was, at that time, known as the Michigan Agricultural & Mechanical College. Simpson returned to the school twice as faculty, as professor of military science and tactics from 1887-1891, and as professor of mathematics and engineering from 1890-1891. Beal (1915), 426.
42 U.S. Military Academy (1934), 126.
43 Cole spent two years at the University of Wisconsin before accepting an appointment to the academy. While assigned to the school as professor of military science and tactics (1888-1891), Cole received his law degree. U.S. Military Academy (1932), 137; Reuben Gold Thwaites, The University of Wisconsin, Its History and Its Alumni (Madison, WI: J.N. Purcell, 1900), 831.
44 In his declaration at West Point, Babbitt claimed spending 15 months in a private high school, 2 years in a normal school, and 8 months in a college prior to his entering the military academy. His memorial in the Association of Graduates annual said he spent some time in St. Louis public schools. This may have been an assumption on the author’s part. U.S. Military Academy (1940), 146.

45 Springfield High School was one of the first equipped four-year schools in the state. Benton graduated with one of the school’s earliest classes, in 1878. Afterwards, he read law and taught school before accepting an appointment to the academy. Vaughan (1931), n.p.

46 Farrand Sayre was tutored at home by his sister, Elizabeth, who had graduated from Vassar in 1869. At the age of 64, he retired from the army for age in 1925. Afterwards, Sayre worked for a time as a parole agent for the state of Massachusetts while taking courses in criminology at Harvard. The state retired him at the age of 70, once again for age, around 1931. In 1932, he and his wife moved to Baltimore, Maryland, to be close to their daughter. By 1933, Sayre had enrolled as a graduate student at Johns Hopkins University. He was awarded his MA in philosophy in 1936, and his Ph.D. in 1938. He published his thesis, entitled “Diogenes of Sinope,” in 1938, at the age of 77. He published his second volume on the Greek cynics in 1948, at the age of 87. He died in Baltimore in 1952, aged 90. “Farrand Sayre,” Assembly 7, no. 1 (Apr 1953), 42-43.

47 Richardson’s memorial also suggests he was tutored privately. U.S. Military Academy, Sixtieth Annual Report of the Association of Graduates (Newburgh, NY: Moore Printing Co., 1929), 281.

48 Hugh and his brother, Patrick J. Gallagher, both attended Saint Benedict’s College, a Roman Catholic school in Atchison, Kansas. Hugh reported he spent 2 years and 2 months in college before entering West Point. Saint Benedict’s College, Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Saint Benedict’s College (Atchison, KS: Daily Champion, 1877), 17.


50 Hutcheson declared he spent 10 months in a private high school, but his memorial mentions being ‘sent to a preparatory school near West Point,’ where he observed mounted drills and instruction. The brief description seems to fit Caleb Huse’s Highland Falls Academy. “Grote Hutcheson,” Assembly 8, no. 2a (Jul 1949), 3.


52 Robins attended Purdue for a year before entering West Point. As a student there, he belonged to Sigma Chi clandestinely because the school’s president had for a time banned secret societies on campus, and so his formal induction in the fraternity dates to 1882. Purdue University (1879), 10; Hostetter (1912), 228.


54 U.S. Military Academy (1932), 133.

55 The State Model School was a boarding school located in Trenton, New Jersey. U.S. Military Academy (1940), 150-151. U.S. Adjutant General, Official Army Register, 1938 (Wash., DC: GPO, 1938), 1014.

56 Shanks only reported spending 18 months in college, but the school’s records list him as having earned a master of arts degree in 1879. In 1921, Roanoke College made Shanks a Doctor of Laws, but did not stipulate it was honorary. Roanoke College, Catalogue of the Alumni of Roanoke College, 1853-1893 (Salem, VA: 1893), 8; Shanks (n.d.), 16.

57 The identity of this school is as yet undetermined. Shanks reported he spent 3 years in normal school and 3 months in private study before entering West Point. When serving as professor of military science at the University of Illinois, Morse named his preparatory school as the Marquette School. James Herbert Kelley, ed., The Alumni Record of the University of Illinois (Chicago: R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1913), 733.


59 The Bingham School was a private school located in Mebane, North Carolina. Its students largely came from ‘families of means and influence.’ The army detailed Second Lieutenant Hughes, an alumnus of the school, as the professor of military science and tactics in 1889. U.S. Army Inspector General, Annual Report of the Inspector-General of the Army to the Major-General Commanding the Army for the year 1890 (Wash., DC: GPO, 1890), 151; U.S. Military Academy (1933), 133.

60 Reportedly, Clarke accompanied his mother to France at the age of 10 and studied there for
three years before returning to the United States. He prepared at Georgetown College, the university’s junior division, beginning the academic year 1875, focusing on Latin, Greek, English and arithmetic. Clarke declared he had attended 3.5 years of college before entering the military academy and he may have counted his preparatory time at Georgetown University. The description of his private papers maintained by the Missouri Historical Society also notes that Clarke spent time studying Baltimore City College, a public prep school where his father was a professor, probably before going on to the Maryland Agricultural College, today’s University of Maryland. “Drowned at Fort Custer,” Helena Independent (Helena, MT: 03 May 1893), 8; Georgetown College, A Catalog of the Officers and Students of Georgetown College, District of Columbia, for the Academic Year, 1875-76 (Baltimore, MD: John Murphy & Co., 1876), 20; Maxwell (1916), 80; Maryland Agricultural College, Register of the Maryland Agricultural College for Session Ending June 25, 1878 (Baltimore: Hagadorn Brothers, 1878), 7; Maryland Agricultural College, Register of the Maryland Agricultural College for Session Ending June 24, 1879 (New York: T. Cotesworth Pinckney, 1879), 7.
APPENDIX C

1884 Officer Cohort Marriages
As of: 19 Dec 2020

The following five tables examine the primary and subsequent marriages for officers commissioned in the 1884 cohort to indicate the degree of social endogamy. The tables compare the achieved status of cohort members as commissioned officers in the Regular Army, with their wives’ ascribed status, based on their fathers’ occupations. Tables list the officer’s name, the year wed, the couple’s ages at the time they married, the bride’s name, and her father’s occupation at the time of her marriage. The couple’s ages have been determined from a wide variety of sources, including published genealogies, service records, obituaries, census responses, and even photographs of headstones. Where conflicts occurred, care was taken to consult several sources to determine the most accurate year of birth. For unmarried officers, their dates of death are listed. On average, officers listed here married within five years of receiving their commissions, regardless of commissioning source.¹

Because many a bride’s father held multiple positions at the same time – such as attorneys engaged as judges, bankers, or merchants – and effort has been made to identify their chief occupation at the time of their daughter’s marriage. For fathers in the army or navy, the tables list their ranks at the time of their daughters’ marriages, rather than their ultimate grades. Fathers holding military commissions after graduating from West Point are identified with ‘USMA’ and the two-digit year of their graduation; those commissioned from other sources and serving in the Regular Army are identified ‘CFR’ for rankers and ‘CDA’ for civil life. Some effort has been made to identify the grades of officers who formerly served the Confederacy.

Brides who were employed outside the home or whose fathers were deceased at the time of their marriage to the officer are identified by symbols marked in the tables’ legends. Similarly, brides with some college or university education are identified by an asterisk (*). Information on the education levels of wives is quite hard to come by. Such information rarely appeared in wedding announcements or obituaries during the period. The 1940 U.S. Census...
was the first attempt to record respondent education levels on a national level, beyond simple literacy. Based on the responses of wives who lived so long, most claimed credit for four years of high school. Few of the wives listed here appear to have attended a college or university, though many of their daughters attended, as shown in Appendix 5. Additional biographic information appears in generous endnotes.

**First Marriages: Officers Commissioned from the Ranks**

Nine of the 11 officers commissioned from the ranks in 1884 married, yielding a nuptiality rate of 82%. The median time from commissioning to marriage was 4 years and the median age at marriage for men raised from the ranks was 31, while their wives averaged 24 years old. As a subgroup, the median marriage age of ranker couplings was higher than for those commissioned through the other sources: 31 years for the men and 24 years for their brides. Time spent out of the marriage market due to informal practices which discouraged enlisted men from marrying likely explains the disparity with West Pointers, direct appointees, and the population at large.

Of those who did marry, only John Park Finley wed while an enlisted soldier, in 1879. The remainder married while serving as company officers, either as lieutenants or captains. The last to marry was Frank Orsemus Ferris, in 1897. The youngest bride was Sara Beth Stokes Roudiez, who wed when she was 18 years old, and the oldest bride was Isabella Howard, who was 31 years old when she married Lieutenant Julius Henry Weber. Two of these brides were employed as government clerks at the time of their marriage: Julia Larkin and Frances Enright. While Larkin’s father was engaged in business in the nation’s capital at the time she wed, no information has come to light on the identity or occupation of Frances Enright’s father. Despite their having served as enlisted soldiers, the marriages of rankers were no less socially homogamous than those of officers commissioned from other sources, indicating provincial elites clearly recognized their higher commissioned status, even as junior officers. While there were no divorces amongst this population, four would remarry at some stage following the death of their first spouse. See, *Table C-5*, below.
The two unmarried rankers died quite early in their careers. Lieutenant Jerome J. Weinberg died only a year after he was commissioned, in 1885, when he succumbed to severe burns received after an oil lamp exploded in his quarters at Fort Leavenworth. At the time of his death, Weinberg reportedly was engaged to Alice Watkins Claiborne of Danville, Virginia. After Weinberg’s death, Miss Claiborne appears not to have married. Lieutenant William McAnaney died in 1894 from an overdose of laudanum, apparently without marriage prospects. Overall, casualties occurring within peak marrying years may partly account for the cohort’s slightly lower nuptiality rate when compared against the general population of the period.

**Table C-I: 1884 Rankers’ First Wives and Their Fathers’ Occupations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Age (H/W)</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th>Father’s Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>25/20</td>
<td>Julia V. Larkin</td>
<td>Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, C</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>31/30</td>
<td>Anna D. VanDerlip</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, J.E.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>24/24</td>
<td>Harriet W. Mansfield</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, J.H.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>33/31</td>
<td>Isabella C. Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>31/28</td>
<td>Frances Enright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>32/18</td>
<td>Sara Beth Stokes</td>
<td>U.S. land agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, W.D.</td>
<td>d.1894</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, F.O.</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>40/27</td>
<td>Anna G. Hobbs*</td>
<td>Sea captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, G.W.</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>31/20</td>
<td>Sarah C. Perce</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, J.J.</td>
<td>d.1885</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, A.S.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>26/23</td>
<td>Florence E. Mann</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Father deceased at time of marriage.
♀Bride employed at time of marriage.

**First Marriages: Officers Commissioned from Civil Life**

Fourteen of the 19 officers directly appointed from civilian life married, yielding a nuptiality rate of 74%. The median time between their commissioning and their first marriage was 5 years, and their median age at marriage was 28 years; their wives averaged 22 years. The youngest bride was Louisa Hurlburt Young Kean, who wed at 17, and the oldest was Mary Minor Penrose, who married at 27 years of age. Note here that Andrew Huckins Young, who had served previously as a Volunteer officer during the Civil War, married considerably earlier than the cohort. He married Susan Miles thirty years before the others in his cohort received their commissions. Apart from Young, the earliest to marry was William Nivison Blow, who wed two years before accepting a direct appointment as lieutenant. While in peacetime Blow’s
circumstances were somewhat unrepresentative of men without prior enlisted or wartime service, his wife was the daughter of a brigadier general with deep political roots in Maine, factors that likely mitigated any official objections. The last to wed was Selah Reeve Hobbie Tompkins, who married in 1902. Tompkins wed the daughter of a Spanish Army major killed in action defending Havana from American forces in 1898.

Table C-2: 1884 Direct Appointees’ First Wives and Their Fathers’ Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Age (H/W)</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th>Father’s Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil, J.P.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>29/23</td>
<td>Nina M. Troup</td>
<td>Owner, steamboat line†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, A.P.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>27/24</td>
<td>Alma E. Enslow</td>
<td>Farmer†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, C.L.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>30/24</td>
<td>Isabel W. Pickering</td>
<td>Hardware magnate†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, W.C.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>27/21</td>
<td>Kate L. Bonnell</td>
<td>Oilman†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, R.H., Jr.</td>
<td>d.1901</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, T.W.</td>
<td>d.1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>28/27</td>
<td>Mary B. Minor</td>
<td>Grocery wholesaler‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüg, F.V.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>28/18</td>
<td>Bertha M. Welty</td>
<td>Physician§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, E.B.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>26/22</td>
<td>Harriet A. Ovenshine</td>
<td>MAJ, USA (CDA)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, R.R.</td>
<td>d.1917</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, W.J.</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>37/25</td>
<td>Mary E. Wilcoxson</td>
<td>Cotton Broker‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, A.H.</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>27/22</td>
<td>Susan E. Miles</td>
<td>Carpenter‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, W.D.</td>
<td>d.1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>29/19</td>
<td>Belle Sinclair*</td>
<td>MAJ (USMA ’57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, E.E.</td>
<td>d.1903</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins, S.R.H.</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>38/25</td>
<td>Delores Muller</td>
<td>MAJ, Spanish Army‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., W.N.</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>27/19</td>
<td>Mary E. Thomas*</td>
<td>BG, USA (CDA)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, J.T.</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>26/26</td>
<td>Helen Bagley</td>
<td>Governor, Michigan‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keen, J.R.</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>34/17</td>
<td>Louisa H. Young</td>
<td>Attorney‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Father deceased on marriage.
*Attended a college or university before marriage.
CDA – Commissioned by direct appointment

First Marriages: Officers Commissioned from the U.S. Military Academy

Thirty-four of the 37 officers commissioned from West Point in 1884 married, yielding an average of 92%, the highest by far of the three commissioned subgroups. The median time from commissioning until their first marriage was 4 years, and their median age at commissioning was 28; the median age of their spouses was 23. The youngest bride was Mary Susana Simpson Palmer, who married at 17, and the oldest was Rosalie St. George Hutcheson, who married at 38 years of age. The first West Pointer to marry was Everard Enos Hatch, who wed Mellie Rowe two months after his graduation from the academy. Rowe was from Hatch’s
home state of Maine, and the two likely were acquainted before he departed to attend the academy. The last to marry was Robert H. Noble (in bold), who married for the first time in 1921 at the age of 60. Noble took two academic degrees in between military assignments, which likely left little time for courting in his youth. When he did, Noble married Ethel Dimond Sherwood, the daughter of a prosperous attorney and widow of a wealthy importer.

