

LD 720

The American Military Experience and the United States Military
Academy

COL KINGSEED
MAJ MANSOOR

The Influence of Oliver Otis Howard's Superintendency on
Discipline and Professionalism

CPT GARRETT C. GRIMM
01 December 1993



Major General Oliver Otis Howard became the twentieth superintendent of the United States Military Academy (USMA) on 21 January 1881. The events surrounding Howard's appointment were extremely explosive. It was during the middle of an academic year that Howard became superintendent after President Rutherford B. Hayes appointed Major General John M. Schofield to the newly created Military Division of the South. The unusual timing for changing superintendents and the scandalous and racially incendiary incident involving Cadet Johnson C. Whittaker placed Howard in an unenviable position, as he stated, "The incident had caused a great deal of public comment in the newspapers, and sharp excitement for and against the colored cadet."¹

Cast in the unenviable position, how did Howard handle the situation? What significance can we attribute to Howard's superintendency? One can not find the answer in any monument or structure left behind, but one can find it in the sense of professionalism among the Corps of Cadets. Howard's execution of his duties during his twenty month tenure as Superintendent of the United States Military Academy steadied the Corps of Cadets through renewed emphasis on discipline and professionalism.

Whittaker was a black cadet in his first class year who had disciplinary problems stemming largely from his being black and his temperament. He was not a good student. He was, however, good enough to stay at USMA until the spring of his first class year, suffering through ostracism from his fellow cadets because

¹ Oliver Otis Howard, *Autobiography of Oliver Otis Howard: Major General United States Army*, (New York: Baker & Taylor, 1908), 2:485.

of his race. However, Whittaker experienced no serious academic trouble until the academic board found him academically deficient in philosophy in the January 1879 examination.

Then on 06 April 1880, his roommate found Whittaker in his room with his ears cut and bound with rope.² Superintendent Schofield initiated an investigation of the incident and the investigating officers found sufficient evidence to refute Whittaker's story of being attacked and molested. They believed the evidence supported the theory that Whittaker had inflicted the wounds himself and fabricated the whole story in the hopes of discrediting his fellow cadets³ and to avoid his imminent dismissal from the academy.⁴ Schofield believed that he had put the incident to rest summing up the incident by stating "it does not seem a reasonable expectation that young men of a race so recently emerged from a state of slavery could complete successfully with those who have inherited the strength gained in the many generations of freedom enjoyed by their ancestors,"⁵ but the incident had hit a political cord with the press and the public. President Hayes ordered Howard to USMA and Schofield to the Military Division of the South.⁶

² John A. Carpenter, Sword and Olive Branch: Oliver Otis Howard, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964), 270.

³ Howard, 2:486.

⁴ Carpenter, 271.

⁵ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1880), 228-230.

⁶ Carpenter, 271.

The timing and the circumstances surrounding the appointment of Howard to the superintendency lends credence to the idea that the President relieved Schofield. Through his positions with the Freedmen's Bureau and Howard University, Howard's reputation grew. President Hayes must have known about Howard's reputation when he selected him without consulting General in Chief William T. Sherman.⁷ He may have wanted a public relations move to help the image of the academy, especially after Schofield's comments from his last Annual Report became public.⁸

Howard and President Hayes met in December 1880 and discussed the Whittaker case. The President explained the details of the case to Howard and asked for his advice. Howard at once recommended the case be taken away from West Point, "where the social prejudice was strong against a Negro cadet" and that President Hayes "yield to his desire to have a regular court-martial and to locate the court in New York."⁹ The President agreed and disposed of the case in this manner with the same results.

Whatever actually happened is unknown, but it is a fact that a court-martial in New York convicted Whittaker and sentenced him to be discharged for "doing himself the injuries in view of putting his cadet comrades in a bad light."¹⁰ The evidence used

⁷ George S. Pappas, To the Point: the United States Military Academy, 1802-1902, (Westport Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1993), 403.

⁸ Carpenter, 271.

⁹ Howard, 2:486.

