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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a social history of more than 2,000 individual state and federal employees between 1898 and 1917 who were charged with the transformation of the law from enacted ideal to lived reality. The study examines the interplay of gendered identity and administrative state formation in the United States through four case studies: the Philippine Constabulary, the Pennsylvania State Police, the US Forest Service, and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division. To grow these agencies, executives—including Gifford Pinchot, Henry T. Allen, John C. Groome, and George C. Wirt—had to recruit, train, and discipline technocratic experts who were inspired by an idealized image of government service. This identity simultaneously and paradoxically praised rugged individualism and bureaucratic conformity. Compounded by bureaucratic stagnation, depreciating salaries, and the realities of living conditions in remote wildernesses, the inherent contradictions of individualism and conformity led many of these men to disillusionment and resignation.

My argument is based upon the reconstruction of individual government careers utilizing bureaucratic social history sources, including circular letters, annual reports, standardized forms, and the extensive correspondence between would-be government-men and senior executives within the four case studies. These personnel records when combined with personal documents, including diaries, letters, and memoirs, provide an intimate picture of administrative state formation between the Spanish American War and the First World War.

Historiographically, the emergence of the administrative state during the Progressive Era has been examined through the lens of government and political leaders, specific policies, and the governed, those impacted by the expanding administrative state. Although often critical of specifics, the literature suggests that the expansion of the American administrative state was successful during the fin-de-siècle. I argue, though, that not only did these resignations represent a loss of human capital, but a failure by politicians and reformers during the Progressive Era to create an administrative state capable of inspiring, recruiting, training, and retaining an increasingly specialized, technocratic bureaucracy. A more intimate knowledge of those who governed suggests that historians need to question the early twentieth-century administrative state as a successful model for the replication, regulation, and maintenance of power.
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Introduction: Bureaucratic Apotheosis
Bureaucracies are immortal. Bureaucrats are not.

Successful government appears immortal. Political scientist Herbert Kaufman criticized the inflexible permanence of bureaucratic governance by noting that of 175 federal agencies that existed in 1923, 148 still existed in 1973 despite technological and societal changes.\textsuperscript{1} Agencies during the twentieth-century have been shuffled, renamed, repurposed, and sometimes eliminated. More often than not, though, agencies live on until they are ascribed independent thought by citizens. When a newspaper reporter denounces the incompetency of a government bureaucracy or lauds the success of an agency, the anthropomorphosis is complete and a faceless organization capable of transcending time is born. The apparent immortality of the bureaucracy, though, has hidden the transient nature of the bureaucrat. Certainly, some bureaucratic elite were canonized by agencies through the festooning of their names on conference rooms, office buildings, and monuments both natural and constructed. The permanence of these canonized few, however, has hidden a reality in which many joined the ranks of government agencies, while few pursued lifelong careers.\textsuperscript{2} What did the creation of transient government careers mean to the development of these burgeoning organizations?

\textsuperscript{1} Herbert Kaufman, \textit{Are Government Organizations Immortal?} (Washington, DC: Brooking Institution, 1976).
\textsuperscript{2} There is a vast theoretical literature on the relationship between public-sector employee satisfaction and career longevity. For an introduction to that literature including a critical analysis of the overreliance upon dated data reports, see Bradley E. Wright, “Public-Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model,” \textit{Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory} 11.4 (2002), 559-586.
The following dissertation seeks to answer this question through an investigation into the identities of the modern bureaucracy and bureaucrat that developed in the United States between 1898 and 1917. Modern government agencies emerged as more than clerical workforces during the 1890s with regulatory agencies creating worker identities that transcended the policies that legislated these new government bureaus into existence. Each agency, though, was made up of hundreds, if not thousands, of individual day-in-and-day-out doers who were governance. To meld individuals to agencies, policymakers and bureaucratic executives developed uniform procedures that created, reinforced, and policed an idealized image of government-service. Focusing upon the first generation of technically-trained career government-men, I explore their place at the nexus of regulatory governance and masculine identity, wherein the law as written code was transformed into the law as enforceable reality. Through recruitment and training programs, bureaucracies created a fantasy that government careers could be patriotic adventures for rugged enforcers of order. Such a fantasy relied upon the construction of ideal bureaucrats that relied upon models created, and sometimes lived, by senior executives.

In reality, though, young men had to contend with bureaucratic stagnation, inflation, and geographic isolation that soured the fantasy. Through the creation of bureaucratic identities, men like founding Philippine Constabulary Chief Henry T. Allen, reforming US Forester Gifford Pinchot, first Pennsylvania State Police Chief John C. Groome, and initial Pennsylvania State Forester George H. Wirt developed the most basic building block of the modern administrative state: government as a professional career.
My dissertation emphasizes the creation of government doers because they determined what was done. In this sense, it is a kind of social, and at times, cultural history of what others have called American political development. The historiography of the American administrative state has obscured the importance of these individual, frontline bureaucrats. Many foundational studies, like William J. Novak’s *The People’s Welfare*, focus upon what the administrative state was allowed to do by state and federal legislatures.3 Others have focused upon the policies that are collectively known as the civil service reform movement, a central component of the Progressive Era.4 Detailed, bureaucracy-specific case studies, like Cathleen D. Cahill’s *Federal Fathers & Mothers* and Daniel R. Beaver’s *Modernizing the American War Department*, have centered upon

---


civil servant narratives, but have been limited to one agency’s bureaucratic experience.\(^5\) Even those studies that do incorporate multiple agencies in depth, like Stephen Skowronek’s *Building a New American State*, define the state as federal, ignoring the simultaneous development of the administrative state below the national level. These studies have constructed the agencies, rather than the agents, as the cause for change over time.\(^6\) In building upon the vast administrative state literature, I explore the development of American bureaucratic capacities from the perspective of those who did governance at both the national and state levels. The result is an administrative state that is all too mortal, driven by individuals whose daily problems, personal fears, and localized hatreds created government as an actual experience.

By approaching the administrative state from the perspectives of governance doers, I have also utilized the vibrant historiography of Progressive Era masculinity. How could we ignore the fact that the modern state was created by men whose masculinity was outsized, explicit, and even evangelistic? Gender identities dramatically changed during the Progressive Era as a result of industrial modernity and the managerial revolution, as Gail Bederman, Kristin Hoganson, Amy Kaplan, and John F. Kasson have demonstrated.\(^7\) In 1880, women represented 4.4% of clerical workers in the United...

---


States, while by 1910 women accounted for 38% of clerks. The majority of these women had obtained a high-school education, which was a near universal prerequisite for a clerical position either within or without government. The rise of the female clerk and the evolution of a government-woman identity, which is outside the scope of this project, spurred, in part, the rise of the hyper-masculinized government-man identities. These government-man identities eschewed increasingly feminized general clerical careers and instead pursued technocratic careers that required either specialized, often military, experiences or, increasingly more prevalent, university education.

Through my reconstruction of bureaucratic careers, I argue that the process through which an employee was deemed a success or a failure was created by the executives of administrative agencies. This is what I call bureaucratic identity formation.

The process was intrinsically linked between 1898 and 1917 to two parallel masculine

---


identities: the rugged and the technocrat. Bureaucratic elites defined the ‘good’ employee as one who could perform ruggedly, which at varying times included braving wildernesses, handling horses, and fighting with fisticuffs and guns. A successful strenuous man had to be able to handle himself.\textsuperscript{10} A ‘good’ employee within these new administrative agencies had to be familiar with the technological advancements of the modern state, including the expansion of standardized paperwork, hierarchically centralized reporting methods, and other aspects of the managerial revolution that suppressed individualism in favor of bureaucratic uniformity. A homogenous workforce, contemporaries argued, would guarantee a uniform experience of governance across time and space.\textsuperscript{11}

The Philippine Constabulary, the Pennsylvania State Police, the US Forest Service, and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division—the four case studies of the dissertation—were experiments in creating modern, technocratic regulatory units of the administrative state and in crafting a masculine bureaucratic identity defined by the strenuous life. These agencies were federal and state versions of a burgeoning new field of governance: state policing. While a number of historians, including Alfred W. McCoy, have recently examined policing in the United States, they have done so by focusing


upon how policing was done and to whom it was done. The Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police were the first paramilitary law-enforcement organizations in the United States above the municipal level and, despite being contemporaneously considered successful, were passionately debated subjects of government expansion.\textsuperscript{12} The US Forest Service under Gifford Pinchot and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division under George C. Wirt represented a similar expansion of government power, but policed land usage rather than the actions of individual citizens.\textsuperscript{13} Each of these organizations sought to recruit and create employees at the height of Theodore Roosevelt’s power during which a hyper-masculine evangelical masculinity was lauded as an ideal. The leaders of these agencies were emblematic of Roosevelt’s strenuous life and the elite formation process proselytized by Republican political elites. They were educated at selective secondary schools and universities, reveled in the class defining brownstone lifestyle, and, most importantly, they were rugged, individual men. These four case studies represent the extreme of a process that, I believe, impacted many, if not, most of

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
the government agencies that underwent rapid modernization during the Progressive Era.\textsuperscript{14}

Furthermore, these rugged and technocratic ideals were nearly impossible to achieve by the young men who threw themselves into government careers from the Pennsylvania to Philippines. Many—if not most—ended up disappointed; a huge number resigned. My dissertation pushes the historiography to consider why these failures mattered and concludes the loss of one of these trained employees represented more than just the loss of a literate clerk. To these technocratic agencies, these employees of the modern administrative state represented years of specialized training and institutional knowledge. More importantly, the loss of these young men, who so enthusiastically believed in the expansion of the Progressive Era state, was a failure of politicians and reformers to create an administrative state—a means of governance—compatible with the class and gender changes of modernity. Instead, the administrative state—curtailed by bureaucratic stagnation—would rely upon a continuous stream of highly skilled employees who after a few years of public service would seek employment elsewhere.

This dissertation is a multi-archival social history of the administrative state that emphasizes the lived experience of America’s Progressive Era technocrats. To understand the idealized identities of government agents created by Henry T. Allen,

Gifford Pinchot, John C. Groome, and George H. Wirt, I reconstructed the careers of more than two thousand individual bureaucrats. Using alumni publications, annual reports, and bureaucratic missives, I tracked key events in a government-employee’s career. These events included promotions, reprimands, marriages, salaries, and resignations. While not all data-sets are complete for each of the agencies, enough emerges to deduce reasons for dissatisfaction. These reasons were linked to the identities created by the executives of these bureaucracies—the bureaucratic elite—who founded or reformed the agencies in question. Men like Allen, Pinchot, Groome, and Wirt utilized manuals, circulars, training regimens, and even formulized bureaucratic schools to proselytize their idealized images of a good government agent and the dire consequences that would befall those who failed to conform. Where possible, I used personal papers, including diaries and letters, to illustrate how government trainees internalized these state-of-the-art programs.

The following five chapters present different aspects of the government-man identity created by the founders and reformers of these four agencies. Chapter I investigates how the technocratic state espoused by Gifford Pinchot and other Progressive Era reformers was translated into a teachable idea capable of inspiring a generation of young men. Literature targeting children during the period was quick to establish the connection between education and a modern successful government career, which replaced the political patronage of the Gilded Age. The correspondence of the senior administrative elite of the four agency case studies and educators at the New Mexico Military Institute, the Yale Forest School, the Pennsylvania State Forest
Academy at Mont Alto, and Carl Schenk’s Biltmore School of Forestry changes our understanding of the process through which academic career networks became exclusionary. Academic career networks reveal not just the importance of conformity to the government-man identity, but also the power of educators as government career gatekeepers.

Chapter II introduces initial research on the militarizing influence of the War Department upon civilian regulatory agencies after 1898 and prior to 1917. Military education arose following the Spanish-American War, which expanded the War Department into a regulatory agency for academic institutions ranging from military academies to land-grant colleges. As a result young men in the United States prior to World War I were far more exposed to military training—from drill to tactics—than has been appreciated. Agencies as geographically removed as the Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police were easily able to recruit a workforce, almost all of whom had either served in the military or attended a military school. Finally, the chapter reveals that in spite of Gifford Pinchot’s contempt for the War Department, he actively consulted the Secretary of War’s vast staff for advice on matters of procurement, technical expertise, and bureaucratic management. The government-man identity that emerged between 1898 and 1917, Chapter II argues, was militarized.

The final three chapters reconstruct and explore the means through which bureaucracies and bureaucrats developed identities. Chapter III examines how administrative founders and reformers like Henry T. Allen, Gifford Pinchot, John C. Groome, and George H. Wirt created bureaucratic identities. The bureaucratic identity
developed by these administrative elites simultaneously celebrated both a rugged, individualized masculinity and a technocratic conformity. Young men were expected by their superiors to handle a horse, brave the wilderness, and file standardized reports. Chapter IV follows how training material and bureaucratic correspondence reaffirmed and policed these identities. Service schools combined with manuals, circulars, and other bureaucratic missives defined who was a good and a bad government-man. Chapter V utilizes diaries and personal letters to examine how the creation of bureaucratic ideals contributed to the mass resignations of men who had fantasized about a modern government career. The romanticized ideals created by administrative elites were unattainable and resulted in widespread disappointment with government careers. In the end, for many of these young men, public service was constructed as public sacrifice. The result was a governance recruitment structure that could not retain talent.

Between 1898 and 1917, the modern American administrative state—a governing structure recognizable today—was enacted by politicians and reformers. That story has been told. Instead, what follows is a methodology for studying government through those who did governance, who everyday sought to transform the law into reality. In reconstructing these individual perspectives, I argue that the modern bureaucratic regulatory state was flawed from inception. Bureaucratic elite formed an identity of rugged masculinity through educational networks and training materials. By incorporating such rugged ideals, these bureaucratic founders inadvertently created an inherent flaw, disappointment. The disappointment of government-men weakened modern governance by creating a career cycle that ended not in promotion or long-tenure,
but in resignation and the loss of human capital. An intimate knowledge of government agents reveals that bureaucratic disillusionment may well have contributed to a broader dissatisfaction with the modern administrative state.
I

Government Fantasies
Government mattered. Government captivated. American citizens, like their counterparts across the colonizing and industrializing fin de siècle world, redefined their relationship with and expectations of good government from the 1880s through the First World War. For most of the nineteenth century in the United States, patronage dominated state and federal governance, evolving from the “honorable” appointee method worked out by George Washington and the Federalists after the ratification of the Constitution to the democratizing political patronage “reforms” outlined in Andrew Jackson’s first inaugural address of 1829.\textsuperscript{15} Jackson’s reforms, popularly understood as the spoils system, promised individuals lucrative government positions requiring only a general education—literacy and a passing familiarity with political and government structures—in exchange for supporting, financially or otherwise, a political party. Accelerated by government—both state and federal—expansion during and immediately after the Civil War, Jackson’s spoils system evolved from a radical institution for social change to what E. L. Godkin dismissed as the change-resistant, conservative, patronage appointed and corrupted “snivel service.”\textsuperscript{16} Through the 1870s and 1880s increasing disgust with the “snivel service” and a presidential assassination—James A. Garfield was shot in 1881 by disgruntled office seeker Charles J. Guiteau—laid the groundwork for a gradual third


shift in American governance: the Progressive Era’s creation of a professional civil service based upon meritocracy rather than political patronage.17

Historians have long been writing of the civil service, or third era of American governance. Scholars of the administrative state, like Ari Hoogenboom and Paul P. Van Riper, have focused on the nearly fifty-year transition from the snivel service to the professionalized civil service that spanned the 1870s and the 1920s.18 Most of these narratives agree with Richard Hofstadter’s classic analysis of the Progressive Era as characterized—even defined—as a reaction to industrialization, urbanization, and the other contemporaneously conceived ills of modernity.19 Having moved away from Robert Weibe and Samuel P. Hays’ organizational arguments and towards a societally—even globally—broader discourse, as advocated by Peter G. Filene and John D. Buenker, progressivism—as an historiographical subject and ideology—has emerged as an historic zeitgeist, as important, nebulous, and problematic as contemporaneous colonialism and imperialism.20 Gender and cultural historians—through studies including the crisis of

18 Ari Hoogenboom, Outlawing the Spoils; Van Riper, History of the United States Civil Service.
masculinity, the imperialization of consumption habits, the globalization of philanthropy, and the reimagining of urban landscapes—have demonstrated just how pervasive progressivism was from the 1890s through the First World War.\textsuperscript{21} What these studies illuminate is the progressive belief that while something—masculinity, domesticity, foreign policy, the built environment, morals—had gone wrong, ingenuity and inventiveness could bring about positive change. As Daniel T. Rodgers so eloquently argued, what defined progressives was their belief that the world could—and should—be made a better place.\textsuperscript{22}

Building upon the complex historiography of the Progressive Era, the following chapter presents how the evolution of technocratic, professionalized governance and expanded administrative state capacities was translated into a teachable idea that shaped the career ambitions of a generation of young men. An examination of popularized children’s books demonstrates how the idea of governance was presented to young boys in order to inculcate a desire to become a government-man. Given the characterization of education within these books as the only pathway to a technocratic dream, the chapter then examines how educational networks were constructed and maintained by

\begin{footnotesize}


\textsuperscript{22} Rodgers, \textit{Atlantic Crossings}, 59.
\end{footnotesize}
bureaucratic and school leaders. Finally, the chapter concludes by evaluating the comparative fairness between the old snivel service and the new world of meritocracy.

Through children’s books—themselves a part of a contemporaneously emerging consumer industry—and the correspondence between educational institutions and bureaucratic agencies, I demonstrate that during the 1890s and 1900s governance was reimagined as a career opportunity linked not to political patronage, but to a meritocracy defined by an idealized image of rugged masculinity that glorified the strenuous life. Francis Rolt-Wheeler’s many-volume US Service series for children presented a consistent image of who a government agent was and how a boy could grow-up to become one.

Nearly all such careers, according to Rolt-Wheeler and others, were dependent upon education, which replaced political participation as a prerequisite for government service. So important was education to government employment that the War Department and the US Forest Service fostered special relationships with key schools, academies, colleges, and universities. The former utilized a handful of leading military academies—including the New Mexico Military Institute (1891), the Virginia Military Institute (1839), the Citadel (1842), and Norwich University (1819)—to staff the officer corps of the Philippine Constabulary. Under Gifford Pinchot, the federal Forest Bureau recruited from Yale’s School of Forestry, which his family had generously created and endowed, as well as the New York State College of Forestry and several land-grant colleges endowed by the 1862 Morrill Act. Demonstrating the importance of education to these new government agencies, the Pennsylvania State Forest Division created its own school,
called the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy at Mont Alto. Between educators and 
bureaucrats there emerged a dialogue as to who was an ideal government-man and how 
that man could be molded from the clay of children. Further, the development of 
educationally dependent government-careers by these agencies demonstrates the 
difficulty Progressive Era reformers had in eliminating patronage.

**Children of Governance**

A new image of governance evolved during the Progressive Era that redefined the 
political patronage-based, corruption-tainted “snivel service” into a patriotic, masculine, 
and technocratic civil service. More importantly, government-work evolved into careers 
with attendant educationally determined pathways, guidebooks, and academic 
theoreticians. That government professionalism emerged symbiotically with the 
modernization of “childhood” meant that many of the clearest images of these new 
careers were created for the next generation.

The modernization of childhood during the Progressive Era was intertwined with 
the expansion of educational expectations. Since Elliot West and Paula Petrik’s 
admonition that historians were guilty of “child neglect” as researchers, a burgeoning 
number of studies have risen to their challenge of narrating and documenting the lives of 
the “youngest fourth estate,” particularly during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth 
centuries.23 Indeed, as Paula S. Fass has concluded, children and childhood were central 
to the era’s reformers and some of the first government regulators; “mandatory schooling,

---

citizenship training, and anti-child labor laws” were hallmarks of political discourse in the United States for progressives and populists, for urban crusaders and rural renewers. As Howard Chudacoff has narrated, following the Civil War, adult experts like Jacob Abbott—author of the 1871 Gentle Measures in the Training of the Young—and Marie Kraus-Boelte structured childhood as a rehearsal for successful adulthood removed from the perceived dangers of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. In the words of Maria Kraus-Boelte, “American children must be taught how to play.” To properly instruct children, experts advocated for proper toys, schools for ever younger and older students, and, of course, books.

Historian Steven Mintz has aptly called the period from 1865 to 1910 the “golden age of American children’s fiction.” Horatio Alger, Louisa May Alcott, Thomas Bailey, Lucy Maud Montgomery, Booth Tarkington, Eleanor Porter, Kate Douglas Wiggin, Richard Henry Dana, Susan Warner, and Mark Twain provided children with “fantasies of escape and empowerment,” while allaying fears of the adult-world to come. Though Mintz, David Blight, and Anne E. Marshall have correctly highlighted the nostalgia and sense of childhood innocence in works like Annie Fellows Johnston’s the Little Colonel series, they have overlooked what Sara E. Clere discusses as contemporaneously

26 Maria Kraus-Boelte, quoted in Bernard Mergen, Play and Playthings: A Reference Guide (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982), 57. Perhaps the clearest expression of Kraus-Boelte’s ideas can be found in the Kindergarten Primary Magazine, which was published from 1891 to 1919.
28 Ibid., 186.
imagined, idealized “public roles” for children. Buried within these children’s books were manuals for how to be adults, or more aptly, how adults should and should not conduct themselves in the rapidly changing world of fin-de-siècle America. More importantly, within these tomes were messages for what sort of government these adults should create.

Nowhere was such a message of Progressive Era government idealism so forcefully presented to young boys than by Francis Rolt-Wheeler in his twenty-volume US Service Series published between 1909 and 1920 by Lothrop, Lee, & Shepard Company of Boston. A prolific author, Rolt-Wheeler had emigrated from Great Britain to the United States in the 1890s, attended the Western Theological Seminary in Chicago, and wrote five juvenile book series, including four propagandistic entries during the First World War collectively known as the Wonders of War series. Following an acrimonious divorce in 1915, he moved to Tunisia in 1922, abandoned writing for a juvenile audience in 1929, and devoted himself to occult topics throughout the 1930s. Despite his fall from the good graces of Episcopalian New York City society, Francis Rolt-Wheeler’s juvenile series was continuously touted by the New York Times Book Review—one of the most influential determiners of public reading habits—as essential to “A Boy’s Bookshelf.”

Despite the seismic historic shifts and personal challenges faced by Rolt-Wheeler between the release of the first volume of the US Service Series in 1909 and the last in

---

1920, he presented a consistent image of the Government-boy across a wide swath of new and newly reorganized federal agencies of the Progressive Era.

The first Rolt-Wheelerian lesson of governance was the rugged individuality of public service. In his 1910 *The Boy with the US Foresters*, the lone individual venturing forth into untamed wilderness in pursuit of better governance was present from the front cover to the closing paragraph. The cover featured a photograph of a boy in an army field hat, later adopted and memorialized by the US Park Service, astride a fallen log gazing out, presumably, at a vast wilderness only recently brought under the full control of the federal government. As with all of the US Service Series, Rolt-Wheeler sought to create a fictional bond between the boy-reader and the “small group of men” who carried out the many missions of the federal government.  

No matter how large the bureaucracy, Rolt-Wheeler emphasized the importance of individuals. In *The Boy with the US Mail*, the “mail-bag” contained “every story of modern adventure” and the mail carrier was the “Messenger of Fate, and, like to Fate, there [was] no corner of the earth a stranger to his footsteps.”  

In 1916, there were 40,127 clerks and 34,144 municipal carriers employed by the US Postal Office Department. Individuality and modern bureaucracy were melded in Rolt-Wheeler’s account of the Forest Service. Wilbur, the protagonist of the tale, explains to his friend Fred how “our” service worked, with Rolt-Wheeler calling special attention to the pronoun:

---

‘As you know, Fred, I’ve been thinking of this for years; in fact, I’ve always wanted it, and I’ve worked hard to get it. And then the Chief Forester’s fine; he’s just fine; I liked him ever so much.’

‘Did you have much chance to talk with him?’

‘Yes, quite a lot. I thought I was likely enough to meet him, and p’raps he would formally tell me I was appointed and then bow me out of the office. Not a bit of it. He told me all about the Service, showed me just what there was in it for the country, and I tell you what—he made me feel that I wanted to go right straight out on the street and get all the other boys to join.’

‘Why?’

‘Well, he showed me that the Forest Service gave a fellow a chance to make good even better than in the army or the navy. There you have to follow orders mainly; there’s that deadly routine besides, and you don’t get much of a chance to think for yourself; but in the Forest Service a chap is holding down a place of trust where he has a show to make good by working it out for himself.’

Not only had the boy immediate and meaningful interactions with the bureaucratic elite of the US Forest Service, but he explained that the agency entrusted men to work individually, thinking for themselves to accomplish a public good.

The second Rolt-Wheelerian lesson of governance was the importance of specialized education and training for the modern civil servant. Education was the only way to enter the new civil service in Rolt-Wheeler’s tales. The Chief Forester applauded Wilbur, the boy forester, for not mentioning that his uncle worked for the US Geological Survey during his interview in an attempt to “get a pull.” Instead, as the author emphasized, Wilbur was awarded a position because he had completed the courses at the Colorado Ranger School, was well read in forestry, and was an ardent outdoors enthusiast. In *The Boy with the US Indians*, Rolt-Wheeler’s main character, Virgil, was introduced to several Native American tribes by an ethnologist with the Bureau of American Ethnography who explained the years of college education required to join the

---

34 Rolt-Wheeler, *The Boy with the US Foresters*, 2-3
agency. The Commissioner of the US Bureau of Fisheries lectured his boy on the importance of a college education in the completion of the agency’s mission. Even the boy with the US Explorers—also known as the US Department of Agriculture—was told that a thorough scientific education had made Washington an expert in farming. Education, though, was not enough as the boy with the US Census Bureau concluded after a multilingual hobo explained that he was “an educated man without any knowledge of how to use his learning.” Government agencies had to devise training regimens for the specific technocratic tasks, as Rolt-Wheeler demonstrated in The Boy with the US Mail, where he described in lurid detail the “sweat-case” test for railway mail clerks. Here, the Commissioner concluded even “clever men” could fail as it took a special man to memorize the constantly changing routes, transfer points, and destination codes required to successfully sort the post. In agency after agency, though, Rolt-Wheeler emphasized that the successful boy was not the one with the most connections, but the one who achieved an education and then successfully passed his chosen agency’s specialized training programs. The new civil service required more than just reading and writing.

40 Rolt-Wheeler, The Boy with the US Mail, 324
The third Rolt-Wheelerian lesson of governance was the primacy of obedience. At odds with the rugged individuality and the technocratic expertise of the government agencies explored by Rolt-Wheeler’s boys, were the perpetual reminders that the men of these bureaucracies were public servants with the emphasis on the latter. Throughout the different bureaucratically themed adventures were cautious warnings of what failing to obey the dictates of an agency might mean. As Wilbur was lectured by the Chief Forester, “A young fellow who is careless in such a post as that [Forest Guard who fails to spot a fire] is as great a traitor to his country as a soldier would be who sold to the enemy the plans of the fort he was defending, or a sailor who left the wheel while a battle-ship was threading a narrow and rocky channel.”

Throughout Conn’s experience with the postal service lurked the dire consequences of failing to enforce all of the service’s many rules and regulations. By failing to abide by one rule, Conn was reminded that he could bring down the entire national economy. The boy with the US Census Bureau was oft reminded that failing to obey the rules of the agency could result in the erosion of the white race through inaccuracies in determining individual identities for tabulation. Regardless of Rolt-Wheeler’s hyperbolic threats, his readers were constantly reminded that the success of the modern state depended upon a technocratic administrative government staffed by individuals who obeyed every edict of their bureaucracy.

---

42 Rolt-Wheeler, *The Boy with the US Mail*, 337.
The final Rolt-Wheelerian lesson of governance was the reward of service. Each of the agencies the author profiled in the US Service Series was presented as being at the forefront of government, whether technologically, organizationally, or in mission-scope. Rolt-Wheeler’s boys were amazed by the pneumatic tube technology and airplanes of the Postal Service.44 Similarly the protagonist—and presumably the reader—was astounded by the organizational sophistication of the Census Bureau’s statisticians.45 Being a part of the future—the future of governance—was a palatable reward for those captured by Rolt-Wheeler’s fantasies. The boys profiled in the series were also excited by being part of a noble cause. The boy with the Bureau of Fisheries dreamed of managing a vast food resource that could feed Americans in perpetuity.46 The boy with the Forest Service knew that his work—unfulfilled in this lifetime—would benefit Americans he could never know.47 A government career promised—as the series title suggested—service to a greater good. Finally and more materialistically, the boys were promised financial security as respectable technocrats. From the stately home of the Chief Forester in Washington, DC, to the white starched collars of the Postal Service, the bureaucratic image encountered in the US Service Series was entirely respectable.48 There was little awkwardness in the oppositional fantasy created by Rolt-Wheeler: a government career could be both adventuresome and comfortable, individually rugged and part of the great engine of government. The rewards were great for those who could serve.

48 Ibid., 243.
Francis Rolt-Wheeler was not alone in espousing the lessons of governance to the children of the Progressive Era. As historian Lorinda Cohoon has documented, the number of serialized book series and periodicals targeting and influencing boys and young men during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries was immense.\textsuperscript{49} Strongly influenced by character builders like Edward H. Griggs, author of the widely read 1903 \textit{Moral Education}, these publications sought to foster “an heroic attitude toward difficulties” and a patriotic belief not only in the superiority of their country, but in the expanding government of that country.\textsuperscript{50} Jacob Abbot, Jane Addams, Felix Adler, James H. Baker, Anna Köhler Barnes, and Earl Barnes were only a few of the character-building experts advocating methodologies for crafting not only a child that loved his country, but a child that believed that the new technocratic careers in government were noble.\textsuperscript{51} James Upham’s 1913 article in \textit{Boy’s Life} on the US Forest Service demonstrated just how interconnected character-building institutions and government became during the Progressive Era. He described the Forest Service as “a new profession which will be the aim of many boy scouts—a healthy, outdoor, free job.” Emphasizing the importance of the ethical creed espoused by the Boy Scouts, he detailed the importance of education and training for the would-be forester, as well as the ruggedness of the profession: “Sometimes a forester has to face very grave dangers—a forest fire perhaps; a long tedious tramp to save a life […] or ride a horse several hundred miles into


\textsuperscript{50} Edward H. Griggs, \textit{Moral Education} (Cotton-on-Hudson, New York: Orchard Hill Press, 1903), 56.

\textsuperscript{51} For a listing of such experts, see Edward H. Griggs, “Bibliography,” \textit{Ibid.}, 297-341.
the heart of a lonely mountain region to begin life alone as a forest ranger on duty.” The successful Forest Service employee, though, would always “act manfully and wear [the] uniform and badge” with pride.52 Upham’s article, like Rolt-Wheeler’s US Service Series, was part of a broadly disseminated literary idealism that presented a clear dream of government service for boys.

That dream of government service, as articulated by Rolt-Wheeler, included clearly defined rewards of independence, of being at the forefront of modern governance, of achieving fulfilment through patriotic service, and of being financially secure. Furthermore, careers with recently reformed or newly created technocratic agencies differed from the clerical positions achieved under the spoils system. These new positions required access to education and academic networks rather than the older political party patronage systems. Schooling was the key to unlocking the new dreams of government service.

**Educational Networks and Government Careers**

A hallmark of the Progressive Era was the expansion of civil service examinations for state and federal government positions. Replacing the political patronage system of bosses doling out government jobs with civil service examinations, though, required the development of civil service exam creators and takers. The networks that emerged to connect these groups relied upon linkages between government bureaucracies and educational institutions creating career pathways. Constantly evolving, these career

pathways relied upon individual relationships and personal beliefs of fairness. The following three case studies—military academies and the Philippine Constabulary, Yale University and the US Forest Service, and the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy at Mont Alto and the Pennsylvania Division of Forestry—demonstrate the uniqueness of educational pathways for governance careers. These examples mark the beginning of a system for staffing the technocratic agencies of modern governance that is very much alive today.

**Marching the Boys to Empire**

The United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, was founded in 1802 by Thomas Jefferson with a far broader mission than the creation of an officer corps for a national army. Through the early-nineteenth century, West Point, and after 1845 the United States Naval Academy, forged educationally institutionalized career pathways. Various state, land-grant, and privately funded institutions attempted to mimic these career pathways with variable degrees of success. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, though, a spate of popular military academies emerged; each vying to provide the career certainty of the three, after 1876, national service academies. With the creation and expansion of exam-requiring civil service jobs during the Progressive Era, the

---

directors of these schools sought to expand their students’ career pathway options from the armed services to newly created agencies. As an expanding paramilitary mounted police force under the authority of the War Department’s Bureau of Insular Affairs, the Philippine Constabulary was particularly targeted by the directors of military institutes, like the New Mexico Military Institute.

While the New Mexico Military Institute (NMMI) is unique today as one of the last surviving military academies, at the turn of the century it was one of many such institutions. Whether venerable institutions like the Virginia Military Institute, the Citadel of South Carolina, and Norwich University in Vermont, or new schools like the New York Military Academy, the Wentworth Military Academy in Missouri, or the Harvard School of Los Angeles, California, fin-de-siècle military schools like the New Mexico Military Institute shared certain institutional characteristics. Identified as Class MC


55 These institutions were more militarized than colleges or universities, like the University of Vermont or Cornell University, to which a military officer had been detailed in accordance with Section IV of the 1862 Morrill Act, which Congress later clarified with Section 1225, Revised Statutes, in 1888, and further amended in 1891, 1893, 1904, 1909, and 1914. Act of July 2, 1862 (Morrill Act), Public Law 37-
schools by the War Department in 1914, these institutions featured habitual uniforms, military drill, military discipline, and a curriculum that generally, before the First World War, culminated in a degree less than a baccalaureate and lasted from four to six years. All of these institutions promised more and better masculine character building than university or colleges with military departments and drill organizations (Class C schools) or public high schools, like those in Boston, Massachusetts, or Cheyenne, Wyoming, that offered military training through extracurricular organizations (Class SM schools). To differentiate themselves, those military institutes like NMMI developed and advertised their ability to prepare students for the meritocratic careers of the new and expanding civil service.

The New Mexico Military Institute began in 1891 as the Goss Military Institute, the result of a Roswell, New Mexico, booster, Joseph C. Lea, and a graduate of the Kentucky Military Academy, Robert S. Goss. Plagued by financial insecurity, Lea sought assistance from the Territorial Government in 1893 and found a sympathetic audience in territorial legislator James F. Hinkle and Governor L. Bradford Prince. Their support appeared to have originated in the perceived need to spread territorially sponsored schools, most of which were in the Rio Grande Valley, to other portions of the territory and out of a more general belief that educational institutions were paramount to the


eradication of “lawlessness and lynch law.”\textsuperscript{57} With funding from Santa Fe, the school developed a strong regional identity, in part through advertising.

Through advertising James W. Willson, the school’s second government appointed superintendent and a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, conveyed the message that NMMI was where boys went to become the men needed by the modern era. Advertising through national periodicals including \textit{The American Boy}, \textit{Everybody’s Magazine}, \textit{Cosmopolitan}, and \textit{Harper’s Bazaar}, Willson emphasized a bucolic campus and a curriculum designed for either entering university or going “directly into life.”\textsuperscript{58} Willson’s advertising strategy consistently emphasized the healthy location of the institute proclaiming that the “sun shines every day from September to June” in the “Beautiful Pecos Valley.” The pleasant weather was directly connected to the year round “outdoor life” enjoyed by the students. Having “but little rain or snow” meant a “great amount of outdoor work” including “base ball, foot ball, tennis, golf, and polo.”\textsuperscript{59} By 1911, Willson was crafting advertisements that even more pointedly connected NMMI to the creation of modern men: “Your boy needs Western training to widen his scope of


\textsuperscript{58} “Cumulative Advertising Reports,” October 29, 1936, September 24, 1937, and October 13, 1939, Advertising Records of the New Mexico Military Institute, AC 91.2-140; “The New Mexico Military Institute,” Advertisement, James W. Willson, Newspaper Clippings Scrapbook, c. 1902, AC 91-138 (A1c), Records of the New Mexico Military Institute, Paul Hoganson Library, New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, New Mexico.

practical knowledge, to develop broad ideas of business and life.”  

For those unclear what Western training might mean, Willson added in another advertisement: “This is a school for manly boys: a school reflecting the big, broad, self-reliant, action-loving spirit of the West.” More importantly, Willson could boast that the War Department had ranked the NMMI as one of the ten best military academies in the country.

The competition amongst military academies for cadets was fierce, and being recommended by the War Department was a differentiator coveted by all. The “Everybody’s School Directory,” published annually by Everybody’s Magazine beginning in May 1908, listed numerous military academies across the United States, but few could boast as NMMI did of having been recommended by the War Department. Following the Spanish-American War, the War Department had increased the accomplishments required to secure such scholastic endorsement. Indeed, the difficulties of obtaining such an endorsement belies the importance Superintendent Willson ascribed to War Department recognition for the success of the institute. As NMMI was not the territorial land grant college, which automatically received an appointed US Army officer to supervise a campus military department, Willson had to petition the War Department

---

62 Ibid.
for an inspection on the grounds of the institute’s “actual worth as a military training school of high order.” He was finally successful in 1906.