Table C-3: 1884 West Pointers’ First Wives and Father’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Age (H/W)</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th>Father’s Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, I.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>26/20</td>
<td>Mary V. King*</td>
<td>LTC (USMA ‘63)31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, J.C.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>37/37</td>
<td>Antoinette Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, H.M.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>27/28</td>
<td>Henrietta Parker</td>
<td>Farmer13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, C.E.</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>30/19</td>
<td>Anna A. Hamilton*</td>
<td>Coal operator34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaillard, D.D.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>28/21</td>
<td>Katherine Ross Davis*</td>
<td>Farmer/COL, CSA35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>39/25</td>
<td>Adele Austin Yates</td>
<td>CAPT, USN (CDA)36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>27/25</td>
<td>Mary M. Cummings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, J., Jr.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>24/20</td>
<td>Rosalie French</td>
<td>Bvt. MG (USMA ‘37)38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell, C.L.</td>
<td>d.1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, S.M.</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>30/21</td>
<td>Sara Brooke</td>
<td>Surgeon (MAJ), USA (CDA)40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, I.N.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>28/26</td>
<td>Mary Wheatley*</td>
<td>Reverend (MEC)41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, E.F.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>29/27</td>
<td>Violet D. Norman</td>
<td>Bvt. COL, USA (CDA)42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, S.D., Jr.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>35/21</td>
<td>Bertha Tracy Bement</td>
<td>Engineer43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, W.L.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>27/21</td>
<td>Marion O. Wood</td>
<td>Industrialist44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>25/23</td>
<td>Mellie S. Rowe</td>
<td>Farmer45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, F.L.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>24/17</td>
<td>Mary Susana Simpson</td>
<td>Chaplain, USA (EC) (CDA)46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>25/19</td>
<td>Mary Tupper</td>
<td>MAJ, USA (CFR)47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.C.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>27/19</td>
<td>Mary Agnes Boggs Otis</td>
<td>COL (USMA ‘53)48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>22/27</td>
<td>Emily A. Fenno</td>
<td>Broker49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, E.S.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>27/24</td>
<td>Mary Raper Branch</td>
<td>Ohio State Rep. (R)50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayre, F.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>27/22</td>
<td>Kate Hamlin Phelps</td>
<td>Physician51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, W.P.</td>
<td>d.1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, H.J.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>24/22</td>
<td>Amelia Paschal</td>
<td>Estate agent53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, C.E.</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>35/20</td>
<td>Delia E. Gellaty*</td>
<td>Farmer44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>38/38</td>
<td>Rosalie E. St. George</td>
<td>Stock Broker55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.K.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>26/23</td>
<td>Mary Swan*</td>
<td>Iron manufacturer56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, G.O.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>24/19</td>
<td>Dora Scott Dean</td>
<td>Judge57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, E.S.</td>
<td>d.1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayer, H.D.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>25/29</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wilkes</td>
<td>Civil Eng./MAJ, CSA59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, J.B.</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>30/27</td>
<td>Marie Clarisse Coudert</td>
<td>Attorney60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, R.H.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>60/42</td>
<td>Ethel D. Sherwood</td>
<td>Attorney62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, D.C.</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>32/25</td>
<td>Nancy W. Chapman</td>
<td>Owner, resort hotel63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, B.C.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>31/26</td>
<td>Jessie Cable*</td>
<td>Owner, resort hotel64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, J.T.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>25/20</td>
<td>Edith Young</td>
<td>MAJ, USA (CFR)65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, J.B.</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>42/27</td>
<td>Florence Belle Naylor</td>
<td>Iron manufacturer66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, P.H.</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>30/21</td>
<td>Elizabeth Clemens</td>
<td>Physician67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Father deceased at time of marriage.  § Bride employed at time of marriage.
* Attended college or univ. before marriage.
CDA – Commissioned by direct appointment
CFR – Commissioned from ranks
Bvt. - Brevet
MEC – Methodist Episcopal Church
EC – Episcopal Church
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Fathers-in-Law by Occupational Category

Out of 57 first marriages, the occupations of four fathers-in-law remain undetermined. The following table provides a snapshot of the occupational categories of 53 of the commissioning cohort’s fathers-in-law, by commissioning source. Categories represented include commercial/industrial, military, professional, political, agricultural, government employee, and trades. Commerce and industry include a wide range of occupations, such as merchants, estate agents, oil men, factory owners, and the like. The military category includes all subjects who held a commission at the time of their daughter’s marriage, regardless of military occupational specialty. For example, military chaplains, surgeons, or engineers are counted under the general heading of ‘military,’ rather than ‘professional.’ The professional category includes traditional professions such as physician, attorney, clergy, or engineer. As with the military category, judges are counted under ‘political’ rather than ‘professional.’ Bear in mind that not only were they either appointed or elected, in the period it was not universally necessary for judges to have actually read law, let alone possess a degree. So, too, are other professionals serving in elected positions, like Mayor Oscar Mann, a physician who spent several terms as mayor of Evanston, Illinois. The agricultural category covers farmers and planters, large and small. Finally, the reader is cautioned on the category of trades.

Table C-4: Fathers-in-Law by Occupational Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Com. &amp; Ind.</th>
<th>Milt.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Pol.</th>
<th>Ag.</th>
<th>Govt.</th>
<th>Trades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsequent Marriages of the Combined Cohort

Of the 67 officers commissioned in 1884 from all sources, 11 married a second time, and three married a third time. In subsequent marriages, the median age for men was 57 and for women 36 years of age. The widest gap in ages 35 years, between Everard Enos Hatch and Annie K. Spring. The couple closest to each other Charles Wilkinson Penrose and Lucy Wadham Townsend, who were separated only by 9 years. In every case, these subsequent marriages demonstrated a consistently high degree status endogamy, based on the high occupational status of their brides’ fathers.

Table C-5: 1884 Cohort Subsequent Marriages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Age (H/W)</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th>Father’s Occup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>87/72</td>
<td>Flora C. Finley</td>
<td>Attorney†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>59/42</td>
<td>Nellie J. Greenough</td>
<td>?†69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.</td>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>53/22</td>
<td>Lulu Gray Horan</td>
<td>Attorney70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, G.W.</td>
<td>Ranks</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>44/17</td>
<td>Gladys Grey Dorsey</td>
<td>Attorney71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>35/26</td>
<td>Fanny Marion Cory</td>
<td>Mining72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>50/44</td>
<td>Annie M. Clapp</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’54)73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>60/34</td>
<td>Elizabeth Harney</td>
<td>?†75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, J.R.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>59/44</td>
<td>Cornelia B. Knox</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’71)76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>57/36</td>
<td>Juliette Roberts</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, J., Jr.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>34/20</td>
<td>Emma Howell*</td>
<td>Merchant†78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>63/28</td>
<td>Annie K. Spring</td>
<td>Physician79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>40/28</td>
<td>Nannie Marshall</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’65)80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.C.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>31/19</td>
<td>Martha M.S. Otis</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’53)81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>62/50</td>
<td>Maud Ainsworth</td>
<td>Entrepreneur†82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td>USMA</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>81/64</td>
<td>Ann Pegram</td>
<td>Estate agent†83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Father deceased at time of marriage.
*Bride employed at time of marriage.

1 In establishing the median marriage ages, two officers were discounted as outliers: Andrew Huckins Young married in 1854, 30 years before the cohort received their commissions; Robert Houston Noble married for the first time in 1921 at the age of 60, 16 years after the last of his classmates married.
3 Julia Vilett Larkin’s father, John F. Larkin, was a commission merchant, or broker, living in Georgetown, DC. She had an appointment as a clerk in the U.S. Bureau of Printing and Engraving when


6 Isabella Howard Weber appears to have been the orphaned daughter of a boarding house owner in Washington. When her husband died of an asthma attack in Imperial, California in 1908, she moved to Los Angeles, where she lived in seeming penury on a widow’s pension. “The Army and Navy,” Critic (Wash., DC: 26 Mar 1886, 1; “U.S., Civil War Pension Index: General Index to Pension Files, 1861-1934,” s.v. “Isabella C. Weber” (b. ABT 1855), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Mayor of Imperial Dead,” Sacramento Bee (Sacramento, CA: 30 Jan 1908), 5.


8 Roudiez likely met his wife while assigned as the professor of military science at the University of North Dakota. She was 18, he was 31 years old. Her father was James Irwin Stokes, the local U.S. Land Agent. “North Dakota, Marriage Records, 1872-1997,” s.v. “Sara B. Stokes” (b. ABT 1874), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Major Roudiez’ Wife Dies at the Presidio,” San Francisco Chronicle (01 Apr 1904), 13.

9 Anna Hobbs Ferris completed three years of college. 1940 United States Census, Berkeley, Alameda, California, digital image, s.v. “Anna G. Ferris” (b. ABT 1870), Ancestry.com; “Captain Hiram Hobbs Dead,” Evening Sentinel (Santa Cruz, CA: 02 May 1900), 3.


14 Isabel Wright Pickering was the daughter of Alfred Pickering, founder of the Pickering Hardware Company of Cincinnati. “Nestor,” Cincinnati Enquirer (16 Dec 1910), 14.


21 Retired for health reasons in 1908, Major Raymond Rogers Stevens returned to active duty for the war effort. In 1917, he was found dead of a heart attack in his room at the Oglethorpe hotel in Brunswick, Georgia, where he was chief quartermaster. He was 56 years old. “Major R.R. Stevens,” Atlanta Constitution (17 Nov 1917), 6.


25 Belle Sinclair was the daughter of Hawthorne’s superior in the 2nd U.S. Artillery Regiment, Major William Sinclair (USMA ’57). She studied some six years at Notre Dame College of Maryland. Belle was granted a divorce from her husband in 1903 and $25 monthly alimony, and resumed her maiden name. She died in 1907. Her father was promoted to brigadier general in anticipation of his retirement in 1899, and passed away in 1903 at t

26 Captain Everett Edwards Benjamin succumbed to malaria while on duty in Manila in 1903 at the age of 43. “Obituary,” Suffolk County News (Sayville, NY: 25 Dec 1903), 2.

27 Carroll (1984), 81.

28 Mary Elizabeth Thomas was the daughter of BG Henry Goddard Thomas, USA, a graduate of Amherst College and attorney who received a Volunteer commission during the Civil War. Of interest, the couple were married before Blow received his commission. Ms. Thomas attended various private preparatory schools and Colorado Springs College before her marriage. American Ancestry, v.11 (1898), 69-70; Georgina Pell Curtis, comp., The American Catholic Who’s Who (St. Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1911), 40.

29 After the death of her husband, Helen Bagley Anderson split her time between residences in

Louisa Hurlbut Young’s father, Mason Young, was a substantial New York attorney educated at Yale. Kean (1928), 29; “Mason Young, Yale ’60,” Harford Courant (Hartford, CT: 26 Apr 1906), 19.

Mary Virginia King was the daughter of LTC William Rice King (USMA ’63), an engineer graduating 5th in his West Point class and who passed away in 1898. Mary King attended Wellesley College from 1885-86, enrolling from Chattanooga, Tennessee. Perhaps of interest, it is likely that political scientist Samuel Huntington is in some way related to this family. Heitman, v.1 (1988), 600; Huntington Family Assoc. (1905), 1004. Wellesley College, General Catalog of Wellesley College, 1875-1922 (Wellesley, MA: The College, 1923), 84.


Henrietta ‘Nettie’ M. Parker was the daughter of Frederick Parker, a New York farmer. She was teaching school at the time she wed Lieutenant Chittenden. 1880 United States Federal Census, Arcade, Wyoming, New York, digital image, s.v. “Nettie M. Parker” (b. 1857), Ancestry.com.