¹⁰ Howard, 2:486. "On review the President, permitting the young man to tender his resignation, remitted the sentence. After a few weeks the ugly excitement that grew out of this event disappeared altogether."

to convict Whittaker was circumstantial at best. The only direct evidence presented that connected Whittaker with self-inflicting the wounds was the testimony of handwriting experts. Nothing else indicated that he had masterminded the whole affair, nor was there any motive proven.¹¹ President Chester A. Arthur reviewed the case and remitted the sentence permitting Whittaker to tender his resignation on the same day the War Department, with Secretary Lincoln's approval, ordered Whittaker dismissed for academic deficiency.¹² The whole incident and its furor subsided within a few weeks.¹³

The Corps of Cadets went through a trying time in the aftermath of the Civil War and then the Whittaker incident. Both had eroded discipline. Subsequent administrations employed policies such as increased Sunday permits to leave post that further reduced discipline. Professionalism in the corps of cadets was low. Integration had come to USMA in 1870. Between 1870 and 1889, twenty-three blacks were nominated, but USMA admitted only twelve, and of these twelve, only three graduated. One of the graduates entered USMA in 1883 and another in 1884. The third had graduated in 1877. USMA admitted no other black cadet until after World War I and none graduated until 1936.¹⁴ It is not surprising that two thirds of the black graduates prior

¹¹ Pappas, 403.

¹² Pappas, 403.

¹³ Howard, 2:486.

¹⁴ Theodore J. Crackel, The Illustrated History of West Point, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1990), 164-170.

to 1936 entered the Academy shortly after the superintendency of Howard.

The selection of Howard as the twentieth superintendent of USMA was a politically astute move made with a knowledge of Howard's past accomplishments and reputation. Howard later remarked, "President Hayes had an idea that I was the proper man to settle such a case."¹⁵ The President undoubtedly knew of Howard's reputation with the Freedman's Bureau and Howard University.

Howard's past provides some insights into his handling of the superintendency of West Point. His deeply religious beliefs governed his lifestyle. He regularly attended church and even once referred to himself as "very pious."¹⁶ In his autobiography, he admitted "at no time in my life did I feel so much that I had attained substantial greatness as when ... I passed in and out of the college (Bowdoin) chapel for the last time."¹⁷ While a cadet, Howard joined the Bible class. This was one reason for a small "cabal" to form against him. He eventually overcame the ostracism, but his faith never wavered.¹⁸

Howard was not an ardent antislavery man, despite his own admission on two occasions that he was an abolitionist.¹⁹ In fact, years later, Howard wrote he was not an abolitionist as a

¹⁵ Howard, 2:485.

¹⁶ Carpenter, 4.

¹⁷ Howard, 1:43.

¹⁸ Howard, 1:52.

¹⁹ Carpenter, 9.

cadet, but he "endorsed the speeches of William H. Seward, which were against slavery and demonstrated the desirability of its nonextension."²⁰ Even so, it was evident that he held strong convictions against slavery. He even once mentioned approvingly of Harriet Beecher Stowe as "that talented woman, Mrs. Stowe, the author of Uncle Tom's Cabin."²¹ During the Civil War, Howard wrote "we have furnished quite a bevy of young men to Jeff - Davis army ... many warm personal friends on that side ... but they are the enemies of my country."²² His antislavery feelings led him to further the cause of the former slaves after the war when he became the commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands on 15 May 1865.²³

As the commissioner of the Freedmen Bureau, Howard was able to transform his belief that blacks were equal in every aspect to their white counterparts into policy. Congress charged the bureau with providing necessities for the destitute, administering the confiscated and abandoned lands controlled by the government in the South, and controlling "all subjects relating to refugees and freedmen."²⁴ The bureau also was responsible for supervising the negotiations of labor contracts for the freedmen. If the local courts failed to grant them equal

²⁰ Howard, 1:49.

²¹ Howard to Charles Howard, (USMA Library, Special Collections, Nov. 21, 1852).

²² Howard to Charles Howard, (USMA Library, Special Collections, May 6, 1861).

²³ Carpenter, 87.