Indeed, Willson was twice successful in securing inspections that year, resulting in the school being officially accredited by the War Department a year later and thereafter of being listed as an honors school. On April 11, 1906, NMMI was inspected by Lt. Colonel George H. Paddock—the commandant of Fort Wingate, near Gallup, New Mexico, a veteran of the Santiago, Cuba, campaign, a member of the military governments of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, who had been invalided back to the United States—also charged with inspecting the territorial Agricultural College at Las Cruces. Paddock was impressed by the uniforms, the utter lack of civilian clothing, the compulsory exercises, and a “course of study […] admirably adapted to train men” for which all work was “done in earnest.” Noting the lack of buildings or equipment, Paddock concluded that the “earnest work of the cadets” was only possible as a result of the “zeal and high efficiency” of the faculty. In May, a second inspection was conducted by Colonel Walter S. Schuyler, who toured Manchuria during the Russo-Japanese War with Henry T. Allen of the Philippine Constabulary. Schuyler, who

65 Transcript of the Retirement Hearing of George H. Paddock, Folder I, Box I, Col. George H. Paddock Collection, Pritzker Military Museum & Library, Chicago, Illinois.
forced the students to miss two days of holiday in order to accommodate his schedule, was also impressed with the institute and recommended the appointment of a permanent military officer.\textsuperscript{68} The result of these glowing reports was the appointment of Captain Warren S. Barlow to the school as a Professor of Military Science and Tactics, whose salary was paid by the War Department. Barlow was another veteran of the Spanish-American War, who after two details to Cuba, was forced to retire due to an illness contracted in the line of duty.\textsuperscript{69} Following the initial accreditation, NMMI was inspected annually by the War Department and listed as a top-ten military academy from 1909 onwards.\textsuperscript{70}

Such an accreditation was much more than an advertising boast. War Department accreditation was a critical career connection for the graduates of the New Mexico Military Institute and similar schools around the country. Merely by being inspected, Willson was able to foster ties between NMMI and the military-dominated territorial and insular governments of the United States, including Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Hawai’i, Alaska, and a host of far flung Pacific Islands. Indeed, as Willson well knew,


\textsuperscript{70} Circulars 123 (1909), 114 (1910), and 81 (1911), War Department, \textit{Subject Index to the General Orders and Circulars of the War Department and the Headquarters of the Army, from January 1, 1881, to December 31, 1911} (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1912), 470; Captain W. T. Merry, “Inspection Report of the Military Department of the New Mexico Military Institute,” April 16, 1914; Special Order No. 35, February 11, 1910, War Department; Special Order No. 56, March 9, 1910, War Department; Special Order No. 62, March 16, 1911, War Department; Special Order No. 69, March 24, 1911, War Department; Bulletin No. 8, June 14, 1912, War Department, from James W. Willson, Letter Press Book, 1914, Paul Hoganson Library, New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, New Mexico.
the War Department between 1898 and 1917 was as concerned with governance as it was with its eponymous vocation. The Philippine Constabulary, under the command of regular Army officers seconded to the Insular Government of the Archipelago, was particularly emblematic of the connection between military academies, the War Department, and colonial governance. Colonel Clarence R. Edwards, chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, reported in 1904,

> Several graduates of military colleges throughout the United States have sought, upon the recommendation of the regular officer their stationed, appointments as third lieutenants in the constabulary. An unusually fine lot of young men has been appointed, whose work gives good promise for the future.\(^{71}\)

That very spring, Willson had negotiated with Luther Foster, the professor of record of the Military Department at the New Mexico Agricultural School, for that institution’s nomination to the Philippine Constabulary.\(^{72}\) Willson’s nominee, George W. Read, Jr., successfully enrolled in the Constabulary and was promoted to captain in 1911.\(^{73}\) As late as 1915, Willson was writing to the Bureau of Insular Affairs annually for the latest bulletin on how cadets could join the Philippine Constabulary. By then, though, the bureau was recommending that applicants look elsewhere for employment owing to Woodrow Wilson’s Flipinization policies.\(^{74}\)

---


\(^{72}\) James W. Willson to Luther Foster, March 10, 1904; James W. Willson to M. A. Otero, March 10, 1904, James W. Willson Letter Press Book, Vol. V, November 13, 1903, through August 8, 1904, Paul Hoganson Library, New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, New Mexico.


\(^{74}\) James W. Willson to the Bureau of Insular Affairs, February 4, 1915, File 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Superintendent Willson was quick to assure prospective parents that a military education was valuable to careers outside of the War Department. In addition to fostering beneficial relationships with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Missouri, both of which accepted NMMI graduates as sophomores, Willson also boasted that “several […] young men [had] received desirable government appointments” and that “all of them are meeting with great success and commanding the highest respect in the various avocations of business and social life.” Willson also encouraged as many Civil Service Examinations be held in Roswell as he could, writing to men like W. M. Reed, the US District Engineer. Not surprisingly, NMMI cadets did quite well during the particular examination with eight cadets receiving appointments with the federal Reclamation Service. Through the forging of educationally dependent career networks, a school with a motivated superintendent could have a profound influence on an expanding government.

The New Mexican Military Institute, though, was far from alone in forging educational career networks. Other military academies across the United States developed connections with various government agencies. Norwich University in Northfield, Vermont, sent multiple cadets every year to the Philippine Constabulary from

---


1908 to 1915. Once several cadets had pioneered careers, like those in 1908 who first entered the Constabulary from Norwich, other cadets followed.\textsuperscript{77} The Virginia Military Institute established such a pathway in 1903, while others—like St. Johns Military Academy of Manlius, New York, Gordon College in Barnesville, Georgia, Georgia Military Institute, Milledgeville, Georgia, and the Citadel—developed pathways that collapsed as a result of Woodrow Wilson’s policies of Filipinization.\textsuperscript{78} As with James W. Willson, commandants and superintendents from these and other military schools of the fin-de-siècle American military academy renaissance wrote to the Bureau of Insular Affairs demanding attention for their cadets until Clarence Edwards began in 1915 responding that there were no more careers in the Philippine Constabulary.\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{Arboreal Technocratic Dream Schools}

The War Department was not the only government agency at the nexus of civil service examinations and educational institutions. Whereas Clarence Edwards and the Bureau of Insular Affairs created a de facto recruitment agency for those young men seeking Constabulary and other colonial careers, Gifford Pinchot actively set out to create and cultivate educationally based career paths for his modernized and renamed US Forest Service. Administratively, Pinchot’s Forest Service originated out of two distinct


\textsuperscript{78} Database compiled by author based upon Case Files of Philippine Constabulary Officers, Containers 1-9, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{79} E. S. Benton to the Clarence R. Edwards, January 9, 1915; Clarence R. Edwards to E. S. Benton, January 14, 1915; R. P. Palmer to Clarence R. Edwards, January 15, 1915; Clarence R. Edwards to R. P. Palmer, January 15, 1915 from File 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350; Entirety of File 8243-41, Box 720, RG 350, National Archive and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
bureaucratic entities: Division “P” or the Timber Deprivation Division of the General Land Office and the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. Arboreal theft had been a concern of the federal executive since at least 1831. Timber Agents, resurrected after a twenty-five year hiatus, were organized in 1877 into a new unit of the General Land Office, Division “P,” which by 1880 was annually seizing over $250,000.00 in illegally harvested timber from federal lands.80 The Division of Forestry had a much shorter administrative history. Created by Congress as a single Special Agent of the Department of Agriculture in 1876, forestry was elevated to divisional level in 1881. Until Gifford Pinchot assumed leadership of the agency, though, the Division of Forestry, later elevated to bureau status, was an investigative service of the executive filing reports on the degraded state of American timberlands.81 In combining the mission of Division “P” and the Bureau of Forestry, Pinchot created more than a new administrative unit, he created new professions and, more importantly, new career pathways.

The creation of a career pathway for what would become after 1905 the US Forest Service is one of the most oft-heralded stories of conservation, environmentalism, professionalization, and Progressive Era civil service reform.82 However, what has remained unexamined within the historiography is how such a career pathway functioned

as a replacement for political patronage. At the center of the arboreal career pathway created by Gifford Pinchot was Yale University’s Forest School.

While not the first school devoted to the arboreal sciences in the United States, Yale’s was the first to develop a deep relationship with the federal government. Announced in February 1900, Yale’s Forest School was the third such institution in the United States—following Carl Schenk’s Biltmore School and Bernhard Fernow’s New York State College of Forestry at Cornell University—but the first to offer a graduate degree requiring applicants to have already completed a four year course of study. Furthermore, no other contemporary institution was so well endowed, including Schenk’s school with the support of George Vanderbilt. Gifford Pinchot believed that only the national government could bring scientific forestry to the United States and that only foresters trained by Americans at a thoroughly American institution could staff such a progressively minded government agency.83

Not surprisingly, then, after Pinchot secured the chiefdom of the Division of Forestry and surveyed both Schenk’s North Carolina school and Fernow’s New York experiment, in January 1900 he approached the president of his alma mater, Yale University’s Arthur Twining Hadley, with the idea of establishing an arboreal technocratic dream school. Hadley eagerly agreed to the idea and announced a month later that the Pinchot family—Gifford had also convinced his brother Amos and his father James—pledged $150,000.00 and a lease of the wooded property surrounding the Grey

Tower’s estate in Pennsylvania as an endowment. 84 While the generous endowment to the school certainly guaranteed some success, the real ability of the Yale Forest School to become the principal academic institution of the profession was the relationship between Gifford Pinchot and Henry Solon Graves, first Dean of the Forest School, oft-assistant forester for the federal government, and, eventually, Pinchot’s successor as chief of the US Forest Service.

Henry S. Graves had first met Gifford Pinchot as an undergraduate at Yale University where they helped and taught at the Yale Sunday School, competed to be the quarterback of the Yale eleven, and, in the general way of things, became quite close friends. Both were avid outdoorsmen and Graves required little coaxing from Pinchot to abandon teaching in the winter of 1893 in order to pursue forestry and follow in his friend’s educational footsteps first at Biltmore under Schenk, then at Harvard University’s Arnold Arboretum under Charles S. Sargent, and, finally, under Sir Dietrich Brandis in Germany. In the mid-1890s, the two collaborated to produce several forest management plans and arboreal studies. Pinchot remembered Graves in his autobiography as the source “for setting up the standards of training, ethics, and performance which have given the profession of Forestry so high a place in American life.” 85 More than the institutions they represented then, Gifford Pinchot and Henry S. Graves’ close personal friendship was responsible for the career pathway nexus that they

84 Diaries of Gifford Pinchot, January 29, 1900, & February 3, 1900, Papers of Gifford Pinchot, Library of Congress; Correspondence between Arthur Twining Hadley, Gifford Pinchot Papers, and James Pinchot, December through February 1900, Papers of Arthur Twining Hadley, Boxes 68 & 98, RU 25, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

created between the US Forest Service and the Yale Forest School between 1900 and 1912.

The high standards that Pinchot accredited to Graves were only part of what distinguished the Yale Forest School and what enabled the institution to dominate the nascent forestry profession. As the first dean of the Forest School, Graves created mechanisms through which young men were transformed into foresters with shared experiences, a common knowledge base expressed through a professionalized language, and the institutional means to further such connections. Each of these shared professionalizing attributes linked the foresters-to-be, through Dean Graves, with Pinchot’s arboreal agency.

The shared experiences and common knowledge base that transformed the foresters-to-be were achieved through the program’s coursework and, often more importantly, the summer session—known as the summer camp—on the Pinchot family estate in Milford, Pennsylvania. Both of these activities were essential to familiarizing the students with Henry S. Graves, the gateway between the Yale Forest School and an arboreal government career. The coursework of the school not only introduced the students to the technical knowledge of the field, but to the men who would start, control, and foster the graduates’ careers for years to come. The course catalogue of the school—published from 1900 onwards—was a veritable who’s who of the profession. In the inaugural year, the program offered courses on “State and National Forestry by Mr.

---

Gifford Pinchot” and on forest protection and forest entomology by the Vice Director of the West Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station. In later years, Frank Hayes Newell of the US Geological Survey’s Reclamation Service offered courses on irrigation and hydrography, while H. von Schrenk, the leading expert at the US Department of Agriculture lectured on arboreal diseases and W. E. Brittons, state entomologist for Connecticut, covered the first half of forest entomology. Forest fish culture was the province of B. W. Evermann from the US Bureau of Fisheries, while C. H. Merriam, chief of the US Biological Survey, covered forest zoology and Overton W. Price, Pinchot’s senior office manager, taught field methodologies. At any one point in the academic year, a half-dozen government technocrats were sojourning each week from Washington, DC, to New Haven in order to teach and meet their perspective new employees.

Even more intimate than the courses taught by federal and state technocrats, though, were the evening campfire lectures that, anecdotally, remained amongst the most vivid recollections of the Yale Forest School graduates. The training camp—technically open to anyone seriously interested in forestry—was an out-of-door, hands-on, program under the direction of Henry S. Graves, who as dean of the Yale Forest School, prioritized admission to his students. Students lived in a lumber camp environment,

---

87 Course Catalogue, Department of Forestry, Yale University (New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Company, 1900), 1.
88 Course Catalogues, Department of Forestry, Yale University (New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Company, 1900-1918), available from 1900 to 1913 as part of the Records Documenting the Yale School of Forestry, RU 40, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut, and from 1913 to 1918 digitally through the HathiTrust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015082997282.
roughing it in tents in the shadows of the Pinchot summer chateau, the Grey Towers. Under the direction of Graves and occasionally Pinchot, the students would spend a week surveying the estate and surrounding countryside creating forest management plans and calculating timber yields in the field. The campfire lectures were arranged by Graves as the camp’s director and the elected student leaders, known as the Camp Fire Committee. Each lecture featured a knowledge expert from the surrounding community or, more likely, from a state or federal government agency. S. J. Record was invited in 1910 and discussed his experience as the supervisor of an Arkansas national forest, “so he could well tell of the possibilities of the work ahead of most of us.” 89 That same summer, J. A. Ferguson, a US Forest Assistant, and “Rattlesnake Bill,” an acknowledged expert on his namesake, also gave campfire lectures. 90 The capstone campfire lecture, though, was given by Pinchot. The latter usually brought several distinguished guests including Edgar Robinson of the boy scouts and William Howland, editor of *Outlook* magazine. 91 Graves furthered the camaraderie fostered by the courses of the Yale Forest School and the summer training camps with an innovative and, at times, aggressive alumni outreach program.

---

90 C. H. Watzek, August 9, 1910, & August 23, 1910, Diary of the Camp Fire Committee, Folder III, Box I, RU 43: School of Forestry, Records of Training Camps, 1901-1963, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.
Graves’ alumni outreach efforts fostered a distinct sense of professional élan or esprit d’corps among the graduates through a variety of student based publications, including after 1912 an alumni newsletter and an abortive “Experience Book.”\(^92\) The most long-lasting and important of Graves’ alumni outreach programs, though, was the Forest School’s Graduate Advisory Board established in 1905 and charged with bringing “the School into closer relations with the alumni.”\(^93\) Graves appointed to the first Graduate Advisory Board three alumni from the first, second, and third classes, respectively: G. H. Myers, J. G. Peters, and W. B. Greeley. As the organization’s first chairman, James Girvin Peters—the banjo-playing scion of a Baltimore Confederate family—established many of the alumni traditions uniting Yale’s coterie of professional foresters. A graduate of Johns Hopkins University’s class of 1900, Peters was convinced to attend the Forest School by Gifford Pinchot on the side of Mount Hood. Finishing the program in 1903, he immediately secured a position with the US Forest Service and within seven years had rapidly risen within the agency to Chief of State and Private Cooperation.\(^94\) While a successful member of the first generation of technocratic foresters, Peters was even more important in establishing many of the alumni pathways that perpetuated Yale’s influence over the profession.

\(^92\) Correspondence relating to the establishment of an alumni newsletter can be found in Series I, Box VI, Folder 69: Graduate Advisory Board, 1912, of MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut; “Experience Book of the Yale Forestry Club,” 1910-1913, Forest History Society Archive & Library, Durham, North Carolina.


\(^94\) “James Garvin Peters,” in Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913), 53-54.
As chairman of the Graduate Advisory Board, known simply as the Advisory Board until an industrial and faculty iteration were created, J. Girvin Peters provided a conduit connecting Dean Graves with the former students of the Yale Forest School. Beginning in January 1906, Peters began an annual survey of graduates. As he explained, “the purpose of the Advisory Board [was…] to co-operate with the Governing Board of the School in maintaining the efficiency of the instruction, in keeping it in line with the needs of the profession, and in other ways to assist in its development.” In short, what courses had been useful and what other subjects, if any, should have been addressed.\textsuperscript{95} Of particular interest to Peters, was whether the program provided enough out-of-doors, practical training. His fellow alumni responded in the negative. Some—like C. D. Mill, J. S. Holmes, Clinton G. Smith—thought the school needed more specialized courses that would allow students to concentrate in fields like forest surveying or timber products.\textsuperscript{96} Others, including Charles S. Chapman, A. K. Chittenden, and Austin S. Hawes, more directly responded that students should spend more time out-of-doors doing the work of the profession rather than theorizing about forestry. As Hawes bluntly put it, “road construction as an indoor course is of no value to a forester.”\textsuperscript{97} While the question of balancing theoretical and practical forestry would eventually be resolved with the

\textsuperscript{95} James Girvin Peters to the Graduates of the Yale Forest School, January 15, 1906, Series I, Box VI, Folder 63: Graduate Advisory Board, 1900-1908, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

\textsuperscript{96} C. D. Mill to J. G. Peters, January 21, 1906; J. S. Holmes to J. G. Peters, January 22, 1906; Clinton G. Smith to J. G. Peters, February 2, 1906; Ralph C. Hawley to J. G. Peters, February 19, 1906, Series I, Box VI, Folder 63: Graduate Advisory Board, 1900-1908, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

introduction of more field practicums during senior years after 1910, the correspondence between Peters and other members of the Graduate Advisory Board continued to connect the alumni with the school.98

The Graduate Advisory Board and Peters also enabled Dean Graves to utilize and chastise the alumni for conduct he found detrimental to the arboreal profession.99 In the winter of 1907, Graves become increasingly alarmed with the dearth of alumni seeking employment with government agencies. He asked Peters why so many graduates were pursuing careers with private companies. Peters, after consulting several alumni, responded that students were discouraged from government careers because of constant managerial shuffling and resignations. Graves understood forestry to be intrinsically government in nature and sought, through Peters, to correct what he perceived to be a mistake by recent alumni.100

An even more heated conversation between Dean Graves and Peters regarding the state of the profession, though, occurred two years later. In the Winter Term of 1905, a group of seniors in the Forest School organized a secret society, the Robin Hood Society

99 While planning the 1908/1909 academic year, Graves was unable to find a replacement to instruct the annual course on National Forest Reserve Administration. Writing to Peters for advice, Graves was able to contact W. B. Greely, an alumni and Supervisor of the Serra Nevada National Forest Reserve, to oversee that class and a special seminar on Western timber practices. See the extended correspondence between H. S. Graves and J. G. Peters during the summer and fall of 1907 culminated, and in part was summarized, with J. G. Peters to H. S. Graves, February 13, 1908, Series I, Box VI, Folder 63: Graduate Advisory Board, 1900-1908, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.
100 Henry S. Graves to J. G. Peters, February 18, 1907, Series I, Box VI, Folder 63: Graduate Advisory Board, 1900-1908, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.
of Foresters. Described as a “purely social organization” whose objectives were “to bring together more intimately those men who are most congenial to each other, and in so doing to intensify their interest in forestry and in the School,” the members proclaimed as their motto, “Fair play and may the best man win.”

While secret societies were hardly new to either Yale or American universities generally, the bow and arrow toting, leotard clad fraternal members of the Robin Hood Society eventually earned the ire of Graves, which was communicated via Peters to the entire alumni. By 1909, Dean Graves was receiving numerous complaints from the senior class, which he described as divided, about the green clad secret society. At the center of the student’s complaints was “the rumor which seems to be in the air almost every year that a member will have certain advantages in his professional career, particularly in the Forest Service.”

While Graves dismissed such allegations as “absurd,” he eventually forbade the organization and confiscated the society’s $500.00 treasury. That he justified such actions as being in the best interest of the profession bellies the importance of Yale’s alumni network within the wider technocratic arboreal world.

---

101 Memorandum for J. G. Peters, October 29, 1909, Series I, Box VI, Folder 64: Graduate Advisory Board, 1909, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.


103 H. S. Graves to Fred R. Mason, November 1, 1909, Series I, Box VI, Folder 64: Graduate Advisory Board, 1909, MS 249: Papers of Henry Solon Graves, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

Dean Graves, though, had a far more direct means of influencing the profession than the alumni networks he encouraged. In the very first summer of the Yale Forest School’s existence and Graves deanship, he and Pinchot discussed the problems of appointing students to the US Forest Service’s Student Assistant program:

The chief reason for not making the appointment was this. Rumsey was a member of a group of three—Dwight and Day being the others, if I recollect rightly—who wished to go west together. We have made no appointments from the sophomore class except Haines, who was with us last year. If Rumsey were appointed, it would be known immediately that he had received the appointment on account of his having secured recommendation from two congressmen. This would be talked of in the sophomore class as well as the other classes and would be mentioned probably in the camps during the Summer, and it would soon be generally understood in all the colleges that in order to secure an appointment the student must have political backing. This would involve you next year in the most frightful political wrangle for the places of Student-Assistants.105

Despite such concerns about the corrupting influence of political patronage, neither expressed concerns over the next decade as year after year Graves selected those students from Yale who would successfully pursue positions within the Forest Service and those who would find their applications ignored.

The correspondence between Overton W. Price, Pinchot’s de facto chief of staff, and Graves concerning the appointment of Student Assistants came to follow an annual pattern. In March and April, eager applicants to the Student Assistant program would send in their applications. All the while, Price would start receiving missives from Pinchot reminding him to “get from Professor Graves the information necessary to classify the seniors and juniors at the Yale Forest School according to their fitness for

---

105 H. S. Graves to Gifford Pinchot, June 13, 1900, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
work.”  

Price would then send to Graves a list of those students from Yale who had applied to the program with a request for “an individual line on each of them, it will be of all kinds of help.” After a bit of prodding, Graves would comply by sending along a neatly typed list of names on school stationary with numbers indicating first, second, and third choice candidates. In a few extreme cases, he would underline in red “don’t appoint him” and thereby end a potential career. Upon receipt either Price or Pinchot would review the list and place next to those candidates marked with a “1” a red check indicating appointment. In some years, particularly before 1905, not only were Graves first choices appointed, but his second and third as well.

Graves even exerted influence through Pinchot and Price over who was selected for positions within the US Forest Service subject to Civil Service examinations. That the examination for forest assistant was held in the spring immediately after the Yale Forest School concluded classes was not a coincidence. As Pinchot explained to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1906, the date was “fixed after very careful consideration and it meets better than any other the needs […] and the conditions of the forest schools, which furnish practically all the candidates for the examination.”

---

106 Gifford Pinchot to Overton W. Price, March 10, 1903, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

107 Overton W. Price to Henry S. Graves, April 9, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

108 Attachment, Henry S. Graves to Overton W. Price, May 4, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

109 Gifford Pinchot to the Secretary of Agriculture, November 22, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
year earlier Graves had intervened on behalf of an examinee who had taken the test in 1902, withdrawn his application, served abroad, and then returned home wanting to have the previous examination upheld. While not specifically forbidden by the Civil Service Commission, Pinchot’s acquiescence to Graves’ request demonstrates the importance of the educational networks in navigating a meritocratic regime.¹¹⁰ Even more explicitly, in 1908 Price wrote to Graves, “[Raphael] Zon has shown me your confidential note on the capacity of your men who took the Civil Service examination, which is going to be, as such notes from you always are, of great use here.”¹¹¹ In only eight years, Pinchot and Graves replaced the political networks that had disgusted them in 1900 with an educational network created and regulated by them.

**Other Schools of Thought**

Despite the importance of Yale’s Forest School, there were other, albeit less celebrated, educational networks available to the would-be forester. Two of these, the New York State College of Forestry at Cornell University and Dr. Carl Schenk’s Biltmore School of Forestry, failed, in part, because their leaders were unable to establish and maintain career pathways for their graduates. The final example, the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, provides an alternative model of career pathway development. Rather than forging a partnership between an educational institution and a government agency, the leaders of the Pennsylvania Division of Forestry created a

---

¹¹⁰ Henry S. Graves to Overton W. Price, August 2, 1905; Overton W. Price to Henry S. Graves, August 5, 1905, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

¹¹¹ Overton W. Price to Henry S. Graves, May 28, 1908, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
service school with a contractually-based career pathway. The differences between these three experiments and the Yale Forest School highlights the importance of Gifford Pinchot and Henry S. Graves’ personal relationship in creating and nurturing an enduring career pathway.

Predating the New Haven experiment by nearly three years, the New York State College of Forestry at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, began instruction during the 1898-1899 academic year under the direction of ex-US Forester Bernhard Fernow. Fernow had written of the deplorable condition of forestry education in the United States in 1892 and had preceded Gifford Pinchot as the director of the Division of Forestry. So he was a natural selection to lead the school. Proposed by the New York Superintendent of Forests, Colonel William F. Fox, the school had the avid support of the state governor, Frank S. Black, and the President of Cornell University, Jacob Gould Schurman, who had already successfully led the effort to create a school of veterinary sciences. The College of Forestry was maintained entirely at state expense with New York residents attending free of tuition.\(^{112}\) While Fernow and Pinchot shared little personal respect for one another, Pinchot and his staff routinely recommended Fernow’s school as a means of gaining entry into federal forestry.\(^{113}\) Evidence further suggests that Fernow and his staff attempted to create the same type of student placement relationship between the College


\(^{113}\) Gifford Pinchot to Charles S. Gilman, October 9, 1901; Gifford Pinchot to Harry Goldberg, March 10, 1902, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
of Forestry and Pinchot’s administration.\textsuperscript{114} However, the state governor withheld funding for the school in 1903 favoring instead a College of Agriculture under Liberty Hyde Bailey, thereby shuttering Fernow’s experiment. When, after 1910, Bailey created an undergraduate curriculum in forestry, Yale’s graduate program had already come to dominate the profession and forestry within the federal government.\textsuperscript{115}

While other state land grant colleges and universities would gradually add professors of forestry and even forestry programs after Cornell’s experiment, Carl Schenk’s Biltmore School of Forestry garnered the most exasperation from Gifford Pinchot and his staff. Modeled upon the \textit{meisterschule} programs of his native Germany, Schenk’s school was an outgrowth of his position as forester for George Vanderbilt’s vast North Carolina estate. The program featured young men learning forestry from Schenk as he went about doing his job and, after 1908, travelling with Schenk around the great managed forests of Europe. Limited to eleven one-day classes, the program offered a certificate upon completion, but neither a bachelor nor graduate degree.\textsuperscript{116} Although rising anti-German sentiments and Vanderbilt’s declining fortune contributed to the failure of Schenk’s school in 1913, the inability of the program to develop academic career pathways was paramount.

\textsuperscript{114} Judson F. Clark to O. W. Price, February 26, 1902; Bernhard E. Fernow to Gifford Pinchot, undated, recommendation for W. H. White, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{115} Rodgers III, \textit{Bernhard Eduard Fernow}, 253-327.

Graduates of Schenk’s school were not bereft of career opportunities and many successfully completed the Civil Service examination created by Pinchot for federal foresters or pursued careers with various state agencies and private companies. However, the majority of them did so as a result of completing a university forestry program, most often at Yale’s Forest School.\textsuperscript{117} In letter after letter, Gifford Pinchot and his assistants recommended that would-be foresters avoid Schenk’s school. Writing to Charles S. Gilman, Pinchot explained that while “there was a great deal to be gotten […] under Dr. Schenk,” he recommend Yale and Cornell as offering “a better opportunity for thorough training in forestry, since their courses are longer […] and their equipment more complete.”\textsuperscript{118} Even more emblematic of Pinchot’s ambivalence towards Schenk’s school was his long term mentoring of George H. Cecil. First writing to the Secretary of Agriculture in April 1901, Cecil introduced himself as a twenty-three year old mercantile clerk who had “always loved the woods and flowers.”\textsuperscript{119} An outdoorsman, he asked how he could join Pinchot’s foresters. After a summer of correspondence, Pinchot concluded, “The absence of a degree is not, to my mind however, of serious importance.”\textsuperscript{120} Cecil thus applied to be a Student Assistant. Pinchot rejected him and appointed a bevy of Yale students. The next year, having studied with Schenk, Cecil applied again and was again

\textsuperscript{118} Gifford Pinchot to Charles S. Gilman, October 9, 1901, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{119} George H. Cecil to Secretary of Agriculture, April 24, 1901, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{120} Gifford Pinchot to George H. Cecil, September 20, 1901, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
rejected. Not until 1903 was Cecil accepted as a Student Assistant and not until 1905 was he able to pass the examination for Assistant Forester, the junior most of the Civil Service arboreal positions. After a further eight years, he was promoted to District Forester, while his degree-holding peers had long since been promoted. Schenk’s school did not prevent graduates from pursuing government arboreal careers, but his school lacked the academic network that enabled Yale’s alumni to dominate the first generation of professional foresters.

While Schenk’s private lessons failed to develop an educational career network to rival Yale’s Forest School, the state school developed by Pennsylvania at Mont Alto did. The Pennsylvania State Forest Academy will be discussed at greater length in subsequent chapters, but here it provides an example of an alternative model of educational career networking. Created by George H. Wirt, the first Pennsylvania State Forester, with the support of Commissioner Joseph Rothrock, de facto chief of the state’s Division of Forestry, and Governor Samuel W. Pennypacker, a self-proclaimed Progressive reformer, the forest school at Mont Alto was entirely supported by the state. The students were required to pass a general knowledge entrance examination and provide a surety against their successful completion of the program in exchange for which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania provided tuition, room, and board. Further, graduates were guaranteed a job; indeed failure to work in the Division of Forestry for a specified period could result in the forfeiture of the original surety. Wirt, a graduate of

Schenk’s school, deliberately melded aspects of the latter with Yale’s Forest School and the existing federal service schools like West Point. Indeed, the academy was widely credited with producing, within the Division of Forestry a level of professionalism and esprit-de-corps second only to Pinchot’s federal service.122

The creation of educationally determined career pathways between the Spanish-American War and the conclusion of the First World War shared numerous similarities. Whether at the New Mexico Military Institute or Yale University’s Forest School, school leaders sought to forge men for the expanding agencies of the Progressive Era. Melding rugged individuality and a desire for government service, these programs developed pathways in direct opposition to the contemporaneously maligned patronage systems of the mid and latter-nineteenth century. A deeper investigation into these educational systems, though, reveals the personal connections and individual relationships that characterized E. L. Godkin’s ‘snivel service.’ Classrooms may have replaced political rallies and professors party bosses, but meritocracy had no fewer gatekeepers than the patronage system.

Those Who Could Not Go

As with the snivel service power networks, the education-based networks created during the Progressive Era were defined by exclusivity. Those who could not attend school—regardless of the reason—were denied full access to government careers, irrespective of their experience. Littered throughout Pinchot’s correspondence were hopeful letters form eager young men like Charles C. Frederick who thought a will to work would gain them one of the new government careers. Frederick was informed by Overton Price, “It is exceedingly improbable that you could prepare yourself for this [the Forest Assistant] examination by home study.”123 Price did not even bother informing Robert M. Gray that his quest for a technocratic career was futile and responded to his inquiry with a form letter and a circular recommending Yale.124 Arthur Hall, who had worked “among the lumber-jacks of Western Penna.,” was rejected from the Student Assistant program and informed a university degree was essential.125 Daniel W. Hamm, a school teacher who successfully secured an early position in the Student Assistant program, was never able to see his “way clear to go to the Yale Forest School.”126 Technocratic careers were for those who could afford the price of admission.

---

123 Overton W. Price to Charles C. Frederick, October 11, 1904, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
124 Overton W. Price to Robert M. Gray, December 3, 1903, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
125 Overton W. Price to Arthur Hall, April 9, 1906; Arthur Hall to Gifford Pinchot, February 11, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
126 Daniel W. Hamm to Overton W. Price, October 27, 1902, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
European migrants with decades of forestry experience and even formal forest management educations failed as readily in the new academic power networks. Gilbert Brown of Scotland noted thirteen years of “practical experience in all branches of forestry” and presented awards from the Royal Scottish Aboricultural Society only to be informed that there were no opportunities for him in the United States.127 Rajmund Goebel, who had immigrated to Wisconsin, was an alumni of the Austro-Hungarian Imperial Academy of Forestry with sixteen years of forestry service. He too was informed that there was no career for him in Pinchot’s service.128 Experience and education were only as important as the power network within which they had been secured.

The expansion of the civil service examination has remained a benchmark by which government modernization could be measured. From the late-nineteenth century through the late-twentieth century, the more positions listed under civil service examination at the federal or state level the more modern, the less corrupt the government. Educationally dependent technocratic careers, though, replaced the politically determined power networks of the party bosses with the more subtle educational power networks of the bureaucrats and the deans. The Philippine Constabulary, the US Forest Service, and the Pennsylvania State Forest Division

127 Gilbert Brown to the Secretary of Agriculture, February 26, 1906; Overton Price to Gilbert Brown, March 12, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
128 Rajmund Goebel to Gifford Pinchot, March 9, 1902; Gifford Pinchot to Rajmund Goebel, March 12, 1902, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
demonstrate that civil service examinations and academic institutions could be as individually connected as any Gilded Age snivel service.
II

The War Department, a Militarized Administrative State, & a Mule
The War Department mattered. As one of the oldest executive cabinet units, the War Department by 1917 was charged with all non-naval aspects of the defense of the United States and many of the regulatory tasks and infrastructure projects undertaken by the general government. Through the Army Corps of Engineers, the War Department was charged with the construction of vast hydrographic projects from canals to dams, military defenses including harbors and coastal installations from Manila, and the enforcement and maintenance of navigable channels within harbors. Through the Coastal Artillery Corps, the War Department maintained a presence in nearly every major harbor under the control of the United States. Through the Quartermasters Department, and Corps after 1912, the War Department administered contracts with private companies ranging from arms manufacturers to dry cleaners. Indeed, the War Department was arguably one of the first executive agencies to inspect universities, colleges, and other educational institutions. The War Department quite literally employed an army.

Historians have universally concluded that the War Department accomplished all of these activities without a broader culture of militarism. Militarism, although used widely by scholars, herein refers to the belief that the trappings, as well as the hierarchical organizational and disciplinary methods, of the military should be widely applied in educational, governmental, and private settings. As Leonard Wood, then Army Chief of Staff, claimed in 1915, “We do not want to establish militarism in this country in the sense of creating a privileged military class, dominating the civil element, receiving especial recognition, and exercising perhaps an undue influence upon the administration of national affairs, but we do want to build up in every boy a realization of the fact that he
is an integral part of the nation, and that he has a military as well as a civil responsibility.” Historians have agreed with Leonard Wood’s assessment that Americans, while cognizant of militarism, remained peripheral to the arms races that consumed the great powers of Europe prior to the First World War. The United States was exceptional amongst industrializing fin-de-siècle societies in eschewing militarism.

Where historians have accepted militarism within the American narrative, it has been constructed as regionally exceptional. Within the antebellum South, John Hope Franklin explained, a militant culture existed as “fighting became a code by which men lived” and organized violence became an acceptable means of protesting legal disagreements. Franklin deliberately chose militant rather than militarism to differentiating the antebellum South from the North. Amy Greenberg has explored how honor and violence were intertwined in the development of regional identities in both her explorations of the Mexican-American War and filibustering. Rod Andrew, Jr., also understood militarism, honor, and violence as inherently regionally defined in his examination of the Southern military school tradition as a distinctly “southern preoccupation with inculcating military virtues.” Both Franklin and Andrew, thereby,

---

presented nineteenth century American militarism as regionally parochial and somehow differentiated from the more broadly understood process associated with Wilhelm II’s New Course and the aggressive policies of the kaiserreich.\(^{133}\)

Where evidence of militarism does seem to appear, historians have semantically suggested a narrative of exceptionalism. Peter Karsten acknowledged an “unmilitaristic militarism,” which enabled military modernization and preparedness without the militarism of fin-de-siècle Europe, wherein the expansion of the administrative state resulted in the integration both politically and socially of the military into governance.\(^{134}\) Indeed, the majority of military historians examining the modernization of the Army deviate little from Stephen Skowronek’s narrative of bureaucratic expansion as part of Progressive Era reforms uninformed by a glorification of and reliance upon the War Department.\(^{135}\) Gail Bederman, Kristin Hoganson, Amy Kaplan, and John F. Kasson have suggested that this “unmilitaristic militarism” was part of a host of cultural expressions that were symptomatic of a crisis in masculinity caused by the spread of industrial modernity and the managerial revolution.\(^{136}\) These historiographical traditions, utilizing cultural expressions and the writings of political elites, have concluded that


militarism was not a part of fin-de-siècle American culture, but that a masculine celebration of violence influenced a number of historical processes from overseas imperial expansion to World War I recruitment.\(^{137}\)

The question of how to explain the modernization of the United States Army and Navy, the greater use of force in achieving American foreign policy, the public support of greater military preparedness in the United States between the Spanish-American and First World Wars, and ultimate success in the latter has also been answered without historiographical recourse to an American militarism. Peter Karsten argued for the rise of a “militaristic civilian,” which dismissed Samuel P. Huntington and John P. Mallan’s claims of American virtual pacifism with evidence that the country was rationally militarized.\(^{138}\) As Karsten explains, rational militarization reconciles that while the United States was not as militarized as Europe, the country’s political elite did support military modernization in recognition of international political realities.\(^{139}\) Even amongst historians comfortable with imperialism and colonialism as causal processes of fin-de-siècle American life, militarism has been ignored in favor of racial and gender arguments.\(^{140}\) Historiographically, therefore, historians have concluded that the United States during the Progressive Era may have experienced an idealization of military

---

\(^{137}\) On imperial expansion and masculinity see Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of US Culture*. On World War I recruitment see Capozzola, *Uncle Same Wants You*.


\(^{140}\) For the best one volume demonstration, see Alfred W. McCoy & Francisco Scarano, eds., *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).
masculinity a la Kristin Hoganson’s arguments, but that such idealizations failed to turn military modernization and preparedness into the institutionalized policies of the European Great Powers.¹⁴¹

Even where the military was celebrated, as in the modernization of the War Department and the Allied victory in the First World War, militarism was not a primary causal factor. Daniel R. Beaver documented the modernization of the War Department with no reference to militarism.¹⁴² Christopher Capozzola discusses military recruitment during the First World War as “coercive volunteerism,” wherein violence was integrated into the idea of military service as an obligation of citizenship. “Prussianism” was eschewed by the citizenry in favor of volunteerism enforced with “atavistic violence” coexisting with “innovative repression.”¹⁴³ Certainly, as Beth Linker has argued, there was no martial glorification of those wounded during the First World War. Her study captures that service may have been glorified, but the cost of such service was not.¹⁴⁴ Militarism, then, did not motivate the modernization of the War Department, the mass recruitment of the First World War, or the care for veterans after the conflict.