Katherine Ross Davis completed her preparatory studies at the private Mount Zion Institute and was one of the first three women to study at South Carolina College. Her father, Lieutenant Colonel Henry C. Davis, was a Confederate officer. He served as a South Carolina state legislator in 1858 and 1864, and represented his county in that state’s Secession Congress. In recognition of her husband’s work on the Panama Canal and his untimely death, Congress awarded Katherine Gaillard considerable means, and was well known in Republican Party circles through her late father. During WWI, she served in Europe with the YMCA at Nice and Aix la Chapelle during WWI, replacing Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr. “Weds a Dying Officer,” Arizona Republic (Phoenix, AZ: 02 Jun 1898), 6; “Ex-Gov. Bagley’s Daughter is Dead,” Detroit Free Press (13 May 1932), 12; “Aristocracy Lends Color,” Burlington Free Press (Burlington, VT: 19 Oct 1918), 13.


Rosalie French Conklin was the daughter of General William Henry French (USMA ’37),

39 In 1893, Lieutenant Charles Loring Corthell suffere a possible cerebral hemorrhage and died at his father’s home in Hingham, Massachusetts at the age of 31. “Graduate of West Point,” Boston Globe (15 Nov 1893), 4.

40 Stephen Miller Foote married Sara Brooke, the daughter of U.S. Army Major and surgeon John Brooke and his wife, Esther Willing Brooke, on 24 Apr 1889 at Fortress Monroe in Virginia. Sara Brooke Foote died on 02 Apr 1941 at her home in Chevy Chase, Maryland. Foote, v.1 (1907), 483-484; “Recent Deaths,” Army and Navy Journal (24 may 1902), 951; Third U.S. Volunteer Engineers, Year Book 1941 (St. Louis, MO: The Society, 1942), 310.


42 Violet Norman was the niece and adopted daughter of Katherine Norman Benteen and her husband, Major (Bvt. Colonel) Frederick W. Benteen. Major Benteen received a Volunteer commission during the Civil War and is better remembered for his participation in the battle of the Little Big Horn with the 7th U.S. Cavalry Regiment. Lieutenant Ladd met Violet when serving with her stepfather in the 9th U.S. Cavalry Regiment. “Atlanta Society,” Atlanta Constitution (02 Jun 1888), 8.


44 Marion O. Wood Simpson was born in November 1865. She was the daughter of William Webster Wood, a leading industrialist in Piqua, Ohio. By the time of his death in 1905, the Wood Linseed Oil Company had transformed Piqua into the nation’s second largest linseed oil producing community. 1900 United States Federal Census, Piqua Ward 1, Miami, Ohio, digital image, s.v. “Marion O. Simpson” (b. Nov 1865), Ancestry.com; “Came Here Just a Century Ago,” Piqua Daily Call (Piqua, OH: 18 May 1937), 3.

45 Everard Enos Hatch was the first of his West Point Class to marry. He wed Mellie S. Rowe on 07 Aug 1884, within two months of his graduation. Mellie Rowe Hatch died at Fort Sam Houston, Texas on 21 May 1886. 1880 United States Federal Census, Palermo, Waldo, Maine, digital image, s.v. “George M. Rowe,” (b. ABT 1831), Ancestry.com; George Hiram Greeley, Genealogy of the Greeley-Greeley Family (Boston: Frank Wood, 1905), 815; “Died,” Army and Navy Journal (30 May 1896), 719.


47 Mary Tupper Cole was the daughter of Colonel Tullius Cicero Tupper, an Ohioan commissioned from the ranks in the 6th U.S. Cavalry Regiment during the Civil War. In 1900, while her husband was stationed in the Southwest with the 9th U.S. Cavalry Regiment, Mary died at her sister-in-law’s residence in Portage, Wisconsin, an unspecified illness of almost five years, possibly related to the birth in 1895 of her only child, the future BG John Tupper Cole (USMA ’17). She was 33 years of age. Heitman, v.1 (1988), 973; “City and Vicinity,” Portage Daily Register (Portage, WI: 20 Sep 1886), 3; “Mrs. J.A. Cole,” Portage Daily Democrat (Portage, WI: 26 Jan 1900), 3.

48 De Rosey Carroll Cabell married Mary Boggs Otis, the daughter of his regimental commander Colonel Elmer Ignatius Otis (USMA ’53), 8th U.S. Cavalry. Mary was born 18 Jan 1869, and on married 8 Feb 1888 she married Cabell. Mary Cabell died 20 Nov 1889 at Fort Meade, SD, after delivering their first child, Marie Cabell. He then married Martha Mary Stanislaus Otis on 7 Mar 1892, and had three more children: Lee Cabell, DCC Jr., and Agnes. Heitman, v.1 (1988), 272, 762; “A Couple of Army Personals,” Bismarck Weekly Tribune (Bismarck, ND), 10 Feb 1888, 5; Spraker (1922), 373-374.
49 Emily Fenno was born in 1857, to Henry and Elizabeth Fenno. The Fenno’s made their home in New York during the 1850s, where Emily was born. Her father was a broker and died of consumption on 02 Jan 1862 in Roxbury, Massachusetts, when Elizabeth was five years old. Her mother died about 12 May 1872, also of consumption. Her younger sister, Cordelia, helped arrange her marriage to Babbitt with Mrs. Katherine E. Browne, wife of prominent patent attorney Causten Browne, and Cordelia’s mother-in-law. The Browne’s held the couple’s reception at her opulent Back Bay townhouse on 19 Marlborough Street. Emily Fenno Babbitt probably died from the influenza, given the year of her death. Of interest, Causten Browne, Jr., was an official in Salt Lake City, and both he and his father attended the Styer-Wilkes wedding in 1891, suggesting an interaction between the Brownes, the Wilkses and the Babbitts. “Massachusetts, Town and Vital Records, 1620-1988,” s.v. “Henry Fenno” (b. ABT 1820), digital image available in Ancestry.com; 1860 United States Federal Census, Albany Ward 2, Albany, New York, digital image, s.v. “Emily Fenno” (b. ABT 1857), Ancestry.com; “Massachusetts, State Census, 1865,” s.v. “Elizabeth A. Fenno” (b. ABT 1819), digital image available in Ancestry.com; 1870 United States Federal Census, Boston Ward 8, Suffolk, Massachusetts, digital image, s.v. “Elizabeth A. Fenno” (b. ABT 1819), Ancestry.com; “Massachusetts, Town and Vital Records, 1620-1988,” s.v. “Elizabeth A. Fenno” (b. ABT 1819), digital image available in Ancestry.com; “Massachusetts, Marriage Records, 1840-1915,” s.v. “Emily A. Fenno” (b. 1857), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Table Gossip,” Boston Globe (09 Nov 1884), 12; William Bradford Browne, comp., The Babbitt Family History, 1643-1900 (Taunton, MA: C.A. Hack & Son, 1912), 320; “Mrs. Edwin B. Babbitt Dead,” Washington Post (21 May 1918), 4; U.S. Military Academy (1940), 148.

50 Mary Raper Branch Benton was born in 1862. Her father, John H. Branch, was struck and killed by a train in 1877. 1920 United States Federal Census, Civil District 8, Davidson, Tennessee, s.v. “Elisha Spencer Benton” (b. 22 Jan 1859), Ancestry.com; “Death of Colonel John H. Branch,” Cincinnati Enquirer (02 Mar 1877), 8.

51 Kate Hamlin Phelps was born on 10 Dec 1864. She was the daughter of daughter of Dr. Charles Hamlin Phelps of St. Mary’s Ohio, a cousin of the Hon. Edward J. Phelps of Vermont, U.S. Minister to England from 1885-1889 and a founding president of the American Bar Association. Banta (1901), 639; Robert E. Healy, “Edward John Phelps: Third President of American Bar Association,” American Bar Association Journal 14, no. 5 (May 1928), 274-281.

52 Retired Colonel Wilds Preston Richardson died at Walter Reed Army Hospital in 1929 after a long illness, aged 68. U.S. Military Academy (1929), 283


54 Delia Gellatly was born in 1874 in Philomath, Oregon and graduated from the Oregon Agricultural College in 1894 with a bachelor’s in home economy. She apparently met Dentler that same year, when he arrived at the school to take up the post of professor of military science. They married shortly after she graduated. Her father, Andrew Gellatly, emigrated from Scotland and prospered in farming and Republican Party politics. Fagan (1885), 513; “Local Lore,” Weekly Gazette-Times (Corvallis, OR: 03 Sep 1894), 5; Oregon Agricultural College, Alumni Directory, 1870-1909 (Corvallis, OR: The College, 1910), 9; 1880 United States Federal Census, Philomath, Benton, Oregon, digital image, s.v. “Andrew Gellatly” (b. 1838), Ancestry.com.


56 Mary Swan was born in 1865. She was the daughter of Charles F. Swan, who emigrated from Londonerry in Northern Ireland. An engineer, Swan who built several iron furnaces in Pennsylvania, including the Tioga Iron Works in Mansfield. It’s possible that Thompson met Swan through his West Point classmate, Cassius Gillette, a native of Tioga County. In 1940, Mary Swan Thompson, then a widow, reported she had attended three years of college. “Morris Thompson Dies Suddenly,” Mansfield Advertiser (Mansfield, PA: 26 Apr 1961), 5. “The Late C.F. Swan,” Mansfield Advertiser (Mansfield, PA: 20 Jan 1886), 3; 1940 United States Federal Census, Richmond, Mansfield, Tioga, Pennsylvania, digital image, s.v. “Mary Swan Thompson” (b. 1865), Ancestry.com.

57 Dora was daughter of Judge Ezra V. Dean. Her brother, James Theodore Dean (USMA ’87), retired from the U.S. Army in 1930 as a brigadier general. “Ohio, County Marriage Records, 1774-1993,” s.v. “Dora Scott Dean,” (b. ABT 1867), Ancestry.com; “The Lieutenant’s Wife,” Chillicothe
Records, 1669
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Association of Edison Illuminating Companies (1904), 41. Wadsworth (1880), 158; Wellesley College, Wellesley College Record, 1875-1912 (Wellesley, MA: The College, 1912), 7.
Ethel Dimond was born in 1879 and was a widow when she married Robert H. Noble. Ethel’s
was married to William R. Sherwood, a wealthy importer and commission merchant who died
in 1918. Ethel Elizabeth (Dimond) Sherwood Noble was the daughter of Lemuel Augustus Sanderson and Lydia Emma (Wilton) Sanderson, who divorced early in 1890. In Jun 1890, Lydia remarried to Henry P. Dimond (likely pronounced ‘Diamond,’ based on misspellings in other documents), a
Edith McFadden Young was born about 1866. She was the daughter of Major Samuel
Baldwin Marks Young. Major Young had enlisted in a Pennsylvania infantry regiment during the Civil War and earned his commission six months later. He ended the war as a Brevet BG of Volunteers. After the war, he was retained in the Regular Army as a second lieutenant. Young retired in 1904 with the rank of lieutenant general after briefly serving as the first Chief of the U.S. Army General Staff. 1910 United States Federal Census, Precinct 10, Washington, District of Columbia, digital image, s.v. “Edith Young Knight” (b. ABT 1866), Ancestry.com; “Texas, Select County Marriage Index, 1837-1965,” s.v. “John Thornton Knight,” (b. 18 Apr 1861), Ancestry.com; Miller (1911), 188; Heitman, v.1 (1988), 1067.
Florence Naylor’s father, John Samuel Naylor (1851-1915), was a mechanical engineer and
president of the People’s Iron Works in Philadelphia. “Pennsylvania and New Jersey, Church and Town Records, 1669-2013,” s.v. “James Bryan Hughes” (b. 17 May 1863), digital image available at


68 Finley’s next marriage came at age 86 to Flora Charlotte Finley, an apparent cousin who was at the time 72 years old. It was her first marriage. At the time, Finley was seriously ill, suffering from heart disease and probably diabetes. He died of pneumonia complicated by severe vascular disease and gangrene in his remaining leg; his left leg was amputated in 1943 from the knee, down. “Michigan, Marriage Records, 1867-1952,” s.v. “Col. John P. Finley” (b. 11 Apr 1854), digital image available at Ancestry.com; Doty (1897), 181; “Michigan, Death Records, 1867-1952,” s.v. “John P. Finley” (b. 11 Apr 1854), digital image available at Ancestry.com.


71 Two weeks before shipping out for Manila in 1902, Ruthers briefly married Gladys Grey Dorsey, the underage daughter of a prominent San Francisco attorney, John W. Dorsey. The marriage was shortly after annulled. “Dream Soon Vanished,” Spokane Press (Spokane, WA: 17 Sep 1903), 1.


73 Penrose’s first wife, Mary Minor, died at Fort Buford in 1887, 15 months after they were married. In 1893, he married Lucy Wadhams Townsend, daughter of Colonel Edwin Franklin Townsend (USMA ’54). Colonel Townsend was promoted to brigadier general on his retirement in 1904. Leach and Penrose (1903), 128; Harriet Weeks Wadhams Stevens, Wadhams Genealogy (New York: Frank Allaben Genealogical Co., 1913), 321.