²⁴ Carpenter, 88.

rights, the bureau held precedence over the judicial matters involving freedmen. It also fostered black education through cooperation with Northern philanthropic societies.²⁵ Here, Howard managed the bureau with fairness and a strong belief that what he was doing was the best for all as depicted in his comment the "we must be fair and consistent with white men as well as with black."²⁶

What the bureau did from 1865 through 1872 was just short of a miracle. Even though the bureau under Howard came under close scrutiny, two different boards of inquiry investigated his performance and publicly exonerated him. With constantly changing personnel, while operating over a vast area, and amongst a hostile white population, the bureau supervised and cared for "roughly four million freed slaves."²⁷ Howard's support for the good of the freedmen accounted for much of the success of the Freedmen Bureau. This was also true for the success he had in the field of education.²⁸

Through his actions, Howard showed that he believed blacks could successfully master higher education. As the commissioner for the Freedmen Bureau, Howard was in a position of great power and had a large quantity of currency at his disposal that he used to further the educational institutions specifically chartered

²⁵ Carpenter, 88.

²⁶ Howard to Charles Howard, (USMA Library, Special Collections, Feb. 11, 1866).

²⁷ Carpenter, 87.

²⁸ Carpenter, 156.

for freedmen. In November 1866, some of the leading members of Washington's First Congregational Church, of which Howard was one, got together to develop a plan for a theological school to prepare the freedmen for the ministry. The members agreed upon the name Howard University over the protests of Howard. The final charter included preparatory, collegiate, law, agricultural, and medical departments. Although the intent of the university was to further higher education for the freedmen, no mention of race or sex was in the charter. Instead, the stated purpose of the university was to provide "for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences."²⁹

As president of the university from 1868 until 1873, Howard developed a school patterned after his experience of higher education at West Point. He led the reading of scriptures and prayers nearly every morning, created the music and the commercial departments, and established a military department. The military department subjected male students who lived on campus to a regime similar to the one Howard had experienced some fourteen years earlier while a cadet at USMA. There were reveille, marching to classes, saluting, roll calls, and inspections in the belief that this provided the needed training in health, neatness, and discipline. The military department lasted only until Howard resigned from the presidency of the university.³⁰ This showed his resolve in the belief that the

²⁹ Carpenter, 170.

³⁰ Carpenter, 183.

"West Point system" had a lot of merit and that black students could benefit from it as well as white.

Although he was very proud of Howard University, he was most proud of his overall contributions to the institutions of higher education that he helped as the commissioner of the Freedmen Bureau.³¹ He wrote,

My glory, if I ever have any, consists in results attained; and the results in the case of the Freedmen's Bureau are, for me, more marked than those of the war. It is a pleasure to know that Institutions of learning like Howard University, Hampton Institute, Atlanta University and others in whose incipiency I bore a part, are now constantly increasing in power and influence, and will continue their good work long after I am gone.³²

The vision that he saw in the education of the freedmen was truly remarkable. Howard saw the potential of blacks more than a hundred years before Congress and he brought this vision to the United States Military Academy on 21 January 1881.

Quiet distinction and professionalism characterized Howard's short tenure as the superintendent at USMA. No inflammatory incidents occurred, there was no power struggle between the academic board and the superintendent, and the corps of cadets conducted themselves in an appropriate manner. However, it was as he described it, "The hardest office to fill that I had ever had."³³

Apparently, Howard believed that a majority of the officers opposed the designation of West Point as a military department.

³¹ Howard, 2:402-416.

³² Howard to Col. George W. Williams, (Nov. 25, 1886) as quoted in Carpenter, 168.

³³ Howard, 2:487.

They wanted West Point to revert back under the control of the Chief of Engineers. This opposition was not open, but rather secret, and "consisted in correspondence with the War Department, with the head of the army [General Sherman], and with all officers who had in Washington anything to do with the Military Academy."³⁴ It was so well known, that the Board of Visitors report of 1881 contained two comments supporting the opposition on the issue.

The Board of Visitors gave a voice to the "majority of the officers" that Howard believed opposed the Department of West Point when it wrote that "the Revised Statutes, sections 1310, 1314, 1334, provide that the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall have the rank of colonel of Engineers. We are not aware that the law above quoted has been repealed, but we do not find it enforced."³⁵ A minority report also discussed the designation of West Point as a military department. Of the seven board members, the following three signed the minority report: General Milo S. Hascall, General Don Carlos Buell, and the Honorable Henry B. Ledyard.³⁶ The report charged that "[t]here being apparently none but personal reasons for this arrangement [the Department of West Point]; we must expect to find personal considerations pervading its operation." The authors "refrain[ed] from pursuing more particularly the hurtful effects

³⁴ Howard, 2:487.