There is, though, broad historiographic consensus that beginning in the 1930s and continuing through the Vietnam War both the political elite and the general citizenry of the United States embraced institutionalized militarism. Michael S. Sherry argued that the militarization—which he defined as “the large and sustained focus of anxieties and

¹⁴¹ Hoganson, Fighting for American Manhood; Hoganson, Consumers' Imperium.
¹⁴² Beaver, Modernizing the American War Department, viii-xiv.
¹⁴³ Capozzola, Uncle Same Wants You, 10-20.
resources on military power”—of post-World War II America was the result of external forces and that prior to the 1930s “a deep ambivalence pervaded American attitudes toward war and its institutions: dependence on both matched distrust of each.” The historiography of militarism in the United States, thus provides two conclusions. First, militarism has been loosely defined as the cultural and political belief to support and maintain military capabilities for aggressively defensive purposes ranging from the territorial militancy of the antebellum South explored by Franklin, the culture of militant masculinity explored by Hoganson and Andrew, or the anti-Communist dominant in Sherry’s work. Second, nationally militarism has been limited to the post-World War II era.

What was the War Department’s influence upon the modernization of the United States? My evidence suggests that the origins of the modern American state were drawn from the War Department, which exerted administrative influence far in excess of its staff size. Leonard Wood and subsequent historians are right that there was no broad support for militarism, the privileging of a military class in the United States during the Progressive Era. Contemporaries did, though, support the staffing of the administrative state with militarized young men. Within fin-de-siècle educational institutions that trained the bureaucrats of the Philippine Constabulary, the Pennsylvania State Police, the US Forest Service, and the Pennsylvania Division of Forestry, young men were broadly exposed to military methodologies of control and discipline that militarized them. Indeed,

---

an overwhelming number of these young men, particularly in the Constabulary and State Police, were recruited because they were veterans. Finally, the War Department was a bureaucratic ideal actively consulted by agency builders like Gifford Pinchot for advice on everything from filing practices to how a mule should be packed. Initial research, though not comprehensive, suggests that a subtle strain of militarism—wherein militarized young men and procedures were diffused throughout governance—fundamentally shaped the modern administrative state created by the reformers of the Progressive Era.

**Military Educations and the New Administrative State**

In 1914 the War Department was the only executive agency monitoring educational programs across the United States. Across the country, publicly supported academies flocked to militarized athletic regimens, riflery teams, and even tactical training for the development of leadership. Children were even more directly exposed to the War Department at identified military academies, which from the 1880s until the 1920s entered a golden age of expansion graduating tens of thousands of students. Finally, college students—particularly those at land grant institutions—were exposed to instruction in military science, including drilling with rifles and cannons. Many of those receiving these educations in fin-de-siècle America brought their militarized understanding of the world to the rapidly expanding administrative state.

Militarized education became in the fall of 1915 one of the great debating points of the era. The Secretary of War, Lindley Miller Garrison, who appeared to have President Woodrow Wilson’s support, considered militarized high school and university
students as cornerstones of a Continental Army, a body of trained citizen-soldiers ready to be drafted and immediately deployed.\textsuperscript{146} A national debate ensued replete with experts, investigations, and reports. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States endorsed a system of universal training by a vote of 889 to 56. A referendum conducted by the \textit{Baltimore Sun} found 8,186 in favor and 1,055 against. Also in 1915, the Chicago school board unanimously enacted a plan for military training as part of the high school curriculum with 87\% of parents favoring the proposition. The Board of Regents in New York that year authorized a bill outlining compulsory physical and military training for all boys enrolled in public and private schools. Providence, Rhode Island, followed New York’s lead. California, Wyoming, and Boston were all recognized—with either approbation or applause—for having already instituted militarized educational programs. New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Ohio created special commissions to study the issue. The National Education Association was split in 1916 over the issue having just a year before voted down a resolution in favor of universal military education.\textsuperscript{147} Despite the eventual failure of the Continental Plan, the many debates over the issue revealed how militarized American education had already become.\textsuperscript{148}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Two municipalities were recognized during the 1915 debate over the militarization of American education: Boston, Massachusetts, and Washington. Lucia Ames Meade—a Brookline, Massachusetts, opponent of military drill in schools—testified about the Boston program before Congress in 1917. She explained how the city for fifty-years equipped boys in the Latin schools with muskets with which to practice the Army’s prescribed manual of arms. The result, according to Meade who cited Colonel Thomas F. Edmunds, a member of a special investigative committee, was physical deformity and a penchant for disliking soldiering later in life. Members of a special commission formed by the governor of Massachusetts in 1915, though, concluded that while not all aspects of military life were appropriate to children, discipline and physical activity were crucial to developing citizens capable of national defense. Furthermore, the commission concluded that the physical health and discipline regimen worked-out at West Point were the best then developed. Contemporaries to 1915 had difficulties defining militarism, but recognized that some aspects of what were done at strictly military institutions, like West Point, were essential to national defense and critical to preparedness. Throughout Congressional investigation the War Department remained central given its investigations and evaluations of military institutes, creation of military manuals, and supplying of weapons for drill. The very standards of health cited by

Thomas C. Edmunds, a military officer, were based on those established by the War Department.

The Washington, DC, public school cadet organization was, in 1915, the second oldest publicly supported militarized educational program in the country and the inspiration for one of the era’s most publicized models, the Wyoming Plan. Edgar Z. Steever, III, created and popularized the Wyoming Plan; accrediting much of its inspiration to his high school years as a cadet in the Washington, DC, public schools.\(^{151}\) As he explained to Congress, the Wyoming Plan sought to take military instruction and adapt it to the “game idea:"

> We have taken the old lock step, routine work out of military instruction, and we have adapted it to the game idea. The boy has definite contests to look forward to in all the phases of his instruction. It is high school against high school, and we get all the dash and all the efficiency of the football team in our national-defense games. That is the fundamental principle of the Wyoming idea.\(^{152}\)

The aim of the Steever’s program was, in his own words, “to develop fine boys […] to put a little stiffening into the American boy, make him more manly, and make him better material.”\(^{153}\) His program deliberately separated the sexes with girls serving as sponsors to a school’s cadet company to provide moral support and medical aid, while wearing a militarized nurse’s uniform.\(^{154}\) Despite many naysayers—the Congressional testimony included a wide-range of anti-Steever letters—the Chicago School Board hired him to


\(^{152}\) *Ibid.*, 848.


\(^{154}\) George Creel, “Wyoming’s Answer: Five Years of Training Schoolboys,” *Everybody’s Magazine* 34.2 (February 1916), 150-159.
set-up a city wide Wyoming Plan cadet program. Indeed, on the eve of America’s entry into the First World War, cadet teams from Chicago, Washington, DC, and Kansas City were scheduled to compete in a national championship. Even during the war, Steever, then a US Army Major, promoted the Wyoming Plan, albeit renamed the High School Volunteers of the United States and with any reference to militarism rebranded as “universal training.” While Congress, after weeks of testimony, did not in 1917 create a national militarized training requirement for children, many local schools followed the examples established in Boston, Washington, DC, and Cheyenne.

However, public schools were not the only institutions attempting to achieve Steever’s motto, “for better citizenship,” with the nation’s children. Military academies, the subject of Ira L. Reeves’ 1914 Military Education in the United States, boomed during the Progressive Era. For Reeves and his academic mentor at the University of Vermont, J. Franklin Messenger, the public was woefully ignorant of the state of military education and, as a topic of study, military academies ranked far below

155 Edgar Z. Steever, III, Testimony, Universal military training: Hearing before a sub-committee of the Committee on military affairs, United States Senate, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, on S. 1695, a bill to provide for the military and naval training of the citizen forces of the United States (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1917), 850.
156 Ibid., 851.
159 “High School Volunteers of the United States, Looking Ahead,” Everybody’s Magazine 40.2 (February, 1919), 83.
160 A demonstration of the importance of Reeves’ study can be found in David I. MacLeod, “Socializing American Youth to be Citizen-Soldiers,” Manfred F. Boemeke, et. al., eds., Anticipating Total War: The German and American Experience, 1871-1914 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), f. 22, 144.
vocational schools. In documenting the military academies of the United States, though, Reeves demonstrated their near ubiquity. Nearly every state and territory could boast a militarily themed educational institution by the time Reeves published his book with several states making up for those—like Alabama and Alaska—that had none. Finally, although historian David MacLeod has argued that American parents rejected militarized activities based upon the failure of the Boys’ Brigade, many of these military academies were founded between 1880 and 1898, more than a decade before militarized education swept the national debate in 1915.

Extant evidence further indicates that American military academies—whether publicly or privately funded—believed that a militarized education was paramount to success in the industrializing, Progressive Era United States. Course catalogues from institutions like the Pennsylvania Military College (today Widener University), the New Mexico Military Institute, and Norwich University in Northfield, Vermont, present a remarkably homogenous means to teach the boy masculinity within a militarized educational curriculum. All three institutions emphasized scientific and mathematical coursework essential to careers in engineering, as well as those foundational courses through which citizenship was taught: literature, history, and government.

---

162 Reeves, Military Education in the United States, 158-198.
to these, students were also offered coursework in business and the nascent managerial sciences. As parents interested in the Pennsylvania Military College were promised, through a militarized environment their boys would develop the “best physical culture—as seen in an erect form, graceful carriage, and vigorous powers of body—but also impresses upon him habits of neatness, system, and punctuality; schools him in self-restraint; cultivates a manly spirit, and gives that equipoise and mastery of self that are the necessary result of well-directed educational effort.” With an indoor riding hall, how could such equipoise not be instilled? Offering high school, preparatory, bachelor, and post-graduate degrees, the academies compiled by Reeves did not promise militarism, but instead a militarized universal masculinity.

Such militarized educational promises of masculinity, though, were not limited to America’s Progressive Era military academies. The land grant colleges endowed by the Morrill Act of 1862 were required by Congress to provide instruction in “military tactics.” By 1914, there were fifty-two land grant institutions with military departments instructing 23,864 students in all of the states and Puerto Rico. Edward Orton, Jr., Dean of the College of Engineering at the Ohio State University, was asked to

---

address a joint session of Congress on November 13, 1913, regarding the status of military sciences at land grant institutions. He concluded that while there was no unified program, each military science department required at least two-years of drilling, which instructed students in discipline, physical activity, and, as an intellectual exercise, in concentration. He also emphasized the way in which military science departments turned abstract university disciplines into practical realities for the young men: geography into cartography, engineering into fortifications, and rhetoric into leadership. These themes continue through the testimonies of Army officers serving as military science instructors collected by Reeves: masculinity was defined by discipline, physical activity, leadership, and loyalty. Overseeing, however loosely and remotely, all of such militarized collegial identity formation was the War Department.

Each year beginning in 1865 the Secretary of War informed the President as to how many boys and young men were being trained by military officers at various educational institutions. When J. C. Breckinbridge reported to the Secretary of War on October 7, 1890—the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first US Army officer being delegated to a military science department at a land grant colleges—that “in the past two or three years […] more interest and renewed vigor seems to have developed” within militarized educational institutions, he was commenting on a process far broader than the military departments of land grant colleges. Public and privately funded military

---

programs—guided by active and retired military officers—were spreading. Breckinbridge’s greater interest had developed by 1904 into 14,836 students over the age of fifteen under the direction of military officers at seventy-four institutions. By 1915, these students, now organized as the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, numbered 32,000 at ninety-five educational institutions. Indeed, these numbers represent not merely a growth in the number of militarized—regardless of what it meant—students, but in the influence of the War Department, which administered the ROTC and JROTC programs, as well as inspecting and overseeing a burgeoning number of military schools.

Veterans and the New Administrative State

A more direct means than education of bringing militarized young men into modernizing administrative agencies was the preferential recruitment of men with military experience. Despite veterans representing 1.6% of the US population in 1900, veterans dominated the early Philippine Constabulary and Pennsylvania State Police. In creating such hiring practices, these agencies created a bureaucracy whose staff’s experience with and knowledge of large, complex government agencies was limited to the military.

---

The Philippine Constabulary was a veritable outgrowth of the United States Army. Henry T. Allen, the founder and first executive of the agency, was a career military officer and West Point graduate. Prior to June 1903, nearly all of the officers recruited into the Constabulary were former members of the United States Volunteer Army and regular Army forces stationed in the Philippines. From 1903 until 1916, the Constabulary enlisted forty former US military personnel and thirty Bureau of Insular Affairs selected junior officers each year. After 1916, the Bureau of Insular Affairs was limited to fifteen junior officer appointments and after 1918 almost none. As Colonel Clarence Edwards, the military senior administrator of the Bureau of Insular affairs, explained in 1903:

In the past appointments to the commission grades in the Philippines Constabulary have been limited to commissioned and non-commissioned officers of the volunteer forces who served in the Philippines, and to non-commissioned officers of the regular Army, upon their muster out. It is, however, the opinion of the commanding general of the Philippines Constabulary that the appointment of a number of young men from civil life who have had military experience and preferably who are graduates of the military institutions would have a beneficial effect and would tend to promote higher esprit du corps in the service.

Therefore, the evolution away from entirely recruiting veterans in the Philippine Constabulary was, according to Edwards, a result of the veterans not being quite militarized enough. His solution was to recruit more properly militarized young men from military academies.

---


175 C. W. Edwards to Alexander Bayard Clark, June 2, 1903, F. 7703, Box 505, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Many of the initial ex-servicemen recruited into the Philippine Constabulary rose with the rapidity of a bureaucratic founding generation and occupied positions of considerable administrative influence within the organization. Jacob S. Mohler arrived in the Philippines in 1899 as part of the VIII Army and served in the Constabulary from 1901 until 1908. 176 Theodore I. Owen retired as a Major in 1916.177 Floie Allen Walker, a veteran of the 10th US Infantry, was one of Henry T. Allen’s first recruits and rose progressively through the ranks of the Constabulary.178 Several founding members of the Constabulary were also veterans from foreign militaries. Oscar Pruess, Otto Beuttler, and George A. Helfert had experience with the German Imperial Army before joining the Philippine Constabulary.179 John Roberts White had served with the Greek Foreign Legion in 1897 before enlisting with the 4th US Infantry in 1899. He left a lasting imprint upon the Insular Government’s management of prisons having served as an early director of the Iwahig Penal Colony before being forced into retirement in 1914 for health reasons. In 1920, he turned his militarized experiences to the National Park Service and

176 Jacob S. Muhler, Case Files of the Philippine Constabulary, Boxes 1-9, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
178 Irwin Walker to Theodore Roosevelt, February 11, 1908, F. 7665, Box 504, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
179 A database of the careers of Philippine Constabulary officers recruited from the United States was compiled from the following sources: for October 1, 1904, through July 1, 1911: “Constabulary General Orders 1929-1930, with Rosters 1904-1911,” V. 805, RG 350; for January 1, 1914, through January 1, 1919: “Official Constabulary Registers, 1914-1919” (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1914-1919), File 4600-229, Box 560, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
rose from ranger to regional director by 1940.\textsuperscript{180} Cosmopolitanism aside, Henry T. Allen’s Constabulary valued military experience.

Organized contemporaneously and with a similar paramilitary police mission, the Pennsylvania State Police was also nearly entirely comprised of veterans at its founding. John C. Groome, the founding chief, was a veteran of the Pennsylvania National Guard having served with the elitist Philadelphia City Cavalry. An associate in a wine importing company, Groome was elected to membership in the First Troop of the Philadelphia City Cavalry in 1882 and by 1896 had been promoted to captain. He served with his unit when it was deployed to the Homestead riots in 1892, as well as the 1897 and 1902 coal mine strikes near Hazelton. During the Spanish-American War, he was placed in command of the cavalry forces used to occupy Puerto Rico.\textsuperscript{181} Similar to the early Philippine Constabulary, prior military service—particularly in the Pennsylvania National Guard or with one of the United States Army Volunteer units during the Spanish American War—was a nearly universal prerequisite to recruitment by Groome for service in the Pennsylvania State Police. Of the 200 initial applicants found qualified for service, “90 per cent had seen service in the United States Army.”\textsuperscript{182} Groome’s eventual assistant and second in command, George F. Lumb, had enlisted in the US Army in 1893, served in the Philippines and China during the Boxer Rebellion, and, in 1905, resigned as a Sergeant Major with the Coast Artillery Corps before immediately enlisting with the Pennsylvania


State Police. Leon S. Pitcher, who Groome recruited as a sergeant, had served with the Delaware Volunteers in 1898 and until 1905 with the Delaware National Guard. Lynn G. Adams had served with the 13th US Infantry from 1900 to 1903. A review of the known-careers from the Pennsylvania State Police suggests that Groome’s boast that 90% of his agency had prior military service was accurate.

The Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police were organized as paramilitary mounted law-enforcement agencies, which unsurprisingly recruited young men with military experience. What is surprising—especially given the revisionist historiography of American unpreparedness for World War I—was how easily these two agencies in vastly different geographic and political locales were able to recruit young men with military experience. While further research is needed, these two preliminary case studies suggest that veterans were disproportionately represented within the Progressive Era state. Evidence from the US Forest Service, discussed below, further indicates that the War Department’s influence was not limited to law-enforcement.

The Military Model and the New Administrative State

Gifford Pinchot had few positive thoughts for the War Department from the comforts of his mid-twentieth century retirement, writing that “the War Department has always had a soft spot for Big Business, High Society, and the Overrich. I suspect that

---

soft spot is with it still.” Yet nearly fifty years earlier, Pinchot regularly consulted with the War Department utilizing the latter’s bureaucratic expertise and administrative model in the construction of the US Forest Service. Pinchot’s utilization of the War Department demonstrates more than how agencies passed procedural methodologies and processes to other administrative units. In consulting with the War Department, Pinchot linked administrative modernization—the use of technical experts, standardized forms, and the constant emphasis on centralized control and efficiency—with the military.

**The Forest Service and the Mule**

Gifford Pinchot and his staff actively sought advice from the War Department on at least two occasions. The first of these instances was on the matter of purchasing cook stoves for field parties, while the second was the longstanding relationship between Pinchot, his affiliates, and the Chief Packer of the United States Army. These two examples demonstrate that the War Department was not merely an administrative model, but was an actively consulted body of militarized experts.

Early in 1901, the Pinchot’s headquarters staff began to search for a cooking range to be used by various Bureau of Forestry field parties during the coming summer. Assistant Forester F. E. Olmstead wrote to the Quartermasters’ Department of the War Department who recommended that he contact the firm of George B. Donavan & Company in Columbus, Ohio. The latter was recommended by Charles W. F. Dick,

---

186 F. E. Olmstead to George B. Donavan & Company, Columbus, Ohio, February 11, 1901, Box XXIII, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Brigadier General of the Second Brigade, 8th Ohio Infantry, who “had personal experience with these ranges in Cuba and during the past Summer gave them a very rigid inspection in the Annual Encampment of the Ohio National Guard.”187 If that recommendation was not enough, the company provided the contact of a Major Bryan stationed in Washington, DC, who had experience of the cooking ranges in Cuba, while the Bureau of Insular Affairs could attest to the popularity of the company’s smallest range with officers in the Philippines. However, for immediate use the company could only ship their larger—and more expensive—model. Beyond the recommendation of the cooking hardware, Olmstead also inquired of the Quartermasters’ Department how the Army contracted out such purchases and then dispersed the desired goods to the intended locations. Olmstead seemed quite concerned that twenty-five iron cooking ranges were going to be delivered directly to Pinchot’s office.188 Pinchot, in 1904, even inquired how to cook upon the ranges and inquired of General John F. Weston, the Commissary-General, for copies of the “Army Cook Book.” He also inquired of General Robert M. O’Reilly, Surgeon-General, for the Army’s first aid manual.189 There was, therefore, a very direct influence by the War Department upon the nascent Forestry Bureau in matters ranging from hardware contracting to gastronomic preparations.

187 George B. Donavan & Company, Columbus, Ohio, to F. E. Olmstead, March 11, 1901, Box XXIII, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
188 F. E. Olmstead to George B. Donavan & Company, Columbus, Ohio, February 11, 1901, Box XXIII, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
189 Gifford Pinchot to Gen. John F. Weston, April 5, 1904; Gifford Pinchot to Gen. Robert M. O’Reilly, April 5, 1904, Box IX, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
On a more technocratic level, Gifford Pinchot wrote to Secretary of War William Howard Taft in early 1904 inquiring whether or not his department might know of someone particularly well versed in mule packing. Pinchot had already written to the Quartermaster General for a manual on the subject.\textsuperscript{190} The Secretary forwarded his letter to Brigadier General H. V. Hall, Assistant Adjutant General, who revealed “that Mr. H. W. Daly, Chief Packer of the Army, now at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, [was] specially qualified as an instructor in all branches of the packer’s art” and that the War Department would be “glad” to second him.\textsuperscript{191}

H. W. Daly was something of a celebrity within the War Department. He had worked for Thomas Moore, a legend for those fascinated by the new Old West, as well as George Crook and Nelson A. Miles during the campaigns against Geronimo in the 1880s.\textsuperscript{192} By 1901, he was recognized as one of a few surviving experts employed by the War Department in, as Pinchot put it, the ‘packer’s art’ and was encouraged to write and publish a manual. His \textit{Manual of Instruction in Pack Transportation} would be republished nearly annually by the War Department through the First World War.\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{190} Gifford Pinchot to Gen. C. F. Humphrey, April 5, 1904, Box IX, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{191} Gifford Pinchot to Henry S. Graves, May 18, 1904, Box IV, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
L. Scott—whose own career began with the 7th Cavalry in 1876, spanned the suppression of the Ghost Dance movement in 1890 and the military government of the Sulu Archipelago from 1903 to 1906, and culminated as the Chief of Staff of the US Army and interim Secretary of War in 1917 before retirement to the Board of Indian Commissioners in 1919—described him as,

The last of those who grew up with the pack service under Gen. George Crook, some of whom have followed ‘the bell’ from the British line far down into old Mexico, and later in Alaska, Cuba, China, and the Philippines. Of them all he stands foremost as the most observant, the one who has added most to the efficiency of the pack service, and one who has placed the mounted service under lasting obligations to him. \(^{194}\)

A romanticized technocrat already viewed as a relic of another age was precisely who Pinchot was looking for teach his would-be foresters at Yale’s summer encampment in Milford, Pennsylvania, and, perhaps a bit of Daly’s rugged, militarized persona might also have been imparted. \(^ {195} \)

In recruiting Daly to instruct his would be foresters, Pinchot revealed a bias that recognized the War Department as a source of expertise in matters other than the eponymously obvious. Pinchot utilized numerous technocratic agencies in the training of his foresters: H. von Schrenk of the Department of Agriculture lectured on tree diseases, B. W. Evermann of the US Bureau of Fisheries taught fish culture, and C. H. Merriam,
Chief of the US Biological Survey, offered instruction in forest zoology.\textsuperscript{196} What makes his consultation of the War Department noteworthy was that unlike B. W. Evermann’s expertise on fish culture, there were certainly more readily accessible instructors of equine packing in a country with over twenty-one million horses and mules than H. W. Daly. The preference Pinchot demonstrated in choosing Daly was the result of a societal glorification of efficiency and the association of the latter with militarized individuals and institutions.

\textit{In Search of a Simpler Bureaucratic World}

The War Department was more, though, than a consulting service for Gifford Pinchot. As Pinchot expanded the missions of his bureau beyond arboreal government research, he turned towards the War Department as an administrative model. Between November 1905 and early-1906, Pinchot and his headquarters staff reviewed an interdepartmental memorandum prepared by the War Department titled, “The Simplification of War Department Methodologies.” A year later, in 1907, the US Forest Service was reorganized to accommodate the agency’s expanded mission, which by then included the administration of the National Forest Reserves. The presence of the report suggest that the War Department directly influenced the reorganization.

In 1903, Gifford Pinchot broached the idea to Theodore Roosevelt of an executive commission charged with investigating inefficiencies within the federal government.\textsuperscript{197}

Organized in May 1905, as the Committee on Department Methods, Roosevelt appointed Charles H. Keep, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Lawrence O. Murray, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, James R. Garfield, Commissioner of the Bureau of Corporations, Frank H. Hitchcock, First Assistant Postmaster General, and, of course, Gifford Pinchot. The youthful committee was charged with no less a task than modernizing the government through new record keeping methods and technologies, streamlined organizing principles, and anything else that could prevent the drowning of government business in a sea of unanswered correspondence. 198 Despite the specific mentioning of the Army and Navy in the commission’s instructions, neither organization was directly investigated. Instead, Robert Shaw Oliver, Acting Secretary of War in November of 1905, forwarded to Gifford Pinchot through Overton W. Price, who was also member of the Keep Commission, a report that dealt with a subject already “thrashed out repeatedly.”199


199 Robert Shaw Oliver, “The Simplification of War Department Methods, taking into consideration the reports, returns, correspondence and records required by each Bureau of the War Department,” September 27, 1905, Box VI, RG 95.2, Records of the Forest Service, Office of the Chief and Other General Correspondence, Selected Records of Gifford Pinchot, 1905-1913, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Oliver’s report, approved by Theodore Roosevelt, provided a blueprint for bureaucratic efficiency. The report began with an overview of the previous attempts to modernize the War Department in 1870, 1888, 1892, 1894, 1901, and 1903, which collectively formed the “Business Methods of the War Department” as stipulated in the Revised Army Regulations. Each of the committees that were formed for these attempts recommended incremental changes until the 1903 group that included Lt. Colonel Crosby P. Miller, Lt. Colonel Charles Shaler, Major G. W. Goethals, Major Samuel Reber, Captain C. H. Muir, Captain, S. W. Cloman, and Captain H. J. Gallagher. These concluded,

The fundamental trouble was in the system of administration of the War Department; a system that was the gradual growth of many years, and founded upon the idea that the bureau chiefs in Washington, and the Secretary of War, were the only ones who could be trusted to decide either important or trivial matters in a manner to properly protect the interests of the Government; a system that necessarily resulted in congesting the paper work in Washington, in multiplying the number of clerks required to handle and record the papers, and finally in so overloading the chiefs of bureaus in the War Department, by attention to unimportant details, that they had not sufficient time for the consideration of more important matters.

The solutions proposed and enacted to remedy the problem of over-centralization were conspicuous in their similarity to what, administratively, impressed members of the Keep Commission about Pinchot’s Forest Service.

Robert Shaw Oliver concluded that the War Department modernized through the eighteen recommendations of the 1903 committee. These recommendations included the

---
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granting of discretion in matters of supply to commanders, that approval for requisitions
be localized, and that budgets should be allotted and left to the discretion of department
commanders. Nearly identical administrative practices in the Forest Service were praised
by the Keep Commission in February 1907. As James R. Garfield explained to Congress,

As a member of the Commission, I personally went through the Forest Service and
examined the various divisions, the methods of accounting, the methods of bookkeeping,
the method of safeguarding the supplies and the issue of supplies, the system of handling
correspondence and vouchers, the system of filing, the methods in vogue for attending to
the work of the aforesaid Service so far as the records of the office were concerned—that
is, the reports of the agents in the field, the officers in charge of the forest reserves, and
the officers who were the general inspectors in the different districts—examining the
reports sent in by these officers, and following through the actions by the Forest Service
upon those reports or recommendations. The general result of this investigation was that
the committee unanimously agreed that the general system in force in the Forest Service
was one of the most complete and most satisfactory of any of the offices which were
examined by the committee.202

Indeed, the War Department’s 1903 recommendations and the Keep Commission’s
Forest Service agreed even on the minutiae of office paperwork and archival procedures.
The most significant differences was Pinchot’s adoption of a system of monetarily
rewarding “deserving employees” and either demoting or removing employees found
“inefficient” regardless of their status within the Civil Service.203 From the use of
indexing cards to the methods of expediting correspondence, Pinchot’s Forest Service
and Oliver’s War Department were more administratively similar than not.

Gifford Pinchot wanted efficiency—the catchword of modernity—for his
administrative domain. To create an agency worthy of the Keep Commission’s praise,

202 “Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture,” House of Representatives, 59th Congress, 2nd
Session, Report No. 8147, March 1, 1907 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1907), 18; also
Comprehensive Presidential Inquiry into Administration,” Western Political Science Association 23.1
(March 1970), 31.
203 Ibid., 19.
Pinchot and his staff had consulted with the War Department on a variety of administrative and technocratic methods that resulted in the adoption by a civilian agency of policies and procedures developed by and for the military. The result, however inadvertent, was a militarized administration.

***

Militarism was far more subtle in fin-de-siècle America than in either the German or British empires, but that in no way diminished its influence on the American administration state. Young men were militarized through an array of educational programs and institutions that ranged from the overt like the New Mexico Military Institute to the less direct military training departments at land grant colleges. Regardless of how direct the militarism was, though, it was overseen by the War Department. Veteran preferences in the Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police further placed those that had been trained by the War Department into disparate administrative agencies. Finally, the War Department became, as exemplified by Gifford Pinchot, a model bureaucracy actively consulted on a range of technocratic and administrative subjects. The War Department’s militarism mattered, but further research is necessary to determine just how much.
III

Leadership and Bureaucratic Identity Formation
Leadership mattered. The bureaucratic elite of the Progressive Era—men like Henry T. Allen of the Philippine Constabulary and Chief Forester of the United States Gifford Pinchot—understood that leadership was important to the agencies they sought to create and reform. Allen and Pinchot, both of whom recorded their reading pleasures periodically in diaries, thought about leadership. What constituted good and bad leadership, who were the great and poor leaders, was debated. Pundits, theoreticians, and experts explained to citizens the importance of passion, virility, and wisdom in the personalities of great leaders. Leadership was even the subject of jargon-filled doctoral dissertations. As Eben Mumford concluded in his 1909 dissertation, “leadership is the pre-eminence of one or a few individuals in a group process of control of societary phenomena. Institutions […] are the social habits which have resulted from successful adjustive or organizing processes in the effort to control the conditions of associate life.” Regardless of whether of how author thought leadership could be defined, all agreed it was something that could be modelled and, more importantly, taught.

While Mumford was attempting to illustrate a universal truth, his definition of leadership and his exploration of how leaders were creators of and created by institutions aptly described the process through which government bureaucracies evolved from the late-1890s to the late-1910s. Bureaucratic elites charged with creating or radically

---


reforming government agencies in response to regulatory legislation developed idealized images of their masculine employees-to-be. These idealized images—bearing a likeness to the promulgating bureaucratic elite—served to entice young men into government careers. Through these ideals government leaders promised young men passionate careers imbued with strenuous, virile activity as part of a modernizing, cutting edge bureaucratic agency. If fully realized, the promise invariably went, then the government novices of today would become leaders themselves, personifying the ideals of governance.

The following chapter differs from other investigations of the administrative state—particularly those following-upon Stephen Skowronek’s seminal *Building a New American State*—in understanding bureaucracies as developing unique, agency-specific cultural identities that were crucial in conducting governance across vast distances. Through the personal papers of Henry T. Allen and Gifford Pinchot the chapter reconstructs their understanding of what it meant to be a successful man. Using the bureaucratic papers these two archetypes used to recruit young men into their agencies demonstrates how their definition of masculine success was transposed upon the agent identities—the Constabulary officers and the Foresters—they created. More limited evidence from the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Forest Division indicate that a similar genesis of bureaucratic identity was created by John C. Groome and George H. Wirt, respectively. Collectively, these case studies suggest a Progressive Era model of masculine identity formation within the bureaucracies that defined the modern administrative state.
The bureaucratic identities created celebrated technocratic efficiency and rugged masculinity. From Manila to Harrisburg, from Washington to Mont Alto, the founders and reformers of the four case studies emphasized the need for all recruits to be modern office workers. Modern to these bureaucratic elite meant efficient, capable of typing and filing, able to conform to standardized procedures, and, most importantly, to work within—not against—complex, hierarchically structured chains of command. Rugged masculinity was implicitly and explicitly defined by Allen, Pinchot, Groome, and Wirt as an ability to ride a horse, handle a gun, thrive in any wilderness, and relish the solitary life of leadership and the comradery of other men. Few, if anyone, in the halcyon days following 1898, commented upon the tension between these two themes. Whether a Constabulary Inspector or a Pennsylvania State Trooper, a federal or state Forester, these were the deliberately constructed government-men of the Progressive Era.

**New Leaders**

Bureaucratic reformers and founders provided more than policy initiatives; they inspired would-be recruits to fantasize of a government career and then established the ideals by which the recruited judged their careers. Henry T. Allen and John C. Groome modelled a paramilitary ideal that they created for their Constabulary officers and State Police troopers, while Gifford Pinchot and George C. Wirt exemplified the technocratic arboreal fantasy that enticed a generation of foresters. Before they could become models, though, they had to live the dream.
When Hamilton Wright, a San Francisco journalist, described Allen’s work with the Constabulary in 1906, he expounded that “never did dime novel thrill more than these exploits.” Even without his career in the Constabulary, though, he was the contemporaneous image of masculinity. Whether redolent in waxed mustaches and the dress uniform of the United States Army amidst the cigar smoke and multi-course extravagances of New York City’s Delmonico’s in 1882 or bedecked in buckskins and unkempt beard, Allen lived an exemplary manly life. Despite frequently complaining of the boredom of Army garrison duty in Montana, Allen spent his free time at Fort Keogh in helping his brother Tom run a cattle ranch beyond Miles City, practicing for the monthly garrison shooting competitions, and in—that most quintessential masculine activity—hunting the local wildlife with his pack of greyhounds.

Even a cursory glance at Allen’s correspondence reveals his passion for ruggedly masculine activity. As noted, Allen spent a great deal of his leisure time while on garrison duty in Montana hunting. During his Alaskan expedition, he was able to extend the party’s supplies by hunting. More than just a hobby, though, for Allen hunting was a masculine trait he actively cultivated in himself and the lack of which he derided in others. While garrisoned at Fort Coeur d’Alène, he was asked to take General William

---

206 Hamilton Wright, *San Francisco Sunday Call*, December 2, 1906.
Carlene, the post commander, deer hunting. In a letter to his future wife, Allen openly mocked “the old gentleman” for forgetting to bring any ammunition, commenting: “He may have anticipated riding up and striking the beautiful animals with the heavy muzzle.”

From Allen, such a comment was a scathing indictment of a man’s failings.

Indeed, Allen’s passion for hunting wherever his career took him brought him to the attention of the Boone & Crockett Club, an association of conservation themed hunters that celebrated Theodore Roosevelt’s philosophy of the strenuous life. Allen’s article for the Boone & Crockett Club’s *Hunting in Many Lands*, while containing the prerequisite travelogue descriptions of the Russian landscape and the technicalities of the Russian wolf-hunt, distilled his connection of masculinity with hunting. The masculine man embraced the discomforts of travel. The masculine man took little notice of cold, wet weather. The masculine man embraced the fear of the charging wolf and relished the struggle of killing the wolf with nothing more than a knife. Allen’s very definition of masculinity becomes apparent throughout his discussion of the Russian method of wolf-hunting. The narrative also contains an inkling of Allen, the creator of progressive era governance, in his simultaneous lamenting of the conditions of the Russian aristocracy’s private army of pitiably impoverished peasants and praise of the sumptuous comforts of

---


Russia’s masculine sport providing great estates. Through his tale of wolf-hunting Allen became a frequent correspondent of Caspar Whitney, the editor of *Outing*, as well as Theodore Roosevelt. The latter, as the founder of the Boone & Crockett Club and the book’s editor, even wrote to Allen with literary style suggestions.

If hunting was what everyman should aspire to, than wilderness exploration was the activity of the truly great fin-de-siècle man and to which nothing short of martial combat could compare. For Allen the opportunity to become an explorer emerged in 1884 after his appointment as General Nelson A. Miles aid-de-camp. Allen had become fascinated with exploration in 1882 and had even applied to lead an expedition in search of Adolphus Greeley, commander of the sensationalized Lady Franklin Bay Expedition. Two years later, Allen’s mission was to locate the missing Copper River Valley exploration and surveying expedition under Lieutenant W. R. Abercrombie. Thereafter, Allen was to continue exploring.

Throughout Allen’s writings about his Alaskan adventure was a firm belief of the civilizational importance of the work. In his final expedition report, he pondered that “it is a very remarkable fact that a region under a civilized government for more than a

---

century should remain so completely unknown.”\textsuperscript{218} Even after the failure of Allen’s first
try to ascend the Copper River, he wrote to his future wife, Dora, “I hope to be able
to get some valuable information from a region never visited by white men.”\textsuperscript{219} Here was
an activity both ruggedly masculine and civilizingly important.\textsuperscript{220} The grueling hardships
of Allen’s nearly 2,500 mile sojourn through the Alaskan wilderness were amply
rewarded with praise and publicity upon his return. According to the \textit{New York Times}, his
expedition “excels all explorations on the American continent since the time of Lewis
andClarke and the world’s record since Livingston.”\textsuperscript{221} Within geographical circles,
Allen’s expedition was positively received as evidenced by the desire of the Royal
Geographic Society of London and the Geographic Society of Bremen to publish his
report before the War Department eventually did so in 1887.\textsuperscript{222} Allen would remain very
proud of his achievements in Alaska.

\textsuperscript{218} Henry T. Allen, \textit{Report of An Expedition to the Copper, Tanana, and Kaykuk Rivers, in the
\textsuperscript{219} Henry T. Allen, Diary, 1884, 87-103, Box I, Papers of Henry T. Allen, Library of Congress.
\textsuperscript{220} Henry T. Allen was certainly not alone in this and the similarities in language between the
writings of other explorers and his own musings cannot be ignored. Following the 1872 publishing
sensation \textit{How I Found Livingston}, American publishing houses had difficulty keeping up with the
voracious demand for tales of exploration, be they of Henry Morton Stanley in Africa or William Francis
Butler’s two volumes on the Canadian wilderness. Indeed, “Schwatka’s unpublished report” read by Allen
on the voyage to Sitka would be published to wide praise and leave a lasting impression upon the American
public, as well as government officials. That Allen shared Schwatka’s romantic image of Alaska becomes
clear when comparing their reports. Schwatka wrote that the “dancing waters [of the Yukon River] made
one feel as though he were floating on the Nile, Congo, or Amazon,” thereby fixing Alaska with other late-
nineteenth century blank spots on the map of the imperial imagination. In noting that he was going where
no white man had gone before, Allen continued the meme established by other nineteenth century
explorers. Robert Campbell, \textit{In Darkest Alaska: Travel and Empire Along the Inside Passage, Passage
(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 5, 22; Frederick Swatchka, \textit{Along Alaska’s Great
Rivers: A Popular Account of the Travels of the Alaska Exploring Expedition of 1883, Along the Great
Yukon River, From Its Source to Its Mouth, In the British North-West Territory, and in the Territory of
Alaska} (New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1885), 143.
\textsuperscript{222} P. M. Lindeman to W. H. Dall, forwarded to Henry T. Allen, December 14, 1885; L. R. Scidmore to
Indeed, a particularly telling insight into Allen’s understanding of masculinity related directly to his exploration of the Copper River. According to Allen, during his Alaskan sojourn he named a particularly tall mountain, the tallest he had encountered, after himself. He had trekked 2,500-miles through the wilderness, proved his manhood, and accordingly left his mark upon the cartographic world. Alas, as he would later complain to his wife in 1900,

In some newspaper I notice that since Mt. Allen (I do not know who honored me) has proven itself something like 20,000 feet high and the highest peak in North America, some sycophant has changed its name to Mt. McKinley. The latter certainly does not appreciate the compliment as much as I dislike the change. Power! Influence! Everything bends on them! On this little island where my will is law, where 250,000 natives and 900 soldiers are completely subject to my orders I realize the above nearly as much as though I were President.223

In changing the name, a portion of Allen’s masculine accomplishments had been erased. Of course, neither William McKinley nor Henry T. Allen appeared to have cared if the indigenous had a name for it.