74 This was Clapp’s third marriage. Her first ended quickly in the death of her husband, Colonel B.W. Hoyt, and she divorced her second, Royal Ripley Sheldon. Annie Mason Clapp Sheldon, was the only daughter of Allen Newcomb Clapp was a former New Hampshire representative and senator who represented Standard Oil in Manchester. On his death he left his daughter a sizeable estate. “Reports of Deaths of American Citizens Abroad, 1835-1975,” s.v. “Harry Leroy Hawthorne” (b. 27 Nov 1859), digital image available at Ancestry.com; George Franklyn Willey, State Builders: An Illustrated Historical and Biographical Record of the State of New Hampshire (Manchester, NH: New Hampshire Publ. Co, 1903), 346-347; Manchester Historic Assoc., The Historic Quarterly, Manchester Historic Association Collections, vol. 2 (1900-1901), Supplement (Manchester, NH: Manchester Historic Assoc., 1901), xiv-xvi.

75 Elizabeth V. Harney was first married c.1905, and the cause of that marriage’s termination is as yet undetermined. She wed Colonel Harry LeRoy Hawthorne before 1919, when he was assigned to

Kean met Cornelia Butler Knox, the daughter of army Colonel Thomas T. Knox (USMA ’71) in France during WW1, when she was serving as head of the Red Cross canteen in Tours. They first exchanged vows in a French civil ceremony, and later in an Episcopal service held in a local Huguenot chapel. Cornelia died in 1954 and was interred in Arlington National Cemetery with her parents. Kean, (1928), 235-236; Heitman, v.1 (1988), 607; 1920 United States Federal Census, Cambridge Ward 7, Middlesex, Massachusetts, digital image, s.v. “Cornelia Kean” (b. ABT 1876), Ancestry.com; “U.S. National Cemetery Internment Control Forms, 1928-1962,” s.v. “Cornelia Knox Kean” (b. 01 Mar 1875), digital image available at Ancestry.com.


Conklin met Alice Emma Lowry Howell in Atlanta, Georgia, on 11 Jun 1896. She was the daughter of the late William H. Howell, who passed away in 1885, and Alverine Hoyle, who died in 1890. The wedding was held at the home of her aunt, Mrs. J.W. Morrow, and Major Clem was Conklin’s best man. Conklin likely met his wife when visiting his friends in Atlanta. William Howell had been a prosperous Atlanta merchant and whose business investments included cattle in Montana. 1880 United States Federal Census, Atlanta, Fulton, Georgia, digital image, s.v. “Emma Howell” (b. ABT 1876), Ancestry.com; “News of the Week in the Social World,” Atlanta Constitution (07 Jun 1896), 6. “Continued from Page Six,” Atlanta Constitution (31 May 1896), 7; “A Sad Death,” Atlanta Constitution (04 Mar 1885), 4; “Howell’s Funeral,” Atlanta Constitution (05 Mar 1885), 7.


After the death of his first wife, Cabell married his sister-in-law, Martha Mary Stanislaus Otis (b. 1873), on 7 Mar 1892, and by her had three more children: Lee Cabell, De Rosey Carroll Cabell, Jr. (USMA ’16), and Agnes Cabell. Spraker (1922), 373-374; 1900 United States Federal Census, Jefferson Barracks, St Louis, Missouri, digital image, s.v. “Martha M. Cabell” (b. 1873), Ancestry.com.

Maud Ainsworth was born on 01 Dec 1874, the daughter and heiress of the late Captain John Commingers Ainsworth, an entrepreneur with interests in steam navigation and banking and who passed away in 1894. Ainsworth’s estate at the time of his death was about $2,000,000, divided between nine heirs, a relative income equal to about $600 million in 2018. “U.S. Passport Applications, 1795-1925,” s.v. “Maud Ainsworth” (b. 01 Dec 1874), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Babbitts Married at Catalina Island,” Los Angeles Evening Express (25 Feb 1924), 17; “Captain George J. Ainsworth,” Los Angeles Evening Express (22 Oct 1895), 5; “Riches,” Oakland Tribune (Oakland, CA: 04 Jan 1894), 1; MeasuringWorth.com.

Hutcheson’s first wife, Rosalie St. George, passed away in California in 1942, and in 1943 he remarried to Anne Holt Pegram, who was employed as a clerk for several government agencies in Washington from the 1910s-1930s. Pegram’s father was deceased. He had been a real estate broker, and
during the Civil War served as a captain in the Confederate army. This was Ann’s second marriage. In
1933, she wed John Carroll Redmond of New York. Grote Hutcheson passed away in 1948, and Anne
passed away in 1951, age 72. It seems likely Hutcheson had known Pegram from his years in
Washington, given his quick remarriage. “Sales of Real Estate,” Vicksburg Evening Post (Vicksburg,
MS: 21 Feb 1889), 4; “The Last of the Earth,” Daily Commercial Herald (Vicksburg, MS: 25 Apr 1893),
Herald (Vicksburg, MS: 20 Jul 1893), 4; “Gen. Grote Hutcheson,” Chattanooga Daily Times (16 Dec
1948), 17; “General’s Widow Dies,” Fresno Bee (Fresno, CA: 26 Dec 1951), 7; “General’s Widow
Dies,” Spokane Chronicle (Spokane, WA: 26 Dec 1951), 18.
APPENDIX D

1884 Cohort Association Memberships
As of: 19 Dec 2020

The following tables record the association memberships for the 1884 commissioning cohort. Membership information was located for 61 of 67 officers, or 91% of the officers studied. As no single resource exists listing this information, the author consulted a wide range of sources included social registers, club annuals, fraternity handbooks, newspaper articles, memorials, and local histories. It is important to note the tables are a work in progress. They do not list every affiliation, as certainly there are gaps. Also, while these officers typically held multiple memberships at a time, because these tables do not take into account initiation dates or lapsed memberships, it is difficult to isolate the number of simultaneous memberships. Nor do they record when an officer might have severed a particular association, which some did when moving to another part of the country.

Of all the associations, Masonic memberships have been the most difficult to document. Partly this is due to the vast number of lodges to which officers belonged, and the lack of easily accessible central membership registers. At times, the only public record of an officer’s Masonic affiliation were memorials and obituaries, unless an officer chose to be especially public about his membership, as was the case for William Cullen Wren. Fraternal memberships of fathers marked (‡) are provided for information only.

At first glance, academy graduates appear to have collected per capita more memberships than either officers commissioned from the ranks or direct appointees. This is, however, misleading because the academy’s Association of Graduates’ annual reports and monthly alumni publications provide a much more complete record of West Pointer affiliations than exist for officers commissioned from the other sources. West Pointers did pursue membership in civilian professional societies at a higher rate, but this reflects the fact that the academy overwhelmingly produced the engineers and artillery officers who typically joined these associations.
The Military Order of the Carabao deserves special attention here, as it is listed under social clubs rather than patriotic societies. The Carabao formed in the Philippines in 1901 to lampoon with the pretentious Military Order of the Dragon, organized by the comparatively small number of officers who had deployed from the islands to participate in the 1900 China Relief Expedition, also known as the Boxer Rebellion.¹ Both groups framed similarly flamboyant constitutions specifying lodge-like hierarchies and regulations typical of the day’s patriotic associations, and likewise provided for hereditary membership to memorialize their respective military campaigns long into their posterity. For the Carabao, however, their stated objective clearly was more social, and their annual dinners, or ‘Wallows,’ bordered at times on the irreverent. They even selected their symbol, the lowly Philippine water buffalo, to take the mickey out of the Dragon. The Carabao proved popular with cohort members, including with those officers who also belonged to the Dragon, like George Nivison Blow and Grote Hutcheson. And while the Carabao still wallow today, the Order of the Dragon has long since faded away.

The table detailing academy graduates does not include the West Point Association of Graduates, to which most every graduate, and quite a number of non-graduates, belonged. An abbreviation key appears below the tables. Finally, generous endnotes provide additional context for the entries.

Table D-1: 1884 Rankers’ Association Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Patriotic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Fraternal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>SSLA, MSIUS</td>
<td>ΔΤΔ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, C</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, Twilight</td>
<td>DAR, MOP, SAW</td>
<td>NGS, MSIUS</td>
<td>TCB, F&amp;FM³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, J.E.</td>
<td>ANC⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, J.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSIUS⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSIUS⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, W.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, F.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, G.W.</td>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>MOLLUS, MOFW</td>
<td>F&amp;FM, BPOE⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, J.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, A.S.</td>
<td>Pacific Club</td>
<td>DAR, MOFW, NSAP</td>
<td>F&amp;FM⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Wife’s affiliation.
### Table D-2: 1884 Direct Appointees’ Association Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Patriotic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Fraternal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil, J.P.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, NDAA</td>
<td>MOLLUS&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>F&amp;AM&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, A.P.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, UCCH</td>
<td>OIWUS</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>KA Order&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, C.L.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, ULC, PAA, MCC</td>
<td>SAR, GSCW, 1812, MOFW</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, W.C.</td>
<td>MOC, USC</td>
<td>SAR, DAR&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;, GSCW</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, R.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F&amp;AM&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, T.W.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, CCNY, UACNY, UCAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KA Society&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>ANC&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüg, F.V.</td>
<td>ANC&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, E.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, R.R.</td>
<td>ANC&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, W.J.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSIUS&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, A.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOLLUS&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, W.D.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td>SOC, MOFW</td>
<td>ACS, AMA, AMS, RSM, MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM, ATΩ&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>ANC, BCC</td>
<td>MOLLUS, SAR, AmLeg</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM, IOOF, KP&lt;sup&gt;‡22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, E.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F&amp;AM&lt;sup&gt;‡23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins, S.R.H.</td>
<td>ANC&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., W.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOD&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, J.T.</td>
<td>SAR, GSCW, SOCD&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>MSIUS, AAAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>F&amp;AM&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;, ΦΓΔ&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, J.R.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>AMA, AMS, MSIUS</td>
<td>ΦΒΚ, ΣΧ&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>‡</sup> Father’s affiliation.

<sup>9</sup> Wife’s affiliation.
Table D-3: 1884 West Pointers’ Association Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Patriotic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Fraternal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, I.</td>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>SAR, DAR, MOFW, NSAP, VFW</td>
<td>CSS, AMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, J.C.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR, DAR</td>
<td>PIANC, MSIUS</td>
<td>XΩ²³⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, H.M.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>ASCE, AHS, AFA, NGS, PNWSE</td>
<td>ΦBK³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, C.E.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>ASE⁶¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaillard, D.D.</td>
<td>ANC, UCP</td>
<td>HSOSC</td>
<td>ASCE, NGS, MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>ANC, CCC, UCNY</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>ASCE, SAME, MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>ASCE, AAPA, MSU</td>
<td>F&amp;FM⁵⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, J., Jr.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>MOFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell, C.L.</td>
<td>ANC, CCC</td>
<td>SAR, DAR, SAW</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, S.M.</td>
<td>ANC, CCC</td>
<td>SAR, DAR, SAW</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, I.N.</td>
<td>ANC, UL, LCNY, PAT</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>MSIUS⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, E.F.</td>
<td>ANC, CCC</td>
<td>SAR, DAR</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, S.D., Jr.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td>MOLLUS⁴⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, W.L.</td>
<td>USC</td>
<td>DAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>F&amp;FM⁴¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, F.L.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td>MOD⁴³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>MSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.C.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td>MOD, MOWW⁴⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td>ANC, Wash, CCCNY, UCNY</td>
<td>SAR, AZTEC, MOLLUS, VFW, MOWW, AmLeg⁴⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, E.S.</td>
<td>ANC, BCC</td>
<td>USCAV</td>
<td>MSIUS⁴⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayre, F.</td>
<td>ANC, USC, Alfalfa</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM²⁴⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, W.P.</td>
<td>ANC, USC, Alfalfa</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM²⁴⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, H.J.</td>
<td>ANC⁶⁹</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, C.E.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>KP⁵⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, CCC, ULC, CCWC, USC</td>
<td>SAR, OIWUS, SFW, MOD</td>
<td>MSIUS⁵¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.K.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, G.O.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, E.S.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styer, H.D.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>VFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, J.B.</td>
<td>ANC, PCUSF, COS, MET, UCNY</td>
<td>OFPA, SAW</td>
<td>MSIUS⁵⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer, W.E.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>MSIUS</td>
<td>F&amp;AM, ATΩ⁵⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, R.H.</td>
<td>ANC, MOC, UCNY, BCSF</td>
<td>SAR, OIWUS, SASC, SAVP, SAW, MOFW</td>
<td>MSBA, SBCA, ABA, MSIUS⁵⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, D.C.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, B.C.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, J.T.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, J.B.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, P.H.</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Father’s affiliation.  
♀ Wife’s affiliation.
Abbreviations