³⁵ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 3.

³⁶ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, Minority Report, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 19.

which must be expected or from answering at length the grounds on which they were introduced."³⁷ This must have sounded like a conspiracy to Howard. He wrote his response in the annual report of 1881. He stated "the academy is established and maintained for the interest of the Army, and not the Army for the Academy. Therefore, worthy and capable officers in all the branches should, I believe, continue to have the opportunity of detail, as the law of Congress contemplates."³⁸ Could the Board of Visitors' remarks have been a scathing rebuke from his two previous courts-martial as commissioner of the Freedmen Bureau or were they Sherman's way of getting even for not being consulted in Howard's appointment? The answer lies beyond the scope of this paper; but by September 1882, the Department of West Point ceased to exist.

Howard also had a hard time convincing the policy makers in Washington, that the superintendent position should be a five year tour instead of the traditional four. He convinced the Board of Visitors in 1881 for they wrote "a period of more than four years seems to us necessary to enable the Superintendent to acquire a perfect knowledge of the interests of the Academy and of the best method of discharging his duties."³⁹ He tried one more time to have his opinion heard by writing "from present

³⁷ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, Minority Report, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 16.

³⁸ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 159.

³⁹ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 3.

knowledge and experience I am of the opinion that the same rule as to length of term [five years] should apply to the commandant and superintendent."⁴⁰

However frustrating the situation was for him, Howard still effected certain reforms designed to improve the state of discipline and morale within the Corps of Cadets.⁴¹ The belief that "the production of manliness may be due to something else than the terror that is constantly experienced when a young man is listening for his name at every evening roll call" drove him.⁴² Upon taking command at West Point, Howard found that the previous administration gave the cadets more privileges in an attempt to relieve the severity of "the West Point system" of merit and demerit. However, no one informed the cadets the intent of the action. Therefore, the Corps of Cadets took advantage of the relaxation of discipline and did some mischievous things. The repercussions were the resumption of the old, severe discipline. Cadets walked post as sentries all night in the barracks; commissioned instructors lived in the barracks "so that every division should have at least one army officer constantly on the watch to supervise and report delinquencies."⁴³ The result was cadets discovered off limits ran for cover, skulked, and hid behind logs. It appeared that the right thing

⁴⁰ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 159.

⁴¹ Carpenter, 272.

⁴² Howard, 2:491.

⁴³ Howard, 2:489.

to do was to "avoid an officer and deceive him, and break the regulations without scruple."⁴⁴

He abolished the cadet "all-night guard" within the barracks, took the academic officers away from company duty with the cadets, confined sergeant positions to the second class and corporal positions to the third class and reduced the number of Sunday permits given cadets to go beyond the limits of the post. The overall effect improved discipline that had grown too lax and to instill a stronger desire to abide by the regulations "because of the right [and] the reason for it on the part of young men. Laxity [and] espionage had grown together."⁴⁵ By giving the Corps of Cadets the responsibility to act professionally and the "kindly and paternal execution of our rules and regulations," he achieved his desired results. He stated, "I cannot help thinking that better results would be obtained ... by any system that leans strongly to trusting the young men."⁴⁶ The Board of Visitors backed him by writing, "the necessarily rigid discipline of the cadets seems to be preserved. The penalties for violation of the regulations of the Academy are mild and calculated to stimulate the well-disposed student to renewed exertions and not to break the manly spirit of independence."⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Howard, 2:490.

⁴⁵ Howard to General Irwin McDowell, (USMA Library, Special collections, Mar. 1, 1881).

⁴⁶ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, 1881, 158; Howard to General Irwin McDowell, (USMA Library, Special Collections, Mar. 1, 1881); and Howard, 2:490-491.

⁴⁷ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 4-5.