Henry T. Allen’s masculinity included not just hunting and wilderness trekking, but also cosmopolitan travel and international diplomacy. He was remarkably well-connected with the members of the Republican Party who would eventually embrace an American overseas imperium in the Caribbean and Pacific. Through familial patronage, Allen was linked to most of the Republican politicians governing Kentucky and the Chicago establishment. Utilizing these connections, Allen was able to secure one of the first military attaché posts to be staffed by a US Army officer.224 As a military attaché in

---

Germany and Russia, Allen studied not just military matters, but the imperial means of governance that defined the era’s great powers. In a letter written as a provincial military governor in the Philippine Islands to then President Roosevelt, Allen demonstrated just how cognizant he was of his training in politics and governance:

I recall with much interest our conversation in the Vienna Café several years ago, in the presence of Mr. White and General Miles, little thinking that our foreign policy was to include such lands as these in such a short time. The Spanish War advanced us in a number of years, and I now recognize that as a great power we are *nolens volens* interested in great questions in all parts of the world. [emphasis in original].225

As an ambitious officer in a slow-to-promote army, Allen cultivated relationships with Roosevelt, Albert Beveridge, and Henry Cabot Lodge, William H. Taft, and others for personal gain, but there appears to have been a genuine feeling of a shared purpose of greatness across their correspondence. Such purpose—to build and administer an expanding imperium—was very much a part of Allen’s definition of masculinity.

During the Spanish-American War and the subsequent Philippine-American War, Allen was given a chance to enact these imperial fantasies. In 1900, he was ordered to restore government to the island of Samar and to suppress the insurrectionary, or *ladrone* as the Army high command thought, Vincente Lucban.226 To pacify the area, Allen commenced “playing the rival factions against each other.” The factions, according to Allen, were on the “one side […those who were] honest and had the best welfare of the

---

country at heart, [while] the other side [was] headed by unscrupulous individuals who have, however, considerable influence and energy.” He hoped to be able “to bend the latter to the welfare of this island as quickly as possible.”²²⁷ The colonial officer, as imagined by Allen, represented the physical embodiment of the United States. In mid-March 1900, Allen explained to his commanding officer, General William A. Kobbe, the link between the success of the colonial state and the colonial officer:

Now General, there is another thing to which I attach greater importance in our work here and that is setting a good example. […] There must be order, cleanliness, and dignity wherever we plant the flag if good results are to be obtained.²²⁸

After he was transferred to Leyte and began to consider a longer career with the Insular Government, he explained to his wife that success was possible to those like him:

In my opinion, a strong effort will be made in the near future to enlist native troops. How would you [Jeannie Allen] like to have me take a regiment? General Hughes told me a few days since that in case regiments were to be formed and he had anything to say, he would send for me. That would mean a considerable stay out here, especially for those persons as healthy and strong as myself.²²⁹

Through his pacification of Samar and, later, Leyte, Allen developed not only his attitude towards the Filipinos, but an idea of how a masculine colonial officer should look and act.

²²⁷ H. T. Allen to Jeannie Allen, February 17, 1900, Container VII, Folder I, Henry T. Allen Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Allen’s biographer, Heath Twichell, Jr., suggests that Allen may have been wrongfully accredited with pioneering the policy of rewarding pro-American Filipinos and punishing insurrectionaries. Twichell suggests, convincingly, that Allen was one of many officers who developed such a strategy. However, Allen was a better writer than most Army officers and it was his reports that were brought to the attention of General Arthur MacArthur. Heath Twichell, Jr., Allen: The Biography of an Army Officer, 1859-1930 (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1974), 105.


Henry T. Allen defined masculinity through his own lived experiences. These spanned frontier garrison duty, cattle ranching, arctic exploration, diplomacy, and participation in the suppression of an imperialist guerrilla war. He understood masculinity as intrinsically rugged: a successful man hunted and trekked in the wilderness. He also saw masculinity as cosmopolitan: a successful man was literate, cultured, and comfortable in the courts of Europe. Finally, he saw the successful man—at least one involved in a colonial state—as embodying order, cleanliness, and health.

*Gifford Pinchot: The Patrician and the Trees*

Gifford Pinchot begat much in his image. Char Miller’s landmark environmental biography of Pinchot convincingly demonstrated his importance to the conservation movement during the early-twentieth century. Pinchot, though, also constructed an idealized identity for those that sought to join him in his arboreal crusade. That identity combined, like Henry T. Allen’s idealized Constabulary, technocratic government service and rugged masculinity. To understand what drove a generation of young men into America’s woods as agents of the Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot’s own journey is crucial.

Gifford Pinchot was seemingly raised to be a Forester. Indeed, his parents, education, and experiences were nearly as deliberately constructed as the bureaucratic system he would develop to staff the US Forest Service. In explaining how he became a forester, Pinchot explained that his “Father’s foresight and tenacity were responsible […] 

---

and is fairly entitled to be called the Father of Forestry in America.”231 The young Pinchot was as exposed as any child could have been to the allure of professional forestry despite his later assertions that since the forester “no longer wore green cap and leather jerkin and shot cloth-yard arrows at the King’s deer,” he had little idea of what the career might entail.232 A particularly prescient comment given Gifford Pinchot’s later support of the Robin Hood Society, a secretive organization creating camaraderie amongst the graduates of the School of Forestry at Yale University and photographed wearing caps and jerkins, while armed with bows and arrows.233 His father and mother had both inculcated within him an aesthetic appreciation of nature generally and the woods particularly.

James W. Pinchot and Mary Jane Eno were both wealthy patricians—albeit the former only second generation—who patronized and befriended landscape artists including Sanford Gifford, Jervis McEntee, Eastman Johnson, and Worthington Whittredge.234 Gifford was not merely named after a leading member of the Hudson Valley School, but was raised surrounded by romanticized depictions of orderly wildernesses—eulogies in oil and canvas—including Whittrede’s *The Old Hunting Ground* (1864), Sanford Gifford’s *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* (1866) and *Indian Summer on Claverack Creek* (1868). As the environmental historian Char Miller has concluded, the message of these somber visual missives of natural Edens ravished by agricultural

---
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233 Photograph of Austin F. Hawes, Image 2838, Folder 166, Box 9, RU 0748, Records of the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Special Collections, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
and industrial expansion could not have been lost on Gifford Pinchot. That Samuel Avery, the infamous New York City art dealer, would later describe Gifford’s earliest forays into forestry to James Pinchot as “noble reports of a noble work” and worthy of his “combined names,” suggesting that an appreciation of the natural world were deliberately introduced and cultivated by the boy’s parents.

His parents, though, did not merely introduce their son to artistic renditions of nature, but to an idea that masculinity was dependent upon nature. Gifford Pinchot fondly recalled in his autobiography that camping was his childhood “delight,” while his most treasured possession was a “pin-fire shotgun.” In the “Adirondack woods,” he recalled hearing the “panther scream” as his father presented him with his first “rod” and taught him “to cast.” That 1879 camping trip—detailed in a 1936 collection of fishing stories—presented Gifford’s coming of age story. Along the shores of Upper Ausable Pond, a long hike out of the Keene Valley and away from his ailing mother and sister, Gifford’s father presented him with a rod that “had a hickory butt, a second joint of ash, and a lancewood tip.” While the final sections of the rod would be retired many years

---

later to a gun cabinet at Pinchot’s residence, the Grey Towers, his camping adventure was only beginning. Even after fifty-seven years, his youthful excitement was palpable in descriptions of roughing-it under lean-tos, sleeping upon balsam beds, and flapjacks cooked by the guide—an ex-circus performer—over an open flame and sweetened maple syrup. Tickling chubs, shirking at screaming panthers, and sleeping to the drone of bullfrogs mingled with the pain of “black flies, midges, and mosquitos.”239 Although failing to catch one particular trout, Pinchot recalled with pleasure overhearing his father in another boat comment, “The boy doesn’t fish as if he were only thirteen.”240 As a coming of age moment, the story demonstrates the importance of Pinchot’s parents in introducing him to the out-of-doors recreational lifestyle he would expect in his foresters and rangers. Far from just dressing their son in the garb of the outdoorsman, the Pinchot’s provided Gifford with a definition of masculinity, wherein a man proved himself in the wilderness.

If Gifford Pinchot’s parents shaped their son through artistic and experiential communions with nature, his education at Philips Exeter Academy and Yale University instilled him with the curiosity of the classical humanist, the social loyalties and kinship networks that would determine his career, and the linking of educational attainment with professionalism. At Philip Exeter, his first prolonged separation from family, Gifford’s mother encouraged A. H. Gesner, an acquaintance, to correspond with her son about the natural sciences as a profession and about the relationship between God and Nature.

239 Pinchot, Fishing Talk, 71-73.
240 Ibid., 74-75.
Gesner, who wrote for *Forest and Stream* such pieces as “The Prescription” and the “Museum Moose” under the pseudonym “Stillaboy,” encouraged Pinchot to conclude that “moral and scientific progress” were not oppositional.\(^{241}\) Given his parents fears that the academy’s many extracurricular activities were having a negative impact upon Gifford’s development, their relief at being informed of the Reverend Gesner’s advice remains palpable in their familial missives.\(^{242}\) The extracurricular activities were, as he recalled at his forty-fifth undergraduate reunion, more important in later years than any of his courses on Cicero or astronomy.\(^{243}\) A socially outgoing student, he played lacrosse, football, and tennis at Philips Exeter and football at Yale University. At both schools he was active in bible study classes through the Young Men’s Christian Association. At Yale, he was invited into the infamous and secretive Skull and Bones Society, while also finding time for campus literary productions and an eating club that he organized.\(^{244}\) As Char Miller concluded, these were the activities “emblematic of, muscular Christianity, a faith fueled by a masculine ethos; gridiron-hardened men could best shoulder the


\(^{242}\) A. H. Gesner to Gifford Pinchot, October 17, 1883; James Pinchot to Gifford Pinchot, October 14, 1880; Mary Pinchot to Gifford Pinchot, October 10, 1880, November 26, 1880; Gifford Pinchot to Mary Pinchot, September 30, 1880, Gifford Pinchot Papers, MSS36277, Library of Congress.


A masculine ethos that Pinchot shared with the young men around him, many of whom, like Henry S. Graves, would become enmeshed with his career.

Masculinity for Pinchot, though, was more than the camaraderie of Yale and wilderness adventures. As with Allen, who found a masculine mission in the Insular Government’s civilizing mission, Pinchot linked masculinity to a bureaucratic purpose. For Pinchot, that purpose was federal forestry. He was not the first, though, to head the clarion call to action espoused by George Perkins Marsh in his 1864 *Man and Nature*. Writing from his native Vermont—all but denuded of arboreal life—Marsh captured the attention of an entire generation with his imagery of Roman collapse. At the very outset of *Man and Nature*, he describes how the Roman Empire at its height “enjoyed a healthfulness and equability of climate, a fertility of soil, a variety of vegetable and mineral products, and natural facilities for the transportation and distribution of exchangeable commodities, which have not been possessed in equal degree by any territory of like extent in the Old World or the New.” Indeed, “every material want, ministered liberally to every sensuous enjoyment,” was provided by the imperial Eden of Rome. Ignorance of “natural law” and the abuse of despotism, though, turned the


ancient paradise of the Caesar’s into “a dry and barren wilderness.” Rome, that symbol of Western civilization and the glories of imperial expansion for the classically educated, was doomed to collapse through poor land management and an imbalanced relationship with nature. On August 11, 1886, surrounded by his family in the sumptuous billiard room of the newly completed Grey Towers, overlooking the Delaware River Valley, Gifford Pinchot was presented with Marsh’s narrative of man’s inequity as Nature’s steward. Thus, beginning his education as America’s first modern federal forester.

Gifford Pinchot may have been the first modern federal forester, but he was neither the first forester nor the first federal official concerned with arboreal rights. Marsh’s apocalyptic narrative of civilization’s collapse stemming from unregulated axes and shovels gave rise to a host of scientific and educated denouncements of American agro-industrial expansion. Many of which were published in full in the annual reports of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. Concern for the nation’s forests manifested itself a decade after Marsh’s treatise with the Timber Culture Act of 1873, which provided a corollary to the 1862 Homestead Act and allowed settlers to substitute
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plantings for managed tracts of forestland.\textsuperscript{252} While the Timber Culture Act recognized for the first time forestlands as productive agricultural units, the 1875 passing by Congress of “An Act to Protect Ornamental and Other Trees on Government Reservations and on Lands Purchased by the United States” brought federal protection to the nation’s arboreal wards.\textsuperscript{253} The act was motivated in part by Franklin B. Hough’s “On the Duty of Governments in the Preservation of Forests.” Originally presented before the 1873 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Portland, Maine, the article was a condensed version of Marsh’s dire prediction of civilizational collapsed and motivated the association to lobby Congress to not only pass the 1875 tree protection act, but also the 1876 act appointing Hough as the first federal forestry agent.\textsuperscript{254}

If Marsh created the cultural impetus for government regulated forestry, Hough created the first federal bureaucratic response to the conviction that without managed forests the United States would follow Rome into imperial collapse. As the federal forestry agent, Hough was charged by Congress with writing a comprehensive report on the state of the nation’s timberlands. The resultant 650-page \textit{Report upon Forestry},

\textsuperscript{252} For an excellent case study of the importance of the Timber Culture Act, see Theresa L. Young, “Living Tools: An Environmental History of Afforestation and the Shifting Image of Trees,” MA Thesis, Kansas State University (Manhattan, Kansas: 2013), 54-91. For the American Forestry Association, which quickly became one of the most influential organizations on government and industrial forest management practices, see Henry Clepper, “Crusade for Conservation: The Centennial History of the American Forestry Association,” \textit{American Forests}, 81 (October 1975).

\textsuperscript{253} “An act to protect ornamental and other trees on Government reservations and on lands purchased by the United States, and for other purposes,” U.S. Statutes at Large, 18.3.151, (Washington, District of Columbia: Government Printing Office, 1875), 481-82.

published by an impressed Congress in 1878, presented little hope for avoiding civilizational collapse. 255 A statistically driven, truly positivist, account of the nation’s lumber industry and timber usages, Hough’s report covered land laws, insect deprivations, the relationship between fire outbreaks and railroads, meteorological concerns, arboreal property rights, and, most importantly, the dearth of trained foresters to administer the nation’s forestlands. 256 Two years and $8,000.00 in Congressional appropriations later, Hough submitted the second volume of his report to Congress. 257 Ominously, the second volume highlighted the growing disparities between foreign and American timber exports. Particularly disconcerting were the figures for Canada. 258 Within a year, the Division of Forestry had been created within the Department of Agriculture and Hough named the first chief. As a chief, Hough researched and wrote more reports, while attempting to protect his nascent department from the refuse of the spoils system. Despite Hough’s efforts, his successor in 1885 was, Nathaniel Egleston. Who failed Gifford Pinchot’s definition of masculinity in being “one of those failures in life whom the spoils system is constantly catapulting into responsible positions.” 259 Not

255 For how Franklin B. Hough researched Report upon Forestry at the Library of Congress and through correspondence with numerous foreign legations, as well as through numerous trips into the field, see Franklin B. Hough Diaries, 1873-1883, copies of which are held by the Forest History Society Library and Archives in Durham, North Carolina, and the originals for which are held by the New York State Library, Manuscript and Special Collections, in Albany, New York.
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until 1886 would the first professionally trained forester be appointed chief of the division and he would fair little better in Pinchot’s eyes.

Bernhard Eduard Fernow, a veteran of the internationally recognized Prussian Forest Service, solidified the Division of Forestry within the federal bureaucracy during his tenure as chief from 1886 to 1898. However, despite increased publicity and Congressional allocations, Fernow’s division remained an agency for research and advice rather than a federal land’s management agency. As Fernow described his division in the annual report for 1887:

The work of the Division in the main is to act as a bureau of information. Hitherto such information has naturally consisted in a recital of the methods of forest administration which prevail in Europe and other countries and a presentation of the needs of our country in general, based upon an imperfect knowledge of its forest conditions. Imperfect as this knowledge is even at the present day, it is sufficient to show how wantonly our forest wealth has been and is being squandered and to demonstrate the necessity of concerted and systematic action by the Government and the people to arrest this waste in view of its threatened effects upon the future.

Despite Fernow’s success in helping to foster the 1891 Forest Reserve Act—Section 24 of which authorized the president to reserve forest lands from the public domain—the Division of Forestry remained estranged from land management. Theoretically, the preservation of forest lands within the public domain fell to Division P, the Timber Depredations and Special Services Division of the General Land Office, an agency within the Department of the Interior.

---
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The failure of the General Land Office to act as a land management agency has been as widely recognized by historians as it was documented by contemporaries.²⁶³ John Ise, an historian and forest policy expert, dubbed the period from the 1878 passage of the Free Timber Act to the 1891 Forest Reserve Act an era of “wholesale timber stealing” in his 1920 study of forest law and conservation.²⁶⁴ Each annual report of the Department of the Interior during the period contained dire warnings from enraged land commissioners about the depravities committed by unscrupulous timber companies and bogus entrymen. In 1886, Commissioner William Sparks detailed how a lumber company in northern California openly used farmers, sailors, and anyone else to file claims under the Timber and Stone Act for forest rights. The conspirators would then sell these rights to the company pocketing between $50 and $125. Sparks estimated that three-quarters of claims were fraudulent.²⁶⁵ Outraged at a doubting Congressman, Sparks railed that “not long since an important witness for the government was murdered by employés [sic.] of parties being proceeded against.”²⁶⁶ As the records of Division P attest, too few


government agents guarded to valuable a prize. In 1889, fifty-five agents spent thirty man-years investigating 3,307 cases of timber fraud, 581 of which were timber trespass violations valued at between three and six million dollars. As the authors of the 1897 the National Forest Commission, a presidentially mandated investigatory body nominally under the National Academy of Sciences, concluded,

> The existing methods and forces at the disposal of the Interior Department are entirely inadequate to protect the forests of the public domain. Civil employees, often selected for political reasons and retained in office by political favor, insufficiently paid and without security in their tenure of office, have proved unable to cope with the difficulties of forest protection, and the reserves are practically unguarded.

At the end of Fernow’s tenure, then, the research of Division of Forestry had imbued dozens of reports with Marsh’s call for scientific land management, but had failed to develop into an agency capable of such management.

To Gifford Pinchot research was not enough. As he sought to evolve the Division of Forestry into the Forest Service following his July 1898 appointment as Chief, he established the ideal arboreal civil servant in his own cosmopolitanly masculine image. Royal S. Kellog, who began his career with the Division of Forestry in 1901, remembered Pinchot as having a “very attractive personality [...] as a very gifted and cultured man [...] and [...] as an artist in getting publicity.” As with Allen, Pinchot, or ‘GP’ as his confidants and office employees referred to him, looked to recruit into the

---


Forest Service similarly gifted, cultured, and educated young men who shared his vision of progressive governance.271

The Men from Pennsylvania

Unlike Henry T. Allen and Gifford Pinchot the founders of the Pennsylvania State Police and Forestry Division did not leave the extensive records that enable a clear reconstruction of their evolution as bureaucratic leaders. However, the evidence that has survived demonstrate that John C. Groome and George H. Wirt recruited young men who shared their definition of a rugged masculinity and progressive bureaucratic administration. More importantly, they shared enough of a masculine worldview with Allen and Pinchot to create uniform ideal of masculine bureaucracy.

In appointing Groome to the command of the Pennsylvania State Police, Governor Samuel Pennypacker selected someone with a worldview similar to Allen. John C. Groome was a wealthy Philadelphian who had inherited an estate large enough to enable him to live as a dabbling investor in various wine importation companies. He had risen to the rank of captain in the First Troop of the Philadelphia City Cavalry, where he gained experience suppressing labor riots during the 1890s. During the Spanish-American War, he was given command of the cavalry forces dispatched to Puerto Rico and served, like Allen, in the military government of the island. Also like Allen, he was an avid polo player with a membership at the Philadelphia Country Club. He even organized a polo team within the Philadelphia City Cavalry and led it to victory in

matches against the 6th US Cavalry in 1896. Groome was also considered an excellent shot by his contemporaries and enjoyed trap shooting and hunting. Finally, Groome raced coaches between Philadelphia and New York. With a redolent waxed mustache, he was an archetype of fin-de-siècle masculinity. 272

Groome was also an advocate of progressive governance and supported the expansion within Pennsylvania of a meritocratic civil service. Indeed, in 1905, when he was first offered the command by Pennypacker, he refused until the governor agreed that if he took “the task of organizing the new State Police, there will be no place in the force for political henchmen or ward politicians, no toleration of wire-pulling in any shape.” 273 As you explained to the New York Times in 1912, “a man can be a gentleman as well as a policeman.” 274 Groome would spend most of fifteen-years attempting to recruit, train, and retain troopers to the Pennsylvania State Police that realized his gentlemanly ideal.

George H. Wirt, Pennsylvania’s first State Forester who evolved the Forestry Division into a regulatory agency, shared Groome’s commitment to meritocratic governance. Although from a less illustrious family than Groome, Wirt was able to attend Juniata College and was recruited by his father’s friend, Joseph Rothrock, to the state’s nascent forest service after attending the Biltmore Forest School in North Carolina. As

272 Conti, The Pennsylvania State Police, 44-46.
273 As cited in Conti, The Pennsylvania State Police, 43.
with Pinchot, Wirt enjoyed the outdoors, firearms, and the ruggedness that united these Progressive Era bureaucratic elite in identifying a man.  

**Recruiting Ideals**

The recruitment preferences of the Philippine Constabulary created by Henry T. Allen and the US Forest Service developed by Gifford Pinchot demonstrate that their individual definitions of masculinity were incorporated into the bureaucratic identities they fostered. Each agency was bombarded by hundreds of young men eager to take part in these government experiments. So many young men wrote to these agencies that both Allen and Pinchot approved standardized form-letters that explained to the applicants what an ideal candidate looked like. These bureaucratic documents incorporated Allen’s and Pinchot’s beliefs about masculinity; a man was rugged and embraced the wilderness; a man was cosmopolitan, comfortable in high society and barrack rooms; and the man was capable of working within the rising technocratic administrative state.

**A Man in Khaki and Red**

The importance of Henry T. Allen’s definition of masculinity manifested itself in who he chose to recruit as officers of the Philippine Constabulary. As organized by Allen, the force was comprised of predominantly white officers from the United States and enlisted men drawn from local populations. As the paramilitary police force of the Insular Government of the Philippine Islands, the organization liaised with the United States

---

Army and other agencies of the federal government through the Bureau of Insular Affairs, which was part of the War Department. Unlike the Philippine Scouts or the Bureau of Education, the Philippine Constabulary, like the Philippine Forest Service, operated with near total administrative autonomy from the Bureau of Insular Affairs.276 Between 1901 and 1918 approximately 939 men served as officers with the Philippine Constabulary.277 Whether the young applicants learned about the Philippine Constabulary through word of mouth, through newspapers and journals, or directly from Henry T. Allen through the Bureau of Insular Affairs (BIA), the message was nearly universally the same.278 A career with the Philippine Constabulary was for the educated young man seeking masculine adventures in a tropically exotic environment for the betterment of civilization.

Many of those commissioned in the Philippine Constabulary from the United States did so through the Bureau of Insular Affairs, which rapidly developed a standardized information packet for the inquisitive. Between 1903 and 1909 approximately 420 information requests were received by the BIA from individuals


278 Particularly evidentiary of this was the letter of recommendation from William F. Knox to Frank McIntyre, July 31, 1915, File of Samuel Morris Martin, Case Files of the Philippine Constabulary, Boxes 1-9, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
desirous of employment in the Constabulary, but who were not subsequently employed; demonstrative, at the very least, of the popular interest in the Constabulary. More importantly, that so many Americans expectantly wrote to the BIA, indicates the centrality of the agency in creating and maintaining the image of the Constabulary officer. The information packet was distributed to concerned citizens like Mary W. Kellog, who wrote that she "was much impressed with the manner of their [the Constabulary’s] accomplishments under most trying circumstances, and shall try to bring it to the notice of others in some way—Probably in a talk to the Daughters of the American Revolution." The nascent Colorado Department of Public Safety sought advice on organizing a state police force, while the International Textbook Company inquired into the desirability of publishing preparatory materials for would-be applicants. Major E. S. Benton of the Columbia Military Academy in Tennessee requested "information and literature […] concerning appointments in Philippine Constabulary,” while noting that he had “distributed some previously.” R. P. Palmer of the Kentucky Military Institute and J. Wilson of the New Mexico Military Institute made similar requests and were equally provisioned with application materials. As demonstrated, many of these military

---

279 Philippine Constabulary, Inquiries, Positions, F. 8243-17, Boxes 518-519, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
280 Mary W. Kellog to BIA, January 23, 1917, General Inquiries, Philippine Constabulary, F. 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
281 Frank Adams to BIA, September 10, 1917, & E. K. Roden to BIA, October 12, 1917, General Inquiries, Philippine Constabulary, F. 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
282 E. S. Benton to BIA, January 19, 1915, General Inquiries, Philippine Constabulary, F. 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
283 R. P. Palmer to BIA, January 15, 1915, & J. Wilson, February 4, 1915, General Inquiries, Philippine Constabulary, F. 8243-34, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
institutes developed long standing relationships with the BIA and the Constabulary. Personnel from military institutes, though, were not the only Americans eager to learn of the Constabulary. The image of the Constabulary created by the American media and Henry T. Allen was perpetuated and widely distributed between 1903, when the first packets were generated, and 1918, when the BIA began advising that no further recruiting would be done from the United States as a result of Woodrow Wilson’s “Filipinization” of the archipelago’s Insular Government.284

Although the BIA in Washington, DC, and Henry T. Allen and his successors in the Philippines were constantly changing the materials sent to applicants, the image of the ideal recruit remained as static as the questions asked by would be Constabulary officers.285 In response to these questions, Clarence Edwards, first Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs and a longstanding friend of Allen, responded “that the prospect of promotion are considered good. As to the duties which will be required of you, the Bureau does not feel competent to make specific answer […] however[,] they [officers of Constabulary] will be found in all parts of the Archipelago, performing the duty of

284 General Inquiries, Philippine Constabulary, Parts I through IV, F. 8243-41 through 8243-47, Box 720, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
285 Washington Grayson to Clarence Edwards, July 6, 1903, F. 8028, Box 514, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland; Charles C. Allen to Clarence Edwards, c. July 8, 1903, F. 8041, Box 514, RG 350; Charles P. Hollingsworth to Clarence Edwards, October 3, 1903, F. 8764, Box 530, RG 350; William S. Thompson to Clarence Edwards, October 5, 1903, F. 8787, Box 531, RG 350; Oliver A. Lynch to Clarence Edwards, October 4, 1903, F. 8818, Box 531, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
maintaining peace and order.” 286 For more information, Edwards directed them to General Circular No. 28 from June 21, 1904. 287

General Circular No. 28 was, in fact, an updated version of the “Handbook, Philippine Constabulary” originally created by Henry T. Allen on September 31, 1901, and through which he sought to create an organization in his image. That handbook contained the various acts of the Philippine Commission empowering the Constabulary, as well as the rules and regulations governing the behavior of Constabulary officers. 288 These regulations were eventually combined in subsequent editions of the handbook with the more prosaic descriptions of the Constabulary found in General Circular No. 28. 289 The descriptions of an officer’s duties contained with General Circular No. 28 mirrored the romantic image purported by Allen. The guide noted:

The responsibilities of the Constabulary are heavy, and the duties often include difficult and dangerous field work. The work of Constabulary officers brings them into close contact with the native peoples, including the wild tribes, and […] is most interesting in its nature. 290

286 Clarence Edwards to Washington Grayson, July 11, 1903, F. 8028, Box 514, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland. Similar responses were sent to each of the applicants mentioned in something quite resembling a form letter.

287 Clarence Edwards to Oliver Lynch, c. September 1904, F. 8818, Box 531, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.


289 Manual of the Philippine Constabulary, 1907 (Manila: Government Printing Office, 1906). The 1907 edition of the handbook contained exhaustive procedural information, as well as the contents of the 1901 handbook and General Circular No. 28. These procedures included the tracing and dispatching of cattle and carabao thieves, the maintenance of hygiene and sanitation, and the recruitment of Constabulary rankers. Furthermore, the Manual contained information on how to greet different “wild tribes” officers might encounter throughout the archipelago.

290 General Circular No. 28, “Circulars of the Philippine Constabulary, 1902-1906,” Volume II, Library of Congress. The Library of Congress has most of the General Circulats and General Orders issued by the Philippine Constabulary between 1901 and 1918. These important documents, though, are not housed in the Manuscript Division, but are housed in the general criminology stacks.
A potential officer should have great physical prowess, for the Filipinos “have a wholesome respect for my [Allen’s] physical prowess in chasing them over their stiffest mountains and my rigorous methods in causing them to clean their towns.” The officers also needed to be capable of administrative management, for “as [the Constabulary] progresses […] it becomes more apparent that field men are more abundant than office men. The great desideratum is to be able to combine these qualifications.” Most importantly, though, officers had to avoid the great shibboleth of strong drink: “The greatest obstacle that the Insular Government has to contend with is the absence of sobriety, and we have reached a stage where every man found under the influence of liquor is dismissed or called upon to resign.” Sobriety, physical strength and courage, as well as the intelligence and training to type and administer a complex and pervasive bureaucracy were the hallmarks of masculinity Allen hoped for in the applicants to the Constabulary.

The Philippine Constabulary, through the BIA, perpetuated the popular conception of adventure amidst the exotic “wild tribes.” The weather was downplayed, being no worse than “the summer months in many parts of the States” and of no danger to “the general health of Americans who take reasonable care of themselves,” while the low cost of living was emphasized. Applicants were further reminded by General Circular No. 28 that they were expected to pass an examination. The examination would

determine not only their overall suitability to the Constabulary, but also their relative rank within their cohort and any specialized duties they might be assigned. Fields included grammar, diction, arithmetic, geography, history, constitutional government, and physique. The questions further belied the themes of exoticism and historical importance, making sure that applicants understood the meaning of civilization, “a state of being civilized,” and the definition of a villain, “a vile person, knave, a scoundrel.” 294 History included such questions as “What was the nature of the early government of Rome?” and “Who was Oliver Cromwell, and what did he establish?,” while constitutional government asked “What is meant by due process of law?” 295 The very questions presented to the inquiring applicant emphasized the importance of the Constabulary in maintaining the due process of law against villains in the preservation of a civilization that descended from classical antiquity through the English Civil War. Furthermore, the questions presented during the physical examination notified the potential applicant that loose morality would not be accepted; questions included, “Do you drink intoxicating liquors? If so, to what extent?” and “Have you had any swelling about or of your testicles?,” as well as “Have you found your health or habits to interfere with your success in civil life?” 296 Throughout the application and examination material Henry T. Allen and his successors repeated the message that candidates were taking part in an

295 Ibid.
296 Ibid.
undertaking of historical importance in an exotic location where even the lowliest official could live well, albeit morally so.297

As the Constabulary matured as a bureaucratic entity, the material it was able to provide potential applicants became more nuanced and direct. In October 1908, J. G. Harbord, a Colonel and Acting Chief of the Constabulary, forwarded to the BIA copies of a lecture he had given in July of that year to the cadets of the Constabulary School. He noted in his covering letter, “It is thought that possibly you may be able to make use of these in connection with your search for suitable candidates for appointment from the several military colleges of the country. Possibly, this pamphlet answers many questions that are ordinarily asked by the heads of those institutions.”298 The lecture, an address by Harbord before the graduating class of the Constabulary School on July 30, 1908, contained in four points the themes outlined in General Circular No. 28. First, Harbord noted that “there are few men of good red blood and right instincts who in youth are not attracted to the profession of arms […]. The glamour of the uniform, the glitter of arms, the jingle of accoutrements, the spice of danger, and the love of authority and command decide many a man’s choice for life.”299 Harbord promised the graduating officers, and through the BIA potential applicants, the colonial adventure already luridly described by the American print media. Furthermore, Harbord continued the historicity of General Circular No. 28: “It seems to me that you are on the threshold of a splendid opportunity.

---

297 See also, Rev. L. B. Hillis, “The Preservation of the Moral Health of the Young Officer,” July 20, 1903, F. 1184-93, Box 174, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.
298 J. G. Harbord to BIA, October 12, 1908, F. 1184-87, Box 174, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
299 J. G. Harbord, “The Philippine Constabulary as a Career,” Constabulary School Notes, No. 1, 1, F. 1184-88, Box 174, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
It is for you to prepare yourselves to grasp it. It is the day of great events, of fascinating history now in the making. You are chosen instruments of the world’s greatest republic in working out a problem without precedent among the nations.” Such rhetoric would have potentially unimaginable allure for a military institute graduate whose other options might include clerical work, teaching, or government service as an agricultural inspector.

Second, Harbord emphasized that while the Constabulary was not a career for financial enrichment, it was also not a career that would lead to destitution. Promotion from 3rd Lt. to Captain took approximately four and a half years at which point an applicant could expect a salary of $1,600.00, which was twenty dollars less than a Class III Clerk in any of the federal executive agencies and a thousand dollars less than a 2nd Lieutenant in the United States Army, but one hundred dollars more than a sergeant of the New York City Police Department. In addition, Harbord emphasized the importance of the officers’ pension fund for retirement and disabilities. Third, Harbord declared, “The Constabulary, in my opinion, is as permanent as our Government of these Islands.” In fact, Harbord indicated a belief that the Philippines would eventually become permanently integrated into the United States political system. The colonial relationship might in some distant future end, but the political relationship and the

---

300 Ibid., 12.
302 J. G. Harbord, “The Philippine Constabulary as a Career,” 3-5, Constabulary School Notes, No. 1, 1, F. 1184-88, Box 174, RG 350, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, Maryland.
303 Ibid., 6.
Constabulary would endure. Finally, Harbord stressed the importance of the Constabulary officer to “stimulate the moral sense of the whole community; his studious habits are an inspiration to a people whose thirst for education and knowledge are greater than any other [...]. His superior knowledge, especially in matters connected with self-government and American institutions, makes him the mentor of every ambitious student and the advisor of every politician honestly striving for his country’s good.” Here, then, was the opportunity for the applicant to civilize, to uplift, the benighted Filipinos and shoulder “the white man’s burden.” An applicant for the Philippine Constabulary could find a similar leitmotif of heroic adventure, gallant leadership, and civilizing carnage in America’s newspapers, journals, and dime novels.

Early coverage of the Constabulary in the American press generally hailed the enterprise as a success and papers were quick to report engagements between “bolomen” and, invariably, outnumbered American officers and their Filipino rankers. The press typically described the activities of the Constabulary as “vigorous” and “aggressive,” as inflicting many casualties and suffering none, as an agency, in short, that celebrated masculinity. Within a few years such terminology became endemic to Constabulary coverage as demonstrated by the full page exposé published by the San Francisco Call on

---

304 Ibid., 8.
305 Ibid.
306 Rudyard Kipling, The Writings in Prose and Verse of Rudyard Kipling, V. XXI (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1903), 78.
December 2, 1906. Beneath a bold banner proclaiming, “Heroes of the Philippine Constabulary: Never did dime novel thrill more than these exploits of brave leaders of the native civil police,” were photographs of various mustachioed, crisply uniformed officers towering over their equally resplendent native rankers. An image of native people’s corpses, captioned “where the Constabulary cleared the way,” was flanked by an illustration of a lone, crisply uniformed officer gunning down a series of swarthy assailants armed with bolos and clothed with ragged loincloths. In explanation of these images, Hamilton Wright, the author of the article, claimed:

The constabulary for the last six or seven years has been quietly at work all over the islands anticipating crime naturally following in the wake of war by arresting malefactors, making friends with and educating them industrially by showing them ‘how the white man does things,’ and, in fact contributing to peace by constructive as well as by limitation of crime. [...] The constabulary is an all-round organization, and the American officers in charge have to be all-round good men. [...] Amazing adventures have occurred to some of the officers of the Philippine Constabulary; in fact, they are occurring every day.311

Here, then, was the civilizing mission of the Constabulary imbedded within alluring tales of heroic, masculine adventures.

The first of Wright’s adventures involved a “Lieutenant William Schermerhorn” who was “a big, strong, resolute, twinkle-eyed Scotchman” standing “six feet two in his

309 Contemporaneously, ranker referred to an enlisted man or noncommissioned officer of the Constabulary or any military organization. A ladrone was corrupted from the Spanish word for outlaw and was applied to armed bands of thieves. Ladrones were differentiated from insurgents or insurrectionaries, who had political motivations. A boloman was a combatant armed with a bolo, a stout club occasionally fortified with metal spikes or protruding nails. A Pronouncing Gazetteer and Geographical Dictionary of the Philippine Islands, United States of America, with Maps, Charts, and Illustrations, also the Law of Civil Government in the Philippine Islands Passed by Congress and Approved by the President, July 1, 1902, with Complete Index (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902).