1812 – General Society of the War of 1812
AAAS – American Association for the Advancement of Science
AAPA – American Association of Port Authorities
ABA – American Bar Association
ACS – American College of Surgeons
AFA – American Forestry Association
AHS – American Historical Society
AmLeg – American Legion
AMA – American Medical Association
AMC – American Mining Congress
AMS – Association of Military Surgeons
ANC – Army and Navy Club
ASCE – American Society of Civil Engineers
AZTEC – Aztec Club of 1847
BCC – Boston City Club
BCSF – Bohemian Club of San Francisco
BPOE – Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks
CCNY – Camera Club of New York
CCC – Chevy Chase Club
CCWC – Country Club of Westchester County, New York
COS – Cosmos Club
CSS – Colorado Scientific Society
CCCNY – Catholic Club of City of New York
DAR – Daughters of the American Revolution
DCC – Denver Charter Convention
F&AM – Free and Accepted Masons
FMIA – Friends of the Minnesota Institute of Art
GSCW – Society of Colonial Wars
HSOSC – Huguenot Society of South Carolina
IOOF – Independent Order of Odd Fellows
KP – Knights of Pythias
LCNY – Lawyer’s Club of New York
MCC – Merion Cricket Club
MSBA – Maryland State Bar Association
MSIUS – Military Service Institution of the United States
MET – Metropolitan Club
MOC – Military Order of the Carabao
MOD – Military Order of the Dragon
MOFW – Military Order of Foreign Wars
MOLLUS – Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States
MOP – Military Order of Pretoria
MOWW – Military Order of the World War
NDAA – Notre Dame Alumni Association
NGS – National Geographic Society
NSAP – National Society of the Army of the Philippines
OFPA – Order of the Founders and Patriots of America
OIWUS – Order of the Indian Wars of the United States
PAA – Philadelphia Art Alliance
PAT – Patria Club
PCUSF – Pacific Union Club of San Francisco
PIANC – Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses
PNWSE – Pacific Northwest Society of Engineers
RSM – Royal Society of Medicine
SAME – Society for American Military Engineers
SAR – Sons of the American Revolution
SASC – Society of the Army of Santiago de Cuba
SAVP – Society of American Veterans of the Philippines
SAW – Society of American Wars
SBCA – State Bar of California
SOC – Society of Cincinnati
SOCD – Society of Colonial Dames
SSLA – Royal Society of Science, Letters, and Art
TCB – Tübinger Corps Borussia
UACNY – University Athletic Club of New York
UCAA – Union College Alumni Association
UCD – University Club of Denver
UCNY – University Club of New York
UCP – University Club of Panama
UCCH – University Club of Chicago
ULC – Union League Club
USC – United Service Club
USCAV – United States Cavalry Association
VFW – Veterans of Foreign Wars
Wash – Washington Club

2 In addition to membership in Delta Tau Delta, Finley reported was a member of some 30 scientific societies, including an honorary fellowship in the British Royal Society of Science, Letters, and Art. Agricultural College of Michigan, Michigan State Agricultural College General Catalog of Officers and Students, 1857-1900 (Battle Creek, MI: Ellis Publ. Co., 1900), 37; “Another Old Timer on the Job,” Rainbow of Delta Tau Delta 58, no. 2 (Jan., 1935), 74; Military Order of the Carabao, Historical Sketch, Constitution, and Register of the Military Order of the Carabao (Wash., DC: W.F. Roberts & Co., 1914), 67; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 33.
3 Reichmann was a charter member of Hancock Lodge No. 311 at Fort Leavenworth, KS, joining on 20 Feb 1889. He was a founding member of the Manila chapter of National Sojourners, and was elected their national vice president on 28 Feb 1918 and president in 1924 while on duty in Chicago, and served as Commander of Chicago’s Heroes of ’76 Camp, an invitational subset promoting patriotism. At some point Reichmann helped charter the National Sojourners camp in Minnesota. Reichmann was an honorary member of the Twilight Club of Wheeling, West Virginia while serving in the city on recruiter duty. “Hancock Lodge No. 311,” at https://hancock311.org/about/ (accessed 24 Dec 2019); Voorhis (1952), 75; Email from Nelson O. Newcombe, National Secretary, National Sojourners, to author, dtd. 20 Dec 2012; Carabao (1914), 93; Marquis (1910), 1586; Commandery of the District of Columbia, Society of American Wars (Wash., DC: 1906), 10; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 38.
4 Harvard College (1921), 155; Army and Navy Club, Certificate of Incorporation, By-laws and House Rules, Officers, Directors, and Members (Wash., DC: The Club, 1902), 52.
5 Army and Navy Club, Certificate of Incorporation, By-laws and House Rules, Officers, Directors, and Members (Wash., DC: Carnahan Press, 1915), 77; Carabao (1914), 64; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 32.
6 Army and Navy Club, Certificate of Incorporation, By-laws and House Rules, Officers, Directors, and Members (Wash., DC: The Club, 1911), 104; Carabao (1914), 93; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 39.
7 “Maj George W. Ruthers, Indian Fighter, Dead,” Boston Globe (29 Apr 1918), 5; Carabao (1914), 95; James H. Morgan, Register of the Military Order of Foreign Wars (New York: The National Commandery, 1900), 219.
8 In addition to being a Freemason, Frost was active in the Society of the Army of the Philippines leadership, having served as a commander and chief and vice president of the organization. Also, he was a member of the Military Order of Foreign Wars. His wife, Florence Eugenia Mann Frost, was DAR. Leonard, v.2 (1910), 695; Daughters of the American Revolution Lineage Books (152 vols.), s.v. “Florence Eugenia Frost” (b. ABT 1861), digital image available at Ancestry.com; Membership Cards, Box 2, ASF
9 “Capt. W.H. Troup,” Vancouver Independent (Vancouver: WA: 13 Apr 1882), 5, 14; Commandery of Kansas, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (Leavenworth, KS: The Order, 1886), 14; Army and Navy Club, Certificate of Incorporation, By-laws and House Rules,
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Beckurt's father-in-law, Tilghman Pickering, was a 32nd degree Mason. The Kappa Alpha Order, or Southern Order, is a wholly different fraternity than the Kappa Alpha Society started at Union College in New York. "Personal," Kappa Alpha Journal 3, no. 2 (Nov 1885), 39; "Nestor," Cincinnati Enquirer (16 Dec 1910), 14; Sons of the American Revolution, Proceedings of the Regular Triennial Meeting (n.p.: 1899), 52; Morgan (1900), 112; Society of Colonial Wars, Addresses Delivered before the Society of Colonial Wars (New York: H.K. Brewer & Co., 1912), 135; Carabao (1914), 54; Social Register Association (1919), 16; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 29.


Both Anderson and his father, Robert Houston Anderson, Sr., were Freemasons. Captain Robert Houston Anderson, Bonaventure Cemetery, Savannah, Chatham County, Georgia, s.v. "Robert Houston Anderson, FindaGrave.com; "Gen. R.H. Anderson Dead," Macon Telegraph (Macon, GA: 09 Feb 1886), 1; Knights Templar (1889), 206.

Moore was a member of the Union College Alumni Club. Kappa Alpha Society (1926), 118; Carabao (1914), 87; "Colonel Tredwell [sic] W. Moore," New York Times (02 Nov 1927), 27; Club Men of New York (1896), 394.

Army and Navy Club, Certificate of Incorporation, By-laws and House Rules, Officers, Directors, and Members (Wash., DC: The Club, 1902), 54.

Krüg's father-in-law was a Mason. "Casper Florist Loses Auto in Big Cloudburst," Casper Star-Tribune (Casper, WY: 02 Aug 1919), 1; Army and Navy Club (1902), 50.


Army and Navy Club (1902), 57.

Army and Navy Club (1902), 53; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 38.

Of the 1884 cohort, Andrew Huckins Young was the only MOLLUS member who actually served during the Civil War. MOLLUS, Collection of Circulars of Various State Commanderies, part 1 (n.p.: 1891), n.p.


Hawthorne's father, LeRoy R. Hawthorne, was a Royal Arch Mason and was a member of the North Star Lodge, I.O.O.F. and Eureka Lodge, No. 7, Knights of Pythias. Harry Hawthorne was a committee member in the Boston City Club, and in 1893 he was elected secretary of the executive committee for that city's Army of the Potomac Reunion. Knights Templar, Covington Commandery, No. 7 (1878), 301-302; MOLLUS, Commandery of Ohio Circular 13, no. 138 (1889), 15; Sons of the American Revolution, Register of Members of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Boston: Rockwell and Churchill, 1895), 49; Army and Navy Club, (1911), 75; Boston City Club Bulletin 10, no. 2 (Nov 1915), 2; "Local Lines," Boston Globe (25 May 1893), 2; "Fighter in Three Wars Succumbs," Los Angeles Times (10 Apr 1948), 14; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 34.

E.E. Benjamin's father, Horace Howell Benjamin, was the Past Master of the Riverhead Lodge No. 645 on Long Island. Grand Lodge of New York (1889), 225.

Army and Navy Club (1911), 113.

Military Order of the Dragon (1912), 50; Carabao (1914), 111.
26 J.T. Anderson was a member of Phi Gamma Delta. His father, James House Anderson, was a Mason and once served as SAR national vice president in 1899. In 1902, James Thomas Anderson was elected Deputy Governor of the Society of Colonial Wars, succeeding the late U.S. Senator E. O. Wolcott. Anderson’s wife, Helen Bagley, was a member of the Society of Colonial Dames. Ohio Archeological and Historical Society (1912), 491; Anderson (1904), 502-504. Society of Colonial Dames, Supplement to Members and Ascendants of the Massachusetts Society of Colonial Dames of America (Boston, MA: Rockwell and Churchill Press, 1899), 42.

27 Kean held memberships in both Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Chi. Sigma Chi, Residence Directory of the Sigma Chi Fraternity (Chicago, IL: R.R. Donnelly & Sons, 1902), 116; Marquis (1910), 1047; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 35.

28 Hale served as president of the SAR Colorado chapter, was past national president of the Society of the Army of the Philippines, and president of the Colorado Scientific Society. He led the Military Order of Foreign Wars in Colorado, and is widely acknowledged as the founder of its successor, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which over time consolidated several other groups. Socially, Hale served on the admissions committee of the University Club of Denver, and professionally he was chairman of the American Mining Congress’ committee on metal mines. Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, Proceedings of the Fourth Triennial Convention (New York: The Order, 1905), n.p.; Marquis, v.6 (1910), 813; “Gen. Irving Hale Dies,” Brooklyn Daily Eagle (28 Jul 1930), 13; Elizabeth Gadsby, Lineage Book of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, vol. 26 (Harrisburg, PA: Telegraph Printing Co., 1908), 24. American Mining Congress Monthly Bulletin 13, no. 2 (Feb 1910), 34; University Club (1900), 7.

29 Sanford was initiated in the Upsilon Chapter of Chi Phi on 18 Sep 1879. Professionally, he held several high offices in the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses. Chi Phi Fraternity, Centennial Memorial Volume (Lancaster, PA: Lancaster Press, 1924), 340; Army and Navy Club (1902), 56; U.S. Military Academy (1930), 185-186; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 39.

30 In 1914, Chittenden was made an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa’s Alpha Chapter at University of Washington. The Arctic Club was a fraternal men’s club in Seattle that today is a hotel. The private Rainer Club, also in Seattle, is still in operation. National Cyclopædia of American Biography, v.17 (1920), 405.


32 Marquis, v.6 (1910), 706; Army and Navy Club (1915), 158; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 33.

33 Taylor was a member of the Oregon Society of SAR. In 1925, he was elected president of the Society of American Military Engineers. National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, Medal List of Sons of the American Revolution Who Served in the War with Spain (n.p.: The Society, 1900), 32; U.S. Military Academy (1934), 125; University Club of New York, Annual of the University Club, 1904-1905 (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1904), 160; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 40.

34 Sibert’s father, William J. Sibert, also was a Freemason. Sibert’s second wife, Juliette Roberts, was a member of the DAR. Professionally, Sibert was the 82nd member of ASCE, and was president of the American Association of Port Authorities from 1929-1930. National Cyclopædia of American Biography, v.35 (1949), 259; Northern Alabama, Historical and Biographical (1888), 370; “Daughters of the American Revolution Lineage Books (152 vols.), “s.v. Juliette Roberts Sibert,” (b. ABT 1881), digital image available at Ancestry.com. Army and Navy Club (1915), 137; American Society of Civil Engineers, Proceedings, vol. 23 (New York: The Society, 1897), x; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 39.

35 Morgan (1900), 132; Army and Navy Club (1902), 43.

36 Corthell’s father was a Mason initiated in 1862 at the Old Colony Lodge. “Massachusetts, Mason Membership Cards, 1733-1990,” s.v. “John King Corthell (b. 26 Jul 1822), in digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Hingham,” Boston Globe (07 Jul 1896), 3.


38 Also, Lewis reportedly belonged to a number of professional associations. The identity of those groups, however, are as yet undetermined. U.S. Military Academy (1932), 155; Club Men of New York.
Founders and Patriots of America, 1944)


Richardson’s father, Oliver Perry Richardson, was buried under a Masonic tombstone in 1873. Richardson also was the ‘Club Whip’ of the exclusive Alfalfa Club of Washington, DC. O.P. Richardson, grave marker, Ladonia Cemetery, Ladonia, Fannin County, Texas, digital image s.v. “Oliver Perry Richardson,” FindaGrave.com; U.S. Military Academy (1929), 283; Club Men of New York (1896), 462. Alfalfa Club, Dinner in Honor of Hon. Joseph Gurney Cannon (25 Mar 1922), n.p.; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 38.