As with superintendents before and after him, Howard attempted to reduce hazing. In his annual report of 1881, Howard reported that "[t]here was no hazing during the last summer encampment" and "scarcely any attempt" in 1882.⁴⁸ A code that came in vogue called "fisticuff" also concerned him. These fights became a way to settle "petty difficulties" that he declared as a "brutal practice." It applied to only a few within the Corps of Cadets, but Howard reprimanded the Corps stating that the code brought only shame to those involved and the Academy as a whole.⁴⁹ He took a similar approach in the summer of 1881, when he publicly reprimanded the Corps of Cadets for violations of the regulations.⁵⁰

However, always committed to fairness, Howard rewarded the good as well as punished the bad. Because of the good conduct of the Corps' during the 1882 summer encampment, he canceled all outstanding punishment on the weekly punishment lists for the corps of cadets.⁵¹ By the end of Howard's superintendency, circumstances enabled him to report that discipline within the corps of cadets is "not too severe, and yet exacting a prompt and

⁴⁸ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158; Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 158; and Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 55", (USMA: Archives, Aug. 10, 1882), 134.

⁴⁹ This incident can be found referenced in the Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 158; Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 55", (USMA: Archives, Aug. 10, 1882), 134; and Carpenter, 273.

⁵⁰ Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 54", (USMA: Archives, Jul. 11, 1881), 68.

⁵¹ Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 58", (USMA: Archives, Aug. 26, 1882), 135.

military habit and attention to every duty. Good order is maintained, and the police administration is efficient and effective."⁵²

Howard had a strong conviction that the disciplinary system that he inherited and passed on to his successor was too cumbersome, the tendency to multiply delinquency reports and to enforce the reporting by an almost inflexible system of action. He sought relief through the "watchful kindness of the tactical and other executive officers."⁵³ His long range plan was to limit somehow the number of reports by abolishing certain classes of delinquencies and modifying others. He was distraught at

the items of regulations in the law, Army rules, Superintendent's orders, commandant's restrictions, general and special academic delinquencies, with the almost infinite 'customs of service' [that] afford a daily and monthly list sometimes quite startling.⁵⁴

That excessive reporting produces "nervousness, timidity, and uncertain action, ... callousness, and disgust at authority" while it impaired freedom of action, manliness, and wholesome restraint concerned him. He recommended that a board of officers thoroughly reconsider the disciplinary system with the end of the Department of West Point an excellent opportunity to "clean the

⁵² General Howard repeated the opinion of the Board of Visitors (1882) in his Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 158.

⁵³ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 157.

⁵⁴ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 157-158.

slate and start anew."⁵⁵ No one put into action this timely piece of advice.

Besides discipline, Howard instilled a sense of professionalism into the Academy. He established permanent committees for preparing forms for cadet examinations,⁵⁶ he instituted an open door policy,⁵⁷ he brought in a new purveyor of the mess to improve the quality of the meals served,⁵⁸ and perhaps his most enduring legacy was his victory of binding dismissals of cadets by the Academic Board. All of his actions, in one way or another, displayed the type of caring professionalism that pervades the officer corps today.

Whatever was the actual cause for the formation of the committees for preparing forms for cadet examinations, whether or not it was a result of the publicity over Whittaker failing philosophy or Patterson failing law, the result was a professional committee meeting to develop fair and standardized tests for the cadets. A system was now in place to ensure a quality examination which would hold up to any public scrutiny.

Howard's open door policy and improvements in the mess hall displayed his care for his charges. These are two areas that

⁵⁵ References are found in the Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158; and the Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, August 1882), 157-158.

⁵⁶ United States Military Academy Staff Records No. 11, (USMA: Archives, Nov. 10, 1881), 497.

⁵⁷ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158.

⁵⁸ Howard, 488.

commanders today still focus their attention on to enhance the quality of life for their soldiers. He set aside "one hour every day, except Sundays, [was] given to the cadet, if he so desired, to visit the superintendent."⁵⁹ He also cut out some bureaucratic red tape for a cadet to see him outside the established time.⁶⁰ In another display of professional caring, Howard brought in William F. Spurgin as the new purveyor of the mess. Howard had experience with him out West and he impressed Howard. Spurgin's theory was to give the cadets "the best possible of everything" and he produced "good results."⁶¹ He worked as "nobody had ever done before," while reducing the cost and soon the cadets called him "General Spurgin."⁶² Like any professional officer, Howard was looking after his soldiers.