310 Evidence indicates that Hamilton Wright served, or at least applied to serve, with the Philippine Constabulary, “Philippine Constabulary, Applicants,” Index to the General Files of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, Boxes 1-93, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

“stocking feet,” a “well-built mass of bone and sinew.” While leading a patrol along a narrow jungle path, Schermerhorn was ambushed, forced to cut three of his fingers from his own hand, wrestle a long knife from an assailant, kill five other attackers, rally his panicked men, and arrest two other would be foes. Potential applicants, though, could rest assured that Schermerhorn was “well and strong” and had retired as a “manager of a great plantation in the peaceful, faraway Cagayan Valley.” Another young lieutenant, Levi E. Case, governed, with the aid of “forty Filipino soldiers […]” 115,000 Igorrotes, the most vigorous race in the entire Malay Archipelago.” Accordingly, Case had the same natives who killed a thousand Spanish troops “building roads, trails and bridges, […] cultivating market truck and putting up schools.” Other officers, according to Hamilton, singlehandedly recaptured steamships and suppressed mutinies or killed scores of ladrones with nothing more than a revolver and a bicycle. \(^{312}\) The leitmotif of Wright’s description of the officers of the Philippine Constabulary was, therefore, that of rugged individuals performing acts of heroism against racially differentiated thieves, while helping other racially differentiated populations, such as the Igorrotes, attain positivistic civilization through roads, schools, and market agriculture. \(^{313}\)

\(^{312}\) Ibid.

\(^{313}\) Positivism herein refers to the philosophy of individuals like August Comte who argued that civilization and progress were inherently linked to scientific and material advances such as the number of miles of steam railway, number of feet of telegraphic wire, and other quantifiable measurements. August Comte and Positivism: Essential Writings, Gertrud Lenzer, ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, 1998, 2004), xxxi.

Adventure through civilization-uplifting masculine heroism, though, was not the only appeal the potential applicant might find in the media’s portrayal of the Philippine Constabulary. The Constabulary officer was also portrayed as a colonial official enjoying a lifestyle unimaginable for a contemporary police officer in the United States. In the Philippines, the junior level bureaucrat could enjoy polo and big game hunting. Henry T. Allen was an inveterate polo player. Upon his return from inspecting the Russo-Japanese War in Manchuria, the Manila Town Topics lyrically chided, “Let polo ponies chomp their bits—/ For Allen’s coming back […] He now can chase the polo ball.”314 Within a week of his reported return Allen did in fact record having spent a day at the polo pitch and was subsequently chided in the colonial press.315 Allen’s polo fixation, though, was not limited to the Manila pundits. Across the Pacific, his polo antics were testament to the benefits of colonialism. David Gray, writing for Outing: An Illustrated Monthly Magazine of Recreation, felt that the most pleasant aspect of Manila life were the daily games of polo to be found on the Luneta Field from November to June.316 Indeed, General Allen’s prized pony, Gawky, received several photos and the author’s general praise, while its Filipino groom was racially demeaned as being of less value than the horse by being described as “the little brother of an orang-outang.”317 More important than the Constabulary’s polo rivalry with the Marine Corps offices stationed at Cavite,

315 Entry for Saturday, May 7, 1904, Diary 1904, Box 1, Papers of Henry T. Allen, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
316 David Gray, “Polo in the Philippines,” Outing: An Illustrated Monthly Magazine of Recreation, 44.3 (June 1904), 365.
317 Ibid., 366.
though, was the article’s portrayal of the comforts and privileges available to the colonial official. That Allen, the titular head of the Constabulary, should have a personal groom detailed to him would not have surprised anyone, but the same article confided that a certain Captain Langhorne’s string of ponies was similarly attended and included a prize pony purchased from the Sultan of Jolo. Comforts of government service in the colonies, thus, included servants and polo.

According to other sources, comforts of the Constabulary included such class ideals as big game hunting and the occasional wayward fiancé. As the *St. Louis Republic* noted, “When 6,000 miles of blue ocean separates him from his sweetheart [Annie R. Mitchell], and there are army officers [Benjamin L. Smith of the Constabulary] around to keep her from getting lonesome, a young St. Louisan has learned that love’s bounds are not always secure.” Indeed, Benjamin L. Smith, the son of a confectioner from Iowa, married Annie R. Mitchell, the daughter of an American government official stationed in Manila; however, the readers of the *Republic* never learned that in 1907, having attained a captaincy in the Constabulary, he left his wife in Houston, Texas, and disappeared into the wilds of Paris, France. The popular conception of a career as a Constabulary officer was, therefore, a combination of masculine adventure, civilizing-uplift, and colonial comforts including recreational sports and sexual allure.

---

320 Bureau of Insular Affairs to W. H. Smith, November 7, 1907, F. 6178, Box 439, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Recommending Wool Socks

As with the Constabulary, the US Forest Service received hundreds of letters addressed to Gifford Pinchot inquiring how the would-be foresters could go about realizing their dream of an arboreal-themed government career. Also paralleling the Constabulary, many, if not most, of the young men wrote to Pinchot as students, but instead of writing from military academies they wrote from state agricultural colleges and universities, from the private forestry academy at Biltmore, and from the Yale Forest School.\(^{321}\) The government career-specific curriculum of the Yale Forest School, the relationship between the head of the Forest Service and the school, and the career paths of the graduates mirrored those found at the Allen’s Constabulary school at the Santa Lucia barracks near Intramuros.\(^{322}\) The Yale Forest School, created by a generous endowment from the Pinchot family, featured courses taught by Gifford Pinchot. The graduates, armed with recommendations from Henry S. Graves, were almost entirely employed by either Pinchot’s federal forest service or one of the many nascent state forest services established with his advice. Indeed, most of the alumni of the Yale Forest School during the first decade enjoyed spending an entire summer camped upon the grounds of the Pinchot’s family estate in Milford, Pennsylvania.\(^{323}\)

---

\(^{321}\) These letters are found in 55 boxes of the General Correspondence of the Forest Service, 1898-1908, Office of the Chief, General Records, Records of the Forest Service, RG 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.

\(^{322}\) Papers of John Robert White, Philippine Constabulary Collection, Manuscripts and Archives Division, Library of the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

\(^{323}\) Evidence of the importance of Gifford Pinchot to the Yale Forest School and of the Yale Forest School and Gifford Pinchot to the creation of numerous state forest agencies—particularly bureaus in Wisconsin and Connecticut—can be found in RG 43, RU 40, RU 748, and the Papers of Henry S. Graves, Yale University Manuscript and Archives, New Haven, Connecticut.
Gifford Pinchot was an acknowledged master of manipulating the press and throughout his tenure as Chief Forester kept his agency well-covered in the national journals and leading newspapers.\textsuperscript{324} From his appointment in 1898, he repeatedly publicized his image of American forestry and the American forester.\textsuperscript{325} Emblematic of how Pinchot became his own ideal was the description of Pinchot provided in \textit{The Outer’s Book: A Magazine of Outdoor Interest}, which portrayed the Yale University-educated patrician as equally at home in either the splendor of his Washington, DC, mansion or in “pushing through the underbrush, scrambling up foothills and climbing mountain slopes that would exhaust many a stronger man.”\textsuperscript{326} That Herbert Smith, an assistant within Pinchot’s Forest Service, was specifically charged with cultivating this image was illustrated by his dutifully clipping the article and adding it to a file filled with other descriptions of the rugged patrician scientist.\textsuperscript{327}

Hundreds of would-be foresters wrote to Gifford Pinchot after an article appeared in the February 9, 1901, \textit{Saturday Evening Post} detailing the exciting possibilities of a career with the newly reconstituted Bureau of Forestry.\textsuperscript{328} George H. Cecil, a 23-year-old clerk in his family’s Maryland store, was one of the young men who excitedly wrote to Pinchot for instructions on how to become a federal forester. Pinchot and Cecil’s

\textsuperscript{324} Several historians have dealt with this and for an example, see McGeary, \textit{Gifford Pinchot}, 126.
\textsuperscript{325} Gifford Pinchot to Forest Supervisors, April 26, 1907, File 164, RG 95.4, Records of the Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{327} Pinchot, \textit{Breaking New Ground}, 304-306.
\textsuperscript{328} René Bache, “Forestry, the New Profession,” \textit{The Saturday Evening Post}, February 9, 1901.
correspondence grew from a few form letters to lengthy discussions of the young man’s dreams and disappointments in government service.\footnote{Letters between George H. Cecil and Gifford Pinchot, 1901-1905, General Correspondence of the Forest Service, 1898-1908, Office of the Chief, General Records, Records of the Forest Service, RG 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.; Carl Alwin Shenck, \textit{The Biltmore Immortals}, Vol. I (Dermstadt, Germany: L. C. Wittich, 1953). 71-73. Other examples of being inspired by the \textit{Saturday Evening Post} article are A C. Barbehem to Gifford Pinchot, February 18, 1901; L. W. Barnes to Gifford Pinchot, February 14, 1901; Harry A. Bailey to Gifford Pinchot, February 15, 1901; Ernest H. Ball to Gifford Pinchot, March 11, 1901; Charles Blackburn to Gifford Pinchot, February 18, 1901; Charles Blanchard to Gifford Pinchot, January 8, 1901; William F. Burns to Forest Service, February 15, 1901; Alfred C. Burrill to Gifford Pinchot, April 10, 1901; Ralph Butcher to Gifford Pinchot, February 18, 1901; H. R. Butler to Gifford Pinchot, February 18, 1901; Clarence E. Campbell to Gifford Pinchot, February 16, 1901; Ernest William Campbell to Gifford Pinchot, February 19, 1901; George H. Cecil to Gifford Pinchot, March 25, 1901; Bert L. Dane to Gifford Pinchot, February 25, 1901; Albert J. Davis to Gifford Pinchot, March 10, 1902; L. C. Dewey to Gifford Pinchot, April 23, 1901; Ona Gaskill to Gifford Pinchot, April 30, 1901; F. A. Gathorne to Gifford Pinchot, May 6, 1901; Benjamin R. Geiss, Arlington to Gifford Pinchot, April 1, 1901; A. C. Hawkins to Gifford Pinchot, April 23, 1901; J. E. Hawthorne to Gifford Pinchot, February 12, 1901, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.} The District of Columbia’s \textit{Washington Star}, though, captured the power of Pinchot’s construct best when run a simple headline in 1909, “Pinchot Their Ideal.”\footnote{“Pinchot Their Ideal,” \textit{Washington Star}, District of Columbia, February 23, 1909, in Newspaper Clippings Folder, Records of the Office of the Chief, Records Relating to Gifford Pinchot, Box VII, 95.2, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.} The image Pinchot created of a rugged, masculine figure striding through the woods dispensing governance resonated.

Indeed the image may have resonated too much given the deluge of applicants Pinchot had for the Student Assistant Program. By 1910 upwards of six hundred young men applied for fewer than forty summer positions. Most of the inquirers had little experience in scientific forestry and so were directed—generally on behalf of Gifford Pinchot by his chief assistant, Overton W. Price—to apply to the student forester program. For nearly a decade, Pinchot and Price invited young men with limited backgrounds in forestry who wanted to “rough it” to apply for one of forty to sixty temporary summer positions assisting Pinchot’s forestry teams in the field mapping and
appraising government and private forests, conducting experiments at forestry stations, and managing the growing number of federal forest reserves. Recipients of the coveted positions were advised by Gifford Pinchot to pack their own camp blanket, as well as “heavy boots, plenty of socks (he advised) woolen socks), and rough clothes.”331 Those capable of keeping up with the hiking and rugged living conditions, capable of not making trouble in camps often shared with lumbermen, and capable of submitting, on time, their reports—on forest conditions, sick leave, holiday leave, medical costs, supplies, and expenses—were invited to continue working for the Forest Service during the winter or the following summer.332

All who wrote to the Forest Service during Pinchot’s tenure about employment were invited to read General Circular No. 23 of the Forest Service of the United States’ Department of Agriculture. As with the Philippine Constabulary’s General Circular No. 28, General Circular No. 23 was written by Gifford Pinchot and Overton W. Price to inform the inquisitive about careers with the Forest Service. Accordingly, the work of the student assistants was described as “severe, monotonous, and often [entailing] some hardship,” requiring “lumbermen’s hours,” and “cheerful obedience to orders.” Potential applicants were admonished that “laziness or discontent [was] fatal to camp discipline and to effective work.” Physically unfit students or those prone to shirking would not be

331 Gifford Pinchot to E. P. Bailey, June 20, 1901, General Correspondence of the Forest Service, 1898-1908, Office of the Chief, General Records, Records of the Forest Service, RG 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
332 “Suggestions to Prospective Forest Students,” General Circular No. 23, Forest Service, United States’ Department of Agriculture, General Correspondence of the Forest Service, 1898-1908, Office of the Chief, General Records, Records of the Forest Service, RG 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
retained: “bodily soundness and endurance [were] absolutely essential.” But, the pamphlet teased, for those rugged enough to excel and capable—both financially and intellectually—of successfully completing a university course in forestry, there awaited a promising civil service career as a forester. For those who were rugged, though, not able to attend a forest school, the position of forest ranger was highlighted as ideal for those with less than patrician means. Either as a forester or as a ranger, though, the applicant worked to fulfill the masculine ideals of Gifford Pinchot.

In February 1914, Pinchot condensed his more than decade long experience with constructing a recruitment ideal into a single volume, *The Training of a Forester*. Dedicated to Overton W. Price, manager of the Washington, DC, office of the US Forest Service, and upon whom Pinchot felt was due “the high efficiency” of the agency, the slender volume drew together his collected advice to would be foresters.333 Pinchot prefaced his argument with a series of questions to the would-be forester: “What is forestry? If he takes it up, what will his work be, and where? Does it in fact offer the satisfying type of outdoor life which it appears to offer? What chance does it present for a successful career, for a career of genuine usefulness, and what is the chance to make a living? Is he fitted for it in character, mind, and body? If so, what training does he need?”334 In answering these questions for the potential recruit, Pinchot created the ideal candidate against whom all were measured.

---

The Forester was, without question, a man. One with a technocratic education that no amount of field experience could replace. He was not afraid of the wilderness and saw in the scientific management of forests the preservation of civilization.335 Pinchot’s ideal, like Pinchot, understood that the Forester’s work would be harvested long after he was gone: “The idea of using the forest first for the greatest good of the present generation, and then for the greatest good of succeeding generations through the long future of the nation and the race—that is the Forester’s point of view.”336 Without the Forester, there could be no future.337

Throughout the manual, the would-be Forester was reminded that his profession was ruggedly masculine. At length Pinchot explained,

Forestry differs from most professions in this, that it requires as much vigor of body as it does vigor of mind. The sort of man to which it appeals, and which it seeks, is the man with high powers of observation who does not shrink from responsibility and whose mental vigor is balanced by physical strength and hardiness. The man who takes up forestry should be little interested in his own personal comfort, and should have endurance enough to stand severe physical work accompanied by mental labor equally exhausting.338

Only the vigorous man, Pinchot went on, could fully become a part of the “American Foresters,” who “are united” in an “esprit de corps.”339 A spirit that was acknowledged as being reserved for Americans, “for the practicing Forester must handle men as well as trees.”340 Gifford Pinchot had created a lasting image of what a good Forester should-be.

335 Ibid., 22.
336 Ibid., 24.
337 Ibid, 18-19.
338 Ibid., 63-64.
339 Ibid., 66.
340 Ibid., 69.
Henry T. Allen, Gifford Pinchot, and others used their lived experiences to create idealized images of government employees. Through their leadership agencies as seemingly disparate as the Philippine Constabulary and the US Forest Service that created normative identities, which defined good employees as ruggedly masculine paragons of the new technocratic administrative state and bad employees as unhealthy, slovenly drunkards unable to survive in the ever present wilderness. Regardless of the mission, these leaders agreed that strenuous men were required.
IV

Training the Bureaucrat
Training mattered. Discipline mattered. The administrative leaders of the Progressive Era who created ideal employee images used innovative training methods and disciplinary regimes to reinforce a bureaucratic masculinity. Frederick Winslow Taylor’s 1911 *The Principles of Scientific Management* and Charles De Lano Hine’s 1912 *Modern Organization: An Exposition of the Unit System* have dominated the historiographical conversations about the evolution of modern management systems. But progressive managers had no shortage of experts professing secrets in motivating workers from industrial laborers to office clerks, from Philippine Constabulary officers to federal foresters.341 Historiographically, Taylor and his disciples’ theories have been debated since the 1920s, but absent from these conversations has been the efficiency cult’s influence on bureaucratic identity formation.342

---


the pages of *Popular Science*, frequently noted in both Allen and Pinchot’s musings on their reading habits, contained exploratory calls for scientific management and the need for robust company training programs for clerks.343 By 1907, Clarence M. Woolley, president of the American Radiator Company, was able to organize an edited volume of expert essays on “how to find, select, and hire men” published by the Business Man’s Library.344 By 1914—after the sensation around Taylor during the Eastern Rate Case—J. William Schulze confidently asserted that “an office manager who desires to build and maintain an intelligent, result-getting office force, must necessarily train his employees, or at least influence them to train themselves.”345

The training programs developed by government agencies, though, did far more than advocate standardized clerical formatting and filing systems. Through these routinized activities bureaucratic identities were created. Who was a good employee of the Progressive Era state? Who was a bad agent of government? The apparati of the efficiency cult were used by administrative elites to create and police these identities. The narrative of the new administrative state has hinged upon the rise of meritocratic technocrats—partisans of subject expertise rather than political parties—who proactively managed the public domain, from colonial subjects to public lands. In so constructing the narrative of the administrative state, historians like Daniel P. Carpenter and Stephen

343 The issue also contained two lengthy articles on naturalist matters, one on barberries by Frederick LeRoy Sargent and another on hummingbirds as pollinators. Floyd Davis, “Science as a Means of Human Culture,” *Popular Science* 45.44 (September 1894), 668.
Skowronek have ignored the importance of building not just bureaucracies, but bureaucrats.346

Through bureaucratic normative identities the following chapter moves beyond the narrative of the modern administrative state during the Progressive Era as expansionary, autonomous, and professionalized. Determining who were good and bad officers of the Philippine Constabulary, troopers of the Pennsylvania State Police, and foresters in the United States Forest Service and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division is possible by examining the ephemera of these hallmark administrative agencies. Each of these agencies constructed schools to train young men to be an idealized image of government agent. Circulars, as well as handbooks and manuals, were distributed to remind these young men to act like their agency’s ideal. Finally, punishments and promotions were meted out as consequences of bad and good behavior, which were defined by the ideal. A government-man was a powerful idea.


Training programs, circulars, and disciplinary actions—all hallmarks of the modern administrative state—were used to reinforce the image of a government agent as an ideal man. The agents of the modern state could not fall sway to effete, individual-denying, automatism despite striving for ever more efficiency and centralization. Thus, creating bureaucrats—the essential agents of the Progressive Era’s ever-expanding and more-autonomous administrative state—occurred in tandem with creating the modern man. Through the language of scientific management the builders of the administrative state created and reinforced the recruitment ideals of the government-man as rugged and, at least with aspirations to be, of the middling sort.

**Training an Image**

Upon recruitment into the Philippine Constabulary, the US Forest Service, or a state agency, would-be agents of governance were taught an identity by their bureaucracy. These training programs included the elaborate formal schools established for the officers of the Philippine Constabulary at Baguio, Benguet, and the foresters of Pennsylvania at Mont Alto. More experimental programs were developed by the Gifford Pinchot’s US Forest Service, which encompassed a proto-internship and summer encampment. The Pennsylvania State Police under John C. Groome tried on-the-job courses. While all of these efforts shared a desire to establish common practices—how to submit supply requests, what expenses could be reimbursed, proper procedures for filing a report—training turned a man into a government-man. Government-men were clean and sober. Government-men spoke clearly and with authority. Government-men
understood the law in order to enforce the law. At all times, the government-man was aware of the ideal he had been recruited to be. His training sought to make him that ideal.

*The Young Teniente*

Henry T. Allen oversaw two phases of recruitment to the Philippine Constabulary, both of which emphasized a similar ideal. An officer in Allen’s colonial paramilitary police force had to embody the ideals of scientific management—efficient, literate, and disciplined—and the rugged masculinity he thought crucial to pacifying and governing the archipelago. During the first phase of recruiting officers—known as inspectors—Henry T. Allen directly interviewed applicants and briefed successful candidates. With the second phase, Allen and his headquarters staff created a more formal recruitment process involving an examination similar to other contemporaneous civil service exams and an official school. The interviews, examinations, and formal training attempted to exclude the hard-drinking, inadequately educated, unhygienic, and morally weak who might jeopardize the American imperial nation building project in the Philippines. In so doing, the image of the Constabulary officer—of the government-man—was one of Progressive Era masculinity, rugged and sober, strenuous and hygienic, independent and bureaucratic.

The first leaders of the Constabulary were recruited from the junior and noncommissioned officers of the Volunteer Army units dispatched to Manila in the wake of George Dewey’s naval victory. By June 1902, eleven months after the Constabulary was created, Allen had recruited 193 officers committed, at the very least, to not
immediately returning to the United States. 347 Those from the volunteer army units had accepted a significant pay cut in signing a two year contract and, according to Allen’s biographer, Heath Twitchell, Jr., “could have been lured only by the prospect of more adventure.” 348 Each of these would be adventurers faced an interview with Allen in his high-ceilinged office, decorated with bolos, spears, and shields. 349 From behind his uncluttered desk, Allen would ask the applicants a series of questions, concluding with, “Do you drink?” In one widely distributed anecdote, a veteran of the volunteers responded, “I drink all I want, and at any time I want. But […] drunk or sober, I can fight like Hell!” While, in these early interviews, Allen was concerned with creating a moral officer corps—hence the sobriety question—he was impressed by overt declarations of masculinity and hired the self-proclaimed drunkard. 350 Indeed, he recruited enough such characters that by late-1902 he was implementing a radically different training policy.

In August 1902, Allen implemented an examination for all applicants to the officer ranks of the Constabulary, which was expanded in early 1903 into a formal program of training—or ‘seasoning’ as the cadets called it—for the recruits drawn straight from American military academies. Clarence R. Edwards, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, was informed by Allen in January 1903, that he had “now in Manila a so-

349 Ibid.
called Headquarters Troop wherein I am educating non-commissioned officers and also giving Inspectors a chance to learn what it is to be the standard of officers in the Constabulary.”  

Allen went on to outline his plans for a “military school here” that in time he thought might be opened to “the Filipinos, wherein bright young natives might be made efficient leaders for […] the […] Constabulary.” Indeed, he noted, “it is a fact vouched for by a number of the natives here that no Filipino officer under the Spanish regime in the regular establishment went over to the insurrectos.” While the Constabulary school would eventually become part of Filipinozation, the turning over of the Insular Government’s civil service to Filipino elites, after 1912, for the foundational decade of the service it was a means of preserving a colonial masculine identity.

While a formal service school was still a dream, Allen articulated his vision of the ideal officer through General Orders No. 78, 1904 Series. Indeed, the order was cited in his annual report as evidence that “the quality of officers is being constantly improved.” The order detailed the eight provisions that each applicant would be subjected to, which included citizenship and age restrictions, education or experience requirements, physical aptitude, personal habits, and knowledge of essential subject matters. Seven of these categories were graded out of 100, multiplied by the categories weight, and then the summative average used to provide the candidate with a score.

---
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The man most likely to score highly on the examination would have required study at an American academy or, more likely, a college, which were the prerogatives of the middle and elite classes.\(^{355}\) English grammar, history, and physique were weighted at three, while constitutional law and geography were weighted at two, mathematics at four, and “aptitude and probability efficiency” at five.\(^{356}\) Wherever possible, Allen localized the problems for would-be recruits. The examination preparatory guide listed, “Asylum: A charitable institution; as, an asylum for the deaf,” “Philippines: The name of a group of islands,” and “Civilization: The state of being civilized,” as potential spelling challenges. Arithmetic included a series of problems including calculating a farmer’s commission on selling hemp and the decline of an inheritance through fractional spending. The examples provided for Geography emphasized Europe—“Name the bodies of water surrounding Europe”—and the United States—“Name the principal mountain ranges crossed by going by rail from New York to San Francisco; state the rail route assumed and States through which it passes.” Given that by 1907 many of the applicants would have travelled from military academies in the Eastern United States recounting the rail route should have been a straightforward exercise based on experience, similar to the question about


naming the waters traversed by a steamer sailing from New York to Manila via the Suez Canal.\textsuperscript{357}

History, like geography, similarly emphasized a Euro-American middleclass worldview:

1. What were the differential characteristics between the people of the Virginia and Massachusetts colonies at the beginning of the Revolution?
2. What political parties were formed soon after the election of Washington as President?
3. Tell the story of the annexation of Texas.
4. Give the territorial boundaries of the United States as set forth in the treaty of 1783.
5. Explain the struggle in Congress which led to the passage of the bill called the ‘Missouri Compromise.’
6. Discuss the battle of Gettysburg and its results.
7. Who were the Pilgrims?
8. Where did each of the following events occur:
   a. Meeting of the first Colonial Congress.
   b. Burgoyne’s surrender.
   c. Arnold’s treason.
9. What was the character of the Spartan people and the nature of their government?
10. What was the nature of the early government of Rome?
11. Who was Augustus Caesar? What were the principle events in his career?
12. Who was Oliver Cromwell, and what did he establish?
13. When and under what circumstance was the new German Empire founded?\textsuperscript{358}

These questions mirrored the history curricula of most American four-year academies and colleges, which required a year of ancient history focusing upon the Grecian city-states, a year of Roman history taught through the perspectives of civilizational rise and fall, a year of modern European history beginning with the Reformation and culminating with Napoleon Bonaparte, and finally a year of modern history including the United States and the creation of Germany and Italy.\textsuperscript{359} Building-upon the history section were questions on Constitutional Law, which tested the applicants’ knowledge of the

\textsuperscript{357} Circular No. 34, June 4, 1907, Bureau of Constabulary, Papers of Henry Gilsheuser, Collection AX325, Box 1, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\textsuperscript{358} Ibid.
government of the United States. To wit, “Give an outline of the judicial system of the United States” or “How is the power of the President to appoint Federal, civil, or military officers limited and regulated” or “What is meant by ‘due process of law’.” These questions would have automatically excluded non-European educated Filipinos and the majority of the non-commissioned officers from the US volunteer units. To understand the world through the questions posed to the Constabulary’s applicants, was to understand the world as a college educated—or at least exposed—middle class American.

The examination, though, went beyond making sure that the officers were intellectually meted to the Constabulary’s ideals. At the end of the written examinations, the applicants were subjected to a physical examination. Here the applicants were stripped by a medical examiner and asked the nationality of their fathers, if they had any detrimental “health or habits to interfere with [their] success in civil life,” whether they drank “intoxicating liquors” and, if so, “to what extent,” and whether they “had a sore of any kind upon [their] penis, and when,” as well as if they had “any swelling about or of [their] testicles.” Alcoholism and syphilis, therefore, were inconsistent with the applicants to the Constabulary just as these maladies were shunned from other aspiring middle-class organization. To score well on Allen’s examination was to more closely align mentally, physically, and morally with the ideal Constabulary officer.

The Constabulary School established in Baguio, Benguet, continued the identity formation process and the normalizing of Allen’s bureaucratic ideal. Posted and widely

360 Circular No. 34, June 4, 1907, Bureau of Constabulary, Papers of Henry Gilsheuser, Collection AX325, Box 1, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
circulated—at least within the service—school regulations emphasized cleanliness of body and spirit. Article 6 stipulated that “each officer will provide himself with individual soap dish and towels, which he will keep in his own apartment when not in use,” while Article 9 placed the “good order and sanitary cleanliness” of the dormitory and its residents under the purview of a dormitory commandant.362 Article 13 noted that “officers are [expected] to observe a gentlemanly demeanor at all times,” which was defined as “conformity” to the “garrison uniform.” In a nod to the climate, officers were permitted to “dispense with the blouse and shoes while studying in the DINING ROOM, but in all such cases will wear an overshirt of some kind or a kimono and chinelas or slippers.” So dressed, though, officers were forbidden from the assembly room and, emphasized in bold, “suitable and proper clothes” were to be worn to and from the baths.363 John Robert White, an oft-heroically stylized English mercenary turned senior Constabulary officer, admonished the “cadets of the first class at the Constabulary Academy” on the importance of “cleaning squad rooms,” asking the cadets how they expected to “keep soldiers clean if you don’t know how to keep clean yourselves?” After an emphasizing “thump” he continued,

All you [are] eager to help in building up the Filipino nation. No nation was ever yet built up by getting other people to do the work or by feeling that work of any kind is dishonorable. If there is one thing that can keep back the Filipino people it is the muchedumbre system. If any cadet after what I have said still feels humiliated I shall be glad to help him clean up his part of the room personally.364

363 Ibid., 7. Chinelas, Spanish in origin, resembled what are colloquially known as flip-flops today.
364 Muchedumbre, literally crowd, here refers to a caste system in which a small group of overlords rules over a larger population through systems of entitlements. Handwritten notes entitled,
Being properly dressed and clean—so central to the identity of the Constabulary’s officers—was directly linked to the success of the American nation building project in the archipelago. An officer, running naked to the bathhouse, was hardly an impressive figure of imperial policing.

Throughout their time at the Constabulary School, instructors emphasized themes of decorum. An “advice to cadets just appointed” bulletin posted in the school’s barracks, reminded the officers that “a few days ago you were schoolboys or college students. You could dress as you please; you could arise in the morning at whatever hour suited your convenience; while at night you could retire [...] as you saw fit.” By entering into the Constabulary, such liberties were abandoned: uniforms required, hours fixed and regulated, “in all things you must do as you are told.” In explaining why these conditions were, the bulletin—written by John R. White—argued that “whatever wrong any one of you may henceforth commit, whatever act unworthy of a gentleman, will reflect not on the individual alone but on the whole Philippine Constabulary. [...] Where one represents the whole there must be uniformity of training.”

Inculcation into the bureaucratic identity was central to the Constabulary School curriculum. The requirement to memorize the Constabulary Regulations from the *Manual for the Philippine Constabulary*, known to cadets as “that little red book,” the criminal laws of the Philippine Islands, the court procedures, and the geography and topography of the archipelago enabled the cadets to

---
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conceptualize the organization’s mission and, more importantly, what the ideal officer contributed to that mission.\textsuperscript{366} Without the ideal, the officers would have had no comparative for their own efforts; no understanding of how their actions could be judged good or bad.

The centerpiece of instruction at the academy was “Constabulary Ethics.” Constabulary Ethics were described as the “study of the moral obligations of a Constabulary officer.” These obligations went beyond “those of any gentleman” to “comprise” the officer’s “special obligations as a peace officer and a soldier combined.”\textsuperscript{367} Central to the Constabulary Ethics was the fear that without such mental fortitude the officers of the Constabulary would experience a “softening to physical and moral fibers.”\textsuperscript{368} As White explained, the American serving as an officer in the Constabulary was faced with two countervailing ailments, which he dubbed “the Call of the East” and “Filipinitis.”\textsuperscript{369} The first was an imperial romanticism: “To the American newly arrived in the islands all is exotic—utterly different from his accustomed life. […] Let him go to the provinces, to some remote pueblo or barrio; for him the hand of time has then been turned back some centuries. He is in the Middle Ages, both as regards the everyday conveniences of life, the customs and the habits of thought of the people around him.”\textsuperscript{370} Furthermore, those subject to the “Call” were “embraced in that brotherhood […] of the American community in the Philippines,” which White defined as the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{366} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{367} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{368} John Roberts White, “The Call of the East: A Partial Analysis,” Document 300-09.1, Papers of John Robert White, Collection AX192, Box 6, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\item \textsuperscript{369} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{370} \textit{Ibid.}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
unconscious mentality “formed wherever a small band of aliens is found in the midst of an indigenous race. Racial interests are then intensified and solidified. The soul of even the dullest glows with a new concept of race and country.”

Constabulary Ethics sought to inculcate the “Call” within the officers, thereby making breaches of conduct detrimental to the American state building agenda—like alienating local populations through racially motivated excessive police violence and corruption—socially prohibitive. The action of the individual American officer reflected upon the collective American population and the civilizing mission of the Philippine Constabulary as the armed force of the Insular Government.

The second of White’s ailments, “Filipinitis,” also featured prominently in the Constabulary Ethics regime. “Filipinitis,” the enervating impact of living within a tropical climate, was the passive killer of the civilizing mission, the rot at the center of the Insular Government. As the American officer became comfortable in the Philippines, he would become “less strenuous physically, less enquiring and quick of mind—in every way less exacting of the code and ethics of the north.” Indeed, White warned that in seeking the masculine adventure of the “Call,” many would fall prey to the “lethargy” and “laziness of mind and body” that “extended residence in the Philippines causes the American.”

Upon returning home, those who answered the “Call” and succumbed to “Filipinitis” were unable to comprehend the “rush and roar of American business and
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social life” and would soon start “pinning for the less strenuous life of the south.”\textsuperscript{373} Of course, if the officer did not succumb to “Filipinitis” then, as with all of the “strenuous ones,” collapse, “neurasthenia or tuberculosis,” was inevitable.\textsuperscript{374} To combat Filipinitis, though, the Constabulary Ethics emphasized cleanliness through the regimes—moral, fitness, and hygienic—imbedded within the identity of each officer.

The result of the Constabulary School according to William Cameron Forbes was a “fine set of young men.”\textsuperscript{375} According to C. P. Hollingsworth, an early graduate of Allen’s training programs, the result was the creation of a Constabulary officer society distinct from the Army’s that favored the hard drinking ex-non-commissioned volunteer officers.\textsuperscript{376} Creating the normatives that defined Forbes’ ‘fine’ and Hollingsworth’s Constabulary society was the purpose of Allen’s training programs. Far more than just a program in how to fill out forms and submit reports, the Constabulary School established the bureaucratic identity for the service’s officers.

\textit{Gifford Pinchot’s Student Assistant Program}

Gifford Pinchot’s US Forest Service shared government-man ideal, but with differences that highlighted the class divide between the Foresters and Forest Rangers. Under Pinchot, the Forest Service evolved from a federal research service into a public land management agency, and in so doing developed two career tracks. Although individuals moved from the Foresters’ career path to that of the Forest Rangers and vice
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versa as jobs were made available, the training programs developed by Pinchot highlighted these as two separate and not equally valued career paths. Through the Student Assistant Program and other training regimens, a Forester was conceptualized as a college-educated government-man modelled upon Pinchot and other social elites of the conservation movement. The Forest Ranger identity within Pinchot’s burgeoning bureaucracy was that of a laborer, albeit an informed one with managerial potential. Pinchot developed one of the first government internship programs for the Foresters, which recruited applicants from leading universities across the United States, enabling a thorough vetting of future career employees and a deep applicant pool. Forest Rangers, however, were recruited locally, trained in an ad-hoc fashion by local forest preserve supervisors, and were never given the individualized attention that Pinchot lavished on his Foresters. While both career paths were united by a bureaucratically reinforced government-man identity, the identity was divided between the aspirational Forester and the laboring Forest Ranger.

Hundreds of would-be Foresters applied each year for one of the coveted Student Assistant Positions with Gifford Pinchot’s widely heralded Bureau of Forestry and, after 1905, with the US Forest Service. Pinchot started the program in 1899 with thirty-three students expanding to sixty-nine in 1900 and nearly three hundred in 1902. By 1903, Pinchot had delegated most of the program’s administration to Overton W. Price, his executive assistant in the Washington, DC, headquarters, who for the first time rejected more applicants than he was able to accept. Indeed, Pinchot mused at a Service Committee meeting that the Student Assistant Program might have become too
successful and thereafter more restrictions—educational requirements, term limits, civil service examinations—were imposed. Many of the applicants became enamored with the idea of being a Student Assistant from reading René Bache’s “Forestry, the New Profession” in the February 9, 1901, *Saturday Evening Post*. The applicants wrote from across the United States, from large cities and small towns, from the denuded Northeast to the plains of the Midwest. Almost universally, they described themselves as in their twenties, of good health and modest means, passionate about the woods and eager to learn. All of them—indeed everyone who applied for the Student Assistant Program—addressed their inquiries directly to Gifford Pinchot, some noting little more than his government title and Washington, DC. Each spring, then, the leaders of the Forest Bureau would determine who would begin a career and who would receive the rejection form letter.

While the Student Assistance Program had all of the appearances of Progressive Era meritocracy, success required access to an educationally determined patronage

---
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Despite the hundreds of assurances to potential applicants that Pinchot and Price mailed out, the reality was that in order to gain acceptance into the program, particularly after 1903, students would need more than just a familiarity with the woods and a bit of formal education in the natural sciences. Correspondence between Pinchot and Price at the Forest Bureau and R. T. Fisher and Henry S. Graves at Harvard University and Yale University, respectively, indicate that without a recommendation from the latter an application had little chance of success. R. T. Fisher’s recommendations came to fill an entire file, while Price at times complained of how difficult it was to have Graves finalize his list. In May 1906, Graves, after much prodding from Price, finally forwarded the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. B. Barrows</td>
<td>Younger and less mature than average. Has great capacity for detail. Almost a genius in statistics but ability for independent work not proved. He should be given silvical or similar work under immediate direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Bruins</td>
<td>Has applied for Wisconsin work. Is shy, doesn’t make a very good impression at first. Is a hard worker, a good scholar, but is a poor penman. Judgment in woods good. Is somewhat apt to jump to conclusions. Is showing up finely in spring work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. T. Dana</td>
<td>A very fine scholar and fine fellow. Hardworker, systematic, thorough and reliable. I want him for the New Haven R. R. work if it goes through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. B. Kellogg</td>
<td>Of rather mediocre ability, but very faithful, reliable man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. R. MacGuffey</td>
<td>Very earnest, hardworking man, but is a poor scholar and superficial. Must be kept under immediate direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. Martin</td>
<td>Very good field man. His work in class room has been mediocre. He probably has not done himself justice. He has executive ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. T. Mason</td>
<td>Naturally brilliant. Gets along well with men. Does not impress me as a hard worker nor as very thorough. Best kept under direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Davis</td>
<td>Much the same kind of man as Dana. Both are rather young, but capable of work like that of New Haven R. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Foster</td>
<td>Very capable. Somewhat older and more experienced that average. Able to do independent work up to extent of his training, i.e. one year’s work at Forest School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

B. T. Harvey 3. A big husky football player. Lacks application and hence is not thorough. Can’t do independent work. Must be under immediate direction and assigned to some practical work like valuation surveys.

√ L. S. Murphy 1. A fine fellow, hardworking, more mature than average, some business experience. Very reliable. Able to do independent work. Somewhat deaf.

C. S. Wilber 3. Work at school exceedingly poor. Is not a hardworker, not thorough, not ambitious I think that he has considerable undeveloped capacity. He deserves an appointment, but under immediate direction. [Handwritten in pencil:] Is doing capital work now in field after my talks with him. He will be all right.

√ H. A. Winkenwerder 1. Has taught school. A fine botanist, seems to me a thoroughly reliable man. [Handwritten in pencil:] Send him Wisconsin if possible.