Army and Navy Club (1911), 70.

Dentler’s father, Jacob, was a member of the Falling Springs Lodge of the Knights of Pythias.


Thompson’s father, John Thompson, helped charter Knights of Pythias Troy Lodge No. 31 in Albia, Monroe County, Iowa, in 1875. Western Historical Company, The History of Monroe County, Iowa (Chicago: Culver, Page & Hoyne, 1878), 452.

Hostetter (1912), 228.

In retirement, Styer was civically involved in his adopted community of Coronado, CA, and was a charter member of the VFW’s Captain Paul Wegeforth Post. Army and Navy Club (1915), 143; “Death Claims Brig. General Henry Styer,” Coronado Eagle and Journal (Coronado, CA: 18 May 1944), 1; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 40.

Commandery of the District of Columbia (1906), 3, 4; New York Society of the Order of The Founders and Patriots of America, Publications of the New York Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, 1944)
56 Waldo Emerson Ayer was a member of the Scottish Rite. His father, Perley Ayer, was initiated in the Grecian Lodge at Lawrence, Massachusetts, in 1861 and his father-in-law, Pardon Armington, was a Knights Templar. Although a West Pointer, Ayer became a member of the fraternity late, in 1895, when he was assigned as military instructor at Ohio Wesleyan University. When Ayer departed his teaching assignment at Oberlin College to take up mobilization duties in Columbus for the Spanish American War, his fraternity brothers held a large send-off and presented him with a ceremonial sword. “Notes from Leavenworth,” Army and Navy Register (02 Nov 1912), 493; “Massachusetts, Mason Membership Cards, 1733-1990,” s.v. “Perley Ayer (b.02 Dec 1817), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Bethany Encampment,” Freemasons Monthly Magazine 24, no. 3 (01 Nov 1864), 92; “Ohio Beta Eta Chapter,” Alpha Tau Omega Palm 16, no. 1 (Jan 1893), 5; “Lieutenant Ayer Receives a Grand Ovation at Chapel Exercises,” College Transcript 31, no. 29 (Delaware OH: 30 Apr 1898), 1; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 29.


58 Shanks’ father, David C. Shanks, Sr., also was a Mason. David Shanks, Jr., performed the Masonic funerary rights for his father-in-law, J.F. Chapman. In retirement, Shanks was Honorary Secretary of the American Federation of the Blind, and maintained numerous memberships in clubs in New York, in Washington, and in Long Beach, California. Royal Arch Masons, Proceedings at the Annual Grand Communication of the Grand Chapter of the State of Indiana (Indianapolis, IN: Elder and Harkness, 1856), 16; “Funeral of J.F. Chapman,” Roanoke Times (Roanoke, VA: 06 Feb 1894), 2; Army and Navy Club (1915), 136; U.S. Military Academy (1940), 155.

59 U.S. Military Academy (1934), 120; U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 37.


61 U.S. Military Service Institution (1906), 35.

1884: Commissioned from the Ranks

Of the 11 men commissioned from the ranks in 1884, seven produced children. Of those without children, two died unmarried early in their careers. Of the sons produced, none embarked on a military career, though Professor Leon Samuel Roudiez, Jr., served as a
commissioned officer in the Second World War. Of the eight daughters, at least six (75%) attended or graduated from a college or university. Overall, the data demonstrate a strong tendency towards status reproduction, either through profession or mate selection.

**Table E-1: Status, 1884 Rankers’ Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finley, J.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Louise*</td>
<td>u/m.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flora Vilett*</td>
<td>m. COL, USA (CFR)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichmann, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte*</td>
<td>m. COL, USA (CDA)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>m. Prof. Chemistry⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxfield, J.E.</td>
<td>Joseph Pease</td>
<td>Physicist⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, J.H.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, F.R.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudiez, L.S.</td>
<td>Leon Samuel, Jr.</td>
<td>Prof. Fr. Lit.⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnaney, W.D.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris, F.O.</td>
<td>Goodwin Bancroft</td>
<td>Chemist⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthers, G.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethel Perce</td>
<td>m. Civil Engineer⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg, J.J.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, A.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence Myrtle*</td>
<td>u/m. Entomologist¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethel Grey*</td>
<td>u/m.¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mann*</td>
<td>m. Attorney¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ - Performed military service, either commissioned or enlisted (see notes).
* - Daughters who attended or graduated from a post-secondary school.
? - Undetermined
u/m. - Unmarried
m. – Married
CFR – Commissioned from ranks
CDA – Commission by direct appointment

**1884: Commissioned from Civilian Life**

Of the 19 officers directly appointed from civilian life in 1884, 12 produced 16 children. Only two out of four boys pursued military careers, and only one, Haldimand Putnam Young, received a direct presidential appointment, his as a quartermaster. Half of the daughters who married did so to army officers, two of whom graduated from West Point. Readers may note that the status of Isabel Pickering Beckurts husband, Robert Briggs Ehrman, is listed as ‘heir.’ Ehrman’s father was a well-off physician and his mother was a successful children’s author, and it appears that he, himself, never pursued a profession.
Table E-2: Status, 1884 Appointees’ Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil, J.P.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffington, A.P.</td>
<td>Margaret*</td>
<td>m. COL (USMA ‘13)13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckurts, C.L.</td>
<td>Isabel P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren, W.C.</td>
<td>Mary S.*</td>
<td>m. Manufacturer15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, R.H., Jr.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, T.W.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose, C.W.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krüg, F.V.</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>m. Physician16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, E.B.</td>
<td>Lawrence B.</td>
<td>BG (USMA ‘13)17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, R.R.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardee, W.J.</td>
<td>Charlotte*</td>
<td>u/m. Dir., Religious Ed.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, A.H.</td>
<td>Haldimand P.</td>
<td>MAJ, USA (CDA)19</td>
<td>Mary H.*</td>
<td>u/m. College Admin.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaw, W.D.</td>
<td>Richard B.</td>
<td>Invest. Banker20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, H.L.</td>
<td>Elizabeth*</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>m.?22</td>
<td>m. Fruit Co. Exec.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, E.E.</td>
<td>No Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins, S.R.H.</td>
<td>Nena</td>
<td>m. COL (USMA ‘20)24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, Jr., W.N.</td>
<td>William T.</td>
<td>Chief Engr., USMM§25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, J.T.</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean, J.R.</td>
<td>Robert Hill</td>
<td>Chem. Engr.27</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>m. CPT, NA (CFR)28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ - Performed military service, either commissioned or enlisted (see notes)
* - Daughters who attended or graduated from a post-secondary school.
? - Undetermined
u/m. - Unmarried
m. – Married
NA – National Army
CFR – Commissioned from ranks
CDA – Commissioned by direct appointment

1884: Commissioned from the U.S. Military Academy

Of the 37 officers commissioned from West Point, all but six produced children who lived to adulthood. Career reproduction amongst these officers’ sons was quite high, with 19 out of 43, or 44%, going on to graduate from the military academy. Even for officers who did not chose military careers, eight followed in their fathers’ intellectual footsteps by choosing careers in engineering or architecture, increasing the percentage to 63%. Amongst their daughters, occupational homogamy was similarly high, with 14 out of 39, or 45%, marrying military or naval officers, of whom 12 were graduates of either West Point or Annapolis.

Finally, readers should note the multiple entries made for the three husbands of Faith Lorraine Mason Sanford, and the two husbands taken by Marian Steelman Hughes.
### Table E-3: Status, 1884 West Pointers’ Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale, I.</td>
<td>Irving, Jr.</td>
<td>Officer§39 Attorney§39</td>
<td>Marjory* d. 1928§31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William King</td>
<td>Electrical Engr.§30</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, J.C.</td>
<td>Hiram M.</td>
<td>Assoc Prof, CE§33</td>
<td>Eleanor M.* m. MG (USMA ‘14)§35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore P.</td>
<td>Port comm.§34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, H.M.</td>
<td>Hiram M.</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’15)</td>
<td>Helen Edith m. COL, USA§36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette, C.E.</td>
<td>Douglas H.</td>
<td>Engineer§37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaillard, D.D.</td>
<td>David St. Pierre</td>
<td>Electrical Engr.§38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Arthur Yates</td>
<td>Engineer§38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibert, W.L.</td>
<td>William Olin</td>
<td>Salesman§40 MG (USMA ‘12) 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin C.</td>
<td>Prof., Aero. Engr.§42 MG (USMA ’18)§43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Ward</td>
<td>Farmers§44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin Luther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin, J., Jr.</td>
<td>John French</td>
<td>BG (USMA ’15)§46</td>
<td>Alvarine m. COL, USA§47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortell, C.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, S.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, I.N.</td>
<td>Richard W.</td>
<td>Engineer§50 COL (USMA ’14)§51</td>
<td>Laura Anne* Margarety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Fenn</td>
<td></td>
<td>m. Electrical Engr.§52 m. Textile Exec.§53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd, E.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgis, S.D., Jr.</td>
<td>Samuel D., Jr.</td>
<td>LTG (USMA ’18)§55</td>
<td>Elizabeth T.* m. COL (USMA ’18)§57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bement</td>
<td>? §56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, W.L.</td>
<td>Bethel Wood</td>
<td>BG (USMA, ’11)§58</td>
<td>Dorothy W. Int. Designer, m. Artist§59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, E.E.</td>
<td>John Everard</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’11)§60</td>
<td>Mae §62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Spring</td>
<td>Marina Owner§61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, F.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, J.A.</td>
<td>John Tupper</td>
<td>BG (USMA ’17)§64 Textile Exec.§65</td>
<td>Marie Otis Agnes Elmer Lee D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td>m. LT, ORC§67 m. (USNA ’15), Cong.§68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell, D.C.</td>
<td>DeRosey C., Jr.</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’16)§66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt, E.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, E.S.</td>
<td>Elisha S., Jr.</td>
<td>Architect§70</td>
<td>Edith Branch Stella Marie m. Attorney§71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayre, F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. Music publisher§72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, W.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth S.* m. Univ. Instructor§73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, H.J.</td>
<td>Philip Edward</td>
<td>MG (USMA ’18)§74 Navigation Co. Exec.§75</td>
<td>Genevieve Mary Lee</td>
<td>m. VADM (USNA ’99)§76 m. VADM (USNA ’98)§77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanette* u/m. Music teacher§80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentler, C.E.</td>
<td>John A.E.</td>
<td>Business§78 d.1932§79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutcheson, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.K.</td>
<td>John Bellinger</td>
<td>BG (USMA ’14)§81 Dairy operator§82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, G.O.</td>
<td>James Bell</td>
<td>MG (USMA ’14)§83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, E.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styer, H.D.</td>
<td>Wilhelm Delp</td>
<td>LTG (USMA ’16)§84 RADM (USNA ’18)§85</td>
<td>Katherine E. m. RADM (USNA ’24)§86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father’s Occupation</td>
<td>Mother’s Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinger, J.B.</td>
<td>John B., Jr. Frederick C., Esq Edmund B., Esq Rene Du Champ</td>
<td>COL (USMA ’17)87 Attorney§88 Attorney§ (USMA ’18) 89 Inter. Decorator§90</td>
<td>Welcome* Constance*</td>
<td>u/m. Teacher21 792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer, W.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, R.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, B.C.</td>
<td>John Cable Benjamin C., III</td>
<td>Aero. Engr.96 Farmer§97</td>
<td>Jesse Jane* Harriet M.*</td>
<td>m. Architect§98 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, J.T.</td>
<td>Samuel Young John T., Jr. Charles O. Alexander</td>
<td>Shipping Exec.§101 Engineer§102 COL (USMA ’18)103 Civil Engr.§104</td>
<td>Alice M.</td>
<td>u/m.?105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, J.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, P.H.</td>
<td>Powhatann H., Jr.</td>
<td>Attorney§108</td>
<td>Marian S.</td>
<td>m. 1LT (USMA ’21)106 m. Sales executive§107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ - Performed military service, either commissioned or enlisted (see notes)
* - Daughters who attended or graduated from a post-secondary school.
? - Undetermined
u/m. - Unmarried
m. – Married
NA – National Army
ORC – Officers Reserve Corps
ANG – Appointed from Army National Guard
CDA – Commissioned by direct appointment

1 Mary Louise Finley never married, and passed in 1971. She possibly lived with or near her younger sister, Flora, and is buried with her parents in Arlington National Cemetery. In 1905, Mary Louise graduated from the Peace Institute, known today as Peace University. Peace Institute, *The Lotus*, 1905 (Raleigh, NC: The Institute, 1905), 12.

2 Flora studied music at Syracuse University from 1900-1901 and was an accomplished violinist. She married William H. Noble, who spent six years as an enlisted engineer and rose to sergeant before being commissioned from the ranks in 1899. He was a colonel of infantry in the 1930s. Frank Smalley, ed., *Alumni Record and General Catalog of Syracuse University, 1872-1910*, vol. 3, part 2 (Geneva, NY: W.F. Humphrey, 1911), 1961; “In the World of Society,” *Evening Star* (Wash., DC: 23 Jul 1909), 7; Heitman, v.1 (1988), 749; “General Moseley to Honor Adjutant Generals of Corps,” *Atlanta Constitution* (Atlanta, GA: 13 May 1934), 44.