Concerning his authority as a commander, Howard won a victory many before him had lost. He was able to convince the Attorney General that the Academic Board and superintendent had binding authority to dismiss cadets and the Secretary of War or President does not have the privilege to overrule this authority at their whim. This was prejudicial to good order and discipline within the command. Even Sylvanus Thayer, "who may be justly be considered the father of the Military Academy,"⁶³ lost this

⁵⁹ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158.

⁶⁰ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158.

⁶¹ Howard, 488.

⁶² Howard, 488.

⁶³ Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, (USMA: USMA Archives, June 25, 1881), 4.

battle. Howard was resolute and refused to back down when, in January 1881, the Academic Board recommended the dismissal of Cadet James A. Patterson for failing the law examinations and Secretary of War Alexander Ramsey wanted to reinstate the cadet as previously had been the practice. When the new Secretary of War Robert Lincoln took office, he referred the case to the Attorney General Benjamin H. Brewster. The Attorney General supported the dismissal of Patterson and "added that dismissal of any cadet by the Academic Board for deficiency in studies or conduct was binding upon the President and the Secretary of War."⁶⁴ This ended a practice from Sylvanus Thayer's time and lasted until the honor scandal of 1976 when Congress revoked it.⁶⁵

During his twenty month tenure as Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, Major General Oliver Otis Howard instilled discipline and professionalism back into the corps of cadets. With his background in higher education and with blacks and their quest for higher education, Howard was an obvious and politically astute choice for superintendent. Following in the turbulent wake of a highly publicized incident with Cadet Johnson C. Whittaker, Howard guided the Academy through rough times into an era of relative stability.

Within the limited time he had to operate, Howard was able to employ professional practices that helped instill a

⁶⁴ Pappas, 404.

⁶⁵ Pappas, 404.

professional character within West Point, officers and cadets alike. Academically, he made future examinations more fair and valid through the formation of committees designed to make the examinations. In the mess hall, the cadets were getting better meals and the Army was paying less for them. Morale increased. His open door policy established a professional communication line with the Corps. Discipline and his trust in the Corps of Cadets were the foundation of his plan.

By giving the Corps the responsibility to act professionally and the "kindly and paternal execution of our rules and regulations," he achieved his desired results. His belief was "better results would be obtained ... by any system that leans strongly to trusting the young men."⁶⁶ In giving his trust and relying on the responsibility of the Corps of Cadets, Howard instilled the professionalism that allowed the Corps to overcome the racial barriers of society and elevated them to a new height of professionalism. If society ever again calls upon the Corps of Cadets to lead us over prejudicial barriers, then Howard's tenure as superintendent should serve as the model for our success over those barriers.

⁶⁶ Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, (USMA: Archives, October 1881), 158; Howard to General Irwin McDowell, (USMA Library, Special Collections, Mar. 1, 1881); and Howard, 2:490-491.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy. October 1880. United States Military Academy Archives, West Point, NY.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy. October 1881. United States Military Academy Archives, West Point, NY.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy. August 1882. United States Military Academy Archives, West Point, NY.

Carpenter, John A. Sword and Olive Branch: Oliver Otis Howard. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Crackel, Theodore J. The Illustrated History of West Point. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1990.

Howard, Oliver Otis, Autobiography of Oliver Otis Howard: Major General United States Army, Vol. 1 & 2. New York: Baker & Taylor, 1908.

Howard, Oliver Otis, 1830-1909. Papers: 1850-1909. USMA Library, Special Collections: West Point, NY.

Pappas, George S., To the Point: The United States Military Academy, 1802-1902. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993.

Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 55". Aug. 10, 1882, United States Military Academy Archives: West Point, NY.

Post Orders No. 10, "Special Orders No. 58". Aug. 26, 1882, United States Military Academy Archives: West Point, NY.

Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy. June 1881, United States Military Academy Archives, West Point, NY.

United States Military Academy Staff Records. No. 10. United States Military Academy Archives: West Point, NY.