J. F. Bitner was fired last year. Don’t appoint him. 381

The check marks were made by Overton Price and indicate the students that were accepted into the program. Graves’ requests for the New Hampshire railroad work referred to the timber-surveying he was leading that summer for the Forest Service; he was not only selecting the applicants, but was deciding which ones would work for him. The list highlights the image of the Forester government-man: hardworking, reliable, intelligent, and, most limiting, college educated.

The purpose of the Student Assistant Program was, according to E. T. Allen, to “get the Harvard rubbed off the students before they came in contact with the loggers.” 382

In addition to providing career pathways for men like Arthur C. Ringland, Coert DuBois, and George H. Cecil, the program taught these men a rugged masculinity—“rubbed the Harvard off”—that Gifford Pinchot defined as integral to the identity of the federal


Forester. Royal S. Kellog, who worked for the Forest Service from 1901 to 1910, recalled that while the “Service didn’t have to go out and hunt for men very much,” making sure that these would be foresters were good government-men was more difficult.\[384\]

Kellogg was, according to Pinchot’s ideal, a quintessential good government-man. He had been recruited by William Hall, with whom he had attended the Kansas State Agricultural College and an early and avid supporter of Pinchot, as a student assistant in 1901. Borrowing $50.00 from a relation, Kellogg moved to Washington, DC, where his first task was to assist Hall in selecting the other student assistants that would be assigned to Nebraska for the 1901 field season: “Will Hall and I went together and picked out young fellows we wanted to put into the Western Nebraska study. I had charge of them. We had plenty of applications. And it was a group that made good only one went back to school teaching. All the others stayed in forestry.”\[385\] Once in the field, Hall, Kellogg, and their recruits surveyed the Sand Hill region of Nebraska. As he recalled the party resembled a group of enthusiastic campers: “We all had horses and we had a good man to drive the team of mules, chuck wagon, and cook for us, and we made a survey of all that western […] country. […] I rode my own cow pony two thousand miles in charge of that


\[384\] Royal D. Kellogg, Oral History Interview, Interviewed by Elwood Maunder, February 9, 1959, Forest History Society Archives, Durham, North Carolina.

expedition that summer of 1901.” As the camp work was taken care of by “a good man,” the student assistants were free to survey and record their observations in mandatory daily journal entries.

Not all of the student assistants, though, were able or willing to confirm to Pinchot’s construction of the good forester as Royal Kellogg. Student assistants were most often criticized for either failing to confirm to Pinchot’s image of rugged masculinity or to his idealized construction of the scientific government administrator, of the technocrat. As each student assistant was assigned to a field party for the summer season, it was the responsibility of the field party leader—usually an assistant forester who reported directly to Pinchot—to report the suitability of each student to the demands of the Forest Bureau. Henry Grinnell, a career forester with the service, reported in 1902, “I would not advise you to consider Holroyd’s application favorably, for he is the kind of man that we want to avoid I think. He is a bull headed worker, very slow, and inaccurate and as dull and stupid as possible.” However capable of a woodsman Holroyd might have been, Grinnell obviously found him intellectually incapable of the technocratic service Pinchot expected from his bureaucrats. Many of the applicants, though, did not even possess Holroyd’s ruggedness. Hubert Hagar and W. M. Balfour were both rejected owing to their unsuitability to the hardships of camp-life. William Strobridge, whose

---
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387 Henry Grinnell to Overton W. Price, August 31, 1902, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
388 W. M. Balfour to Bureau of Forestry, October 7, 1906; Hubert Hagar to Gifford Pinchot, December 10, 1904, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
friend Lewis S. Halsam petitioned Pinchot to give him a chance, hoped to escape life as an engineer in a Pittsburg iron mill, which was having a deleterious impact upon his health. Pinchot responded tersely, “that Student Assistants must be prepared to combine severe mental work with severe bodily labor under conditions which make each peculiarly trying, and that bodily soundness and endurance are absolutely essential for those who take up the work. It would be impossible [...] to appoint a man whose health is impaired, even in the slightest degree.”

Ruggedness and intelligence would not be enough, though, as the student assistant program evolved.

William Herbert Haines, heir apparent of Haines & Company Lumber Dealers of Buffalo, New York, was critiqued for not being as passionately committed to forestry as a profession as Pinchot demanded. Overton W. Price explained to Haines and his father—who had written an angry letter demanding an explanation as to why his son had not received an appointment—that “when working with him in the Adirondacks [...] he gave me to understand that he had not fully decided to take up forestry; in the Black Hills last summer, he stated to Mr. Griffith that his present intention was to take up lumbering and that he considered his work as Student Assistant exceedingly useful toward that end.”

Despite Williams’ impassioned retort that he had “no intention of going into lumbering” and explanation that in the Black Hills “pretty much every form of business was talked over about camp [...] , more stock raising [...] than anything else, though one man wished

---

389 Lewis S. Haslam to Gifford Pinchot, April 29, 1903; Gifford Pinchot to Lewis S. Haslam, May 1, 1903, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
390 Overton W. Price to Alfred Haines, April 29, 1901, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
to raise frogs and mushrooms and fatten turkeys by driving them through Kansas,” his application was relegated to the wait list until he was appointed to a field party in the Adirondacks late in the season. The 1901 season was his last as an agent of Gifford Pinchot.\(^{391}\) Intellect and passionate commitment were not the only requirements of Pinchot’s would be arboreal technocrats.

As the number of applicants to the student assistant program increased, swelling to over 700 a year by 1903, Pinchot’s ideal increasingly excluded the self-taught in favor of those from Yale University, other elite universities, or certain state agricultural programs. As demonstrated by Henry S. Graves, best qualified increasingly denoted those trained by close associates of Gifford Pinchot. Despite having read an extensive list of material recommended by Overton W. Price over several years, F. M. Eaton was repeatedly rejected from the student assistant program for not having the formal forestry education enshrined by Pinchot at the Yale Forest School.\(^{392}\)

Similarly, despite Pinchot’s work in George Washington Vanderbilt’s technically managed forests surrounding Biltmore, the estate’s forestry school directed by Dr. Carl A. Schenk never met technocratic ideals of the Forest Bureau. As early as 1901, Pinchot only reluctantly recommended the Biltmore Forestry School to Charles Gilman, a Harvard-trained lawyer and aspiring forester. Having informed Pinchot that his courses at Harvard were mostly “mostly History and English, and [he would] have to begin at the

\(^{391}\) William P. Haines to Overton W. Price, April 27, 1901, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\(^{392}\) Correspondence between F. M. Eaton and Overton W. Price, 1904-1906, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
bottom,” he was informed: “The Biltmore forest is the oldest example of practical forestry on a large scale in this country, and is instructive in a great many ways. The Yale and Cornell Forest Schools, however, offer a better opportunity for thorough training in forestry, since their courses are longer than at Biltmore and their equipment more complete.” As the Forest Bureau evolved into the Forest Service, Pinchot’s respect for the Biltmore Forest School deteriorated, mostly as a result of the greater number of university level programs in forestry, particularly at state agricultural colleges, and because of his opposition to Schenk’s support for Wilheminian Germany’s aggressive foreign policy. Indeed, by 1906, Pinchot could only recommend Biltmore for some post-graduate work and not for a complete training regimen in the arboreal sciences. The student assistant program created by Pinchot, therefore, enforced upon federal foresters a bureaucratic identity emphasizing rugged masculinity, passion for forestry as a profession, and technical knowledge confirmed by access to specific university programs.

In contrast to the technocratic foresters, the training regimen developed for Forest Rangers emphasized de-centralization, local expertise, and a rugged masculinity divorced from educational certifications. Gifford Pinchot did not devote attention to the Forest Rangers until after the 1905 government reorganization amalgamated his research-focused Forest Bureau with the forest preserve land management duties of the

393 Charles S. Gilman to Gifford Pinchot, October 6, 1901; Gifford Pinchot to Charles S. Gilman, October 9, 1901, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
394 Pinchot, Breaking New Ground, 154.
Department of the Interior’s Division P and thereby creating the US Forest Service. As Forest Ranger Elliot Barker recalled, the Rangers of the early 1900s were “a combination ranch-and-cowboy type of men, mostly with limited education” that contrasted with the technocratic foresters. The forest rangers, Barker boasted, “were rugged enough to meet any situation” and “without [whom] trained foresters could never have done” what they did. Smith C. Bartrum had been able to secure a Forest Ranger position after meeting Binger Hermann, Commissioner of the General Land Office, in June 1898, while the latter was on holiday in Roseburg, Oregon, near Bartrum’s farm. Hermann asked Bartrum to meet him at his home where he told him, “I have had you in mind for some time in connection with our new Bureau of Forest Service, […] we are just organizing it. I have been talking with our mutual friend A. C. Marsters and others and they agree with me, that you are a logical man, being a vigorous and practical young man, you would fit into this work splendid; I can arrange a Forest Ranger position for you now right on the start.” As Bartrum’s recruitment story demonstrates, Forest Rangers relied upon local political patronage networks as opposed to the educational patronage networks of the Foresters. How the Forest Rangers defined their ruggedness, though, was determined by the training, limited though it may have been, they received.

In contrast to the Foresters, the Forest Rangers both before and immediately after their placement within Gifford Pinchot’s administrative purview were minimally trained.

---
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While the Foresters were subject to collegial programs influenced, if not established, by Pinchot and a student training program, the Forest Rangers were often simply handed a letter of instruction from their immediate supervisor at the forest reserve. As Gila Forest Supervisor McClure wrote Charles T. McGlone in 1903, he was to provide himself with “a pocket compass, camp outfit, axe, shovel, and pick or mattock,” familiarize himself with the “Manual,” and conduct “regular patrol service.”399 Once the forest reserves were transferred to Gifford Pinchot’s US Forest Service in 1905, the localized recruitment and training continued albeit with a civil service examination overlay. Henry L. Benham, who was hired as a Forest Guard in 1907 and became a Forest Ranger after taking the civil service examination a year later, recalled,

Well, we had a little written test to find out what you knew about surveying, if anything, and mining. It wasn't too big a test. What they wanted to know mostly was whether a man was able to ride the range and see that the cowmen and the sheep men stayed on their own allotments. They gave you a paper about the duties of a Forest Ranger, and it was a pretty good description. You had to ride and be able to take care of yourself out in the open in all kinds of weather.400

The civil service examination, then, continued to emphasize the rugged man who could ride the range.

Jay L. B. Taylor, an early Forest Ranger and author of the widely used Handbook for Rangers and Woodsmen, listed the many skills of the ranger as including riding, laying telephone lines and managing field telephone systems, constructing trails and roads, building cabins and shelters, painting, general carpentry, estimating timber,

surveying, field cooking, caring for the various livestock animals found in the reserves, and treating ailments and injuries. His manual, compiled from reports and circulars written by other Forest Service employees, emphasized the laboring, albeit skilled laboring, identity constructed through training initiations and materials for Forest Rangers. While the Foresters may, therefore, have been provided with a more technocratic training regimen than the Forest Rangers, both were inculcated with an employee identity determined by the bureaucratic elite through programs and manuals that emphasized a particular image of the government-man.

*A Trooper and a Gentleman in Pennsylvania*

The directors of federal agencies like Pinchot and Allen were not alone in experimenting with bureau schools and training programs. In Pennsylvania, with one of the most advanced administrative bureaucracies, the Department of State Police contemporaneously created recruitment programs similar to the regimens developed by the administrative elite of the Philippine Constabulary and the US Forest Service. The Pennsylvania Department of State Police, also known colloquially as the Constabulary, was the political creation of Governor Samuel W. Pennypacker. Frustrated by the performance of private industry security forces and the state’s National Guard during the 1902 labor strikes in the anthracite coal fields, Pennypacker ushered enabling legislation through the state’s government in early 1905.401 The gentlemanly Superintendent of the

---

State Police, John C. Groome, a former captain in the Pennsylvania National Guard’s elitist Philadelphia City Cavalry, created a recruitment and training program that reinforced his vision of the ideal police trooper. In July 1905, Groome began recruiting for the 228 positions authorized by Pennypacker’s legislation and within a month had over one thousand applications.402

The one thousand applicants were subjected to a physical examination, a mental examination, and a character examination similar to that devised by the Philippine Constabulary. Through a careful examination of the applicants’ references, Groome selected men who embodied the qualities he would describe later thusly:

A man who does not know the population of Rome, the height of the Himalaya Mountains, or whether the Duke of Wellington was a man, a trotting horse, or a brand of smoking tobacco, I’ll teach him all that is required of a state policeman. He must be fearless, have a good character, and a whole lot of common sense. If he can read and write and do simple sums in everyday arithmetic, he is fit educationally, to maintain order and prevent crime.403

To follow through on his promise to “teach all that is required,” Groome developed a training program at the Pottsville Barracks analogous to the Philippine Constabulary’s officer school and the US Forest Service’s student trainee program. Over the course of four months the Pennsylvania Constabulary troopers undertook courses in physical exercise, marksmanship and riding, as well as criminal, game, road, health, and forest laws of the state. The training regimen developed by Groome reinforced the recruitment ideal that each state constable would be a tough, disciplined man unafraid of violence and

---

403 The following quotes and discussion of John C. Groome’s training regimen come from, Paul Willard Garrett, “The Pennsylvania State Police,” New Jersey Bureau of State Research, 5.3.3 (November 1917), 1-16.
capable of meting out justice in a professional manner. As Groome reminded his troopers through additional lectures and classes, “A man can be a gentleman as well as a policeman. He must treat everybody with respect. If he starts after a criminal, he MUST get him. He must never fail save in self-defense. He must never strike a prisoner after an arrest, and Each Constable Must Be Equal to One Hundred Foreigners.” Throughout his tenure as superintendent, Groome developed and defended the idealized image of the State Police as law enforcement professionals, servants of public order, and the sort of bureaucratic government-men required by modern industrial society. Indeed, no amount of contrary evidence or questions from US Senators could sway Groome to denouncing the Pennsylvania State Police as anything but the realization of his ideal.404

How to Grow Foresters in Pennsylvania

Governor Pennypacker, though, was not content with creating the first state police force. By radically reshaping in 1903 the mission of the state’s Division of Forestry, he created a bureaucratic need for technically trained state foresters. The original Division of Forestry under the direction of Commissioner Joseph Rothrock had, like Fernow’s federal Division of Forestry, investigated the condition of Pennsylvania’s timbered land and issued biannual recommendations beginning in 1895. Much of Rothrock’s activity included surveying land for acquisition as forest reserves by the state under P.L. 11 and P.L. 98 of 1897 and 1899, respectively. By 1902 the over half-million acres owned by the state required more aggressive administration, which—combined with more frequent

flooding and forest fires—provided the impetus for the appointment of George Herman Wirt as the State Forester. Wirt’s first objective was to create the government-men capable of more aggressive administration.

To create such government-men, Wirt under the direction of Rothrock started the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy at Mont Alto. A Biltmore School of Forestry alum, Wirt created a German-inspired forestry school assisted by at least one, Paul E. Arnold, instructor who had been trained at the Tharandt Forest Academy in Saxony. Wirt and his fellow instructors, though, created a hybridized program at Mont Alto that incorporated the practicum and field components of the Germanic Biltmore and Tharandt schools with the educational professionalism of Yale’s fledgling forestry school. The curriculum created by these first instructors was approved by the Forestry Reserve Commission on June 4, 1902, and by the state legislature on May 13, 1903, after which the first class was admitted. Political pressure from rural state legislators resulted in the first class of students at Mont Alto “to be composed of young men from the wooded districts with practical woods experience,” but Wirt “soon recognized that these men were often unable to do the mental work required in a study of scientific forestry and the entrance requirements were made strictly competitive with both physical and mental ability

---

entering into the test." The examination—similar to the Philippine Constabulary’s—was composed of questions demonstrative of having completed a contemporaneous college preparatory program. Bellying the meritocratic nature of entire program, the covered each student’s tuition, room, and board; although applicants were required to provide a $500.00 bond with sureties, which was forfeited to the state if the program was not completed or a graduate refused employment with the Department of Forestry. Until 1929 when the campus was acquired by the Pennsylvania State College, the School of Forestry melded technical classroom instruction with rugged out-of-door practical experiences to “develop men who love the forest, for a successful forester […] should not be lonesome in the forest, but instead find continuous contentment in his extensive out-door laboratory.”

As with the Philippine Constabulary’s initial officer cadre, the Pennsylvania foresters were white. Further, such an image was reinforced through the training program at the State Forest Academy. Ralph E. Brock was one of the earliest documented African American foresters in the United States. Corresponding with Commissioner Rothrock, Brock was appointed student assistant by Governor William A. Stone in 1902 and in May

---

406 *State Forest Academy*, Pennsylvania Department of Forestry (Harrisburg: J. L. L. Kuhn, 1918), 6-7.
409 *State Forest Academy*, Pennsylvania Department of Forestry (Harrisburg: J. L. L. Kuhn, 1918), 14-15.
1903, after passing the entrance examination, was admitted into the inaugural class at the Mont Alto academy.411

Graduating with six other students in 1906, Brock worked for the Department of Forestry until March 1, 1911, when he resigned. Wirt suggested that Brock resigned because one of the other state employees at Mont Alto would not “work beside a Negro anytime, and he got the other fellows all ‘het’ up and it resulted in a couple of fistfights over at the nursery.”412 Edwin Ziegler, who replaced Wirt as the Mont Alto academy director in 1910, attributed Brock’s resignation to negligence in the managing of the nursery facilities at the school.413 Rothrock, with whom Brock maintained a lasting relationship, recorded in his diary simply that his friend “to leave state service and do for himself in West Chester.”414 Given the frequent publication of Brock’s technical reports and articles in the Forest Leaves, the publication of the Pennsylvania Forestry Association, Ziegler’s allegations of negligence appear spurious. As demonstrated by Eric S. Ellin’s study of the Wilsonian administration’s deliberate re-segregation of the federal government in the 1910s, African American government employees were subjected to a number of racial stressors including earning disparities and promotional

Ralph E. Brock’s idealization of Pennsylvania’s arboreal bureaucratic elite—Commissioner Rothrock and State Forester Wirt—and his inability to realize these institutionalized ideals demonstrates that government-men in Pennsylvania would, as historian Eric S. Yellin has described within the Wilsonian federal service, be white. While the Philippine Constabulary, the US Forest Service, the agencies of Pennsylvania, and the urban police forces differed widely in their daily duties, the bureaucratic elite that established, reformed, and commanded these agencies shared a common problem: How to guarantee a unified response across time and space by differing individuals? The solution was to provide an unprecedented amount of training for civilian—however paramilitarized—government employees that reduced individuality. In so doing, these elite-created training regimes turned rugged activities glorified by the contemporary press as archetypally and strenuously masculine into bureaucratic identities. To maintain these identities, these bureaucracies were ever vigilant for deviants.

The Writing of Bureaucratic Conscience

Were the Progressive Era administrative state possessed of corporeal form, it would be made of circulars, handbooks, and manuals. Bureaucratic empires—real, imagined, and academic—were built, administered, quantified, and defined through these

---

anonymous odes to the passive voice. Through such standardized missives, bureaucratic elites were able to praise the heroic, chastise the negligent, and publicly condemn the guilty. Often issued daily and delivered in near simultaneity across vast distances through the efficiencies of post and telegraph, written ephemera reminded each member of the agency what the bureaucratic mission and identity was. Manuals, handbooks, circulars, and an assortment of referential guides enabled different men separated geographically and temporally to act as one entity, to think as a single bureaucratic agency. For the Constabulary, there were reams of circulars and the ubiquitous manual. For the Forest Service, there were circulars and the ever expanding ‘Use Book.’ All of these were the written manifestations of bureaucratic identities.

**When Empire Writes**

The preamble of the Philippine Constabulary’s “Handbook” ominously concluded that “nothing contrary to the tenor thereof will be enjoined in any part of the [service] by any commander whomsoever,” but the “regulations, manual of discipline, and code of

---

rules” outlined within and so studiously memorized by the officer trainees were part of an evolving agency-wide conversation. That conversation happened through circulars. Between August 1901 and April 1907, the Constabulary issued more than 330 “Circular Letters” that discussed the duties of each officer and trooper, clarified and reminded these agents of empire of the law and their task of enforcing it, and prodded the agents into improving their skills as imperial “peace officers.” Pinned to hundreds of office notice boards and filed into the cabinets of desks from Manila to Kiangan the circulars created a forum for bureaucratic identity formation.

The bulk of Constabulary’s bureaucratic ephemera dealt with aspects of duty or what these agents of empire were supposed to be doing and how they were supposed to be doing it. All of the versions of the Constabulary’s “Handbook” opened with Act No. 175 of the Insular Government of the Philippine Islands, which was drafted by Henry T. Allen and approved by William Howard Taft. While in section after section the Constabulary Act detailed how the organization was to be structured and staffed, uniformed and armed, paid and distributed, the specifics of how the organization was “to be peace officers […] authorized and empowered to prevent and suppress brigandage, unlawful assemblies, riots, insurrections and other breaches of the peace and violations of law” were left undefined.418 The conversations maintained through the circulars, then, addressed the specifics of how someone went about being a “peace officer.” After five years of working as an armed Constabulary, Attorney-General Gregorio Araneta issued Circular Letter No. 53 to clarify what a “peace officer” was. After consulting both the

“Standard Dictionary” and “Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary,” he determined that “the term ‘peace officer’ is one of common use, but its use in law is not clearly defined; it is not defined in the laws or legislation of these islands, and there appears to be no common law definition of the term.” The Attorney-General had been asked to adjudicate a case in which a “Constabulary soldier” had “absented himself from his command without leave” and when confronted by “a sergeant and private of Constabulary” resisted arrest “with an open knife.” At issue was whether the absentee soldier was punishable as a citizen of the Insular Government for resisting a “peace officer” or was he punishable as a member of the Constabulary for resisting a superior officer. In short, was the Constabulary a military organization with its own justice system, or an armed organization subject to the civil courts? The Attorney-General concluded that in disciplining the behavior of Constabulary men, members were not acting as “peace officers” and were therefore not subject to the civil courts.419 These bureaucratic missives defined what the Constabulary was and who the officers were.

The more mundane reminders conveyed through the circulars emphasized the importance of the Constabulary officer as the frontline of American governance in the Philippines. Constabulary officers were to count lepers, maintain supply stores for civil officials “including school teachers,” survey all government buildings within their jurisdiction, and correct and maintain all provincial maps.420 The locating and monitoring
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420 Circular Letter No. 7, November 6, 1901; Circular Letter No. 3, September 22, 1901; Circular Letter No. 10, November 23, 1902; Circular Letter No. 19, March 15, 1902, from Circulars of the
of all public wells fell under the jurisdiction of Constabulary officers as was the inspection of coinage to prevent counterfeiting.\textsuperscript{421} Senior inspectors acted as justices of peace and thereby administered oaths, affidavits, and certifications.\textsuperscript{422} During the 1905 cholera epidemic, Constabulary officers were instructed to provide instruction to the citizenry within their district on how to prevent the spread of the disease, focusing particularly on teaching school children.\textsuperscript{423} The quality of food was placed under the purvey of Constabulary officers who were instructed to ensure that diseased meat, particularly horse, was not sold for human consumption.\textsuperscript{424} Even the way in which Constabulary officers were to report and format information was controlled through circulars. Circular No. 25 of June 22, 1902, evolved into a standardized form submitted periodically to the central office in Manila and requested a minutia of information ranging from the date the officer arrived at that station to the number of miles covered by each patrol. These lists were eventually compiled into quantitative data laden reports against which the accomplishments of the entire Constabulary were judged.\textsuperscript{425} The success of each individual Constabulary officer was, then, directly linked to the completion and accuracy of these forms. As the circulars reminded everyone, the good

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Constabulary officer did not just perform his duty—whether policing horsemeat or recruiting spies—but quantified that duty, tabulated that duty, and reported that duty.

Periodically circulars reminded officers of the importance of not only acting as governing agents, but of looking like governing agents. Regular bathing was advocated for hygiene, particularly during epidemics of cholera, dysentery, typhoid, or other diseases. Uniforms were a nearly ubiquitous subject. Proper dress attire, including white blouse shirts and clean undergarments, was repeatedly stressed. Certain shades of khaki were explicitly banned, while campaign hats were conscribed to the field and “marine corps hat cords” were outright banned. The exact design and placing of buttons was explained in Article V of the “Handbook” as was the appropriate time to wear the officer’s white uniform, the proper color of red for the uniform’s trouser legs, the correct locations upon the belt of field accoutrements like canteens, revolvers, and swords, as well as what could be left off of the belt when remaining at the post. The “wearing of red underwear” was prohibited. Indeed, the physical appearance of the Constabulary officers was so highly regulated that the subject was treated satirized by at least one Manila editor. As the wit quipped, “Soon to be Sabered Satraps/Allen Insular Army Officers Will Wear Swords/.../With my sabre at my side/I’m Henry Allen’s...
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430 Circular No. 33, Jun 3, 1907, Bureau of Constabulary, Papers of Henry Gilsheuser, Collection AX325, Box 1, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
They are nice, long, blunt edged sabers, with a deal of decorative work upon their flat sides. They are of the sort used by courtiers at state receptions such as those given occasionally when the Tsar is holding forth in his palace on the Neva. If you hit hard enough you might break a ladron’s skull with one of them but you would have to choose a thin skull and strike with deadly strength and fury.  

Little humor was expressed, though, in Circular No. 6, which chastised officers for having office hours in cluttered or dirty work spaces. If “six and one-half hours of labor each day” were to be spent in a space, that space would be kept clean. The image of a meticulous, uniform agent of government was, then, created and regulated through the Constabulary’s circulars regardless of how much humor these efforts enjoined.

Throughout the Constabulary’s circulars the Manila headquarters staff enshrined the importance of individual improvement into the officer identity. Central to improvement for the officers were linguistic skills. Henry T. Allen had busily worked to provide “premiums for learning native dialects.” Frequently, officers were asked to report their “attainments” regarding the Spanish language or “the prevailing local dialect” with special attention to their ability to translate. Indeed, a poor officer was one who did not with alacrity learn at least Spanish. As one circular noted, “It is […] made incumbent upon all Inspectors to take up this matter with a view to becoming proficient,
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as soon as possible, in the subjects here indicated.” 435 Being able to communicate with
the subjects of the insular government was paired with having something to communicate
to them. Circulars repeatedly emphasized that the successful officer understood the law
and could articulate that understanding. Officers were reminded that cases would be
inadmissible if they neglected “to appear as witness in any case submitted by him, when
regularly subpoenaed, or who neglects to be present and to assist in the trial of a case
submitted by him.” 436 Furthermore, if officers understood the law, they would be less
likely to create intragovernmental problems. As one circular testily noted, “Complaints
have been received at these headquarters that on occasions officers of Constabulary and
Scouts have interfered in the administration of provincial and municipal affairs. […]
Officers serving with the Civil Government […] should at all times be polite and
respectful toward such authorities, encouraging and assisting whenever it is possible.”
Volunteering political opinions, participating in fractious quarrels, or in any way
alienating the local officials was demonstrative of an improperly commanded station.
Any officer making allegations of “inefficiency or disloyalty” against local officials was
to be “prepared to substantiate his statement by evidence” or face the strictest of
disciplinary actions. So important was the issue considered in Manila, that the circular
carried the rejoinder to “carefully” study the material provided and make sure that

435 Circular No. 12, October 16, 1902, from Circulars of the Philippine Constabulary, Vol. I:
436 Circular No. 27, June 17, 1904, from Circulars of the Philippine Constabulary, Vol. II: 1902-
everyone understood the matter.  

A similar circular, almost exactly a year later, specifically addressing the relationship between Constabulary officers and governors, further emphasized the theme of cooperating with and being supportive of the local governmental administrations. Indeed, so many circulars pertained to legal clarification questions in 1906 that the Manila office finally recommended that all officers read “Hawley’s manual on the ‘Law of Arrest,’ and Underhill’s ‘Treatise on the Law of Criminal Evidence.’” The good officer was actively encouraged to improve himself.

Through handbooks, manuals, and circulars, therefore, Allen’s Philippine Constabulary headquarters staff was able to project bureaucratic power across the archipelago. These projections actively asserted a single identity upon the agency’s officers. An identity of bound to a specific administrative mission: paramilitary law enforcement. An identity bound to imperialized superiority exemplified by decorum and cleanliness. An identity of self-improvement and of legitimacy through knowledge. To find oneself in the Philippine Constabulary, you need look no further than the next circular from Manila.

**Pinchot’s Arboreal Missives**

As with the Philippine Constabulary, Gifford Pinchot utilized circulars and manuals to create and enforce a standardized bureaucratic identity. The Forest Service’s
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origins as an executive level knowledge production bureau meant that two distinct types of circulars were produced, which reflected the eventual bifurcation of the agency between Foresters and Forest Rangers. Starting as Student Assistants, Foresters were expected to produce and consume circulars demonstrating the new profession’s expertise in all matters arboreal. Emblematic of Pinchot’s vision—his mission—for the federal agency he led was the October 1898 Circular No. 21. A guide to the agency’s work, Circular No. 21 outlined how arboreal technocrats were to collect field data, produce reports for circularization, and consume the created information. The agency distributed thousands of copies of the publication, which eventually went through five revisions before being superseded by Circular No. 165 in 1909.440

While the explicit purpose of Circular No. 21 was the provision of “practical assistance to farmers, lumbermen, and others in handling forest lands” by the federal government, the program outlined was far more important as a training program for technocratic, bureaucratic foresters.441 On the very first page of the circular, Pinchot wrote, “A knowledge of how to bring about [scientifically managed forests] is still more restricted, while trained men capable of advising forest owners in the matter are very few indeed.”442 What followed was Pinchot’s solution: private landowners would provide the forests to be managed, while the federal government would provide the technocrats to
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create arboreal management plans. To further reduce the cost of the program to the government, private owners would also cover the cost of student assistants and any necessary travel and field expenses. The nation would be assured an abundance of timber in perpetuity, land owners would realize long-term profits, a doubtful Congress and public would not be presented with a large bill, and Pinchot would prove the importance of foresters as government technocrats, while simultaneously creating those selfsame arboreal bureaucrats. Through Circular No. 21, Gifford Pinchot created the bureaucratic means to create a bureaucratic identity enforcing training program.

The technical specifications of the circular—the sample agreements, contracts, and working plan expectations—were used by Pinchot’s assistant foresters and student assistants as bureaucratic standards. What they were to accomplish in their assigned woods was determined by and weighted against what Pinchot had outlined in Circular No. 21. As Austin F. Hawes was reminded by Ralph Hosmer in November 1900:

> It is customary for the men who have been Student Assistants and who intend to remain with the Division of Forestry, to write an essay at the end of the field season, covering some phase of the summer’s work. For the men in the Raquette Lake party, the subject is “Forest Conditions at Raquette Lake.” The report should contain not over 2500 words, and should be submitted not later than February 1st, 1901. The points to be considered are those mentioned in Mr. Graves’ letter of instructions to you in the spring. Your report should include a general geographic and topographic description of Raquette Lake, transportation, etc., followed by a detailed forest description, treating the forest as a whole, according to natural divisions and forest types, and dealing with the habits of the principal species, distribution, growth, reproduction, etc.

Only a few seasons into Pinchot’s tenure as Chief Forester and the language enshrined in Circular No. 21 had become “customary.” More importantly, though, the student

---
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assistants were specifically instructed in the language and forms of the circular. Hawes’ subsequent success in the Forest Service—from Student Assistant to Assistant Forest Expert in two years—demonstrates the rewards of understanding these customs in realizing the bureaucratic ideal established by Pinchot.

The student assistant program instilled within the trainee-foresters Pinchot’s twin emphasis of rugged outdoorsmanship and bureaucratic punctiliousness. Ralph S. Hosmer recalled his first student assistantship under the direction of Circular No. 21 as being part of an acceptable “rough life:”

You got enough to eat, such as it was—and different from the food that men have in lumber camps today, especially in the West. Some of the camps were pretty primitive. Nobody got hungry, however. It’s a hard life; men worked tremendously and there was not outlet or recreation. [...] The only outsiders that came were towards the spring, agents for tailors taking orders for suits to be ready at the end of camp in the spring, that they could have when they came out. They were the only outside people that turned up. When I came back, after occasional visits out, and brought newspapers in, if the papers I brought had accounts of prize fights, they thought I was a helpful person.445

Such was life in the wilds of New Hampshire. Being able to survive in the “bunk house” society of French Canadians, Canadian Maritmers, and other lumbermen was part of the purpose of the student assistant program. Hosmer, the son of a Massachusetts minister and graduate of Harvard’s Lawrence Scientific School, not only succeeded in surviving the bunk house without incident, but also in transforming his time with the lumbermen into a timely submitted report for the Forest Bureau.446 So well did Hosmer complete his field report that Pinchot placed an entire surveying party under his supervision the
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following season.\textsuperscript{447} Success in Pinchot’s administration was directly linked to both ruggedness and bureaucratic aptitude.

Circular No. 21 was one of more than 150 circulars published under Gifford Pinchot’s administrative tenure, which in small, sometimes mundane, ways created and controlled the identities of his burgeoning, far-flung staff. On average, Pinchot oversaw the release of more than one circular every month during his time with the Department of Agriculture. The circulars discussed the proper ways to package saplings for shipping, the space needed between planting for proper tree growth, tree species—like eucalyptus—new to the United States, and, especially, industrial uses for trees.\textsuperscript{448} Pinchot’s assistant foresters were expected to read and discuss these tracts as they were published by the bureau. Furthermore, they were expected to write tracts for publication by the bureau. As Royal S. Kellogg recalled, his entrance into Pinchot’s service was, in part, secured by a circular on the tree plantings in Western Kansas and Nebraska, while his first task after passing the civil service exam was to collect data for an extensive statistical analysis of manufactured forest products.\textsuperscript{449} Even the nervous, non-confrontational Charles A. Cary was able to gain substantial notoriety through the burgeoning forestry profession for his

\textsuperscript{447} Henry S. Graves to Ralph S. Hosmer, August 9, 1900, RG 95.3, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{448} The discussion of US Forest Service circulars is based upon the collection of said circulars bound by Cornell University in four volumes and subsequently digitalized by Google, Inc., and accessed at https://books.google.com/books?id=O8xGAAAAYAAJ.

circular on lumbering terms.\textsuperscript{450} The expectation of participating in a technical discussion of what forestry was, what the best practices of the profession should be, and how those best practices should be carried out was instilled by Gifford Pinchot through his position within the federal government. Indeed, as Cary’s dictionary demonstrates, Pinchot was commissioning the very language that foresters would use amongst themselves. As a technical body of literature, these circulars formed the foundation of professional forestry, which was as Pinchot intended.\textsuperscript{451}

Forest Rangers, though, were provided with a different language. The 1902 \textit{Forest Reserve Manual for the Information and Use of Forest Officers}—colloquially referred to as the “Use Book”—was probably written by Gifford Pinchot and formed the foundation of what forest rangers did and who they were.\textsuperscript{452} According to the first Use Book, the duties of a forest ranger fell into four categories:

1. Protective duty, guarding against fire and trespass, fighting fires and stopping trespass, as well as assisting the State authorities in the protection of game.
2. Care and propagation of the forest by judicious management of timber sales and cases of ‘free use’ of timber and actual propagation by seeing and planting.
3. Special work in attending to grazing, to the supervision of the construction of roads and other improvements, and in examining into and reporting upon the numerous claims and applications for special privileges, etc.
4. Permanent improvements carried out by the reserve force, such as making surveys of land and timber, and the construction of trails, cabins, bridges, and other improvements.\textsuperscript{453}

Interspersed amidst the legal procedures and regulations for carrying out these four tasks was a career devoid of the technocratic, scientific skillset proselytized within the

\textsuperscript{451} Pinchot, \textit{Breaking New Ground}, 187.
\textsuperscript{452} Steen, \textit{The U.S. Forest Service}, 264.
foresters’ circulars. The instructions on fighting fires was utilitarian, including a brief
description of tools and common causes of arboreal fires. No special language was
created; no international comparisons were provided. Perhaps, the creation of a special
language for firefighting was ludicrous, but even in areas where a technocratic jargon
existed—like bridge construction or telephone wiring—the writing remained sparse. The
forest ranger was expected to enforce rules, not theorize them.

The bureaucratic identity of the forest ranger as a government laborer was further
reinforced through task-detailed ranger guides, which mirrored the Foresters’ technical
circulars. In 1916, Jay L. B. Taylor, an early American forest ranger, published a
Handbook for Rangers and Woodsmen that was written “especially [for] rangers on
National Forests” and drew upon contributions by numerous former and current
rangers.454 While Taylor’s ranger handbook and other similar guides for the outdoorsman
included such useful tidbits as how “to use a hat as a drinking-cup” and the intricacies of
saddling a horse, scientific or technical discussions of forestry remained—as with the Use
Book—absent.455 In print, therefore, the Forest Ranger was not a technocrat and was not
part of a new profession. The Forest Ranger might be a government-man—subjected to
circulars, manuals, and guidebooks like the Forester—but his identity was tied to his
particular forest, his expertise was a knowledge of local conditions, and his career was
locally restricted. Indeed, if the Forester was the modern technocrat, the Forest Ranger
was a bastion romanticized nostalgia.

1916), iii.
455 Ibid., 2, 139.
Circulars, manuals, guidebooks, and handbooks were critical to the evolution of the administrative state. Through these productions government agents spread across thousands miles could act in unison to the point where bureaucracies could achieve anthropomorphization. Bureaucracies and not their attendant employees became capable of action. Historians of the administrative and knowledge—building upon the works of Michel Foucault and Benedict Anderson—have demonstrated the process through which a government agency could assume causal agency for actions.\textsuperscript{456} What an analysis of the above case studies demonstrates was the ability of these same documents to create a rugged, masculine archetype. Regardless of the amount of training mandated by government elite or the number of missives pinned to office walls, some government-men would or could not comply with the ideal. For those who deviated, punishment was required.

**Punishment and Promotion**

In punishing and promoting Progressive Era government-agents, bureaucratic elites found a final source for defining who were good and bad government-men. Through anecdotes young men consumed moralized tales of what actions warranted punishment, what behavior would guarantee promotion, and the shifting boundaries of proper deportment. Regardless of the agency, bureaucratic elites taught officers what was acceptable: Where was the line between reasonable cooperation and bribery? How much corruption was permissible? What drinking was ignorable? When did slothfulness become prejudicial to the good of the service? The anecdotes—created for official reports

\textsuperscript{456} See footnote 77 above.
and at times sensationalized by the press—created the institutional narratives through
which certain identities and behaviors were normalized. Identities and behaviors that
defined these government-men as ruggedly masculine.