Florence Frost earned her AB at Northwestern in 1908 and her MA at the University of Wisconsin in 1912. She received her PhD in entomology from the University of California at Berkeley in 1934. She spent her career studying tropical medicine and never married. She died in 1978 at the age of 92. University of California, University of California, Register, 1933-1934, vol. 2 (Berkley, CA: The Univ., 1934), 64. “Florence Myrtle Frost,” San Francisco Examiner (15 Jun 1978), 47.

Ethel Frost studied music at Northwestern University. Northwestern University, General Catalog, 1906-1907 (Evanston, IL: The Univ., 1907), 356.

In 1909, Louise Mann Frost graduated with honors from Northwestern University’s Evanston Academy, a preparatory school. She later studied at Univ. of Michigan and possibly the Univ. of South Dakota before marrying Peter Olson, a prosperous attorney in Vermillion, South Dakota. In 1930, the Frost-Olsens valued their house at $10,000, a sum equal to more than $300,000 today. Northwestern University, Evanston Academy General Catalog (Evanston, IL: The Univ., 1909), 39; University of Michigan, Calendar of the University of Michigan, 1909-1910 (Ann Arbor, MI: The Univ., 1910), 540; “Brides of Today,” Inter Ocean (Chicago, IL: 11 Jun 1913), 4; “Incorporations,” Sioux City Journal (Sioux City, IA: 10 Jul 1923), 2; 1930 United States Federal Census, Vermillion, Clay, South Dakota, s.v. “Louise Frost Olson” (b. ABT 1890), Ancestry.com; MeasuringWorth.com, 2020.


Isabel Pickering, also reported as ‘Isolde,’ prepared at the private Agnes Irwin School in the Philadelphia Main Line suburb of Bryn Mawr. Robert Briggs Ehrman was an heir. He was the son of Dr. George B. Ehrman, a wealthy Cincinnati physician, and his wife, Mary Bartholomew Ehrman, a writer of children’s songs. Robert prepared at the private Mercersburg Academy in Pennsylvania and Hughes High School in Cincinnati, which he graduated in 1918. Although reportedly destined for Yale, Ehrman appears to have attended the University of Cincinnati. Mr. and Mrs. Ehrman split their time between the old family home in Cincinnati and Miami. There is no indication Robert Ehrman ever practiced a profession or held a job in his life. “Mrs. R.B. Ehrman,” Cincinnati Enquirer (14 Feb 1961), 22; Mercersburg Academy, Kartex, vol. 22 (Lewiston, ME: Journal Printshop, 1915), 51; Hughes High School, The Hughes Annual, 1918 (Cincinnati, OH: 1918), 56; 134; “Beckurts-Ehrman,” Courier-Journal (Louisville, KY: 12 Oct 1942), 10; “Retired Physician Taken by Death,” Miami News (24 May 1940), 17; “Private Rights Set for Cincinnatian,” Miami Herald (04 Mar 1939), 5; 1930 United States Federal Census, Cincinnati, Hamilton, Ohio, s.v. “Robert Briggs Ehrman” (b. ABT 1904), Ancestry.com.

Mary S. Wren completed two years of college and married Walter Doorninck Idema, a Princeton graduate and co-founder of Steelcase, Inc., the Grand Rapids, Michigan company that at one


17 Lawrence Weeks was raised by his mother, Harriet Ovenshine Weeks, after his father committed suicide in Texas in 1890. Wirt Robinson, ed., Biographical Register of the Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, Supplement, vol. 6-B (Saginaw, MI: Seemann & Peters, 1920), 1640.


19 Andrew Huckins Young’s first son, Andrew, died in 1868 at age 12. He named his other sons, Haldimand Putnam and Richard Batchelder, after wartime colleagues COL Haldimand Sumner Putnam (USMA ’57) and COL Richard Napoleon Batchelder. Haldimand Young appears to have attended MIT. He was a volunteer officer in the Spanish-American War and received a direct appointment as a regular quartermaster captain in 1901. He died in 1934. Heitman, v.1 (1986), 1067; Ham (1949), 61; Hurd (1882), 873.

20 Richard Batchelder Young attended the University of Ohio and Cincinnati Law School before signing on with Investment Bankers of Boston, and was vice president of their New York office. He died in 1927. Ham (1949), 61.

21 Mary Hale Young graduated from Wellesley College with a BS in 1884. Afterwards, she taught school in New Jersey and New Hampshire, and later was a house head at Wellesley. She never married, and died in 1939. Ham (1949), 61; Wellesley College, Alumnae Register, 1885 (Boston, Rand, Avery, & Co., 1886), 65; Wellesley College, Register of the Wellesley College Alumnae Association (Natick, MA: Natick Bulletin, 1901), 114; “Officers of Administration,” Wellesley College Bulletin 14, no. 8 (Nov 1925), 15.

22 Elizabeth Hawthorne Knowlton was the daughter of Elizabeth Harney, Harry LeRoy Hawthorne’s third wife. She graduated from UCLA with a degree in French literature and in WWII served in the WAVES. She passed away in 2015 at the age of 106. Reportedly, she was engaged to army Lieutenant Jack Krimbill in 1942, and married Robert Paul Knowlton in 1946. “Deb’s Bridal Plans Told,” Los Angeles Times (05 Jun 1942), 40; “Weddings,” Los Angeles Times (13 Dec 1946), 15; “Elizabeth Hawthorne Knowlton, March 18, 1908-March 15, 2015” at lohmanfuneralhomes.com (accessed 09 Jan 2020).


25 William Thomas Blow was born in Yale, Virginia on 29 Sep 1884. He prepared at the Lawrenceville School in Mercer County, New Jersey. Blow graduated from Stanford University in 1909 and married Ina McClanahan in Pasadena, California. During WWII, William Blow deployed to France as a first lieutenant in a guard company. He worked for the Freeman Steamship Company of San Francisco before WWII, and served during the war as a U.S. Merchant Marine engineering officer. He was killed in
“William Thomas Blow” (b. ABT 1844), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Reports of Deaths of
American Citizens Abroad, 1835-1974,” s.v. “William Thomas Blow” (b. ABT 1884), digital image
available at Ancestry.com; “Mrs. Blow’s Rites Are Set for Today,” Times Dispatch (Richmond, VA: 06
Nov 1943), 9.

26 Little is known of Helen Anderson. After her father’s death, she and her mother split their
time between residences in Denver, Detroit, and New York City. She did not marry. “Ex-Gov. Bagley’s
Daughter is Dead,” Detroit Free Press (13 May 1932), 12.

27 Robert Hill Kean graduated from the University of Virginia, his father’s and grandfather’s
alma mater, with a PhD in Chemistry and worked as a chemical engineer for the Virginia-Carolina
Chemical Corporation. Robert Garlick Hill Kean, Inside the Confederate Government, edited by Edward
Younger (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957), xxxiv; 1940 United States Federal Census, Richmond,
Richmond City, Virginia, s.v. “Robert H. Kean” (b. ABT 1901), Ancestry.com;

28 In 1917, Martha Jefferson Kean married Captain William C. Chason. William Chason was
born in Donaldsonville, GA, on 21 Dec 1891 and enlisted in the Coast Artillery Corps in 1913. He
received a provisional commission from the ranks in 1917, and a temporary appointment to captain of
cast artillery officer that same year. Chason was made redundant in 1919, and the couple divorced in
image available at Ancestry.com; “Personal Matters,” Army and Navy Register (01 Dec 1917), 688;
“Artillery Orders,” Liaison 1, no. 22 (17 May 1919), 218; “Florida, Divorce Index, 1927-2001,” s.v.
“Martha Kean” (b. 07 Aug 1895), digital image available at Ancestry.com.

29 Two of Hale’s children, Hope and John Huntington, did not reach adulthood. Irving Hale, Jr.,
became a prominent attorney in Colorado. “3 Highest Names in Bar Test Revealed,” Fort Collins
Coloradoan (Fort Collins, CO: 03 Oct 1928), 6.

30 William King Hale was an electrical engineer. He graduated from Culver Military Academy
in Indiana in 1905, and planned to study at Purdue University. He died of pneumonia in on 31 Dec 1935.
“Personals,” Army and Navy Journal (18 Jun 1910), 1256; 1930 United States Federal Census, Denver,

31 Marjory King Hale attended the University of Colorado and died unmarried in 1928, aged 25

32 Faith Lorraine Mason Sanford was the adopted daughter James Clark Sanford, by way of his
first wife, Antoinette Hawley Mason. She mostly was educated abroad, and studied French, German,
Italian, and music, and attended one year of college. Also, Miss Sanford was an equestrian. Faith first
was engaged to Lieutenant Edwin Hall Marks (USMA ’09) in 1910, but the couple did not marry. In
1913, she wed Reginald Spear, a U.S. Navy paymaster (LCDR) she met in Newport, Rhode Island,
where her father was assigned as an engineer. Spear was dismissed from the servi
33 Chittenden’s oldest son, Hiram Martin, held a direct appointment as an artillery officer during
WWI. After graduating from the Univ. of Washington in 1920, he became an instructor and later
associate professor of civil engineering, and combined teaching with private consulting. University of
After graduating from the Univ. of Washington in 1924, Theodore Parker Chittenden worked as a representative of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., a Bell subsidiary, and later served as long-time commissioner of the Port of Edmonds. Ted Chittenden, "How a Lookout Got Blasted Off His Peak by Lightning," *Mountaineer* 76, no. 7 (Jun 1982), 34; “Edmonds Boat Harbor Assured; Bonds Sold,” *Mountlake Terrace Enterprise* (Mountlake Terrace, WA: 15 Mar 1961), 1.


William Olin Siebert served during WWI and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel. He attended the University of Virginia, and was employed in sales before dying in 1935. *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, v.17 (1920), 384-385; “W.O. Siebert, 46, Dies in New Jersey,” *Franklin Favorite* (Franklin, KY: 19 Dec 1935), 1.


Harold Ward Sibert graduated in 1914 from Cornell with a degree in mechanical engineering and received his doctorate in mathematics from the Univ. of Cincinnati in 1946. He served during WWII as a major, and during WW II he rose to lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Air Force and its successor, the U.S. Air Force. He retired as a professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering at the Univ. of Colorado in 1960. Cornell University, *The Register of Cornell University, 1914-1915* (Ithaca, NY: The Univ., 1915), 190; Dr. Harold Sibert,” *Cincinnati Enquirer* (24 Dec 1973), 4.

During WWII, Edwin Luther Sibert rose to major general engaged in intelligence duties. “Edwin Luther Sibert,” *Assembly* 37, no. 4 (Mar 1979), 122-123.

Martin David Sibert attended the Univ. of Kansas and on the U.S. entry into WWI he enlisted unknown to his parents. He attained the rank of corporal, and later in life owned a farm near Gadsden, Alabama. “General’s Son is a Private,” *Fulton County Tribune* (Wauseon, OH: 14 Dec 1917), 2; 1940 United States Federal Census, Election Precinct 3 Kansas, Kansas, Topeka, Kansas, s.v. “Martin D. Sibert” (b. ABT 1898), *Ancestry.com*.


49 Following in the footsteps of her grandfather, Surgeon Major John Brooke, Dr. Lois Brooke Foote graduated with honors from University of Pennsylvania medical school in 1921. In 1923, she married Dr. William Raney Stanford, who graduated from the same school in 1919. University of Pennsylvania (1921), 81; W.J. Maxwell, comp., General Alumni Catalog of the University of Pennsylvania, 1922 (Philadelphia: The Univ., 1922), 675.

50 Richard Wheatley Lewis graduated from MIT in 1910. During WWI, he received a direct appointment as a major of engineers. He served again during WWII as a colonel. In civil life he was associated with the production of his father’s machinegun and was president of the Lewis Asphalt Engineering Corporation. “Col. R.W. Lewis, Former Resident,” Montclair Times (Montclair, NJ: 29 Jan 1959), 6.

51 Graduating from West Point in 1914, George Fenn Lewis served during WWII as a lieutenant colonel of engineers but resigned in 1919. Afterward, he served as the police commissioner of Montclair, New Jersey, his father’s home town. He served again during WWII, rising to the rank of colonel. See, “COL. I.N. Lewis,” Montclair Times (Montclair, NJ: 10 Nov 1931), 1, 4; Robinson, v.6-B (1920), 1673;


54 Katherine Ladd married William Torbert MacMillan on 14 February 1910. MacMillan graduated from West Point in 1906 and was assigned as an infantry officer. He served in WWI and WWII, rising to colonel. “Notes from the Islands,” Army and Navy Register (26 Mar 1910), 81; U.S. War Department, Official Army Register, 1942 (Wash., DC: GPO, 1942), 974.

55 U.S. Military Academy (1933), 139; “Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis,” Kansas City Times (Kansas City, MO: 06 Jul 1964), 27.

56 Robert Bement Sturgis appears to have been the family’s black sheep. He received a presidential nomination for West Point in 1921 but did not attend. In 1925, he stole a rental car and went on a spree in Virginia and North Carolina, where he was arrested for larceny and kiting checks, possibly the account of his brother-in-law, Hugh A. Murrill. Sturgis spent several weeks in jail before Murrill dropped the charges on the condition he removed himself from the family seat and not attempt to enter the armed forces. Provided a car and cash by Murrill, Sturgis set out, possibly for the Midwest. He died in California in 1980 at the age of 77, having been an office manager for a construction company. “Harding Names Minneapolis Woman’s Kin for West Point,” Star Tribune (Minneapolis, MN: 15 Dec 1921), 11; “Drop Charges Against Youth,” Times Dispatch (Richmond, VA: 23 Jun 1925), 2; “Robert Sturgis Given a Chance,” Charlotte Observer (Charlotte, NC: 23 Jun 1925), 12; “Robert B. Sturgis,” La Crosse Tribune (La Crosse, WI: 25 Jun 1980), 13.


60 COL John Everard Hatch, Sr., graduated from Colby College in Maine in 1908, and West Point in 1911. His sons, COL McGlachlin Hatch and MAJ John Everard Hatch, Jr., both graduated from the academy in January, 1943. John, Jr., was killed in 1946 during a training mission in Germany when his P51 crashed on landing. Robinson, v.6-B (1920), 1526; U.S. Military Academy (1941), 144-147; Dede Hatch and Wray Page, “McGlachlin Hatch Jan ’43,” Taps 66, no. 1 (May-Jun 2008), 12; “Our War Story – Continued,” Phi Gamma Delta 69, no. 3 (Dec 1946), 305.

61 Edward Spring Hatch joined the Maryland National Guard in the 1930s and entered active duty during WWII. By war’s end, he rose to lieutenant colonel. Afterward he operated a marina on Maryland’s Severn River. “Edward S. Hatch, Sr., World War II Veteran,” Baltimore Sun (23 Jun 1991), 59.

62 No information on Mae Hatch Brown has come to light, other than she lived in Maryland with her father up until his death in 1940.

63 COL Palmer’s marriage to produced two sons but neither lived to adulthood. Hugh Livingston Palmer was born on 21 July 1888 at Fort Sidney, NE, and died there 06 Sep that same year. Frederick Allen Palmer was born on 08 May 1895 at Plattsburgh Barracks, NY and died at Atlanta, GA on 27 Nov 1909. Langworthy (1940), 126-127.


65 James Marshall Cole graduated with an MS from the Univ. of Virginia in 1927, probably in chemistry. He was an executive in the textile industry, having served as president of the Cold Spring Bleachery in Yardley, PA, and for a time as president of the U.S. Finishing Company. “J. Marshall Cole,” Doylestown Intelligencer (Doylestown, PA: 20 Nov 1991), 76.


67 Marie Otis Cabell married Lieutenant George Ambrose Armstrong, a reserve officer assigned to the 308th Cavalry. “Personal Matters,” Army and Navy Register (13 Apr 1918), 68.

68 LT Edouard Victor Michael Izac (also, ‘Isaac’) graduated from Annapolis in 1915, and after a daring escape from a German POW camp in WWI was awarded the Medal of Honor. He later served as a congressman from California. “Lieut. Isaacs Escapes from German Prison,” Army and Navy Register (24 Oct 1918), 463.


Elizabeth Stanford Sayre attended two years of college and married Lieutenant Harry Robert Kilbourne, a reserve officer assigned to the 16th U.S. Cavy Regiment, on 24 March 1918 at San Antonio, TX. In 1933, Kilbourne was a junior instructor of English at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. The couple may have divorced by 1940. 1940 United States Federal Census, Baltimore (Districts 251-500), Baltimore, Maryland, s.v. “Elizabeth S.S. Kilbourne” (b. ABT 1892), Ancestry.com; “Farrand Sayre,” Assembly 12, no. 1 (Apr 1953), 42-43; “Society,” Junction City Weekly Union (Junction City, KS: 18 Apr 1918), 3; U.S. War Department, Official Army Register, 1920 (Wash., DC: GPO, 1920), 299; Johns Hopkins University, The Johns Hopkins University Circular, School of Engineering, 1934-35 (Baltimore: The Univ., 1933), 765.

Philip Edward Gallagher was commandant of cadets at West Point in the early years of WWII. “Mrs. John W. Greenslade,” Philadelphia Inquirer (29 Mar 1943), 12.


Mary Lee Gallagher was the wife of RADM John Wills Greenslade, USN. “Society,” Coronado Eagle and Journal (Coronado, CA: 1 Apr 1943), 4.

Graduating from the Student Army Training Corps camp at Plattsburg, NY, in 1918, John Andrew Eugene Dentler was commissioned a 2LT of field artillery, too late to see active service in Europe. Afterwards, he studied commerce at the Oregon Agricultural College, graduating in 1924, and held positions in local industries, such as Aero Motor Inc. and Iron Fireman, and in state government.


Robinson, v.6-B (1920), 1720.


James Bell Cress graduated with a BS in engineering from the University of Michigan before attending West Point. Hilkert (2004), 154-164. See also note 26.


Katherine Elizabeth ‘Bess’ Styer possibly met Adrian Melville Hurst through her brother, Charles Wilkes Styer, who was assigned to the same submarine, USS Cuttlefish, as its commander. She was the first woman elected to the city council of Coronado, CA, and served from 1944-1948. She


92 Constance Ayer studied at Goucher College in Baltimore and possibly also Smith College. She received a BA from the University of California at Berkeley in 1916. Like her sister, she appears never to have married. “In Society,” Topeka Daily Capital (Topeka, KS: 25 Jul 1913), 6; University of California, The Fifty-Third Commencement, May 1916 (Berkeley, CA: The Univ., 1916), 13.


96 In 1909, John Cable Morse received a presidential nomination for West Point but he attended MIT, instead. He graduated in 1914 with a BS in civil engineering and was kept on a year as an assistant professor at the school. Later, he worked as an aeronautical engineer at McCook Field, the U.S. Army’s experimental aviation station in Dayton, Ohio, and in the 1930s he was a consulting engineer for an oil company, also in Dayton. “41 Named for West Point,” Baltimore Sun (11 Apr 1909), 3; “At Fort

97 Benjamin Clark Morse, III (also called ‘Jr.’), prepared at Phillips Andover Academy, graduating in 1916. He entered MIT but the war interrupted his studies. In August 1917, he received a reserve appointment as a lieutenant of infantry and deployed to France where he took part in the Meuse-Moselle attack that preceded the Armistice in 1918. After the war, he was employed by the Goodyear Rubber Company in Akron, Ohio. Later, he turned to farming on a large spread near Columbus, OH. Phillips Academy (1917), 64; Claude Moore Fuss, ed., Phillips Academy, Andover in the Great War (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1919), 367; “Service Weddings,” Army and Navy Register (07 Feb 1920), 699-700; “Retired U.S. General Drops Dead in Garden,” Salt Lake Tribune (Salt Lake City, UT: 17 Apr 1933), 2.

98 Jesse Jane Morse graduated from the Univ. of Illinois with a BA in literature and art in 1914. There, she was a sister in the Pi Beta Phi sorority. In 1921, she married Lieutenant Edward Haywood Raymond in the Canal Zone at Corozal, Panama. After his service, he was employed as an architect. University of Illinois, Alumni Quarterly and Fortnightly Notes (Champaign, IL: 15 Oct 1921), 31; “At Fort Benjamin Harrison,” Indianapolis Star (28 Jun 1914), 40. “Marriage is Announced,” Battle Creek Moon-Journal (Battle Creek, MI: 14 Jul 1921), 11; 1940 United States Federal Census, Columbus, Franklin, Ohio, s.v. “Edward H. Raymond” (b. ABT 1894), Ancestry.com.


100 In 1906, Knight and his wife lost their youngest child, Edith Young Knight. “Recent Deaths,” Army and Navy Journal (24 Mar 1906), 829.

101 Samuel ‘Sam’ Young Knight was born in San Antonio on 05 April 1891. He prepared for university at the Blight School in Philadelphia. Although he received an appointment from President Taft to attend West Point in 1908, he studied at Virginia Polytechnic Institute from 1907-08 and at Lehigh Univ. in Pennsylvania from 1910-12. Afterwards, he worked for the Southern Pacific Railroad and for John Rothschild and Company in Manila and Honolulu. In 1918, he received a National Army appointment as a second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps. By 1922, he started what became his long association with the McCormack shipping line in California, and by the 1930s was the line’s Southern California manager. He served at least one term a president of the Los Angeles Steamship Association, and died on 26 November 1966 in California. Kappa Alpha Society (1926), 612; “Appointed to West Point,” The Sun (New York, NY: 11 Jan 1908), 4; “D.C. Men Commissioned,” Evening Star (Wash., DC: 18 Jul 1918), 14; Paul Faulkner, “Pacific Marine Personal,” Pacific Marine Review 30, no. 4 (Apr 1933), 11; “Knight Returns,” News-Pilot (San Pedro, CA: 06 Nov 1934), 8; “U.S., Find A Grave Index, 1600s-Current,” s.v. “Samuel Young Knight” (b. 05 Apr 1891), in Ancestry.com.

102 John Thornton Knight, Jr., graduated from West Point in 1917 and was commissioned as a field artillery officer from the academy in 1917 and deployed to France. He commanded a battery at the Vosges and St. Mihiel, was twice wounded and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. He resigned in 1920 as a result of his wounds. In civilian life he was an engineer and worked for various companies, including Paramount Pictures. In 1942, he returned to active duty as a major of engineers but was restricted from combat duty on account of his previous injuries. He resumed his business career after the war, and died on 05 June 1990 in San Antonio, Texas. “John T. Knight, Jr. Aug 1917,” Social and Personal News, Indianapolis Star (Dayton, OH: 01 Jan 1922), 39; “Retired U.S. General Drops Dead in Garden,” Salt Lake Tribune (Salt Lake City, UT: 17 Apr 1933), 2.

103 O’Farrell Knight, usually known by his middle name or nickname ‘Offie,’ was born in Richmond, Virginia on 24 December 1896. He graduated from West Point in August 1918 as class first captain and accepted a commission in the field artillery. After graduation, he married Mary ‘Polly’ Josepha Williams, daughter of Bishop G. Mott Williams of Marquette, Michigan, and the niece of Colonel John Biddle, who had been the academy superintendent during Knight’s schooling. One of their children attended West Point: Jeffery D. Knight (USMA ’52). O’Farrell resigned his commission in 1926 and entered the Officers Reserve Corps. During WWII, he served in the Pacific Theater in staff assignments, and was released from active duty in 1947. He retired from the U.S. Army Reserves in 1954 as a colonel. In civilian life, he bought and managed a 1,300-acre cattle ranch on the Clackamas River near Estacada, Oregon, and died in Tacoma, Washington in 1965. John Thornton Knight, Jr., “Charles O.
Alexander ‘Sandy’ Knight graduated from the Univ. of Arizona with a degree in civil engineering in 1943. He worked briefly for a local construction company until accepting a commission in the U.S. Naval Reserve and was assigned to a SEABEE battalion in the Pacific Theater. He was promoted to lieutenant junior grade in 1944. Knight stayed on as a reserve officer, possibly rising in rank to lieutenant commander. In 1970, Sandy Knight appears to have committed suicide by pistol in his home in San Carlos, California, at the age of 64. “Death Claims Mrs. Knight in California,” Tucson Citizen (Tucson, AZ: 20 Jul 1940), 6; “Alexander Knight Wins Promotion,” Arizona Daily Star (Tucson, AZ: 13 Sep 1944), 3; “Engineer is Gun Victim,” The Times (San Mateo, CA: 28 Dec 1970), 25.

Alice Margaret Knight reportedly attended a fashionable school in New York with Sally Garlington, daughter of General Garlington. This may have been Pelham Hall Academy, from which an “Alice Margaret Knight” graduated in 1907. In any event, there is no indication Miss Knight married, or that she followed any profession. “Society in Washington,” Baltimore Sun (22 Oct 1907), 7; “Graduation at Pelham Manor,” Daily Argus (Mount Vernon, NY: 31 May 1907), 1-2.


Powhatan Hughes Clarke attended St. Louis Univ. in St. Louis, Missouri, entering in 1909 and graduating with a law degree. During WWI, he held a commission as a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army Aviation Service, and shipped out to France with the 21st Aero Squadron and served there as a training instructor. In 1920, he passed away at Saranac Lake, New York, from pneumonia. At the time of his death, he left a considerable personal fortune in securities and real estate to his mother. St. Louis University, Bulletin of St. Louis University (St. Louis, MO: The Univ., 1909), 41; “U.S., Army Transport Service, Passenger Lists, 1910-1939,” s.v. “Powhatan Hughes Clarke,” (b. ABT 1893), digital image available at Ancestry.com; “Powhatan H. Clarke Dies at Saranac Lake,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (St. Louis, MO: 31 Aug 1920), 11; “Young Lawyer, Descendant of Famous St. Louisans, Died in East,” St. Louis Globe-Democrat (St. Louis, MO: 05 Sep 1920), 4; “$84,784 in Securities in P.H. Clarke Estate,” St. Louis Times and Star (St. Louis, MO: 14 Oct 1920), 2.
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