The Constabulary reports created the bureaucracy’s institutional narrative,
lionizing those who contributed to the moto, ‘Always outnumbered, never outfought.’
John R. White, the dashing English mercenary who joined the Constabulary and would
rise as one of its great raconteurs, liberally peppered his monthly reports with tales of
daring that were incorporated into circulars for consumption by other officers and into
annual reports for consumption by the Insular Government, War Department, and the
United States Congress. On November 4, 1902, White submitted a special report—as
opposed to the standardized monthly reports—detailing an “engagement with
“Dalmacio’s band of outlaws” on October 30. The report detailed how he, Inspector
Walter A. Smith, twenty-two men, and two volunteers acting upon secret intelligence
ambushed Dalmacio’s band of seventy “bad-eggs.” With pride, White reported that Smith
“pursued and killed until exhausted.” Further, White gave Smith the pride of place in his
report, the concluding line: “Inspector Walter A. Smith showed courage and intelligence
of the highest order which was a large factor in the success which crowned the
Constabulary arms.”457 Noted in the annual report to the War Department, Smith’s
actions were considered “the most important steps taken to the extinction of bandits” in

457 John R. White, “Special Report of Engagement with Dalmacio’s Band of Outlaws, October 30,
1902,” Bacolod, November 4, 1902, Collection AX192, Box 6, Special Collections and University
Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
the province. Twenty-five years later, White would recount the experience and recall how Governor-General William Howard Taft sent Smith and him letters of congratulations, as well as their eventual promotions. The immediate special report detailing how a leading opponent of the American state building project was captured through the tools of the modern administrative agency—the secret intelligence relayed by telegraph—and the brave leadership of the white officers had evolved into a higher echelon annual report and finally into a memoir. An anecdote central to the Constabulary’s bureaucratic identity formation had, therefore, come full-circle.

Gerald V. ‘Vic’ Hurley, a prolific writer of life in the American expatriate community of the Philippines during the 1920s and 1930s, collected many more of these celebratory anecdotes; so many, indeed, that he was made an honorary third lieutenant in the Constabulary. Amongst his collection was “A Question of Taste,” which was written by John R. White under the pseudonym Lt. J. Connolly. In the tale, the sunburned Connolly captures Dalmacio in order to impress an American women, the first he had seen in three months. In “Krag vs. Kris: On Uncle Sam’s Last Frontier,” J. A. Tiffany and E. C. Callaway, recalled their youth spent in the Philippine Constabulary. Tiffany recalled participating “in desperate fights in his early twenties and had every experience

---

that can come to a white man in military campaigns against a savage people.” 461 Indeed, “he saw and faced the amok runner who, armed with the cruel kris or barong, swathes himself in bandages and, sworn to die killing, runs amok slaying every human being he sees until he fall—and dies to gain a Paradise in the arms of the houris.” 462 The hyperbole of the civilizing mission undertaken by the white agents of the Philippine Constabulary evolved from a bureaucratic identity—the élan that united the expatriate officer corps—into a romanticized retiree nostalgia for “the days when we who wore the Khaki and Red were strong in our faith in the value of the work to which our country had set its hand.” 463 Within these romanticized tales, though, were the darker memories, the stories circulated by the Constabulary to emphasize unacceptable behavior and the punishment that awaited those who failed the bureaucratic identity test.

Bravery was as much a part of the Constabulary identity as was loneliness. Leonard Furlong, another contributor to Hurley’s collection of anecdotes, wrote, “It is lonely in Bagao, but it is not dull.” 464 Such loneliness may have led Elmer B. Melton, a lieutenant, to commit suicide. As the officer in charge of a peaceful post that was subsequently audited and found to be unaccountably in arrears, perhaps Melton had other reasons. 465 The entire agency—indeed the entire insular government—would have known

462 Ibid.
463 Ibid., 6.
464 Leonard Furlong, “Expeditions in Connection with Ampuan Agaus Outlaws, from April 4, 1911, to April 24, 1911,” Papers of Gerald V. Hurley, Collection AX343, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
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of Melton’s questionable accounting through the circulars and annual reports already discussed. While anecdotes reinforced positive behavior, the Constabulary executives used the same mechanisms to highlight actions unbecoming of the service, a terrifying phrase for the officers involved. Captain Herman and Lieutenant C. G. Johnson became bywords for drunken and corrupt officers within the Constabulary. According to White,

Captain Herrman, a German-American with a foreign tang in his speech and manner, was a disgrace to the Constabulary; his speech and manner were those of the bar-room. Lieutenant Johnson, Herrman’s supply officer, was a callow youth entirely under the older man’s thumb. It took little time to persuade me that both were unfit for the service.

Herrman, who was “habitually drunk,” tortured prisoners and killed a guide in a fit of rage. When White, who had been ordered to inspect Herrman’s station by his superiors in Manila, recommended that Herrman be suspended and tried, he fled. He and Johnson, who cleaned out the government funds under his supervision, hijacked a steamer, and after that ran-aground commandeered a parao and the six man Visayan crew. On the second night of their flight, Johnson, now plagued by a fever, dosed while on watch giving the crew the chance to retake their vessel. In the ensuing conflict, Johnson was mortally wounded, while Herrman killed four of the sailors. After a multiday manhunt, Herrman was captured, tried, and sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment in Billibid prison. He served eight years of his sentence before being pardoned and banished from
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the Philippine Islands. As White concluded in a May 1903 monthly report, “Needless to state that any cases of abuse committed by constables are promptly investigated and severe punishment follows conviction.” It may have been needless to state, but only because the Constabulary developed a bureaucratic system of defining and shaming bad behavior.

As with the Constabulary, the employees of Pinchot’s Forest Service reinforced the bureaucratic identities of foresters and forest rangers through reports and anecdotes actively reinforced by Congressmen, state legislators, and journalists. In September 1905, at the beginning of Pinchot’s takeover of the Forest Reserves, a scandal erupted involving Forest Supervisor R. H. Charlton, who was accused by the Arizona press of enforcing fines upon the “poor” local stockmen to “support [a] still greater number of experts to travel around the country in Pullman Palace cars—living in opulence and luxury at government expense.” Pinchot and Overton W. Price were pressed by the Secretary of Agriculture—who had in turn been motivated by representatives of the Arizona territorial government—to explain the allegations of corruption form the Prescott Herald and the Arizona Journal-Miner. Price reminded the Secretary that report of extravagant expenditures had originated in a letter by Supervisor F. R. Stewart on July 15, which had
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been investigated and found to be entirely scurrilous. 471 Stewart had been terminated and Charlton given charge of a Forest Reserve near Los Angeles, California. Much of Overton W. Price’s correspondence with Secretary Wilson related to allegations by local newspapers of corruption, excessive enforcement, or other misdeeds by Pinchot’s agents. The evolution of a Forest Ranger’s bureaucratic identity into someone who could manage local concerns and fears stemmed from these early failures.

While official reports and allegations of corruption provided the starkest assessments, anecdotes more subtly provided Forest Rangers and Foresters with an understanding of who they should be. Stories told around campfires to Yale forestry students by instructors at the summer forestry school held on the Pinchot estate in Milford, Pennsylvania, or to new rangers being shown their district provided key indicators into the masculinized bureaucratic identity. A. O. Waha, one of the first technically trained foresters to be assigned to the forest reserves of the southwest, recalled being told of Forest Supervisor R. C. McClure’s cow incident, “which made him appear both ludicrous and ridiculous.” 472 According to Waha,

> It seems that McClure was riding horseback, and was carrying an umbrella—horsemen in those days carried a quirt and slicker tied to the cantle of their saddle. Whether or not he actually opened up the umbrella while riding in the rain I do not know. At any rate, it was bad enough simply to be packing an umbrella while on horseback. But when he came to a pasture and saw a calf that had been born only a few hours previously and shivering in the cold rain and meanwhile bawling plaintively, McClure dismounted, wriggled through the barbed wire and on reaching the calf stood alongside with his umbrella held over it for protection against the elements. Evidently, [...] this was too much for the mother cow grazing a few yards away. She became infuriated, and with head down chased McClure

471 F. R. Stewart to James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, July 15, 1905, Records of the Office of the Chief, General Records of the US Forest Service, 95.3, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

McClure, while failing to appear to be a rugged enough ranger what with his Prince Albert coat and politically based appointment, held his forest rangers to demandingly high bureaucratic standards. As Ranger McGlone discovered through repeated rebukes for the poor “phraseology” of his monthly reports, which were filled with dire warning of marauding and malicious goatherds that were actually only confused owing to an absence of a boundary line he was supposed to have demarcated. Forest Supervisor McClure, a legend of the southwestern forest reserves, therefore represented the subtleness of anecdotally enforced identities. The umbrella wielding, Prince Albert wearing manager was recognizable even to the technocratic Waha as a failure of rugged masculinity. Yet, McClure pushed his Forest Rangers to be better government-men and more mindful of their bureaucratic duties.

Anecdotally, then, discipline was used to enforce the government-man identity within the Philippine Constabulary and the US Forest Service, where Foresters and Forest Rangers were divided. Gleanings from annual reports indicate that similar problems faced identical reactions within the Pennsylvania State Police and Forestry Division. While many men were inspired by the rugged masculine ideal of the government-man presented in training, not all were capable of either achieving or maintaining the trained archetype.
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Who was a good bureaucrat? From Henry T. Allen to John C. Groome, from Gifford Pinchot to Joseph Rothrock, senior government administrators from differing backgrounds and in vastly differing locals presented a similar answer. More than clerks, the government-man was clean and sober, spoke with erudition and authority, and, most importantly, understood his purpose as the agency’s mission. Throughout, the government-man was capable of working within a state-of-the-art administrative organization with all of the emphasis upon standardization and efficiency that entailed. However, the government-man, or at least his ideal, could work within the Progressive Era state without sacrificing his rugged masculinity. The government-man could type a report according to a standard set by his superior a thousand miles away in the morning and pack a mule for an overland journey in the afternoon. Office and wilderness were the equal environments of the government-man.
V

Disappointment and Bureaucratic Identity Formation
Disappointment mattered. Fantasies, ideals, and training were not enough to transform the majority of government employees into career bureaucrats. Elbie K. Foltz, author of a widely disseminated 1909 manual on entering the federal civil service, concluded that “the popular conception of duties in a Federal position is one of fantastic distortion.”\(^\text{476}\) Government agencies perpetuated idealized images of a civil service career as synonymous with a “responsible and lucrative position.”\(^\text{477}\) From the Philippine Constabulary to the Pennsylvania Forest Division, bureaucratic elites promised recruits a Progressive Era dream of masculine adventure, career advancement, and middling respectability. In most of these, they were disappointed.

Many government-man’s disappointment stemmed from the success of the merit system created by the 1883 Pendleton Act, which was integral to the staffing of the new, modern regulatory agencies of the 1890s and 1900s. Historians have linked the very idea of progress and the success of the administrative state with the expansion of the merit system overseen by the Civil Service Commission. Robert Wiebe criticized the Pendleton Act as having almost no meaning because loopholes that allowed each presidential administration to selectively choose positions to be classified.\(^\text{478}\) Despite contemporaneously and historiographically recognized failings, though, citizens of Progressive Era America and later historians saw and continue to see the Pendleton Act and civil service reform as what historian Paul Van Riper defined as an “opportunity


system.”479 In legislating a civil service in which entrance was based upon acumen, intelligence, and education, Progressive Era civil service reformers like Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft created the foundation upon which Henry T. Allen and Gifford Pinchot’s bureaucratic ideals were built. The merit—“opportunity”—system enabled applicants to dream and prepare for careers with the government rather than politically appointed jobs. But, when those dreams became bureaucratic realities, disillusionment resulted.

Through an analysis of individual government careers from four case study Progressive Era agencies, I argue that very ideal created to recruit and train these regulators—Constabulary and State Police officers, federal and state foresters—created a perception that government service was a missed-opportunity system that required a lived reality of economic and social frustrations. The reconstructed government careers are based upon alumni and professional publications like the Yale Forest School News and The Oak Leaf, a yearbook published by the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy. Annual reports and circulars also provided information on career timelines, promotions, dismissals, and salaries. Finally, personal letters, diaries, and, particularly for the Forest Service, oral history interviews provide insights into the oft-unexplained decisions recorded by bureaucratic personnel documents. The narratives captured through these documents reveal that the merit system integral to the modern administrative state created a world of public service as public sacrifice.
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The following chapter examines the reasons that recruited and trained government-men left the Philippine Constabulary, the US Forest Service, and Pennsylvania’s State Police and Forestry Division. Unifying the many individual reasons for leaving these Progressive Era agencies was a sense that the ideal against which bureaucratic elite—and in some ways society at large—judged them was false. Career advancement stagnated as bureaucracies matured. Professional aspirations and middling dreams collapsed in the face of wage stagnation and poor living conditions. Finally, the applicability of government training and experience within other industries—private security, state and foreign government service, and business—proved more lucrative. The image of professional rugged masculinity inculcated into the government-men was at times the very source of their decision to leave the services that had created them.

**Stagnation Escapism**

In the late 1950s and 1960s, members of the new Schools of Public Administration, the crowning achievement for those pushing for civil service professionalization, identified a problem haunting government agencies: bureaucratic stagnation. The 1955 Second Hoover Commission—officially the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—recognized the issue, which was reiterated by another commission in 1965. Historian Paul Van Riper thought that the discouragement of mobility within the civil service was a threat to democracy, which would collapse as the government failed through a sustained lack of
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recruitable and retainable talent. Herbert Kaufman, the great chronicler of post-World War II rangers in the US Forest Service, argued that the control of mobility enabled uniform governance across vast distances. Immobility, however, was an important cause for dissatisfaction with government employment long before the alphabet soup agencies of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Government-men from Manila to Harrisburg repeatedly reported vertical and geographic immobility as a cause of disappointment with their careers.

The perception by second-generation government-men of the ease with which first-generation agency employees rose to positions of political, social, and economic respectability was an implicit cause of the former’s dissatisfaction. Nearly all of the idealized leaders, so essential to agency recruitment, had been appointed directly to their positions. Henry T. Allen, who had languished as a captain in the rare-to-promote regular army, lobbied William H. Taft and other members of the archipelago’s Insular Government to not only choose him to be the first chief of the Philippine Constabulary, but to be so with the eventual rank of brigadier general. Gifford Pinchot, while

---
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consulting for Bernhard E. Fernow’s Division of Forestry, was appointed to chief of his agency having never worked as a ranger or on a forest reserve.\textsuperscript{484} John C. Groome, despite nearly a decade as captain of an award-winning National Guard cavalry unit frequently deployed to quell labor unrest, admitted to having no experience in police work, but was appointed superintendent of the Pennsylvania State Police.\textsuperscript{485} The age of these government senior executives—Allen was 43, Pinchot 33, and Groome 43 at appointment—imparted the impression that an eighteen or twenty year old recruit could expect to rise to the pinnacle of the agency within fifteen or twenty years.

Later recruits were further encouraged to dream of youthful seniority by who Allen, Pinchot, and Groome appointed as their deputies.\textsuperscript{486} Henry T. Allen, as he was building the agency, almost universally appointed all of the senior commanders of the Philippine Constabulary, whose ranks were militarized as captains, majors, and colonels. David J. Baker, Jr., was appointed as a colonel, as was James G. Harbord, William S. Scott, and Harry H. Bandholtz, who would succeed Allen as Chief. The oldest colonel
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working for Allen was 46 when the Constabulary was created, while the youngest was 36. Of the first majors appointed to the Constabulary, Thomas J. Mair at 42 was the oldest, while Amos D. Haskell at 29 was the youngest. John Robert White, the English adventurer who joined the Constabulary at the age of 22 in 1901 as a junior inspector, was promoted to a captain and senior inspector in 1904, a major in 1906, and a colonel in 1908; and had become a senior officer before the age of 30. The Constabulary that young men from the United States encountered between 1904 and 1910, then, was directed by men who had achieved respectable senior positions in the prime of their lives.

Gifford Pinchot’s first staff members were equally swift in climbing the ranks of federal forestry. Eventually referred to as the ‘Old Guard,’ the members of Pinchot’s first staff enjoyed meteoric career advancement. A few, like Henry S. Graves, were directly appointed to their positions by Pinchot. Many, though, were early participants in the student assistant program like Arthur C. Ringland, Coert Dubois, Ferdinand A. Silcox, and William B. Greeley. Studying during the fall and winter months at the Yale Forest School or the Biltmore School and then working in the field for the Forest Service during the summer, these young men were well-prepared for the Civil Service examinations—often created by their instructors or field-supervisors and scheduled around their final exams—and between 1902 and 1908 were rapidly promoted to fill positions in the

487 A database of the careers of Philippine Constabulary officers recruited from the United States was compiled from the following sources: for October 1, 1904, through July 1, 1911: “Constabulary General Orders 1929-1930, with Rosters 1904-1911,” V. 805, RG 350; for January 1, 1914, through January 1, 1919: “Official Constabulary Registers, 1914-1919” (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1914-1919), File 4600-229, Box 560, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

expanding agency.\textsuperscript{489} Coert Dubois, a Biltmore Immortal, worked as a student assistant from 1899 to 1902 before being selected by E. T. Allen for a highly coveted position with the boundary men—charged with enforcing land-usage laws and surveying the national forests—until 1905, when he was promoted to forest inspector.\textsuperscript{490} The image of the Forest Service as a technocratic agency staffed at all levels by ambitious, well-educated young men was created by employees like Dubois and the Old Guard.

Youth was similarly captured with John C. Groome’s appointments to the Pennsylvania Department of State Police. Asides from a small headquarters staff—John H. Clarke as chief clerk, Alan C. Frazier as stenographer-typist, Dr. Francis D. Patterson as chief medical officer, and Dr. C. J. Marshal as a contracted veterinarian—Groome appointed four captains who would command four regionally barracked companies. Their average age was just shy of 32: John W. Borland, 31, was a Mercer insurance agent; Frank D. Beary, 36, was an Allentown jeweler; William P. Taylor, 30, was a clerk; and Joseph P. Robinson, 30, was an editor. All had military experience, mostly with state guard units.\textsuperscript{491} To assist these captains, Groome appointed four lieutenants: Henry F. Egle, 32, a manager from Erie born in Switzerland; Charles F. Fenerstein, 31, a salesman

\textsuperscript{489} Henry S. Graves to Overton W. Price, August 2, 1905; Overton W. Price to Henry S. Graves, August 5, 1905; Gifford Pinchot to the Secretary of Agriculture, November 22, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; Arthur C. Ringland, \textit{Conserving Human and Natural Resources}, Oral History Interview by Amelia R. Fry, et. al., 1970, Regional Oral History Office, Bancroft Library; Ralph S. Hosmer, Oral History Interview, Interviewed by Bruce C. Harding, November 4, 1957, Forest History Society Archives, Durham, North Carolina; Steen, \textit{The U.S. Forest Service}, 63-64, 82.
from Wilkes-Barre; Charles P. Smith, 33, a Philadelphia plumber; and William L. Swarm, 28, another veteran of the Spanish-American War.\textsuperscript{492} The choice for Deputy Superintendent, James Cheston Morris of Penllyn, complied with the respectable and youthful image of Groome’s department leadership.\textsuperscript{493} Morris was the 45 year old son of a nationally noted physician—for whom he was named—and an executive with the Pottstown Iron Works. While Morris was the only non-military veteran appointed by Groome, he was a member of the Philadelphia Club, which explains how the superintendent might have overlooked both his age and lack of military service.\textsuperscript{494} The Pennsylvania State Trooper, with a socially and educationally based support network, who complied with the agency’s ideal could expect to spend his thirties as a captain and his forties in command of the force.

In contrast to the mass appointment of the senior executives of the Pennsylvania State Police, was the gradual recruitment of foresters of Pennsylvania Department of Forestry. Much of the differentiation stemmed from differences in administrative origins. While the Pennsylvania State Police—like the Philippine Constabulary and US Forest Service—expanded rapidly over a short period of time, the Pennsylvania Department of Forestry did not. The Pennsylvania Department of Forestry had evolved out of a


\textsuperscript{494} Conti, \textit{The Pennsylvania State Police}, 53.
gubernatorial commission under the direction of Dr. Joseph Trimble Rothrock, who delegated the creation of an arboreal administrative agency to George H. Wirt. Wirt was appointed the first—and de facto chief—State Forester in March 1901. Owing to limited funding and the desire to employ technically trained foresters, Rothrock and Wirt staffed state forests only as foresters graduated from their Mont Alto academy. By 1911, then, fifty-two state foresters supervised ninety forest rangers and an undisclosed number of seasonal laborers. While foresters were given unequal responsibilities—some were placed in charge of entire state forests and others individual tree plantings—there was no formal hierarchy, with the exception of Wirt who reported directly to Rothrock and his successor, Robert S. Conklin. Despite the more moderate recruitment strategy, these were universally men in their 20s; Wirt was, after all, only 21 when he started.495

Many of the young men in these government agencies were told to expect rapid, or at least timely, promotion. George Washington Grayson, a Creek Indian leader and much older than the average aspirant to the Philippine Constabulary, wrote to the Bureau of Insular Affairs in 1903 asking what opportunity there was “for promotion and emolument for conscientious and efficient performance of duty.”496 Clarence Edwards replied, “the prospects of promotion are considered good.”497 So often was the question of promotion potential raised, that the Bureau of Insular Affairs eventually resorted to circulating an address prepared by James G. Harbord for the class of 1908 at the

496 George Washington Grayson to Bureau of Insular Affairs, July 6, 1903, F. 8028, Box 514, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
497 Clarence Edwards to George Washington Grayson, July 11, 1903 F. 8028, Box 514, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
According to Harbord, the insular police was “a congenial career” with reasonable assurance of promotion: “the proportion of the higher grades and higher salaries of those of lieutenant and junior captain […] sufficient to give reasonable expectations as you grow older.” Of course, Harbord—being appointed to the Constabulary by Allen as an assistant director and colonel—had personally found promotion within the insular police quite rapid.

Similar promises of promotion and emolument were made to aspiring foresters by Pinchot and his acolytes. In response to Pinchot’s campaign to raise awareness of the federal government’s forestry activities, many young men—and quite a few worried parents—wrote to him asking about the prospects of arboreal careers. D. H. Harrington of Massachusetts wrote in 1902 inquiring about how quickly promotions happened within federal forestry. G. E. Hastings of New Jersey and F. Halet of Belgium made the same inquiry, while T. G. Greaves of Virginia was similarly concerned three years later in 1906. Although their wordings were sometimes different, some preferred advancement and others promotion, all noted that they were writing to Pinchot because they had read

498 Washington Grayson to Clarence R. Edwards, July 6, 1903, F. 8028, Box 514; Clarence R. Edwards to H. A. Hutchings, F. 6227, Box 440; Alexander Bayard Clark to Clarence R. Edwards, May 29, 1903, F. 7703, Box 505; T. Henry McConnell to Clarence R. Edwards, June 8, 1903, F. 7868, Box 509; T. Henry McConnell to Clarence R. Edwards, February 8, 1908, F. 7868, Box 509; Clarence Edwards to George S. Holmes, July 2, 1903, F. 8025, Box 513; Arnett F. Perry to Theodore Roosevelt, June 25, 1903, F. 8088, Box 515; RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park Maryland.

499 James G. Harbord, “The Philippines Constabulary as a Career,” Constabulary School Notes, No. 1, RG 350, Box 174, File 1184-1188, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

500 D. H. Harrington to Gifford Pinchot, March 21, 1902, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

501 G. E. Hastings to Gifford Pinchot, May 22, 1905; F. Halet to Gifford Pinchot, January 26, 1903; T. G. Greaves to Overton W. Price, November 7, 1906, RG 95.3: General Correspondence of the US Forest Service, Office of the Chief, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
somewhere, maybe in the *Saturday Evening Post* or in the Department of Agriculture’s annual *Yearbook* or in the local newspaper, about the rapid career advancement open to those with training in forestry. Over and over again, Pinchot, Overton W. Price, and other members of the Washington office assured applicants to the Forest Service, that “there is such a lack of foresters that there is no prospect of supplying the demand for a long time to come” and that “the opportunity for young men who are looking for an occupation in a life is proportionately great.” With education and resolve, employees of the Forest Service could expect fulfilling careers.

In Pennsylvania, the promise of promotion was made by example. When Captain William P. Taylor resigned in June 1906, Groome promoted Lieutenant Charles P. Smith to the position. Similarly, in October 1907, Groome promoted Lieutenant George F. Lumb to replace Captain John W. Borland and promoted by competitive examination First Sergeant John S. VanVoorhis to the rank of lieutenant. Lumb was promoted again a year later to Deputy Superintendent, thereby passing from junior commissioned officer to second in command in only two years. Indeed, Lumb’s life was a well-publicized morality tale of the uplifting career a young-man could have by conforming to the ideals of the Pennsylvania State Police. A poor immigrant from Great Britain, Lumb was reduced to sleeping on park benches in Baltimore until enlisting with the army in 1893. After serving in the Philippines and in China during the Boxer Rebellion, Lumb was transferred to the US Coast Artillery, where he attended garrison schools until he was

---

502 Gifford Pinchot as cited by René Bache, “Forestry, the New Profession,” *Saturday Evening Post* 173.32 (February 9, 1901).
himself appointed schoolmaster. In 1905, he resigned from the military and enlisted in Groome’s experiment. The pairing of Groome, wealthy scion of a Philadelphia society family, and Lumb, a self-made immigrant, was not lost on the State Police Troopers or self-help books.\footnote{Conti, \textit{The Pennsylvania State Police}, 70-71; A. S. Gregg, “The Man Who Said I Will,” \textit{Success}, Vol. 5 (New York: Lowrey-Marden Corporation, 1921), 39.} Lumb may have been an extreme example, but during the first five years of Groome’s administration promotion for many was swift.

The first-generation of Pennsylvania State Foresters, though, had an even better promise of promotion than the Troopers of the State Police. With no established administrative hierarchy, the State Department of Forestry was notably egalitarian. Once applicants were admitted into the State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, they were guaranteed a job as a state forester pending successful completion of the course. Joseph Rothrock, Robert Conklin, and George Wirt, the founders of state’s forest service, had consciously chosen to create a “German” style academy like the federal military service academies that eschewed the rigid hierarchy of the British Imperial Forest Service and various continental, particularly French and German, models.\footnote{Henry Clepper, “Forest Conservation in Pennsylvania: The Pioneer Period, from Rothrock to Pinchot,” \textit{Pennsylvania History} 48.1 (January 1981), 45; Henry Clepper, “The Pennsylvania State Forest School,” \textit{Forestry Education in Pennsylvania}, Henry Clepper, ed., (Baltimore: Monumental Printing Company, 1957), 11-30; Orazio Ciancio and Susanna Nocentini, “The Forest and Man: The Evolution of Forestry Thought From Modern Humanism to the Culture of Complexity. Systemic Silviculture and Management on Natural Bases,” \textit{The Forest and Man}, Orazio Ciancio, ed., (Florence: Accademia Italiana di Scienze Forestali, 1997), 42-43.} Nearly all of the graduates of the Mont Alto academy became Pennsylvania state foresters with their responsibilities being assigned to them according to their perceived abilities rather than...
an administrative hierarchy.\textsuperscript{506} When Gifford Pinchot was appointed to the Pennsylvania Forestry Commission in 1920 following allegations that Conklin had failed in his duties and subsequent resignation, Pinchot reorganized around geographic units, each one under a district forester. The latter would then manage ranked assistant foresters who would supervise graded rangers and wardens.\textsuperscript{507} Until then, though, applicants to the State Department of Forestry could expect rapid promotion to the highest position possible, forester.

Promotion, though, for those outside of the founding bureaucratic generation was slow. An analysis of over nine-hundred Philippine Constabulary officer career tracks demonstrates that the further from the founding of the organization that a third lieutenant (the lowest commissioned rank) was appointed, the longer that officer could expect to wait for a captaincy. Almost no American officers who started their careers after 1908, seven years after the creation of the service, climbed into the senior executive ranks of major or colonel.\textsuperscript{508} Further, appointees increasingly understood the nature of advancement. Don P. Branson, who received a commission as a third lieutenant in 1907, put aside his racial bigotry in order to foster career advancement. He had been assigned to


\textsuperscript{508} A database of the careers of Philippine Constabulary officers recruited from the United States was compiled from the following sources: for October 1, 1904, through July 1, 1911: “Constabulary General Orders 1929-1930, with Rosters 1904-1911,” V. 805, RG 350; for January 1, 1914, through January 1, 1919: “Official Constabulary Registers, 1914-1919” (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1914-1919), File 4600-229, Box 560, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
work under a Filipino senior lieutenant and, as he “did not enjoy serving under a man with a brown skin,” immediately complained to a superior. His colonel explained that if he was patient and worked for the lieutenant, promotion would come more quickly, so he “consented to stay put” being “naturally very much pleased to learn that [he] was to be put in command of a company so soon, for a young shave-tail usually had to serve as a junior officer for a much longer time.” In acknowledging the exceptionalism of his own eight-year rise to captain, Branson demonstrated that not only that promotion slow, but understood to be normatively so.

Some senior officers within the organization realized that the slow nature of promotion was detrimental to the Constabulary. As John Robert White concluded, “the American who would remain in the islands to work for seventy-five or one hundred dollars a month without promotion or prospects was, more often than not, just the cheap, swaggering sort of fellow least suited to deal with men of different color and race.” White, who as a member of the founding generation was a captain by 1904, acknowledged that his initial promotion was a result of agreeing to be the paymaster for the entire Constabulary in 1901, despite having no bookkeeping experience. Junior officers would eventually have gladly agreed to nearly anything for a promotion. The first
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509 Don P. Branson, “Recollections of Service in the Philippine Constabulary, 1907-1915,” Folder CB B7, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
510 A database of the careers of Philippine Constabulary officers recruited from the United States was compiled from the following sources: for October 1, 1904, through July 1, 1911: “Constabulary General Orders 1929-1930, with Rosters 1904-1911,” V. 805, RG 350; for January 1, 1914, through January 1, 1919: “Official Constabulary Registers, 1914-1919” (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1914-1919), File 4600-229, Box 560, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
512 Ibid., 15.
circular of 1909 requested that the “growing tendency” of officers to have their desires for “promotion” or “privileges” conveyed to headquarters by “relatives, assemblymen, or other government officials,” was to cease for, “in addition to annoyance,” these petitions caused “an increase of work at bureau and district headquarters.”513 For those who joined the Constabulary after the initial growth and organization of the agency, promotion was frustratingly slow.

The US Forest Service offered a similar experience as demonstrated by the career tracks of over three-hundred graduates of the Yale Forest School between 1902 and 1913. Over fifty-percent of the graduates were employed outside of the US Forest Service, while approximately twenty-percent had never worked for the agency. The majority of those that had worked for the Forest Service and resigned had done so after spending multiple years as Forest Assistants, which was the lowest rank of Pinchot’s arboreal legion. The third of graduates who were still with the agency in 1913 had spent less than five years as Forest Assistants before being promoted. Career longevity correlated with rapid promotion through the Forest Service’s ranks of Assistant Forest Inspectors, full Forest Inspectors, Assistant District Foresters, full District Foresters, Forest Supervisors and divisional chiefs. The further their start date from the beginning of Pinchot’s reforms, the greater the time was between promotions. Graduates from the class of 1903 like

513 Ralph W. Jones, Circular No. 1, January 9, 1909, Henry Gilsheuser Papers, Collection AX 325, Box I, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
Ralph Hosmer, Albert W. Cooper, Elers Koch, and Samuel N. Spring were promoted far more rapidly to senior positions than graduates from the class of 1906.\textsuperscript{514} Anecdotally, subsequent bureaucratic generations perceived and resented the relative ease with which the founding generation secured promotion. Royal S. Kellog—who joined Pinchot’s agency in 1901 as a Student Assistant, worked for over five years as a Forest Assistant before finally being promoted to Assistant Forester, and resigned in 1910—left the service frustrated with slow promotion and a perception that employee independence was curtailed.\textsuperscript{515} The “Experience Book,” a collection of letters solicited from alumni of the Yale Forest School a year after graduation, recorded the frustration of many graduates. The letters express a clear expectation of becoming foresters with the federal government and of enjoying the freedom of promotion experienced by the founding generation. However, as with Kellog, a majority experienced disappointment. Even amongst Julius A. Larsen’s raptures of beautiful natural vistas or Thornton T. Munger’s exultation in the “inspiration that it is useful, patriotic, public service,” there were tales of settling for positions as Guards or Rangers rather than the technical Forest Assistant positions for which they had been trained.\textsuperscript{516} Career disappointment was as much Pinchot’s legacy to the US Forest Service as the technocratic ideal he so fervently espoused.

\textsuperscript{514} Data compiled by author from \textit{Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School} (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913) and \textit{Yale Forest School News}, Vol. 1.1 (January 1913) to Vol. 9.4 (October 1921).
\textsuperscript{515} Royal S. Kellog Oral History Interview, Interviewed by Elwood Maunder, Palmetto, Florida, February 9, 1959, Forest History Society Archives, Durham, North Carolina.
The two Pennsylvania state agencies under consideration provide important
counterpoints to the two federal agencies discussed above. Neither the Pennsylvania State
Police nor the State Department of Forestry experienced the widespread employee
frustration with promotion discussed by members of the Philippine Constabulary and the
US Forest Service. In part, frustration was absent because both of the state agencies were
able to meet promotion expectations. The Pennsylvania State Police was able to
continuously offer promotion to troopers through competitive examinations because
agency expansion and employee attrition—through death and resignation—continuously
exceeded recruitment into the 1920s.\textsuperscript{517} The State Department of Forestry enjoyed over a
decade of continuous growth through the expansion of state owned and managed lands.
Resignations, dismissals, and deaths for the agency were incredibly few from 1908 to
1918, while dozens of new employees—both Forest Rangers and Foresters—were added
annually. In 1912-1913 (the state government operated on a biannual basis) alone, thirty
new Forest Rangers and eleven new Foresters were added to the roster, while only eight
Forest Rangers and no Foresters left the service.\textsuperscript{518} Through the First World War, then,
both the Pennsylvania agencies under investigation were able to avoid employee
disappointment with promotions through attrition and expansion.

So within all of the agencies considered, there was both an implicit and explicit
promise of promotion. The youthfulness of the agencies’ senior executives implicitly
promised recruits that they could anticipate fulfilling careers before middle-age. More

\textsuperscript{517} Data compiled from the annual and biannual “Reports of the Department of State Police of the
\textsuperscript{518} Data compiled by author from the biannual “Reports of the Pennsylvania Department of
explicitly, those newly joining these government bureaucracies could point to members of the founding generation who had risen from entry-level positions to ones of power and responsibility within a few short years. However, when agencies were unable to continuously grown like the Philippine Constabulary or the US Forest Service, then perceptions of career stall fostered disappointment. Agencies that experienced high rates of attrition or were able to continuously expand avoided such disappointment.

**Public Service as Sacrifice**

Promotion, though, was not the only source of disappointment for government-men. An absence of promotion was compounded by young men, who had been promised a patriotic-ideal by their recruiters, constructing government service as a personal sacrifice. Discussions of personal sacrifice centered upon individual boredom and a pervasive sense of loneliness, living conditions removed from middle-class expectations, and salaries diminished by inflation. The reality of government service as public sacrifice directly contrasted the middle-class imagery of the idealized professional government-man.

Government-men from the outposts of Luzon to the northern reaches of Pennsylvania complained with unerring regularity of boredom and loneliness. For the officers of the Philippine Constabulary the romanticized ideal and the tedious reality was particularly stark. Required to keep diaries recording their daily actions, officers like M. P. Algers made entries of “at office,” “at station,” “weather: hot,” or various
commentaries about changing locations.\textsuperscript{519} Indeed, one of Algers’ longest entries each year from 1908 to 1916 was an annual listing of all of the reports he was expected to submit: “Post Reports to S.I. [Senior Inspector], Events Reports to S.I., Pay Roll, Account of Subs. [Substation] Funds, Return of Subs. Funds, Strength Report, Report of Daily Ratio Strength, Police Inspection, Forage Inspection, Rent Quarters.”\textsuperscript{520} Lemuel E. Borens filled his diaries with steamship arrivals and departures with the occasional colonial celebrity, like President of the Philippine Commission and later Governor William H. Taft, spotting. When there were no steamers or celebrities, he simply noted the weather and his dinner companion, usually a Mr. Campbell.\textsuperscript{521} Harold Hane Elarth discovered early in his diary writing career the phrase “nothing encountered,” but nonetheless diligently recorded his movements, inspections, and long stints “at office.”\textsuperscript{522} Despite the explicit recruitment promise of patriotic adventure in the colonial tropics, the majority of Constabulary officers, according to their diaries, spent the bulk of their time compiling information and filing reports.

Pinchot, like Allen, required federal Forest Service employees to maintain daily journals, especially Forest Rangers, whose supervisors were specifically ordered to routinely check dairies as part of mandated efficiency evaluations.\textsuperscript{523} As with the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{519} Diaries, 1908-1916, Papers of M. P. Alger, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\item \textsuperscript{520} August 8, 1908, Diary for 1908, Papers of M. P. Alger, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\item \textsuperscript{521} Diaries, 1903-1907, Papers of Lemuel E. Borens, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\item \textsuperscript{522} Diaries, 1910-1912, Papers of Harold Hane Elarth, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
\item \textsuperscript{523} While not appearing in the Forest Service Manual, also known as The Use Book or The Use of the National Forest Reserves, until 1912, diary regulations were discussed as early as 1906 at a Service
\end{itemize}
Constabulary diaries, those maintained by Forest Service employees contained minimalist descriptions of daily activities and geographic movements. Yet, through their minimalist musings, behavioral patterns emerge far removed from the outdoor activities idealized by the service’s leaders and fantasized about by would-be foresters and rangers. Surviving diaries reveal day after day of office work, of filing reports, making reports, and having meetings with supervisors, colleagues, and concerned—usually angry—citizens. Martin McAllister, who started with the Forest Service as an Assistant Ranger in 1907, frequently spent entire months “at Office.” Indeed, of the 4380 days he was employed by the Forest Service, he spent 1332 days “at Office,” 116 days on annual leave, and ten holidays recorded as “no work.” Thirty percent of his time was spent doing clerical work. Aldo Leopold’s diaries from 1909 to 1916 reveal a similar amount of time spent conducting office work. Other diaries from Forest Service employees across the country reveal that between 1906—when diaries were first collected by Pinchot’s staff—to 1917 a significant amount of time was dedicated to exactly the type of clerical work.


525 Ibid.

526 Aldo Leopold, Diaries and Journals, 1899-1927, Digital Collections Center, University of Wisconsin, last accessed October 11, 2015, via http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/cgi-bin/AldoLeopold/AldoLeopold-idx?id=AldoLeopold.ALMiscJourn.
that many applicants to the agency specifically hoped to avoid. That the Forest Service *Use Book* expanded from fewer than 100 pages in 1906 to over 300 pages in 1908 and had to be supplemented with an equally lengthy *Manual of Procedure* detailing form submission processes and report drafting methods underscores the meaning of “at Office.” The range-roaming dreams of these arboreal government agents was far removed from the reality of reporting every movement and task.

Government-men—whether Constabulary officers, federal foresters, state police troopers, or state forest rangers—also consistently expressed their frustration with lonesomeness and isolation. Complaining of isolated postings and finding companionship solutions, not surprisingly, occupied a great deal of the Constabulary officers’ time, who found solutions similar to other colonial civil servants. Even Manila—despite an undersea-cable connection—was isolated when a letter from San Francisco took twenty-
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527 Selected Diaries, 1906-1944, Miscellaneous Records of the US Forest Service, RG 95.2.4, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.


five to thirty days for Americans accustomed to a postal service that could deliver a letter across a continent in as little as three days. Tiffany Bernard Williams, commissioned as a third lieutenant with the Mountain Battalion of Ifugao Province in 1914, recalled that while the command post was connected to Manila via telephone the narrow mountain trails—frequently washed out by seasonal monsoons—delayed the mail by a month translating into an interval of at least two months for letters to and from the United States. He emphasized with others that while the telephone and telegraph network constructed by the Constabulary was impressive—over six thousand miles by 1903—the system was limited to strictly regulated official business. Isolation was as much a reality of geography as it was of communication costs and time.

Geographical remoteness, though, was only one form of isolation. While the officers of the Philippine Constabulary were dramatically isolated culturally, linguistically, and geographically from the United States, members of government agencies stationed much closer to home expressed similar feelings. Student Assistants in the Forest Service routinely wrote of the isolation of their camps, whether in Maine or Alaska. Thornton T. Munger would forever remember the loneliness of his first summer
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530 Tiffany Bernard Williams, “Spear and Bolo Interlude,” 3, Papers of Tiffany Williams, 1893-1986, Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
spent in the Maine woods with only the occasional companionship of a French Canadian “who used to argue about whether the world was flat or round.” Ferdinand W. Haasis mocked those who thought of foresters in the East as effete, describing the Adirondacks as a “virgin wilderness” with no company except for “the blackflies.” Even the state employees of Pennsylvania—hardly a wilderness—complained of isolation. State troopers, despite the lurid details of Katherine Mayo’s numerous tales of derring-do, spent much of their time in enforced silence confined to barracks, staffing substations, or mounted on patrol. Indeed, the very concept of the State Police was an isolating experience for many of the troopers who found themselves isolated from the communities they garrisoned. The Commissioner of Forestry reported to the governor in 1911 that “the isolation necessary […] to exercise the duties” was a “serious problem.” Isolation, the Commissioner argued, was a sacrifice unbefitting state employment:

The Department is, therefore, brought face to face with the problem of relieving as far as possible, the isolation of its employes [sic.] and the deprivation which heretofore they have necessarily suffered respecting facilities relating to schools, churches, family supplies, and
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534 The Pennsylvania State Police compiled statistics for how many hours were spent doing categorically defined duties and for how many miles of the state were patrolled for inclusion within the annual or biannual report submitted to the governor of the state by the agencies chief. A similar list of duty stations was also included. From the annual and biannual “Reports of the Department of State Police of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,” 1906-1925, (Harrisburg: Harrisburg Publishing Company, 1906-1926). For anecdotal evidence of the troopers activities, see Elmer Faber, Behind the Law: True Stories Compiled from the Archives of the Pennsylvania State Police (Greensboro, Pennsylvania: Charles M. Henry, 1933); John P. Guyer, Pennsylvania’s Cossacks and the State’s Police (Reading, Pennsylvania: John P. Guyer, 1924); Lawrence G. Holmes, “An Analysis of State Police,” Trade Winds (May 1925), 16-20; Blair Jaekel, “Pennsylvania’s Mounted Police,” World’s Work 23 (1912), 641-652; Katherine Mayo, Justice to All: The Story of the Pennsylvania State Police (New York: Putnam’s Sons, 1917); Katherine Mayo, The Standard Bearers: True Stories of Heroes of Law and Order (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918); Katherine Mayo, Mounted Justice: True Stories of the Pennsylvania State Police (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922).
communication with the outlying world such as other citizens of our State almost uniformly enjoy.535

Government-men did not need to be stationed in Ifugao Province to feel isolated. The lone ranger in the midst of a thousand acre state forest could feel just as cut-off from the world he had known.

Social isolation compounded the Constabulary officers’ frustrations with geographical remoteness. Historians, like Aaron H. Skabelund, have chronicled agents of imperialism from other fin-de-siècle colonial state building projects expressing loneliness through correspondence about their pets.536 Philippine Constabulary officers were no less reticent in writing about theirs, many of whom appear to engage in daily allegorical battles. Tiffany Bernard Williams wrote passionately about his pet monkey, Jocko, who “ran loose and was into some kind of mischief several times a day, such as getting into the office and drinking the ink, or sneaking up to the doors of soldiers barracks and after watching them gambling for few minutes grabbing […] pieces of silver.”537 In one of the numerous animal-empire allegories, Williams told the story of how Jocko abandoned him
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537 Tiffany Bernard Williams, “Spear and Bolo Interlude,” 45, Papers of Tiffany Williams, 1893-1986, Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
for a troop of wild monkeys, but “on the third or fourth day after his disappearance, a
bedraggled and much chewed up Jocko came home. His wild cousins had refused to take
him in. After that he […] wouldn’t even look at the wild monkeys.”538 Jocko was not
Williams’ only source of pet-metaphor. In 1915, Williams inherited “a large, black, fierce
Chow dog” named Foo Sing, which “hated natives and for that matter […] was not very
friendly to Americans.” Enroute to a new station, Williams finally had a confrontation
with Foo Sing as the dog was attacking his soldiers and, more importantly, his horse.
Taking the dog off the trail and into a small clearing, he drew his pistol, fully resolved to
shoot the animal if it attacked him. On the contrary, though, “he licked [his] hand and
[…] after that he was always by [his] side.”539 Williams was not alone in owning a pet
sensitive to the colonial hierarchy. Don P. Branson fondly recalled how his dog,
Snowball, was a “friend and companion thru many long and lonesome months.” More
allegorically, the all-white dog was “very proud and tolerated the natives, but he seemed
to feel superior to all.”540 Even John Robert White, the intrepid chronicler of the
Constabulary, wrote of the comfort a cocker spaniel provided to him and his wife on
some of their lonelier postings.541 The Philippine Constabulary officers were not alone in
turning to pets for companionship.

538 Ibid., 59.
539 Ibid., 60.
540 Don P. Branson, “Recollections of Service in the Philippine Constabulary, 1907-1915,” Folder
CB B7: Branson, Don P., Philippine Constabulary Collection, Special Collections and Archives, University
of Oregon.
541 John Robert White, Diary 1912, Philippine Constabulary Collection, Special Collections and
Archives, University of Oregon.
Other agents of government found similar comforts in pets. Ralph Hosmer attributed recovery from an illness to his pet dog.542 Irving G. Stetson, a Yale Forest School graduate and Deputy Forest Warden for the state of Maine, strongly recommend that anyone considering a career in forestry acquire a dog. While patrolling remote lakes in northern Maine by canoe, he found his labrador retriever a wonderful companion and source of security.543 Similarly Katherine Mayo, the chronicler of the early Pennsylvania State Police, recorded the presence of dogs at the various barracks and at least one instance of a canine alerting the troopers to imminent danger.544 While these pets might comfort their masters, they were not a perfect substitute for their owners’ oft-pined for wife, or potential wife.

Senior executives at nearly all of the agencies in question recognized marriage as both a preferred and problematic solution to the companionship issue. As a solution, a correctly constructed marriage was acknowledged by agency elites to have a beneficial impact upon the performance of government-men. The Philippine Constabulary widely circulated a 1908 lecture on “the Preservation of the Moral Health of the Young Officer” before the First World War that likened acceptable women—mother, sister, or “sweetheart”—to “guy ropes” crucial to keeping a man’s moral tent erect and free from the “moral diseases” of debt, embezzlement, alcoholism, slovenliness, lying, and “neglect

542 Ralph S. Hosmer, Oral History Interview, Interviewed by Bruce C. Harding, November 4, 1957, Forest History Society Archives, Durham, North Carolina
of duty.” Of course, finding the right “guy rope” was difficult. As another Constabulary circular noted, the right woman chosen was “sensible: […] willing to share his [an officer’s] lot in a tropical land; and [was] undeceived as to his income and what [was] expected of his position.” Finding such a woman, though, given the isolation already noted, was not easy and the correlation of marriage and resignation was high within the Constabulary from 1902 to 1917.

Diaries and memoirs clarified that a “sensible” woman was white. John Robert White, as a senior member of the Constabulary in 1912, wrote about the subject at length. He opined that as was “usual in mixed marriages the man has married a woman of much lower class and education than himself. She mangles English as I have not heard for years; wears half a dozen gaudy rings, as many bracelets, and only two earrings. One day she is dressed in […] baggy blue silk trousers; small silk slippers; embroidered silk jacket, etc. The next she is a l’Americaine with skirt and flowers galore.” Don P. Branson, who turned his dog into a racial metaphor, similarly disapproved of mixed marriages generally, while admiring several specifically. Within the racially

545 L. B. Hillis, “The Preservation of the Moral Health of the Young Officer,” Constabulary School Notes No. 5, Box 174, File 1184-93, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
546 J. G. Harbord, “The Philippine Constabulary as a Career,” Constabulary School Notes No. 1, Box 174, File 1184-88, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
547 John Robert White, Diary 1912, Philippine Constabulary Collection, Special Collections and Archives, University of Oregon.
548 Don P. Branson, “Recollections of Service in the Philippine Constabulary, 1907-1915,” Folder CB B7, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
constructed social hierarchy, then, the career conscious Constabulary officer would seek domestic bliss and moral health from home.\textsuperscript{549}

Indeed, many officers turned their first home leave—usually in their third year—into an opportunity to find an eligible bride.\textsuperscript{550} James F. Quinn was granted a special leave to marry a woman from Boston after his fiancée’s sister wrote to Henry T. Allen through Senator Henry Cabot Lodge inquiring whether the junior officer could be reassigned to a less dangerous post than Samar. Allen obligingly responded that Quinn was in the northern part of Leyte, a “locality without any fear of insurrectos.”\textsuperscript{551} Two years after his marriage, Quinn’s wife died from what were vaguely referred to as tropical complications, thereby demonstrating the very real perils the wives of Constabulary officers faced.\textsuperscript{552} Howard F. Alexander, who married as a third lieutenant after joining the Constabulary in 1902, wrote to his brother-in-law in six-years later requesting $250.00 with which to leave the service. His brother-in-law—who was self-described as “a poor professor” of Greek at Cornell University—wanted to help his sister’s husband, but could not understand why so long serving a government official would need such a loan. Alexander was eventually forced to resign from the Constabulary owing to a

\textsuperscript{549} For a broader discussion of the culture and legal structure of intermarriage in the United States during the period in question, see Peggy Pascoe, \textit{What Comes Naturally} (New York: University of Oxford Press, 2010), 17-47.

\textsuperscript{550} A database of the careers of Philippine Constabulary officers recruited from the United States was compiled from the following sources: for October 1, 1904, through July 1, 1911: “Constabulary General Orders 1929-1930, with Rosters 1904-1911,” V. 805, RG 350; for January 1, 1914, through January 1, 1919: “Official Constabulary Registers, 1914-1919” (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1914-1919), File 4600-229, Box 560, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{551} Senator Henry Cabot Lodge to the Bureau of Insular Affairs, January 7, 1902, Folder 4097, Box 373, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{552} Status Report, Juan C. Quimbo (James F. Quinn), F. 4097, Box 373, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
debilitating illness. The Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, Clarence R. Edwards, eventually counselled Alexander that for the sake of his health and his wife, he should seek a quiet clerical position through the Civil Service Exam.\textsuperscript{553} Marriage to a Constabulary officer was a risk, especially given that an illness might very well lead to death, or worse, unemployment. Edwards warned H. A. Hutchings that supporting a wife as a third lieutenant in the Constabulary was difficult and that the Philippines could be quite unforgiving.\textsuperscript{554} Hutchings, though, like R. A. Duckworth-Roberts and Raymond H. Harrell, was able to marry and remain in government-service.\textsuperscript{555} Edwards and other senior executives of the Philippine Constabulary, however, quite clearly recognized these men and their marriages as unique. The majority of Constabulary officers, particularly after the agency reached bureaucratic maturity, used leave in their third year to return home, many found wives, and most resigned their commission.

A similar culture of recommending marriage in general, but not for employees specifically, existed in Pinchot’s Forest Service. In transforming the Division of Forestry into the Bureau of Forestry and then the US Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot encouraged a bachelor culture. Applicants to the service like M. M. Burtner and John C. Hall who announced that they were married were presented with form letters highlighting the low pay of the Student Assistantships and the difficulty of supporting a family while obtaining the necessary education to become Forest Assistants, Assistant Foresters, or

\textsuperscript{553} Howard F. Alexander, Folder 4494, Box 385, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{554} H. A. Hutchings, Folder 6227, Box 440, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{555} Raymond H. Harrell, F. 8573, Box 526, RG 350; R. A. Duckworth-Ford, Folder 8757, Box 530, RG 350, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Even those who were able to secure such positions were expected to frequently relocate, more often-than-not to isolated regions. Those that were stationed in Washington, DC, were still expected to participate in the late—and sometimes all—night thought sessions held by Pinchot at his family’s Rhode Island Avenue mansion. Yale Forest School graduates frequently chronicled their post-school careers as a series of geographically disparate moves until marriage, shortly after which they resigned from federal service. Few early Forest Rangers married before they became supervisors and even then their wives lived in austere conditions far removed from the street-car suburbs idealized by the Progressive Era middle-class.

Whether in the Philippine Constabulary, the US Forest Service, or the Pennsylvania State agencies, government-men worried that their wives—or potential wives—were not living middle-class, comfortable lives because of their career choices. John C. Groome, declaring marriage impractical to the realities of the barrack-bound Pennsylvania State Police, outright banned matrimony for the rank-and-file of his
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558 Data compiled by author from Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913) and Yale Forest School News, Vol. 1.1 (January 1913) to Vol. 9.4 (October 1921).

The Commissioners of the Pennsylvania State Forest Department worried that men would leave the service rather than subject their wives and families to living in remote areas bereft of modern conveniences. G. I. Porter, a Forest Guard and eventual Forest Ranger under Pinchot, described a career that required a wife to inhabit a decrepit, inadequately furnished remote cabin or shack, lacking in all facilities of sanitation and convenience; frequently located on side roads, unpaved-mud, ruts, dust, snow-year-round conditions, all nonconducive to neighborly or social contacts, miles from town; no telephone, no motorcar, no radio, no anything to take the curse off loneliness and household cares.

While marriage was not impossible for most of these government-men—even Groome eventually allowed troopers to marry after their third enlistment—the men and their superiors recognized that marriage would require their wives to make sacrifices because of their government careers.

The greatest sacrifice, though, was financial. Contemporaries, particularly members of the United States Civil Service Commission, recognized that government service had become a financial sacrifice for employees. In 1905, the Commission reported that federal clerk salaries had been reduced on average by $2.70 per year. The 1916 annual report for the US Department of Commerce concluded that not only had salaries in the federal service stagnated, but had shrunk as a result of inflation and the rising cost of living. Between 1854 and 1915 federal salaries had lost 14.1% against
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560 General Order No. 3, March 1907, Records of the Pennsylvania State Police, RG 30.5, Box I, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Mayo, Justice to All, 296.
inflation and another 16% in 1916. Furthermore, the report added that while workers in other industries had won shorter working hours or more limited working weeks, “the Government employee has received increased hours.”\textsuperscript{564} Paul H. Douglas, when testifying about the Welch Increase Salary Bill of 1928, concluded that by 1914 government workers had received a net 9% salary reduction by 1914, which rose to 30% by 1926, when accounting for inflation.\textsuperscript{565} The authoritative chronicler of the federal civil service, Paul P. Van Riper, further concluded that by 1913 even the generous vacation and sick leave accorded to government employees had been eclipsed by benefits—including pensions, which despite more than seventy separate proposals between 1886 and 1914 had still not been approved by Congress—offered by comparable private sector positions.\textsuperscript{566}

Low salaries were particularly problematic to agencies requiring specialized training and attempting to foster bureaucratic identities for long careers. The bureaucratic leadership of the Philippine Constabulary recognized that low salaries led to corruption, the recruitment of inferior men, and poor agency morale. John Robert White ascribed low salaries to putting many a “22 caliber man in a 45 caliber job.”\textsuperscript{567} Indeed, White blamed the poor salary of officers upon rampant embezzlement during the early years of the


\textsuperscript{566} Van Riper, \textit{History of the United States Civil Service}, 246.

\textsuperscript{567} John Robert White, Diary, May 28, 1912, Philippine Constabulary Collection, Special Collections and Archives, University of Oregon.
Constabulary, which he argued was only curtailed by the threat of dire consequences, including Bilibid Prison. Even as a senior colonel within the Constabulary, White lamented that the colonial lifestyle dreamed of by many would-be officers was beyond his financial means: “One afternoon I renewed my acquaintance with the royal game of polo at the Country Club at Calarian, where a very fine polo field has been laid out since I left Zamboanga in March 1911. If I could afford a pony or two I certainly would play this game which is the very king of games.” Since the founding of the Constabulary, polo had been associated with the agency’s officer corps and, yet, by 1912 the game was beyond the means of even senior officers. Another senior colonel, Henry Gilsheuser argued,

I am for giving junior officers and privates more pay before anything else is undertaken. Considering the services rendered by them they are very much underpaid—and for the present I feel no enthusiasm in any scheme which involves the spending of money for any matter not connected with active service, and unless it be a pension or retirement.

Even the enviable vacation and sick leave awarded to the Constabulary officers had to be fought for through arduous correspondence. Alexander J. Robertson, a decorated member of the Constabulary who rose to be a major in the service, sent numerous letters and supporting documents to headquarters before Allen intervened to grant him an extended stay in San Francisco to recover from “gastric neurastenia.” The financial reality of
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service in the Constabulary was far removed from the romantic construction of a colonial service where danger was compensated with servants and rounds of polo.

Life was little better for the employees of the US Forest Service. From early in his reformation of federal arboreal management, Pinchot warned would-be foresters about the lack of financial reward. In January 1902, he wrote to an inquisitive Austen H. Fox that “foresters will probably never be more than fairly paid in this country.” Instead of financial reward, though, for “a man […] who likes the work and who has thoroughly prepared himself for it, it may reasonably be expected to give a useful career and a living.”572 In absence of financial reward, a government-man could expect usefulness and a fair living. Douglas K. Noyes—a multigenerational Yale legacy from middle-class parents who graduated with the Forest School’s class of 1911—wrote to future alums of penury in government service:

I had done so much travelling by this time that I had arrived in the state of penury affected by all Forest Service men and had to borrow money to get away from the place. But I made the fatal error of not borrowing enough and by the time I got back to Fresno, found by a series of careful calculations that I would have to ride all the way two days or so in a chair car and live on two meals a day. What rubbed it in was the fact that I was on Government expense. I finally arrived at Yreka with 57 cents in my pocket.573

Not surprisingly, Noyes left the Forest Service, married, and accepted a position at an investment bank on Wall Street. After leaving the government, he updated his fellow graduates of 1911 not about hard-won promotions and federal penury, but of buying a motor car and touring the East Coast during his generous vacations, of raising his

572 Gifford Pinchot to Austen H. Fox, January 2, 1902, Box XXV, Office of the Chief, General Records, General Correspondence of the Forest Service, 1898-1908, RG 95, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

children in a large home in Jersey City, and of swiftly rising through the ranks of finance.\textsuperscript{574} Noyes, and others like him, were able to find Pinchot’s reward, just not as government-men.

Monetary remuneration was little better for Pennsylvania State Police troopers. In his annual report to the governor in 1910, Superintendent John C. Groome reported, “morale, personnel and discipline of the Force continue excellent,” but 138 of the 220 men authorized had resigned with 82 having “left the Force to accept better paying positions.”\textsuperscript{575} In 1913, Groome reported 42 resignations for better pay.\textsuperscript{576} Despite such reports from Groome, the state government left the troopers’ salaries at $60.00 per month, of which $18.00 was reserved for room and board.\textsuperscript{577} Groome pleaded with the governor that “the present pay of the men on the force is not commensurate with the arduous and dangerous character of the duties they have to perform.”\textsuperscript{578} Citing a “cost of living” increase of “over 15 per cent,” Groome argued that his men deserved more than the “average ignorant untrained day laborer.”\textsuperscript{579} Funding for the agency was so low that had the trooper attrition rate not been so high there would been a shortage of horses.\textsuperscript{580}


\textsuperscript{578} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{580} Conti, \textit{The Pennsylvania State Police}, 78.
The Pennsylvania Department of Forestry suffered from similar wage and funding problems. On August 10, 1910, R. J. Rothrock promised the first four classes of the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy a rosy-middle class future:

You are guaranteed for your first of post-graduate labor $720.00. That comes to you in solid cash. Of all those who graduate in law, medicine, or theology, after bearing the expense of their own education, not one in ten has any hope of such a sum for his first year’s work. At the commencement of your third year you receive one hundred dollars a month. That is more money than three-fourths of your fellow citizens have received at the most productive period of their lives. You are entering on the flood tide of a young and needed profession.\(^{581}\)

Rothrock’s rhetoric made note of the “actual trial” forestry work entailed—even referring to the “self-denial and hard work” of the “pioneer” and the “soldier”—but he was convinced that the career would not entail financial sacrifice.\(^{582}\) The financial reward promised by Pennsylvania’s founding arboreal advocate, though, was gilded. As early as the biannual report of 1906, agents of the State Forestry Department warned that the wages the state paid manual laborers was far below the same rates paid by private companies.\(^{583}\) Two years later, George Wirt reported direly that laborers had “chosen to work for the Forestry Department when they might have received higher wages nearer home, and their loyalty should be regarded.”\(^{584}\) In the biannual report for 1913, nearly every State Forest and State Nursery managed by the Forest Department reported difficulty in securing laborers owing to the sharp increase in the cost of living. By 1920, when Gifford Pinchot assumed control of the agency, the assistant commissioner, I. C.

\(^{582}\) Ibid., 201.
Williams, reported that “the failure of government salaries to keep up with outside wages and the cost of living” was the “most potent reason” why forty percent of the graduates—55 of 107 men—from the State Forest Academy were not working for the state government. The inability or unwillingness of the state government to recognize inflation and adjust salaries accordingly had created the same financial disappointment with the State Forest Department as it had with the State Police, the US Forest Service, and the Philippine Constabulary.

At the cutting-edge of Progressive Era governance, these government agencies had promised young men an idealized identity as romantic, masculine men of a new bureaucratic state capable of projecting order upon the land and society. Instead, thoroughly educated and trained, these young men faced a life of personal sacrifice. Romantic adventures became mired in paperwork spent in isolated offices. Patriotic service quickly soured as remoteness and salary devaluation dashed the middle-class expectations of ambitious men. By 1920, as the era of experimental Progressive governance ended, many of these government-men were simply too well-trained not to continue seeking some sort of ideal.

Life Ever After

Despite extensive identity development the majority of men recruited and trained by the agencies in question left the service after experiencing disappointment with bureaucratic stagnation, the nature of their work, or ability to attain a middle-class
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lifestyle. On submitting their resignations, these young men pursued either careers promising further romanticized adventure or positions avoiding one or all of the disappointments experienced with their first government career. The majority of them, though, before the great disruption of the First World War leveraged the technical skills inculcated by their agency to move themselves closer to an ideal.

Unencumbered by specialized forestry training, officers of the Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police were the most apt to leave their respective services for further adventure elsewhere. For most, with past military experience and with paramilitary police training, the US Army was a likely employer. Indeed, between 1914 and 1918 both the Philippine Constabulary and the Pennsylvania State Police experienced an exodus of officers for the armed services. Officers in both services were interested in other, newer, policing agencies with the Bureau of Insular Affairs routinely being asked to provide letters of recommendation in support of applications to the Gendarmerie d'Haïti, which was organized like the Constabulary with white, American officers and local rank-and-file. Applicants assumed the agency would be nearly identical with the Constabulary, so much so that they referred to it as the Haitian Constabulary. Edward P. Lowry and Oscar Preuss were recruited from the


587 Ralph R. Faison, Charles P. Gilchrist, John Benedict Hanrahan, Edward P. Lowry, Samuel Morris Martin, William J. Platka, Robert A. Shope, Myles Standish Wilder, compiled from the following
Philippine Constabulary for positions in the Treasury Gendarmerie created in Persia by C. B. Stokes at the request of William M. Schuster. After the Mexican Revolution, John W. Spence wrote to the Bureau of Insular Affairs, “I should like very much to be placed in charge of police duty in any town in Mexico, as my qualifications fit me peculiarly for such position. My experience as a Constabulary officer will be decidedly valuable in that respect.” While Spence’s proposed career in Mexico might seem delusional, the global marketability of those with training in paramilitary police forces prior to World War I was very much a reality.

With specialized training many of the officers and agents in question leveraged hiring paying positions with greater responsibilities in new or expanding agencies. Many of the Constabulary and Pennsylvania State Police officers found their way to the New York State Police, the second state police force in the United States, and other such agencies, including the Treasury Department’s Prohibition Bureau, the Internal Revenue Service’s intelligence unit, and the inspection bureau of the Department of Labor’s
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Immigration & Naturalization Service.\textsuperscript{591} Foresters and Forest Rangers with the US Forest Service found ample work with emerging state agencies in the years before the First World War. The Connecticut Division of Forestry was directed by Austin F. Hawes, who had started a career with Pinchot’s federal agency in 1900 and resigned in 1904 as a Forest Assistant.\textsuperscript{592} Nearly the entire California Board of Forestry created in 1905 was managed by veterans of the federal Forest Service. George B. Lull, the first significant State Forester, had been appointed as a Student Assistant in the US Forest Service by Pinchot in 1902.\textsuperscript{593} Other veterans would follow Lull, including William C. Hodges who after more than a decade with the US Forest Service accepted a position as Deputy Forester for the State of California in 1913.\textsuperscript{594} E. T. Allen, one of Pinchot’s first Forest Assistants, was quick to accept the directorship of the Philippine Bureau of Forestry, an agency that would consistently provide employment for Yale Forest School alumni until the First World War.\textsuperscript{595}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{592} Data compiled by author from Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913) and Yale Forest School News, Vol. 1.1 (January 1913) to Vol. 9.4 (October 1921).
\textsuperscript{593} Gifford Pinchot to George B. Lull, June 14, 1902, Box VI: General Correspondence of the Forest Service, Office of the Chief, 1898-1908, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
\textsuperscript{594} Data compiled by author from Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913) and Yale Forest School News, Vol. 1.1 (January 1913) to Vol. 9.4 (October 1921).
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Not all of the government-men, though, chose to stay in government. Disappointment with government salaries may well have motivated many of the agents in question to pursue employment in business. Philippine Constabulary officers developed strong career connections with Standard Oil managing offices from Hong Kong to India. Others managed plantations, mining and lumber firms or joined exporting and importing companies. Similarly, US Forest Service employees started consulting companies, worked for lumber concerns and railroads, or left forestry and found managerial careers in insurance, investment, and finance. Even the Pennsylvania State Forest service lost young men to the private sector. Royal S. Kellog summarized the experience of many of his contemporaries:

Well, there’s a good many things to be said about government. I always said I did two good things myself—I went into the service and I got out. It was a great education experience being in government service at the time I was. But it wasn’t anything permanent as far as I was concerned—there’s a certain amount of deadening effect from


598 Data compiled by author from Biographical Record of the Graduates and Former Students of the Yale Forest School (New Haven: Yale Forest School, 1913) and Yale Forest School News, Vol. 1.1 (January 1913) to Vol. 9.4 (October 1921).

public service—Civil Service. The Civil Service is a great refuge for mediocrity—I think maybe you understand that.  

Promised a role in the creation of modern governance, many of Kellog’s contemporaries felt as he did: that the government trained them for a more fruitful career elsewhere.

***

Disappointment mattered. The young men discussed here each had their own individual reason for leaving the government career they had struggled to achieve. Some were frustrated by the lack of career advancement as bureaucracies matured following initial bursts of hiring and advancement. Many were frustrated by the loneliness and poor living conditions. Others became disillusioned with the promise that a government career could lead to middle-class success and sought a more livable ideal elsewhere. Their disappointment with the idealized government-man—the ruggedly masculine individual bringing modern governance near and far—was foundational to the idea of public service as public sacrifice.

Conclusion
Individual government agents mattered. Between 1898 and 1917 the builders of the modern American administrative state created professionalized government careers. In doing so, men like Henry T. Allen, Gifford Pinchot, John C. Groome, and George H. Wirt pioneered new educational pathways to technocratic jobs within the regulatory state. Using cutting-edge administrative control methods, they developed idealized normative institutional identities that celebrated rugged individualism and bureaucratic conformity. As a result of the government service fantasy they created, agents from the Philippines to Pennsylvania resigned in disappointment and took their expertise elsewhere. Public service became public sacrifice with highly skilled employees—often trained over long periods at great expense—resigning their positions.

Educational institutions like the Yale Forest School and the New Mexico Military Institute were early participants in the creation of the modern government career between 1898 and 1917. These and other schools created direct linkages with senior government employees in order to gain access to expanding bureaucracies for their students. While perceived as more meritocratic than the E. L. Godkin’s “snivel service,” these education-based career pathways still excluded those who could not gain admission to these schools or those who failed to cultivate the necessary relationships with key directors, teachers, and professors, like Henry S. Graves.601 Gifford Pinchot’s Forest Service, which routinely rejected applications from men with decades of experience in the forest management or timber production, was a particularly extreme example of education as a
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career prerequisite. Ultimately, educational institutions that were closely aligned with
government agencies served as an introduction to what a good government employee was
and how a young-man could become one.

Determining bureaucratic normative identities were agency elites like Henry T.
Allen, Gifford Pinchot, John C. Groome, and George H. Wirt. These men in establishing
or reforming their agencies actively developed definitions of what it meant to be a
successful Constabulary officer, Forester, or State Trooper. These identities were
consciously constructed amalgams of rugged masculine individuality and bureaucratic
conformity. Successful government agents were paragons of the new administrative state
capable of braving wildernesses—whether the remote mountains of Luzon, the depths of
the National Forest Reserves, or the urban and rural outposts of Pennsylvania—and
completing standardized reports in a timely way. These were strenuous technocrats.
Government-men did not appear disheveled, drunk, or weak.

To transform young men into government-men, the agencies examined created
complex recruitment and training programs. Some of these were as simple as John C.
Groome’s regular lectures for Pennsylvania’s State Police that taught the troopers the
importance of gentlemanliness. Others were as complex as the training academies
established by Henry T. Allen and George H. Wirt. At the Constabulary School, Allen
and his officer-instructors provided lessons in law and governance that emphasized the
importance of each cadet in the success of the American civilizing mission in the
archipelago. Every wrinkled shirt and unmade bed became a threat to the colonial state.
Wirt’s Pennsylvania State Forest Academy was, perhaps, one of the most radical
government career institutions of the Progressive Era providing guaranteed jobs to the successful graduates who were trained in the art of representing the state. Gifford Pinchot’s federal Foresters were introduced and vetted by the service through an experimental internship program that weeded out those who could not conform to his professional ideals. These institutions and programs professionalized government-careers as more than merely clerical positions, while also introducing would-be recruits to the agencies’ normative identities.

To enforce the idealized image of each agency’s employee, senior staff members wrote and circulated hundreds of missives that reminded each officer, trooper, and forester how he was supposed to look and act. The most infamous of the missives discussed was the Use Book crafted by Gifford Pinchot for Foresters and Forest Rangers across the United States that grew from a slim pocket folio to a massive tome. Allen’s Philippine Constabulary relied upon Circulars issued from Manila and then distributed throughout the archipelago. These often short documents reminded officers how to carry out their duties and how to meet the expectations of headquarters. Similar strategies of manuals, handbooks, and circular letters were utilized by the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division. These documents went beyond guaranteeing a uniform experience of governance for citizens and subjects. The bureaucratic missives created by the various headquarter staffs strove to conform individuals to a single government-man identity.

The unfortunate reality of these government-careers was that disappointment dominated many of the individual lives examined between 1898 and 1917. Inherent
within the identity of the government-man was a dream of masculine adventure, career advancement, and middling respectability. Through bureaucratic stagnation—experienced eventually by all of the agencies discussed—career advancement was either unobtainable or realized at glacial speeds. Compounding slow promotions was the declining value of government work as a result of inflation, which caused real government salaries to plummet through the end of World War I in the United States. Finally, poor living conditions—the reality of promised masculine adventures—resulted in dispirited workers residing in poor, isolated housing and burdened with an ever increasing amount of office-bound paperwork. Being a Forest Ranger was as much about paperwork as it was about roaming America’s woodlands, but in the recruitment literature office-work went unmentioned. Disappointment with the government-man ideal resulted not only in the loss of morale, but the loss of training and institutional knowledge that vanished with each resignation as young men moved to more lucrative careers as higher-ranking executives in other government agencies or as experts in the private sector.

Unifying the Philippine Constabulary, the Pennsylvania State Police, and the Pennsylvania Forestry Division was the War Department. Young men in the United States were exposed to the War Department in a variety of ways. Military academies and military service were the more obvious ways. The New Mexico Military Institute and other military academies regulated by the War Department provided nearly all of the officers for the Philippine Constabulary, while the Pennsylvania State Police was deliberately composed of nearly all veterans. The college educated technocrats of the US
Forest Service were more subtly influenced by the War Department. Graduates from land grant colleges were required to take military courses overseen by officers detailed from the US Army. Once within Pinchot’s Forest Service, Foresters and Forest Rangers took part in a bureaucracy that was modeled in part on the War Department, which had decades of experience managing large numbers of men across vast distances. My preliminary research demonstrates the previously unrecognized extent of the War Department’s influence upon the expansion of the administrative state.

This dissertation has attempted a social history of American political development and in so doing has revealed the importance of individual stories in understanding governance. The individuals of government mattered and have been ignored in favor of simplified narratives in which agencies are ascribed actions: the Philippine Constabulary was racist, the Pennsylvania State Police was classist, the US Forest Service was elitist, the Pennsylvania Forestry Division was all three. What such anthropomorphosis obfuscates are the thousands of young men who dreamed of working for these agencies—dreamed of governance—and then made government a reality for citizens from Harrisburg to Manila. These individuals mattered because they, much more than the policy makers and legislative reformers, were the government.

The more than two-thousand young men profiled throughout this dissertation also matter because creating effective government agencies staffed by mission-driven employees has remained an elusive goal for reformers since the Progressive Era. Governance has only become more complex since 1917 and understanding who has been drawn to government careers and why remains critical. Yet, my methodology—
examining personnel correspondence for personal motivations—suggests a model for understanding why people choose to pursue and abandon government careers.

Historians have examined the emergence of the administrative state during the Progressive Era from the vantages of government elites, political leaders, and the governed. Specific policies and acts have been traced from expostulation to fruition. Yet, the intimate lives of those who did governance, the day-in-day-out agents of government, have been ignored. In exploring these intimate lives, I have demonstrated the importance of gender identity—specifically the rugged masculine evangelical identity of the strenuous life—in creating a pervasive sense of disappointment within these doers. I have demonstrated that not only did the resignations this disappointment caused represent a loss of human capital, but a failure by politicians and reformers during the Progressive Era to create an administrative state capable of inspiring, recruiting, training, and retaining an increasingly specialized, technocratic bureaucracy. Perhaps, most importantly then, a more intimate knowledge of bureaucrats demonstrates the need to readdress our belief that the modern administrative state successfully created a model for the replication, regulation, and maintenance of power.

The similarities between government employees today and their counterparts presented here emphasizes the importance of reevaluating government success to include the satisfaction of government agents. An extensive survey of government employee satisfaction matrices published at the beginning of the 21st century concluded that public sector workers were discouraged by the devaluing of their work, the paucity of career
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opportunities, and a lack of a voice in the administering of their agencies. These reasons are eerily similar to those reported at the beginning of the 20th century when modern hierarchical, bureaucratic management was first adopted by reforming old agencies like the US Post Office Department and the War Department, as well as new agencies like those already discussed. Anecdotal evidence from public sector employees even more eerily reflect the concerns of those who resigned government service prior to World War I. Sam Navarez, a thirty-six year old human resources manager with the US Forest Service, explained to a reporter in 2012 that his federal salary failed to provide him with a stable middle-class lifestyle despite advanced degrees. As he explained to the reporter, “I never thought I would be here […] but the private sector is just looking better and better.” The evidence of government employee satisfaction today—where only 60% of employees feel that agencies are hiring the right people and highly skilled technocrats are regularly wooed away from public service—demonstrates the ongoing importance of understanding the evolving identity of those in governance.

Despite changes in the scope of government during the long New Deal and the rise of anti-government ideologies on the right, the importance of bureaucrats to the

---


604 Skowronek, *Building a New American State*.


606 Tom Fox, “Federal Agencies are Failing when it Comes to Managing Employees throughout their Careers,” *Washington Post*, August 21, 2015.
everyday life of Americans remains. Whether the historical exploration of Robert B. Horwitz or the popular WikiQuote website, bureaucracies have long been ridiculed in part, I have argued, because historians and political scientists have failed to understand governance as being comprised and conducted by individuals.607 What is needed is an ever greater understanding of those who choose to become bureaucrats.

---
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